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INTRODUCTION

Since Alfred Klaar's study of Grillparzer's sources for König Ottokars Glück und Ende in 1872, there has been no investigation of Grillparzer's use of historical materials in the writing of his plays. Klaar discusses all possible sources, and points out which parts of the drama are based on which particular source, and which parts of the play are Grillparzer's own inventions. He does not, however, enter into a detailed discussion of why Grillparzer based a particular event on a description from a particular source, and he does not interpret the effect of the author's inventions on the drama as a whole.

More recent interpretations of Grillparzer occasionally make statements about the author's reliance on sources, but they mostly refer to isolated events in Grillparzer's historical dramas or base their findings on a very limited selection of the source material available to Grillparzer. Thus we find Walter Silz's opinion that Grillparzer "improved" upon Ottokar when the character of the Bohemian king is checked against the sources; but as we

1Alfred Klaar, König Ottokars Glück und Ende: Eine Untersuchung über die Quellen der Grillparzerschen Tragödie (Leipzig, 1872).
read on, we discover that Silz based his statement exclusively on one source, namely Ottokar von Steiermark's Österreichische Reimchronik.²

Common also are statements to the effect that Grillparzer followed the historical events, at least the most important ones, closely in one play, but did not do the same in another play. Gustav Pollak, for instance, singles Ein Bruderzwist out as a historically accurate play,³ and Gerhard Heine claims that Grillparzer followed history in König Ottokars Glück und Ende and in Ein Bruderzwist in Habsburg but did not do so in Ein treuer Diener seines Herrn.⁴ August Sauer, however, states that while in Ein Bruderzwist the character of Rudolf II corresponds very closely to the authenticated character of the Emperor, Grillparzer showed complete independence from his sources in other aspects of the play.⁵

In his dissertation, Grillparzer's Turn to the Historical Drama: König Ottokars Glück und Ende, Henry Geitz discusses the development of historical drama before Grillparzer and distinguishes two basic approaches to the


subject. The one is the "subjective" approach, meaning that the dramatist chooses a topic from history, but that his drama is a mixture of historical facts and the poet's invention; the other is the "objective" approach, in which historical events are dramatized on the stage. The theoretical foundation of the practice of the first group was laid by Herder, who advised the dramatist to take a topic from history, but should then, in order not to stifle his creative genius, not slavishly adhere to history. Goethe and Schiller could, as playwrights, belong to this category. On the other hand, August Kotzebue, Karoline Fichler, and Zacharias Werner are the main practitioners of the "objective" approach. Geitz classifies Grillparzer as a dramatist who places poetic truth above historical truth.

In the following study I will discuss Grillparzer's use of historical sources for his three historical plays, König Ottokars Glück und Ende, Ein treuer Diener seines Herrn, and Ein Bruderzwist in Habsburg. The study will investigate the sources and the manner in which they were used in the plays as well as Grillparzer's own statements

---

6 Henry Geitz, Jr., Grillparzer's Turn to the Historical Drama: König Ottokars Glück und Ende (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1961), pp. 4-19. This information is not accurate. The theoretician who treated the nature of historical drama, decisive for German literature, was Gotthold Ephraim Lessing in Die Hamburgische Dramaturgie.

7 Ibid., p. 85.
concerning this use. These three plays present a distinct group as they all deal with Austro-Hungarian history. Libussa and Die Jüdin von Toledo are very often considered historical dramas, but they deal more conspicuously with psychological problems and situations. Friedrich Sengle, for instance, does not consider these two plays to be historical dramas. 

In this study each of the three plays will be treated separately and the discussion of each play will be preceded by a longer or shorter recital of the historical facts which offered the material to the playwright.

\[8\text{Friedrich Sengle, Das deutsche Geschichtsdrama (Stuttgart, 1952), p. 96.}\]
CHAPTER I

HISTORICAL EVENTS AS BACKGROUND FOR

KÖNIG OTTOKARS GLÜCK UND ENDE

The period, 1245-1273, preceding Rudolf of Habsburg's election as the ruler of the Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation in 1273 is usually referred to as the Interregnum.¹ The situation of the Empire, unstable and torn by dissensions since the premature death of Frederick Barbarossa's son, Henry VI, in 1197, became chaotic in 1245 when Pope Innocent IV announced the deposition of Emperor Frederick II at the Council of Lyon. Bruno Gebhardt claims that the term Interregnum is misleading. This period was, indeed, the low point of a long crisis, but even during the almost thirty years in question the German throne was never vacant for very long and, in fact, for the most part it had two kings.²

In 1246, immediately after the excommunication of Frederick II, the ecclesiastical electors, however, without the concurrence of any secular princes, elected Henry Raspe

¹Lynn Thorndike, The History of Medieval Europe (Cambridge, 1928), p. xvi, gives 1256-1273 as the dates for the Interregnum.

to be the German king, or, strictly speaking, Gegenkönig, as Frederick II was still alive. But Henry Raspe died nine months later without having been crowned. It was difficult to find a successor as hardly anybody desired this hopelessly burdensome office. Finally, nineteen-year-old William of Holland was elected in October, 1247. Again only the ecclesiastical princes participated (the Duke of Brabant was present, but he was not an elector), and therefore William was often referred to as the Pfaffenkönig.

In 1251, however, after the death of Frederick II, William was recognized by the secular electors, too, and some cities elected him in special by-elections in 1252. This new alliance of the secular princes with the powerful League of Rhenish Cities displeased the ecclesiastical princes, and the Archbishop of Cologne, Conrad of Hochstaden, negotiated with Ottokar, King of Bohemia, in 1255 to find out whether he would be willing to become a candidate if William could be deposed. In spite of the ecclesiastical activity against him, William's position in Germany continued to gain strength, especially after the

3Ibid., p. 379.

4This term also was applied to his predecessor.

5Ibid., p. 380. Ottokar Lorenz, however, thinks that the Archbishop's trip to Prague was to win Ottokar's support, as one of the electors, for Richard of Cornwall. Cambridge Medieval History is also of the opinion that the Archbishop's trip to Prague (summer, 1256), was to persuade Ottokar to vote for Richard.
death in 1254 of Conrad IV, the son of Frederick II, when even some of the Hohenstaufen supporters began to recognize William as the legitimate king. His cooperation with the Rhenish League, a league of cities founded to preserve peace and defend itself against unfair tariffs, and with other similar smaller leagues gave hope for some unity and order. Previously such cooperation between the crown and the cities had been impossible, since leagues of cities had been forbidden. But the new alliance, which seemed to give hope for the possible restoration of order and the crowning of one ruler who could be accepted as the legitimate king, lasted only until William fell in battle against Frisians in 1256.

After William’s death the Rhenish League took the land under its protection until a unanimously elected king could be secured. But the electors could not agree on a candidate. The Archbishop of Cologne made another trip to Prague, possibly to negotiate again about King Ottokar’s candidacy, while the north German princes—Saxony, Brandenburg, and Brunswick—were seeking the support of the Rhenish League for the candidacy of Margrave Otto III of Brandenburg.⁶ They soon were persuaded, however, by Archbishop Arnold of Trier, to support Alfonso von Castile, who was

⁶Gebhardt, I, 385. (Although Gebhardt refers again to Archbishop Conrad, Oswald Redlich, in Rudolf von Habsburg [Innsbruck, 1903], p. 149, claims that the second trip was made by his successor, Archbishop Engelbert, in August 1272.)
recommended also by Pope Alexander IV. The English King, Henry III, warned the Curia about the French designs on Germany and suggested the candidacy of his brother, Richard of Cornwall. First the Archbishop of Cologne and then the Count Palatine were won over to Richard's cause. According to Cambridge Medieval History, the Archbishops of Cologne and Mainz were paid 8,000 marks each and Louis, the Count Palatine, 12,000 marks for their support of Richard.7 Gebhardt mentions only that Richard schüttete Geld wie Wasser vor die Füsse der Fürsten.8 The Count Palatine and the Archbishop of Mainz journeyed to Frankfurt in order to hold the elections. However, when they reached Frankfurt, they found the city occupied by the Archbishop of Trier and the Duke of Saxony, who denied them entry. They then decided to elect Richard outside of the city gates in January, 1257. The Archbishop of Cologne was also representing the Archbishop of Mainz, who was at the time being held captive in Brunswick, and the delegates of Ottokar eventually agreed to vote for Richard, so that Richard of Cornwall received a total of four votes. (Actually, according to Mitteis, Ottokar's late vote should not have been counted.9) Eleven weeks later the Archbishop of Trier, with the consent

7Cambridge Medieval History, VI, 118.
8Gebhardt, I, 385.
of the electors of Saxony and Brandenburg, elected Alfonso of Castile. Ottokar also voted in this election, so as not to neglect any opportunity to assert Bohemia's electoral right. This right was disputed in the Saxon law-code, a factor which was important in the election of 1273. The problem stemmed from the provision in the Saxon law-code that the electors must be Germans and represent Germans.

According to Mitteis this provision in the code denied the King of Bohemia the electoral right. Lorenz claims that the Saxon law-code granted the King of Bohemia an electoral vote in the case that the particular king was of German descent. Such an interpretation would indeed make Ottokar eligible since his mother was German (Kunigunde of the Hohenstaufen, a sister of Frederick II).

Richard took steps toward being recognized by the German people as king by coming to Germany and being crowned in Aachen by the Archbishop of Cologne. Soon many other cities along the Rhine opened their gates to Richard. Even the Rhenish League, which had previously pledged to recognize only a unanimously elected king, showed very little resistance. The supporters of Alfonso, seeing his indifference toward German affairs (he never set foot on German soil), lost their interest in him, and thus ceased active

---

opposition to Richard.

The Pope, although he had favored Alfonso on account of his plans for a crusade, did not want to antagonize Richard, because he hoped for English help against Manfred, a half-brother of Conrad IV, who had become King of Sicily in 1258. Besides, Pope Alexander IV was not a strong-willed political pope. He could be swayed one way or the other, and in 1259 he was willing to crown Richard. But by this time Richard had returned to England to help his brother, Henry III, with his struggle against the nobility. During Richard's absence his popularity in Germany declined. He came to Germany three more times but never recovered the influence which he had won initially. He died in 1272, four years after his last visit to Germany.

One of the most influential princes of the Holy Roman Empire was the King of Bohemia, which, though inhabited by Slavs, had been linked since the ninth century to the Empire and German culture. Because of numerous inter-marriages the royal family (Přemislids) had become more German than Slavic. It was at the very time of the interregnum that Bohemia reached its most powerful position under Ottokar II.

Ottokar had shown his ambitious designs quite early. In 1248, when he was but eighteen years old and

---

13Cambridge Medieval History, VI, 122.
Margrave of Moravia, he joined a rebellion of the Bohemian nobility against his father, the indecisive King Wenzel. Ottokar's attempt at deposing his father was not successful. Wenzel had full papal support, since the Pope feared that the Bohemian nobility would restore Hohenstaufen influence in Bohemia, and the rebellion was crushed. At that time, although he was not quite twenty years old, Ottokar reached the most important decision of his political career. He saw that the power of the once powerful Hohenstaufens was declining, and he discontinued any connection with their supporters.14 His realization that an alliance with the Papal See was a much more promising prospect to attain his ambitions was to influence his politics in the future.15

Ottokar's next plans were to annex Austria. He had now the full support of both his father and the church. He made friends with the leading Austrian nobility, including the influential Liechtensteins.16 With the cooperation of his father, Ottokar defeated Duke Otto of Bavaria, his main rival for Austrian lands. With the consent of the Bishops Philipp of Salzburg and Berchthold of Passau, who were soon joined by the Bishop of Freising, Ottokar moved into

14Lorenz, p. 88.


16Lorenz, p. 89. (Apparently the Liechtensteins had possessions in Austria and Styria, as on p. 110 Lorenz speaks of Ulrich Liechtenstein being a Styrian.)
Austria in 1251. He declared himself Duke of Austria immediately and entered Vienna accompanied by the three bishops. Ottokar restored to the church all privileges and possessions which it had lost in recent struggles.

Bishop Berchthold of Passau suggested that the young prince marry Queen Margaret to satisfy that part of the Austrian population which was still loyal to the house of Babenberg. Margaret was the widow of Henry (VII), the German king and oldest son of Frederick II, and a sister of Frederick the Fighter, the last Babenberg duke who had died without leaving a male heir.\(^{17}\) The marriage took place in 1252, even though it might have meant the extinction of the Premislids, since Ottokar was the last member of the family and Margaret was in her late forties. Margaret’s attitude toward the marriage is not clear. Some reports claim that she was longing for new power, others that she accepted the marriage proposal only after long hesitation.\(^{18}\) Papal dispensation, which was needed for this marriage since Ottokar and Margaret were related (their great-grandfathers were brothers), came after the wedding had taken place.

Ottokar’s next aspirations, the annexation of Styria, were temporarily checked. King Bela of Hungary,

---

\(^{17}\text{Ibid.}, \text{p. } 94. \text{ Lorenz claims that the report in the Reimchronik that King Wenzel proposed the marriage, is false.}\)

\(^{18}\text{Ibid.}, \text{p. } 95.\)
also a protégé of the Pope, was encouraged by a group of Styrian nobility to enter Styria. They were under the illusion that Bela would make his son-in-law, Heinrich of Bavaria, their Duke and that Styria would thus become independent of her two neighbors, too powerful for comfort, Hungary and Bohemia. Bela and Ottokar went to war in 1253, the same year in which Ottokar became ruler of Bohemia after the death of his father Wenzel. This war did not result in a final settlement between the two contestants as the Pope negotiated a peace in which Bishop Bruno of Olmütz played a decisive role. According to the conditions of the peace, Styria was divided between the two kings, with the bigger part going to Hungary. The decisive battle between Ottokar and Bela came in 1260 at the March River near Kroissenbrunn and ended with Ottokar's victory. Cambridge Medieval History calls it a brilliant victory, but Lorenz points out at least three major mistakes in Ottokar's strategy during the battle. The battle secured Styria at least temporarily for Ottokar. By this time the majority of the Styrian nobility was on Ottokar's side. Ottokar's expansion plans were directed also to the north and northeast of Bohemia. He participated in two crusades of the Teutonic Order against the heathen Prussians; one in 1254-55 mainly to show his gratitude to the

\[19\] Bid., pp. 110-111. \[20\] VI, 438.

\[21\] Lorenz, pp. 198-207.
Papal Curia for its support in his acquisition of the Babenberg inheritance and another in 1268 to help establish Christianity in Lithuania and place this region under his rule. Lithuania was to become an archbishopric with Bruno of Olmütz as its first archbishop. The events of these Eastern crusades are so hazily established that the historians offer very widely varying reports as far as the two protagonists with whom we are dealing are concerned. Mowat states that Rudolf of Habsburg served as an esquire to Ottokar in the first crusade.\textsuperscript{22} Theo Goerlitz, in his chapter, "Der unersättliche Kriegsmann," which fully covers Rudolf's various expeditions and battles up to his election in 1273, does not even mention this Baltic episode.\textsuperscript{23} In fact, by tracing Rudolf's activities we find him in the vicinity of Basel in 1254-55, at the opposite corner of the empire.\textsuperscript{24} Besides, in the middle fifties Rudolf was at odds with the Pope and under a papal interdict not to hold public worship on his territories (excepting Muri and Wettiningen); therefore it is very unlikely that he would have

\textsuperscript{22}R. B. Mowat, \textit{The Later Middle Ages} (Oxford, 1917), p. 21. Mowat's date of 1245 I believe to be a misprint, as at this time Ottokar was not yet on the papal side, and, besides, he would have been only fifteen years old at that time.


\textsuperscript{24}Ibid., pp. 28-29.
wished to participate in an expedition encouraged and promoted by the Curia. Lorenz claims that little is known about who participated in this expedition. He even doubts that Ottokar was the real commander of this campaign, as the king was in Breslau on December 25, 1254 and in Troppau on February 6, 1255, leaving him much too little time to have participated in the entire campaign.

Lorenz assumes that Ottokar sent his troops to join the expedition earlier and made the trip himself when the campaign was already in progress, as he could move faster without the army. He also most likely returned ahead of his troops. Lorenz does not exclude the possibility that Ottokar went again to Prussia in the fall of 1255, since his presence in his own territories cannot be traced at that time. Even the widely held belief that the city of Königsberg was founded by Ottokar and named after him is doubted by Lorenz, since Ottokar did not carry the title of king before his coronation in 1261.

In the same year Ottokar began to worry about having an heir to the Bohemian throne. He legitimized his three natural children, but Pope Alexander IV excluded Duke

---

26 Cambridge Medieval History, VI, 129; Mowat, p. 21.
27 Lorenz, p. 134. Ottokar was, however, considered King of Bohemia after his father's death in 1253, even though the coronation did not take place until later.
Niklaus, the only male child, from the right of succession.\textsuperscript{28}

Ottokar now had to think of a new marriage or face the extinction of the Premislid dynasty, and he therefore decided to divorce Margaret.\textsuperscript{29} The Bishops of Prague and Olmütz nullified the marriage between Ottokar and Margaret, proclaiming as the reason for doing so that Margaret had taken a vow in Trier to become a nun when, after Henry (VII)'s death, she became a widow.\textsuperscript{30} She left Prague in October 1261, for Krems, where she lived on a pension. In the same month Ottokar married Kunigunde, who was, according to Lorenz, a granddaughter,\textsuperscript{31} according to Gebhardt, a niece,\textsuperscript{32} of the Hungarian King Bela. Ottokar immediately sent to Mainz for the new Archbishop Werner of Eppenstein to crown him and Kunigunde. Pope Urban IV approved all the proceedings in April 1262. In fact, it pleased the Pope to see the marriage of Ottokar and Kunigunde as it promoted peace between Hungary and Bohemia.\textsuperscript{33}

Although in 1257 Ottokar had voted for both Richard and Alfonso, he now joined Richard's camp and was instrumental in preventing a new election during Richard's

\textsuperscript{28}\textsuperscript{Ibid.}, p. 226.

\textsuperscript{29}\textsuperscript{Ibid.} Schünemann is also of the opinion that Ottokar divorced Margaret because she could not give him an heir (pp. 162-163).

\textsuperscript{30}\textsuperscript{Lorenz, p. 229.} \textsuperscript{31}\textsuperscript{Ibid.}

\textsuperscript{32}\textsuperscript{Gebhardt, I, 386.} \textsuperscript{33}\textsuperscript{Lorenz, p. 230.}
lifetime in which possibly Conradin of Hohenstaufen could have been elected.\(^{34}\) In return Ottokar had Richard invest him in 1262 with Austria and Styria so that he might feel more secure in his possession of these lands since his divorce from Margaret. The legality of this procedure was questionable, since Ottokar did not appear personally before Richard, and no imperial prince witnessed the event.\(^{35}\)

Ottokar's territorial expansion continued through 1270. He was at war with Bavaria, but when his armies entered lower Bavaria, they found very little resistance. He still enjoyed support from Passau, and the city of Regensburg opened its gates for him, although he had to pull out after two days because Regensburg could not provide for his troops. He entered Eger in May 1266, with Richard's permission, and quickly made friends with the population there by promising to defend them against Conradin and allowing their merchants to cross his entire kingdom without paying tariffs. Eger, however, seems to have been the only clearcut gain of this campaign, as Ottokar realized that he could not decisively defeat Duke Henry of Bavaria. Lorenz again points to Ottokar's military inability.\(^{36}\) Ottokar was forced in the spring of 1267 to a truce which might not have lasted very long if he had not

\(^{34}\text{Ibid.},\ p.\ 215.\

\(^{35}\text{Ibid.},\ pp.\ 217-218;\ \text{and Gebhardt, I, 386.}\

\(^{36}\text{Lorenz, p. 248.}\)
been forced by the Curia to undertake the crusade to the north in the winter of 1267-8.

After Ottokar's return from the crusade, he turned his attention to domestic affairs. His main problem was Styria. Lorenz goes into painstaking details to defend Ottokar against the accusations of tyranny which were launched against him for his dealing with certain Styrian nobles. The nobility in general, not only in Styria, had acquired many lands belonging to the church during the struggle between the empire and the Curia. They also had built fortified castles, although there was a law forbidding such construction. Ottokar endorsed this law, but did not enforce it before his position was secure. After all, in 1248 he had joined the nobility in a revolt against his father, and it was the same nobility who had started the revolt against Hungary to which he owed his acquisition of Styria. But as early as 1265 Ottokar began to break up many castles in Austria and Bohemia. Some of the nobles were so upset that they began to conspire with Hungary, but the details of the conspiracy remain unclear. It is certain that Ottokar arrested the Czechs Benesh, Milota, and Otto of Meissau and had Benesch and Otto executed, as was customary in such cases. In 1266 Ottokar issued an order that all castles built within the last twenty years had to be

37 ibid., pp. 245-250. 38 ibid., pp. 251-273.
Many castles had been built after 1245, during the period when the central government was weak. After the second Northern crusade, which did not achieve the expected objectives, Ottokar invited certain Styrian nobles (Bernhart and Ulrich of Pfannberg, Hartneid of Wildon, Wulfing of Stubenberg, Ulrich of Liechtenstein, and Frederick of Pettau) to Prague. He then imprisoned them, and they were tried for treason but found not guilty. As soon as they agreed to open their castles and have them dismantled, Ottokar freed them. Lorenz points out that if one looks closely at these people, one can hardly sympathize with them. He describes them as opportunists who tried to take advantage of the chaotic situation in order to fill their pockets. They did not even feel humiliated, as Ulrich of Liechtenstein served in Ottokar's army after his imprisonment, and, in many ways, better than before.

The case of Seifried of Merenberg was different. He was not among the invited nobles but was executed several years later for unknown reasons.

With the acquisition of Carinthia and Carniola in 1269 Ottokar's territorial expansion reached its peak. It also showed Ottokar's most successful manipulation of his political career. As in Austria and Styria, Ottokar had many supporters in Carinthia. He was held in especially

41Ibid., p. 290.
high esteem by Ulrich of Sponheim, the Duke of Carinthia. The Duke formally bequeathed Ottokar Carinthia and Carniola in December 1268, in case he should die childless.42 (His first wife and child had died, and he had no children by his second wife.) Whether Ulrich bequeathed these lands to Ottokar out of love for him or because he thought that it would be best for his territory to be placed into the hands of a very powerful monarch is unclear, but the bequest was surprising because the Duke had a younger brother, Philipp, who expected to inherit these lands. Ottokar feared trouble on this account. He therefore used all his influence to have Philipp elected Patriarch of Aquileja. Philipp would have preferred holding this position to being ruler of Carinthia and Carniola, but when Ulrich died within a year, Pope Clemens IV also had died, and there was no pope to approve Philipp's election. (Gregory became pope in 1271.) Not being sure whether a new pope would approve his election, Philipp thought he might be more successful in challenging his brother's testament. By aspiring indecisively for both offices, however, he wound up with none.

Philipp at first found some supporters for his claim, but too many nobles respected the will of the former duke, and the church also was on Ottokar's side. Philipp went so far as to consider an alliance with King Stephan of Hungary, but in 1270, when the powerful Bohemian king moved

42 Ibid., p. 292.
into Carinthia, Philipp was forced to surrender. To avoid trouble from the young widow of Ulrich, who also could have claimed her husband's possessions, Ottokar arranged a marriage between her and his loyal servant, Count Ulrich of Heunburg, his administrator in Carinthia and Carniola.

In 1272 Richard of Cornwall died in England, and the question of a new election arose again. Even during Richard's lifetime the electors had tried to arrange an election, but Ottokar had persuaded the Pope to forbid it. But now the Pope began to realize that a new election was necessary. Alfonso of Castile insisted that now he was the only elected German king and tried to influence the Pope not to permit a new election. However, it had become clear to the Pope that Alfonso was a forgotten man in Germany and could never rally the Germans behind him for a crusade to the Holy Land, which was a favorite project of Pope Gregory X. The Pope also hoped for a strong German ruler who would be able to reduce the power of the French king, Charles of Anjou, who, after the decay of the south Italian kingdom of the Hohenstaufens, had established himself as a powerful ruler and had laid a heavier hand on the papacy than the Hohenstaufens had ever done. Thus Pope Gregory X urged the electors to arrange an election; otherwise he would appoint a king himself.\textsuperscript{43} Goerlitz refers to the Pope's proposition as an ultimatum.\textsuperscript{44} In any case, the papal position caused

\textsuperscript{43}Gebhardt, I, 389. \textsuperscript{44}Goerlitz, p. 50.
quick action, as the electors were afraid that if Gregory X were forced to intervene it would undermine their electoral authority for all times. The Pope gave the electors a free hand as to whom they wanted to elect, except that he forbade the election of Frederick the Bold, a grandson of Frederick II who was sixteen years old in 1273.45

How active Ottokar was to acquire the crown for himself is not very clear. He sent a delegation to Rome which returned convinced that the Curia would not be displeased if Ottokar were elected.46 In order not to be resisted by the powerful Charles of Anjou, he was arranging a marriage between one of his daughters and a grandson of Charles.47 Goerlitz claims that after the Archbishop of Cologne visited Prague in 1272, hopes were high that Ottokar would receive the German crown, and that the King of Bohemia was very active in trying to be elected.48 Harry Bresslau is of the opinion that at the beginning of the year (1273) Ottokar strove eagerly for the German crown.49 Schünemann, on the other hand, states that except for a short moment in 1273 Ottokar did not aspire to the crown.50 Lorenz claims there

45Gebhardt, I, 389. 46Ibid.
47Goerlitz, p. 48. 48Ibid.
50Schünemann, p. 165.
is no reason to believe that Ottokar ever wanted the crown. He thinks that Ottokar had very different designs: to build a new state on the ruins of the decomposed German empire.51

The previously mentioned planned marriage between Ottokar's daughter and Charles of Anjou's grandson seemed very favorable to Pope Gregory X because, although he gave the electors a free hand in choosing the king, he, as well as a number of cardinals on the Curia, thought that Ottokar might be elected,52 and such a marriage would appease Charles, and Ottokar, if elected, would be able to concentrate on an expedition to the Holy Land. By the time of the election, however, Charles had different plans, namely to promote his nephew, Philipp III, to the German throne.53

Among other candidates were Count Siegfried of Anhalt and one of the electors, the Count Palatine, Louis. But surprisingly enough the electors were very quickly united in their choice of Rudolf of Habsburg. The Pope's announcement had come in August, and the majority of electors reached a decision on September 11.54 Ottokar was not even considered. The instrumental figure in the quick decision was Werner of Eppenstein, the Archbishop of Mainz.

52Oswald Redlich, Rudolf von Habsburg; das Deutsche Reich nach dem Untergang des alten Kaisertums (Innsbruck, 1903), p. 154.
53Gebhardt, I, 388. 54Goerlitz, p. 51.
He had been promoting a new election for quite a while, and, after the Pope's ultimatum, he quickly persuaded the other electors to hold the election in Frankfurt. From the start he supported Count Rudolf of Habsburg, whom he had known since 1260. At that time Rudolf had escorted Werner to Rome and back. The long trip made it possible for Werner to become well-acquainted with the Count, and Rudolf made a very good impression on him. Burgrave Frederick of Zollern helped Werner in persuading the other electors to cast their votes for Rudolf. It was Burgrave Frederick who made the trip to Rudolf, at that time besieging Basel, to ask him whether he would accept the German crown. Rudolf answered positively and immediately set out for Frankfurt.

Ottokar was not present in Frankfurt. He was in a battle with Hungary and unaware of what was taking place in the electoral college. A representative of his, Bishop Berthold of Bamberg, appeared in Frankfurt and was, to his great surprise, confronted with the unanimous choice of the electors. He objected to Rudolf's election but to no avail. On October 1, the Count Palatine elected Count Rudolf of Habsburg in the name of all the electors. The disputed electoral vote of the Bohemian king was replaced by the vote of Duke Henry of Bavaria, the brother of the Count Palatine. (Actually Duke Henry was not present,

---

55Goerlitz, p. 31. 56Ibid., pp. 40-41.
57Ibid., pp. 52-53. 58Gebhardt, I, 389.
but his brother cast the vote for him.) The helpless Bishop of Bamberg then returned home. According to Mitteis, a legal historian, the validity of the Bavarian or Bohemian vote was, in this particular case, immaterial, because legally the majority vote, which was four, would have been sufficient, although a unanimous vote of seven made a better impression.59

As soon as Rudolf was elected he promised to forgive all his enemies and free all his prisoners and vowed to become the protector of public peace, notwithstanding the fact that he had been up to now an insatiable warrior.60 He made this pronouncement outside of the Frankfurt Cathedral before a great number of people who could see for the first time his towering figure and hear the determination in his voice.

On October 24, Archbishop Engelbert of Cologne performed the coronation in Aachen, the seat of Charles the Great. The coronation supper had to be delayed one day, instead of being held on the same day as was the customary procedure, because of a dispute between the Archbishops of Mainz and Cologne about who should sit on Rudolf's right. Adolf of Dassel, Archbishop Engelbert's cup-bearer, took Ottokar's place as cup-bearer of the empire at the

59Mitteis, pp. 175-176. Mitteis also goes into detail about how in some cases even two votes could constitute a legal election, but this is immaterial for the purpose of our discussion.

60Goerlitz, pp. 54-55.
coronation supper. Ottokar was still involved in the campaign against Hungary, and it is unclear whether the news of Rudolf's election had reached him by then.61

According to Goerlitz, Rudolf's election must have appeared to his contemporaries, as well as to future generations, as a political miracle.62 To be sure, he did not belong to the class of imperial princes, but he was not, as Ottokar called him, "the poor, little count."63 His ancestors can be traced to the tenth century. The fortress Habsburg is located between Basel and Lucerne, but the Habsburgs also had possessions in southern Alsace and Breisgau.64 Rudolf was born in 1218 and was knighted in 1243. From his father, who died in 1239, he inherited various estates and the administration and jurisdiction of some towns and monasteries (Muri, Säckingen). His first battle experiences began in 1240, but they were fought on a very small scale. In 1240 he witnessed a political event which made a lasting impression on him. He was at the court of Frederick II when a delegation of the Hungarian King Bela pledged Hungary to the empire as an investiture, in return for protection against the Tartars. It was also the beginning of a friendship between Rudolf and the

---

61 Ibid., p. 56. 62 Ibid., p. 43.
63 Gebhardt, I, 389.
64 The following description of Rudolf is based on Goerlitz, pp. 17-42. Other references are footnoted separately.
Hohenstaufen dynasty which lasted to its extinction in 1268. The deposition of Frederick II in 1245 split the Habsburg family into two opposing camps, as some of them, including a brother of Rudolf, joined the papal party. In 1249 Rudolf fought his first successful battle against the papal forces in the vicinity of Lucerne. In return for Rudolf's services after Frederick's death in 1250, Conrad IV invested him with various territories. In the process of acquiring these territories, which were partly under the jurisdiction of the church, Rudolf burned a monastery of innocent nuns in 1254. In a peace settlement with Bishop Berthold of Basel, Rudolf paid indemnity for the burning of the monastery, and the Bishop absolved him from the papal ban that had been imposed on him previously. Rudolf never was able to take possession of all the places invested to him by Conrad, but the ones he did acquire he administered diligently and well.

In 1253 or 1254, Rudolf married Gertrude of Hohenberg, who brought as a dowry the Albrecht Valley which adjoined Rudolf's Alsatian territories and formed a substantial addition to his possessions. Although Rudolf probably married her because of her dowry, it was nevertheless a happy marriage. Rudolf's natural son, Albrecht,

---

65Redlich, p. 87. The date 1245 in Goerlitz on p. 30 must be wrong. It might be a misprint, as he claims that Rudolf's marriage took place in the same year he over-ran the monastery. The year of his marriage is 1253 or 1254.
had been borne by a noble lady called Ita before Rudolf's marriage. 66

A more peaceful period in Rudolf's warring life followed his marriage. In 1254 Conrad IV died, as did Pope Innocent IV. Conradin was too young to rally Hohenstaufen supporters behind him, and Pope Alexander IV was less aggressive than his predecessor. These two factors together caused a lull in the big feud of the empire.

At this time Rudolf's popularity and recognition of his good judgment were spreading outside of his own possessions. In 1257 he was called upon to settle a feud between two quarreling families, and in 1260 he was asked to escort the Archbishop of Mainz to Rome.

In 1261 the peaceful period of Rudolf's life ended. He joined the forces of the Bishop of Strassburg against a citizens' revolt in which he was defeated. He immediately realized that his alliance with the Bishop was a mistake of practical politics and changed his alliance to the citizens' cause in the same year. It has to be noted that at that time Rudolf was not concerned with the welfare of the empire but with his own private politics. Rudolf then became the victor in the Strassburg feud, quite a few territories thus falling under his jurisdiction.

Thanks to his pleasant personality and wit, Rudolf was able to turn many of his enemies into friends, as was

66Ibid.
the case with Abbot Berthold of St. Gallen, but he could not reconcile himself with Bishop Henry of Basel. 67 A war between them started in 1268 over a trivial cause and lasted until Rudolf's election. It was Rudolf's bloodiest war that did not seem to accomplish anything but devastation, in his own as well as in Bishop Henry's territories. After five years of warring Rudolf finally was planning to deliver the crucial blow to the besieged Basel, when Burgrave Frederick of Zollern arrived in his camp. The people of Basel were surprised when instead of the expected attack they saw Rudolf's forces withdrawing from the field. The news of Rudolf's election spread quickly, and it brought immediate peace to the southwest of the empire, but when Bishop Henry heard the news, he is supposed to have said, "Jetzt, Herrgott, sitze fest sonst nimmt dir dieser Rudolf noch deinen Platz!" 68

So we find that Rudolf was a successful territorial landlord during the period of the Interregnum, known to many for his good judgment and good administrative and fighting ability, and yet not so powerful as to cause a threat to those who elected him.

Rudolf's political maneuvering began immediately. On the evening of his coronation he announced the

---

67 Yet even he became very friendly with Rudolf after his election.

68 Gebhardt, I, 390.
forthcoming marriages of two of his daughters (he had six) to two electors, Louis, the Count Palatine, and Duke Albrecht of Saxony. His next step was to appease the Pope. This was necessary because he was known as a strong supporter of the Hohenstaufens, and only six years before he had been in Conradin's war camp. He sent, therefore, a delegation to the Pope with his promise to serve the church in all matters. He promised to help restore to the church all its possessions and to make a crusade to the Holy Land as soon as possible. Pope Gregory X was very much impressed by the unanimous election, and after conferring with some of the cardinals, he gave Rudolf's delegation a letter whose words of address tell the entire story: "An den erwählten römischen König Rudolf."\(^69\)

There were many protests against Rudolf's election, the strongest from Ottokar and Alfonso of Castile.\(^70\) Ottokar sent Bishop Bruno of Olmütz to the Pope, who was meeting at a council in Lyon, and after Bishop Bruno failed to convince the Pope that Rudolf was not fit for his new position,\(^71\) he proffered the argument that the Bohemian electoral right had been ignored, thus making the election illegal. This was answered by the simple formula that Bohemia's one vote was a minority against the other six votes.

---

\(^69\)Goerlitz, pp. 57-58.  \(^70\)Lorenz, p. 483.

\(^71\)Schönenmann claims that the Pope did not want to have a strong German king either (p. 166).
for Rudolf. The Pope wrote to Ottokar trying to persuade him to subordinate himself for the good of the empire, but Ottokar did not accept the conditions because they offered no guarantee for his possessions. In 1275 the Pope persuaded Alfonso to relinquish all pretenses to the German throne, so Ottokar remained the only serious rival of Rudolf.

Right after the election Rudolf seems to have sworn to preserve and restore to the empire its possessions; therefore, any territorial acquisitions after 1245 were declared invalid. The electors, however, ignored Rudolf's pronouncement, at least as far as they themselves were concerned. Furthermore, Rudolf had to share more power with the electors in that all investitures had to have their approval (Willebriefe). Consequently, the Rhenish archbishops who had usurped the most during the Interregnum kept their territories. They also made Rudolf promise to reimburse them for their expenses for the election. It became clear very soon that a showdown between Rudolf and Ottokar was unavoidable because the Bohemian king was the only one besides the electors who had acquired considerable

---

72 Lorenz, p. 484. Goerlitz does not mention that the Pope acknowledged Bohemia's electoral right at any time.
73 Lorenz, pp. 485-486. 74 Schünemann, p. 167.
75 Gebhardt, I, 390. 76 ibid.
77 Schünemann, p. 167. 78 Lorenz, p. 430.
imperial lands. At the Imperial Diet in November 1274, a decree was passed against Ottokar that required him to return to the empire those territories which he had acquired after 1245 (namely Austria, Styria, Carinthia, and Carniola) and appear before Rudolf to receive investitures for his own lands (Bohemia and Moravia). Ottokar was invited to appear at a diet in Würzburg, but he ignored the invitation. He then was invited to a diet in Augsburg, as Rudolf tried, with Pope Gregory X's wholehearted approval, to achieve a peaceful solution. Ottokar sent a representative to Augsburg, Bishop Bernhard of Sekau, who gave a speech in Latin, which not all present could understand, in which he denounced Rudolf's election and made it clear that Ottokar was not going to subordinate himself to Rudolf. This led eventually to a declaration of war, but at the time of Bishop Bernhard's denunciation Rudolf had no means to fight the strong and rich Bohemian king.79

From the moment he was elected Rudolf found himself in financial difficulties. For a while some imperial cities paid their taxes, but soon they, too, balked so that he had to depend mainly on his own territories for income. Rudolf's diplomatic skill, however, was by far superior to that of Ottokar, and this superiority proved to be the decisive factor in the final outcome of the struggle between the two rulers.80 Rudolf came to an agreement with

79 Goerlitz, pp. 79-80. 80 Schünemann, p. 167.
Ottokar’s arch-enemy, Hungary, that Hungary would fight with the empire against Ottokar, thus forming the beginning of an alliance between the Habsburgs and Hungary which lasted until 1918. Rudolf also entered into many minor agreements with and made concessions to individual knights in return for their help in the war against Ottokar. In some cases he gave them back some imperial lands which he had recently restored to the empire. Rudolf also had twelve thousand silver marks from the Pope at his disposal. The money was not intended for a war against Ottokar but for Rudolf’s journey to Rome so that he could be crowned Roman Emperor of the German Nation. Because of the struggle with Ottokar and Pope Gregory X’s death in January 1276, the trip never took place, and Rudolf, regretfully, used this money for war purposes.

Some of Ottokar’s former allies began to leave him and join Rudolf’s side. The most important of these was the new Archbishop of Salzburg, Friedrich of Walchen. He had a strong personality and was able to organize many landlords

---

81 Goerlitz, p. 79. Ottokar had penetrated deep into Hungarian territory so Hungary was glad to have a chance to regain its possessions.

82 Ibid., p. 86. 83 Ibid., p. 66.

84 Goerlitz, pp. 84-85.

85 Ibid., pp. 72-76. He personally was never an ally of Ottokar, but his two predecessors had been and were helpful in Ottokar’s acquisition of Austria and Styria.
against the Bohemian king. Philipp of Spomheim, who still had ambitions to rule Carinthia, also joined Rudolf. Many of the Czechs began to distrust Ottokar and started aiding Rudolf. Lorenz reports a correspondence between a certain Moravian nobleman, Borso of Riesenburg, and Rudolf, starting in 1274, and a complete defection of the Witkoxice family in 1276, but prefers not to commit himself about the extent of the alleged revolt and defection of the Rosenberg family. On the other hand, some Austrian cities, especially the population of Vienna with its Mayor Peltram, were strong supporters of Ottokar.

Ottokar expected Rudolf's attack in Bohemia, but Rudolf left Nürnberg on September 1, 1276, stopped in Regensburg and in Passau, and then moved toward Vienna. He started from Nürnberg with a relatively small force, but on the way his army steadily increased as he was joined by many princes. Of great importance among the princes was Duke Henry of Bavaria, because he had been Ottokar's ally until recently and originally was to defend Austria against Rudolf's attack. An engagement was arranged between one of Rudolf's daughters and the Duke's son, Otto, and Duke

---

86 ibid., p. 74. 87 Lorenz, p. 569.
88 ibid., p. 568. 89 ibid., pp. 584-585.
90 ibid., pp. 582-583. Lorenz doubts whether Ottokar really planned to depend on Duke Henry. Ottokar expected Rudolf in Bohemia and thought that the decisive battle would be fought there.
Henry was to receive the administration of Upper Austria as soon as it could be taken from Ottokar. Thus Rudolf moved with a respectable army toward Vienna, while Ottokar's army was still in Bohemia. The fortresses on the right bank of the Danube went over to Rudolf without a battle, making it difficult for Ottokar's forces to cross the river. Rudolf was besieging Vienna while Ottokar was still on the opposite bank of the river, and the city capitulated after five weeks without Ottokar's forces arriving there. When Ottokar heard about Rudolf's occupation of Vienna, he began to think about submission and peace. The conditions of peace were negotiated by the Count Palatine, and Bishop Berthold of Würzburg for Rudolf's side and Bishop Bruno of Olmütz and Margrave Otto of Brandenburg for Ottokar's side. The outcome of these negotiations was a draft of eleven articles which in the main points contained the following: Ottokar was to receive investitures for Bohemia and Moravia and return to the empire Austria, Styria, Carinthia, Carniola, the Mark, Eger, and Portenau (most of which were already in Rudolf's hands anyway by this time). Parts of lower Austria formed an exception because a marriage was arranged at this time between Rudolf's daughter and Ottokar's son, with the result that these lands eventually would belong to the Bohemian royal family (Article VIII). Article VII, which arranged a marriage between Rudolf's son and Ottokar's daughter, was contradictory to Article VIII regarding the
question of the lands of lower Austria. Lorenz does not exclude the possibility that those two articles were the main reason for future problems. (Ottokar wanted his daughter to become a nun most likely in order to avoid the conditions of Article VII.) On November 25, Ottokar appeared in Rudolf's camp outside of Vienna to receive the investitures and on November 26, the peace treaty was signed. On the same day Ottokar left Rudolf's camp.91

The peace conditions, however, did not please either party. They were dictated by necessity, as Ottokar could not cross the Danube after the fall of Vienna and was endangered in the rear by Hungarian forces. Bishop Bruno's insistence was also of great influence on Ottokar's accepting the peace conditions.92 Rudolf, on the other hand, did not think he could defeat Ottokar's strong army in Bohemia proper. But the peace treaty did not give Rudolf full authority over the lands which Ottokar gave up. Parts of Upper Austria were to go to Duke Henry; Carinthia was to be governed by an incapable ruler, Philipp of Sponheim; and Styria wished to be independent, while Ottokar still had many supporters among the Austrian nobility.93 Ottokar did not consider himself beaten and continued to call himself besides King of Bohemia, Duke of Austria, Styria, Carniola, and Carinthia.94 The wavering Duke Henry of Bavaria once

91Lorenz, pp. 585-593.  92Ibid., p. 588.
93Ibid., p. 595.  94Goerlitz, p. 94.
more became Ottokar's ally, Brandenburg was on Ottokar's side, and the other imperial princes were not eager to fight against Ottokar. Ottokar also called upon Slavic solidarity to stop the power-hungry Germans, and Poland joined his cause. The only strong ally of Rudolf was Hungary. The war erupted again when a small group of Ottokar's supporters attacked Rudolf's troops in Austria in 1278. Rudolf moved then against Ottokar with a relatively small force, which again grew as he moved on and united with the strong Hungarian force. Ottokar moved with his army toward Vienna and the two adversaries met on the Marchfeld near Dürnkrut in August of 1278.

During the battle the advantage swung from side to side. When the first lines met, Rudolf had the advantage; the light Hungarian cavalry was advancing while the Czechs were retreating. But in the second line Ottokar's heavier armor was superior, and the Czechs began to move forward. It looked as if Ottokar were now winning the battle. Even when the third line with Rudolf as its leader joined the battle, they could not stop the forward-moving Czechs. Rudolf himself was almost killed, but a Swiss knight, Walter of Ramswag, killed the Bohemian knight who was attacking Rudolf and saved Rudolf's life. At this point a reserve

95Gebhardt, I, 392.  
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group which had not yet participated in the battle attacked
the Czechs from the side, and the surprised Czechs began to
flee.\(^{98}\) The use of reserves was very unknighthly.\(^{99}\) In
fact, Rudolf found it difficult to persuade his knights to
undertake such action, and the first knight, Henry of
Pfannberg, whom Rudolf approached to lead this group, re-
fused, and Ulrich of Kapellen and Konrad of Sumerau accepted
the leadership very reluctantly. Both Lorenz and Köhler do
not believe the reports that Milota of Diedicz committed
treason against his king by not attacking at the last moment
as he was supposed to do. Lorenz thinks it most likely that
the flight of the Czechs was so complete that Milota could
not rally his troops any more.\(^{100}\) Köhler doubts whether
both kings would simultaneously have thought of using re-
serves when it was so completely against the custom of the
time. He is of the opinion that Milota was leading the
Moravian troops in the first line and was beaten by the
Hungarians to the point that he could not reorganize his
troops to participate in the third line encounter.\(^{101}\)

Ottokar himself fell in the battle. The exact re-
ports of how he met his death vary a little, but he


\(^{100}\)\textit{Lorenz}, p. 679.

\(^{101}\)G. Köhler, \textit{Die Entwicklung des Kriegswesens und
der Kriegführung in der Ritterzeit} (Breslau, 1886), II,
135-136.
definitely was killed after the battle already was decided.

Some accounts are as follows:

Ottokar selbst wurde auf der Flucht von Österreichischen Gegnern unritterlich umbracht. 102

Ottokar selbst kämpft mit seinen letzten Kräften und nur von einer kleinen, versprengten Schar geschützt, gegen ein paar persönliche Todfeinde, die ihn aufge spürt haben, unter ihnen Berthold von Emmerberg, der Truchsess Österreichs. . . . Auch ihn, den schreck lich Erschöpften stossen sie von Ross. . . . und stossen dem tödlich Verwundeten, dem völlig Wehrlosen ein Schwert in die Brust und einen Docht in die Kehle. 103

Der Böhmenkönig blieb in seiner bekannten Tapferkeit zu lange auf dem Schlachtfelde und wurde feige ermordet. 104

Aber er wurde getötet, wobei persönliche Rache eine Rolle gespielt zu haben scheint. Die näheren Umstände werden sehr verschieden erzählt, doch kommen die Nachrichten darin überrein, dass er in rohester Weiss verstümmelt wurde, auch bleiben mehrfache glaubhafte Quellen auf dem Namen Bechhold von Emmersberg [sic], Truchsess von Österreich, haften. 105

But Lorenz, whose book otherwise is very detailed, has only this to say:

Wer wollte da die dunkeln Gerüchte untersuchend nach erzählen, welche die geschäftige Fama von jeder einzelnen Wunde, die man dem Könige versetzte mit epischer Breite zu erzählen wusste. 106

Even though Ottokar fell in this most important battle of his life and did not fulfill his ambitions, he succeeded at least temporarily in expanding his territories

102 Gebhardt, I, 393. 103 Goerlitz, pp. 110-111.
104 Schönemann, p. 169. 105 Kübler, II, 136-137.
106 Lorenz, p. 680.
so far outside of his inherited principality that during the
Middle Ages he was considered a unique phenomenon and fre-
quently he was compared to Alexander the Great. And, in
spite of his merciless punishment of his enemies, Lorenz re-
ports (relying on Bohemian chronicles) his humbleness before
the church.107

After his death Ottokar was praised by his friends
as well as his enemies as the most courageous and noble
knight of the time.108 Many poems were written in his honor.
The following is one by a German poet.

Der gute König ist tot,
Der König ist erlegen,
Des weinen die Augen wie Regen.
Die Witwen und die Armen,
Wer soll sich jetzt ihrer erbarmen?
Der König ist tot, der Ritter,
Der um die Ehre nur stritt!109

107Ibid., pp. 301, 303. 108Goerlitz, p. 111.
109Ibid.
CHAPTER II

GRILLPARZER'S SOURCES FOR KÖNIG OTTOKARS

GLÜCK UND ENDE

Grillparzer took the preparation for his writing of König Ottokars Glück und Ende very seriously. This preparation consisted of a careful study of the historical sources concerning the period covered in the drama. Here is what the author himself said about this matter:

Um nun nicht ohne Not eigene Erfindungen einzumischen, fing ich eine ungeheure Leserei von allem an was ich über die damalige österreichische und böhmische Geschichte irgend aufreiben konnte. Ja selbst mit der mittelhochdeutschen Sprache--die damals noch nicht unter die Modeartikel gehörte und zu deren Verständnis alle Hilfsmittel fehlten--musste ich mich befassen, da eine meiner Hauptquellen die gleichzeitige Reimchronik Ottokars von Horneck war. Ich war damals noch fleissig und notierte und exzerpierte in ganzen Massen.1

Since his early student days Grillparzer had been interested in the events leading to the emergence of the Habsburgs as the ruling dynasty of Austria. This is evident from his essay "Rede zum Lobe Rudolfs von Habsburg" written in 1807.2 However, his serious preparation for writing a drama on this

1Werde, part i, XVI, 166. Part i, vol. XVIII contains Grillparzer's notes of his "research" for this drama.

2Ibid., part ii, VI, 11-16.
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subject did not begin prior to 1819. The preparation for
the drama, which was then written rather quickly, lasted
three and a half years:

Dreieinhalb Jahre. Studien geschichtlicher Quellen für
"König Ottokar" waren der Niederschrift des Dramas,
vorhergegangen, die ihm in kaum vier Wochen gelang.

In this chapter I will discuss the historical sources which
contributed most of the material for this drama.

Grillparzer's main source was a rhymed chronicle
which in over 98,000 lines covers historical events of the
Roman Empire, with particular stress on Austrian and Styrian
affairs, from 1245 through the first decade of the four-
teenth century. Until recently very little has been known
about the author of the chronicle. However, two items about
him, stemming from the chronicle itself, were assumed cer-
tain. They were his name, Ottokar (Otta, 1186),
and that he was in the service of Otto of Liechtenstein
(11. 8120-8121). These two items led eventually to some
more details about the author.

The historian Wolfgang Léus attached to the author
of the chronicle the surname of Horneck. But Joseph
Seemüller, the nineteenth-century editor of the chronicle,

3Ibid., part i, III, 320.
4Walter Naumann, "Grillparzer--König Ottokars Glück
und Ende, Das deutsche Drama, published by Benno von Wiese
(Düsseldorf, 1964), 1, 410.
5Wolfgang Léus, Commentariorum in Genealogiam
Austriacam libri duo (Basel, 1564), p. 21.
stresses the fact that Lazius did not give any explanation as to why he assigned this name to the author.⁶

Maja Loehr, using the aforementioned data which were given in the chronicle, shed more light on the author's identity and ended many speculations which had been based on false assumptions. She searched the records in the Styrian land-archives concerning Otto II of Liechtenstein and found that only two persons with the name of Otтокar were connected with Otto II. One was easily eliminated because of the date of his death (he died circa 1303), and the other, Otacher ouz der Geul, must therefore be the author of the chronicle.⁷ Ottокar's ancestors already were connected with the Liechtensteins, and his great-grandfather, who died between 1274 and 1277, was especially involved in the events of the time. Maja Loehr suspects that many incidents involving famous personalities of the time were witnessed by the great-grandfather and then told from generation to generation until they reached Otтокar, making a vivid impression on him.⁸ Ottокar's grandfather and father participated in the battle of Dürnkrut, and they must have given


⁸Ibid., pp. 101-102.
him the information which the chronicle contains that exceeds the date given in the other sources of the period. Maja Loehr disagrees with her teacher, Joseph Seemüller, who maintained that Ottokar had hired collectors to gather historical data and that he wrote the chronicle for a patron. She is of the opinion that he began to write the chronicle on his own impulse but probably was inspired by the literary ambitions and achievements of the Liechtensteins. (Otto's father, Ulrich, was a poet.) Ottokar was born in 1265 and belonged to a knightly family, but since he never mentions in his work that he was knighted, Seemüller assumes that he never was. Maja Loehr is of the opinion that the only military campaign in which the chronicler participated was that of King Albrecht against Bohemia in 1304. According to her Ottokar was a minstrel from 1287 to 1301. He was well-to-do because of his family status and the money he earned as a minstrel. This made it possible for him to devote much time to literary activity and probably to undertake "research" trips at his own expense. Ottokar's singing teacher was Konrad of Rotenberg.

9Ibid., p. 104. 10Ibid., pp. 115-117.
11Ibid., p. 122; Reimchronik, I, xcii.
12Ibid., p. xcv. 13Loehr, p. 122.
14Ibid., p. 110. 15Ibid., p. 121.
16Reimchronik, I, ci.
Both Seemüller and Loehr agree that work on the chronicle began shortly after 1305.\textsuperscript{17} 1320 usually is given as the date of Ottokar's death.\textsuperscript{18} Maja Loehr found that the last documents bearing his name were dated July 13, 1319 and that on January 15, 1322 his wife appeared as a widow. She also found an entry that he died on September 27, but the year was not given.\textsuperscript{19}

Today the history of literature refers to the author of the chronicle as Ottokar of Steier or Steiermark.\textsuperscript{20} Grillparzer, however, calls him Ottokar of Horneck, both in the drama and in his diaries.

Ottokar often acts as if he had witnessed certain events described in the chronicle. Seemüller does not believe all these references, as some are impossible, others inaccurate. Ottokar implies that he witnessed the battle by Kroissenbrunn in 1260, although he probably was not yet born. His description of the battle of Dürnkrut in 1278—again, he would make us believe that he was present—is full of inaccuracies.\textsuperscript{21} On the other hand, he must have witnessed many

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{17}Reimchronik, I, lxxxviii; Loehr, p. 110.
\item \textsuperscript{18}Wilhelm Kosch, Deutsches Literatur Lexicon (Bern, 1956), III, 1966.
\item \textsuperscript{19}Loehr, p. 124. \textsuperscript{20}Kosch, III, 1966.
\item \textsuperscript{21}Reimchronik, I, xcvi-xcvii. I do not think these inaccuracies are proof that he was absent. If he were there as a ritterlicher Knappe at the age of thirteen, he might not have remembered all the details accurately thirty years later.
\end{itemize}
of the events he recorded, especially the ones taking place after 1292. The chronicle contains elements of popular poetry as well as elements of poetry of the courtly tradition. Ottokar was well acquainted with the literature of his time. Poets, as well as the heroes of the epics and legends, appear in the chronicle. He was strongly influenced by Hartman of Aue's Iwein, and he also imitated Wolfram of Eschenbach and Konrad of Würzburg. Besides being well-read in German literature, he read Latin and consulted Latin historical sources. The author of the chronicle used conversations and speeches very effectively to give vividness to some important historical events.

Historians refer to the chronicle frequently, but they do not regard it as a consistently reliable source. Thus Köhler reporting on the battle of Dürnkrut names the chronicle first as he lists the reliable sources describing Ottokar's death. With reference to Ottokar's crusade to Prussia in 1268, however, he says, "Was die steierische Reimchronik hinzufügt, ist nicht der Wiedergabe werth." We find similar diverse evaluation in Lorenz. Reporting on the marriage between Ottokar and Margaret, he says, "In der Reimchronik erscheint nämlich nicht, wie es in der

---

22Ibid., p. xcvii. 23Ibid., p. cx.
24Ibid., pp. cxvi-cxix. 25Ibid., p. cv.
26Köhler, II, 137, 170.
Wahrheit der Fall war," but in discussing certain details of the battle of Dürnkrut he says that the chronicle is the best source. He adds, however, "Doch muss man sich nur vor seiner Poesie in Acht nehmen." Lorenz mentions several times that the author of the chronicle exaggerated certain events to make them more dramatic. He emphasizes this point especially in his discussion of Ottokar's divorce from Margaret. In *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen im Mittelalter* Lorenz devotes a chapter to Ottokar. Although Lorenz's dates of the chronicler's birth and death, as well as his estimates of the periods when the work on the chronicle began and ended, have since been disproved, his evaluation of the chronicle as a historical source is valuable. According to him no other work of the Middle Ages is so detailed about so many events. The statement, "Nirgend wird man leicht die grösste historische Treue und die unglaubwürdigste Fabeli so dicht nebien einander vereinigt finden," explains why historians sometimes rely on the Reimchronik and at other times are so skeptical of it.

A more recent source expresses similar views about the author of the chronicle: "Er nahm die grössten

---

27 Lorenz, *Ottokar II*, p. 94.


fabelleien auf und erfand wohl auch solche." But this source later adds: "Doch bleibt er für die Geschichte der östlichen Alpenländer ein einzigartiger und ganz unentbehrlicher Gewährsmann. Kein deutsches Territorium kann etwas ähnliches aufweisen."32

Maja Loehr, in her well-researched monograph of the Styrian chronicler, arrives at the following conclusions with regard to Ottokar's political views:

Ottokars eigene politische Gesinnung, die in seiner Darstellungsart zum Ausdruck kommt, ist gegenüber den vor seiner Lebenszeit liegenden Ereignissen ausgesprochen staufisch und antipäpstlich; für seine eigene Zeit ist er ein unbedingter Anhänger der Habsburger und erbitterter Gegner des Böhmenkönigs Ottokar.33

Miss Loehr describes his conception of history as being governed by a metaphysical causality. He believed that people will be punished for their sins during their life on earth.34 Miss Loehr speaks of the errors in some of his historical descriptions. Yet her discovery of the close connections between Ottokar's family and the leading families of the period has again raised his credibility.35

Besides the chronicle Ottokar wrote a lost book on the chronology of the emperors, and he is known to have

---


33 Maja Loehr, Der steirische Reimchronist--ein österreichischer Geschichtsschreiber des Mittelalters (Wien, 1946), p. 11.

34 ibid., p. 13. 35 ibid., pp. 19-20.
intended to write a book about the popes, although he apparently never started it.36

Another source of great influence on Grillparzer was a twenty-volume work, Österreichischer Plutarch, by his contemporary, Joseph Freiherr von Hormayr.37 As the title indicates, it is similar to Plutarch's Lives, and it describes famous personalities in Austrian history. For König Ottokars Glück und Ende, Volume I, containing the life of Rudolf of Habsburg, and Volume XV, containing the life of Ottokar of Bohemia, were of great importance, although occasionally other biographical works were used by Grillparzer.

In the introduction Hormayr explains the importance of biographies— they are the substance and spice of history.38 "Was ist die Geschichte der Handlungen ohne die Geschichte des Handelnden?"39 Hormayr lists in the introduction the main sources which he used for the biographies,40 but an almost complete lack of documentation is noticeable in the individual volumes. Although he promises to picture the people objectively,41 he tends to be intensely pro-Habsburg and very patriotic. In describing the

---

36 Reimchronik, I, cxxiii.
38 ibid., I, iii. 39 ibid., p. vii.
40 ibid., p. xviii. 41 ibid., pp. xx-xxii.
political events of the thirteenth century he favors first the Hohenstaufen and then the Habsburg policies.

Hormayr's works were praised highly in the nineteenth century, but recent literature refers to him as an unreliable source ("der wenig zuverlässige Tiroler"). Friederich Bock also expresses himself about Hormayr's falsifications. He does not discuss the issues involving the biographies of Rudolf of Habsburg or Ottokar of Bohemia, but this article throws a dark light on Hormayr's reliability.

A source frequently used by Grillparzer was Johann Jacob Fugger's Spiegel der Ehren des Erzhauses Oesterreich. The work was written in 1555 but was not published for more than one hundred years. Emperor Leopold, who was very interested in bringing to light the glory of his dynasty, commissioned the poet, Sigismund Birken, to revise Fugger's work for publication. The work starts in 1218 (Rudolf's birth) and ends in 1519 (Maximilian I's

42Constant von Wurzbach, Biographisches Lexikon des Kaiserthums Oesterreich (Wien, 1856-1891), IX, 281.

43Karl and Mathilde Uhlirz, Handbuch der Geschichte Oesterreich-Ungarns, 2nd ed. (Graz, 1963), I, 73.


45Johann Jacob Fugger, Spiegel der Ehren des Erzhauses Oesterreich, ed. Sigismund Birken (Nurnberg, 1668).
death). Only Book I (the almost fifteen-hundred-page volume is divided into six books) refers to historical events pertaining to König Ottokars Glück und Ende. The title page indicates that Birken made quite a few changes: "Aus dem Original neuüblicher umgesetzt und in richtige Zeit-rechnung geordnet aus alten und neuen Geschichtschriften erweitert." Anna Coreth considers Birken’s changes very unfortunate, as he compounded and added to the errors of the original text.\(^46\)

Oesterreichisches Interregnum,\(^47\) by Phillip Jacob Lambacher, also was used by Grillparzer but apparently less frequently than the previously mentioned works. August Sauer has only one reference to this work: "Anschliessend Lambacher’s Österr. Interregnum von 1773."\(^48\) This remark refers to Grillparzer’s research for his play during the summer of 1821.

Grillparzer also was familiar with Franz Kurz’s Österreich unter den Königen Ottokar und Albrecht I.\(^49\) August Sauer claims that he had read the entire work by

\(^46\)Anna Coreth, Österreichische Geschichtsschreibung in der Barockzeit (Wien, 1950), p. 52.

\(^47\)Phillip Jacob Lambacher, Österreichisches Interregnum (Wien, 1773).

\(^48\)Grillparzer, Werke, part 1, XVIII, 9.

\(^49\)Franz Kurz, Österreich unter den Königen Ottokar und Albrecht I (Linz, 1816).
June 17, 1816.50 Kurz does not go into details about historical events, especially those concerning Ottokar. In the introduction Kurz writes the following about his work:

Das erste Hauptstück ist als eine blosse Einleitung zur Geschichte der Regenten Österreichs aus dem Hause Habsburg anzusehen. . . . desto fälliger konnte ich K. Ottokars Regierungs-Geschichte in gedrängter Kürze erzählen.51

The second part of this work, where the author treats the cultural and social life of the thirteenth century in Austria is significant, however. Kurz and Ottokar of Steiermark are the only two writers in Grillparzer's apparatus who discuss the customs and manners of the period.

It is of great significance that Hormayr, Fugger, and Lambacher often relied on Ottokar's Reimchronik. The latter two have frequent references to the chronicle, and the former lists it in his introduction among his sources.52

The above-mentioned sources were all written by Austro-German authors. But Grillparzer also used works written by Bohemian authors. The two most frequently mentioned in his diaries are Franciski Pubitschka and Vaclav Hajek (Hayek).

Pubitschka's Chronologische Geschichte Böhmens unter den Slaven is, according to his own introduction, the

50 Werke, part i, XVIII, 6.
51 Kurz, pp. ix-x. 52Hormayr, I, xviii.
first complete and chronological Bohemian history. Franz Krones also refers to it as the first complete Bohemian history, but considers Pubitschka inferior to his contemporary historian, Gelasius Dobner, the originator of a reliable source collection in Bohemia. Events involving King Ottokar are described in Volume V.

Hajek wrote a Bohemian chronicle (Kronika ceska) in 1541 which was translated into German by Joannen Sandel and published in 1596. The work offers a compilation of events listed chronologically, year after year. The chronicle starts in 649 and ends in 1527. Because the author adhered strictly to the year after year arrangement, the work often lacks continuity, as some events extending over a longer period of time are broken up into disjointed fragments.

Today Hajek's chronicle enjoys little respect among historians. Uhlirz has this to say:

### 53Franciski Pubitschka, Chronologische Geschichte Böhmens unter den Slaven (Leipzig, 1770-1801), I, 6.

### 54Franz Krones, Grundriss der österreichischen Geschichte (Wien, 1882), pp. 30-31.

### 55Vaclav Hajek, Böhmische Chronik, trans. Joannen Sandel (Prag, 1596). Another edition of this translation came out in Nürnberg in 1697. I have been able to see only the 1596 edition. I assume that Grillparzer used the 1697 edition, as the page references in the body of his notes do not correspond to the 1596 edition. Sauer's references are based on the 1697 edition.

### 56Not each year has an entry in the beginning.
Krones, in evaluating Gelassius Dobner, adds the following statement: "Indem er Hajek's Geschichtsfälschungen aufspürte und über den Haufen warf." The most favorable evaluation of Hajek's book is James Westfall Thompson's: "The book based on archive material, had a long-lived success."
CHAPTER III

OTTOKAR'S CHARACTER IN
GRILLPARZER'S SOURCES

Nothing distinguishes the Austro-German sources from the Czech sources as much as the manner in which they present the character of Ottokar. Alfred Klaar says the following about this subject:

A potiori [sic] kann man wohl sagen, dass die böhmischen Quellen mehr auf die Verherrlichung des Ottokar ausgehen, während die Österreichischen ein härteres Urteil sprechen.¹

This is true in most cases, but occasionally, as we will see later, Ottokar is praised by German sources and denigrated by the Czech. All sources, however, agree on Ottokar's greatness, and Klaar adds this statement in discussing the sources hostile to Ottokar:

... wenn sie, wie Ottokar von Horneck, dem Held schwarze Thaten aufbürden, die nicht vollkommen beglaubigt erscheinen, doch die Grösse und Bedeutung nicht in Frage ziehen.²

The Reimchronik describes Ottokar frequently as a tyrant. According to the Reimchronik the most cruell of

¹Klaar, p. 17. ²Ibid.
Ottokar's acts was the execution of Seifried of Merenberg. The circumstances of Seifried's punishment and death point to the extreme vanity of Ottokar. After Ottokar acquired Carinthia and Carniola, he called the nobility of his kingdom into the Drau valley to pay him homage as the Bohemian king. Seifried let Ottokar know that he was sick and did not appear. Ottokar did not accept Seifried's excuse and ordered his arrest. Seifried was then brought to Prague and sentenced to death. There, according to the chronicle, Seifried was not simply executed but tortured until he died a martyr's death. He was hammered to the gallows with his feet up and his head down, and finally a Bohemian nobleman hit him on the head with a club to end his agony. The author's choice of words to describe this event also points to Ottokar's extreme cruelty:

ie harter unde harter
hiez in her kunic pînen.  (11. 11914-11915)

And especially:

mit des Merenberger bluot
hiez er leschen sînen durst.  (11. 11920-11921)

Lambacher, who on two occasions condemns Ottokar for the unjust execution of Seifried, does not believe that Seifried was executed in the cruel manner reported by

3Reimchronik, 11. 11830-11992.

4Other historians ascribe Seifried's absence and his severe punishment to the fact that he was a supporter of Gertud, a niece of Frederick the Fighter, who had claims to Austria and Styria. Ottokar had banished her.
others:

Wie aber die Hinrichtung desselben erzählt wird, riecht solche mehr nach der Fabel, als nach dem Wahren.\(^5\)

In a footnote to this passage Lambacher makes it clear that it is the report in the Styrian chronicle that he doubts:

Da die erste Nachricht hievon von Hornecken herrührt; so kann man um so sicherer glauben, dass, nach seiner Gewohnheit, dieselbe übertrieben sey.\(^6\)

The chronicle also reports twice, without going into details, that Ottokar put Benesch of Diedicz, Milota's brother, in the tower and then burned him.\(^7\)

Ottokar of Steiermark describes the divorce from Margaret as the darkest mark on the character of the Bohemian king.\(^8\) The author even goes so far as to say that Ottokar poisoned Margaret when he married Kunigunde. This accusation is completely unfounded.\(^9\) The author says that the divorce was so unjust to the queen that Ottokar, acting without the permission of the Pope, must have been following the advice of the Devil. He is unwilling to talk about the wedding of Kunigunde and Ottokar because the affair is too repugnant for him. He prefers to bewail the abusive treatment which Margaret received.

---

\(^5\) Lambacher, p. 101.  \(^6\) Ibid., p. 102.

\(^7\) Reimchronik, 11. 13340 and 16560.

\(^8\) Ibid., 11. 9196-9379.

\(^9\) Margaret died six years later (1267) in Krems.
The Reimchronik pictures Ottokar unfavorably mainly in his actions against Austrians and Styrians. In contrast, the chronicle brings out Ottokar's good points when comparing him with other Slavs and Hungarians, and particularly praises his bravery in battle.

The chronicle has nothing but praise for Ottokar's stand against the Hungarians on the side of the Styrians. In this context the Bohemian king is described as a diligent defender of Styrian rights. It is not surprising, therefore, that the author of the Styrian chronicle sides with Ottokar in his war against Bela in 1260 and stresses the fact that many nobles from Styria and Carinthia participated in the battle on Ottokar's side.

Thus, in spite of the cruelties previously described, the Reimchronik often pictures the Bohemian king as a good and compassionate person. The best example of this is his lament for the dead after the battle by Kroissenbrunn, even though it was the greatest victory of his reign:

\[ \text{sin klage wart unmåzen grôs. (1. 6867)} \]

Accenting another good quality of Ottokar, the chronicler portrays him as a mediator for peace. He is praised for negotiating a peace between Bishop Ulrich of Seckau and

\[ ^{10}\text{Reimchronik, 11. 2341-2345 and 2409-2417.} \]

\[ ^{11}\text{Ibid., 11. 6888-6894.} \]
Philipp of Carinthia.\textsuperscript{12}

The author of the chronicle pays a great tribute to the Bohemian king with a colorful passage after his death (Nachruf nach Ottokar, 11. 16735-17078). Even though Ottokar's faults are brought to light once more in this passage, his greatness also is stressed. Thus the passage begins:

\begin{quote}
\textit{hie lac erslagen \text{"uf dem plan}
der aller tiuriste man,}
der ie getruoc kr\text{"one} (11. 16735-16737)
\end{quote}

The author also is amazed that Ottokar's people did not stand by him during his last battle. He calls it a disgrace:

\begin{quote}
ez was wol ein schande (1. 16873)
\end{quote}

The enumeration of Ottokar's faults begins with his failure to serve God and his breaking of His commandments. Ottokar was driven by great ambition in this world:

\begin{quote}
\textit{wand er volfuort mit gelust}
der Werlde \text{"kust}
unde ranc hie alze s\text{"ere}
nach der zergenclichen ere, (11. 16763-16766).
\end{quote}

But the author hopes that Ottokar will be forgiven:

\begin{quote}
daz sol im got vergeben. (1. 16770).
\end{quote}

Ottokar's cruelty when in a rage is stressed again in this "posthumous speech":

\begin{quote}
\textit{und s\text{"in grimmige muot,}
daz er gerne menschenbluot}
umb kleine schulde verg\text{"ez.} (11. 16907-16909)
\end{quote}

At the end of this passage Ottokar's unfaithfulness

\begin{quote}
\textsuperscript{12}ibid., 11. 8339-8372.
\end{quote}
is pointed out:

er was mit unkiusche, (l. 17032).

In summarizing Ottokar of Steiermark's picture of the Bohemian king, we may say that Ottokar was a very ambitious king who strove for too much power and prestige. In order to achieve his goals, he was at times extremely cruel. For these excesses he was punished. Ottokar was a man with a complex personality, having good as well as bad traits of character. Even though the author censures Ottokar for often not serving God in the proper manner, he praises him as a protector of the church for his actions as mediator for peace.

er beschirmt daz goteshus
als verre, als er mohte. (11. 8371-8372)

Above all Ottokar possessed courage, a quality which was considered in his time one of the highest manly virtues.

Joseph Seemüller summarizes the opposing traits of Ottokar's character, as described in the chronicle, in the following manner:

König Ottokar von Böhmen ist z.b. überall dort sympatisch behandelt, wo er mit den Bayern oder insbesondere mit den Ungarn zu thun hat, ungunstig aber, wo sein verhalten gegenüber der Babenbergerin Margarethe erzählt wird, oder wo er in gegensatz zu König Rudolf tritt.13

Although Hormayr was not in agreement with Ottokar's policies, he was fascinated with his personality. His

13Reimchronik, p. cxxi.
description of Ottokar's life is more than thirty pages longer than his description of Rudolf's life, and even in the latter he devotes much space to the Bohemian king. Hormayr refers to Ottokar as a tragic hero.\textsuperscript{14}

Ottokar's atrocities, which are described at such length in the chronicle, are mentioned by Hormayr but not dwelt upon. Seifried of Merenberg's execution, for instance, is reported as unjust but with no mention of torture. Furthermore, Hormayr claims that Ottokar showed great remorse after the execution and had an epitaph placed on Seifried's grave saying that he died innocently.\textsuperscript{15}

Among the worst atrocities of Ottokar reported by Hormayr, and not mentioned by other sources, is his order that the imperial messengers who had been sent by Rudolf to the Bohemian capital to negotiate on behalf of Rudolf be hanged on the gates of Prague. In this connection the author also mentions the burning of some Bohemian nobles whom Ottokar did not trust.\textsuperscript{16}

Hormayr describes Ottokar's ambition ("ergeitzig ohne alle Schranken")\textsuperscript{17} as the worst trait of his character. He pictures Ottokar as a man strong in spirit who always was involved in restless activities. He was much

\textsuperscript{14}Hormayr, XV, 71. \textsuperscript{15}ibid., p. 48.
\textsuperscript{16}Ibid., I, 24-25 and XV, 54-55.
\textsuperscript{17}Ibid., I, 23.
more experienced in the arts of war than in those of peace; he worshipped war and was arrogant without limit. Only the fact that his long chain of luck finally had broken explains Ottokar's irresolution after his first unsuccessful undertakings against Rudolf. Everything that Ottokar said or did was based upon impulse rather than on long, carefully weighed, cool deliberation. He quickly started and carried through feuds, sometimes with little apparent provocation. Even his officers were true copies of their master—impatient, impetuous, and violent. He rewarded his faithful subjects royally, but he punished his enemies inhumanly. Hormayr thinks that the only reason his enemies never found a willing assassin is the fact that opposition led him to such rage and made him so dangerous that nobody was brave enough to undertake the risk.18

Like Ottokar of Steiermark, Hormayr stresses Ottokar's faults mostly in discussing his actions against the Austrians and Styrians. By contrast, Hormayr pictures Ottokar more favorably in his relationships with Hungarians and Bavarians, sometimes mentioning good traits in the Bohemian king. For instance, Ottokar advised the Styrians to be patient in their feud with Hungary, since he could not help them at the time because of the armistice.19 When renewed hostilities broke out between Hungary and Bohemia, it

18Ibid., I, 23. 19Ibid., XV, 31.
was Hungary that broke the armistice while Ottokar waited patiently.\textsuperscript{20} Moreover, Ottokar is described as the defender in the early 1270's of Styria against Hungarian barbarism.

Like the Styrian historian, Hormayr pictures Ottokar as a courageous hero. He praises the Bohemian king especially for his bravery and honor in his last battle. Hormayr reports the following as Ottokar's last words:

\begin{quote}
Wie der Erste im Leben, so muss ein König auch im Tode der Erste seyn. Ich will diese meine Würde behaupten, so lang ich noch ein Arm regen kann--
\end{quote}

And then the author adds:

\begin{quote}
und er sprengte sein Ross in das dichteste Gedränge hinein. Hätten alle gethan wie er, der Sieg wäre ihre gewesen.\textsuperscript{21}
\end{quote}

Although Ottokar failed in his ambition to make his kingdom an example during his lifetime as well as for the time to come, he nevertheless succeeded in introducing many useful reforms from which not only Bohemia proper but also Austria benefitted:

\begin{quote}
Brünn dankt ihm seine städtischen Satzungen, Iglau seine Bergrechte, Österreich einen kraftvoll gehandhabten Landfrieden und bessere Gerechtigkeitspflege.\textsuperscript{22}
\end{quote}

Hormayr characterizes Ottokar in the following manner:

\begin{quote}
Das sind Eigenschaften eines stürmischen, nicht eines schwarzen Gemütthes.\textsuperscript{23}
\end{quote}

Fugger's work is devoted to the history of the
Habsburg dynasty, and consequently he does not discuss the Bohemian king except for his confrontations, direct and indirect, with Rudolf. From the few passages concerning themselves with Ottokar, it is obvious that Fugger belongs to the anti-Ottokar camp:

Gleichwie nun Ottocar, in diesem allen/wider Ehre/Recht und Billichkeit gehandelt.\(^{24}\)

The author's particular accusations are that the Bohemian king subjected Austria, Styria, and Carinthia to tyranny, kept a mistress while married to Margaret, and poisoned Queen Margaret\(^{25}\) (the latter accusation, as already mentioned, has not been historically documented). Ottokar supposedly abused a sister of Merenberg, then later hanged him, and also abused Benesch's daughter, later hanging Benesch for complaining about the matter.\(^{26}\)

Fugger also mentions Ottokar's arrogance, and, like the two other historians already cited, pictures him as a brave man, but without glorifying his bravery as much as the others did.\(^{27}\)

The only positive characteristic of Ottokar allowed by Fugger is contained in the excerpts of the speech to his subjects before his last battle. Ottokar told his people

\(^{24}\)Fugger, p. 88. \(^{25}\)Ibid.

\(^{26}\)Ibid., p. 104. Fugger is the only source which mentions a sister of Merenberg, but the abuse of Benesch's daughter is mentioned also by Hormayr (XV, 39).

\(^{27}\)Ibid., p. 87 and pp. 104-105.
that if they intended to act against him, they should do it now, because if they acted later it would cost not only his life but also the lives of thousands of others. Even though this was a moving speech, Fugger implies that he doubts Ottokar's sincerity.\(^{28}\)

Of all the Austro-German sources, Lambacher is the least hostile to Ottokar. He does not picture him as a good person, but also he does not make him such a villain as some of the others do. Lambacher does not believe some of the cruelties ascribed to the Bohemian king by the other Austrian authors and gives justifications for some acts of Ottokar for which he was called to account in other sources. As previously mentioned, Lambacher disagrees with the chronicle as to the manner in which Seifried of Merenberg was executed. He also gives evidence that Ottokar did not poison Queen Margaret.\(^{29}\) Lambacher states that Ottokar banished Gertrud from Styria probably because Seifried was in her service and Ottokar suspected him of treason. Even though the suspicion was unfounded, he thought that Gertrud might also have been involved.\(^{30}\) Lambacher does add, however, that she had received a pension that was rather substantial in terms of that period.\(^{31}\)

In general, Lambacher presents Ottokar as an ambitious man longing for greatness. He was trying for the

\(^{28}\)Ibid., p. 103.  \(^{29}\)Lambacher, p. 89.
\(^{30}\)Ibid., p. 83.  \(^{31}\)Ibid., p. 81.
most part to achieve his goals by legal means, even though the author consistently questions the legality of some of Ottokar's "legal" procedures. Thus, although Lambacher states that Ottokar felt justified in his claim to Austria and Styria because King Richard had invested him with these lands, he questions the legality of the investiture.  

Lambacher points out a similar lack of legality in the acquisition of Carinthia and Carniola. Ottokar not only relied on Ulrich of Sponheim's testament but also on the judgment of four arbitrators who told Philipp, Ulrich's brother, to give up claim to these lands. Lambacher stresses, however, that the acquisition was illegal—that according to the old German feudal law Ulrich had no right to make Ottokar his heir.

Only after Rudolf's election did Ottokar begin to ignore legal steps. The author summarizes Pope Gregory X's arbitration efforts in the following manner:

Ottokar aber ward väterlich ermahnet, nicht das, was er wünschte, sondern was sich geziemte, in Erwägung zu ziehen; sogleich sich mit dem Kaiser, zum Besten der ganzen Christenheit, zu vereinigen, und mit demselben zu Wiederherstellung des Reichs nach allen seinen Kräften mitzuwirken.

Ottokar, of course, did not follow this advice.

The Czech historians show the Bohemian king in a completely different light. For the most part they have

---

32 ibid., p. 77. The legality of this investiture was discussed on page 17.

33 ibid., pp. 94-100. 34 ibid., p. 131.
nothing but praise for the young king. Franz Pubitschka describes him as a man of great generosity, wisdom, piety, and other royal virtues. He quotes from Prebendary Franz of Prague what he considers to be the best description of Ottokar's character:

Ein gewisser Eifer der Frömmigkeit, sagt dieser Geschichtschreiber, beseelte ihn durch seine ganze Regierung; hörte die Klagen der Wittwen gern, und sprang den Waysen in jeder Noth schnell bey. Während vierzigtagigen Fasten verfügte er sich zur Nachtzeit von einem einzigen Diener begleitet, und ohne von jemanden bemerkt zu werden, täglich in die Kirche, wo er am Boden liegend sein Gebet mit so vieler Innbrust verrichtete, dass er ganz in Tränen zerfloss; noch vor Anbruch des Tages aber liess er jenen von seinen Hofleuten rufen, dem er die Sorge für die Armen aufge- tragen hatte, um ihn zu fragen; ob er auch für dieselben alles veranstaltet habe; denn der König pflegte durch die ganze Fastenzeit täglich 800 Arme zu speisen; die er auch durch den edlen Gregor von Drazicz am Charfreytag kleiden liess. Eine gleiche Wohltat erfuhr auch sonst viele Arme von ihm; besonders aber ein jeder von der Clerisey, dessen er nur an- sichtig geworden. Am grünen Donnerstage wusch er 12 Arme zur Ehre der 12 Aposteln die Füsse, und be- schenkte einen jeden mit einem Stück Münze. Oft sprach er in der Prager Hauptkirche die Priester persönlich an, und bade sie für das Heil der Lebenden, für die Ruhe der Abgestorbenen; zur Ehre der heiligsten Dreyeinigkeit, des heiligen Geistes, der seligsten Jungfrauen, der böhmischen Schutzheiligen, Messen zu lesen, und drückte einem jeden dieser Priester 2 Gold- oder Silberstücke in die Hand. Überhaupt kann seine Freybebigkeit gegen hohe und niedrige nicht genugsam beschrieben werden; und immer umgab ihn eine grosse Anzahl von adelichen und adnern Armen. Die königliche Hofkapelle war mit dem kostbarsten mit Gold durch wirkten Stof ausgezirert; und die Gefässe in derselben, waren von dem feinsten Gold; oder doch aus künstlich gearbeiteten Silber. Dieses ist gewiss eine Schilderung, die in uns einen sehr hohen Begriff von Ottokars Frömmigkeit erwecken muss.35

As another proof of Ottokar's piety Pubitschka

35Pubitschka, V, 356-357.
offers the king's belief that his glorious victory over Bela, which was undoubtedly the most important event in his path to success, was accomplished only through God's grace. He therefore felt that nothing was more urgent than to present the donor of this victory with a sacrifice of thanks. Zealous prayers were performed in entire Bohemia, Austria, and Moravia. Even Germans from as far as Cologne joined Ottokar's subjects in this act of religious devotion. For his part, the king made a vow to build a monastery, a promise which he fulfilled in 1263.36

According to Pubitschka, however, nothing is a clearer proof that Ottokar attributed his victory to divine grace from heaven than his letter to Pope Alexander IV, in which he described in detail the origin, the course, and the result of the battle with Bela. In this letter he once more expressed his thanks and devotion to God.37

Another feature of Ottokar's personality, which is stressed heavily by Pubitschka but not mentioned by the Austrian sources, is the king's humility, which the author describes as having its root in his genuine love for his subjects. According to Pubitschka, in the early stages of Ottokar's reign and before the deciding battle with Bela, Styria wanted Ottokar for its duke, but he refused. He thought that his rule would be good for the people of Styria; he feared, however, that at this time the Hungarian

king would not give up peacefully his rights to Styria, and Ottokar did not want to cause bloodshed. He later accepted the investiture of Styria when it was offered to him by Richard of Cornwall. 38

A second example of Ottokar's humility and consideration is seen in Pubitschka's description of his refusal to accept the German crown. After William of Holland's death Ottokar was the first candidate considered by the electors for the crown. This is fully understandable considering his power, his regal qualities, and his acquired fame. The Archbishop of Cologne came in person to Prague to negotiate Ottokar's candidacy, but the king did not accept the honor. 39

After Richard of Cornwall's death, the Archbishop of Cologne, accompanied by many nobles, made another trip to Prague in the name of the German electors and urged Ottokar to accept the crown of the German Empire. 40 The Bohemian king received this noble legation in a most friendly way and entertained them royally. The offer seemed so important to him, however, that he did not want to reach a decision without conferring with his advisors, whose age and wisdom inspired his confidence. Some were

38 Ibid., pp. 300-301. 39 Ibid., p. 288.

40 Pubitschka does not mention it, but if both offers were true, two different Archbishops of Cologne must have been involved. For the view of modern historians on this issue see pp. 8 and 22.
for acceptance and some were against it, but a speech by Andreas of Riziczan against acceptance was the most influential factor in Ottokar's refusal of the crown. Pubitschka adds that although some Austrian historians doubt that Ottokar ever was offered the German crown, he is convinced that the Bohemian king did receive the offer.41

Pubitschka occasionally points to bad traits of Ottokar's character. Besides discussing many good deeds of the Bohemian king, the author also talks about the cruel executions of some nobles, among whom was Benesch of Diedicz. Pubitschka makes it clear that these nobles deserved to be punished because they had committed treason, and he refers to them as criminals.42 He also describes the cruel execution of Seifried of Merenberg and states that Ottokar's initial anger was caused by Seifried's not greeting him personally; but he adds that the Styrian nobleman was accused of robbery and murder:

Nun fehlte es nicht an Verleumdern die Sifrieden vieler Räubereyen und Mordthaten beschuldigten; und ich kann nicht sagen, ob ganz ohne Grund.43

In general one can say that Pubitschka presents Ottokar as a model king, who, however, occasionally showed poor judgments during his reign. He is aware that there are many accusations charging the king with cruelty. He

41 Pubitschka, V, 385-386. 42 Ibid., pp. 348-349. 43 Ibid., p. 390.
refutes these accusations in the following statement:

Was Ottokars Strenge betrifft, über die einige öster-
reichischen und steyrischen Grossen klagten, so hät-
ten sie dieselbe nur ihrer Untreue, und ihren aufrührri-
schen Anschlägen zuzuschreiben; nicht aber der Ge-
mühtsart eines Fürsten, dessen Milde und Wohlthätig-
keit sonst jederman erfahren.\textsuperscript{44}

Hajek's portrayal of Ottokar is similar to Pub-
itschka's. Grillparzer expressed himself in this way about
Hajek's picture of the Bohemian king:

Hayek stellt den Ottokar als sorgfältig in der Beo-
bachtung Äusserer Religionspflichten, dar.

Hayek nennt ihn einen gütigen und gerechten König.\textsuperscript{45}

There are many examples in Hajek's chronicle that
might cause the reader to reach this conclusion:

Primislaus Ottogar/ der König in Böhmen/ der ein
gütiger vnd gerechter Herr/ vnd seinem Königreiche
sehr genaigt gewesen/ trachtete mit allem fleiss dar-
nach/ vnd hielt Raht mit seinen Getrewen/ wie er das
Königreich Böhmen bey seinem Leben erweitern vnd
zur Ruhe stellen möchte.\textsuperscript{46}

Hajek gives many examples to show how just Ottokar
was toward poor people. The following example, however,
might be considered by some observers as showing rather
harsh treatment by Ottokar of one of his subjects. In
1265, while most of the Bohemian army was guarding Bohemian
borders to prevent a Bavarian invasion, some of the knights,
who were supposed to be keeping order in Moravia and Bo-
hemia, were plundering the countryside instead. Ottokar

\textsuperscript{44}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 410. \textsuperscript{45}\textit{Werke}, part 1, VIII, 14.
\textsuperscript{46}\textit{Hajek}, p. 330.
asked the commander of this group how he could allow his men to do so much damage to the poor people, and when the commander answered that he could not prevent it, the king ordered his execution, sold his possessions and used the money to compensate the people who had been robbed. Hajek ends this passage with these words:

Manniglichen wunderte sich über des Königes Gerechtigkeit und batten ihm ein langes Leben.47

To point to Ottokar's piety, Hajek uses mostly the same examples as Pubitschka. The letter to the Pope after the victory over Hungary in 1260 is stressed the most.48

Hajek stresses the fact that Ottokar consulted the Bohemian elders on all important decisions. This picture is contrary to the one given us by Hormayr, who portrays the Bohemian king as a man of rash decisions. Thus Hajek says that it was the Bohemian nobility who advised Ottokar to divorce Queen Margaret in order to insure an heir to the Bohemian throne through a second marriage. After receiving Ottokar's agreement to abide by this advice, they wrote to the Pope asking him to allow the divorce, giving Margaret's inability to bear children and her vow not to remarry as reasons for the divorce. The Pope gave his permission:

Als der Babst diese Ursachen vernommen, hat er seinen Willen därein geben.49

According to Hajek, Ottokar's actions against Rudolf

47Ibid., p. 329.
48Ibid., pp. 321-326.
49Ibid., p. 326.
also resulted from advice received from the Bohemian wise men. In 1275 he called them in and asked whether to submit to Rudolf's demands or to resist him. All but one, Boresch of Ossegk, advised resistance, and thus resulted the confrontation of the two kings in 1276.\(^{50}\)

Often Ottokar regretted that he listened to his advisors, especially so after his 1276 agreement with Rudolf:

\begin{quote}
Desgleichen bedachte er auch seiner Böhmischen Herrn bösen Raht/ in dem sie ihme gerahten/.das er mit dem Kayserthumb zu frieden sein/ vnd sich an deme was er hette/ begnügen lassen solte.\(^{51}\)
\end{quote}

The atrocities committed by Ottokar which are discussed by other sources, namely the executions of Seifried of Merenberg and Benesch of Diedicz, are not mentioned by Hajek. He occasionally mentions trials which ended with death sentences or banishments, but he usually does not attribute such decisions to Ottokar personally (the aforementioned execution of the commander is one of the very few exceptions).

The humility of Ottokar, which is so often stressed by Pubitschka, is not mentioned by Hajek. Hajek is, however, very critical of the Bohemian king for his pro-German leanings.

\begin{quote}
Auff einen Tag/ hiess König Wenzeslams alle Bühmen/ aus der neuen Prager Vorstadt ziehen/ vnd besetzte
\end{quote}

\(^{50}\)Ibid., p. 336.

\(^{51}\)Ibid., p. 337.
Although King Wenzel is mentioned in the above citation, it is undoubtedly an error. It must refer to Ottokar. The passage is under the 1257 entry, four years after King Wenzel's death, and the paragraph from which the quotation was taken begins:


This must undoubtedly be a reference to Ottokar. (Hajek does not use the name Ottokar until his coronation in 1261.)

Hajek complains several times about the preferential treatment which the Germans received in Bohemia. He considers the replacement of the Czech population by Germans in the suburb of Prague as the worst offense.

From the above one can see that the sources present Ottokar as a man of complex personality. Since the sources do not agree on all the traits of his character, one cannot give a definitive general picture of the king which would cover all his characteristics. Some traits, however, are clear. Ottokar was a very ambitious person and was very determined in achieving his goals, even when this meant being extremely severe with certain individuals. And even

Hajek, p. 321. The original Czech version of 1541--reprinted in 1819--p. ccxxxx, states "Kral rozkazal" (the king ordered) without attaching a proper name.
though he did not achieve all his goals, he was considered a
great king by his enemies as well as his supporters.
CHAPTER IV

RUDOLF'S CHARACTER IN GRILLPARZER'S SOURCES

Rudolf's character was completely different from Ottokar's. Hormayr neatly sums up the difference between the two men by calling Ottokar a tragic hero and Rudolf an epic hero.1 Rudolf was not a controversial figure, and therefore he was less dramatic. All sources praise him as a virtuous man, and very rarely do we find any criticism of him.

The author of the Styrian chronicle does not tell us much about Rudolf's life up to his election in 1273.2 But from this moment on Rudolf holds a central place in Ottokar of Steiermark's work and appears in the most favorable light. The author portrays the new emperor as a man of perfect virtues. He was generous, prudent, and courageous when faced with danger:

\[
daz
er\text{ an tugenden war volkomen,}
er\text{ er het sich dàmit für genomen,}
daz
er\text{ er was milt genuc,}
zurliuge witzic und kluoc,\]
menlich in herten freisen, (11. 12661-12665).

1Hormayr, XV, 71.

2He is mentioned once (l. 12072), less than 300 lines before his election is discussed.
Rudolf is then described as a protector of widows and orphans and as an impartial judge:

\textit{ein schirmbar wibben und weisen guot und gemeiner richtare} (11. 12666-12667).\textsuperscript{3}

He is very firm, yet merciful and humble. He stands as an example, embodying all the knightly virtues.\textsuperscript{4}

Ottokar of Steiermark is repetitious in praising Rudolf, mentioning the same virtues again and again. In a passage paying tribute to Rudolf after his death, the author says in a poetic manner that the Emperor had so many virtues that it would be impossible to list them on one tombstone.\textsuperscript{5}

Hormayr portrays Rudolf as a man of great spirit, one who is respectful of all that is noble and holy:

\textit{Aus dem, was bisher vorgekommen, erheilet schon satt-sam Rudolphs tieifes Gemüth und ruhmwürdige Ehrfurcht für alles Edle, Grosse und Heilige. Mehrere Klöster hat er gestiftet, viele bereichert.} \textsuperscript{6}

Rudolf often showed great political skill, and he could be humble when the situation called for it. Hormayr reports that Rudolf, at the time when he was still only a count, had a feud with the Abbot of St. Gallen. Since he

\textsuperscript{3}These characteristics given here to Rudolf are dictated by the unchangeable and all-pervading model of the "laudativ regis." Protection of widows and orphans and the fair dispensation of justice belong, since the Jewish kings of the Bible, to the hallmarks of the truly God-sent ruler. This applies to Ottokar as well. He protects and feeds the unprotected and poor. (See p. 67.)

\textsuperscript{4}\textit{Reimchronik}, 11. 12669-12677.

\textsuperscript{5}\textit{Ibid.}, 11. 39172-39194.

\textsuperscript{6}Hormayr, I, 15.
could not fight against the Abbot at the same time as he was fighting against the Bishop of Basel, he resorted to the following gesture, noble and politically shrewd at the same time. The Abbot had invited all his supporters to plan their strategy against the Count, when Rudolf appeared unexpectedly at their meeting and humbly recognized the Abbot as his liege lord. He promised to accept the judgment of arbitration and asked for peace. The assembled men were so impressed with Rudolf’s speech that they immediately accepted his proposal and pledged support for him in his feud with Bishop Henry of Basel.7

Hormayr stresses Rudolf’s composure, presence of mind, and calm calculations. Rudolf was capable of making quick decisions when the situation demanded speed, and once he had made a decision, action followed swiftly.8

According to Hormayr, the most humane trait of Rudolf’s character came to light during the preparation for the battle against Ottokar in 1278. A few conspirators from the Bohemian camp came over to Rudolf and informed him that they were planning to kill his greatest enemy, Ottokar of Bohemia. The conspirators hoped to be praised by the Emperor, but instead, to their great surprise, they were scorned by him. Furthermore, Rudolf sent messengers to the

7Ibid., I, 14-15.
8Ibid., I, 14 and 21, and XV, 69.
Bohemian king to warn him about the conspiracy.\(^9\) When the battle started, Rudolf ordered his troops to spare Ottokar's life.\(^{10}\)

In spite of his achievements, Rudolf's way of life was simple. In all enjoyments of life he showed great sobriety. After a victory he was moderate, generous, and forgiving toward his enemies.\(^{11}\) Hormayr ends Rudolf's biography by portraying him (and Maria Theresa) as models for all rulers:

Dieses haben der Erste und die Letzte vom Hause Habsburg, Rudolph und Maria Theresia miteinander gemein, dass sie wohl unstreitig die Grössten desselben gewesen,---dass das reine Wohlwoilen ihres Herzens, dass die Weisheit ihrer Entschlüsse, die Kraft ihrer Handlungen, die dankbare trauer ihrer Völker nach Jahrhunderten,---den Herrschern aller Zeiten zum hehren Vorbilde, zur erhebensten Ermunterung dienen mögen.\(^{12}\)

Hormayr mentions that Rudolf was excommunicated by the church twice before he was thirty years old, but he blames the action entirely on the officials of the church and not on Rudolf. In fact, he praises the young Count for being able to see through the machinations of the clergy.\(^{13}\)

Johann Jacob Fugger, in *Spiegel der Ehren*, gives a very detailed description of Rudolf's activities. He consistently stresses Rudolf's piety, generosity, and bravery and gives many examples to back up his statements. Once

\(^9\)ibid., I, 33, and XV, 64.

\(^{10}\)ibid., XV, 67.  \(^{11}\)ibid., I, 46.

\(^{12}\)ibid., pp. 47-48.  \(^{13}\)ibid., pp. 16-17.
when Rudolf was returning from a hunt, he met a priest who was going by foot in bad weather to visit a sick person. Rudolf gave his horse to the priest and said these words:

Es ist nicht recht/ dass ich reite und der Diener und Träger meines Herrn und Gottes zu fuss gehe.\[14\]

Rudolf later gave the priest a piece of land so that he would be able to feed the horse.

The following story describes another of the many good deeds of Rudolf. He emerged the victor after a feud with the Bishop of Strassburg in 1263. The Bishop died shortly after, and his successor made peace with Rudolf. The new Bishop offered a sum of money to Rudolf as a war reparation. Rudolf refused the money. The city of Strassburg honored Rudolf for this virtuous deed four years later by erecting a statue in his honor.\[15\] Fugger often talks about Rudolf’s generosity, especially in rewarding people for previously rendered services.\[16\]

Rudolf was a courageous and excellent warrior. He was victorious in fourteen battles, and the title

\[14\] Fugger, p. 57. Hormayr also mentions this incident (I, 10). This is, of course, the episode from which Schiller fashioned his ballad "Der Graf von Habsburg." Schiller states in an Anmerkung that he has this story from Tschudi and since the wording used in the description of this episode by Tschudi and Fugger are very similar, both historians, who wrote their works approximately at the same time (both works were published a long time after their completion), most likely used the same source. Aegidius Tschudi, Chronicon Helveticum, ed. Johann Rudolf Iselin (Basel, 1734-1735), I, 166.

\[15\] Fugger, pp. 62-63. \[16\] Ibid., pp. 84-85.
"Victoriosus," which was attached to his statue in Strassburg, was well-deserved.\textsuperscript{17}

Fugger also stresses how wise Rudolf was and how often he achieved his objectives by shrewd decisions rather than by brute force. One example of this is the previously mentioned negotiation with the Abbot of St. Gallen.\textsuperscript{18} Fugger also describes how wisely Rudolf acted in the feud he had with Ulrich of Regensberg. He describes a few of Rudolf's strategic manipulations during this feud. The following is the decisive one. Ulrich had twelve white horses and twelve white hunting dogs. Rudolf acquired similar horses and dogs. One night when Ulrich was away, Rudolf and a few of his warriors arrived with the horses and dogs at Ulrich's fortress, Ötliberg (near Zürich). The inhabitants of the fortress, thinking that their commander was being pursued by his enemies, lowered the bridge and let in Rudolf's group. This gave Rudolf a rich booty, and as Ulrich had no further resources with which to continue the war he was forced to end it.\textsuperscript{19}

According to Fugger, Rudolf owed much of his success to his confidence in God. Often he would start a campaign without adequate financial resources, but believing that his

\textsuperscript{17}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 64.

\textsuperscript{18}\textit{Ibid.}, pp. 71-72. Hormayr's and Fugger's versions of the story are very similar.

\textsuperscript{19}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 67.
cause was right, and that God would therefore help him to achieve his goals:

Wie mir Gott bisher vorsehung gethan/ also wird er es auch in diesem Zug thun/ nachdem er mich zum Keyserturn/ und des Reichs Feinde zu straffen/ berufen hat.20

Fugger also points to Rudolf's respect for learning. A historian once presented him with a book on the Roman-German wars. After Rudolf had leafed through the book he rewarded the author with a golden chain and some money.21

Like Hormayr, Fugger praises Rudolf the most for not allowing a traitor22 to kill Ottokar. This is what Rudolf told the traitor:

Obschon Ottcar mein Todfeind ist/ so soll er doch das an mir nicht erleben/ dass ich seinerwegen der Gerechtigkeit und Redlichkeit vergessen sollte.

Because of this behavior, the following was said of the Emperor:

Diss ist der Rudolphus, der ja so wenig von der Tugend/ als die Sonne von ihrem Lauf/ sich zurückhalten lässt.23

The only objectionable action of Rudolf reported by Fugger occurred during his feud with Bishop Berchthold of

---

20Fugger, pp. 92-93.

21Ibid., p. 75. Historians frequently point to Rudolf's respect for education, although his own was meager. According to Goerlitz (p. 21) he did not know how to read or write.

22Hormayr and Pubitschka refer to a group of conspirators or traitors, while Fugger refers to a single traitor.

Basel. During this feud Count Rudolf, in alliance with other counts, entered the suburb of Basel, plundering and burning it. Later they also burned the monastery of St. Maria Magdalena, which was occupied by nuns.\textsuperscript{24}

Philipp Jacob Lambacher's \textit{Österreichisches Interregnum} contains relatively little about Rudolf. The book concentrates on events in Austria (including Styria, Carinthia, Carniola, and the Windische Mark) from the death of Frederick the Fighter until the installation of Habsburgs in these lands. Since Rudolf's activities before 1273 were entirely outside these lands, he is never mentioned before his election.

Lambacher does not discuss Rudolf's virtues to illustrate why the electors chose him, but it is obvious from Lambacher's description of Rudolf's behavior after the election that the historian is very sympathetic toward the Emperor. Everything that Rudolf did after his election had the author's approval. There is not one remark in the book that sheds a bad light on him. In his disputes with Ottokar and Henry of Bavaria, he repeatedly called them to conference in order to settle differences at the conference table instead of on the battlefield. When they did not appear, he called upon the Pope to arbitrate and agreed to accept any verdict of this arbitration.\textsuperscript{25}

Lambacher praises Rudolf for his strategic decisions

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{24}Ibid., p. 56. \textsuperscript{25}Lambacher, pp. 133-141.
\end{flushright}
as a commander of the forces in the 1276 campaign against Ottokar and depicts him, after his victory in this war, as a man of honor. He tried to honor all agreements of the 1276 treaty with Ottokar until the Bohemian king broke the treaty completely.

Finally, Lambacher portrays Rudolf as a humble and pious man who ascribed his great victory over Ottokar in 1278 to the strong hand of God. This can best be seen from two letters, one to the Pope and the other to the Archbishop of Salzburg, which Rudolf wrote after the victory was achieved.

Although Pubitschka has a tendency to rave about Ottokar's good qualities, he does not necessarily degrade the enemies of the Bohemian king. The good traits of Rudolf's personality, which the Austrian historians discussed at length, are stated also by Pubitschka, but in a much shorter version. Thus, in describing the election of 1273, Pubitschka writes that Rudolf's candidacy was proposed by Archbishop Werner of Mainz because of his wisdom and his magnanimity.

Pubitschka pictures Rudolf as being a model knight

26 Ibid., pp. 172-175. 27 Ibid., pp. 200-207.
28 Ibid., pp. 224-225.
29 Both letters are printed in their entirety on pp. 167-170 of the appendix to Lambacher's book.
30 Pubitschka, V, 396.
when he sent a warning to Ottokar that there were traitors in the Bohemian camp just before the decisive battle in 1278. Pubitschka praises Rudolf for his humaneness after the battle with Ottokar and especially his show of emotion at the sight of the dead Bohemian king:

Der Tod des Königes von Böhmen, und besonders der Anblick seines so mishandelten Körpers rührte sein ganzes Herz zum Mitleid.  

Vaclav Hajek's *Böhmische Chronica* is the only source that pictures Rudolf in a negative light. Although he calls Rudolf a wise man when mentioning his election, that is the only kind word for Rudolf in this chronicle.

Hajek states that many people accused Rudolf of ridiculing Ottokar because he gave in to his demands so easily in 1276:

Der Kayser trieben seinen Spot daraus/ das er ihme dem König aus Böhmen also leichtlich Vnterthänig gemacht/ in deme er ihme Oesterreich/ Steyermanck und Kärndten/ ohne allen Wehrzug eingenommen.  

Hajek holds Rudolf responsible for the plundering and burning by German troops of numerous cloisters in Bohemia after his victory over Ottokar in 1278.

Finally, Hajek is critical of Rudolf for the manner

31*ibid.*, p. 439.  32*ibid.*, p. 447.

33Hajek, p. 334. (According to Hajek, the election took place in 1272.)

34*ibid.*, p. 337.

35*ibid.*, p. 339. This is in contrast to Pubitschka, who praises Rudolf for ordering his troops to stop the pursuit of the enemy (p. 447).
in which he used his power in the distribution of conquered lands:

Kayser Rudolphus/ welcher nunmehr die Länder Böhme 
vn Oesterreich in seiner Gewalt hatte/ theiletet sie 
nach seinem Wohlgemün einen aus.36

Hajek, however, stands alone among the sources with these accusations.

36Hajek, p. 339. Hajek smears Rudolf unjustly. Rudolf did not touch the Bohemian lands after Ottokar's death. Ottokar's young son Wenzel (II) kept the Bohemian kingdom--under the guardianship of his uncle, the Margrave of Brandenburg (who was married to Ottokar's sister Beatrix) and his mother Kunigunde.
CHAPTER V

THE MAIN EVENTS OF OTTOKAR'S LIFE
IN GRILLPARZER'S PRESENTATION

In this chapter I will treat the main events of König Ottokars Glück und Ende and discuss Grillparzer's handling of given situations, showing how he relied on or rearranged the data furnished by his sources. I will include in this discussion Grillparzer's treatment of Otto kar's and Rudolf's characters, since they can be separated neither from each other nor from the course of the dramatic action. Even though Grillparzer states in his autobiography, which he began to write in 1853 (thirty years after he finished König Ottokars Glück und Ende), that he read everything he could about Austrian and Bohemian history in order not to have to add his own inventions (see page 41), his drama is not a true picture of events as he found them in his historical sources. In 1822, at the time when he was working on this drama, he thought that a poet might use his inventiveness if he so desired. History, according to Grillparzer, is a series of events which do not have to follow in a logical order. In the drama, however, the events must have a logical connection. He ends this passage...
with these words:

Da es nun aber nicht die Begebenheiten, sondern ihre Verbindung und Begründung ist worauf es dem Dichter ankommt, so lässt ihn in Gottes Namen sich auch seine Begebenheiten selbst erfinden, wenn er anders dazu Lust hat.  

The above statement indicates, then, that Grillparzer studied historical events for König Ottokars Glück und Ende not on account of any belief that he must reproduce them in his drama, but because of his growing interest in the subject.

Ich habe nun so viel über den König Ottokar gelesen, fange aber an zu bemerken, dass das poetische Interesse für diesen Gegenstand allmählig zu einem historischen wird.

The fact that these events led to the establishment of the Habsburg dynasty in Austria intensified the author's interest.

Wenn nun zugleich aus dem Untergange Ottokars die Gründung der Habsburgischen Dynastie in Österreich hervorging, so war das für einen Österreichischen Dichter eine unbezahlbare Gottesgabe und setzte dem Ganzen die Krone auf.

Thanks to his familiarity with history Grillparzer was able to include in his play many small historical details; but his belief that it was unnecessary to reproduce history exactly in a historical drama allowed him to deviate from historical facts, especially in the dramatic structure and the development of character, where it

---

1 *Werke*, part II, VIII, 93.
benefitted the drama to do so. Alfred Klaar states that
Grillparzer did not try to separate legend from historical
facts.4 The author says this much himself:

Zugleich bemerkte ich in meinem Stoff das Eigentüm-
liche, dass ich beinahe alle Ereignisse, die ich
brauche, in der Geschichte oder Sage bereitliegend
vorfand.5

Legend often supplied the author with very colorful in-
cidents, especially the legends connected with Rudolf of
Habsburg.

Rudolf v. Habsburg, der den weltlichen Ehrgeiz seiner
Jugend mit starker Willenskraft überwunden hat, ist
der gottvertrauende, im Glücke demtige, im Unglück
nicht verzagende Ritter, wie ihn mehr die Legende als
die Geschichte kennt.6

From the presentation of Ottokar's character as
found in Grillparzer's sources, we have seen how complex
his personality was and in how different a light the
sources present the Bohemian king. This diversity is re-
flected in Grillparzer's presentation of Ottokar. In
discussing the drama Walter Silz rightly repudiates the
many simple literary interpretations concerning the title
hero and then adds the following:

The result is a complex and contradictory character,
not wholly satisfactory as a hero, but intensely in-
teresting psychologically and as a self-revelation
of his author.

4Klaar, p. 16. 5Werke, part i, XVI, 166.
6Richard Mahrenholtz, Franz Grillparzer: Sein Leben
und Schaffen (Leipzig, 1890), pp. 72-73.
On the other hand the creative artist in Grillparzer, the great shaper of dramatic character, could not be content with making Ottokar merely a deterrent example, a bogy. Both deliberately and instinctively, he produced a many-sided hero-villain, appealing and exasperating by turns.7

The complexity and diversity of Ottokar's character as drawn in Grillparzer's drama also exist in raw form in the sources taken together. The sources, viewed as a whole, are not one-sided, as a single source looked at alone might be.

Mahrenholtz also indicates Grillparzer's deviations from his main source:

Grillparzer hält sich nicht sklavisch an die partei-
ische Darstellung des steirischen Rittermannes [Ottokar von Steiermark].8

Ottokar's worst traits were brought to light in the Reimchronik where he was presented as a tyrant. Since, according to Grillparzer, this chronicle was his main source (see page 41), literary criticism rarely goes beyond it, although it is obvious that Grillparzer's Ottokar is quite different from the Ottokar of the Reimchronik. Walter Silz, in discussing the author's sources, refers only to the Styrian chronicle and states the following:

The man who dies thus ignobly has nevertheless been endowed with attractive and admirable qualities. It is noteworthy that Grillparzer "improved" his hero in comparison with his sources.9

7Silz, p. 245. 8Mahrenholtz, p. 71.
9Silz, p. 248.
The attractive and admirable qualities can, however, be found in Pubitschka and Hajek, and to some degree even in the Austro-German sources. Silz mentions Ottokar's atrocities discussed by Ottokar of Steiermark with special stress on the savage killing of Merenberg, while in the drama Merenberg's "murder" is mitigated to accidental manslaughter. In fact, I suspect that Grillparzer tries to emphasize the change when, contrary to exposing Merenberg to torture as in the Reimchronik, Ottokar says in the play:

Ist er ein Schurk auch, soll man ihn nicht quälen,  
Und soll ihm geben ritterliche Haft (11. 2512-2513).

Silz then describes Ottokar's actions against Merenberg in the following manner:

Ottokar acts under great emotional stress and in fact soon relents and shows compassion with his prisoner (2511 ff.) - a mollifying touch added by the poet.10

Although this is the case in the drama, it is not Grillparzer's invention. We find in Hormayr this statement concerning Merenberg's death:

Ottokar scheint tiefe Reue über das unruhmliche Werk seines argwöhnischen Zorns empfunden zu haben; denn er nahm Seyfrieds Stiftung, das Frauenkloster Merenberg in besonderen Schutz, und litt, dass auf sein Grab geschrieben wurde, er sey unschuldig gestorben.11

Lambacher makes a similar statement.12

Although the circumstances of Merenberg's death are

10Ibid., p. 248.  11Hormayr, XV, 48.  
completely different in the Reimchronik and in the drama, there is a small similarity to indicate the chronicler's influence on Grillparzer. In the chronicle, the guard (suppan) killed Merenberg to end his tortures, while in the play, the guard (Szupan) who took him to prison accidentally killed him, so that the actual death blow came from the same person in both cases.

Revenge as the motivating factor which causes Ottokar's death equally appears in the sources. Hormayr states that a cousin of Merenberg, also named Seifried, participated in the killing of Ottokar. Pubitschka and Fugger claim that Berthold of Emerberg, who according to most sources was the leader of the group that attacked the Bohemian king, was a relative of Merenberg. Ottokar of Steiermark mentions a nephew of Merenberg as being among the participants. In all instances they give revenge for the murder of old Merenberg as the motive for the destruction of Ottokar.

Incidentally, the old Merenberg of the drama is historically Seifried of Merenberg, and Seyfried Merenberg.

---

13Grillparzer (11. 2519-2522) leaves it in the dark if this Szupan who pushes the captive Merenberg on the steps of the prison-tower does so with the purpose of killing him or more or less harmlessly in anger at his restive prisoner.

14Reimchronik, 11. 11959-11960; Ottokar, 1. 2521.

15Hormayr, XV, 67; Pubitschka, V, 446; Fugger, p. 104; Reimchronik, 11. 16638-16639.
who appears as his son in the drama, is Grillparzer's invention, since no source mentions a son of Merenberg. This invention by Grillparzer is a very significant change from history and alters completely the intensity of the revenge motive against Ottokar. While in the sources a participant in the assault on Ottokar is revenging the death of either a cousin or an uncle (and in one case an unspecified relative), in the drama Seyfried is holding the Bohemian king responsible for the death of his father. In addition, Seyfried is revenging Berta of Rosenberg, his former sweetheart, who was mistreated by Ottokar. This gives Seyfried a double cause and puts the matter on a more personal basis.

By strengthening the motive of retribution, by assigning the role of the king's killer to a son who feels called upon to revenge his father's death, Grillparzer adds a superb touch of tragic irony to the final event. For in his treatment the proud king, who has committed so many wrongs, loses his life in atonement for a crime which he has not committed: the murder of old Merenberg. The final battle in the drama is transformed into a personal duel between Seyfried and Ottokar, while the sources report a group assault on the Bohemian king; and Berthold of Emerberg, who according to the sources was either a leader or one of the participants of the assault, actually warns Seyfried in the drama not to kill Ottokar.

But the big change that Grillparzer made is his
treatment of the origin of the feud between old Merenberg and Ottokar. The sources differ on this point. Ottokar of Steiermark and Pubitschka state that the Bohemian king became infuriated when Merenberg did not appear in Drau Valley to pay homage to the king; according to Lambacher Ottokar ordered Merenberg's execution because he was a supporter of Gertrude, the niece of Frederick the Fighter. Hormayr mentions both reasons without putting much weight on either of them. Modern historians cannot detect a clear reason for Merenberg's execution (see page 19). Grillparzer, however, did not use any of the reasons given by the sources but invented his own. In the drama, Merenberg leaves the court in Prague because of the king's brutal treatment of and divorce from his queen (11. 34-38), and Ottokar orders his arrest because he suspects him of trying to denounce him before the electoral college and thus prevent the king's election to the imperial office. Nothing could be further from historical accuracy. Ottokar divorced Queen Margaret in 1261, and Merenberg was arrested and executed in 1271. In this period of ten years he often performed services for the Bohemian king. It is also to be noted that at the time of Merenberg's death in 1271,

16 Reimchronik, 1. 11839; Pubitschka, iv, 11, 390; Lambacher, p. 83; Hormayr, XV, 48.

17 Actually, in the drama Merenberg dies in 1277, but Grillparzer's handling of the dates will be discussed later.
the decisive election was still two years away.

The manner in which Grillparzer portrays the relationships of the two Merenbergs to Ottokar illustrates what the author meant by insisting that in a drama the events must have causal connection, while in history such causal connection is not necessarily detectable. The historical sources give vague motives, but in König Ottokars Glück und Ende the actions of the participants are well-motivated and dramatically integrated.

The Austro-German sources portray Ottokar as an arrogant person. Grillparzer made arrogance Ottokar's main character trait. This trait comes to light even before the King appears on stage—namely in the Margaret-Rudolf conversation. Although the first act begins with the termination of the Ottokar-Margaret marriage, the above-mentioned conversation sheds light on how the marriage came about. In some respects Grillparzer followed the account given in the Reimchronik, namely that a delegation of Austrian nobles came to see Queen Margaret in her home in Haimburg, pointed out to her the suffering of the country, and convinced her that she should marry Ottokar to save her countrymen from bloodshed and hunger.

darunter jahen die boten
und der minister von Wienen
wolde si gar wol verdienen
só solt si trahten darmách,
daz daz leit und der ungemach,
den daz lant het erliten,
färbaz wurde vermiten    (11. 1840-1846)
The *Reimchronik* never mentions that the family relationship between Ottokar and Margaret ever was discussed as an obstacle to their marriage. In the drama Margarete tells Rudolf:

*Auch hat man Aufangs dessen nicht erwähnt! (I. 277)*

So in this respect, too, Grillparzer follows the Styrian chronicler. But here any similarity with the *Reimchronik* ends. The *Reimchronik*, as well as all other sources, reports that Ottokar entered Austria in 1251, a year before the marriage took place.

Lambacher notes that the Austrian nobility accepted Ottokar

---

18 Their great-grandfathers were brothers. Lambacher states that because they were related, Ottokar and Margaret obtained from Pope Innocent IV a special dispensation permitting their marriage a year after the marriage took place (p. 146); and Pubitschka talks about the dispensation under the 1252 entry, the year of the marriage, but does not specify whether it was granted after or before April 9, the wedding date (p. 254).
as their duke without much objection, and only after Gertrud returned to Austria and tried to convince the estates to name her son as the Duke of Austria did Ottokar begin to seek Margaret's hand.¹⁹ The sources imply, therefore, that Ottokar married Margaret to secure his position in Austria, while in the drama he acquired Austria and Styria as a result of his marriage.

Doch war es Schenkung um der Ehe wegen, (1. 373).

Thus, when Ottokar divorced Margaret in 1261, nobody demanded that he return these lands to the empire, since he had not acquired them with the marriage. In fact, Richard of Cornwall invested Ottokar with Austria and Styria in 1262. It was Rudolf, then, after his election in 1273, twelve years after the divorce, who declared Ottokar's acquisition of these lands, as well as Richard's investiture of them, invalid (see pages 32 and 66).

Grillparzer's presentation of the marriage and divorce displays Ottokar's arrogance even more sharply than do the "anti-Ottokar" sources. Margarete (as everybody else) was just an instrument to him for climbing to power, in this case for acquiring Austria. When he believed that his position was secure, he divorced her without regard for her feelings. Grillparzer makes it clear that Ottokar's explicit reason for the divorce, namely that Margarete did

¹⁹Lambacher, pp. 42-44.
not bear an heir and was too old to give him one, is just a pretext because she told him this before they were married:

Was gibt man an als unser Trennung Grund?
Den ersten weiss ich: ich bin kinderlos,
Und ohne Hoffnung je ein Kind zu säugen;
Weil ich nicht will, weit mehr noch als nicht kann!
Das wusste Ottokar, als er mich freite,
Ich sagt ihm, und er nahm es für genehm;
(11. 256-261)

This did not, however, prevent him from marrying her. This statement by Margarete is, incidentally, in opposition to the Reimchronik, where it is reported that the legation from Vienna which came to Margaret to propose the marriage in Ottokar's name, persuaded her to accept the proposal so that there could be an heir. They cited examples from the Bible in which older women had borne children (11. 1860-1893).20

The sudden exodus of Austrians and Styrians from Ottokar's court after his divorce is strictly Grillparzer's invention. In the 'sixties, long after his separation from Margaret, they actually were among Ottokar's most ardent supporters and we find Ulrich of Liechtenstein in 1269 and Bechthold of Emmerberg as late as 1271 in the service of the Bohemian king. Only after 1273 do we find the first defectors from Austria and Styria joining Rudolf's side and

---

20 The Reimchronik does not mention how old Margaret was, but Hormayr (XV, 17) and Pubitschka (p. 254) claim that she was forty-six years old when the marriage took place, an age normally considered past the time of child-bearing.
complaining about Ottokar's tyranny.21

When Ottokar finally appears on the stage his arrogance is revealed in every instance. It coincides with the climax of his success. He returns the victor from the war against the Hungarians; representatives of the Tartar Khan come to his court to pay homage to him; representatives of the estates from Austria and Styria bring him the crowns from their lands; the mayor of Prague tells about the king's fame after the victory over the Hungarians; a delegation from Carinthia comes to inform Ottokar that his uncle, the Duke of Carinthia, has died and that he has inherited Carinthia; and finally messengers of the imperial electors come to inquire whether he would accept if offered the highest honor yet, namely the imperial crown. Ottokar is drunk with power in this scene.

Nun Erde, steh mir fest!
Du hast noch keinen Grösseren getragen! (11. 682-683)

In this moment of glory Ottokar shows complete disrespect for people, their traditions, and their feelings. He ridicules the Tartars' traditional hair style and their weapons; then he sends them away without letting them deliver their message; he disregards the request of the mayor of Prague not to replace the Czechs in the suburb with Germans; he insults Queen Margarete by comparing her to a baker's wife; and he tells the representatives from the electors

21Hormayr, XV, 41, 46, and 53.
to wait until he is good and ready to let them know whether he will accept the crown.

Grillparzer portrays Rudolf as the complete contrast to the selfish, egotistical, and arrogant Ottokar.

Beringer states this contrast in the following manner:

In König Ottokar hat er den Herrscher dargestellt, der seine Aufgabe dadurch verfehlt, dass er seinen persönlichen Machtwillen für das Staatsinteresse, für den Ausdruck göttlichen Willens hält, und in Rudolf hat er den Gegner gegeben, der sich in allem vom Bewusstsein dieses Unterschiedes leisten lässt.22

Sulz says this:

From first to last Rudolf is given every opportunity to distinguish himself im Gutem.23

Rudolf is understanding, unselfish, and just. As Sulz says:

As Grillparzer’s chosen mouthpiece he [Rudolf] condemns Kunigunde’s tactless intrusion (727) as, at the end of the play, he speaks the author’s final verdict on her, on Zawisch, on Seyfried and on Ottokar himself. He defies the King’s anger and champions the distressed queen.24

These above-mentioned situations, in which Grillparzer portrays the two central figures of the play, vary as to their historical authenticity from invention by the author to rendering of actual historical events. Thus the friendship offer by the Tartar Khan has no historical basis whatsoever. However, the significant point of bringing the Tartars into

23Sulz, p. 257. 24Ibid., p. 258.
this scene in the drama is, of course, that it gave Grillparzer an opportunity to show one more example of Ottokar's arrogance, by pointing to his disregard for a long-established tradition of these people, even though there was no trace of such an example in the sources.

The bringing of the Austrian and Styrian crowns to Ottokar is apparently a reference to the investiture of these lands by Richard of Cornwall, since Heinrich of Liechtenstein's words indicate that Ottokar had been in possession of these lands for quite some time and now the official ceremony was being completed:

Und leichten Herzens wiederholen wir
Die Huldigung, die erst jetzt in voller kraft.
(11. 566-567)

Heinrich of Liechtenstein, however, according to the Reimchronik (1. 1500), was a member of the Austrian delegation which stopped in Prague on the way to Meissen and was persuaded by the Bohemian King Wenzel to take his son, Ottokar, as Duke of Austria.25 By making Heinrich of Liechtenstein chairman of this later delegation, Grillparzer concentrated functions of various people into one dramatic figure. This procedure eliminates many unimportant characters.26

---

25 All sources report about this delegation, although they do not always mention who participated in it.

26 Grillparzer used this technique very frequently, and I will discuss it later.
Prague suburb and settling Germans there stems from Hajek.27

The inheritance of Carinthia and Carniola is a well-established fact and is reported by all sources.

The offer of the imperial crown to Ottokar presents a complicated situation. In Grillparzer's presentation the inquiry of the electoral representatives as to whether Ottokar would accept the crown if the electors chose him comes close to being a genuine offer. The accepted procedure was to inquire first, in order not to embarrass the electors in case the candidate would refuse the honor. This procedure actually took place in 1273 when Rudolf was elected. The electors sent Burgrave Frederick of Zollern to Rudolf, who was at the time engaged in a war against the Bishop of Basel, to inquire whether Rudolf would accept the crown. The electors chose him only after they received a positive reply.28 In the drama, Ottokar never gives the electoral delegation an answer but wanted them to bring the crown first, and then he would let them know his decision. Taking into consideration, however, what the ambassadors had witnessed at the Bohemian court, it becomes obvious that Ottokar would not have been chosen even if he had given a positive answer, especially since the electors did not know of the divorce at the time when they sent the

---

27 Hajek, p. 321.

28 See pp. 23-24 for details.
ambassadors to Prague. This becomes obvious from Burgrave of Nuremberg's words:

Beschuldigt Ihr des Treubruchs Deutschlands Fürsten?  
So wisst denn was die Wahl von Euch gewandt!  
Wir suchten einen Herrn, gerecht und gnädig,  
Als einem solchen bot man Euch den Thron.  
Da kam der Ruf, da kamen selber Zeugen,  
Die laut es riefen in der Fürsten Ohr,  
Wie Ihr getan an Königin Margareten,  
Die Eure Gattin war, die Ihr verstießst;  
Wie Ihr die Rechte schmälert jener Lande,  
Die rechtlos vorenhalten Ihr dem Reich;  
(11. 1247-1256).

There is some historical basis for the offer of the crown to Ottokar. Undoubtedly the two Archbishops of Cologne, first Conrad of Hochstaden in 1256 and then his successor, Engelbert of Falkenburg, in 1272 negotiated with Ottokar about the imperial crown. There is no evidence, however, as to whether they consulted other electors, or instead felt that if the Bohemian king would accept the crown, they could persuade the majority of the electors to promote Ottokar's candidacy. It seems that at least Archbishop Engelbert acted with some authority in 1272.29 Not all Grillparzer's sources discuss this issue. Ottokar of Steiermark and Fugger do not mention it, and Lambacher claims that the historians who report about a concrete offer to Ottokar are wrong.30 Hajek discussed the

29See p. 22.  
30Lambacher, pp. 113-115. One of the reasons that he mistrusts the report is that the offer of 1271 (actually, modern historians place the offer in August, 1272) supposedly was made by Archbishop Conrad of Cologne, but at that
offer of 1272, and Pubitschka discusses both offers with special stress on the second offer. Hormayr reports the following about the two offers:

Der Erzbischof von Köln, Ottokars alter Freund, eilte nach Prag, ernste Beratung darüber zu pflegen. Ottokar versammelte die ersten Baronen des Reichs, sie befragend, ob er die Krone annehmen sollte, die er bereits vor sechzehn Jahren ausgeschlagen.

Like Pubitschka, Hormayr claims that Andreas Rziczen spoke most strongly and influentially against Ottokar's accepting the crown.32

Grillparzer's presentation of this issue differs significantly from any presentation offered by his sources. In the drama, the ambassadors who come to Prague with the inquiry are sent by the electors who gathered in Frankfurt to elect an emperor. Historically, however, no matter how strongly the Archbishop of Cologne previously supported Ottokar's candidacy, by the time the electors met in Frankfurt in 1273 Ottokar was no longer a candidate. By changing this circumstance Grillparzer adds another display of Ottokar's arrogance, by showing his disrespect for the electors and for the imperial crown itself. He humiliates time the ruler of the archbishopric of Cologne was not Conrad. Apparently Lambacher read a report which confused the negotiations of Archbishop Conrad in 1256 and the negotiations of Archbishop Engelbert in 1272. Conrad of Hochstaden died in 1261.

31 Hajek, pp. 333-334; Pubitschka, V, 288 and 385-389. Pubitschka also places the second offer in 1271.

32 Hormayr, XV, 49-50. This reference is for 1272.
the delegation by refusing to give a clear-cut answer to their question, and his haughty contempt reaches its climax by his insistence that the imperial crown be brought to him physically before he will decide whether or not he is willing to accept it. Actually, Pubitschka points to quite different behavior by Ottokar toward the imperial delegation:

Er verehrte den Gesandten prächtige Geschenke von Gold und Silber, kostbare Edelgesteine, Armbänder, und verschiedene Zeiter, und schickte sie mit seiner Danksagung an die Kurfürsten zurück. Nach eben diesem Geschichtsschreiber kamen mehrere Gesellschaften mit eben diesem Auftrage nach Prag; sie wurden von Ottokarn immer königlich beschenket, aber auch immer mit einer abschlagenden Antwort zurück geschickt.33

The decisive re-arrangement in Grillparzer's treatment of these situations is his placing them into one act. Although an indefinite period of time separates the individual acts from each other, the first act of the drama covers only one day even though the events in it are spread historically over a number of years. Superficially, the first act covers twelve years, since it begins with the divorce which took place in 1261 and ends at the time of the meeting of the electors in Frankfurt in 1273. One can even say, in spite of the last line of the act—"Der Deutschen Kaiser! Lebe Ottokar!"—that it ends with Rudolf's election because Ottokar's display of arrogance is

33Pubitschka, V, 386. The above-mentioned historian is Prebendary Franz of Prague.
presented as the decisive factor in favor of Rudolf, and the ambassadors' lifting of the shield with the sign of the Habsburg lion on it foreshadows symbolically Rudolf's election. Not all events, however, fall within these twelve years. The displacement of the Czech population from the Prague suburb took place in 1257. Other events which occur in the first act and can be dated are Kunigunde's arrival in Prague (1261) and Ottokar's inheritance of Carinthia upon the death of Duke Ulrich of Sponheim (1269). Rudolf's remark that he is returning from a crusade (1. 709) must be a reference to the 1267/8 crusade. The presence of Rudolf in Prague is a very significant point. Walter Silz claims that Rudolf's presence at Ottokar's court is not historical. He is most likely right (see page 14). The incident, however, was not Grillparzer's invention. The Reimchronik does not mention it, but Hormayr and Fugger report that Rudolf participated in Ottokar's northern crusade of 1254, andPubitschka

34Hajek, p. 321.

35Actually, Ottokar had to struggle for quite a while before his actual acquisition of Carinthia and Carniola. See pp. 19-21 for details.

36Where historians consider the possibility of Rudolf participating in a crusade under Ottokar, they refer usually to the crusade of 1254. I am of the opinion, however, that 1254, Ottokar's first year in power, is here out of the question.

37Silz, p. 257.
discusses it as a possibility since some historians report Rudolf's participation and others do not. Pubitschka gives Fugger as one of his sources for his claim. Ottokar's reference in the drama to the effect that Rudolf participated in the battle of Kroissenbrunn (1. 432) is reported only by Fugger. He even goes so far as to say that Rudolf, as a reward for his contribution to the Hungarian campaign, was knighted by Ottokar and became his court marshall.39 Grillparzer's indication, therefore, that Rudolf fought in Ottokar's battles only as a free warrior (11. 737-740) is not based on Fugger, but on Hormayr:

Mit dem Künige, aber nicht in dessen Gefolg, sondern wie so viele andere Fürsten und Herrn als Kreuzfahrer, zog auch Graf Rudolf von Habsburg, dessen und seines Hauses Grösse zwanzig Jahre später Ottokars Fall fest-gegründet hat.40

Klaar also points out that some of Grillparzer's sources report Rudolf's services in Ottokar's army and others report Rudolf's presence in other parts of the country.41 Whether or not Rudolf served under Ottokar was, however, not important for the dramatist. Grillparzer did not try to separate history from legend (see pages 88-89). The important point is that he took full advantage of the information available to create an excellent dramatic

---

38Hormayr, I, 17 and XV, 23; Fugger, pp. 56-57; Pubitschka, V, 308-309.

39Fugger, p. 57. 40Hormayr, XV, 23.

effect, namely making the future emperor and the chief instrument of Ottokar's downfall an earlier participant, perhaps even a vassal, in the military campaigns of the Bohemian king.

Rudolf's presence in Prague also serves other purposes. Since the main victim of Ottokar's arrogance in the drama is Queen Margarete, Rudolf's humane understanding of her situation puts him at the very outset in a dramatic contrast to the Bohemian king. In addition, by offering Margarete his arm Rudolf demonstrates his royal qualities as the protector of the unprotected.

Historians report many episodes glorifying Rudolf of Habsburg. Grillparzer used some of them very effectively to portray Rudolf's honesty, piety, generosity, and simplicity. I discussed previously the encounter between Rudolf and the priest (see page 80). This episode is rendered in the drama in an almost exact manner:

Gibt Ihr nicht einst im Walde nah bei Basel
Dem Priester, der das Allerheilige trug
Zu eines Kranken Trost, und aufgehalten
Vom wütgen Strom der Aar, am Ufer irrte,
Das eigne Pferd, die Flut drauf zu durchsetzen?
(11. 74-75)

The encounter between Rudolf and Ottokar of Horneck is based on an episode reported by Fugger, although in this case Grillparzer made some changes. According to Fugger, the historian is from Strassburg and praises a leader of
the Roman-German wars.\textsuperscript{42} In the play, the historian, Grillparzer's main source, appears as a character and he praises his country and her emperor at the time when the drama takes place. This change enables Grillparzer to add to the description of the period, but Rudolf's respect for poetry and learning and his generosity follow Fugger's description, since he rewards the historian for his toils, in the source as well as in the drama, with a golden chain.\textsuperscript{43}

In the play, however, Rudolf not only rewards the poet, but, as in Schiller's "Graf von Habsburg," the poet is left free to speak his mind as his conscience dictates, and the ruler's highest nobility consists in the fact that he will not put any demands on him. Grillparzer, thus, does not only describe Rudolf's generosity reported by various sources but adds this additional regal quality: the respect of the powerful for the man of the mind.

In the drama the meeting between the two rulers takes place on the island of Kaumberg.\textsuperscript{44} According to the Reimchronik, the encounter took place in Vienna.\textsuperscript{45} Fugger and Hajek report that the encounter took place on the

\textsuperscript{42}Fugger, p. 75.

\textsuperscript{43}The participation of the author of the Reimchronik in the wars against Ottokar is questionable (see p. 45).

\textsuperscript{44}According to Rudolf Franz, Grillparzers Werke (Leipzig, 1903), III, 338, the location of this island in the Danube cannot be found any more.

\textsuperscript{45}Reimchronik, 11. 14530-14662.
island of Kamberg [sic]. By deciding to use the island as the meeting place, Grillparzer minimizes the humiliation of Ottokar, because the island appears to be in neutral territory. At least Chancellor Braun uses this argument in persuading his king to agree to see Rudolf:

Die Insel Kaumberg ward ersehn.
Von beiden Teilen werde sie besetzt,
Nicht Ihr zu ihm, nicht er zu Euch,
Auf gleichgeteilten Boden sollt Ihr kommen,
Und dort verhandeln, was uns allen nützt.
(11. 1509-1513)

Although the Danube was the dividing line between the two armies, the meeting does not really take place in neutral territory, since Ottokar goes inside Rudolf's tent. Symbolically, however, the island serves as a bridge, so to speak, between the two shores, as the meeting in itself was to serve as a bridge between the two adversaries.

Here we see again that where the sources supplied Grillparzer with different data concerning the same event, he used the information of the particular source which better fitted his dramatic structure or, as in this case, infused the event with symbolical meaning, rather than trying to seek the historical truth.

The plan to keep the humiliation of the Bohemian

---

46 Fugger, p. 95 and Hajek, p. 337.

47 Actually, the negotiations took place on the outskirts of Vienna without Ottokar. The King appeared four days later to receive the investitures of Bohemia and Moravia. See pp. 35-36, Lorenz, Ottokar II, pp. 589-593, and Gebhardt, I, 392, for details.
king to a minimum continues, as Ottokar was to receive the investiture for Bohemia and Moravia in the privacy of Rudolf's tent. In the crucial moment of the ceremony, however, when Ottokar, according to tradition, is kneeling before the Emperor to receive the investitures, Zawisch opens the tent and exposes the once proud King of Bohemia to everyone. This becomes the most humiliating moment in Ottokar's life. That Zawisch exposed the kneeling Ottokar is the author's invention, but the sources contain various reports about an accidental collapse of the tent.

The Reimchronik does not mention the incident, since according to this source the ceremony did not even take place in a tent but in a palace. Fugger reports the collapse of the tent but does not mention what caused it:

Indem nun der stolze und prächtige König in Böhmen/ vor dem Keyser auf kniehen lag/ den Eid ablegte/ und die Lehen empfiehle/ da wurden die vier Wände des Gezeltes gefällt. Solchgestalt befand sich Ottokar höchstbeschammt/ und mitten in den armen der Schmach/ vor welcher ihn zuvor sein Hochmut fliehen heissen.48

Lambacher, on the other hand, denies this story and implies that there was no intent of privacy during the investiture ceremony and that at least the Archbishop of Salzburg witnessed the procedure:

Dass ein so anderes in dem kaiserlichen Lager, und nicht, wie die gemeine Fabel hat, auf einer Insel in Mitte der Donau unter einem künstlich aufgerichteten Zeit, welches während dem, dass der König vor dem Kaiser auf den Knieen lag, vor allen vier Seiten

48Fugger, p. 96.
zusammen fiel und den König in seiner Demütigung öffentlich dargestellt hätte; weder, wie andere wollen, in dem königlichen Palast, in der Stadt, geschähe, beweiset nicht allein der noch vorhandene Lehensbrief, als der im Lager vor Wien datiert ist; sondern auch das Schreiben des Erzbischofs von Salzburg, und seiner Suffraganen, die bey dem Akte gegenwärtig waren.49

Pubitschka, in describing the meeting between Ottokar and Rudolf, mentions that historians differ about the details, but he tends to believe the historians who claim that the meeting took place in the imperial camp and was attended by many ecclesiastical and secular princes. He ends this discussion by mentioning that some reports speak of a collapse of the tent in which the meeting took place, at the moment when Ottokar kneeled. Furthermore, these reports claim that the collapse was prearranged. Pubitschka adds, however, that scholars consider the entire incident a fable.50

Although Zawisch revealed to the world Ottokar's humiliating defeat, it was Rudolf's strength of character and his determination to restore order in the empire that made Ottokar concede to Rudolf everything that he demanded, even though Ottokar approached Rudolf with no intention of giving in to his demands. In fact, the Bohemian king was convinced that Rudolf would drop most of the demands when the two should meet face to face. This dramatic change in Ottokar's behavior when confronted with Rudolf is also

49Lambacher, p. 182. 50Pubitschka, V, 424-429.
Grillparzer's invention, since, as previously mentioned, the terms of the peace treaty had already been determined when the King of Bohemia went to see the Emperor.

After the encounter Ottokar emerges a totally different person. His arrogance and vaingloriousness are shattered and the Bohemian king now shows great humaneness. Ottokar's human qualities come to light especially well in the fourth act, where they contrast sharply with the harshness of Kunigunde.

Ottokar's true human greatness becomes clear in the fifth act, in his fall. He fully realizes his former misdeeds, and before his death he is repentant. One can call it almost a conversion, when one compares him with the Ottokar of the first act. The repentance is clearly seen from the moment the King encounters the corpse of Queen Margarete, but it is most apparent from the following words:

Ich hab nicht gut in deiner Welt gehaust,
Du großer Gott! Wie Sturm und Ungewitter
Bin ich gezogen über deine Fluren.
Du aber bist allein der stürmen kann,
Denn du allein kannst heilen, großer Gott.
(11. 2825-2829)

Now we feel genuine sympathy and respect for Ottokar. The Ottokar of the final act is the real king, who previously was perverted by the power which he acquired too effortlessly to learn the true meaning of it.

The repentance of Ottokar before his final battle is Grillparzer's invention, and yet the seeds can be
found in the sources, since Pubitschka and Hajek portray the Bohemian king as a pious man who always obeyed religious customs (see pages 67-69 and 71-72), and even the Austro-German sources emphasize the fact that Ottokar died nobly and a true king. The appearance of Queen Margarete as Ottokar's "good angel," and her devoted servant's, Elisabeth's, forgiving him in behalf of the dead queen, are also, of course, Grillparzer's inventions, since, as previously mentioned, Margaret actually had died eleven years earlier.

Grillparzer took great liberties in his treatment of historical facts and dates. It is usually pointed out that König Ottokars Glück und Ende covers seventeen years—from the divorce in 1261 to Ottokar's death in 1278. Grillparzer telescoped this period into a more or less unbroken sequence of scenes, with longer time lapses between acts. The sequence of these scenes does not, however, follow the sequence of events as they occurred in history. The most striking examples are, as frequently mentioned before, the dates of the deaths of Queen Margarete and old Merenberg. Their roles in the drama, however, do not correspond to their historical lives. In the drama Ottokar's

51Actually two events fall outside this period. I already have mentioned the evacuation of Czechs from the suburbs of Prague in 1257. Rudolf invested his son with Austria (ll. 2971-2973) in 1282. In fact, Rudolf had quite a struggle to make Austria a Habsburg possession.
mistreatment of the queen is the beginning of his downfall, even though, in reality, new victories fell into his lap for quite a while longer. Margarete warns the King of Bohemia in his proudest and most powerful moment, and appears, though only symbolically, after her death as his spiritual savior in his final moment. The old Merenberg is the first defender of the dethroned queen, and he voices the first Austro-Styrian opposition to Ottokar. As we have seen from the chapter on the historical background for König Ottokars Glück und Ende, these incidents were not historical. It is, however, dramatically very effective to involve, even though indirectly, these two important people of Ottokar's surroundings in the most important struggle of his life, namely that with Rudolf of Habsburg.

Ulrich of Liechtenstein appears among the hostages who are still in Ottokar's custody in the fourth act (11. 2291-2300). This scene must be in 1277, since it is after the encounter between the two protagonists of the drama in 1276 and after Ottokar's long wanderings through the country before his return to Prague. Ulrich died, however, in 1275. To be sure, Ulrich was arrested by Ottokar and held in custody for twenty-six weeks, but that was in 1267. In fact, all of the hostages listed in the drama, with the exception of Merenberg, are the Styrian nobles who were tried in 1267 for fortifying their castles (see pages 18-19). By naming these Styrian nobles and Merenberg
as hostages in place of the actual hostages, Grillparzer concentrated the functions of his dramatic characters, as he did in the case of Heinrich of Liechtenstein (see pages 101-102).

Another example of the concentration of functions may be seen in the services and duties assigned to Herbott of Füllenstein. Many of his functions in the sources and in the drama are identical, including the personal attack on Rudolf in the battle of Därnkrt. But the arrest of Merenberg by Füllenstein (and Ortolf of Windischgrätz) is an additional function invented by Grillparzer. According to the Reimchronik, the only source describing the arrest of Merenberg, the two men who came to get him in his castle were Ortolf of Windischgrätz and Wolf of Durrenholz.52

Klaar points out that Berta, as she appears in the drama, is a combination of many mistresses of Ottokar.53 He also points out that at the end of the play when she is apparently insane, she resembles a daughter of Merenberg who is described in a history of Vienna in the following manner:

Seine Tochter soll vergebens das Kleinod ihrer Schönheit und Ehre dem König gegeben haben, den Vater zu

52Reimchronik, 11. 11893-11903.
53Klaar, p. 83.
retten und darauf in Wahnsinn verfallen seyn.54

From the preceding discussion we have seen that in

König Ottokars Glück und Ende Grillparzer used history as a
background; but this does not mean that he reproduced his-
tory exactly in his drama. He presented the struggle of an
individual on a much more personal basis than he found
basis for in the historical data. Henry Geitz has the fol-
lowing statement concerning history in Grillparzer's drama:

With regard to historicity, Grillparzer followed
Schiller's example in placing poetic truth above his-
torical truth.55

We have seen, however, that even though Grillparzer
did not follow exact historical fact in his drama, he was
very well-informed about the history and legend of this
period.

Oswald Redlich, the noted historian, evaluates

54Wien, seine Geschicke und seine Denkwürdigkeiten, 
ed. Joseph Freyherr of Hormayr. (Wien, 1823), III, 47. Un-
doubtedly, Grillparzer was familiar with this work, but it
is never mentioned in the critical edition as a source for
König Ottokars Glück und Ende, probably because a book pub-
lished in 1823 can hardly have had much bearing on a drama
finished in March of the same year. This brings out, how-
ever, an interesting point. Although this is the only work,
to my knowledge, which mentions a relationship between
Ottokar and a daughter of Merenberg, Fugger mentions that a
sister of Merenberg was abused by Ottokar. This makes a
relationship between a female relative of Merenberg and the
King of Bohemia very probable, and it might have had a
bearing on the Ottokar-Merenberg affair. In Grillparzer's
treatment, however, the Merenberg-Berta relationship is not
a family relationship but is established by young Meren-
berg's love of Berta.

55Geitz, p. 85.
Grillparzer's understanding of the history of the period in the following manner:


And then he adds:

Diese Auffassung des glänzenden Ottokars konnte Grillparzer sich um 1820 aus keinem historischen Werke holen, er hat sie mit selbständig intuitivem Blick den dürftigen und vielfach einseitigen Quellen abgerungen. Er hat geschaut, was die Historiker erst nach ihm erforscht haben.56

The most important fact is, however, that Grillparzer created in König Ottokars Glück und Ende an excellent drama. Walter Silz summarizes his interpretation of the play in these praising words:

In later years, he declared Ottokar to be his best play, and in a theatrical sense it undoubtedly is. The opening act is a magnificent achievement which he never surpassed and which has been duly praised from Hebbel onward. The whole play abounds with dramatic life and opportunities for fine acting. Character and motive are presented in visible stage action, in contrast and confrontation. The expressive, flexible language, supplemented by eloquent objects and gestures; the management of suspense; the Stimmungskunst of crescendo and diminuendo in act-ending—all show the master of theater who completely visualized his work. In the judgment of a recent authority, Ottokar in its consummate synthesis of dramatic form and historical matter, still towers as "ein Gipfelpunkt des deutschen Geschichtsdramas." And its imperfections, one must admit, appear only on repeated critical reading. In the theater, the author's brilliant stage art suffices to cover them.

56Oswald Redlich, Grillparzers Verhältnis zur Geschichte (Wien, 1902), pp. 359-360.
and we are carried along to the triumphant conclusion as the Bühnendichter Grillparzer meant us to be.\textsuperscript{57}
Besides Rudolf and Margarete, three other individuals are of extreme importance in determining Ottokar's fate. They are Zawisch, Kunigunde, and Chancellor Braun. Each one is directly responsible for an important turn of events in a crucial moment of the king's life. The chancellor persuades Ottokar to meet Rudolf, Zawisch exposes the kneeling king in Rudolf's tent, and Kunigunde's scorn is the most important factor in Ottokar's decision to resume hostilities with Rudolf. Their role in other events involving Ottokar's fate are consistent with their roles in the three above-mentioned events.

Zawisch plots Ottokar's downfall and humiliation from the beginning of the play. He does it not as a family revenge which was the cause of the older Rosenbergs but out of pure unmotivated viciousness. He ridicules his relatives in their designs to associate themselves closely with the Bohemian throne and refuses to cooperate with their schemes to bring about Ottokar's downfall. He tries to humiliate the Bohemian king singlehandedly and on his own.
Consistently he gives Ottokar wrong advice and wrong information. So he urges Ottokar not to accept the imperial crown (11. 767-772). As discussed in the previous chapter the sources report that a council of elders advised the king to refuse the crown, and Zawisch was not a member of this council.

At the end of the second act Zawisch questions the chancellor about the details of the electors' objections to Ottokar, so everybody within ear-shot becomes aware of the reasons for Ottokar's rejection. Zawisch then immediately urges Ottokar to fight the newly-elected emperor (11. 1330-1331), although he himself had no intention of fighting. He advises Ottokar not to meet with Rudolf and lies about the superiority of the Bohemian troops (11. 1524-1585). The sources do not mention anything about these activities of Zawisch. Thus, in Grillparzer's treatment, Zawisch becomes a villain on a much greater scale than in the sources.

But Zawisch's most devilish means to destroy Ottokar are the exposure of the king kneeling before Rudolf and the love affair with Kunigunde. The collapse of the tent was discussed in the preceding chapter, but the most important point in Grillparzer's treatment of this incident, regardless of its authenticity, is that Zawisch caused the most humiliating moment in Ottokar's life, even though, as previously mentioned, Grillparzer found no trace of the
incident in his sources. Thus we have another example, and the most striking one yet, of how the author changed events to tie them in with his dramatic needs, in this case the characterization of one of Ottokar's antagonists. Zawisch, out of pure viciousness, is determined to destroy Ottokar, to hurt him in all spheres of his life, here, in the tent scene, in the political realm, but no less on the most personal and intimate level, in Ottokar's relationship with his wife, Kunigunde.

The sources supplied Grillparzer with the basic information for the Zawisch-Kunigunde affair. The Reimchronik treats it as a rumor, but Pubitschka states that the evidence leads to the conclusion that the affair between the two did indeed start during Ottokar's lifetime. They did get married eventually, but that happened five years after Ottokar's death. Franz Aloisius Wacek writes most convincingly about the Zawisch-Kunigunde affair and his influence on Grillparzer was most likely decisive, since the author's Vorarbeiten contain excerpts from Wacek.

All sources portray Zawisch as very appealing to women, a good poet, and a capable singer, but his

\[1\text{Reimchronik, 11. 17055-17062.}\]
\[2\text{Pubitschka, V, 432 and 463.}\]
\[3\text{Franz Aloisius Wacek, "Zawisch von Rosenberg, Sohn Budivogs, Dynasten von Welisch" in Archiv für Geographie, Historie, Staats- und Kriegskunst (Wien, 1816), pp. 251-56; Werke, part 1, XVIII, 103-104.}\]
viciousness is of the author's invention. In Zawisch, Grillparzer thus created a perfect villain—pleasant in appearance but extremely effective in his destructive schemes. He works toward Ottokar's downfall very much like Shakespeare's Iago works fiendishly toward the destruction of Othello and Desdemona.

While the sources differ in the appraisal of Ottokar, depending to a large degree on whether they are of Austro-German or Czech origin, their appraisal of Kunigunde is unanimous. She is Hungarian and since, therefore, no nationalistic sensibilities are at stake, neither the Austro-German nor the Czech sources feel mercifully inclined toward her. This might partially explain the harshness in the description of the young queen, but since certain traits of her character are described by all sources, they must have some historical foundation.

Hormayr portrays Kunigunde as a much vainer and haughtier person than Ottokar himself. His description of the queen's insults hurled at Ottokar after his return from his meeting with Rudolf are absolutely cruel. Grillparzer also reveals this cruel side of Kunigunde's character in her scorning of the king upon his return, but the author adds a certain redeeming feature: the hurt which Ottokar's abasement has caused her. She considers Ottokar's

---

4Hormayr, I, 29.
kneeling before Rudolf a disgrace and an insult not only to his pride but also to her own:

Er aber hats getan! vor seinem Feinde,
Vor jenem Mann gekniet, den er verachtet,

Ich aber will nicht heissen: Knechtes-Frau;
Nicht eines schmeckenden Dienstmanns Bette teilen.

(11. 2174-2184)

All sources report that Kunigunde incited her husband to renew hostilities with the Empire, but the treatment in the drama, where she challenges Ottokar's manliness, is closer to Pubitschka than any other source. 5

The ease with which Zawisch won the queen's affection is in all likelihood based on Hajek. Although he does not mention any illicit relationship between the two during Ottokar's lifetime, he informs us that when they met a few years after Ottokar's death, Kunigunde could not resist Zawisch and had a child by him before they got married. 6

Chancellor Braun is the contrasting figure to Zawisch. His character is the exact opposite of Zawisch's. Braun is as good and sincere as Zawisch is wicked and

5Pubitschka, V, 432. Earlier in the play Kunigunde complains to Zawisch that Ottokar is an old man. "Ich komm und finde--einen Greis. Ja, Greisl" (1. 978). This is Grillparzer's invention, since Ottokar was thirty-one years old at the time. The theme of an old man and a young woman was, however, of profound psychological interest to the author, and he treated it more fully in his next drama, Ein treuer Diener seines Herrn.

6Hajek, p. 345.
insincere, truly and unswervingly devoted to Ottokar. This picture agrees quite generally with the sources; yet some of the duties performed by Braun in the play are at variance with the reports in the sources. There is, for instance, his service as Ottokar's representative at the electors' assembly in Frankfurt during the election. The sources give various reports as to the identity of Ottokar's representative at this election, but none of them mentions Chancellor Braun. However, since the chancellor represented Ottokar so frequently, first of all at the negotiations with Wenzel during Ottokar's disputes with his father, and then as an emissary to the Pope a year after Rudolf's election trying in vain to have this election nullified by the intercession of the highest church authority, it was appropriate for Grillparzer to assign the role of Ottokar's speaker in Frankfurt to the chancellor. The second of Grillparzer's additions concerns Braun's guardianship of Ottokar's corpse after the fatal battle (1. 2956). This last pious act stresses the chancellor's devotion to the king until his death. According to the sources this service was actually rendered by Berthold of Emerberg. And

7Pubitschka mentions Bishop Berthold of Bamberg (V, 396); Reimchronik mentions Bishop Wernhard of Seccau (11. 12510-12511).

8Pubitschka, V, 239 and 398.

9Reimchronik, 11. 16718-16721.
finally, Braun's function is strengthened by the role which he plays at the turning point of the drama, the encounter between the two protagonists. Ottokar was very reluctant to meet Rudolf, since he considered it an insult to his pride, but Chancellor Braun persuaded him to do so. All sources report that Bishop Braun was the main negotiator in bringing about the encounter. Klaar, however, stresses the point, and rightly so, that in the sources Braun is mainly an organizer and a political advisor to the Bohemian king, while in the drama he is Ottokar's personal friend.¹⁰ Thus, we have another illustration of how Grillparzer used a situation which had a historical background but treated it in a much more personal manner.

In the main, we can conclude that in Grillparzer's treatment these three characters have more pronounced individualistic traits than they have in his historical sources.

¹⁰Klaar, p. 68.
CHAPTER VII

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND AND SOURCES FOR

EIN TREUER DIENER SEINES HERRN

The presentation of the historical background of and the sources for *Ein treuer Diener seines Herrn* has to differ from that of background and sources for *König Ottokars Glück und Ende*. As we have seen from the discussion of Ottokar in the previous chapters, the play treats events stretching over at least seventeen years, and Grillparzer consulted numerous historical sources to acquaint himself with the vast canvass of the history of the Empire during this period. *Ein treuer Diener seines Herrn* involves only one single historical event, namely the brutal murder of a German-born Queen of Hungary, and Grillparzer consulted only one authentic historical source.

The end of the twelfth and the beginning of the thirteenth centuries in Hungary were marked by turbulence and disorder. King Bela III died in 1196 and his son, Imre (Emerich), became King of Hungary. According to Bálint Hóman he was a capable ruler, but because of the interference of his younger brother, Andreas, he never had the
opportunity to demonstrate his capabilities. Andreas was enraged that his older brother inherited the rule of the entire country while he inherited only some estates and money. Under the pretext of organizing a crusade to the Holy Land, Andreas gathered an army against King Imre. An open battle between the two quarreling brothers took place on the western borders of Slavonia in 1197, and Andreas, with the help of Leopold of Styria, decisively defeated his older brother. Andreas occupied, then, in 1198, Slavonia, Croatia, Dalmatia, and Rama, and ruled like a king. The Popes, Celestine III (1191-1198) and Innocent III (1198-1216), strongly supported King Imre, but Andreas was very generous with land and money and found therefore many supporters among the big landowners and clergy.

In 1199 another confrontation between Imre and Andreas took place, and this time Imre emerged the victor. He pursued Andreas all the way to Vienna, devastating Austrian and Styrian lands on the way. In 1200 emissaries of Pope Innocent III succeeded in negotiating a peace between the two brothers. Andreas tried another revolt against his brother in 1203 but was defeated again and taken prisoner. He was freed by his supporters a year later.

King Imre died in 1204 at the age of thirty,

1Balint Hóman, Geschichte des ungarischen Mittelalters (Berlin, 1943), II, 3-4.
2Ibid., pp. 4-5. 3Ibid., p. 5. 4Ibid., p. 11.
leaving his five-year-old son, Ladislaus, as the legal King of Hungary. Ladislaus had the support of the Pope, but the Hungarian nobility and even a substantial part of the clergy demanded a strong ruler and therefore supported Andreas in his aspirations to the Hungarian throne. Imre's widow, Constantia, and her son were forced to flee the country, and they found refuge at the Austrian court. Andreas took over the reign in Hungary, and when Ladislaus died a few weeks later, Andreas was crowned officially as King of Hungary.5

Historians consider Andreas among the worst rulers of the Árpád dynasty. Here are some typical descriptions of his reign.

After many short lived kings of the Árpád dynasty, Andrew II reigned for thirty full years (1205-1235), a lapse of time long enough to jeopardize most of the achievements of his predecessors.6

Zuerst ein treuloser Vormund, denn ein schlechter König!7

Of them all, only Stephen II was almost entirely bad, and Andrew II, irremediably silly.8

Foreign policy was the most important arena for

5Ibid., pp. 11-12.
Andreas. Trying to be original, he abandoned the policy of southward expansion which had been pursued fairly successfully by his predecessors. Andreas II's ambition was to bring Halicz, a Russian principality which during his childhood had belonged to Hungary, back under Hungarian rule. In the first fifteen years of his rule Andreas made fourteen expeditions to Halicz and never succeeded in securing this principality. Hőman considers Andreas' foreign policy a complete failure.

These unrealistic plans of the Hungarian king caused him to disregard domestic policies, and the expeditions drained the country's economic resources. Until the thirteenth century the king's treasure depended mainly on the great crown lands, but, as previously mentioned, Andreas II was very generous with these lands and therefore further depleted the royal income. In addition, he was incapable of checking the growing influence of the great landowners, even though most of them had become wealthy on account of his generosity.

The greatest misfortune for Hungary, however, was the fact that Andreas was completely dominated by his German-born wife, Gertrude, of the house of Meran. Although

9Sinor, pp. 58-59. 10Hőman, II, 12.
11Ibid., p. 32. 12Sinor, p. 58.
13Dominic G. Kosáry, A History of Hungary (Cleveland, 1941), p. 32.
she did not interfere with his foreign affairs, for all practical purposes she conducted his domestic policy, and her main interest was to bestow power on her brothers, who had followed her from Germany.

Gar bald wurde es offenbar, dass nicht er das Ruder führte, sondern seine ehrgeizige Gattin, Gertrud von Meran, deren Rath er im jedem Ding befolgte, auf deren Drängen er mit Übergabe der Ungarn die obersten Würden ihren Brüdern verlieh.14

Thus, in 1206 Andreas appointed one of Gertrude's brothers, Berthold, to the archbishopric of Colocz, even though he was only twenty-five years old and the law required that archbishops be at least thirty. The Pope was very reluctant to approve this appointment, but after persistent requests from Andreas and Gertrude, he finally gave in, except that he postponed the sending of the archiepiscopal pallium until 1212.15

Another brother of Gertrude, Ekbert, who was the Bishop of Bamberg, was suspected of being a conspirator in the murder of Philipp of Swabia and escaped revenge by fleeing to Hungary. There he received from King Andreas several estates and the title of Ban16 of Croatia and Slavonia.17 There were many similar incidents in which


16"Ban" is the Hungarian word corresponding to the English "count"—head of county. His duties at the time were that of a governor of the region.

17Csuday, I, 232-233.
the queen's German relatives received property and privileges which were denied to the Hungarians. These conditions infuriated the Hungarian nobility. In 1210, when Andreas was on one of his numerous expeditions to Halicz, the nobility organized a plot in which they planned to depose Andreas and elect a son of Geisa,¹⁸ who was in exile in Constantinople, as their king. The secret plot was, however, prematurely discovered and did not succeed.¹⁹ This ended this particular plot, but new plots and rebellions were characteristic of the thirty-year rule of Andreas II.

In 1213 Andreas was again on a campaign to Halicz. Before he reached his destination, however, he received the news that his wife had been murdered, and he was forced to return home. Csuday gives this account of the event which led to the murder of the queen. Before he left, Andreas had appointed his wife and her brother, Berthold, to share the regency during his absence. This infuriated many influential Hungarians, and the situation became very tense. It exploded when one of the queen's brothers, possibly Berthold himself, raped the young and beautiful wife of Bank, the Count Palatine. The enraged Hungarians, perhaps relatives of Bank, invaded the royal palace and murdered

¹⁸Geisa (Geza) was a brother of Bela III (King of Hungary, 1172-1196). He revolted against the King and after fifteen years in prison was exiled from Hungary.

¹⁹Csuday, I, 233.
the queen, whom they despised. They had only needed an excuse and opportunity to rid the country of her.\textsuperscript{20}

Otto Zarek is more convincing in his claim that it was Berthold who committed the rape. He also adds that after Gertrude was murdered the nobles expelled from Hungary all her brothers and followers.\textsuperscript{21}

According to the chronicle of Markus of Kált, the queen had set the stage for the rape. The chronicler does not mention which brother committed the deed. Banus Bank then revenged his wife by killing the queen.\textsuperscript{22} The commentator of the chronicle, László Mezey, however, does not believe that Bank was directly involved in the murder of the queen, since he was not among the ones who were punished for the deed by King Andreas II.\textsuperscript{23} In any case, the conspirators achieved their prime objective—getting rid of the foreign-born queen—but this did not change the state of affairs in Hungary much.

Grillparzer's main source for ein treuer Diener seines Herrn, and actually the only historical source, was

\textsuperscript{20}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 236.


\textsuperscript{22}Markus von Kált, \textit{Die ungarische Bilderchronik}, trans. Imre Szentpetery, commented on by Laszlo Mezey (Budapest, 1961), p. 232. This is actually a fourteenth-century chronicle which has been recently translated and supplied with additional comments.

\textsuperscript{23}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 298.
J. A. Fessler's *Die Geschichten der Ungarn und ihrer Landsassen*. This work is a very detailed, ten-volume study of Hungarian history. Franz Krones says this:

\[ \text{... während sein langlebiger Zeitgenosse, Aurel Fessler, reiche Fälle umfassender Sachkenntnisse mit vielseitigem Blick für Culturgeschichte in einem un-gemein gehaltvollen Werke niederlegt, das leider in der Darstellung eine oft ungenügsbare Theosophie und moralisirende Überschwägigkeit zeigt.} \]

Krones prefers this edition to the second of 1867 edited by Ernest Klein. James Westfall Thompson says the following about Fessler:

His numerous volumes gave the Magyar race in Hungary their first general history.

Fessler's work is much more detailed than any other modern work I have been able to examine with regard to the historical background of *Ein treuer Diener seines Herrn*. Therefore, I am adding here a few more details from Fessler which are pertinent to the events in the drama, and which I have not found in the modern sources.

At the very time that King Andreas made the

\[ \text{24 J. A. Fessler, Die Geschichten der Ungarn und ihrer Landsassen (10 vols.; Leipzig, 1815-1825).} \]

\[ \text{25 Volume II contains the events pertaining to Grillparzer's drama.} \]

\[ \text{26 Krones, p. 35. 27 Ibid., pp. 88-89.} \]

\[ \text{28 Thompson, II, 639.} \]

\[ \text{29 I do not know Hungarian and my investigation was limited to historical works written in (or translated into) German or English.} \]
expedition to Halicz, two younger brothers of the queen, Otto, Duke of Meran, and Henry, Count of Istria, were also at the Hungarian court. One of the two brothers fell in love with Bank's beautiful wife, who was one of the queen's ladies-in-waiting. Not understanding the behavior of Hungarian women, and taking neither marriage nor chastity very seriously, the queen's brother made numerous attempts to seduce her. When his advances were contemptuously rejected, however, he used force. Because this scene took place in a room of the queen, she was suspected of aiding her brother in this scandalous deed. This caused even the faithful Bank to join the conspiracy against the reign of King Andreas. The guilty brother successfully escaped revenge by fleeing the country, so the conspirators decided to murder the queen instead, since they blamed her not only for this specific outrage but also for their other troubles.

The two leaders of the conspiracy were Counts Peter and Simon, and they committed the murder. They were most likely aided by Bank. The tutor of the royal children managed to get all three of the children out of the palace to safety. The older brother of the queen, Archbishop Berthold, succeeded in fleeing the country with a goodly portion of the royal treasury, which King Andreas never retrieved.

The following night, however, the supporters of the queen organized and revenged their queen by murdering
many of the conspirators, including Count Peter. But they spared Count Bank, as King Andreas later also did.30

Besides Fessler's *Geschichte der Ungarn*, Grillparzer used as background for *Ein treuer Diener seines Herrn* sources which were in essence fictional but closely related to events on which Grillparzer's drama is based. Thus, according to Sauer, Grillparzer became first acquainted with the material for the drama in his youth, when he read *Leithold. Ein Fragment aus der Geschichte fürstlicher Leidenschaften*.31 Except for Andreas, the proper names in this story differ from historical names, but some of the fictional names show a striking resemblance to the historical names. Banus Bank, for instance, is Zancebanus, and the queen's brother is Leithold—apparently a variant of Gertrude's brother Berthold.32 The story places special stress on Leithold's passion.

An essay by Marianne of Neumann-Meissenthal, which appeared in *Wiener Zeitschrift für Literatur, Theater, Kunst und Mode* in August of 1820, also treated the events which are treated in Grillparzer's drama. The author of this essay, like *Leithold's*, deviates from historical facts.

30Fessler, II, 403-419.

31*Werke*, part 1, XVIII, 317.

32Sauer claims that Leithold is the exact image of the Prince of Meran. *Werke*, part 1, XVIII, 317.
Sauer says this about the essay:

... in der Wiener Zeitschrift der Aufsatz von Marianne von Neumann-Meissenthal, geb. v. Tiell "Emerich und Andreas, Könige von Ungarn" der, offenbar aus Fessler schöpfend, auch die Bankan-Fabel entrollt, sie aber gouvannentaft verfälscht und in einer Art darbietet, dass ein gesunder Mensch sich dagegen auflehen muss. Gr. dachte anfangs gewiss nur (wie einst bei Erscheinen von Müllners "Schuld"): Wie leicht wäre das besser zu machen gewesen! Allein gerade auf diese Weise wurde die jämmerliche-Stümperei ein Antrieb zu eigner produktiver Gedankensarbeit. Ich glaube, dass schon damals der Stoff wenigstens ideell in die Pläne Grs. einrückte.33

Here is the summary of the part of the essay by Marianne of Neumann-Meissenthal which contains events treated in Ein treuer Diener seines Herrn:34

Andreas, who after several revolts against his brother came to power in 1205, tried with constructive measures to erase from the memory of his people his former behavior. One of these measures was a crusade to Palestine, during which he left the rule of the land to his oldest son, Bela. King Andreas ordered a few counselors to advise his son, but Queen Gertrude was completely excluded from power. Among the advisors was Count Banko, a courageous, but very ambitious and proud man, who had just married for the second time. His wife (here she is called Helene) was young and charming and she quickly gained the favor of the

33ibid., p. 320.
34I was not able to see the original essay. The summary is based on excerpts which appear in August Sauer's critical edition. Werke, part I, XVIII, 320-323.
queen. Banko was displeased with this because he hated the foreign-born queen on account of the favoritism she showed toward her German brothers. Helene had married Banko to please the wishes of her father and honored and obeyed her husband; the queen took on the role of the younger woman's deceased mother.

During the absence of the king, the queen's brother, Margrave Otto von Meran, surprised the queen with his arrival, and she arranged many festivities in his honor. The Margrave was fascinated by Helene, especially by her skill at singing and harp playing. She did not pay any attention to him as a man but only as a brother of her beloved queen. Count Banko was very much displeased with the affection which the Margrave showed his attractive wife and considered sending her away from the court, but his pride did not allow him to do so. Helene noticed that Banko was becoming more and more morose but attributed his mood to her attachment to the queen, rather than to his jealousy toward the Margrave; she therefore stayed away from the royal court for a few days. The Margrave's ill-humor during Helene's absence made the queen realize that her brother was in love with Helene. The queen explained to him the seriousness of the situation and begged him to leave the country. He originally refused, even threatened to commit suicide. After prolonged arguments he finally agreed to leave under the condition that he would get a chance
to talk to Helene once more and explain to her what a sacrifice he was making for her sake. The queen arranged a "last breakfast" for her departing brother, and after the breakfast the Margrave, Helene, and the queen went for a walk in the garden of the palace. When they reached a place, quite far removed from the palace, he said the following:

Ich scheide, in diesem Leben seh' ich euch nicht wieder; ----betrachtet mich als einen Sterbenden, denn für Glück und Freude bin ich von diesem Augenblick an tot. Ein Sterbender darf sagen, was ihm die Seele belastet--so hört denn, schöne Helene, dass ich euch liebe, das diess Gefühl nur mit meinem Leben endet wird; aber ich ehre eure Verhältnisse, eure Tugend, ich verbanne mich selbst für immer aus eurer Gegenwart; ich fordere nichts als euer Mitleid, und das Versprechen, dass ihr manchmal eines Unglücklichen gedenken wollet--könnt ihr mir diess versagen. Helene?35

These words moved Helene to tears and the Margrave thanked her for this show of pity, kissed her hand, and ran off. Count Banko observed this scene from a garden villa and arrived seconds after Margrave Otto's departure. In an outburst of rage he killed the queen. The Margrave, hearing of the death of his sister, returned, realizing that his passion for Helene had been the cause of the queen's death, and he swore at her grave that he would not rest until he had punished the murderer. At this point the account loses continuity and the end does not have any bearing on Grillparzer's drama.

While these above-mentioned sources, no matter how

35Werke, part I, XVIII, 322.
freely they handle the sensational events centering around the Hungarian throne, can be considered historical materials, there are to be mentioned works of a different area, works of literature which had a bearing on Grillparzer's conception and execution of his "Hungarian" play. These works are Lord Byron's two historical dramas, Marino Faliero and The Two Foscari. They also influenced Grillparzer's presentation of Ein treuer Diener seines Herrn. Ludwig Wyplel discusses this influence in detail.36 Here is a short summary of the two plays by Lord Byron:

Marino Faliero, the Doge of Venice, when he was almost ninety years old, married the daughter of his friend, a woman who was young and extremely beautiful. At one of the parties at the ducal palace a young nobleman named Michele Steno was offended by the Doge and decided to take revenge on him. Since there were many rumors about the odd marriage of the Doge, Steno wrote on the ducal chair a derogatory remark about the young wife. The Council of Forty tried Steno and pronounced a rather light sentence: two months in prison and a year of banishment, which was a far cry from the Doge's demand that Steno be beheaded. The Doge considered it an insult to his ducal dignity and a very poor reward by the Council for the many years of

service that he had rendered to the city.

At the same time a plebian, Israel Betruccio, was mishandled by a patrician, whereupon Betruccio went to complain to the Doge. The smart Betruccio, realizing that the Doge was dissatisfied with the Council, told the Doge of a plebian conspiracy against the city rule, and asked the Doge to join them, offering in exchange the crown from the common people of Venice. The Doge accepted the offer and also persuaded his nephew, Betruccio Faliero, to join the cause. One of the conspirators, however, informed senator Lioni about the plot on the night of the revolt, and the senator arrested the Doge and made the news public before the revolt began. The conspirators were seized and their leaders, including the Doge, were put to death.

It must be noted that the young wife of the Doge stood by her husband to the last moment, and after his death retired to an old family estate, refusing even the pension which was coming to her as a widow of a Doge of Venice.

In The Two Foscari the major similarity with Ein treuer Diener seines Herrn lies not so much in the plot but rather in the two main characters, the older Foscari and Bancbanus respectively.

The theme of the play is the conflict between a father's love and his duty to the state. Jacopo Foscari, the son of the Doge of Venice, returned illegally to Venice
from his place of banishment because his devotion to the beloved city was so great that he could not live outside its boundaries. On account of this act of transgression and an alleged conspiracy with the city of Milano which was never proven, the young Foscari was arrested and then brought to court. The court procedures had to be suddenly interrupted, however, because the accused was tortured so much that he finally collapsed in a coma.

The main prosecutor was James Loredano, who was involved in a prolonged family feud with the Foscari family and who intended to strike at the Doge by the prosecution of the son. Jacopo finally was banished for life from Venice and upon insistent pleading by his wife, Marina, she was allowed to leave with him. But their children had to remain in Venice and be reared by the city. The stoic Doge accepted the verdict against his own son and granted himself as the only concession to his fatherly love the permission to accompany his son personally from the prison to the ship. The expected scene of leave-taking did not occur, however, since Jacopo died on the way to the ship as a result of the wounds he had received during the tortures.

Loredano continued his revenge by convincing the Council of Ten to depose the Doge, although a request by the Doge to relieve him of his duties had twice previously been denied. The Doge left the ducal palace proudly and with dignity, but the funeral of his son was too great an
emotional shock even for him, and he died at the bier.

The two themes of the Byron plays which are pertinent to *Ein treuer Diener seines Herrn* are: 1) love partners whose age differs considerably, 2) the conflict between duty to the state and duty to the family. In this connection, it should be pointed out that Grillparzer himself intended to write a play about Marino Falieri.
CHAPTER VIII

DISCUSSION OF EIN TREUER DIENER SEINES HERRN

Grillparzer was asked to write a drama for the celebration ceremonies in honor of Empress Caroline Augusta, who was to be crowned Queen of Hungary in September of 1825. He began to search Hungarianchronicles for an appropriate topic,1 and two events began to interest him: the revolt against King Stephan and Queen Gisela, and the rebellion in which Queen Gertrude was murdered. Both queens were German-born, and for Grillparzer to even consider a dramatic treatment of a revolt against one of them for the coronation of another German-born queen seems absurd. According to the Sauer edition of Grillparzer, the author realized the inappropriateness of the topic and eventually forwent the idea of writing any play for the coronation ceremonies.

Dass aber weder ein Aufruhr gegen eine historische Königin noch vollends deren Ermordung zum Krönungsfestspiel für eine gegenwärtige geeignet sei, war Gr. rasch klar geworden.2

Grillparzer says the following on this subject in his

---

1Grillparzer's diaries of 1824 contain notes based on Fessler, but many of the notes have no connection with the eventual topic of the play.

2Werke, part i, III, 355.
As we see from the above, Grillparzer did not want to treat a rebellion as a drama topic for a coronation ceremony. National and ethnic considerations, however, stemming from the fact that the two Hungarian queens of the past, as well as the present one, were German-born, seem never to have entered his mind, just as he had been unaware that in Königin Ottokars Glück und Ende the Czechs came out much worse than the Germans.

The events surrounding the murder of Queen Gertrude, however, seemed worthy of dramatic treatment, and Grillparzer continued to work on the idea. The age difference between Count Bank and his beautiful wife presented a topic which interested the author for a period of years, even though it did not become the central theme of the play. This problem had already been touched upon by Grillparzer, to be sure, in a much smaller way in Königin Ottokars Glück und Ende.

---

3Ibid., XVI, 203.

4Even Bishop Braun, the King's Chancellor and loyal to him to the end, was a German by birth. He came originally from Saxony. Grillparzer, however, was unaware of this partiality and very much taken aback by the protests of the Czech aristocracy.
Another indication that Grillparzer was intrigued by the situation of an older man married to a young woman is his interest in Marino Faliero. As early as the winter of 1812/1813 Grillparzer made notes on the historical Marino Faliero. His interest in this subject continued up to the time when he worked on Ein treuer Diener seines Herrn. In his diary of 1821 we find a passage which starts as follows:

Wenn ich je den Marino Falieri bearbeiten wollte,—
ein Vorhaben, das sich schon unter meinen frühesten Planen befindet. . . . 7

The above passage is followed by critical notes on Byron's Marino Faliero. And in November of 1826 we still find Marino Faliero on the list among planned topics.8

Byron's Marino Faliero led Grillparzer to the English poet's next play, The Two Foscari. The diary of 1822 contains excerpts from this play.9 The main theme of The Two Foscari, the conflict between a father's love and his duty to the state, is closely related to the main theme of Ein treuer Diener seines Herrn. Wyplel claims that in the older Foscari, Grillparzer found the prototype of

---

5It is also to be noted that Grillparzer had already treated the problem of love partners ill-matched in age in Sappho. Sappho is considerably older than Phaon.

6Werke, part ii, VI, 272-274.
7Ibid., VII, 354. 8Ibid., VIII, 245.
9Ibid., pp. 65-66.
Bancbanus.

In dem Dogen Foscari wird man also das Urbild des Bancban zu suchen haben.¹⁰

As a historical drama Ein treuer Diener seines Herrn is completely different from König Ottokars Glück und Ende. While the latter drama covered at least seventeen years and treated numerous important historical events, the former revolves around one incident, namely the murder of the German-born Queen of Hungary, Gertrude. The circumstances of the incidents and the behavior of the participants are so changed that it can hardly be called a historical drama.

In Grillparzer's treatment of the murder of the queen, we find a most radical departure from his source. According to Fessler, the rebels were so wild with rage at the queen that they held a caucus and decided to kill her and then hacked her body to pieces.¹¹ In Grillparzer's play the queen is killed by sheer, unfortunate accident, against the will and intention of the rebels. Actually Count Peter, who is responsible for the accident, is trying to save her life, and when the effort proves futile, he shows regret (11. 1656-1658). Thus Grillparzer does not present the brutality of the murder. This is very similar to his handling of the death of the old Merenberg in König Ottokars Glück und Ende, where in the sources he is

tortured to death on orders of Ottokar, and in the play his death is accidental. In fact, both situations are handled in an awkward and contrived manner, this clumsiness being the result of Grillparzer's reluctance to have them killed in the drama.

Grillparzer treats the entire revolt in a completely different manner than does his source. In Fessler the real cause of the revolt was the national antagonism of the Hungarians against the German-born queen and her relatives, the misbehavior of one of her brothers being only the spark that ignites the powder keg. In the drama the national antagonism is toned down decisively. Thus in Grillparzer's treatment not only do we never hear of the favors bestowed on the German relatives of the queen, but, apart from Otto's presence, we do not know of any other relative of Gertrude being in Hungary at that time. The only favor that Gertrude tries to bestow on Otto in the play, namely that he share with her the guardianship of the state during Andreas' absence, is flatly refused. Since Grillparzer does not mention the succession of revolts prior to the queen's murder in 1213, Otto's misconduct becomes the prime reason for the revolt and the accidental murder of the queen. We find, therefore, as was so often the case in *König Ottokars Glück und Ende*, that Grillparzer treats historical events of national importance on a more personal basis.
Grillparzer changed other events significantly from his historical source. According to Fessler, one of the queen's brothers raped the young wife of Count Bank. He does not say another word about the fate of this woman. In the drama rape does not enter the picture. In Otto's passionate outburst he does not touch Erny but threatens to lock her for life in a secret prison and orders his servants to seize her. Erny then commits suicide (11. 1275-1320). In Fessler Count Bank joins the rebellion after the rape of his wife, while in the drama, even though his wife loses her life, Bancbanus remains loyal to the king.

The interesting part about *Ein treuer Diener seines Herrn*, however, is not Grillparzer's changes from history but the way in which he presented the characters of the play in view of the fact that his historical sources gave him very little information about them.

In Otto of Meran, the villain of the play, Grillparzer created a very sensitive and complex character. Outwardly he reminds us of Zawisch. Both are harp-playing Romeo types, and both try to seduce a married

---

12He is not sure whether it was Otto or Henry (II, 416). Modern historians are inclined to believe that it was Berthold.

13Besides the similarity to Zawisch, Otto shares many characteristics with Don Cäsar. Like the latter Otto is a rebel, and wants, at all costs, to know the truth about the feelings of a woman.
woman. But the similarity stops here because their characters are completely different. Zawisch is insensitive, cool, and calculating, and achieves his objective, while the sensitive, emotional, and passionate Otto fails, and when he fully realizes his failure he collapses under the pressure. Heinz Politzer says that Grillparzer portrayed in Otto a Nervenzusammenbruch. Otto undoubtedly is a sick person. Bancbanus' composure and self-control while Otto is making open advances to Erny both infuriate and fascinate him. Politzer goes too far, however, with the idea of Vaterschaft, and completely neglects Otto's affection for Erny:

Und doch bedeutet ihm [Otto] die Eroberung der Frau nichts anderes als eine "Zutat." Im Grunde gilt die unzeitige Werbung dem Mann, an dessen väterlicher Sicherheit er teilnehmen möchte auch um den Preis, dass er diese Sicherheit durch einen Ehebruch zugrunde richtet.

It is after Erny's unexpected suicide that Otto, like a child, succumbs completely to Bancbanus' will. But when the physician describes Otto's disease (11. 929-931), the symptoms point to a person in love. And in the beginning of the conversation between Otto and Erny in the third act,

---

14Actually his affair with Kunigunde is only a part of his bigger plan.


16Ibid., pp. 74-75.
he tells the truth when he tells her how fascinated he is with her beauty. But Erny's contempt for him causes him to lose his self-respect, and Politzer is right when pointing at the ravages that Erny’s scornful rejection works in Otto's unstable and dangerously debilitated soul:

Je öfter Erny das Wort [Verachtung] wiederholt, desto mehr glaubt er ihm. Nun weiß er endlich was er ist: ein Verachteter.17

Some of Otto's characteristics and actions can be traced to the fictional sources of Grillparzer. As previously mentioned, in Sauer's edition Leithold is described as an exact image of Otto (see pages 136-137). Otto's passion especially reminds us of the passionate Leithold, and Otto's confession to Erny that he is returning to Germany and only asks her to promise him that she will remember him (11. 1204-1214) has its parallel in the narration given by Marianne of Neumann-Meissenthal. Here, too, Otto is talking about leaving Hungary and is asking Helene to remember him.18 Helene's and Erny's reactions to the prince's words, however, are completely different. While Helene is moved by Otto's emotion, Erny refuses him any kind of personal satisfaction. But Erny is a Grillparzer creation, not modeled after any character from the author's sources. According to Joseph Nadler, Erny is a new type

17Ibid., p. 75.
18Werke, part 1, XVIII, 322.
among Grillparzer's women.


In Grillparzer's diaries of 1821 we find the following passage:

Die hübsche E**, ohne überflüssigen Geist, aber jung und blühend an einen bejahrten, fast widerlichen Mann verheirathet, der ihr aber an Bildung überlegen ist, und sie durch Gefälligkeit und Aufmerksamkeiten aller Art an sich zu fesseln oder vielmehr zu gewöhnen weiss. Durch ihn in grösse Zirkel eingeführt, in denen sie ihrer langenweile [sic] los wird, und mit Bequemlichkeiten umgeben, die ihren rein körperlichen Ansprüchen an das Leben wenn auch nicht völlig genug thun, doch wenigstens sie beschwichtigen sieht sie ihren Mann als den Schöpfer dieses behaglichen Daseins an und ist ihm darum recht aufrichtig gut. Sie findet offenbar Wohlgefallen an manchen Männern, besonders an solchen von hübscher Aussenseite, aber ihr Wunsch wird nie zum Verlangen, und selbst der Wunsch geht nie so weit, dass sie dachte:
O wäre doch ein Solcher mein Mann! sondern höchstens:
O wäre doch mein Mann ein Solcher! Schon ihre Liebe zum Gewohnten und Bequemen hält sie von jeder Untreue zurück, und die Unruhe einer Liebes-Intrigue könnte ihr nicht durch alle möglichen Reize derselben aufgewogen werden. 20

Konrad Schaum considers this passage to be an early sketch


20 Werke, part ii, VII, 144-145.
of Erny,\textsuperscript{21} and the Sauer edition lists this passage in the Vorarbeiten of the drama.\textsuperscript{22} If E** really is the early projection of Erny, then the author changed this projection considerably, because little similarity between the two women remains. It shows, however, how frequently Grillparzer was pre-occupied with a marriage of an older man to a young woman, and the resulting, even though only unconscious and latent, feelings of frustration and dissatisfaction arising in the young woman.

There is no indication in the play that Erny wished that her husband were like someone else, and definitely Erny's faithfulness is not based on her love for comfort. On the contrary, she remains faithful to her husband even though at times it is decidedly difficult for her to do so. To be sure, there is, as Politzer points out, a certain father-child relation between Bancbanus and Erny,\textsuperscript{23} but above all she wants Bancbanus to protect her as a husband should protect his wife. When Erny's faithfulness is jeopardized, whether on account of the brute force of Otto and his two servants who confront her, or on account of the confusion of her feelings, she commits suicide.


\textsuperscript{22}Werke, part i, XVIII, 402.

\textsuperscript{23}Politzer, pp. 59-60.
Although Erny remains faithful to the end, she is not completely innocent. She felt a certain attraction toward Otto, and he made her aware of it again by reminding her that she took a lock of his hair from the queen's room.

Bancbanus, the faithful servant of the title of the play, is, of course, the central figure of the play, and in his behavior we find the most decisive deviation from Grillparzer's source. According to Fessler Bank becomes a partner to the rebellion, while in the play he remains the unshakeable and unalterable faithful servant. The crowning of his loyalty and self-abnegation is his successful effort to save Otto's life, since the latter is the truly responsible source of Bancban's tragedy and misery.

The author has often been criticized harshly for this character, but I tend to agree with Frederic Coenen that "our dramatist is by far a greater psychologist than these critics."  

When the King leaves Hungary he entrusts Bancbanus with the administration of the land. The orders are very specifically spelled out. These orders are: not to abuse his power; to be protector of the king's house, wife, and child; and to maintain peace. Bancbanus lives up to the expectations of the king at great personal sacrifices.

24Fessler, II, 417.

Grillparzer wrote in his autobiography:

Bancbanus hat dem Könige sein Wort gegeben die Ruhe im Lande aufrecht zu erhalten, und er hält sein Wort, trotz allem was den Menschen in ihm wankend machen und erschüttern sollte.²⁶

But to Bancbanus loyalty to the king is a categorical imperative²⁷ and therefore more important than all other matters. The question is whether Bancbanus could remain loyal to the king and obey his orders and still save Erny, in a court undermined by moral laxness and peopled with individuals striving for personal gain; the answer is no. He not only is unable to save Erny's life, but in spite of his efforts under the prevailing conditions of the court he is unable to maintain order. Order, however, is quickly restored as Bancbanus is able to persuade the rebels to lay down their arms, and, thanks to his untiring efforts, the king's son is saved, as a symbol of justice and order for future generations. Thus Bancbanus performs his duties, as the king expected of him before he left Hungary, and after his return the king realizes how well Bancbanus has performed his duties, how loyal he is, and what sacrifices he has had to make.

Wie aber soll ich dir die Treue lohnen,
Zum Teile nur vergelten, was du tatst,

²⁶Werke, part I, XVI, 204.

²⁷Kantian philosophy as an important factor in the drama is discussed by Coenen, pp. 36 and 38, and Emil Reich, Franz Grillparzers Dramen, 3rd ed. (Dresden, 1909), p. 144.
Was du erlittst im Dienste deines Herrn? 
(11. 2081-2083).

Coenen considers him a dramatic hero, and Grillparzer saw in him a real hero.

. . . ich hatte dabei den Heroismus der Pflichttreue im Sinn, der ein Heroismus ist so gut als jeder andere.

Gertrude has some characteristics in common with the historical queen. The most significant one is masculinity. Fessler calls the queen "eine Frau voll unternehmenden Eigensinnes und männlichen Muthes." In Grillparzer's treatment Gertrude reveals her masculine traits in the conversation with Andreas (11. 322-332). Politzer calls her a "half-man." Gertrude is, however, a much more complex person than the historical queen. In the play Gertrude knows that she should not allow Otto to see Erny, but the queen's love for her brother is so strong that she cannot deny it to him.

Nun aber hört Ich weiss, was ich verletzte, Wie sehr zu tadein, dass ich mich gefüg't. Verdammlich ist die Liebe, meine Liebe, Die du missbrauchst, und doch so teuer mir. 
(11. 1128-1131)

Furthermore, she realizes the danger in which she finds herself on account of her leniency toward Otto. When she leaves him her words sound like prophecy:

O Gottl

28Coenen, p. 41. 29Werke, part i, XVI, 204.
30Fessler, II, 403. 31Politzer, p. 70.
Auf dir ruht nun mein Dasein, fahre mild!
(11. 1136-1137)

King Andreas is a minor figure in the drama since he appears only at the beginning and the end of the play. He rises above the historical king, however, not on account of his action but on account of Bancbanus' complete confidence in the king as a competent and just judge.

Among other possible influences of Neumann-Weissenthal's essay on the play are the festivities at the court during Otto's presence there, in which Count Banko's wife played an important role, and Count Banko's thought of sending his wife away from the court. 32

The title of the drama Grillparzer took from Fessler; the term "des Königs treuer Diener," however, was in the source not a reference to Count Bank, but to Count Domaldus, an official of the king in the Balkan possessions. 33

From the above we can see that in Ein treuer Diener seines Herrn Grillparzer used history only as a frame and that his main efforts were directed toward the treatment of the main theme, namely loyalty to the established order, and toward the development of the psychological complexities of his characters.

---

32 Werke, part 1, XVIII, 321.
33 Fessler, II, 413.
CHAPTER IX

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF EIN BRUDERZWIST
IN HABSBURG

The sixteenth and the first half of the seventeenth centuries were marked by religious strife in central Europe. But when Rudolf II became Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire in 1576, relative tranquility prevailed in German lands. The main reasons for this temporary cessation of hostilities were the Peace Treaty of Augsburg in 1555 and the extreme tolerance of Rudolf's predecessor, his father, Maximilian II (1564-1576).

As Hajo Holborn points out, however, the terms of the Treaty were vague and open to various interpretations. Eventually this vagueness led to new and grave discord.¹

The new emperor was not as tolerant as his father had been. According to Holborn, Rudolf, after spending his formative years in Spain under Jesuit tutelage, never wavered in his devotion to the Catholic Church.² One of the


²Ibid., p. 284. Maximilian II's religious beliefs still provoke disagreement among historians. Some historians are of the opinion that he had to identify himself with the Catholic religion because he was the Emperor of
most striking differences between Maximilian's and Rudolf's reigns was that Rudolf chose only Catholics of very strong convictions for important positions in his government.

Tension grew in the Empire, but Rudolf lived in a world of his own and let his ministers run the government.3

Although the period was marked by religious unrest, other factors, often related to the religious struggle, began to disrupt the equilibrium in the Empire. Foremost among them was the conflict between the princes and nobility. The Protestant estates in Habsburg territories had gained more and more power, while the princes were trying to preserve or restore the old Church. Besides, the Empire was threatened constantly by the Turks, and the Emperor was a sick man who was preoccupied much more with curbing the power of his brother, Mathias, than contending with any of the dangers facing the Empire.

In 1568 the Turks had agreed on an eight-year armistice with Maximilian II. This armistice was renewed before its expiration date. But in 1590 Sultan Murad III concluded a successful peace treaty with the Persians, and many Turkish leaders demanded the renewal of hostilities against Hungary and the Emperor. In August 1593 the war

the Holy Roman Empire, but that he was a Protestant at heart (Gebhardt, II, 116-119).

3Anton Gindely, Rudolf II und seine Zeit (Prag, 1868), I, 27.
was declared, and in September Turkish armies crossed the river Drau and moved swiftly forward.  

The Emperor was now faced with the difficult task of rallying all Christians in his lands against the Turkish aggression. This meant the assembling of armies, quartering of soldiers, and higher taxes. Since the people of the Empire feared a Turkish invasion, Rudolf found more cooperation than he had expected, but the Protestant estates made it clear that they would not respect imperial authority in other matters.  

Rudolf appointed his brother, Mathias, who since his command in the Netherlands had waited eleven years for an advancement, to be in charge of the defense against the Turks.  

Although the war was costly, it was fought on a relatively small scale. The battles were fought mainly for the possession of individual fortresses on the Turkish-Hungarian border. Within the Empire, however, unrest began to increase. The Protestant cause and the estates made substantial gains during the war, and Rudolf decided to reverse that trend. In 1604 he announced that he intended to restore the Catholic Church in Hungary. The nobility of


5 Ibid., pp. 103 and 157-158.
Hungary and Siebenbürgen, on the other hand, fearing that Protestant services would be forbidden from then on, chose Stephan Bocskay, a Turkish ally at the time, to become Prince of Siebenbürgen and King of Hungary in 1605. He quickly expelled imperial troops from these lands and entered Moravia.6

Rudolf's brothers and the archdukes of the Styrian line doubted whether the Emperor was capable of solving the problems of the Empire, and they assembled in Vienna in April of 1606 and elected Mathias as the head of the dynasty. Mathias' first efforts were to secure peace. He achieved settlement with the Hungarians and Bocskay in June 1606 and with the Turks in November of the same year.7 Considering the fact that the Empire was not winning the war, the terms of the settlement were not unfavorable. But the Hungarians did not want to break with the Habsburgs, so when they had the opportunity to negotiate with Mathias rather than with Rudolf whom they distrusted, they seized it, and the Turks were willing to negotiate because they were being pressed again by the Persians. Mathias gave the Hungarians the religious freedom which Rudolf had denied them. Rudolf, after long hesitation, signed the treaty but was unhappy with its terms and tried to thwart them.8

7Ritter, II, 184-185. 8Gebhardt, II, 126.
fact, as soon as he signed the treaty, he ordered that it not be delivered to the Turks.\textsuperscript{9} Rudolf considered the treaty a trick of Mathias to ally himself with the Emperor's enemies, while Mathias saw in Rudolf's hesitation a further proof of his inability to conduct the affairs of the Empire.\textsuperscript{10}

Rudolf also tried to avert Mathias' succession to the throne. He preferred his cousin Leopold.\textsuperscript{11} Mathias, in the meantime, began to arm himself against Rudolf. He had the support of the Protestant nobility of Hungary, Austria, and Moravia, since he had endorsed their demands for religious freedom, and he also had on his side Bishop Klesel, an ardent supporter of the Counter-Reformation. This makes it clear that the enmity between the two brothers was not caused by different religious views but by personal jealousy and animosity. Gertrude of Schwarzenfeld says this about the feud:

\begin{quote}
Der Bruderzwist bedeutet also nicht die Auseinandersetzung zwischen zwei gegensätzlichen religiösen-politischen Haltungen, sondern war ein reiner Kampf um die Macht.\textsuperscript{12}
\end{quote}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{9}Gertrude von Schwarzenfeld, \textit{Rudolf II: Der saturnnische Kaiser} (München, 1961), p. 218.
\item \textsuperscript{10}Ibid., p. 219.
\item \textsuperscript{11}Franz Kurz, \textit{Der Einfall von Kaiser Rudolf II in Passau angeworbenen Kriegsvolkes in Oberösterreich und Böhmen} (Linz, 1897), p. 11.
\item \textsuperscript{12}Schwarzenfeld, p. 226.
\end{itemize}
Thus the first decade of the seventeenth century marks the beginning of open hostilities between the two brothers, but Hans Sturmberger contends that the origin of this feud can be traced to the early years of Rudolf's rule, even before the issue of succession became a problem:


In 1608 Mathias moved with his forces toward Prague, although according to Ritter, both sides tried to avoid a battle at this time. When Mathias was only one mile from the city a settlement was reached whereupon Rudolf relinquished to his brother his rights to Hungary, Austria, and Moravia, but he remained King of Bohemia. Mathias was, however, assured the succession to the Bohemian crown. Two days later Rudolf sent Mathias the Hungarian crown.

The reason Rudolf was able to retain, at least temporarily, the Bohemian crown, was the support he received from the Bohemian estates. Now they demanded a reward for their support in the form of religious freedom to be enjoyed by the estates in neighboring lands. To resist the

---

13 Hans Sturmberger, "Anfänge des Bruderzwistes in Habsburg," Mitteilungen des Oberösterreichischen Landesarchivs (Graz, 1957), V, 153. Until 1595 when Archduke Ernst, a third brother and Mathias' elder, died, Mathias was not considered a successor to Rudolf.

pressure from the Protestant estates, Rudolf called on Leopold to assist him in military matters. The Bohemian guards, however, blocked Leopold's access to the Emperor. Rudolf was then forced to yield to the demands and sign the so-called "Letter of Majesty." Schwarzenfeld summarizes the letter in the following manner:


Almost immediately Rudolf regretted signing the letter. Kurz states it this way:

Er empfand bittere Reue, dass er durch Drohungen sich habe Privilegien abzwingen lassen, die ihn anwiderten, weil sie ihn zu einem wahren Schattenkönige machten. Der frohlockende Jubel der Protestanten zeigte ihm deutlich, was er an den eigenen Glaubensgenossen verschuldet habe.

Two days after the signing of the letter Rudolf received Archduke Leopold. As soon as Leopold entered the Emperor's room, he threw himself at Rudolf's feet, and offered him his loyal services. The two spoke for a very long time, which astonished the entire court, since at that time Rudolf was either holding very short audiences or refusing them.

16Kurz, Der Einfall, p. 12.
17Schwarzenfeld, p. 233.
18Kurz, Der Einfall, p. 12.
altogether.\textsuperscript{19}

As previously mentioned, Rudolf wanted Leopold to be his successor. During their long conference they decided that the first step toward achieving this goal would be to take an active part in the Jülich-Cleve dispute.\textsuperscript{20} Rudolf announced, as Gebhardt puts it, "mit ungewohnter Entschiedenheit,"\textsuperscript{21} that Jülich-Cleve was now under his provisional administration and appointed Leopold as his administrator there. He also authorized Leopold to occupy Jülich-Cleve.\textsuperscript{22} The Archduke set out immediately for Jülich, and in the meantime a huge army was recruited on his behalf in Passau. This move had a two-fold purpose. First, it was to restore the imperial power of Rudolf, and second, to regain the lands from Mathias. Kurz states the goals of the imperial party in the following manner:

Wir sehen, es waren zwei Ziele, welche man bei Hofe im Auge hatte. Wiederherstellung der kaiserlichen Machtfülle und Demütigung des Mathias.\textsuperscript{23}

Rudolf also began negotiations with some dissatisfied groups in Mathias' lands. Once again a battle

\textsuperscript{19}Gindely, II, 32-33.

\textsuperscript{20}The childless Duke John William died in May, 1609, and each of his four sisters had sons with aspirations to rule these united principalities. Saxony also had claims to succession stemming from an old agreement. Gebhardt, II, 129.

\textsuperscript{21}\textit{ibid.} \textsuperscript{22}Gindely, II, 33.

\textsuperscript{23}Kurz, \textit{Der Einfall}, p. 14.
between the forces of the two brothers seemed to be unavoidable, but imperial princes, fearing that this would hurt considerably the Catholic cause, called a congress in Prague (May 1, 1610). Both sides continued, however, to arm themselves.\(^{24}\)

Rudolf had great hopes that the congress would force Mathias to return to him the lands which Rudolf had relinquished previously to his brother. But Rudolf's hopes were an illusion. Mathias' position was very strong and, when an agreement was reached on September 30, 1610, Mathias retained all possessions and remained the head of the dynasty, and the army in Passau was to be disbanded within a month.\(^{25}\)

The army did, however, remain intact, and suddenly, on December 21, 1610, under the command of Colonel Ramee, the Passau troops entered Upper Austria. There, confronted with Mathias' forces, Colonel Ramee turned toward Bohemia. It is unclear whether Ramee acted on orders from Rudolf or Leopold, but as soon as he entered Bohemia Leopold joined him, took over the command, and the Passau army arrived at the outskirts of Prague.\(^{26}\) The Bohemian estates took up the defense of the city and Leopold did not have the courage to make an all-out attack on Prague.\(^{27}\) The estates in

\(^{24}\)ibid., pp. 16-19.  \(^{25}\)ibid., pp. 21-23.

\(^{26}\)Ritter, II, 354.  \(^{27}\)ibid., p. 355.
the meantime sent for help to Mathias, who gladly obliged and entered Bohemia in March 1611. By the time he reached Prague, however, Leopold had dissolved his army and fled to safety. Mathias thus entered Prague without a battle. Now he could concentrate on his plan, which he had conceived with Klesel, namely to force Rudolf to abdicate in his favor.

The Bohemian estates were by now convinced that no order was possible under Rudolf II, and even before Mathias arrived in Prague they sent two negotiators, Wenzel Kinsky and Mathias Thurn, both Protestants, to plan Rudolf’s removal from office. In May 1611, they forced Rudolf to relinquish the Bohemian throne, and Mathias was crowned King of Bohemia. Rudolf became a virtual prisoner in his palace, surrounded by a few loyal friends, including Duke Julius of Brunswick. Officially, however, he still was the Emperor.

In October 1611, the electors gathered in Nürnberg to discuss the situation. But they did not want to break with the tradition and elect a successor during the lifetime of an emperor without his permission, and this they did not have. Consequently, they decided on an election day in May 1612, in Frankfurt, assuming that they would have Rudolf’s permission by then.

28 Ibid., p. 356.
Rudolf, however, was not cooperative. He tried to influence the electors to postpone the election and tried to resist the concessions he had made to Mathias by starting secret negotiations with the Union.\textsuperscript{29} This was, however, his last effort to resist Mathias. He died on January 20, 1612, at the age of fifty-eight.\textsuperscript{30}

In June 1612, Mathias was elected Emperor. He was incapable of making independent decisions and was completely dominated by Kiesel. The cooperation between Mathias and the Protestants ceased, since Mathias, influenced by Kiesel, worked openly toward the furthering of the Catholic cause. Mayer says this about Mathias' reign:

\begin{quote}
Er war, solange es galt, sich die Herrschaft zu erwerben, ungemein tätig, war es aber als Herrscher ebensowenig wie Rudolf. Der Kaiser war selbst in seinen Ländern ganz mächtlos.\textsuperscript{31}
\end{quote}

In the last two years of his reign Mathias was just a figurehead, thus experiencing the same fate as Rudolf. The affairs of the dynasty were conducted by Leopold's older brother, Ferdinand, who became King of Bohemia in 1617 and King of Hungary in 1618, and by Archduke Maximilian. Mathias' impotence was demonstrated best when on July 20, 1618, over his vigorous protest, Ferdinand and Maximilian ordered the arrest of Cardinal Kiesel.\textsuperscript{32}

\textsuperscript{29}A Protestant organization formed in 1609.
\textsuperscript{30}Ritter, II, 356-358.  \textsuperscript{31}Mayer, II, 82.
\textsuperscript{32}Ibid., p. 89.
Mathias died on March 20, 1619, at the age of sixty-three.\textsuperscript{33}

Rudolf's reign seems to have been very ineffective. Holborn summarizes it in the following manner:

Rudolf never wavered in his devotion to the Catholic Church, but the weakness of his character made his reign one of the least effective in the history of Austria as well as of the Empire. He was not lacking in political acumen or in the consciousness of the significance of his high office, but it was almost impossible for him to reach decisions or to adhere to those he made. His mind and personality deteriorated as the years went on. Melancholy turned into deep suspicion of his entourage and distrust of the world.\textsuperscript{34}

And yet Rudolf II was one of the most fascinating emperors who ever ruled the Empire. His interests covered a wide range. Gertrude of Schwarzenfeld says this in the preface to Rudolf's biography:

Zugleich aber leuchteten neue Facetten seiner Gestalt auf: Rudolf II. als Liebhaber und Mäzen der Künste und der Wissenschaften, Rudolf als Alchemist, als Magier, und ich trat in den weiten Kreis seiner Interessen ein, Interessen, zu denen wir heute eine neue Beziehung finden.\textsuperscript{35}

Miss Schwarzenfeld describes Rudolf as a true representative of his time.\textsuperscript{36}

Mayer has both praise and criticism for Rudolf:

In seiner besten Zeit war der Habsburger eine gewinnende Persönlichkeit. . . . Es war etwas Kaiserliches an ihm, er fasste vollkommen, was man ihm vortrug und antwortete mit Einsicht und Urteil. . . . Selbst so feine Beobachter, wie es die venetianischen Gesandten waren, erstaunten über die Schärfe seines Urteils und seine treffenden Bemerkungen.

\textsuperscript{33}Ibid., p. 89. \textsuperscript{34}Holborn, I, 284.
\textsuperscript{35}Schwarzenfeld, p. 6. \textsuperscript{36}Ibid., p. 8.
But then Mayer adds:

Aber das änderte sich. Das Phlegma Rudolfs wurde zur Melancholie, er wurde eigensinnig und jähzornig, menschenscheu und argwöhnisch.

Mayer ends his discussion of Rudolf in the following manner:

War dieser Kranksinn ein Erbe nach seiner spanischen Urgrossmutter oder eine Folge des religiösen Zwiespaltes seines Vaters? Das Reich und die Erbländer hatten schwer für ihn zu büßen.37

The mental sickness took complete hold of Rudolf around 1600.

After the turn of the century the morbidity of his mind led to open fits of insanity.38

I will illustrate with some specific examples how Rudolf's character and sickness influenced his reign.

Rudolf's father, Maximilian II, in order to appease Philip II of Spain for the privileges granted to the Protestants in Germany, sent the eleven-year-old successor to the throne to be educated in Spain. At the Spanish court he received an excellent education. Besides knowing German and Spanish, he knew Latin, Italian, and French. Later he also learned Czech. In spite of his Spanish upbringing and his leanings toward Spanish culture, however, he preferred German over any other language.39 He was extremely interested in natural sciences, and this interest had no

37Mayer, II, 81-82. 38Holborn, I, 284.

religious boundaries. Thus, in the later years of his rule, Rudolf brought to his court Tycho de Brahe, a Calvinist, and Johann Kepler, a Lutheran. The preoccupation with sciences, however, distracted Rudolf's attention from affairs of state and thereby corroded his ability to rule. After 1581 he rarely attended the meetings of his administrative councils. His negligence of state affairs took on disastrous proportions when the mental illness, which according to Stieve he inherited from his mother, took complete hold of him. Gindely says this on the subject:

Um das J. 1600 nahm zum erstenmale Rudolfs melancholische Gemüthsstimmung eine so krankhafte Wendung, dass sie nahe an Verrückheit grenzte. Die Geschäfte, schon früher vernachlässigt, ruhten zeitweise vollständig und Audienzen wurden fast garnicht erteilt, denn sonderbare Vorstellungen trübten den Verstand des Kaisers und erhitzte seine Phantasie derart, dass er sich den mannigfachsten Befürchtungen hin-gab.

He began to suspect everybody who surrounded him, especially members of the clergy, since Tycho de Brahe predicted that he would be killed by a monk. Because Rudolf did not trust anybody, he constantly changed ministers, who therefore were rarely long enough in their positions to acquaint themselves with their work. Many of Rudolf's advisors who had been with him for a long time were dismissed.

40 Schwarzenfeld, p. 10. 41 Stieve, pp. 495-497. 42 ibid., p. 496. 43 Gindely, I, 44. 44 Schwarzenfeld, p. 142.
after the turn of the century.

One of Rudolf's most capable advisors was Wolfgang of Rumpf. He had been with Rudolf from his childhood, including the years in Spain. And yet, in September 1600, in one of his fits, Rudolf called Rumpf in at three o'clock in the morning, threw a rapier at the minister barely missing his heart and ordered his dismissal. Apparently Rudolf began to mistrust Rumpf in 1599, when Rumpf advised the Emperor to settle the question of succession. Rumpf never returned to Rudolf's court. Thus Rudolf, who characteristically avoided making decisions, committed some of his gravest mistakes by quick decisions. Gertrude of Schwarzenfeld characterizes Rudolf very well in the following statement:

Wir müssen ihn in einem Spannungsfeld der Gegensätze sehen, in dem verschiedene Seelenzustände Geltung haben.

Due to a rash action, Rudolf also lost Marshall Russworm, his ablest military commander, who distinguished himself in the campaigns against the Turks. Miss Schwarzenfeld is of the opinion that he would have been the only one

45Stieve, p. 493. 46Schwarzenfeld, pp. 146-147.
47Gindely, I, 46-47.
48"In der Verzögerung sah Rudolf seit jeher die Taktik, die ihm ermöglichte, sich unangenehmen Entscheidungen zu entziehen." Schwarzenfeld, p. 255.
49Ibid., p. 255.
who could have helped Rudolf when the hostilities with Matthias began. But by that time he had been executed (November 1605). Because of Russworm's ability and closeness to Rudolf, he had many enemies at the court. They set up a trap for him. Due to the unrest in the streets of Prague, Rudolf had issued an order forbidding the carrying of weapons and dueling. Russworm, being a marshall, ignored the order. One day on the way from the Emperor, he was met by ten of General Belgiojoso's servants who informed him that the General, one of Russworm's bitterest enemies, was waiting for him at the entrance to his home. When Russworm arrived, the forbidden duel started in which Russworm killed Belgiojoso. The court found Russworm guilty of instigating the duel and sentenced him to death. Rudolf, persuaded by Philipp Lang, another of Russworm's enemies, signed the verdict. Rudolf regretted it almost immediately and ordered Russworm's release. It was too late, however, since the Marshall's enemies, fearing Rudolf's change of mind, executed Russworm as soon as possible. Stieve says, however, that the incident with General Belgiojoso was a pretext and that Russworm was executed because he had an affair with one of Rudolf's mistresses.

50Ibid., p. 208. 51Ibid., pp. 208-213. 52Stieve, p. 500.
Stieve describes Rudolf in his last few years as a man with a sick mind, possessed by only one thought, revenge on his brother Mathias. Stieve thinks, however, that Rudolf's indecision probably postponed the outbreak of the Thirty Years' War. Gertrude of Schwarzenfeld is more positive in her assertion.

Rudolf II. hat während seiner Regierungszeit, also sechsunddreissig Jahre lang, eine kriegerische Aus­ einandersetzung der Religionsparteien vermieden und dem Reich den inneren Frieden erhalten. 54

53 Ibid., pp. 512-514. 54 Schwarzenfeld, p. 9.
CHAPTER X

SOURCES FOR EIN BRUDERZWIST IN HABSBURG

The nature of Grillparzer's preparation for the writing of Ein Bruderzwist in Habsburg is completely different from that of his preparation for the writing of his two previous historical dramas. Even though Grillparzer had been interested in the subject matter of his future play since childhood, he intensively studied the historical events of the period for three and a half years prior to the actual writing of the drama. He then wrote the entire play within a few weeks (see page 142). Ein treuer Diener seines Herrn revolves around one historical event, and Grillparzer relied, in the main, on only one historical source (see pages 133-134). The actual writing of the drama was also accomplished rather quickly. But for Ein Bruderzwist in Habsburg Grillparzer wrote the first few sketches in the 1820's, intensified his work in the 1830's, and the first version was not finished until 1848. A few small changes were made in the text in the 1850's and it reached the public after Grillparzer's death in 1872.\(^1\) In

\(^1\)Werke, part i, VI, xxv.
other words, the author was preoccupied with this particular drama for the greater part of his creative years. As a result, Grillparzer's historical studies also were spread over a long period of time. This makes it virtually impossible to trace every work dealing with the subject that the author used in his research in these many years. I will examine, therefore, in this chapter only those works which deal with the main events and themes of Ein Bruderzwist in Habsburg and only when their use by Grillparzer is well documented.

Some of the historical sources which Grillparzer studied as background for this drama he had studied previously as background for König Ottokars Glück und Ende. The most significant of these are Franciski Pubitschka's Chronologische Geschichte Böhmens unter den Slaven and Joseph Freyherr von Hormayr's Österreichischer Plutarch. These works were discussed in Chapter II. Pubitschka's Volume X contains the events which Grillparzer treats in Ein Bruderzwist in Habsburg. Several volumes of Hormayr's work were used by the author for this drama. Volumes VII and VIII contain biographies of Rudolf II and Mathias respectively. Grillparzer also used volume II, containing the biography of Franz of Dietrichstein, because this biography has several references to Wolfgang Rumpf, Rudolf II's "Kämmerer" in Grillparzer's drama. August Sauer also claims that Hormayr's biography of Wallenstein was the
Undoubtedly Grillparzer was well-acquainted with Wallenstein's life and fascinated with Schiller's trilogy on Wallenstein, but Wallenstein's presence in Ein Bruderzwist in Habsburg is only meaningful with regards to future historical developments which are hinted at in the last scene of the play. He appears as a catalyst of events which will follow those treated in this drama, namely the events of the Thirty Years' War. His appearance in the context of events of Ein Bruderzwist in Habsburg is not historical. I therefore do not consider Wallenstein's biography as a historical source.

Although, as mentioned in Chapter II, Hormayr was generally sympathetic with the policies of the Habsburg dynasty, he portrays Rudolf II and Mathias in much more negative terms than Rudolf I. He has nothing good to say about Mathias; he is, however, of the opinion that Rudolf's treatment of his brother was unfair.

2 Werke, part 1, XXI, 3.

3 Kurt Partl, Friedrich Schiller's "Wallenstein" und Franz Grillparzer's "König Ottokars Glück und Ende" (Bonn, 1960).

4 Hormayr, VII, 70.
In describing Rudolf, Hormayr enumerates generally the same faults of the Emperor which are pointed out by modern historians, but he tries to explain the reasons for Rudolf's failures. Among the most disrupting influences on Rudolf's reign, Hormayr cites his upbringing at the Spanish court and the power of the Jesuits at Rudolf's court:

Darin lag die Ursache des unglückseligen Ganges der grossen Angelegenheiten unter Rudolph, in der spanischen Erziehung und später in der jesuitischen Direktorien an seinem Hofe.  

Despite Rudolf's strong dislike for Mathias, he did not desire open hostilities with his brother. Rudolf started to fight Mathias only after strong pressure was exercised by the Papal Nuncio, the Spanish ambassador, and the military-minded Jesuits. Only then did the Emperor call for Leopold's troops.  

In spite of Rudolf's shortcomings, Hormayr is of the opinion that he did not deserve the harsh treatment which he received from his contemporaries in the last few years of his life. The author praises Rudolf especially for working very hard, although unsuccessfully, toward the formation of an Order of Friedensritter to prevent the outbreak of the religious war.  

Although Grillparzer's portrayal of Rudolf is quite different from Hormayr's, Grillparzer relied on this

---

5Ibid., p. 31.  6Ibid., p. 80.  
7Ibid., p. 82.  8Ibid., p. 72.
biography more than on any other source in his treatment of the Emperor.

For the general historical background of the period Grillparzer's main source was Frantz (Franz) Christoph Khevenhüller's (Khevenhüller) *Annalium Ferdinandeorum*. As the title indicates, the work concentrates on the life of Emperor Ferdinand II, but it also covers fully all historical events in Europe from Ferdinand's birth in 1578 until his death in 1637.

Weit über den Rahmen einer Biographie hinaus ist das Werk eine pragmatische Geschichte ganz Europas, deren Mittelpunkt Kaiser Ferdinand ist.

Like Ottokar of Steiermark and his family, who were actively involved in important events of the thirteenth century (see Chapter II), Franz Christoph Khevenhüller and his family played an important part in imperial politics before and during the Thirty Years' War.

Dieser Historiker [Khevenhüller] gibt uns ein typisches Beispiel, wie die Geschichtsschreibung aus der amtlichen Tätigkeit eines Staatsmannes herauswachsen konnte.

Khevenhüller grew up at the court of the Archduke Ferdinand and later became his ambassador to Spain, a position which

---


10 Coreth, p. 70. 11 Ibid.
he held for fourteen years. This assignment did not start, however, until 1617. But his uncle, Johann Khevenhüller, was the ambassador to Spain under Maximilian II and Rudolf II and was a very close advisor to Rudolf. He was the main mediator in trying to arrange a marriage between Rudolf II and the daughter of Phillip II, Isabella. He was in constant correspondence with Rudolf, and Franz Christoph Khevenhüller has many references to this correspondence. Franz Christoph inherited six volumes of his uncle's personal records.

Wurzbach considers Khevenhüller's work to be an impartial study. Today most historians consider it to be pro-Catholic (Khevenhüller was a converted Catholic), but still the best historical work that emerged from the period. Thompson says this about this source:

Naturally it is pro-Habsburg and pro-Catholic; but despite inaccuracies and inevitable bias, it is one of the most valuable sources on the Thirty Years' War.

Anna Coreth explains why certain shortcomings in Khevenhüller's work are to be expected:

Dass aber ein Werk, das den lebenden Monarchen behandelt, zu jeder Zeit, insbesondere aber zur Zeit des Absolutismus, unter Zensur stand, daher nicht alles Wissenswerte bringen durfte, ist selbstverständlich.
D. Runde discusses the mistakes in Khevenhüller's work, but if we consider that his analysis covers twelve large volumes of historical study, the number of actual mistakes is rather small. Runde mainly objects to Khevenhüller that since being so close to certain events of the period he tends to over-emphasize them but pays little attention to other events which in Runde's opinion deserved more detailed study.18

Franz X. Wegele is the most severe critic of Khevenhüller. Although he admits that the historian's access to his uncle's protocols was of immense value and that they were used well, Wegele accuses Khevenhüller of severe bias. The critic is of the opinion that Khevenhüller purposely concealed important information in order to portray the Habsburg dynasty in a favorable light. The Protestant estates are always seen as rebels and in the wrong while the Emperor is always right.19 Wegele's following statement is a good appraisal of the state of historical writing of the period and Khevenhüller's work in particular.

Leider sind die Annalen in ungefährr derselben Weise gearbeitet, wie die meisten zeitgeschichtlichen Werke der Epoche. Von einer Verarbeitung der gesammelten


The events treated in *Ein Bruderzwist in Habsburg* are discussed in volumes VI and VII, but Grillparzer also made excerpts for his *Vorarbeiten* on the drama from earlier volumes. He used them for references to past events, especially for the second act of the drama, where for a short while events are introduced which took place almost a decade earlier than the play's opening scene.

Another source for *Ein Bruderzwist in Habsburg* was the twenty-two volume *Geschichte der Deutschen* by Michael Ignaz Schmidt. It is a very thorough study which till today enjoys a good reputation. As the title indicates, it does not concentrate on a specific period but portrays the entire history of the German people. Wurzbach considers it the first work that treats the German people as a unity.


Thompson also has very high praise for Schmidt:

Schmidt was detached and impartial, especially in his treatment of the Reformation. . . . Remarkably enough, it was Schmidt, and not Ranke, who made the famous

---


21 Michael Ignaz Schmidt, *Neuere Geschichte der Deutschen* (Ulm, 1787). For his drama Grillparzer used volumes III and IV of this study.

22 Wurzbach, **XXX**, 305.
statement about writing history wie es eigentlich gewesen ist. Edward Fueter says that although Schmidt's approach to history was, in spite of his indebtedness to Voltaire and Robertson, highly original, he was a sound judge of history. Fueter, like Thompson, praises Schmidt for his treatment of the Reformation:

Schmidt ist der erste, der die Reformation leidenschaftlos und unparteilich zu beurteilen versucht.

Grillparzer also used for this drama Geschichte Maximilians I und seiner Zeit by Peter Philipp Wolf. Although Maximilian I of Bavaria does not appear in Ein Bruderzwist in Habsburg, he was a very influential figure of the period. He often participated in events treated in this play, but Grillparzer lets somebody else perform the actions which actually were performed by Maximilian I. Wolf is a noted historian who achieved his fame mainly for his treatment of the history of the Jesuits.

Of some influence, although of a less direct nature than the aforementioned sources, was Carl Spindler's Der Bastard: Eine deutsche Sittengeschichte aus dem Zeitalter Kaiser Rudolph des Zweiten. To be sure, it is not a work of historiography but a historical novel in three volumes.

23Thompson, II, 125.


25Peter Philipp Wolf, Geschichte Maximilians I und seiner Zeit (München, 1807).
which appeared in 1826.26 Grillparzer comments on Spindler in his diaries of 1831.27 The main character of the novel is Archimbald, an illegitimate son of a city councilman of Ulm, not the illegitimate son of Rudolf who appears in Grillparzer's drama. But Archimbald leaves his home town and comes into the service of Rudolf, and from that point in the novel most of the characters who appear in *Ein Bruderzwist in Habsburg* appear also in the novel. Many situations described in the novel do not differ much from the actual historical events. Thus Julius, whom Spindler introduces as an illegitimate son of Rudolf, meets the same end as in the historical sources consulted by Grillparzer. The figure of Don Cäsar in the drama is based on Julius. Rudolf is portrayed in the novel in very negative terms. Joseph König claims that Spindler's picture of the Emperor borders on caricature.28

As mentioned before, the above list of sources is not complete. The sources do, however, give a detailed picture of events treated in *Ein Bruderzwist in Habsburg.*

---

26I could not get hold of the 1826 edition. I do have at my disposal an edition published in Stuttgart in 1838. The editor of the Grillparzer critical edition was not able to get the 1826 edition either. He read one published in Stuttgart without a date. *Werke,* part 1, XXI, 29. This edition is divided into four volumes.

27Ibid., IX, 33.

And all of them, with the exception of Spindler's novel, are mentioned numerous times by Grillparzer in his diaries and his preliminary studies to the drama.
According to August Sauer, it is not quite clear what induced Grillparzer to use the term Bruderzwist in the title.\(^1\) His historical sources do not use this term for the feud between Rudolf and Mathias, but the word appeared in the literature of Grillparzer's time, and Karoline Pichler used it in one of her plays to describe this particular feud. In any case, it is a very appropriate term for Grillparzer's drama because it indicates more than just the strife between Rudolf and Mathias. The title itself projects the complicated problems of the drama, particularly the disintegration of order.

The title suggests that the natural order is destroyed because the closest natural relation is destroyed. When the basic social unit, the family, is disintegrating, the state is brought to the point of disintegration, too. In this case that is especially so, since the family happens to be the ruling dynasty of the state. The term Bruderzwist also has a religious connotation. It not only

\(^1\)Werke, part i, VI, 415.
signifies a Biblical situation but also symbolizes the split in Christianity since the emergence of Martin Luther. In discussing the word Zwist, as well as words which have a similar meaning and are used in the drama, Sauer says the following:

Sie wurden nicht bloss durch den Streit der Brüder, sondern auch durch das von Kampf und Hass erfüllte Zeitalter der Reformation nahegelegt, in dem die religiösen Meinungsverschiedenheiten ja auch politische und soziale Umwälzungen zur Folge hatten.

In other words, already the title reveals the tragedy which is going to unfold before us in the drama.

The disintegration of order is emphasized in the very first scene of the drama when Don Cásar stands up rebelliously against the authority, while Rudolf uses for the motto of his Order the opposite of Don Cásar's rebellious pronouncement, "Nicht ich, nur Gott" (1. 1221) insisting that the words be used literally. The fact that Don Cásar, the natural son, rebels against Rudolf is another sign of the disintegration of the family.

Don Cásar is the first rebel appearing in the drama, but before the first act is over we are confronted with several others. I do not agree with Gerhart Baumann that

---

2Since Zwist is derived from zwei it symbolizes the breaking in two of what once was the unity of Christendom.

3Werke, part 1, VI, 416.
Kiesel is Rudolf's actual antagonist. Although Kiesel, who is the shrewdest of Rudolf's opponents, seems to be more directly responsible for Rudolf's downfall and Mathias' usurpation of power, Don Cásar, Mathias, Max, Ferdinand, and even Leopold, who loves Rudolf and is loved by him, constitute his opponents because they are disobedient and rebel against the existing order.

The first incident of the play, the sentencing of Russworm and his execution, is based on an historical event, although in Grillparzer's presentation it is changed considerably. Besides, Don Cásar's connection with Russworm's execution is the author's invention.

According to Khevenhüller Russworm was tricked into a fight with Belgioioso (Belgioiosa) in which Belgioioso was killed. The instigator of the fight was Carl Furlan, a citizen of Milan who hoped to receive a reward of 12,000 crowns which had been put on the head of Belgioioso by the dukedom of Milan. Russworm was sentenced to death and Rudolf approved the sentence because of the false depositions by the field marshall's enemies, who envied his fame. Rudolf regretted his approval of the sentence almost

---


5 Actually Rudolf did not have an illegitimate son named Cásar. Don Cásar's fate is, however, very similar to that of Rudolf's illegitimate son Julius who will be discussed later.
immediately and pardoned Russworm, but it was too late—
Russworm had already been executed.  

In the drama Don Cäsar tries desperately to iden-
tify Russworm’s deed with the love rivalry between
Belgioioso and himself (he and Mathias try to benefit from
deeds of others), but Russworm denies any connection with-
out giving a reason for his deed. He only hints that
treachery and slander may have been behind it:

Ob falsche Nachricht, Ohrenbläser Tücke
Mich trieb zur Tat, die nun mich selbst verdammt,
Ob meine Dienst', in mancher Türkenschlacht
Rücksicht verdienen, Mildrung und Gehör,
Das mag der Richter prüfen und erwägen;
Allein, dass Belgioiso euch im Weg,
Euch Nebenbuhler war in euerm Werben,
Hat seinen Tod so wenig ihm gebracht,
Als, war ers nicht, es ihn vom Tod errettet.
(11. 21-29)

There is, of course, no sign of any kind of regret or par-
don on the part of Rudolf in Grillparzer’s presentation.
In fact, Rudolf is quite emphatic about the death sentence:

Er stirbt!—Und du mit ihm,
Wagst ferner du's ein Wort für ihn zu sprechen.
(11. 270-271)

There is also no hint in the drama that the execution was
performed in a hurry. Not until the fourth act do we find
out that Russworm was beheaded and with no indication of
the time lapse between the sentence and the execution

Russworm’s trial and execution took place,

6Khevenhüller, Annales, VI, 2920-2921.
according to Khevenhüler, in 1605, and according to Pub-
itschka, whose account of the incident is similar to
Khevenhüler's but with fewer details, in 1604. Ein
Bruderzwist in Habsburg begins, therefore, about that time.
But as in König Ottokars Glück und Ende, in this play too
Grillparzer frequently deviated from the historical sequence
of events and occasionally happenings which took place be-
fore 1605 are treated in the drama.

One of the most noticeable deviations from the his-
torical sequence of events is the inclusion of Wolf Rumpf
among the dramatis personae. All sources report that Rumpf
was expelled from Rudolf's court in 1600 or 1601, well be-
fore the first action treated in Ein Bruderzwist in Habs-
burg. It is also to be noted that among the sketches for
the play which Grillparzer jotted down in 1827, Hans
Mettich is listed as the Kämmerer. Mettich held various
positions in Rudolf's court between 1601 and Rudolf's death
in 1612, including the position of Oberkämmerer.

7Khevenhüler, VI, 2921. 8Pubitschka, X, 354.

9Werke, part I, XXI, 141 and 144.

10Kämmerer was a much higher position in that period
than the literal meaning of the word indicates. Apparently
it was a position of even more power in Rudolf's court, be-
cause modern historians refer to Rudolf's reign in his last
few years as die Kämmererregierung, since they ran the
affairs of the state while the Emperor kept himself in
isolation.
Considering, however, that the Kämmerer in the drama was to have the complete confidence of the Emperor, Rumpf was a much more appropriate person for the position than Mettich, because of all Rudolf's advisors during his thirty-six-year reign Rumpf was the closest to him and enjoyed more power than any others. Khevenhüller lists the numerous titles and positions held by Rumpf, but the following statement is the best description of Rumpf's importance at Rudolf's court:

... und dirigierte nicht allein dieses Kaysers Hof sondern auch sein Herz.\(^{11}\)

Rumpf apparently was dismissed because he advised Rudolf not to marry Philipp II's daughter, Isabella. Rudolf regretted not marrying her after she married his younger brother, Albrecht.\(^{12}\)

Schmidt also discusses Rumpf's important role at Rudolf's court. He refers to him as Rudolf's Liebling and is of the opinion that Rudolf's indecisions in political matters increased after Rumpf's dismissal, because Rudolf lacked an advisor of Rumpf's intelligence and devotion.\(^{13}\)

In Grillparzer's treatment, however, Rudolf has Rumpf's advice to the end of his life, and it does not change matters at all. In the drama, even though Rudolf seems to

\(^{11}\)Khevenhüller, *Conterfet Kupferstich*, II, 66.


\(^{13}\)Schmidt, III, 148-149.
live in the seclusion of his own world very much like the sources describe him, he knows the dangers which surround him, and even knows which virtues would be necessary to avert a catastrophe.

Und in den Reden des Kaisers zeigt er, welche Tugenden nötig wären, um den drohenden Untergang aufzuhalten. Das was andrängt, und wogegen der Kaiser zu bewahren strebt, ist also die Zeit. 

There are numerous references in the drama to the chaotic tendencies, the unrestrained wilfulness rampant in this period, but Rudolf's characterization of Don Cäsar describes it best:

Der freche Sohn der Zeit. --Die Zeit ist schlimm, Die solche Kinder nährt und braucht des Zügels. (11. 1343-1344)

Gerhard Heine says the following about this passage:

Das Wort spricht aus, was diese Scene darzustellen beginnt, und zeigt zugleich die symbolische Bedeutung Don Cäsars als einer Verkörperung der Willkürlichen und ungezügelten Strebungen der Zeit. 

The tragedy of the period in Grillparzer's presentation lies in the fact that individuals, Don Cäsar as well as the other previously mentioned rebels, want to assert their individuality at all cost. This is not, however, what Grillparzer found in the sources. The general tone of the sources conveys a genuine concern of the members of the

14 Walter Neumann, Grillparzer; Das dichterische Werk (Stuttgart, n.d.), p. 38.

Habsburg dynasty and of the Bohemian estates about Rudolf's ability to conduct the affairs of the Empire in the last few years of his reign. What Grillparzer really portrayed is his own period. He prophetically foresaw the events of the latter part of the nineteenth century. Nadler says the following on this subject:

"Ein Bruderzwist" atmet, sosehr es die Tragödie Kaiser Rudolfs II. ist, die zeitgenössische Luft des Dichters. . . . Denn sein Blick war tief in die Folgen und weit über 1848 hinausgerichtet.  

Heine and Naumann also point to the drama's timeliness to the author's own time.  

All main participants of the drama, with the exception of Duke Julius of Braunschweig, are assembled on the stage at an early moment of the first act. This gathering in the Emperor's ante-room has no historical foundation. There is no evidence in Grillparzer's sources that the individuals involved came to Rudolf in 1605, the time of the first event of the play, or ten years earlier, before Mathias took over the command in Hungary. But since they were the rebels in the drama, their confrontation with Rudolf in the first act enabled Grillparzer to introduce us very quickly to their motives and to the main theme of the play.

---

16 Nadler, p. 428.
17 Heine, p. 376; Naumann, Das dichterische Werk, p. 38.
Mathias appears with Klesel. One can consider Mathias actually as a puppet in Klesel's hands, because the shrewd Cardinal manipulates the future Emperor any way he wants, and when at the end Klesel is taken away from him and Mathias has to face responsibilities alone, he is completely helpless. The sources talk frequently about Klesel's power at Mathias' court and his influence in determining Mathias' policies before the latter became Emperor. Sauer even quotes a source that states that Klesel was among the most active persons to cause Rudolf's downfall. The cooperation, however, between Mathias and Klesel did not take place until the latter part of the first decade of the seventeenth century, and Klesel's help in Mathias' receiving the command in Hungary is therefore completely unhistorical. The first time Klesel and Mathias became associated with each other was, according to Schmidt, in 1609. But as it was in the case of Rumpf, who actually was Rudolf's most important advisor before the turn of the century and yet, in Grillparzer's treatment, advised Rudolf to the end of his life, so Klesel, Mathias' advisor of his later years, advises him through all the events of the drama. This eliminates the introduction of less

18 Werke, part 1, VI, 426. The above source is Geschichte des österreichischen Kaiserstaates by Johann Mailath. The book is not available.

19 Schmidt, III, 246.
important characters and enables the author to develop the participating characters much better. Grillparzer employed this dramatic concentration also in König Ottokars Glück und Ende.

Grillparzer's presentation of Mathias' character is quite different from the presentation we find in the sources. In the drama Mathias is completely dominated by Kiesel. Mathias is willing to forego all his ambitions, but Kiesel manipulates him so shrewdly that he does not even realize what the Cardinal has in mind. The sources, however, portray Mathias as an independent man in trying to achieve his goals. Hormayr says this of him:

Mathias, welchem Rudolf, aus unseligem Argwohn jede, seinem Stande und seinen Fähigkeiten angemessene Beschäftigung auf eine, nicht sehr schonende Art, versagt hatte, beschloss aufgebracht, sich das, wenn Zeit und Umstände günstig wirkten, selbst zu verschaffen, was er von seinem Bruder vergeblich gebeten hatte. 20

In the drama Mathias is a failure at every undertaking. This is historical, but Hormayr is of the opinion that this was due to circumstances rather than Mathias' inability. He had the talent to be a good military leader.

Ich [Mathias' tutor] beseelte die Hoffnung, Mathias werde einst ein grosser Feldherr werden, und wirklich hatte die Natur diesen Prinzen freygebirg mit Anlagen ausgestattet, die die Bedingungen und Mittel dieses grossen Berufes sind. 21

Especially unfortunate was Mathias' involvement in

20Hormayr, VIII, 8-9. 21Ibid., p. 6.
the Netherlands. He was approached by a delegation from one of the feuding parties to become their leader. However, when Mathias arrived in the Netherlands, he found out that the delegation had not informed the majority of the party's members about their offer, with the result that they were rather hostile toward Mathias. He found himself, then, in the embarrassing position of having a title without real power and had eventually to leave the Netherlands.22

In the drama, too, Mathias claims he was deceived in the Netherlands (ll. 105-110), yet his self-defense is much more in keeping with his character as projected by Grillparzer. Being unwilling to admit his failure, he offers William of Orange's deception as an excuse in response to Kiesel's accusation that he failed. The fact that Mathias is portrayed in the drama as a weakling tends to elevate Rudolf's, the true protagonist's, stature.

In the drama Ferdinand attempts to persuade Rudolf to confer upon Mathias the command in Hungary. Actually it was the mother of the two quarreling brothers who pleaded with Rudolf on Mathias' behalf. He became the actual commander only after Carl of Mannsfeld fell in battle and nobody else desired the command, but, according to Hormayr, Mathias gave a creditable account of himself in Hungary:

Er führte es mit Einsicht, Treue und Muth.23

According to Khevenhüller, Ferdinand acted as a negotiator between Rudolf and Mathias, but this took place in 1610, when for all practical purposes Mathias had all the power.\(^\text{24}\)

Hormayr mentions frequently the temperamental difference of the two brothers. He is of the opinion that Mathias' anxiousness to be active was at the root of the conflict.

Schon in den ersten Knabenjahren zeigte sich in Mathias jene, von seines edelmütigen Vaters heroische Ruhe, von der Unentschlossenheit und Schwäche seines Bruders Rudolph, so weit verschiedene, vorschnelle Lebhaftigkeit, jener feurige Thatendurst, jenes unruhige Streben nach einem immer grösseren Wirkungskreise, das sein ganzes Leben hindurch, seinem Hause und ihm selbst so wenig frohe Stunden gebracht.\(^\text{25}\)

Grillparzer, too, although he points to certain similarities of the two brothers not found in the sources, stresses Mathias' unfortunate thirst for activity.

Among other similarities between the drama and the sources in the Rudolf-Mathias relation are their dislike for each other heightened by the favoritism that Mathias enjoyed at the hands of their father, Maximilian II (11. 93-96).\(^\text{26}\) The fact that Mathias was ordered by Rudolf not to leave Linz (1. 443) is also historical.\(^\text{27}\)


\(^{25}\)Hormayr, VIII, 5-6. \(^{26}\)Ibid., VII, 7-8.

In the first act we are also introduced to Archduke Ferdinand and to the basic principles he stands for. It happened to be in 1597 that he was in Prague at the same time that Mathias was there. He came to Rudolf to ask permission to marry Maria Anna, the daughter of Duke William of Bavaria. He also wanted to get Rudolf's approval for his plan to clear Inner Austria of Protestants. He was told that he had the right to do so; however, Rudolf advised him against it, because it was too dangerous. But as Hormayr characterizes Ferdinand, dangers never stopped him from achieving his goals:

Aber Gefahren waren es niemals, was Ferdinaniden abhielt, irgend einen seiner Entscheidisse zu verfolgen.29

Grillparzer's version, therefore, that Ferdinand had written for Rudolf's permission to expel all Protestants not willing to convert to Catholicism and not getting an answer (11. 172-181), does not agree with the author's sources. However, Rudolf's neglect of matters of state in his later years, often making it necessary for his subordinates and advisors to act before he expressed his opinion on matters, is frequently reported by the sources.30 In applying this characteristic of Rudolf to a case in which it did not historically apply, Grillparzer stressed a point in Rudolf's

28Khevenhüller, Annales, IV, 1717-1718.
29Hormayr, VIII, 49.
30Ibid., VII, 68, and Schmidt, III, 143-144.
character consistent with the sources without having to
treat additional events not necessary for the theme of the
drama. Grillparzer used this technique frequently in this
play as well as in König Ottokars Glück und Ende (see Chap­
ter V).

From the moment Ferdinand is confronted with Rudolf,
Grillparzer stresses the contrast between the two men.
Rudolf, as Nadler characterizes him, is a good person. His
convictions are based not on his weaknesses but on his de­
votion to humanity. He is therefore appalled by Fer­
dinand's cruel handling of the non-Catholics and his cold
approach to his decision in personal matters, namely his
refusal to marry the girl with whom he apparently is in
love because she is a Protestant, and his marrying instead
a Catholic woman, who, at least in Rudolf's eyes, is utterly
lacking in physical attraction (11. 487-501). This por­
trayal of Ferdinand as the fanatic, inflexible promoter of
the Catholic cause is based on the author's historical
sources. His uncle, Duke William of Bavaria (later also
his father-in-law), to whom Ferdinand's mother had entrusted
his education after his father's death, sent Ferdinand with
his own son Maximilian to Ingolstadt to be brought up by
the Jesuits. Ferdinand's strict Catholic upbringing in the
Jesuit school and the close connection with the ruling house

31Nadler, p. 425.
of Bavaria, where the Protestant religion was not tolerated, made a lasting impression on the young Archduke. In this spiritual climate he made up his mind that in his lands the new religion would also be disallowed.\textsuperscript{32} Rudolf's dislike for Ferdinand's religious zeal is also reported in the sources, although they refer to a period later than Ferdinand's 1597 visit to Prague.

Auch der Erzherzog Ferdinand, als das Haupt der Grützer Linie, auf welchen die Oesterreichischen Staaten insgesammt nach Rudolphs und seiner Brüder unbeerbten Abgänge fallen sollten, stand nicht sonderlich bey ihm in Gnaden; nicht nur allein, weil er sich mit dem Matthias und andern Erzherzogen im J. 1606 in die bereits angeführte Verbindung gegen ihn eingelassen hatte, sondern auch wegen seines Religionseifers, welcher mit der Zeit alles in Feuer und Flammen setzen könnte.\textsuperscript{33}

Ferdinand's intention of marrying the Princess of Saxony and then his change of mind are based on historical sources, but Grillparzer changed the details considerably. Ferdinand met the widowed Princess Hedwig on a trip to Dresden. An affectionate relationship developed very quickly between them, and it was generally believed that if it were not for the religious differences they would have married. Mathias, Kiesel, and, to the surprise of everyone, even the Spanish court favored the marriage.\textsuperscript{34} Besides having the electoral right of Saxony, Princess Hedwig was

\textsuperscript{32}Hormayr, VIII, 46-48.  \textsuperscript{33}Schmidt, III, 319.

\textsuperscript{34}Wolf, III, 662-663; Schmidt, IV, 41; Khevenhüller, \textit{Annales}, VIII, 1148.
a sister of the King of Denmark; thus the proposed marriage could have been a soothing factor in the religious and political turmoil of Europe. Ferdinand's visit to Dresden, however, took place in 1617, five years after Rudolf's death, and he did not, as Grillparzer implies, forsake the Protestant princess in order to marry Maria Anna, the daughter of the Bavarian Duke. Ferdinand and Maria Anna were married in 1600, and at the time of his visit in Dresden he was a widower (Maria Anna died in 1616). Grillparzer thus used an established historical fact which emphasized Ferdinand's rigid religious beliefs, his willingness to sacrifice personal happiness to their demands, but he placed the event much earlier to make it coincide with the events treated in the drama.

In the drama Ferdinand and Leopold appear as Rudolf's and Mathias' nephews. Actually they were cousins. Their father, Carl, was the youngest brother of Maximilian II. Sauer is of the opinion that Grillparzer probably made the change because of the age difference between them. (Rudolf was born in 1552, Mathias in 1557, Ferdinand in 1578, Leopold in 1586.) I think, however, that we can go further than that. Ferdinand represents in the drama the spirit of the new age, the period after Rudolf and Mathias are gone. In Grillparzer's treatment Mathias' usurpation

---

35Hormayr, VIII, 45. 36Werke, part 1, VI, 442.
of power and his downfall seem to be simultaneous. At the end of the play, while the crowd outside is shouting "Vivat Mathias," Mathias condemns himself with his "Mea culpa." This is also simultaneous with the news of Rudolf's death, and so unaffected by inner doubts in contrast to Mathias, the dominating figure in this scene is Ferdinand, the future Emperor, with Wallenstein at his side. It is the start of the new bloody and ruthless age, of the Thirty Years' War in which these two men are to be the leading proponents.

Not only at the end of the drama but also in the beginning, Ferdinand appears as the symbol of the new times. In his first encounter with Rudolf, although the conversation centers around Don Cäsar, Rudolf's remarks about the approaching new times refer also to Ferdinand. Ferdinand speaks of the numerous guards he had to pass in order to reach the room where he will eventually meet the Emperor. Rudolf, in turn, refers to these guards, hundreds of them, whom he has posted to protect himself against the assault of the hateful and chaotic new age, thus establishing a subtle and indirect link between Ferdinand and the new era which he detests:

Seht Ihr, so halten wir's in unserm Schloss,—
So dringt die Zeit, die wildverworrene, neue,
Durch hundert Wachen bis zu uns heran
Und zwinge zu schauen uns ihr greulich Antlitz.—
Die Zeit, die Zeit! (I. 320-324)

An uncle-nephew relationship is therefore more appropriate
because as the nephew, Ferdinand truly represents a new generation.

Although this change in relationship is meaningful in the context of the play, Grillparzer occasionally changes a relationship without apparent reasons. Thus Carl V is referred to in the drama as Rudolf's uncle (11. 349, 2326), while he actually was a granduncle. In *König Ottokars Glück und Ende* Kunigunde appears interchangeably as a granddaughter and niece of King Bela (see *dramatis personae* and 1. 132), and in *Ein Bruderzwist in Habsburg* Ferdinand is referred to once as a cousin of Rudolf (1. 2273).

Before the first act ends, Rudolf meets Leopold. Although the Emperor had never seen his nephew before, he liked him on the basis of what he had heard about him. Leopold is young, vigorous, and above all, as Rudolf refers to him, humane (1. 515). The sight of him is especially refreshing to the Emperor after the presence of his older brother whose cold, calculated, fanatical actions were so repulsive to the Emperor that he is really quite anxious to see Leopold:

Ich will ihn sehn,

37Carl V is the brother of Rudolf's grandfather, Ferdinand I, but due to frequent intermarriages within the Habsburg dynasty Carl V is also Rudolf's maternal grandfather. One might, of course, argue that even this change is meaningful, that Grillparzer intended to move Rudolf by one generation closer to the monarch under whose scepter the Germanic and the Spanish worlds, including the South-American possessions, had been united in at least relative "peace."
Leopold, too, as the stage directions before the curtain falls indicate, shows his affection for Rudolf. Thus, although only a touching silent gesture of greeting between them takes place, an affectionate relation between Rudolf and Leopold is established already in this first short encounter.

Grillparzer's sources report frequently about Rudolf's love for Leopold:

Hingegen war Ferdinands Bruder Erzherzog Leopold, Bischof zu Passau und Strassburg, der einzige von seinen Verwandten, den er liebte.38

In fact, the sources go much farther than that. Because Rudolf disliked Mathias so strongly and had no children to succeed him and since his younger brothers, Maximilian and Albrecht, were not interested in the imperial crown, he tried to appoint Leopold his successor, thus consciously bypassing Ferdinand, who as the older of the two cousins would have been next in line.39 None of these reports, however, are dated earlier than 1609. They refer to a period, therefore, much later than the action of the closing scene of the first act, when Mathias receives the command

38Schmidt, III, 319.

39Ibid., pp. 320-321; Khevenhüller, Annales, VII, 158; Wolf, III, 234-235. Hormayr claims that Rudolf tried to bypass Mathias' succession first in favor of Ferdinand and later in favor of Leopold, but there is no indication when Leopold replaced his older brother in Rudolf's plans. VII, 14.
in Hungary.

As we have seen, the historical events treated in the first act are widely separated in time, but Mathias being entrusted with the command of the imperial troops in Hungary (1596) is the event most closely connected with the central plot of the drama, namely Mathias' usurpation of power. In Grillparzer's treatment, much more so than in his sources, the Hungarian command was the first step toward Mathias' ultimate goal. From this point on the sequence of events in the plot coincides in chronological order with the corresponding historical events, although the actual dates do not always correspond. For dramatic concentration, however, Grillparzer frequently combines various events into one scene. This technique, combining a number of events into one or assigning some additional functions to an individual which according to historical sources were performed by others, was used by the author in this play as well as in König Ottokars Glück und Ende.

The second act continues with the main plot, but at least a few weeks have passed between acts. Mathias is now in charge of the forces in Hungary and the archdukes have been called to military headquarters for a meeting. The camp is located in the vicinity of Raab, a locality mentioned frequently in the sources as a battlefield in the 1590's. The meeting of the archdukes, however, took place
in 1606. This is another example of the dramatic concentration in Grillparzer's treatment. Although the events of a few years are telescoped in this act, the action of the drama from this point onward does not treat any other historical events prior to 1606. Grillparzer, for dramatic convenience, places the meeting of the archdukes in Hungary, but, according to Wolf, it took place in Vienna.

The meeting of the archdukes is of great importance because at its conclusion it is decided that Mathias will become the head of the dynasty, and it is therefore the next step toward Mathias' usurpation of power. This much is historical, but Grillparzer's changes are very significant. According to the sources, the participating archdukes were Mathias, his brother Maximilian, and his cousins Ferdinand and Maximilian Ernst (another brother of Ferdinand and Leopold). In Grillparzer's treatment Leopold replaces Maximilian Ernst. This first of all eliminates a person who is not mentioned by the sources in any other event treated in the drama. But more important is the fact that during the meeting Leopold consistently stands up for Rudolf and is the only one among the archdukes who does not


41Prokop is Grillparzer's invention and his appearance, therefore, is not bound to definite historical data.

42Wolf, II, 122. Schmidt does not mention the location of the meeting.
sign the document entrusting Mathias with the leadership of the affairs of the dynasty. Although Leopold's participation is unhistorical, his behavior and actions are very consistent with his character and his relation to Rudolf. Grillparzer's statement, therefore, that in the drama the causal connection must follow a logical order much more closely than in history (see page 87), although meant as a guideline for *König Ottokars Glück und Ende*, applies also to *Ein Bruderzwist in Habsburg*.

Kiesel's role as the actual instigator and leader of the meeting is also Grillparzer's invention. In fact, it remains questionable whether Kiesel was present at the meeting at all or whether he was at that time even in the same locality. Schmidt, in describing the meeting, does not mention him, and Wolf reports that Mathias, when he had summoned the archdukes to Vienna, also had called upon Kiesel to leave Prague secretly and come to Vienna.\(^4^3\) Khevenhüller, however, claims that Kiesel left Prague and joined Mathias in 1607, a year after the meeting of the archdukes.\(^4^4\) In any case, in the drama Kiesel is behind the important decisions, demoting Mathias to his puppet, while in the sources Mathias is directly responsible for the settlement with the Turks and with the rebellious

\(^{4^3}\) Schmidt, III, 157; Wolf, II, 122.
Hungarians and Bocskay\textsuperscript{45} and is very active in securing the leadership of the Habsburg dynasty. Only after these objectives had been achieved do we find Kiesel on his side. Grillparzer's portrayal of Mathias as a weak, indecisive individual, with Kiesel making all of his decisions, applies much more to the period after he became emperor than to the period covered in the first four acts of the drama. Hormayr says this of Mathias:

\begin{quote}
Gleichwohl zeigte sich während seiner sieben jährigen Herrschaft keine Spur jener glänzenden Eigenschaften, die seine Jugend auszeichneten.\textsuperscript{46}
\end{quote}

The presence of Colonel Ramee (Rome in some sources) in the military camp in Hungary is Grillparzer's invention. He was, however, in charge of the Passau troops recruited by Leopold which entered Austria and Bohemia in 1611.\textsuperscript{47} But Grillparzer introduces him in the second act, at the time of the battles in the 1590's and the meeting of the archdukes in 1606. He is already here linked with Leopold, and may be, even as Sauer suggests, Leopold's spy.\textsuperscript{48} The Passau troops are also mentioned here and so is the pretext

\begin{quote}
\textsuperscript{45}Grillparzer completely omits the last event. The Bocskay rebellion runs parallel to the Turkish war and its omission is a further example of how the author simplifies the plot and eliminates complicating and confusing details. The drama, as it stands, is already very rich in historical events.
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\textsuperscript{46}Hormayr, VII, 42. \textsuperscript{47}Schmidt, III, 322. \\
\textsuperscript{48}Werke, part 1, VI, 456.
\end{quote}
for their existence. In Leopold's words:

Das Heer in Passau, das ich andern Vorwands,  
Seit lange werbt, es stellt die Wage gleich  
Und gibt dem Kaiser wieder seine Rechte.49

1608 is, however, the earliest date in which the Passau troops are mentioned. Grillparzer thus develops gradually an event which plays such an important role later in the drama.

The beginning of the third act is temporarily removed from the main events of the play. It stresses the very warm relation which existed between Rudolf II and Duke Julius of Braunschweig. Here we see Rudolf in a completely different light. He is open and talkative and reveals much more of his personality and his ideas than he does anywhere else in the drama.50

The sources report that the Duke of Braunschweig arrived in Prague in 1610 and performed various services for Rudolf until the latter’s death in January of 1612. Their conversation, however, and some events that follow indicate that this act does not begin later than 1608. Thus in the drama the Duke shows his devoted service to the

---

49The pretext, not mentioned by name, is the Jülich-Cleve dispute. This is the only mention in the play, although indirect, of this important issue. It will be discussed later in connection with the invasion of Bohemia by the Passau troops.

50The specific details will be discussed in the next chapter dealing with Rudolf's character.
Emperor much sooner than he did in history. This is another example of how in Grillparzer's treatment, for dramatic concentration, certain people perform additional services; but these additions always remain consistent with the character of the individual. This example is very similar to Rumpf being Rudolf's advisor after 1601, Kiesel Mathias' advisor before 1607, and Herbott of Füllenstein participating in the arrest of the old Merenberg in König Ottokars Glück und Ende.

The Duke's trick, to disguise himself as one of the servants in order to gain access to Rudolf, is Grillparzer's invention. But, as previously mentioned, in the last few years of Rudolf's reign he lived in such strict isolation that it was extremely difficult to get an audience with him, and often callers had to mingle among the house servants in order to see him. Schmidt, for instance, reports the following:

Manche, die keine Hoffnung vor sich sahen zu einer Audienz zu gelangen, sich unter das Stallgesinde mischten, um mit ihm sprechen zu können.51

Here information which was discussed in the sources only in generalities is applied by Grillparzer to a specific case.

Although the dialogue between Rudolf and the Duke of Braunschweig mainly reveals the relation between them, their conversation contains many references to historical

51Schmidt, III, 345.
events of the period. Rudolf's charge that the Duke may assure the people that he is still alive (II. 1157-1158) is based on Hormayr, who reports that for a long time the people of Prague thought that Rudolf had died, and that his favorites were keeping his death a secret so that they could continue to enjoy the privileges of the court. The peace in Hungary and Rudolf's reluctance to ratify it (II. 1199-1200) are reported by all sources. According to Schmidt, Rudolf agreed to the 1606 peace treaty in 1608. Rudolf's proposed Order of Peace (II. 1205-1220) is reported by Hormayr and Schmidt. Schmidt stresses the point that Protestants were to be members of the Order. Braunschweig's name, however, is not mentioned. Incidentally, the frequent references to the Duke as a Protestant (II. 1224, 1294) are based on Pubitschka:

... indem dieser Herzog, obwohl ein Protestant, dem Hause Oesterreich immer treu zugethan war.

Although Grillparzer had no authentic basis for Duke Braunschweig's membership in the Order, this membership is very appropriate. His devotion to the Habsburg dynasty can be read from the above quotation. Wolf and Schmidt report that in 1611, shortly before Rudolf's death,

---

52 Hormayr, VII, 71. 53 Schmidt, III, 212.
54 Hormayr, VII, 72; Schmidt, III, 321.
55 Pubitschka, X, 473.
the Duke was his only true friend and confidant, and according to Pubitschka the Duke was one of the pallbearers at Rudolf's funeral, thus rendering this last service to the Emperor.

The important historical events of the third act are the two imperial signatures: Rudolf's signing of the Letter of Majesty and the written permission given to Leopold to bring his troops from Passau to Prague. These two signatures mark the turning point of the play. The catastrophe that follows is a direct result of these signatures. Nadler, referring to Rudolf's signing of the Letter of Majesty and his permission to bring the Passau troops, points out that in the third act Rudolf acts twice, only to find out in the fourth that he acted twice too often. Grillparzer notes in the Vorarbeiten to the play:

Am Schluss des III Aktes soll der Kaiser endlich handeln und dadurch sich noch tiefer ins Unglück stürzen.

Grillparzer's treatment of the Letter of Majesty is very similar to that of his sources. In the drama Rudolf is very reluctant to sign the Letter, which would give the Bohemian estates religious freedom. The stipulations contained in the Letter were known to him and he had refused

56Wolf, III, 265-266; Schmidt, III, 341-342.
59Werke, part i, XXI, 141.
to sign previously. But now the representatives of the estates are adamant and he gives in against his better judgment. During the course of the negotiations mention is made of Mathias who is leading an army against Prague (11. 1517-1518).

Schmidt reports that the Bohemian estates first put the demands before Rudolf in April 1608, and at the same time, according to Khevenhüller, Mathias was encamped with his troops outside of Prague. Schmidt further reports that the estates were well organized and armed and Rudolf feared that if he did not satisfy their demands they would join Mathias, who would gladly promise them whatever they demanded. Rudolf thus signed the Letter, which Schmidt calls "the fuse of the war," in May 1609.

Mathes Thurn, a very important figure in Bohemia at the time and a military leader of the estates, is not mentioned as one of the negotiators. The fact that he is not a native of Bohemia (11. 1510-1511) is drawn from Hormayr.

Grillparzer's treatment of the movements of the troops under Leopold's command is quite different, however,

60Schmidt, III, 216.
61Khevenhüller, Annales, VII, 10.
64Hormayr, VIII, 23.
from his sources. Leopold's presence in Prague at the time of the Letter of Majesty is not mentioned by the sources. Furthermore, there is no evidence that Rudolf gave Leopold his permission to bring the Passau troops to Prague. Schmidt is very specific in stating that it was not the Emperor's will to have the Passau troops enter Prague, but once the troops arrived he wanted to use them against Mathias.65 Khevenhüller quotes an official of Rudolf's court as saying that although the troops in Passau were recruited by imperial order,66 they left Passau without Rudolf's consent.67 It is to be noted that Grillparzer deliberated whether the troops were to come to Prague without Rudolf's consent, which would have been closer to his sources, or with his permission. A note of 1827 concerning the drama contains the following considerations:

Soil (am Schluss des III Akts) Rudolf seinen Grundsätzen untreu werden, indem er die Passauer herbeiruft und den Protestanten den Majestätsbrief ertheilt, und dadurch das erstemal seine Unthätigheit überwindend, sich selbst ins Verderben stürzen? oder soll dieser Einbruch ohne sein Wissen geschehen, und er von denen, die ihm helfen wollen, den letzten Schlag empfangen?68

In Grillparzer's treatment, therefore, the event marking the turning point of the play contradicts his

65Schmidt, III, 327.

66As previously noted, the troops were originally to be used in the Jülich-Cleve dispute.

67Khevenhüller, Annales, VII, 352.

68Werke, part 1, XXI, 144.
sources. This is, of course, another example that shows that the author's main concern was not historical truth but the drama as a whole. Gerhart Baumann points out that the dramatic situation was the most decisive factor in Grillparzer's works.69

As the aforementioned quotation from Nadler indicates, the catastrophe takes place in the fourth act (see page 212). Although the circumstances of the arrival of the Passau troops in Prague differ from the sources, Grillparzer's treatment after their arrival is very similar to the sources. The troops were never involved in a major battle but rather in isolated skirmishes. Rudolf, even though he tried to use these "friendly" troops as a trump card in his negotiations, forbade them to fire.70 In the play Rudolf is horrified when he hears the shooting, and no big battles are mentioned. Thurn talks mainly about robberies, not about military engagements. The robberies are historical. Schmidt reports the following:

So viel ist gewiss, dass die Passauischen Truppen nun gar in die Gegend von Prag ruckten, ja selbst in die sogenannte Kleinseite einfielen und dort durch Plundern und Todtschiessen verschiedene Ausschweifungen verdubten.71

Don Cæsar's participation in these robberies (11. 2084-2085)

69Baumann, p. 435.
70Khevenhüller, Annales, VII, 345-347.
71Schmidt, III, 324-325.
is, of course, Grillparzer's invention, but Thurn's function as the commander of the estates corresponds with the sources.72 The skirmish on the bridge (11. 2027-2053) is also historical. The sources report that one unit of the Passau troops crossed the bridge to the Altstadt but the gate was shut behind them and the company wiped out.

The characterization of Thurn as an ambitious, subtle, untiring commander is also based on the sources. His characterization is especially similar to that by Hormayr.75

The apology of Archdukes Ferdinand and Max (11. 2278-2280) is also historical. The treatment of this event in the drama is similar to Khevenhüller's report, which makes mention of the kneeling of the two archdukes as a gesture of repentence. In the drama (11. 2281-2287) and in the aforementioned source the archdukes fall to their knees and Rudolf orders them up, for he considers kneeling a humiliation unworthy of the dynasty.76

72Khevenhüller, Annales, VII, 345.
73Ibid., pp. 345-346. 74Schmidt, III, 325.
75Hormayr, VIII, 23.
76Khevenhüller, Annales, VII, 272-273.
the archdukes took place in August 1610, a few months before
the Passau troops came to Prague, while in the drama it
takes place immediately after their withdrawal.

Besides the aforementioned events and the actual
death of the Emperor, even though it becomes official in
the next act, the fourth act integrates completely the sub-
plot of the drama, the Prokop, Lukrezia, and Don Cásar in-
volvement with the main action. Prokop, whom we originally
met as a father concerned about his daughter's plight, de-
fends Prague now together with other citizens of the city,
and his father-image becomes secondary. His duties as a
citizen come first now:

Dich, Kind, indes befehl ich Gottes Hut.
Der ist kein Bürger, der die eigene Sorge
Vergisst nicht in der Not des Allgemeinen.

(11. 1846-1848)

Baumann summarizes the integration of the personal and
public affairs in this act in the following manner:

Ähnlich wie beim ersten Aufzug treffen sich Öffent-
l iches und Persönliches in jenem Schnittpunkt, wo
Privates das Allgemeine repräsentiert und das Poli-
tische beinahe Privatcharakter annimmt.77

The above statement can apply to the entire play and, in
fact, to all Grillparzer's historical dramas.

As mentioned before, Don Cásar has certain sim-
ilarities to an illegitimate son of Rudolf, Julius.78

77Baumann, p. 437.

78In early sketches Grillparzer had references to
Don Julio. Werke, part 1, XXI, 142.
Grillparzer used the accounts of Khevenhüller and Hormayr for his creation of Don Cásar. The former reports that Julius committed a murder and Rudolf ordered that his four main arteries be cut. In Hormayr's account Julius' fate is the same, but his crime is an offense against a woman. The nature of the offense is not mentioned. Neither source gives the name of the victim or the date of the incident. Even though Don Cásar and Julius commit the same deeds and die in a similar fashion, Don Cásar is a Grillparzer creation. Heine groups Don Cásar with Zawisch and Otto. The similarities with Otto are especially noticeable. Both want to know the absolute truth from the women they love, and when they remain uncertain they are driven to insanity. Incidentally, there are some similarities between Lukrezia and Erny. They remain an unsolved puzzle. Walter Naumann states that in Grillparzer's work a woman is always a puzzle to men. He mentions Lukrezia, Rahel, and Libussa in particular.

79Khevenhüller, Conterfet, I, 29-30.
80Hormayr, VII, 71-72.
81In the drama Rudolf throws away the key to the jail in which Don Cásar is kept, thus preventing any possibility of saving him. This change, however, has a bearing on Grillparzer's presentation of Rudolf's character, not on his presentation of Don Cásar.
82Heine, p. 369.
83Naumann, Das dichterische Werk, pp. 34-35.
The fifth act presents mainly the events of 1618. Only the announcement of Rudolf's death, which took place in 1612, forms a noticeable exception. The situation described in the last act, however, gives a good picture of the preceding six years. We find out that now Mathias is completely dominated by Klesel. Although in Grillparzer's treatment the domination began before the sources even mention any connection between the two men, the sources contain many examples of this situation during Mathias' reign. Hormayr expresses the relationship very precisely:

Er [klesel] rühme sich öffentlich, er habe des Kaisers und der Kaiserin Herz dergestalt in seiner Hand, dass sie—ohne seinem [sic] Vorwissen—nicht das Geringste thun dürften.84

Mathias' end is very similar to that of Rudolf. Ferdinand is now in virtual control of the affairs of the Empire, as Mathias was toward the end of Rudolf's life. This too agrees with the sources. Hormayr ends Mathias' biography with these words:

Krank, kinderlos, sah er aller Augen auf seinen Nachfolger gerichtet, der ihn, nur unter viel anständigeren Formen, dasselbe Schicksal liess, das er Rudolphen bereitet hatte.85

There are striking parallels between the first and fifth acts. In the first act Mathias requests a private audience with the Emperor and he has to negotiate with Rumpf, who tries to prevent it. In the fifth act Ferdinand

84Hormayr, VIII, 35. 85ibid., p. 50.
wants to see the Emperor and has to overcome the obstacles of Kiesel, Rumpf's counterpart in Mathias' court.

The two important historical events of the fifth act are the *Fenstersturz* and Kiesel's arrest. There are minor differences in Grillparzer's presentation of these events. In the sources Kiesel was arrested on orders of Ferdinand and Maximilian with the consent of the Spanish court. In the drama Ferdinand, the dominating figure of this act and of events following the conclusion of the drama, arrests Kiesel on his own initiative.

The incident of the throwing out of the two imperial representatives through a window in Prague is, of course, the well-known event which triggered the Thirty Years' War. The sources go into many details of this incident, while Grillparzer just states the fact. His short account of it is, however, basically the same as that in the sources. Even Mathes Thurn's participation is historical. Grillparzer's change, and it is a significant one, is not in the event itself but in the timing of the event. Rudolf died in 1612, and the *Fenstersturz* took place in 1618. In the drama these two events are linked together. Thus the impression is conveyed that during Rudolf's lifetime, although many disturbances take place,

---

87ibid., p. 31.
peace prevails within the Empire, and that his death marks the beginning of the civil war. The end of the drama also signifies how these two dates, 1612 and 1618, are placed together. While the crowd celebrates the new ruler with their shouts of "Vivat Mathias" he already admits the hopelessness of his situation by his "Mea maxima culpa."

As we have seen, Ein Bruderzwist in Habsburg covers numerous events, the presentation of which are in many cases very similar or even identical with their description in the author's sources. But Grillparzer never felt compelled to reproduce history exactly and we therefore found many significant changes. These changes enabled the author to write a play which includes many events and yet has good dramatic structure. The most frequent changes concern dates. This brings the events closer together and makes them more adaptable for stage presentation. It also enabled the author to develop certain characters and emphasize certain relations between individuals. The relations between Rudolf and Rumpf and between Mathias and Kiesel are good examples. The most significant point, however, is that these changes resulted in a play which is an excellent historical drama. As Nadler says about Ein Bruderzwist in Habsburg:

Es ist die mächtigste geschichtliche Tragödie, die bis jetzt ein Deutscher geschaffen hat.88

88Nadler, p. 425.
CHAPTER XII

THE CHARACTER OF RUDOLF II

The interpretations of \textit{Ein Bruderzwist in Habsburg} differ in many respects as to the ramifications of the ideological and political problems of the drama as a whole. All interpreters, however, concentrate their discussion on Rudolf. Nadler, thus, says this about the play:

\begin{quote}
Diese Tragödie des Hauses Habsburg ist die Tragödie eines Menschen, der der Kaiser ist und sich mit seinem Hause völlig wesenseins weiss.\footnote{Nadler, p. 423.}
\end{quote}

Or Heine:

\begin{quote}
In dem Charakter Rudolf liegt die Tragik des Stückes.\footnote{Heine, p. 362.}
\end{quote}

And Naumann implies that Rudolf is in some respects the most important figure in all the dramas of Grillparzer:

\begin{quote}
Die Hauptfigur des Dramas, die Gestalt des Kaisers Rudolf des Zweiten, spiegelt, wie keine andere Gestalt der Dramen, die Gesamtheit der eigenen Persönlichkeit des Dichters, das Erlebnis seines Schicksals, seine Weiterfahrung, seine Wünsche und Eigenheiten.\footnote{Naumann, \textit{Das dichterische Werk}, p. 33.}
\end{quote}

In comparing Grillparzer's Rudolf with the Emperor of the author's sources, we find that the two are similar in certain character traits, actions, and intentions.
August Sauer says the following about this matter:


Yet, in many respects Grillparzer's Rudolf and the historical Rudolf are completely different. This discrepancy, which sounds almost paradoxical, exists because in the sources Rudolf's actions, or strictly speaking his inaction, are ascribed to his inability to master the political situation. His behavior stems from distrust and hatred of his relatives, and sometimes even insanity. In Grillparzer's presentation, Rudolf's behavior is a political philosophy, the only one which in his opinion could prevent the catastrophe.

The opening passage of Hormayr's biography describes the disappointment caused by Rudolf II's reign:

Eine Reihe lehrreicher, schauderhafter Erfahrungen, des ruhmwürdigen Vaters herrliches Beispiel, die ausgedehnten Kenntnisse, die, bey aller unruhigen Kraft der Jugend, in Rudolphen gleichwohl von jeher vorherrschende Liebe zur Ruhe, liessen mit hohem Recht erwarten, der neue Kaiser werde, wenn auch nicht eigene Bahn brechen, um den Erbstaaten, dem deutschen Vaterlande, der Welt, um jeden Preis ein Gut wiederzugeben, was gar keinen Preis hat, den inneren Frieden, doch wenigstens dem Pfade folgen, den ihm der hochherzige Vater, so treulich vorgezeichnet hatte.

4 Werke, part 1, VI, 418. Even though Felix Stieve's biography is not one of Grillparzer's sources, since it was published after the completion of Ein Bruderzwist in Habsburg, Stieve's portrayal of Rudolf is very similar to that which the author found in his historical sources.
Diese Erwartung wurde jedoch in seiner 36-jährigen, unruhvollen Regierung schrecklich getäuscht.  

In Grillparzer's presentation Rudolf lives up to the expectations of his contemporaries. During his long reign he is able to appease the feuding factions of the Empire and to delay the outbreak of the civil war which begins only after his death. In fact, some of the reasons that the sources give for Rudolf's ineffectiveness are precisely the reasons that in Grillparzer's treatment are the causes for the preservation of order.

This difference between the historical Rudolf and Rudolf in Grillparzer's portrayal is evident from the first incident treated in the drama, the sentencing of Marshall Russworm. Khevenhüller reports that Russworm's enemies at the court succeeded in executing him quickly because at that time Rudolf lived in isolation and was uninformed about the details of the incident. By the time he learned the truth, Russworm had already been executed. In the drama Rudolf's presence is felt immediately. The first line of the play, "Im Namen kaiserlicher Majestät," tells us that the procedure is in accordance with Rudolf's wishes. He is the highest judge of the Empire, and he pronounces the verdict, "Er stirbt" (1. 270), very emphatically. He

5Hormayr, VII, 30-31.
6Khevenhüller, Annales, VI, 2921.
later acts in the same way in the case of Don Cásar:

Er ist gerichtet,
Von mir, von seinem Kaiser, seinem— (11. 2188-2189)

There is no doubt that in these two instances Rudolf is in
complete control of the situation.

Khevenhüller and Hormayr stress the point that it
was customary for Rudolf not to admit audiences and not to
read or answer letters. As a result he remained uninformed
and important state business remained either unattended to
or was acted on by Rudolf's subordinates. This procedure
often had disastrous results. 7 In the drama Rudolf also
shies away from official business, refuses audiences, and
does not answer letters. He is, however, very well in-
formed about the events which take place around him, and
knows that any action in this turbulent period would be
catastrophic. Rudolf's words, "Im weisen Zögern seh'nd die
einzige Rettung" (1. 2303), spell out his entire program.
Unfortunately, his inactivity can only delay the un-
avoidable; he cannot prevent it. He is well aware of it:
"Die Zeit kann ich nicht bändigen" (1. 345). Rudolf's
awareness of the approaching danger, and being at best able
only to delay it, is his real tragedy. Grillparzer ex-
pressed himself on this subject in the following manner:

Rudolf's inactivity in the drama, therefore, unlike his inactivity in the sources, is the only possible road open to him as a responsible ruler. This path is dictated by his insight into the situation. Baumann characterizes the difference between Rudolf and Mathias in these words:

In den Brüdern stellt sich der unausgleichbare Gegensatz zwischen Erkennen und Handeln dar; dem Tätigen fehlt die Einsicht, welche der Tatenlose besitzt, den die Erkenntnis zur Untätigkeit führt.9

Rudolf's problem is how to keep order in the Empire without being active. As the last words of the drama indicate, Mathias realizes what dangerous results have been wrought by his activity, but then, of course, it is too late.

Rudolf's handling of the war in Hungary is a good example of how the Emperor's attitude in the sources and in the drama is attributed to different causes. In both cases we find that he wanted to prolong the war and was very reluctant to sign the treaty which was negotiated by Mathias. Schmidt contends that Mathias' efforts in these negotiations are to be applauded. According to some of his contemporaries, however, Rudolf was by then (1606) too weak physically and mentally to conduct the affairs of the Empire. Others, according to Schmidt, accused Rudolf of purposely trying to create confusion.10

8Worke, part 1, XXI, 148. 9Baumann, p. 433.
10Schmidt, 1, 154.
Rudolf's reluctance to ratify the treaty to his mental sickness in the last few years of his reign. In the drama Rudolf does not ratify the treaty for a clear and well worked-out purpose: to prevent a civil war, which would be much worse than the war with Turkey. He makes his reasons very clear to Julius von Braunschweig:

Den Krieg, ich hasse ihn als der Menscheit Brandmal
Und einen Tropfen meines Blutes gib ich
Für jede Träne, die sein Schwert erpresst;
Allein der Krieg in Ungarn der ist gut.
Er hält zurück die streitenden Parteien,
Die sich zerfleischen in der Meinung schon.

Rudolf states very explicitly why he keeps himself in isolation:

Ja alter Freund,
Damit ich lebe muss ich mich begraben,
Ich wäre tot, lebt ich mit dieser Welt.
Und dass ich lebe ist vonnöten Freund.
Ich bin das Band, das diese Garbe hält,
Unfruchtbar selbst, doch nütig, weil es bindet.

And there is, of course, no trace in Grillparzer's treatment of Rudolf's character of any mental disorder, while all sources at least mention it. Hormayr, who calls Rudolf's mental state melancholy, and Wolf, who calls it insanity, diagnose his malady most neatly. In contrast, Grillparzer makes it very clear that Rudolf's presence of mind stays with him to the very last. When he finds himself

11 Hormayr, VII, 67-68.
12 Ibid., III, 64 and VII, 68; Wolf, II, 119.
arrested in his own palace, Rumpf and the Duke von Braunschweig try to soften the blow by telling him that the containment of his person is the result of a misunderstanding, but he cannot be fooled. He is painfully aware of the situation (11. 2227-2234).

A statement by Johannes von Müller about Rudolf made a great impression on Grillparzer, even though he hardly used Müller's history as a source, since it contains very little on the specific period. Nevertheless, Müller's characterization of Rudolf is among the most prevailing influences on Grillparzer's presentation of Rudolf. Müller writes:

Der stille Kaiser Rudolf II. wurde durch den Erzherzog Matthias, seinen Bruder zu Abtretung der hungarischen und böhmischen Krone genötigt.13

We find this note in Grillparzer's preliminary studies:

Joh. Müller spricht in seiner Weltgeschichte kaum von Rudolf II. Einmal nur nennt er ihm einen ganz den Studien ergebenen Fürsten; dann "den stillen Kaiser Rudolf II."14

Grillparzer's Rudolf is indeed the "quiet Emperor." He talks very little or not at all. His statements are often

---


14Werke, part i, XXI, 106. The first part of the quotation is based on Johannes von Müller's earlier description of Rudolf (III, 109).
fragmentary or in Spanish, and he communicates very little with the world. Often he makes only a gesture. The lack of communication with the surrounding world is most evident in the first act when Rudolf is passing across the stage from his private rooms to the chapel. He is then intercepted in the passage and prompted to attend the affairs of the Empire; this first entrance of Rudolf is symbolic for his entire existence. He would much rather be left alone than be an Emperor, but he has to remain the Emperor because as Emperor he can keep peace. His presence is a necessity.

All sources report Rudolf's interest in art, literature, and the sciences. Hormayr states this:

Die Natur- und Sternkunde, die Chymie (er versuchte Gold zu machen), das Studium der Alterthümer und alle bildenden Künste, waren Rudolphs einzige Beschäftigung.16

And Schmidt points to Rudolf's enormous expenditures to acquire his fine art collection:

So wenig er auch sonst die Geldausgaben liebte, so war ihm doch kaum ein Preis eines schönen Gemäldes, einer Gemme, Antike oder eines andern seltenen Stückes zu hoch.17

These interests of Rudolf's are reflected in the drama. In his first appearance on the stage he is buying a

15 Out of the first eleven times that Rudolf speaks, seven of the statements contain only one word, and three are in Spanish.

16 Hormayr, VII, 69. 17 Schmidt, III, 344.
painting and offers for it much more than does Rumpf. In
the same scene he also pushes away official letters to read
Lope de Vega. In the beginning of the third act we find
him preoccupied with chemical experiments and he gives a
long explanation of his views on astrology (11. 391-439).18
There is even an indirect reference to Tycho de Brahe in
the words of Ferdinand:

Seht ihr, da senkt das alte Misstrauem wieder
Sich nebelgleich herab auf eure Stirn!
O weh uns, wenn es wahr, was man sich sagt,
Dass jener finstern Sternekund'gen Einer,
Die eurn Hof zum Sammelplatz erwählt
Mit astrologisch dunkler Prophezeiung
Euch abgewandt von erum edeln Haus
Gefahr androhend von den Nahverwandten. (11. 381-388)

These lines are based on Hormayr who speaks of Brahe's
horoscope indicating that Rudolf's closest relative would
make an attempt on his life.19

Grillparzer's treatment of these interests of the
Emperor are, however, again quite different from their pre-
sentation in the sources, since they all are very critical
of Rudolf's preoccupation with art, the natural sciences,
and literature. Schmidt claims that if it had not been for
these interests Rudolf could have been among the best
rulers of his time.20 Hormayr refers to Rudolf's

18There was no distinction between astrology and
astronomy at that time.

19Hormayr, VII, 70. 20Schmidt, III, 344-345.
preoccupation with astrology as thürliche Spielerey\textsuperscript{21}; and
Khevenhüller reports that the Emperor's interests kept him
away from official business, which had to be conducted at
times by incompetent ministers:

\begin{quote}
Diese Curiositeten und Künstleyen aber haben diesen Herrn viel von denen negotijis, und sonderlich in den letzten Jahren dergestalt divertirt, dass er alle Sachen durch seine Ministren, und zu Zeiten durch schlechte verrichten, und sich selten in publico sehen lassen.\textsuperscript{22}
\end{quote}

As discussed previously, in the drama Rudolf purposefully does not take action on the issues which the historians claim were to be acted upon. Rudolf's preoccupation with art is therefore not the reason for his neglect of the affairs of the Empire. Rudolf finds satisfaction in art because in it he finds form and order, the order which he is missing in his surroundings.

This is even more pronounced in his study of the stars. His prime interest in the stars is not their ability to reveal the future which is implied by the sources:

\begin{quote}
Fragst aber du: ob sie mir selber kund,
Die hohe Wahrheit, aus der Wesen Munde?
So sage ich: nein, und aber, wieder: nein.
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
(11. 418-420)
\end{quote}

He admires the stars for their solid order:

\begin{quote}
Dort oben wohnt die Ordnung, dort ihr Haus,
Hier unten eitle Willkür und Verwirrung.
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
(11. 428-429)
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{21}Hormayr, VII, 70.

\textsuperscript{22}Khevenhüller, Conterfet, I, 30.
In watching the stars, Rudolf finds comfort and strength. They follow the order prescribed for them by God; but man is unruly, endangering and disrupting by his willfuiness the harmony and peace which prevail among the celestial bodies.

Rudolf's love for order can also be seen in the case of Don Cäsar. Rudolf is willing to sacrifice his own son for the sake of the majesty of the law without which an orderly state cannot exist, and to which everybody, and a member of the imperial family above all, is subject. Grillparzer points to Rudolf's revulsion against Don Cäsar's lawlessness which endangers the peace and rights of Prokop's family. Thus the basis for the conflict between the Emperor and his son is the principle of law and order.

Rudolf's insistence on the preservation of law and order and his protection of the rights of a citizen are dominating traits in Grillparzer's portrayal of the Emperor's character. This trait—and it is the one that makes Grillparzer's Rudolf so fully humane and noble—is completely lacking in the presentation of Rudolf's character in the sources.

Numerous incidents in the play point to Grillparzer's thorough knowledge of the sources. Thus Rumpf's remark that Rudolf's favored lion eats only if fed by the
Emperor (1. 2117) is based on Hormayr.\textsuperscript{23} Rudolf's curse on the fickle and disloyal city of Prague also is based on sources.\textsuperscript{24} Incidents of this nature prompt one to believe that basically Grillparzer recreated the historical Rudolf II, but a closer look into these incidents convinces us that Grillparzer was reworking his sources to suit his overall purpose. The incidents are usually changed just enough to be consistent with Rudolf's character in the play. In the case of Rudolf's lion, for instance, Hormayr mentions the incident only to point out that the death of this animal grieved Rudolf much more than the loss of his Empire. In the play the incident points only to Rudolf's love for nature. In the play Rudolf shows genuine regret for cursing the city of Prague:

\begin{quote}
Tat ichs? Nun ich bereu's. Mit jedem Atemzug
Saug' ich zurück ein vorschnell rasches Wort,
Ich will allein das Weh für alle tragen.
Und also segn' ich dich, verlockte Stadt,
Was Böses du getan, es sei zum Guten.
(11. 2413-2417)
\end{quote}

This revocation of the curse which he had uttered against the beloved city in a moment of hasty indignation is Grillparzer's invention. It is significant because in the play Rudolf is a good and forgiving person. One does not get that impression by reading the sources.

\textsuperscript{23}Hormayr, VII, 72-73. Khevenhüller also discusses a favored lion of the Emperor, but does not mention that he ate only if fed by Rudolf; VII, 440.

\textsuperscript{24}Schmidt, III, 333.
The best example of Rudolf's warmth and kindness is shown by his concern for the Protestants expelled from their homes by Ferdinand:

Mit Weib und Kind, bei zwanzigtausend Mann,  
In kalten Herbstesnächten, frierend, darbend!  
Mir kommt ein Grauen an. (11. 498-500)

As mentioned in the preceding chapter, Ferdinand's expulsion of the Protestants is based on historical sources, but Rudolf's concern for these people is Grillparzer's invention.

Grillparzer's Rudolf is much more complex than the historical Rudolf. Grillparzer made a distinction between Rudolf the Emperor and Rudolf the man. The play states this distinction clearly twice:

Nicht Kaiser bin ich mehr, ich bin ein Mensch.  
(1. 2408)

Der Kaiser starb, ob auch der Mensch genese.  
(1. 2436)

Rudolf's behavior in these two roles is completely different. In confronting the Archdukes and the Bohemian estates he is the Emperor. In the confrontation with Julius of Braunschweig he is a human being above all else. The Duke is not involved personally in the affairs of the state. He appears as Rudolf's friend, and in this relation the quiet Emperor becomes the talkative man. In the conversation with the Duke we find out why as an Emperor Rudolf has to live in isolation. When he is relieved of the burden of his imperial duties Rudolf demands, to the
great surprise of Rumpf, who after the long years of service knew him only as an Emperor, to be led to the window to breathe fresh air and look at people (11. 2398-2410).

Thus, in Rudolf II Grillparzer presents a ruler who is in a very precarious position. He sees the disintegration of his empire and yet he knows that any action he might undertake would only bring the catastrophe closer. He is, however, human and therefore has human weaknesses. He does not live up to his own convictions and is driven to action. The results are catastrophic.

Through Rudolf, Grillparzer condemns also his own time. Heine analyzes this subject in the following manner:

Wir hören aus den Worten Rudolfs zugleich das Urteil des Dichters, der mit Schrecken die Revolution von 1848 erlebt hatte.25

In the play the estates not only receive religious freedom but also gain political power. Grillparzer foresaw the rule of the selfish mob, and Rudolf, like no other creation of the author, is his speaker:

Grillparzer selber spricht aus ihm.26

---

SUMMARY

In the preceding study I have tried to show how thoroughly Grillparzer knew and understood the historical events which he treated in his historical plays. His knowledge of details is most noticeable in his description of small, seemingly insignificant details. Such intimate touches as, for example, in König Ottokars Glück und Ende, the arrest of old Merenberg while sitting at his dinner table, or Rudolf's choosing of Konrad Haslau, despite his advanced age, as the Austrian banner carrier during the battle at Dürnkrut, are lifted directly from the author's historical sources. In Ein Bruderzwist in Habsburg Grillparzer included the authentic fact that Rudolf II's favorite lion would not eat unless fed by the Emperor himself. Yet such minor features hardly matter when compared to Grillparzer's thorough understanding of the total historical picture. No less an authority than the distinguished Austrian historian Oswald Redlich claimed that the playwright had evaluated the historical forces active in the period of König Ottokars Glück und Ende better than any historian before or of Grillparzer's time had done (see page 118).

For Ein treuer Diener seines Herrn, which centers
mainly around one marginal historical event, namely the murder of the German-born Hungarian Queen Gertrude, the historical sources did not supply Grillparzer with the detailed information available for the other two plays.

Even though Grillparzer was so familiar with the sources, he was, as we have seen, not a slave to them. He felt free to change historical events when it helped the overall purpose of the drama. Throughout my investigation two reasons for such changes became most noticeable: one reason was condensation and concentration of events and functions of individuals, and the other reason was the shaping and plastic clarity of dramatic character.\(^1\) An example of the first category is his combining into one event Ottokar's arrest of certain Styrian nobles in 1267 and the arrest of Austrian and Styrian hostages in 1277. He also fused two reported trips of two different Archbishops of Cologne to Prague into one event. Consistent with this principle of condensation and concentration, figures like Heinrich of Lichtenstein and Herbott of Füllenstein perform duties in König Ottokars Glück und Ende which according to the sources were performed by other persons not appearing in the play. This procedure eliminated the necessity of including many marginal characters who otherwise would have cluttered up the stage. The same procedure holds true for

\(^1\)Walter Silz calls Grillparzer "the great shaper of dramatic character" (see page 90).
Ein Bruderzwist in Habsburg. Wolfgang Rumpf serves Rudolf II in the play until the Emperor's death in 1612, while he was actually relieved of his duties in 1601, and Kiesel's association with Mathias in the play begins in Grillparzer's drama a few years sooner than it was reported in the sources. The meeting of the archdukes to end the war with Turkey, and the meeting of the archdukes to elect Mathias as the head of the Habsburg dynasty are also combined in the play into one event.

The main characters of Grillparzer's historical dramas, although they are historical figures, are characters imbued with the author's creative imagination. To accomplish this Grillparzer used different devices. Ottokar's description in the Austro-German sources was so different from the description in the Czech sources that Grillparzer superimposed these two images and created a character more humane than the one found in the description of the severest critics of the King of Bohemia and not quite as flawless as the character found in the sources admiring Ottokar. In Rudolf II Grillparzer created a character whose refusal to act stems from his profound insight that any action would lead to catastrophe, while according to the sources the emperor's indecisiveness was actually a pathological character trait. In Bancban the author extolled the heroic loyalty and self-abnegation of a true servant to the body politic, and for this reason had to
revise completely the historically transmitted fact that Bancban joined the rebellion against his king.

Occasionally Grillparzer omitted from his plays events of great historical importance. Thus, there is no mention in König Ottokars Glück und Ende that at the time of the election in 1273 Ottokar was preoccupied with a military campaign against Hungary, and, for this reason, could not exert his energies toward the promotion of his election. In the play, however, Grillparzer offers an entirely different motivation for Ottokar's failure to secure the imperial crown: his arrogance and ruthlessness which alienated even those who had been favorably inclined toward him. What in historical fact was a political impediment thus is transformed for the sake of the enrichment and deepening of the hero's psychological structure.

Grillparzer often used anecdotal details for the purpose of evolving and strengthening the general impression of his hero's character. Thus following reports in the sources that the seeker of an interview with Rudolf II often had to mingle with the servants, we find in Ein Bruderzwist in Habsburg Julius of Braunschweig disguised as a servant in order to get access to the emperor.

The most important fact is, however, that Grillparzer created excellent historical plays. Silz calls König Ottokars Glück und Ende "a magnificent achievement," and Sengle sees in it "ein Gipfelpunkt des deutschen
Geschichtsdramas" (see page 118). Nadler refers to *Ein Bruderzwist in Habsburg* as "die mächtigste geschichtliche Tragödie" (see page 221).
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