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Abstract

This article explores how deviant behaviour in life, deviant circumstances of death, and young age at death affected mortuary treatment among historically documented individuals from Medieval and Post-Medieval European dynasties. The study is based on an investigation of 868 individuals who are members of the Habsburg and Babenberg Dynasties or affiliated with these two houses. From this sample a group of 221 individuals as well as an additional 36 individuals, whose lives or deaths may be considered deviant, were selected for a closer investigation. The results show that ‘social deviants’ as well as people who died during warfare and in battle, victims of murder and disease, as well as young children have been afforded differential mortuary treatment. On the other hand, individuals who died during childbirth or from accidents were usually treated according to the norm.

Introduction

Several years ago I conducted an analysis of elite burials in Medieval and Post-Medieval Europe. I especially investigated historic sources concerning the mortuary treatment of 868 individuals belonging to two Austrian dynasties: the Babenbergs and the Habsburgs. The purpose of the study was to gain a better understanding of the reasons for variability in mortuary treatment and to develop more appropriate methods of burial analysis. During my research I came across a variety of individuals whose mortuary treatment not only differed from those afforded to other people but was directly caused by circumstances relating to their lives or death. Being accorded differential treatment these individuals and their burials can be classified as ‘deviant’, in the sense that they diverge from the burial norm. I have already partially touched upon this issue by discussing the nature of so called ‘secondary burials’, the formation of collective burial deposits and the causes for variation in the treatment of the corpse (Weiss-Krejci 2001; 2004; 2005). The current paper will
provide a more complete and condensed summary of the relationship between unusual life, unusual death and the fate of the corpse amongst these groups.

Archaeologists always run the risk of misinterpreting evidence derived from bones, burial position, grave goods and the kind and location of the burial. To be able to infer that a specific dead person in an archaeological deposit did not receive mortuary treatment in accordance with his/her normal social persona but rather in relation to deviant behaviour in life, or deviant circumstances of death, one must understand the nature of the society that produced the deposit. It is also necessary to understand its death symbolism, rituals, ideology and ideas about what constitutes a proper burial. In a prehistoric context this is not easy. The present analysis of a historic sample forms a contribution to this ongoing discussion (e.g. Ucko 1969; Shay 1985; Duncan 2005; Forgey and Williams 2005).

**The Sample**

For this investigation I have selected historically documented individuals whose lives or deaths may be considered deviant and compared the characteristics of their mortuary treatment to those that followed the norm. I started with an investigation of 868 individuals who died between AD 994 and 1993 (see Weiss-Krejci 2001). I then split the sample into three successive patrilineal groups: the Medieval Babenberg Dynasty (ruled AD 976–1246), the Medieval and Post-Medieval House of Habsburg (AD 1273–1740), and the House of Habsburg-Lorraine (AD 1740–1918). The House of Habsburg and the House of Habsburg-Lorraine form one dynasty, but two patrilineal groups. When the House of Habsburg died out in the male line in AD 1740, political survival was only possible through the female line. The descendants of Maria Theresa of Habsburg and Francis of Lorraine again followed rules of patrilineal descent (Hamann 1988).

In the sample 136 people from ten generations are affiliated with the Babenberg Dynasty (dates of death range from AD 994–1333), 389 individuals from 15 generations are connected to the House of Habsburg (dates of death range from AD 1256–1780) and 343 individuals derived from six generations of the House of Habsburg-Lorraine (dates of death range from AD 1740–1993). The total sample includes 505 patrilineal blood relatives (58 Babenberg, 237 Habsburg, and 210 Habsburg-Lorraine), 120 affinal relatives (23 Babenberg, 52 Habsburg, and 45 Habsburg-Lorraine) and 243 non-dynasty members (55 Babenberg, 100 Habsburg, 88 Habsburg-Lorraine). Patrilineal blood relatives are women and men who were born into one of the two dynasties as well as several children from morganatic marriages. Affinal relatives are women who were married to male dynasty members at some point in their lives. The founder of the House of Habsburg-Lorraine, Maria Theresa’s husband Francis of Lorraine, also belongs to this group. The group of non-dynasty members consists of men who married patrilineal female blood relatives, children of female blood relatives who were members of other dynasties but were buried with the Habsburgs, morganatic wives whose status was too low to be accepted as full members of the dynasty, morganatic husbands, and – if married more than once – men who were married to female affinal relatives, and the women who were married to these men.
Proper Burial

From a large group of archaeologically visible variables of mortuary practices (see Binford 1971; O’Shea 1984, 39–44; Carr 1995, 130–2) I have selected three practices for this comparative analysis – the treatment of the corpse, the location of the burial, and the association of individuals with each other (Table 10.1).

Treatment of the Corpse

Almost all people in the sample were members of the aristocracy and were therefore treated differently from the rest of society. The proper treatment of the corpse was to leave it in the flesh or to embalm it. Originally, evisceration (also called exenteration) of the internal organs was practiced in Central Europe only when corpses needed to be transported. Gradually, in Medieval France, England and Scotland, it also became a practice independent from the necessity to transport a corpse (Bradford 1933; Brown 1981; Dodson 1994). In large parts of the German-Roman Empire evisceration remained predominantly functional until the end of the Middle Ages (Meyer 2000, 212). From the late sixteenth century onwards a high percentage of corpses were eviscerated without need for preservation. At this time it became customary in the House of Habsburg to extract and separately bury the internal organs, especially the heart (Gerbert et al. 1772; Hawlik-van de Water 1989; Weiss-Krejci 2001, 778). At least 117 people in the sample were eviscerated (five from the Babenberg sample, 67 Habsburg, 45 Habsburg-Lorraine), and their entrails buried in separate places or within containers. In the sample only nine eviscerations are known to date before AD 1500.

In Medieval times noblemen and women often died during journeys to southern Europe and to the Holy Land. Since burial in foreign, hostile and heathen lands was out of the question for a high noble of the Middle Ages the remains of the deceased needed to be

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corpse treatment</th>
<th>Grave location</th>
<th>Association of individuals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FREQUENT/PROPER</td>
<td>cathedral, church, monastery, castle church</td>
<td>with dynasty members (close affinal or blood relatives)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>boiling, defleshing, skeletal mutilation</td>
<td></td>
<td>with distant patrilineal relatives, without relatives (alone)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cremation</td>
<td>churchyard</td>
<td>with matrilineal relatives, with members of an unrelated group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10.1. Proper and improper mortuary behaviour in three categories of mortuary practices in dynastic Europe.
transported back home. An excarnation method was invented that became known as mos teutonicus. The corpses were eviscerated, boiled in water, wine or vinegar and then defleshed and wrapped in animal skins (Brown 1981; Finucane 1981; Weiss-Krejci 2001; 2005). Three people in the sample of 868 individuals had received this treatment.

An additional selection of processed nobles, bishops, kings and queens from various other European dynasties as detailed in Figure 10.1 shows that excarnation was the preferred treatment for individuals who had died far from their homeland and in the Mediterranean region. Evisceration was used for transport over shorter distances. The map includes two excarnated Babenbergs (Frederick I, † 1198 and Leopold VI, † 1230), two eviscerated people affiliated with the Babenbergs (Emperor Conrad II, † 1039 and Empress Gisela, † 1043), one excarnated Habsburg (Rudolph IV, † 1365) and two eviscerated Habsburgs (Queen Anna, † 1281 and Emperor Frederick III/V, † 1493).

Duke Frederick I died on a Crusade during April 1198. His excarnated skeleton (Figure 10.2) was brought to the monastery of Heiligenkreuz in Austria where it still rests today (Niemetz 1974; Lechner 1976, 193). Queen Anna (alias Gertrud), the founding ancestress of the House of Habsburg who died in Vienna in February 1281, was transported over a much shorter distance. Her corpse was first eviscerated and filled with sand and ash and it was then wrapped within a wax-soaked cloth and dressed in a silk gown. The body of the embalmed queen travelled 600 km to Basel where it was buried at the cathedral within 32 days (Schäfer 1920, 482; Gut 1999, 100). When Queen Anna’s grave was opened in AD 1762 her corpse was found to have been partially mummified (see Figure 10.2).

Both excarnation and evisceration were banned by the pope in AD 1299 and again in AD 1300. In the aftermath of the ban alternative body processing techniques were sought. Henry VII from the House of Luxembourg was roasted over a fire in AD 1313. When the sarcophagus was opened in AD 1727 the bones were found to exhibit signs of burning (Meyer 2000, 55). Privileges were also granted by the pope, for example, to Philip the Fair in AD 1305 who was allowed to have his body treated as he wished (Brown 1981, 256). The pope’s ban made body processing an even more desirable practice and a sure sign of status and distinction. Excarnation went out of fashion in the fifteenth century, but evisceration remained a popular practice among people of noble descent up until the twentieth century. In the House of Habsburg-Lorraine it was regularly practiced until AD 1878, and was then revived in 1922 (death of Emperor Karl I) and 1989 (death of Empress Zita) (Weiss-Krejci 2001; 2005).

Cremation of the corpse was construed as destructive to the soul and was considered to be highly improper (Finucane 1981). The ideology regarding cremation is the reason for the development of excarnation. Cremation is still unpopular among Roman Catholics to this very day. Only one person in the sample was cremated, and this occurred in 1958 and took place in the USA.

Passive excarnation (temporary storage of corpses) and postfuneral relocation (exhumation and reburial) were also very frequent in the sample (see Weiss-Krejci 2001; 2004; 2005 for details).
Location of Burial Place
The proper deposition places for members of aristocratic houses were ceremonial structures such as cathedrals, churches, monasteries, convents or castle churches. The dead were deposited in wooden, stone or metal monuments and buried in front of the altars, in side chapels, or within subterranean crypts (Vocelka and Heller 1997; Jahn 2001; Weiss-Krejci 2004; see also Boase 1972; Binski 1996; Störmer 1980 for other areas of Europe). Burial in a churchyard would have been considered highly improper for a member of a dynasty. The few graveyard burials in the sample either belong to morganatic spouses from the nineteenth and twentieth century, to infants, or to members of the House of Habsburg-Lorraine who had died after the abolishment of the monarchy in 1918.

Association of Individuals
The majority of people were buried or reburied with close relatives (i.e. patrilineal blood relatives and affinal house members) in collective burial vaults. Few individuals were buried with distant relatives and even fewer alone and away from other members of the dynasty. Burial with matrilineal relatives (e.g. the parents or grandparents of the mother), other non-dynasty members, or people of lower status was very rare (see Weiss-Krejci 2004). As in many other areas of the world where collective burial is practiced the mixing of unrelated people and people of unequal rank was regarded as improper (Waterson 1995, 210; Hutchinson and Aragon 2002, 32). Within the 15 House of Habsburg generations (AD 1273–1740) no adult non-dynasty member was ever buried in a Habsburg vault. In the House of Habsburg-Lorraine (AD 1740–1918) a few exceptions were made (see Weiss-Krejci 2004, 387–8).

Deviant Burial
From the sample of 868 individuals I have selected 221 people who stand out either because of circumstances surrounding their death, because of their ideological or political positions or because of their young age. I have separated them into three groups (Table 10.2) and compared the characteristics of their burials with the burial norms of the overall sample:

1. Unusual death is a characteristic of men who died during war expeditions (a), men who were killed in battle (b), people who died from communicable diseases (c), women who died in childbirth (d), and victims of accidents (e), suicide (f), and murder (g).
2. ‘Social deviants’ are defined as people who suffered political prosecution and were executed (h) and outlaws (i). Since members of the Babenberg and Habsburg Dynasties were Roman Catholic, excommunicated people (j) and non-Catholics (k) also belong in this group.
3. Children who died younger than five years of age are included in the third group. Some of these individuals were premature (l) or stillborn (m). The exact age for seven children of the Babenberg Dynasty (q) is not known.

A few individuals who contracted morganatic marriages and were buried away from their dynasty together with their spouses have been omitted from Table 10.2. Table 10.2 also
Figure 10.1. The relationship between place of death, transport distance and the treatment of the corpse from the ninth to the fifteenth century. The arrows point from the place of death to the place of burial.

**Eviscerated:** Emperor Charles II the Bald († 877); Emperor Otto I († 973); Walthardis, Archbishop of Magdeburg († 1012); Emperor Conrad II († 1039); Empress Gisela († 1043); Emperor Henry III († 1056); Emperor Henry IV († 1106); Robert of Abrissel († 1117); Emperor Henry V († 1125); Henry I, King of England († 1135); Albero, Archbishop of Trier († 1152); Richard I the Lion-hearted, King of England († 1199); Wenceslas I of Bohemia († 1253); Queen Anna († 1281); Charles I of Anjou, King of Naples and Sicily († 1285); Philip IV, King of France († 1314); Jean II, King of France († 1364); Emperor Frederick III/V († 1493).

**Excarnated:** Emperor Lothar II of Supplingenburg († 1137); Ekbert III, Count of Puntten († 1158); Frederick of Berg-Altena, Archbishop of Cologne († 1158); Henry, Bishop of Liege († 1164); Adolf II, Count of Holstein († 1164); Rainald of Dassel, Archbishop of Cologne († 1167); Frederick of Rothenburg, Duke of Swabia († 1167); Daniel, Bishop of Prague († 1167); Welf VII, Duke of Spoleto († 1167); Emperor Frederick I Barbarossa († 1190); Ludwig III, Landgrave of Thuringia († 1190); Conrad, Duke of Bohemia and Moravia († 1191); Philip of Heinsberg, Archbishop of Cologne († 1191); Frederick I, Duke of Austria († 1198); Hademar II († 1217); Luitold, Count of Plauen († 1219); Ludwig IV, Landgrave of Thuringia († 1227); Leopold VI, Duke of Austria and Styria († 1230); Louis IX the Saint, King of France († 1270); Isabelle, Queen of France († 1271); Alfonso of Poitiers († 1271); Henry of Almain († 1271); Pierre, son of Louis IX († 1283); Philip III, King of France († 1285); Rudolph, Archbishop of Salzburg († 1290); Ludwig III, Duke of Bavaria († 1294); Hermann, Count of Gleichen († 1345); Rudolph IV, Duke of Austria († 1365).
Figure 10.2. (A) – The excarnated skeleton of Duke Frederick I († 1198) in grave VIII of the chapter house at the monastery of Heiligenkreuz, Austria. The drawing was made by Salomon Kleiner in 1739 and engraved by Georg Nicolai (Gerbert et al. 1772, 4/2, plate VI). (B) – The mummified corpse of Queen Anna († 1281) at Basel Cathedral, Switzerland; drawn and engraved by Johann Baptist Haas (Gerbert et al. 1772, 4/2, plate II).

shows that the number of Babenbergs and Habsburgs in the group ‘Unusual Death’, especially categories (a), (b), (f) and (g), and in the group of ‘Social Deviants’ is rather low. In order to better understand the relationship between ‘deviants’ and mortuary behaviour I have tried to increase my sample size. I have found 36 members of European dynasties who are not related to the Babenberg or Habsburg Dynasty but fit into one of the two groups [categories (a), (b), (g), (h), and (j)]. I added them on to the sample, which brings the total number up to 257. Among them are 20 Medieval kings and nobles who died during war expeditions (a) (e.g. Frederick Barbarossa † 1190), seven who died in battle (b) (e.g. Richard the Lion-hearted † 1199) and two who were murdered (g) (Archbishop Engelbert † 1225 and Henry of Almain † 1271). Five individuals were executed (h) (among them Mary, Queen of the Scots † 1587 and Tsar Nicholas II † 1918) and two individuals who were excommunicated (j) (Louis the Bavarian † 1347 and Emperor Henry IV † 1106).

Every individual in the list of 257 was only counted once. In some instances, multiple categories apply to one person and I have chosen the variable, which I consider most significant. Henrietta of Nassau-Weilburg died from scarlet fever, for example, but she also was a Protestant. The deviant burial treatment in her case was due to her having been a Protestant, not the fact that she died of a communicable disease. As such, Henrietta is counted in Category (k) of Table 10.2, and omitted from Category (c). Frederick Barbarossa drowned during the Crusades and was excarnated because his remains needed to be transported. As such, he is listed under Category (a), as a victim of a war expedition, and not as a victim of an accident [Category (e)].
Results

The investigation revealed that individuals in some of these categories did receive differential treatment in death, whereas others did not.

Unusual Death

The circumstances of death did influence the treatment of individuals who died during war expeditions (a), in battle (b), who died, or were believed to have died, from communicable diseases (c) and were murdered (g).

War Expeditions (a) and Death in Battle (b)

Since the locations of wars (especially during the Crusades), and the warrior’s homeland
and burial place were usually distant from each other, it was necessary for corpses to be processed for transport. Of 38 individuals who died during war expeditions or directly in battle (Table 10.2), 26 were boiled and defleshed, four were eviscerated, two were not eviscerated, and the treatment of six is unknown. Excarnation would appear to have been the proper treatment for high ranking persons who had died during a Crusade. All eleven Crusaders in the sample were excarnated. The corpse of Emperor Frederick Barbarossa, who drowned in Seleucia during the Third Crusade in AD 1190, was boiled and defleshed but subsequently lost somewhere in Palestine, probably at Acre (Prutz 1879, 30–3). His burial spot at Speyer Cathedral was occupied by Rudolph of Habsburg 100 years later (Klimm 1953, 55). Count Hermann of Gleichen died in AD 1345 in Nuremberg on his way back from the Holy Land (Schäfer 1920, 490). Despite the comparably low transport distance from Nuremberg to Erfurt, he was excarnated probably because he had died during a Crusade.

King Richard I, the Lion-hearted, was also a Crusader. His death at the siege of Chalus in AD 1199, however, was unrelated to the Crusades. He was not excarnated but eviscerated; his entrails, blood and brain were buried at Charroux, his heart at Rouen and his corpse at the abbey of Fontevrault (Giesey 1960, 20).

Don John of Austria, also known as Don Juan d’Austria, Governor General of the Netherlands and illegitimate son of Emperor Charles V with a woman from Regensburg, was eviscerated and cut into pieces. He died in AD 1578 during the war against William of Orange, most likely from typhus, although the cause of his death has been a matter of great speculation. His entrails and corpse were buried at Namur Cathedral with great pomp. In the year following the funeral the body was exhumed by order of his brother Philip II for removal to Spain. Because of the political conditions at the time it was decided to smuggle the body through France. In order to keep the transport secret, the corpse was disarticulated at the joints and packed into three leather bags, which were carried on the pack saddle of a horse (Petrie 1967, 326–8). The portions of the corpse were reassembled in Spain and Don John of Austria was buried in the dynastic vault of the Spanish branch of the House of Habsburg at El Escorial (Martínez Cuesta 1992). John’s corpse was of interest to many parties and its fate can be considered to be directly related to his special status and political significance. He was the victorious commander of the Holy League and winner of the Battle of Lepanto in AD 1571, which saved Italy from the Turks. He was a native of Germany, the brother of the King of Spain and Governor of the Low Countries, but he was also the enemy of William of Orange and his allies.

Communicable Diseases (c)

The most common diseases in the sample are smallpox, tuberculosis, plague, influenza and typhus. They caused the death of 30 individuals. Those individuals who died from these diseases during war expeditions [Category (a)] are not included in this count. In the group of 30 disease victims, eleven individuals were eviscerated, nine were not eviscerated and the treatment of the rest is unknown. The eleven eviscerated individuals had died from
smallpox (n=6), tuberculosis (n=3), typhus and influenza. Of the nine untreated individuals three had died from smallpox, three from tuberculosis, two were suspected to have died from plague and one is known to have died from influenza.

Two smallpox victims did not lie in state as usual because of the disease (Hawlik-van de Water 1989, 68). One was Maria Josefa, the 16 year old daughter of Emperor Leopold I who died in AD 1703, and the other was the young King Ferdinand IV († 1654). Both individuals had been eviscerated.

For the two suspected plague victims, Bohemian and Hungarian King Ladislas Postumus († 1457) and Duke Albert VI of Austria († 1463), there exists a direct relationship between mortuary treatment and the suspected cause of death. The doctors refused to eviscerate the corpse of Ladislas Postumus († 1457) although this was customary in Bohemia at that time (Bláhova 1997, 104). Duke Albert VI of Austria († 1463), who was also not eviscerated, was stored in a plague pit and later reburied (Mraz 1988, 43; Weiss-Krejci 2001; 2005). Such fear of the plague had not existed 300 years earlier. When the plague broke out in Frederick Barbarossa’s army in Rome in the summer of AD 1167 six bishops and four dukes [in Category (a)] were eviscerated and also boiled and stripped of flesh (Schäfer 1920, 483).

**Death during Pregnancy and Childbirth (d)**

Five women died because of complications during pregnancy and 21 during, or shortly after, childbirth (Table 10.2). Ten women died together with their babies, while 12 babies (ten singletons plus a pair of twins) survived the death of their mothers. In the sample child bearing appears to have been a more frequent cause of death from the end of the fifteenth century onwards. Since this is the time of the development of medical sciences and breakthroughs in anatomy (Bergdolt 2000, 100) I would suggest that these deaths were directly caused by the doctors who – after dissecting bodies – caused infections in the women as a result of their unwashed hands.

In this group no relationship exists between the cause of death, the kind of treatment afforded to the corpse and the choice of burial location. When mothers and babies died together they were buried either in the same coffin or within the same monument or vault (Figure 10.3). It should be noted, however, that the presence of a woman and child in one monument does not always indicate simultaneous death. Queen Anna (see Figure 10.2) shared a grave at Basel Cathedral, for example, with her six month old son Karl who had died five years previously (Gut 1999).

**Accidents (e)**

Sixteen people, 13 of them male, had died as a result of accidents. The most frequent reasons for death were hunting accidents (n=4), riding accidents (n=4) and accidents involving a carriage (n=2). Other fatal accidents had been caused by an arrow (which went astray), a dress (which caught fire from a cigarette), drowning, a joust, a fall from a tree, and an explosion. As far as I can tell death as a result of an accident did not result in deviant mortuary treatment.
Suicide (f)
The only person in the sample to have committed suicide was Crown Prince Rudolph, the only son of Emperor Franz Joseph and Empress Elizabeth. Rudolph shot his lover, the 17 year old Baroness Mary Vetsera, before shooting himself in the head in Mayerling in AD 1889. The whole affair was covered up by the Habsburg court. Rudolph received a Christian funeral and was deposited in the Habsburg dynastic burial place, the Capuchin Vault in Vienna (Hawlik-van de Water 1993, 301–3).

Murder Victims (g)
Eleven people had been murdered (stabbed, shot and decapitated), and two additional individuals (Medieval) were possibly poisoned. The most famous and best documented murder cases are the shooting of Archduke Franz Ferdinand and his wife Sophie in Sarajevo in AD 1914, the stabbing of Empress Elizabeth in Geneva in AD 1898, the killing of King Albert
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I by his nephew John in AD 1308, the murder of Henry of Almain, the son of Richard of Cornwall in AD 1271, the decapitation of Mary of Brabant by her jealous husband in AD 1256, and the murder of Engelbert, Archbishop of Cologne in AD 1225.

The burials of Empress Elizabeth, Archduke Ferdinand and Sophie followed the norm. The corpses were not eviscerated because this was no longer fashionable at that time. Elizabeth was laid to rest in the Capuchin Vault in Vienna. Archduke Franz Ferdinand and his wife Sophie were not buried at the Habsburg vault in Vienna, but rather in the castle of Artstetten because of their morganatic marriage (Hawlik-van de Water 1993).

German-Roman King Albert I was assassinated in AD 1308 by his nephew John at Brugg at the Aare. He was probably not eviscerated (Meyer 2000, 211) but instead temporarily buried in close proximity to the location of the murder at the monastery of Wettingen. A year later the family sought permission from the new German-Roman King Henry VII to rebury the corpse at Speyer Cathedral. Speyer was the burial place of the Holy Roman emperors from the Salian and Staufen Dynasties as well as the burial place of Rudolph I, Albert’s father (Klimm 1953). Albert was reburied in a single ceremony along with the preceding German-Roman King Adolph of Nassau whom he had killed in the battle at Göllheim in AD 1298 and who was exhumed from Rosenthal. Since Rudolph I had already taken the last burial spot in the cathedral, Adolph of Nassau was buried in the sarcophagus of Barbarossa’s little daughter and Albert I was interred with Barbarossa’s wife (Meyer 2000, 19–52; Weiss-Krejci 2004, 391).

Henry of Almain was murdered in AD 1271 in Viterbo, Italy. He received the same treatment as all the other Crusaders who had died from other causes. He was eviscerated and defleshed and his bones and heart were returned to England (Bradford 1933, 78; Brown 1981, 232).

As with Albert I, the murder of the Archbishop of Cologne, Engelbert, had a direct impact on the fate of his corpse. While Albert I had been exhumed and reburied one year after death, Engelbert of Cologne was excarnated and displayed. In contrast to most other excarnated individuals (see Figure 10.1), he was neither killed during a Crusade nor killed in southern Europe. After he was murdered by Count Frederick of Isenburg in AD 1225 at Gevelsberg near Cologne, his corpse was first brought to the monastery of Altenberg (seven hours away), where it was eviscerated and filled with myrrh and salt. Then it was publicly exhibited at Saint Peter’s Church in Cologne. Since it was decided to leave the body of evidence unburied for a while, it was subsequently boiled and defleshed (Schäfer 1920, 485).

‘Social Deviants’

Convicted and Executed (b)

Up until the nineteenth century the primary method of execution for members of the aristocracy was decapitation. Seven people had been decapitated (two by the guillotine) – Frederick of Baden and Prince Conradin, the last Staufen, both in AD 1268; Zavis of Falkenstein in AD 1290, Mary, Queen of Scots in AD 1587, Charles I of England, Scotland and Ireland in AD 1649 and Louis XVI and Marie Antoinette, both in AD 1793. The two
latest executed individuals – Maximilian of Mexico in AD 1867 and Tsar Nicholas II in 1918 – had been shot. All of these executions were based on charges of treason.

Maximilian of Mexico was executed in Mexico in June 1867. Six months after the execution his body was disinterred and brought to Trieste on the Austrian frigate Novara and buried in the Capuchin Vault in Vienna in January 1868 (Hawlik-van de Water 1993, 264). Tsar Nicholas II and his family were killed in Yekaterinburg during the night of July 16–17, in 1918, and their remains were hidden in the ground. After the breakdown of the Communist regime, their bodies were exhumed in 1991 and reburied exactly 80 years after death in St. Petersburg. The reburial took place on July 17 1998 in a huge public ceremony in the presence of President Boris Yeltsin (Follath 1998).

Exhumation and reburial is also a characteristic of other corpses in this group. Mary, Queen of the Scots was executed at Fotheringhay Castle in AD 1587 and buried at Peterborough Cathedral. Her body was exhumed 25 years after her death in AD 1612 and reinterred within a pompous monument in Westminster Abbey by the order of her son King James I of England (Carr 1999). King Louis XVI of France was guillotined on January 21 1793; his wife Marie Antoinette suffered the same fate on 16 October 1793. Their bodies were buried at the cemetery of the Madeleine but, when the monarchy was restored, they were exhumed and reburied at St. Denis in AD 1815 (Brown 1985, 255).

The reasons for these exhumations are obvious. The original grave location and the funeral rites of the executed individuals were not proper according to their original status. Through exhumation and reburial at some later point in time the mistake of their improper burial was rectified.

**Outlaw (i)**

John, the posthumous and only son of Rudolph II, was cheated out of his inheritance by his uncle King Albert I and subsequently he decided to kill him in AD 1308 at Brugg at the Aare. The murder, one of the great catastrophes of German history (Honemann 1997, 109), caused the loss of the German-Roman kingship for the House of Habsburg. What made John's crime so special was not the murder – Albert I had also ordered the murder of King Adolph of Nassau – but rather the killing of a patrilineal blood relative. John was soon called *Parricida*, the Parricide, and outlawed in AD 1309 by the newly elected German-Roman King Henry VII. He managed to escape, but died in Italy a few years later (possibly in AD 1313) and was buried at San Niccolo in Pisa (Dienst 1988). John the Parricide is one of the few adult people in the House of Habsburg who was buried in isolation from relatives. No effort was ever made to retrieve his body.

**Excommunication (j)**

One of the most powerful – and therefore frequently used – political instruments that a pope could direct against a ruler who did not follow his orders was excommunication. Such a ban on a person denied the right for burial in consecrated ground and thus seriously endangered the destiny of the soul. Three people died while excommunicated. These were Emperor Henry IV from the Salian Dynasty († 1106); Ottokar II of Bohemia (Przemyslid),
who died in AD 1278 and Louis the Bavarian from the House of Wittelsbach († 1347).

Emperor Henry IV – one of his many crimes against the church was the expulsion of Pope Gregory VII – died excommunicated on 7 August 1106 in Liege. After four weeks his eviscerated corpse was transported to Speyer Cathedral and buried in an unconsecrated side chapel of the cathedral, where he remained for five years. When the ban was lifted, he was reburied on 7 August 1111 beside his father Henry III (Klimm 1957; Ohler 1990, 147).

After the Babenbergs had died out in the male line in AD 1246, Ottokar II the King of Bohemia, ruled over the former Babenberg territory – the duchies of Austria, Styria, Carinthia and Crain – for 26 years. In AD 1273 Rudolph of Habsburg was elected German-Roman king and granted the Babenberg territory by the German electors. Ottokar, who himself had wanted to become the new German-Roman king, rebelled and was excommunicated by the pope. In AD 1278 Ottokar and Rudolph met for a final confrontation in a battle on the Marchfeld near Dürnkrut. Ottokar lost his life and Rudolf became the uncontested ruler of the Austrian lands. After the fight Ottokar's body was eviscerated and his corpse publicly displayed for 30 weeks in Vienna. In AD 1279 Ottokar was buried at Znojmo, but he was exhumed and reburied in St. Vitus Cathedral in Prague in AD 1297, by order of his son (Millauer 1830, 35–8).

Before the fourteenth century excommunication had a direct impact on the fate of the corpse and often caused significant delays between death and final deposition. Dying excommunicated in later times was no longer considered to be as serious. Louis the Bavarian, who died excommunicated in AD 1347, for example, was almost immediately buried in consecrated ground. Many diverging stories exist, however, concerning his burial in Munich (Meyer 2000, 76–87).

Protestant (k)
Several Protestant women married into the Habsburg Dynasty. All but one converted to Roman Catholicism. The one notorious exception is Henrietta of Nassau-Weilburg, wife of Archduke Karl. Although Henrietta was very popular among the Austrian population – she introduced the Christmas tree in Vienna (Hawlik-van de Water 1993, 260) – her confession created a problem when she died in AD 1829. Though her corpse was buried according to the norm, i.e. in the Habsburg vault in Vienna by order of her brother in law, Austrian emperor Francis I (Timmermann 1996, 137), her entrails were not deposited in the proper location. When Henrietta died it was still a custom to bury the hearts at the Augustinian church in Vienna and the intestines at St. Stephen's, Vienna. Henrietta’s heart and intestinal urns instead were deposited in the Capuchin Vault beside her coffin (Wolfsgruber 1887, 293).

Small Children
Babenberg
The Medieval records regarding children of the Babenberg Dynasty are incomplete. There were only seven dead children – all belonging to Leopold III – listed in the entire Baben-
berg genealogy [Table 10.2; Category (q)]. The seven infants were probably all buried at Klosterneuburg in Lower Austria, the foundation and later burial place of their father. Since other Babenbergs probably had lost children too, but these are missing from the record, it is impossible to evaluate child mortality or mortuary behavior concerning children in this dynasty.

Habsburg and Habsburg-Lorraine

In the House of Habsburg child mortality was higher than in the House of Habsburg-Lorraine. Of the 237 blood relatives born into the House of Habsburg 24% died in the first year of life (including premature and stillborn babies), while another 8% perished between the ages of one and four years. In the House of Habsburg-Lorraine only 8% died in their first year, whereas 9% perished between the ages of one and four years.

Children were treated differently than adults. No child was excarnated; only 19 were eviscerated. The earliest evisceration of a child took place in AD 1629 (a two-year old), the last in AD 1855. All eviscerated children had lived for at least a few weeks. While the internal organs of adults at that time were buried in two containers – one for the heart and another for the intestines – and in separate locations in Vienna (hearts at the Augustinian Church, intestines at St. Stephen’s), the internal organs of six very small children were each buried within single urns at St. Stephen’s. If a child’s heart and intestines were enclosed in two urns, they were – with a few exceptions – also buried only at St. Stephen’s.

Official mourning ceremonies for children were also much simpler and shorter than for older persons (the borderline was the age of 12 years). Exceptions were made when the child was an important heir to the throne and the only surviving male heir. Leopold Johann, for example, was only seven months old when he died in AD 1716. Since he was the only son of Emperor Charles VI and the last descendent in the male line, a different protocol was followed. As was customary at that time also for children the corpse was eviscerated and laid in state for a few hours. However, a funeral conduct – much larger than usual – which consisted of priests, courtly personnel, and knights from the Order of the Golden Fleece accompanied the body to the Capuchin Vault. Additionally, 23 years later Charles VI commissioned a pompous tin coffin for the corpse of his little son (Hawlik-van de Water 1989, 99–107).

Sources from the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries also show that babies were usually baptised within the first days of life, either by midwives or by a priest. A six-month old live foetus was cut out of the corpse of the deceased Empress Maria Anna in AD 1646. The child was baptised before it died (Wolfsgruber 1887, 94).

In contrast to the House of Habsburg-Lorraine, burial locations for children are very diverse in the House of Habsburg. In the House of Habsburg-Lorraine almost all children were buried in dynastic family crypts and with close patrilineal relatives in Austria, Hungary and Italy (Vienna, Budapest, Florence and Modena). One baby († 1911) was buried in a graveyard in Bad Ischl, the emperor’s summer residence. In the House of Habsburg children were buried all over Europe and in all manner of combinations – with adults or
with other children; with close patrilineal relatives or with distant relatives. This behaviour is a direct result of the political conditions and geographical extension of the Habsburg territory from the fourteenth to the early eighteenth century. As a result of travels through the vast empire, children often died a long way from their home. Whereas adults were either transported immediately to their burial place or temporarily stored and transported later, deceased infants (as well as adolescents and sometimes even young unmarried adults) were usually interred within the most convenient available crypt. Of 76 children younger than five years in the Habsburg sample 28 (37%) had been buried in the city where they had died and an additional 18 (24%) were transported only between 20 km and 40 km for burial. Only six individuals (8%) were transported more than 40 km for burial. The maximum transport distance for a child younger than five years is 180 km. However, this child was transported with the mother. For the remaining 24 (31%) children of the Habsburg sample the location of death or burial, and thus transport distance, is unknown (see Weiss-Krejci 2004 for House of Habsburg statistics including older children and adolescents).

The transport distance of children’s remains is higher in the House of Habsburg-Lorraine. Of 36 children from the House of Habsburg-Lorraine who died younger than five years, eleven (31%) were transported long-distance between 80 km and 380 km. The remaining 25 (69%) individuals were buried at, or close to, the place of death.

In order to avoid the long-distance transport of the remains of a small child, some older Habsburg vaults had to be reopened. The crypt at St. Stephen’s Cathedral in Vienna for example, which was used by Habsburg generations four to seven and was out of use since AD 1463, was reopened in AD 1552, 1564 and 1566 to receive the corpses of three infants of Emperor Maximilian II from generation eleven. These children, who had died during visits of the royal family to Vienna, were buried at the entrance of the crypt (Weiss-Krejci 2001, 773). In other instances children were buried alone and away from the dynasty. Five young children from the second marriage of Styrian Duke Ernest († 1424) were buried in the cathedral of the residential city Wiener Neustadt between AD 1421 and 1432. Their father and his first wife († 1407) were buried at the monastery of Rein (Lein 1978), while their mother, Cimburgis of Masovia († 1429), rests at the Babenberg foundation in Lilienfeld (Lein 1978; Jahn 2001).

The monastery of Tulln, a foundation of Rudolph of Habsburg, was also only used for children. No adult from the dynasty was ever buried in this city. A monument in front of the altar steps (Figure 10.4) holds the remains of approximately 16 infants (Lein 1978, 7). These are patrilineal as well as matrilineal grandchildren and great grandchildren of the founder.

If no patrilineal contemporary tomb was available a child or adolescent could also be buried in the dynastic vault of matrilineal relatives. This did not happen with any subadult patrilineal blood relatives of the Habsburg Dynasty, but it explains why several non-dynasty members – i.e. children of Habsburg-born women – were buried in Habsburg tombs. The permission for burial was granted through this connection of blood in the female line (Weiss-Krejci 2004).
The Deviant Burial of Maximilian I

Differential treatment of the death has also occurred for other reasons, for example penitence (see Holloway, this volume). One example is the burial of Emperor Maximilian I who died in Wels, Austria, in January 1519 (Figure 10.5). He gave very specific instructions for his funerary treatment. He did not want his body to be opened; his hair should be cut off and his teeth knocked out and buried in the graveyard of Wels together with burning coals. His body was to be whipped and covered with lime and ash, wrapped in a bag of coarse linen, covered with bags of fine linen, white silk and damask and publicly displayed to show the perishableness of all earthly glory. The opening of Maximilian’s coffin in Wiener Neustadt in both AD 1573 and 1770 confirm the historic accounts of his mortuary treatment. The corpse was covered with lime and all teeth but one were missing. Beside the skeleton several twig whips were encountered (Schmid 1997, 203).

Final Remarks

The investigation had shown that in some instances there exists a relationship between differential life, death and mortuary treatment. High ranking persons who had died during a Crusade were usually defleshed; other warriors were either defleshed or eviscerated in order to be transported home. People who died from plague in the fifteenth century were not eviscerated. The bodies of murdered, executed and excommunicated individuals have been used by survivors for political purposes and therefore were exhumed and reburied in pompous ceremonies. Finally children were buried close to their place of death, and sometimes – at least in pre-industrial times – away from their parents and together with distant relatives or other related children.
The study also shows that deviant treatment of the corpse can sometimes happen to persons who are the opposite of criminals or misfits. Both the mutilated Don John of Austria and the tortured Maximilian I, for example, were people of tremendous political significance and their deviant treatment is a sign of high and very special status.

Despite a certain relationship between deviant life, death and burial, without historic sources it is quite difficult for an archaeologist to understand why an individual was treated in a certain way. In this sample travellers and pilgrims who died a long way from home were also defleshed in order to be transported home. The remains of some were stored for later exhumation and reburial. Exhumation and reburial were also practiced for many other reasons. In the past investigation of 868 Babenberg and Habsburg burials (Weiss-Krejei 2001) I have shown that at least 40% of the entire sample had been tampered with. Coffins have been opened, bones have been relocated either within buildings, from one building to another, or between towns and even distant countries. The reasons for these frequent manipulations of the dead body are manifold and include territorial shifts, reconstruction of buildings, warfare, etc. They are not necessarily related to the lives or deaths of the deceased.
Every individual in this sample has his/her own story and exceptions from the norm are always possible. This investigation proves that deviant life and deviant death does have an effect on treatment and deposition of the corpse, but in the absence of historic records it is highly recommended that the interpretation of any deviant burial is undertaken in a cautious manner.
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