

Dukes of Mödling: Cadet Branch of the Babenbergs¹

Tomáš Ekrt²

The author in this paper presents the history of the cadet branch of the House of Babenberg, the so-called dukes of Mödling. Within this study are introduced their lives, especially the life of Henry I, who is represented in contemporary sources most, and that of his son Henry II. Also, the author tried to fill in some gaps in their lives through the method of comparison – mostly with the contemporary member of the Přemyslids called Theobald I. Attention is also paid to estates owned by the cadet branch and to its court. As an appendix of the study, a list of known estates with a reference to the documents, in which they were mentioned, is presented.

[Middle Ages; Babenberg Dynasty; Austria; Cadet Branch; Mödling; Estates]

The cadet branch of the Babenberg dynasty, which is more widely known as the dukes of Mödling (in German *Herzogen von Mödling*) is, in my opinion, a neglected topic by historians. Last study concerning this dynasty was written by Franz Gall in 1954.³ Even though members of this cadet branch are mentioned in many books, historians did not pay a larger attention to them. Usually, they just referenced Gall's study.⁴ Member

¹ This paper is based on a part of my master's thesis: The second one, less important? – Comparison of the cadet branches of sovereign dynasties in Central Europe, which I completed at the Institute of Czech History at the Faculty of Arts Charles University, Prague in the year 2021.

² Institute of Czech history, Faculty of Arts, Charles University, Prague; ekrtomas@seznam.cz.

³ F. GALL, 'Die Herzoge' von Mödling, in: *Archiv für österreichische Geschichte*, 120, 1954, pp. 3–44.

⁴ Short excurses occurred in publications about the Babenberg dynasty such as: K. LECHNER, *Die Babenberger. Markgrafen und Herzoge von Österreich 976–1246*, Wien, Köln, Weimar 1976 or G. SCHEIBELREILER, *Die Babenberger. Reichsfürsten und Landesherren*, Wien, Köln, Weimar 2010. A short study dedicated to relations between Henry I and his brother Leopold occurred in: J. R. LYON, *Princely Brothers and Sisters: The Sibling Bond in German Politics, 1100–1250*, Ithaca, London 2013, pp. 124–125. Also, a short

of this cadet branch, Henry I, played a significant role in the history of central Europe in the second half of the 12th century. While his wife was daughter of the second king of Bohemia, Vladislaus II, Henry and his son were also great patrons of the arts in the first half of the 13th century. That bids a question, why almost nobody paid attention to them? Among possible explanations might be the lack of historical sources, the fact that only two generations of this cadet branch existed or the aforementioned study by Franz Gall, which by its extent made another research pointless.

However, the problem with Gall's study is that it was written before the collection of Babenberg documents was completed.⁵ This makes referencing certain documents complicated for historians. Because of that, and of the fact that this topic has not been a focus of any serious research in a long time, I have decided to write this paper. I would like to present the lives of Henry I and his son Henry II using a method of comparison to fill in the blanks in their lives. Then I would like to focus on estates owned by this cadet branch and its court while providing a list of those estates accompanied by references to new collections of documents. I would also like to show, what the relations between this cadet branch and their ruling relatives looked like. In this study, I would like to answer a question, if Henry I and his son Henry II were capable of being the second ones or if their relations with their ruling relatives were more complicated.

Henry I

*"Heinricus frater Luipoldi nascitur, filius Heinrici ducis Austriae."*⁶ This short sentence, written by an anonymous monk from Klosterneuburg Abbey and inserted among other events of the year 1158, is informing about the birth

chapter about Henry I and Henry II could be found in: H. SCHARSCHING, *Burg und Herrschaft Mödling. Die Zeit der Babenberger 976–1246*, Weitra 2020, pp. 35–41.

- ⁵ In the time, when study was published, only two volumes of edition of Babenberg's documents were completed. Rest of them were completed later. That edition is *Urkundenbuch zur Geschichte der Babenberger in Österreich* (therefore BUB). H. FICHTENAU – O. von MITIS – L. SANTIFALLER – E. ZÖLLNER (eds.), BUB, Bd. 1, *Die Siegelurkunden der Babenberger bis 1215*, Wien 1950; H. FICHTENAU – O. von MITIS – E. ZÖLLNER (eds.), BUB, Bd. 2, *Die Siegelurkunden der Babenberger und ihrer Nachkommen von 1216 bis 1279*, Wien 1955; F. GALL – O. von MITIS (eds.), BUB, Bd. 3, *Die Siegel der Babenberger*, Wien 1954; H. DIENST – O. von MITIS – E. ZÖLLNER (eds.), BUB, Bd. 4, *Halbband 1*, Wien 1968; H. DIENST – H. HAGENEDER – C. LACKNER – O. von MITIS (eds.), BUB, Bd. 4, *Halbband 2*, Wien 1997.
- ⁶ *Continuatio Claustroneoburgensis secunda* (MGH Scriptores in Folio, Vol. 9), G. H. PERTZ (ed.), Hannover 1851, p. 615.

of Henry I, who is also called the Elder.⁷ He was a second born son of duke of Austria Henry II Jasomirgott and his wife Theodora Komnena. His elder brother and heir to the duchy named Leopold, was born previous year.⁸ This short age gap played an important role during the life of Henry I.

At the time of Henry's birth, his father Henry II Jasomirgott was at least forty years old and lived a turbulent life. Henry II Jasomirgott was the eldest son of the margrave of the Bavarian Eastern March and was not meant to become the ruler of his family domain. That privilege was meant for his younger brother Leopold. Instead, he received his mother's estates in the Rhineland and in the year 1140 was made the Count Palatine of the Rhine by the king Conrad III.⁹ This favour by the ruler of the Holy Roman Empire was not a random act. Conrad III was a half-brother of Henry II and his siblings. This kinship was also useful for Henry's younger brother Leopold IV, who received from the king the Duchy of Bavaria.¹⁰ It is not the point of this paper to discuss, why Henry II did not receive his family's domain. However, let's just mention that when Henry's father died, Henry probably received a part of the patrimony – most likely the region around Mödling.¹¹ However, he did not remain the count of Palatine for long. In 1141 suddenly his younger brother Leopold died without an heir and Henry II inherited the Duchy of Bavaria and the Bavarian Eastern March. However, he had to give up his position in the Palatinate. Even though, Henry was still one of the most powerful persons in the Holy Roman Empire. Yet, nothing last forever. Bavaria was formerly ruled by the House of Welf. Conrad III, to accommodate Leopold IV, took this duchy from them and gave it to the Babenbergs. Members of the house of Welf never reconciled with that loss. Also, position of Henry II in the duchy was not so strong. The conflict over the duchy which was also part of the conflict between the House of Welf and the Hohenstaufen Dynasty, is not the topic of this paper. Important for this study is that in 1156, Henry II had to give up the duchy of Bavaria. On the other hand, he received the so called *Privilegium minus* from emperor Frederick Barbarossa. This document elevated the Bavarian Eastern March sometimes called the

⁷ This is due to his son, whose name was also Henry and is usually called the second or the Younger.

⁸ *Continuatio Claustroneoburgensis secunda*, p. 615.

⁹ About this period of his life: H. HANKO, *Herzog Heinrich II. – Jasomirgott: Pfalzgraf bei Rhein – Herzog von Bayern – Herzog von Österreich*, Darmstadt 2012, pp. 48–51.

¹⁰ LECHNER, pp. 145–146.

¹¹ HANKO, p. 40.

march of Austria, to a duchy, which was given as an inheritable fief to the Babenbergers. This elevation also meant that the duke of Bavaria was no longer an overlord of the Babenberg Dynasty.¹² For this paper is important that even at the time, when the document was issued, on 17th September 1156, Henry II was still without a male heir. His firstborn son, Leopold, was born the following year. However, as some historians presume, his wife, who was also mentioned in the document, was pregnant at the time.¹³ Why it is important for this study? Because it could help to discover when Henry was born.

Henry first appears in a historical document in 1158, in the donation of his father for Schottenstift monastery. It is mentioned that this donation occurred with consent of duke's wife Theodora and their children Leopold, Henry and Agnes.¹⁴ However, the document is not dated and could only be used as a confirmation of information from the annals. On the other hand, if Theodora was pregnant on the September 17, 1156, Leopold was most likely born in the first half of the year 1157. In that case, Henry would probably be born in the first half of the year 1158. This is only an assumption, however, biologically this scenario is possible. Also, it's important to mention, why was Henry, who was only a few months or days old, mentioned in this document. Certainly, the document was not created with his consent. The reference to Leopold and Henry could have been used to help in securing their smooth succession in case, should anything happen to their father, when they were still underage. This reference was most likely made due to age of Henry II Jasomirgott.¹⁵

It is impossible to say, what Henry's childhood looked like. Probably, it was not different from childhood of other members of sovereign

¹² W. POHL – B. VACHA, *Die Welt der Babenberger: Schleier, Kreuz und Schwert*, Graz, Wien, Köln 1995, pp. 152–155. More about the document: H. APPELT, *Privilegium minus: das staufische Kaisertum und die Babenberger in Österreich*, Wien 1973.

¹³ SCHEIBELREILER, p. 212. That's also why some historians believe she was mentioned in the document – to secure her position as a regent in the case that Henry would die, and his sons were still underage.

¹⁴ BUB, Bd. 1, No. 27, pp. 36–40.

¹⁵ However, this reference could also express support of whole family to the monastery, which was established by Henry II Jasomirgott in 1155 and which in future became place, where he was buried. It is also possible that all family members were mentioned upon request of the recipient of this document, who believed, that this could provide him with their future support.

dynasties at that time.¹⁶ Henry was most likely raised with his older brother. Maybe their common childhood and short age gap made them very close. However, this is still only a speculation. At this time, Henry was twice mentioned in historical documents. First in 1161 in two documents of his father for Schottenstift,¹⁷ then in 1168 in the document addressed to the citizens of Nymburch.¹⁸ Again, both documents emphasized, that they were created with confirmation from Leopold and Henry. However, these mentions do not mean that Henry was at that time active in administration of the country. He was mentioned alongside his brother by their father, who wanted to secure their position.

Sources did not inform us, what happened with Henry in following years. He is mentioned only once, in a document, which was sealed on March 31, 1171, in Klosterneuburg Abbey. In this document is Henry for the first time stated as a witness of the act.¹⁹ This is important, because it is a prove of Henry's entrance into the political life of the duchy. On the other hand, it does not mean that he was acting freely. He was most likely only witnessing his father's political actions and his rule over the country. From this, he was learning and preparing for a future duty.

The following three years spent Henry probably with his father and older brother by practical education. However, there are no sources, which would inform us how precisely or where he spent these years. Next information about his life is connected to events of 1174. Sources informed us, that in this year, more precisely on the Pentecost of that year, was Henry, together with his older brother, knighted.²⁰ The question is why both deserved to be knighted. In the 12th century it was still usual that knighting occurred before the battle, to boost the morale of the army, or after the battle.²¹ As an example of such knighting could be used the situation of the Bohemian crusaders on the Third Crusade. After the battle against Seljuks in Anatolia, emperor Frederick Barbarossa knighted many Bohemian crusaders, who showed great courage. It is worth mentioning, that most of those men were formally criminals, released by the

¹⁶ To the problematics of childhood in the Middle Ages generally, demonstrated on the case of England: N. ORME, *Medieval Children*, Yale 2003.

¹⁷ BUB, Bd. 1, No. 29, pp. 42–44; No. 31, pp. 45–46.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, No. 36, pp. 50–51.

¹⁹ BUB, Bd. 4, *Halband 1*, No. 840, pp. 175–177.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, No. 845, pp. 179–180.

²¹ J. FLORI, *Rytíři a rytířství ve středověku*, Praha 2008, p. 73.

Bohemian duke only to be sent on the Crusade.²² Is it then possible that in 1174 Henry received his first combat experience? Most likely not. Henry's and Leopold's knighting was only a part of celebrations connected to the marriage of Leopold with daughter of Géza II Helena. Why could it relate to this event? Because it occurred on the same day. In the High Middle Ages old tradition of battlefield knighting partly receded into the background to ceremonial knighting connected with a significant event, such as marriage.²³ However, important for this paper is not why was Henry knighted, but that he was knighted together with his brother. This showed us, that both brothers were educated together and their position within the family was very similar.

What happened with Henry after the knighting is uncertain. Historians are not sure, if he was present at the turn of June and July at the court of Frederick Barbarossa, where his brother paid homage to the emperor and received the duchy of Austria as a fief.²⁴ However, that does not matter, because Henry played an important role in the events of the next year. Austrian source informed that in 1175 Bohemian Duke Soběslav II conspired with vassals of an underage margrave of Styria against Henry II Jasomirgott.²⁵ The reason for this "conspiracy" was Weitraer Gebiet, area on the border of the duchies of Bohemia and Austria. The problem was the border itself. In the Middle Ages there were no strict borders like today. Borderline ran in the case of Bohemia in the middle of border forests. When on Austrian side began the colonization and the forest was from their side cut down, borderline moved into the middle of the new forest.²⁶ Bohemian duke was not happy with that situation. He was losing his land and decided to act. This dispute did not immediately escalate into a war. Gerlach in his chronicle even mentions some sort

²² K. WETZKY, *Bůh tomu chce: Češi a Moravané na 3. křížové výpravě do svaté země*, Brno 1998, p. 113.

²³ FLORI, p. 73.

²⁴ BUB, Bd. 4, *Halband* 1, No. 846, p. 179–180.

²⁵ *Continuatio Zwetlensis Altera*, (MGH Scriptorum in Folio, Vol. 9), G. H. PERTZ (ed.), Hannover 1851, p. 541. On the other hand, *Continuatio Claustro-neoburgensis* emphasized, that the reason of conflict were borders: *Continuatio Claustro-neoburgensis tertia*, (MGH Scriptorum in Folio, Vol. 9), G. H. PERTZ (ed.), Hannover 1851, pp. 630–631.

²⁶ This is how the reason of conflict is described by Josef Žemlička. J. ŽEMLIČKA, *Čechy v době knížecí (1034–1198)*, Praha 1997, p. 314. Similarly, however with reflection of Austrian sources and explanation of the conspiracy: HANKO, pp. 107–108.

of negotiations. However, they failed, and the only solution was war.²⁷

During the harvest time of 1176 Bohemian Duke Soběslav II, accompanied by his relative Conrad II, ruler of Znojmo and Brno, invaded Austria and pillaged the countryside.²⁸ The effect of the invasion was heavy, because it came in the most important part of agricultural season. However, the description of vast “coalition”, as it is described in the annals is most likely only a fiction by the author.²⁹ When Bohemian army left Austria, forces of the Babenbergs attacked Moravia, with Leopold and Henry in command. Brothers pillaged the countryside of southern Moravia and even besieged Znojmo, the ancestral seat of Conrad II. Even though, this siege was unsuccessful and lasted only for one day, brothers inflicted serious damage.³⁰ Realizing that for Henry and Leopold this was most likely their first combat experience, it seems unlikely, that Henry II Jasomirgott let his inexperienced sons lead armies unsupervised. Henry II probably charged some Austrian noble with military experience with supervision over his sons. This was not unusual. For example, when son of Bohemian Duke and King Vladislaus II (I) Frederick led for the first time Bohemian contingent to help emperor Frederick Barbarossa into Italy, he was accompanied by his uncle Theobald I. Inexperienced Frederick was in charge of the contingent, however his uncle stood with him as a supervisor, who could help him not only on the battlefield but also with orientation in the emperor’s court milieu.³¹

Devastation of southern Moravia caused another Bohemian invasion. Bohemian Duke Soběslav II once again pillaged the countryside. According to the Austrian chronicle, this time Bohemian soldiers inflicted absolute devastation.³² However, Babenbergs did not strike back. On January 13, 1177, duke Henry II Jasomirgott died after he fell from his horse and broke his leg. The title of the duke of Austria was passed on to his son

²⁷ *Letopis Jarlocha, opata kláštera milevského*, (Fontes rerum Bohemicarum, Vol. 2), J. EMLER (ed.), Praha 1875, pp. 470–471.

²⁸ *Continuatio Claustro-neoburgensis tertia*, p. 631. See also: *Letopis Jarlocha*, pp. 470–471.

²⁹ Sources mentioned Hungarians, Poles, Bavarians and others. *Continuatio Claustro-neoburgensis tertia*, p. 631.

³⁰ *Continuatio Claustro-neoburgensis secunda*, p. 616. See also: V. NOVOTNÝ, *České dějiny I./II., Od Břetislava I. do Přemysla I.*, Praha 1913, p. 1036. M. WIHODA, *Vladislaus Henry: The Formation of Moravian Identity*, Leiden 2015, p. 30.

³¹ NOVOTNÝ, p. 922. See also: *Letopis Vincencia, kanovníka kostela pražského*, (Fontes rerum Bohemicarum, Vol. 2), J. EMLER (ed.), Praha 1875, p. 452.

³² *Continuatio Claustro-neoburgensis tertia*, p. 631. See also: HANKO, p. 109.

Leopold.³³ Henry, most likely due to some sort of last will of his father, received Mödling and some other estates in the duchy – for example Jedlese, Wolfpassing, Reisenberg and others.³⁴ This inheritance should have undoubtedly quelled Henry's ambitions and secure his loyalty to the dynasty. And it served its purpose. Henry and his son remained for all their lives loyal to their ruling relatives.

Shortly after his father's death, Leopold with Henry's consent dedicated a forest to Heiligenkreuz Abbey to honour the memory of their father.³⁵ However, sources did not inform, what happened with Henry after that. His brother Leopold left the duchy to pay homage to the emperor. Also, as Václav Novotný stated, the duke of Austria wanted to sue Soběslav II.³⁶ Henry, at the same time, most likely remained in the duchy to defend it. There is no evidence about Bohemian invasion into Austria that year. However, border skirmishes could be expected. On the other hand, for Henry's life was more important his brother's mission. It might seem that Leopold's journey was unsuccessful. The emperor was not happy with the actions of Bohemian duke, whom he helped to the ducal throne, but for the time being, he did not intervene.³⁷ Yet, there was one thing Leopold achieved at the emperor's court. The duke of Austria met there his relative Frederick, son of second king of Bohemia Vladislaus II/I. He was forced to leave Bohemia when his uncle Soběslav acceded to the throne. Since then, Frederick was a sworn enemy of Soběslav II and was biding his time at the imperial court waiting to get a revenge.³⁸ Because of that, he must have seemed like a natural ally for the young duke. Alliance between them was soon sealed. Such an alliance was usually confirmed by marriage. Leopold was already married, but his brother was not.

In 1177 Henry married Richeza, daughter of Vladislaus II and sister

³³ *Annales Mellicenses*, (MGH Scriptorum in Folio, Vol. 9), G. H. PERTZ (ed.), Hannover 1851, p. 508. Before he died, old duke donated Heiligenkreuz Abbey with consent of his family. BUB, Bd. 1, No. 45, pp. 61–63.

³⁴ SCHEIBELREILER, p. 230. Complete list of known estates will be presented in the part about estates and court of Henry I and his son.

³⁵ BUB, Bd. 1, No. 51, pp. 67–68.

³⁶ NOVOTNÝ, p. 1042.

³⁷ The emperor had many reasons to be unsatisfied with actions of Soběslav II – for example, incompetence and pillaging of Bohemian auxiliary force and duke's action in Hungarian efforts. The situation of Soběslav II became worse with papal excommunication. Pope excommunicated him because Bohemian soldiers during their Austrian campaign attacked churches. WIHODA, pp. 30–31.

³⁸ To circumstances of his banishment, see: ŽEMLIČKA, pp. 263–264.

of Frederick.³⁹ It was a usual political marriage. On the other hand, it could be presumed, that it was a happy marriage. Why am I so bold to say such a thing? Richeza died in 1182, after five years of marriage. Henry was twenty-four at that time and for the rest of his life, he did not marry. This was unusual. Henry was still young, and his other marriage could be used by his brother Leopold to secure new alliances. This could mean that Henry refused to marry again after Richeza's death because of his undying love. However, it could be said, that sources only did not inform about another wife of Henry. It would be possible considering how often they mention members of this cadet branch. But this is not possible. All members of this Babenberg cadet branch were buried in Heiligenkreuz Abbey.⁴⁰ If there would be another wife, her body would be there. Also, Henry would remember another wife in one of his donations⁴¹ and that did not happen.

Sources did not inform, what was Henry doing in the following years. It is also difficult to say, how the war between Soběslav II and Babenberg brothers continued. It might have turned into border skirmishes; however, it is not certain. Turning point came in 1178, when Frederick Barbarossa gave Bohemia as a fief to Frederick.⁴² In the same year, Frederick's ally Leopold attacked Moravia. Ruler of southern Moravia Conrad II have already switched sides and combined Babenberg's and Conrad's armies besieged Olomouc, which was defended by Soběslav's brother Wenceslaus.⁴³ It is uncertain, if Henry participated in this campaign or if he remained in Austria to take care of the country during his brother absence. Siege of Olomouc failed, and the combined army only pillaged the countryside. Yet, this campaign helped Babenberg cause because, at the same time, Frederick and his followers invaded Bohemia, defeated Soběslav II and seized control over Prague. Even though he still had to fight to maintain his position, the war for Babenbergs ended.⁴⁴ The hostility was officially

³⁹ *Continuatio Zwetlensis Altera*, p. 541.

⁴⁰ To Heiligenkreuz Abbey see: W. RICHTER, *Beiträge zur Geschichte von Heiligenkreuz im Wienerwald 1133–2008*, Heiligenkreuz 2011.

⁴¹ Some donations Henry made for salvation of his wife's soul. For example: BUB, Bd. 1, No. 60, p. 80–81 or BUB, Bd. 4, *Halband 1*, No. 870, p. 193.

⁴² *Letopis Jarlocha*, p. 472.

⁴³ *Continuatio Zwetlensis Altera*, p. 541 or *Letopis Jarlocha*, p. 472.

⁴⁴ Frederick was defeated by Soběslav II near Loděnice in 1179, however Frederick maintained his position in Bohemia and key Prague Castle. Soběslav was finally defeated and in 1179 he left the duchy. See: ŽEMLIČKA, pp. 314–315.

ended by Emperor Frederick Barbarossa, who arbitrated Bohemian and Austrian duke in Magdeburg on the 1st of July 1179.⁴⁵

Henry's life in the following years cannot be reconstructed easily. In the year 1179 he arbitrated dispute between Henry of Hainsbach and Saint Emmeram's Abbey.⁴⁶ Then, in 1180, Henry appeared on the donation for Heiligenkreuz Abbey alongside his brother.⁴⁷ However, this is all, that is possible to say about Henry's life between 1179 and 1182. It could only be presumed, due to the arbitration, that he was charged by Leopold with certain tasks connected with government of the duchy. Remaining time spent Henry most likely at the court of his brother and in Mödling.

On 19th April 1182 Henry's wife Richeza passed away.⁴⁸ The reason of her death is uncertain. It is tempting to connect her death with complications connected with childbirth. However, this is only a hypothesis. Let's just emphasize, that Richeza's death must have affected Henry significantly, as was indicated above. Despite Richeza's death, sources informed us in 1182 one more time about Henry's life. Note from *Liber dativus* of Schottenstift monastery informed, that in the year 1182 Henry of Mödling donated ivory desk, which he brought from Greece to the Abbey.⁴⁹ Does it mean that Henry visited in 1182 Greece, probably on the pilgrimage to the Holy Land? Most likely not. As Austrian historians demonstrated, this information is not true. Such a gift was brought by Leopold, who, in the same year, made pilgrimage into the Holy Land.⁵⁰ So why *Liber dativus* mentioned Henry? That's impossible to say. Perhaps he was planning to visit the Holy land, perhaps the author just made a mistake. Nevertheless, there is still a question, what happened with Henry that year? He most likely remained in the duchy and took care of administration, while his brother was on the pilgrimage.⁵¹

Reconstruction of Henry's life between 1182 and 1189 is a very difficult task for historians. There are only three documents, which mentioned

⁴⁵ BUB, Bd. 4, *Halband 1*, No. 862, pp. 188–190.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, No. 859, p. 187.

⁴⁷ BUB, Bd. 2, No. 480, pp. 346–347.

⁴⁸ BUB, Bd. 4, *Halband 1*, No. 870, p. 193.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, No. 869, pp. 192–193.

⁵⁰ LECHNER, pp. 181–182.

⁵¹ The same thing occurred on Bohemia, when Vladislaus II left for the second crusade, he entrusted administration of the duchy to his younger brother Theobald I. J. DEJMEK, *Děpoltici: K mocenskému postavení a osudům jedné veldejší větve Přemyslovců*, in: *Mediaevalia historica Bohemica*, 1, 1991, p. 95.

him. Two of them are donations of duke Leopold to Heiligenkreuz Abbey from years 1187 and 1188. In both is stated that they were made with consent of Henry.⁵² Then he is mentioned in the document, in which duke of Styria Ottokar IV gives him village Gumpoldskirche.⁵³ That's all the information. It could only be presumed that Henry was still helping his brother, doing some tasks Leopold entrusted him and staying at the duke's court or in Mödling. However, in the year 1190 Henry once again played significant role in the history of medieval Europe.

In 1189 Frederick Barbarossa, accompanied by nobles of the Holy Roman Empire, set out for the Third Crusade. However, Babenbergs and some other nobles, such as Bohemian Duke Conrad II, were not in his retinue. It could be mentioned that their decision was criticized by so-called Ansbert, official chronicler of the emperor's crusade.⁵⁴ However, in 1190 Leopold changed his mind and took the cross. It is not important, why he did it. More interesting is the list of nobles, who accompanied him. "*Erant autem in comitatu illustris ducis Austrie Leupoldi comes Sifridus de Morl et Dietmarus liber et pauci ministrales sui, Ortlebus videlicet de Winchil, Huge de Pucperch, Heinricus de Medlik, [...]* Quorum nullus secum reversus est, sed omnes predicta fatali necessitate dies suos clauserunt preter comitem Sifridum [...]"⁵⁵ There are two reasons why is this note interesting for this paper. Firstly, in the view of the chronicler Henry was just other noblemen of Austrian duke. This could mean that the status of duke of Mödling was at least for foreigners like the status of Austrian nobility. Secondly, chronicler informs about Henry's death. However, this is not truth. Henry I did not die in the Holy Land, he neither die in the 12th century. Duke of Mödling passed away in 1223. Also, while his brother Leopold was in the Holy Land, Henry was in Italy with Henry VI, son of Frederick Barbarossa.⁵⁶ That bids a question, how could chronicler, who was relatively well informed, make such a mistake. The easiest explanation would be to presume that Henry left the duchy in 1190 and in his brother's retinue arrived into the Holy Land. Then upon hearing about the death of Fredrick Barbarossa, he was sent by his brother home to represent Babenbergs on the Henry's VI

⁵² BUB, Bd. 1, No. 68, pp. 92–94; No. 73, pp. 98–100.

⁵³ BUB, Bd. 4, *Halband 1*, No. 879, pp. 197–198.

⁵⁴ *Historia de expeditione Friderici imperatoris (Der sogenannte Ansbert)*, (MGH Scriptores rerum Germanicarum Nova series, Vol 5), A. CHROUST (ed.), Berlin 1928, pp. 22–24.

⁵⁵ *Historia de expeditione*, pp. 97–98.

⁵⁶ He is mentioned as a witness of Henry's VI documents. BUB, Bd. 4, *Halband 1*, No. 900, p. 210; No. 902, p. 211.

imperial campaign to Rome. In that case, it would be possible that the chronicler knew about Henry's participation on the crusade and simply did not notice his departure.

However, that explanation is not possible. Leopold left his duchy in 1190,⁵⁷ however because of weather he had to spend the winter in Zadar. He arrived at the Holy Land in spring of 1191.⁵⁸ Henry was at the same time, more precisely before March 1, in northern Italy, by the side of Henry VI.⁵⁹ So, perhaps it could be presumed that there were two people with same name and title. That does not seem possible. Let's assume that Henry left Austria in 1190 alongside his brother or was preparing for the Crusade. At the same time, news about death of Frederick Barbarossa reached Europe.⁶⁰ The Austrian duke realized that Barbarossa's son Henry would soon set out to Italy for imperial coronation. So, Leopold decided that it would be appropriate if someone from the dynasty represented Babenbergs on this journey and would oversee the auxiliary contingent, send for this trip. His choice was his younger brother Henry. However, chronicler was already informed about the nobles accompanying Austrian duke and that's how this mistake could have occurred.⁶¹ It is not point of this paper to describe Henry's role in Henry's VI Italian campaign. Let's just mention that Henry did not only attend the imperial coronation, but he also accompanied the emperor in his campaign in southern Italy, where Henry VI was conquering the Kingdom of Sicily.⁶²

It is not certain, what happened with Henry after his return to the duchy. Sources remains silent. It is impossible to say, if he helped his brother with governing of the duchy, if he stayed at his brother's court in Vienna or if he participated on the imprisonment of Richard the Lionheart. The only thing which could be certain is that he was really affected by the death of his brother in 1194.⁶³ However, even after his

⁵⁷ He left after August 25, 1190, because that from this day is his donation for Schottenstift, which was sealed in Vienna. In this document is among witness mentioned Henry I. BUB, Bd. 1, No. 77, pp. 106–107.

⁵⁸ *Historia de expeditione*, pp. 96–97.

⁵⁹ BUB, Bd. 4, *Halband 1*, No. 900, p. 210.

⁶⁰ He died on June 10, 1190, when he drowned in river Salef. *Historia de expeditione*, pp. 91–92.

⁶¹ It is also possible that Henry VI ordered Austrian duke to send him auxiliary contingent for the trip and Leopold entrusted leadership of this force to his brother Henry.

⁶² To his role: LYON, p. 125. He was with Henry VI. in Pisa and near Naples. BUB, Bd. 4, *Halband 1*, No. 900, p. 210; No. 902, p. 211.

⁶³ *Annales Mellicenses*, p. 506.

nephew Frederick I ascended to the throne, it is still impossible to say, how Henry's life looked like. Because of the following events, it could be presumed, that Henry had close relationship with his nephew. It is also possible that he was helping the young duke. Henry was at that time an experienced man, who was a veteran of several wars and was orientated himself at the court of the emperor. Those skills could be very useful to Frederick. Yet, this is all only a theory, because duke of Mödling did not appear in the sources until 1197.

Once emperor Henry VI consolidated his rule over the Kingdom of Sicily, he began to prepare expedition into the Holy Land. This expedition was different from all previous crusades. It had strictly national character, because only nobles from the Holy Roman Empire could take the cross. The emperor also did not underestimate the logistic problems and hired many mercenaries.⁶⁴ Among the nobles, who took the cross, was the duke of Austria Frederick and his uncle Henry I of Mödling.⁶⁵ This fact could serve as a prove of good relations between young duke and his uncle, as was indicated above. According to the sources, the whole expedition was monumental. The emperor should have gathered on the Sicily nearly sixty thousand men, who were ready to embark. However, contemporary historians are stating that it was more likely one fifth of that number. Yet, it was still imposing and well-equipped force, which could change the tides in the Holy Land. The first portion of the army, with both Babenbergs and other nobles, left Messina on autumn of 1197.⁶⁶ But, before the rest of the army could embarked, Emperor Henry VI died. His death caused disintegration of the army on the Sicily.⁶⁷

The crusaders, who left before emperor's death, managed to arrive at the Holy Land. However, their forces also disintegrated after the news from Sicily reached them. Yet, their expedition was partly successful. Upon their arrival, peace concluded by Richard the Lionheart and Saladin ended and smaller German contingent was more than welcomed. With its support local forces managed to recapture Tyre, Sidon, and Beirut.⁶⁸ In those campaigns participated the young duke Frederick alongside his

⁶⁴ C. TYERMAN, *God's war: A new history of the Crusades*, London 2007, pp. 488–492. Circumstances were also described by Ansbert: *Historia de expeditione*, pp. 110–113.

⁶⁵ GALL, pp. 23–24.

⁶⁶ Before they left, Babenbergs helped the emperor with suppression of rebellion on Sicily. E. ZÖLLNER (ed.), *Das babenbergische Österreich (976–1246)*, Wien 1978, p. 55.

⁶⁷ ANSBERT, *Historia de expeditione*, p. 114.

⁶⁸ TYERMAN, pp. 492–494.

uncle Henry. However, in 1198 Frederick fell ill and on April 16, 1198, died in Acre.⁶⁹ After his death, the rest of the Babenberg forces with the body of their duke returned home, most likely under the leadership of Henry I of Mödling. It could be presumed, that his nephew's death affected Henry significantly. He was most likely one of duke's closest companions and person, who might have been helping Frederick in the beginnings of his rule.

It seems like Henry I retired from the higher politics, after his return from the Holy Land. Duke of Mödling did not help his nephew, duke Leopold VI, during the dramatic events at the turn of 12th and 13th centuries, in which Babenbergs played a significant role. Historical documents mention him sporadically. After Frederick's death, Henry was only once named among witnesses of duke's Leopold documents. That could mean that the duke of Mödling was only rarely present at duke's Leopold court. The question is why? Why Henry retired and did not visit court of his nephew often, when in 1197 and 1198 he was still very active in the politics of the duchy. That's impossible to say. Maybe there was some kind of misunderstanding between main and cadet branch of the dynasty. Perhaps Henry wanted to help his nephew, who was still in his eyes inexperienced, however new duke did not want that. Maybe Henry's health got worse, and he had to retire. Yet, all of this remains only a theory.

Duke of Mödling spent most likely the rest of his life mostly on his estates, where he became renowned as a patron of arts and churches. There was several donations by Henry I at that time. However, it is impossible to date them.⁷⁰ Also, Henry started to use the title of duke of Mödling.⁷¹ This title appeared even in the document of duke Leopold VI, where among witnesses is mentioned Henry with that title.⁷² From this document it could be presumed that Leopold agreed with the usage of the new title by his uncle. Until his death, Henry only once played an important role in the administration of the duchy. In 1217 he acted as a judge of dispute

⁶⁹ ZÖLLNER, p. 55.

⁷⁰ It's a donation to Heiligenkreuz Abbey, which is dated into period 1194–1223. BUB, Bd. 1, No. 89, pp. 122–123. Note from book of privileges mentioning donation to Heiligenkreuz Abbey dated into period 1187–1223. BUB, Bd. 4, *Halband 1*, No. 883, p. 201. Donation to Klosterneuburg Abbey dated into period 1195–1216. BUB, Bd. 4, *Halbnad 2*, No. 952, pp. 6–7.

⁷¹ For the first time he used this title in donation for Melk Abbey in 1220. BUB, Bd. 2, No. 228, pp. 31–32.

⁷² It's the document for Vienna from October 18, 1221. BUB, Bd. 2, No. 237, pp. 56–65.

about chapel in Inzersdorf.⁷³ That's all, what could be said about the rest of his life.

Henry I died in 1223 and his only son Henry inherited his estates.⁷⁴ Let's just mention here, that despite Henry not playing a significant role in the duchy since his return from the Holy Land, the relationship between main and cadet branch of the dynasty remained proper. As a sign of that could serve Henry's new title and also a donation of Leopold VI, where he mentioned, that the donation was made for the salvation of his family members. Among them, he did not forget to mention his uncle Henry.⁷⁵

Henry II

Henry II also called the younger was the eldest and most likely the only descendent of Henry I and his wife Richeza. The biggest problem with reconstructing his life is the lack of sources. Henry II is only mentioned in historical documents. Also, sources register him only after the death of his father. Because of that, his life could be reconstructed only from 1223, from the time, when Henry II was at least forty-one years old.

It's not certain, when Henry II was born. However, the period, in which he was born, could be defined easily. His parents married in 1177 and his mother died in 1182. Therefore, his birth could be placed between 1178 and 1182. It is tempting to connect his birth with his mother's death, as it was indicated above, however, it would be only a theory. Let's rather settle on this five-year period. After his birth there is a period of more than forty years, which are impossible to describe. The question is why Henry II was not mentioned in that time by sources. The easiest explanation would be the same name of father and son. Because of it, when in some historical document from the period before 1223 is mentioned Henry of Mödling, it could Henry II. Yet, this is not possible. When Henry I was mentioned in the historical documents, it was always with emphasis such as brother or uncle of the duke of Austria. Perhaps Henry II was not mentioned by the sources during the life of his father because of some disability. That would also explain, why he never married⁷⁶ and why he did not participate on governing of the duchy like his father. However, this is only a theory.

⁷³ BUB, Bd. 4, *Halband 2*, No. 1041, pp. 91–92.

⁷⁴ LYON, p. 126; G. M. WIDHALM (ed.), *Lexikon des Mittelalters. Band 9*, München 2003, family tree Babenberger jüngere.

⁷⁵ BUB, Bd. 1, No. 136, pp. 175–176.

⁷⁶ If he would marry, his wife would be buried in Heiligenkreuz Abbey.

Another question is when for the first time was Henry II mentioned in the sources. Even this is impossible to say. There are two documents mentioning Henry II, which are not dated. Austrian historians assume that they were created in the period 1223 and 1232/36.⁷⁷ In that case they could contain the eldest note about Henry II or one of the last. Except those, Henry II was first mentioned in two papal documents. First was created in 1230, second in 1232. Why was the duke of Mödling mentioned by two papal documents? The first document, which was made on the 19th of April 1230,⁷⁸ provides an answer to this question. In this document, Pope Gregory IX authorized the abbot of Zwettl Abbey to investigate the situation at the parish in Mödling. According to the document, after the death of a parish priest in Mödling abbot of Melk Abbey installed a new one. However, the duke of Mödling disagreed with this procedure and installed his own priest. This problem was not solved easily. Another papal document informed that the dispute continued in 1232.⁷⁹ This time, pope Gregory IX charged provost of Klosterneuburg Abbey with investigation of situation regarding the usurpation of the parish prebend in Mödling.

This conflict between the duke of Mödling and the abbot of Melk Abbey cannot be considered as something unique. Conflicts connected with usurpation of church right were usual at that time due to the emancipation of the Church.⁸⁰ Henry II as a patron of the church in Mödling believed, that he had the right to install a new priest. However, abbot of Melk disagreed with this and believed that he had this right. Sources did not inform how the whole dispute ended. Yet, because no other papal document exists, it could be presumed, that the whole conflict ended to the satisfaction of both the Church and Melk Abbey. On the other hand, when it ended is uncertain. Dispute could have continued until Henry II died in 1236.

The conflict of Henry II and the abbot of Melk might have had one interesting outcome. A document, which is not dated, informed, that Henry II duke Frederick II, son of Leopold VI, should inherit all Henry's

⁷⁷ BUB, Bd. 2, No. 245, p. 74; BUB, Bd. 4, *Halband 2*, No. 1074, p. 118.

⁷⁸ BUB, Bd. 4, *Halband 2*, No. 1131, p. 169.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, No. 1172, pp. 200–201.

⁸⁰ To the problematic of *ius patronale* on example of western and southwestern Bohemia, and relations between patron and clerics: Z. HLEDÍKOVÁ, Ke studiu a možnostem využití patronátních práv v předhusitských Čechách, in: *Folia historica Bohemica*, 6, 1984, pp. 43–99.

estates, if he would die without the heir.⁸¹ The question is why Henry did this. The answer might relate to the year of document's creation. Some Austrian historians suggested that it was sealed in 1231.⁸² If they are right, it would be possible to relate this document to the above-mentioned conflict. Henry II was trying to find help in his conflict with the abbot of Melk, who was supported by the pope. The closest relative, who would be able to help him, was the duke of Austria. For that help, Henry would "pay" by this document. Frederick would, for offering his support, receive the prospect of inheriting rich estates of his relative. And that prospect was presumable. Henry II was probably fifty or more years old. He remained unmarried and had no children. However, this construct is only a theory, which could not be supported by any other sources.

The rest of Henry's II life is uncertain. He was only twice mentioned in the historical documents. Both are donations to the Heiligenkreuz Abbey. The first was published on August 20, 1232,⁸³ the second on December 14 of the same year.⁸⁴ When the duke of Mödling appears again in the sources, he was already dead. In 1236 Frederick II donated a village from the heritage of his relative Henry II.⁸⁵ Because of that, historians presume, that the duke of Mödling died in 1236.⁸⁶

Estates and Court in Mödling

How the domain of Henry I and Henry II looked like? An apt description was provided by Franz Gall. He described the domain as a conglomerate of rights, fiefs and allodial land,⁸⁷ which centre and most important settlement was Mödling with its castle.⁸⁸ Henry I did not receive this domain accidentally as his heritage. As I have indicated above, Henry's father most likely held Mödling during the rule of his brother margrave Leopold. Mödling situated southwest of Vienna was not the only castle held by Henry I. He also owned the castle Schwarzenburg, which was

⁸¹ BUB, Bd. 4, *Halband 2*, No. 1165, p. 195.

⁸² SCHEIBELREILER, p. 313.

⁸³ BUB, Bd. 2, No. 303, pp. 140–141.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, No. 307, pp. 144–145.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, No. 329, pp. 167–168.

⁸⁶ WIDHALM, family tree Babenberger jüngere.

⁸⁷ GALL, p. 17.

⁸⁸ The connection of this cadet branch with Mödling is represented on the city sign. Lower part of the sign is made up from the seal and maybe the sign used by this cadet branch. The picture of the seal: BUB, Bd. 3, No. 51, p. 47.

situated in Bavaria near the Upper Palatine Forrest. Castle is mentioned by document created between 1174 and 1190, in which Henry I. sold it along with all affiliated servants to Frederick Barbarossa.⁸⁹ Yet, it is uncertain, how the duke of Mödling gained it. It is possible that Henry II Jasomirgott as the duke of Bavaria acquired the castle once the house of Schwarzenburg died out and later gave it to his son Henry. On the other hand, it is certain, that Henry I. sold the castle due to the distance from his domain, in the duchy of Austria.

It is impossible to fully reconstruct the domain of the dukes of Mödling because estates were usually mentioned in the donations. In that case, it is possible to reconstruct only a small portion of the domain. Nevertheless, let's present localities connected with the dominion of Henry I and Henry II. Historical documents informed, that this cadet branch was holding villages, farmsteads, vineyards, bailiwick, and forests in those locations: Wartberg, Wolfpassing, Sollenau, Suring, Chogelprunn, Sulz, Münchendorf, Rittenhof, Rorenwisen, Gumpoldskirchen, Sooss, Großjedlersdorf, Unterwaltersdorf, Reisenberg, Wisen, Traiskirchen. Regensburg and Peilstein.⁹⁰ Those localities are situated mostly near Vienna and Mödling, and on Marchfeld.⁹¹ However, this so-called Mödling domain most likely was not some kind of region fully under the control of the dukes of Mödling. If it would be so, even from those remains of historical documents would emerge that Vienna would be part of such domain. So, the so-called Mödling domain was most likely a conglomerate of separated estates.

The seat of Henry I and Henry II and also the most important location in the domain was castle in Mödling. This castle was first mentioned by historical sources in 1002, however the settlement beneath existed longer. It was first mentioned as a bishop's estate in 903, so perhaps the castle is older. Yet, to this day Henry I is considered the founder of the castle. Why? Because in the second half of the 12th century, mostly during the rule of Henry I, the castle was rebuilt into one of the greatest fortresses in Austria. However, the whole reconstruction of the old castle did not begin because of Henry I. The whole reconstruction started by order of Henry II Jasomirgott, who meant to give the castle to his wife as a widow's estate. On the other hand, the work was finished in the time, when Mödling was the seat of Henry I. Because of that, the construction of the castle is

⁸⁹ BUB, Bd. 4, *Halband 1*, No. 843, p. 178.

⁹⁰ GALL, pp. 14–17. Complete list with the references in Appendix 1.

⁹¹ LECHNER, p. 169.

usually connected with him. There is only a few information about the settlement under the castle. Most likely, it was not very significant at that time, because it received the right of a market only in the 14th century. Yet, it must have had some economical potential. The settlement contained church with Byzantine elements built at the time of Henry I. It might be interesting for this paper, that inside could be found fresco a of Richeza.⁹²

Thanks to the historical material, it is possible to partially reconstruct the court, which formed around this cadet branch in Mödling. This court was not so different from the court in Vienna, which means, that this cadet branch tried to imitate the main branch in lifestyle and representation.⁹³ At the court in Mödling acted marshal, waiter, steward, and chaplains. As a marshal is in the historical documents mentioned a man called Sigfried.⁹⁴ He was most likely a nobleman, however it is impossible to say something more about him. He most likely remained the marshal for the whole life of Henry I. At the court of Henry I acted waiters Wolfger and Leopold.⁹⁵ Steward is mentioned only once, however that does not mean, he was not acting at the court for longer period. It was man called Rudiger.⁹⁶ Sources also informed about two chaplains, whose names were Herbord and Walthar.⁹⁷ All these officials were mentioned in the documents of Henry I. Yet, it does not mean that there were no court officials in Mödling after Henry II succeeded his father. However, due to the lack of sources, historians do not know about them.

The dukes of Mödling were also surrounded by many companions and members of Austrian nobility. They were usually mentioned as witnesses of Henry's I and Henry's II documents. Some of them have the same name

⁹² More about history of Mödling: H. KUCERA – G. WALDNER – I. WALDNER, *1100 Jahre Mödling – Die Geschichte einer Stadt*, Mödling 2003 or SCHARSCHING, *Burg und Herrschaft Mödling*.

⁹³ Martin Wihoda reached similar results, when he studied the court of younger brother of Bohemian king Přemysl Otakar I. Vladislaus Henry (margrave 1197–1222), who established a court in Moravia. WIHODA, pp. 145–157.

⁹⁴ He is mentioned in these documents: BUB, Bd. 1, No. 89, pp. 122–123; BUB, Bd. 2, No. 228, pp. 31–32; BUB, Bd. 4, *Halband 2*, No. 952, pp. 6–7.

⁹⁵ Wolfger is mentioned in this document: BUB, Bd. 1, No. 89, pp. 122–123. Leopold is mentioned in these documents: BUB, Bd. 4, *Halband 1*, No. 854, p. 185; No. 870, p. 193.

⁹⁶ He is mentioned only once: BUB, Bd 1, No. 89, pp. 122–123.

⁹⁷ Herbord is mentioned in these documents: BUB, Bd, 1, No. 60, pp. 80–81; No. 89, pp. 122–123. Walthar is mentioned in these documents: BUB, Bd. 1, No. 89, pp. 122–123; BUB, Bd. 4, *Halband 2*, No. 952, pp. 6–7.

as the court officials mentioned above.⁹⁸ It would be tempting to connect them with them; however, it would remain only a theory. Among many nobles, who appeared in Mödling, it is important to mention only lords of Manswerde. Three members of this house stayed at the court, and it is most likely that they were bannermen of this cadet branch – namely Rudiger, Henry and Sigfried.⁹⁹ So, it is possible to say, that court in Mödling imitated a court of sovereign dynasty, only in smaller scale. Yet, in some cases it became equal. For example, during the rule of Henry I and his son, the court in Mödling was the centre of arts. The rulers of Mödling were glorified for their generosity.¹⁰⁰ Also, dukes hosted famous minnesinger of that time. However, the thesis about the stay of Walther von der Vogelweide is untruthful. When this minnesinger thanked in one of his works for audience at the court, he thanked to Leopold VI not to duke of Mödling.¹⁰¹ On the other hand, certain is the stay of minnesinger Neidhart von Reutal, who was welcomed in Mödling by Henry II in 1230, when he lost his Bavarian estates.¹⁰²

From all what was described, it could be stated, that this cadet branch of Babenberg fully imitated the lifestyle of the main branch. Even though the court in Mödling was smaller, it had similar structure and in the case of arts it was equal. Henry I and Henry II must have held a large domain with many estates. Only because of them were they capable of generous donation policy and the support of famous minnesingers. So, it is possible to agree with Georg Scheibelreiler, who stated, that the conclusion of inheritance agreement between Frederick II and Henry II was a great success of the young duke.¹⁰³

⁹⁸ In different document is mentioned Rudiger of Guntramsdorf, who could theoretically be the same person as the steward Rudiger. Rudiger of Guntramsdorf is mentioned in this document: BUB, Bd. 2, No. 228, pp. 31–32. Also, in one document is mentioned Leopold of Mödling, who could be the same person as waiter Leopold. Leopold of Mödling is mentioned in this document: BUB, Bd. 1, No. 89, pp. 122–123.

⁹⁹ Rudiger: BUB, Bd. 1, No. 60, pp. 80–81; No. 89, pp. 122–123. Henry: BUB, Bd. 4, *Halband 2*, No. 952, pp. 6–7. Sigfried: BUB, Bd. 2, No. 228, pp. 31–32; BUB, Bd. 4, *Halband 1*, No. 854, p. 185.

¹⁰⁰ LECHENER, p. 169.

¹⁰¹ H. BRUNNER – G. HAHN – U. MÜLLER et al., *Walther von der Vogelweide: Epoche, Werk, Wirkung*, München 1996, pp. 22 and 24.

¹⁰² SCHARSCHING, p. 38.

¹⁰³ SCHEIBELREILER, p. 313.

Conclusion

In this paper I have tried to carry out a revision of a research on the so-called dukes of Mödling. I have studied lives of both members of this cadet branch, and I have tried to fill in some gaps in their lives through the method of comparison. Yet, it is important to say, that it is and most likely would be impossible to fully reconstruct them. I have also paid attention to the estates and the court of this cadet branch. From this research, it is now possible to answer the question stated in the beginning. Was Henry I and his son capable of being the second ones? I believe that they were. They never revolted or opposed their ruling relatives and at least for the part of Henry's I life, they were very helpful to Austrian dukes. It is possible that their relations changed a little bit after the ascension of Leopold VI, yet the members of the cadet branch still knew their place. They were the second one, however, not less important.

Appendix 1: List of known estates

Location	Estate	Document	Reference
Shwarzenburg	Castle and all affiliation servants.	Henry I sold this castle with all servants to Frederic Barbarossa.	BUB, Bd. 4, <i>Halband 1</i> , No. 843, p. 178.
Wartberg	Vineyards	Henry I granted the Heiligenkreuz Abbey tax from vineyards in Wartberg.	BUB, Bd. 1, No. 60, pp. 80–81.
Wolfpassing	Three fiefs	Henry I granted the Heiligenkreuz Abbey three fiefs in location of Wolfpassing.	BUB, Bd. 1, No. 89, pp. 122–123.
Sollenau	Tithe from vineyards near Sollenau	Henry I granted Melk Abbey unjustly gained tithe from vineyards near Sollenau.	BUB, Bd. 2, No. 228, pp. 31–32.
Suring	Four fiefs	Henry II granted Virgin's Mary church in Voracheberg four fiefs in Suring.	BUB, Bd. 2, No. 245, p. 74.
Chogelprunn	Whole locality	Klosterneuburg Abbey bought this locality from Henry II.	BUB, Bd. 2, No. 289, pp. 125–127.

Sulz	Whole locality	Duke Frederick II granted the locality, which he has inherited from Henry II, to Heiligenkreuz Abbey.	BUB, Bd. 2, No. 329, pp. 167–168.
Münchendorf	Whole locality	Henry I and his brother Leopold V granted the Heligenkreuz Abbey entire locality.	BUB, Bd. 2, No. 480, pp. 346–347.
Rittenhof	Farmstead near Rittenhof	Henry I granted the Klosterneuburg Abbey farmstead near Rittenhof.	BUB, Bd. 4, <i>Halband 1</i> , No. 854, p. 185.
Rorenwisen	Farmstead	Henry I granted the Klosterneuburg Abbey farmstead in Rorenwisen.	BUB, Bd. 4, <i>Halband 1</i> , No. 870, p. 193.
Gumpoldskirchen	Whole locality	Duke of Styria granted Henry I entire locality.	BUB, Bd. 4, <i>Halband 1</i> , No. 879, pp. 197–198.
Sooss	Two vineyards	Note from book of privileges of Heiligenkreuz Abbey. Henry I granted two vineyards in Sooss.	BUB, Bd. 4, <i>Halband 1</i> , No. 883, p. 201.
Großjedlersdorf	Islands around settlement	Henry I granted Klosterneuburg Abbey islands around the settlement.	BUB, Bd. 4, <i>Halband 2</i> , No. 952, pp. 6–7.
Unterwaltersdorf, Reisenberg, Wisen	Whole localities	Countess Richardis left entire localities to Henry I.	BUB, Bd. 4, <i>Halband 2</i> , No. 960, pp. 13–14.
Traiskirchen	Farmstead	Henry II granted the Heligenkreuz Abbey farmstead in Traiskirchen.	BUB, Bd. 4, <i>Halband 2</i> , No. 1074, p. 118.
Pielstein	Forest	Henry II bought the forest from Markward von Robsbach.	BUB, Bd. 2, No. 307, pp. 144–145.