Anti-mirrors of Princes in Neo-Latin Habsburg Novels

By Florian Schaffenrath

This paper deals with the literary feature of 'negative mirrors of princes' in Neo-Latin novels from the Habsburg Empire. After a general clarification of the term 'anti-mirror of princes', we discuss these passages in detail: an essential, significant feature of the Habsburg novels is their propagation of a supranational identity capable of uniting different peoples for the ruling dynasty. They succeeded in this not only by using Latin, but with a series of different literary techniques, e.g. anti-mirrors of princes, as often the exact opposite of a good ruler of an entire empire is depicted in these antitheses.

I

In the third chapter of the famous Spanish novel *La vida de Lazarillo de Tormes y de sus fortunas y adversidades* (earliest surviving edition Burgos 1554, among others), the protagonist and first-person narrator Lazarillo is in the service of an impoverished member of the lower nobility, who one day reveals to him how he might preserve the favour of a member of the higher nobility, if only he could manage to be employed by such a nobleman:[1]

> Ya cuando asienta un hombre con un señor de título, todavía pasa su lacería. ¿Pues por ventura no hay en mi habilidad para servir y contestar a estos? Por Dios, si con él topase, muy gran su privado pienso que fuese y que mil servicios le hiciese, porque yo sabría mentille tan bien como otro, y agradalle a las mil maravillas: reille ya mucho sus donaires y costumbres, aunque no fuesen las mejores del mundo; nunca decirle cosa con que le pesase, aunque mucho le cumpliese; ser muy diligente en su persona en dicho y hecho; no me matar por no hacer bien las cosas que el no había de ver, y ponerme a reñir, donde lo oyese, con la gente de servicio, porque pareciese tener gran cuidado de lo que a él tocaba; si riñese con algún su criado, dar unos puntillos agudos

[1] The following passage is based on Rico 1998, 104–106, who also provides explanatory notes (above all textual criticism) and recommendations of more in-depth secondary literature.

> para la encender la ira y que pareciesen en favor del culpado; decirle bien de lo que bien le estuviese y, por el contrario, ser malicioso, mofador, malsinar a los de casa y a los de fuera; pesquisar y procurar de saber vidas ajenas para contárselas; y otras muchas galas de esta calidad que hoy día se usan en palacio. Y a los señores del parecen bien, y no quieren ver en sus casas hombres virtuosos, antes los aborrecen y tienen en poco y llaman necios y que no son personas de negocios ni con quien el señor se puede descuidar. Y con estos los astutos usan, como digo, el día de hoy, de lo que yo usaría. Mas no quiere mi ventura que le halle.
>
> (Even if a man becomes a member of a nobleman's household, he needn't think his troubles are over. Do you think I am not clever enough to serve one of them, by any chance, and to his complete satisfaction? By God, if I were to encounter one of them I'm sure I could become a great favorite with him, and have a thousand services to do for him, because I could lie to him as well as the next man, and afford him prodigies of delight. I'd laugh uproariously at all his witticisms and antics, even though they weren't the best in the world. I'd never tell him anything unpleasant, however much it might be to his advantage. I would be extremely solicitous of his person, both in word and deed, but I wouldn't kill myself being over-meticulous about things which he wasn't going to see. And I'd scold his servants where he was sure to hear me, so that he'd think I took endless pains over everything that had to do with him. But if he scolded one of them I'd slip in a few little barbs to make him angry, while appearing to take the servant's part. I'd say nice things about everything that he liked, but on the other hand I'd be malicious, and a mocker, and a trouble-maker, both among members of the household and among outsiders. And I'd find ways of picking up bits of gossip to tell him, and develop a whole array of other talents of that sort, which are all the rage nowadays in palaces and are highly esteemed by the lords and masters there. Who have no wish to see men of virtue in their houses: they have an aversion to them, they look down on them, they call them fools and say that they're hopeless at practical affairs and are not men whom their masters can rely on.)[2]

The passage cited above is a template for an array of texts to be discussed in this essay: it addresses a nobleman, instructing him as to how he should behave in public life. In regard to such texts we generally speak of mirrors of princes (see below for details). The instructions given here are, of course, not meant seriously. From the many ironic hints (for instance, the morally questionable speaker), it is clear that what should be taken as correct is in

[2] Translation by Mervin 1962, 117–118.

fact the opposite of what the speaker describes. In this case, we might speak of an 'anti-'mirror of princes, or a 'negative' mirror of princes. Finally, the location of the passage is also of significance: it is inserted into an Early Modern novel. *Lazarillo* stands at the beginning of a long prose fiction tradition which would later encompass Thomas Nashe's *The Unfortunate Traveller* (1594), Charles Sorel's *Francion* (1622–1633) and Hans Jakob Christoffel von Grimmelshausen's *Der Abentheuerliche Simplicissimus Teutsch* (1668) under the umbrella term 'picaresque novel'.[3] As *Lazarillo* remained popular long after its composition (as is made evident in translations and continuations) it is no surprise that the anti-mirror of princes cited above was frequently taken up creatively by others and developed further.

Such passages can also be found in the Neo-Latin Habsburg novels – that is, an array of novels which emerged from the Habsburg Empire and which address its political landscape with remarkable intensity. The aim of this essay, following a general clarification of the terms 'mirror of princes' and 'anti-mirror of princes', will be to present the function of these passages in detail. An essential, significant feature of the Habsburg novels is their propagation of a supranational identity capable of uniting different peoples for the ruling dynasty. They succeeded in this (besides the fact that they were composed in the nation-embracing tongue Latin) with a series of different literary techniques. I will show that one of these was an anti-mirror of princes, as often the exact opposite of a good ruler of an entire empire is depicted in these antitheses.

II

At the mention of 'mirror of princes', those in the field of classical philology think first of classical texts such as Xenophon's *Cyropaedia* or Seneca's *De clementia*, the work in which the mirror metaphor in the context of educating princes was first shaped ("ut quodam modo speculi vice fungerer," clem. 1.1).[4] A reader more interested in Renaissance Studies would surely admit into this undeniable canon Erasmus' *Institutio principis Christiani*[5] of 1516 as well, which aspires to forge a synthesis of ancient pagan and medieval Christian mirrors of princes.[6]

[3] Cf. Moore 2010, 313–315.

[4] For a general account of mirrors of princes in ancient literature, cf. Hadot 1972; Philipp & Stammen 1996; Schulte 2001.

[5] For Erasmus' *Institutio principis Christiani* as a mirror of princes, cf. Born 1928.

[6] For a general account of mirrors of princes in the medieval period cf. Berges 1938; for the Early Modern Period cf. Heim 1919; Singer 1981.

Apart from these texts, whose inclusion in the canon is beyond question,[7] a wide range of other text types and characteristics typical of mirrors of princes exist, insofar as they direct themselves towards a reader who is a ruler and present him with an ideal image of a regime, upon which he should base his conduct. Dramatists present ideal kings in their plays (Shakespeare's Henry V comes to mind), epic poets create their heroes – following in the footsteps of Virgil – as typological models of current rulers, and novels package their didactic intentions in appealing narratives.[8] The list goes on. There is a consensus that mirrors of princes can appear in the most varied of literary forms.[9]

In most cases, mirrors of princes construct an ideal ruler figure and have him embody a range of virtues, so that a *princeps optimus* emerges.[10] To some extent the authors realise that the ideal they portray is unattainable for a real prince—in Petrus Antonius Finariensis' mirror of princes (*De dignitate principum*, 1464), one dialogue partner expresses a certain amount of disappointment: "unicum, qui ea omnia teneat, quae in principe necessaria esse statuisti, vix posse inveniri iudico," (I believe you will not find one single person who possesses all these features which are, according to you, necessary for a prince, fol. 4[r]).[11]

Mirrors of princes function not only in a positive and affirmative fashion, but also, in a different way, do the opposite in order to fulfil their intention of commending a given form of socio-political conduct. In such cases one can speak of negative mirrors of princes or anti-mirrors of princes. Here we do not include works such as Niccolò Macchiavelli's *Il principe* (1532), which has also been called an anti-mirror of princes in scholarship;[12] Macchiavelli composed the instructions for his princes in all sincerity.

In this essay, we will understand the term 'anti-mirror of princes' as advice describing the exact opposite of what, for a ruler, is considered exemplary and worth aspiring to in contemporary ethical discourse. On the one hand, we can deduce this from the fact that in many texts which sketch a

[7] Defining the genre of mirror of princes is not easy. Mühleisen & Stammen 1997, 13 see it as its own "literary form and genre" and consider it didactic literature. Cf. Eberhardt 1977; Singer 1981, 15–24 uses a narrower mirrors of princes concept, but considers it nevertheless a *Bildungsroman*; Blum 1981, 1–5.

[8] For novelist Christoph Martin Wieland as an author of a mirror of a prince cf. Jacobs 2001, 5–9.

[9] Cf. Mühleisen & Stammen 1997, 13–15; Jacobs 2001, 7.

[10] Cf. Singer 1981, 31–32.

[11] Cited from Singer 1981, 32.

[12] Schorn-Schütte, for example, designates *Il principe* as "Anti-Fürstenspiegel"; Schorn-Schütte 2009, 163. This designation is also found in scholarly literature on *Principe* in English, cf. Blythe 1997, 19 (anti mirror of princes).

positive image of a prince, these positive characteristics of the ruler are brought to light more effectively by a contrasting, negative figure.[13] However, we also find sophisticated literary games which use certain ironic indicators to make it clear to the reader that any explicit recommendation of the character of an anti-mirror of princes figure is in no way intended to be taken seriously. On another level, such passages fulfil a didactic or guiding function: precisely because they seem so absurd and comical in light of established behavioural norms, the reader is subtly invited to accept the exact opposite of the recommended behaviour as what is actually exemplary and worth striving for.

In the passage cited at the beginning of this essay from *Lazarillo de Tormes*, the reader must be sceptical just from the fact that the tips for success are coming from a man who has not only experienced no success in life but is also so poor that hunger threatens him daily. Moreover, this speech is part of a series of speeches by the *escudero* to Lazarillo, during which the stark contrast between the knight's perception of himself as an important nobleman and the inner fictional reality of this poor fellow becomes more and more visible. Thus, when the impoverished knight suggests lying to his liege lord, refraining from telling him anything unpleasant and only working when his lord can see it, the reverse, positive advice is recognisable: always tell the truth, inform one's lord of unpleasant truths when necessary and work on his behalf even when he will not hear of it directly. Such passages function, therefore, in the same way as normal mirrors of princes, but make use of an ironic inverse, which the reader must recognise and decipher. (All examples of this literary technique in Neo-Latin novels known to me at this point, incidentally, target not princes but the leading figures in the prince's inner circle, courtiers and attendants.)

The use of anti-mirrors of princes is an old literary technique: in the second song of *Iliad* (2.211–69), the poet conjures, in the form of Thersites, a character who shows in uncommonly impressive fashion how a noble leader should not behave in an assembly: he is ugly to look at, rants improperly to himself and offends the most important men. With Thersites as a backdrop, Ulysses—who puts him in his place—looks all the more splendid. Later authors use the same technique: they depict ugly figures behaving inappropriately which the reader can absolutely enjoy imagining (in terms of the aesthetic of ugliness). They then employ these figures as points of contrast with the ruler figure whom they wish to portray positively and affirmatively.

[13] Borzsák researches this, above all in regard to the portrayal of Tacitus as a leader; Borzsák 1994.

I would now like to concentrate on one of these literary forms, the novel, and specifically Neo-Latin novels. Much of what is generally applied to mirrors of princes can also be applied to these novels in particular: the huge popularity and appreciation of these texts were not, in the first instance, the result of the descriptions of ideal rulers but rather, among other things, a result of the fact that these novels often contained critical material which satisfied readers' curiosity about the misconduct of the rich and powerful.[14] Neo-Latin novels are often about historical figures but use (perhaps also due to censorship) allegorical codification so that solving these allegories offers an additional attraction for the reader. Claude Morisot, for example, sets his novel *Peruviana* (Dijon 1645) in a fictional South American tribal world, but hides behind it the French history of the years 1610 to 1643, with the dispute between King Louis XIII and his younger brother Gaston d'Orléans.

The technique of anti-mirrors of princes can be found at the beginning of the tradition of the Neo-Latin novel. One of the earliest texts which must be mentioned here is Leon Battista Alberti's *Momus* (ca. 1443–1455).[15] In its four books, this novel depicts an "image of poor rulership" and thus delivers the "anti-image of the behaviour"[16] of Alberti himself. It is therefore correctly classed as an "anti-mirror of princes."[17]

In the Neo-Latin novel *par excellence*, John Barclay's *Argenis,* this does not constitute a central aspect. The closest comparison is the criticism directed in *Argenis* 1.2 towards the reign of King Meleander.[18] This criticism, put forward here by Poliarchus, advances some points which would also count as valid criticism of a king according to the common imagination of the 17th century. However, there is no passage which portrays, in an ironic refraction, certain patterns of behaviour as negative.

Who were the intended readers of these mirrors of princes which have been integrated into Neo-Latin novels? There is no straightforward answer: besides the rulers themselves, we might also include the court and the extended educated circle who were capable of reading an extensive Latin prose text. By the 18th century, we must take into account also that these works sought to appeal to broader sections of the bourgeoisie, presenting them with criticism of the transgressions of absolutism and its instruments of power. This difficult question concerning the intended audience justifies limiting the study below to Neo-Latin Habsburg novels, as we can observe

[14] Mühleisen & Stammen 1997, 16 speaks of a "chronique scandaleuse".
[15] Cf. Consolo 1986.
[16] Both citations Boenke 1993, XX.
[17] Cf. Wulfram 2013, 19.
[18] Cf. Riley & Pritchard Huber 2004, 108–115.

how a series of texts apply to a longstanding ruling dynasty and its institutions, both church and state.

III

Before we turn to specific texts, an overarching, important aspect essential for understanding these works must be stressed: all Habsburg novels have a similar political aim. They develop an image of the ruling house which justifies its rule over a supranational entity in the heart of Europe.

After the Habsburgs had worked their way up from very humble beginnings, they ruled in the Early Modern Period over an empire encompassing numerous peoples speaking different languages.[19] Finding and constructing a common identity for this Empire was one of the greatest challenges for the ruling family.[20]

For the Habsburgs, one method of creating a sense of identity in the Empire was the nationwide use of certain symbols which stood for the unity of the Empire. The black double-eagle against a yellow background had been the symbol of the Holy Roman Emperor from the 15th century on. As this office had been held almost exclusively by the Habsburg family since the 16th century, they furnished the double-eagle with the coats of arms of the lands they ruled in a heart shield.

Besides the many forms of culture diffusion which could be mentioned here, such as typical Habsburg architecture,[21] literature also fulfilled a central function in creating an identity in the Empire. In this instance, literature composed in Latin holds a particular importance, as Latin was not the first language spoken in any of the lands ruled by the Habsburgs but formed an essential part of the education in all of them.[22] As a result, Latin offered a means of communicating with all subjects of the ruler in Vienna, near or far, and was therefore ideally suited to enabling the creation of a supranational identity.

The largest research project into Habsburg literature in Latin to date is the project on Habsburg panegyrics, established by Franz Römer at the University of Vienna, which has spawned an array of books and essays on the relevant texts.[23] This was complemented by a project at the Ludwig Boltzmann Institute for Neo-Latin Studies in Innsbruck addressing the

[19] Cf. Vacha 1992; Erbe 2000; Heimann 2006.
[20] Cf. Leiße 2012, 43–49.
[21] In regard to typical Habsburg architecture cf. Moravanszky 1988; Haslinger 2007.
[22] Cf. Engelbrecht 1982–1988; on the question of language, above all in Hungary cf. Almási & Šubarić 2015.
[23] For a general presentation of the project cf. Klecker & Römer 1994.

question of the role played by a small group of texts, Neo-Latin novels, in constructing a 'Reichsidentität' in the Empire.[24] The following reflections on the Neo-Latin novel in the Habsburg Empire are also the product of this area of study.

In their *Companion to Neo-Latin Studies*, Jozef IJsewijn and Dirk Sacré identify a series of texts as "romans à clef of Habsburg affairs",[25] namely, Anton Wilhelm Ertl's *Austriana regina Arabiae* (Augsburg 1687),[26] *Aeneas Habspurgus* (Tyrnau 1695)[27] of anonymous authorship, and András Dugonics' *Argonauticorum sive de vellere aureo libri XXIV* (1778).[28] Also mentioned in IJsewijn and Sacré's list is Christoph Friedrich Sangershausen's *Minos*, which does not belong in this category since the author concerns himself with events of Prussian history.[29] For this essay I have also excluded three other novels which were not on their list: *Josephus II. in campis Elysiis. Somnium Eleutherii Pannonii*, s.l. 1790; *Leopoldus II. in campo Rákos. Visio Eleutherii Pannonii*, s.l. 1790; *Eleutherii Pannonii mirabilia fata, dum in metropoli Austriae famosi duo libelli Babel et Ninive in lucem venissent*, s.l. 1791. A range of features differentiate these three works by Joseph Keresztury (1739–1794) from the novels discussed below and demand a separate investigation which would unfortunately require more space than is available here.[30]

All three works I wish to discuss here use a specific strategy to incorporate themselves into the political discourse of their time. Whilst Ertl produces a classical *roman à clef*, hiding the different European powers of the late-17th century behind the characters. The novel *Aeneas Habspurgus* presents the contemporary potentates of the House of Habsburg behind the figure of Aeneas/Rudolf, who is intended to serve as a typological model. Dugonics proceeds differently again, allowing a number of 18th century political references to shine through his retelling of the myth of Jason and the Argonauts.

While the general political implications of these texts are broadly outlined elsewhere,[31] here a specific phenomenon will be singled out, which has not yet been discussed *in extenso* but which, in terms of the ideas

[24] Cf. Schaffenrath & Tilg 2011.
[25] IJsewijn & Sacré 1998, 255.
[26] Isabella Walser's work is fundamental: Walser 2013; Walser 2014a; Walser 2014b.
[27] Cf. Schaffenrath 2013.
[28] Cf. Tilg 2013.
[29] Cf. Walser 2014, 349 Anm. 8.
[30] A comprehensive study of these novels is currently being undertaken by Jonathan Meyer at the Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore.
[31] For the political implications of Ertl's *Austriana* cf. Walser 2013, for Dugonics' *Argonautica* cf. Tilg 2013, 166–170.

concerning anti-mirrors of princes outlined at the beginning of this essay, clearly displays the political impetus of the novels: the portrayal of enemies. Generally, it can be shown that the protagonists of the novels (Austriana, Aeneas, Jason respectively) are designed as ideal figures with whom rulers are supposed to identify. The addressee is always a Habsburg and there is an emphasis in the advice to the princes on uniting the peoples of differing nations.[32] The protagonists of the novels are not merely described with great vibrancy, rather the authors use a technique which they may have learnt from their predecessors in Antiquity. For example, just as Caesar clearly portrays himself in his *Commentarii de bello civili* as starkly contrasted with the character of Pompey,[33] so too do the heroes of the Habsburg novels benefit from sharp contrast with their adversaries. The deeds and the underlying behavioural norms are presented to the intended readers as a model which should encourage them to emulate the qualities of the positive, leading characters.

IV

In 1687 the Bavarian jurist Anton Wilhelm Ertl[34] (1654–ca. 1715) published his novel *Austriana regina Arabiae*[35] in Augsburg. Split into four books and set in the exotic world of Arabia, easily recognised as an allegorical codification of the European reality of the late 17th century, the plot revolves around the young Queen Austriana, who together with her husband Aurindus fights Altomira, the Queen of Babylon, for power in the Arabian peninsula.[36] Altomira initially succeeds in invading Arabia and sending the royal couple into exile. After all kinds of adventures they regain power. Altomira is caught and commits suicide, whereupon her niece Tigrania swears revenge, allies herself with the Indian King Torvan and lays siege to Manambis, the capital of Arabia. The town is saved only with the help of the Ethiopian King Sorbiastus who rushes to their aid. Austriana and Aurindus rule once more in peace.

[32] In no other Neo-Latin novel that I have researched thus far is this aspect of the main hero given so much weight; it would appear to be specific to the Habsburg novels.

[33] Cf. Batstone & Damon 2006, 89–116.

[34] For his biography cf. Deckart 1977, 9–20; additional bibliographical sources are listed by Walser 2014a, 354, note 30.

[35] A critical text with a German translation of the novel is presented by Isabella Walser as part of her thesis submitted in Freiburg in 2014. Until this edition is released the first (Augsburg 1687) and second (Salzburg 1717) editions are available. I would like to thank Ms. Walser for kindly allowing me to use her unpublished manuscript.

[36] Plot summaries can be found in Walser 2014a, 355–362 and Walser 2014b, 273–274.

In deciphering the numerous allegories of this plot—Austriana stands for Austria and Emperor Leopold I (1640–1705), Aurindus for the Holy Roman Empire, Altomira for France and King Louis XIII (1601–1643) etc.—17th century European history is recognisable as the foundation of the novel's plot: the constant conflict between France and Austria and in particular the Siege of Vienna of 1683. When Ertl published his book, Emperor Leopold I (1640–1705) ruled in Vienna. Under his rule, shaped by conflict with France and the Turks, Austria advanced to become a major European power,[37] presenting the ruling house with the difficult problem of how they might unify the many new lands and peoples in the Empire. With his novel, Ertl made a small contribution to the literary support of this project with the fundamental message of his novel, namely that a wide-reaching peace in Europe was only attainable and sustainable if the Habsburg family ruled over the Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation. Fittingly, the last sentence of the work reads "Ego applaudente orbe universo id unum prolixe voveo, ut Austria esset in orbe ultima" (With the applause of the whole world I solemnly swear that Austria is the last thing in the world) – a skilful adaptation of the regime motto of emperor Frederick III (1415–1493), *AEIOU*, for which "Austria erit in orbe ultima" (Austria will be the last thing in the world) was one of many suggestions.[38]

Besides several other political aspects, which for the sake of brevity cannot be addressed here, the element of the mirror of princes also plays an important role in Ertl's novel. Austriana and Aurindus embody the ideal princely virtues and explicit instructions regarding their conduct are given at the beginning of the fourth book in the form of a speech by the character Themistocles (representing Charles V, Duke of Lorraine, who played an important role in the second Turkish Siege of Vienna), explaining to the ruler how one organises a military campaign wisely.

With respect to our investigation into negative mirrors of princes, in many regards we strike gold with *Austriana*: there is an explicit anti-mirror of princes, meant ironically, which encourages scheming behaviour at court, and there are powerful ruler figures, adversaries of the protagonists, who act as examples of how not to rule.[39] Let us first consider these figures.

Besides the Indian King Torvan, representing the Grand Vizier Kara Mustafa Pascha, Austriana and Aurindus have in Altomira and Tigrania their greatest enemies. Behind Altomira, the Queen of Babylon, is King Louis XIII of France and behind her niece Tigrania, King Louis XIV (1638–1715). These figures are not simply adversaries who fulfil the role of

[37] Heimann 2001, 70 speaks of a "Baroque world power".
[38] Cf. Lhotsky 1952.
[39] For general character design in *Austriana regina Arabiae* cf. Walser 2014a, 373–378.

antagonists by virtue of being the queens of foreign lands. Rather, Ertl's intention is to intensify the hostility between these figures by acquainting the reader with it from the start: in the story told by Austriana's maid Floresina at the beginning of the first book, she is able to report that Altomira is a declared enemy of Austriana ("Altomiram *[...]* Austrianae juratam hostem," p. 24). It is precisely this, the positive and negative figures of the plot set directly against each other, which makes the contrast between the two all the more stark and allows the characters of Altomira and Tigrania to fulfil their function as anti-mirrors of princes all the more effectively. This is also the reason for Ertl repeatedly setting the enemies in direct confrontation with each other throughout the novel. In the second and third books Austriana finds herself at Tigrania's court, where she heroically bears torture and torment. In the third book Aurindus and Altomira are together in the Arabian capital Manambis, where he is preparing for their mock wedding, whilst she attempts to corrupt him by any means necessary. When it comes to the siege of Manambis in the fourth book, Tigrania shoots the ominous first arrow at Austriana in the town. Eventually, at the end of the novel, Austriana challenges Tigrania to a duel, which is refused. An official duel takes place between Torvan and Aurindus, but with Austriana secretly fighting in her husband's armour. Through these examples we can see that Ertl arranged a series of central scenes so that the main characters of his novel would come up against each other and it would be easy for the reader to compare both their story and their general description.

That the hostility between Austriana and Altomira represents the real-world hostility between Austria and France is made clear to the reader in a scene at the beginning of the first book. The subject is Altomira's birthday celebration:

> Agebatur fors aliquando natalis Altomirae dies, quo in hortis suis pensilibus sublimem thronum erigi jusserat regina. Duodecim gradus, quibus solium innitebatur, variorum florum et cumprimis liliorum exuviae obtexerant. [...] Jacebat praeterea in supremo throni accessu et ignobili limo confecta aquila, quam Altomira petulanti pede identidem conculcans ejus vires videbatur vilipendere.[40]
>
> (It was the day of Altomira's birthday, when the queen had given the order to set up a lofty throne in her hanging gardens. The 12 steps, on which the throne was placed, were covered with different flowers, especially lilies. [...] An eagle, made of unworthy mud, lay on the highest step to the throne; Altomira kicked it repeatedly (*identidem*) with her bold foot and seemed to despise its power.)

[40] Ibid., 25.

The lilies which adorn the steps up to the throne help the reader to decode the political allegory: Altomira stands for France, the heraldic flower (Fleur-de-Lys) of which is well known to be a yellow lily. The eagle which Altomira tramples (*petulanti pede*) is the heraldic symbol of the Holy Roman Empire. A series of details—such as the fact that the eagle is made of mud or that she degrades it—show that her dealings with other rulers and kingdoms are not conducted in a friendly manner but that she would like to rule as a tyrant.

The next scene, which describes Altomira and her way of ruling, is not proffered by the narrator directly but is inserted into a speech by the Indian King Torvan. He welcomes onto his ship the pirate Agrames (under whose control the disguised Austriana currently finds herself). Torvan reports how Altomira's rule has developed since Austriana and Aurindus were sent into exile. For him, Altomira is the only true queen (p. 43):

> Scilicet Altomiram solam orbis universi haeredem esse, caeteros omnes solum vi, clam aut precario dominari. Austrianam contrahendis potius nuptiis quam expugnandis urbibus aptam esse.
>
> (He thought that Altomira was the only true heir of the whole world, while all the others would reign only by force, secretly or precariously. Austriana was better fitted for marriages than for the conquest of towns.)

The implication that Austriana came to power through skilfully arranged marriages rather than through military success plays on the well-known dictum about the Habsburg marriage policy: "Bella gerant alii, tu felix Austria nube!" (Let others wage war; you, happy Austria, marry!) However, continues Torvan, the kingdom lacks unity and cohesion: "Nunc Arabiae regnum in diversas factiones devium et vix sibi simile exspectare tandem dominum vel dominam, quisquis ille sit." (Now the kingdom of Arabia is split up into different parties and, scarcely resembling itself, waits for a king or a queen, whoever it might be. p. 44). Even if Torvan, because of his diplomatic position, is working on the assumption that Altomira should be this ruler over all Arabia, his position also implicitly shows that there is no unity in the kingdom without Austriana: she alone (or the royal couple) can bring about this sense of unity.

The first direct description of Altomira's rule can be found at the beginning of the third book. Initially, she tries to sweeten the new regime for the people by granting a range of privileges and concessions (*privilegiorum largitione*, p. 108). Then she makes use of the rhetorical abilities of astrologers, poets and orators (*fluida verborum inanitate*, p. 109) in order to make herself popular among the people. A poetological reference can be found in this detail, suggesting that Ertl considered poets and writers

to play a role in legitimising a certain type of regime before a large audience.

However, Altomira's regime soon shows its true colours ("post breve tempus latentis tyrannidis alveo viam praebuere", p. 109): out of fear of attack she spies on her people and prohibits travel abroad, she fuels conflict amongst her subjects so that they do not unite and turn against her, she exiles powerful nobles who pose a threat to her rule. Behind the pretence of lawfulness, brutal crimes rage. Both science and merrymaking are only encouraged with the aim of deterring the people from mounting any possible protests (cf. pp. 109–111).

We see here an anti-mirror of princes, which does not need to be inferred from the characters but which explicitly demonstrates and decries misconduct from a ruler. Every small detail shows the reader what an intelligent leader, concerned for the well-being of their people should not do. The regime of Austriana and Aurindus appears to be a deliberate contrast on the inner fictional level. The reader would, however, also compare the description with their own reality and Leopold I's regime, brought to light indirectly in the text.

In fact, events of the Viennese court are discernible in the critical description of Altomira's regime. She exiles powerful, potentially dangerous nobles; Leopold I repeatedly overthrew his leading advisors—Johann Weikhard, Prince of Auersperg (1615–1677) in 1669 and the President of the Privy Council, Wenzel Eusebius, Prince of Lobkowitz (1609–1677) in 1674—because they were reportedly in league with France.[41] The mirror of princes of Austriana is therefore effective on two levels. Firstly, it is clear that the regime of Austria's enemies, above all that of France, is supposed to be portrayed as evil and tyrannical, whilst Habsburg rule is set aside as positive. Secondly, a subversive reading of the text is possible: Ertl seeks to show how an ideal ruler should not behave, and also slips in elements of the Viennese court. In this way he can mount criticism at no risk to himself, as his words credibly assure us again and again that these scenes refer to France (Altomira) and not Austria (Austriana).

The final encounter with Altomira plays out in her prison cell after Aurindus uses force to bring her regime to an end. There she regrets having put too much faith in fortune ("Vah flagitiosa sidera, quae tam perfricta fronte insultastis fortunae meae!" P. 140). She is angry with the gods ("ad decipiendam plebem excogitatos Deos *[...]* Nullus est Deus, qui me non oderit, nullus, quem non oderim prius", p. 141) and considers herself

[41] Cf. Press 1985.

abandoned by all her allies. She turns away from any piety (*abscede pietas*, p. 141). Finally, she commits suicide with a silver hairpin. In this scene Altomira appears once more as the clear antithesis to Austriana: she put her trust in the unpredictable forces of fortune, is in conflict with the gods and wants nothing to do with piety. In the Baroque Era in particular, piety was a guiding virtue of the Habsburgs and the *pietas Austriaca* was proverbial.[42]

Altomira's niece Tigrania succeeds her as Queen of Babylon, making her first appearance in the second book. There she acts as Altomira's deputy whilst the Queen remains in Arabia ("regno Babyloniae vicario nomine praeerat", p. 90). Her first act as ruler is to have her subjects pay homage to her and have them swear allegiance to her (p. 91). Apart from this, the description of her general practice as a ruler is somewhat colourless in comparison to that of Altomira. She plays an important role in the siege of the Arabian capital in the fourth book and imitates her predecessor not only with a series of schemes against Aurindus and Austriana, but also with her suicide following her defeat (p. 213).

Another explicit anti-mirror of princes in *Austriana regina Arabiae* comes with Veritas, the personification of truth, whom Austriana comes across on an exotic island in the first book.[43] Veritas recounts (pp. 55–63) how she once served in the court of the evil King Proteus. She was driven from there, unable to bear seeing a royal court devoid of virtue. A nobleman takes her into his household, where during the evening meal he schools his son in how best to introduce himself to the court:

> "Opus modo est, ut te praesente et auscultante ea monita a me hauriat, quae ad sustinendos aulicae versutiae fucos suffecerint." Inde ad filium conversus "Ut probe aulicum agas, fili mi, egregie adulaberis, fide parcus, verborum prodigus; Amicitiam nullam nisi privati lucri causa coles. Neminem nisi artificiose laudans et omnibus cum tuo impendio detrahens. Qui lucrum non afferunt, hos tu velut steriles arbores despice. Tam diu tibi quis cordi sit, quamdiu usui. Nullius fidei crede, nullius amicitiae fide. Solum observa principis genium, cui per vitia quaevis blandiri non tergiversaberis. Honestum enim in aulis, nisi nomine tenus, nullum est. Stupra, venena, mendacia et periuria tuto adhibe, ubi tuis prosunt commodis aut expiscandis arcanis aliorum [...]"[44]
>
> ("While you are there and listen, I will give him my advice, which will be helpful in bearing the falsehood of trickery at court." Then he turned to his son and said: "To become a good courtier, my son, you

[42] Cf. Coreth 1959.
[43] Cf. Walser 2013, 225.
[44] Ertl (unpublished), 58–59.

> must be an outstanding flatterer, trust almost nobody, and be generous with words. You will not cultivate anyone's friendship if not for personal benefit. If you praise someone, do it in an artificial way and disparage him by your extravagance. Scorn like fruitless trees those who bring you no profit. A man should lie at your heart as long as he is useful to you. Don't trust any promises, don't trust friendship. Only consider the king and don't shy away from flattering him by all kinds of vices. At court there is nothing honorable, except in name. Use shame, poison, lies and perjury, if it helps you and lets you find out other people's secrets.")

The advice to his son continues in this style for several pages (pp. 58–62). This enrages Veritas to the extent that she lunges at the father and attempts to claw his face. He has advised his son to be a flatterer, to trust no-one and to only form friendships which will benefit him personally. He should flatter the Prince, committing misdeeds if necessary—there is no honour at court after all. Adultery, poison and lies are tried and tested methods to advance his interests. If he must give counsel, he should be vague so that he can always later claim that he has been misunderstood. He should not take offence when friends turn into enemies. He should pretend to desire not what he really wants but only that which reassures the people, towards whom he is, incidentally, indifferent. The Prince cannot know of his schemes, but should indeed fear him as he knows the Prince's secrets. He should pay individuals to spread rumours amongst the people or to report back to him what is said about him. He should work out the best time to ask the Prince for things. He should never ask for something for someone else. He should never do what he says, or say what he does. He need not worry about the minutiae of justice and righteousness. He should attend church often, so that he can prepare his schemes there in peace and quiet. He should not, however, doggedly adhere to religion.

This catalogue of instructions forms, stylistically and linguistically, the showpiece of the novel. Facetiae and punch lines, parallelism, chiasmus and antitheses heighten the hyperbole of the image of the degenerate courtier. The charm of the passage does not only lie in its stylistic artistry: Ertl indirectly criticises the behaviour at court of certain ruthless careerists. In the course of his legal career he may have met with such characters himself and his criticism would have appealed to others who had already had unpleasant dealings with them. Through literary embedding—the anti-mirror of princes is part of Veritas' speech, which in turn cites the nobleman father—Ertl again shields himself against the potential criticism of those who might feel attacked: he could always maintain that he is not for the father but for Veritas, who is categorically against the opinions voiced.

In conclusion, it is clear that Ertl presents Austriana (and to a certain extent Aurindus) as the ideal ruler of a large, diverse kingdom. This portrayal is all the more convincing as she stands out as fundamentally different to a range of negative figures, her enemies. Nevertheless, stylistically speaking, the presentations of her enemies—as we have seen—form the most accomplished passages of the text and contributed to its popularity at the time.

V

The novel *Aeneas Habspurgus* recounts the story of Rudolf I of Habsburg who is recognised without difficulty behind the figure of Aeneas. From the start this masquerade is made clear to the reader, as the text's anonymous author reveals in the *argumentum* at the beginning of the work that the Habsburg Prince is concealed behind the disguise (*schema*) of Aeneas.[45] The three sections (*partes*) of the novel retell the chapter of Rudolf's life from the death of Emperor Frederick II (1250) until Rudolf's election as King of the Romans (1273), covering, historically speaking, the so-called *Interregnum*.[46]

King Ottokar II of Bohemia (ruled 1253–1278) appears as Rudolf's most significant adversary. In fact, the historical Ottokar mounted a fierce resistance against Rudolf's endeavours to build up his own power base, but ultimately failed and fell in battle. The hostility between the two quickly became a theme in literature.[47] Dante mocked it in his *Divina Commedia*, bringing the two rulers together and having them console each other whilst climbing the Mountain of Purgatory (*Purg*. 7.91–102).

In *Aeneas Habspurgus*, Ottokar makes two big appearances, in the first and third sections. His allegorical name is of interest: the anonymous author initially christens him *Urocottas*, an anagram of *Ottocarus*. In the third book, however, he is given a new name, *Turnus*. This change of name is due to the fact that *Aeneas Habspurgus* seeks to imitate Virgil's *Aeneid* both structurally and with its characters, and is composed as a 'palimpest', to use

[45] Cf. Aeneas Habspurgus, argumentum: "Sub hujus [sc. Aeneae] schemate Rudolphum Habspurgum adducimus." (Under the figure of Aeneas we introduce Rudolf of Habsburg).

[46] Cf. Kaufhold 2002.

[47] Cf. Dorer 1886 (above all the relevant poems by Pedro Calderón de la Barca and Friedrich Schiller); Frenzel 1976, 571–573.

Genette's terminology.[48] For this reason he places a decisive duel between the two protagonists Aeneas and Turnus at the end of his novel.[49]

In the first part of the novel Aeneas is in the service of Urocottas, who rules as King of Drymosemia (Bohemia) (fol. [B1]^{r}). In the first sentence of this section of the story the author is preparing the reader for the fact that their relationship will meet an unhappy end, should destiny dictate that Aeneas finds his Turnus in Urocottas ("quem deinde Turnum fuisse iidem casus ostendent"). However, from Aeneas' point of view, he has approached the King with his inbred humility (*nativa humanitate*). From the start, therefore, he is depicted as Urocottas' antithesis. He holds a high office at court (*supremus aulae moderator*) and develops forthwith into the model of a leading official.

Today, no reliable historical evidence exists to suggest that Rudolf actually served under King Ottokar of Bohemia. Nevertheless, this story can be found in Early Modern historiography: in his 1540 work *De Caesaribus atque imperatoribus Romanis*, printed posthumously in Strasbourg, Johannes Cuspinianus (1473–1529) mentions Rudolf's services as *magister curiae* for King Ottokar (p. 532):

> Fuit *[sc. Rudolphus]* insuper magister curiae Ottocari regis Boemiae, qui hanc electionem summis viribus impedire nitebatur, quandoquidem et ipse ad Imperium aspirabat et Brandenburgensem Marchionem muneribus corruperat.
>
> (Rudolf was the major-domo of Ottocar, king of Bohemia, who tried with all his power to prevent his election, as he himself aspired to the empire and had already bribed the Margrave of Brandenburg.)

It is striking that in the first scene of the *Aeneas Habspurgus,* which involves Aeneas and Urocottas, the latter is upstaged somewhat. After the introductory remarks discussed above, the King all but falls silent. The anonymous author chooses passive structures (e.g. *quaerebatur dux*, fol. [B1]^{v}) or only includes Urocottas in specific contexts which are important for Aeneas ("delatum ab Urocotta labarum [*viz*. Aeneas] Imperator suscipit"; the field commander Aeneas received the standard sent by Urocottas). As soon as Aeneas, then, has taken control of the Bohemian campaign against the Hulmigeri (Prussia), the developments at Urocottas' royal court no longer play a part.

[48] Under 'pastiche' as a special form of textual transformation, Genette generally understands an imitation undertaken with no satire intended. Cf. Genette 1982, 130–138.

[49] The anonymous author carries out the change of name from *Urocottas* to *Turnus* explicitly: "Urocottam, quem Turnum imposterum audies, excipias," fol. [D1]^{v}.

Urocottas is only portrayed as active after this section: when Aeneas returns to the Bohemian court from his successful military campaign, Urocottas toys with the idea of granting him further military powers, this time in the conflict against King Belagar (Bela of Hungary), who has crossed the kingdoms' shared border ("Ad eum repellendum animo suo designarat Urocottas Aenean", fol. B2^{r}). Scheming court sycophants try to dissuade the King with a series of arguments against his plan, but Urocottas, undeterred, sends Aeneas out against Belagar. At the battlefield, Aeneas receives a letter informing him that the King has been swayed by his inner circle after all and is no longer well-disposed towards him. Thereupon Aeneas decides to end the war as quickly as possible, which he promptly does, but rather than returning to Urocottas, he quits his service to travel to Latium (Holy Roman Empire). This concludes the first section of the novel.

The essential characteristics attributed to Urocottas stand in stark contrast to Aeneas': the King is incapable of putting his ideas into practice, does not stand by his decisions, allows himself to be influenced by insinuations and is deceived by schemers. The jealous individuals at court ("invidi aulicorum sermones", fol. B2^{r}) succeed in alienating Aeneas from the King. By way of contrast, Aeneas' behaviour is characterised by great *constantia*: he remains loyal to his King and liege lord, even when he knows that Ottokar has turned against him.

For one possible allegorical interpretation of the novel, Urocottas' engagement with conquered peoples is especially worth noting. Following Aeneas' victory over King Belagar, several peoples and lands come under Urocottas' rule:

> Germanocordiae etenim arces Triumphatoris leges praesidiumque hosti trucidato receperant, atque exemplum secutae Aemonia, Sytrocilia, ac Trileonina victoriae appendices in Urocottae lupata sacramentum dixerant, eae videlicet provinciae, quas familiaribus inter peritura vicibus eidem coelum subijciet, qui alienis auspiciis, suo Marte, eas subjugavit.[50]
>
> (The castles of Germanocordia accepted the laws and the protection of the winner, when the enemy was killed; Aemonia, Sytrocilia and Trileonina followed its example in company of this victory and swore an oath of allegiance to Urocottas. These were certainly lands which, after internal struggles in family, Heaven will subject to the man who conquered them for someone else, but with his own power.)

A *clavis*, which follows the *argumentum* at the beginning of the novel, reveals that *Germanocordia* stands for Austria, *Aemonia* for Carniola,

[50] Fol. B3^{r}.

Sytrocilia for Styria and *Trileonina* for Carinthia. The historical King Ottokar actually did secure a series of military victories, above all over Bela IV of Hungary, Duke of Austria, Styria, Carinthia and Carniola. Only after Ottokar's death did Rudolf, through clever marriages, succeed in bringing under his control these lands which would later be almost synonymous with the House of Habsburg.

In this dense passage both figures, Rudolf and Ottokar, are described dealing with foreign, conquered peoples. Urocottas appears as the tyrant who forces the people to submit to his will (*in Urocottae lupata*). Aeneas, on the other hand, brings them law and order (*Triumphatoris leges*) and is preordained by the authority of the gods (*eidem coelum subijciet*) to rule over them.

Urocottas' second big appearance comes at the end of the novel: after Aeneas has been chosen as King of the Romans, Urocottas is the only prince unable to come to terms with the election ("unum si Urocottam [...] excipias", fol. [D1]^{v}). Having become Turnus (see above), he takes up arms against Aeneas, loses and must cede the territories Aeneas had conquered for him a short time before: Germanocordia, Aemonia, Trileonina und Sitrocylia. That Aeneas would one day rule these lands is indicated through the use of the future tense (*subijciet*) in the passage from the first section of the work cited above.

After the arch-enemies make peace, Turnus' wife urges her husband in a fierce speech to wage war against Aeneas once more, despite bad omens. War breaks out and Turnus finally succumbs in a duel with Aeneas.

Once again, some of Urocottas' character traits already evident in the first section of the novel come to light: he does not keep his promises, but ruptures his truce with Aeneas. If he was incited to such behaviour in the first section by the schemes of his courtiers, it is now his power-hungry wife who causes him to break his oath.

Aeneas is able to rely on divine help, whereas Urocottas invokes dark forces, securing the support of Hell for his fight ("excita in opem Styge", fol. [D1]^{v}) shortly after Aeneas' election as King. Before the final battle against Aeneas, Urocottas disregards an omen which could have forewarned him of the outcome (fol. [D1]^{v}–[D2]^{r}). Whilst piety is one of Aeneas' key virtues, his enemy is characterised by its opposite.

Dominion over foreign lands also plays a role in this passage. When Urocottas loses the first battle against Aeneas, he must cede the territories Aeneas once won for him:

> Iamque aperto Marte a Caesare victus et ad pacis leges coactus Germanocordiam cum Aemonia, Trileonina et Sitrocylia victori cesserat. (fol. [D1]^{v}).

(He was defeated in the battle by the emperor and had to accept the conditions of peace. He surrendered Germanocordia together with Aemonia, Trileonina and Sitrocylia to the winner.)

Aeneas is not portrayed as a cruel victor who imposes his will upon those he has defeated; instead he enforces laws of peace (*pacis leges*) which Urocottas must comply with when he gives up the lands. It is precisely these lands which are then invoked in Urocottas' wife's diatribe (*convitia*): she asks him how the loss of these lands fits in with his plans for a grand empire confined only by the Baltic and Adriatic seas. From his wife's words Urocottas appears as an excessive conqueror, interested only in expanding his territory and driven not by a higher calling but by base motives (on fol. [D2]^{r} his *regnandi libido* is mentioned explicitly).

Aeneas Habspurgus presents the reader with an adversary of the protagonist who, as ruler, allows himself to be swayed by a lust for power, bad advisors, scheming court sycophants and the insinuations of his wrathful and domineering wife. He uses violent measures to rule lands conquered as part of his plans for a grand empire. By way of contrast, the Habsburg Rudolf appears as a ruler of various lands, chosen by God, ensuring law and order with no little personal commitment. The more his enemy Ottokar is shown as sinister and degenerate, the brighter he shines.

VI

The final novel of interest to us in this context bears the title *Argonauticorum sive de vellere aureo libri XXIV*, published by András Dugonics (1740–1818) in 1778 with Johannes Michael Landerer in Bratislava and Kosice. Dugonics, who later reputedly established the Hungarian novel with his *Etelka* (1788),[51] describes in the *Argonautica*'s 754 pages Jason and the Argonauts' expedition to Colchis, where with Medea's help they succeed in acquiring the Golden Fleece.[52]

As with *Aeneas Habspurgus* and Ertl's *Austriana regina Arabiae*, there are elements in this novel which can be interpreted as mirrors of princes. In the 19th book, the deceased Hypsipyle appears to Jason in a dream and gives him concrete instructions as to how he should conduct himself later as a ruler in Greece (pp. 549–550).[53] One of them reads: "Omnium communis sis pater" (O, might you be the common father of all, p. 550). This fits with one reading of the novel, interpreting it as a work which seeks to legitimise the

[51] Cf. Penke 2002.
[52] The fundamental research on *Argonautica* is Tilg 2013. Cf. Szörényi 2006.
[53] Cf. Tilg 2013, 167.

Habsburgs' supranational rule over a multinational empire. Even if the characters of this novel are not as easily and clearly linked to 18th-century Austro-Hungarian figures as those in *Austriana*, there are nevertheless convincing reasons to read this work as a political allegory.[54]

What of anti-mirrors of princes in this work? Whilst no figure is depicted as Jason's main enemy—it emerges that a close family network unites all the figures, like the Colchisian King Aeaetas or Almus, King of Scythia—a series of passages criticise the false and reprehensible conduct of ruler figures. In the seventh book the Argonauts reach Delos, where Jason speaks with a priest. The priest tells him of the carelessness of the youthful King Anius (pp. 189–190):

> Regem habemus Anium, Apollinis filium, admodum iuvenem, puerorum perpetuo gregibus, quos in deliciis habet, stipatum. Amicitias illorum non secundum generis dignitatem, aut virtutis excellentiam, sed iocandi et colludendi dexteritatem init. In crucem agendi sufficiens illi caussa: praesentem ex pueris non adfuisse, cum magna eum ludendi libido incesserat. Varius ad haec supra aetatem: irascitur ponitque iram temere. [...] Vitiis potius quam virtutibus suorum, servili adhoc quam liberali ingenio delectatur [...]
>
> (Our king is Anius, the son of Apollo; he is still a boy, always surrounded by a band of boys whom he likes. He chooses them as friends not because of the nobility of their descent or because of their virtue, but because of their skills in joking and playing. The following reason is enough for him to crucify someone: if one of the boys is not there, when he wants to play. He is inconstant, more than normal for his age: He flies into a rage and calms himself down just barely. [...] He likes the vices of his friends more than their virtues, their servile more than their liberal character.)

The reproaches continue in this vein: Anius reserves all important positions in his kingdom, even the appointments of priests, for servile characters who benefit from his favour. He hates bald men and mocks them, as he does elderly people. This negative mirror of princes is characterised by a mix of realistic problems (awarding offices according to whim) and comic elements (the King's hatred of bald men) which renders the passage particularly entertaining for the reader.

In the eleventh book, Dugonics tells the story of the brave and beautiful Amazonian warrior Carambis (pp. 300–311). She earns such good reputation in battle that the Amazonian Queen Poppaea makes her commander of her entire army. She fulfils this task to the utmost satisfaction of the Queen,

[54] Cf. Tilg 2013, 166–170.

who showers her with precious gifts and glory. Eventually, though, Carambis can no longer stand having someone rule over her and decides to slay the Queen. In a devilish plot she plans to leave all suspicion resting on the Queen's sister, Tape. Although the attempt on Poppaea's life fails, Tape is the suspect and is sentenced to death: Carambis is to throw her from a cliff. However, unable to bear her guilty conscience, Carambis confesses her crime to the Queen in a letter and instead throws herself from the cliff, which bears her name from that day forth. In this etiological tale, Dugonics again mixes fantastical elements (such as the thrilling showdown on the precipitous cliff) with genuine criticism – namely, of the everyday scheming practiced at many courts. In the same way, he criticises a priest who has become too entangled in the worldly concerns of his King (pp. 359–360), and the King who is a poor role model for his soldiers during battle preparations (pp. 616–617).

In the *Argonautica* there is also a passage which provides us with an anti-mirror of princes in explicitly ironic terms: in the fourth book the Argonauts help King Lycus in the Mariandinian Islands to kill a dangerous wild boar who has settled in a temple in the woods dedicated to Diana and rendered temple service impossible. Now a new priest for the temple is sought, and different individuals entertain hopes of being awarded the office by virtue of various qualities. One stands out (pp. 106–107):

> Unus aliquis erat inter ceteros, cuius nomen, transmisso facinore, ereptum est posteritati, qui ad id Antistitium magnis quidem animis, sed infelici exitu adspirabat. Quo de homine si quidpiam breviter retulero, operae pretium me facturum existimo. Is, inde a prima pueritia in animum induxerat omnia illa agere, quibus mortales ad summa niti consueverunt. Pauca inter aequales, gravia apud summos, et meditata proloqui; fugere vulgum sollicite; raro ad Regiam, nec, nisi vocatus, accedere: artibus tamen occultis, uti et saepe, et palam vocaretur, facere; Apud Regis ministros inprimis gratiam aucupari, eosque officiis colere; Loqui de Sacrificiis saepe magnifice; saepe Deos, praesertim iratos, ostendere, sicque homines futuris potius, quam praesentibus terrere; corpus inedia, vigiliis, et multo, gravique labore adfligere; probitatis specie contentus, eam in exsanguem vultum induere; Vestem, nec, ut, sordidus adpareret, modicam; nec, ut ambitiosum dicerent, copiosam gerere. Mediocri contentus vivere; denique videri potius bonus, quam esse. His ille artibus nitebatur, fueratque in Delubro certa spe nitens: se unum in id fastigium evehendum. Tanta vero id temeritate speraverat, ut rogare Regem pro Antistitio noluerit, et, quos rogaturos existimaverat, amicos impedierit: Scilicet, ut, si adsequi dignitatem liceret, non humana ope, et consiliis evectus, sed divina destinatione sacratus videatur. [...] Sed speravit simulator ille tam diuturno tempore Pontificium, adsequi certe non potuit.

> (One man stands out amongst the others, whose name is no more known to posterity, while his misdeed is still remembered. He longed for that priesthood, and tried hard, but had no luck in the end. I think it will be a good idea to tell you about this man in a few words. From his early boyhood on he wanted to do everything, by which men normally aspire towards the highest things. He only spoke a few words among the boys of the same age, but in front of important people he spoke severely and deliberately. He avoided the normal people, and came rarely to the king's court, and only when called for. With secret skills he could manage to be called often and publicly. He was in special favour with the king's ministers and rendered them services. Often, he spoke about holy services in a magnificent way. Often he could show that the gods were angry, and so he scared people not with current, but with future things. He exercised his body by abstinence, keeping vigil and much hard work. He was happy with the semblance of honesty, which he showed on his bloodless face. His clothes were modest, so that he did not look dirty, and not abundant, so that he did not look ambitious. He was happy to live with mediocrity. He wanted more to seem good, than to be good. These were his skills, and in the temple service he had this one hope, that he would be the only one to get this position. But he had this hope with such rashness, that he did not want to ask the king for the priesthood and hindered those friends who he thought would ask for him. He did this with the view that if he could get the position, it should seem that he got it not with the help or advice of a man, but out of divine design. [...] But even if this trickster was hoping for the priesthood for such a long time, he did not get it.)

It is not too great a step to see in the description of the scheming candidates of the Mariandinian Islands a criticism of the way in which some priests were working their way up in the church hierarchy in Hungary and in the entire Catholic world of the 18th century. Dugonics was well acquainted with the situation, as he himself was a priest: he was born in Szeged, and ordained in the Piarist order there in 1756. He taught at various schools of the order until he eventually became Professor of Mathematics at the University of Nagyszombat from 1774.[55] With great attention to detail, he describes the career-obsessed candidates for the priesthood, who from early childhood work to achieve a high position, above all by dubious means. With a certain joy, Dugonics concludes the passage with the terse hint that the man who long had designs on the position did not, in the end, receive it.

[55] For Dugonics' Biography cf. Szörényi 1996, 108–140; Tilg 2013, 162.

VII

As has been shown, these three Habsburg novels, Wilhelm Ertl's *Austriana regina Arabiae*, the anonymous *Aeneas Habspurgus*, and András Dugonics' *Argonautica* definitely use the literary technique of the incorporated mirror of princes, which supports their common political direction and aim – that is, legitimising the multinational regime of the Habsburgs. They succeed especially with the convincing and captivating passages in which they present the inverse face of a mirror of a prince, either in the depiction of the positive hero's antagonist or with explicitly morally reprehensible recommendations as to how a ruler should conduct himself, which the reader must be able to decode correctly through certain ironic hints. By virtue of their stylistic sophistication and their graphic clarity, these passages have helped to contribute to the popularity of the genre.

Bibliography

Almási, Gábor & Lav Šubarić (eds.) 2015, *Latin at the Crossroads of Identity: The Evolution of Linguistic Nationalism in the Kingdom of Hungary*, Leiden.

Batstone, William & Cynthia Damon 2006, *Caesar's Civil War*, Oxford.

Berges, Wilhelm 1938, *Die Fürstenspiegel des hohen und späten Mittelalters*, Leipzig.

Blum, Wilhelm 1981, *Byzantinische Fürstenspiegel: Agapetos, Theophylakt von Ochrid, Thomas Magister*, Stuttgart (*Bibliothek der griechischen Literatur* 14).

Blythe, James M. (ed.) 1997, *Ptolemy of Lucca: On the Government of Rulers: De regimine principum*, Philadelphia.

Boenke, Michaela (ed.) 1993, *Leon Battista Alberti: Momus oder Vom Fürsten*, Munich (*Humanistische Bibliothek* 2.29).

Born, Lester 1928, "Erasmus on Political Ethics: The Institutio Principis Christiani", *Political Science Quarterly* 43, 520–543.

Borzsák, István 1994, "Die Kehrseite der römischen Fürstenspiegel", *Speculum regis*, eds: Ibolya Tar & Gyula Wojtilla, Szeged *(Acta Universitatis de Attila József nominatae: Acta antiqua et archaeologica* 26), 13–19.

Consolo, Rino (ed.) 1986, *Leon Battista Alberti: Momo o del principe*, Genua.

Coreth, Anna 1959, *Pietas Austriaca: Ursprung und Entwicklung barocker Frömmigkeit in Österreich*, Munich.

Deckart, Gerald (ed.) 1977, *Größte Denkwürdigkeiten Bayerns*, Düsseldorf.

Dorer, Edmund 1886, *Rudolf von Habsburg in Chronik und Dichtung*, Dresden.

Eberhardt, Otto 1977, *Via Regia: Der Fürstenspiegel Smaragds von St. Mihiel und seine literarische Gattung*, Munich (*Münstersche Mittelalter-Schriften* 28).

Engelbrecht, Helmut 1982–1988, *Geschichte des österreichischen Bildungswesens. Erziehung und Unterricht auf dem Boden Österreichs*, 5 vols., Vienna.

Erbe, Michael 2000, *Die Habsburger (1493–1918): Eine Dynastie im Reich und in Europa*, Stuttgart (*Urban-Taschenbücher* 454).

Frenzel, Elisabeth, 4th edition 1976, *Stoffe der Weltliteratur*, Stuttgart.

Genette, Gérard 1982, *Palimpsestes: La littérature au second degré*, Paris.

Hadot, Pierre 1972, "Fürstenspiegel", *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum* 8, 555–632.

Haslinger, Ingrid 2007, *So lebten die Habsburger: Kaiserliche und königliche Schlösser in der österreichisch-ungarischen Monarchie*, Vienna.

Heim, Hans 1919, *Fürstenerziehung im 16. Jahrhundert: Beiträge zur Geschichte ihrer Theorie*, Paderborn (*Pädagogische Forschungen und Fragen* 11).

Heimann, Heinz Dieter, 3rd edition 2006, *Die Habsburger – Dynastie und Kaiserreiche*, Munich (*Beck Wissen*).

IJsewijn, Jozef & Dirk Sacré 1998, *Companion to Neo-Latin Studies* 2, Leuven (*Humanistica Lovaniensia, Supplementa* 14).

Jacobs, Jürgen C. 2001, *Der Fürstenspiegel im Zeitalter des aufgeklärten Absolutismus*, Wiesbaden (*Nordrhein-Westfälische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Geisteswissenschaftn, lectures* G376).

Kaufhold, Martin 2002, *Interregnum*, Darmstadt (*Geschichte kompakt, Mittelalter*).

Klecker, Elisabeth & Franz Römer 1994, "Poetische Habsburg-Panegyrik in lateinischer Sprache: Bestände der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek als Grundlage eines Forschungsprojekts" *Biblos* 43, 183–198.

Köhler, Hartmut (ed.) 2006, *Lazarillo de Tormes: Klein Lazarus vom Tormes: Spanisch / Deutsch*, Stuttgart (*Reclams Universal-Bibliothek* 18481).

Leiße, Olaf 2012, *Der Untergang des österreichischen Imperiums*, Marburg.

Lhotsky, Alfons 1952, "A.E.I.O.U. Die 'Devise' Kaiser Friedrichs III.", *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung* 60 , 155–193.

Mervin, William S. (ed.) 1962, *The life of Lazarillo de Tormes: His fortunes and adversities*, New York.

Moore, Steven 2010*, The Novel: An Alternative History: Beginnings to 1600*, New York & London.

Moravanszky, Akos 1988, *Die Architektur der Donaumonarchie*, Berlin.

Mühleisen, Hans-Otto & Theo Stammen (ed.) 1997, *Fürstenspiegel der Frühen Neuzeit*, Frankfurt am Main & Leipzig (*Bibliothek des deutschen Staatsdenkens* 6).

Penke, Olga (ed.) 2002, *Dugonics András: Etelka*, Debrecen.

Philipp, Michael & Theo Stammen 1996, "Fürstenspiegel", *Historisches Wörterbuch der Rhetorik* 3, 495–507.

Press, Volker 1985, "Leopold I.", *Neue Deutsche Biographie* 14, 256–260.

Rico, Francisco (ed.), 13th edition 1985, *Lazarillo de Tormes*, Madrid.

Riley, Mark & Dorothy Pritchard Huber (eds.) 2004, *John Barclay: Argenis*, Assen (*Bibliotheca Latinitatis Novae*).

Schaffenrath, Florian & Stefan Tilg, 2011, "Neulateinische Literatur und das moderne Europa: Kurzvorstellung des Ludwig Boltzmann Instituts für Neulateinische Studien", *Neulateinishes Jahrbuch* 13 , 351–362.

Schaffenrath, Florian 2013, "Aeneas Habspurgus vor dem Hintergrund der zeitgenössischen Romantheorie", Tilg & Walser 2013, 145–160.

Schorn-Schütte, Luise 2009, *Geschichte Europas in der Frühen Neuzeit: Studienhandbuch 1500–1789*, Paderborn.

Schulte, J. Manuel 2001, *Speculum regis: Studien zur Fürstenspiegel-Literatur in der griechisch-römischen Antike*, Münster (*Antike Kultur und Geschichte* 3).

Singer, Bruno 1981, *Die Fürstenspiegel in Deutschland im Zeitalter des Humanismus und der Reformation: Bibliographische Grundlagen und ausgewählte Interpretationen: Jakob Wimpfeling, Wolfgang Seidel, Johann Sturm, Urban Rieger*, Munich (*Humanistische Bibliothek* 1.34).

Szörényi, László 1996, *Memoria Hungarorum: Tanulmányok a régi magyar irodalomról*, Budapest.

Szörényi, László 2006, "Dugonics' Argonautica", *Camoenae Hungaricae* 3, 161–168.

Tilg, Stefan & Isabella Walser (eds.) 2013, *Der neulateinische Roman als Medium seiner Zeit: The Neo-Latin Novel in its Time*, Tübingen (*NeoLatina* 21).

Tilg, Stefan 2013, "The Neo-Latin Novel's Last Stand: András Dugonics' Argonautica (1778)", Tilg & Walser 2013, 161–171.

Vacha, Brigitte (ed.), Walter Pohl, Karl Vocelka 1992, *Die Habsburger: Eine Europäische Familiengeschichte*, Graz, Vienna & Cologne.

Walser, Isabella 2013, "Im Namen des Fürsten und des Volkes: Die politische Dimension des neulateinischen Romans", Tilg & Walser 2013, 211–227.

Walser, Isabella 2014a, "Heroic Verse Goes Prose: Anton Wilhelm Ertl's Novel Austriana Regina Arabiae (1687)", *Humanistica Lovaniensia* 63, 347–393.

Walser, Isabella 2014b, "Der neulateinische Habsburgroman als Geschichtsbuch: Ein Beitrag zur österreichischen Historiographie des Barock", *Neulateinisches Jahrbuch* 16 , 271–289.

Wulfram, Hartmut 2013, "Der Bogen der Juno: Vergilparodie und Zeitkritik in Leon Battista Albertis Momus", Tilg & Walser 2013, 19–35.

.