

Lenka MARŠÁLKOVÁ

Dominik Andreas von Kaunitz during the 80's and the early 90's of the 17th Century. The Early Career of the Imperial Diplomat¹

Abstract: The present study focuses on documenting the beginnings of the diplomatic career of one of the most important imperial diplomats, Dominik Andreas Count von Kaunitz (1655–1705) and on defining the information that was learned within the context of the current research. Researchers have already studied the peak period of Kaunitz' diplomatic career in the late 1690's, when he served in the Hague as the imperial envoy and was subsequently appointed as the Reichsvizekanzler. His previous activities, however, have so far not aroused much interest, though it was the 80's and the beginning of the 90's of the 17th century that were crucial in regard to his future direction. Based on the research that was carried-out in the Moravský zemský archiv in Brno (Moravian Land Archive, in the Kaunitz and Dietrichstein Family Archives) and in the archives in Vienna (in Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchiv and Allgemeines Verwaltungsarchiv) and also in the Munich archive (Bayerisches Hauptstaatsarchiv) attention will be paid not only to what, when and where Count von Kaunitz discussed during his journeys, but also the manner in which he acted and the strategies that he chose to employ. This study should therefore reveal not only this diplomat's mental world but also his everyday life and his social background.

Keywords: Diplomacy – the Early Modern era – the 17th Century – Leopold I – Dominik Andreas von Kaunitz – Bavaria – England – Passau – Mainz

The purpose of this study is to present information about the personality and the diplomatic career² of one of the most important imperial diplomats at the end of the 17th century, Dominik Andreas Count von Kaunitz, and defining the

1 This study was created within the GACR project No. 13–12939S, *Bohemian and Moravian Nobility in the Diplomatic Service of the Austrian Habsburgs (1640–1740)*.

2 The question of the suitability of the term “diplomatic career” is currently under discussion and in fact it is increasingly being replaced by the term “diplomatic service”. There were very few aristocrats whom we could actually identify as being career diplomats; for most of them their activities in the ranks of diplomacy more likely represented their path to reaching higher posts. The author of this study is aware of these nuances and, while she does use the term “diplomatic career”, she does so at a distance.

information that was learned within the context of the current research.³ Thereby attention will be focussed not only on what, when and where Count von Kaunitz discussed during his journeys, but mainly on how he acted and what strategies he chose to employ. In association with his everyday life and his social background this study should therefore also reveal this diplomat's mental world and at the same time answer the following questions: What were von Kaunitz' tasks and powers during the missions on which he was sent in the 1680's and early 1690's, i.e. at a time when his diplomatic career began to develop precipitously? With whom, where and in what manner did he act and what strategies did he use in specific cases? With whom did he cooperate personally and who supported his work only from afar and what were the grounds of this cooperation? What was Kaunitz' motivation and what consequences did the missions that he completed have for him?

While the personality of Dominik Andreas, Count von Kaunitz (1655–1705) is not completely unknown to today's scholars, so far it has not raised much interest in them. The first comprehensive information about him was provided in Max Braubach's study entitled *Graf Dominik Andreas Kaunitz (1655–1705) als Diplomat und Staatsmann*, which though it did attract attention to him, basically it did not critically assess his activities within the ranks of the imperial diplomacy. Following-on from this there were other studies, such as the chapter in the still widely cited work from the pen of Grete Klingenstein *Der Aufstieg des Hauses Kaunitz. Studien zur Herkunft und Bildung des Staatskanzlers Wenzel Anton*, which, however, is also not focused closely on this crucial period of Kaunitz' life.⁴

3 See particularly Jiří HRBEK, *Cesty evropské historiografie k diplomacii raného novověku* [Ways of European Historiography to the Diplomacy of Early Modern Period], *Theatrum historiae* 13, 2013, pp. 7–30; find further references there. An example of the currently-held concept of research concerning diplomacy and the diplomats of the Early Modern era are studies that have been penned by participants in the grant project that is referred to above; for example: Jiří KUBEŠ, *Jan Marek z Clary a Aldringenu jako vyslanec Leopolda I. u saského kurfiřtského dvora na konci 17. století* [Johann Marcus Count von Clary and Aldringen as the Envoy of Leopold I at the Saxon Court of the Prince-Elector at the End of the 17th Century], *Český časopis historický* 113, 2015, pp. 346–380, for a brief comparison of Count von Clary and Aldringen's diplomatic mission with that of Count von Kaunitz see pp. 375–378.

4 Max BRAUBACH, *Graf Dominik Andreas Kaunitz (1655–1705) als Diplomat und Staatsmann*, in: Heinrich Fichtenau – Erich Zöllner (Hg.), *Beiträge zur neueren Geschichte Österreichs*, Wien – Köln – Graz 1974, pp. 225–242. Grete KLINGENSTEIN, *Der Aufstieg des Hauses Kaunitz. Studien zur Herkunft und Bildung des Staatskanzlers Wenzel Anton*, Göttingen 1975, in regard to Count Dominik Andreas pp. 41–74. Count von Kaunitz' diplomatic missions are mentioned in the work of Ludwig BITTNER – Lothar GROß (Hg.), *Repertorium der diplomatischen Vertreter aller Länder seit dem Westfälischen Frieden (1648)*, Band I, 1648–1715, Oldenburg – Berlin 1936, specifically pp. 125, 126, 139, 146, 150, 153 and 158. Dominik Andreas is also mentioned in more or less detail in various publications that are related to the Early Modern aristocracy: e.g. in the work of Vít VLNAS, *Princ Evžen Savojský* [Prince Eugene of Savoy], Prague – Litomyšl 2001 we can read selectively about Count

Dominik Andreas was born from the marriage of Leo Wilhelm Count von Kaunitz and Maria Eleonore, née Dietrichstein. After his Grand Tour, which took place between the years 1671 and 1674, and during which he visited a number of Italian and French cities, the young Count married Countess Maria Eleonore von Sternberg (1656–1706), whose beauty and charm often significantly helped him during his later diplomatic negotiations. The Count and the Countess participated in the travels of the royal court, during which Dominik Andreas also gained his first political experience. The Count obtained his first major diplomatic post in 1682—it was the post of imperial envoy in Munich. In the current political situation in which the monarchy found itself between Scylla and Charybdis in the form of a Turkish threat on one side and the conquest policy of Louis XIV on the other side, it was necessary for the Emperor to find allies. At the Bavarian court Kaunitz therefore had the task of obtaining the young Elector Maximilian II Emanuel (1662–1726) for the Habsburg case. After about a year of his service in Munich he actually succeeded when the Bavarian troops participated in the victorious Battle of Vienna. In addition Kaunitz also strengthened the Habsburg-Bavarian alliance by mediating the Elector's marriage to the daughter of Emperor Leopold I from his first marriage, Maria Antonia. The success of the mission, in 1683, was also reflected in the advancement of Dominik Andreas von Kaunitz to the status of a *Reichsgraf*.

Until 1686 Count von Kaunitz travelled between the Munich and the Viennese courts. Then he was sent to negotiate a potential alliance with England; this mission failed however. Even this time Kaunitz' capability impressed the Emperor and in 1685 he was appointed to the position of a *Geheimer Rat* and two years later he was even awarded the high ranking Order of the Golden Fleece.⁵ In 1687 Count von Kaunitz returned to Munich to discuss with the Elector the steps necessary for electing a new Cologne coadjutor and also for diminishing the French influence while also strengthening the

von Kaunitz at many different places, i.e. pp. 37, 118, 138–139, 150 etc.; additionally see Petr MAŤA, *Svět české aristokracie (1500–1700)* [The World of Bohemian Aristocracy (1500–1700)], Prague 2004, pp. 179, 424, 844, 847, 860. Dominik Andreas Count von Kaunitz also has his own entry in Zedler's lexicon: Johann Heinrich ZEDLER, *Grosses vollständiges Universal Lexikon Aller Wissenschaften und Künste*, Bd. 6, Halle – Leipzig 1733, cols. 278–279; in regard to Kaunitz see also: Kateřina KLÍMKOVÁ, *Císařská diplomacie na bavorském a saském dvoře v osmdesátých a devadesátých letech 17. století* [Imperial Diplomacy at the Bavarian and Saxon Courts during the 1680's and the 1690's], a diploma thesis at Masaryk University, Brno 2006; Lenka FLORKOVÁ, *Kavalířská cesta Dominika Ondřeje z Kounic* [The Grand Tour of Dominik Andreas von Kaunitz], Vyškovský sborník 4, 2004, pp. 87–111 and Lenka MARŠÁLKOVÁ, *Dvě instrukce pro Dominika Ondřeje z Kounic, císařského vyslance na bavorském dvoře*, z 26. 3. a 31. 10. 1688 [Two Instructions, from the 26th March and the 31st October 1688, for Dominik Andreas von Kaunitz, the Imperial Envoy at the Bavarian Court] (available on-line at URL: <<http://uhv.upce.cz/cs/documents-and-editions/>> [cit. 21. 12. 2016]).

5 G. KLINGENSTEIN, *Der Aufstieg des Hauses Kaunitz*, pp. 43–47.

Habsburg-Bavarian alliance.⁶ Despite some initial difficulties eventually this mission was also successful: In early July he finally managed to persuade Maximilian II Emanuel to go to Hungary as the Commander-in-Chief, where he participated in the victorious Battle of Belgrade. After a short stay in Vienna in early November Kaunitz again went to Munich and again tried to lure Bavaria into the pro-Habsburg Camp, which he eventually succeeded in achieving: in May 1689 the alliance treaty between the Bavarian Elector and the Emperor was finally re-signed.

In the late 1690's Dominik Andreas Count von Kaunitz experienced the peaks of both his diplomatic and his political career. During the years 1694–1697 he served in The Hague as the imperial envoy, where, amongst other issues, he also negotiated the provision of military assistance against the Turks and also the readmission of the Bohemian electoral vote; in June 1696 he was appointed as the *Reichsvizekanzler*. Around the turn of the century, however, the Count apparently became involved in a dispute with a group of influential aristocrats who were headed by Ferdinand Bonaventura von Harrach and Heinrich Franz Mansfeld, Prince of Fondi, and subsequently he was gradually removed from power. Although Count Kaunitz could no longer fully realise himself in politics, this does not mean that he completely withdrew from public life. He made use of the situation for cultivating his estates, reconstructing Slavkov castle, purchasing townhouses and also for establishing a textile manufacturing business in Slavkov.⁷ Dominik Andreas von Kaunitz died in January 1705 and, apart from many debts, he did also leave his successfully developing estate to his two sons and four daughters.⁸ The Count therefore spent his entire active life dedicated mainly to faithful service in the ranks of diplomacy of

6 In regard to Count von Kaunitz' Bavarian mission during the years 1687–1688: Lenka MARŠÁLKOVÁ, *Bavorská mise Dominika Ondřeje z Kounic v letech 1687–1688* [The Bavarian Mission of Dominik Andreas, the Count of Kaunitz, between the years 1687–1688], contribution to the Splendid Encounters IV International Conference, that was held in Budapest (25. – 26. 9. 2015), and also M. BRAUBACH, *Graf Dominik Andreas Kaunitz*, there particularly pp. 227–232 and in regard to Cologne election also pp. 229–231. Before he arrived in England and after returning from there, the Count stopped by to visit the Elector Palatine, L. BITTNER – L. GROß, *Repertorium*, p. 158; in the same publication he is also listed in 1687 and then again in 1697 as the envoy to the Bishopric of Magdeburg; this fact has not yet been documented, however (ibidem, p. 150). Kaunitz visited Bavaria more times, however; in 1695 he stayed there from 30. 3. until May and then from 21. 9. until 10. 12., during which time he was discussing there the readmission of the Bohemian Electoral Vote (ibidem, p. 126).

7 More information can be found in regard to the Kaunitz family's textile production business in Jindřich ŠEBÁNEK, *Textilní podniky moravských Kouniců* [The Textile Enterprises of the Moravian Kaunitz], *Časopis Matice moravské* 55, 1931, pp. 95–168, 418–468 and *Časopis Matice moravské* 56, 1932, pp. 101–186.

8 Cf. in detail G. KLINGENSTEIN, *Der Aufstieg des Hauses Kaunitz*, pp. 47–74; additionally also M. BRAUBACH, *Graf Dominik Andreas Kaunitz*, pp. 232–242.

Emperor Leopold I during a difficult period in much of Europe involving fierce fighting for influence and power both in the military and the diplomatic field.

Table 1: What has been so far known concerning the diplomatic missions of Dominik Andreas von Kaunitz – A Summary

Duration of the mission	Destination	Tasks
1682–1686	Bavaria	The Habsburg-Bavarian alliance against the Turks and France + military assistance; the marriage of the Elector to Maria Antonia von Habsburg
1686–1687	England	The Habsburg-English alliance against the Turks and France + military assistance
1687–1689	Bavaria	The Habsburg-Bavarian alliance against the Turks and France + military assistance; the election of the Cologne Coadjutor and the Archbishop
1694–1697	The Hague	Peace talks, military assistance against the Turks, the readmission of the Bohemian electoral vote

Even in this brief introduction there is a series of gaps that deserve to be filled. For example: How the Count achieved obtaining all the aforementioned diplomatic posts – because the Emperor was personally familiar with his previous experience or did he have an influential intercessor? How did he perceive these missions: as a necessary evil, which, however, would guarantee his progression up the career ladder and perhaps even obtaining some court office, or as an honour and a validation of his skills? Did he always set out on an expedition with one major mission, or would he be fulfilling a wide range of smaller tasks at a specific location? How did his diplomatic missions actually go: did he live in the place of his work continuously or did his missions involve his constant travel between the specific destination and the imperial court? How and with whom did he develop useful contacts at the place and what helped him to convince (frequently very hesitant) potential allies? And what was he actually doing during the periods between the individual missions? Based on the research that was conducted in both domestic and foreign archives, I will also try to clarify any other ambiguities or at least suggest answers to the above questions. Attention will be paid to the early 1690's, i.e. the period during which it is possible to find a lot of blank white spots in the existing research; Kaunitz' last major diplomatic task – the peace talks in the Hague – will be omitted, as this has already been sufficiently mapped in the literature.⁹

9 Volker JARREN, *Die Vereinigten Niederlande und das Haus Österreich 1648–1748. Fremdbildwahrnehmung und politisches Handeln kaiserlichen Gesandter und Minister*, in: Helmut Gabel – Volker Jarren (Hg.), *Kaufleute und Fürsten. Außenpolitik und politisch-kulturelle Perzeption im Spiegel*

Sources directly from the provenance of Dominik Andreas von Kaunitz (or those which relate to him in some way) have been preserved to a greater extent, namely in connection with the beginnings of his work in the service of imperial diplomacy. They are stored mainly either in the rich Kaunitz or in the Dietrichstein family archives in the Moravský zemský archiv (Moravian Land Archive) in Brno and in archives in Vienna (in Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchiv and Allgemeines Verwaltungsarchiv) and also in the archive in Munich (Bayerisches Hauptstaatsarchiv).

Bavaria I

Whether Count Kaunitz had already gained some experience in the diplomatic service even before his first journey to Bavaria, still remains somewhat shrouded in mystery. After marrying Maria Eleonore von Sternberg, the young couple participated in several journeys of the imperial court, but the Count (then only twenty years old!) had apparently caught the attention of the Emperor and his family even before then: for example, in early September 1675, i.e. a few months before the wedding with Maria Eleonore, he apparently went to Poland as a member of the entourage of Empress Claudia Felicitas von Tyrol.¹⁰

The first significant diplomatic mission on which Count Kaunitz was sent was directed to the court of the Bavarian Elector and it became greatly prolonged – as it ushered him in following delays and problems which the Count had already had more than enough of during his period of tenure within the ranks of imperial diplomacy. According to the draft of imperial instruction the main task of Dominik Andreas von Kaunitz from the 23rd November 1682 was to obtain the support of Maximilian II Emanuel as an ally that was to be crowned by signing an alliance treaty against the “hereditary enemy” and also against France. In addition to the Elector the Count was to negotiate mainly with the Elector’s *Vizekanzler*, Baron Leidel, to whom he should explain the Emperor’s motives in detail.¹¹ Also, if possible, he should, continually move about within the Elector’s proximity

niederländischdeutscher Beziehungen 1648–1748, Münster 1998; in regard to the development of the local diplomatic talks in general see pp. 39–354.

10 See the mention of this in the letter of 25. 7. 1675 from Prince Ferdinand von Dietrichstein to Count Ferdinand Bonaventura von Harrach. Österreichisches Staatsarchiv Wien (= ÖStA Wien), Allgemeines Verwaltungsarchiv (= AVA), Familienarchiv Harrach (= FA Harrach), Kart. 229, s. f.

11 Baron Johann Baptist von Leidel, the diplomat, the Elector’s *Geheimer Rat* and the *Hofvizekanzler*. To him, for example, in Ludwig HÜTTL, *Max Emanuel, der Blaue Kurfürst 1679–1726. Eine politische Biographie*, München 1976, pp. 105, 118, 138, 165, 176, etc. The Bavarian Leidel family is also mentioned in a few lines of Zedler’s lexicon, J. H. ZEDLER, *Grosses vollständiges Universal Lexikon*, Bd. 16, col. 1576. The Count had a good overview concerning what Baron Leidel had communicated from Vienna to Munich thanks to the Archduchess Maria Antonia; see Kaunitz’ letter from 12. 2. 1683, ÖStA Wien,

– either in his residence in Munich or on hunting trips and journeys. He should also, of course, inform the Emperor about everything in regular reports and then await further instructions.¹²

To Munich, to the court of the Bavarian Elector Maximilian II Emanuel, Count Kaunitz arrived on the 11th December 1682.¹³ He had to wait several days for his first audience with the Elector, however – at that time the Elector and his court were staying in Dachau. The Count therefore accommodated himself¹⁴ and, in accordance with the imperial instruction, he turned to Baron Leidel, who, several days after Kaunitz' arrival, went to the imperial court as an envoy of the Elector.¹⁵ The Count finally received his first audience (during which, as he mentioned in his letter to the Emperor, he did not forget anything and everything went to the full satisfaction of all concerned) on the 25th December at five o'clock in the afternoon and then he made courtesy visits with other members of the Elector's family.¹⁶ During the rest of 1682 and early in the next year the Count was invited to a variety of other audiences;¹⁷ the issues that needed to be talked about with the Elector were very diverse.

In addition to the issue of a possible alliance, the Count was also negotiating about dynastic issues: in fact he was functioning as an imperial “matchmaker” – he presented to the Elector the option to marry the Emperor's daughter from his first marriage, Maria Antonia (1669–1692), and also the benefits that would be associated with this marriage and, unobtrusively, but convincingly, he tried to persuade the Elector to consent to this marriage. It was certainly not easy work: the young Elector was reluctant to marry, and in

Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchiv (= HHStA), Österreichische Geheime Staatsregistratur (= ÖGSR), Kart. 105, Fasz. 75, Pars 1, fol. 88–91.

- 12 The draft of imperial instruction for Count Kaunitz for his mission to Bavaria from 23. 11. 1682. *Ibidem*, fol. 1–6.
- 13 The Count arrived in Munich with his wife. He hardly mentioned her presence in official correspondence, however, and references to her can be found only in his own private correspondence.
- 14 According to his letter to the Emperor from 22. 12. 1682, he lived in an unspecified “*Gesandtenhaus*” (ÖStA Wien, HHStA, ÖGSR, Kart. 105, Fasz. 75, Pars 1, fol. 10–11). Later on, during his second mission to Bavaria, however, he stayed at the court and also in rented accommodation in a private house – see below.
- 15 He left on 1. 1. 1683 (ÖStA Wien, HHStA, ÖGSR, Kart. 105, Fasz. 75, Pars 1, fol. 22–23); he probably did not arrive in Vienna until 27. 1. of that year (*ibidem*, fol. 44–45). He did additionally appear in Vienna in the spring of 1688, for example; see the Emperor's letter to the Bavarian Elector dating from 21. 3. 1688 (*ibidem*, Kart. 107, Fasz. 76, Pars 2, fol. 61). At this time negotiations with him took place at Prince Ferdinand of Dietrichstein's house (*ibidem*, fol. 165–166, the draft of the Emperor's letter dating from 31. 3. 1688).
- 16 Amongst others, he visited “*Duke Max and his wife*”, i.e. the Elector's uncle – Maximilian Philipp Heinrich (1638–1705) and Mauricienne Febronie de la Tour-d'Auvergne (1652–1706). See Kaunitz' letter to the Emperor dating from 25. 12. 1682, *ibidem*, Kart. 105, Fasz. 75, Pars 1, fol. 14–15.
- 17 They took place on 27. 12. 1682 and on 1. 1., 15. 1. and 29. 1. 1683, *ibidem*.

addition a competing matchmaker, Luigi Ballati, the envoy from Hanover, was operating in his court as also was the “Hanoverian clique”, allegedly led by Countess von Krieching. According to Kaunitz’ opinion, Count Friedrich von Preising, Canon in Salzburg, Passau and Augsburg, also belonged to this clique, for example.¹⁸ Ballati’s task was to negotiate the Elector’s marriage to the daughter of Ernst August von Braunschweig und Lüneburg and later (from 1692) also the first Elector of Hanover, Sophia Charlotte (1662–1705). From the outset Ballati’s mission did not seem very hopeful, however, and was accompanied by purely “technical” problems: for example, he had to wait a few days for the creditive from his master, until which time he was obliged to act *incognito* (based on Kaunitz’ surprised and at the same time disgusted observations regarding this situation one can only assume that it was probably not a common practice). Kaunitz still did not succeed in obtaining the Elector’s consent to marry the Habsburg Archduchess until during the year 1684 and even during the following year it was not entirely certain that the wedding would take place without any problems occurring. Eventually everything turned out in the way that the Emperor had imagined. Subsequently Count von Kaunitz helped to negotiate the conditions under which the marriage could be carried-out and also the details of the marriage contract.¹⁹

Another marriage, in regard to which Count von Kaunitz had been intervening since 1683 based on the Emperor’s orders, was the planned marriage of the Polish Prince James Louis Sobieski to the Bavarian Princess and the Elector’s younger sister, Violanta Beatrix, who, at that time, was just 10 years old. The Emperor was quite impatient in regard to arranging this marriage: he wished the future Polish King to oblige him and Bavaria and, based on Kaunitz’ reports, he considered that the young Prince was a quiet and stable person who could be beneficial for him in the future, especially in fighting against the Turks. The Elector hesitated again, however; the reason for this was the young age of the

18 The Countess von Krieching (possibly Maria Elizabeth Anna), as the Count noted several times, was not too successful: apparently nobody in the Bavarian court other than her wanted this Hanoverian marriage and even though the Elector based on her wishes sent his man to the Hanover court to take a look at the potential bride, subsequently these talks later ended in failure. Apparently the Countess was actually the wife of the Elector’s *Geheimer Rat* and the *Hauptmann* of trabants, who as of 1685 is mentioned as representing an aspect of the Elector’s court, for example in contemporary publications: Christoph BOETHIUS, *Ruhm-belorberter triumph-leuchtender und glantz-erhöherer Kriegs-Helms...*, Volumes 2–3, Nürnberg 1688, p. 77 and also in the work: Eberhard Werner HAPPEL, *Der Bayerische Max, Oder so genannter Europaeischer Geschicht-Roman...*, Volume 1, 1692, p. 197.

19 ÖStA Wien, HHStA, ÖGSR, Kart. 105, Fasz. 75, Pars 2, fol. 168–169. See also numerous mentions in Kaunitz’ correspondence with Count Ferdinand Bonaventura von Harrach (ÖStA Wien, AVA, FA Harrach, Kart. 254/35, s. f.), additionally also ÖStA Wien, HHStA, ÖGSR, Kart. 105, Fasz. 75, Pars 1 and 2 and also in regard to the actual wedding, which took place on 15. 7. 1685, see the large folder in ÖStA Wien, HHStA, Obersthofmeisteramt, Ältere Zeremonialakten (hereinafter referred to as OmeA, ÄZA), 14/13.

Princess, due to which any marriage would need to be suspended for many years, and then especially there was the question of the Polish Succession – the Elector wanted to ensure that, thanks to his sister, he would in the future have a guaranteed entitlement to the Polish crown.²⁰ The negotiations also continued during the following year, even when the marriage contract had been drafted, but the actual marriage had not yet taken place. The marriage of the Bavarian Princess was also one of the crucial factors of Kaunitz' second Bavarian mission that took place in the late 1680's. The Princess was to be betrothed to Archduke Joseph, but even this marriage had not been negotiated and Violanta Beatrix was married in Italy.²¹

In addition to the marriage policy Count Kaunitz during his first actual mission to Bavaria also discussed less “romantic” matters: i.e. obtaining military assistance for the fight against the “hereditary enemy” and against France. He was obliged to argue with the Elector about almost any soldier that Bavaria might possibly provide and also about any specific conditions related to this cooperation, regarding which the Elector was, of course, a bit hesitant and nor was hurrying in regard to his own personal involvement in the fighting. But eventually Kaunitz' persuasion was successful after all: Maximilian II Emanuel as the Commander-in-Chief of the Bavarian troops (amounting to cca. 11,000 men) on the 11th and the 12th September 1683 personally took part in the Battle of Vienna and thereby contributed to a glorious victory over the Turks.

Of course, Count von Kaunitz very closely followed the development of the mood at the Elector's court, whether in the pro-French cliques (where initially, for example, Kaunitz' later ally, Baron Johann Friedrich Karg von Bebenburg, also belonged), or in the pro-Habsburg cliques were led by the afore-mentioned Baron Leidel. The Count who was acquainted with the environment of high politics was deftly moving between the two camps and was discovering which additional power would be willing to join the Emperor (or who could eventually conclude an alliance with whom). Already since the early 1680's, thanks to Kaunitz' messages, we can trace, for example, the Habsburg and the Bavarian “Courtship” with Sweden as a possible ally against France, though the official founding of the Augsburg alliance did not actually take place until a few years later.²²

20 See, for example, Kaunitz' letter to the Emperor from Dachau, 17. 8. 1683, ÖStA Wien, HHStA, ÖGSR, Kart. 105, Fasz. 75, Pars 1, fol. 238–239, 292–295 and many other letters from this folder.

21 In regard to these negotiations concerning the marriage of the Bavarian Princess see the *Bavaria II* Subchapter.

22 Habsburg-Swedish relationships are discussed, for example, by Martin BAKEŠ in *Mimořádná diplomatická mise Adolfa Vratislava ze Šternberka: Švédské království v polovině 70. let 17. století očima císařského vyslance* [Special Diplomatic Mission of Adolf Wratislaw of Sternberg. The Kingdom of Sweden in the mid-1670's, as seen by the Emperor's envoy], *Folia Historica Bohemica* 29, 2014, Nr. 1, pp. 31–62.

At the Bavarian court the Count was also making friendships – or at least useful acquaintances – with both secular and spiritual dignitaries, which would also come in very handy during his other missions and if, for some reason he could not move about close to the Elector, he would be informed about his conduct at least indirectly; he also did not forget to send news to Vienna about the members of the Elector’s family or about the Bavarian court.²³ During the War of the Reunions that took place in the years 1683–1684 and during the preparations for the peace negotiations in Regensburg, where Emperor Leopold I went personally to negotiate the terms for a much-needed peace,²⁴ the Count (together with the governor of the Spanish Netherlands, Ottone Enrico del Carretto, Marquis de Grana) apparently provided for the Emperor’s journey a sufficiently representative carriage horses and chariots and also followed, of course, the steps of Maximilian Emanuel, who, despite repeatedly hesitating as to whether to set off on the journey (or if instead he should definitely lean to the side of the Emperor), eventually also went to Regensburg.²⁵ During the preparation of these peace negotiations in Regensburg, respectively in Augsburg,²⁶ after which the entire alliance was later called, the Count held several personal meetings with the Elector and in the letters to the Emperor commented on his actions and opinions.²⁷

23 Already during his first mission to Bavaria, for example, he noticed the local efforts to secure Prince Joseph Clement: already then, almost still in childhood, he was promised the throne in Regensburg and he was even looking-out for the Cologne Archbishopric, which, eventually with Kaunitz’ help, he achieved in 1688. In regard to these endeavours, see below.

24 The Austrian diplomats were in Regensburg already at that time, which was for the good of the whole Empire to negotiate the concluding of universal peace and which cooperated with the Imperial *Prinzipal-Kommissar*, Count Gottlieb von Windischgraetz (1630–1695) and with a local resident, Baron Johann Ferdinand Stroiber; the Bavarian Elector’s envoy was a doctor of law, Baron Johann Rudolph Wampel. Peace talks, however, were not spared of serious problems of ceremonial nature, which did not miss even those who in theory should be the closest, and which did not diminish even in the coming years. According to Kaunitz’ reports disputes occurred, for example, between the mentioned Count von Windischgraetz and Bishop of Eichstätt, Count Marquard II Schenk von Castell (1605–1685). See L. BITTNER – L. GROß, *Repertorium*, pp. 12, 13 and 137. The task of Count von Kaunitz in this case was to calm the situation and in particular to influence the Elector of Bavaria, who in turn, should calm down the Eichstätt Bishop. ÖStA Wien, HHStA, ÖGSR, Kart. 105, Fasz. 75, Pars 1, fol. 241–244, 249–250, 303–304, etc; *ibidem*, Pars 4, there, for example, fol. 21–27, 57–58, etc. The copy of the report concerning the ceremony in Regensburg; see Moravský zemský archiv Brno (= MZA Brno), Rodinný archiv Kouniců (= RA Kouniců), Inv. No. 2357 (III), sign. 77 (2), Kart. 266, fol. 44–45.

25 ÖStA Wien, AVA, FA Harrach, Kart. 254/35, s. f.

26 While the Elector went to Augsburg personally, he arrived there incognito and stayed for only one day and immediately went back again to Munich. ÖStA Wien, HHStA, ÖGSR, Kart. 105, Fasz. 75, Pars 1, fol. 292–295.

27 What specifically should the Count at this time negotiate in Bavaria (“*foederi Hispanico-Suecico*”, additionally also tracts to Regensburg regarding the negotiations with France, and ultimately, of course, “*universal concerto zwischen den allyrten*” and armistice agreements for 10, 20 or 30 years) is

During 1683 Count von Kaunitz repeatedly visited his estates, or at least the imperial court: for example, in October he (together with the Elector, who came to participate in anti-Turkish fighting for Vienna) made a shorter journey from Munich to Vienna and Slavkov and back – he delivered a report and received further orders and stayed in his Slavkov castle and checked his estates.²⁸ A longer and in terms of its organisation disproportionately more demanding journey he took in the spring of that year. At that time, he was helping in organising a major event: Maximilian II Emanuel in the last days of April was going to visit the Emperor and therefore there was a great deal of responsibility with the Count (as an expert on the Bavarian environment and on the Elector): to discuss in advance everything necessary and to provide information regarding the Elector's expectations. Then he travelled to Vienna and Laxenburg at a slight advance of the Elector, and later he joined the Elector's entourage and even housed and hosted him on his estates and took care of his entertainment and programme. Thanks to the sources stored in the Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchiv in Vienna, we have very detailed information regarding the exact course of the entire journey.²⁹

We do not know whether or not all the formalities regarding the Elector's visit were arranged exclusively by Count von Kaunitz, but nevertheless his support for the smooth course of the journey was undeniable and he proved himself to be a very efficient organiser. Not only that he provided necessary information to everyone who needed it in a timely manner, but (either personally or indirectly) he took care of the Elector's and also of his entourage's "body and soul" by providing both accommodation and meals for them, as well as regular Mass and entertainment, musical and theatre performances, sightseeing and – speaking in today's lingo – also tourist attractions. This expedition from Munich to Vienna and then to Prague was not the Elector's final one; subsequently, during the

discussed in the draft Imperial instruction from 25. 6. 1683, *ibidem*, fol. 192–195; additionally see, for example, fol. 249–250, etc. After his military campaign during the defence of Vienna, the Elector on 16. 9. met with several members of his court and with Count von Kaunitz and at that meeting he expressed (apparently under the impression of recent victory) an enthusiastic support for the Emperor and also participation, warm patriotism and zeal for the defence of Christendom against the infidels and also pointed to the need to build a belt of forts along the Rhine. *Ibidem*, fol. 265–270.

28 See the draft of the instruction for the journey from 25. 6. 1683, *ibidem*, fol. 196.

29 ÖStA Wien, HHStA, OmeA, ÄZA, 14/13, s. f. Four (almost identical) versions of the *Project Ceremoniali* from 25. 4. and also an excerpt from *Hoffprotocoll* from the same date refer to the following: the Elector completed most of the journey on water. He set off from Munich – on 25. 4. and he arrived in Linz on 27. 4., where accommodation had been prepared for him in the house of the *Landeshauptmann*, Count von Weissenwolf, and he then travelled (again by boat) to Melk, where he arrived on 28. 4. and Count Johann Christoph von Althan, the *Oberstkuchelmeister*, met him there. The next morning he set off towards Laxenburg, while in the meantime a cavalier was sent to announce his forthcoming arrival to the Emperor. The *Oberstpostmeister*, Count Karl Joseph von Paar sent postal carriages to meet him; weather permitting the Elector, together with other people should also be welcomed

coming years he met the Emperor several times and it can be assumed that these trips were also organised in a very similar manner. After the joys and sorrows of travel the Elector and Count von Kaunitz also returned to their diplomatic negotiations, and the Count also returned to Munich.

in front of the residence of our well-known Count von Kaunitz. The meeting with the Emperor was planned down to the smallest detail: it was to take place outside the residence and the Elector was to stop 40 steps in front of the Emperor, who would also be accompanied by the *Obersthofmeister* Albrecht von Zinzendorf. Subsequently, the Emperor first made his speech and then invited the Elector to board his coach. In Laxenburg the carriages arrived in the interior courtyard and the Elector and the Emperor were greeted by the Cavaliers and the Ministers who were present and the Elector could climb-up the stairs in front of the Emperor. The Elector, together with a part of his entourage, was accommodated with a part of his entourage directly at the court and his safety was protected by an honour-guard. Some members of his entourage arrived later (specifically the Elector's *Vizekanzler*, Baron Leidel, with his secretary and his physician) and they made use of the Imperial Carriages, were housed and then joined the Elector's entourage. Count von Kaunitz was expected to accompany the Elector. If the Elector participated in any public audience, it was expected that he would be invited to the antechamber, where selected ministers and cavaliers were already awaiting and he could sit on the chair that the *Oberstkämmerer* Count Gundakar von Dietrichstein offered to him. The first dinner was served in the apartment of the Empress, where members of aristocratic society were served by maids-of honour, while musicians waited at the table and were ready to start their performance. The Elector sat in a chair with armrests that were padded with red velvet, while the chairs of the Imperial Majesty were padded with golden velvet. The seating arrangements were also important: the Elector's place of honour was located on the right side of the Emperor. If the Archduchess, the Elector's prospective bride, participated in dining in common or in other activities, she was expected to always sit on the right side of her future husband. At dinner the Empress offered the Elector a cup and toasted to the health of the Emperor (at which point in time the Elector was obliged to stand up). Then, when sweets were served, the Elector assisted the Empress with her hand-washing by handing her a napkin. After the banquet, everyone went to their rooms, while the Elector was escorted by an honour guard (ÖStA Wien, HHStA, OmeA, ÄZA, 14/13, s. f.; an inventory of the elector's court, servants, horses was made – reportedly, the total number amounted to 455 people and 565 horses – or of consumed wine, etc.). Only after these ceremonies had been completed was it possible to proceed to the actual negotiations that would be taking-place in the coming days. However the Elector, with his people, did not enjoy the beauty of Laxenburg very much and on 22. 5. he already left for Favorita and then went on to Vienna and Slavkov, where he met Count von Kaunitz. Thanks to the care with which he kept his records, we know that the Elector undertook this journey between 28. 5. and 8. 6. 1683 and exactly how this stay went and also that it was actually only an intermediate stop on the Elector's journey from Vienna to Prague from where he then returned to Bavaria. It should also be noted that Count von Kaunitz was not the only person who cared about the Elector's welfare (ÖStA Wien, HHStA, OmeA, ÄZA, 14/13, fol. 1–4). At the beginning of his journey he was accompanied by Karl Eusebius von Liechtenstein and subsequently by Ferdinand von Dietrichstein. The Elector arrived in Mikulov on 30. 5., he attended Mass, looked at the Loreto and the sacristy and then Dietrichstein arranged a breakfast for him at the Capuchins. The expedition did not stay in Mikulov, however, and already on Monday 31. 5. Kaunitz welcomed the Elector in Slavkov. His day began with a Mass and he lunched and dined with the Count and also attended “*Judentanz*”. The following day passed in a similar manner and in the afternoon the noble guest visited one of the Prince von Liechtenstein's Palaces (probably it was Bučovice Chateau). On 2. 6. the Elector arrived to Brno and was housed in the

England

Until the end of 1686 Count Dominik Andreas spent his time in negotiations with the Elector in Munich and with the Emperor in Vienna;³⁰ after that he was offered another opportunity, namely the post of imperial envoy to the English King James II, who was leaning towards the side of his cousin, Louis XIV. Before his departure to London, Count von Kaunitz stopped by in Frankfurt, Düsseldorf and then in The Hague and in Brussels. He arrived in the first mentioned place during the first half of December 1686—what he was examining there was how the King of England likes the idea of a possible alliance and also his attitude to the issue of the Palatine Succession.³¹ The Count already arrived

local residence of Count von Kaunitz, in front of which his arrival was already anticipated by a veritable welcoming committee consisting of burghers; he was accompanied by the *Landeshauptmann* Franz Karl Liebsteinsky von Kolowrat and a number of nobles who were staying there at that time. In St. Thomas Church he attended the Mass, then he looked around the city and even at Špilberk, where his guide was Count von Zinzendorf. The Elector was served breakfast at Kaunitz' house, while in the evening he was invited to a party at the house of the *Landeshauptmann*. On the next day (at 6 a.m.), the Elector attended Mass with the Jesuits (perhaps it was at The College of the Assumption of the Virgin in Brno) and there he also attended "*eine kleine Comoedi*" and after the noon-hour, he was hosted by the *Kreishauptmann* Michael Adolf Ignaz von Althan and members of the municipality. On 4. 6. the Elector, together with his entourage, arrived to visit Johann Georg Joachim von Slavata (probably at his Chateau in Telč), who entertained him exquisitely and a day later, he finally arrived in Prague, where (together with his entourage) he was housed in the house of the *Oberstlandrichter* Adolf Wratislaw von Sternberg, with whom, when he was not invited elsewhere, he usually dined. Prague had plenty to offer its honoured visitor; the Elector was invited to take tours of several imposing Palaces and he visited their interiors and their gardens (in Wallenstein Palace, for example, at the expense of the *Oberstlandrichter*, a costly celebration took place including a selected musical production). The Elector additionally visited the Old Town, the Klementinum, the Lesser Town, Prague Castle, the Loreto, the Menagerie, and he even inspected the location of the Battle of the White Mountain, where he was awaited by the Piccolomini Regiment (*ibidem*).

30 In the spring of 1684, for example, the Count stayed again in Vienna and probably it was in late May or early June that he returned to Munich. See the draft Imperial instruction from 19. 5. 1684, the text of which was not significantly different from those that he had received earlier, apart from the danger from France and the necessity of concluding of an armistice at the peace negotiations in Regensburg are more seriously emphasised. ÖStA Wien, HHStA, ÖGSR, Kart. 105, Fasz. 75, Pars 2, fol. 99–103. During the next year, the Count was seen in Vienna more frequently, probably due to the long-planned marriage of the Elector and Archduchess Maria Antonia, which he then subsequently attended personally, together with his wife. See, for example, a note in his letter from Munich to Count Ferdinand Bonaventura von Harrach from 16. 10. 1685, in which he mentions returning to Vienna. ÖStA Wien, AVA, FA Harrach, Kart. 254/35, s. f.

31 Kaunitz' letter from Frankfurt from 10. 12. 1686, ÖStA Wien, HHStA, Österreichische Geheime Staatsregistratur, Kart. 106, Fasz. 75, Pars 4, fol. 164–173. Additionally see, for example, his letter to Prince Ferdinand von Dietrichstein from 6. 1. 1687, which, however, had already been written in Brussels. The Count mentions in it that he is just about to set off for England, where the Secretary Hoffman and the Spanish envoy Ronquillo are awaiting him. He also complains that again he will have to be away from his beloved Lenorl (i.e. his wife Maria Eleonore); the Count especially feared

in Dusseldorf in cca. mid-December, where he attended audiences (public and then private) with the Elector Philipp Wilhelm von der Pfalz and also the *Kurprinz* Johann Wilhelm, with whom he again discussed the issue of the Palatine Succession and also received instructions in regard to his upcoming stay in England.³²

The last stop before travelling to England was in The Hague, where he arrived two days before Christmas 1686 and the Elector Palatine graciously lent him carriages for his journey.³³ There he discussed England's inclinations with the Dutch statesmen, who, however, discouraged him in advance from trying to make an alliance with James II, or with the local imperial resident Daniel Johann Kramprich von Kronfeld, who was also not too optimistic.³⁴ Immediately after his arrival in The Hague, first, however, the Count attended an audience with William III, Prince of Orange (who within just two years would be sitting on the English throne) and presented him the creditive. Though Kaunitz had not expected it their meeting took place in a very pleasant atmosphere; the Prince accepted him graciously and talked with him about the current situation in England.³⁵

The tasks for this mission that were assigned to Count von Kaunitz are mapped in the preserved original of the imperial instruction from the Moravský zemský archiv in Brno and its draft and also the original of the Palatine instruction and points prepared

that the Elector of Bavaria might find her in Vienna after his return from his military campaign and spend time with her in his absence (MZA Brno, Rodinný archiv Dittrichštejnů (= RA Dittrichštejnů), Inv. No. 21, sign. 10, Kart. 9, fol. 35–36). Additionally he complains about his health (apparently he was suffering from some problems with his legs and, in his opinion, next summer he would need to visit a spa. He was also assailed by waves of sadness and melancholy) and he is sorry for his old mother, whom he had to leave behind (Maria Eleonore née von Dietrichstein died shortly after his departure: on 20. 3. 1687; the Count informed about this sad event in his letter from 24. 3. 1687 that was addressed to Prince Ferdinand von Dietrichstein (ibidem, fol. 29) and in his letter from 28. 3. to Count Ferdinand Bonaventura von Harrach (ÖStA Wien, AVA, FA Harrach, Kart. 254/35, s. f.). See also MZA Brno, RA Dittrichštejnů, Inv. No. 1925–48, sign. 867, Kart. 467, fol. 73–76.

32 See Kaunitz' letter from Düsseldorf from 18. 12. 1685, ibidem, fol. 174–175.

33 Kaunitz' report from 24. 12. 1686, ÖStA Wien, HHStA, Staatenabteilungen (= StA), England, Kart. 23, reports from Count von Kaunitz and from the legation secretary Johann Philipp Hoffman, s. f. For providing this and other Kaunitz' reports from England (or from a journey to England) I thank Jiří Kubeš, who currently intensively examines the activities of diplomats in the service of the Habsburgs on English soil.

34 Kaunitz was supposed to stay in touch with Johann Daniel Kramprich von Kronfeld, who, during the years 1667–1693 served as the imperial resident in The Hague, not only during his English mission; see below the original and also the draft of imperial instruction. Kramprich's name appears in a series of publications on Early Modern diplomacy; in regard to his personality, see, for example: Volker JARREN, *Europäische Diplomatie im Zeitalter Ludwigs XIV. Das Beispiel Johann Daniel Kramprichs von Kronfeld (1622–1693)*, Jahrbuch für Europäische Geschichte 3, 2002, pp. 101–131 and numerous mentions in: Daniel LEGUTKE, *Diplomatie als soziale Institution: Brandenburgische, sächsische und kaiserliche Gesandte in Den Haag, 1648–1720*, Münster 2010.

35 Kaunitz' report from 24. 12. 1686, ÖStA Wien, HHStA, StA, England, Kart. 23, s. f.

for Kaunitz by the Elector Palatine Philipp Wilhelm are stored in the Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchiv in Vienna.³⁶ Not only for the Emperor, but also for the Palatine side, of utmost importance for the defence of their interests and territories was to conclude an alliance with most of the major powers of that time, amongst which England undoubtedly belonged. Therefore in this instance Count von Kaunitz was given full trust and support, because, in the words of the Elector Palatine, “*wird herr graff von Kaunitz, von selbsten, nach seiner hohen prudentz, und großen experientz sich aller circumspection zugebrauchen wissen*”.³⁷

The Count arrived in London on a fishing boat (since because of the inclement weather he could not negotiate for another one) on the 25th January 1687 via Ghent and Bruges in his pessimistic mood: he thought that all his efforts were already doomed to failure and that in England he would only spend money and waste time.³⁸ Immediately after his arrival he contacted the imperial legation secretary Hoffman³⁹ and he also found a common language regarding imperial interests and in the case of the Spanish Netherlands it was with the Spanish envoy, Don Pedro Ronquillo. Their collaboration was very fruitful and their relationship was exceptionally friendly – Kaunitz informed him in advance about his arrival and the next day, after Ronquillo had visited him, Kaunitz had reciprocated his visit; in addition to that, he also stopped by the Swedish and the Palatine ministers.⁴⁰

36 See the original version of the imperial instruction for the mission to England from 11. 10. 1686 in MZA Brno, RA Kouniců, Inv. No. 2454, sign. III, 90–2, Kart. 273, fol. 1–9; for the draft of this instruction see ÖStA Wien, HHStA, Reichskanzlei (= RK), Instruktionen, Fasz. 6, s. f.; the original of the Palatine instruction for the mission to England from 8. 12. 1686 in MZA Brno, RA Kouniců, Inv. No. 2453, sign. III, 90–1, Kart. 273, fol. 1–7; the letter of Philipp Wilhelm to the Emperor from 7. 12. 1686 in ÖStA Wien, HHStA, Österreichische Geheime Staatsregistratur, Kart. 106, Fasz. 75, Pars 4, fol. 167–172. Extensive official correspondence that the Count received from the Emperor in regard to his English mission, as well as numerous drafts of Kaunitz' reports are stored in MZA Brno, RA Kouniců, Inv. No. 2455, sign. III, 90–3, Kart. 273. In the rich Dietrichstein Family Archive there are also other sources associated with Kaunitz' mission to England; see, for example: MZA Brno, RA Ditrichštejnů, Inv. No. 21, sign. 10, Kart. 9; *ibidem*, Inv. No. 1925–48, sign. 867, Kart. 467.

37 The letter from Philipp Wilhelm to the Emperor from 7. 12. 1686, ÖStA Wien, HHStA, Österreichische Geheime Staatsregistratur, Kart. 106, Fasz. 75, Pars 4, fol. 167–172.

38 Kaunitz' report from London from 27. 1. 1686, ÖStA Wien, HHStA, StA, England, Kart. 23, s. f.

39 Johann Philipp Hoffman served as the legation secretary in England at several different times: in the years 1685–1687, then during Kaunitz' mission in 1687, in the years 1687–1691 and 1693–1724, L. BITTNER – L. GROß, *Repertorium*, pp. 139–140.

40 Don Pedro Ronquillo Briceño (1630–1691) was the Spanish envoy in England, first in the years 1674–1676 and then again between 1679 and 1691; he was also in the service of Emperor Leopold I, however. Count von Kaunitz often mentioned him in his letters; see, for example, the letters to Prince Ferdinand von Dietrichstein: MZA Brno, RA Ditrichštejnů, Inv. No. 1925–48, sign. 867, Kart. 467 or *ibidem*, Inv. No. 21, sign. 10, Kart. 9. A substantial amount of literature can be found in regard to this interesting Spanish diplomat (also including directly from his pen), for all to see his edited correspondence, for example: Gabriel MAURA GAMAZO (ed.), *Correspondencia entre dos*

After his arrival Count von Kaunitz should also request an audience; the first audience should be public, covering all the essentials, and ideally should take place in Latin: the Count was supposed to pass-on the imperial creditive and also memorials and to express his greetings and compliments. Due to James II's inclination towards France, the Count had already been forewarned that the King of England might want to speak French during this audience. The main reason for Kaunitz' arrival, i.e. negotiations regarding a possible alliance (the Count was to encourage James II to join, if possible immediately, the Augsburg alliance)⁴¹ was addressed during his subsequent private audience with the King of England. Using all possible arguments the Count should convince him that the alliance against France and against the Turks and the preparation of the peace talks in the Hague (which were also promoted by the Pope and by other powers, such as Brandenburg) are necessary – otherwise there is a threat of the destruction of the entire Holy Roman Empire and, after that, also of England. The delicate matter of the Palatine Succession should also be addressed, as has already been mentioned.⁴² In addition to the diplomats mentioned above Count von Kaunitz should be able to find an ally in the Queen of England herself, whereby he should also attend an audience and convey a creditive to her; on the other hand he should be very fearful of the numerous pro-French ministers at the English court (and ultimately also of the King's scepticism). That was why he was advised to keep his correspondence secret.⁴³ In addition to the not very friendly environment of the English court the Count also had to cope with a local and different confession: although King James II was a convinced Catholic (as also were some of his loyal followers), the majority of the country reacted sharply against “papists”, which the Count could certainly feel too. Therefore, in order to not unnecessarily support any animosity, the Emperor prohibited him from allowing the English to enter his private chapel.⁴⁴

embajadores. Don Pedro Ronquillo y el Marqués de Cogolludo, 1689–1691, I–II, Madrid 1951. Also see Kaunitz' report from 31. 1. 1687 in ÖStA Wien, HHStA, StA, England, Kart. 23, fol. 25.

41 While England did eventually join the Augsburg alliance this did not occur until during the reign of William III, Prince of Orange, see the extensive correspondence between the Emperor and the Count, MZA Brno, RA Kouničů, Inv. No. 2455, sign. III, 90–3, Kart. 273.

42 For example, on 3. 3. 1687 the Count attended an audience with James II at which they discussed the proposals that had emanated from the French side. MZA Brno, RA Ditrichštejnů, Inv. No. 1925–48, sign. 867, Kart. 467, fol. 18–19.

43 See the sources mentioned in Note 36.

44 “... *hingegen aber das exercitium religionis Catholicae und capelam zu hauß halten und keine Engländer darzu admittiren*”. The original of the Imperial instruction from 11. 10. 1686, MZA Brno, RA Kouničů, Inv. No. 2454, sign. III, 90–2, Kart. 273, here fol. 7. This fact, for example, is also mentioned by Jiří HRBEK in *Barokní Valdštejnové v Čechách 1640–1740* [The Baroque Waldsteins in Bohemia (1640–1740)], Prague 2013, p. 544. Cf. with the maintenance of the Catholic chapels in Dresden and with the often precarious situations of the Imperial envoys: Jiří KUBEŠ, *Kaple císařských vyslanců*

In the case of any uncertainty the Count should discuss ceremonial matters (i.e. those that were not specifically addressed in the instructions) in advance with his predecessors, Waldstein and Thun,⁴⁵ and also with the legation secretary Hoffman. Thanks to Kaunitz' detailed report and to the accidentally preserved copy of the postscript of his letter from England the description of his first audience at the local court was preserved. It actually took place shortly after his arrival at noon on the 31st January 1687. Cavalier Cotterell, the Master of the Ceremonies, picked the Count up in a royal carriage that was drawn by six horses and drove him to the palace for an audience – here in the Knights' Hall – where the King's musketeers and servants were already waiting. Cotterell escorted Kaunitz to meet the Lord Chamberlain and the Vice-Chamberlain and the Count was obliged to wait until the King had been advised of his presence. Kaunitz was then guided through the gallery to the Royal Bedchamber, where Lord Listfield was already awaiting him, who then escorted him to the King's antechamber. His Majesty awaited the Count standing with his head uncovered in the presence of his lords, his privy councillors and his chamberlains and he even took a few steps towards Kaunitz. Then the Count, in accordance with the instructions that he had been given, carefully handled the compliments and greetings, to which the King replied very politely, thanking him for the honour, and taking off his hat again whenever the person of the Emperor was mentioned. Everything eventually took place in the French language, which the Count had been warned about in advance.⁴⁶

v Drážďanech v druhé půli 17. století [The Chapels of the Imperial Envoys in Dresden during the second half of the 17th Century], *Folia Historica Bohemica* 30, 2015, pp. 127–156.

- 45 The Count was to contact Waldstein and Thun, the envoys who, even before his own journey to England, already had a lot of experience from their previous stays in England. Karl Ferdinand von Waldstein (1634–1702) was a distinguished diplomat in imperial service, an expert on English affairs and a Knight of the Golden Fleece, and at that time also the Empress' *Obersthofmeister*. He had already during previous years (i.e. 1677–1679) undertaken missions to England and also to Poland (there he helped to negotiate for military aid in the fight against the Turks in the fatal year 1683). Karl Ferdinand is mentioned many times in the book by J. HRBEK, *Barokní Valdštejnové*, in regard to Waldstein's diplomatic career (especially to his English mission and the journey to Poland) pp. 526–592; additionally, for example, L. BITTNER – L. GROß, *Repertorium*, p. 139. Franz Sigmund von Thun (1639–1702), a member of the Knights of Malta, an imperial envoy to England (1680–1685) and also to Poland and later a Field Marshal. See the original of the imperial instruction from 11. 10. 1686, MZA Brno, RA Kouničů, Inv. No. 2454, sign. III, 90–2, Kart. 273, fol. 1–9 or L. BITTNER – L. GROß, *Repertorium*, p. 139. Count Thun also served in Bavaria as the imperial envoy, in the interim period between Kaunitz' missions (in 1687); during the same year he also operated in Saxony and in the years 1687, 1688 and 1689 he was the envoy in Salzburg. *Ibidem*, pp. 125, 163 and 165.
- 46 In regard to this especially Kaunitz' report from 31. 1. 1687, ÖStA Wien, HHStA, StA, England, Kart. 23 and also Kaunitz' letter from 31. 1. 1687, MZA Brno, RA Ditrichštejnů, Inv. No. 21, sign. 10, Kart. 9, fol. 5. Also see ÖStA Wien, HHStA, StA, England, Kart. 23 and an undated copy of the postscript of Kaunitz' letter to the Emperor describing his first audience, MZA Brno, RA Kouničů, Inv. No. 2357 (III), sign. 77 (2), Kart. 266, fol. 34. Cf. with the ceremony that Count Karl Ferdinand von

This was followed by audiences with both the ruling and the widowed queen and with other members of the Royal Family.⁴⁷ He also spent his time in London visiting or receiving other diplomats, negotiating with royal politics (the most frequently mentioned in his reports is the name of the President of the Privy Council, Robert Spencer, the 2nd Earl of Sunderland) and especially waiting for a private audience with the King. He finally received it on the 5th February and using all the arguments he tried to persuade the King to the promise of an alliance. The King, however, was answering his questions rather evasively or in a general manner, which only supported Kaunitz' pessimism and his desire to return home as soon as possible (he thought that he could be replaced by the legation secretary Hoffman and the Spaniard Ronquillo).⁴⁸

Time passed and the Count failed to achieve either his promise of an alliance with England or his withdrawal from this project; the deaths of little children from within the Royal Family – i.e. the descendants of Princess Anne and Prince George of Denmark – also did not contribute to a good atmosphere.⁴⁹ The Count was also plagued by financial distress and by the knowledge that his efforts are completely unnecessary. His budget was affected, for example, by the moving of the royal court to the summer residence in Windsor, in which, of course, he also participated, by spending on grief due to the death of the Empress Dowager in December of the previous year; the considerable expenses that he also faced for the maintenance of his Catholic chapel and with the time passing also with the general costs of representation (though he stated that he would rather ruin himself than to cause shame to the Emperor in this respect).⁵⁰ The Emperor was not

Waldstein experienced at the English court a few years earlier and for more on this topic see also: J. HRBEK, *Barokní Valdštejnové*, pp. 537–539.

47 The Queen, for example, accepted him on 2. 2. at eight o'clock in the evening and what he noted about it was that the meeting took a similar course to that of the first audience with the King; Kaunitz' report from 3. 2. 1687, ÖStA Wien, HHStA, StA, England, Kart. 23, s. f.

48 Imperial diplomats, including Kaunitz, during their stay at the English court should maintain their prevalence over the other envoys; however, with "good-minded" beings, i.e. supporters of imperial policy, the Count should meet in privacy and not stand on ceremony. Although Kaunitz should seek that his English negotiations take place as far as possible in harmony – at all times and in all dealings (i.e. both public and private, with foreign envoys and also with anyone else, in the chapel and in the public areas). He should follow the requisite decorum, however, if it is not possible otherwise, he was advised to take advantage of any disputes that take place between the English Monarch and Parliament. The fact that between James II and the Parliament there are not overly harmonious relations was generally known and Count Kaunitz also noted that detail, of course; see, specifically the postscript to his letter of 21. 2. 1687 (and many other letters) in MZA Brno, RA Ditrichštejnů, Inv. No. 21, sign. 10, Kart. 9, here fol. 12 or Kaunitz' reports from 7. and 28. 2. 1687, ÖStA Wien, HHStA, StA, England, Kart. 23.

49 Kaunitz' reports from 14. and 21. 2. 1687, *ibidem*.

50 See Kaunitz' extensive report full of complaints and moaning about expenditures from 17. 3. 1687 with the attached bill for the establishment of the chapel, for which he spent 49 Pounds Sterling (whereby

moved, however, even by these reasons, nor by his original promise (often cited by the Count) that he would not stay in England longer than six months, nor would the death of Kaunitz' mother or the Count's pleading for his withdrawal from the mission in order to be able to get back home and put his affairs in order.⁵¹

In May 1687, however, a surprising turn-around in the King's approach occurred, which, for the Count, aroused great hopes. The King began to seek for his presence. He enjoyed talking with him and did everything he could to show him his favour; at the table, for instance, and several times he invited him to the parade and he even invited him to visit his retirada. The reason for this was the temporary cooling of relations between England and France, which Kaunitz, of course, wanted to take advantage of. Which is to say that James II began to suggest that he would be willing to confirm the alliance with the Emperor, who was now all for ensuring universal peace and organising a congress at which the requisite circumstances for peace would be discussed. Kaunitz' mission would immediately make sense again (as the Count thought a long gone).⁵²

Kaunitz was also going to make use of this favourable turnaround in Palatine favour as he promised to the Elector. Unsurprisingly, the Palatine instruction that he received in regard to his journey to England urged him to specifically obtain the support of James II in regard to the thorny issue of the Palatine Succession; hitherto, however, James had shunned conquering the Sun King. Philipp Wilhelm left nothing to chance and in his instruction he analysed the past and the current development of the disputed territory in great detail and also the attitude of the other powers to the Palatine issue, to offer the

additional costs for the chapel still accumulated over time), and for mourning clothes and other essentials on the occasion of the death of Empress Dowager Eleonore, which cost him 1,620 guildens (ibidem). Cf. this with Count Alois Thomas Raimund von Harrach's expenditure on the chapel in Dresden in Saxony. The Count established a new chapel there in 1695, for which he spent 200 guildens while its annual operation cost amounted to an additional 200 guildens. J. KUBEŠ, *Kaple císařských vyslanců v Drážďanech*, here pp. 147–148.

51 Kaunitz' reports from 24. and 28. 3. 1687, ÖStA Wien, HHStA, StA, England, Kart. 23.

52 In regard to this see the reports from 9., 12. and 16. 5. and especially from 19. and 23. 5. 1687 (ibidem). The reason for this cooling of Anglo-French sympathies may have been the affair about the release of a pamphlet by Huguenot Claude, the protégé of William of Orange, that was seen by some as representing a Protestant manifesto, which could additionally, in the French interest of course, undermine the religious policies of the sworn Catholic James II. In England the pamphlet was burned and James took amiss that Louis XIV did not support him in regard to this matter. The primary factor, however, was the dispute over the issue of the Succession to the English throne. James II tried to enforce the recognition of the succession on behalf his daughter Anna, thereby bypassing his older daughter Maria, who was married to William of Orange. James heard, however, that France, nevertheless intended to support the claim of his older daughter, Maria. The situation during the spring and the summer of 1686 is described in detail by Onno KLOPP in *Der Fall de Hauses Stuart und die Succession des Hauses Hannover in Gross-Britannien und Irland, Dritter Band: Die Zeit Jacobs II. von England vom Februar 1685 bis zum März 1688*, Wien 1876, here specifically pp. 184–213, etc.

Count something to bite on during the discussions. Also he did not even hesitate to think about the military measures against France and against the Turks that would be necessary. The Palatines hoped that based on his authority and on the good relations that James II had with Louis XIV, he would manage to persuade him to make peace and perhaps even to spare the estates that he was claiming. The Palatine interests, as the Elector thought, coincided with those of the Emperor and as a result they actually served “*pro bono publico*” and supported the maintenance of peace throughout the entire Empire. The Elector Palatine also thought that an appropriately chosen ally at the English court would help the Count; specifically the already mentioned Spanish envoy.⁵³ All the Count’s and Emperor’s hopes faded, however, after the French response to the promised guarantee of peace talks arrived: as Kaunitz feared the French were demanding too large concessions, to which the Emperor could not possibly agree.⁵⁴

Despite the fact that most of the time that the Count was in England he was obviously very unhappy, he was also worried, amongst other things, about the amount of the costs involved in regard to which he had no illusions that they would ever be paid-back to him in full. He was therefore anxious to attend his last audience (which took place on the 3rd August and was followed by a private audience and also then by a private audience with the Queen too) and to then return to the continent. Therefore he followed developments on the Old Continent closely while also maintaining a regular correspondence with his friends who passed fresh information on to him, or, even from a distance, oversaw his other interests.⁵⁵ His foresight had paid off; despite all his efforts he failed to persuade James II to support the Emperor and his allies and he left England in August 1687. On his way back home, he briefed the Elector in Heidelberg about the outcome of his mission.⁵⁶

53 See the original of the Palatine instruction from 8. 12. 1686 (MZA Brno, RA Kouniců, Inv. No. 2453, sign III, 90–1, Kart. 273, fol. 1–7), in regard to this see also Philipp Wilhelm’s letter to the Emperor from 7. 12. 1686 (ÖStA Wien, HHStA, Österreichische Geheime Staatsregistratur, Kart. 106, Fasz. 75, Pars 4, fol. 167–172). Although he talked to James II about the Palatine issue on several occasions, there was no clear answer from him; see, for example, the report from 30. 5. 1687 in ÖStA Wien, HHStA, StA, England, Kart. 23.

54 See his reports from 16., 26. or 27. 6. 1687 (ibidem). The French King was not too pleased with the idea of organising a peace congress (which supposedly should be mutually guaranteed by the Habsburg Monarchy, Spain and England) and in return for his helpfulness he asked, for example, for the recognition of the succession of Dauphin children in Spain and he would also like to exchange the French estates in Belgium for different ones. O. KLOPP, *Der Fall de Hauses Stuart*, especially pp. 184–213.

55 One of them was again Ferdinand von Dietrichstein, who at that time was the *Obersthofmeister* of Leopold I. The correspondence with him is stored in MZA Brno, RA Ditrichštejnů, Inv. No. 21, sign. 10, Kart. 9; ibidem, Inv. No. 1925–48, sign. 867, Kart. 467.

56 According to L. BITTNER – L. GROß, *Repertorium*, p. 139, the Count left England on 18. 8. 1687; however, the fact that he would finally be able to leave England is already mentioned in the imperial rescript from 4. 5. (ÖStA Wien, HHStA, StA, England, Kart. 23); in regard to his stop in Heidelberg

Already at the beginning of his stay in England, Count Kaunitz was aware that this was just a temporary situation and that after his return another mission would be awaiting him at the court of the Elector of Bavaria, with whom many issues remained unresolved (especially the signing of the alliance treaty).⁵⁷ Almost immediately after his return he set off on his second Bavarian mission, which, in fact, proved to be much more dangerous than his previous duties, while, on the other hand, it was also crucial for the further development of his career.

Bavaria II

In the case of this specific mission Kaunitz' main task was to monitor and especially to support the election of the Cologne coadjutor, i.e. the successor to the still living but weak and ill archbishop Maximilian Heinrich of Bavaria (1621–1688).⁵⁸ Both the causes

ibidem, the report from 23. 8. 1687. Although Kaunitz' mission to England was essentially unsuccessful, as seen through the eyes of the Emperor the Count did not lose any prestige: already during his mission the news that he would be decorated with the prestigious Order of the Golden Fleece had reached him and after returning he did actually receive it. See the frequent mentions concerning the possibility of being decorated with the Order in his correspondence with Ferdinand von Dietrichstein (MZA Brno, RA Ditrichštejnů, Inv. No. 21, sign. 10, Kart. 9).

57 Ibidem, fol. 70–71, 78, 82–83. See mentions of his longed-for return home in almost every letter written to his friend, Ferdinand von Dietrichstein (ibidem). In regard to the last audience and the postponing of its date ibidem, fol. 72, 75, 76, 79 and also Kaunitz' reports from 26. 6., 28. 7., 1. 8., 4. 8. and 12. 8. 1687 (ÖStA Wien, HHStA, StA, England, Kart. 23).

58 The electing of the coadjutors (the archbishops), i.e. their successors in office, who were selected during the lifetime of the existing dignitaries, was quite frequent during the 17th and the 18th centuries. A series of requirements was imposed on the candidate; in addition to his reputation and his relevant education (ideally he should be a doctor of theology or a doctor of canon law and also an ordained priest), another important factor was also the age of the applicant, who usually should not be less than 30 years old, while subsequently the minimum age was stabilised at 35. These conditions could be circumvented, however, especially when the appointment of the candidate as an (arch)bishop had been suggested by the Pope himself. The actual election took place in the chapter, whereby the candidate needed to obtain at least two thirds out of the total number of 24 votes. A newly elected (arch)bishop then also had to be confirmed in office by the Holy Father. The ruler or his deputy could also participate in the election as an assessor. In the case of the Emperor it was therefore an imperial electoral commissioner – often a diplomat – who also performed other diplomatic duties at the same place and who was also familiar with canon law and a strict protocol. Other sovereigns, e.g. the Elector of Bavaria, could also send their own electoral commissioners. The two commissioners could work together, but their rivalry and their quarrels were frequent rather than exceptional. Rainald BECKER, *Bischofsernennung (Mittelalter/Frühe Neuzeit)*, in: *Historisches Lexikon Bayerns*, available on-line at URL: <[http://www.historisches-lexikon-bayerns.de/Lexikon/Bischofsernennung_\(Mittelalter/Frühe_Neuzeit\)](http://www.historisches-lexikon-bayerns.de/Lexikon/Bischofsernennung_(Mittelalter/Frühe_Neuzeit))> [cit. 28. 10. 2016] and also Helmut FLACHENECKER, *Wittelsbachische Kirchenpolitik in der Frühen Neuzeit. Beobachtungen zur Funktion bayerischer Wahlkommissare bei Bischofswahlen*, in: *Zeitschrift für bayerische Landesgeschichte* 56, 1993, pp. 299–316, here especially pp. 304–316, available on-line at URL: <http://periodika.digitale-sammlungen.de/zblg/kapitel/zblg56_kap15>. In regard to the

and the consequences of this election essentially represented the next steps in regard to the distribution of the spheres of influence between France and the Habsburg Monarchy. There is no doubt that this was really a key issue; fortunately, due to the large number of extant sources we do have sufficient information about this election.⁵⁹ The election of a coadjutor in Cologne started to be addressed well in advance. The reasons for this were both the declining health of the Elector at that time and also concerns about the impact that one of his potential successors, the dedicated pro-French candidate, Cardinal Willhelm Egon von Fürstenberg (1629–1704) could have on him.⁶⁰ Thereby the Emperor became even more committed to the fickle Elector of Bavaria but nevertheless, when he was in Cologne, he had decided to support the election of his younger brother, Prince Joseph Clement (1671–1723).⁶¹ Therefore one of Dominik Andreas von Kaunitz' first

Bavarian mission of Count von Kaunitz during the years 1687–1688 see also: L. MARŠÁLKOVÁ, *Bavorská mise Dominika Ondřeje z Kounic v letech 1687–1688* and also M. BRAUBACH, *Graf Dominik Andreas Kaunitz*, especially pp. 227–232, in regard to the Cologne election pp. 229–231.

59 Instructions, rescripts and other documents (both originals and copies) related to the election are preserved in MZA Brno, in Bayerisches Hauptstaatsarchiv München (= BayHStA München) or in HHStA, and they are actually quite extensive; the author of some of the instructions is not the Emperor, but the Electors of Bavaria and Palatine. See MZA Brno, RA Kouniců, Inv. No. 2597, sign. 119 (1), Kart. 285, fol. 1–102 (imperial instructions from 14. 11. and 13. 12. 1687, 23. 6., 24. 6. and 26. 6. 1688, 8. 8. and 13. 9. 1688 and the instructions from the Elector of Bavaria from 14. 9. 1687 and 7. 12. 1687); two additional instructions (from 26. 3. and 31. 10. 1688) in regard to Kaunitz' mission to Bavaria can be found *ibidem*, Inv. No. 2587, sign. 117 (1), Kart. 285, fol. 1–20. The first folder (*ibidem*, sign. 119 (1), Kart. 285, fol. 1–102) also comprises the Emperor's letters or creditives to the different stakeholders from 16. 6., 19. 6., 23. 6., 25. 6. and 26. 6. 1688. The additional creditive that comes from 4. 11. 1688 is in the form of a draft that is stored in ÖStA Wien, HHStA, ÖGSR, Kart. 107, Fasz. 76, Pars 2, fol. 179–180. Drafts of instructions can also be found in ÖStA Wien, HHStA, RK, Instruktionen, Fasz. 6, s. f. In all the above archives we can of course also find other types of documents, especially extensive correspondence.

60 Prince Wilhelm Egon von Fürstenberg (1629–1704), the Prince-Bishop of Strasbourg (since 1682), a Cardinal (since 1686) and the Abbot of Saint-Germain-des-Prés during the years 1657 and 1658 was an envoy of Cologne during the election of Leopold I as an Emperor, but already at that time he was working as an agent on behalf of Louis XIV. See Erwin GATZ – Stephan M. JANKER (Hg.), *Die Bischöfe des Heiligen Römischen Reiches 1648 bis 1803. Ein biographisches Lexikon*, Berlin 1990, pp. 141–143 or, for example, L. HÜTTL, *Max Emanuel*, pp. 171–174, 191.

61 In the period of the fight for Cologne, Maximilian II Emanuel was well aware that the conditions under which he was negotiating the election of his younger brother were far from ideal. Above all, he had to admit that Joseph Clement did not meet the basic requirements of the future Elector of Cologne: Prince had not yet received his priestly ordination, and especially he was too young for this function (for these reasons it was later necessary to obtain permission from the Pope). The counterparty at the Bavarian court represented by Marquis Louis Hector Villars (1653–1734), a French diplomat and Marshal, additionally spread rumours that the Prince manifests considerable reluctance to the sacred spiritual state – although the Elector dismissed these allegations, it is possible that there was a grain of truth. L. HÜTTL, *Max Emanuel*, pp. 171–174. In regard to Villars see frequent mentions *ibidem* or for example his published memoirs: *Mémoires du duc de Villars, pair de France, Maréchal général des armées de S. M. T. C.*, I–III, The Hague 1734–1736. While Kaunitz met Villars several times, their

tasks – immediately after his return from England – was to not only to try to win-over the still living Cologne Elector Maximilian Heinrich and to obtain his support for the forthcoming election of his successor, but also to achieve a stronger attachment both to the Elector of Bavaria and to the Habsburgs.⁶² Despite the considerable empathy that Maximilian Emanuel had with France, he did not perceive the concept that the Cologne throne should be denied to his brother enthusiastically. That in fact greatly facilitated the work of Count von Kaunitz and the Elector additionally promised him that if everything went according to plan, both his willingness and his assistance would be richly rewarded.⁶³ The fact that it was not only his loyalty to imperial and Bavarian matters that was behind Count von Kaunitz' efforts, but also his own purely private interests, is evidenced from the Bavarian archives in Munich by certain sources. The Count asked Provostry of Altötting for one of his sons and the Elector fully supported his efforts and, thanks to his advice and in return for his services and his influence, Kaunitz' wishes were listened to.⁶⁴

The Count arrived to Munich at the end of 1687 (probably on the 19th December) and was housed directly at the court; later, however, since the beginning of 1688, the Count lived at the house of Jean Chateaufort, whose services he used in the coming years several times.⁶⁵ Since Kaunitz represented the Emperor, he was treated respectfully – upon his arrival an honour guard apparently stood everywhere and the Elector's *Obersthofmeister* accompanied him from his coach all way to his apartment. He did not have to wait long for his first audience: he received it on the 20th December at eight o'clock in the morning and was again accompanied by the *Obersthofmeister* and other officials. The *Oberststallmeister* joined them in the gallery, who apparently represented the absent *Obersthofmarschall*, and at the doorway to the *Ritterstube* he sent Kaunitz ahead to the *Oberstkämmerer* to

talks apparently proceeded quite correctly (ÖStA Wien, HHStA, ÖGSR, Kart. 107, Fasz. 76, Pars 2, fol. 176–177, the letter of the Elector of Bavaria to the Emperor from 23. 10. 1688). A few months later the Marquis was expelled from the court because despite his still good relationship with the Elector he openly opposed the granting of the Cologne office to Joseph Clement; see the imperial concept for Bavaria from 20. 1. 1689 (ibidem, fol. 252–253).

62 The *Plenipotenz* for dealing with Maximilian II Emanuel from 26. 3. 1688 is stored in MZA Brno, RA Kouniců, Inv. No. 2589 (3), sign. 117 (3), Kart. 285, fol. 1.

63 The Elector's instruction for Count von Kaunitz from 7. 12. 1687, ibidem, Inv. No. 2597, sign. 119 (1), Kart. 285, fol. 49–58.

64 Franz Karl Joseph Anton von Kaunitz (1676–1717) was chosen for the spiritual career: he served as a superior in Altötting and as a canon in Salzburg, Passau, Olomouc and Wrocław, and eventually he also became Bishop of Ljubljana. E. GATZ – S. M. JANKER (Hg.), *Die Bischöfe des Heiligen Römischen Reiches*, pp. 220–221 and J. H. ZEDLER, *Grosses vollständiges Universal Lexikon*, Bd. 15, cols. 276–277 and 279. In the Bavarian archive there are a few letters on this matter and also the draft recommendations (specifically the expectance for one of Count von Kaunitz' sons) from the Elector of Bavaria from 3. 2. 1688. BayHStA München, Abteilung I, Personenselekt Kart. 168, Kaunitz, s. f.

65 BayHStA München, Abteilung I, Personenselekt Kart. 168, Kaunitz, s. f.

meet Count Ferdinand von Fürsten. The latter finally escorted him into the antechamber and into the presence of the Elector himself for the audience. There the negotiations, for which the Count had arrived, immediately took place, and (as instructed) he presented the Emperor's wishes.⁶⁶

Count von Kaunitz began to travel between the two electoral courts (Cologne and Munich) and tried to get the two parties to the agreement; apparently during one of the private audiences he presented to Maximilian Heinrich the Emperor's and the Elector's good intentions and concern for the future welfare of the Cologne See.⁶⁷ The whole Empire intently watched the negotiations: the Elector Palatine with his sons, headed by Franz Ludwig, Bishop of Wrocław, also arrived to Cologne, for example, to support the election of the Bavarian Prince. Kaunitz' task, therefore, was not only lobbying for Joseph Clement, but also the monitoring of the situation and providing information to the Emperor and to Bavaria and Palatine and to process on the basis of agreement between all these parties who were very well aware of the branched flow of information.⁶⁸

Contacts that the Count made in Bavaria in previous years now became very handy:⁶⁹ a very fruitful proved to be particularly the cooperation with the Bavarian envoy, Baron

66 The copy of the Kaunitz' report to the Emperor from 20. 12. 1687 (ibidem, Abteilung I, Kasten blau 14/13, s. f.). For comparison, see the work of Henriette Graf, who provides a description of the ceremony, which Count Tarini experienced at the Munich court: after he arrived in Munich, he even had to find accommodation, sent his credentials to the *Oberstkämmerer* and discuss with him the date of the first audience. Then a carriage was sent for him drawn by six horses, in which the envoy arrived to the broad stairs. From there he was escorted to the first antechamber (or maybe the *Ritterstuben*) and to a newly constructed Alexanderzimmer where an honour guard was standing. He spent some time in the antechamber and then continued into the audience room. Here under the canopy the Elector was waiting, who greeted the envoy by taking off his hat. After the envoy delivered his speech, his way from the audience room was the same, but in a reverse order. The purpose of the envoy's visit was addressed during a private audience (or audiences). In regard to ceremonies in the period of Maximilian II Emanuel see more in: Henriette GRAF, *Die Residenz in München. Hofzeremoniell, Innenräume und Möblierung von Kurfürst Maximilian I. bis Kaiser Karl VII.*, München 2002, especially pp. 70–144, here p. 120.

67 Obtaining the Cologne archbishopric is actually presented in the Elector's instructions as a matter of fundamental importance and this impression is also supported by referring to it in the text as the "gem of the whole Empire". See the Elector's instructions for Count von Kaunitz from 14. 9. 1687 and 7. 12. 1687 (MZA Brno, RA Kounicü, Inv. No. 2597, sign. 119 (1), Kart. 285, here fol. 42–48 and fol. 49–58) and the imperial instruction from 14. 11. 1687 (ibidem, fol. 81–88).

68 The Elector's instructions for Count von Kaunitz from 14. 9. and 7. 12. 1687 (ibidem, fol. 42–48 and 49–58) or the imperial instruction from 13. 12. 1687 (ibidem, fol. 28–34). During his second Bavarian stay, Count von Kaunitz visited Palatinate court several times – always with the confirmation of mutual support and sympathy; see, for example, Philipp Wilhelm's letter to the Emperor from 24. 11. 1688 or Kaunitz' letter from 30. 11. 1688. See ÖStA Wien, HHStA, ÖGSR, Kart. 107, Fasz. 76, Pars 2, fol. 185–186 and 187–188.

69 Dominik Andreas von Kaunitz, of course, was not the only imperial envoy; his activities were complemented by the activities of many other envoys and secret agents, some of whom are mentioned

Johann Friedrich Karg von Bebenburg,⁷⁰ who was also moving between Cologne and Bonn, one of the residences of the Cologne Electors. The cooperation of these two gentlemen was so narrow that they were both familiar with the wording of instructions that they individually received from the Elector and they could therefore act in concert and be helpful for each other (if it was not been possible for both of them to stay in Cologne, at least one of them should expeditiously arrive there to not leave the situation without any supervision).⁷¹

Based on imperial orders Count von Kaunitz found himself at the centre of the action: the credits that he received authorised him to negotiate with all of the electoral courts and also with the Electors of Bavaria and Palatine.⁷² He also attended the actual electoral assembly,⁷³ where he was to stretch all his forces and convince the Electors about Prince Joseph Clement's suitability.⁷⁴ Despite these extensive powers that were entrusted to the

specifically in the instructions, while others are not. As an example we can mention Baron von Mayersheim (probably Johann Friedrich), who was supposed to monitor the situation in Cologne when the Count von Kaunitz served in Mainz or at other electoral courts – then the Count should not significantly interfere with his mission and rather just second him (The imperial instruction for Count von Kaunitz from 14. 11. 1687, *ibidem*, fol. 67–78). Baron von Mayersheim is additionally mentioned in the instruction from 24. 6. 1688 (*ibidem*). Johann Friedrich von Mayersheim who already previously (in 1685) operated in Cologne is also mentioned in the publication of L. BITTNER – L. GROß, *Repertorium*, for example, p. 125; in the same year he negotiated with the Elector Palatine concerning the military aid (*ibidem*, p. 156).

- 70 Doctor of Laws and Baron Johann Friedrich Karg von Bebenburg (1647–1719) was at that time the Bavarian *Geheimer Rat* and dean of the zu Unser Lieben Frauen monastery and later the Cologne *Oberstkantler* and the Abbot of Mont Saint Michel. Initially he focused on France, but later he gravitated to the Emperor and provided Count von Kaunitz with invaluable information (for example, he played a significant role in negotiating the marriage of the Bavarian Elector's younger sister, Violanta Beatrix. See briefly L. MARŠÁLKOVÁ, *Dvě instrukce pro Dominika Ondřeje z Kounic*). Contacts between him and Count von Kaunitz can be dated back at least until the period of Kaunitz' first Bavarian mission, while in later years it is evidenced by the numerous mentions in his correspondence with the Elector Palatine (BayHStA München, Abteilung I, Kasten blau 14/13, s. f.). Cf. Johann Friedrich von SCHULTE, *Karg von Bebenburg, Johann Friedrich Ignaz*, in: *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*, Band 15, 1882, p. 121.
- 71 The imperial instruction from 13. 12. 1687, MZA Brno, RA Kouniců, Inv. No. 2597, sign. 119 (1), Kart. 285, fol. 28–34. The Elector's instruction suggest that in addition to official instructions Kaunitz also received secret – encrypted – orders. Currently it is possible neither to prove nor to disprove whether or not Baron Karg had access to these orders. See the Elector's instruction for Count von Kaunitz from 7. 12. 1687, *ibidem*, fol. 49–58.
- 72 For example the imperial instruction from 14. 11. 1687, *ibidem*, fol. 81–88. Immediately after Count von Kaunitz submitted his credentials at the appropriate places and took care of the necessary formalities the Emperor was eagerly awaiting the first report; see the second imperial instruction from the same date, *ibidem*, fol. 67–78.
- 73 The imperial instruction from 13. 12. 1687, *ibidem*, Kart. 285, fol. 28–34.
- 74 While Emperor Leopold I was well aware that the young Bavarian Prince did not completely satisfy the requirements that were imposed on such an important function as the management of one of the spiritual electoral positions, he hoped that the health of the current Elector of Cologne would

Count, he needed to strive again to ensure that, if possible, all the negotiations took place smoothly, without any scandals or squabbles and he should be prepared to counteract any personal sympathies or antipathies and, on the contrary he should strive to ensure the most favourable representation of the Imperial Majesty.⁷⁵ The Count should also slowly start, with all due discretion, preparing for the eventual withdrawal of Fürstenberg from the election and he should assist him to obtain the Bishopric of Luttych, whose superior at that time was still Maximilian Heinrich of Bavaria.⁷⁶

With the advent of 1688, however, all the efforts of the imperial diplomats proved futile: Maximilian Heinrich (with substantial support from France) appointed Wilhelm Egon von Fürstenberg as his successor and the Chapter affirmed his nomination on the 7th January.⁷⁷ Emperor Leopold refused to accept it however, and even Pope Innocent XI

enable him to function until such a time that the Prince reaches the required age and also that, in the meantime, his negotiators will achieve a sufficient number of votes in the Chapter (i.e. at least two thirds of the total number of 24). Both the imperial side and the Bavarian side were thereby relying on the adjournment or at least the delaying of the election and also counting that they would be able use this time to obtain the Papal approval, without which it was not possible to occupy the See. Ibidem.

75 The imperial instruction from 14. 11. 1687 (MZA Brno, RA Kouniců, Inv. No. 2597, sign. 119 (1), Kart. 285, fol. 67–78). Even Dominik Andreas von Kaunitz himself was not spared from ceremonial disputes, however. For example in the extensive report to the Emperor from 16. 11. 1688 he complained about the conduct of the Florentine envoy to the Bavarian court, who had come there to negotiate the terms for the marriage of the Elector's sister Violanta Beatrix to Ferdinand, the Grand Duke of Tuscany. Apparently the envoy acted superciliously to one-and-all, which the Count perceived as representing unforgivable insolence: he was very much attached to his privileged position, which, as an emissary of the Emperor himself, belonged to him by right and he was not going to accept any reproaches (neither his own nor the Emperor's). Later, for the occasion of this Tuscan wedding, Count of Kaunitz was going to purchase a gala suit and additionally livery for his servants in the amount of 1,000 guildens. ÖStA Wien, HHStA, ÖGSR, Kart. 106, Fasz. 75, Pars 4, fol. 93–94 and 186–187.

76 The imperial instruction from 14. 11. 1687 (MZA Brno, RA Kouniců, Inv. No. 2597, sign. 119 (1), Kart. 285, fol. 81–88). Eventually Prince von Fürstenberg did not obtain the Bishopric of Luttych: after the death of Maximilian Heinrich its management was assigned to Johann Ludwig von Elderen (1620–1694) and when he also died a few years later, Fürstenberg's old enemy Joseph Clement of Bavaria who at that time was already the Elector of Cologne, also became the Bishop of Luttych. In regard to Johann Ludwig von Elderen see: Ernst Heinrich KNESCHKE, *Neues Allgemeines Adelslexikon*, Bd. 7, Leipzig 1867, p. 455. See more about Fürstenberg's futile struggle for Luttych in 1694 and the difficulties of organising elections at that time, during which the Bavarian Elector Maximilian Emanuel intervened in favour of his brother in: *Theatrum Europaeum XIV/I.*, Frankfurt am Main 1702, here especially pp. 653–660. Also the election there took place by voting in the Chapter and the future Bishop had to obtain at least two-thirds of the 24 votes; in general, in regard to elections, see Note 58.

77 In regard to this see Kaunitz' correspondence with the Elector Palatine: setting the date and the last pre-election meetings and the actual election of Cardinal Fürstenberg were all very obviously carefully monitored. See the relevant letters, especially those from December 1687 and January 1688. BayHStA München, Abteilung I, Kasten blau 14/13, s. f. It behoves mention that according to Palatine correspondence Count von Kaunitz was ill at this time, but he still fulfilled his duties conscientiously and reliably. He stated, for example, that he is very "matt" and has "Kopffwehe"; Kaunitz' letter to the Elector Palatine from 29. 11. 1687, ibidem.

was not in a big hurry to confirm this choice. A few months later (on the 6th June)⁷⁸ the old Elector Maximilian Heinrich died and in accordance with Canon Law it was necessary to choose his successor again, because the Pope had failed to confirm the previous election. The dispute concerning the Cologne See therefore erupted again with unprecedented force. Fürstenberg, who at that time moved between Cologne and Bonn, began to fortify Bonn with intensive support from France and in this manner to prepare for a new conflict.⁷⁹

Therefore Count von Kaunitz' mission did not also end during the second election in which he was to act as the main imperial envoy⁸⁰ and to whom the other diplomats were subject (for example Baron Christian von Eck und Heugersbach from Luttych).⁸¹ The instructions that were issued in the course of 1688 were reflecting the disappointment that was felt about the current developments. The imperial party therefore had to strive for the early implementation of a new election and also for securing votes for the Bavarian Prince.⁸² The date of the second election was eventually established for the 19th of July and therefore the negotiators did not have a lot of time. Additionally it was necessary

78 However, Max Braubach already provided, as the date of death of Maximilian Heinrich, 4. 6. See M. BRAUBACH, *Graf Dominik Andreas Kaunitz*, here p. 230 (in regard to the Cologne election see pp. 229–231).

79 A secret imperial instruction dating from 23. 6. 1688, MZA Brno, RA Kouniců, Inv. No. 2597, sign. 119 (1), Kart. 285, fol. 91–101.

80 Count von Kaunitz' activities during that time are recorded, for example, in his correspondence with the Elector Palatine, which is stored in a rich archive in Munich. At the beginning of 1688 the Count stayed in Cologne or Munich, while he spent February and March in Vienna, where he passed-on to the Emperor information that had not yet been discovered while he was preparing for another journey. In May, he left Vienna again for Munich, where he stayed until about mid-June; then he returned again briefly to Vienna to discuss with the Emperor and obtain further instructions and at the end of June he set off again on another journey – this time he stayed mainly in Cologne, but he also visited other electoral courts. In the autumn of 1688 (probably during early September) Kaunitz returned to Vienna again and then in November he returned to Munich, where he usually stayed until April of the upcoming year (with a few exceptions, of course: for example his letter to the Emperor from 17. 1. 1689 was drawn in Augsburg, from 20. 1. 1689 in Vienna and from 25. 1. in Vaihingen an der Enz: ÖStA Wien, HHStA, ÖGSR, Kart. 106, Fasz. 75, Pars 4, fol. 1–221). Also see: BayHStA München, Abteilung I, Kasten blau 14/13, s. f.

81 Baron Christian von Eck und Heugersbach (1645–1706) is mentioned in the imperial instruction dating from 26. 6. 1688 (ÖStA Wien, HHStA, ÖGSR, Kart. 106, Fasz. 75, Pars 4, fol. 1–2) and in the imperial instruction dating from 13. 9. 1688 (MZA Brno, RA Kouniců, Inv. No. 2597, sign. 119 (1), Kart. 285, fol. 20–24). He is mentioned as an envoy to Cologne as of the year 1688 and then again in 1693 in L. BITTNER – L. GROß, *Repertorium*, p. 146; also in regard to him: J. H. ZEDLER, *Grosses vollständiges Universal Lexikon*, Bd. 8, col. 133.

82 See the imperial instruction from 13. 9. 1688 (MZA Brno, RA Kouniců, Inv. No. 2597, sign. 119 (1), Kart. 285, fol. 20–24). The Emperor tried to influence the Electors not only through his envoys, but of course he also used handwritten letters – see, for example, a copy of one such letter designated for the courts of Mainz, Trier, Bavaria, Palatine, Brandenburg and Saxony dating from 16. 6. 1688 (*ibidem*, fol. 11–12). Additionally see the copy of the Emperor's letter to the Chapter from 25. 6. 1688 (*ibidem*, fol. 6–10).

to consider the fact that this time there might be some problems on the part of Rome; although the Pope continued to support Joseph Clement there were only a few weeks left for ensuring that all the requirements were fulfilled; the Holy Father also began to fear that the case of the election of the Archbishop of Cologne might become a precedent for future elections.⁸³

Even now, Dominik Andreas von Kaunitz could rely on co-operating with the Bavarian envoy Baron Karg and also with the Palatinate side. The aforementioned Baron von Eck additionally operated there as a secret diplomat (or perhaps rather as an agent), who should not enjoy any public honours (these were intended only for Kaunitz as the main envoy), but should work as an informant for the Emperor and the Count von Kaunitz, to whom he should always provide a copy of the letter to the Emperor).⁸⁴ After the Count had learnt all the useful information he was required to officially present himself to the Chapter as an imperial envoy and to express his deepest condolence regarding the death of the former elector. Then he was required to pass-on his credentials to the members of the Chapter and to await whatever opinion the Pope would adopt, which somewhat hampered Count von Kaunitz.⁸⁵

Equally (if not more) important at this time therefore appeared to be Kaunitz' unofficial activity as was evidenced by the secret instruction from the end of June 1688,⁸⁶ namely the re-securing of the votes for Joseph Clement.⁸⁷ Electors, or those who could significantly influence the election in a different manner, he should approach with an offer of significant sums, prestigious offices for them and their relatives, various other benefits and privileges

83 The Pope – according to Kaunitz' letter to the Elector Palatine – commented that this election may serve as "*pro exemplo in futurum*" and that therefore nothing should be rushed. BayHStA München, Abteilung I, Kasten blau 14/13, s. f. Additionally also: a secret imperial instruction from 23. 6. 1688, MZA Brno, RA Kouničů, Inv. No. 2597, sign. 119 (1), Kart. 285, fol. 91–101.

84 See the *credenz schreiben* for Dominik Andreas von Kaunitz from 23. 6. 1688, which was intended for the Elector Palatine (ibidem, fol. 13) or the copy of the Emperor's letter to the Chapter from 25. 6. 1688 (ibidem, fol. 6–10).

85 Even before his official introduction to the Chapter the Count was required to visit the local dean, who, at that time, was Wilhelm Egon von Fürstenberg (he should visit him immediately – even without due pomp), and only afterwards could a public audience follow. Ibidem, fol. 6–10.

86 A secret imperial instruction from 23. 6. 1688 (MZA Brno, RA Kouničů, Inv. No. 2597, sign. 119 (1), Kart. 285, fol. 91–101). Information regarding the identification of suitable persons who would support the election of Joseph Clement is already listed in a copy of Kaunitz' report to the Emperor (ibidem, Inv. No. 2598, sign. III, 119 (2), Kart. 285, fol. 1–5).

87 The Emperor advised Count von Kaunitz to carry-out private visits with relevant persons and also to monitor the behaviour of Prince Joseph Clement and to report about everything that took place. Apparently some secret negotiations took place in the Cologne apartment of the Bishop of Wrocław where Count von Kaunitz, Baron Karg and other diplomats were designated to meet him. See the copy of Kaunitz' report to the Emperor from 25. 12. 1688, BayHStA München, Abteilung I, Kasten blau 14/13, s. f.

and, of course, imperial grace and gratitude;⁸⁸ the costs should be paid from the funds that flowed-in from the United Provinces.⁸⁹

The most frequently occurring attraction was undoubtedly represented by the prestigious offices from which adequate security flowed, whether for the electors and their relatives or for those entities who were influencing the successful course of the election from a distance. The Count therefore promised Count Philipp Karl von Fürstenberg-Möskirch a position in the *Reichshofrat* and the Chamberlain's key. Count Hohenzollern,⁹⁰ whose passion was hunting and everything associated with it, should be supported for obtaining the Office of the *Oberstjägermeister*. Also those who wanted a prestigious military function for themselves or for a family member, such as Count von Salm⁹¹ and the Prince of Croÿ⁹² should get their own. Another kind of motivation was the sums of money that were promised (as we saw above in the case of Count von Salm), or the attractive land that could be offered, as was the case with Johann Heinrich von Anethan.⁹³ Of course all those involved could also count on undying imperial favour, gratitude and support for their interests, which was the capital that could certainly be very beneficial in the future.

Despite the abovementioned tempting offers up till the date of the new elections imperial and Bavarian diplomacy only succeeded in providing nine votes for Joseph Clement out of a total number of 24. 13 electors voted for Fürstenberg; however, this

88 The bribing of Electors (albeit indirectly or allusively – and without providing specific names) has already been mentioned in Kaunitz letters since the end of 1687 (i.e. a copy of Kaunitz' report to the Emperor from 25. 12. 1687, *ibidem*).

89 See the imperial rescript from 13. 9. 1688, MZA Brno, RA Kounicû, Inv. No. 2597, sign. 119 (1), Kart. 285, fol. 20–24.

90 The identity of this count has not yet been verified, nor whether he is actually a spiritual or a secular person. Theoretically, Count Herman Friedrich von Hohenzollern-Hechingen (1665–1733) could still come under consideration; see: Rudolf Graf von STILLFRIED-ALCÁNTARA, *Beschreibung und Geschichte der Burg nebst Forschungen über den Urstamm der Grafen von Zollern*, Nürnberg 1870, p. 21.

91 Unfortunately it is not entirely clear who he actually was – in Kaunitz' letters from the following years Count Paris von Salm is mentioned (i.e. the Canon in Salzburg, Passau and Olomouc) and it is therefore possible that he was also in contact with him during the course of his Bavarian mission; see: ÖStA Wien, AVA, FA Harrach, Kart. 254/35, s. f., Kaunitz' letter to Ferdinand Bonaventura von Harrach from 16. 5. 1689.

92 Most likely Philipp Heinrich, the Canon in Wrocław and Cologne. J. H. ZEDLER, *Grosses vollständiges Universal Lexikon*, Bd. 6, col. 1738 or Jakob Christoph BECK – Jakob Christoph ISELIN – August Johann BURTORFF, *Neu-vermehrtes Historisch- und Geographisches Allgemeines Lexicon...*, Bi-C, 1742, p. 979.

93 Johann Heinrich von Anethan (1628–1693), during the years 1680–1693 an Auxiliary Bishop and the Vicar General in Cologne; during the Cologne election he actually voted for Joseph Clement and after his election he was commissioned by the Pope with the temporary administration of the Cologne See (owing to the low age of the Prince). For more about him see: E. GATZ – S. M. JANKER (Hg.), *Die Bischöfe des Heiligen Römischen Reiches*, p. 12.

was not enough to elect him – he did not obtain a two-thirds majority and therefore, in accordance with Canon Law his rival was elected, i.e. our already well-known Bavarian Prince.⁹⁴ Even then not everything had yet been completely won over: the negotiations with Pope Innocent XI (or with his commissioner, Cardinal *Protector Germaniae* Carlo Pio di Savoia) became somewhat stretched.⁹⁵ Also now Kaunitz watched over everything and in this case cooperated with Baron Karg, who even went to Rome to personally move the Pope to make the decisions and to keep the pro-Emperor party directly informed right from the centre of the negotiations.⁹⁶ Both the imperial and the Bavarian efforts were eventually crowned with success: the Pope spoke favourably in regard to the election and on the 20th September 1688 he confirmed it; the ceremonial proclamation took place in Cologne Cathedral on the 11th of October.⁹⁷

Cardinal von Fürstenberg was not about to give up his claims, however, so he gathered his followers and sought to prevent Prince Joseph Clement from taking office by military force, which France had provided for him. An important Kaunitz' task during the autumn and winter of 1688 and at the beginning of the following year was therefore searching for a military aid, negotiations with representatives of the City of Cologne,⁹⁸ which the Cardinal plunged into the hands of France, negotiations with all the parties and slow preparation of the ground for his successor to the post of imperial diplomat in Bavaria.

94 Of course the election was also mentioned in other sources, for example in Kaunitz' Palatine correspondence (there specifically the letter from 28. 7. 1688 and also an undated copy of a letter – probably from a similar period). BayHStA München, Abteilung I, Kasten blau 14/13, s. f. Celebratory Latin prints about the election are stored ibidem. Also in regard to this see: M. BRAUBACH, *Graf Dominik Andreas Kaunitz*, here p. 230 (in regard to the Cologne election pp. 229–231). How the two remaining electors voted has not yet been determined.

95 In his letters the Emperor understandably also turned to the Pope in order to persuade him to approve the election of Joseph Clement as quickly as possible. See a copy of the Emperor's letter to the Pope from 26. 7. 1688, MZA Brno, RA Kouničů, Inv. No. 2597, sign. 119 (1), Kart. 285, fol. 3. The helplessness of all the stakeholders while they were awaiting the Pope's decision is also vividly illustrated in other sources, such as the Count's correspondence with the Elector Palatine. BayHStA München, Abteilung I, Kasten blau 14/13, s. f.

96 The imperial rescript from 8. 8. 1688, MZA Brno, RA Kouničů, Inv. No. 2597, sign. 119 (1), Kart. 285, fol. 38–40.

97 See the Latin prints that were published on the occasion of the election (MZA Brno, RA Kouničů, Inv. No. 2605, sign. III, 119–9, Kart. 285, fol. 1–15) or, for example, sincere thanks for the support that the new Elector of Cologne sent to the Emperor in his letter from 16. 11. 1688 (ÖStA Wien, HHStA, ÖGSR, Kart. 107, Fasz. 76, Pars 2, fol. 183–184).

98 The Count was already busy in the summer of 1688 discussing his reflections regarding negotiations with representatives of the City of Cologne in his letters to the Elector Palatine (ibidem). See also the letters from the City of Cologne in 1688 to Emperor Leopold (MZA Brno, RA Kouničů, Inv. No. 2601, sign. III, 119–5, Kart. 285, fol. 1–12) and the letter from the City of Cologne to Dominik Andreas von Kaunitz (ibidem, Inv. No. 2602, sign. III, 119–6, Kart. 285, fol. 1–8).

At that time Baron Christian von Eck und Heugersbach, with whom Kaunitz worked previously and who was proficient in regard to the local conditions, was considered.⁹⁹

The Cologne election was not the only task that the Count should deal with at the turn of 1687–1688. Equally important was the long-anticipated conclusion of the treaty of alliance, which the outcome of the election should also help,¹⁰⁰ and finding the information about the French and Turkish armies and their progress and negotiations on military aid (military affairs and concerns of the French and Turkish threats indeed intertwine almost all available sources). The Emperor was well aware of intensive preparations for the clash of the two opposing camps and also of poor status of his troops, which suffered heavy losses and moreover were decimated by the weather; so to avoid fight of the Monarchy on two fronts, the Emperor wished at the time of the election to conclude a truce with France (with the preservation of the status quo); the power of attorney to negotiate the truce was awarded to Dominik Andreas von Kaunitz.¹⁰¹

Another of Kaunitz' key tasks in Bavaria was to secure support of Maximilian Emanuel in regard to upcoming election of the Emperor's elder son Joseph as the King of Romans (or he should dissuade the Elector in regard to his ambitions, if by chance he would consider running).¹⁰² Additionally Kaunitz was endowed with power of attorney¹⁰³ to negotiate Joseph's marriage to the Elector of Bavaria's younger sister Violanta Beatrix. This marriage, however, was conditional on Maximilian II Emanuel giving his vote to Joseph and nobody else during the election of the Roman King.¹⁰⁴ In this case the Emperor (in his own words) granted Kaunitz an extraordinary trust and full power to decide as he deemed appropriate: should be a marriage contract or a wedding present, all negotiations and conclusions he was to kept secret and any agreement was to bear, amongst others,

99 The imperial instruction from 13. 9. 1688, MZA Brno, RA Kouniců, Inv. No. 2597, sign. 119 (1), Kart. 285, fol. 20–24. Baron Eck was also in contact with the Bavarian envoy, Baron Karg, as evidenced by Kaunitz' correspondence with the Elector Palatine (specifically, for example, the letters from 8. or 21. 8. 1688). BayHStA München, Abteilung I, Kasten blau 14/13, s. f.

100 A treaty of alliance between the Emperor and the Bavarian Elector was eventually concluded on 4. 5. 1689—in regard to this see: L. HÜTTL, *Max Emanuel*, pp. 195–196. Already in December 1688, however, letters of the Elector Palatine to Count von Kaunitz talk about the need for concluding an alliance between the Emperor, the Elector of Bavaria and the Elector Palatine (e.g. a copy of the letter from 7. 12. 1688, BayHStA München, Abteilung I, Kasten blau 14/13, s. f.). Additionally see the draft of points for Kaunitz in regard to an alliance with Bavaria (MZA Brno, RA Kouniců, Inv. No. 2588 (3), sign. 117 (2), Kart. 285, fol. 4–7) and a proposal for an alliance between the Emperor and the Bavarian Elector (*ibidem*, Inv. No. 2595 (3), sign. 119 (9), Kart. 285).

101 See L. MARŠÁLKOVÁ, *Dvě instrukce pro Dominika Ondřeje z Kouniců*.

102 In regard to the support for the election of Joseph (I) as the King of Rome briefly *ibidem*.

103 The *Plenipotenz* from 26. 3. 1688 for negotiations of Count von Kaunitz regarding the marriage of Joseph (I) to Violanta Beatrix is stored in MZA Brno, RA Kouniců, Inv. No. 2588 (3), sign. 117 (2), Kart. 285, fol. 2.

104 See the imperial instruction from 31. 10. 1688, *ibidem*, Inv. No. 2587, sign. 117 (1), Kart. 285, fol. 1–7.

also his signature.¹⁰⁵ This negotiation eventually ended unsuccessfully, however, and the Bavarian Princess in the same year married Ferdinand Medici, the Grand Duke of Tuscany.

At the turn of the years 1688–1689, i.e. at the time when the Nine-Years War or the War of the Palatine Succession erupted, Dominik Andreas von Kaunitz' second Bavarian mission was slowly coming to an end. Almost all targets and tasks, which the Count should achieve in Bavaria, were met (although some only temporarily). Elector Maximilian II Emanuel after a long hesitation set off to Hungary, where, as Commander-in-Chief of the Christian armies, he took part in the famous victory near Belgrade. The demanding Cologne election also did eventually end exactly as the anti-French faction led by Emperor Leopold I imagined. Bavarian Prince Joseph Clement was elected to the Cologne See, which, however, was “the last straw” for Louis XIV: when he failed to dominate Cologne electorate through a legitimately elected Archbishop he resorted to a military solution. In this he was relying on the Emperor's preoccupation with the struggle against the Turks. In September 1688, French troops invaded Rhineland and occupied a series of imperial cities, such as Philipsburg, Mainz and Cologne. Attacks against his own brother sponsored by France for some time considerably cooled the Elector of Bavaria's sympathy to the Sun King and therefore long negotiations about an alliance with Bavaria brought its fruit, which was a long prepared alliance treaty from the 4th of May 1689.¹⁰⁶

105 For the negotiations of marriage, see the points dedicated to Kaunitz (without dating), *ibidem*, fol. 9–14.

106 Count von Kaunitz had to wait for his return home (despite his numerous pleas for release) until April 1689 (see ÖStA Wien, HHStA, ÖGSR, Kart. 106, Fasz. 75, Pars 4, fol. 1–221). One of the triggers of the war (known as the Nine-Years War, the War of the Augsburg League or of Grand Alliance) was the death of the forerunner of the current Elector Palatine Karl II (1651–1685), the last male member of the Protestant-Reformed Wittelsbach branch of the Pfalz-Simmern. After his death, the Catholic line of the Pfalz-Neuburg family took over the reign. The war broke up in 1688 and lasted until 1697, its first signs, however, could be seen already in 1685 or 1686 (i.e. at a time when Kaunitz was preparing for his English mission and for speaking in London not only in favour of the Emperor but also the Elector Palatine). After concluding the Nijmegen Peace Treaty in 1678 and after the Wars of Reunions in the years 1683–1684, Louis XIV (although he agreed to the terms of the long-prepared armistice signed in Regensburg in 1686) was looking for a new target. This time he found it in Rhineland Palatinate. The spark that ignited the fire was the forthcoming election of the new Elector of Cologne in the years 1687–1688. The horrors of war brought to an anti-French camp a number of existing Louis' allies, including the Elector of Bavaria, and an Alliance of Augsburg was formed against France. The situation began to turn around in 1694: the reason was the unfavourable economic situation and the great famine, which affected parts of Europe, especially the French territories, and also the death of one of the ablest French generals, Marshal Luxembourg. Peace negotiations were launched by a separate peace with France entered into by the Duke of Savoy, Victor Amadeus; in May the following year in the palace of William III of Orange in Rijswijk peace talks were commenced. After difficult and lengthy negotiations, on 20. 9. 1697 (or on 30. 10. – between Louis XIV and Leopold I) a peace treaty was finally concluded, whereby the situation should return to the period after concluding the peace of Nijmegen. The person who had the greatest benefit from the war was probably William III of Orange, because Louis XIV finally recognised him as the legitimate King of England and, moreover, pledged

Passau

Although after his exhausting Bavarian mission Dominik Andreas von Kaunitz might like to indulge in peace and quiet to be able to organise his affairs at home, he was not vouchsafe to do so. Already during the last months of his stay in Bavaria he knew where his next steps would lead him. This is to say that he capitalised the experience that he gained in regard to the Cologne election during his next mission. After a short stay at home the next task was already awaiting him, namely the election of the Bishop of Passau,¹⁰⁷ where on the 16th March 1689 the then Bishop Count Sebastian von Pötting, the Emperor's favourite diplomat,¹⁰⁸ died, for whom it was necessary (with regard to the next planned election, this time in Mainz) to find a suitable replacement.¹⁰⁹ The aristocratic society, however, was aware of the Bishop's frail health already some time before his death. Count von Kaunitz also was aware of these news and in January 1689, still during his mission in Munich and Cologne, he was thinking that in Passau a new election would have to be taken, in which he would – after considering the impact of another (as hoped successful) mission – he would like to participate as an imperial envoy.¹¹⁰ The Count was in addition hoping that Ferdinand Bonaventura von Harrach could intercede for his appointment to Passau, who most likely did so and later supported the Count during his mission and

that he would not provide any support to the previous monarch James II in the case of regaining the throne of England. See, for example, William YOUNG, *International Politics and Warfare in the Age of Louis XIV and Peter the Great. A Guide to the Historical Literature*, New York – Lincoln – Shanghai 2004; John A. LYNN, *The Wars of Louis XIV: 1667–1714*, London 1999, etc.

107 In regard to Bishopric of Passau see Herbert W. WURSTER, *Das Bistum Passau und seine Geschichte*, Strasbourg 1994; Konrad BAUMGARTNER, *Die Seelsorge im Bistum Passau zwischen barocker Tradition, Aufklärung und Restauration*, Landsberg am Lech 1975; in regard to his bishops and other clerics: August LEIDL, *Das Bistum Passau zwischen Wiener Konkordat (1448) und Gegenwart: Kurzporträts der Passauer Bischöfe, Weihbischöfe, Offiziale (Generalvikare) dieser Epoche*, Passau 1993, etc.

108 The Bishop apparently died early in the morning, between two and three o'clock, as the Emperor was the next day informed by the Chapter. The letter from 17. 3. 1689 in ÖStA Wien, HHStA, RK, Geistliche Wahlakten (Passau A-D), 30 a). Sebastian von Pötting (1628–1689), first the Provost in Passau and then (since 1665) the Bishop of Ljubljana. In 1675, based on the recommendation of the Emperor Leopold I he was elected Bishop of Passau and a year later he married there the Emperor to Princess Eleonore Magdalene von Pfalz-Neuburg; since 1683 he worked as an imperial envoy to the *Reichstag* in Regensburg.

109 The future Bishop of Passau should in accordance with ideal requirements support the election of the Coadjutor of Mainz, which took place two years after, but already then it was necessary to prepare the ground for the imperial candidate (see below). Also see MZA Brno, RA Kouničů, Inv. No. 2640, sign. III, 130–2, Kart. 288, fol. 9–10. The importance of the Passau election in regard to future events is also confirmed by other sources; see an undated and unsigned draft (presumably of Kaunitz' letter or report to the Emperor, apparently from May 1689), *ibidem*, fol. 31–32.

110 In the letter to Count Ferdinand Bonaventura von Harrach from 15. 1. 1689 from Munich Kaunitz mentions, that he would like to be sent to Passau. See ÖStA Wien, AVA, FA Harrach, Kart. 254/35, s. f.

provided him with information.¹¹¹ Due to Kauntiz' experience with the election of high-ranking religious dignitaries it was not necessary to persuade the Emperor too much. The decision that Count von Kauntiz should lead the negotiations in Passau was made at the end of March or early April 1689; anecdotal reports of Count's appointment as an imperial envoy probably circulated in aristocratic society much earlier.¹¹² The pro-Emperor party was clear from the beginning who should win the election in Passau: he was another protégé of the Emperor and experienced diplomat, Count Johann Philipp von Lamberg.¹¹³ Only a few sources survived in regard to this mission from Count von Kauntiz,¹¹⁴ so we have to be satisfied with indirect reports, i.e. the letters addressed to the Count during his Passau mission and the drafts that the Count drew up.¹¹⁵

As was the custom of that time, initial preparations for occupation of the Passau See and the election began well in advance, still during the life of Count Sebastian von Pötting. The first concrete debates on this issue that have been preserved in the Kauntiz family archive date to the beginning of 1687: already then Lamberg was referred to as a clear favourite.¹¹⁶ These were not just debates, however – Count Lamberg himself left nothing to chance and was obtaining detailed information on how the Emperor and prominent spiritual dignitaries (his potential electors) see his chances and also timely began with securing votes.¹¹⁷

111 See Kauntiz' pleas for the intercession, *ibidem*.

112 See, for example, the letter of Count Ferdinand Maria Franz von Neuhaus from 28. 3. 1689 from Regensburg to Count von Kauntiz (MZA Brno, RA Kouniců, Inv. No. 2640, sign. III, 130–2, Kart. 288, fol. 7–8), additionally see the drafts and the copies of letters *ibidem*, fol. 9–10.

113 Johann Philipp von Lamberg (1651–1712) was an important diplomat in imperial service. As an envoy he stayed in Düsseldorf, Dresden, Berlin and Regensburg. Later (in 1697) he went to Warsaw, where he participated in the election of August of Saxony, the King of Poland, and two years later he received the rank of the *Prinzipal-Kommissar* in Regensburg; he also participated in the election of Joseph I and Karl VI. The peak of his career was his appointment as Cardinal in 1700, again at the instigation of Emperor Leopold I. Franz NIEDERMAYER, *Johann Philipp von Lamberg, Fürstbischof von Passau (1651–1712). Reich, Landesfürstentum und Kirche im Zeitalter des Barock*, Passau 1938, etc. The emperor was clear about sending Lamberg to the *Reichstag* in Regensburg even before he was elected Bishop of Passau. See Kauntiz' letter from 23. 5. 1689, ÖStA Wien, HHStA, RK, Geistliche Wahlakten (Passau A-D), 30 a), s. f.

114 ÖStA Wien, AVA, FA Harrach, Kart. 254/35, s. f. and ÖStA Wien, HHStA, RK, Geistliche Wahlakten (Passau A-D), 30 a), s. f.

115 MZA Brno, RA Kouniců, Inv. No. 2640, sign. III, 130–2, Kart. 288.

116 See, for example, the copy of the Emperor's letter to Archbishop of Salzburg from 15. 9. 1687, in which the Emperor intercedes for the support of Count Lamberg and convinces Archbishop for cooperation in this matter. *Ibidem*, fol. 33–34.

117 See the excerpts from the letters to Count Lamberg from Count Friedrich von Preising, Canon in Salzburg, Passau and Augsburg, as well as the excerpts from the letters to Count von Harrach from Bishop of Leitmeritz Jaroslav Ignaz von Sternberg (who several times expressed his friendship and support in obtaining Passau to Lamberg – as well as one of the possible candidates for the post of

The instruction for Count von Kaunitz' Passau mission has not been found unfortunately so far; this mission, however, in this respect, certainly was not exceptional. The Count was certainly provided with the instruction and proved himself at the Chapter by the imperial creditives.¹¹⁸ Due to his workload during his previous mission Count von Kaunitz went to Passau at the last moment, so to speak. He arrived there on the 15th May 1689¹¹⁹ and the date of the election was set for the 24th May. It is therefore clear that the Emperor's allies had to prepare the ground there (on-site or from a distance) well before his arrival.¹²⁰ Although there was complete trust in Kaunitz' ability at court and in the highest circles, Lamberg's appointment was still far from a certain issue.¹²¹ Kaunitz was

Bishop Count Rudolf von Thun), and also the excerpts from the encrypted messages related to the Passau election, all from October 1687 and from January, March and April 1689. Ibidem, fol. 9–10.

118 See the letter in French to the Count from the *Hofkanzler* Count Theodor Heinrich Althet von Strattman from 12. 5. 1689 (ibidem, fol. 1). Count Strattman in his letter even commented that the instruction might not be necessary and Kaunitz' would receive only a copy of the imperial letter and the creditives. Creditives or their drafts were not drawn up until the beginning of May 1689 (on 4. or 6. 5.) and the Emperor in a handwritten letter turned to the Chapter, and announced Kaunitz' arrival and asked for cooperation and also more than strongly recommended Lamberg's election since the latter has "*sonderbahre Vernunft*" and also "*rare qualiteten*". Another Emperor's letter (from 11. 5. 1689) was delivered to individual canons; their list is stored in HHStA and comprises 22 names (addressees were, for example: Provost Franz Anton von Losenstein, Walter Xaver von Dietrichstein – despite the fact that at that time he already had no much in common with the spiritual environment, Franz Anton von Harrach, Bishop of Leitmeritz Jaroslav Ignaz von Sternberg, Bishop of Ljubljana Sigmund Christoph von Herberstein, Rudolf von Thun, Ferdinand Franz von Pratto, Johann Philipp von Lamberg himself and many others). ÖStA Wien, HHStA, RK, Geistliche Wahlakten (Passau A-D), 30 a), s. f.

119 Ibidem, Kaunitz' letter from 16. 5. 1689.

120 About the specific names of diplomats, agents or other persons involved, who worked in favour of Lamberg's election in a greater advance of the election date, sources keep silent, with a few exceptions. It is sure that some of the possible candidates for this function already previously voiced in favour of Count Lamberg; for example, the above mentioned Count Rudolf von Thun, Count Paris von Salm and Bishop of Leitmeritz (who, however, is mentioned as Lamberg's supporter, while in other sources as his rival), etc. See (probably) Kaunitz' draft from 18. 5. 1689 in MZA Brno, RA Kouničů, Inv. No. 2640, sign. III, 130–2, Kart. 288, fol. 15–17. During Kaunitz' mission the number of votes for Lamberg was gradually increasing about which the Count informed the Emperor and his friends in detail; see below and also see Kaunitz' draft from Passau from 23. 5. 1689 (ibidem, fol. 19–20).

121 The letter from Count Harrach from 16. 5. 1689 (ibidem, fol. 5) or Kaunitz' response from the same date (ÖStA Wien, AVA, FA Harrach, Kart. 254/35, s. f.), also his letters to the Emperor from 16., 18. and 23. 5. 1689 (ÖStA Wien, HHStA, RK, Geistliche Wahlakten (Passau A-D), 30 a), s. f.). For example, as of 18. 5. 1689 only seven votes were secured for Lamberg, while the next four to six electors seemed to also speak for him, but according to Kaunitz' words at least eight votes were necessary, although already after securing the ninth vote he in advance congratulated the Emperor for winning this election (the letter from 18. 5. 1689, ÖStA Wien, HHStA, RK, Geistliche Wahlakten (Passau A-D), 30 a), s. f.). Additionally see also the draft from 18. 5. 1689 in MZA Brno, RA Kouničů, Inv. No. 2640, sign. III, 130–2, Kart. 288, fol. 15–17. Ibidem on fol. 29–30, there are two undated lists of candidates and electors, who are divided according to their 'nationality' (from Austria, Bohemia, Tyrol, Bavaria, etc.) and also according to which faction they belonged.

therefore responsible for securing critical voices and for persuading hesitant electors; as the biggest Lamberg's rivals were generally considered Count Franz Anton von Losenstein and especially Count Sigmund Christoph von Herberstein; other serious candidates were Count Jaroslav Ignaz von Sternberg and Rudolf von Thun.¹²² In the few days that remained to the election, Count therefore undertook everything possible so that his mission was a success and he could leave as soon as possible. At the Chapter, where he arrived with his creditive,¹²³ he delivered his message and the reasons why the electors should adopt the will of the Emperor; in his apartment in the episcopal princely residence (today's Old Residence), where he was staying, he received and reciprocated the visits, while offering various benefits and gifts, which, based on his words, did not work very well.¹²⁴

Thanks to Kaunitz' letter, which he wrote after returning from his mission, we can get some idea of what his first official meeting with the canons looked like.¹²⁵ Already on the day of his arrival he sent his creditive to the dean and on the day later to the Chapter. On the 17th May, the Bishop's *Hofmarschall* Baron Berg sent for him three princely carriages with six horses and six lackeys to arrive timely to the Chapter Assembly, which took place at ten o'clock in the morning. When the Count got out of carriage at the gate of the residence, he was received by the *Hofmarschall* and, of course, awaiting him was the entire princely court. The dean and the senior were waiting by the so called *Österreichische Ritterstuben* and brought him into the room where the Chapter gathered; there a large black padded chair was ready for Kaunitz. In the audience room he was first respectfully welcomed by all the dignitaries (they did not shake hands, however) and then he delivered his message. After the audience, about which he apparently wanted to report the Emperor personally, because he did not describe it, he returned to his apartment: the older canons accompanied him to the end of the *Ritterstuben* and the younger ones

122 Franz Anton von Losenstein (1642–1692), first Canon and later (from 1673) Provost of Passau. The peak of his career was his appointment as the successor to Bishop of Olomouc. Alfred A. STRNAD, *Der letzte Losensteiner aus der Sicht römischer Quellen*, in: *Ecclesia peregrinans*. Josef Lenzenweger zum 70. Geburtstag, Wien 1986, pp. 209–221. Sigmund Christoph von Herberstein (1644–1716) was Canon in Passau and later (1683) he became Bishop of Ljubljana. He is briefly mentioned by Rudolf VIERHAUS (Hg.) in *Deutsche biographische Enzyklopädie*, 2. Ausgabe, München 2008, p. 462.

123 Stored in ÖStA Wien, HHStA, RK, Geistliche Wahlakten (Passau A-D), 30 a), s. f., there is an undated copy of the creditive intended for the Chapter in Passau.

124 According to some reports the Count had the entire floor available in his residence. He described his first days of negotiations in the letters from 16. and 18. 5. 1689 (*ibidem*). According to these reports some Electors apparently offered their votes themselves because they supported the imperial case and were just waiting for news from the imperial envoy. See also the draft from Passau from 16. and 18. 5. 1689 in MZA Brno, RA Kouničů, Inv. No. 2640, sign. III, 130–2, Kart. 288, fol. 21–22, 15–17.

125 Kaunitz' letter to the Emperor dated in Vienna on 29. 5. 1689 and an undated draft. See ÖStA Wien, HHStA, RK, Geistliche Wahlakten (Passau A-D), 30 a), s. f. and MZA Brno, RA Kouničů, Inv. No. 2640, sign. III, 130–2, Kart. 288, fol. 11–13.

with the part of the court all way to his apartment. Part of the honour guard went with him, while another part was already waiting outside his room and guarded his door. In the evening the chair with a backrest was prepared for him in the dining room and the *Hofkanzler* May gave him a panatiera (apparently it was an ornate box for bread) and also passed him water to wash his hands and the *Stallmeister* Mornberg handed him a towel; during the banquet he was served by butlers and toast was made with the first cup, then and also in the coming days, to the health of the Emperor.¹²⁶

In the following days he was diligently attending individual electors and foreign envoys and was forwarding them the Emperor's will and he also accepted visits (the first came to him the envoy of Bavaria, Baron Neuhaus, whom he knew from before).¹²⁷ He made some visits *incognito* because he was not equipped with a sufficiently representative carriage (he used the carriage with two horses and two lackeys). During his entire stay he enjoyed, as the Emperor's envoy, the highest esteem and respect. When he travelled in the episcopal carriage, sitting with him were the most important dignitaries (such as the Bishop of Leitmeritz) and his carriage was accompanied by six lackeys on foot. In churches and elsewhere he was provided with a velvet-upholstered chair with gold tassels and he also had his own oratory available, where he sometimes undertook unofficial discussions – he talked there, for example, with the Bavarian envoy.¹²⁸

Kaunitz' negotiations, for which he had so little time, were, fortunately, successful and two days prior the election the Count and the whole court could be already relieved – in accordance with the letter of Ferdinand Bonaventura von Harrach already then it was clear that the outcome of the election will be as the Emperor wished. Harrach therefore did not hesitate in advance to pass on the Emperor's satisfaction and also that the whole court applauds Kaunitz' good negotiations. The *Hofkanzler* Count Theodor Heinrich von Strattmann and the *Oberstkämmerer* of the Kingdom of Bohemia Count Johann Friedrich von Trauttmansdorf, apparently commented that: "*habemus pontificem, en fin dem graffen von Kaunitz ist nichts unmogliches, wann er sich darumbes ainnimbt*".¹²⁹

126 The Count obviously noticed that he was accepted there considerably warmer and more respectfully (e.g. compared with England) and in his report he stated that he felt there at home and that respect for the Emperor was clearly evident from the Chapter's approach. *Ibidem*.

127 It could be Ferdinand Franz Maria von Neuhaus, with whom the Count was in contact already during his previous mission; see, for example, their correspondence in MZA Brno, RA Kouničů, Inv. No. 2640, sign. III, 130–2, Kart. 288, fol.7–8, additionally see the drafts and copies of the letters on fol. 9–10.

128 *Ibidem*, fol. 11–13.

129 Harrach's letter to Kaunitz from 22. 5. 1689, *ibidem*, fol. 3.

Kaunitz again did not describe the actual election – he probably wanted to report to the Emperor himself; however, he might be satisfied with the outcome in any case.¹³⁰ The new Bishop Lamberg accepted Kaunitz' official congratulations and to honour the election a festive banquet was held at which Count von Kaunitz sat on the privileged right side of the new bishop; sitting near to him were the other (electoral) envoys. The Count met Lamberg again in the evening. He arrived *incognito* to his house, where a banquet was held in honour of the election and to celebrate Lamberg's birthday, which he had on the following day; Kaunitz was warmly welcomed by the host. Celebrations both at the court and in private lasted another two days, Kaunitz always sat at the right hand of the new bishop. Eventually the Count attended his last audience, after which Lamberg escorted him to his apartment. On the day of his departure the new bishop invited him into the carriage and rode part of the way with him (Kaunitz again sat to his right) and they were accompanied by many carriages occupied by prominent aristocrats and clerics; then they got off the carriage and said their goodbyes. A boat was already prepared for Count von Kaunitz, but Lamberg awaited Kaunitz' departure before he set off on his own return trip.¹³¹

After returning from Passau, which took place shortly after the successful election at the end of May,¹³² Count von Kaunitz finally devoted more of his time to his own affairs – especially managing the estates – and to family which he always greatly missed during his travels. The Count already previously thought of setting up *Familienfideikommiss* and now, after completing several missions during which he showed the Emperor his abilities and loyalty more than enough, he thought that it was an appropriate time to initiate steps to the establishment of *Fideikommiss* and also to obtain some prestigious office (if possible directly at the court). In regard to obtaining this function he relied on the intercession of his friends, especially of Ferdinand Bonaventura von Harrach.¹³³ He

130 See the two Kaunitz' congratulations to the Emperor to the successful election from 25. 5. 1689, ÖStA Wien, HHStA, RK, Geistliche Wahlakten (Passau A-D), 30 a), s. f. This election is also briefly mentioned by Joseph SCHÖLLER, *Die Bischöfe von Passau und ihre Zeitereignisse...*, Passau 1844, pp. 229–230, however the election date is defined as being a day earlier.

131 The new bishop was well aware that his election is due to the Emperor and his envoy, Count von Kaunitz. He therefore did not forget to express his undying gratitude and willingness to serve the Habsburg Family and praised the Count highly in his letters. See Lamberg's letters from 25. and 26. 5. and 11. 6. 1689, ÖStA Wien, HHStA, RK, Geistliche Wahlakten (Passau A-D), 30 a), s. f.

132 Just a few days after the election the Count was already writing to Count Ferdinand Bonaventura von Harrach from Vienna (specifically on 29. 5. 1689) and later from Slavkov. ÖStA Wien, AVA, FA Harrach, Kart. 254/35, s. f.

133 Ibidem. Also see MZA Brno, RA Kounicû, Inv. No. 1717, sign. 3a, Kart. 191, fol. 173–195. As is evident from these references concerning the information flow between Kaunitz and Harrach and also about requests for intercession, the relationship between these two nobles was still good in the early 1690's. Their correspondence bears quite a friendly spirit and Kaunitz in his letters shared the impressions

had to wait a few more years, however, both for *Fideikommiss* and for the office, since the Emperor had other plans with him.

Mainz

The last mission of Dominik Andreas von Kaunitz, that will be briefly addressed here, concerned (not surprisingly, given his previous experience) another election in the highest imperial ecclesiastical circles. This time it was about the occupation of the Electoral See in Mainz,¹³⁴ which he briefly visited during the election of the Coadjutor or Archbishop of Cologne. Preparations for the elections traditionally took place well in advance – still during the life of the current elector, Anselm Franz von Ingelheim.¹³⁵ Significantly less sources survived in regard to this mission than from the previous expeditions directly from Count von Kaunitz, so we have to accept more mediated reports. But one can assume that in terms of organisational and ‘technical’ aspects (for example as regards the ceremony¹³⁶ or the manner of negotiations with high-level spiritual dignitaries) this mission was not very different from the two previous ones, i.e. the Cologne and Passau elections. Somewhat surprisingly, however, a significant number of originals of creditives were preserved generally addressed either to Mainz and Trier, to the Chapter in Mainz as a whole or to its individual members (in this case it is a total of 38 pieces). The name lists will not tell us a much about Kaunitz’ mission, however.¹³⁷ The fact that all the

and (sometimes very private) information from his diplomatic missions. See ÖStA Wien, AVA, FA Harrach, Kart. 254/35, s. f.

134 In regard to electorate and the Electors see Peter Claus HARTMANN, *Der Mainzer Kurfürst als Reichserzkanzler. Funktionen, Aktivitäten, Ansprüche und Bedeutung des zweiten Mannes im Alten Reich*, Stuttgart 1997; Friedhelm JÜRGENSMEIER (Hg.), *Handbuch der Mainzer Kirchengeschichte 2. Erzstift und Erzbistum Mainz. Territoriale und kirchliche Strukturen*, Würzburg 1997; IDEM, *Das Bistum Mainz: Von der Römerzeit bis zum II. Vatikanischen Konzil*, Frankfurt am Main 1989; Irmtraud LIEBEHERR, *Das Mainzer Domkapitel als Wahlkörperschaft des Erzbischofs*, in: Anton Philipp Brück (Hg.), *Willigis und sein Dom. Festschrift zur Jahrtausendfeier des Mainzer Doms*, Mainz 1975, pp. 359–391, etc.

135 Anselm Franz von Ingelheim (1634–1695) was in close connection with the Austrian Habsburgs. See Anton BRÜCK, *Anselm Franz von Ingelheim*, in: *Neue Deutsche Biographie*, Band 1, Berlin 1953, pp. 310–311.

136 Ceremonial issues are not addressed at all in the below mentioned instruction (nor in the instructions issued in regard to election of the Coadjutor of Cologne) – the reason may be numerous previous experiences of Count von Kaunitz both with the elections in the highest ecclesiastical circles and also his knowledge of this part of the Empire and useful acquaintances that he had made during his earlier diplomatic visits. Do not forget that by the time of the Cologne election the Count travelled based on the instructions *inter alia* also to Mainz.

137 MZA Brno, RA Kouniců, Inv. No. 2596, sign. III, 118 (there are 73 folios and 38 letters, while the original number of letters was certainly even higher). Preserved were the letters (sometimes only one

creditives (with few exceptions) were drafted either on the 24th December 1690 or on the 12th April 1691 and that many capitulars should receive the creditives from both of these dates suggests that Count von Kaunitz went to Mainz twice (one time well ahead of the election, which was announced to take place on the 19th April 1691, and then again just before the election) and during both visits he always handed over a letter to the same dignitaries; in the meantime he probably stopped by at the court for new instructions.¹³⁸

Information on how the Mainz election should ideally take place and what role Dominik Andreas von Kaunitz should play in it can be drawn from the instruction.¹³⁹ Already its title clarifies that the Count should not act and persuade electors or potential supporters of the imperial policy only in Mainz but also in Trier (the local elector, Johann Hugo von Orsbeck would become Kaunitz' main ally).¹⁴⁰ This should conclude his journey through the clerical electoral courts. As in his other instructions, the Emperor did not omit to mention the Turkish danger and of course the need to enforce his will as the sole correct. This time the Emperor wished for the good of the whole Empire to establish in Mainz as Ingelheim's successor "*his beloved cousin*" Ludwig Anton von Pfalz-Neuburg, Provost of Ellwangen (1660–1694). The Emperor thereby imposed difficult task on Count von Kaunitz, because as he acknowledged himself, his candidate did not have many followers; he therefore advised Kaunitz to act more privately than publicly, to scrupulously avoid any problems and if they occur to immediately inform him.

The conference report in regard to Kaunitz' journey to Mainz does not differ significantly from the text of the instruction. Since Ingelheim (at that time already very ill) did not leave any instructions concerning his successor, the Emperor decided to take matters into his own hands and through Count von Kaunitz to enforce the election of his man. Kaunitz' task there was to observe and especially to influence the situation – despite any resentment of the Chapter or the Pope himself he was supposed to secure sufficient

from that date, sometimes from both dates) for a total of 25 capitulars. Additional creditives (with a standard wording) or their drafts are preserved in ÖStA Wien, HHStA, RK, Geistliche Wahlakten (Mainz Erzbistum A-G), 24 a), here fol. 289 (the creditive from 27. 11. 1690 valid for Mainz and Trier), fol. 301 and 302 (draft creditives for Mainz from 24. 12. 1690).

138 The Emperor informed the Chapter as a whole about the arrival of Count von Kaunitz by his letter from 24. 12. 1690 and again on 14. 4. 1691. Ibidem, fol. 303–305 and 328–329.

139 There are eight sheets of the draft instruction for Mainz and Trier from 24. 12. 1690 (ÖStA Wien, HHStA, RK, Instruktionen, Fasz. 6, s. f.) and especially its original which, including the creditives from the years 1690–1691, is stored in MZA Brno, RA Kouničů, Inv. No. 2360, sign. III-78, 1, Kart. 267, instructions in fol. 2–8, creditives in fol. 8–10. Although a note was added to the original instruction that this is a secret instruction, this fact is not mentioned in the text and it is also consistent with its draft from Vienna, which also does not mention secrecy of the instruction.

140 In regard to Johann Hugo von Orsbeck (1634–1711), who was the Elector of Trier from the year 1676 until his death in 1711, see Max BRAUBACH, *Johann Hugo von Orsbeck*, in: *Neue Deutsche Biographie*, Band 10, Berlin 1974, pp. 540–542.

number of votes for the Emperor's protégé. All participants were aware that it was a post of extraordinary importance; the winner of the election should in fact play his role, for example, in regard to concluding the Emperor's alliances with Bavaria, Palatinate, Spain and others. The Emperor unlike Kaunitz did not have a doubt that Ludwig Anton von Pfalz-Neuburg would win (on this occasion, he promised to give him a cross or another gem worth ten to twelve thousand gulden), his election, however, he conditioned by him joining his side in battle against France.¹⁴¹

Formalities probably took place as it was expected: Kaunitz probably experienced at both electors (Mainz and Trier) a festive welcome similar to those in previous missions; he asked for an audience at the Chapter, where he presented his credentials, delivered a speech and passed on the Emperor's requirements. The actual audience he had with Anselm Franz von Ingelheim whom he managed to persuade for the Emperor's case.¹⁴² Then the Count presented his credits to the individual capitulars and dealt with them and also with other influential people (in addition to the Elector of Trier, he should seek, for example, the Landgrave of Hessen¹⁴³). Chapter members who before the election stayed elsewhere, he should, if possible, find and convince them of the suitability of the Emperor's protégé.¹⁴⁴ Kaunitz was very carefully preparing for his meetings in advance; certainly because of saving the time and also for the modest popularity of the imperial candidate.

Also this Kaunitz' mission was eventually crowned with success: Ludwig Anton von Pfalz-Neuburg was on the 19th April 1691 indeed elected to succeed still living Ingelheim, although it should be noted that he did not reach to the Mainz See – he died before Ingelheim and therefore, in 1695, a re-election had to be undertaken, which Count Lothar Franz von Schönborn won and served there until his death in 1729.¹⁴⁵ Count von Kaunitz experienced uneasy moments in Mainz. Promoting not very popular Ludwig Anton certainly was not an easy task and, moreover, he faced many problems. He arrived to the election late and Mainz was not a very safe place, similarly as earlier during the siege of Cologne (it was almost impossible to leave the city due to French forces and men of

141 *Protocolum conferentiae* from 2. 12. 1690, ÖStA Wien, HHStA, RK, Geistliche Wahlakten (Mainz Erzbistum A-G), 24 a), fol. 291–296.

142 After Kaunitz' audience Ingelheim announced to the Emperor that he intends to support his candidate. See his letter and congratulations on the successful election of Ludwig Anthon von Pfalz-Neuburg from 20. 4. 1691, *ibidem*, fol. 330–331 and 332–333.

143 Maybe Karl Landgrave of Hessen-Kassel (1654–1730) or Ernst Ludwig von Hessen-Darmstadt (1678–1739) – unfortunately, it is not specified in the instruction, which ancestral branch is concerned.

144 See the original and also the draft of the instruction for Mainz and Trier from 24. 12. 1690, MZA Brno, RA Kouničů, Inv. No. 2360, sign III-78, 1, Kart. 267, fol. 2–7 and ÖStA Wien, HHStA, RK, Instruktionen, Fasz. 6, s. f.

145 In regard to the election see also Maria LEHNER, *Ludwig Anton von Pfalz-Neuburg (1660–1694). Ordensoberhaupt, General, Bischof*, Marburg 1994, pp. 161–164.

Cardinal Fürstenberg). Additionally, as he claimed, he suffered greatly in regard to the development of his own business; mainly because of his long absence – he was receiving the permissions to return home too late.¹⁴⁶

Financial Background

In regard to financial background of Kaunitz' missions in the 1680's and early 1690's we, unfortunately, have to rely only on random and incomplete surviving fragments. Moravský zemský archiv does not store any complete accounting for all the missions and we are therefore unable to determine the exact amount that they consumed, although there is no doubt that like all diplomatic journeys of that time there were extremely costly and that the Count would have to pay a substantial part of the costs himself to cover expenses for the representation of his and thereby also the Emperor's. He also had to borrow money – mostly from the famous Viennese banker and lender to many important people, Ottavio Pestalozzi, as evidenced by a number of memoranda signed by either the Count or his wife Maria Eleonore. Although his actions always lead to “civilised” countries, he was purchasing some of his equipment in Vienna; for example, luxurious fabrics for fashion clothing, which he picked up during his infrequent visits home.¹⁴⁷

The *Hofzählamtsbuch* from 1692 also slightly expands knowledge about Count von Kaunitz' next mission: this year he was paid more than 2,700 guildens for his journey to the court of the Elector of Saxony, specifically for mourning clothes.¹⁴⁸ The Count therefore undoubtedly went to condole the ruling Elector Johann Georg IV von Sachsen on the death of his father Johann Georg III, who had died in the autumn of the previous year.¹⁴⁹ Due to Kaunitz' previous experience the mission to another electoral court does

146 Although the Emperor promised the Count extra 5,000 guildens for his mission to Mainz, the payment of which should be taken care of by the *Hofkammer*. Reimbursement probably not happened, however (*Protocolum conferentiae* from 2. 12. 1690, ÖStA Wien, HHStA, RK, Geistliche Wahlakten (Mainz Erzbistum A-G), 24 a), fol. 291–296). Additionally also the decree for the *Hofkammer* from 11. 4. 1691 (ibidem, fol. 327). *Hofzählamtsbücher* do not mention those 5000 guildens for “*extra Spesen*” to Mainz, however. Kaunitz, unfortunately, does not mention a specific amount of loss, nor what undertaking it concerned, nor the date on which he could set off on the return trip. See MZA Brno, RA Kouniců, Inv. No. 1717, sign. 3a, Kart. 191, fol. 173–195.

147 For example MZA Brno, RA Kouniců, Inv. No. 3720, sine sign., Kart. 408.

148 ÖStA Wien, Finanz- und Hofkammerarchiv Wien (= FHKA), Hofzählamtsbücher (= HZAB), Bd. 137, pp. 126, 250.

149 No sources were found in regard to this mission so far; future studies, however, should provide more detailed information.

not seem surprising and it is also possible that by the time he went to the Hague he had already made several similar journeys.¹⁵⁰

The table 2 shows the amounts that the *Hofkammer* expended on Kaunitz' diplomatic missions during the period monitored.¹⁵¹ They are neither small nor too large amounts; *Hofzahlamtsbücher* also do not always indicate the precise purpose for which the money was provided. During the first year of his diplomatic service Count von Kaunitz received for his current expenses (i.e. *Subsistenzgelder*) 500 guildens per month; since 1683, however, this sum was increased twofold and 1000 guildens per month he was receiving throughout the entire period monitored. The data contained herein also suggest that the amounts intended for individual missions were usually paid with a delay and also that the Count was often forced to borrow the necessary amount of money from one of the bankers whom this money was subsequently refunded (or rather, he was always cashed interest on this amount out of the *Hofkammer*, which mostly ranged around three or four per cent, but sometimes reached up to twenty per cent). In total, between the years 1682 and 1693 Dominik Andreas von Kaunitz received from the *Hofkammer* 92,827 guildens and all the bankers received a total of 3,204 guildens as interest, while Ottavio Pestalozzi received the largest sum (more than 2,879 guildens).¹⁵²

As Kaunitz stated in his application for permission to establish a *Fideikommiss* and for the imparting of a high courtly or provincial office (he would prefer the post of the *Oberstallmeister* or of the Moravian *Landeshauptmann*), the total amount that he apparently lost during his missions reached 200,000 guildens. Additionally he did not fail to mention the damage to the estates that occurred during his absence (for example, his estate in Uherský Brod was during the "Hungarian rebellion", i.e. Thököly's Uprising,

150 Cf. with another diplomatic mission which was also directed to Saxony: J. KUBEŠ, *Jan Marek z Clary a Aldringenu*; and also with the instruction for Franz Maximilian von Mansfeld, who in 1667 went to condole on the death of Elector of Brandenburg, Louise Henriette d'Orange, see: IDEM, *Instruction for Franz Maximilian von Mansfeld as the Imperial envoy to Frederick William, Elector of Brandenburg to Berlin, 13th July 1667*, available on-line at URL: <<http://uhv.upce.cz/cs/documents-and-editions/>> [cit. 29. 7. 2016].

151 Depending on the destination, where they were sent, imperial ambassadors received 1,000 or 1,500 guildens per month and the envoys of the lower order (residents) only 200–250 guildens – in this respect, Count von Kaunitz, in theory, had nothing to complain about, but the fact is that for example, even in 1693, he demanded the payment of the promised money and salary for previous years (starting from the year 1688). See Kaunitz' letter to the *Hofkammer* (undated based on its wording the letter was written in or after 1693) in ÖStA Wien, FHKA, Autographensammlung, Kart. 156, s. f. Cf. with financial situation of Johann Marcus von Clary und Aldringen, who was paid first 250 and later 500 guildens monthly, J. KUBEŠ, *Jan Marek z Clary a Aldringenu*, pp. 372–374.

152 See Table 2.

wasted and the Count enumerated his loss as 130,000 guildens).¹⁵³ The question remains, however, how (or whether) these numbers are exaggerated. While his officers certainly maintained his accounts carefully, the evidence is preserved only fragmentarily; a more detailed study of these fragments should in future provide more information.

Table 2: The expenditure table for the missions of Dominik Andreas von Kaunitz – payments made by the *Hofkammer* (in guildens = fl.)¹⁵⁴

	Mission/Destination	The aggregate amount paid to Kaunitz	The amount paid for Kaunitz to others	N.B.
1682 ¹	Electeur of Bavaria	<u>2,100</u>		<u>A monthly subsistence allowance in the amount of 500 fl.</u>
1683 ²	Electeur of Bavaria	1,500 + 5,500 + 2,000 = <u>9,000</u>	20 (interest for Ottavio Pestalozzi from the amount of 500 fl.)	Including the amount of 2,000 fl. for a kitchen, a cellar and other similar expenses. <u>From 1683 his monthly subsistence allowance was increased to 1,000 fl.</u>
1684 ³	Electeur of Bavaria	1,500 + 13,000 = <u>14,500</u>	300 (interest for Ottavio Pestalozzi)	
1685 ⁴	Electeur of Bavaria	7,000 + 6,000 = <u>13,000</u>	210 (interest for Ottavio Pestalozzi from the amount of 7,000 fl.)	Subsistence allowance in the amount of 7,000 fl. for expenses between 21. 10. 1684 and 21. 5. 1685 (paid after seven months), the amount of 6,000 fl. to cover the expenses between 21. 5. and November 1685 may also represent a subsistence allowance.

153 See an undated draft petition to the Emperor, in which the Count summarises his previous diplomatic activities, draws attention to his merits and also mentions his financial losses. Based on its wording the draft was prepared after 1696 and it indicates that at that time Kaunitz' expenses certainly were not reimbursed in their entirety. MZA Brno, RA Kouničů, Inv. No. 1717, sign. 3a, Kart. 191, fol. 173–195.

154 ÖStA Wien, FHKA, HZAB, Bd. 126–138.

1686 ⁵	The King of England	3,000 + 5,000 = <u>8,000</u>	300 (interest for Ottavio Pestalozzi from the amount of 10,000 fl. for the period 21. 11. 1685–21. 9. 1686)	Including the amount of 3,000 fl. for expenses for travel, equipment, establishment of a chapel and provision of two clerics and the amount of 5,000 fl. for “ <i>Extra Spesen</i> ” that were spent in Bavaria in the previous year.
1687 ⁶	The King of England Elector Palatine	9,375 + 1,000 = <u>10,375</u>	1875 (interest for Ottavio Pestalozzi from the amount of 9,375 fl.)	Including the amount of 9,375 fl. for the management of the chapel in England in the period 1. 12. 1686–31. 8. 1687 and the amount of 1,000 fl. for a journey to the Elector Palatine (for the period 17. 11. – 17. 12. 1687).
1688 ⁷	Elector Palatine Elector of Bavaria Elector of Cologne	2,000 + 3,100 + 1,000 = <u>6,100</u>	175 (interest for Mr. Varena and Mr. Caresana from the amount of 3,000 fl. for Kaunitz' expenditure in Cologne.) + cca. 174 fl. (interest for Ottavio Pestalozzi from the amount of cca. 872 fl. for Kaunitz' journey to London)	Including the amount of 2,000 fl. for current expenses at the court of the Elector Palatine in the period 17. 12. 1687–17. 2. 1688.
1689 ⁸	Elector of Bavaria Elector of Cologne Bishop of Passau Other electors – e.g. the Elector of Trier	2,666 + 4,000 + 2,000 + 7,500 = <u>16,166</u>	150 (interest for Lorenzo Gabrieli)	Including the amount of 2,666 fl. for the bills between 1. 6. and 30. 9. 1688 and the amount of 2,000 fl. for expenses (mail, travels, etc.) at the courts of the Electors of Bavaria and Palatine.
1690 ⁹	Elector of Mainz	2,000 + 500 + 3500 + 20 = <u>6,020</u>		Including an amount of 500 fl. for expenses still from Bavaria and the sum of 3,500 fl. for equipment and for travel to Mainz.

1691 ¹⁰	Elector of Mainz	2,000 + 864 = <u>2,864</u>		
1692 ¹¹	Elector of Saxony	2,000 + 702 = <u>2,702</u>		Including the amount of 702 fl. for expenditure on a journey to the Elector of Saxony and on mourning clothes at his court.
1693 ¹²	Not stated	<u>2000</u>		Maybe an additional payment for some of the previous missions.

Conclusions

Let's pause once more to look at the questions that were asked in the introduction to this study. Regarding the social background, Count von Kaunitz did not set off to his missions unprepared – whom he should contact at a specific place, who could provide him with important information and introduce him into local society or help him in any other way; all of these details have already been clearly defined in the instructions for the individual missions. During his first mission to Bavaria he should, even before meeting the Elector, contact Baron Johann Baptist Leidel, the Elector's *Geheimer Rat*, the *Hofvizekanzler* and diplomat, to whom he should be prepared to explain the Emperor's motives. At that time he had already met Baron Johann Friedrich Karg von Bebenburg, a Doctor of Law and a *Geheimer Rat*, who later on was to become very helpful for him. Prior to his mission to England he was to contact those envoys who had a lot of experience of residing in England, namely the above-mentioned Counts Karl Ferdinand von Waldstein and Franz Sigmund von Thun, who had been detailed to introduce him to the situation and to advise him in regard to ceremonial matters. He was expected to

155 Ibidem, Bd. 126, p. 234.

156 Ibidem, Bd. 127, pp. 63, 238, 326, 336.

157 Ibidem, Bd. 128, pp. 51, 217, 296.

158 Ibidem, Bd. 129, pp. 176, 234 and Bd. 130, p. 203.

159 Ibidem, Bd. 131, pp. 291, 396, 412.

160 Ibidem, Bd. 132, pp. 258, 259, 382.

161 Ibidem, Bd. 133, pp. 270, 271, 380, 399, 402.

162 Ibidem, Bd. 134, pp. 73, 196, 197, 206, 297.

163 Ibidem, Bd. 135, pp. 141, 258, 388.

164 Ibidem, Bd. 136, pp. 127, 248, 249.

165 Ibidem, Bd. 137, pp. 126, 250.

166 Ibidem, Bd. 138, p. 127.

find common ground in regard to the imperial interests and in the case of the Spanish Netherlands specifically with the Spanish envoy, Don Pedro Ronquillo, and last but not least he should also listen to the advice of the legation secretary Johann Philipp Hoffman. In the case of his second Bavarian mission he again collaborated with Baron Karg and also with other imperial envoys, such as Baron Christian von Eck und Heugersbach and Johann Friedrich von Mayersheim.

Count von Kaunitz also initiated friendly, or at least mutually beneficial, relationships with representatives of the territory to which he had been sent and with their families. He also succeeded in initiating a very friendly relationship with the Bavarian Elector Maximilian II and also with Philipp Wilhelm, the Elector Palatine, and his sons (specifically with Franz Ludwig, the Bishop of Wrocław, and with Johann Wilhelm, the future Elector). In England he found an ally in Mary Beatrice d'Este, the Queen of England, while in Passau he also managed to establish a close relationship with the future Bishop Johann Philipp von Lamberg and, probably before even travelling to Mainz, he had an opportunity to become acquainted with the current local Elector whose successor was to be chosen, i.e. with Anselm Franz von Ingelheim. We should not forget his friends back home (in the Czech lands and in Vienna), who during his absence supervised his interests and also interceded on his behalf – primarily Prince Ferdinand von Dietrichstein and Count Ferdinand Bonaventura von Harrach.

In addition to Kaunitz being in regular contact with important people (if it was possible he was constantly moving around in their vicinity and even travelled or at least corresponded with some of them or collected information about them), his tactics also included perfect preparedness and awareness regarding the customs, the people and their environment and not only where he should go but also the potential risks. Some of his missions additionally required obtaining information well in advance (e.g. his mission to Passau).

The Count was sent on all these aforementioned missions as “*envoyé extraordinaire*”, i.e. a special envoy, who, within a certain fixed period of time should fulfill one or more specific tasks. As the main imperial envoy (albeit a special one) he mostly functioned officially, but this did not prevent him, if the situation demanded it, to act *incognito* while within the pro-Habsburg camp – he “traded” information (i.e. he exchanged it for other information). Gifts represented an important argument for him and also a means of persuasion. For most missions we can only assume that the norm was offering gifts or benefits, however, the preserved original of the secret instructions for his second mission to Bavaria and to the election of the Cologne Coadjutor and later the Archbishop represents both important evidence and also an example of what such gifts and benefits might look like. To the Electors and to those others who could significantly influence

the election in some other manner he offered considerable sums of money, together with prestigious offices for them and their nearest and dearest, a variety of other benefits and privileges and, of course, also the imperial favour and gratitude. Most attractive for the recipients were the prestige offices – whether for the Electors themselves and their relatives or for those whose influence actually affected the successful course of the election from a distance. Also those who wanted for themselves or for their relatives to obtain a prestigious military function could obtain it. Financial sums and ultimately land as well also served as incentives. All those who voted in favour of the imperial and Bavarian candidate could also count with an intangible and indefinable, but equally significant capital: i.e. with the imperial favour and gratitude and support for their future interests.

Count von Kaunitz was required at all times to ensure that this form of *decorum* was respected during all negotiations. Though if it was not possible otherwise, he was advised to take advantage of various points of disagreement and thorny issues, such as benefitting from any rifts that might occur between the King of England and Parliament. According to the sources studied, Dominik Andreas von Kaunitz' mission took place in an entirely standard manner: before leaving for the mission he received instructions from the Emperor, credentials and other important documents and information (memorials, etc.) personally, while he also had to find a lot of information for himself in advance. After his arrival sometimes he stayed directly at the court and sometimes in private houses. After he first arrived in Bavaria he lived in a "*Gesandtenhaus*". He asked for his first audience and contacted the legation secretary, if he or the resident would be operating in that specific area. He never had to wait long for his first audience; sometimes it took place on the day following his arrival and sometimes within several days. The first or the final audience was public; the main reason for Kaunitz' arrival was usually addressed during a private audience, of which were always a few (in addition to this the Count also participated in other audiences or visits, e.g. such as with family members of the Electors or of the King of England).

All Kaunitz' missions have one thing in common; namely constant travelling. During his missions he never stayed long in one place, and we can say for certain that over the years he became very well acquainted with a large part of the Empire. Leaving aside the fact that he often accompanied important people on their travels and shared their entertainment (he willingly participated in balls, hunts or military parades), during his second Bavarian missions, for example, in addition to Munich and Cologne he also visited Mainz and the court of the Elector Palatine while during his Passau mission he made a journey to Mainz and, prior to the election of the Elector of Mainz he also went to Trier. In addition, if a mission lasted longer, he would also return to Vienna to personally refer

to the Emperor and thereby receive further orders from him, and rarely he could also even take a look at his estates.¹⁶⁷

Count von Kaunitz' motivation should certainly be taken seriously: he always accepted the tasks that were entrusted to him by Emperor Leopold I with the best of intentions and also with knowledge of his aristocratic honour. He longed for the edification of his own family name and also, of course, for his good reputation in the eyes of the Emperor and of aristocratic society. It would be mistake, however, to assume that his motivation was totally selfless and that his only reason for accepting and being retained on missions was his loyalty to the interests of the Emperor and of his allies. His strongest personal motivation was certainly the prospect that his successful completion of missions would open-up a path to his career progression (which did also happen and eventually he achieved the post of the *Reichsvizekanzler* in regard to which the Elector of Bavaria and especially Palatine were both very instrumental on his behalf) and he also very much longed for *Fideikommiss* establishment, which he finally achieved, though not until 1702. However, it is also necessary to mention the fact that neither was he himself spared of obtaining further rewards that he probably accepted without remorse. Maximilian II Emanuel, for example, promised him a financial reward if all went according to plan. This is mentioned directly as one of the instructions for his second Bavarian mission; the fact that during his missions he received other valuable gifts, with minor exceptions, is not mentioned in the studied sources, but it is certain that, like other diplomats, he was also given a valuable gift at the end of the mission. A significant role was also played by the Count's endeavour to provide for his own children; for one of his sons he asked the Provostry of Altötting and thanks to the influence of the Bavarian Elector his wish was later heard and that is how Franz Karl Joseph Anton von Kaunitz began his spiritual path.

How Kaunitz perceived his diplomatic missions is not easy to track, but some documents that shed light on it did survive. Essentially these mentions occur in his personal correspondence (for example with Prince Ferdinand von Dietrichstein) together with the preparatory materials for his application for the establishment of *Fideikommiss* and also other less important notes. On one hand the Count expressed that the service to the Emperor and prosperity of the House of Habsburg constituted a sufficient reward for him and that he wanted nothing more than to be actively on his missions and far away from court intrigues. On the other hand he admitted, however, that he would very

167 Here cf. with an untypical course of the mission of Johann Marcus von Clary und Aldringen, the envoy at the court of the Elector of Saxony in Dresden, who for much of his diplomatic mission was living at his estates in Teplitz. This situation, however, was related to the favourable location of his estates and, in addition, the Emperor expressly authorised this exception. Therefore this did not mean that he would neglect his function; the Elector, together with his family, actually often visited the Teplitz Spa. For additional information see: J. KUBEŠ, *Jan Marek z Clary a Aldringenu*, the itinerary of Johann Marcus' stays on pp. 358–360.

much have liked to receive the Emperor's permission to establish *Fideikommiss* and that he also hoped to obtain some high office, preferably one of the four highest court offices (already in cca. 1690 he considered that he had proved satisfactory and that, consequently, he would receive his consent, but these hopes were mismatched and instead he still had to go to Mainz and eventually to The Hague).¹⁶⁸

During his missions, which essentially followed up on each other without pause, he had almost no free time that he could spend with his family or use for carrying-out the administration of his affairs and thereby he suffered from his separation from his family, especially from his beloved Lenorl, which is the name that he called his wife. On his journeys he was not spared any health problems (mostly fever, headaches or stomach problems) nor the melancholy that can be caused by homesickness or missing the family, yet he never dared to waver and he continued fulfilling his obligations even during times of illness. During his weak moments (which already started occurring after his first Bavarian mission!) he confessed to his friends that he needed a break in order to take care of his affairs; he was not sure whether or not to remain in such a demanding service and asserted that in the future – should he continue to act as an imperial envoy – he would like to take his family with him.

Finally he was plagued by jealousy because of the affection of the Elector of Bavaria for his wife and he also feared that because of her close relation with him, to the Emperor he could start appearing suspicious.¹⁶⁹ It was his friends who helped him to overcome the challenging period during which he worked in the imperial diplomatic service. Especially mentioned many times was Prince Ferdinand von Dietrichstein, whose officials apparently partially supervised the management of Kaunitz' estates, who was informing him about the Emperor's intentions of and who also interceded on his behalf with both the Emperor and the court. Apparently, therefore, Count von Kaunitz perceived his service in imperial diplomacy as being somewhat exaggerated, that is to say simultaneously both a validation of his skills and also as a necessary evil, rather than as his main objective – which was obtaining high office and the establishment of *Fideikommiss*.

Although Count von Kaunitz entered into all of his missions during the period monitored both prepared and informed as much as possible, this definitely was not an easy task (either in Bavaria or maybe in Mainz he was even threatened with physical harm), even though in most cases he moved about in a familiar cultural milieu and he often managed to make friends with those with whom he was supposed to be negotiating. Almost all his missions were successful, however, and during them the Count managed to achieve everything that was asked to (e.g. a treaty of alliance with Bavaria was signed,

168 MZA Brno, RA Kouniců, Inv. No. 1717, sign. 3a, Kart. 191, fol. 173–195.

169 MZA Brno, RA Ditrichštejnů, Inv. No. 1925–48, sign. 867, Kart. 467, fol. 73–76.

though not until 1689; Maximilian II Emanuel provided military assistance to the Emperor and even participated in the fighting himself, and he also married the Emperor's daughter Maria Antonia; the highly spiritual tenures that were mentioned here were occupied in accordance with the Emperor's wishes, etc.). Exceptional was his mission to England, about which, however, Kaunitz had previously suspected that it did not offer many opportunities, which was also confirmed.

Although he had no certainty that his wishes concerning obtaining high office and the establishment of *Fideikommiss* will be fulfilled in the future, Count von Kaunitz sacrificed a lot to the success of his missions (and therefore also to his own future): i.e. the time that he could have spent with his family, his own plans for the cultivation of his estates and he even risked his own life. Eventually, however, he lived to experience success, even though it came about a little later than he had expected and thanks to the intercession of the Electors of Bavaria and Palatine, both of whom he had befriended during his missions, in 1696 he was appointed to the position of the *Reichsvizekanzler*. After demonstrating his skills during the intensive peace negotiations that took place in the Hague – i.e. this was to be his last major diplomatic mission – in 1702 he finally received the Emperor's permission and from his estates in Slavkov, Uherský Brod, Moravské Prusy, Velký Ořechov and Bánov he could also establish his longed-for *Fideikommiss*.

Table 3: Missions and tasks of Dominik Andreas von Kaunitz – adding new findings and a summary (compare Table 1)

Duration of the mission	Destination	Count von Kaunitz' tasks and activities
1682–1686	Bavaria	The Habsburg-Bavarian alliance against the Turks and France + military assistance; the marriage of the Elector to Maria Antonia von Habsburg + negotiating the details of the marriage, the marriage of the Polish Prince to the Elector's sister Violanta Beatrix, organising the Elector's visit of the Emperor
1686–1687	England	The Habsburg-English alliance against the Turks and France + military assistance, the Palatine succession issue
1687–1689	Bavaria	The Habsburg-Bavarian alliance against the Turks and France + military assistance; the election of the Cologne Coadjutor; the truce with France; support for the election of Joseph (I) as the King of Romans, the marriage of Joseph to the Elector's sister Violanta Beatrix
1689	Passau	Election of the Bishop of Passau
1690–1691	Mainz	Election of the Elector of Mainz
1691–1693	Empire	Various minor tasks within the Empire (search for potential allies, shorter trips – condolences, etc.); endeavours to obtain the courtly or provincial office
1694–1697	The Hague	Peace talks, military assistance against the Turks, the readmission of the Czech Electoral Vote, etc.