

Jiří KUBEŠ

Hermann Jakob Czernin von Chudenitz' Diplomatic Mission in Warsaw in 1695. A Contribution towards the Travel Arrangements of Imperial Diplomats¹

Abstract: This paper examines the previously unknown diplomatic mission of Hermann Jakob Count Czernin von Chudenitz in Warsaw in 1695. Neither Polish nor Czech nor Austrian historians paid any attention to it. Based on this, however, it is possible to demonstrate perfectly how tense the relations between Emperor Leopold I and the Polish King John III Sobieski, who, at the end of their lives, were officially allies in the Holy League. The author first briefly introduces this mission and then, using it as an example, attempts to show how the travels of the imperial ambassadors of that time were organised and also unveils other additional aspects of the diplomatic service. Above all he reconstructed the court of Count Czernin, who was surrounded by over 80 people, and also located the place of his accommodation in Warsaw and showed which apartment the Count possessed as an ambassador. Finally, he examined the question of the financial costs of this stay, and documented the fact that the ambassador had to pay many expenses from his own pocket, and that this mission had cost him cca. 50,000 guildens.

Keywords: diplomacy – 17th Century – Poland – Leopold I – John III Sobieski – Hermann Jakob Czernin von Chudenitz

Up till now neither in the Czech nor in the Polish nor in the Austrian historiography has any work in regard to the diplomatic mission of Hermann Jakob Czernin von Chudenitz to Poland in 1695 originated. In the Czech environment this is not surprising, because until recently almost no one there was actually dealing with the diplomacy of the early modern period and this situation has only improved during the last five years by the publication of the results of the systematic research work that was carried

¹ This study originated as a part of the solution of the GA ČR's standard project No. 13–12939S entitled *Bohemian and Moravian Nobility in the Habsburg Diplomatic Service (1640–1740)*. At this point I would like to note that the final form of this study originated with the assistance of several friends and colleagues. The results of his research of personal correspondence from the 1690's were kindly provided to me by Petr Mařa from Vienna, for which I thank him very much. I am also grateful to Vítězslav Prchal (for the data obtained from the Viennese archives concerning the funding of Czernin's mission) and to both the reviewers of this article (for the other recommended literature).

out by authors from České Budějovice, Pardubice and Prague.² In 2017, the first Czech scientific monograph concerning the imperial diplomats during the years 1640–1740 should be completed in collaboration of researchers from Pardubice and Prague.³ This has all been made possible not only through archival research, but also through inspiration that has been engendered especially by Anglo-Saxon and German historiography that have been engaged in researching early modern diplomacy over the long term and since the 1970's their approach to this issue has developed and changed markedly.⁴ Especially by now the new views and works of Klaus Müller and William J. Roosen have already

-
- 2 The state of knowledge in the Czech environment was summed up by Jiří HRBEK in *Cesty evropské historiografie k diplomacii raného novověku* [The Ways of European Historiography to Early Modern Diplomacy], *Theatrum historiae* 13, 2013, pp. 7–30. Since then, several specialised studies have originated that have significantly widened our understanding of this subject matter. See 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 und Aldringen as the Envoy of Leopold I at the Saxon Court of the Prince-electoral at the End of the 17th Century], *Český časopis historický* 113, 2015, pp. 346–380; IDEM, *Kaple císařských vyslanců v Drážďanech v druhé půli 17. století* [Chapels of Imperial Legates in Dresden in the Second Half of the 17th Century], *Folia Historica Bohemica* 30, 2015, pp. 127–156; Martin BAKEŠ, *Diplomatická mise jako nejistá investice. Antonín Jan z Nostic u stockholmského královského dvora (1685–1690)* [The Diplomatic Mission as a Non-guaranteed Investment. Anton Johann von Nostitz at the Stockholm Royal Court (1685–1690)], *Český časopis historický* 113, 2015, pp. 714–747; IDEM, *Mimořádná diplomatická mise Adolfa Vratislava ze Šternberka: Švédské království v polovině 70. let 17. století očima císařského vyslance* [Extraordinary Diplomatic Mission of Adolf Wratislaw von Sternberg. The Kingdom of Sweden in the mid-1670's, seen by the Emperor's Envoy], *Folia Historica Bohemica* 29, 2014, No. 1, pp. 31–62; Rostislav SMÍŠEK, *Anton Florian von Liechtenstein und Rom. Selbstpräsentation eines kaiserlichen Gesandten zum Ausgang des 17. Jahrhunderts*, in: Marek Vařeka – Aleš Zářický (Hg.), *Das Fürstenhaus Liechtenstein in der Geschichte der Länder der Böhmisches Krone*, Ostrava – Vaduz 2013, pp. 197–212; Monika KONRÁDOVÁ – Rostislav SMÍŠEK, *Jan Kryštof z Fragsteinu a jeho diplomatická cesta do Ruska v letech 1657–1658* [Johann Christoph von Fragstein and his Diplomatic Mission to Russia 1657–1658], *Opera historica* 16, 2015, No. 2, pp. 247–268; Monika HRUŠKOVÁ, *Každodenní život císařských vyslanců v Polsku v druhé polovině 17. století* [Everyday Life of the Imperial Diplomats in Poland during the Second Half of the 17th Century], České Budějovice 2012 (thesis at the Faculty of Arts of the University of South Bohemia); Anežka HREBIKOVÁ, *Štěpán Vilém Kinský jako císařský vyslanec v Rusku Petra Velikého v letech 1721–1722. Acta Legationis Moscoviticae aneb Diplomatické relace jako raně novověký pramen* [Stephan Wilhelm Kinsky as the Imperial Envoy in Russia of Peter the Great, 1721–1722. Acta Legationis Moscoviticae or Diplomatic Relations as an Early Modern Source], Prague 2016 (thesis, the Department of Auxiliary Historical Sciences and Archive Studies, the Faculty of Arts of Charles University in Prague) and several others.
- 3 See the basic information about the project *Bohemian and Moravian Nobility in the Diplomatic Service of the Austrian Habsburgs (1640–1740)* available at URL: <<http://uhv.upce.cz/cs/gacr-project-nobility-and-diplomacy/>> [cit. 7. 11. 2016].
- 4 The current discussions have been summarised, for example, by Matthias KÖHLER in *Neue Forschungen zur Diplomatiegeschichte*, *Zeitschrift für Historische Forschung* 40, 2013, No. 2, pp. 257–271; Sven EXTERNBRINK, *Internationale Politik in der Frühen Neuzeit: Stand und Perspektiven der Forschung zu Diplomatie und Staatensystem*, in: Hans-Christof Kraus – Thomas Nicklas (Hg.), *Geschichte und Politik: Alte und Neue Wege*, München 2007, pp. 15–39 or Michael ROHRSCHEIDER, *Neue Tendenzen der diplomatiegeschichtlichen Erforschung des Westfälischen Friedenskongresses*, in: Inken

become standard,⁵ which have since been followed-up by various culturalist studies,⁶ on which today's new political history draws. All of these viewpoints and the results of Austrian historiography⁷ provide a new impulse to research the early modern diplomatic service within the environment of the Habsburg emperors, in which high-status, noble and wealthy aristocrats have played the key roles. Thanks to this development today we are gradually learning about the Emperor's representatives' individual diplomatic journeys, not only from the perspective of classical political history; instead we are dealing with this issue within the wider context of a perceived history of the diplomatic service, in which diplomatic ceremony, diplomatic immunity, faith in countries that follow other religions (raising the issue of ambassadorial chapels and chaplains), the communication networks of diplomats, gifts, the financial demands of diplomatic service, dealing with otherness and many other aspects have also played a key role. However, not always does our source base allow us to learn the answers to all these questions, but as the present study attempts to show, the mission of Hermann Jakob Czernin von Chudenitz that took place in Poland in 1695 is still hiding a large – and as yet unappreciated – potential.

The relationships between the Austrian Habsburg Monarchy and the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in the second half of the 17th Century are certainly not unknown. Research, however, has long been dominated by the issue of the Polish participation in the liberation of Vienna from the clutches of the Ottoman Turks' forces in 1683 and therefore this important historical event has indeed been explored in great detail.⁸ Taking a closer

Schmidt-Voges et al. (Hg.), *Pax perpetua: Neuere Forschungen zum Frieden in der Frühen Neuzeit*, München 2010, pp. 103–121.

- 5 Klaus MÜLLER, *Das kaiserliche Gesandtschaftswesen im Jahrhundert nach dem Westfälischen Frieden 1648–1740*, Bonn 1976; William J. ROOSEN, *The Age of Louis XIV: The Rise of Modern Diplomacy*, Cambridge: Mass. 1976.
- 6 Cf., for example, the works of Barbora STOLLBERG-RILINGER, *Die Wissenschaft der feinen Unterschiede. Das Präzedenzrecht und die europäischen Monarchien vom 16. bis zum 18. Jahrhundert*, Majestas 10, 2003, pp. 125–150 or IDEM, *Honores regii. Die Königswürde im zeremoniellen Zeichensystem der Frühen Neuzeit*, in: Johannes Kunisch (Hg.), *Dreihundert Jahre Preußische Königskrönung. Eine Tagungsdokumentation*, Berlin 2002, pp. 1–26 and others.
- 7 For example Friedrich B. POLLERROSS, *Die Kunst der Diplomatie. Auf den Spuren des kaiserlichen Botschafters Leopold Joseph Graf von Lamberg (1653–1706)*, Petersberg 2010; conference proceedings Ralph KAUZ – Giorgio ROTA – Jan Paul NIEDERKORN (Hg.), *Diplomatisches Zeremoniell in Europa und im mittleren Osten in der frühen Neuzeit*, Wien 2009; dissertation Christian STEPPAN, *Akteure am fremden Hof: Politische Kommunikation und Repräsentation kaiserlicher Gesandter im Jahrzent des Wandels am russischen Hof (1720–1730)*, Göttingen 2016 and others.
- 8 Production currently, as of 1683, is essentially disorganised and, at the same time, multilingual. Cf. at least the monograph by Jan WIMMER, *Odsiecz wiedeńska 1683 roku* [The Polish Help to Besieged Vienna in 1683], Warszawa 1983; the anthology Robert WEISSENBERGER (Hg.), *Die Türken vor Wien. Europa und die Entscheidung an der Donau 1683*, Salzburg – Wien 1982; Andrew WHEATCROFT, *The Enemy at the Gate: The Habsburgs, the Ottomans, and the Battle for Europe*,

look it becomes evident that other issues did not receive such thorough attention. There are not many specific contributions regarding the links between sovereigns, their families, foreign policy and individual diplomatic missions.⁹ In terms of the history of diplomacy the Polish *Sejm* elections, at which the imperial diplomats were always present, aroused the greatest interest,¹⁰ but mutual relationships during times of the rule of individual sovereigns remained, with exceptions, outside the interest range of researchers.¹¹ The Polish, Czech and Austrian historiographies are thereby noticeably missing a treatise on imperial ambassadors and their positions in the Polish Royal Court because even a cursory peek at the standard list of diplomatic representatives reveals that the Emperor regularly sent his diplomats to his northern neighbour paradoxically, however he did not maintain an ordinary ambassador there, as did the French King Louis XIV.¹²

As also happened in other instances the diplomatic relationships between the Austrian Habsburgs and the Polish Kings reached a new phase during the second part of the Thirty Years' War, when the Emperor was slowly but surely expanding his network to spread

London 2009 (in the Czech translation was published in 2010) or the German translation of the already classic English work by John STOYE, *Die Türken vor Wien. Schicksalsjahr 1683*, Graz 2010, etc.

- 9 Cf. the overview study by Michael KOMASZYŃSKI, *Die Rivalität zwischen Habsburgern und Bourbonen am polnischen Hof im 17. Jahrhundert*, Österreichische Osthefte 32, 1990, pp. 116–128. The author defined the basic contours of the issue throughout the entire century.
- 10 Cf. Janusz WOLIŃSKI, *Poselstwo Krzysztofa Leopolda Schaffgotscha na elekcję polską 1674 roku* [The Mission of Christoph Leopold von Schaffgotsch to the Election of King in Poland in 1674], in: idem, *Z dziejów wojny i polityki w dobie Jana Sobieskiego*, Warszawa 1960, pp. 100–125; Leszek ZIĄTKOWSKI, *Poselstwo Krzysztofa Leopolda Schaffgotscha do Polski w latach 1667–1674 (Przyczynek do organizacji i funkcjonowania poselstw austriackich w II połowie XVII w.)* [The Diplomatic Journeys of Christoph Leopold von Schaffgotsch to Poland, 1667–1674], *Śląski kwartalnik historyczny Sobótka* 43, 1988, pp. 31–48; Marcus MILEWSKI (Hg.), *Die polnische Königswahl von 1697*, Wien 2008.
- 11 Only the activities of John III Sobieski during the Holy League in the 1680's received a certain amount of attention. See Kazimierz PIWARSKI, *Między Francją a Austrią: Z dziejów polityki Jana III Sobieskiego w latach 1687–1690* [Between France and Austria: History of Politics of John III Sobieski between 1687 and 1690], Kraków 1933. Although he treats the subject in the spirit of the classic history of diplomacy the author reflects the interests of both the imperial and the French parties and therefore he is primarily interested in the subject matter of the specific negotiations and in the treaties that were concluded. From the perspective of the Austrian Habsburgs this issue was addressed by Albert RILLE (Hg.), *Aus den letzten Jahren der Regierung des polnischen Königs Johann Sobieski 1689–1696. Berichte des kaiserlichen Ministers Geörge von Schiemunsky an Ferdinand Fürst von Dietrichstein, Präsidenten der geheimen Konferenz, im Archiv Nikolsburg*, in: *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Vereins für die Geschichte Mährens und Schlesiens* 15, 1911, pp. 312–338, 430–465; M. HRUŠKOVÁ, *Každodenní život* or Martin BAKEŠ, *Kryštof Václav z Nostic a jeho diplomatická cesta na území Polsko-litevské unie v roce 1693* [Christoph Wenzel von Nostitz and his Diplomatic Journey to the Polish-Lithuanian Union in 1693], *Východočeský sborník historický* 24, 2013, pp. 99–119.
- 12 Cf. Ludwig BITTNER – Lothar GROSS (Hg.), *Repertorium der diplomatischen Vertreter aller Länder seit dem Westfälischen Frieden (1648)*, I. Band (1648–1715), Berlin 1936, pp. 159–160. Unfortunately the list of imperial residents and ambassadors is incomplete, however.

his permanent representation to other European countries. From 1635 onwards, with short breaks, the Habsburgs sent their resident representatives to the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, i.e. they did not maintain a diplomat of the first rank there over the long-term as they had done during the 17th Century in Madrid. This did not mean, however, that the Emperor would completely underestimate the Polish issue. This is to say that the local imperial resident, if necessary, would be accompanied by an extraordinary ambassador, whose legation would most likely be restricted time-wise to the period of the *Sejm*, which traditionally was held at least once every two years. A special chapter, of course, is represented by the afore-mentioned electoral *Sejms*, that always took place after the death of the monarch and at which Habsburg diplomacy was always very visibly represented.¹³

The Emperor, however, did not send his extraordinary ambassadors to every *Sejm* – he sent them there only when he was forced to do so due to problems that were occurring in the international arena. It could be seen beautifully during the period of the long Turkish War from 1683 to 1699. At the outset Ambassador Karl Ferdinand von Waldstein concluded a treaty of alliance and subsequently the Poles also entered into the Holy League.¹⁴ Then during the 1680's they were mostly helping the Emperor so that there was no need for greater diplomatic efforts to ensure that the cooperation would take place. In the late 1680's and the early 1690's, however, the situation began to change under the influence of some Turkish achievements and based on French diplomacy, that sought to dismantle the anti-Turkey alliance.¹⁵ The Poles had become less and less willing to participate in the Holy League struggles and instead they were listening to French diplomats. In this situation, it was vital for the Emperor to ensure the cooperation of the Polish King, and therefore it was not acceptable for a diplomat of the lower rank to take care of all the Emperor's issues and therefore ambassadors appeared during the *Sejms*, which enjoyed a far greater degree of seriousness in the contemporary society and whose legation received greater privileges and honour on the basis of their degree of importance for the host court. Therefore in the 1690's an imperial ambassador would attend every Polish-Lithuanian *Sejm* and sometimes he even arrived at times when the *Sejm* was not

13 Cf. K. MÜLLER, *Die kaiserliche Gesandtschaftswesen*, pp. 65–66.

14 Both of the treaties were made available, for example in the work of Zbigniew WÓJCIK (ed.), *Traktaty polsko-austriackie z drugiej połowy XVII wieku* [Polish-Austrian Treaties from the Second Half of the 17th Century], Warszawa 1985, pp. 104–122 (Warsaw, 31. 3. 1683), 123–134 (Linz, 5. 3. 1684).

15 K. PIWARSKI, *Między Francją a Austrią*, esp. pp. 111–156. Vienna rebounded from the first onslaught of French diplomacy when it succeeded in pushing through the marriage of Prince James Sobieski with the Emperor's cousin, the Princess of Palatinate-Neuburg (1689–1690). Then in 1691 the King again went into the field. After an unsuccessful campaign, however, French diplomacy had increasingly become about scoring points.

taking place. This position was sequentially occupied by eminent noblemen, all of whom came from the Czech lands.¹⁶ They included Franz Sigmund Graf von Thun (spring 1691 in Warsaw), Christoph Wenzel Graf von Nostitz (at the beginning of 1693 in Grodno), Georg Adam Graf von Martinitz (at the turn of 1693 and 1694 in Warsaw) and the last regular *Sejm* during the reign of John III Sobieski that took place at the beginning of 1695 in Warsaw was participated in by Hermann Jakob Czernin von Chudenitz.¹⁷

Count Czernin (1659–1710), who in 1695 was the Bohemian *Oberstlandmarschall*, belonged to the elite Czech nobility and, relatively speaking, we know a lot about him. His Grand Tour, for example, was described in great detail,¹⁸ we know about his contribution to the construction and the equipping of the Czernin Palace in Prague's Hradčany,¹⁹ we know that he was lending a lot and often to the Habsburgs²⁰ and that by the end of his life he had become the *Oberstburggraf* of the Kingdom of Bohemia.²¹ No one paid great attention to his career or his diplomatic service, however, and erroneous information is even now circulating in Czech literature that he spent three years in Poland (*sic*).²² This is in part due to the fact that the Czernin family archive in Jindřichův Hradec has not yet been organised in a modern format, nor has it been provided with an inventory. It does contain, however, six extensive Kart.es of materials that document his diplomatic activities in Poland in detail.²³ Preserved there are the original of the imperial instruction,

16 Petr MAŤA, *Svět české aristokracie, 1500–1700* [The World of the Bohemian Aristocracy, 1500–1700], Prague 2004, p. 862, note 637.

17 L. BITTNER – L. GROSS (Hg.), *Repertorium*, p. 160 (with errors); M. HRUŠKOVÁ, *Každodenní život*.

18 Zdeněk HOJDA – Eva CHODĚJOVSKÁ (eds.), *Heřman Jakub Černín na cestě za Alpy a Pyreneje. Kavalerijská cesta českého šlechtice do německých zemí, Itálie, Francie, Španělska a Portugalska* [Hermann Jakob Czernin von Chudenitz on his Journey over the Alps and the Pyrenees: the Bohemian Nobleman's Grand Tour of the Germanic Countries and Italy, France, Spain and Portugal], I–II, Prague 2014. Its authors are also the only ones who briefly mention Czernin's mission. *Ibidem*, I, p. 81.

19 In more detail Václav LORENC – Karel TŘÍSKA in *Černínský palác v Praze* [Czernin Palace in Prague], Prague 1980; in regard to collections already Josef NOVÁK in *Dějiny bývalé hr. Černínské obrazárny na Hradčanech* [The History of the Former Czernin's Picture Gallery in their Prague Palace], *Památky archeologické* 27, 1915, pp. 123–141; subsequently also particularly Lubomír SLAVÍČEK in *Černínové jako sběratelé a podporovatelé umění* [The Czernins as Collectors and Supporters of Art], in: *Idem* (ed.), *Artis pictoriae amatores. Evropa v zrcadle pražského barokního sběratelství*, Prague 1993, pp. 131–170.

20 Aleš VALENTA, *Věřitelem Habsburků. Heřman Jakub Černín za války o dědictví španělské* [The Creditor of the Habsburgs. Hermann Jakob Czernin von Chudenitz during the War of the Spanish Succession], *Jihočeský sborník historický* 80, 2011, pp. 23–51.

21 P. MAŤA, *Svět*, esp. pp. 179, 210, 256, 435, 622 and others; Jiří HRBEK, *Barokní Valdštejnové v Čechách 1640–1740* [The Baroque Waldsteins in Bohemia 1640–1740], Prague 2013, esp. pp. 329–332.

22 J. HRBEK, *Barokní Valdštejnové*, p. 329.

23 Cf. Státní oblastní archiv [State Regional Archive] Třeboň, the section in Jindřichův Hradec (hereinafter referred to as SOA Třeboň, JH), Rodinný archiv Černínů [the Czernin von Chudenitz Family Archive] (hereinafter referred to as RA Černínů), temporarily in Kart. 282–287.

rescripts, copies of 19 reports, a portion of the accounting documentation, lists of the members of the Ambassador's court, the house rules of the Ambassador's palace and also a portion of the personal correspondence received, including the concepts of Czernin's responses.²⁴ Unfortunately the section Polen in the Staatenabteilungen fund of Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchiv in Vienna is not in the same condition because almost nothing from the 1690's was preserved there.²⁵

In this study we are seeking not only to present basic information about the hitherto unknown mission, but also to reveal additional aspects of the diplomatic service. This will mostly be about the reconstruction of the Court of Hermann Jakob Czernin as an imperial ambassador and to see to what extent it resembles the Court of Emperor Leopold I, whom he represented (during his mission the Polish King was required to behave to the Count as if he himself was the Emperor). It is also important in this context to know where this man was housed and what spatial and social backgrounds in Warsaw he possessed. Usually not much attention is paid to these issues, whereby most of the authors are satisfied with the laconic statement that most of the ambassadors had rented a house, and that when they came a few dozen servants arrived with them, but what they do not choose to address is how large the diplomat's abode was, which spaces the diplomats occupied there and who had actually stayed at his Court. We believe, however, that both the social and the spatial background of the embassy represented keys to understanding the manner in which the mission functioned. To put it simply we will be looking at the embassy as representing a spatially anchored social unit, one that is created by an ambassador, his servants, together with other diplomats and a number of their friends and acquaintances who supported the Habsburg policy. Thereby, right in front of our eyes, appears the "team" that Czernin had available to enforce the Emperor's ideas. In

24 These are the letters from the *Reichshofratspräsident* Gottlieb von Windischgrätz, the *Oberstkämmerer* Karl Ferdinand von Waldstein, the Bohemian *Oberstkanzler* Franz Ulrich Kinsky and Bohemian *Vizekanzler* and also the Ambassador's brother, i.e. Thomas Zacchaeus Czernin von Chudenitz. Additionally correspondence is also taking place with some allies in Poland (e.g. Nuncio Andrea Santacroce) and also with certain people who had been indispensable for Czernin's legation, i.e. the Legation Secretary Johann Eberhard von Hövel from Głogów and the Imperial Resident in Poland Georg Schiemunsky.

25 Czernin's legation is documented there only through a few letters sent by the Ambassador to the Bohemian *Oberstkanzler* Franz Ulrich Kinsky and the letters of a certain Baron Piccinardi (a secret imperial agent perhaps?) to Emperor Leopold I. See Österreichisches Staatsarchiv Wien (hereinafter referred to as ÖStA Wien), Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchiv (hereinafter referred to as HHStA), Staatenabteilungen, Polen I, Kart. 82, fol. 22–83. Kart. 84 and 87, contrary to expectations, do not contain any documents that are related to Czernin's mission. Unfortunately neither the originals of Czernin's reports nor his diary – which he demonstrably kept – have been found in this fund.

this way we will “populate” the otherwise relatively simple story about the Ambassador’s negotiations with the Polish King and his courtiers.

Czernin’s mission, viewed from the perspective of international relations

Hermann Jakob Czernin was to arrange in Warsaw that the Polish King John III Sobieski should continue to actively support the activities of the Holy League against the Turks, i.e. to support the recruitment of troops in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and their transference to Hungary or elsewhere and, notably, to prevent the King from stepping outside the League or signing a separate peace treaty with the Turks to resolve this ongoing long war (1683–1699). This is to say that after Belgrade had fallen-back into Turkish hands in 1690 they had already captured signals in Vienna that some of the influential Polish magnates, including the Queen Marie Casimire de La Grange d’Arquien herself (she was of French origin), listened more and more frequently to French diplomacy, which was actually attempting to engender the disintegration of the Holy League.²⁶ Czernin spent cca. three months during the first half of 1695 in Warsaw in the rank of an imperial ambassador. He set off from Vienna on the 12th January and he had arrived in Warsaw via Prague and Wrocław *incognito* not till after the 1st February 1695.²⁷ After his ceremonial entry, during which the first ceremonial problems appeared on the 10th February, he subsequently underwent²⁸ his first public audience with John III Sobieski on the 17th February.²⁹ The Queen gave Czernin his first audience a day later and

26 The original instruction of the *Reichskanzlei* of 3. 1. 1695 is stored in the SOA Třeboň, JH, RA Černínů, temporarily in Kart. 284, fol. 11–24, in regard to the main objectives of the legation in particular fol. 12–13. In regard to the international context in detail Aleksandra SKRZYPIETZ, *Francuskie zabiegi o koronę polską po śmierci Jana III Sobieskiego: Misja Melchiora de Polignac u schyłku panowania Jana III* [The French Attempts to Gain the Polish Crown after the Death of John III Sobieski: The Mission of Melchior de Polignac], Katowice 2009, pp. 26 nn. The Queen’s pro-French attitude in the 1690’s is analysed in Michał KOMASZYŃSKI, *Piękna królowa Maria Kazimiera d’Arquien-Sobieska 1641–1716* [The Polish Queen Marie Casimire d’Arquien-Sobieska 1641–1716], Kraków 1995, mainly pp. 172–221.

27 The journey is summarised in Czernin’s first report to the Emperor which is stored in the SOA Třeboň, JH, RA Černínů, temporarily in Kart. 284, fol. 93–101, Warsaw, 3. 2. 1695, here fol. 93.

28 *Ibidem*, fol. 126–136, Czernin’s report to the Emperor, Warsaw, 17. 2. 1695, here fol. 126–128. In regard to ceremonial entries, for example in K. MÜLLER, *Die kaiserliche Gesandtschaftswesen*, pp. 125–130; Leopold AUER, *Diplomatisches Zeremoniell am Kaiserhof der Frühen Neuzeit: Perspektiven eines Forschungsthemas*, in: R. Kauz – G. Rota – J. P. Niederkorn (Hg.), *Diplomatisches Zeremoniell*, pp. 44–45.

29 The basic data about the first audiences have been collected by K. MÜLLER, *Die kaiserliche Gesandtschaftswesen*, esp. pp. 129–137; W. J. ROOSEN, *The Age of Louis XIV*, pp. 117–119. In regard

it was held in an ambience of slight tension.³⁰ Thereby the Imperial Ambassador became accredited in the Court and was able to engage in its life on a formal basis.

Czernin's tasks were basically the same as those of his predecessors, who were legated by Leopold I to work in his favour as ambassadors during the meeting of the Polish-Lithuanian *Sejms*, whether they were held in Warsaw, Grodno or somewhere else. Eventually Ambassador Czernin did not arrange anything about the *Sejm*, because his activities were paralysed by internal divisions, with which the Ambassador was forbidden to interfere by the Emperor.³¹ Although the *Sejm* began in mid-January, its first two weeks were filled with arguments without even proceeding to the election of the Marshal of the *Sejm* who should be elected at the very beginning to preside over the subsequent proceedings.³² When he arrived in Warsaw in early February Czernin himself found the *Sejm* in such a state, and since even the following days did not bring any improvement of the situation,³³ he was not surprised when the *Sejm* was dissolved on the 19th February, which meant that he could not – in contrast to his predecessor, Count Nostitz – present his official speech either then or there.³⁴ According to the Ambassador and his people, so far nothing was lost yet, however, because it was expected that the King would convene a *senatus consulta*, i.e. a committee of the most prominent senators who were to advise the King during a period in which the *Sejm* was not convened. Also the pro-Emperor member of the mightily noble families Sapieha and Lubomirski should have been present there so that the opinions of the opponents of French diplomacy could thereby be heard.³⁵

to Czernin's audience – SOA Třeboň, JH, RA Černínů, temporarily in Kart. 284, Czernin's report to the Emperor, Warsaw, 17. 2. 1695, here fol. 129–131.

- 30 SOA Třeboň, JH, RA Černínů, temporarily in Kart. 284, fol. 141–151, Czernin's report to the Emperor, Warsaw, 24. 2. 1695, here fol. 141–142. On the same day the Ambassador's official audiences with the King's sons took place.
- 31 The events that took place on the *Sejm* and the King's policy in that period are summarised by Zbigniew WÓJCIK, *Jan Sobieski 1629–1696* [John Sobieski 1629–1696], Warsaw 1983, pp. 488–503.
- 32 SOA Třeboň, JH, RA Černínů, temporarily in Kart. 283, fol. 30–31, Hövel to Czernin, Warsaw, 27. 1. 1695. The basic data about the Marshal of the *Sejm* can be found in the standard work Władysław KONOPCZYŃSKI, *Chronologia sejmów polskich 1493–1793*, Kraków 1948. In 1695, the *pisarz polny litewski* Krzyszpin was elected. See Tadeusz WASILEWSKI, *Andrzej Kazimierz Krzyszpin-Kirszensztejn*, in: *Polski Słownik Biograficzny* 15, 1970, pp. 496–497.
- 33 SOA Třeboň, JH, RA Černínů, temporarily in Kart. 284, fol. 93–101, 131–132, Czernin's report to the Emperor, Warsaw, 3. and 17. 2. 1695.
- 34 *Ibidem*, fol. 139–140, Czernin's report to the Emperor, Warsaw, 24. 2. 1695. In regard to Nostitz M. BAKEŠ, *Kryštof Václav z Nostic*, p. 109.
- 35 The experienced legation secretary Hövel was calming Czernin down in this respect. Cf. SOA Třeboň, JH, RA Černínů, temporarily in Kart. 283, fol. 30–31, Hövel to Czernin, Warsaw, 27. 1. 1695. The reasons for the cooperation of the initially pro-French Lubomirski with the Emperor and Sapieha during this period are discussed by Kazimierz PIWARSKI, *Hieronim Lubomirski: hetman wielki koronny* [Hieronymus Lubomirski: Great Crown Hetman], Krakow 1929, esp. pp. 48–54.

Although the strength of the Sapiehas or Lubomirskis should not be underestimated since 1691 a significant part of the Royal Court and of the Polish magnateria had already begun to accept the French ambassador's view that the war depletes the country and that it is necessary to suspend fighting and withdraw from the League while continuing to maintain neutrality.³⁶ In this situation sentiment towards concluding a separate peace treaty with the Turks and Tatars increased, which was fully manifested primarily in the King's meetings with the senators (*senatus consulta*) and also at sessions of the War Council that took place in the spring of 1695. According to Czernin the attitude of John III Sobieski was also slowly changing.³⁷ And so it is no surprise that the sessions had a somewhat explosive atmosphere from the outset and while the monarch attempted to strengthen his position there he ran into opposition from some senators and in early March the atmosphere came to a head.³⁸ Then simply an informal meeting between the King and Cardinal Radziejowski together with several senators was held, whereby the completely differing opinions of the Poles and the Lithuanians immediately surfaced.³⁹

During Czernin's stay no decision had been made concerning the recruitment of troops to Hungary because everything else was drowned in April not only by the internal Polish-Lithuanian disputes, but also by the problem of granting a final audience to the Imperial Ambassador, thereby ensuring that further negotiations would be completely impossible. One specific pretext for denying a final audience with the King of Poland was an incident that occurred on the 1st March. On that day Count Czernin went on one of his customary visits to the Royal Castle and left his carriage guarded by his servants in front of the castle. Suddenly, however, someone started throwing various items from the upper floors of the castle and one of Czernin's hajduks fired at the attackers and hit and fatally injured one of them. He was a Squire of Polish nationality, who subsequently succumbed to his injuries.⁴⁰ Although it was very unpleasant situation for the Ambassador,

36 M. KOMASZYŃSKI, *Die Rivalität*, p. 125 quotes the words of the Venetian ambassador from the autumn of 1693, based on which the Warsaw Court had never been so hostile against Vienna as it was at that time.

37 SOA Třeboň, JH, RA Černínů, temporarily in Kart. 284, fol. 149, Czernin to the Emperor, Warsaw, 24. 2. 1695: "*Ihro Mtt. der könig vor diesem offft die finger pro constantia sacri foederis außgestreckt, jetzo aber gantz und gar verendert und der frantzösischen intention zugethan wahre.*"

38 The first session of the *senatus consulta* took place from 25. 2. till 2. 3. 1695. Ibidem, fol. 180–186, Czernin to the Emperor, Warsaw, 3. 3. 1695.

39 Ibidem, fol. 224–225, Czernin to the Emperor, Warsaw, 17. 3. 1695.

40 This entire matter has already been described very briefly by M. KOMASZYŃSKI in *Die Rivalität*, p. 125, who, however, did not name the Imperial Ambassador. Additionally cf. Janusz WOLIŃSKI (ed.), *Kazimierz Sarnecki, Pamiętniki z czasów Jana Sobieskiego. Diariusz i relacje z lat 1691–1696* [Kazimierz Sarnecki, Memories from the Times of John Sobieski. His Diary and Correspondence 1691–1696], Wrocław 1958, pp. 202–203, 206 and a description of the incident from the pen of Czernin himself:

by the end of March everything seemed to have been resolved thanks to an intermediary intervention by the Royal Confessor. Czernin had made an agreement with the injured party, in which he pledged to provide financial compensation while the King expressed himself in the manner that he would not require any additional compensation from the Ambassador.⁴¹ Things changed in the second half of April, however, when Czernin wished to complete his stay in Warsaw and began negotiating the terms for his final audience with the King. Despite the initial assurance that he would be granted an audience shortly in fact everything turned out differently. The King now demanded satisfaction for the March incident, wanted the hajduk's head and refused to grant an audience to the Count.⁴² The Imperial Ambassador was writing desperate letters to Vienna, complaining that it now looks to the world as if he is in prison there, and asking for advice. Additionally, he was trying to influence the King through various prominent people. This had remained fruitless for a long time and in early May it even appeared that he would have to leave without any official farewell. Only after a sequence of mediations by influential clerics was his journey to the coveted audience finally settled and the date was set for Saturday the 8th of May at Wilanów Chateau. The final visit of the King would take place in the morning and of the Queen in the afternoon, as also happened. Apparently not a word was uttered during either of the two very short visits concerning the contentious issue because it was expected that the Polish King would deal with the matter directly with the Emperor. Both the parties generally assured each other of their mutual affection and of their cooperation within the Holy League. From few details it was still possible, however, to feel the tensions that prevailed between the Ambassador and some of the Poles.⁴³ It is interesting that no detailed news dealing with the activities of the Imperial Ambassador in Poland that spring were occurring in the most important contemporary Central European newspapers and the tensions between both the neighbours was not discussed in public.⁴⁴ According to the Munich newspapers the Imperial Ambassador “*ist*

SOA Třeboň, JH, RA Černínů, temporarily in Kart. 285, fol. 8–13, an undated concept of a letter. I will deal with this matter in another article of mine that will be published in Poland during 2017.

- 41 Cf. J. WOLIŃSKI (ed.), *Kazimierz Sarnecki*, p. 207. Only then did Ambassador Czernin inform Emperor Leopold I of the matter in a special report. Cf. SOA Třeboň, JH, RA Černínů, temporarily in Kart. 284, fol. 153, a list of the people from Czernin's entourage who were with him on 1. 3. 1695 at the Court; *Ibidem*, fol. 155–179, 216–217, 230–234, deeds concerning the course of the dispute in March 1695.
- 42 *Ibidem*, temporarily in Kart. 286, Czernin to the Emperor, Warsaw, 21. 4. 1695, fol. 274–275. Additionally cf. J. WOLIŃSKI (ed.), *Kazimierz Sarnecki*, pp. 307–308, an entry from 26. 4. 1695.
- 43 SOA Třeboň, JH, RA Černínů, temporarily in Kart. 286, Czernin to the Emperor, Lubochnia, 10. 5. 1695, fol. 297–309.
- 44 See *Hamburger Relations-Courier*, *Die Europäische Relation* (Altona), *Ordentliche wochentliche Post-Zeitungen* (Munich), *Braunschweigische Post-Zeitung*, *Saltzburgische Ordinari-Zeitungen*, etc.

sehr vergnügt abgereist” and nearly the same news appeared in Salzburg. Count Czernin supposedly “*mit höchster Satisfaction von dem Königlichen Hoff seine Abreiß widerumb alhero nacher Wien angetretten*”.⁴⁵ However, we can learn from the ambassador’s report to the Emperor that in the evening of the 8th May angry Czernin was already on his way from Warsaw and his mood was improved only shortly afterwards by his heartfelt farewell from Cardinal Radziejowski on the 9th and the 10th May at his country estate in Radziejowice.⁴⁶ Then he travelled through his Silesian estates to Bohemia, where he was going to see his sick wife.

Czernin eventually arrived in Vienna in mid-July 1695, to report to Leopold I personally on his diplomatic mission. Though we do not know anything yet about the course of his audience, we can assume that Czernin was not accepted so enthusiastically at the Court. Although in regard to the ceremonial aspects he received the appropriate honours in Poland, he brought with him an unresolved dispute with the King, who continued to demand satisfaction for the March incident. Even though eventually the Polish King did not conclude a separate peace treaty that year and nor did he secede from the Holy League, at the same time he did not send any help to the Emperor to Hungary. French diplomacy thereby managed to reach its own, because in practice John III Sobieski basically stopped helping the Emperor. Typical of this situation was that shortly after the departure of the Imperial Ambassador for home, the French ambassador prepared a banquet for the Royal Couple at Służewiec Chateau, which belonged to the pro-French oriented Polish Crown Secretary,⁴⁷ while from other sources we learn that the King spent a lot of time in the summer of 1695 in the company of the French Ambassador Polignac.⁴⁸

(URL: <<http://brema.suub.uni-bremen.de/zeitungen17>> [cit. 11. 11. 2016]) and other press (*Theatrum Europaeum*). The most regular news about him were published in *Hamburger Relations-Courier*. Generally, there were any negative remarks on his activities.

45 See *Ordentliche wochentliche Post-Zeitungen*, Num. XXIV, 11. 6. 1695 and *Salzburgische Ordinari-Zeitungen auß Wienn*, Num. XLIII, 31. 5. 1695.

46 SOA Třeboň, JH, RA Černínů, temporarily in Kart. 286, Czernin to the Emperor, Lubochnia, 10. 5. 1695, fol. 309–310. Czernin wrote that “*auch gestern abentß von selben mit einen schönen Mariae muttergottes bilt und türckischen tapet regaliret worden, welcheß mich dan heint biß zu dessen aufwachtung aldorten annoch aufgehalten, umb mich persönlich z bedancken, deme dan in gegengedechtnuß eines von meinen handpferden verehret und also in gänzlicher vertreüligkeit mit ihme mich geschiden.*”

47 See *Theatrum Europaeum*, Volume 14 (1691–1695), Frankfurt am Main 1702, p. 822. The banquet was held on 23. 5. 1695.

48 Cf. A. SKRZYPIETZ, *Francuskie zabiegi o koronę polską*, p. 53.

Personnel, spatial and financial backing for Czernin's embassy

As we already know, Hermann Jakob Czernin spent the greater part of the first half of 1695 in Warsaw as an imperial ambassador. Because this was a very politically responsible and ceremonially demanding function (a crowned head sending its representative to another crowned head, should in accordance with the law at that time obtain a royal admission) an ambassador without certain customary social habits and with only a little background could not be sent to the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. This function required a wealthy nobleman who was accustomed to moving around in courtly society and who was surrounded by an appropriately large court. All of these requirements Count Czernin satisfied abundantly, but – like most imperial ambassadors – he had never been in Poland before (his Grand Tour had taken him only to countries located in Southern and Western Europe), so additionally he had to be accompanied by more experienced men who helped him with everything and who knew a country from their own eye-witness observation.

Usually within the embassy the legation secretary used to be a true professional and an expert in diplomacy though often in the second half of the 17th Century none was appointed. If the Emperor assigned him to any mission, it was evident that its outcome would be of great importance for him. Legation secretaries had always been chosen from the ranks of educated, experienced and proven men who – ideally – had already visited the land into which they were to head at least once more. An ambassador usually did not interfere with their selection himself but it was also in his interest to get along well with them. In fact, they were partly following his written agenda, but in addition they also alleviated the ambassador's day-to-day life by representing him at meetings of lesser importance.⁴⁹ The legation secretary of Czernin's mission was Johann Eberhard von Hövel, then already an older and very experienced man, who, during the previous 25 years, had travelled throughout almost all the Northern and the Eastern states. First, however, he had been in Sweden twice (in 1670–1671 and in 1673–1674) and after his return he had worked in the *Reichskanzlei* in Vienna. He also visited the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth twice (in 1683 and 1693) and Russia once (in 1684). He was knighted for his merits in 1686, but then he left Vienna and was active in the Duchy of Głogów, where he served as the secretary of the local authority at the same time that Christoph Wenzel von Nostitz was working there as the *Landeshauptmann*. With him he also visited the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in the year 1693. However, after 1695 we did not

⁴⁹ In regard to legation secretaries in detail see K. MÜLLER, *Die kaiserliche Gesandtschaftswesen*, pp. 94–101.

have any fresh news from or about him.⁵⁰ His contemporaries welcomed his selection for the post of the legation secretary in Czernin's mission. One nobleman wrote about him approvingly, saying: "*Daß der herr secretarius von Hövel seine herrn gesandten hoffstatt vermehren sollen, glaube gar wohl, er hat wissenschaftt und derentwegen die priora im kopf...*"⁵¹

In this case it is evident from sources what we usually do not learn, and this is how Hövel found out that he should go with Czernin to Poland. Surprisingly he did not learn it from the *Reichskanzlei* nor from any other authority, but from a personal message from a man whom he had apparently never seen in his life and did not know – i.e. directly from Count Czernin. He wrote to him on the 8th December 1694 from Vienna, that after his arrival at the Court he learned that he was to become an Ambassador to the *Sejm* and that Hövel had been assigned to him as his secretary. Therefore although they do not know each other, he is writing to Hövel to announce this news to him and he hopes that he will significantly assist him on the journey with his "*villberihmbter capacitet*". At the same time he is also promising him that in the future he will reward him for all his "*treuer assistenz*".⁵² Originally Czernin planned that Hövel would join his entourage in Wrocław but the situation eventually evolved in such a manner that the secretary went to Poland ahead of him. What was to blame was waiting for an instruction that delayed Czernin's departure from Vienna, and also direct orders that Hövel received from the *Reichskanzlei*. On Twelfth Night he therefore left Głogów and by the 15th of January he was already in Warsaw, where he joined a local imperial resident and together they were preparing everything that was needed for the arrival of the Ambassador.⁵³

This brings us to another very important character of the mission, i.e. to the imperial resident in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. He was then Georg von Schiemunsky († 1696), who as well as Hövel was not any beginner, because he had already been

50 For the basic information see *ibidem*, pp. 183 and 210; while Martin BAKEŠ documents individual missions in his *Habsbursko-švédské diplomatické vztahy v období vlády Karla XI. (1672–1697)* [Swedish-Habsburg Relations during the Reign of Charles XI (1672–1697)], a thesis for the Institute of Historical Sciences, the Faculty of Arts of the University of Pardubice, Pardubice 2014, pp. 27–28; *IDEM, Kryštof Václav z Nostic*, p. 107. Additionally cf. L. BITTNER – L. GROSS (Hg.), *Repertorium*, p. 165 including his correspondence with Czernin in SOA Třeboň, JH, RA Černínů, temporarily in Kart. 283.

51 SOA Plzeň, the section in Klášter, RA Nosticů (Planá), Kart. 49, a letter from Johann Jakob von Gastheim to Christoph Wenzel von Nostitz, 2. 2. 1695, Vienna.

52 SOA Třeboň, JH, RA Černínů, temporarily in Kart. 283, fol. 3, Czernin to Hövel (a concept), Vienna, 8. 12. 1694.

53 *Ibidem*, fol. 6, Czernin to Hövel (a concept), Vienna, 15. 12. 1694 and *ibidem*, fol. 26–27, Hövel to Czernin, Warsaw, 20. 1. 1695.

operating in this country since the turn of 1683 and 1684.⁵⁴ During the time of Czernin's legation he had proved indispensable both for the logistic securing of the embassy and for his knowledge of the local environment, although at that time he was thinking about his departure from office.⁵⁵ Czernin had already written his first letter to him on the 4th December 1694 in which he informed him about his appointment as an ambassador and his scheduled arrival in Warsaw. Because he did not know the City the newly appointed ambassador was asking the resident to help him with the provision of adequate accommodation and catering. In particular, he was interested in renting an imposing house and therefore he was asking Schiemunsky to send him a groundplan of the building that he had selected including the dimensions of the rooms. For representing his position he required not only suitable premises but he also needed to know where and how he would accommodate his large number of servants.⁵⁶

An diplomat's entourage and servants – this is another relatively largely unknown part of the history of diplomacy.⁵⁷ From previous research it is obvious that the ambassador's household fulfilled a relatively large number of different tasks. Not only did it take care of the personal needs of its master, but also of his family, which in the case of longer missions, followed the ambassador abroad. It had to also ensure the communication between the ambassador and the host environment – the servants were in charge of catering and care of the ambassador's guests and various other representative activities (entries, audiences and celebrations), so there had to be enough of them there and reasonably experienced and noble people had to be at their head.⁵⁸ All this can also be observed at Czernin's Court.

54 Basic information is provided by L. BITTNER – L. GROSS (Hg.), *Repertorium*, p. 160, according to whom he was operating there, with some breaks, from March 1684 till January 1695. This is not entirely accurate, because Emperor Leopold I had already appointed him to an office in Linz in December 1683 (*Acta historica res gestas Poloniae illustrantia ab anno 1507 usque ad annum 1795*, Volume 6, 1883, pp. 572–573) and he had demonstrably worked in Warsaw even for the whole year in 1695 and he died there of dropsy on Saturday 11. 2. 1696. In more detail M. HRUŠKOVÁ, *Každodenní život*, p. 15 and elsewhere; A. RILLE (Hg.), *Aus den letzten Jahren*; J. WOLIŃSKI (ed.) lists the date and the cause of his death in *Kazimierz Sarnecki*, p. 324.

55 Cf. his correspondence with Czernin from December 1694–February 1695 and from May 1695–January 1696 in SOA Třeboň, JH, RA Černínů, temporarily in Kart. 282, fol. 212–223 and ibidem, Kart. 285, fol. 175–286.

56 Ibidem, Kart. 282, fol. 212, Czernin to Hövel (a concept), Vienna, 4. 12. 1694.

57 Cf. K. MÜLLER, *Die kaiserliche Gesandtschaftswesen*, pp. 88–111. The author, however, was mainly focused on legation secretaries and additional diplomatic personnel, while in regard to the actual Courts of the ambassadors (including their wives and servants) he only referred to ibidem, pp. 108–111. Additionally also, for example, there was Phyllis S. LACHS, *The Diplomatic Corps under Charles II & James II*, New Brunswick 1965, p. 66–79.

58 See also, for example, Martin KRUMMHOLZ, *Gallasovský hofmistr Johann Heinrich Dienebier (1677–1748)* [The Hofmeister of the Gallas Family Johann Heinrich Dienebier (1677–1748)], *Theatrum historiae* 9, 2011, pp. 375–395, here pp. 379–382.

The Count had probably originally planned to take his wife Maria Josepha, born Countess Slavata, with him to Poland. She arrived with him from Vienna to Prague in January 1695 but in the end she did not actually accompany him on his mission.⁵⁹ Probably it was thought that the Polish legation would not last too long (the *Sejm* always sat for just a few weeks), so Hermann Jakob Czernin left her behind in Prague. Despite remaining in Bohemia the Ambassador's wife claimed ceremonial precedence in Prague noble society.⁶⁰ Notable individuals were surprised by that, pointing to examples from the past and did not want to admit this precedence to her. Therefore Maria Josepha sometimes did not go out in society.⁶¹ Yet eventually, in a Prague church, she got into a dispute and all of this had to be resolved at the Court in Vienna. She was ordered to apologise.⁶² Czernin's wife then moved from Prague to Carlsbad.⁶³

Although Count Czernin did not bring his wife to Poland, albeit he did take care to have sufficient, though not an exaggerated number of servants, supervised, if possible, by noble people who should occupy some significant functions that normally did not exist at his court. He acted as did his predecessors. The surviving lists of courtiers and

59 Cf. SOA Plzeň, the section in Klášter, RA Nosticů (Planá), Kart. 47, a letter from Prince Ferdinand von Dietrichstein to Christoph Wenzel von Nostitz, 15. 12. 1694, Vienna (“*Gr. Czernin lise ihme waß kosten, nicht in Pohlen zu gehen, daß negotium alda ist schwer, weilien die Galli alda praevalliren, die zeit ist kurz und die spessen werden nicht klein sein, dan der graff wird sich sehen laßen wollen. Stehet annoch an, ob er sein fr. gemahlin mitnehmen wird.*”) and ÖStA Wien, Allgemeines Verwaltungsarchiv (=AVA), Familienarchiv Harrach, Kart. 304, a letter from Wenzel Adalbert von Sternberg to Ferdinand Bonaventura von Harrach, 19. 1. 1695, Prague (“*Vorgestern ist anhero kommen per posta herr graf Czernin sambt seiner gemahlin.*”)

60 To the character of “ambassador” see Charles MOSER, *L’Ambassadrice et ses Droits*, Berlin 1754 and the article of Laura Oliván Santaliestra in this volume.

61 “*Nous avons icy mientenant beaucoup des princesses, la palatine, la dovariee marggrave de Baden, la duchesse de Saxe et une jeune princesse de Hessen. La comtesse de Czernin evite de se trouver dans les companies, parce qu’elle pretend le rang comme feme d’un ambassadeur et crain, que les autres ou luy (?) le disputeroit, parce qu’icy elle n’est pas ambassadrice, ou que les autres chercheroit sens (?) assamblé à part. Jousqu’à present elles n’ont pas esté ensamble et comme elle est niepce de ma feme ainsy elle vien chez nous à la petite table. Nous avons l’exemple du C. de Colowrat capitaine de Moravie [Franz Karl Liebsteinsky von Kolowrat], qui avoit esté deux an ambassadeur en Pologne, avoit laissé sa feme icy sens pretendre le rang qu’une ambassadrice, n’à pas en Pologne mesme. Je me suis informé aupres de M.r le grand chancellier [Franz Ulrich Kinsky], mais il ne me repons pas sur ce chapitre.*” ÖStA Wien, AVA, Familienarchiv Harrach, Kart. 304, a letter from Adolf Wratislaw von Sternberg to Ferdinand Bonaventura von Harrach, 2. 2. 1695, Prague.

62 “*Unsers nach den pohlnischen hoffspedierten bottschaftters herren graaffen Czernins fraw gemahlin hat unlängst allhier in einer kirchen mit der verwittibten pfalzgräffin [Elisabeth Amalie, nee von Hessen-Darmstadt] oder sachsblauenburgischen prinzessin einige competence angefangen, worüber sich dieße bey hoff beklagt, undt hat die erste destwegen auß key. befelich der pfalzgräffin satisfaction geben undt eine abbitt in dero behaußung thun müssen.*” SOA Plzeň, the section in Klášter, RA Nosticů (Planá), Kart. 57, Daniel Mayer to Christoph Wenzel von Nostitz, 3. 3. 1695, Prague.

63 Ibidem, Mayer to Christoph Wenzel von Nostitz, 5. 6. 1695, Prague: “*Unßer herr gesandter auß Pohlen ist noch zu Schmideberg, von wannen er nach Carlsbaad gehen, von dort seine gemahlin abholen undt mit deroselben sodann ferner nach Wienn gehen will.*”

servants suggest that the Count brought with him more than 80 people, including several nobles (three Barons) and therefore he had available essentially the same entourage as Georg Adam von Martinitz who was heading to Rome at the same time (see Table 1).⁶⁴

Table 1: The Court of Hermann Jakob Czernin when he was an imperial ambassador to Poland in 1695

Hoffstatt	Name	Function	Number
	Count Hermann Jakob Czernin von Chudenitz	Botschafter	1
	Baron Wenzel Czernin von Chudenitz	Kavalier	1
	Baron Tarolt	Kavalier	1
	Baron Dillherr	Marschalk	1
	Johann Eberhard von Hövel	Legationssekretarius	1
	Ludolph Bockelkamp	Confidan	1
	Jesuit Priest	Beichtvater	1
	Eberl from Mladá Boleslav	Leibmedicus	1
Oberofficier	Franz Xaver Locher	Hofmeister	1
	Zesner; Kirchsteher; Keller	Aufwarter	3
	Karl Schubert	Sekretarius	1
	Küßwetter	Referendarius	1
	Hans Ernst	Stallverseher	1
	Hans	Kammerdiener	1
	Kaspar	Barbier	1
	Joseph	Oberkoch	1
Unterofficier	Öhm	Kammerschreiber	1
		Kammerdiener of Baron Czernin	1
		Kammerdiener of Baron Dillherr	1
		Schreiber of Mr. Hövel	1
	Giovannino	Paucker und Zwerg	1
	Karl; Baltzer; Christoph; Hans Jakob	Pagien	4
		Pagie of Baron Czernin	1
	Karl; Hans; Paul; Andres	Trompeter	4

⁶⁴ Martinitz was accompanied by 90 people – see K. MÜLLER, *Die kaiserliche Gesandtschaftswesen*, p. 127. In regard to Czernin in detail in SOA Třeboň, JH, RA Černínů, temporarily in Kart. 282, fol. 157, 159, 161–162 (lists of the people from Vienna and Prague who accompanied Count Czernin) and 192 (an undated list of Czernin's servants whom he took with him to Poland).

Kuchel	Barthl	Kellermeister	1
	Joseph	Kuchelschreiber	1
	Paul	Einkäufer	1
	Türck	Koch	1
	Maria; Liesl; Pischlin	Menscher	3
		Kucheljungen	2
	Tieroller	Hausknecht	1
Loquay	Rupert Decano	Loquay	1
		Loquay of Baron Tarolt	1
		Loquay of Doctor	1
	Franz Decano	Loquay	1
	Hans Michel Schneider	Loquay	1
	Christoph	Loquay	1
		Zuckerbacher	1
		Tapetzierer	1
	Tischler	Loquay	1
	Rihmer	Loquay	1
	Möhlzter	Loquay	1
	Binspeter	Loquay of Mr. Bockelkamp	1
	Giergl; Anton	Laufer	2
		Polish Loquay	2
Stallparthey		Kutscher	6
		Vorreither	5
	Wentzl; Hellebrandt; Losenblather; Michel Schmidt	Reitknecht	4
		Diener of Mr. Hövel	1
		Heyduck	12
The Summation:			86

Some of them he knew well, as was the case with Wenzel Czernin von Chudenitz, his distant relative.⁶⁵ On the other hand, some of them he hired newly and only because of his mission, such as a certain Baron “*Tyllherr*” – apparently a member of the old imperial Dillherr von Alten family. He then entrusted him with the function of the Marshal of his Court, and therefore behaved in the same way as Ambassador Schaffgotsch had thirty years ago, who at the outset of his legation also requested a man with a Baron title to be

65 It was probably Wenzel Wilhelm Czernin von Chudenitz (1652–1698).

his Marshal.⁶⁶ No Ambassador as a representative of the Emperor could do without this function, because although usually in the aristocratic courts this function did not exist,⁶⁷ at the Viennese Court the *Obersthofmarschall* performed several vital functions. As the second highest-ranking man in the hierarchy of courtiers he could act as a deputy for the *Obersthofmeister*; he was in charge of accommodation for both his master and his visitors and during official visits he had to welcome and greet the guests. Additionally, he was entrusted with jurisdiction not only over the members of the court, but also in relation to foreign diplomats and their staff. Therefore, the two crowned heads and their respective ambassadors always communicated primarily through their marshals.⁶⁸ Later on, however, Czernin regretted his choice because at the end of the Warsaw residence he broke-up badly with Dillherr and departed without him.⁶⁹

Most of the others had already worked in the service of Hermann Jakob before this mission, since it is noted in partial lists that they had been taken from Czernin's households in Vienna and in Prague. This applies in particular to the kitchen staff (11 people led by a chief cook), to the stable staff (16 persons led by the Stallmaster [*Stallverseher*]) and to a majority of the lackeys. Count Czernin had brought eight of them; one was brought by Baron Tarolt and the Doctor, while the Ambassador hired two more in Poland. As a representative of the Emperor Hermann Jakob was also obliged to have a guard. For this purpose, he brought with him 12 hajduks who were equipped with small-calibre

66 See L. ZIAŃKOWSKI, *Poselstwo Krzysztofa Leopolda Schaffgotscha*, pp. 36–37.

67 Jiří KUBEŠ, *Die Dienerschaft der Aristokraten in den böhmischen Ländern in den Jahren 1550–1750*, in: Anna Fundárková – István Fazekas et alii (Hg.), *Die kirchliche und weltliche Elite aus dem Königreich Böhmen und Königreich Ungarn am Wiener Kaiserhof im 16. – 17. Jahrhundert*, Wien 2013, pp. 273–299, here p. 284–285.

68 Mark HENGERER, *Kaiserhof und Adel in der Mitte des 17. Jahrhunderts. Eine Kommunikationsgeschichte der Macht in der Vormoderne*, Konstanz 2004, pp. 418–419 talks about the status of a *Obersthofmarschall* being precarious for various reasons. That is certainly true, but perhaps the author somewhat underestimated his power – it is also important to acknowledge his powers in regard to his contact with foreign diplomats. L. AUER points it out in *Diplomatisches Zeremoniell*, pp. 42–43.

69 During the mission a dispute broke out between Czernin and his marshal that each of the parties involved interpreted differently. According to Dillherr Czernin was jealous that the Marshal had reported better news to Vienna than the Ambassador had and therefore he did not like him and finally also left him imprisoned. Resident Schiemunsky saw it differently, however – the reason that Czernin disliked Dillherr was the debts that the Marshal did not want to pay and eventually the Ambassador was obliged to pay them himself. The rift had gone so far that Dillherr simply left Czernin's service but after his departure he remained in Warsaw and even became friends with the French ambassador. Eventually the Imperial Resident considered him to be a traitor and reported back to Czernin that Dillherr wanted to become an imperial resident in Poland instead of him. Cf. SOA Třeboň, JH, RA Černínů, temporarily in Kart. 285, esp. fol. 261–263, Schiemunsky to Czernin, Warsaw, 18. 5. 1695.

hunting rifles (so called *Teschinken*). The representative character of the entourage was also enhanced by a drummer and four trumpeters.⁷⁰

Count Czernin placed great emphasis on the composition and the size of his entourage and although it was not exactly the greatest of all those that the imperial ambassadors were bringing at that time to the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth (the largest were brought for electoral *Sejms*),⁷¹ we can assume that they were from amongst those who were exceptionally large and well equipped. This is evident both from the recognition of some contemporaries and also from the problem that arose regarding accommodating Czernin's entourage in Warsaw. In his very first letter, which he wrote to the Imperial Resident Schiemunsky to Warsaw, the Count asked about ensuring that there would be adequate accommodation for himself and his people. The resident then replied that he was counting with it and had booked the same accommodation as another imperial ambassador had got recently, i.e. the already mentioned Georg Adam von Martinitz (who visited Poland at the turn of 1693 and 1694).⁷² He praised its great location near the Royal Castle and also the settlements of all the supporters of the imperial policy and sent to Czernin the requisite groundplan of the first floor of the house together with the room dimensions.⁷³ However, when the Count looked at it, he adopted a clear and uncompromising position towards it – i.e. he could not stay in this house because its representative rooms on the first floor are too small (the dining room was apparently too small to be able to fit a large round table there for cca. 20 people that would still enable walking around it comfortably), there are also too few of them and in addition his servants could not also fit in this house. Therefore he asked the resident to find for him “*eine etwas geraumbere behausung*”, if necessary in the suburbs, because he had clear priorities: “*Lieber die ungelegenheit der gassen als alzueeng zue wohnen...*”⁷⁴ From this decision it is possible to sense, amongst other things, Count Czernin's rivalry with

70 Ibidem, Kart. 282, fol. 157, 159 and 161.

71 K. MÜLLER, *Die kaiserliche Gesandtschaftswesen*, p. 127 notes that Count Schaffgotsch (1669) came with 158 persons and Count Lamberg (1697) even with 200 people. In both cases the electoral *Sejm* was taking place. The size of the entourage for less significant events was usually smaller, as can be seen in the case of Schaffgotsch – in 1667 he took with him 80–100 people. In more detail L. ZIĄTKOWSKI, *Poselstwo Krzysztofa Leopolda Schaffgotscha*, p. 37.

72 L. BITTNER – L. GROSS (Hg.), *Repertorium*, p. 160 reported that he was in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in January 1695, but this is not true. Although not much information was preserved about this mission, there are the first and the last pages of his instructions from 7. 12. 1693. Cf. ÖStA Wien, HHStA, Staatenabteilungen, Polen I, Kart. 82, fol. 20–21.

73 SOA Třeboň, JH, RA Černínů, temporarily in Kart. 282, fol. 214–215, Schiemunsky to Czernin, Warsaw, 16. 12. 1694.

74 Ibidem, fol. 222–223, Czernin to Schiemunsky (a concept), Vienna, 29. 12. 1694.

Georg Adam von Martinitz, because it was originally Martinitz who had intended to go to Poland again, but eventually the Emperor sent him to Rome instead.⁷⁵

The resident was not pleased with that decision (any better accommodation in Warsaw had been booked long ago now) and his opinion was also shared by Hövel, the legation secretary, who arrived at the place in mid-January 1695 and immediately tried to persuade Count Czernin to reconsider it. His argument was that everything was heated and ready for his arrival, that the table would fit in the dining room, that it would also be possible to secure the neighbouring house, that the majority of palaces in the suburbs are not finished and that it will take a long time for them to heat it up. He also added that Count Martinitz was satisfied with this accommodation and that the Polish magnates also do not live in the suburbs, but in smaller houses located in the town.⁷⁶ Hermann Jakob remained adamant, however – apparently he did not consider such housing worth while because when building his own projects he was really generous,⁷⁷ but mainly it was about his position as an ambassador defining him as the embodiment of his sovereign. Eventually the resident and the legation secretary found a spacious but still unfinished palace for him in the Krakow suburbs belonging to the Denhoff family (which is now known as the Palace of Potocki)⁷⁸ and thereby Czernin, of all the imperial ambassadors to the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth during the second half of the 17th Century, had probably the most representative dwelling.

75 See SOA Plzeň, the section in Klášter, RA Nosticů (Planá), Kart. 79, Adolf Wratislav von Sternberg to Christoph Wenzel von Nostitz, 5. 12. 1694, Prague: *“Mein aydam graff von Martinitz hat mir von seiner romanischen ambasciada von Wien auß parte gegeben, hingegen ist graff Herrmann Czernin in vorschlag, nacher Pohlen zu gehen, und vermeint mann, er werde es Ihro Kay. May. nicht abschlagen können und diese gesandtschaft auf sich nehmen müssen, weilen die zeit kurtz, und derselbe, solche zu gewinnen, meinem obgedachten aydam seine equippage abberuffen könnnte, indeme waß nicht Rom, iedoch in Pohlen tauget.”* Ibidem, Kart. 47, a letter from Ferdinand von Dietrichstein to Christoph Wenzel von Nostitz, 8. 12. 1694, Vienna: *“Vermeine geschriben zu haben, daß der ältere graff Czernin in Pohlen gehet, weillen gr. von Martiniz für Rom erklärt ist.”* Ibidem, Kart. 49, a letter from Johann Jakob von Gastheim to Christoph Wenzel von Nostitz, 11. 12. 1694, Vienna: *“Die kay. credentialien für den älteren herrn grafen von Martiniz seind schon ausgefertigt gewesen in Pohlen, jezo werden sie umbgefertiget für den älteren herrn grafen I. E. von Czernin.”*

76 SOA Třeboň, JH, RA Černínů, temporarily in Kart. 283, fol. 26–27, Hövel to Czernin, Warsaw, 20. 1. 1695.

77 Cf., for example, V. LORENC – K. TRŽSKA, *Černinský palác*.

78 SOA Třeboň, JH, RA Černínů, temporarily in Kart. 284, fol. 122, Czernin to Leopold I, Warsaw, 10. 2. 1695. The Palace, which originated in the early 1690's at the request of Ernest Denhoff (cca. 1630–1693) and that since the Baroque period has been rebuilt several times, is now the seat of the Polish Ministry of Culture and National Heritage.

The first floor housed an apartment that similarly to the Vienna Hofburg consisted of a hall, two anterooms, the audience room and a *retirada*.⁷⁹ This composition of the apartment was not usual for the nobility – mostly nobles did not have an audience room and only had one anteroom,⁸⁰ so it appears that even in his style of housing the Ambassador attempted to imitate his sovereign. According to the contemporary theorists of diplomacy it belonged to the standard rules every ambassador should fulfil.⁸¹ This is also reflected in the fact that at the end of December 1694 Count Czernin borrowed equipment for his audience room from the imperial warehouse tapestries, including the imperial canopy.⁸² Since his people were apparently not accustomed to the intricate layout of rooms in the manner of an imperial apartment, on that occasion Czernin issued new house rules that briefly defined the basic responsibilities of his groups of servants that clearly determined who is subject to whom (also highlighted in these rules is the function of the Marshal who should be responsible for the “*standtsparada*”) and the Count also stipulated which rooms of his suite may be accessed by the different groups of his servants (cf. the Appendix with the edition of house rules). The house rules refer to Czernin’s entourage as representing a complex entity in which everyone involved has a clearly defined area in which s/he has to operate and cooperate with other servants. None of the rooms of the Ambassador’s suite should ever be left empty and everything was set so that any access to Count Czernin was graded (see Table 2) in order to maintain the relatively private character of the *retirada*. It could be unrestrictedly accessed by the

79 Cf. Christian BENEDIK, *Die herrschaftlichen Appartements. Funktion und Lage während der Regierungen von Kaiser Leopold I. bis Kaiser Franz Joseph I.*, Österreichische Zeitschrift für Kunst und Denkmalpflege 51, 1997, pp. 552–570, here esp. pp. 552–560; IDEM, *Repräsentationsräume der Wiener Hofburg in der ersten Hälfte des 18. Jahrhunderts*, Das 18. Jahrhundert und Österreich 6, 1990/1991, pp. 7–21.

80 Jiří KUBEŠ, *Vývoj obytné jednotky v sídlech vyšší šlechty z českých zemí (1550–1750)* [The Development of Apartment in the Residences of the Higher Nobility of the Czech Lands (1550–1750)], in: *Sborník* 6, 2008, pp. 79–90.

81 Gottfried STIEVE, *Europäisches Hof-Ceremoniel ...*, Leipzig 1723², pp. 295–296: “*Die erste Magnificentz nun eines Ambassadeurs bestehet in dessen Logement, welches 1. commode, 2. propre seyn muß. Die Commodität zeigt sich [...] specialiter, daß selbiges versehen mit [...] 5. einem feinen Tafel-Zimmer, 6. einer oder auch zwey Anti-Chambres, 7. einem Audientz-Zimmer, 8. einer Retirade...*”

82 SOA Třeboň, JH, RA Černínů, temporarily in Kart. 282, fol. 164, Count Czernin’s loan certificate, 31. 12. 1694. The certificate states that Czernin borrowed the same equipment as Count Martinitz did before he went to Poland: “*Ich unterschriebener bekhenne, das ich von dem kayserlichen tapezirer von der kayserlichen tapezerey nacher Pohlen habe mitgenohmen, auff ein zimmer domasko nemblich neun stuckh halten in blath zwey undt fünfftzig und drey sommete teppicht mit goldenen frantzen, zwey sammete pölster, einer hat vier quasten, der ander hat drey quasten, einen valdagin von domasko sambt den ruckhblath und die zwey darzugehörige schnur, mehr einen türckhischen banckh teppicht.*”

Ambassador's closest persons, e.g. his relative Wenzel Czernin, his long-term confidant Ludolph Bockelkamp,⁸³ his chamberlain Hans and four pageboys.

Table 2: The accessibility of the individual rooms in the Ambassador's suite in Warsaw for his servants in 1695

hall	1 st anteroom	2 nd anteroom	audience room	retirada
lackeys, people from the stable, hajduks,	lackeys, trumpeters, officers	lackeys, trumpeters, officers, higher officers, chamberlain, pageboys	higher officers, chamberlain, pageboys	Wenzel Czernin, Ludolph Bockelkamp, chamberlain, pageboys

After what was said it is evidently clear that Czernin's lodgings in Warsaw were very expensive. During four months he paid rent amounting to 1,200 guildens, while he also additionally invested 360 guildens for the necessary adjustments and 60 guildens for stabling the horses that did not fit in the Palace.⁸⁴ Under the pressure of circumstances other ambassadors, however, resigned themselves to better housing and stayed in inconvenient buildings – especially in Lithuania. This is illustrated, for example, by the legation secretary Hövel who, remembering his visit to Grodno with Count Nostitz, wrote that he must warn Czernin regarding the accommodation there. There are not many large houses in Warsaw that are completed and usable and therefore “*wir auch vor zwey jahren in einem gantz holtzernen hauße sowohl zu Warschau alß zu Grodno haben wohnen und für lieb nehmen müßen*”.⁸⁵ Nostitz, however, then eventually tried to improve the substandard housing at his own cost and apparently also invested 1,500 guildens in a house in Grodno.⁸⁶

83 They had known each other for nearly two decades. It was Czernin's steward from the time of his Grand Tour (1678–1682), who, since then, had remained at his side and had dealt with the important stuff on his behalf. Now he was referred to in the lists as a “*confidan*”. Cf. Z. HOJDA – E. CHODĚJOVSKÁ (eds.), *Heřman Jakub Černín*, I, pp. 124–126.

84 Cf. SOA Zámorsk, RA Colloredo-Mannsfeld, non-inventoried, temporarily in Kart. 31, an undated list of items that the Ambassador Czernin needed in Poland (this material was created for the needs of Hieronymus Count Colloredo when he was preparing for his mission to Poland, which eventually did not happen but probably dates from the year 1715): “...*der graf von Czernin hatt logirt ausser Crackauischen vorstatt in einen woywoda hauß, welches obschon unmobiliret geweßen, so hatt er gleich wohlen hiervon monathlich 200 specie thlr geben müßen undt das holtz seye von einem unvergleichlich hohen preiß geweßen*”. Additionally cf. a summary account for extraordinary expenses that is preserved in SOA Třeboň, JH, RA Černínů, temporarily in Kart. 285, fol. 29.

85 Ibidem, temporarily in Kart. 283, fol. 21, 24, Hövel to Czernin, Glogów, 4. 1. 1695.

86 Nostitz then complained to Ferdinand von Dietrichstein: “*Ich muß vor daß hiesige logiament 1000 rth. geben, dadoch wahrhaftig zu hause meine loquaien ein beßer zimmer, alß ich zu der audienz, haben*.” Quoted in accordance with M. HRUŠKOVÁ, *Každodenní život*, p. 39; additionally also see M. BAKEŠ, *Kryštof Václav z Nostic*, pp. 108–109.

This brings us to the question of financing. The literature agrees that usually we are not aware of how much of their own money ambassadors had to invest. It is considered as certain, however, that their expenses exceeded the revenues that they had been promised by the *Hofkammer*, because the Emperor mostly only allocated to his representatives money for the journey and equipping the mission (*Reise- und Ausstaffierungsgelder*), then a monthly amount to ensure their stay (*Subsistenzgelder*), which ambassadors received retroactively for the quarter and then occasionally they also received money for various exceptional expenses (*Extraordinariausgaben*) depending on how close they were to the sovereign and how important their mission was considered to be. Often, however, the money did not arrive regularly and therefore ambassadors had to rely on their own resources and on credit.⁸⁷

Czernin's mission was rather well ensured by the Emperor because he not only obtained the aforementioned funds, but also something more than that. In this case, the Ambassador's expenses should have been paid by the Silesian Chamber, which, at the very end of December 1694, received an order from the *Hofkammer* to secure for Ambassador Czernin 6,000 guildens for the journey and equipment, 1,000 guildens for his monthly salary and additionally also 6,000 ducats (i.e. 24,000 guildens) in advance for the anticipated additional "secret" expenses. Because in terms of the Imperial Court this was an extremely important diplomatic mission, Hermann Jakob was also provided with an additional 2,000 ducats ("*in cassu necessitatis 2000 duggaten in bereitschafft zuhalten*"). In addition to this money he also brought with him funds for paying the pensions of two Polish nobles (amounting to a total of 7,000 thalers, i.e. 10,500 guildens). Altogether therefore for three months he had 48,000 guildens available, but he could not spend them all for his own needs because most of these funds had already been allocated for a specific purpose. Of this amount he could only use about a quarter on his own behalf (i.e. cca. 10,000 guildens for the journey, necessary equipment and a four-month stay plus a small margin for extraordinary expenses). All this depended on what extra spending his sovereign approved and was willing to reimburse.⁸⁸ For comparison, in the 1680's the imperial envoys to the English and the French Kings received 3,000 guildens for their

87 Cf. K. MÜLLER, *Die kaiserliche Gesandtschaftswesen*, pp. 162–179; Heiko DROSTE, *Im Dienst der Krone. Schwedische Diplomaten im 17. Jahrhundert*, Berlin 2006, pp. 193–233. See also R. SMÍŠEK, *Anton Florian von Liechtenstein und Rom*, pp. 210–211 or M. BAKEŠ, *Diplomatická mise jako nejistá investice*, pp. 735, 740–741.

88 ÖStA Wien, Finanz- und Hofkammerarchiv (hereinafter referred to as FHKA), Alte Hofkammer, Hoffinanz Österreich, Bücher, Bd. 999, Protokoll Registratur 1694, fol. 693, a record of 31. 12. 1694. Eventually, he did not spend all of these funds – he returned to the *Hofkammer* not only 760 of the original 6,000 ducats that were allocated for secret expenses, but also a bill of exchange with a value of 2,000 ducats. Ibidem, Bd. 1003, Protokoll Registratur 1695, fol. 530, a record from 10. 10. 1695.

journey and equipment and an additional 750 guildens as a monthly salary. But these were not diplomats of the first rank, only envoys (*Abgesandte*), who did not have to undertake any kind of festive entry. Count Czernin was also an ambassador, so he received more, but again this amount could not compare with what the ambassadors of the Emperor to the Spanish King received, who went on their missions provided with 20,000 guildens and an additional salary of 1,500 guildens per month.⁸⁹

In Czernin's case we are extraordinarily fortunate that a relatively complete accounting document survived (though some summary accounts only as a concept), so that we can at least estimate how much of his own money Hermann Jakob spent (see Table 3). Although the Emperor allocated 6,000 guildens to him for the journey and equipment, he additionally spent over 30,000 guildens (sic). The highest expenditures were for transportation means. For a large new representative coach and eight horses ("*leiptziger rappen*") and their harnesses that were designated for the festive entry and two smaller carriages for routine use the Count paid a total of cca. 13,400 guildens. The second largest item comprised the servants livery "*von sauberen carmesin tuch und mit reichen sielbernen portten außstaffiret*", which cost more than 8,500 guildens. In accordance with the monthly salary he was entitled to 4,000 guildens (for four months of the mission), but even here he expended extra funds, in this instance nearly 6,000 guildens. Then for the extraordinary expenses Czernin demanded an additional payment of nearly 4,000 guildens.⁹⁰ Although we do not have the final accounts available, it is clear that the Ambassador spent cca. five times the amount of the funds that were paid for journey and equipping the mission and about twice the amount of money that had been allocated for his stay in Warsaw. In short, from the monarch he had 10,000 guildens available for equipment, travel and his salary, but for these items he spent nearly 46,000 guildens. After the completion of the mission Hermann Jakob himself estimated his own expenditure in autumn 1695, when he complained to the *Hofkammer* that he had not yet been paid the promised 10,000 guildens, as almost 50,000 guildens.⁹¹ This clearly shows that Czernin did not spare on this mission; many

89 ÖStA Wien, FHKA, Hofzahlamtsbücher, Bd. 124, 1680, fol. 189 (The Marquis de Grana, the Ambassador in Spain), fol. 190 (Count Mansfeld, the Envoy to France) and Bd. 125, 1681, fol. 193 (Count Thun, the Envoy to England).

90 SOA Třeboň, JH, RA Černínů, temporarily in Kart. 285, fol. 29–32; temporarily in Kart. 286, fol. 12–14; Detailed specifications of Ambassador Czernin's expenditures.

91 Ibidem, temporarily in Kart. 286, fol. 6–9, Hermann Jakob Czernin to the *Hofkammer*, two undated concepts: "*zu ... dero kay. hohen ehren über die zur equipir- und subsistirung mir ausgeworfene etlich tausent gulden von dem meinigen bey der gantz eilfertig zu solcher bodtschafft zumachen bemüesigter einrichtung und gegenwehrtigen unerhert teüren zeithen nicht weith 50 000 fl treülich verzehrten summa...*"

items were provided at his own expense and his contemporaries were right when before his departure from Vienna they noted that the Count was preparing for the journey “*sehr stattlich*”. At the same time they were adding, however, that as one of the richest Bohemian aristocrats he – unlike others – could afford this expense without any problems.⁹²

Table 3: Hermann Jakob Czernin von Chudenitz’s expenditure during his diplomatic mission (January – May 1695)

The type of expenditure	Item	Costs
Hofstaat Equipierung		
1) for the Count	a bed and two chaises longues	1,561 gulden
	clothes from Vienna	2,332 gulden
2) for his servants	livery	8,958 gulden
	furniture, dishes and other household items	1,193 gulden
	food supplies	3,118 gulden
3) for the stable	8 black horses from the Viennese merchant Wolf Daubenger	1,600 gulden
	8 pearl horses from Count Windischgrätz	2,000 gulden
	a ceremonial coach	2,981 gulden
	a carriage	430 gulden
	a carriage	400 gulden
	the harnesses for four carriages	2,773 gulden
	accessories for the carriages and the harnesses	994 gulden
Travel costs	travel costs for the kitchen staff, the stable staff, the steward, the secretary and for their people travelling from Vienna to Warsaw and back to Bohemia	8,352 gulden
The Summation:		36,692 gulden
Subsistenzgelder	the steward’s bills from February to May	7,919 gulden
	furniture for the palace that was purchased in February	408 gulden
	the stallmaster’s expenses for February to May	1,336 gulden
The Summation		9,663 gulden

92 “I. E. der h. graff Czernin, wie man verspührt, will sich in Pohlen stattlich sehen lassen, welches er herr zwar auch wohl thun kan ohne sein schaden.” (SOA Plzeň, the section in Klášter, RA Nosticů (Planá), Kart. 49, a letter from Johann Jakob von Gastheim to Christoph Wenzel von Nostitz, 18. 12. 1694, Vienna). “Alle meine correspondenten berichten mir von Wien, wie sehr stattlich graff Hermann Czernin sich zu seiner ambasciada außrüstet. Er kann aber dieses leicht thuen, weilien die mittel darzu verhanden.” (Ibidem, Kart. 79, Adolf Wratislav von Sternberg to Christoph Wenzel von Nostitz, 26. 12. 1694, Prague).

Extraausgaben	the transportation of the imperial gift (a carriage and a horse) to Warsaw	135 guldens
	for the originally booked house	400 guldens
	the gratuity during the festive entry and the first audience	389 guldens
	for the palace in which the Ambassador lived	1,200 guldens
	adjustments made to the palace	360 guldens
	the rent for the additional stable	60 guldens
	the provision for the confidant, the doctor and the marshal	123 guldens
	the provision for resolving the dispute between the Polish squire and the hajduk	600 guldens
	the gratuity during the final audience	154 guldens
	the carriage and the Mělník wine for the wife of Prince Jakob	400 guldens
	office expenses	26 guldens
	The Summation	3,847 guldens
	Summa summarum	50,202 guldens

Although the Ambassador Czernin was housed in a Viennese manner and in a very representative abode and it was anticipated that the Poles would appreciate this costly behaviour,⁹³ this strategy did not help him much in regard to establishing contact with the Polish King and his court. His main opponent, the French Ambassador Melchior de Polignac, was housed in Warsaw's Royal Castle⁹⁴ and enjoyed the great affection of Queen Marie Casimire who spent a lot of time with him.⁹⁵ Czernin could therefore hardly fight with him because he could not really get the Queen on his side. As we know, he eventually

93 "...alß ich darvon hier habe discurriren gehört, wird er [ambassador] in Pohlen einen schenen train machen und denen Pollackhen zeigen, daß sich der keyser noch nicht verblüthet, wie sy einmahl noch dem baron de Lisola zu verstehen gegeben". SOA Plzeň, the section in Klášter, RA Nosticů (Planá), Kart. 49, a letter from Johann Jakob von Gastheim to Christoph Wenzel von Nostitz, 2. 2. 1695, Vienna.

94 See J. WOLIŃSKI (ed.), *Kazimierz Sarnecki*, p. 185, a journal entry from 20. 2. 1695. Sarnecki is documenting two visits of Kazimierz Jan Sapieha on that day. After the audience with the Imperial Ambassador Sapieha with a large entourage "do Zamku przyjechał; tam oddawszy wizytę drugą jmp. posłowi francuskiemu w stancyjej jego na gankach będącej...". The Habsburg party was very well aware of this advantage that the French Ambassador had and some members of it prophesied significant problems for Czernin because of this: "E. E. erstatte schuldigen danck vor alle mir communicirte zeitungen, bey deren beschaffenheit herr gr. Czernin in Pohlen noch viel ungelegenheiten ausstehen dörffte, zumahlen der frantzösische gesandte bey dem könig einlogiret." SOA Plzeň, the section in Klášter, RA Nosticů (Planá), Kart. 55, a letter from Karl Maximilian Lažanský von Buková to Christoph Wenzel von Nostitz, 6. 2. 1695, Prague.

95 J. WOLIŃSKI (ed.), *Kazimierz Sarnecki*, an index entry on p. 415; M. KOMASZYŃSKI, *Piękna królowa*, pp. 177–180.

failed even with the King, despite some of his nearest and dearest (e.g. the eldest son Jakub Sobieski with his wife) and including such major Polish clergy as the Archbishop of Gniezno and Cardinal Michał Stefan Radziejowski⁹⁶ and the Bishop of Poznań, Stanisław Witwicki, powerful magnates (Hieronim Augustyn Lubomirski⁹⁷ and other members of his family and, in addition, the Lithuanian brothers Kazimierz Jan and Benedykt Paweł Sapieha) and also several foreign diplomats (esp. the Papal nuncio Andrea Santacroce) belonged amongst the Emperor's supporters.⁹⁸ However, the Imperials lost a key player on the Polish power board, the great Polish crown *hetman* Stanisław Jan Jabłonowski. In 1695 this man had sided with the Queen and with French diplomacy.⁹⁹

Conclusions

Hermann Jakob Czernin von Chudenitz was the last ambassador that Emperor Leopold I sent to the Court of the Polish King John III Sobieski. When comparing his mission with those of his predecessors at the turn of the 1680's and 1690's, it is evident that they were all trying to ensure the continuation of the military cooperation between the two sovereigns who were active within the Holy League. All of these missions were relatively short because the Emperor only sent his deputies of the first rank to Poland for the length of the duration of the *Sejm*. Therefore Czernin spent just a little over three months in Warsaw (from the 1st February to the 8th May), and if there were not problems with the final audience, he would have left still a few weeks earlier.¹⁰⁰ From a factual standpoint, it was an unsuccessful diplomatic mission, because Count Czernin never actually spoke

96 The previous ambassador Count Nostitz promised Cardinal Radziejowski 1,000 ducats (i.e. 4,000 guildens) and, according to the Emperor's orders, a luxury coach would be purchased that had been promised to the Cardinal's confidante, Lady Towiańska. See the instructions in SOA Třeboň, JH, RA Černínů, temporarily in Kart. 284, fol. 15–16.

97 Czernin had prepared a pension for him amounting to 3,000 thalers, i.e. 4,500 guildens. ÖStA Wien, FHKA, Alte Hofkammer, Hoffinanz Österreich, Bücher, Bd. 999, Protokoll Registratur 1694, fol. 693, a record of 31. 12. 1694.

98 Cf. a list of visits that is unexpectedly stored in SOA Zámorsk, RA Colloredo-Mannsfeld, non-inventoried, temporarily in Kart. 31; see more in regard to the dispute concerning the first audience with the Cardinal in J. WOLIŃSKI (ed.), *Kazimierz Sarnecki*, p. 204.

99 Cf. the Ambassador's instructions from 3. 1. 1695 in SOA Třeboň, JH, RA Černínů, temporarily in Kart. 284, fol. 11–24, here esp. fol. 15–17. Jabłonowski had already been promised a pension from the Emperor in the amount of 4,000 thalers per year. Czernin brought this money with him and was supposed to pay it to him provided that he continued to support the imperial policy. This did not happen, however, so when he was departing he left it with the Imperial Resident. See ÖStA Wien, FHKA, Alte Hofkammer, Hoffinanz Österreich, Bücher, Bd. 1003, Protokoll Registratur 1695, fol. 530, a record from 10. 10. 1695.

100 His mission therefore did not end prematurely, as is believed by Z. HOJDA – E. CHODĚJOVSKÁ (eds.), *Heřman Jakub Černín*, I, pp. 124–126.

to the *Sejm* (since the *Sejm* had prematurely dissolved) nor did he later negotiate any military aid from the King for the Hungarian front. In regard to its ceremonial aspects the mission nearly ended as a fiasco when the Polish King refused to grant the Ambassador his final audience for a long time. Eventually though he did agree to provide it; in any case Czernin's mission had definitely contributed to the escalation of tension between the two rulers, because John III Sobieski was demanding satisfaction from the Emperor based on the incident that occurred in Warsaw Castle at the beginning of the March, during which a Polish Squire died after being hit by the Imperial Ambassador's hajduk.

Count Czernin cannot be seriously blamed for these failures, however, because he did everything that he could that was in his power. He prepared systematically for his mission and he did not hesitate to invest considerable resources from his own pocket. The Emperor gave him 10,000 guildens, while during his mission Czernin himself spent approximately 50,000 guildens. In many ways he also tried to act as if the Emperor himself had arrived in Warsaw. This is apparent not only from the innovative composition of his Court, but also in the manner of his accommodation. Hermann Jakob Czernin was surrounded by cca. 85 people, while with the connivance of the Emperor, it was just for this mission that introduced the function of Marshal to his court. His court also included two very experienced diplomats – the Legation Secretary Hövel and the Imperial Resident Schiemunsky both of whom had knowledge of the local environment. He also had a personal guard comprising 12 hajduks. He definitely did not shame the Emperor even by his Warsaw dwelling when he refused a smaller house that was located in the city centre and instead rented a large palace in the suburbs, which cost him 1,200 guildens. The first floor of the palace housed a large suite composed, in accordance with the Vienna Hofburg, of a hall, two anterooms, an audience room in which a canopy was installed and a retirada. Because of all these changes he also issued new house rules to his servants to inform them how they should behave in these premises and who would be able to access which rooms. Then he received in this apartment the first visits of prominent Polish and Lithuanian ministers and magnates and attempted to use their influence on the King. He did receive strong support from the Princes Lubomirski and Sapieha, from the Polish Primate and Cardinal Radziejowski and from the Papal Nuncio Santacroce. However, he was not able to get the King's closest associates, who indulged themselves by listening to French diplomacy, on his side and this also contributed to the failure of his mission.

So after leaving the country Czernin had no good reason for rejoicing because the mission had cost him a lot of money from his own pocket and it had failed but nevertheless he assumed that this "sacrifice" on behalf of the Emperor would eventually be paid back somehow. He had not only spent his money but he had also served the Emperor despite the health problems that had befallen him. During his relatively short stay in Warsaw

twice he proved to be so ill that he had to lie down and to avoid participating in social life. In February he felt cold for the first time. For his first audience with the King he already arrived with a cold, and during the second half of February for a few days he had to lie down to recover.¹⁰¹ As soon as he had recovered a different malady had already shown up. During the second half of March 36-years old Czernin suffered from a leg-pain that was similar to gout – his left leg was causing him such torment that he was not even able to get out and about socially.¹⁰² And as if that was not enough, in early March the Ambassador accidentally pinched his thumb when getting into a coach, so that he was unable to write for a few days.¹⁰³ But Czernin endured all of this happily because he was anticipating the Emperor's reward. He did indeed long for higher positions and for prestigious titles. Apparently he was even thinking about the Order of the Golden Fleece.¹⁰⁴ Although he never did receive this Order (because of the War of the Spanish Succession), the Monarch eventually came to appreciate his diverse merits (including his huge loans, his diplomatic service, his assistance at the Bohemian *Landtag*, etc.) and Hermann Jakob was later to become the *Obersthofmeister* of the Kingdom of Bohemia and eventually the *Oberstburggraf* of the Kingdom of Bohemia, i.e. the top provincial official in Bohemia. Czernin thereby joined the ranks of many other wealthy and influential nobles whose diplomatic service helped with their progress at the Court or in the ranks of the provincial administration.¹⁰⁵

101 SOA Třeboň, JH, RA Černínů, temporarily in Kart. 287, fol. 35, a letter from Hermann Jakob Czernin to Gottlieb von Windischgrätz, a concept, 3. 3. 1695, Warsaw. He is apologising that he had never reacted before, but this is because “*mein bieshero allzeit habende stek huesten undt febrile alterationes, die mich auch einige tag betliglich gehalten*”.

102 Ibidem, fol. 55, Hermann Jakob Czernin to his brother Thomas Zacchaeus, a concept, 31. 3. 1695, Warsaw. Ibidem, fol. 37, Hermann Jakob Czernin to Gottlieb von Windischgrätz, a concept, 31. 3. 1695, Warsaw: “*Ich lige seither Montag mit einen rotlauff an linkhen fueß, so dem podagra ganz emdlich (?) sehet, in beth angenaglet, sollicitire aber demnach meine urlaubsaudienz...*”.

103 Ibidem, fol. 35, Post scriptum to a letter from Hermann Jakob Czernin to Gottlieb von Windischgrätz, a concept, 3. 3. 1695, Warsaw.

104 SOA Plzeň, the section in Klášter, RA Nosticů (Planá), Kart. 55, a letter from Karl Maximilian Lažanský von Buková to Christoph Wenzel von Nostitz, 16. 12. 1694, Prague: “*Diese ietzige application des hiesigen herrn landtmarschallen Exc. soll, wie man saget, mit seinen zimblichen zueuß und verschonung der cammer eine beförderung zum toison in das künfftige seyn.*”

105 Cf. Andreas PEČAR, *Die Ökonomie der Ehre. Der höfische Adel am Kaiserhof Karls VI. (1711–1740)*, Darmstadt 2003, pp. 41–53.

Text Appendix:

The edition of the house rules that Hermann Jakob Czernin von Chudenitz prepared for his servants during the period of his diplomatic mission to Poland in early 1695 (SOA Třeboň, JH, RA Černínů, temporarily in Kart. 285, fol. 33–35; there is a copy in SOA Zámorsk, RA Colloredo-Mannsfeld, non-inventoried, temporarily in Kart. 31, fol. 283–286)¹⁰⁶

*Ordnung, so ich in haus gehalten haben will*¹⁰⁷

1. *Unten beim dohr sollen die heyduken in den einen gewelb logiren undt gleichsamb aldar ihre corde gardt halten, einer beim dohr undt einer oben bey der sahl tier schieldtwacht stehen, sonsten aber ihr gewer bey der einfardt zuer parada aufhanken. Wan ich ausfahre, bies auf zwey, so zue haus bleiben, nach der in befelender ordnung mit mier gehen. Diesse werden in gehorsamb dependiren principaliter von den h. marschalk¹⁰⁸ als zur standtsparada geherigen, secundario auch von den hoffmeister¹⁰⁹ als zuer hoff- undt hausnoturfft gebräuchlich. NB. Diese heyduken sollen den zuetriedt zue mier in haus nicht weiter haben, als zue der ersten anticamera dier.*
2. *Die loquaian werden ihren standt in den sahl haben, alwo sie die gelegenheit des camins zuer wermung haben, 4 loquaian sollen taglich den dienst haben undt zwahr dergestalten, das 4 loquaian, welche den dienst haben, nie ausser haus geschieken, sondern nur die haus schickungen verrichten, und so viel meglich bey den zimmeren des tags bleiben, damit der sahl nie ohne leit seie, die 4, so nicht den dienst haben, zuer ausschiekung gebraucht werden, die zwei laufer sollen allemahl tag ein tag aus bey handen sein, umb solche etwas geschwiendt vor mich zue haben laufen khonnen, 2 loquaian werden aber destiniret, die vrembde zue bedienen. Wan ich aber ausfahre, sollen alle samendtlich mit mier der ihnen befelender ordnung nachgehen undt wan kein parada geschiet, auf die zwey, so die frembde zuebedienen destiniret, mit gehorsamb werden diese samendtlich kleich denen heyduken an den h. marschalk undt hoffmeister gewiessen. NB. Die loquaian*

106 Cf. Jiří KUBEŠ, *Reprezentativní funkce sídel vyšší šlechty z českých zemí (1500–1740)* [The Representative Function of the Residences of the Higher Nobility in the Czech Lands (1500–1740)], České Budějovice 2005 (An unpublished PhD thesis that was defended at the Institute of History of the Faculty of Arts of the University of South Bohemia), pp. 346–349.

107 Basically, I follow the rules of edition of the Archivschule Marburg, *Grundsätze für die Textbearbeitung im Fachbereich Historische Hilfswissenschaften* (Stand: 26. 4. 2009), URL: <http://www.archivschule.de/uploads/Ausbildung/Grundsätze_fuer_die_Textbearbeitung_2009.pdf> [cit. 8. 11. 2016].

108 The Marshal at Czernin's Court during his mission was a certain Baron Dillherr.

109 The Steward was Franz Xaver Locher.

werden den zuetriedt zu mier bies in die andere anticamera haben, nach verichter post, oder was zue thuen were, siech wieder in sahl gleich retiriren.

3. Trompeter undt unterofficier haben ihre aufundthaldt in der ersten anticamera, auch die trompeter in sahl, besonders wan sie plassen undt sollen sich oftens da sehen lassen, besonders wan visiten siendt, in functionibus publicis werden mich solche in ausfahren bekleiten undt bedienen. Die trompeter werden auch von den h. marschalk alle abendt undt sonsten die ordinantzien, welche er bey mier zuevernemen hat, abholen undt die dienste, so ihnen anbefohlen werden, fleisig beobachten, ausser haus ohne erlaubnus nicht gehen, weniger plassen. Die trompeter werden mit den gehorsamb als zuer hofstadtparada geherigen den h. marschalk angewiesen, die übrigen unterofficier dahien ihr dienst sie zeigt. NB. Den zuetriedt sollen diese weiters nicht haben als in mein andere anticamera.
4. Der hoffmeister, aufwarter undt stalverseher werden ihre aufundthaldt in der anderen anticamera haben, der hoffmeister seinen hausdienst obsicht, wie er particulariter instruiert, beobachten, die aufwarter allendthalben mier die cur machen, bey viesiten allen in der anticamera, sonsten aber taglich einer, der den dienst in setzung, der speissen, mit welchen der hoffmeister aus der khuechl vorangehet, auch haben wierdt, sich befinden, damit in aller verfallenheit iemanden an der handt habe. Der stolverseher aber auch die anticamera frequentiren, principaliter aber den stol beobachten, ohne anmeldung solle kheiner ausser haus gehen, umb das ich sie, es seye wehme, zuem gebrauch beyhanden habe, der hoffmeister des haus- undt der stolverseher des stolwesens wegen sollen alle abendt bey mein schlaffengehen ordinantz begeren. In ceremonialibus werden disse sich auch bey dem h. marschal anmelden, welcher siech bey mier zuebelernen hat. NB. Diese haben der acces zue mier bies in mein audientz cimer, nach verichter sach sich aber in die anticamera zue retiriren haben.
5. Khammerdiener undt pagien, wan ich mich in audientien befinde, sollen bey der tier in der anderen anticamera sein, so aber in der retirada bey der tier in audientz ziemer, die camerdiener sollen, ein tag nach den anderen, ihren dienst haben, die pagien aber taglich ohne exception alle 4, jedoch solle khein camerdiener ohne erlaubnus ausser haus gehen. Diese werden, wer zue mier viel, solchen ansagen, besonders wan ich in der retirada bien, wo ich rue haben mues undt solle khein mensch ohne anmelden zue mier gelassen werden, ausser meines h. vetters¹¹⁰ undt h. Bockelkamp.¹¹¹ NB. Die khammerdiener undt pagien haben den zuetriedt zue mier bis in die retirada, nach verrichter sach sie sich aber vor die tier retiriren sollen.

110 Baron Wenzel Czernin von Chudenitz.

111 Ludolph Bockelkamp, Czernin's old friend and confidant.

6. Die stolleit haben zwahr ihr verbliben in dem stollen bey ihren pferden, wan ich aber in publico ausgehe, sollen besonders die reitknechte zue meiner parada stadt loquaien auch mit mier gehen. Die 8 rapen werden destiniret vor die 2 schwartze wagen zue bedienung der cavaglier, den marschalk undt wer solche wagen zue brauchen hette, mein postwagele khan auch gebraucht werden, worzue bey der nacht die 7 braun undt 6 kleinere scheken (?), bey dach aber die 4 kleine breindl gebrauchet werden khonnen, damit die schek- und braunzuech durch fierung der officier nicht in discredito gelangen, die reitroß aber durch den Hans Ernest, kleich ich ihme instruiren werde, exertiret werden undt sollen solche auch gebraucht werden, wan ein officier auszueschiken, welcher reiten khan, kleich es bey h. graffen Carl Waldstein¹¹² gebräuchlich gewesen, der Hans Ernest solle fleisig die anticamera frequentiren, damit ich ihme offters bey henden habe undt sonsten seinen stel treu fleisig beobachten, auch wan was von pferden zue verkhauffen oder zue verhandlen were, mit profit nachsehen, warzue er sich des h. doctors¹¹³ diener gebrauchen konte als ein roshandler undt wan was vorfiele, miech avisiren, allein indeme behuetsamb gehen, das nichts unter meinen sondern seinen oder des drieten gehe, wie ich mit ihme weiters mindtlich reden, also hat es auch sein verstadt, mit denen wagen principaliter umb geldt zue verkhauffen, secundario umb etwas reiscalessen, raren futterwerck oder anderen neüen nitzlichen waren ohne schaden, sondern ehender mit profit zueverhandlen, jedoch die paradawagen ehender nicht als bies geendichten reichstag wekzugeben, warumb sich unter der handt zue bemiehen. NB. Der stolleite zuetrit solle sein gleich loquaien, nicht aber weiter als denen heyduken zuegewissen.

112 Karl Ferdinand von Waldstein, who served as the Imperial Ambassador in Poland in 1683.

113 Dr. Eberl from Mladá Boleslav, Czernin's doctor during the period of the Polish mission.