

Prince Eugene and Maria Theresa: Gender, History, and Memory in Hofmannsthal in the First World War

Wolfgang Nehring
University of California Los Angeles

Gender, memory, and history are icons, two of which are hotly admired in the groves of academe; enthusiasm for the third has clearly abated somewhat. How closely do they belong together? Has “gender” anything substantial to do with “history” and “memory?” Or have these concepts rather come together by chance in a “cult-community?” I have tried to provide a connection between them by choosing a topic that unites them in a natural way. Prince Eugene and Maria Theresa are historical figures who personify gender-determined views, and Hofmannsthal’s approach to them calls upon collective, national, and cultural memory.

Hofmannsthal’s works on Prince Eugene were written in the years 1914-15, his essay on Maria Theresa in 1917. Not only on account of their dates of origin, both works were attempts to come to terms with the First World War.¹ Hofmannsthal was among those people who, while not exactly welcoming the war, nevertheless justified it without reservation. Full of reverence and apprehension, he tried to conjure up and fathom the “enormity” of the moment in proclamations, commentaries, and interpretations—he wanted to be a part of the great upheaval he was witnessing. How does this mesh with the sensitive poet of youthful lyrics or the culture poet and experimental dramatist after the turn of the century? What fascinated Hofmannsthal about World War I seems to have been the forcible incursion of reality into his own life, the chance to submerge himself in “real” life. “How everything to do with one-

self seems small and distant in these times,” he wrote on 7 October 1914 to his friend Eberhard von Bodenhausen, “and yet everything that I hold dear is very near, in a gleaming, ineffable light. For forty years we have been alive and have not lived, and now we are living” (Hofmannsthal/Bodenhausen 169). The most important concern in Hofmannsthal’s early work, and not only in his early work but in his entire opus, is the connection between the solitary individual and “life,” “existence,” a larger extra-personal reality. In the war essays the adjectives “alive” and “real” radiate a magical force.²

But is the author’s war experience actually more real, more “alive” than his early aesthetic work? Than *Elektra*? Than *Der Rosenkavalier*? In his early period Hofmannsthal sought to represent the “modern” generation scattered throughout the great European cities, calling them the “consciousness” of his time (*Reden und Aufsätze* I:175); now that he saw the threat to the very existence of the Hapsburg monarchy where his roots were, the past seemed closer to him and more present; again he felt that he was a representative, but this time a representative of a national-supra-national community. For him the historical past no longer languishes as neglected inheritance, as a dead cultural asset, as something known but not reflected upon in the basement of modern consciousness; it lights up, full of significance, seeming important here and now for a person’s self-image. The past that had been lived, the history that had been called back into collective remembrance, would now explain the events and experiences that burst so violently upon the scene, and would endow them with significance. Yet—because the situation was so new, because the poet was even less prepared for war than the Hapsburg monarchy, because the ideas of the author were only minimally thought-out, were as unformulated as the war goals of his country, he initially adorned the events with incidental observations rather than compelling commentaries, with emotional evocations of the grandeur of the moment rather than with deep analyses.³ The word “Geist” ‘spirit’ became a beacon—but the more frequently it was used, the less concrete seemed the content it would express. In 1919 the poet would admit how difficult it had become for him and for others to really grasp or even guess “what *Geist* is” and asserts “an almost religious awe will henceforth prohibit us from prostituting such a hard-won concept.”

At the beginning of the war, Hofmannsthal did not so much shape the discourse of the time as he adapted to it. Like so many of his contemporaries—poets, philosophers, scientists—Thomas Mann, Georg Simmel, even Sigmund Freud in the first months of the war—the author expected the outbreak of hostilities to overcome a paralyzing culture crisis, a state of stagnation and lack of direction in public life: he hoped that the individual and society would find themselves, that spiritual life would be renewed. Struck by the dire need of the moment, disturbed by the secret fear of a bad end, the poet's aim was to compensate for the deficits in meaning of the epoch by proposing new meaning—to himself as well as to the larger community to which he felt he belonged.

His greatest concern in this connection was with grasping and conveying the monarchy to which he felt bound as a natural and altogether justified entity. During the world war Hofmannsthal's aesthetic or aestheticist Europeanness receded into the background in favor of a nationally conceived Austrianness. Did Hofmannsthal, as Roland Barthes says of myth and mythologists in his famous treatise, lend to historical and political events the status of the natural and the eternal (Barthes 142)? Is there an attempt here at what Claudio Magris objects to in the Hapsburg myth: the sublimation of a problematic reality into a beautiful fairy-tale?⁵ One cannot give an entirely negative answer to these questions. Something mythical is undoubtedly implicated in Hofmannsthal's efforts to defend Austria—not only against wartime enemies, but also against German allies. But if one does not understand myth formalistically as a figure of speech, does not dogmatically reject it as distortion and lies, if one does not find it principally in everyday life like Roland Barthes—then myth is the past experienced alive; it is a kind of historical memory that does not concern itself primarily with the correlation of dates and facts, but designs pictures and symbols for later times. Since in the nineteenth century the consciousness of one's own nationality had become the most important criterion of entitlement for the establishment of states,⁶ Hofmannsthal sought to grasp the Austro-Hungarian monarchy itself as a nation, plagued as it was by national conflicts. In the speech he gave several times before European audiences, "Austria As Mirrored in Its Literature," drawing on the historian Leopold von Ranke, he called the nation

a “task of God” (*Reden und Aufsätze* II:21), and in this sense it was not difficult to interpret the multi-national state as a nation. God at least would not readily contradict this.

One of the most important concepts in Hofmannsthal’s thinking, not only after the beginning of the war but as early as the decade before the war and then particularly in the years after it, was the category of “necessity.” The arbitrary, the coincidental, the superfluous have no right to life, no claim on continued existence; the necessary, on the other hand, must be recognized as such and preserved. Thus Hofmannsthal liked to speak of a higher “destiny,” of “fate,” and of what “must” be. Perhaps in this high regard for necessity he was influenced by Nietzsche, who in his second *Untimely Meditation* declared the superfluous to be the “enemy of the necessary” and only applied the term “necessary” to something that “serves life” (I:209). Hofmannsthal could in general subscribe to this, but for him there was an added aspect. Only what transcended superficial reality was necessary—only what guaranteed a supra-personal, transcendental meaning. And his goal was a different one from Nietzsche’s. While Nietzsche wrote against the “powerful historical trend of modern times” (I:210), Hofmannsthal sought in the historical what is valid, timeless, alive. In no way did he turn to the historical past, as Ranke had, for its own sake, in order to know “how it really was.”⁷

Since Halbwachs, Bartlett, Nora, Assmann, Wertsch, and others, research into remembrance has been using with conviction the terms “collective memory” and “collective remembering.” Most researchers seem however to be clear that there is no collective memory in a strict sense, that only individuals can remember experiences and events, and that the term is a kind of metaphor.⁸ Nevertheless the expression has meaning in a derived sense. Remembered content can live and be handed down collectively; therefore it can belong to a collective. Furthermore, even the most personal memories are, as we know today, shaped by the social environment, by the dynamics of this or that group. Preferable for dealing with the historical past is the term “collective remembering” or, in the words of Aleida and Jan Assmann, “cultural remembering.” Such cultural remembrance is for the most part not taken for granted but maintained through commemorative events and commemorative places, or often created by them. Thus is the task that Hofmannsthal set himself: through

the memory of Austrian history and culture he wanted to bring to the consciousness of his contemporaries, the intellectuals as well as the so-called “Volk,” what Austria was in a higher sense and what was at stake in this war.

His most important project in this connection was the founding of the *Österreichische Bibliothek*, the Austrian Library. Within two years the poet published in the Leipzig Insel-Verlag twenty-six volumes with sources and presentations documenting the spirit of Austria and Austrian literature and culture. They were meant to demonstrate the richness of both the intellectual life and the down-to-earth life that had developed under the Hapsburg monarchy. Not only the voices of the German-speaking areas are heard, but also those of Czech Bohemia and Hungary.⁹ The author’s intention was to demonstrate the unity of the multi-nation-state and to explain its mutual relations, including all its tensions, as “life-enhancing constellations” (“Die österreichische Idee” [1917], *Reden und Aufsätze* II:455).

In Hofmannsthal’s announcement of the Austrian Library in the *Neue Freie Presse* scarcely a year after the outbreak of the war, he placed the project in the tradition of Count Stadion’s *Vaterländische Blätter* ‘Patriotic Papers’ of 1809, and he explicitly declared it an enterprise intended to awaken remembrance: “Austria should not be so lacking in memory that at every turn of the historical path those who in earlier times desired and performed great things drop out of sight” (*Reden und Aufsätze* II:432). It was Hofmannsthal’s opinion that other countries—Switzerland, the USA, and Prussia—dealt with their past much more attentively and respectfully and celebrated the contributions of their great men in word and symbol. But the author hoped that in Austria he would be able to revive “numb memories,” for in his view true life is “indestructible” and “cannot completely fade away” (II:434). The people have a need to commemorate “great men and deeds” (II:137) that can be reconnected to the present. Thus the Austrian Library is conceived as something that Jan Assmann calls “owed memory” (18), a canon that sets down what everyone should know and should remember, and what in Hofmannsthal’s book-series appeared in black and white as “exteriorized memory” (Hutton xii). At a time before Michel Foucault’s *Archéologie du savoir* (1969), Hofmannsthal trusts in the past and

in tradition, seeing them as open to interpretation, but also as possessing reality and legitimacy and in no way to be dismissed as invention or fabrication. It is sometimes said that the past exists only insofar as one reflects upon it (Hutton and others) and refers to it, but it was similarly asserted that the world existed as non-self only by the grace of self until the realists came and did away with such hair-splitting. Hofmannsthal seems still to be untouched by post-Foucault doubts. For him there is a living, indestructible past.

A particular focus of Hofmannsthal's Austrianism and of his cultural remembering was Franz Grillparzer. If previously he had only respected the poet as one among many others and had even considered himself occasionally as his opposite,¹⁰ he now rediscovered Grillparzer as a personification of Austrian identity. "In Grillparzer," he wrote, "we meet such an expression of our pure Austrian self that we almost take fright at the fineness and sharpness of the features." (II:405) In the face of those "difficult times" Hofmannsthal recognized the older man for the first time correctly, he believed, and "us in him," as he says. Every memory is, as the relevant readership emphasizes, imprinted with the needs of the present and is a new interpretation of the remembered past. The situation of the war, the demand for models, for poetic closeness and community, transforms the image of the familiar poet and old grouch into something different and new. Grillparzer is, so to speak, re-styled into the model Austrian, who radiates presentness across the ages.

Prince Eugene and Maria Theresa are the most significant politico-historical personalities whom Hofmannsthal called to mind, the one an inspired warrior, general, and statesman to whom Austria owed its ascent to the position of a great power in Europe, the other perhaps the greatest ruler-personality in Austrian history. It is certainly no accident that the poet pays homage to the warrior-prince in the early phase of the war when he is still reckoning unconditionally with success for the Austrian war efforts, while he focuses on Maria Theresa at a time when he has become weary of optimism and of belief in a favorable outcome of the armed conflict, and when thoughts of peace are closer to him.

Hofmannsthal could hardly have found a better model for his own time, a more convincing guarantor of Austrian greatness in war

ingly overpowering opponent, than Eugene of Savoy, the victor over the Turks and the French. In his enthusiasm for his hero, the poet tends to forget that Eugene's enemies, the Turks, are actually now allies of Austria and that the guarantor of Serbia, the overpowering threat to Austria, is Russia. However, since he can not and does not want to relinquish the Turkish wars as the supreme historical power-confrontation, since the memory of that historical event is intended to mobilize forces, pride, confidence, and staying-power in the present battle, he often spoke from then on in general terms of the "danger from the East," which was once again surging forward. Frederick the Great is said to have called Prince Eugene the "real Emperor" in Austria.¹¹ Hofmannsthal goes one step further: he called him straight out the "greatest Austrian" (*Reden und Aufsätze* II:376).

The "noble knight," the Savoy Austrian, is summoned up three times: first in the "Worte zum Gedächtnis des Prinz Eugen" 'Words in Memory of Prince Eugene' in the *Neue Freie Presse*, Christmas 1914; then, drawn up at the same time, in a kind of picture book, popular book, children's book that appeared one year later in print; and finally, a source book in the Austrian Library was dedicated to the Prince. The way that Hofmannsthal conjures up his greatness for the present corresponds to what Nietzsche calls "monumental" or "monumentalist" history, only without Nietzsche's rather spiteful peripheral meaning, the assumption that most people only pay homage to past greatness because they do not believe in greatness in their own times, or even reject it (Nietzsche 221-25). Of Hofmannsthal's three publications on Prince Eugene, the children's book seems the most suited to bring about a collective or cultural remembering because it picks up individual scenes from Eugene's life and transforms them consciously into anecdotes and stories in the style of an easy-to-remember legend. "I spent a good deal of effort," writes Hofmannsthal, "on stylizing a figure who is extremely important for these days into legendary and anecdotal form" (*Erzählungen* I:264). Admittedly, in Hofmannsthal's source, Eduard von Vehse's substantial *Geschichte der deutschen Höfe* 'History of German Courts,' history is already close to legend. Hofmannsthal emphasizes not only what is popular and fabulous, he also lays intense emphasis on patriotic elements that foster community; he combines the political thoughts and wishes of the present into his depiction of the past.

Despite the objections of Rudolf Pannwitz and various others, the book was well-received and a second edition was soon necessary.¹²

The essay "Worte zum Gedächtnis des Prinzen Eugen" in the *Neue Freie Presse* is spiritually and intellectually more difficult, but it is still powerful and monumental enough to affect the reader or listener with the emotionalism of a memorial. Dietrich Harth speaks with reference to revolutions of "mythopoietic symbolization strategies" (9). Mythopoietically and symbolically the figure of the Prince becomes an allegory for Austria's greatness in his own time and in the present. To know about Prince Eugene, Hofmannsthal suggests, means to find the present in the past. His tribute to the Prince seems to have been conceived as a speech that set out not to just depict, but rather to "remind us of great things" (*Reden und Aufsätze* II:379), though there is no evidence that Hofmannsthal actually presented it as a speech anywhere. The introduction still has the vaguely wandering, abstract, philosophical, emotionally charged tone of the early war essays, yet the historical content gives the piece more form and substance. The poet reminds us of the "centrifugal force" of genius in the commander-in-chief who in twenty-four battles, seven so-called "primary battles," took Hungary from the Turks, won Southern Germany and Northern Italy, and above all performed the "deed of deeds," highly relevant in the First World War: he held his own against an overwhelming power and conquered Belgrade, where present-day troops had just had a very tough time. But Hofmannsthal not only praises the general, he recalls in just as much detail—less easily verifiable—of the statesman Eugene who had used "battle and victory only as a tool to achieve political ends" (II:380). He saw Prince Eugene as the great colonizer of southeastern Europe, for at the beginning of the twentieth century the word "colonization" did not yet sound as bad as it does to many of us in the age of "post-colonialism." "From military deeds" emerge "the works of peace," suggests Hofmannsthal; "Behind his army goes the plough and in the woods the axe of the colonist" (II:380). Is Hofmannsthal propagating Austrian expansion in this picture of the past, or is he only trying to resurrect what is past and to defend what is present? It is not out of the question that the author is pointing to Austrian war goals which had indeed not yet

litical circles to which the poet had access.¹³

So the question arises as to whether Hofmannsthal's presentation is history or rather a reconstruction through memory. Is the focus on information, instruction, or enlightenment? Does he intend to persuade or to convince? Or, going further, should we apply the modern term of war-propaganda to describe his activity? In his *Welt von Gestern* 'World of Yesterday' Stefan Zweig speaks of the official "culture-propaganda" which the warring powers in his opinion indulged in because they were "subconsciously ashamed of the war," maintaining that poets and philosophers were sent to neutral foreign countries not to seek political support, but to prove that in the face of the barbarism of war their nation was still a "nation of culture" (295). Propaganda is a bad word to most people. Propaganda which comes from one's own group, however, and supports one's own views usually passes for "information." President Wilson's excellently organized and successful propaganda ministry under the direction of George Creel during the First World War was called the "Committee on Public Information." Only Hitler, inspired by Creel, did not hesitate to apply the word propaganda to his own strategies for influencing people, and this has naturally increased our fear of the term even more. States and governments usually do not only direct public opinion, the collective consciousness, but they also direct collective remembering. In state life the collective, public memory is ideologically organized through the control of information, through manipulation and indoctrination, it is reduced to simple, practical formulae (see A. Assmann 6823 and Wertsch 27). Questions of definition and criticism of language go beyond the scope of this article (see attempts at definition in Jowett and O'Donnell, Pratkanis and Aronson, and Lasswell). But it is certain that Hofmannsthal consciously supports the war efforts of the monarchy with his essays, and that he endeavored as poet and historian to contribute creatively to the politics of his country by seeking bases in the past which make the surging events of the present meaningful or at least plausible to him and to others. Direct politico-ideological manipulation and unscrupulous rhetoric for the achievement of premeditated goals appear to have been far from his thoughts.

In his "Words in Memory of Prince Eugene," Hofmannsthal had already described Austria as the "empire of peace [though]

born in battles" (*Reden und Aufsätze* II:377). After the death of Emperor Franz Josef I in the year 1916, the Austrian longing and hope for peace grew under his successor Karl I into a political force, and the poet, who had already given expression to his own war-weariness more than once in his letters, finally in 1917 turned his attention away from the manly, warlike, bachelor Prince to the motherly Empress whom he honored as peace-loving ruler and guarantor of the ideal Austrian state.¹⁴ The concepts "feminine," "peaceful," "Austrian" come together. The author emphasizes Maria Theresa's strength as woman and regent. Her femininity seems to entail the quality of her ruler-personality: "She was a great ruler in that she was an incomparable, good and 'naïvely magnificent' woman" ("Maria Theresia," *Reden und Aufsätze* II:443).

Maria Theresa's efforts for Austrian-Bohemian-Hungarian cohesion correspond exactly to the political desires and goals of the poet. Her success in a world that wanted to manipulate the "weakness" of woman and to diminish her inheritance qualify her no less as a model for the threatening present than the warlike Prince Eugene in the early phase of the world war. Hofmannsthal omits in this portrait the military entanglement at the beginning of her rule, her passionately stubborn fight for her inheritance and her rights, and, above all, the ultimate loss of Silesia to Frederick II. Instead of this he expresses appreciation of her personal qualities, her naturalness and piety, her love for her husband, her becoming a mother sixteen times, her concern for and about her country, and finally her strong feeling for reality and necessity. We know from Maria Theresa's letters toward the end of her life how deeply she condemned the Polish partition of which her son Joseph II was an energetic participant, how she sought to avoid a new war with Prussia and in these efforts worked directly against her son the Emperor—but not necessarily out of deep-rooted pacifism. "What an appalling business war is," she is often quoted as saying; "It works against humanity and happiness!" (letter of 12 April 1778 to Joseph II, *Briefe der Kaiserin Maria Theresia* I:250). This was indeed an unusual thing for a feudal regent to say, but she had quite pragmatic reasons for her position: "If we were in the position of the king [Frederick II of Prussia], I would not think of peace, but as things are, peace is much to be desired and indeed necessary" (letter of 22 May 1778 to Joseph II, *Briefe* I:255).

The idea of a dishonorable, a “humiliating peace,” she totally rejects (letter of 8 June 1778 to Joseph II, *Briefe* I:255).

At the time when Hofmannsthal was writing, Maria Theresa had long become a myth—as much an Austrian symbolic personage as a historical figure.¹⁵ Hofmannsthal could create his picture out of numerous sources and historical depictions intended to recall to mind and glorify the greatness of the ruler and of the state created by her: her wise and moderate reforms of state administration, the seemingly successful merger of Austria and Bohemia (for which Hofmannsthal himself struggled anew, albeit in vain, on his Prague journey), her consideration for the special position of Hungary, and, finally, her unshakable moral-religious conservatism—all these caused early historians to see her as the ideal ruler-personality in comparison with whom her enlightened, “free-thinking” son cut a poor figure in most commentaries, guided as he was by the “false principles” of tolerance and reason (*Briefe* I:242-43). Hofmannsthal compares her with the Roman Emperor Augustus, the emperor of peace, who brought the power struggles in Rome to a peaceful conclusion, and “like her [...] was an architect of the living” (*Reden und Aufsätze* II:451). With Maria Theresa the author has even less need to “portray” and interpret than he had in his “Prince Eugene.” Reminding people of Maria Theresa and the order she created is enough to bring to life in existing memory what is at stake in the world war: something absolutely precious and worth holding on to. Therefore his essay is less a historical portrait than a hagiography. The author does not report deeds, but rather praises qualities.

Claudio Magris says of Maria Theresa that in the memory of later generations she has been transformed outright into the ideal symbol of “Austrianism” (28). We cannot discuss here how far her image is a “distortion” and, as Magris thinks, serves the defense of the monarchy’s outmoded existence in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. In any case, Hofmannsthal’s portrait of the Empress bears witness to the correctness of Magris’s observation. The “Theresan” is for the poet “Austrian nature and social essence in concentrated form” which still lives on in his own time (*Reden und Aufsätze* II:452).¹⁶ The properties that he praises in Maria Theresa—sense of reality, naturalness, piety, preeminence of feeling over intellect, delicately nurturing femininity (even in her most firm decisions),

a sense of tradition, proximity to the people—these are categories that Hofmannsthal also associates with the soul of Austria—at any rate since he has read Grillparzer with new eyes and to a large extent made Grillparzer’s “anthropology” his own (see Nehring, esp. 9-11). Many of these categories are to be found again in the schematic summary “Prussian - Austrian” published by Hofmannsthal in December of the same year as the essay on Maria Theresa—at the most unfavorable moment, in the Berlin *Vossische Zeitung* (see *Reden und Aufsätze* II:459-61). These concepts of what is Austrian, gained during the world war and maintained in the face of enemies, neutrals, and allies, will be reinforced in Hofmannsthal and will continue to define Austrian identity for him in the future.

In summary, we have seen that Hofmannsthal’s historic essays during the First World War do not set out to depict history but rather to create or awaken memories; he is not concerned with historically accurate pictures but with models for his own time. Paying no attention to Eugene’s origins, he raises the heroic Prince to the status of the “greatest Austrian” because he served Austria and his Emperor like no one else, because he was a victorious commander and conqueror the likes of whom the monarchy did not see again. If his spirit could only be revived, it seemed that the war of 1914, which had not gotten off to a good start, could only end happily. Maria Theresa was to the poet the peaceable and at the same time successful regent. In the late phase of the war, when a military success could no longer be taken for granted, she appeared as the great bearer of hope since she embodied the ideal Hapsburg-Austrian world which Hofmannsthal sought to preserve intact. While the poet speaks much of the past, it means nothing to him as an end in itself. “The past,” says Jan Assmann, is a social construct “whose composition emerges from present needs for meaning and frames of reference. The past does not just exist like a growth of nature; it is a cultural creation” (48). Hofmannsthal perceives it as a kind of myth or shapes it into one. Myth is not intended to be tested intellectually, but rather to be respected, celebrated, felt. Myths simplify reality and can therefore be dismissed as unhistorical fiction or propaganda by those who have no feeling for them. Earlier historiography largely distanced itself from memory and myth; con-

his historico-mythical portraits and observations Hofmannsthal's own Austrian identity has become clearer to him, and this self-understanding lived on beyond the end of the Hapsburg Empire in his later works, usually with a touch of grief.

Translated by Dorothy James
Hunter College/CUNY Graduate School

Notes

1 Thus Hofmannsthal's friend Hermann Bahr, for example, who looked at the war with "dedicated eyes" and "blessed, blessed, blessed" it (preserved for posterity by Karl Kraus, adversary of Bahr; see *Die Fackel* 27 (Dec. 1925): 30f.

2 Hofmannsthal wrote more than twenty pieces during the First World War that have as a topic Austria's self-image in the context of the war.

3 See "Appell an die oberen Staende," "Boykott fremder Sprachen?" "Unsere Fremdwörter," and similar texts (*Reden und Aufsätze* II:464).

4 See "An Henri Barbusse, Alexandre Mercereau und ihre Freunde" (*Reden und Aufsätze* II:464).

5 In the Hofmannsthal chapter of his book, Magris makes surprisingly little use of his war essays, which one could very well interpret critically in the spirit of his thesis.

6 With regard to the Hapsburg myth, Magris particularly objects that it has repressed the historical development into a nation state.

7 A popular quotation from his 1824 *Zur Kritik neuerer Geschichtsschreiber*, originally "wie es eigentlich gewesen ist."

8 Tulving's and Craik's big *Oxford Handbook of Memory* does not contain one article on collective memory. The editors concentrate exclusively on aspects of experimental psychology.

9 Volume 21, for example, is a Czech anthology, albeit in German translation.

10 Compare the undated letter to his father from the year 1907 (*Briefe 1900-1909* 304) with what he said in “Grillparzer’s political legacy” (*Reden und Aufsätze* II:405).

11 Edwin Dillmann calls the prince at his death the secret king in the Austrian court—without naming a source for this characterization but dubbing it a quotation. He probably took it from Vehse 2.6: 211.

12 Pannwitz criticized the language and spirit of the book and observed paradoxically, “the content is much too patriotic and, precisely because of this, it is by far not patriotic enough” (*Erzählungen* 1 265).

13 In 1916 in a similar way in his semi-official ‘Reden in Skandinavien’ he picked up and pursued the thoughts of other writers, particularly of the ideologist Johann Plenge. Hoffman was an invited guest in the “Archive Circle” attended by politicians and diplomats.

14 He also does not speak any longer just to the readers of the *Neue Freie Presse* in Vienna as in most of the earlier pieces on politico-historical or war events; his essay is published in the Berlin *Vossische Zeitung* at the same time on, May 13, 1917.

15 Monumental works had been written on her regency; see Vehse, Wolf, and von Arneth.

16 This was already the case in his Theresan “comedy for music” *Der Rosenkavalier*, which Josef Redlich admired as a testimony to Hofmannsthal’s “sublime Austrianism” (Hofmannsthal/Redlich, *Briefwechsel* 11).

Works Cited

Assmann, Aleida. "History and Memory." *International Encyclopedia of the Social and Behavioral Sciences*. Ed. Neil Smelser and Paul Baltes. Vol. 10. Amsterdam, New York: Elsevier, 2000. 6822-29.

Assmann, Jan. *Das kulturelle Gedächtnis*. Munich: Beck, 1997.

Barthes, Roland. *Mythologies*. Sel. and trans. Annette Lavers. 25th ed. New York: Noonday, 1991.

Bartlett, Frederic. *Remembering: a study in experimental and social psychology*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1932.

Dillmann, Edwin. *Maria Theresia*. Munich: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag, 2000.

Halbwachs, Maurice. *La mémoire collective*. Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1950.

Harth, Dietrich, and Jan Assmann. *Revolution und Mythos*. Frankfurt a. M.: Fischer Taschenbuch Verlag, 1992.

Hofmannsthal, Hugo von. *Briefe 1900-1909*. Vienna: Bermann-Fischer, 1937.

—. *Reden und Aufsätze I und II. Gesammelte Werke in Einzelausgaben*. Ed. Bernd Schoeller with Rudolf Hirsch. Frankfurt a. M.: Fischer Taschenbuch Verlag, 1979.

—. *Erzählungen 1. Sämtliche Werke (Kritische Hofmannsthal-Ausgabe)*. Ed. Ellen Ritter. Vol. 28. Frankfurt a. M.: S. Fischer, 1975.

Hofmannsthal, Hugo von, and Eberhard von Bodenhausen. *Briefe der Freundschaft*. Berlin: E. Diederichs, 1953.

Hofmannsthal, Hugo von, and Josef Redlich. *Briefwechsel*. Frankfurt a. M.: S. Fischer, 1971.

Hutton, Patrick. *History as an Art of Memory*. Hanover: UP of New England, 1993.

Jowett, Garth, and Victoria O'Donnell. *Propaganda and Persuasion*. Thousand Oaks: Sage, 1999.

Kraus, Karl. "Kriegsseggen." *Die Fackel* 27 (Dec. 1925): 29-42.

Lasswell, Harold D. *The Analysis of Political Behavior*. Hamden: Archon, 1966.

Magris, Claudio. *Der habsburgische Mythos in der österreichischen Literatur*. Salzburg: Otto Müller, 1966.

[Maria Theresia.] *Briefe der Kaiserin Maria Theresia*. Ed. W. Fred. Trans. Hedwig Kubin. 2 vols. Munich: G. Müller, 1914.

Nietzsche, Friedrich. *Werke in drei Bänden*. Ed. Karl Schlechta. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1997.

Nehring, Wolfgang. "Grillparzer und Hofmannsthal: Geistige Begegnung und ideologische Gemeinschaft." *Modern Austrian Literature* 16.1 (1983): 1-16.

Nora, Pierre. *Les lieux de mémoire*. 3 vols. Paris: Gallimard, 1984-92. Trans. Anthony Pratkanis and Elliot Aronson. *Age of Propaganda*. New York: W. H. Freeman, 1992.

Tulving, Endel, and Fergus Craik, eds. *Oxford Handbook of Memory*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2000.

Vehse, Eduard. *Geschichte des österreichischen Hofes und Adels und der österreichischen Diplomatie*. 11 vols. Hamburg: Hoffmann u. Campe, 1851-53.

Wolf, Adam. *Österreich unter Maria Theresia*. Vienna: L. Gerold's Sohn, 1855.

Zweig, Stefan. *Die Welt von Gestern. Erinnerungen eines Europäers*. Frankfurt a.M.: Fischer Taschenbuch Verlag, 1982.