

Jiří HRBEK

Acting on behalf of the Bohemian King: Ferdinand Ernst von Waldstein's Journey to Westphalia (1645–1647)¹

Abstract: Ferdinand Ernst von Waldstein participated within the imperial delegation at the peace negotiations in Münster and Osnabrück where together with Georg von Plettenberg he represented the interests of Ferdinand III as the King of Bohemia at the Electoral College. Although he only took part in discussions that concerned one specific disputed issue, namely the return of the electoral vote to the Count Palatine of the Rhine, his presence at the meeting represents important evidence about the relations between the Czech Lands and the Holy Roman Empire during the period prior to the readmission of the Bohemian Elector and his representatives to the Electoral College, which occurred as late as in 1708. That mission also had an impact on the career of the young Waldstein, who, after his return, was introduced to the Aulic Council and from 1650 onwards another career awaited him in the Bohemian provincial offices and even there he was still performing tasks that were associated with the imperial policy.

Keywords: The Peace of Westphalia – the Bohemian electoral vote – imperial diplomacy – Ferdinand Ernst von Waldstein – the Electoral College – the Electoral Palatinate

On the 29th November 1645 the main imperial negotiator Maximilian von Trauttmansdorff accompanied by the young Bohemian nobleman Ferdinand Ernst von Waldstein arrived for the Westphalian negotiations, which were intended to bring an end to the Thirty Years' War. Count Waldstein stayed in Münster on Königsstraße and later he should become a representative of the Bohemian King. Information of this kind may well seem strange for several reasons. Above all at that time the Czech Lands already constituted a fixed part of the Habsburg Monarchy and this bond had been additionally strengthened in a fundamental manner by the Battle of the White Mountain and the subsequent issuance of the *Verneuerte Landesordnung* (1627/1628),

¹ This research was realised within the standard grant project Nr 13–12939S *Bohemian and Moravian Nobility in the Diplomatic Service of the Austrian Habsburgs (1640–1740)* supported by the Grant Agency of the Czech Republic.

which the earlier historiography often referred to as “The End of Czech Independence”.² Thereby amongst the representatives of the European powers an individual appeared who was acting on behalf of the Monarch of the Lands of the Bohemian Crown, which clearly at that time did not match the definition of a sovereign state. Whereas the legitimacy to hold top-level talks with other independent states belongs and in the 17th Century also belonged to the indisputable signs of sovereignty in regard to international law. Such a discrepancy is just one of the oddities that was associated with Waldstein’s mission that the following lines will attempt to explain.

Authorisation

Although the results of the Westphalian negotiations brought peace to most of Europe and the actual war continued only between France and Spain, their primary purpose was to arrange relations within the Holy Roman Empire. Also the Kingdom of Bohemia does not act in the person of its King or of his authorised deputy on the basis of European international law, but as a subject nation of the Holy Roman Empire. The mission of Ferdinand Ernst von Waldstein alternately in Münster and Osnabrück can only be understood in the context of the relations between the Empire and the Czech Lands.

Especially historians of the early and high Middle Ages, who have followed the turbulent relationships between the Bohemian Dukes and Kings on one side and the Emperor on the other side, have up till now been trying hard to answer the question of pertinence of the Czech Lands to the union of the Holy Roman Empire.³ Since in early

2 This view specifically resonated in “Masaryk’s” perception of Czech history. The French historian and bohemist Ernst DENIS described the pre-White Mountain period in *Konec samostatnosti české I-II* [The End of the Bohemian Independence], Prague 1893 as representing the phasing out of Czech independence and this perspective is also shared by Jindřich Vančura, the translator of Denis’ work.

3 Cf. Václav VANĚČEK, *Stát Přemyslovců a středověká říše* [The State of Přemyslids and the Medieval Empire], Prague 1945; Zdeněk FIALA, *Vztah českého státu k německé říši do počátku 13. století. Podle kritiky pramenů* [The Relationship of the Bohemian State to the German Empire. According to the sources], *Sborník historický* 6, 1959, pp. 23–95; IDEM, *Počátky české účasti v kurfiřtském sboru* [The Beginning of the Bohemian Presence in the Electoral College], *Sborník historický* 8, 1961, pp. 27–66; Jiří KEJŘ, *Böhmen und das Reich unter Friedrich I.*, in: Alfred Haverkamp (Hg.), *Friedrich Barbarossa. Handlungsspielräume und Wirkungsweisen des staufischen Kaisers*, Sigmaringen 1992, pp. 241–289; more recently Josef ŽEMLIČKA, *Počátky Čech královských (1198–1253). Proměna státu a společnosti* [The Beginning of the Kingdom of Bohemia (1198–1253). The Change of the State and the Society], Prague 2002; IDEM, *Království v pohybu. Kolonizace, města a stříbro v závěru přemyslovské epochy* [The Kingdom in the Motion. The Colonisation, the Towns and the Silver at the End of Přemyslids Period], Prague 2014; Martin WIHODA, *Zlatá bula sicilská. Podivuhodný příběh ve vrstvách paměti* [The Golden Bull of Sicily. The Curious Case in the Layers of Memory], Prague 2005; IDEM, *Morava v době knížecí (906–1197)* [The Moravia in the Age of Dukes (906–1197)], Prague 2010.

modern times the person of Roman-German Emperor and Bohemian King, with a few exceptions, was identical, there was not any similar rivalry that in regard to the feudal rights often had a personal character. This does not mean, however, that the relationship between the two constitutional units was any less complicated.

The majority of the reforms that Emperor Maximilian I (1495) implemented in the late 15th Century did not affect the Czech Lands; primarily because they were not included in the imperial provincial system (*Reichskreise*) and thereby paid no imperial taxes, which, since 1530, were regularly prescribed for them based on the Imperial Register (*Reichsmatrikel*) and after some time also amortised, however. The Czech Lands were also not subject to the imperial laws nor to the imperial authorities' resolutions, including those of the Imperial Chamber Court (*Reichskammergericht*) and the Aulic Council (*Reichshofrat*). The attempts to achieve stronger ties in the economic sphere also failed, including an attempt to introduce a unified monetary system into the Empire's territory including the Czech Lands. Still, it cannot be clearly affirmed that the Czech Lands were not part of the Holy Roman Empire in early modern times;⁴ fundamental question should therefore not sound whether they existed, but how did the constitutional ties between the empire and the Kingdom of Bohemia actually manifest. When doing so it is important to disregard such categories as inferiority and superiority and even today's concepts about the State.

Outside the imperial provincial administration that was playing its vital role, especially in those areas with the most widespread territorial fragmentation (i.e. Franconia and Swabia) were not only some smaller Imperial Estates (these were “*ungekreist*”), but also, for example, the *Confederatio Helvetica* that had not officially been released from the bond to the Empire until the year 1648. The Czech Lands were not released from the imperial union by means of a formal legal act, so its basic law, i.e. The Golden Bull of Charles IV, continued to apply to them and counted them as pertaining to one of the Electorates. This periodically enlivened feudal bond thereby continued to function and, for example,

4 Perhaps most radical was recently with his thesis Petr VOREL in *Velké dějiny země Koruny české VII* [The Great History of the Czech Lands VII], Prague – Litomyšl 2005 (cf. also a review of Vorel's work published by Petr Maťa in the *Dějiny – Teorie – Kritika* magazine, 2006, specifically pp. 148–149); IDEM, *Země Koruny české a Svatá říše římská v raném novověku* [The Lands of the Bohemian Crown and the Holy Roman Empire in the Early Modern Period], *Theatrum historiae* 7, 2010, pp. 259–272; IDEM, *Státoprávní vyčlenění českých zemí ze Svaté říše římské. Důsledky říšské reformy Maxmiliána I. Habsburského* [The Constitutional Separation of the Czech Lands from the Holy Roman Empire. The Consequences of the Imperial Reform of Maximilian I of Habsburg], *Český časopis historický* 4, 2013, pp. 743–804. Vorel argues primarily against the unilateral, automatic integration of the Czech Lands with the Imperial entirety as some German historians have described this process.

Ferdinand II, in 1628, did not hesitate to grant his son a Bohemian Electorate in fief.⁵ It should be emphasised that the subject of this act was not just an electoral vote or the office of *archipincerna* (*Erzmundschenk*), but the Electorate as such (“*das Churfürstenthumb mit der Chur und dem Erzschencken Amt des Heiligen Römischen Reichs*”).⁶ In addition to the constitutional plane it is also necessary to take into account the personal level: the imperial bodies (especially the Aulic Council) were always seated by the members of the Bohemian and Moravian Catholic (and therefore loyal to the Emperor) families, which the Habsburg Emperor counted-on for strengthening his influence in the Empire. So the paradoxical situation occurred that while the resolutions of the imperial authorities should not have applied to the Czech territory, the implementation of these resolutions often laid in the hands of the Czech nobility. Understandably the influence of the Czech representatives in the imperial bodies was considerably augmented after 1708, when by the readmission of the Bohemian Electorate they became members of the Electorate Collegium of the Imperial Diet (*Reichstag*) in Regensburg or members of the *Reichskammergericht* in Wetzlar. For the sake of completeness, it can be recalled that unlike the Aulic Council these representatives were paid from a special provincial fund that was approved annually by the Bohemian *Landtag*.⁷

Perhaps the strongest remaining bond between the Czech Lands and the Holy Roman Empire was the rank of Elector, that was performed by the Bohemian King or even by representatives of the Estates.⁸ The Bohemian King's right to vote within the

5 Cf. Jiří VESELÝ, *K otázce lenního vztahu k římské říši v českých dějinách* [On the Issue of the Feudal Relation to the Roman Empire in Czech History], *Sborník archivních prací* 29, 1979, pp. 56–116; in this text pp. 75–77. It is possible to encounter the efforts to re-emphasise the position of the Czech Lands within the Empire at Matthias, who, shortly before his death (in 1619), granted the Czech Lands to Ferdinand II in fief. The last time that fief was granted to Ferdinand IV, was in 1653. The template document that the Emperor gave to (the younger) King of Bohemia was in every case Frederick III's liege sheet from the year 1477 that had originally been granted to Vladislaus II Jagiellon.

6 Analogously a liege reverse of Ferdinand IV was edited in *ibidem*, pp. 104–105. In regard to liege oath Alexander BEGERT, *Böhmen, die böhmische Kur und das Reich vom Hochmittelalter bis zum Ende des Alten Reiches*, Husum 2003, p. 428. In regard to the genesis of the liege reverse also P. VOREL, *Státoprávní vyčlenění*, pp. 760–764. Whether the term “Electorate” meant only the elector's office, or the country, disputes were already being conducted there since the early modern period. In summary Jiří KUBEŠ, *České země a římsko-německá říše v raném novověku* [The Czech Lands and the Holy Roman Empire in the Early Modern Period], in: Karel Schelle – Jaromír Tauchen (eds.), *Encyklopedie českých právních dějin I*, Prague 2015, pp. 677–682.

7 For example, in the year 1709, 6000 guldens were approved for an elector legate in Regensburg and for an observer at the *Reichskammergericht* in Wetzlar. *Národní archiv v Praze* [The National Archives in Prague] (hereinafter referred to as the NA Praha), *Sněmovní snesení*, inv. Nr. 130a.

8 In this respect, the election of a Roman-German King was carried-out by the estates representation both in 1440 and in 1519. The Estates after being acknowledged as the bearers of the elector title also later sought, and to this end they submitted, by the proxy of Zdenko Adalbert Popel von Lobkowitz and

community of Electors was based on Charles IV's Golden Bull (*Wahltag*). Negotiations on electoral capitulation (*Wahlkapitulation*), which since the time of Charles V comprised an agreement between the claimant to the Roman-German throne and the electors as representatives of the Empire and it also defined the future limits of imperial power. It actually took place, however, in the format of the Imperial Diet's Electoral College (*Kurfürstenrat*).⁹ There the representative of the Czech Lands had not had any access until 1708, although the candidate stayed at the place of the election accompanied by the current Emperor, when the election was taking place during the life of the previous ruler (*vivente imperatore*). During the 16th Century, a few days before the actual election, the future Emperor (often accompanied by Bohemian noblemen) was usually also made familiar with the text of electoral capitulation. Due to the short deadlines (the election date had to be determined in advance by the archbishop of Mainz), however, he could interfere only minimally with the capitulation text. The actual election that was taking place mostly in a side chapel of St. Bartholomew in Frankfurt am Main was then also attended by the Bohemian King. Thanks to previous agreements and to the subsequent unanimity he could always afford to abstain and not have to vote for himself.¹⁰

Until 1708 attendance at other meetings of the Electoral College was an exceptional event. The electors themselves protested against the representatives of the Czech Lands coming amongst them and the arguing about this finished with the Kingdom of Bohemia's non-payment of the imperial taxes. It is necessary to admit that until the rule of Emperor Matthias the Habsburg emperors did not try too hard and sometimes – as for example Ferdinand I did in 1545 – they even turned the argument upside-down: i.e. since the Bohemian King there has not been admitted to the Electoral College he does not pay any taxes.¹¹ Whereas the Czech presence in the college could not be imposed on the

of Adam the Younger von Waldstein, a memorial to Emperor Matthias on the 12. 10. 1613. A. BEGERT, *Böhmen*, p. 364.

- 9 From the end of the 15th Century the Imperial Diet had been divided into three groups: electoral, princely and urban, each of which was entitled to act independently. Additionally also Winfried BECKER, *Der Kurfürstenrat. Grundzüge seiner Entwicklung in der Reichsverfassung und seine Stellung auf dem Westfälischen Friedenskongreß*, Münster 1973; Georg SCHMIDT, *Der Städtetag in der Reichsverfassung. Eine Untersuchung zur korporativen Politik der Freien- und Reichsstädte in der ersten Hälfte des 16. Jahrhunderts*, Stuttgart 1984. In summary also Petr VOREL, *Říšské sněmy a jejich vliv na vývoj zemí Koruny české v letech 1526–1618* [The Imperial Diets and their Influence on the Development of the Lands of the Bohemian Crown in the years 1526–1618], Pardubice 2005, esp. pp. 69–72.
- 10 The election procedure for a Roman-German King, who, in the early modern period after his coronation with the Ottonian crown became an Emperor, has recently been described in the Czech historiography by Jiří KUBEŠ, *Trnitá cesta Leopolda I. za říšskou korunou (1657–1658)* [The Trying Way of Leopold I to the Imperial Crown (1657–1658)], Česká Budějovice 2009, pp. 22–45.
- 11 A. BEGERT, *Böhmen*, p. 324.

electors, even in the form of imperial decisions. In this area the Sovereign had to proceed very cautiously, because the electors were placing themselves into the position of being the most significant interpreters of the Golden Bull of Charles IV and they considered the approval or the refusal of allowing someone to attend their college as a sign of their privileged rights and a feature of the much vaunted “*teutsche Libertät*”. On the part of the Habsburg ruler as the King of Bohemia there could be maximally protests served at periodic intervals to the Imperial Archchancellor – that is to the Archbishop of Mainz.

A dynamic debate took place regarding the pertinence of the Czech Lands to the Empire throughout the entire early modern era both at the level of scholarly treatises (often compiled compulsorily) and in the area of producing pamphlets and leaflet journalism.¹² As in the case of other peripheral areas such as Lorraine or various fiefs located in northern Italy and also in the case of the Kingdom of Bohemia, the argument of imperial jurisdiction was purposefully used and it happened that the official authorities in Vienna, during the reign of one and the same Habsburg, changed their opinions several times in accordance with the current international and domestic situations. The process of the exclusion of the Czech Lands from the Empire during the late 15th Century that was described by Petr Vorel¹³ was therefore neither the first nor the last and – especially in the 17th Century – we can also identify the mirror-inverted processes of their re-integration. Even during the Westphalian negotiations, the positions of the imperial ambassadors were not at all clear: when discussing the applicability of the imperial religious freedoms in the Czech Lands they were also stressing the Czech Lands’ independence, while when there was a need to influence the negotiations that were related to the imperial representations, they were suggesting representatives of the Bohemian Electorate to them. This attitude of ambiguity obviously weakened the position of the imperial negotiators but nevertheless they still managed to introduce to the Westphalian negotiations, at least for a while, Ferdinand Ernst von Waldstein, as a representative of the Bohemian King.

12 E.g. the work of a Swiss lawyer Melchior GOLDAST OF HAIMINSFELD, *Consultatio de officio electoris Bohemiae iureque in conventibus S. Rom. Imperii electorum tam electorali in actu eligendi, quam collegiali in consilio rei publicae sibi competente*, Frankfurt am Main 1627 (issued with a dedication to Johann Ulrich von Eggenberg). The manuscript for the first work on this topic had already been compiled in 1612; probably either on the orders of Melchior Khlesl or directly by King Matthias himself. Goldast also operated with pertinence of the Kingdom of Bohemia to the Empire in his other works and for this he was attacked by the Czech Baroque Patriots. More on this topic from Jiří HRBEK, “*That feckless Bohemomastix*”: *The Life and Work of Melchior Goldast of Haiminsfeld*, *Acta Comeniana* 22–23, 2009, pp. 99–132.

13 Specifically P. VOREL, *Státoprávní vyčlenění*.

The Course of the Mission

The reason for which the representative of the Bohemian King participated in Westphalian negotiations was related to the ongoing discussions concerning the form that the Electoral College would take after the Thirty Years' War. It was because in 1623, during the war, Maximilian of Bavaria was awarded this rank for helping the Emperor that he became the holder of the Upper Palatinate, that had been confiscated to the Bohemian "Winter" King Frederick of the Palatinate. Due to imperial anathema the latter's elector rank was also taken away from him. At the end of the Thirty Years' War, however, the issue of the restitution of the elector rank reappeared, which at that time would have been linked to the Lower (Rhine) Palatinate, and it was returned to Charles (I) Louis, the son of Frederick of the Palatinate. About the Bavarian Electorate, Ferdinand II made a decision arbitrary and therefore not entirely consistent with imperial law and their own electoral capitulation. Now the enlargement of the Electoral College should carry out in accordance with the imperial law.¹⁴ Thereby the number of electors would have increased to eight, which entailed a sequence of risks, especially during the election of a new Roman-German King, which, according to the Golden Bull of Charles IV, should be carried by a simple majority. Therefore, if in the future there were to be a 4:4 stalemate there would be a risk of the destabilisation of the Empire or even the election of Anti-Emperor that had troubled the Medieval Empire at a time when a consensus choice was needed. For this reason, several solutions for how to avoid this dangerous split were laid on the table during the first half of 1646: in the game were *duplex votum*, i.e. a double vote for Saxony or for the Bohemian Elector, the establishment of a ninth Electorate bound, for example, to the Austrian lands, or a *votum decisivum*, i.e. the deciding vote of the Dean of the Electoral College, the Imperial Archchancellor and the Archbishop of Mainz.

Since *causa Palatina* was related to the actual composition of the College and additionally also to electoral issues, in which, as the Imperial Elector, the Bohemian King regularly intervened, while Maximilian of Trauttmansdorff, the head of the imperial mission, had the idea to invite the representative of the Kingdom of Bohemia to the Westphalian negotiations. During the legitimisation of their claim to be representing the Kingdom of Bohemia the Habsburg party skilfully used Swedish arguments such as that peace negotiations should be attended by the maximum possible number of stakeholders, including those from the provincial estates of the individual imperial principalities. The requirement that the Swedes should push-on until the end of 1645 in the belief that through the participation of the North German Protestants they will manage to

14 Cf. Johann FRANZL, *Ferdinand II. Kaiser im Zwiespalt der Zeit*, Graz – Wien – Köln 1978, pp. 255–260.

numerically outweigh the Catholic side, now also served as a supporting argument for both Bohemian and also Austrian participation.

First, the instruction for Westphalian mission was prepared for the Vice-President to-be of the Aulic Council, Georg Ulrich von Wolkenstein, who came from an important Tyrolean family,¹⁵ and for the Lower Austrian Chancellor Dr. Leonhard Richtersberger. They were supposed to represent Ferdinand III and Archduke Ferdinand Karl in the Princely Council (*Fürstenrat*). Ferdinand Karl, following the long guardianship reign of his mother, took over the reign in Tyrol in 1646. The interests of the Bohemian Electorate, which, at rather a symbolic level, however, should be represented by the experienced Westphalian aristocrat Georg von Plettenberg, who from 1634 worked in the imperial diplomatic service while the highlight of his previous career was a mission to the Danish King Christian IV in the middle of the year 1644.¹⁶ Now Plettenberg managed to persuade the Archbishop of Mainz to grant him formal admission into the Electoral College, which, however, was not enough for Ferdinand III.¹⁷ Therefore Maximilian von Trauttmansdorff, the main imperial negotiator and the *Obersthofmeister*, still wrote on 7th December 1645, to Ferdinand III to also send, in addition to representatives of the Austrian Lands, representatives of the Kingdom of Bohemia, amongst whom there would be at least one native Czech.¹⁸

Although Waldstein had already arrived in Münster in late November 1645, he stayed a member of Trauttmansdorff's staff without any assigned task and probably after the Trauttmansdorff's letter to Ferdinand III the concept of Waldstein's instruction was

15 In regard to Wolkenstein Oswald VON GSCHLIESSER, *Der Reichshofrat. Bedeutung und Verfassung, Schicksal und Besetzung einer obersten Reichsbehörde von 1559 bis 1806*, Wien 1942, pp. 222–223.

16 An overview of Plettenberg's biography at URL: <<http://www.30jaehrigerkrieg.de/plettenberg-georg-herting-graf-von/>> [viewed on 1. 9. 2016]. In regard to his mission to Denmark also Miroslav TOEGEL et al. (eds.), *Documenta bohemica bellum tricennale illustrantia VII. Der Kampf um den besten Frieden (1643–1649)*, Prague 1981, passim.

17 “Jedoch halten [wir] vor guth und ratsamb ..., dass zwischen dem Anbringen und Begehren wegen unsern als königs zu Boheimb Admission und dann der wirklichen beywohnung im Churfürsten-rath ein Unterschied gemacht werden möchte und zwar, was das begehren wegen der blossen admission betrifft, würde g[e]nug sein, da solches allein von dem Plettenberg zu seiner Zeit, wan du es zum faslichsten erachten würdest, anliecht und negocirt, auch der churfürsten erklärung darüber ersuchet und sollicitirt würde. Nachdeme aber hierauf die admission erhalten und diese materia wegen des achten churfürsten oder einer alternativa gewiss und sicher bey dem churfürstlichen collegio ... kommen würde ... so würden als dann die Graf Ferdinand von Waldstein und Plettenberg sich vor unsere als König zu Böhembgesandten angeben und der consultation dieses Werks abwarten kennen.” NA Praha, Sbirka opisů z cizích archivů – Videň, Ministerstvo vnitra (1612–1845) [A collection of transcripts from foreign archives – Vienna, the Ministry of the Interior (1612–1845)], Ferdinand III to Trauttmansdorff, s. d.

18 A. BEGERT, *Böhmen*, p. 393, note 178.

written on the 5th January 1646.¹⁹ Waldstein should obtain the necessary creditives as well that were signed by the Bohemian Chancellor Georg Adam von Martinitz²⁰ and also the accompanying letters for Trauttmansdorff.²¹ These documents were delivered to Waldstein in May 1646, so he could be officially incorporated into the largest delegation, which in addition to the Emperor's *Obersthofmeister* was led by Johann Ludwig von Nassau-Hadamar and Johann Maximilian von Lamberg. The legal work, however, was supervised by the experienced and competent Aulic Councillors, Isaak Volmar and Johann Crane, on whom, to a large extent, the foreign policy of the Habsburg Monarchy in the Empire depended during the mid-17th Century. Also working for them was a powerful apparatus which, of course, also reflected the interests of the individual players that were grouped around the Emperor (one example may be Wilhelm Schröder who, as one of the principal secretaries, acted rather on behalf of the Archbishop of Mainz). Connected to this "core" were representatives of other constitutional units that were linked to the Habsburg family, such as the Austrian Lands and the County of Tyrol mentioned above. The Emperor's brother Leopold Wilhelm who, amongst other things, was the holder of eight ecclesiastical principalities in the Empire also sent delegates to take part in the imperial mission.²² The homogeneity of this diverse group should be defined by a link to Trauttmansdorff, who was the head of the association and was also the most frequent recipient of the Emperor's letters.

In accordance with the instructions received Waldstein was supposed to find out "*ob solten bey ietzigen friedenstractaten vorschläg unnd sachen obhanden sein, welche die hergebrachte verfassung deß churfürstlichen collegii betreffen thetten*".²³ Given the previous developments the primary reason for his mission was to inform both the Emperor and Trauttmansdorff about the topics that were discussed in the context of the Electoral College

19 Ibidem, p. 393, note 179. A. Begert states, that there was a false dating of the concept of Waldstein's instruction (end of 1645) and he argues with the opinion of Karsten Ruppert, who mentioned the instruction has never been released. Karsten RUPPERT (Hg.), *Acta pacis Westphalicae. Die kaiserlichen Korrespondenzen, Serie II, Abt. A, Bd. III*, Münster 1985, s. 21, note 4.

20 W. BECKER, *Der Kurfürstenrat*, p. 297, note 118.

21 Concepts in Österreichisches Staatsarchiv Wien, Allgemeines Verwaltungsarchiv, Hofkanzlei, sign. II B 4, Kart. 250; originals of the fair copy dated in Linz on 5. and 6. 1. 1646 in ÖStA Wien, Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchiv, Mainzer Erzkanzlerarchiv, Korrespondenz, Fasz. 7b (Conv. IV), fol. 2. Also in NA Praha, Sbirka opisů z cizích archivů – Vídeň, Ministerstvo vnitra (1612–1845) [A collection of transcripts from foreign archives - Vienna, the Ministry of the Interior (1612–1845)].

22 Hans WAGNER, *Die kaiserlichen Diplomaten auf dem Westfälischen Friedenskongreß*, in: Erich Zöllner (Hg.), *Diplomatie und Außenpolitik Österreichs. 11 Beiträge zu ihrer Geschichte*, Wien 1977, pp. 39–73; here pp. 60–61.

23 NA Praha, Sbirka opisů z cizích archivů – Vídeň, Ministerstvo vnitra (1612–1845) [A collection of transcripts from foreign archives - Vienna, the Ministry of the Interior (1612–1845)], 6. 1. 1646. Also W. BECKER, *Der Kurfürstenrat*, p. 240, note 91.

and about the attitudes of its individual members. Trauttmansdorff was also required to choose a specific strategy based on which Plettenberg and Waldstein should strive to obtain admission to college (e.g. when and in what manner to file a request for admission to the meeting) and he interceded in Vienna by sending money for the equipping of Waldstein's representative office, if this Czech nobleman was actually admitted to the college.²⁴ Initially Ferdinand III chose a cautious strategy and urged his diplomats to not question the preferences of the Archbishop of Mainz as the Dean of the college nor the sovereignty of his decision-making. Perhaps also because of this the caution negotiations dragged on for a long time and it was only on the 24th August 1646 that Waldstein informed the Emperor that he had presented his credentials and his application to both the Mainz Chancellor Nicolas George Neigersberger and to the Bavarian and Palatinate representatives because the discussion about the Palatinate electoral vote was impending.²⁵

Gradually, however, the leaders of the imperial delegation became more audacious and when they saw that the usual wave of protests against Waldstein's participation in meetings did not arise, and with the exception of some Saxon invective,²⁶ the Czech representatives were prepared to commence their full participation in the negotiations. Trauttmansdorff even arranged a festive entry to Münster for Waldstein and Plettenberg, about the course of which, unfortunately, we were not informed in detail.²⁷ Similarly also little is known about the ceremonial dispute over the seating arrangements between the Papal Nuncio (and officially the mediator between the warring parties) Fabio Chigi on one side and the Czech Counts Ferdinand Ernst von Waldstein and Johann Friedrich von

24 NA Praha, Sbirka opisů z cizích archivů – Videň, Ministerstvo vnitra (1612–1845) [A collection of transcripts from foreign archives – Vienna, the Ministry of the Interior (1612–1845)], 25. 1. 1646, Trauttmansdorff to Ferdinand III. Trauttmansdorff acted as *a spiritus agens* and on the 11. 3. 1647 he wrote to another Imperial Ambassador, Nassau, that there will be a discussion “... zu welchem ich den herrn Graven von Wallenstein morgen oder übermorgen hinüberkommen lassen werde, gestalt selbiger consultation als königlich böheimischer gesandter beyzuwohnen.” Antje OSCHMANN (Hg.), *Acta pacis Westphalicae. Die kaiserlichen Korrespondenzen, Serie II, Abt. A, Bd. V*, Münster 1993, p. 608.

25 NA Praha, Sbirka opisů z cizích archivů – Videň, Ministerstvo vnitra (1612–1845) [A collection of transcripts from foreign archives – Vienna, the Ministry of the Interior (1612–1845)], 24. 8. 1646, Waldstein to Ferdinand III. The hearing scheduled for the 27. 8. 1646 was eventually suspended due to the efforts of Bavaria to first reach an agreement with the Swedes. A. BEGERT, *Böhmen*, pp. 394–395.

26 Already in January 1646 it was suggested that the Bohemian King, if he wishes to be invited to the Electoral College, should finally begin to pay the imperial tax due in the amount of one Roman month (corresponding to the cost for the monthly maintenance of 400 horsemen and 600 infantrymen). Cf. Johann Jacob MOSER, *Neues teutsches Staatsrecht. Bd. X – Von der Teutschen Crays-Verfassung*, Frankfurt am Main – Leipzig 1773, pp. 17–18, §13. I would like to thank to Jiří Kubeš, for pointing out this source.

27 Waldstein's presence in Münster and Osnabrück was not noticed even by such a careful observer as the diplomat and the author of famous memoirs, Isaak Volmar. Cf. Joachim FOERSTER – Roswitha PHILIPPE (Hg.), *Acta pacis Westphalicae. Diarium Volmar I-II, Serie III, Abt. C, Bd. I-II*, Münster 1984.

Trauttmansdorff on the other side.²⁸ Johann Friedrich's father who was the Chief Imperial Ambassador in fact intended to seat both these two young men, imperial chamberlains, in front of clergymen in accordance with the Vienna practice, which naturally aroused the Nuncio's resentment. The frequent ceremonial problems that occurred during the diplomatic missions could not diminish the importance of Waldstein, who during that period visited important personalities and the ambassadors of foreign powers, who were thereby re-affirming his status (for example, the Chief Spanish Ambassador Don Gaspar de Bracamonte y Guzmán, Conde de Peñaranda).²⁹

The second half of 1646 brought about other significant problems, so that the negotiations concerning the expansion of the Electoral College became deadlocked while the parties involved insisted on their own opinions being correct. Still in October 1646 Trauttmansdorff received an order from Vienna to attempt to enforce *duplex votum* for the Kingdom of Bohemia, while the Swedish ambassador, Johann Oxenstierna, based on sheer brazenness, proposed the cancellation of the Bohemian electoral vote and suggested transferring it to the Rhineland Palatinate. Finally, both the Catholics and the Protestants started to incline towards the introduction of a decisive vote for the Archbishop of Mainz, which was specifically advocated by representatives of Maximilian of Bavaria. While awaiting the unblocking of the Palatine issue Waldstein passed his time at social events³⁰ and on journeys to neighbouring towns; he visited not only Osnabrück but also some relatively remote locations such as Bremen, Hamburg, Lübeck and Oldenburg.³¹ It seems that progress on the Palatine issue depended primarily on the imperial side. There, together with the Cologne deputy, they handed over to the Swedish diplomats the Electoral College's statement in regard to the potential establishment of the eighth elector (Palatinate). These also included the Palatine electoral vote. Thereby, after a break

28 The dispute apparently impressed the diplomatic community because even Abraham DE WICQUEFORT mentioned it in his work entitled *Mémoires touchant les Ambassadeurs et les Ministres publics*, Cologne 1679, pp. 329–330.

29 Additionally, in regard to his activities in Westphalia, Jonathan ISRAEL, *Conflicts of Empires: Spain, the Low Countries and the Struggle for World Supremacy (1585–1713)*, London 1997, esp. pp. 93–144; Fritz DICKMANN, *Der Westfälische Frieden*, Münster 1998, esp. pp. 200–204; Michael ROHRSCHEIDER, *Der gescheiterte Frieden zu Münster. Spaniens Ringen mit Frankreich auf dem Westfälischen Friedenskongress*, Münster 2006.

30 Regarding the regular visits and the joint dinners cf. the diary of the Imperial Ambassador Johann Maximilian von Lamberg – Herta HAGENER (Hg.), *Acta pacis Westphalicae. Diarium Lamberg, Serie III, Abt. C, Bd. IV*, Münster 1986, pp. 104, 113, 122, 124, 132, 171. It is interesting that Waldstein's younger brother, Karl Ferdinand, who was then only twelve years old, was also present in Osnabrück at that time.

31 Alessandro CATALANO – Katrin KELLER (Hg.), *Die Diarien und Tagzettel des Kardinals Ernst Adalbert von Harrach (1598–1667)*, Bd. V, Wien – Köln – Weimar 2010, p. 220.

of more than six-months, there was suddenly a reopening of this issue. And just then, in March 1647, climactic moments occurred in regard to the Waldstein's journey.

Actual presence in the college was preceded by bilateral negotiations between Waldstein and Plettenberg and the representatives of the individual missions that took place in rapid succession from the 14th of March onwards. At the moment when their participation in the plenum became evident, the electors' representatives started to offer their assistance to Waldstein and Plettenberg and to ask for support in regard to various matters.³² Finally they were inducted into the plenum of the College and on the 18th March, as the third entity after the Archbishop of Mainz and the Archbishop of Cologne, they officially carried-out their *votum* which supported the establishment of an eighth electoral vote for the Palatinate. All of this took place on behalf of the Bohemian King Ferdinand III.³³ Both the Czech representatives spent the next ten days making final visits to the Bavarian and the Trier diplomats and also to the Spanish ambassador Peñaranda and the Austrian ambassador Wolkenstein; then they left Münster and went on to Osnabrück.³⁴ There, together with the Cologne deputy, they handed over to the Swedish diplomats the Electoral College's statement in regard to the potential establishment of the eighth Electoral Palatinate.³⁵ Thereby *de facto* Waldstein's duties in Westphalia ended and he again enjoyed the subsequent weeks of social contacts and travel, while he also went to the United Provinces.³⁶ The stay in Westphalia was thereby extended until July

32 For example the Trier ambassadors sought for support against the demands of the Palatinate that at that time was holding a part of the territory that belonged to the Speyer Chapter (the Archbishop of Trier, Philipp Christoph von Sötern, was also the Bishop of Speyer). NA Praha, Sbirka opisů z cizích archivů – Videň, Ministerstvo vnitra (1612–1845) [A collection of transcripts from foreign archives – Vienna, the Ministry of the Interior (1612-1845)], 19. 3. 1647, Waldstein and Plettenberg to Ferdinand III.

33 The negotiations regarding the admission of Ferdinand Ernst von Waldstein to the Electoral College also required clarification as to whether he is actually representing the Emperor and the Bohemian King Ferdinand III or his son, the crowned “younger” King of Bohemia, Ferdinand IV. During the election activity the Bohemian electoral representatives always held the positions of the “younger” King of Bohemia, who usually was also a contender for the imperial throne. In the case of the Westphalian negotiations, however, the electors concluded that from the perspective of the Golden Bull of Charles IV Ferdinand IV was not mature enough to carry-out his electoral role. A. BEGERT, *Böhmen*, pp. 395–396.

34 There is more information about the departure in the NA Praha, Sbirka opisů z cizích archivů – Videň, Ministerstvo vnitra (1612–1845) [A collection of transcripts from foreign archives – Vienna, the Ministry of the Interior (1612-1845)], 22. 3. 1647 Waldstein and Plettenberg to Ferdinand III.

35 Cf. Maria-Elisabeth BRUNERT (Hg.), *Acta pacis Westphalicae. Die Beratungen des Fürstenrates in Osnabrück, Serie III, Abt. A, Bd. IV*, Münster 2006, p. 167.

36 “[Ferdinand Ernst von Waldstein] ist von Osnabrück hinweg nacher Oldenburg, will von dorten aus durch Friesland ins Holland, selbige provinzen ein wenig zu sehen.” A. CATALANO – K. KELLER (Hg.), *Die Diarien V*, p. 374.

1647 and then on the 16th of that month, he left the Congress³⁷ together with Maximilian von Trauttmansdorff,³⁸ although some uncertainties remained in regard to the Electoral Palatinate (e.g. the possible recovery of the office of Imperial Vicar or of the hereditary rank of *archidapifer*).³⁹

Somewhat unclear is the role played by Georg von Plettenberg, the second Bohemian electoral ambassador, in Münster and in Osnabrück. It seems that for the period of Waldstein's presence he also remained *de jure* the Bohemian ambassador. Thanks to his experience he was arranging for himself some service, some catered formal events and during the six-month intermezzo, when the Palatine matters were not on the agenda, he travelled across northern Germany to carry-out a variety of tasks. His letters sent in December 1646 are dated in The Hague, and concurrently the instructions for Brandenburg where he was negotiating the possible division of Pomerania between the Great Elector Friedrich Wilhelm and the Swedes were drawn up for him.⁴⁰ After Waldstein's departure Plettenberg stayed in the Westphalian cities and continued to be a part of the imperial delegation, although he did not attend any of the highest-level meetings. It was not until February 1648 when, via the mission leaders, he received from the Emperor a passport enabling him to leave the meeting places⁴¹ and subsequently we can find him living as an imperial resident in Hamburg in the Lower Saxony region and working for the Elector of Saxony as his diplomat (1665–1667).⁴²

The mission of Ferdinand Ernst von Waldstein did at least have a symbolic meaning. Although at the actual signing of the Peace of Westphalia the signature of the representative of the Bohemian King and his seal are both missing (unlike the seal of Count Wolkenstein, who attached his on behalf of the Austrian Lands),⁴³ we can still find Waldstein's portrait between the other portraits at Friedenssaal in Münster. The young Czech nobleman was also immortalised on one of the forty medals that were issued on the occasion of the

37 Cf. Heinz DUCHHARDT – Gerd DETHLEFS – Hermann QUECKENSTEDT, "zu einem stets währenden Gedächtnis". *Die Friedenssäule in Münster und Osnabrück und ihre Gesandtenporträts*, Bramsche 1996, pp. 246–247.

38 In regard to Trauttmansdorff's hasty departure, for example Bedřich ŠINDELÁŘ, *Vestfálský mír a česká otázka* [The Westphalian Peace and the Bohemian Question], Prague 1968, p. 240.

39 These issues were resolved by a majority vote at the Nuremberg Execution Diet in 1650. Additionally also Antje OSCHMANN, *Der Nürnberger Exekutionstag 1649–1650. Das Ende des Dreißigjährigen Krieges in Deutschland*, Münster 1991.

40 J. FOERSTER – R. PHILIPPE (Hg.), *Acta. Diarium Volmar*, Bd. I, p. 762.

41 Cf. Andreas HAUSMANN (Hg.), *Acta pacis Westphalicae. Die kaiserlichen Korrespondenzen (1647–1648), Serie II, Abt. A, Bd. VII*, Münster 2008, 1. 2. 1648, Ferdinand III to Nassau, Lamberg, Volmar and Crane from Prague.

42 Ludwig BITTNER – Lothar GROSS (Hg.), *Repertorium der diplomatischen Vertreter aller Länder seit dem Westfälischen Frieden (1648). Bd. I (1648–1715)*, Berlin 1936, p. 162.

43 A. BEGERT, *Böhmen*, p. 396.

Peace of Westphalia – on the reverse there is a crowned Waldstein coat of arms visible between the palm leaves and also the biblical inscription: “*Que Caesaris Caesari, que Dei Deo.*”⁴⁴ In addition to the constitutional implications of this diplomatic journey that also influenced Waldstein’s further rise, since because of it he found himself involved in the middle of the Habsburg world.

Career consequences

In the 17th and the 18th Centuries the Emperor’s delegations visiting the Holy Roman Empire were entrusted to the care of leading courtiers or of active members of the Aulic Council. Till now, however, the career of Ferdinand Ernst von Waldstein had been taking place only within the confines of the Kingdom of Bohemia and at the Court of Appeal (*Appellationsgericht*) he was looked upon as being a “mere” councillor. Therefore, his selection for the mission to Westphalia was, at the very least, looked upon as being unusual. It is only possible to speculate about the reason for this choice: apparently Trauttmansdorff’s requirement that was referred to above – that a Czech representative should be from a Czech family and be connected with the Czech authorities – was behind it. Maximilian von Waldstein, who belonged amongst the most influential collaborators of Ferdinand III and till 1642 held the important post of the *Oberstallmeister* and then became the principal military commander in Prague while in 1647 the Privy Council (*Geheimer Rat*) also recommended his son. Shortly before Ferdinand Ernst’s appointment Maximilian additionally wrote a letter to the Emperor in which he explicitly expressed his fervent wish that his children could also follow in his (Maximilian’s) footsteps and faithfully serve their Emperor and the whole House of Habsburg.⁴⁵ For the sake of completeness it should be noted that Maximilian was actually able to ensure a career for all of his sons, not only for his second son Ferdinand Ernst, but also for his brothers Franz Augustin and Karl Ferdinand and, with the help of Cardinal Harrach, also for Albrecht Leopold who was handicapped and for the future Archbishop of Prague Johann Friedrich too.⁴⁶

44 Cf. Constant VON WURZBACH, *Biographisches Lexikon des Kaisertums Österreich LII*, Wien 1885, p. 221.

45 The letter from Maximilian von Waldstein to Ferdinand III has been paraphrased by O. VON GSCHLIESSER, *Der Reichshofrat*, p. 256.

46 Cf. Jiří HRBEK, *Die Familie Waldstein als höfische Dynastie. Zur sozialen Reproduktion am Wiener Hof im 17. Jahrhundert*, in: Gerhard Ammerer – Ingolda Hanneschläger – Milan Hlavačka – Martin Holý (Hg.), *Präzedenz, Netzwerke und Transfers. Kommunikationsstrukturen von Herrscherhöfen und Adelsresidenzen in der Frühen Neuzeit*, Leipzig 2016, pp. 99–108.

Unlike that of the 1650's, the mutual correspondence between Maximilian von Waldstein and his son Ferdinand Ernst has not been preserved. It was precisely Maximilian, however, who during the years 1647 and 1648 regularly sat in the narrowest group of the chosen Privy Councillors who participated in formulating opinions, which were sent to Münster and Osnabrück on behalf of the Emperor. The Privy Council was corresponding with Nassau, Lamberg, Crane and Volmar, while Trauttmansdorff communicated directly with Ferdinand III. Ferdinand Ernst von Waldstein and Plettenberg were also corresponding with the Emperor however and it was this direct contact that represented the most significant benefit from the Westphalian mission for the personal experience and the future career of young Waldstein. Subsequently the latter often thanked the Emperor for his confidence in him.⁴⁷

Waldstein's appointment to the Bench of Lords of the Aulic Council took place just prior to his departure on the 20th October 1645, while he was not inaugurated to the *Reichshofrat* until the 2nd March 1648, after returning from a trip to the Westphalian cities.⁴⁸ In this regard Trauttmansdorff reminded the Imperial Vice-Chancellor (*Reichsvizekanzler*) Ferdinand Sigismund Kurz von Senftenau not to forget about Waldstein, who, at that time, was still in Münster.⁴⁹ Within the activities of the *Reichshofrat*, there were other missions awaiting him after his return from northern Germany, such as in Wasserburg in the Bavarian region, where he was expected to convince the gathered estates about the need to financially participate in the payment of the Swedish troops who were still residing in the territory of the Empire.⁵⁰ This was also the topic that he had most often had to deal with in his office of Aulic Councillor and he also participated in providing expert opinions that the *Reichshofrat* then forwarded to the *Geheimer Rat*, where they were also decided on, amongst others, by Waldstein's father Maximilian.

Ferdinand Ernst returned to Prague to take up the vacant post of the President of the Court of Appeal in February 1650. At the same time he retained his seat in the *Reichshofrat*, though he appeared only rarely on its meetings and his presence is documented during the year 1655.⁵¹ An illustrious career, behind which it was possible to see the hand of his

47 "... umb so viel mehrers ich mich auch allerdemütigst bedanken der gehorsamsten zuversicht lebend, es werde Euer may[estät] durch mein[e] embsigkeit, treu und fleiss mehrers und weiters anlass geben werden." NA Praha, Sbíрка opisů z cizích archivů – Vídeň, Ministerstvo vnitra (1612–1845) [A collection of transcripts from foreign archives – Vienna, the Ministry of the Interior (1612–1845)], 24. 8. 1646, Ferdinand Ernst von Waldstein to Ferdinand III.

48 For example ibidem, 18. 6. 1646, Trauttmansdorff to Ferdinand III.

49 Cf. Hubert SALM – Brigitte WÜBBEKE-PFLÜGER (Hg.), *Acta pacis Westphalicae. Die kaiserlichen Korrespondenzen, Serie II, Abt. A, Bd. IV*, Münster 2001, p. 92, 26. 4. 1646, Trauttmansdorff to Kurz.

50 More details in regard to this mission can be found in Jiří HRBEK, *Barokní Valdštejnové v Čechách (1640–1740)* [The Baroque Waldsteins in Bohemia (1640–1740)], Prague 2013, pp. 529–530.

51 ÖStA Wien, Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchiv, Reichshofrat, Residenzprotokolle, Nr. 164.

powerful father, continued actually in Prague. His experienced father Maximilian needed a good contact in the Czech state capital rather than in Vienna, who would be able to take care of his affairs and keep an eye on the management of the Waldsteins' estates that could suffer from Maximilian's long-term absence. In 1650 this long-time courtier also occupied the post of the *Obersthofkämmerer* of Ferdinand III, which required his constant presence close to the Emperor. Ferdinand Ernst was soon promoted to the ranks of the highest officials in the Kingdom of Bohemia, while from holding the post of the President of the Court of Appeal (*Präsident des Appellationsgerichts*) he then became the *Oberstlandrichter* (1651) and later even the *Oberstlandkämmerer* (1652). In both cases the highest provincial officials' *vota* were maintained who always nominated Ferdinand Ernst as one of the most suitable candidates for these offices. Unlike his knowledge of the law and of both of the provincial languages, no voices defined his representation of the Bohemian King in the Westphalian negotiations as being amongst his merits.⁵² Even in these provincial offices he did not avoid his obligations that were associated with the Empire. At the end of February 1652, he left for Saxony with Johann Crane to invite Duke Johann Georg to attend the Electoral Diet in Prague.⁵³ In September of the same year, Waldstein was at the southwestern border welcoming the Electress of Bavaria and the Emperor's sister, Maria Anna, who was the guardian of the juvenile Ferdinand Maria.⁵⁴ He escorted her together with her courtiers to Prague and Waldstein's entourage, which consisted of the accountants and of the fourriers who took care of the catering and the accommodation, thereby ensuring both the smooth course of the journey and also the payment of the considerable bills.⁵⁵

In accordance with Harrach's Diary, Ferdinand Ernst was not the healthiest of people and his weak body structure corresponded to the Cardinal's reports concerning Waldstein's frequent digestive problems. These were also accompanied by chronic inflammation of the throat, which could exclude him from public life for even longer periods of time.⁵⁶

52 Unfortunately the *vota* in regard to his appointment as the President of the Court of Appeal, which initiated his career in Czech offices, have not been preserved. *The vota* prior to his appointment as the *Oberstlandrichter* and the *Oberstlandkämmerer* are stored in the NA Prague, Česká dvorská kancelář [The Czech Court Office], inv. Nr. 860, sign. IV H 5, Kart. 718.

53 Their stay in Saxony lasted only briefly (i.e. from 27. 2. to 7. 3. 1652). L. BITTNER – L. GROSS (eds.), *Repertorium I*, p. 162. Eventually Johann Georg (II), the successor, arrived in Prague as the Plenary Representative of his father.

54 ÖStA Wien, Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchiv, Obersthofmeisteramt, Ältere Zeremonialakten, Kart. 3, Nrs. 3–22.

55 Ferdinand B. MIKOVEC, *Ferdinand III. v Praze roku 1652* [Ferdinand III in Prague 1652], Lumír 10, 1860, pp. 734–737, 759–760, 807–809.

56 In my opinion the onset of the disease may explain, for example, the fact that he was inducted into the Aulic Council a whole nine months after his return from northern Germany.

It was also illness that ended his promising career in May 1656, during the midst of the preparations for the Bohemian Coronation of Leopold I, for which, based on his function as the *Oberstlandkämmerer*, he was required to ensure the fresh decoration of the Old Bohemian diet room (*Stará sněmovna, Alte Landstube*) at Prague Castle, including the upholstery of the royal throne.⁵⁷ The probable cause of his death, which surprised the aristocratic society of the time, was *aposthema*, i.e. a tuberculous abscess in the left lung, probably also with metastases throughout the body and especially in the areas of the neck and the lymph nodes.⁵⁸

According to the diary of Cardinal Harrach, Ferdinand Ernst von Waldstein arrived at Westphalia only to gain some experiences and to visit the towns in northern Germany as well.⁵⁹ His “grand tour” changed to diplomatic mission thanks to his patron Maximilian von Trauttmansdorff and became one of the biggest intervention in the negotiations of the Electoral College during the entire 16th and 17th Centuries that implemented by a representative of the Bohemian King, apart from the election of the Roman-German King. It can also be interpreted as having been a “trial balloon” that was dispatched in the direction of the imperial public and the other electors, by means of which the Emperor could test if there was a suitable moment for the readmission of the Bohemian electoral vote. In this respect it is possible to observe a certain continuity of the decisions of Ferdinand III with the previous policies of his predecessors, Ferdinand II and Matthias, who, unlike Ferdinand I, Maximilian II and Rudolph II, all tried to change the status of the Czech Lands and to find a path to stronger ties with the entire Holy Roman Empire.

This is to say that the Bohemian Electorate also provided the Habsburgs with a solid base within the Empire. In this respect, they actually followed the concepts behind the dynastic and territorial policies of Charles IV, whose Golden Bull for the Empire belonged

57 Originally the new decoration and upholstery was to have been paid for out of the arrears on the Coronation Tax, which was approved for the coronation of Ferdinand IV (1646). Eventually this purpose was abandoned because many of the receivables proved to be recoverable and therefore a cameral portion of collected taxes (i.e. a *quantum camerale*) was used instead. The NA Praha, Nová manipulace [The New Record file manipulation], sign. K1/7, Kart. 290.

58 Cf. the testimony of Waldstein's servant Johann Sigismund Neschitz in a letter written to Cardinal Harrach. ÖStA Wien, Allgemeines Verwaltungsarchiv, Familienarchiv Harrach, Kart. 153 (Graf Franz Ernst von Waldstein), 21. 5. 1656. In regard to Waldstein's posthumous translation and funeral also Jiří HRBEK, *Proměny valdštejnské reprezentace* [The Changes of Waldstein's Representation], Prague 2015, pp. 242–244.

59 “... mit deme [Trauttmansdorff] ziehet dahin unser Graf Ferdinandt von Walnstein per curiosita.” A. CATALANO – K. KELLER (Hg.), *Die Diarien und Tagzettel, Bd. V*, p. 176.

to its set of “constitutional” laws till the end of this sovereign entity in 1806. The mission of Ferdinand Ernst von Waldstein can therefore be read only within the context of these long-term objectives, for the achievement of which the Czech Lands were, for the last time, granted in fief to Ferdinand IV on the 16th May 1653 at the Regensburg Diet.⁶⁰ Then he demonstrated his rank during his election at the end of May of the same year, in which he participated personally and which he attended in a specially-made electoral ermine coat and he also acceded to the throne in it during the subsequent imperial coronation.⁶¹ At a symbolic level this also demonstrated the pertinence of the “younger” Bohemian King (Ferdinand IV who had been crowned in St. Vitus Cathedral on the 5th August 1646) to the Electoral College.

Parameters of statehood in the modern sense are not applicable either to the Holy Roman Empire nor to the Czech Lands. The model of state sovereignty by which we currently judge the state organism that was theoretically defined during the second half of the 16th Century; in practice, however, was only introduced very slowly and as a result of the enlightened absolutism and nationalism of the 19th Century. In pre-modern times the state entity was maintained by personal (feudal) bonds, symbolic acts and only an *ad hoc* enforcement of rule. Nevertheless, the brief participation of Ferdinand Ernst von Waldstein at the meeting of the Electoral College concerning one single issue still necessitated a long and complicated preparation and this is also why, in the end, it actually meant more than it may now seem to be at first glance.

60 Cf. J. VESELÝ, *K otázce lenního vztahu*, p. 75.

61 Cf. Štěpán VÁCHA, *Repräsentations- oder Krönungsornat? Zum Ursprung und zur Funktion des Zeremonialgewands Ferdinands IV. aus dem Jahre 1653*, *Umění* 54, 2006, pp. 229–239.