

The Funerals of the Habsburg Emperors in the Eighteenth Century

MARK HENGERER

I. *Introduction*

The classic interpretation of the eighteenth century as a period of transition—from sacred kingship to secular state, from a divine-right monarchy to enlightened absolutism, from religion to reason—neglects, so the editor of this volume suggests, aspects of the continuing impact of religion on European royal culture during this period, and ignores the fact that secularization does not necessarily mean desacralization. If we take this point of view, the complex relationship between monarchy and religion, such as appears in funerals, needs to be revisited.

We still lack a comparative and detailed study of Habsburg funerals throughout the entire eighteenth century. Although the funerals of the emperors in general have been the subject of a great deal of research, most historians have concentrated either on funerals of individual rulers before 1700, or on shorter periods within the eighteenth century.¹ Consequently, the general view

I owe debts of gratitude to Melana Heinss Martel and Derek Beales for their comments on an earlier version of this essay, and to Thomas Just from the Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchiv, Vienna, for unbureaucratic access to the relevant source material.

¹ Most attention has been paid to Emperor Maximilian I. Cf., among others, Peter Schmid, 'Sterben—Tod—Leichenbegängnis Kaiser Maximilians I.', in Lothar Kolmer (ed.), *Der Tod des Mächtigen: Kult und Kultur des Sterbens spätmittelalterlicher Herrscher* (Paderborn, 1997), 185–215; Elisabeth Scheicher, 'Kaiser Maximilian plant sein Denkmal', *Jahrbuch des kunsthistorischen Museums Wien*, 1 (1999), 81–117; Gabriele Voss, 'Der Tod des Herrschers: Sterbe- und Beerdigungsbrauchtum beim Übertritt vom Mittelalter in die frühe Neuzeit am Beispiel der Kaiser Friedrich III., Maximilian I. und Karl V.' (unpublished Diploma thesis, University of Vienna, 1989). Much less work has been done on later rulers. Cf. Achim Auernhammer and Friedrich Däuble, 'Die Exequien für Kaiser Karl V. in Augsburg, Brüssel und Bologna', *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte*, 62/63 (1980/81), 101–57; Karl Vocelka, 'Die Begräbnisfeierlichkeiten für Kaiser Maximilian II. 1576/77', *Mitteilungen des Österreichischen Staatsarchivs*, 84 (1976), 105–36; Elisabeth Wolfik,

of eighteenth-century religion in the Habsburg monarchy is dominated by a strong Counter-Reformation Catholicism and its dynastic expression as *Pietas Austriaca* in the earlier part of the century,² and by the period of Enlightenment reform after the death of Emperor Charles VI (1711–40). Several studies show that, under the influence of Jansenism and Enlightenment philosophy, monarchs reduced their ritual participation in the holy mass. Court ceremonial was accordingly modified, and various expressions of Austrian baroque Catholicism were restricted (including processions, pilgrimages, and the veneration of the Virgin Mary and the saints, among others).³ From the eighteenth century to the present day, the interpretation of this transition from ostentatious baroque forms of religious expression to the more private contemplation of the ‘essence’ of Catholicism has been ambivalent. On the one hand it has been read as indicating a decline, and on the other, a purification, of religion.⁴

If we look more closely, however, it is clear that this somewhat schematic view of the position of religion in the context of royal

“Was auf solches unser Ewiglichs absterben unser Fürstliches Begrebnus belange . . .”: Tod, Begräbnis und Grablege Erzherzog Ferdinands II. von Tirol (1529–1595) als Beispiel für einen “Oberschichtentod” in der Frühen Neuzeit” (unpublished Diploma thesis, University of Vienna, 2000); Johannes Ramharter, ‘Apotheose Kaiser Rudolfs II.’, in Kunsthistorisches Museum Wien (ed.), *Prag um 1600: Kunst und Kultur am Hofe Kaiser Rudolfs II.*, exhibition catalogue (Freren, 1988), ii, 200; Michael Brix, ‘Trauergerüste für die Habsburger in Wien’, *Wiener Jahrbuch für Kunstgeschichte*, 26 (1973), 201–65. Important aspects of the 18th century are dealt with in Magdalena Hawlik-van de Water, *Der schöne Tod: Zeremonialstrukturen des Wiener Hofes bei Tod und Begräbnis zwischen 1640 und 1740* (Vienna, 1989) and Waltraud Stangl, ‘Tod und Trauer bei den österreichischen Habsburgern 1740–1780 dargestellt im Spiegel des Hofzeremoniells’ (unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Vienna, 2001). Karl Vocelka and Lynne Heller, *Die private Welt der Habsburger: Leben und Alltag einer Familie* (Graz, 1998), and eid., *Die Lebenswelt der Habsburger: Kultur- und Mentalitätsgeschichte einer Familie* (Graz, 1997) provide good and well-illustrated overviews of the whole early modern and modern period. For the European context see Dirk Reimann, *Vom Himmel erwählt: Herrschertod und Herrscherbegräbnis im Zeitalter Ludwigs XIV.* (Kassel, 2002).

² R. J. W. Evans, *The Making of the Habsburg Monarchy, 1550–1700* (Oxford, 1979); Anna Coreth, *Pietas Austriaca: Österreichische Frömmigkeit im Barock* (2nd edn.; Vienna, 1982), English edn.: *Pietas Austriaca* (West Lafayette, Ind., 2004).

³ Elisabeth Kovács, ‘Kirchliches Zeremoniell am Wiener Hof des 18. Jahrhunderts im Wandel von Mentalität und Gesellschaft’, *Mitteilungen des Österreichischen Staatsarchivs*, 32 (1979), 109–42; Franz Wehr, ‘Der “neue Geist”: Eine Untersuchung der Geistesrichtungen des Klerus in Wien von 1750–1790’, *Mitteilungen des Österreichischen Staatsarchivs*, 20 (1967), 36–114.

⁴ Kovács, ‘Kirchliches Zeremoniell’, 140–2.

culture must be further differentiated. Thus the funerals of emperors in the early modern period reveal that religion was losing its primary function of providing a framework and set of rules for dealing ritually with death. In the eighteenth century, it was one framework for action among others. Something that in the Middle Ages would have inspired fear and terror, a sudden death (*mors repentina*), afflicted two emperors in the eighteenth century, without being seen as anything especially significant. The importance of doctors and of court ceremonial for structuring the final days of the dying ruler grew, and the function of the family changed. Instead of providing a prayer community, it became a group of individuals suffering a painful loss. And finally, the death of the ruler, which in the seventeenth century had appeared to be accompanied by supernatural phenomena such as visions, was now presented as a natural—although sometimes grisly—phenomenon.⁵

Given this background, the aim of this essay is to take a step forward by analysing funerals over a longer period of time. It will focus on two aspects: first, it will look at the relationship between continuity and change in the ritualistic and symbolic forms of the funeral; and, secondly, taking account of the distinction between secularization and desacralization, it will ask which of the interpretations can be applied to these complex symbolic settings. However, to analyse a ritual which links religious and political culture is a difficult task, especially when both aspects are simultaneously undergoing dramatic changes. Three points need to be made in this context.

First, the concept of religion was fundamentally transformed in the eighteenth century. Emperor Francis I (1745–65), who was greatly influenced by Jansenist thought, saw himself as 'L'Érémite dans le monde', and his son, Joseph II (1765/80–90), introduced extensive ecclesiastical reforms, which overthrew many popular forms of baroque piety. In addition, religion underwent a process of internal differentiation resulting in such diverse movements as Jansenism, Methodism, and Deism. Religious expression might even be disregarded, in particular, by the numerous officials and members of the élite, many of whom stopped attending mass or ridiculed it, especially from the 1790s

⁵ Mark Hengerer, *The Deaths of the Habsburg Emperors and the Transformation of Royal Religious Culture in the Eighteenth Century* (in preparation).

on.⁶ And as far as scholars are concerned, they have very different criteria for deciding whether a phenomenon can be called religious or not: the religious experience of historical actors, the explicit use of signs and symbols with religious connotations, and internal or external reference to meaning or transcendence.⁷ Despite their differences, these options point the historian towards analysing the use of religiously coded signs, and thus to examine the elements of a process of communication. This communicative behaviour can be understood or not understood, accepted or even rejected by contemporaries.⁸ However, the fact that all a funeral rite needs to succeed is for nobody to act in a way that contravenes it, means that people can take part in it without actually having to share the belief on which it is based. Discrepancies between forms of religious expression and religious experience may leave behind traces which, taken together, can seem like a desacralization of the ritual. But where the discrepancy between religious experience and expression can be so large without necessarily being visible in the situation of a funeral, there is great deal of latitude for widely varying individual interpretations and accounts of religious statements. One example is the highly controversial integration of ancient philosophies, such as stoicism, or ancient symbols of life and death, into the intellectual stock and visual imagery of Christianity.⁹

⁶ Hans Hollerweger, 'Die gottesdienstlichen Reformen Josephs II. und ihre Auswirkungen auf die Frömmigkeit des Volkes', *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, 94 (1983), 52–65, at 60–3. For the impact of sacred architecture cf. Ursula Brossette, *Die Inszenierung des Sakralen: Das theatralische Raum- und Ausstattungsprogramm süddeutscher Barockkirchen in seinem liturgischen und zeremoniellen Kontext*, 2 vols. (Weimar, 2002), I.

⁷ Horst Firsching and Matthias Schlegel, 'Religiöse Innerlichkeit und Geselligkeit: Zum Verhältnis von Erfahrung, Kommunikabilität und Sozialität—unter besonderer Berücksichtigung des Religionsverständnisses Friedrich Schleiermachers', in Hartmann Tyrell, Volkhard Krech, and Hubert Knoblauch (eds.), *Religion als Kommunikation* (Würzburg, 1998), 31–81; Hubert Knoblauch, 'Transzendenzerfahrung und symbolische Kommunikation: Die phänomenologisch orientierte Soziologie und die kommunikative Konstruktion der Religion', *ibid.* 147–86; Thomas Luckmann, *Die unsichtbare Religion* (Frankfurt am Main, 1991); Günter Thomas, *Implizite Religion: Theoriesgeschichtliche und theoretische Untersuchungen zum Problem ihrer Identifikation* (Würzburg, 2001).

⁸ Horst Firsching, 'Warum "Kommunikation"? Auf welche Problemstellungen reagieren kommunikationstheoretische Ansätze in der Soziologie—insbesondere in der Religionssoziologie?', in Tyrell, Krech, and Knoblauch (eds.), *Religion als Kommunikation*, 187–240, at 203–23; Niklas Luhmann, 'Religion als Kommunikation', *ibid.* 135–45, at 145. By adopting such a theoretical framework, we can define indicators of the degree of religiousness of a given monarch's funeral: the presence of direct, indirect, or attributed religious communication, of religious frameworks, and their respective strength and prevalence.

⁹ Derek Beales, 'Christians and "Philosophes": The Case of the Austrian Enlightenment',

The second point to be made is that in the political culture of the eighteenth century, rituals with strong religious elements relating to the ruler became much less important. This applied even to coronations. Although they continued to be held in the empire, even the monarchs themselves regarded them more as a historical spectacle than as an event crucial to the basis of their rule. A classic example is Goethe's account in *Dichtung und Wahrheit*, where Maria Theresa watches parts of the coronation of Emperor Francis I and of Joseph II with amusement (which did not prevent such scenes from being depicted on her sarcophagus). In the Habsburg hereditary lands, Joseph II refused coronation as king in Bohemia and Hungary, and renounced most of the homages (*Erbhuldigungen*). Later emperors of Austria, in the nineteenth century, were no longer crowned as such. This renunciation of the traditional form of inaugurating a reign created no visible problems for the establishment of monarchical rule.

It was not possible to dispense with royal funerals. However, in contrast, for example, to France in the sixteenth century, within the Habsburg monarchy the funeral rite was not a legal requirement for the continued existence of dynastic rule.¹⁰ By comparison, the funerals of the Habsburg emperors were much more open to diverse cultural influences, such as, for example, debates about what a monarchy should be. Yet in terms of expense and public attention, they were an important part of the representation of the monarchy, traditionally underlining the unity of secular power and religious mission in the 'res publica christiana' by means of grand, ritualized interaction between nobles and commoners. This can be seen in the sumptuous and well-documented exequies for Emperor Charles V (1519–56) held in Brussels.¹¹ At the end of the early modern process of state-building, however, this interactive

in id. and Geoffrey Best (eds.), *History, Society and the Churches: Essays in Honour of Owen Chadwick* (Cambridge, 1985), 169–94; reprinted in Derek Beales, *Enlightenment and Reform in Eighteenth-Century Europe* (London, 2005), 60–89. For a contemporary discussion see Gotthold Ephraim Lessing, 'Wie die Alten den Tod gebildet: Eine Untersuchung' (Berlin, 1769), in Hugo Blümner (ed.), *Lessings Werke*, ix pt. 2: *Antiquarische Briefe: Wie die Alten den Tod gebildet. Kleine Schriften und Nachlaß antiquarisch-archäologischen Inhalts* (Berlin, 1886), 283–368.

¹⁰ Ralph Giesey, *The Royal Funeral Ceremony in Renaissance France* (Geneva, 1960) and Gustav Turba, *Die Grundlagen der pragmatischen Sanktion*, pt. 2: *Die Hausgesetze* (Leipzig, 1912).

¹¹ Auernhammer and Däuble, 'Exequien für Kaiser Karl V.', 126, with reference to the exequies in Brussels.

model of society almost came to an end. Once events such as coronations or funerals were staged, they were in danger of being seen, in the spirit of the Enlightenment, merely as ceremonial acts or even as folkloric traditions. If we therefore take the funeral as the dependent variable, and both political and religious culture as two independent, though interdependent, variables, it becomes clear that the consequences for one side or the other can easily be misleading.

My third point is that a royal funeral was not a single coherent event or ritual, but a sequence of several events and rites, each with different participants and different forms of participation. Firmly rooted in the public sphere, it consisted of several active and passive participants, as well as spectators who watched proceedings, read about them later on in the press, or viewed them in prints. The sequence of events beginning with the emperor's death and continuing to the end of the exequies was filled with prayers, services, sermons, the ringing of church bells, processions, the attendance of priests, and so on. However, these religious manifestations were accompanied by more profane, yet still highly relevant, layers of communication comprising political, organizational, and especially ceremonial aspects. In addition, there was the contribution of the arts, whose often ambiguous symbolism only partially reflected Christian interpretations of the event. The authors of the records fixed the end of the burial as the point when the keys of the coffin were put into the treasure vault on the day after the monarch's corpse had been deposited in the Capuchin crypt in Vienna.¹² This shows why the identification of any one decisive analytical framework for an event which itself consisted of innumerable events over a period of weeks, or the identification of one definitive level of communication is questionable, even if we adopt fluid concepts such as 'ritual', 'ceremonial', or 'Gesamtkunstwerk'.¹³ There were many distinctions with regard to the degree of participation in the funeral (from being responsible for the planning to simply hearing the bells ringing by chance, from being present at the time to hearing or reading

¹² Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchiv, Vienna (henceforth HHSA), Ältere Zeremonialakten (henceforth ÄZA), K. 23, Konv. † Joseph I., fos. 22 ff. 'Womit der traurige actus geendigt hat' (Herewith this sad event has come to an end).

¹³ Giesey, *Royal Funeral Ceremony*, refers in his introduction to 'ceremonial' and 'ritual'; for the concept of 'Gesamtkunstwerk' cf. Vocelka and Heller, *Lebenswelt der Habsburger*, 292.

about the proceedings later on). There were also different perspectives on the events, determined, for example, by the position of the onlooker in the crowds or, in the case of etchings, by the viewpoint of the engraver. Any individual could not experience all of them, of course, but they make a difference to the meaning attributed to funerals in royal religious culture. Unfortunately, lack of space means that they cannot be discussed in detail here.

This essay, therefore, cannot attempt more than a brief reconstruction of the elements of the funeral central to the question of how royal ceremonial changed. For this reason its main divisions are not chronological, but reflect the boundaries between highly traditional, ritualized, and interactive events on the one hand and the more dynamic, artistic expressions, be they of an ephemeral or lasting nature, on the other. Changes in religious attitudes are traced largely by examining the clearly religious aspects of the ritual and the language of artistic signs and symbols in the monuments. Space does not permit a discussion of the subjective and many-layered process of reception, or of the significance of the various media for this process. In addition, I will concentrate almost exclusively on the Habsburg emperors, at the expense of the empresses and the princes of the blood. As I will be discussing rituals with long traditions, it will at times be necessary to widen the temporal scope of the discussion.

II. *Funeral of the Monarch*

1. *Ceremonial Check-Lists*

As the traditional character of royal funerals in Austria was primarily the result of the traditionalism of Habsburg ceremonial, it might be useful to start by outlining the relevant organizational procedures. Before the reign of Ferdinand III (1637–57), the House of Habsburg had neither a fixed burial site nor an established funeral rite, despite the significance of Prague as the burial place of the Emperors Ferdinand I (1556–64), Maximilian II (1564–76), and Rudolf II (1576–1612). However, there was an established sequence of events, comprising a temporary lying-in-state of the corpse, a grandiose procession with mourning-horses leading directly to the burial site where the exequies were held, and a final deposition of the coffin. Detailed instructions containing further

information were often not available when monarchs or members of the dynasty expired.¹⁴ For example, when Archduchess Maria died in Linz in 1556, the official in charge had to make enquiries about where she should be interred: in the local monastery or parish church, or in Vienna? The fact that the entrails of the Habsburg Emperor Frederick III (1452–93) had been buried in the parish church in Linz, was, to the Emperor's mind, a decisive argument in favour of the Archduchess lying there as well. But he added that she should be laid to rest in such a way that her father, Maximilian II, could easily move her remains elsewhere if he so wished.¹⁵

When Emperor Maximilian II himself died in 1576, his son Rudolf II consulted several princes about the proper place of burial, and this time Prague was chosen because of earlier royal interments there.¹⁶ None the less, in 1612, on the death of Rudolf, his younger brother and successor Matthias (1612–19) again deliberated with his privy counsellors 'when, where, and how' the corpse of the Emperor should be consigned to the grave.¹⁷ He also turned to his relatives concerning his hated predecessor's funeral. It may be because of their advice that Rudolf II eventually received a funeral worthy of an emperor: 'in my opinion, one should observe exactly the same solemnities as at the funeral of our beloved ancestor and father, Emperor Ferdinand I, and of Emperor Maximilian II of most laudable memory, which should be imitated wherever possible'.¹⁸ Imitation was thus the key to the form taken by a funeral.¹⁹ But personal memory was not usually sufficient, as the newly devised procession for Rudolf II shows. And it is characteristic of the high degree of contingency that the main organizers were not imperial or court officials, but royal Bohemian officials, who found it necessary to state that Rudolf II had to have an imperial funeral.²⁰

¹⁴ An outstanding exception was Maximilian I. See Scheicher, 'Kaiser Maximilian'.

¹⁵ HHSA Hausarchiv, Familienakten (henceforth HA FA), K. 60, Konv. 2, fos. 4–9.

¹⁶ Vocolka, 'Begräbnisfeierlichkeiten', 113 esp. n. 41.

¹⁷ Cf. HHSA HA FA K. 65, Konv. † Rudolf II., 23. Feb. 1612.

¹⁸ HHSA HA FA K. 65, Konv. † Rudolf II. Archduke Albrecht to Matthias, Brussels, 4 May 1612 (in response to Matthias's demand of 4 Apr. 1612). The officials wrote that the funeral should not be performed 'in a worse manner' than that of Maximilian II (*ibid.* 16 Aug. 1612).

¹⁹ Cf. Brix, 'Trauergerüste', 217–18; Vocolka, 'Begräbnisfeierlichkeiten', 113, 116; Wolfik, 'Tod, Begräbnis und Grablege'.

²⁰ HHSA HA FA K. 65, Konv. † Rudolfs II., 16 Aug. 1612.

Matthias's own funeral broke with the tradition of burial in Prague. Deprived of power by his successor while still alive, he was buried, fifteen years after his death, in the then inconspicuous crypt of the new Capuchin church in Vienna which his wife, Anna (died 1618) had founded for them both in her last will dating from 1617.²¹ His successor Emperor Ferdinand II (1619–37) selected his home town, Graz in Styria, as his burial site. There he had erected an outstanding mausoleum for the inner-Austrian branch of the Habsburg dynasty. The last funeral procession that had had to convey the body over such a distance to its final resting place, however, had been held some sixty years before, and in 1637 new, detailed plans had to be made for the exequies in both Vienna and Graz.²² The records of the *Reichskanzlei* were consulted to find out how the imperial princes had previously been invited to hold exequies for the emperor, but many other aspects, apart from the traditional sequence of events, were determined by contingency. The Bishop of Vienna had offered to perform the religious hymns and chants. As the corpse of Ferdinand II had already been deposited in the Augustinian monastery in Vienna, it was arranged for the exequies to be held in the church of St Augustine, which also served as court church. An order was given to see whether any black clothes remained from the funeral of Emperor Matthias. (They were found in the *Königinnenkloster*.) It was further decided that, if the old funeral insignia could be reused, they should be taken to Graz and then carried back again to Vienna. For the exequies, two or more different models of a *castrum doloris* for the church of St Augustine were ordered, and it was discussed whether they should be illuminated by wax-candles or by oil-lamps. A tin coffin was prepared, and the inscription discussed; the seating of the knights of the Order of the Golden Fleece in Vienna and the proceedings in Graz were agreed upon; and instructions for the exequies in the territories were given.

It was only during the reign of Ferdinand III that this lack of continuity came to an end. Residing mainly in Vienna, the Emperor had used the local Capuchin crypt of Matthias and

²¹ Hawlik-van de Water, *Der schöne Tod*, 43–4. The church was built between 1622 and 1627; the crypt was completed in 1633.

²² HHSA HA FA K. 66, Konv. 2, fos. 11–20.

Anna as the burial place for several of his children who died early, for his wives, and for his son, King Ferdinand IV (died 1654).²³ This marks a turning point both in the choice of the burial site and the performance of the funerals: Vienna became the final resting place for members of the Habsburg dynasty and the major elements, comprising the funeral procession (which had once reflected the unity of the empire), the exequies, and the burial, were reorganized. Divided into the lying-in-state, procession, and burial, the process officially ended only weeks later when the *castrum doloris* was ready for the court exequies.²⁴ The written plans for the burial of Ferdinand IV describe all of this: the lying-in-state of the corpse and the imperial insignia in the King's antechamber, where an altar had to be erected for the reading of services; the procession from the antechamber through the court church of St Augustine to the Capuchin crypt, with the chamberlains as pall-bearers (here, reference was made to the example of Empress Leopoldina who had died in 1649); the burial of the deceased's heart in the Loreto chapel in the court church of St Augustine and of his entrails in St Stephen's Cathedral; the number of participating clergy, ambassadors, and nobles; the tapestries adorning the palace, the clothing of the court staff; and the exequies to take place weeks later in the church of St Augustine with a great *castrum doloris*. There were already records that could be used as models for the announcement letters, as well as precedents for the ringing of the bells, and the arrangement of the services.²⁵

Above all, it was the institution of systematic ceremonial records in the early 1650s²⁶ that established the funeral of King Ferdinand IV in 1654 as a basic model for the future. Thereafter, whenever an emperor died, a committee of courtiers responsible

²³ Hawlik-van de Water, *Der schöne Tod*, 44. The removal of Empress Maria Anna's body from Linz, where she died in 1646, to Vienna, was the model for the transfer of Archduke Carl Joseph's corpse who also died (1664) in Linz (HHSA HA FA Konv. 12).

²⁴ Brix, 'Trauergerüste', 218–19.

²⁵ HHSA HA FA K. 8, Konv. † Ferdinand IV. 1654, 'Puncta'.

²⁶ Jeroen Duindam, 'Ceremonial Staffs and Paperwork at Two Courts: France and the Habsburg Monarchy c.1550–1720', in Klaus Malettke and Chantal Grell (eds.), *Hofgesellschaft und Höflinge an europäischen Fürstenhöfen in der frühen Neuzeit (15.–18. Jh.)* (Münster, 2001), 369–88; Mark Hengerer, 'Die Zeremonialprotokolle und weitere Quellen zum Zeremoniell des Kaiserhofes', in Thomas Winkelbauer, Martin Scheutz, and Josef Pauser (eds.), *Quellenkunde der Habsburgermonarchie (16. bis 18. Jahrhundert): Ein exemplarisches Handbuch* (Vienna, 2004), 76–93.

for planning the funeral reviewed these detailed records and cautiously adapted proceedings to the precedents they contained.²⁷ This was the case when Ferdinand III died in 1657. In 1705, only an hour after the death of Leopold I (1658–1705), the High Steward (*Obersthofmeister*) and the Lord Chamberlain (*Oberstkämmerer*) discussed the preparations for the lying-in-state, the post mortem, the embalming and robing of the corpse, provision for a first coffin and receptacles for the heart and for the coffin, the fitting of the Knight's Chamber (*Ritterstube*) with altars and black cloths, the guards, and the music. The rest of the arrangements were discussed at a council meeting with other court officials on the next day. At this meeting, the ceremonial records of 1657 (concerning the death of Ferdinand III) were read, and thus became, with only a few variations, the guidelines for the funeral of Leopold I. As usual, after the funeral, a detailed description was integrated into the records.²⁸

The death of Joseph I (1705–11) followed a similar pattern. The High Steward ordered the consultation of the 'Protocollum de anno 1654' to check a detail concerning the lying-in-state;²⁹ after everything was prepared for the lying-in-state, the already customary council meeting was held. It began with a reading of the records from the years 1654 and 1705 (that is, the funerals of Ferdinand IV and Leopold I). These descriptions, because of their extreme elaborateness, were taken as a guideline, and many of the rituals were executed again with some small adaptations.³⁰ After the death of Charles VI (1711–40) in the Favorita palace near Vienna, a council meeting of the same type was convened. Again, reports of former funerals were read from the ceremonial records. This time the deaths of the Emperors Leopold (1705) and Joseph (1711) were selected. Eventually

²⁷ Some early examples: after the death of his firstborn son in 1701, Leopold I ordered a copy of the description of an earlier firstborn prince's funeral, held in 1668, from the *Protocollum Aulicum in Ceremonialibus* and decided that (with minimal differences) everything should be done in the same way as in 1668 (HHSA ÄZA K. 20, Konv. † Archduke Leopold, fo. 433). For the burial of Charles VI's firstborn son in 1716, the same description served as an 'instruction' (ibid. fo. 436^v). When a council meeting was called to deliberate the details of the funeral of an archduchess who had died of smallpox in 1703, the court officials took the funeral of another princess, who also died of smallpox in 1696, as a model (HHSA ÄZA K. 20, Konv. † Archduchess Maria Josepha 1703).

²⁸ HHSA Zeremonialakten, Protokolle (henceforth ZA Prot.) 7, fos. 333^v–362^v.

²⁹ HHSA ÄZA K. 23, Konv. † Joseph I., fo. 13; ZA Prot. 7, fo. 41^v.

³⁰ HHSA ZA Prot. 7, fos. 44^v, 45; ÄZA K. 23, Konv. † Joseph I., fos. 22 ff.

Leopold's burial was chosen as the relevant precedent, while Joseph's funeral was regarded only as a reference.³¹ When Francis I died in Innsbruck in 1765, the first measures (initial lying-in-state, removal of the body to Vienna) were taken 'out of necessity', without consulting the ceremonial records at a meeting of court officials,³² but as soon as the court arrived back in Vienna, those in charge held another meeting and referred to the records, this time taking the funeral of Charles VI as a model.³³

The imitation of earlier funerals as described in the ceremonial records reinforced traditional forms of religious expression and monarchical representation as they had evolved at the height of the Counter-Reformation in the mid-seventeenth century. The lying-in-state, the exequies (with the exception of the *castrum doloris*, which was subject to changes in artistic taste), the procession, and the burial,³⁴ therefore, all retained their essential form, making small but significant changes more visible.

The Lying-in-State

For the lying-in-state, the emperor's heart and entrails were removed and put into receptacles, which were displayed with the corpse and a stoup on a temporary structure in the *Ritterstube*, situated before the emperor's antechamber in the Hofburg. The

³¹ HHSA ÄZA K. 39, Konv. † Karl VI., fos. 11 ff. The changes made to Leopold's funeral referred to the transfer of the corpse to the Hofburg (cf. Stangl, 'Tod und Trauer', 161–2); this is why it also became relevant for the lying-in-state (cf. the copy in HHSA HA FA K. 67, Konv. † Karl VI., fos. 18–23). Maria Theresa approved the council's proposition but noted that the 'protocol cannot have been properly consulted' (fo. 18).

³² HHSA ÄZA K. 69, Konv. 11, fo. 74^v; quotation from Rudolf von Khevenhüller-Metsch and Hanns Schlitter (eds.), *Aus der Zeit Maria Theresias: Tagebuch des Fürsten Johann Josef Khevenhüller-Metsch, kaiserlichen Obersthofmeisters, 1742–1776*, 8 vols. (Vienna, 1907–72), vi. 127.

³³ *Ibid.* 132. Cf. HHSA ÄZA K. 69, Konv. 11, fos. 51–3. Two interesting details: the court officials disagreed on whether *pleureuses* had been worn in 1740, and finally decided in favour of them so that the funeral would not be of minor decorum; and when the proposition was ready, the officials asked for permission formally to include the description of the funeral ('ausführliche schmerzhaftte beschreibung') in the 'Protocollum Aulicum in Ceremonialibus' as a guideline. Joseph II gave his *placet* and remarked: 'nur soll für zukünftige zeiten in denen Protocollen alles auf das Genaueste aufgemerkt werden, auch jenes was schon zu Insprug geschehen ist (for the future, everything is to be noted in the greatest detail in the records, including everything that happened in Innsbruck)'.

³⁴ Vocolka and Heller, *Lebenswelt der Habsburger*, 288–304. Further details can be found in Hawlik-van de Water, *Der schöne Tod*; Stangl, 'Tod und Trauer'.

body was robed in black court costume and surrounded by candles and insignia, including funeral crowns, a crucifix below the feet, and another placed in the hands. The room, and other parts of the palace, were hung with black draperies. Four altars were erected, and priests read services from morning until midday; one or more chaplains, several monks, two chamberlains, two valets, and two commoners prayed, each for one hour, throughout the whole day and night; twice during the day the court clerics, accompanied by the court musicians, sang the psalm *Miserere mei Deus*, and performed a consecration; the bells in the city rang from midday until 1 p.m.;³⁵ and for three consecutive days anyone who wanted to could enter the room and view the dead monarch. From Leopold I to Charles VI, almost no changes occurred in this part of the funeral ceremonial. Even when Francis I died in Innsbruck, his corpse lay in state in an improvised but exactly similar way in the great hall of the Innsbruck palace, which was adapted for the purpose; the lying-in-state was repeated in Vienna in the traditional way.³⁶

Changes were rare, but those that did occur show the extent to which the lying-in-state became formalized, as a few examples may demonstrate. Whereas in 1701 the court chaplain had performed the *spiritualia* along with the other participants,³⁷ in 1711 the court chaplains refused to take part in the ceremony of the Emperor's lying-in-state, arguing that they had received a dispensation from Joseph I's High Steward. In the years that followed, a compromise was reached by which fewer members of the court clergy were delegated.³⁸ The lying-in-state of Francis I in Innsbruck in 1765 was conducted merely as a traditional and ceremonial duty,³⁹ and the plan to put an empty coffin on

³⁵ Hawlik-van de Water, *Der schöne Tod*, 50–2; Stangl, 'Tod und Trauer', 164–89. For Leopold II cf. Helga Peham, *Leopold II. Herrscher mit weiser Hand* (Graz, 1987), 302, 304. Astonishingly, in the 18th century Sunday was increasingly considered to be inappropriate for the vigil.

³⁶ Khevenhüller-Metsch and Schlitter (eds.), *Tagebuch des Fürsten Khevenhüller-Metsch*, vi, 133–6.

³⁷ HHSA ÄZA K. 20, Konv. † Erzherzog Joseph, 1701, fo. 434.

³⁸ Stangl, 'Tod und Trauer', 180.

³⁹ 'daß der entblichene Leichnam zwar mit allem in der Eile möglichen Apparatu exponiret, sodann aber zu Wasser nacher Wienn zur förmlich solennen Begräbnus transportiret' (so that, of course, the deceased body lies in state with all the decorum possible given the urgency of time, then, however, it be transferred to the solemn interment at Vienna by boat). Khevenhüller-Metsch and Schlitter (eds.), *Tagebuch des Fürsten Khevenhüller-Metsch*, vi, 127.

display in Vienna because of the stench of the corpse reveals that the robust religious concept of requiem masses and prayers in the presence of the deceased had faded.⁴⁰

A stronger differentiation between matters of religion and state may be seen in other circumstances. One example is the relocation of the lying-in-state, which was moved out of both private and state apartments. Usually, archdukes lay in state in their private apartments, but in 1761 one particular room was considered too small, so that the Archbishop of Vienna was asked to approve the use of the court chapel for the purpose.⁴¹ He did so and later this relocation became the norm. Thus Maria Theresa (1740–80) lay in state in the chapel of the palace of Schönbrunn,⁴² and Joseph II (1765/80–90) in the court chapel of the Hofburg in Vienna. Although from this time on a church was always chosen as the site of the lying-in-state, the transformation of apartments or antechambers into sacred spaces indicates a greater willingness to allow the religious dimensions of the funeral to expand into wider areas than an already consecrated church. This process could be described as ‘interfusion *v.* differentiation’. Moreover, in 1763 the duration of the lying-in-state of corpses of archdukes had already been reduced to two days. As compensation, Maria Theresa had the requiem masses started before the beginning of the lying-in-state;⁴³ even this compensation was missing when Joseph II lay in state for only one day.⁴⁴ The fact that he was dressed in the uniform of a field

⁴⁰ Ibid. 133; ‘und auf das Parade-Gertüst im Ritter=Saal aufgesetzt worden. Den ersten Tag hat der durch die große Hitze aufgeährte Leib starck gerochen: Zwischen d. 28 und 30^{ten} dieses Monaths muß man in der Nacht die Veranstaltung getroffen haben, daß derselbe in die kaysersl. Grufft in aller Stille ist beygesetzt worden, massen gestern nicht der mindeste wiedrige Geruch zuverspüren war, mithin dieses nur ein Schau=Gertüst ist’ ([The corpse of the Emperor] was deposited in the *castrum doloris* in the Ritter-Saal. On the first day the body, swollen by the great heat, emitted a strong stench. Between the 28th and 30th of this month, during the night, a decision must have been taken quietly to bury the same in the imperial vault, since yesterday not the least bad smell could be noticed. Hence the *castrum doloris* is only a stage), Hauptstaatsarchiv Stuttgart, A 16a Büschel 245; dispatch by Friedrich Staub, Vienna 31 Aug. 1765.

⁴¹ Stangl, ‘Tod und Trauer’, 167. Since 1761 the great chapel in the Hofburg had been the place for the lying-in-state. The Archbishop had to give his consent as this was a bishop’s privilege. HHSA Neuere Zeremonialakten, K. 18, fos. 106^r, 107.

⁴² Stangl, ‘Tod und Trauer’, 169.

⁴³ Ibid. 165, 183–4.

⁴⁴ Karl Gutkas (ed.), *Kaiser Joseph II.* (Vienna, 1989), 452; a three-day lying-in-state had been planned but not carried out (HHSA ÁZA K. 92, Konv. † Joseph II.); for the uniform *ibid.* fo. 66.

marshal may be attributed to the abolition of Spanish court dress, but it also reflects the monarch's perceived role as a statesman. The mourning clothes of the attending courtiers had also changed from long black coats to the more elegant *campagne* mourning clothes.⁴⁵

The Funeral Procession and the Burial

From 1654 on, the funeral procession was a well-organized parade involving hundreds of people, including almost all the clergy of Vienna, courtiers of the inner circle, representatives of the Estates and the government, members of the university, poor people from the almshouses, and soldiers.⁴⁶ After the deceased's heart and entrails had been buried,⁴⁷ clergy, courtiers, and members of the dynasty met in the hall where the laying-in-state was being held; the priests sang the *De Profundis* and consecrated the dead emperor. The chamberlains then lifted the coffin and, accompanied by members of the dynasty and a few other participants, carried it along a corridor to the court church of St Augustine. The procession was later swollen by the addition of those who were waiting there. Before the coffin was taken to the Capuchin church, the funeral insignia were attached to it. As the procession, now lit by lanterns, passed over a specially erected walkway, the court musicians sang the *Miserere* and the bells were rung.⁴⁸ The order of the procession generally followed that of the funeral of Ferdinand IV, but it was later changed slightly in response to some alterations in the court ceremonial.⁴⁹

These changes were unrelated to religious matters, but they

⁴⁵ Stangl, 'Tod und Trauer', 179–80.

⁴⁶ For the varying presence of members of the dynasty cf. *ibid.* 215–16; Hawlik-van de Water, *Der schöne Tod*, 65. This depended more on ceremonial problems and pregnancies than on religious attitudes.

⁴⁷ Generally, the entrails were buried in St Stephen's Cathedral in Vienna; the hearts in the Loreto chapel in the court church of St Augustine.

⁴⁸ For Ferdinand II, the night was chosen because 'in dergleichen fählen ein mehrere apparenz als bey tag geben thut' (in such cases there is a greater effect than during daytime) (HHSA HA FA K. 66, Konv. 2, fos. 11–20). Cf. also Stangl, 'Tod und Trauer', 249.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.* 237–68; Hawlik-van de Water, *Der schöne Tod*, 59–65. For Joseph I cf. HHSA ÄZA K. 23, Konv. † Joseph I, fo. 31^v. The whole process was so strongly regulated that the order of precedence to be followed by the members of the university in the case of processions on the occasion of the burial of members of the ruling house was laid down in Section VI of the printed *Ordo procedendi dominorum doctorum ad actus et consessus academicos* (1641) by the Vice-Chancellor of the University of Vienna, Johann Wilhelm Mannagetta.

reveal a decline in personal interest in the event. In 1711, valets had already helped the chamberlains to carry the coffin;⁵⁰ by 1765 the chamberlains only touched the coffin, and only for ceremonial reasons (*pro decore*).⁵¹ As religious concerns (for example, the notion that animals such as horses must not follow the cross in the procession) became less compelling, coaches were used to carry the coffin in the eighteenth century. Beginning with a funeral in 1762, a hearse was used for archdukes and archduchesses by order of Maria Theresa who, like Joseph II, was herself carried in a hearse.⁵² This significantly relaxed the ceremonial order of those who had to walk in the procession.⁵³

In the case of royal funerals, the Capuchin church was prepared for the solemn reception of the procession and the coffin.⁵⁴ Access to the church was strictly regulated, so that only members of the dynasty, courtiers, representatives of the Estates, and priests could enter. The coffin was received by a procession of monks at the entrance, and taken into the church while the psalm *Miserere* was sung. The crucifix and the funeral insignia were then removed from the coffin. While the court musicians sang the *Libera me, Domine* once more, the dead emperor was consecrated by the Bishop of Vienna with the assistance of numerous priests. Finally, Capuchin monks carried the coffin down into the crypt. At this point most of those present left the church, except for the bishop and the other priests, who remained to perform the last rites in the crypt. The coffin was opened for a last consecration and for an identification of the corpse by the Guardian of the Capuchins and the High Steward. Then the coffin was closed, one key was kept by the Guardian and the other by the High Steward, who later had it placed in the treasure vault. Changes in this part of the funeral were rare, and hardly related to religious matters,⁵⁵ largely because the

⁵⁰ HHSA ÄZA K. 23, Konv. † Joseph I., fos. 32-3.

⁵¹ HHSA ÄZA K. 69, Konv. 11, fos. 127-130^v. Cf. Stangl, 'Tod und Trauer', 245-6; later, guardsmen carried the coffin (*ibid.* 261).

⁵² *Ibid.* 250-1. Maria Theresa had a walking and a driving conduct (HHSA HA FA K. 68, Konv. † Maria Theresia, fo. 143-143^v; Stangl, 'Tod und Trauer', 263-8).

⁵³ Cf. e.g. HHSA HA FA K. 68, Konv. † Maria Theresia, fo. 143-143^v.

⁵⁴ Hawlik-van de Water, *Der schöne Tod*, 72, states that antique funeral symbols were used.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.* 71-8; Vocelka and Heller, *Lebenswelt der Habsburger*, 296-304; dispersal of the mourners as official end of the burial: HHSA ÄZA K. 92, fo. 24; no identification in the

Capuchins kept a special record of their own that supplemented the ceremonial records and served as a guideline for the ritual until 1918.⁵⁶

The Exequies

Exequies for the emperors, a series of masses and prayers for the soul of the defunct held over several days, were held in churches throughout the Habsburg monarchy and even beyond.⁵⁷ From the 1650s to the end of the eighteenth century, the exequies at court were celebrated in the presence of the emperor's successor and other members of the dynasty after the burial; they consisted of a series of vigils and requiem masses (accompanied by court musicians) in the church of St Augustine, where a *castrum doloris* had been erected, and lasted for at least three days. The exequies for Leopold I in 1705 began approximately one month after his death (once the *castrum doloris* was ready) with a first vigil on a Sunday, the first requiem mass and the second vigil on Monday, the second requiem mass and the third vigil on Tuesday, and closed with the third requiem mass and a mass of praise on Wednesday. Each requiem mass was followed by a special absolution, the *absolutio ad tumulum*. Funeral sermons were read on Monday and Tuesday. The church bells of Vienna rang on these days from 12 noon to 1 p.m. on Sunday, from 9 to 10 a.m. and from 12 noon to 1 p.m. on Monday and Tuesday, and from 9 to 10 a.m. on Wednesday. High-ranking priests performed the liturgical functions, most visibly the bishops, but also a cardinal, a number of prelates, court chaplains, and Augustinian monks. The attendants—noble ladies of the court and the town, cardinals, ambassadors, ministers of state, courtiers, chamberlains, prelates, and rich landowners—were invited by the court and appeared in full mourning clothes.⁵⁸

This sequence of religious functions remained unchanged throughout the century since it was regulated by both church

case of Francis I: Khevenhüller-Metsch and Schlitter (eds.), *Tagebuch des Fürsten Khevenhüller-Metsch*, vi. 136; presence of the Lord Chamberlain and the High Steward in the crypt: HHSA ÄZA K. 23, Konv. † Joseph I., fos. 22 ff.; alternative entrance in case of driving conducts: Stangl, 'Tod und Trauer', 260.

⁵⁶ Ibid. 272–3; Hawlik-van de Water, *Der schöne Tod*, 69.

⁵⁷ Ibid. 167, with the example of 1705. For an explanation of the exequies cf. Stangl, 'Tod und Trauer', 301.

⁵⁸ HHSA ZA Prot. 7, fos. 359–362^v.

and court ceremonial.⁵⁹ However, as the court celebrated so many exequies, not only for the members of the House of Habsburg, but also for members of affiliated families and other dynasties, and as the occasions differed from each other in many matters—from the number of vigils held to the duration of the subsequent mourning period and the details of the mourning clothes of the noble attendants—the exequies had already been more or less systematized by 1720. This system was frequently reviewed, however, especially in 1746 and 1767, and the modifications were almost always reductions—in the sumptuousness of the mourning clothes, in the number of people for whom exequies were celebrated, and in the individual parts of the exequies. In 1766 Joseph II excluded exequies in cases of kinship by marriage,⁶⁰ when presented with the plans for the exequies of his mother, Maria Theresa, who had forbidden a funeral sermon for herself, he accepted the three vigils and requiem masses but rejected the celebration of a mass of praise.⁶¹

2. *The Ambiguity of the Artistic Elements*

The castrum doloris

Within this religious and ceremonial framework, the *castrum doloris* was an ephemeral structure full of different symbols of artistic design and highly flexible in both its religious and political message. For this reason it has often been seen as the centre of the exequies and even of the funeral itself, which—from this perspective—constituted a deeply profane demonstration of the House of Habsburg's authority, intended to both glorify and legitimize the monarchy.⁶² But even the eighteenth-century *castra doloris*, which appear as profane statements of either monarchical power, neo-classicism, or Enlightenment ideas, none the less

⁵⁹ The prelates' ceremonial dispute about the obligation to assist during the exequies: HHSA ÄZA K. 23, Konv. † Joseph I., fo. 6–6^v; when the Empress emphasized the aspect of devotion, they accepted a compromise.

⁶⁰ Stangl, 'Tod und Trauer', 305–13.

⁶¹ 'jedoch ohne Lobamt da selbes als nirgends bekant aufgehoben worden' (without a mass of praise, however, since it has been abolished as completely unknown) (HHSÄ ÄZA K. 90, Konv. † Maria Theresia, fo. 276). Magdalena Hawlik-van de Water, *Die Kapuzinergruft: Begräbnisstätte der Habsburger in Wien* (Vienna, 1987), 50–2. For Joseph II, classical exequies were held, but without the mass of praise (HHSÄ ÄZA K. 92, Konv. † Joseph II., fo. 56).

⁶² Stangl, 'Tod und Trauer', 304 with reference to Brix, 'Trauergerüste'.

contained symbolic elements which allowed a Christian view of the *castrum doloris*.⁶³ They retained an inherent ambiguity which allowed for different, even contrasting, interpretations, depending on the spectator.⁶⁴

The *castrum doloris* had evolved from the medieval *chapelle ardente* (burning chapel), which was the place where the *absolutio ad tumulum* was performed. It had been adapted to the Habsburg funeral tradition for the exequies organized by Charles V for his grandfather in Brussels (1516), and his own exequies in Brussels and Augsburg in 1558 and 1559 respectively. When Ferdinand I died, the events in Augsburg were taken as a model for the exequies in Vienna in 1565.⁶⁵ Thus the *castrum doloris* became an essential element of the funerals of the Habsburg emperors. However, in the beginning the Austrian line reduced the elements drawn from antiquity and those indicating a triumph, and emphasized instead symbols of Christianity. The unity of the Habsburg reign and the Catholic faith was symbolized by the *castra doloris* for Rudolf II and Matthias; the latter's *castrum doloris* showed Church Fathers, Evangelists, and obelisks as signs of the triumphant Church as well as an intricate Christian numerology.⁶⁶

Though we do not know what the *castra doloris* for Ferdinand II looked like, records reveal the important fact that two models were ordered to allow a choice to be made between them, and that the artists proposed competing programmatic visions.⁶⁷ From this time on, the *castra doloris* were part of the development both of art and learned discourse. As a result, the *castrum doloris* for Empress Maria Anna (1646) focused on representations of her ancestors (not without reference to Roman portraits), on the Empress herself and her children, and on the dynasty, whereas the one for Ferdinand IV symbolized the apotheosis of the King

⁶³ See the reproductions in Brix, 'Trauergerüste'; Liselotte Popelka, *Castrum Doloris oder 'Trauriger Schauptatz': Untersuchungen zu Entstehung und Wesen ephemerer Architektur* (Vienna, 1994); Hawlik-van de Water, *Der schöne Tod*.

⁶⁴ Brix, 'Trauergerüste', 243: 'viele Bedeutungsschichten' (many layers of meaning).

⁶⁵ *Ibid.* 209-11. Cf. the detailed report by the fascinated imperial ambassador to Spain, Adam von Dietrichstein, on the 'Cappellen oder Castrum doloris (wie sie es nennen)' (chapel, or *Castrum doloris*, as they call it) in HNSA HA FA K. 60, Konv. 6, fos. 3-6, Madrid, 7 Oct. 1654.

⁶⁶ Brix, 'Trauergerüste', 227.

⁶⁷ HNSA HA FA K. 66, Konv. 2, fo. 12^v (Ferdinand II); *ibid.* Konv. 5, fo. 538 (Maria Anna); cf. Hawlik-van de Water, *Der schöne Tod*, 169-70, and the hints in Brix's catalogue, 'Trauergerüste', 253-65.

with its triumphal arch and the victory of belief over death. The *castrum doloris* which the Jesuits erected for Ferdinand III, on the other hand, was inspired by the interpretation of the *chapelle ardente* as a Roman pyre (*rogus*) and the idea of the apotheosis as a kind of Roman consecration (*consecratio*).⁶⁸

The unity between ruler and faith that had been expressed around 1600 faded at the beginning of the eighteenth century. Five *castra doloris* were erected in Viennese churches for the exequies of Leopold I. In the church of St Augustine, the Emperor was celebrated as a representative of the Habsburg Empire, with references to his victories, his virtues, and (at the top) his apotheosis: a personification of immortality receives the portrait of the divine Emperor, which is carried by an eagle. Another *castrum doloris* displays the programme of *mansuetudo* (clemency), referring to his secular power, his virtues, and his resurrection or apotheosis, and celebrates the Emperor as 'a new King David'. A third pays homage to his victories over the Ottoman Empire, while another refers to Roman funeral architecture and presents the Emperor in secular form as a hero in a hall of fame.

Six *castra doloris* were erected for Joseph I in 1711, and the degree of diversity increased again. Instead of complicated maxims, the visual language of Roman coins was used by the historians and artists who together designed these temporary structures. The main topics were the Emperor's victories over the Turks, represented by colossal columns; his virtues; his path to heaven in a chariot; his apotheosis; and the representation of ancient funeral and triumphal architecture.⁶⁹ Under the reign of Charles VI, this diversity took on a new aspect. The design of the many official *castra doloris* was mainly in the hands of those responsible for the decorations at imperial ceremonies and feasts—people who preferred ornamental refinement to ambitious programmatic statements. The Viennese city magistrate, however, incorporated learned literary concepts that were inspired by Roman coins, and identified Vienna with ancient Rome in the *castrum doloris* for Eleonore Magdalena Theresia

⁶⁸ Ibid. 222–3, 228–30.

⁶⁹ Ibid. 230–44. Cf. Ingeborg Schemper-Sparholz, 'Das Münzbildnis als kritische Form in der höfischen Porträtplastik des 18. Jahrhunderts in Wien', *Jahrbuch der kunsthistorischen Sammlungen in Wien*, 92 (1996), 165–88.

(1720).⁷⁰ The *castra doloris* erected by the magistrate and the university of Vienna for Charles VI himself in 1740 appealed to public sentiments, the former as a mausoleum with the urns of the Habsburg emperors surrounded by battle pieces in 'both ancient and modern architecture', the latter as an archaic burial site under a celestial sphere. Whereas these *castra doloris* were designed as monuments, the court had erected a rather unassuming *castrum doloris* that hardly conveyed a message.⁷¹

Several reasons have been suggested to explain why the official *castra doloris* passed their peak at that time. In 1729 a *castrum doloris* collapsed, killing two workmen. Earlier, in 1726, a dispute arose about the panegyric inscriptions that were criticized as being too flattering or too feeble. In order to avoid such criticism, the Emperor resolved to ban inscriptions from the official *castra doloris* altogether.⁷² In addition, Stangl offers the classical Enlightenment justification of reducing unnecessary costs to explain the construction in 1751 of a cheap *castrum doloris* designed to be adaptable for use in all future exequies by simply attaching the relevant coat of arms. This led to a reduction in the time that elapsed between the burial and the exequies, which from 1761 began the day after the burial—leaving no time for any changes to the outward appearance of the *castrum doloris*.⁷³ Brix stresses that major artists were no longer interested in this now old-fashioned type of architecture, dominated as it was by sterile mannerism.⁷⁴ He suggests that the *castrum doloris* as a *Gesamtkunstwerk*,⁷⁵ combining religious and political dimensions, no longer appealed either to the artists or, probably, the clergy.⁷⁶ The pompous courtly exequies had even lost their relevance as an expression of political and dynastic ideas.⁷⁷

As state, dynasty, and religion drifted away from each other, each evolved distinct symbolic forms and media of representation

⁷⁰ Brix, 'Trauergerüste', 244–8. The description of this *castrum doloris* refers to Roman temples of virtue and honour. The inscriptions identify virtues and deities, including the 'PIETAS AVGVSTA' (HNSA HA FA K. 67, Konv. 1720).

⁷¹ Brix, 'Trauergerüste', 248–52.

⁷² Hawlik-van de Water, *Der schöne Tod*, 168–9.

⁷³ Stangl, 'Tod und Trauer', 330–1, 308–9.

⁷⁴ Brix, 'Trauergerüste', 252.

⁷⁵ Popelka, *Castrum doloris*, 104.

⁷⁶ Brix, 'Trauergerüste', states that the 'absolutio ad tumulum' was performed 'only symbolically'.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.* 225; with reference to Stangl, 'Tod und Trauer', 304.

that could not be convincingly united in interaction-based models of representation such as funerals or coronations.⁷⁸ However, two essential elements in the representation of the monarchy at this time developed out of the royal funeral. One was the chapel of Loreto at the centre of the court church of St Augustine, which had been the customary burial site for the hearts of most members of the dynasty since 1654. It was probably the most sacred place for the Habsburg dynasty until Joseph II removed it in the 1780s to a remote place in the same church.⁷⁹ The other was the Capuchin crypt, which, during the first half of the eighteenth century developed into an open public space, a showcase of imperial rule. Within this new setting of monumental memorials, the ephemeral *castrum doloris* became a courtly requirement which, by 1765, was hardly ever interpreted in a religious way. The Viennese newspaper wrote of the *castrum doloris* for Francis I that any connoisseur could admire the size and magnificence of this majestic, beautiful, and well-proportioned 'Mausoläum'.⁸⁰ Whereas the city of Vienna erected an elaborate *castrum doloris* in neo-classical style for Maria Theresa in 1781 in St Stephen's Cathedral, with references to religion and piety as well as to the sciences, arts, commerce, and glory,⁸¹ the *castrum doloris* ordered by the court outshone it only because of the many candles required by the architect. The epithet 'splendid' (*prächtig*) in the ceremonial records was used before it was erected, and seems quite formal.⁸² Accordingly, the *castrum doloris* for Joseph II is described in the same records as 'splendidly illuminated'.⁸³

⁷⁸ Andreas Gestrich, *Absolutismus und Öffentlichkeit: Politische Kommunikation in Deutschland zu Beginn des 18. Jahrhunderts* (Göttingen, 1994); Vocolka and Heller, *Lebenswelt*, 395.

⁷⁹ Hawlik-van de Water, *Der schöne Tod*, 85–9; Coelestin Wolfsgruber, *Die Hofkirche zu S. Augustin in Wien* (Augsburg, 1888); Brix, 'Trauergerüste', 239; Stangl, 'Tod und Trauer'. Some hearts are also buried in St Stephen's Cathedral. See Marquard Herrgott, *Taphographia Principum Austriae*, 2 vols. (Sankt Blasien, 1772), ii. tabula XV.

⁸⁰ Stangl, 'Tod und Trauer', 331. Cf. HHSÄ ÄZA K. 69, Konv. 11, fos. 132, 134; 'dermahlen werden die Exequien gehalten: das Castrum Doloris ist von außerordentl^{en} Decoration und ist dergleichen noch nie gesehen worden' (at the moment exequies are being held: the *castrum doloris* is of exceptional beauty and such a thing has never been seen before), Hauptstaatsarchiv Stuttgart, A 16a Büschel 245; dispatch by Friedrich Staub, Vienna 4 Sept. 1765.

⁸¹ HHSÄ HA FA K. 68, Konv. Maria Theresa, fos. 228–31.

⁸² HHSÄ ÄZA K. 90, Konv. Leichenbegängnis Maria Theresa, fos. 1–2, both: 30 Nov. 1780. Maria Theresa died on 29 Nov. 1780, and the lying-in-state lasted from 1 to 3 December.

⁸³ HHSÄ ÄZA K. 92, Konv. † Joseph II., fo. 69; cf. for the exequies, *ibid.* fos. 34, 38.

The Crypt

The Capuchin crypt in Vienna—still famous today—was endowed, with the Capuchin monastery, as a burial place for Emperor Matthias and his wife Empress Anna only in the seventeenth century, and it was not finished until the early 1630s. However, it was not yet associated with the plan to establish a second, permanent burial place in Vienna—St Stephen's Cathedral already contained the graves of a number of medieval Habsburgs. The successor to Matthias, Ferdinand II, had already had a mausoleum erected for himself in Graz, and was buried there in 1637. By contrast, Ferdinand III buried several of his children, who had died early, and two wives, in the crypt where Matthias and Anna were interred. This is probably why he also buried King Ferdinand IV in the small chamber in 1654, and later, shortly before his own death, named it as his burial chamber, thus establishing the tradition of the 'Kapuzinergruft' as the crypt of the emperors.⁸⁴ By the twentieth century, the crypt had been expanded on a number of occasions, but it was the eighteenth-century works that first created an adequate framework for the presentation of the baroque sarcophagi placed on show there.

After the incorporation of an underground chapel fitted with an altar, the crypt was opened to the public in 1717. As early as 1720, Charles VI had grilles put up to protect the sarcophagi from the proximity of the crowds. The public also had access to engravings of the sumptuous baroque sarcophagi.⁸⁵ In 1753,

⁸⁴ A list of royal infants and wives buried there can be found in Hawlik-van de Water, *Kapuzinergruft*, 280–1; for the history of the foundation and construction *ibid.* 16–20. For an overview cf. Vocolka and Heller, *Lebenswelt*, 305–19; Hawlik-van de Water's source for the inscriptions is Coelestin Wolfsgruber, *Die Kaisergruft bei den Kapuzinern in Wien* (Vienna, 1887). Herrgott, *Taphographia Principum Austriae*, ii, deals with the burial sites of the Habsburg dynasty known at that time, including Spain, and contains a series of engravings. The author, an abbot influenced by Enlightenment ideas, confirms at the very beginning of his introduction that in the history of mankind funerals have always been a religious undertaking (*ibid.* i, Praefatio): 'Religiosa fuit semper inter mortales sui fati memores funerum cura, atque inter sanctiora loca omni aetate sepulcra sunt relata.' James Steven Curl, *Death and Architecture: An Introduction to Funerary and Commemorative Buildings in the Western European Tradition, with some Consideration of their Settings* (Stroud, 2002), 126, describes the crypt as follows: 'This vault has an assemblage of funerary art in such concentrations that the effect is almost overpowering, while the images of skulls crowned, panoplies of the insignia of power, and massive sarcophagi contribute to its oppressiveness.'

⁸⁵ Hawlik-van de Water, *Kapuzinergruft*, 52–3; cf. Schemper-Sparholz, 'Münzbildnis als kritische Form', 174.

while the couple were still alive, a high-ceilinged crypt with natural illumination was erected to hold the monumental double sarcophagus of Maria Theresa and Francis I. Joseph II, finally, removed the altar from the crypt. Its anteroom had already been reduced in size to make space for another sarcophagus. Thus Joseph II made room for his own sarcophagus and those of his followers, and closed the crypt to the public in 1787. His successor, Leopold II (1790–2), by contrast, admitted the public to the crypt again.⁸⁶

Unlike the *castra doloris*, the metal sarcophagi were expected to last. From the first decade of the eighteenth century on, they were designed as magnificent monuments to the emperors, detailing their apotheoses, virtues, and victories. The emblems of vanity were reduced, whilst the dominant Christian symbol, the crucifix on top of the sarcophagus, vanished altogether in the eighteenth century. In the seventeenth century (and earlier), there were few sarcophagi without a crucifix. As a rule, it was attached to the head end of the coffin. In the late seventeenth century, a skull was frequently added. In the eighteenth century, the sarcophagus of Leopold I also had a crown on a cushion, and an eagle bearing the epigraph;⁸⁷ the sarcophagus of Joseph I still has a crucifix and the crown on a cushion. However, the sarcophagus is crowned by two cherubs, one of which holds a victor's wreath and a snake forming a circle with its tail in its mouth, the other a trumpet and a medallion bearing the Emperor's portrait. In both cases, the skulls on the sarcophagus have been moved down to the foot end, and are somewhat separate. The sarcophagi of Charles VI, and Francis I and Maria Theresa (erected in 1754) do not have a crucifix. The sarcophagus of Joseph II is, consistently, decorated not with a crucifix but with a simple hammered cross. In the later eighteenth century, the crucifix in association with crowns is rare, and appears on the sarcophagi mainly of female members of the dynasty. In the course of the nineteenth-century Restoration period, however, it makes a comeback.⁸⁸

⁸⁶ Hawlik-van de Water, *Kapuzinergruft*, 20. Under the reign of Leopold II the crypt had about fifty visitors daily in the summer and about ten daily in the winter, *ibid.* 53. The reduction in size of the room with altar is illustrated in Herrgott, *Taphographia*, ii. tabulae LXX and LXXXVIII.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*

⁸⁸ For crucifixes on the sarcophagi of Archduchess Johanna Gabriela (died 1762), Maria Josepha (died 1767), and Archduke Karl Joseph (died 1761) see Hawlik-van de

In addition to the reduced frequency of Christian symbols on the sarcophagi, we must also register a strong increase in profane elements. The sarcophagus of Joseph I just mentioned initiated this trend. It was based on a design by the court artist Johann Lukas von Hildebrandt, presumably drawn up in line with the concept put forward by the imperial historiographer Carl Gustav Heraeus, who also provided ideas drawn from classical antiquity for the design of *castra doloris*.⁸⁹ The sarcophagus bears a medallion with a portrait, which, in innovative style, combines 'the portrait on a coin, *historia* or allegory, and inscription'.⁹⁰ And, for the first time, an emperor's sarcophagus contains an image of a profane historical event. The Battle of Turin (1706) is depicted in the French *Histoire métallique* style. The sarcophagus of Charles VI, measuring more than two metres high by three metres in length, continues this trend of reducing Christian symbolism even further. It contains, among other things, a portrait medallion with a cherub, crowns, and other insignia, and depicts a battle on the front. Crowned skulls adorn each of the four corners.

On the double sarcophagus housing Maria Theresa and Francis I, in whose design the Empress was actively involved, the symbols of vanity are even more reduced. On top of the sarcophagus rest reclining figures of the two rulers, with the upper body raised and faces turned towards each other, jointly holding a sceptre. Above them, a cherub holds a wreath of stars. He has already put aside the trumpet with which he announced the resurrection. The four sides of the sarcophagus, all equally visible because of its central location in the chamber, contain pictures drawn from the life of the rulers, including coronation scenes and, at the foot end, an image of the crossing of the Rhine in 1744. Two skulls are attached to the head, and two to the foot end. The cross appears only on the crown held aloft by four cherubs sitting on the corners of the raised sarcophagus, and on the crowns lying behind the rulers. The decorative scheme of this sarcophagus, too, is clearly dominated by profane elements.

Water, *Kapuzinergruft*, 172, 174, 176; for Maria Magdalena (died 1746) and Eleonore Magdalena Theresia (died 1720) see Herrgott, *Taphographia*, ii. tabula LXXXIV; for 19th- and 20th-century crucifixes see Hawlik-van de Water, *Kapuzinergruft*, *passim*.

⁸⁹ Schemper-Sparholz, 'Münzbildnis als kritische Form', 172-4. Heraeus served both Joseph I and Charles VI.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.* 172, with reproductions of the engravings of the sarcophagi of Joseph I and Charles VI from Herrgott, *Taphographia*.

Admittedly, the inscriptions refer equally clearly to the extraordinary Christian *pietas* of Maria Theresa.⁹¹ Joseph II's sarcophagus, only a little bigger than a normal coffin, presents a complete contrast, and was made only of copper. It demonstrated his ideas about the role of the monarch in the age of Enlightenment. Apart from a hammered cross it is undecorated, and has only a simple plate for an inscription. Leopold II's sarcophagus is similarly austere, although the idea of a representative funerary monument was realized elsewhere.⁹²

The Capuchin crypt of the Habsburg emperors thus became a central memorial to the dynasty. Visitors, however, were free to view the sarcophagi and their broad and heterogeneous range of Christian, profane, neo-classical, and contemporary symbolism in their own way. They might merely satisfy their curiosity, or perhaps try to steal part of a sarcophagus, they might harbour religious feelings or just venerate the past. We read about sudden emotional outbursts, such as tears shed in sentimental veneration of the Countess Fuchs, the only non-Habsburg interred in the crypt, and about a prominent visitor, Napoleon I, who drew the following conclusion: 'Vanitas Vanitatem—hors la force.'⁹³

III. Conclusion

Habsburg funerals have an ambivalent place in the religious culture of the Viennese court in the eighteenth century. The sequence of imperial funerals can be seen as revealing a decline in the relevance of religious matters, despite the fact that funerals were a highly traditional procedure. The impact of the increasingly well-organized ceremonial regime of the court meant that some parts of the funeral retained a rigidly traditional form,

⁹¹ 'SOLA. FERRE. SED. DEO. NIXA. PIETATE. ET. CONSTANTIA. PATERNA. REGNA. CONTRA. HOSTES. POTENTISS. ADSERVIT.' (Hawlik-van de Water, *Kapuzinergruft*, 155). For the sarcophagi made by the sculptor Moll, see Ulrike König, 'Balthasar Ferdinand Moll: Ein Bildhauer des Wiener Spätbarock' (unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Vienna, 1976).

⁹² Hawlik-van de Water, *Kapuzinergruft*, 212–13. His neo-classical cenotaph, which was modelled on medieval *tumba* graves, was too big for the crypt or even the Capuchin church. Instead, it was erected in a remote chapel of the court church of St Augustine. Even here, Christian symbols are heavily, though not entirely, reduced.

⁹³ Hawlik-van de Water, *Kapuzinergruft*, 53.

including its Christian character and content; other parts were much more open to being fashioned into the profane expression of an enlightened monarchy. Where changes were made, the expression of intense pious concern was weakened, though the religious framework, upheld, ironically, by the court ceremonial and the crypt with an altar, never entirely disappeared from any part of the funeral.

In this development, an important distinction is that between interactive, ceremonial acts (lying-in-state, procession, burial, and exequies) and elements offering more opportunity for creative expression (the *castrum doloris* as part of the exequies and the crypt as part of the burial). In addition, we must distinguish between ephemeral art and durable monuments. From the mid-seventeenth century, the Christian statements made by ephemeral art in the form of the *castrum doloris* were heavily supplemented by the addition of profane elements. In the early eighteenth century, under the influence of a circle of scholars and artists, the Christian symbols commonly used were even more overshadowed by neo-classical interpretations which emphasized the tradition of the Roman Empire. The highly diversified symbolic messages of the *castra doloris* increasingly left the realms of an officially defined Christian faith. Yet from about the second third of the eighteenth century, this ephemeral form of art, tied to the ceremonial events, received less and less attention from the dynasty and the artists. The intermingling of sacred and secular seems to have pleased neither the public nor the participants after about 1740.

The main function of monarchical representation seems to have shifted to the Capuchin crypt, which became a permanent monument to an official—and popular—memorial culture. From the 1720s it was open to the public and functioned as a showcase for the Habsburg sarcophagi, which were works of art and decoration shaped by scholarly and creative ideas. Previously marked as unambiguously Christian by the fact that the crucifix was the dominant element, the sarcophagi developed into an iconographically rich ensemble representing power. Christian motifs were marginalized, but never disappeared entirely.

The dynamic of change in the elements of funerals thus proved to be dependent both on the ceremonial organization of

the court and on its receptiveness to contemporary learned discourse and artistic expression. However, a number of open questions remain. To what extent was religious experience associated with the various events of the total funeral, via the references to religious signs and symbols? What role did the media and distance in time play in determining how the dynasty, the planners, the active participants, observers, readers, viewers of engravings, and visitors to the crypt interpreted each element?