

Jiří M. HAVLÍK

The Extraordinary Imperial Ambassadors to the Conclave during the 1667–1730 Period*

Abstract: *This study focuses on the practice of the appointing of extraordinary imperial ambassadors and representatives for papal elections during the years 1667–1730. To describe the development and the changes in the approach to this issue during the period monitored the author selected three model cases – the last mission of Cardinal Ernst Adalbert von Harrach at a conclave in 1667, the appointing of the extraordinary secular ambassador to the conclave, Anton Florian von Lichtenstein, in 1689 and the mission of Antonio Rambaldo di Collalto who, in 1730, collaborated with the ordinary Imperial Resident, Cardinal Cienfuegos. The study is based on the family archives of Harrach (held in the Österreichisches Staatsarchiv in Vienna), and of Collalto and Kaunitz (both are held in the Moravský zemský archiv in Brno) and on the diplomatic correspondence and the recorded agenda of the Imperial Embassy in Rome that is preserved in the Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchiv in Vienna.*

The period in question can be divided into three different sections. For the papal elections in 1667, 1669 and 1676 Emperor Leopold I appointed those cardinals who favoured the House of Habsburg. After the death of Pope Innocent XI in 1689 the situation changed to the detriment of the Habsburg dynasty and Leopold I decided to appoint an extraordinary secular ambassador. Anton Florian von Liechtenstein, in cooperation with Cardinal Johann von Goess, was supposed to correct the steps of the not so reliable Cardinal Protector Germaniae et Hispaniae Francesco Maria de' Medici. Liechtenstein's task was to build-up prestige and to establish a permanent embassy at the Holy See. During the years 1691–1730 the practice of appointing extraordinary secular ambassadors to the conclave had already stabilised – mostly they were imperial counts who intervened with total respect in the events that took place around the papal election.

Keywords: *Imperial Diplomacy – Conclave – Papal Elections – Early Modern Era – Leopold I – Charles VI – Antonio Rombaldo Collalto – Anton Florian von Liechtenstein*

The conclaves that took place during the years 1667–1676 were different in many ways from those that took place later in the years 1689–1691 and in the years 1700–1730, specifically in regard to the manner in which the imperial interests were represented.¹ Therefore, for the Holy Roman Emperor, the papal election

* This article was written thanks to the research realized in the frame of the standard project of the Grant Agency of the Czech Republic No. 13–12939S *Bohemian and Moravian Nobility in the Diplomatic Service of the Austrian Habsburgs (1640–1740)*.

was serious for multiple reasons.² These were primarily related to the territories of the Apennine peninsula subordinated to the Roman Emperor and comprised his fiefdom,³ his cooperation with the Spanish branch of the Habsburg dynasty, which, until the year 1700, dominated much of today's Italy (specifically Kingdom of Naples). The Roman Emperor had also an interest in cooperating with Pope in the recatholisation (and the Catholic reform) of its imperial possessions. From the late 1670's papal subsidies were needed for the war against the Ottoman Empire.

I restricted the period selected to the years between 1667 and 1730 in order to be able to describe the different attitudes that Leopold I (1640–1705, Roman Emperor since 1658), Charles VI (1685–1740, Roman Emperor since 1711) and their envoys and representatives adopted to the conclave.

The Emperor's representation at the Holy See was not only through his imperial diplomats. Often a more important role was played by the cardinals-protectors of Germany and Austria.⁴ Those were the cardinals, to whom were confided a particular solicitude

-
- 1 Very little has been written in Czech historiography regarding the history of papal elections and the relations between the Kingdom of Bohemia and the Papal State. This is also why it is necessary to specifically emphasise the usefulness of those compendia that do pay attention to this topic. They should not really suffice, however, even though the impression may be given that all the “grand narratives” of political history have already been written. František X. HALAS, *Fenomén Vatikán. Idea, dějiny a současnost papežství: Diplomacie Svatého stolce. České země a Vatikán* [The Vatican Phenomenon: The concept, the history and the current status of the papacy: the diplomacy of the Holy See. The Czech Lands and the Vatican], Brno 2013; Tomáš ČERNUŠÁK et al., *The Papacy and the Czech Lands. A History of Mutual Relations*, Praha 2016. When I was preparing this paper this publication was not available to me. From the early modern conclaves Czech historiography paid increased attention for the last time to the election of Pope Innocent X in 1644. Ferdinand MENČÍK, *Volba papeže Innocence X.* [The Election of Pope Innocent X], Prague 1894; Zdeněk KALISTA, *Císař Ferdinand III. a papež Innocenc X. v prvních letech pontifikátu* [Emperor Ferdinand III and Pope Innocent X during the early years of the latter's pontification], *Český časopis historický* (hereinafter referred to as ČČH) 33, 1927, No. 3, pp. 548–579 and its continuation in ČČH 34, 28, 1928, pp. 280–321, 574–612. From the Austrian environment it is necessary to mention a thorough treatise regarding the election of Clement XI and the subsequent imperial representation in Rome during the early years of the 18th Century. Friedrich POLLEROß, *Die Kunst der Diplomatie. Auf den Spuren des kaiserlichen Botschafters Leopold Joseph Graf von Lamberg (1653–1706)*, Petersberg 2010. In regard to Lamberg's mission to Rome see pp. 302–504; *ibid.* in regard to the conclave in the year 1700.
 - 2 A lot has already been written about the history of papal elections. For basic bibliography see, for example, URL: <<https://www.csun.edu/~hcfl004/Conclave-Bibliography.html>> [cit. 15. 8. 2016].
 - 3 The territories of Mantua, Milan, Parma, Modena and Mirandola were dependent on the Holy Roman Empire to varying degrees.
 - 4 During the period monitored the function of the Cardinals *Protectores Germaniae* was carried-out sequentially by Girolamo Colonna (1644–1666), Friedrich von Hessen-Darmstadt (1666–1682), Carlo Pio di Savoia (1682–1689), Francesco Maria de' Medici (1689–1701), Leopold von Kollonitsch (1701–1707), Johann Philipp von Lamberg (1707–1712), Christian August von Sachsen-Zeitz (1712–1725) and Wolfgang von Schrattenbach (1726–1738). The Cardinals *Protectores Austriae* were Ernst Adalbert

for the interest of some nation (state). Since the 13th century Cardinal Protectors served as representatives or orators of sovereigns, religious orders etc. in then Roman Curia. Popes have repeatedly tried to ban this practice, pointing out that the cardinals primary loyalty should be given to the Bishop of Rome and that they should not serve any of the reigning monarchs. The first of these prohibitions had already been declared by Martin V in the year 1425, while forty years later Pius II, after he had been considering favouring the monarchs as being incompatible with the responsibilities of the Roman Curia echoed his opinion. He did allow some exceptions, however. Starting with Innocent VIII and Alexander VI this function gradually became recognised – including through a written confirmation, whereby the Pope approved of this function and accepted the Cardinals Protectors as representatives of their own countries at the same level as those of an ambassador. Yet even Clement IX himself repeated his objections to this function. However what it really represented was more a protest against the inconvenient Friedrich von Hessen-Darmstadt (1616–1682).⁵

Leopold I relied on them entirely and until 1689 he did not appoint any extraordinary ambassadors to the conclave. Also, during the papal elections in 1667, 1669 and 1676, there were not even any ordinary imperial ambassadors in Rome. Although Charles VI's manner of procedure differed in many respects, even during his reign the Cardinals Protectors had not lost their importance. In several cases the Emperor appointed as his trustee another cardinal. In this manner, during the conclave in 1691, the role of the

von Harrach (1655–1667) and Carlo Pio di Savoia (1673–1689). After 1689 the Cardinals Protectores Germaniae also held this function. There is a summary work in regard to this topic by Josef WODKA, *Zur Geschichte der nationalen Protektorate der Kardinäle an der römischen Kurie*, Innsbruck – Leipzig 1938. For basic biographical information and the confirmation of participation at the conclave, unless it is stated otherwise, in regard to individual cardinals I am utilising the following source: Salvador MIRANDA, *Cardinals of the Holy Roman Church*, URL: <<http://www2.fiu.edu/~mirandas/cardinals.htm>> [cit. 13. 7. 2016]. For the biographical data concerning the church dignitaries I refer to URL: <<http://www.catholic-hierarchy.org/>> [cit. 13. 7. 2016]; Erwin GATZ – Stephan M. JANKER (Hg.), *Die Bischöfe des Heiligen Römischen Reiches: Ein biographisches Lexikon*, Bd. III (1648–1803), Berlin 2001; *Dizionario biografico degli Italiani* (URL: <<http://www.treccani.it/biografico/presentazione.html>> [cit. 14. 8. 2016]. For data concerning the sojourns of ambassadors at various courts and also for personal information concerning them – unless stated otherwise: Ludwig BITTNER – Lothar GROß, *Repertorium der diplomatischen Vertreter aller Länder seit dem Westfälischen Frieden (1648), I. Band (1648–1715)*, Berlin 1936; Friedrich HAUSMANN, *Repertorium der diplomatischen Vertreter aller Länder seit dem Westfälischen Frieden (1648), II. Band (1716–1763)*, Zürich 1950; Heribert STURM, *Biographisches Lexikon zur Geschichte der böhmischen Länder*, München 1984; *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie* (ADB), Leipzig 1875–1912 (available online at URL: <<https://de.wikisource.org/wiki/ADB>>).

5 Ulrich KÖCHLI, *Trophäe im Glaubenskampf? Der Konvertit und Kardinal Friedrich Landgraf von Hessen-Darmstadt (1616–1682)*, in: Anne Karsten (Hg.), *Jagd nach dem roten Hut, Kardinalskarrieren im barocken Rom*, Göttingen 2004, pp. 186–204, here p. 200; Arkadiusz WOJTYŁA, “*Cardinale langravio*” i “*Conte savio*” – *dygnitarze Rzeszy w barokowym Rzymie*, *Quart* 2, 2007, No. 4., pp. 28–33.

Emperor's trustee was played dually by the Cardinal and the experienced diplomat Johann von Goëss, the Bishop of Gurk (1612–1696), while the Cardinal *Protector Germaniae, Hispaniae et Austriae* at that time was Francesco Maria de' Medici (1660–1711).⁶ Similarly the protector of Germany and Austria and Bishop of Olomouc, Wolfgang Hannibal von Schrattenbach (1660–1738), repeatedly left the initiative to Álvaro Cienfuegos Villazón (1657–1739). Many of the cardinals understood their role as representing “providing service to the Emperor at the conclave”.⁷

Unlike the ordinary ambassadors these cardinals did not have to be resident in Rome. Many of them only came to Rome on specific occasions – of which the conclave was one of the most important. They were often the ones who headed the faction that discussed and voted in the Emperor's interest. It was also they who actually pronounced the royal veto (*vota exclusiva*) against uncooperative candidates.⁸ The decision regarding its applicability was ultimately their responsibility. It was frequently an art of the possible, however. The conclaves that took place in the 17th and the 18th Centuries (and subsequently) comprised very complex negotiations, whereby between 50 and 70 cardinals participated in voting of whom more than a two-thirds majority was needed for electing a successful candidate. In several instances the cardinals actually unanimously agreed about the person who was to become the future pope. In 1655, prior to the conclave, Ernst Adalbert von Harrach evaluated such a situation as follows: “*I regard any prediction made about the outcome of the upcoming election in this conclave as being all dubious and uncertain ...*”⁹ Twelve years

6 Johann von Goëss was already supposed to lead the negotiations during the conclave in 1689. However, he failed to arrive in Rome on time and was not permitted to even enter the conclave. In regard to the more informations see below.

7 For example, in 1730 Cardinal Schönborn was talking about “*il servizio di Sua Maesta al Conclave*” (service to the Emperor on conclave). Cardinal Schönborn to Antonio Rambaldo di Collalto, 18. 4. 1730 at the Moravský zemský archiv [Moravian Land Archive] in Brno (hereinafter referred to as MZA Brno), G 169–The Collalto Family Archive, Brtnice (hereinafter referred to as G 169), Kart. 113, inv. No. 2140, sign. VII 2 3, fol. 5r.

8 Some sovereigns of Catholic states (esp. French, Spain and Emperor) applied the prerogative to prevent the election of some candidate. This *votum* pronounced during the conclave usually some cardinal instructed by sovereign. For the development of the *vota exclusiva* see: Drahomír SUCHÁNEK, *Ius exclusivae, Právo exkluzivity při papežských volbách* [Ius exclusivae. The privilege of exclusion by papal elections], Praha 2012; Klaus COCHLOVIUS, *Die Papstwahl und das Veto der katholischen Staaten*, Greifswald 1910; Alexander EISLER, *Das Veto der katholischen Staaten bei der Papstwahlen seit dem Ende des 16. Jahrhunderts*, Wien 1907; Erich MACK, *Das Recht der Exklusive bei der Papstwahl*, Borna – Leipzig 1906; Johannes Baptist SAGMÜLLER, *Das Recht der Exklusive in der Papstwahl*, Archiv für katholischen Kirchenrecht 73, 1895, pp. 193–256; Ludwig WAHRMUND, *Das Ausschliessungsrecht (Jus Exclusivae) der katholischen Staaten Österreich, Frankreich und Spanien bei den Papstwahlen*, Wien 1888; Ludwig WAHRMUND, *Beiträge zur Geschichte des Exklusionsrechtes bei den Papstwahlen aus römischen Archiven*, Wien 1890.

9 “*Dico dunque esser molto dubbio il pronostico et incerte giudizio della futura elezione nel presente Conclave...*” Discorso sopra il conclave della sede vacante d’Innocentio X. nell’anno 1655, Österreichisches

later he considered the Spanish faction, with which he was then working, as being so weak that at best it could only prevent the election of a Pope hostile to the Habsburgs.¹⁰ In the years 1655, 1689 and 1730 more than ten *papabili*¹¹ were involved in the game. The actual imperial instructions were to repeatedly suggest a large number of alternatives and only rarely did they manage to succeed in pushing through the first one chosen.

Some of the other cardinals were suggested to the Pope by the Emperor with the purpose of their interference in the politics of the Roman Curia and in the conclave itself, while he was obliging others in various different ways. During the elections that took place between the years 1667–1676 Leopold I relied solely on the cardinals and did not send any extraordinary secular diplomat to the conclaves of 1667, 1669 or 1676. When during the years 1689 and 1691 issues concerning Anton Florian von Liechtenstein's (1656–1721) accession as an extraordinary ambassador were repeatedly addressed during the conclave, the fact that in 1655 Ferdinand III had appointed Marc-Antonio V. Colonna († 1659) as an extraordinary ambassador – an observer – was overlooked.¹² Since 1689, however, in every case an extraordinary ambassador had been coming there to both support and instruct the cardinals.

Apart from the “political”, “crown” or “national” cardinals who were acting in the interests of the various superpowers, in the Cardinal College itself frequently a more important role was played by the cardinals-nephews of the former popes, who usually led the factions that were assembled from amongst the cardinals who were created in the time of the pontificate of their relatives. During the second half of the 17th Century the most important role was played specifically by the nephews of Alexander VII¹³ and Clement

Staatsarchiv Wien (= ÖStA Wien), Allgemeines Verwaltungsarchiv (= AVA), Familienarchiv (= FA) Harrach, HS 195, without any pagination.

- 10 Cardinal Harrach to Leopold I, 3. 6. 1667, quoted in accordance with Ludwig WURMBRAND, *Das Ausschliessungs-Recht (Jus Exclusive) der katholischen Staaten Österreich, Frankreich und Spanien bei den Papstwahlen*, Wien 1888, p. 276.
- 11 This term is commonly used for such cardinals (other priests or also secular persons), which have enough chance (thanks to a larger count of potential voters), prerequisites (due to their personal quality), power and support of statesman and nobility to become a pope.
- 12 P. Scarlatti to Leopold I, 20. 3. 1691: *Replica alle proposizioni del Principe Antonio di Linchtestein in ordine al modo, che egli dovrà tenere in congiuntura d'assumere il crattare di Ambasciatore di Sacra Maesta Cesarea in Roma*, ÖStA Wien, Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchiv (= HHStA), Staatenabteilungen (= StAbt), Rom Korrespondenz (= Rom Korr.), Kart. 70, fol. 180r–183v; for the letters of Pompeo Scarlatti, Johann von Goëss, Giacomo Emerix de Mathiis and Antonio Florian de Liechtenstein in regard to both conclaves see ÖStA Wien, HHStA, StAbt, Rom Korr., Kart.es 67 and 70.
- 13 Alexander VII, i.e. Fabio Chigi (1599–1667, pope since 1655); his nephew Flavio Chigi (1631–1693).

X¹⁴ and of Urban VIII.¹⁵ Innocent XI¹⁶ and Innocent XII¹⁷ refused to support nepotism and therefore additional groups of their cardinals were still being recruited – *the zelanti* – and also of some of Alexander VII’s cardinals – the *squadron volante*.¹⁸ All of these “apolitical” groups more or less declared their desire for independence from the current international political situation in Europe and, in regard to the candidates for the tiara they highly-rated their personal piety, their “pastoral quality” and the efforts by means of which their candidate was willing to defend religious liberty and independence from the secular superpowers. In some cases they even refused to respect the royal veto and consistently voted for those candidates who had been excluded.¹⁹ The national cardinals thereby tried to find ways in which to bring the cardinals nephews, *the zelanti* and/or also the *squadron volante* onto their side, or to choose the most suitable cardinal from amongst them more frequently, relatively speaking.²⁰

The purpose of this study, however, is not to describe the changes that took place in the individual factions during the period monitored nor all the peripeteia of a total of nine conclaves that took place during it. We must also abandon the possibility of being able to pay attention to the missions of all the representatives and imperial crown-cardinals during the 1667–1730 period. The extreme cases are represented by the last mission of Ernst Adalbert von Harrach, by the secondment of Anton Florian von Liechtenstein as the first extraordinary secular ambassador to the conclave and of Antonio Rambaldo di Collalto (1681–1740), who, in 1730, was working in cooperation with the experienced Cardinal Cienfuegos. In regard to these missions we monitor both the overall developments and the differences in the approaches of Leopold I and Charles VI to the selection of their representatives in the papal election.

14 Clement X, i. e. Emilio Bonaventura Altieri (1590–1676, pope since 1670); his nephew Paluzzo Paluzzi Altieri degli Albertoni (1623–1698).

15 Urban VIII, i. e. Maffeo Barberini (1568–1644, pope since 1623); his nephews Francesco Barberini and Antonio Barberini, Jr. (1607–1671).

16 Innocent XI, i. e. Benedetto Odescalchi (1611–1689, pope since 1676).

17 Innocent XII, i. e. Antonio Pignatelli (1615–1700, pope since 1691).

18 Stefano TABACCHI, *Cardinali zelanti e fazioni cardinalizie tra fine Seicento e inizio Settecento*, in: Gianvittorio Signorotto – Maria Antoinetta Visceglia (eds.), *La corte di Roma tra Cinque e Seicento „teatro“ della politica europea*, Roma 1998, pp. 139–165; Gianvittorio SIGNOROTTO, *Lo squadron volante, I cardinali „liberi“ e la politica europea nella seconda metà del XVII secolo*, in: ibidem, pp. 93–138; Marie-Louise RODEN, *Church politics in Seventeenth-Century Rome: Cardinal Decio Azzolino, Queen Christina of Sweden and the Squadron Volante*, Stockholm 2000.

19 Benedetto Odescalchi in the years 1670 and 1676, when he was actually elected; Gregorio Barbarigo in the years 1689 and 1691 and Renato Imperiali in the years 1724 and 1730. Other examples would also be numerous.

20 For the relationships systems in the Cardinal College in the Early Modern Age see Christoph WEBER, *Senatus Divinus, verborgene Strukturen im Kardinalskollegium der frühen Neuzeit (1500–1800)*, Frankfurt am Main 1996; S. TABACCHI, *Cardinali zelanti*.

Table 1: The List of the Imperial Representatives and Imperial Ambassadors to Conclave, 1667–1730

Conclave	Imperial Representative / Ambassador	New Pope
2. – 20. 6. 1667	Cardinals Ernest Adalbert von Harrach Friedrich von Hessen-Darmstadt	Giulio Rospigliosi – Clement IX
20. 12. 1669–29. 4. 1670	Cardinals Friedrich von Hessen-Darmstadt Carlo Pio di Savoia	Emilio Bonaventura Altieri – Clement X
2. 8. – 21. 9. 1676	Cardinal Carlo Pio di Savoia	Benedetto Odescalchi – Innocent XI
23. 8. – 6. 10. 1689	First Secular Extraordinary Ambassador Anton Florian von Liechtenstein	Pietro Vitto Ottoboni – Alexander VIII
12. 2. – 12. 7. 1691	Anton Florian von Liechtenstein	Antonio Pignatelli – Innocent XII
9. 10. – 23. 11. 1700	Leopold Joseph von Lamberg	Gianfrancesco Albani – Clement XI
31. 3. – 8. 5. 1721	Franz Ferdinand Kinsky in cooperate with Cardinal Michael Friedrich Althann	Michelangelo Conti – Innocent XIII
20. 3. – 29. 5. 1724	Maxmilian Ulrich von Kaunitz	Pietro Francesco Orsini – Benedict XIII
5. 3. – 12. 7. 1730	Antonio Rambaldo di Collalto	Lorenzo Corsini – Clement XII

Ernst Adalbert von Harrach (1598–1667) in the year 1667

The personality of the Archbishop of Prague and, since 1626, Cardinal Ernst Adalbert von Harrach does not need any introduction within the Czech environment.²¹ He attended in total three conclaves – in the years 1644, 1655 and 1667. During the last two of these he achieved partial success in several scrutinia. For example on the 9th June 1667, when a total of seven cardinals voted for him, his opportunities seemed very promising. During the entire prior monitoring period, none of the imperial cardinals had ever received such a large number of votes. At the same conclave, Friedrich von Hessen-Darmstadt also received two and four votes (on the 8th and the 13th June), but his chances still remained pretty slim.²²

21 On the recent records see Alessandro CATALANO, *La Boemia e la riconquista delle coscienze. Ernst Adalbert von Harrach e la controriforma in Europa centrale (1620–1667)*, Roma 2005, Czech translation: Alessandro CATALANO, *Zápas o svědomí: Kardinál Arnošt Vojtěch z Harrachu (1598–1667) a protireformace v Čechách*, Praha 2008.

22 ÖStA Wien, AVA, FA Harrach, Fam. in spec., Kart. 173.

In 1667, Leopold gave all of the three Imperial Cardinals the instructions in accordance with which they should proceed. A month before Alexander VII's death the Viennese *Reichskanzlei* instructed both Harrach and Guidobald von Thun (1616–1668)²³ to travel as soon as possible to Rome and, before entering the conclave, to meet with the Cardinal Protector of Germany Friedrich von Hessen-Darmstadt for a mutual consultation and also to visit the Spanish Ambassador, Cardinal Federico Sforza (1603–1676), the other Spanish cardinals and the extraordinary ambassador,²⁴ to reach agreement on their subsequent joint procedure. At that time Leopold I was talking only about the pope, who would be able to stabilise the situation and to unite the Church during these difficult times.²⁵ Apparently specific names were not mentioned until the actual meeting, which took place on the 1st June, i.e. the day prior to the joint entry of the Imperial and the Spanish cardinals to the conclave.

Harrach was welcomed at the gates of Rome on the 30th May 1667 by his agent, Michele Orsucci, and also by Johann Friedrich von Waldstein (1642–1694, Archbishop of Prague since 1675) with two six-horse carriages. One of the carriages belonged to Waldstein and the other to Johann Friedrich von Trautmannsdorff (1619–1696), who had remained in Rome during that time. The procession met Cardinal Sforza's carriage at the Porta del Popolo. From there, they went together to Waldstein's apartment where Harrach was housed. On the same day he visited the Cardinals Sforza, Friedrich von Hessen-Darmstadt, Lorenzo Raggi (1615–1687) and also the Spanish Ambassador.²⁶ He then spent the next day receiving visitors.

23 Thun did not attend the election. He excused his absence by his being occupied with the details of the course of the Imperial Diet in Regensburg, which had escalated, especially after Louis XIV had invaded Flanders. Katrin KELLER – Alessandro CATALANO (Hg.), *Die Diarien und Tagzettel des Kardinals Ernst Adalbert von Harrach (1598–1667)*, Bd. 4, Wien – Köln – Weimar 2010, pp. 391; this record is from 16. 6. 1667.

24 This was Antonio Pedro Sancho Dávila y Osorio, Marquis de Astorgay Velada (1615–1689). He arrived in Rome on 26. 4. 1667. In his instructions Leopold I did not directly identify him.

25 "...*talem suffragiis suis Sanctae Romanae Ecclesiae Pontificem eligant, qui afflictiae Religionis Catholicae, totiusque Reipublicae Christianae salutem et tranquillitatem sibi quam maxime propositam habeat, et in Nos Augustamque Domum nostram peculiari benevolentiae sensu inclinet. In quo quantum momenti atque praesidii situm sit, tum ad turbulentissimum fidei in Romano Imperio statum restaurandum, tum ad auctoritatem eiusdem ac nostram, unde Religionis quoque catholicae securitas dependet, stabiendam...*" Instructions for Cardinal Harrach from 24. 4. 1667, ÖStA Wien, HHStA, StAbt, Rom Korr., Kart. 59, fol. 119r–122v.

26 Harrach's Diary of 1667 commences with his arrival in Rome. It also ends on 24. 7. while he was still staying in Rome. As in previous instances, Harrach was making quite detailed records about the events that were taking place during the conclave. K. KELLER – A. CATALANO (Hg.), *Die Diarien und Tagzettel*, Bd. 4, pp. 378, 380–396. The Conclaves from the years 1644 and 1655: Ibidem, Bd. 2, pp. 520–625 (1. 8. – 14. 9. 1644); Bd. 4, pp. 25–91 (7. 2. – 7. 4. 1655). Simultaneously he was making

During the election he wished to have the assistance of Waldstein and of Maximilian Ernst von Scherffenberg (1643–1713) as his conclavists. The papal bull prohibited him from doing so, however, thereby preventing him from appointing a relative as a conclavist.²⁷ Both of them then continued to observe the events taking place in the conclave but only from outside.

On the following day Harrach, together with Raggi and Sforza and already in his own carriage, visited the Spanish Ambassador *incognito* to discuss the candidates for the tiara again and also the joint procedure. In the course of these prior considerations the name of Cardinal Giulio Rospigliosi (1600–1669) had already been sounded-out as representing the second option,²⁸ while in fact it was not an ideal option at all. Harrach was confirming that for two or three years he himself had been talked about as potentially representing a provisional solution. This was essentially based on one specific factor – the exclusion of the possibility that a pro-French cardinal could emerge from the conclave.²⁹

The conclave was concluded in the early evening of the 2nd June 1667. When, after only eighteen days, it was Rospigliosi who emerged from the unanimous vote, the Spanish-Imperial party was able to talk about its success.³⁰ The first scrutiny took place on the 3rd June after the Opening Mass had been served by Francesco Barberini (1597–1679), the Dean of the Conclave. In accordance with the prescribed rules two scrutinia – morning and afternoon – were held every day, while the future pope could emerge from any of them.

To attend the conclave it was necessary to get-up early in the morning. Immediately after the cardinals had offered-up the prescribed prayers and served the mass, they had reached the period of the morning scrutinium, which usually lasted until lunchtime. After lunch they had two hours of rest prior to the afternoon scrutinium, which this time lasted until dinnertime. Thereby the cardinals did not have a lot of free time and had no other choice than to meet each other, to write letters and for other activities, stealing time from their sleep.³¹

So far the first scrutinium had not brought even a hint of a result. The most votes were awarded to Giovanni Battista Maria Pallotta (1594–1668), while lined up behind him in

card records for 1667 that begin on 27. 3. 1667 and end with the record of 17. 10. 1667. Ibidem, Bd. 7, pp. 795–914.

27 A record of 31. 5. 1667. Ibidem, Bd. 4, p. 379.

28 In addition to him they talked in the first place about Girolamo Farnese (1599–1668) and then about Scipione Pannocchieschi D'Elci (1600–1670), Girolamo Buonvisi (1607–1677) and Giambattista Spada (1597–1675). The most ardent support for Farnese came from Cardinal Sforza. Harrach commented that in such a situation he would have acted independently. The record of 1. 6. 1667. Ibidem.

29 Ibidem, Bd. 7, p. 801, the record of 14. 6. 1667.

30 Ludwig von PASTOR, *Geschichte der Päpste im Zeitalter des fürstlichen Absolutismus von der Wahl Innozenz' X. bis zum Tode Innozenz' XII. (1644–1700)*, XIV/1, Freiburg im Breisgau 1929, pp. 303–309.

31 K. KELLER – A. CATALANO (Hg.), *Die Diarien und Tagzettel*, Bd. 7, p. 797, the record of 4. 6. 1667.

close succession were Francesco Barberini and Carlo Carafa Della Spina (1611–1680). Only Harrach actually voted for Rospigliosi. Also added to the votes (*vota*) were the accessions (*accessi*) that the electors carried out at their own discretion after handing their votes to the scrutineers (i.e. the election adjudicators), who were appointed individually for each scrutinium. That day, however, the situation did not seem any clearer even after they had all been added together.³² Therefore fresh negotiations and discussions commenced, during which new figures appeared and also new coalitions were formed that supported the different candidates, together with the participation of additional conclave electors and then what was awaited was who could direct their actual development towards one party or towards the other.

The cardinals' decisions more or less constituted a "public secret" that was also influenced by news of world events and both personal and open letters that were sent either by individual rulers or by their representatives. At the same time messengers carrying news about the latest developments were leaving from the gates of the conclave on a daily basis. In June Harrach himself corresponded, amongst others, with his relatives Ferdinand Bonaventura von Harrach (1636–1706), Johann Friedrich and Karl Ferdinand von Waldstein (1634–1702), Johann von Goëss and also with the Emperor Leopold I.

Resisting against the election of Cardinal Rospigliosi was mainly cardinal-nephew of Alexander VII Flavio Chigi. Harrach in cooperation with Friedrich von Hessen-Darmstadt did not manage to persuade him otherwise until the 17th June. On that day he recorded that Rospigliosi's conclavists had brought him cold chocolate to taste. Harrach, however, refused it, saying that he does not drink chocolate.³³

During the morning scrutinium on the 20th June there was not much that would suggest a successful outcome of the elections however. When it ended Cardinals Barberini and Chigi met with their supporters ("*con le loro creature*") and during an hour-long meeting they agreed that henceforth they would consistently support Rospigliosi. Probably some of their conclavists caught up with Harrach with this information at lunchtime. Then they locked themselves in their cells again and did not accept any other visits. Harrach rushed this news to Sforza and subsequently also to Friedrich von Hessen-Darmstadt. The Imperials then also visited the members of the other factions and called for them to cast their votes during the afternoon scrutinium. From that activity Rospigliosi received 31 votes. Prior to the actual accession the 32 remaining electors voted variously – some for Barberini, others for Farnese and even one for Harrach. After counting the *accessi*

32 Ibidem, Bd. 4, pp. 381–382.

33 Ibidem, p. 392.

the result was clear, however – Rospigliosi emerged from the conclave with a majority of 31 votes and 30 *accessi* and adopted the name Clement IX.³⁴

Approximately at this moment the later extraordinary ambassadors to papal elections ended their sessions concerning the conclave, whereby they did not have any direct access to it and only indirectly learned about the individual twists and turns that occurred and also about the actual outcome. Harrach continued, however, and recounted (again for each conclave) the course of the solemn ceremonies that traditionally concluded the conclaves. Unlike in the case of the previous conclave now he could feel satisfied. He did not have to worry about the confrontations that had taken place in the years 1644 and 1655 due to the repeated Spanish veto against Cardinal Giulio Cesare Sacchetti (1586–1663). In 1655, it was he who was supposed to negotiate with Francesco Barberini to ensure that his supporters would stop voting for Sacchetti. It was also for him that the Spanish and the Imperial factions even casted 14 votes, just for the purpose of weakening Sacchetti's support.³⁵ In 1667 the veto was not discussed and, compared to previous instances, the conclave went smoothly. Harrach already arrived for an audience with Clement IX on the 23rd June and on the 9th July Leopold I expressed his official thanks to Clement for his services to the Imperial Throne.³⁶

The procedure in cooperation with the Spanish party was a tactic that Imperial ambassadors and cardinals chose repeatedly. Until the outbreak of the War of the Spanish Succession³⁷ it was also the same in the upcoming conclaves.

After the end of the conclave none of the ambassadors, nor any of the papal election commissioners, immediately left Rome. Harrach, together with Johann Friedrich von Waldstein, stayed there until the 19th September 1667.³⁸ Additional important meetings were held which concerned, amongst other things, the representation of the Viennese Court at the Holy See. At the beginning of July Clement IX had accepted Cardinal Friedrich von Hessen-Darmstadt as being a *protector Germaniae* and accredited him as an ordinary Imperial Ambassador to Rome. Cardinal “*d’Hasia*” remained in this function until 1676, when he left for his diocese in Wrocław. This case of the accumulation of the function of an ordinary ambassador and of the Cardinal *protector Germaniae* was rather unique. *De facto* it means the absence of a secular imperial resident in Rome. This situation lasted until 1689, when Anton Florian von Liechtenstein arrived in Rome.

34 Ibidem, p. 394.

35 A. CATALANO, *La Boemia*, pp. 359–366, 450–457.

36 Ibidem, pp. 504–505; K. KELLER – A. CATALANO (Hg.), *Die Diarien und Tagzettel*, Bd. 7, pp. 809–810.

37 Joseph GALLAND, *Die Papstwahl des Jahres 1700 im Zusammenhang mit den damaligen kirchlichen und politischen Verhältnissen*, Historisches Jahrbuch 3, 1882, pp. 208–254, 355–387, 596–630.

38 K. KELLER – A. CATALANO (Hg.), *Die Diarien und Tagzettel*, Bd. 7, p. 889.

Anton Florian von Liechtenstein and the conclaves in the years 1689 and 1691

When Pope Innocent XI died on the 12th August 1689, it became very important for the Habsburg monarchy that his successor should favour the monarchy as much as possible. A lot was connected with the name of the recently deceased pope – first of all the diplomatic, military and financial support for the war with the Turks, who, in the summer of 1683, had besieged Vienna but by 1689 under pressure from the troops of the anti-Turkish coalition they had been forced to retreat to Belgrade and even further towards the southeast. The formation of the “Holy League” that was led by the Polish King Johann III Sobieski (1629–1696) and the Holy Roman Emperor Leopold I was largely influenced by the papal diplomats who were supervised by the curia of Innocent XI. Since 1688 the Habsburg Empire was additionally threatened by attacks of both the Ottoman Empire and the France of Louis XIV (1638–1715). Concern about the fate of the Spanish branch of the Habsburgs was also increasing. The Habsburgs made a claim against the Bourbons for the throne of the Empire Over Which the Sun Never Sets. It was not all just about Spain, however – its colonies were also at stake and because of the papal throne also other important areas on the Apennine peninsula that were subject to the Spanish crown. This also involved the issue of future cooperation with Spanish diplomats and with other cardinals during the upcoming papal elections.

The Bavarian Envoy (*minister primae audientiae*) Pompeo Scarlatti,³⁹ who, from the beginning of September 1689 had regularly reported to the Imperial Court about any new developments at the conclave, in that context emphasised the need for the occupying (or in many cases the reoccupying) of the ordinary diplomatic posts at all the Italian Courts.⁴⁰ This was necessary for preventing the election of a pro-French candidate, which could significantly reduce the current papal subsidies as well as diplomatic support for the Habsburgs’ efforts. Both of the two trends – the pro-Habsburg and the anti-French – needed to be maintained however. At the turn of the 1680’s and the 1690’s, as the ambitions of the French King were increasing, the imperial negotiators and diplomats were well aware of this too. The credentials for the Imperial Ambassador to the conclave of the 7th September 1689 expressed the wish that the future pope should be as similar

39 Pompeo Scarlatti acted in the rank of the Bavarian Envoy (*minister primae audientiae*) from 5. 12. 1678 to 15. 9. 1703. Bettina SCHERBAUM, *Die bayerische Gesandtschaft in Rom in der frühen Neuzeit*, Tübingen 2008.

40 *Reflessioni sopra la commissione del Signor Prencipe Antonio di Liechtenstein, e suo arrivo in Roma*, Pompeo Scarlatti to Leopold I, 24. 9. 1689, Roma. ÖStA Wien, HHStA, StAbt, Rom Korr., Kart. 67 (hereinafter referred to as *Reflessioni*), fol. 324v–325r.

as possible to the deceased one.⁴¹ The same concept was mooted in January 1691 by the Bavarian Envoy in an introductory session for the extraordinary Imperial Ambassador to the conclave, when he noted that Leopold I “*has no desire other than to see in the successor to Alexander VII the return of the spirit of Innocent XI*”,⁴² while “*the spirit of Innocent XI*” was also discussed in association with the conclave that took place in the year 1700.

During the entire 17th Century the influence of pro-French politicians and cardinals in Rome was increasing, who were becoming – not only at conclave – ever-stronger opponents to the Spanish party, which from the time of Charles V (1500–1558) considered a right of veto and also other ways of influencing elections, as an aspect of their traditional eminent domain. The possibility that two rivals might gradually (or perhaps even suddenly) become collaborators, certainly did not please the Imperials and the less they liked it the more likely it appeared. It was also necessary to prevent the breakup of the Spanish party, as well as its inclination towards supporting the French interests.

For all these reasons Leopold I changed his former approach to the conclave and for the first time he seconded his extraordinary secular ambassador – Anton Florian von Liechtenstein,⁴³ who also exercised the same function in the year 1691.

For more than twenty years since the retirement of Jacob Lombardi in the 1660’s, no imperial secular resident had lived in Rome. After 1676, after Friedrich von Hessen-Darmstadt had left Rome for Wrocław, nor did even any other German cardinal reside there. He was replaced in the office of Cardinal Protector by Carlo Pio di Savoia (1622–1689). After his death in February 1689 this post also remained vacant for several months. At the instigation of Grand Duke of Tuscany Cosimo III Medici (1642–1723), only shortly before the death of Pope Innocent XI, Leopold I commissioned this function to his brother Francesco Maria de’Medici, to whom the *de facto* ruler of Spain, Maria Anna von Habsburg (1634–1696), also entrusted her confidence. Despite all these intentions it

41 “*Successor defuncto quam similis.*” Sigismund Freiherr von BISCHOFFSHAUSEN, *Papst Alexander VIII. und der Wiener Hof (1689–1691)*, Stuttgart – Wien 1900, p. 4.

42 “*...l’importanza di farsi un’ elezione profittevole al bene della Santa Chiesa, e della Religione Cattolica, conforme al desiderio dell’ Augustissimo Leopoldo, il quale nient’ altro brama, che di vedere ruscitato lo spirito d’ Innocenzo XI. nel successore di Alessandro 8.....*” *Per informazione dell’ Eccellentissimo Signore Principe di Linchtstein*, 27. 1. 1691, Roma. ÖStA Wien, HHStA, StAbt, Rom Korr., Kart. 70, fol. 37r–v.

43 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; Michael HÖRRMANN, *Fürst Anton Florian von Liechtenstein (1676–1735)*, in: Volker Press – Dietmar Willoweit (Hg.), *Liechtenstein – Fürstliches Haus und staatliche Ordnung, Vaduz 1988*, pp. 189–210; Jakob von FALKE, *Geschichte des fürstlichen Hauses Liechtenstein*, 3. Bd., Wien 1882, pp. 9–78.

was a compromise that gave preference to the Tuscan rather than to the imperial or the Spanish interests. The Medici family also had good relations with France and Francesco Maria himself attended to the needs of the cardinal-nephew of Alexander VII, Flavio Chigi. His position between the two competing superpowers is well illustrated by the fact that later on, during the years 1702–1709, he served as *protector Franciae*. Nevertheless 1689 Medici was to become the head of the imperial and the Spanish parties at the Cardinal College. It appeared more important that imperial appointee should cooperate with him (or perhaps direct him?). Also the German cardinals were supposed to travel to Rome as soon as any message arrives concerning the death of Pope Innocent XI, *inter alia*, because it was not possible to rely on Medici.

Giacomo Emerix de Mathiis (1626–1696), the Dean of the Rota Romana Tribunal had been informing Leopold I about the damaged health of Pope Innocent XI since June 1689.⁴⁴ The summer months were marked by feverish preparations for negotiations. The conclave was closed on the 23rd August and on the 6th October the close associate of Pope Innocent XI, Pietro Vito Ottoboni (1610–1691), came triumphantly from it and assumed the name Alexander VIII.⁴⁵

When, on the 10th September 1689, Liechtenstein set off on a journey to Rome, he was no longer a novice in the diplomatic world. He had seen Rome for the first time during his Grand Tour during the years 1674–1676.⁴⁶ He had already in 1687 been present at the coronation of Joseph I as the King of Hungary as an imperial representative. Scarlatti regarded his selection for this mission as primarily being in consideration of his noble origin, his polite demeanour and his casual easiness during discussions.⁴⁷

He travelled *incognito* with the mail courier⁴⁸ and in ten days he had already reached the gates of Rome. He was met there by two six-horse carriages belonging to Cardinal Medici, which brought him to the Cardinal's Palace on Piazza Madama.⁴⁹ Also between the 20th and 24th September he was acting *incognito*. What that meant in this case, however,

44 Correspondence of Giacomo Emerix de Mathiis with Leopold I from the year 1689. ÖStA Wien, HHStA, StAbt, Rom Korr., Kart. 67.

45 In regard to the conclave in 1689 see in detail S. BISCHOFFSHAUSEN, *Papst Alexander VIII.*, pp. 1–53.

46 Gernot HEISS, “*Thro keiserlichen Mayestät zu Diensten ... unserer ganzen fürstlichen Familie zur Glori*”, *Erziehung und Unterricht der Fürsten von Liechtenstein im Zeitalter des Absolutismus*, in: Evelin Oberhammer (Hg.), *Der ganzen Welt ein Lob und Spiegel, Das Fürstenhaus Liechtenstein in der frühen Neuzeit*, Wien – München 1990, pp. 155–181.

47 *Reflessioni*, fol. 325r–v.

48 *Ibidem*, p. 26.

49 Today's Palazzo Madama. Giacomo Emerix de Mathiis to Leopold I, 24. 9. 1689. See ÖStA Wien, HHStA, StAbt, Rom Korr., Kart. 67, fol. 131r–v.

was as a so far non-accredited representative, since he was not hiding his name in any manner whatsoever.

His secretary meanwhile visited Leopold Kollonitsch (1631–1707), the only German cardinal who was already in Rome,⁵⁰ to pay him tribute and to arrange a personal meeting. With the same intentions he also visited the Spanish Ambassador, the Marquis de Cogolludo (1660–1711), who had already been living in Rome with his wife since July 1687.⁵¹ He also went to the other cardinals, who were closed in conclave, and to visit important officials of the Holy See to negotiate Liechtenstein's accreditation.

Already on the second day Liechtenstein personally visited both of the cardinals (Medici and Kollonitsch) and in the evening the Spanish ambassadorial couple too. On that occasion he accepted the already prepared accreditation, by which the College of Cardinals accepted him as an extraordinary ambassador and gave their assent that during the coming days he could step-up to its gates for an official audience.⁵²

Scarlati evaluated the first days of Liechtenstein's mission using the following words: *"This mission was praised a lot, everybody had applauded it, and especially the persons who love the glory, the service to Emperor, who care heartily the dignity of The Empire, but also the zelanti who love reputation of Apostolic Throne and the Court of Rome have been satisfied a lot."*⁵³ He was hoping that Liechtenstein's current progress would lead to a consensus during the upcoming negotiations between Cardinal Medici, the Imperial Court and the Spanish Ambassador.

Shortly thereafter the French Ambassador, Charles d'Albert d'Ailly Duc de Chaulnes (1625–1698),⁵⁴ arrived, accompanied by the French cardinals. While the cardinals were able to enter the conclave on the 27th September 1689, the College refused to accept the ambassador while Louis XIV remains unwilling to budge from the territory of Avignon. His audience was also held two days after that of Liechtenstein's.

50 Leopold Karl von Kollonitsch was originally the Bishop of Nitra. In 1669 he became the Bishop of Wiener Neustadt. In 1686 Innocent XI promoted him to a cardinal and appointed him the Bishop of Győr.

51 Luis Francisco de la Cerda y Aragón, Marquis de Cogolludo, was the Spanish ambassador at the Papal Court in the years 1687–1696.

52 *Reflessioni*, fol. 322r–328r.

53 *"Questa missione ... e stata generalmente lodata, et applaudita, non meno dalle persone che amano la gloria, et il servizio di Sacra Maesta Caesarea, e che hanno a cuore il bene e la dignità dell' Imperio, ma anche dalli zelanti della reputazione della Sede Apostolica, e di questa Corte di Roma."* Ibidem, fol. 323r.

54 Duc de Chaulnes (1625–1698) already first arrived in Rome back in 1666 as an ambassador. His visit in 1689 was already his third mission.

Liechtenstein should follow the modified instructions, originally addressed to Cardinal Medici, with whom he was supposed to closely cooperate.⁵⁵ According to this instruction had Liechtenstein to choose which of the Cardinals he should promote, which he should only tolerate and which completely exclude. First, the diplomat should prevent the election of the former Cardinal Secretary of State Alderano Cybo (1613–1700), Gasparo Carpegna (1625–1714) and Angelo Maria Ranuzzi (1626–1689), all of whom appeared to be too pro-French. On the other hand Leopold I nominated ten cardinals – those whom he deemed to be the most appropriate, or at least sufficiently so.⁵⁶ Of these, to the Imperials, Carlo Cerri (1610–1690) seemed too old, Gianfrancesco Ginetti (1626–1691) evidently had failing health and Giannicolò Conti (1617–1698) was suspected of excessive favouritism towards the French side. The most suitable appeared to be Carlo Barberini (1630–1704).⁵⁷ They also evaluated highly the ultimately successful Pietro Vitto Ottoboni, whom the Imperials were barely able to tolerate. Also to his detriment was the fact that he came from the Venetian Republic.⁵⁸ Liechtenstein was supposed to discourage Cardinal Medici's affection for Cardinal Flavio Chigi. The Imperials considered him to be too close to Giovanni Delfino (1617–1699), whom they considered as being totally pro-French.

The actual methods that Cardinal Medici and Liechtenstein should use for fulfilling imperial requirements were left largely at their discretion. The instruction did suggest however, that they had discussed the listed candidates with the Spanish Ambassador – the Marquis de Cogolludo. Thereby Cardinal Medici could base his decision on satisfying the requirements of both the Austrian and the Spanish parties. Together with Liechtenstein they were also required to listen to the opinions of Cardinal Johann von Goëss. Unlike with the others, probably because he also had a much richer experience of diplomacy

55 The instructions of Leopold I to Anton Florian von Liechtenstein, 4. 9. 1689. See ÖStA Wien, HHStA, StAbt, Rom Korr., Kart. 77, fol. 82r–83v. The original instructions for Cardinal Medici dated 29. 8. 1689 were looser in many respects. As compared to the adapted version that was prepared for Liechtenstein, for example, it contained the names of the 21 cardinals who could be supported. S. BISCHOFFSHAUSEN, *Papst Alexander VIII.*, pp. 17–22; L. WURMBRAND, *Das Ausschliessungs-Recht*, pp. 280–281.

56 “*Optimos vero aut saltem bonos putamus Barberinum [Carlo Barberini], [Carlo] Cerri, [Giannicolò] Conti, Spinulas ambos [Giulio and Gianbattista Spinola], Acciaciolum [Nicolò Acciaioli], Nerlium [Francesco Nerli], Ginettum [Gianfrancesco Ginetti], Pallavicinum [Opizio Pallavicini], Duratium [Marcello Durazzo] et quisquis eorum eligeretur, gratum nobis accideret, modo ita res processisset, ut debere se Nobis exaltationem sentiret.*” None of these was elected, however. The instructions of Leopold I to Anton Florian von Liechtenstein from 4. 9. 1689. See ÖStA Wien, HHStA, StAbt, Rom Korr., Kart. 77, fol. 82r–83v.

57 A variant manuscript that comprises the same instructions. Ibidem, fol. 84r–v.

58 “... *ut Venetus, non omnino esset gratus*”. Ibidem, fol. 84r.

than they did,⁵⁹ they could openly discuss with him concerning the procedure. In the instructions related to Liechtenstein Kollonitsch is not mentioned, while in the guidelines intended for his team he is placed on the same level as Goëss, though he did not meet either his diplomatic qualities nor have his geopolitical knowledge. Unlike him, however, he had entered the conclave on the 13th September and therefore could participate directly in the top-level talks.

Apart from the cardinals who were excluded by the instructions, Liechtenstein, Medici and Cogolludo also decided about the possible exclusion of other candidates for the tiara only after they had heard their views and together assessed their quality.

The Viennese *Reichskanzlei* also directly recommended to Liechtenstein the persons in Rome on whom he could rely, and, if it was necessary, turn to for help. These included the Dean of the Rota Romana – Giacomo Emerix de Mathiis,⁶⁰ the Roman Senator and the Count of Ferrara Giulio Cesare Nigrelli, the Bavarian envoy Pompeo Scarlatti,⁶¹ “*Father Slavata*”, i. e. the General Definitor of the Order of Discalced Carmelites, Carolus Felix of St. Theresa (1640–1712),⁶² and the Secretary of the Cardinal College Lorenzo Casoni (1645–1720).

59 “*De tota mente hac nostra cum Cardinale Gurcensi se omnino aperiat audiatque illius consilium; sed non ita cum aliis, opus est enim silentio, et quidem maximo.*” Ibidem, fol. 84v. During the years 1676–1679 Johann von Goëss belonged amongst the principal creators of the Peace Treaty of Nijmegen. J. A. H. BOTS, *The Peace of Nijmegen (1676–1679)*, Amsterdam 1980; Paul Otto HÖYNCK, *Frankreich und seine Gegner auf der Nymwegener Friedenskongress*, Bonn 1960; Anneliese KERMAUNER, *Johann Freiherr von Goëss*, Dissertation, Universität Graz, Graz 1966.

60 Giacomo Emerix de Mathiis (1626–1696) had been the auditor of Sacra Rota Romana since 23. 1. 1668, after his uncle Giovanni Emerix († 1669) ceded the post that he had held which had been presented to him by the Emperor Leopold I to him, which took place in 1660 (and also later, in 1668, to his nephew). Subsequently, from the year 1686, he was the Dean of Rota Romana. When, in 1689, the concept of a new pro-Austrian Cardinal was considered, his name, amongst others, was also in the pot. Niccolò del RE, *La Curia Romana, Lineamenti storico-giuridici*, Città Del Vaticano 1998, p. 232; Mirella TOCCI a cura di, *Il diario di Jacob Emerix de Matthiis, decano della Sacra Romana Rota*, Napoli 1982; Richard BLAAS, *Das kaiserliche Auditoriat bei der Sacra Rota Romana*, Mitteilungen des Österreichischen Staatsarchivs 11, 1958, pp. 37–152; Zdeněk HOJDA – Eva CHODĚJOVSKÁ et al. (eds.), *Heřman Jakub Černín na cestě za Alpy a Pyreneje, Kavalířská cesta českého šlechtice do německých zemí, Itálie, Francie, Španělska a Portugalska* [Herman Jakub Czernin on his journey over the Alps and the Pyrenees; the Czech Nobleman's Grand Tour of the Germanic Countries and Italy, France, Spain and Portugal], Prague 2014, I., p. 268; Jiří M. HAVLÍK, *Jan Fridrich z Valdštejna, arcibiskup a mecenáš doby baroka* [Johann Friedrich von Waldstein: the Archbishop and a Patron of the Baroque Period], Prague 2016, pp. 40, 83–84, 157.

61 His credentials can be found in Pompeo Scarlatti's correspondence folder and also mentioned in it as being his addressees are Giacomo Emerix de Mathiis, Alfonso Litta, Giulio Cesare Nigrelli and the as yet undetermined Geiger. Pompeo Scarlatti's credentials, as of 7. 9. 1689, comprised ÖStA Wien, HHStA, StAbt, Rom Kor., Kart. 77, fol. 109r.

62 Johann Karl Joachim Slavata made a solemn vow to the Carmelite Order on 12. 7. 1663 in Rome and adopted the religious name of Carolus Felix of St. Theresa. He became the General Definitor of the

The imperial appointees were also expected to cooperate with Duke Livio Odescalchi (1652–1713), who, as the nephew of Pope Innocent XI, was the head of the cardinals that he had established (who were also referred to as the *zelanti*), and although he did not pertain to Cardinal College Leopold I was trying to obligate Odescalchi amongst other things also by introducing him on the 28th August 1689 into a state of Imperial Princes.⁶³ Liechtenstein was to secretly inform the *Reichskanzlei* – and specifically its head, the *Reichsvizekanzler* Leopold Wilhelm von Königsegg-Rothenfels (1630–1694) – about the course that the negotiations were taking and about the entire mission.

Three days later, additional instructions were provided that clearly specified the guidelines in regard to the recent developments in the conclave, whereby Cardinal Medici had reached an agreement with Chigi and with Altieri.⁶⁴ At the same time he was turning his back on the *zelanti*, who at that time were breaking away in favour of the French party. Thereby, to unify the *zelanti*, Liechtenstein was obliged to negotiate intensively with Odescalchi in order to deter their inclination towards accepting the French proposals. The instructions received stressed the need to veto Cybo and Ranuzzi as well as Carpegna and Lorenzo Brancati di Lauria (1612–1693) all of whom Cardinal Medici had ceased to trust. Of those cardinals whom the previous instructions had identified as being acceptable, it was Giambattista Spinola (1615–1704), Opizio Pallavicini (1632–1700), Gianfrancesco Ginetti and Marcello Durazzo (1633–1710) who probably enjoyed the highest level of joint-support from the Imperials, the Spaniards, Chigi and Odescalchi. Ottoboni was still just referred to in the same manner – i.e. he should just be tolerated. Therefore this instruction did not directly determine a single best candidate, thereby, within the boundaries outlined leaving the possibility of Liechtenstein's independent judgment being accepted, based, however, on reaching a consensus with the other supporters of the Imperial and the Spanish interests.

In addition to attending their individual consultation meetings the prime duty of the ambassador in regard to the papal election was his audience before the conclave (*alloquio ad Conclavem, audienza al Conclave, visita al Sacro Collegio*). Its date was supposed to be arranged by the Cardinal-protector of Germany in association with both the Dean of the Cardinal College and the Marshal of the Holy Roman Church (*Il maresciallo di Santa Romana Chiesa*) who conducted the surveillance of the conclave. During both of

Order of Discalced Carmelites on 18. 4. 1689. For basic biographical data see URL: <<http://reholnici.hiu.cas.cz/katalog/l.dll?hal~1000126580>> [cit. 23. 3. 2016].

63 S. BISCHOFFSHAUSEN, *Papst Alexander VIII.*, p. 12.

64 The instructions for Anton Florian von Liechtenstein from 7. 9. 1689. See ÖStA Wien, HHStA, StAbt, Rom Korr., Kart. 77, fol. 89r–90r. See also L. WURMBRAND, *Das Ausschliessungs-Recht*, pp. 282–283; S. BISCHOFFSHAUSEN, *Papst Alexander VIII.*, pp. 23–25.

these negotiations these functions were exercised by the Cardinals Alderano Cybo and Giulio Savelli (1626–1712). Savelli's family, which held the Secular Office of the Marshal of the Holy Roman Catholic Church during the entire 1503–1712 period, was favourable towards the imperial politics. During the pontificate of Urban VIII the father of Giulio Savelli, Bernardino (1604–1658), was an Imperial Pro-legate. During the years 1642–1649 Federico Savelli († 1649) was an Imperial Orator while Giulio himself was the Spanish Ambassador at the Papal Court during the reign of Philip IV (1605–1665).⁶⁵

In the year 1689 the term of audience was determined for the 29th September 1689. Its course can be reconstructed on the basis of the reports from Giacomo Emerix de Mathiis and Liechtenstein himself.⁶⁶ The extraordinary Imperial Ambassador came to the Vatican in the festive carriage of Cardinal Medici, accompanied by twenty carriages containing other members of the Medici family, Tuscan courtiers and other nobles, together with two of Cardinal d'Este's carriages and 76 additional two-horse carriages in which the imperial representatives rode – i.e. the Counts, Bishops, Prelates and Nobles of the Empire who were residing in Rome at that time. When entering the colonnade at St. Peter's Square the ambassador was welcomed by the Guard and Marshal Savelli received him at the gates of the conclave, and brought him to the hall where the door to where the audience was taking place was located. Greeting him there were the cardinals who were presiding over the conclave – Dean Alderano Cybo, Dominican Philip Thomas Howard of Norfolk (1616–1694) and Urbano Sacchetti (1640–1705). Liechtenstein took off his hat, knelt and received a blessing from the Dean of the Conclave and then appeared in front of the Cardinal College. Next, already standing, he handed to the Secretary of the Conclave a letter from Emperor Leopold I that was addressed to the cardinals. The secretary read it out loud and then Liechtenstein continued by presenting his own celebratory speech in Latin. He first expressed his regret concerning the death of Pope Innocent XI. Then he requested the election of a worthy successor who would continue in Pope Innocent's footsteps and would also contribute both to the defeat of the Ottoman Empire and to peace in Europe. In his speeches he described the Emperor as being the protector of the entire Church ("*advocatus totius Ecclesiae*"), whom the new pope should be helping in his tasks. The Dean of the conclave replied to him solemnly and Liechtenstein then passed-on one more letter. It referred both to the recent victory of Louis of Baden (1655–1707)

65 Niccolò del RE, *Il Maresciallo di Santa Romana Chiesa, Custode del Conclave*, Roma 1962, pp. 30–45, 100–101; Irene FOSI, *La famiglia Savelli e la rappresentanza imperiale a Roma nella prima metà del Seicento*, in: Richard Bösel – Grete Klingenstein – Alexander Koller (Hg.), *Kaiserhof – Papsthof (16. – 18. Jahrhundert)*, Wien 2013, pp. 67–76.

66 A. F. von Liechtenstein to Leopold I, 1. 10. 1689, ÖStA Wien, HHStA, StAbt, Rom Korr., Kart. 67, fol. 165r–168v; Giacomo Emerix de Mathiis to Leopold I, 1. 10. 1689, *ibidem*, fol. 134r–135v.

over the Turks in Serbian Moravia and to the recapture of Mainz. This message was timed to be delivered exactly and precisely in order to highlight the role of the Emperor as a protector of the Church and victorious in battles with its enemies. However, with regard to the French party this letter was not accepted. Liechtenstein said farewell to the cardinals and Marshal Savelli then escorted him back up to his coach, in which he returned to the palace in which he was staying.⁶⁷

During the first days of the conclave it was Cardinal Capizucchi (1615–1691), supported by the *zelanti*, who had the greatest chance. On his side they pulled the cardinals around Chigi and Altieri. The Imperials were also satisfied but France stood in opposition and the number of votes for him began to drop even before the arrival of the ambassador who was to convey his exclusion. Chigi and Altieri suspended the negotiations and together with Medici and César d'Estrées (1628–1714), the Head Cardinal of the French party, they awaited the arrival of all the other ambassadors and cardinals.

Meanwhile the preference for one of the most respected members of the College, Gregorio Barbarigo (1625–1697), had started to increase. Liechtenstein in his first report to Leopold I on the 24th September 1689 had communicated that Barbarigo's name resounds everywhere and that the City is looking forward to his success. Barbarigo himself rejected the idea of his own candidacy and thereby fortune was gradually leaning towards Ottoboni.

Despite all the efforts that he had instigated, Liechtenstein had the feeling that Cardinal Medici was somewhat avoiding any mutual contact and that the conclave was continuing quite independently of his presence. During one of the meetings he did at least manage to convey the imperial vetos of Cybo and of Ranuzzi.⁶⁸ Actually, in the end, none of these activities needed to be announced at the conclave, because Cybo had not gained so many supporters and Ranuzzi had died on his way to Rome. Even in regard to the notice about Carpegna and Lauria, Medici could answer with a smile that their names are out of the question anyway. Neither Cogolludo nor Odescalchi were seeking a meeting with Liechtenstein, however. The strategies that this imperial ambassador evolved, fell on deaf ears. He evaluated himself as representing an astonished onlooker.⁶⁹

As had been anticipated Cardinal Medici cooperated with Flavio Chigi and agreed with him in regard to Ottoboni's candidacy.⁷⁰ While Liechtenstein also approved this variant, in accordance with the instructions that he had been given he did not personally

67 R. SMÍŠEK, *Anton Florian von Liechtenstein*, pp. 203–205.

68 Relation of A. F. von Liechtenstein to Leopold I, 1. 10. 1689, Roma. See ÖStA Wien, HHStA, StAbt, Rom Korr., Kart. 67, fol. 166r.

69 A. F. von Liechtenstein to Leopold I, 16. 10. 1689. Ibidem, fol. 181r–190v; S. BISCHOFFSHAUSEN, *Papst Alexander VIII.*, p. 49.

70 A. F. von Liechtenstein to Leopold I, 1. 10. 1689. ÖStA Wien, HHStA, StAbt, Rom Korr., Kart. 67, fol. 170r–172v; S. BISCHOFFSHAUSEN, *Papst Alexander VIII.*, p. 38–39.

participate with his support. Initially the French party had been refusing to accept Ottoboni. Things subsided, only based on the promise of a relative and probably him being a cardinal-nephew of the future pope, Pietro Ottoboni (1667–1740), that the bishops who signed Declaration of the clergy of France in 1682 would be recognised and that French entitlement for a law- and tax-freedom of apartment would be acknowledged (see below) and that the Bishop of Beauvais, Toussaint de Forbin de Janson (1631–1713) would become a cardinal.⁷¹ On the 6th October Pietro Vito Ottoboni assumed the title of Alexander VIII.

Liechtenstein remained in Rome in anticipation of the papal audience that he had been granted for the 10th December 1689. Meanwhile the possibility of his accreditation as an ordinary ambassador to the Papal Court or as an imperial commissioner in Rome – possibly with responsibility for Italy in its entirety – was discussed.⁷² Before these issues had been resolved Liechtenstein once again had the opportunity to engage in frantic negotiations concerning the election of a new Pope during the first half of 1691. Indeed in discussions regarding the support for Ottoboni it was frequently said that this would be a temporary solution for just two or three years.

During the second half of January Pompeo Scarlatti informed Leopold I of the fact that Alexander VIII was terminally ill and that he was preparing an extensive account of this in regard to Lichtenstein in which he would interpret the imperial proposition concerning the forthcoming conclave at the end of the month.⁷³ If the Pope dies a courier with a message should set off promptly to the Viennese Court. Even if he recovered, Lichtenstein should slowly and quietly (*“pianpiano”*) prepare everything that is necessary for a future conclave so that this time he would also be acting in concert with Cardinal Goëss. He was also expected to pay his respects to the Spanish cardinals Pedro de Salazar (1630–1706) and José Sáenz de Aguirre (1630–1699), the latter being the only one who specifically resides in Rome.⁷⁴ It was they who could have the greatest impact on the cardinals of the Spanish possessions that were located in the Apennine peninsula. Scarlatti was reminded of peripeteia in regard to the election of Benedetto Odescalchi in 1676, when the French party excluded all the cardinals who had been appointed under Clement X, without having to use a direct veto, and thereby placed emphasis on the fact that Liechtenstein was talking with Cardinals Chigi, Barberini, Altieri and Bandino Panciatici (1629–1718)

71 L. von PASTOR, *Geschichte der Päpste*, XIV/2, p. 1050; S. BISCHOFFSHAUSEN, *Papst Alexander VIII.*, pp. 45–48.

72 *“il titolo d’Inviato nell’altro di Commissario Imperiale in Roma, o in tutta Italia...”*, P. Scarlatti to Leopold I, 10. 12. 1689. See ÖStA Wien, HHStA, StAbt, Rom Korr., Kart. 67, fol. 388r.

73 P. Scarlatti to Leopold I, 20. and 27. 1. 1691. Ibidem, Kart. 70, fol. 13r–14r, 35r–38r.

74 *Per informazione dell’Eccellentissimo Signore Principe di Linchtstein*, 27. 1. 1691, Roma. Ibidem, fol. 35r–38r.

regarding a similar process. According to Scarlatti Altieri had been ruled-out of the hope of a tiara by his very great age – while all those who were appointed could have a great influence on the forthcoming election. Scarlatti again attributed particular importance to his festive speech in Latin – he wanted Liechtenstein to present it even before the cardinals actually entered the conclave and, when doing so, to claim the position of being the Ambassador of the first Christian Ruler. He should also express regret concerning the death of Alexander VIII and demand that the cardinals, when they are choosing his successor, above all keep in mind the good of the Church and choose the candidate “*in accordance with the requirements of Emperor Leopold I, who has no desire other than the return of the spirit of Innocent XI*”.⁷⁵

Cardinal Goëss should bring with him the Secretary of the Imperial Embassy, Francisco Chassignet, as his assistant at a closed meeting. Scarlatti considered him to be very reliable and especially suitable for mediating the negotiations between himself and Cardinal Medici. He also recommended establishing a strong coalition comprising Livio Odescalchi and the Cardinals Goëss, Salazar and Aguirre.

The Pope died on the 1st February 1691 and on the 12th February the conclave was closed. It was only shortly afterwards that Scarlatti reported on the success of Liechtenstein’s appearance before the Cardinal College. At that time nobody could have known that the largest electoral contest of the entire 17th Century, for the papal tiara, had begun!⁷⁶ On the 19th February 1691 Leopold I appointed Anton Florian von Liechtenstein to the post of his Ordinary Ambassador at the Papal Court.⁷⁷ Together with this the *Reichskanzlei* also addressed the credentials of Scarlatti and of Giacomo Emerix de Mathiis so that they could be fully available to him.⁷⁸ At that time the preference for having Gregorio Barbarigo at the conclave was increasing again. The imperial cardinals established a veto against him however. Some of the electors persisted nevertheless and thereby the negotiations started to become more complicated again. The Imperials were glad to be able take advantage of an actual audience before the conclave, which Chassignet tried to negotiate for the 17th March 1691.⁷⁹ Some cardinals stated, however, that they would not permit an audience unless Liechtenstein would officially waive his right to a freedom of apartment as the Duke de Chaulnes had done in 1689.⁸⁰

75 “*conforme al desiderio dell’Augustissimo Leopoldo, il quale nient’altro brama, che di vedere ruscitato lo spirito d’Innocenzo XI.*” Ibidem, fol. 37v.

76 P. Scarlatti to Leopold I, 17. 2. 1691. Ibidem, fol. 79r.

77 Ibidem, fol. 118r. Liechtenstein stayed in Rome until 11. 9. 1694.

78 Credentials for P. Scarlatti and G. Emerix de Mathiis, 19. 2. 1691. Ibidem, Kart. 77, fol. 198r, 200r.

79 A. F. von Liechtenstein to Leopold I, 24. 3. 1691. Ibidem, fol. 84r–v.

80 An unsigned letter of 18. 3. 1691 that was delivered by Cardinal Medici’s Messenger. Ibidem, fol. 105r–v.

This included the requirement that houses that were inhabited by representatives and their associates should be excluded from the jurisdiction of the Rome Courts and from paying the duty and the taxes that are normally applicable for accommodation in Rome. Often it was a whole part of the City that was outside the range of the Roman jurisdiction. When Innocent XI declared that in the future he would not accept any envoy who refused to resign over this entitlement in 1687 the French Ambassador Henri Charles Lavardin de Beaumanoir († 1701) reacted to this by entering the City in the manner of an armed parade. Throughout his stay he cruised through the City daily with a military escort and threatened to punish anyone who refused to acknowledge him as being the high official Ambassador.⁸¹ From the equally hard-headed Innocent XI he obtained just one result: excommunication. Whereas when the Duke de Chaulnes arrived in 1689 with 28 galleys, which were moored close to Rome, the Spanish Ambassador Cogolludo reacted to their presence indignantly and, in response, he called in up to 500 soldiers. Another 3 000 remained gathered on the borders of the Kingdom of Naples. De Chaulnes did not require the freedom of an apartment however but instead stayed in Cardinal d'Estrée's Palace. In 1689 Liechtenstein, as an extraordinary ambassador to the conclave, could not make any similar claim; especially when his instructions had not even mentioned it. The instructions that he received two years later also did not talk about the freedom of apartments and once again he decided not to make it a requirement.⁸²

He set off on the 19th March 1691 for his audience before the conclave, accompanied by a total of 290 carriages. The first three, with six horses, carried Liechtenstein's delegation, while the other carriages held a total of 44 prelates and 84 nobles of the Empire, followed by 64 carriages bearing representatives of the cardinals' entourage. Apparently each of the cardinals sent one decorated carriage.⁸³ Subsequently everything else happened in the same manner as it had during the first audience before the conclave that took place in

81 S. BISCHOFFSHAUSEN, *Papst Alexander VIII.*, p. 34. Lavardin stayed in Rome from 16. 11. 1687 until 30. 4. 1689.

82 A. F. von Liechtenstein to Leopold I, 24. 3. 1691. See ÖStA Wien, HHStA, StAbt, Rom Korr., Kart. 70, fol. 84r–v.

83 Anton Florian von Liechtenstein started his diary entries with this event, from which it results, inter alia, that the sessions were far from actually listing the entire equipment that was designated for the processions. Scarlatti, in his session, talked only about the 112 guides (apparently these were all imperial prelates and nobleman). The Diary of Anton Florian von Liechtenstein from the years 1691–1694 is otherwise quite scanty in terms of the information that it provides about the events that took place during the elections, whereby it almost exclusively simply records the names and the ranks of the prelates, the ambassadors and the secretaries whom Liechtenstein met during this period. Also included are the instances of the visits of cardinals and/or of conclavists coming to the door (*porticella*) to attend the conclave. Only rarely does he actually describe the nature of the visit. There was nothing to learn about their content and the results of the negotiations until 12. 7., when Antonio Pignatelli emerged from the conclave victorious. Ibidem, fol. 182r. The Diary of Anton

1689. Giulio Savelli introduced Liechtenstein to Cardinal Altieri, who had presided over the conclave and, after receiving a blessing from the hands of the Dean of the Conclave, Liechtenstein gave a short oration.⁸⁴ However it did not have any significant nor any direct impact on the negotiations.

After the exclusion of Barbarigo many other alternatives became available and in early April Liechtenstein reported: “*The outcome of this election is still not in sight and it still continues to be postponed. There are many candidates, but there is not too much difference between them. None of them can overcome any of the others without becoming a detriment to them.*” He saw the strongest rivals as being Altieri, Barberini, Niccolò Acciaioli (1630–1719), Panciatici and Barbarigo.⁸⁵ At the end of March the French cardinals had also opposed the latter. In mid-April, the imperial ambassador delivered two letters to Cardinal Goëss. In the first one Leopold I disavowed Barbarigo’s exclusion. In the second he subsequently admitted that he had not wanted him, but he refused to take-on a real share in ensuring that he would not be elected. In actual fact this should have been the responsibility of two of the pro-French cardinals, Ottoboni and Altieri. The whole issue came-out right and the *zelanti* believed that they could still achieve Barbarigo’s election. As was anticipated, Altieri and Ottoboni, with the support of the French cardinals expressed themselves as being strongly against this. Cogolludo and the representatives of the Spanish possessions in the Apennine peninsula also intrigued together against Barbarigo. Barbarigo himself eventually acted in the same manner as he had on the previous occasion – i.e. he resigned his candidacy.⁸⁶ From the end of April the possible candidacy of Antonio Pignatelli, who was the papal nuncio in Vienna during the years 1668–1671, had started to be talked about. In May, it seemed that the Imperials would agree with the Spaniards on this alternative.⁸⁷ In actual fact, however, the negotiations only continued until the 12th July 1691.

After Pignatelli’s election Pompeo Scarlatti also attributed the merit for it to Goëss and Liechtenstein.⁸⁸ In the spring and the summer months of 1691 Liechtenstein finally

Florian von Liechtenstein 1691–1694–see LIECHTENSTEIN. The Princely Collections, Vaduz – Vienna, Hausarchiv, HA2036. I thank Michaela Buriánková for providing a copy of the Diary.

84 A. F. von Liechtenstein to Leopold I, 31. 3. 1691. See ÖStA Wien, HHStA, StAbt, Rom Korr., Kart. 70, fol. 127r–128v, 126r.

85 “*Nondum ita maturus videtur huius Conclavis exitus imo ulterius protrahendus, Candidati enim plurimi sunt, nullus autem inter istos Summae distinctionis, qui aemulis praevaleat, nisi ut alter alteri noceat ne desideratam lauream adipiscatur.*” A letter from A. F. von Liechtenstein to Leopold I, 7. 4. 1691, Roma. Ibidem, fol. 1r.

86 L. von PASTOR, *Geschichte der Päpste*, XIV/2, pp. 1073–1080.

87 Ranuzio Pallavicini to Leopold I, 19. 5. 1691. See ÖStA Wien, HHStA, StAbt, Rom Korr., Kart. 70, fol. 15r.

88 P. Scarlatti to Leopold I, 14. 7. 1691. Ibidem, fol. 168r–173r.

achieved what he had hoped for two years previously – that he would actually be able to involve in the election of a new Pope. During the next conclaves it had already become a common praxis. To illustrate the course of these negotiations, I chose the prior mission of Antonio Rambaldo, Conte di Collalto, which resembled the above scenarios in many different ways.

Álvaro Cienfuegos Villazón and Antonio Rambaldo, Conte di Collalto in the year 1730

During the years 1720–1730 three conclaves were held sequentially in rapid succession in the course of which the imperial Cardinal and native-son of Asturias, Álvaro Cienfuegos Villazón SJ played a significant role. He was educated at the Universities of Oviedo and of Salamanca, which is where he joined the Jesuit Order. Subsequently he worked at the Universities of Santiago de Compostela, Avila and Salamanca. He also served as a theologian at the Court of the Count de Melgar (1646–1705), the Spanish Ambassador to the papal election in 1676, whom he also accompanied until he was on his deathbed. During the War of the Spanish Succession he was in the service of Joseph I (1678–1711) on behalf of whom he also undertook diplomatic missions not only in Lisbon and London but also in the United Provinces. It was in this context that after the Bourbons had taken-over the reign of Spain, he was forbidden from returning to his homeland. From 1702 he therefore resided in Portugal, adopting the role of a Minister of Emperor Charles VI, for whom he also carried-out other diplomatic tasks. In 1715, however, he moved to Vienna where Charles VI appointed him to the position of a cardinal. His negotiations with Pope Clement XI (1649–1721, pope since 1700) concerning establishing himself were lagging however and in fact Cienfuegos was not to wear the purple robe until the 30th September 1720. Less than a year later, for the first time, together with Cardinal Friedrich Michael von Althann (1682–1734) and Franz Ferdinand Kinsky (1678–1741), he was helping with the decision-making regarding a new Pope and it was Althann who had prevented the election of Cardinal Fabrizio Paolucci (1651–1726) in 1721.⁸⁹ From the 27th April 1722, as an imperial plenipotentiary (*plenipotentiarius*), Cienfuegos also headed the Imperial

89 Petra VOKÁČOVÁ, *Příběhy o hrdé pokoře. Aristokracie českých zemí v době baroka* [Stories of a Proud Submission: Aristocracy in the Czech Lands during the Baroque period], Prague 2014, pp. 395–398; Norbert HUBER, *Österreich und der Heilige Stuhl vom Ende des spanischen Erbfolgekrieges bis zum Tode Papst Klemens' XI. (1714–1721)*, Wien 1967, pp. 164–165, 179–196; Max von MAYER (Hg.), *Die Papstwahl Innocenz XIII.* (Wien 1874); Joachim BÄHLCKE, *Michael Fridrich hrabě z Althannu (1680–1734). Životní etapy preláta ve službách habsburské monarchie na počátku 18. století* [Michael Friedrich Graf von Althann (1680–1734), The stages in the life of a prelate in the service of the Habsburg Empire in the early 18th Century], in: Bronislav Chocholáč – Libor Jan – Tomáš Knoz (edd.),

Embassy. Interesting in regard to this is that most of the correspondence that he wrote by hand was in Spanish. His letters that were apparently intended for the officials of the *Reichskanzlei* and also of the Embassy are generally accompanied by Italian translations.

Alongside Cienfuegos there was always another extraordinary ambassador to the conclave – in 1721 it was Franz Ferdinand Kinsky,⁹⁰ in 1724 Maximilian Ulrich von Kaunitz (1679–1746)⁹¹ and in 1730 Antonio Rambaldo, Conte di Collalto. The first two had gained their experience in the Roman environment for the first time during their Grand Tours.⁹² Certainly, in respect of both of them, it was their kinship with experienced imperial diplomats that also played a significant role. Franz Ferdinand Kinsky's uncle was Franz Ulrich Kinsky (1634–1699), who was famous amongst other things for his participation in the Peace Congresses that took place in Nijmegen, Rijswijk and Sremski Karlovci, while the father of Maximilian Ulrich von Kaunitz was Dominik Andreas von Kaunitz (1655–1705), a former imperial plenipotentiary, who had been present at meetings that took place in the Hague and in Rijswijk. Maximilian Ulrich von Kaunitz could additionally draw on the experience of his older brother Franz Karl von Kaunitz (1676–1717), who had lived in Rome during the years 1699–1704, first during the course of his studies and later as the Imperial Auditor of Rota Romana.⁹³ Therefore neither of them was on a diplomatic mission for the first time. Franz Ferdinand Kinsky attended the meeting regarding the election of Charles VI as the Roman King that took place in 1711 in Frankfurt am Main⁹⁴ and in May 1716 Maximilian Ulrich von Kaunitz was sent to Lower Rhine-Westphalia and to Upper Saxony to negotiate for obtaining military aid against the Ottoman Empire.

Antonio Rombaldo, Conte di Collalto had an indisputable advantage in comparison with any of the previous imperial ambassadors to the conclave, from the fact that he was

Nový Mars Moravicus aneb Sborník příspěvků, jež věnovali Prof. Dr. Josefu Váلكovi jeho žáci a přátelé k sedmdesátinám, Brno 1999, pp. 506–507.

90 P. VOKÁČOVÁ, *Příběhy o hrdé pokoře*, pp. 369–411.

91 The younger son of Dominik Andreas von Kaunitz and Maria Eleonora von Sternberg (1656–1706). On 21. 9. 1720 he was awarded the title of Privy Councillor. During the years 1721–1746 he held the office of the Moravian *Landeshauptman*. Grete KLINGENSTEIN, *Der Aufstieg des Hauses Kaunitz. Studien und Herkunft und Bildung des Staatskanzlers Wenzel Anton von Kaunitz*, Göttingen 1975.

92 Maximilian Ulrich von Kaunitz was on a journey together with his brother Franz Karl in the years 1696–1700; he stayed in Rome from 19. 11. 1699 to 5. 5. 1700 (with the exception of a trip to Naples that he made in February). Jiří KUBEŠ, *Náročné dospívání urozených. Kavalírské cesty české a rakouské šlechty (1620–1750)* [Challenging Adolescence of Nobles. The Grand Tours of the Czech and the Austrian nobility], Pelhřimov 2013, p. 373.

93 Some marks about his dealing in diplomatic service of Austrian Habsburgs see David Martin MARCOS, *El papado y la Guerra de sucesión Española*, Madrid 2011, pp. 94, 116n, 140, 144.

94 Jiří KUBEŠ, *Volba a korunovace Karla VI. římským císařem v roce 1711* [Election and Coronation of Charles VI to Holy Roman Emperor in 1711], ČČH 111, 2013, pp. 805–841.

a native Italian.⁹⁵ In 1707 the last member of the Moravian Antonio branch, Leopoldo Rambaldo, Conte di Collalto had died. The Moravian Collalto estates with their residences in Brtnice and Rudolec were then taken over by Vinciguerra V di Collalto (1647–1719), who lived in the ancestral castle of San Salvatore in northern Italy, and he then passed them on to his eldest son – Antonio Rambaldo.

His mother was Eleonora Teresa Countess della Torre-Tassis (Thurn-Taxis, † 1726), while her brother Ferdinando († 1721) held the hereditary office of the Imperial Postmaster in Venice. Collalto maintained a correspondence with his cousin Leopold († 1728), who took office after his father. This also facilitated Collalto's way to mission in Rome.

His education had begun in his native castle in San Salvatore, which he subsequently left for the Jesuit College in Brescia, where he graduated in the year 1700. Four years later he became a member of the *Maggior Consiglio* of Venice. Expected of him was a clerical career in the service of the Venetian Republic. After the tragic death of his relative, however, he moved to Vienna to take over the management of the Moravian Estates and of the customs in Ybbs an der Donau. He subsequently settled in Brtnice near Jihlava. At that time he was also engaged to Maria Eleonora, Countess of Starhemberg (1691–1745). The mediators of both the betrothal and the marriage that followed in 1708 were, amongst others, the Venetian representative in Vienna Daniele Dolfin (1688–1762), the *Obersthofmeister* of Joseph I (and later also of Charles VI) Leopold Donat Trautson (1659–1724) and the Bohemian *Oberstkanzler* Johann Wenzel Wratistlaw von Mitrowitz (1669–1712). In 1709 Vinciguerra Tomaso, the first son of the marriage, was born.

Even after the departure to Moravia and to the Imperial Court in Vienna Collalto kept in touch with many Italian Princes, cardinals and scholars. He also maintained his ties to the Accademia dell'Arcadia in Rome. From his correspondence we can follow his relationships with Ludovico Antonio Muratori (1672–1750),⁹⁶ Francesco Ercolani SJ

95 Zdeněk KAZLEPKA, *Ostrov italského vkusu. Umělecký mecenát Antonia Rambalda hraběte z Collalto a San Salvatore mezi Itálií, Vídní a Moravou v první polovině 18. století* [Island of Italian Taste. The artistic patronage of Antonio Rambaldo, Conte di Collalto e San Salvatore between Italy, Vienna and Moravia during the first half of the 18th Century], Brno 2011; IDEM, *Paprsky Apollónovy a Martovy blesky, Umělecký mecenát Antonia Rambalda hraběte z Collalto a San Salvatore mezi Itálií, Vídní a Moravou v první polovině 18. století* [Apollo's rays and Mars's lightning bolts. The Artistic Patronage of Antonio Rambaldo, Conte di Collalto e San Salvatore between Italy, Vienna and Moravia during the first half of the 18th Century], available at URL: <<http://www.slu.cz/slu/cz/projekty/webs/popularizace/postery-sylaby-publikace-1/poster/ka2/KA2-sylabus-kazlepka.pdf>> [cit. 23. 8. 2016]; Štěpán VÁCHA – Irena VESELÁ – Vít VLNAS – Petra VOKÁČOVÁ, *Karel VI. a Alžběta Kristýna: Česká korunovace 1723* [Charles VI and Elizabeth Christine: The Bohemian Coronation in 1723] Prague – Litomyšl 2009, pp. 94–97, 251–256.

96 Letters of L. A. Muratori to A. R. di Collalto from the years 1708–1712. MZA Brno, G 169, Kart. 118, inv. No. 2212, sign. VII 10 7.

(1659–1731)⁹⁷ and with Charles VI's Court Poet in Vienna, Apostolo Zeno (1688–1750),⁹⁸ the Cardinals Prospero Marefoschi (1653–1732), Alessandro Albani (1692–1779), the prefect of the Congregation de Propaganda Fide – Vincenzo Petra (1662–1747)⁹⁹ and many others. In 1719 he also brought together his Moravian and his Italian possessions.

In 1716 Charles VI bestowed upon him a golden key with the *wirklicher Kämmerer* title. He then especially won over the Emperor when in 1723 he hosted him with his whole family in Brtnice twice, both when he was travelling to and returning from his Coronation as the King of Bohemia.¹⁰⁰ His status rose to its highest point in 1729, when he was appointed as the *wirklicher Geheimer Rat*. At that time, according to the testimony of steward of Cardinal Leandro di Porzia (1673–1740), Collalto was referred to in Roman circles as the possible future Governor of Milan or as the Naples Viceroy.¹⁰¹ These intentions, however, were cancelled because of the news concerning the deteriorating health of Pope Benedict XIII (1649–1730, pope since 1724). The Imperial Court started to search for an extraordinary ambassador.

In February 1730 Cardinal Cienfuegos advocated for Prince Scipione Publicola di Santa Croce († 1747),¹⁰² while Eugene of Savoy (1663–1736), for a change, proposed Franz Josef Czernin von Chudenitz (1697–1733).¹⁰³ The fact that the choice eventually fell on Collalto was partly due to Gundakar Thomas, Count of Starhemberg (1663–1745), who had offered his services to the Emperor immediately after the announcement of the death of Benedict XIII.¹⁰⁴ In comparison with Czernin, Collalto possessed an undoubted advantage in terms of his origin and his associated linguistic and social capital. He outweighed both of his competitors by his promise that he would carry out the mission at his own expense. He received the instructions to set off to Rome on the 4th March 1730 and, in connection therewith, he was also promoted to the status of an Imperial Count.¹⁰⁵

97 MZA Brno, G 169, Kart. 118, inv. No. 2209.

98 Letters of A. Zeno to A. R. di Collalto from the years 1722–1724, 1732. Ibidem, inv. No. 2213, sign. VII 10 8.

99 MZA Brno, G 169, Kart. 113, inv. No. 2138, sign. VI 2 8.

100 Š. VÁCHA – I. VESELÁ – V. VLNAS – P. VOKÁČOVÁ, *Karel VI. a Alžběta Kristýna*, pp. 94–97, 251–256.

101 P. VOKÁČOVÁ, *Příběhy o hrdé pokoře*, pp. 450–451.

102 Cardinal Cienfuegos to Charles VI, 21. 2. 1730. See ÖStA Wien, HHStA, StAbt, Rom Korr., Kart. 113, fol. 27r–v. Finally he worked for Imperial Embassy. He was in contact with Cardinal Davia and his conclavists and gave their reports to Collalto. See MZA Brno, Knihovna Collaltů [Collalto Family Library], Memoria del Ambasciata di Roma del Antonio Rombaldo di Collalto, inv. No. 55, sign. MS II B 1, 2. Vol., fol. 161r–162r.

103 P. VOKÁČOVÁ, *Příběhy o hrdé pokoře*, pp. 413–465.

104 Ibidem, pp. 450–451.

105 A. R. di Collalto to Charles VI, 4. 3. 1730. ÖStA Wien, HHStA, StAbt, Rom Korr., Kart. 113, fol. 1r.

In the winter of 1730 everyone in Rome was keeping a watch on the health of Benedict XIII. To the session from the 21st February Cienfuegos added a postscript that the Pope had suddenly weakened and received the last rites. Apparently he died just hours after Cienfuegos had sent his letter. When considering the upcoming conclave he was reminded of the last one, from 1724, when, due to the absence of some “*German*” cardinals, Cardinal Giulio Piazza (1663–1726), whom he and Maximilian Ulrich von Kaunitz both supported, did not succeed.¹⁰⁶

In Rome in the 18th Century the expression *German cardinal* (*cardinale tedesco*) basically corresponded to *imperial* – a cardinal who favours the Emperor. In addition to the native Spaniard Cienfuegos in 1730 they also included the Bishop of Speyer – Damian Hugo Philipp von Schönborn (1676–1743), the Bishop of Vác – Michael Fridrich von Althann, the Archbishop of Vienna – Sigismund von Kollonitsch (1677–1751) and the Bishop of Győr – Philip Ludwig von Sinzendorf (1699–1747), while absent were the Bishop of Olomouc and the Cardinal *protector Germaniae et Austriae* Wolfgang Hannibal von Schrattenbach, the Archbishop of Kalocsa and Bács Imre Csáky (1672–1732) and the Archbishop of Mecheln in Belgium Thomas Philip d’Alsace-Boussu (1679–1759). The Milanese, the Neapolitan and some other cardinals also cooperated with the Imperials.

Already in 1729 the Emperor had commissioned Cardinal Cienfuegos to reorganise the inventory of the current cardinals *papabili*, including their labelling, as being “*too young and therefore hardly eligible*”, “*too old and therefore weak*”, “*suspicious*”, “*devoted to the Emperor*” and/or “*indifferent*”. The list of candidates of tiara was very extensive, as also was the number of factions that clashed during the election. Although Benedict XIII only reigned for six years, he managed to establish 29 cardinals, of whom 22 were still alive. Twenty five of Clement XI’s cardinals had stood against them, headed by his nephew Annibale Albani (1682–1751).

Under the leadership of his brother Alessandro a new Savoy faction had formed. In concordance with the Imperials and the *zelanti* they rejected the Tuscan candidates and, on the contrary, preferred the French cardinals who were under the leadership of Melchior de Polignac (1661–1741). Also in the game was the danger of war of succession in Tuscany between the Empire and France. The ageing Grand Duke of Tuscany Gian Gastone de’Medici (1671–1737) had no male offspring and many of the Tuscan cardinals had direct ties to him. The Spanish cardinals, led by Cornelio Bentivoglio (1668–1732), had already not been cooperating with the Imperials for a long time. Lengthy negotiations were anticipated, during the course of which it would not be easy to find any solution.¹⁰⁷

106 Cardinal Cienfuegos to Charles VI, 21. 2. 1730. Ibidem, fol. 27r–v.

107 For more information in regard to this see L. von PASTOR, *Geschichte der Päpste*, XV, pp. 607–624.

The conclave was closed on the 5th March 1730. Cienfuegos was accompanied by two of his officials (as fellow conclavists) – i.e. the auditor Giovanni dell’Aquila and the secretary Francesco Galante. The Secretary of the Imperial Embassy, Bartolomeo Antonio Passi, had already adopted the role of the principal imperial rapporteur on the 4th March.¹⁰⁸ His letters were frequently delivered by special couriers, whom apparently Passi appointed from time-to-time.¹⁰⁹

Already during the first days Cardinals Polignac and Bentivoglio converged while the French and Spanish parties also began to cooperate. The *zelanti*, at the very beginning of the negotiations, had suggested Cardinal Giuseppe Renato Imperiali (1651–1737). Just as had happened in 1724, however, the French and Spanish cardinals again excluded him. The Albani brothers did not support him either, because apparently they assumed that he would be acting against their own private interests. Cienfuegos did not reject Imperiali’s election; however, he maintained a compromise opinion in regard to the two camps while awaiting instructions from the Imperial Court.¹¹⁰ He tried to take advantage of the fragmentation of the Imperiali’s faction to negotiate concerning other possible options.¹¹¹ The *zelanti*, however, could not be discouraged so easily and they requested direct confirmation from the mouth of the Spanish King that he really did insist on the exclusion. They also tried to obtain support from Cardinal André-Hercule de Fleury (1653–1743), who had stayed in France, while from the Imperials they expected a clear stance. At the scrutinium, that took place on the 20th March, Imperiali again received 18 votes. At that time Cienfuegos was negotiating in favour of Cardinal Tommaso Ruffo (1663–1753).¹¹²

Sigismund von Kollonitsch and Michael Friedrich von Althann entered the conclave on the 1st April. On the same day Antonio Rambaldo di Collalto arrived in Rome *incognito*.

108 Bartolomeo Antonio Passi was born in Pressano near Trento, where he was ordained a priest in 1716. He was a Canon of Trent and the Secretary of the Imperial Embassy in Rome. In 1744 he was appointed as an auxiliary Bishop of Trent and a titular Bishop of Pelle (now Jordan). He is also the author of an Italian biography of St. John of Nepomuk that was published on the occasion of his canonisation. He dedicated it to Cardinal Cienfuegos. Bartolomeo Antonio PASSI, *La Istoria Della Vita, del Martirio, e de’ Miracoli Di S. Giovanni Nepomuceno Canonico Di Praga, Con gli Atti della sua Canonizzazione*, Roma 1729.

109 In the letter of 18. 3. he appoints a certain Dreiling, while on 22. 3. also Giuseppe Osso, who travelled with messages from the Viceroy of Naples Aloys Thomas Raimund von Harrach. Letters of B. A. Passi to Charles VI from 18. and 22. 3. 1730. See ÖStA Wien, HHStA, StAbt, Rom Korr., Kart. 113, fol. 8r–12r, 30r.

110 B. A. Passi to Charles VI, 22. 3. 1730. Ibidem, fol. 8r–12r.

111 B. A. Passi to Charles VI, 18. 3. 1730. Ibidem, fol. 16r. See also the instructions for Cardinal Cienfuegos of 8. 3. 1730. All the attached lists with the names of excluded and recommended cardinals were lost. The instructions for A. R. di Collalto are also of the same date. L. WURMBRAND, *Das Ausschliessungs-Recht*, p. 320.

112 B. A. Passi to Charles VI, 25. 3. 1730. ÖStA Wien, HHStA, StAbt, Rom Korr., Kart. 113, fol. 39v.

Like Liechtenstein, even in this case it did not mean that Passi and Cardinal Cienfuegos would not be informed about his arrival. They had already been watching his steps closely since the 13th March, when, equipped with the instructions, he set off on a journey in the postal coach through Venice, Ferrara, Bologna, Ancona and Loreto. In Narni he was reached by a fast courier,¹¹³ who, on behalf of Cardinal Cienfuegos offered him the latter's palace, which at that time stood on the Piazza della Pilotta at the site of the Pontifical Gregorian University's present building and transmitted to him the information about the people in Rome who will be available to him. Passi himself rode to Castelnuovo to meet him, where he reported on the developments in recent days. Collalto then asked him to be available as his personal secretary.¹¹⁴ Upon his arrival at the Ponte Molle Cardinal Cienfuegos' carriages awaited him. He was greeted by his future steward Cesare Ercolani di Santo Stefano and accompanied by him, still *incognito*, he entered, the gates of Rome. Immediately after lunch he sent Ercolani to brief his arrival directly to the conclave and to arrange an accreditation there together with the earliest possible date for an audience. On the same evening he appeared in the anticamera of the Palace of Francesco Barberini, Jr. (1662–1738), the Dean of the Conclave, where the Cardinal's Steward officially welcomed him. In the following days he met with many nobles and diplomats. He also discussed in writing the most immediate joint approach with Cardinal Cienfuegos, who then, almost daily, reported to him in detail about what was happening at the conclave.¹¹⁵ On the 6th April he hosted an official welcoming ceremony in Cardinal Cienfuegos' Palace with the participation of many prelates, ambassadors and nobles and announced to them that on the 10th April 1730, after the morning scrutiny, he would be admitted to the audience before the conclave. He was also inviting his guests to accompany him in a festive parade to St. Peter's Square.¹¹⁶

113 B. A. Passi to Charles VI, 11. 3. 1730. Ibidem, fol. 8r–12r.

114 Most of Collalto's sessions were written by Passi's hand. From June 1730 Giovanni Battista Ruele took over the agenda. Ibidem.

115 Correspondence of Cardinal Cienfuegos sent to A. R. di Collalto. MZA Brno, G 169, Kart. 113, inv. No. 2139, sign. VII 2 2. B. A. Passi, 1. and 11. 4., and A. R. di Collalto to Charles VI, 4. 4. 1730. See ÖStA Wien, HHStA, StAbt, Rom Korr., Kart. 113, fol. 56r, 58r–59v, 4r.

116 He issued an extensive session about it in the Jan Jakub Komárek's printshop. *Relazione dell' audienza pubblica, che a 10. di Aprile 1730 ebbe dal Sagro Collegio in Conclave l' Eccellentissimo Signor Antonio Rambaldo del Sagro Romano Imperio Conte di Collalto, ...*, Roma 1730. MZA Brno, G 169, Kart. 143, inv. No. 2320. See also the letter of A. R. di Collalto to Charles VI of 11. 4. 1730 in ÖStA Wien, HHStA, StAbt, Rom Korr., Kart. 113, fol. 8r–11v, 7r–v, 24r. On 4. 4. Cardinal Cienfuegos informed him about the date of audience. The letter of Cardinal Cienfuegos to A. R. di Collalto of 4. 4. 1730 in MZA Brno, G 169, Kart. 113, inv. No. 2139, sign. VII 2 2, fol. 5r–v. Already in 1694 Komárek's printing house issued a treatise on the allegorical carriages of Anton Florian von Liechtenstein, which was dedicated to the Cardinal Goëss. *Breve descrizione e disegni delle carroze dell' eccellentissimo Signore Antonio Floriano del S.R.I. Principe di Liechtenstein e Nicolsburg, ...*, Roma 1694 (Knihovna

The audience took place in accordance with the already well-known scenario. At the head of the procession came the gold-decorated six-horse carriages of Cardinal Cienfuegos, led by the Secretary of the Imperial Embassy Francesco Antonio Spada (1688–1736). Behind him, at a distance of about sixty steps, came Collalto himself, surrounded by five archbishops. Alongside him were a dozen armed men and two canons who were supposed to inform him about the people whom they had met along the way. Collalto's *Stallmeister* Giuseppe Gonzalez de Sepulveda († 1741) followed them on an ornately clothed horse, together with two richly gilded carriages holding prelates and twelve other nobles. Outside the gates of Vatican Collalto was received by Marshal Augusto Chigi (1662–1744),¹¹⁷ who escorted him to the door of the conclave. He opened the door window and the secretary Spada submitted Collalto's authorising letters to the dean of the conclave. Cardinal Cienfuegos who on that day chaired cardinals-priests and Cardinal Carlo Maria Marini (1677–1747), as a superior of the cardinals-deans, subsequently checked those letters and then handed them over to the Secretary of the Conclave to read them out loud in front of everyone. Collalto then doffed his hat and bowed, put his hat back on his head and delivered a solemn speech in Latin.

In his speech he urged the electors to elect such a pope who will be “*a burning lamp before thy people and who will be all for all*”.¹¹⁸ Already, traditionally, he referred to the Emperor as “*the eternal advocate and the most powerful and resolute protector of the Church*”.¹¹⁹ However, in any way he suggested the name of any preferred candidate. He ended with a deft quip: “*Let the clergy possess leading position in the Empire and let the Empire possess the leading position in the clergy*”.¹²⁰ Cardinal Barberini replied briefly in Italian and Collalto received compliments from the cardinals who were present. He then left for the Basilica of St. Peter to pray there and he looked at St. Peter's tomb, the altar of the Virgin and Child and that of St. Wenceslas and the family patrons, Apostles Simon and Jude. After his return to the palace a banquet was held for forty-six guests.¹²¹

Národního muzea [The National Museum Library], sign. 55 B 5). In regard to the production of Komárek's printing house in Hana BERÁNKOVÁ, *Činnost tiskařské rodiny Komárků v Římě* [Activities of the Komárks printing family in Rome], *Miscellanea oddělení rukopisů a starých tisků* 12, 1995, pp. 59–71, 210–213.

117 The Chigi family took over the office of the Marshall of the Holy Roman Catholic Church in 1712 after the Savelli family. Subsequently they held it until the year 1966. N. del RE, *Il Maresciallo di Santa Romana Chiesa*, pp. 46–48, 101.

118 “*qui sit lucerna ardens coram hominibus, et omnibus omnia sit...*” *Relazione dell' audienza pubblica*, MZA Brno, G 169, Kart. 143, inv. No. 2320.

119 “*perpetuus advocatus, potentissimus Protector, acerrimus Defensor*”. *Ibidem*.

120 “*Sacerdotium erit praesidium Imperii, et praesidium Sacerdotii erit Imperium*.” *Ibidem*.

121 *Ibidem*.

Even at that time many still hoped that the Spanish party would withdraw its veto against Imperiali. Ruffo, Antonfelice Zondadari (1665–1737) and other candidates were also mentioned. Cienfuegos won for his interests Cardinal Armand-Gaston-Maxmilien de Rohan (1674–1749), who negotiated with the other French and with Barberini about the possibilities of an agreement with the Imperials. His attempts proved unsuccessful, however, because the French maintained their coalition with Barberini and waited for the messenger from Paris. The messenger arrived with the confirmation of Imperiali's exclusion at the beginning of May.¹²²

In mid-April Cardinal Schönborn crossed the Ponte Milvio and complemented the number of the Imperials in the conclave. From the letters that Schönborn's conclavists had been sending regularly to Collalto since the 18th April, it is apparent that he, as well as Collalto, was in permanent contact with the *Prinzipalkommisar* of the Imperial Diet in Regensburg, Frobenius Ferdinand zu Fürstenberg-Mößkirch (1664–1741), and also with his brother, *Reichsvizekanzler* Friedrich Karl von Schönborn (1674–1746).¹²³ The *Reichskanzlei* was thereby putting pressure on several places at the same time.

Cienfuegos failed to promote Ruffo against the wishes of Cardinal Barberini. The latter seemed to be more willing in regard to the candidacy of the former nuncio in Vienna Gianantonio Davia (1660–1740). Cienfuegos was putting him in second place however, and was negotiating with the Spanish party for possible support for Ruffo. A certain part of the Imperials, together with the cardinals of Benedict XIII, agreed on Alessandro Falconieri (1657–1734); Cienfuegos hoped, however, that they would not obtain the requisite majority.¹²⁴ When, on the 24th April, the Spanish courier arrived with the confirmation of the veto against Imperiali,¹²⁵ Cienfuegos managed to obtain support for Ruffo from Cardinal Bentivoglio. Meanwhile Collalto was negotiating with the Spanish and the Savoy representatives about possible cooperation and intervened with the Milan Governor Wirich Philipp von Daun (1669–1741) to put pressure on the Milan cardinals. The result of the election was not yet in sight however, because neither of the acceptable candidates had the possibility of winning a majority.¹²⁶

122 A. R. di Collalto to Charles VI, 10. 5. 1730. ÖStA Wien, HHStA, StAbt, Rom Korr., Kart. 113, fol. 75r–v.

123 A. R. di Collalto to Charles VI, 24. 4. 1730. Ibidem, fol. 41r–42v, 51r–52r. The correspondence of Cardinal Schönborn and of his conclavists sent to A. R. di Collalto in MZA Brno, G 169, Kart. 113, inv. No. 2140, sign. VII 2 3. Antonio Rambaldo, Conte di Collalto also maintained a correspondence with Friedrich Karl von Schönborn and with Fürstenberg. Ibidem, inv. Nos. 2147 and 2152, sign. VII 3 4 and 9.

124 Cardinal Cienfuegos to A. R. di Collalto, 23. 4. 1730. Ibidem, inv. No. 2139, sign. VII 2 2, fol. 41r–v.

125 A. R. di Collalto to Charles VI, 24. 4. 1730. ÖStA Wien, HHStA, StAbt, Rom Korr., Kart. 113, fol. 55r.

126 Cardinal Cienfuegos to A. R. di Collalto, 28. 4. 1730 in MZA Brno, G 169, Kart. 113, inv. No. 2139, sign. VII 2 2, fol. 53r; W. Daun to A. R. di Collalto, 19. and 26. 4. 1730, Venezia, ibidem, Kart. 114, inv. No. 2159, sign. VII 4 3.

Already in April the Cardinal Lorenzo Corsini's (1652–1740) star was gradually rising, supported by Clement's and the French cardinals, while during the first half of May nearly half of the conclave had been standing on his side.¹²⁷ Therefore the Imperials gathered at a secret night meeting in Althann's cell to agree on a unified procedure against him. They intended to use the veto only in extreme situations. Cienfuegos characterised Corsini as being a very old and nearly blind man who suffers from severe gout and thereby is incapable of managing the World Church, "*apart from which the fact is that he is even from Tuscany*".¹²⁸ Imperial resistance caused the growth of Cienfuegos' importance when Cardinal Barberini tried to convince him in regard to Corsini, saying that it will be he who will create the Pope ("*un Papa fatto da me*").¹²⁹ When Alessandro Albani also anti-voiced¹³⁰ Corsini in mid-May he suddenly lost.¹³¹ The interviews that Collalto, Cienfuegos and Schönborn organised suggested that the Imperials would have to give up their hopes of Cardinal Ruffo's success.¹³²

In May Collalto's son, Vinciguerra Tomaso, came to Rome to participate in the festive life of the Eternal City.¹³³ The time was filled with ceremonial visits and also worshipping on various specific occasions – whether it was the celebration of St. John of Nepomuk, which was held on the 20th May in the church of St. Maria dell'Anima and continued with a banquet in Collalto's residence, or the feast of Corpus Christi, about which the contemporary Viennese newspaper also reported because they carefully followed the events in Rome.¹³⁴

127 Cardinal Cienfuegos to A. R. di Collalto, 15. 5.1730. Ibidem, Kart. 113, inv. No. 2139, sign. VII 2 2, fol. 79r.

128 Cardinal Cienfuegos to Charles VI, 18. 5. 1730. ÖStA Wien, HHStA, StAbt, Rom Korr., Kart. 113, fol. 56r–58r.

129 Cardinal Cienfuegos to A. R. di Collalto, 14. 5. 1730. MZA Brno, G 169, Kart. 113, inv. No. 2139, sign. VII 2 2, fol. 75r.

130 A. R. di Collalto to Charles VI, 10. and 19. 5. 1730. Ibidem, fol. 77r–v, 98r; L. von PASTOR, *Geschichte der Päpste*, XV, pp. 607–624.

131 Since May A. R. di Collalto began to attach to his sessions printed summaries of votes from scrutinia that he received from Cienfuegos' conclavists. Scrutinia of 15. and 16. 5.; Corsini 15. 5.: 15 votes / 16. 5. 5 votes; Falconieri 16 / 19; Ruffo 14 / 12; Zondadari 6 / 12; Imperiali 5 votes. See ÖStA Wien, HHStA, StAbt, Rom Korr., Kart. 113, fol. 96r, 97v.

132 Cardinal Cienfuegos to A. R. di Collalto, 20. 5. 1730, MZA Brno, G 169, Kart. 113, inv. No. 2139, sign. VII 2 2, fol. 87r; Dullard, Cardinal Schönborn's conclavist, to A. R. di Collalto, 19. 5. 1730, ibidem, inv. No. 2140, sign. VII 2 3, fol. 37v.

133 Cardinal Cienfuegos to A. R. di Collalto, 6. 5. 1730. Ibidem, inv. No. 2139, sign. VII 2 2, fol. 66r.

134 *Fernerer Bericht dessen, was währenden Conclave zu Rom von dem 9ten Junii bis den 13den Junii 1730 sich merkwürdig zugetragen*, Wienerisches Diarium, An Appendix to No. 54, 8. 7. 1730. Available at URL: <<http://anno.onb.ac.at/cgi-content/anno?aid=wrz&datum=17300708&seite=9&zoom=33>> [cit. 18. 8. 2016]. In regard to festivities and representation during A. R. di Collalto's stay in Rome Z. KAZLEPKA, *Ostrov italského vkusu*, pp. 96–98.

That time Collalto started to write about the course of the conclave much more extensively. He was describing turns and coalitions of individual cardinals day after day and also cited correspondence and conversations that he had with his rapporteurs, conclavists, lobbyists of individual parties and also cardinals. It was just then, when a disagreement occurred between the Imperials. It was mainly up to Cienfuegos and Collalto to once again reunite so that they could decide on the final outcome of the conclave.

At the end of May, the Spanish party in accordance with French vetoed Zondadari and the fortune began to turn towards Davia.¹³⁵ However the French together with Barberini, who preferred Pier Marcellino Corradini (1658–1743), lined up against.¹³⁶ Collalto characterised him latter as a choleric man with attacks of rage, who hates the Germans.¹³⁷ Cienfuegos therefore preferred the return to the previous support of Ruffo.¹³⁸ While Cardinal Althann inclined to Corradini. In response to Kollonitsch's appeal for loyalty to the Emperor he was referring to the freedom of choice.¹³⁹ Austrian historian Ludwig von Pastor (1854–1928) claimed on part of the French faction it was only about the manner of how to break the imperial unity, to discredit Cardinal Althann and to intimidate the Imperials so that they opposed vetoing Corradini thereby making it easier to subsequently promote another candidate. Cardinal Schönborn later also inclined to Corradini's election,¹⁴⁰ but he fell ill in late June and left the conclave for health reasons on the 1st July. Cienfuegos thereby remained the main opponent and claimed that the Emperor will not let Corradini to become a pope.¹⁴¹ Together with Collalto they had to make every effort to find another alternative. To this end Cienfuegos said about Collalto that he proceeds with extreme wisdom and admirable manners (*“con particolare prudenza, zelo, e maniera ammirabile”*).¹⁴²

135 Cardinal Cienfuegos to A. R. di Collalto, 26. 5. 1730. MZA Brno, G 169, Kart. 113, inv. No. 2139, sign. VII 2 2, fol. 95r.

136 Cardinal Cienfuegos to A. R. di Collalto, 8. 6. 1730. Ibidem, fol. 107r.

137 A. R. di Collalto to Charles VI, 20. 6. 1730. See ÖStA Wien, HHStA, StAbt, Rom Korr., Kart. 113, fol. 163r.

138 Cardinal Cienfuegos to A. R. di Collalto, 8. 6. 1730 in MZA Brno, G 169, Kart. 113, inv. No. 2139, sign. VII 2 2, fol. 107r. Similarly also the letter of the conclavist Schönborn to A. R. di Collalto of 9. 6. 1730, ibidem, inv. No. 2140, sign. VII 2 3, fol. 64r.

139 The session of the conclavist Kollonitsche is attached to the letter of A. R. di Collalto of 1. 7. 1730, MZA Brno, G 169, Kart. 113, inv. No. 2139, sign. VII 2 2, fol. 5r–6r. Likewise in April Althann apparently belonged to the cardinals, who refused to respect Spanish veto against Imperiali. A. R. di Collalto to Charles VI, 24. 4. 1730, ÖStA Wien, HHStA, StAbt, Rom Korr., Kart. 113, fol. 51r; L. WURMBRAND, *Das Ausschliessungs-Recht*, p. 321.

140 A. R. di Collalto to Charles VI, 1. 7. 1730. ÖStA Wien, HHStA, StAbt, Rom Korr., Kart. 113, fol. 22r.

141 Francesco Galante to B. A. Passi, 23. 6. 1730. Ibidem, fol. 7r–v.

142 Cardinal Cienfuegos to Charles VI, 3. 6. 1730. Ibidem, fol. 67r.

Althann claimed that the Emperor would not contradict any pope to which most of the conclave agree to ensure an untouchable freedom of decision-making of the Cardinal College. Together with Barberini and with others he sent on the 19th June a messenger to the Emperor with a question of whether or not he insists on his opposition against Corradini. Collalto only hoped that his intentions were good, even if his behaviour is rather to the detriment of imperial intentions. By contrast he considered the main rival of Corradini, Falconiere, who was a longtime enemy of Cardinal Barberini as much better, whole “ours” and suitable for the tiara.¹⁴³

The imperial faction throughout June abated, Ruffo also fell ill and Collalto stated that the situation is turning worse and worse.¹⁴⁴ Corradini’s preferences fortunately eventually dropped even before the answer to Althann’s letter arrived, in which the Emperor confirmed his exclusion. It was the pro-French Cardinal Antonio Banchieri (1667–1733) who had now the greatest hope for success. Nevertheless the Imperials together with the *zelanti* were against him, because they did not find him sufficiently morally upright and virtuous.¹⁴⁵ In the night of the 5th July, hopes returned back to Zondadari and Corsini who was particularly favoured by former Corradini’s supporters. The Imperials continued to insist on their opposition to the Tuscan cardinals and tried to promote Ruffo again. Collalto’s moment came.

In the evening of the 6th July Cienfuegos asked him to immediately attend the conclave. On the site he then told him that Barberini was fully determined to support Corsini. Since Collalto could not avert this step of the Dean of the Conclave, it was necessary to discuss what next.¹⁴⁶ A day later a messenger arrived to Cienfuegos with instructions based on which the Imperials were to resign on resistance in the event of a new candidacy of Corsini.¹⁴⁷ On the same day Collalto therefore met the nephew of favoured candidate Neri Maria Corsini (1685–1770) and spoke with him extensively about a possible support of the Imperials, who accepted it only “*in order to avoid the greater evil*”.¹⁴⁸ Collalto started slowly to talk about something else and mentioned the conversation that they had two months ago. He said that even today he would responded the same way. However, the conclave had lasted too long, and it is necessary to decide as soon as possible. Therefore, there is a possibility of agreement between the French, imperial and Savoy parties. The

143 “*molto più perche è nostro affatto, ed è degnissimo del Papato...*” A. R. di Collalto to Charles VI, 1. 7. 1730, ÖStA Wien, HHStA, StAbt, Rom Korr., Kart. 113, fol. 21v, 27r, 34r, 35r.

144 Ibidem, fol. 37r.

145 Ibidem, fol. 230v.

146 Ibidem, fol. 238r–v.

147 L. von PASTOR, *Geschichte der Päpste*, XV, p. 622.

148 “*...solo per evitare un male molto maggiore...*” A. R. di Collalto to Charles VI, 12. 7. 1730. See ÖStA Wien, HHStA, StAbt, Rom Korr., Kart. 113, fol. 50v.

imperial party did not propose Corsini, but they chose him just to avoid a greater evil. The Imperials will therefore not take any redundant steps. Corsini primarily had to prove his loyalty to the Emperor and this was a fact in regard to which Cienfuegos had not trusted him much.¹⁴⁹ When Neri Corsini promised it, Collalto went to see the Savoy diplomat Carlo Francesco Ferrero di Roasio, the Marquis d’Ormea. He was quite surprised by this development in the turn of events; although he had assured himself that he always acted in accordance with the Imperials, after May’s rejection of Corsini’s candidacy it now seemed hard for him to agree with him.¹⁵⁰

Alessandro Albani, who headed the Savoy faction, was also not enthusiastic about the current situation. The French now insisted on having Banchieri and Cardinal Rohan even talked about excluding Corsini. Eventually, on the 11th July, they did express their consent. However, they did make it conditional on Banchieri actually becoming a Papal State Secretary. Their wish did come true just three days after Corsini had been elected to become the Pope. Collalto’s cautious approach towards him did pay off. In many ways these events resembled the situation in 1689, when the Imperials chose the lesser evil, while the French achievement was that their chosen candidate became the Papal State Secretary. In this case too, the Imperial Ambassador negotiated with the potential papal nephew in regard to finally achieving success and also tried to commit him, and especially his uncle, by means of them taking an oath of loyalty to the Emperor.

The sessions of diplomats and their secretaries at the conclave often revealed that during these missions what went on was not only about the papal election. Already during the *sede vacante* period what loomed out was the roles that the individual cardinals would be playing during the next pontificate. For example in 1689 Pompeo Scarlatti revealed that Liechtenstein carried out his activities with regard to Cardinal Colonna, who had been excluded in accordance with instructions that emanated from the *papabili* circle, and also with other important persons, who in the future would be negotiating with a new Pope.¹⁵¹

After the end of the conclave, the Imperial Embassy official, Giovanni Battista Ruele, prepared an extensive report for Emperor Charles VI.¹⁵² On the 12th July 1730 even Collalto’s mission had not yet been completed. He received the instructions for the next meeting, in accordance with which he was supposed to conclude his mission on the 9th August 1730. It was mainly the audience before Pope Clement XII, which took place

149 Ibidem, fol. 50v–51r.

150 There was a sharp dispute between them, during which they almost “drew their swords” (*così dire, sfoderata la spada*). Ibidem, fol. 43r–47r.

151 P. Scarlatti to Leopold I, 24. 9. 1689. ÖStA Wien, HHStA, StAbt, Rom Korr., Kart. 67, fol. 323r.

152 *La storia del conclave in cui è stato eletto il Cardinale Lorenzo Corsini Fiorentino, orà Papa Clemente XII il dì 12 luglio 1730*, ÖStA Wien, HHStA, StAbt, Rom Varia, Kart. 39, fol. 1r–123v.

on the 23rd August 1730, late in the evening. Collalto recorded it in his (fake?) letter of the 29th August, which he published.¹⁵³ The Count again invited the noble guests to accompany him to the papal palace at Colle Quirinale. There the Papal Chamberlain Troiano Acquaviva D'Aragón (1696–1747) greeted him to first bring him to the private audience, during which Collalto had a festive speech in Latin, in which he expressed the Emperor's joy concerning the election of a new Pope. He also admitted him to the audience were then Vinciguerra Tomaso di Collalto, Francesco Antonio Spada and other participants in the parade. He received numerous gifts from Clement XII for playing his part in the election – amongst them were the reliquary Kart. with the relics of St. Fidelio or a tapestry in a gold frame depicting St. Peter by Guido Reni (1575–1642).¹⁵⁴

A few days later Collalto visited Antonio Banchieri in the Quirinal Palace and also other members of a newly built Corsini's Curia. Collalto highly esteemed experience gained during his mission and conscientiously work on preservation of commemorating it. Part of his correspondence from the Roman era mission was arranged and bonded in three volumes.¹⁵⁵ Carefully retained is also the number of letters from Cardinals Cienfuegos, Schönborn, Porzia and Camillo Cybo (1681–1743), but also from Eugene of Savoy, Wirich Daun and other notables. Folders with the correspondence from 1730 occupy almost three Kart.es in the family archive. The accounting records of the journey to Rome have also been preserved carefully. This chapter of our study cannot be more than a call for a more detailed processing of these valuable materials.¹⁵⁶

Conclusions

Taking into account a number of imperial diplomats to the conclave in the years 1667–1730, it is certainly not surprising that they all belonged amongst the closest collaborators of the Emperors Leopold I and Charles VI. They came from the richest families in the Emperor's circle – not for nothing was Franz Josef Czernin von Chudenitz considered, not unnecessarily did financial capital and the promise of private funding play an important role in the final selection of Anton Florian von Liechtenstein and Antonio Rambaldo di Collalto. It is probably unnecessary to give more weight to the fact that in their youth they

153 *Lettera, colla quale un Personaggio di Roma ragguaglia un suo Amico nella Corte di Vienna intorno laudienza, chebbe da Papa Clemente XII. a 23. di Agosto 1730 ... Antonio Rambaldo del Sagro Romano Imperio Conte di Collalto.* See MZA Brno, G 169, Kart. 143, inv. No. 2321.

154 Z. KAZLEPKA, *Ostrov italského vkusu*, p. 99.

155 *Memorie del Ambasciata di Roma del Antonio Rambaldo di Collalto.* See MZA Brno, Knihovna Collaltů [Collaltos' Library], inv. No. 51/Ms II B 1.

156 MZA Brno, G 169, Kart. 125, inv. Nos. 2282–2283, sign. VII 18 1 and VII 18 2; Kart. 126, inv. Nos. 2285–2290, sign. VII 18 4–VII 18 9. For the purposes of this study, I left these materials aside.

had all spent at least a few months in Italy during their Grand Tours. Only exceptional in this respect is the case of Liechtenstein himself, who spent over a year and half there, and that of Collalto, who lived in Italy throughout his entire twenty-six years. After the experience with the previous elections, when only a few cardinals arrived in Rome and the imperial ambassadors acted with only a little support from inside the conclave, the imperial politicians wanted to be sure that the negotiations would be conducted by a person who has a deep knowledge of the Italian environment. The significance of Kinsky and Kaunitz (and during his time also of Liechtenstein) was rather more evident in the office itself and Roman agents and ambassadors approached them somewhat *ex offio*. Collalto's case was different thanks to the immediacy of his relationships with Roman, Venetian and Tuscan diplomats. The permanent correspondence contacts with the Milan Governor Wirich Daun and with the Viceroy of Naples, Aloys Thomas Raymund von Harrach (1669–1742),¹⁵⁷ confirmed Collalto's deep knowledge of both countries in the administration of which he could serve during this time. Even Cienfuegos was recommending Prince di Santa Croce, who had strong ties to the Albani family. Charles VI, however, decided for Collalto, who was significantly closer to the Viennese Court and simultaneously internally combined the qualities of an Italian prince and of a servant of the Imperial Court.

The imperial representatives appointed to the papal election usually acted in the rank of extraordinary ambassador (*ambasciatore straordinario*), even if they were in the same time accredited as ordinary ambassadors or even if there were some other ordinary ambassador or imperial representative. The first case is documented by the second mission of Anton Florian von Liechtenstein, 1691. The second strategy was used during the legacies of Counts Kaunitz (1724) and Collalto (1730), when the dignity of ordinary ambassador was represented by Cardinal Cienfuegos. The imperial ambassadors to the conclave had not enjoyed real respect till 1691, i.e. during Anton Florian von Liechtenstein's second mission. Only then did Cardinal Goëss veto Gregorio Barbarigo. Leopold I, in accord with Liechtenstein, eventually chose a more cautious approach and thereby withdrew his veto. Charles VI's ambassadors and representatives acted with much less compromise. The conclave in 1721, during which Cardinal Althann contacted all the members of the Cardinal College to personally remind each individual elector about the veto against Paolucci, was etched into the memory of many cardinals and it certainly played a part in the respect that the imperial party had in the course of both these negotiations – especially when its real strength was also increasing due to the growing number of its cardinals and to Collalto's position. The French tried to break it up and they did actually manage

157 MZA Brno, G 169, Kart. 114, inv. Nos. 2159 and 2166, sign. VII 4 3 a 10.

to drive it into a corner. But this was not the first time that the Imperials chose the lesser evil – they had also acted in the same manner in many previous cases.

When selecting his diplomats Leopold I first betted on the experienced Harrach, for whom Cardinal Friedrich von Hessen-Darmstadt was available (or rather being a nuisance) who had stayed in Rome over the long-term. In both the latter's and in Liechtenstein's case the Emperor appointed the participants to the conclave as his ordinary ambassadors at the Holy See. In regard to both primarily it was all about representation that, according to Leopold I, only imperial counts would be capable of providing on behalf of the Imperial Court. Also similar was the case of Leopold Josef von Lamberg (1653–1706),¹⁵⁸ who stayed in Rome for several years. In contrast Charles VI elected his representatives from the Count's families. This was probably not so much about lower expenses for representation – the ambassadors to the conclave often paid the expenses for the mission themselves plus, like Liechtenstein, they frequently came to the City *incognito*. However, they might have been more tightly bound to the Emperor after he had promoted them to the status of Imperial Counts before their travels. Additionally neither Kinsky, Kaunitz, nor Collalto reckoned from the outset that their mission could somehow be significantly prolonged. They were leaving for just a few months and they returned to their estates shortly after having an audience with the new Pope, in whose election they had participated. Therefore they did not have to consider such expenditures as building the embassy, which instead of being held by them was held by Cardinal Cienfuegos who resided in Rome permanently. After the departure of Friedrich von Hessen-Darmstadt to Wrocław and the death of Carlo Pio, Leopold I did not have a permanent cardinal in Roman. It was therefore advantageous for him when Franz Karl von Kaunitz became an Auditor of the Rota Romana and could cooperate with Lamberg in the role of an ordinary ambassador. Despite this the starting positions of Kinsky, Kaunitz and Collalto were much improved when they could rely on the strength of the Cardinals Cienfuegos and Althann.

In none of these cases was the Emperor represented by a diplomatic novice in the papal election. Still, many times this was a mission that the ambassadors considered as being a springboard for their further career advancement at the Imperial Court. It can be seen like this especially in regard to Anton Florian von Liechtenstein, who in 1691 was accredited as an ordinary ambassador to the Papal Court in Rome. In the cases of Kinsky and Collalto this was rather the peak of their diplomatic careers, which only confirmed their eminent positions in the imperial environment.

Of all the ambassadors who between 1667–1730 stood before the conclave in the service of the Emperor, the strongest positions were those of Harrach and Collalto – the

158 F. POLLEROß, *Die Kunst der Diplomatie*, pp. 302–504.

experienced cardinal with solid ties to the Curia and an Italian noble, living close to Venice, with ambitions for managing Milan or Naples, in relationships with many Italian families, including Torre-Tassis who controlled the mail service, as well as secure anchoring in the Empire because of his kinship with the Starhemborgs and the Sinzendorfs with their domains in Moravia, which in addition always reminded the Emperor of his route to his coronation as the King of Bohemia. Similar efforts of double bonding (i.e. both to the Italian environment and to the Empire) might be found in the selection of the cardinal's representatives, starting with Goëss, who, in Nijmegen proceeded to collaborate with the papal diplomats who were led by Cardinal Bevilacqua and via Althann and Schönborn, who were bound to the Imperial Court by their kinship ties, to Cienfuegos, who, during his exile from Spain, was the Emperor's protégé in Portugal.