

JIŘÍ KUBEŠ

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3217-4887>

University of Pardubice

## THE DELEGATION OF THE BOHEMIAN KING-ELECTOR TO THE ELECTION OF THE NEW ROMAN KING IN FRANKFURT AM MAIN, 1745

### Abstract

It may seem that we know a lot about the elections and coronations of Roman kings and emperors in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and this also applies to the one of 1745, when Francis I Stephen became emperor. However, very little attention has been paid to the electoral delegations, their tasks, and their role in the pre-election negotiations. This article will therefore analyse the instructions issued by Queen Maria Theresa of Bohemia, who did not personally come to Frankfurt am Main for the election, to her diplomats. The analysis will then be supplemented by additional sources from the National Archives in Prague, where the reports of the delegation and other sources have been preserved. The election of 1745 is thoroughly compared with the elections of 1657–58 (Leopold I), 1711 (Charles VI), and 1742 (Charles VII). The author shows who made up the Bohemian delegation and how some of these diplomats' tasks changed over time. Although the delegation of three noblemen – Counts Wurmbbrand and Khevehüller, and Baron Hillebrand – had mainly ceremonial tasks, its role was also crucial in the actual negotiations, both on the very day of the election, then when it represented the Queen in the cathedral, and finally in conclave vote and when it was given other tasks (such as organising the celebratory banquet, illuminating the houses, etc.). It is evident that the delegation helped Queen Maria Theresa and her family regain possession of the imperial title.

**Keywords:** Holy Roman Empire, eighteenth century, Frankfurt am Main, election, diplomacy, Kingdom of Bohemia, Maria Theresa

At first sight, it may appear unnecessary to write anything further about the election and coronation of Francis Stephen of Lorraine in 1745. The topic has already received considerable attention from scholars. As early as 1745–46, two extensive and detailed works were written summarising all the important events that occurred from the death of the previous emperor up to the election of his successor, and all the key documents of relevance to these events have been published, including the minutes from the meetings of the electoral college. Similar diaries chronicling elections and coronations were commonly compiled throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Still, up to that time, relevant documents (especially meeting minutes) were not published in large numbers.<sup>1</sup> The first modern scholarly study of these materials on the election and coronation of Francis I was published in 1883 by Elias Fromm, whose interest focused on the contemporary discussions about the vote of the Bohemian Elector (*Kurfürst*), specifically about whether the Queen of Bohemia could exercise this vote.<sup>2</sup> Later, after the Second World War, Josef Posch returned to this topic; he was more concerned with the international context of the (pre-)election negotiations. In 1982, Alois Schmid contributed a Bavarian perspective on the matter, tracing the evolution of Bavarian policy after the death of Emperor Charles VII.<sup>3</sup>

The information provided by Fromm, Posch, and Schmid (together with the electoral diary [*diarium*]) formed the factual basis for all later interpretations of this topic. However, several new studies have been published, substantially expanding our knowledge. In 2007 Márta Vajnági defended a master's thesis about British-Austrian relations at

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *Protocolla, so bey der Wahl und Crönung des ... Herrn, Herrn Francisci, Erwehlten Römischen Kayzers ... zu Franckfurt am Mayn im Jahr 1745 gehalten worden* (Frankfurt am Main: [s.n.], 1745); *Vollständiges Diarium von der höchst-beglückten Erwehlung des ... herrn, herrn Franciscus ... zum römischen König und Kayser...* (Frankfurt am Main: Jung, 1746).

<sup>2</sup> Elias Fromm, *Die Kaiserwahl Franz I. Ein Beitrag zur deutschen Reichsgeschichte des achtzehnten Jahrhunderts* (printed dissertation, Gnesen: Universität Jena, 1883).

<sup>3</sup> Josef Posch, *Die Kaiserwahl Franz I. 1745* (typewritten dissertation, Wien: Universität Wien, 1949); Alois Schmid, 'Bayern und die Kaiserwahl 1745', in *Festschrift für Andreas Kraus zum 60. Geburtstag*, ed. by Pankraz Fried, Walter Ziegler (Kallmünz: Verlag Michael Laßleben, 1982), pp. 257–76.

the time of Francis I's election; she convincingly demonstrated that without the involvement of the British king and the elector of Mainz, the election would not have proceeded as smoothly as it did.<sup>4</sup> In her doctoral dissertation on the history of propaganda, Vajnági investigated the importance of journalism during the pre-election negotiations (2014).<sup>5</sup> Queen Maria Theresa's role in the events has recently been studied by Bettina Braun, who investigated why the Bohemian queen did not choose to be crowned empress (2018).<sup>6</sup>

However, with only minor exceptions, none of the authors mentioned above has written about the role of the Bohemian elector's delegation, dispatched to Frankfurt am Main by Maria Theresa.<sup>7</sup> That is why this text has been written. Drawing primarily on sources held by the National Archives in Prague,<sup>8</sup> it seeks to enrich our current historiographic knowledge with an account of the role played by the Bohemian delegation, presenting at least the most basic facts about it and analysing the instructions that were issued to the envoys. It offers a good example of what was expected of an elector's delegation. The account will be situated in the context of previous elections and compared with the events of 1745.<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Márta Vajnági, *Great Britain and the Habsburg Monarchy in the Eighteenth Century: Imperial Election 1745* (unpublished MA thesis, Budapest: Eötvös Loránd University, 2007). An abridged version was published as: ead., 'Britain–Hanover and the Imperial Election of 1745', *Hungarian Journal of English and American Studies*, 14, no. 1 (2008), 51–64.

<sup>5</sup> Ead., *Császárválasztás 1745* (Budapest: ELTE BTK Középkori és Kora Újkori Egyetemes Történeti Tanszék, 2014) (this is a revised version of her 2011 doctoral dissertation).

<sup>6</sup> Bettina Braun, *Eine Kaiserin und zwei Kaiser. Maria Theresia und ihre Mitregenten Franz Stephan und Joseph II.* (Bielefeld: Transcript Verlag, 2018), pp. 81–98.

<sup>7</sup> Among the modern literature, it is briefly mentioned in Fromm, *Die Kaiserwahl*, pp. 64–65, 74–75, and 79; or Alexander Begert, *Böhmen, die böhmische Kur und das Reich vom Hochmittelalter bis zum Ende des Alten Reiches. Studien zur Kurwürde und zur staatsrechtlichen Stellung Böhmens*, Mainzer Historische Kulturwissenschaften, 42 (Husum: Matthiesen Verlag, 2003), p. 484. The only contemporary study that devotes more space to the Bohemian Elector's delegation is *Protocolla and Vollständiges Diarium*.

<sup>8</sup> Národní archiv Praha (National Archives Prague, hereafter cited as: NA Praha), Česká dvorská kancelář (Bohemian Court Chancellery, hereafter cited as: ČDK), boxes 307–09.

<sup>9</sup> The older literature only contains brief mentions of Bohemian Electors' delegations. The composition and activities of the delegations in 1657–58 and 1711 were

## CONTEXTS

The story of the Bohemian delegation should be viewed in terms of two fundamental frameworks which enable it to be read and understood. The first is the military/political context of the War of the Austrian Succession (1740–48). By 1745, the worst was already over for Maria Theresa. Indeed, she had not managed to prevent Bavarian and French troops from occupying Prague (1741), had to cede almost the whole of Silesia to the Prussian King (first in 1742), and also had to accept that for the first time in three centuries, the emperor would not be a member of the Habsburg dynasty (in 1742 the duke of Bavaria won the election, becoming Charles VII). However, her fortunes were beginning to take a turn for the better. This was partly due to the support of the Hungarian magnates, and she could also access British subsidies. Maria Theresa's troops first expelled her enemies from Bohemia, then occupied Bavaria; moreover, Charles VII died in early 1745. His son was no longer willing to fight against the numerically superior forces of the Bohemian and Hungarian queen; in April 1745, he signed a peace with her and supported her husband Francis's candidacy for the imperial throne. In the end, there were no other candidates; in July, the French army was forced back across the Rhine, and Maria Theresa's troops ensured that the election in Frankfurt proceeded smoothly. In early July, Francis, its nominal commander, joined the headquarters of her army so that he could demonstrate his military prowess to the electors. The headquarters eventually based itself in Heidelberg, awaiting the election result.<sup>10</sup>

---

first explored more thoroughly by Jiří Kubeš, *Trnitá cesta Leopolda I. za říšskou korunou (1657–1658). Volby a korunovace ve Svaté říši římské v raném novověku* (České Budějovice: Veduta, 2009); id., 'Volba a korunovace Karla VI. římským císařem v roce 1711', *Český časopis historický*, 111, no. 4 (2013), 805–41. No text has yet dealt with the 1745 delegation.

<sup>10</sup> On Charles VII, see e.g. Milan Hlavačka, *Karel Albrecht. Příběh druhého zimního krále* (Praha: Akropolis, 1997), especially pp. 81–152; a very detailed account of the 1745 events is given by Alfred von Arneth, *Maria Theresia's erste Regierungsjahre*, Bd. 3: *1745–1748* (Wien: Salzwasser-Verlag, 1865), especially pp. 1–109. More information on the British subsidies is given in Vajnági, 'Britain-Hanover', pp. 53–54. Francis Stephen's movements were carefully recorded in *Vollständiges Diarium*, pp. 135–36. On 28 June he departed from Vienna, travelling via Jindřichův Hradec (Neuhaus) and Plzeň (Pilsen) before arriving in Nuremberg on 2 July. His location

There is also a second fundamental framework in which the 1745 imperial election should be viewed. Shortly after the death of Charles VII, the dean of the Electoral College, the archbishop of Mainz sent the other *Kurfürsten* the traditional invitation to attend the election. That was on 31 January; the electoral deliberations were scheduled to begin on 1 June and take place in Frankfurt am Main (precisely under the 1356 Golden Bull). The deliberations did not occur according to this schedule, as the electors' delegations (most of the electors did not participate in person) did not arrive in Frankfurt until later in the summer. In late July and early August, an accord was reached in Hannover between British King George II (who was also the elector of Hannover), Bohemian Queen Maria Theresa, and the elector of Mainz, who agreed on a joint approach. It was crucial to ensure that the negotiations proceeded quickly and smoothly. Another important factor facilitating the pre-election deliberations was Britain's willingness to support several pro-Habsburg electors financially. It was in the interests of all three parties mentioned above to hold the vote as soon as possible and to prevent obstructive behaviour by hostile electors. They also agreed to scale back the pomp and ceremony, which would reduce the cost of the process in a time of war. However, both the British and the Austrians had to accept that some issues which concerned them would not be dealt with; for example, there would be no detailed discussion on the electoral capitulation that Maria Theresa sought (as she was dissatisfied with the last electoral concession from the era of Charles VII).

The Hannover accord was essentially fulfilled. The College of Electors met for the first time in Frankfurt on 20 August, marking the beginning of the electoral diet. The deliberations were not lengthy because no other candidate came forward and most of the nine electors supported the Habsburg candidate. The only dissenting voices were the margrave of Brandenburg (i.e. the Prussian King Frederick II) and the count palatine of the Rhine; they objected to the notion that a woman (i.e. Maria Theresa) was exercising the rights of an elector. The discussions on

---

then changed frequently depending on troop movements. He also visited Mainz, and on 28 July he began his stay in Heidelberg. See also Arneht, *Maria Theresa's erste Regierungsjahre*, pp. 98–99.

the electoral capitulation were unprecedentedly short, lasting for just three meetings of the College. The stance taken by the elector of Mainz meant that the obstructions of the Brandenburg and Rhine Palatinate delegations were essentially ignored. On 3 September, despite the objections of the two delegations mentioned above, it was decided that the election would occur 11 days later. The envoys of the two opposing electors submitted official complaints, and they left Frankfurt shortly before the vote as a protest against the College's refusal to discuss their proposals. On 13 September, the election took place at the Cathedral of St Bartholomew in Frankfurt. 'Only' seven votes were cast in favour of Francis Stephen of Lorraine, and subsequently, he was crowned an Emperor in Frankfurt on 4 October. Queen Maria Theresa attended the ceremony, though she herself had declined to be crowned Empress.<sup>11</sup>

#### BOHEMIAN DELEGATION OF 1745

Queen Maria Theresa was helped to achieve her electoral plans by the delegation sent to Frankfurt to represent her in her capacity as the Bohemian king-elect. As a woman, she was not permitted to stand for election herself, and she did not want to attend the vote in Frankfurt personally. Still, it was important for her voice to be heard during the pre-election negotiations and at the voting itself, especially because she wanted to support her husband's candidacy to keep the imperial title within the family. After her experiences in 1741–42, she wanted to leave nothing to chance, so she devoted considerable attention to the selection of her delegates. By 1745, none of the members of the 1711 Bohemian elector's delegation was still alive (the last of them, Count Franz Ferdinand Kinský, died in September 1741).<sup>12</sup> Nonetheless, Queen Maria Theresa

---

<sup>11</sup> Basic factual information about the pre-election discussions and the political constellation of the time is summarised in Arneth, *Maria Theresa's erste Regierungsjahre*, pp. 82–104. A detailed account of the Hannover negotiations between Britain, Austria, and Mainz and the subsequent cooperation of these three parties in Frankfurt is given by Vajnági, 'Britain-Hanover', pp. 55–60. Queen Maria Theresa's reasons for refusing to be crowned empress are analyzed by Braun, *Eine Kaiserin*, pp. 87–98.

<sup>12</sup> Information on the composition of the 1711 delegation is given in Kubeš, 'Volba', pp. 813–14.

could use the same men she had nominated as her envoys for the 1741 election. However, that election had been unusual from the perspective of the Bohemian elector, as the possession of the Kingdom of Bohemia was disputed (between the Bavarian Charles VII and Maria Theresa with her husband), so the College of Electors had decided that it would not allow anybody to cast the Bohemian elector's vote.<sup>13</sup> That year, Maria Theresa selected a trio of diplomats: Johann Wilhelm von Wurmbrand (1670–1750), Johann Joseph von Khevenhüller (1706–1776), and Karl Ludwig Hilleprand von Prandau. As in previous times, the envoys were selected due to their knowledge and experience of imperial politics. Some were members of the Bohemian nobility, being holders of the Bohemian *Inkolat*.<sup>14</sup> However, in 1741 only Baron Hilleprand came to Frankfurt for the vote. Although he diligently attempted to promote Maria Theresa's interests, he was eventually unable to participate in the electoral process.<sup>15</sup>

In the spring of 1745, Queen Maria Theresa nominated the same three men as the Bohemian elector's delegation members ('anwalder und besondere bottschaffter') to the upcoming election.<sup>16</sup> It should

---

<sup>13</sup> Cf. Ulrich Kühne, 'Geschichte der böhmischen Kur in den Jahrhunderten nach der Goldenen Bulle', *Archiv für Urkundenforschung*, 10 (1928), 1–110 (esp. 98–107); and Begert, *Böhmen*, pp. 480–82.

<sup>14</sup> In 1728, Khevenhüller married Karolina Maria Augusta von Metsch, thus acquiring the Komorní Hrádek estate, and the Hilleprands of Prandau also held the Bohemian *Inkolat*. However, it is not clear whether Karl Ludwig was from the Bohemian line of the family. See Petr Mašek, *Šlechtické rody v Čechách, na Moravě a ve Slezsku od Bílé hory do současnosti*, 1 (Praha: Argo, 2008), pp. 361–62, 451. Only Wurmbrand did not hold the Bohemian *Inkolat* at the time; he was bequeathed it in 1748. Cf. Petr Mašek, *Šlechtické rody v Čechách, na Moravě a ve Slezsku od Bílé hory do současnosti*, 2 (Praha: Argo, 2010), p. 477. More information on the Bohemian properties and roots of the 1657–58 and 1711 delegation members is given in Kubeš, *Trnitá cesta*, pp. 142–43 and id., 'Volba', pp. 813–14.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. Fromm, *Die Kaiserwahl*, pp. 64–65; for a more detailed account see Johann Heinrich Zedler, *Grosses vollständiges Universal-Lexicon aller Wissenschaften und Künste*, Bd. 68 (=Supplement 4), 1754, pp. 483–85.

<sup>16</sup> The documents appointing the members of the delegation, including their power of attorney, are held by NA Praha, ČDK, box 307 (all the documents are dated 5 May 1745). The membership of the delegation as of August 1745 is also given in *Vollständiges Diarium*, cols 172–75.

be pointed out that the delegates were very prominent figures who could call on a wealth of experience and deep knowledge of imperial politics. Count Wurmbrand, the head (*Primarius*) of the delegation, had won renown as a historical scholar and genealogist, and under Charles VI, he was the president of the Aulic Council (*Reichshofrat*). In the Holy Roman Empire, he was a member of the Franconian College of Counts, and in 1739 he was made a Knight of the Order of the Golden Fleece. It was perhaps also not without importance that Wurmbrand had experienced the 1711 election; he had been present in Frankfurt during the election period, and he had been honoured to accompany the Bohemian delegation at the St Bartholomew Cathedral on the day of the election itself.<sup>17</sup> The second envoy, Count Khevenhüller, was also a member of the Order of the Golden Fleece, having been inducted in 1744. His experience of imperial politics reached back to 1728 when he was appointed member of the Aulic Council. He had served as an envoy in Munich and Dresden, as well as undertaking missions to The Hague and Copenhagen. From the perspective of his membership in the electoral delegation, it is important that from 1737 to 1740, he served as the Bohemian elector's envoy at the Imperial Diet in Regensburg. Maria Theresa later appointed him the Supreme Marshal of her court.<sup>18</sup> Less is known about the third member of the delegation, Baron Hillebrand, who had served as a member of the Aulic Council and as an imperial con-commissioner (*con-commissarius*) at the

---

<sup>17</sup> There are no separate studies devoted to Count Wurmbrand. Even today, the basic source of information on him is still Zedler, *Grosses vollständiges Universal-Lexicon*, Bd. 60, 1749, cols 80–83.

<sup>18</sup> The most detailed study of Khevenhüller still remains Adam Wolf, *Aus dem Hofleben Maria Theresias. Nach den Memoiren des Fürsten Joseph Khevenhüller* (Wien: Carl Gerold, 1859), pp. 5–43. See also his published diary: *Aus der Zeit Maria Theresias. Tagebuch des Fürsten Johann Joseph Khevenhüller-Metsch. Kaiserlichen Oberhofmeisters*, Bd. 2: 1745–1749, ed. by Rudolf Khevenhüller-Metsch, Hanns Schlitter (Leipzig–Wien: Verlag von Moritz Ruhl–Verlag von Adolf Holzhausen, 1908), the diary entries from January to early July 1745 are on pp. 1–69 (however, on 3 July he unfortunately stopped writing the diary due to his trip to Frankfurt). His activities in Regensburg are described in Walter Fürnrohr, 'Die Vertreter des habsburgischen Kaisertums auf dem Immerwährenden Reichstag', Teil II, *Verhandlungen des Historischen Vereins für Oberpfalz und Regensburg*, 124 (1984), 106.



Regensburg Imperial Diet; his experience of the 1741 election also made him a suitable appointment.<sup>19</sup> A secretary accompanied the delegation, Joseph Ignaz von Stang, who had likewise experienced the previous election, having accompanied Hillebrand during his time in Frankfurt.<sup>20</sup>

The final decision on the membership of the delegation was taken in late April and early May, and Maria Theresa herself had a decisive say.<sup>21</sup> The documents appointing the members were issued on 5 May, and on the next day, the 'Secundarius' Count Khevenhüller learned of his appointment directly from the queen. In his diary, he wrote that he was not entirely enthusiastic about the prospect, as his diplomatic missions were already behind him, and he knew that the task would cost a lot of money. He was also of the opinion that membership in the delegation would not bring any new career benefits to him, and that it would, in fact, prevent him from fulfilling his duties as the Supreme Court Marshal. He understood the logic behind Maria Theresa's choice of delegates (after all, the membership was the same as that of the 1741 delegation, unable to participate in the election). He also wrote that in 1741 he had not yet been appointed to his high-ranking position at the court, nor had he been inducted into the Order of the Golden Fleece. However, he did not inform the Queen about his opinions and accepted the appointment, wishing to remain unconditionally loyal to the monarch.<sup>22</sup> He commented: "The Lady has the special gift from

<sup>19</sup> Zedler, *Grosses vollständiges Universal-Lexicon*, Bd. 68, cols 483–85.

<sup>20</sup> Stang was the secretary of the Bohemian Court Chancellery (*Böhmische Hofkanzlei*) in Vienna (*Aus der Zeit Maria Theresias*, Bd. 2, p. 55); he was inducted into the lower nobility in 1734. His 1741 visit to Frankfurt is mentioned in a letter of recommendation to Maria Theresa written on 26 April 1745 by the Supreme Chancellor of the Kingdom of Bohemia Phillip Joseph Kinský; it is the reason why Kinský proposed that Stang should once again serve as the delegation's secretary. See NA Praha, ČDK, box 307.

<sup>21</sup> In his letter of recommendation written on 26 April 1745, Phillip Joseph Kinský stated that the Bohemian Queen had already told him that she wanted to appoint the same delegation as in 1741, and that he was in accord with this choice. See *ibid.*

<sup>22</sup> 'In der That ist leicht zu ermessen, daß mir dise Commission nicht wohl angenehm sein können, dann zu geschweigen deren großen Unkosten und daß ich aus diser Carriere herauß geschritten; mithin mich sothane Botschafft weiter zu nichts mehreren führen kann, so ist es auch auf eine gewisse Weis infra meam dignitatem,

God to win over the hearts and wills of her people through her friendly manner so that nothing can be refused her'.<sup>23</sup>

We do not know the opinions of the other two delegation members. However, it is evident from Khevenhüller's diary that he and his colleagues took their tasks very seriously. While still in Vienna, they regularly attended meetings during May and June to prepare for the election. The first of these meetings was held on 7 May, hosted by Gundakar Thomas von Starhermberg. Initially, there was talk of the possible postponement and relocation of the electoral diet due to developments on the battlefield; however, the progress made by Queen Maria Theresa's forces soon removed the need for this. All the remaining meetings took place at the Bohemian Court Chancellery (12 May – 14 June), hosted by the Supreme Chancellor Phillip Joseph Kinský, who was officially responsible for the delegation's mission. There were at least six of these meetings, and they were attended by people who were well acquainted with imperial politics (the former imperial Vice-Chancellor Rudolf Joseph Colloredo, the Bohemian envoy at the Imperial Diet Franz Philipp von Sternberg, and the renowned foreign policy expert Johann Christoph von Bartenstein, who was later replaced by the Austrian Court Councillor Georg Christian von Knorr). The main topic of discussion was, paradoxically, because of later developments, the electoral capitulation. The delegation members acquired a detailed knowledge of the electoral concessions of Charles VI and Charles VII. They were instructed to remain as close as possible to the first of these because the second contained several new elements that further restricted the Emperor's powers.<sup>24</sup>

---

daß mit meinem obhabenden Hoff Ammt unter oder doch neben einen andern, der nicht mehr als ich dermahlen bin, ja in Ansehung meiner Charge eher weniger zu sein scheint, mich absenden lassen solle, welche letztere Incongruitet sich in der That lediglich dardurch in etwas vermäntlen last, daß ich allbereits a<sup>o</sup> 1741 zum letzteren Wahltag in hac qualitate und mit denen nemmlichen Collegen benennet worden; allein zur selben Zeit ware ich noch nicht Obrister Hoffmarschall, weder Toisonist', *Aus der Zeit Maria Theresias*, Bd. 2, pp. 51–52.

<sup>23</sup> 'Die Frau hat die besondere Gab von Gott, deren Leuth Hertz und Willen durch ihre freundliche Art also einzunehmen, daß mann ihr nichts abschlagen kann', *ibid.*

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 52–53, 55, 57–60, 65. More information on electoral capitulations is given in Gerd Kleinheyer, *Die kaiserlichen Wahlkapitulationen. Geschichte, Wesen*

The delegation members did not travel to Frankfurt together, as they had been given slightly different tasks and were instructed to meet there later. The first to arrive (on 10 July) was Baron Hilleprand.<sup>25</sup> The second (on 8 August) was Count Khevenhüller. He had already departed from Vienna at the beginning of July, but Queen Maria Theresa had entrusted him with some other tasks to be done *en route*. He was to travel to Dresden to visit the elector of Saxony (and the Polish King August III), who was hesitant to support Francis Stephen's candidacy. Then he was to go to Hannover and meet with representatives of the Hannoverian elector (and British King George II) to arrange their cooperation during the election process.<sup>26</sup> The last member of the delegation to arrive in Frankfurt was Count Wurmbrand. He left Vienna on 9 August, and *en route* to Frankfurt, he met the bishop of Passau before travelling to Nuremberg via Regensburg. He later complained that he did not receive any ceremonial welcome in Nuremberg and that no traditional procession had been arranged (despite this being stipulated by the 1356 Golden Bull). The most recent ceremonial reception of a Bohemian Elector's delegation had been in 1657 when the delegation was led by Prince Wenzel Eusebius von Lobkowitz, but in 1711 the Bohemian delegates were short of time, and so they refused the offer of a reception ceremony. It is thus not surprising that in 1745 nobody laid on

---

*und Funktion*, Studien und Quellen zur Geschichte des deutschen Verfassungsrechts, Reihe A: Studien, Bd. 1 (Karlsruhe: C.F. Müller, 1968).

<sup>25</sup> This is evident from his first report from Frankfurt, dated 13 July 1745. The report is held by NA Praha, ČDK, box 308. After departing from Vienna, he travelled via Passau, Regensburg, Nuremberg and Würzburg, and he was accompanied by an Austrian military unit on the final leg of his journey. In early August, Court Councillor Knorr was sent to assist Hilleprand. This is mentioned in a separate instruction issued by Maria Theresa to Baron Hilleprand, Vienna, 2 August 1745, *ibid.*, box 307.

<sup>26</sup> He left Vienna on 2 July and travelled to Prague. Then he was to visit the Austrian army in Hradec Králové (Königgrätz) before continuing onward to Dresden and Hannover. He writes about this in his diary: *Aus der Zeit Maria Theresias*, Bd. 2, pp. 68–69. See also Arneith, *Maria Theresia's erste Regierungsjahre*, pp. 80–83. His negotiations in Hannover at the end of July are described in Vajnági, 'Britain–Hanover', pp. 55–58. His journey from Hannover to Frankfurt (accompanied by his wife) was described in *Vollständiges Diarium*, p. 157. His first report from Frankfurt co-authored with Baron Hilleprand was sent on 13 August. See NA Praha, ČDK, box 308.

a particularly lavish welcome for a Bohemian delegate who was, in any case, travelling alone. Wurmbrand arrived in Frankfurt on 22 August, when the electoral college was already in session.<sup>27</sup>

### INSTRUCTIONS AND REALITY

The tasks of the Bohemian delegation were set out in a document issued in Vienna and dated 14 June (see the Appendix).<sup>28</sup> The delegates were instructed to participate in the pre-electoral deliberations of the College of Electors and the election itself (the document states that the delegates were to appear 'on the aforementioned election day of a Roman King to the emperorship'). It was expected that the proceedings would follow the same scenario as in 1711 when the elected Roman King Charles VI first arrived in Frankfurt for his imperial coronation.<sup>29</sup> It had marked a break with previous tradition; in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the Bohemian Habsburg kings were personally present at their own elections. In 1745, the Bohemian electoral delegation would have to cast a vote in the conclave in place of Queen Maria Theresa herself. However, before they could do so, numerous other duties awaited them.

The first numbered section of the instructions states that there was no need for the delegates to arrive in Frankfurt together but that they should wait until the delegation was complete before undertaking their festive entry into the city to make their arrival as impressive as possible (this is also mentioned in the fifth section). However, the document

---

<sup>27</sup> Wurmbrand's arrival is noted in a report written by the delegates on 24 August 1745 (ibid.). Details about his journey are mentioned in a letter he wrote personally to Queen Maria Theresa on 25 August 1745 (held NA Praha, ČDK). The previous delegations' journeys to Frankfurt are described in Kubeš, *Trnitá cesta*, pp. 144–48; and id., 'Volba', pp. 831–32. It should be pointed out that on 5 May the Bohemian Court Chancellery sent letters to the owners of the lands through which the delegation would be travelling to Frankfurt in 1745, asking them to supply armed guards during their passage (precisely in accordance with the Golden Bull). Cf. documents held at NA Praha, ČDK, box 307.

<sup>28</sup> NA Praha, ČDK, box 307, draft instructions.

<sup>29</sup> Kubeš, 'Volba', pp. 823–24, 836–37. From the sixteenth century onwards, it was written in principle about the election of a Roman King, who would become emperor only at the coronation. Therefore the envoys were to come 'auf vorbesagten angesezten wahl-tag eines römischen königs zum kaysertum'.

also states that it would be possible to forego this festive entry entirely if the other delegations did likewise. Festive entries were reserved solely for monarchs and their ambassadors, i.e. the highest-ranking diplomats, who could act on behalf of their monarch in all matters.<sup>30</sup> The ceremony – its nature, the size of the procession, and the pomp with which it was undertaken – reflected the monarch's prestige and ambition. In 1657 the festive entry had been a matter of the utmost importance for the Bohemian delegation, which sought to equal or even outshine the ambassador of the King of France, who had entered Frankfurt before them.<sup>31</sup> However, the situation had significantly changed since then. In 1711, the Bohemian elector's delegation members arrived separately and entered the city incognito; no festive entry was organised.<sup>32</sup> In 1745, an agreement was reached with the other delegations to eschew this traditional ritual;<sup>33</sup> this reflected a more general trend, as festive entries were becoming increasingly rare by this time.<sup>34</sup>

The second and third sections of the instruction document concern the first contacts between the Bohemian delegates and the dean of the College of Electors, the *Kurfürst* of Mainz, who was responsible for organising the electoral diet. The delegates were to ascertain when the pre-election deliberations (*die churfürstliche sessiones*) would begin.

---

<sup>30</sup> Cf. Winfried Dotzauer, 'Die Ankunft des Herrschers. Der fürstliche "Einzug" in die Stadt bis zum Ende des Alten Reiches', *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte*, 55 (1973), 245–88; more details, using the example of pre-electoral deliberations in Frankfurt, are given by Bernd Herbert Wanger, *Kaiserwahl und Krönung im Frankfurt des 17. Jahrhunderts. Darstellung anhand der zeitgenössischen Bild- und Schriftquellen und unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Erhebung des Jahres 1612* (Frankfurt am Main: Verlag Waldemar Kramer, 1994), pp. 48–68.

<sup>31</sup> Kubeš, *Trnitá cesta*, p. 147.

<sup>32</sup> Id., 'Volba', pp. 831–32.

<sup>33</sup> The detailed electoral diary mentions only one festive entry. It took place on 31 August, when the elector of Mainz entered the city. He was the only elector to come to Frankfurt in person, and for that reason he took part in the ceremony (*Vollständiges Diarium*, pp. 188–99). The other electors abided by the agreement that had been reached in Hannover between Britain, Austria, and Mainz (Vařnági, 'Britain-Hanover', p. 57), and they even agreed to restrict the number of carriages they used to travel to meetings of the College (*Vollständiges Diarium*, p. 165).

<sup>34</sup> Jiří Kubeš et al., *V zastoupení císaře. Česká a moravská aristokracie v habsburské diplomacii 1640–1740* (Praha: NLN – Nakladatelství Lidové noviny, 2018), pp. 49–61.

Still, primarily they were to present their credentials (their documents of appointment and a power of attorney) to the Archbishop of Mainz. However, this proved to be not entirely straightforward because (as previously) there were discussions about the ceremonial reception afforded to the Bohemian delegation by the Archbishop. In 1657, there had been a ceremonial dispute over this matter, as the dean of the College of Electors had failed to acknowledge the hierarchically superior status of the king of Bohemia.<sup>35</sup> However, in the eighteenth century, this was no longer the case; at the turn of the century, a further three secular electors had been awarded royal titles, so in 1711 (despite opposition from the Habsburgs), an agreement was reached to introduce ceremonial equality among all the electors in the Empire, so that there would be no difference in the reception offered to them.<sup>36</sup>

Nevertheless, before their first official visit, the Bohemian delegates had to ascertain which ceremonial reception would be given to them, as the reception had to reflect their monarch's status as an elector whose standing was equal to that of the archbishop of Mainz. They were also instructed to ascertain how the other delegations had been received. Only then were they to request their first audience, and it was not considered a problem that the *Primarius* would not yet be present; the delegation could consist merely of the second- and third-ranking diplomats.

The concern with the delegation's reception by the elector of Mainz may appear excessive from today's perspective, but the dean of the College of Electors was a key figure in the success of Queen Maria Theresa's policy. He had to verify the credentials issued to the delegation, and it was up to him whether the Bohemian delegates would even be admitted to the sessions of the College. The situation could have become very complicated had he taken a hostile stance. Indeed, the Bohemian Elector's

---

<sup>35</sup> Cf. details in Kubeš, *Trnitá cesta*, pp. 150–54. On that occasion, the elector of Mainz deliberately received the Bohemian delegation in the same manner as all the other electors, failing to respect their royal status. A complaint was lodged and he eventually rectified his behaviour, but three weeks had already elapsed (waiting for a response from the king of Bohemia), and this delay played into the hands of the elector of Mainz, who was dissatisfied with the candidacy of the young Leopold I and was very actively seeking an alternative solution.

<sup>36</sup> Cf. Kubeš, 'Volba', pp. 817 and 835.

vote had already been re-admitted (1708), but of fundamental importance now was the situation in 1741, when the prevailing opinion had been that the Bohemian Elector's vote would ultimately not be cast (due to the dispute over who had the right to vote).<sup>37</sup> In 1745, it had to be re-decided whether the Bohemian elector would be permitted to vote – and even that was a matter of dispute because, for the first time in history, the vote would be cast by a woman as the ruling queen.<sup>38</sup> However, the elector of Mainz this time (appointed in 1743) was Johann Friedrich Karl von Ostein (1689–1763), a member of the Habsburgs' client network and a supporter of Maria Theresa. He greatly simplified the entire situation: already in the winter, he had officially invited the Bohemian queen to attend the election in Frankfurt.<sup>39</sup> When the Bohemian delegation arrived, he did not cause any ceremonial issues and accepted their credentials (partly due to the Hannover agreement).<sup>40</sup>

The fourth section of the instruction document stipulates that the delegates had to attend their first audience with the other electors (or their delegations). They could only do so with all three Bohemian diplomats present. Here too, however, they were to pay close attention to the ceremonial receptions they received; the reception had to be the same in all cases, and it had to correspond with the reception that the Elector of Mainz had given them. It was customary for each first audience to be followed within a few days by a visit hosted by the other party (these were known in German as *revisiten*).<sup>41</sup> At these initial visits, the delegates were to express 'the usual compliments' to their counterparts.

---

<sup>37</sup> Cf. e.g. From, *Die Kaiserwahl*, p. 52.

<sup>38</sup> For a more detailed account see *ibid.*, pp. 52–75.

<sup>39</sup> The invitation was brought to Prague by the Mainz envoy Philipp Christoph von Erthal in March 1745; he presented it to the Governor's Office (*Statthaltereii*). Cf. *Vollständiges Diarium*, pp. 37–44; and extensive sources concerning his reception, NA Praha, ČDK, box 307 (especially reports from the Governor's Office to Maria Theresa dated 15 and 16 March 1745, a copy of a report on the reception of the Mainz envoy, and other documents).

<sup>40</sup> This was mentioned by Maria Theresa in a supplementary instruction for Baron Hillebrand issued on 2 August 1745, NA Praha, ČDK, box 307. Cf. the Mainz envoy Baron von Erthal's participation in the Hannover talks, which is demonstrated in Vajnági, 'Britain–Hanover', pp. 55–58.

<sup>41</sup> More details are given in Wanger, *Kaiserwahl*, pp. 75–78.

However, that was not all from the ceremonial perspective. There could also have been foreign ambassadors and envoys in Frankfurt from countries outside the Holy Roman Empire, such as the United Provinces of the Netherlands. It was also necessary to contact these representatives – though there was a risk that they would insist on ceremonial priority and demand so-called ‘die rechte hand’. This is the subject of the sixth section of the instruction document, which clearly stipulates that no official contact should be made in such a case, as this would prevent ceremonial disputes. It was permitted to discuss with these diplomats, but the meetings had to occur on neutral ground (‘in loco tertio’) and on private premises. In the end, the Bohemian delegates probably did not have to take account of this section of the instructions because the Hannover agreement stated that the College of Electors would attempt to prevent foreign diplomats from coming to Frankfurt by ensuring that no accommodation would be available for them there, so they would have to travel into the city from outlying towns.<sup>42</sup> It certainly affected the French or Danish diplomats or the papal nuncio, but no representative of the king of Spain was undoubtedly present at the election. On the other hand, an envoy of the Russian Tsarevna attended the election for the first time.<sup>43</sup>

The instructions then deal with the pre-election deliberations of the College of Electors (sections 7 and 8). The document states that the Bohemian Crown was entitled to participate in these deliberations,<sup>44</sup>

<sup>42</sup> This was agreed at the second session of the College. Cf. Vajnági, ‘Britain–Hannover’, pp. 57 and 59.

<sup>43</sup> The papal nuncio was Giovanni Francesco Stoppani (the titular Archbishop of Corinth); the king of France was represented by Count Alphonse Marie Louis Saint-Séverin; the Russian envoy was Count Hermann Karl Keyserling (according to *Vollständiges Diarium*, p. 184, he stayed in the city from 23 May, but he did not present his credentials as the tsarevna’s envoy until 25 August); the Danish envoy Baron Johann Friedrich Bachoff von Echt arrived at the last moment. Cf. *Repertorium der diplomatischer Vertreter aller Länder seit dem Westfälischen Frieden (1648)*, Bd. 2: 1716–1763, ed. by Friedrich Hausmann (Zürich: Verlag Fretz und Wasmuth, 1950), pp. 34, 107, 262, 317; and the appendices to the minutes from the College of Electors held at NA Praha, ČDK, boxes 308–09.

<sup>44</sup> This was a result of the so-called re-admission. Cf. Jiří Kubeš, ‘Readmise (1708)’, in *Encyklopedie českých právních dějin*, 10: R–Ř, ed. by Karel Schelle, Jaromír Tauchen (Plzeň: Vydavatelství a nakladatelství Aleš Čeněk, s.r.o., 2017), pp. 74–77.





**Fig. 1:** A session of the electors or their delegates during pre-election deliberations at the Römer in Frankfurt, 1711 (NA Praha, ČDK, box 299, appendix to minutes from the first meeting of the College). Evidently, the electors (or the heads of their delegations) sat in an elevated position under a canopy and were arranged in hierarchical order. The position of the highest importance was occupied by the elector of Mainz (no. 1), and at his left hand, also in a central place, was the elector of Trier (no. 2). The elector of Cologne was under an imperial ban (*Reichsacht*), so the third-ranking member of the College was the head of the Bohemian delegation, Count Windischgrätz, who sat at the right hand of the dean of the College. The diplomats of the other electors (except the elector of Bavaria, who was also banned) followed according to the hierarchy and the right-hand rule.

so the Bohemian delegates needed to attend the sessions regularly and in large numbers. They should assume their standard seating positions. Under the hierarchy, the head of the delegation was

to be seated ‘inter electores’, while the others – among the other electors’ envoys as per an agreement of 1653 (Fig. 1). The secretary of the delegation also had to attend the sessions, as he performed the crucial role of compiling minutes of everything that was discussed.<sup>45</sup> The head of the delegation received further clear instructions: although his seating position came after the positions of all the electors who attended the sessions personally<sup>46</sup> when it came to the voting, he was to cast his vote immediately after the ecclesiastical electors, as he was the representative of the highest-ranking secular elector.

Sections 9 and 10 of the document instructed the Bohemian delegates on how to conduct themselves when drawing up the electoral capitulation for the new emperor: Maria Theresa considered this one of the most important tasks at the sessions of the College. She stated that the perpetual capitulation (*capitulatio perpetua*) had still not been agreed upon and accepted,<sup>47</sup> and that it was also still unclear whether the College would use the capitulation of Charles VI or Charles VII as the basis for its deliberations. Due to this uncertainty, the queen was unable to issue clear instructions, but she did provide her diplomats with extensive appendices (A and B), in which she listed and explained her objections to both capitulations and detailed the changes that she sought to secure. The envoys had already acquainted themselves with these matters, having attended meetings at the Bohemian Court Chancellery (see above). Queen Maria Theresa left it up to the diplomats how they would exploit their knowledge and experience to ensure that

<sup>45</sup> The order of seating at the College sessions in 1745 is described in *Vollständiges Diarium*, pp. 172–75 (on pp. 172 and 173 there is also a depiction of the seating plan). Count Khevenhüller (*Secundarius*) sat ‘among the electors’ until the head of the delegation Count Wurmbrand arrived.

<sup>46</sup> In 1711, this principle meant that during sessions and when walking, the elector of the Palatinate had priority over all the diplomats, as he was one of the few electors to attend personally. In the voting order he cast the penultimate (i.e. eighth) vote, but he sat in the third-ranking position, directly behind the electors of Mainz and Trier, because none of the remaining electors had come to Frankfurt for the vote. Cf. Kubeš, ‘Volba’, pp. 813, 817, 820, 831, and especially 834.

<sup>47</sup> Cf. Kleinheyer, *Die kaiserlichen Wahlkapitulationen*, pp. 86–99. The proposal for the perpetual capitulation had been drawn up in 1711, but in the end it was not approved.

the College accepted a capitulation that would place as few restrictions as possible on the future emperor. If they felt that they were not up to making such a significant decision without consultation, they could (time permitting) consult her and ask for her opinion. However, we know that this never came about because, in the end, there was not enough time to push through any substantial changes in the capitulation; the main priority was to hold the election quickly, and the issue of the electoral capitulation was sidelined. The capitulation remained based on that of Charles VII, with only cosmetic modifications.<sup>48</sup>

The core of the instruction document comprises sections 11 and 12, which instructed the delegates on how to proceed on election day itself. Until the end of the seventeenth century, the King of Bohemia himself participated in the voting.<sup>49</sup> It was only in 1711 that this task was delegated to the Bohemian diplomats,<sup>50</sup> and this arrangement was evidently expected to continue in 1745 – though this time for a different reason. In 1711, Charles could not attend the vote in person because he had been delayed on his journey from Spain.<sup>51</sup> A generation later, Maria Theresa would have been able to arrive in Frankfurt in time for the vote. Still, since the death of Emperor Charles VII, there had been a constant debate about whether she could legitimately hold the status of an elector and exercise the rights that this status conferred. Although most of the College of Electors favoured her being able to do so, thus legitimising her participation in the vote, Maria Theresa had evidently made up her mind from the beginning not to attend in person, as it could have needlessly inflamed an already tense situation. She, therefore, instructed her delegates to arrive at the vote accompanied by a sizeable entourage and stated that the head of her delegation (the *Primarius*) should take the Bohemian monarch's place in the procession among the other electors in the sessions. The second and third members of the delegation, along with two cavaliers who had to attend as witnesses (like

---

<sup>48</sup> See Vajnági, 'Britain–Hanover', pp. 57–59; the electoral capitulation of Francis I was published as the final appendix to the *Vollständiges Diarium*. It contained 30 articles, and the first one details the differences between it and the capitulation of Charles VII.

<sup>49</sup> For a more detailed account see Kubeš, *Trnitá cesta*, pp. 22–45.

<sup>50</sup> Kubeš, 'Volba', pp. 836–37.

<sup>51</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 824–27.

in 1711),<sup>52</sup> were to stand at a distance and take part in the deliberations before the actual vote in the Cathedral of St Bartholomew. However, only the *Primarius* could remain part of the conclave; he was entrusted with representing Maria Theresa and casting the Bohemian vote ('von wegen der cron Böhheim') when his turn came.<sup>53</sup> He was explicitly instructed to cast his vote 'to our most beloved husband Francis Stephen, Duke of Lorraine and Grand Duke of Tuscany'.<sup>54</sup> Although the Queen was a sovereign monarch recognised as a legitimate elector, she could not be elected because the 1356 Golden Bull clearly declared that the emperor must be a man.<sup>55</sup> When casting a vote, Count Würmbrand was instructed to inform those present that the selected candidate's rule would undoubtedly be one of good fortune and would be highly beneficial to the Holy Roman Empire.

The instructions for the Bohemian delegation consisted of 14 sections. In section no. 13, the text briefly stated that the delegates were to immediately inform the Queen and her husband of the result after the vote. They would be in different places: Francis was to be based not far from Frankfurt for a substantial time (with the Austrian troops in Heidelberg),<sup>56</sup> but Maria Theresa did not leave Vienna until shortly after the election.

The final section of the instructions returned to questions of the ceremony, clearly stating that if the Bohemian delegation were to appear as a single unit at various sessions, the head of the delegation would always take priority (*die oberhand*) among them. This was evidently

<sup>52</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 823–24.

<sup>53</sup> In 1711, the Bohemian king was represented by Ernst Friedrich von Windischgrätz, who voted for his King Charles, Kubeš, *Trnitá cesta*, p. 39. Cf. the election of Leopold I in 1658, which the king himself attended and which is described *ibid.*, pp. 123–24.

<sup>54</sup> See the Appendix at the end of the article.

<sup>55</sup> It stated that they would elect 'einen gerechten, guten und geeigneten Mann als Römischen König und künftigen Kaiser' (the text of the Latin version states 'hominem iustum, bonum et utilem'); cf. the edited text of the Golden Bull in *Quellen zur Verfassungsgeschichte des Römisch-Deutschen Reiches im Spätmittelalter (1250–1500)*, ed. by Lorenz Weinrich, *Ausgewählte Quellen zur Deutschen Geschichte des Mittelalters*, 33 (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1983), pp. 314–95, here chapter 2.1, pp. 334–35.

<sup>56</sup> See fn. 10.

a reaction to a dispute between the first and second diplomats in the 1711 delegation, which in 1745 was to be avoided at all costs.<sup>57</sup>

#### BOHEMIAN DELEGATION DURING THE ELECTION DAY

The activities of the Bohemian Elector's delegation culminated on the day of the election (13 September), and the Primarius Count Wurmbrand played the key role. Paired with the head of the Bavarian delegation, he took part in the ceremonial arrival of the electors (or their diplomats) at the Cathedral of St. Bartholomew. He sat in the conclave with the elector of Mainz and the heads of a further five delegations. Francis Stephen of Lorraine was elected the new Holy Roman Emperor, receiving seven votes. The Bohemian delegates then swore an oath on behalf of the new Roman king, committing to abide by the electoral capitulation.<sup>58</sup> The first and second Bohemian diplomats were the central figures at the post-election celebrations held that evening. Count Wurmbrand hosted an opulent banquet at the Braunfels house on the Liebfrauenberg (Fig. 2), where the king of Bohemia stayed during previous elections and coronations; the guest-of-honour was the elector of Mainz, and the banquet was also attended by all the envoys present. The celebrations culminated with the beautiful illumination of the houses, in which the Bohemian delegates and other important courtiers of Queen Maria Theresa were quartered (including Count Rudolf Joseph Collaredo, who had travelled to Frankfurt from Heidelberg, where he had been accompanying Francis Stephen of Lorraine). The most magnificent decorative display was apparently on the façade of Count Khevenhüller's house, where skilfully crafted lamps were arranged to illuminate the night with the message 'FRANCISCVS STEPHANVS LOTHARINGICVS, AVSTRIACÆ THERESIÆ CONSORS, ELECTVS SEMPER AVGVSTVS'. White and red wine were served outside the house, and coins were thrown to the common people.<sup>59</sup>

---

<sup>57</sup> In 1711, the younger diplomat Franz Ferdinand Kinský had sometimes failed to respect the higher-ranking head of the delegation Windischgrätz, and he received a rebuke from Vienna. Cf. Kubeš, 'Volba', pp. 814–15.

<sup>58</sup> *Vollständiges Diarium*, pp. 241–55.

<sup>59</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 259–60.



**Fig. 2:** The Braunfels house after a Baroque remodelling at the end of the seventeenth century, copper engraving by Georg Daniel Heumann according to a drawing by Salomon Kleiner, 1728. Extract from a view of the Liebfrauenberg from the publication *Das florirende Franckfurth am Mayn, oder Wahrhafftige und eigentliche Abbildung dieser Berühmten Freyen Reichs- Wahl- und Handel Statt...* (Augsburg, 1738).

Surprisingly, the Bohemian delegation did not cease its activities in Frankfurt when Queen Maria Theresa arrived in the city at the end of September to attend the coronation.<sup>60</sup> Her delegates continued to represent her at College meetings; they sent their last report to her on 14 October, i.e. ten days after the coronation and two days before she set out on her homeward journey.<sup>61</sup>

<sup>60</sup> Maria Theresa left Vienna on 15 September, and she learned about the successful vote on 16 September while in Linz. She met up with her husband in Aschaffenburg, and she arrived in Frankfurt on the day of the new emperor's festive entry into the city (25 September). Cf. Arneth, *Maria Theresia's erste Regierungsjahre*, pp. 107–08.

<sup>61</sup> The College eventually met at 27 sessions in total, the last of which was held on 12 October 1745, NA Praha, ČDK, box 308. Maria Theresa and her husband departed from Frankfurt on 16 October 1745, Arneth, *Maria Theresia's erste Regierungsjahre*, p. 109.

## CONCLUSIONS

All the members of the delegation later received honours. The new Emperor appointed Count Wurmbrand the President of the Aulic Council, a position he had previously held once before, until 1740. Count Khevenhüller was appointed the emperor's Supreme Chamberlain, and Baron Hillebrand received his second appointment as an Imperial Court Councillor. The three diplomats had substantially raised their profiles in Frankfurt, and members of their families had also become known in elite society, as had the other nobles who had accompanied them there as members of their entourages. However, it was not the *Primarius* who had brought the most opulent entourage but rather the second envoy. Whereas Count Wurmbrand had been accompanied by more than sixty people, including two cavaliers from families of counts, Maria Theresa's Supreme Court Marshal Count Khevenhüller had brought twice as many people, including twelve cavaliers! Among them was the young and very rich Bohemian noble Prokop Adalbert Czernin von Chudenitz, who had interrupted his cavalier's tour to attend the event. Sources show that he was in the Cathedral of St Bartholomew choir during the vote, accompanying the Bohemian delegation. The third envoy, Baron Hillebrand, was attended by more than 20 people, including his son Stephan Andreas.<sup>62</sup>

If we are to believe the registers compiled in 1746, the three Bohemian diplomats representing Maria Theresa brought over two hundred people with them to Frankfurt, based themselves in the city's Horse Market district (where Bohemian electors and their representatives traditionally had their quarters), and remained there roughly from mid-July to mid-October, i.e. around three months. They carried out the Queen's orders, having already attended a series of preparatory meetings in Vienna and been given an extensive set of instructions divided into 14 sections

---

<sup>62</sup> *Vollständiges Diarium*, appendix to the diarium containing lists of the members of the electors' delegates' entourages. Aristocratic cavaliers are all mentioned by name. More information on Czernin, who was in Khevenhüller's entourage from the Hannover meeting in late July, is given in Jiří Kubeš, *Náročně dospívání urozených. Kavalírské cesty české a rakouské šlechty (1620–1750)* (Pelhřimov: Nová tiskárna Pelhřimov, 2013), pp. 174–75. His presence at the election in the cathedral is evidenced by *Vollständiges Diarium*, p. 268.

summarising all their key tasks. Queen Maria Theresa's delegates to the pre-election deliberations were men with extensive experience in imperial politics, Counts Wurmbbrand and Khevenhüller and Baron Hillebrand.<sup>63</sup> She focused intently on implementing her plans for her husband's election as the new Roman king. The delegation was entrusted with some fundamental tasks in the domain of ceremony; the delegates had to ensure that the other electors showed appropriate respect to Maria Theresa both as the queen and as the elector of Bohemia, and they also had to ensure that the hierarchical order of the electors was respected at sessions of the electoral college (in both the seating positions and the voting procedures). However, the delegates were relieved of some of the tasks their predecessors had been entrusted with. They did not even have to arrive in Frankfurt together. As they reached an agreement with the other delegations, there were – with a single exception – no festive entries to the city. Besides these tasks, the delegates also had to participate in crucial political negotiations. For example, before arriving in Frankfurt, the second-ranking diplomat travelled to Hannover for a meeting at which the Bohemian delegation, the Elector of Mainz and the British King agreed to cooperate in a joint approach. Subsequently, in Frankfurt, it was necessary to coordinate the activities of the other electors inclined towards Maria Theresa because, until the last moment, it was still unclear whether e.g. the Duke of Saxony would support her plans.<sup>64</sup> In the end, they did not have as much work regarding the electoral capitulation; to speed up the election, they agreed that only minor changes would be made to the previous capitulation. Their activities culminated on the day of the election itself; all three delegates attended an electoral mass in the Cathedral of St Bartholomew, and then the *Primarius* cast his vote for Francis Stephen of Lorraine. After the unusual election of 1742, the 1745 election marked a return to tradition, demonstrating that the Bohemian monarch was a legitimate member

---

<sup>63</sup> Research on this issue has made it possible to correct the inaccurate information on the membership of the delegation given in Kubeš, *Trnitá cesta*, p. 224.

<sup>64</sup> During the first sessions of the College, his delegate did not make the deliberations easy, and it was not until the end of August that he began to show more support for Maria Theresa. Count Khevenhüller was also sent to meet with representatives of Saxony before arriving in Frankfurt. Cf. Arneth, *Maria Theresa's erste Regierungsjahre*, pp. 82–84.



of the electoral college and held the highest rank among the secular electors. Another vital aspect of the delegation was its social role outside the College of Electors; this was demonstrated during the post-election celebrations, which included a lavish banquet hosted by the Bohemian delegates, who decorated their houses in a very abundant manner that was obvious to all in the city. Queen Maria Theresa would have been highly satisfied with her delegation because the envoys helped her reclaim the imperial title for her family.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Archival Sources

*Národní archiv Praha, Česká dvorská kancelář*  
boxes 307–09

### Printed Primary Sources

*Aus der Zeit Maria Theresias. Tagebuch des Fürsten Johann Joseph Khevenhüller-Metsch. Kaiserlichen Oberhofmeisters*, Bd. 2: 1745–1749, ed. by Rudolf Khevenhüller-Metsch, Hanns Schlitter (Leipzig–Wien: Verlag von Moritz Ruhl–Verlag von Adolf Holzhausen, 1908)

*Quellen zur Verfassungsgeschichte des Römisch-Deutschen Reiches im Spätmittelalter (1250–1500)*, ed. by Lorenz Weinrich, *Ausgewählte Quellen zur Deutschen Geschichte des Mittelalters*, 33 (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1983), pp. 314–95

### Old Prints

*Das florirende Franckfurth am Mayn, oder Wahrhafftige und eigendliche Abbildung dieser Berühmten Freyen Reichs– Wahl– und Handel Statt...* (Augsburg: [s.n.], 1738)

*Protocolla, so bey der Wahl und Crönung des ... Herrn, Herrn Francisci, Erwehlten Römischen Kayzers ... zu Franckfurt am Mayn im Jahr 1745 gehalten worden* (Frankfurt am Main: [s.n.], 1745)

*Vollständiges Diarium von der höchst-beglückten Erwehlung des ... herrn, herrn Franciscus ... zum römischen König und Kayser...* (Frankfurt am Main: Jung, 1746)

Zedler, Johann Heinrich, *Grosses vollständiges Universal-Lexicon aller Wissenschaften und Künste*, Bd. 60 and 68, 1749 and 1754

## Secondary Works

- Arnoeth, Alfred von, *Maria Theresia's erste Regierungsjahre*, Bd. 3: 1745–1748 (Wien: Salzwasser-Verlag, 1865)
- Begert, Alexander, *Böhmen, die böhmische Kur und das Reich vom Hochmittelalter bis zum Ende des Alten Reiches. Studien zur Kurwürde und zur staatsrechtlichen Stellung Böhmens*, Mainzer Historische Kulturwissenschaften, 42 (Husum: Matthiesen Verlag, 2003)
- Braun, Bettina, *Eine Kaiserin und zwei Kaiser. Maria Theresia und ihre Mitregenten Franz Stephan und Joseph II.* (Bielefeld: Transcript Verlag, 2018)
- Dotzauer, Winfried, 'Die Ankunft des Herrschers. Der fürstliche "Einzug" in die Stadt bis zum Ende des Alten Reiches', *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte*, 55 (1973), 245–88
- Fromm, Elias, *Die Kaiserwahl Franz I. Ein Beitrag zur deutschen Reichsgeschichte des achtzehnten Jahrhunderts* (printed dissertation, Gnesen: Universität Jena, 1883)
- Fürnrohr, Walter, 'Die Vertreter des habsburgischen Kaisertums auf dem Immerwährenden Reichstag, Teil II', *Verhandlungen des Historischen Vereins für Oberpfalz und Regensburg*, 124 (1984), 99–148
- Hlaváčka, Milan, *Karel Albrecht. Příběh druhého zimního krále* (Praha: Akropolis, 1997)
- Kleinheyer, Gerd, *Die kaiserlichen Wahlkapitulationen. Geschichte, Wesen und Funktion*, Studien und Quellen zur Geschichte des deutschen Verfassungsrechts, Reihe A: Studien, Bd. 1 (Karlsruhe: C.F. Müller, 1968)
- Kubeš, Jiří, 'Readmise (1708)', in *Encyklopedie českých právních dějin*, 10: R–Ř, ed. by Karel Schelle, Jaromír Tauchen (Plzeň: Vydavatelství a nakladatelství Aleš Čeněk, s.r.o., 2017), pp. 74–77
- , 'Volba a korunovace Karla VI. římským císařem v roce 1711', *Český časopis historický*, 111, no. 4 (2013), 805–41
- , *Národné dospívání urozených. Kavalírské cesty české a rakouské šlechty (1620–1750)* (Pelhřimov: Nová tiskárna Pelhřimov, 2013)
- , *Trnitá cesta Leopolda I. za říšskou korunou (1657–1658). Volby a korunovace ve Svaté říši římské v raném novověku* (České Budějovice: Veduta, 2009)
- , et al., *V zastoupení císaře. Česká a moravská aristokracie v habsburské diplomacii 1640–1740* (Praha: NLN – Nakladatelství Lidové noviny, 2018)
- Kühne, Ulrich, 'Geschichte der böhmischen Kur in den Jahrhunderten nach der Goldenen Bulle', *Archiv für Urkundenforschung*, 10 (1928), 1–110
- Mašek, Petr, *Šlechtické rody v Čechách, na Moravě a ve Slezsku od Bílé hory do současnosti*, 1–2 (Praha: Argo, 2008 and 2010)
- Posch, Josef, *Die Kaiserwahl Franz I. 1745* (typewritten dissertation, Wien: Universität Wien, 1949)
- Repertorium der diplomatischer Vertreter aller Länder seit dem Westfälischen Frieden (1648)*, Bd. 2: 1716–1763, ed. by Friedrich Hausmann (Zürich: Verlag Fretz und Wasmuth, 1950)
- Schmid, Alois, 'Bayern und die Kaiserwahl 1745', in *Festschrift für Andreas Kraus zum 60. Geburtstag*, ed. by Pankraz Fried, Walter Ziegler (Kallmünz: Verlag Michael Laßleben, 1982), pp. 257–76

- Vajnági, Márta, 'Britain–Hanover and the Imperial Election of 1745', *Hungarian Journal of English and American Studies*, 14, no. 1 (2008), 51–64
- , *Császárválasztás 1745* (Budapest: ELTE BTK Középkori és Kora Újkori Egyetemes Történeti Tanszék, 2014)
- , *Great Britain and the Habsburg Monarchy in the Eighteenth Century: Imperial Election 1745* (unpublished MA thesis, Budapest: Eötvös Loránd University, 2007)
- Wanger, Bernd Herbert, *Kaiserwahl und Krönung im Frankfurt des 17. Jahrhunderts. Darstellung anhand der zeitgenössischen Bild- und Schriftquellen und unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Erhebung des Jahres 1612* (Frankfurt am Main: Verlag Waldemar Kramer, 1994)
- Wolf, Adam, *Aus dem Hofleben Maria Theresias. Nach den Memoiren des Fürsten Joseph Khevenhüller* (Wien: Carl Gerold, 1859)

**Jiří Kubeš** – associate professor at the Institute of Historical Sciences of the Faculty of Arts and Philosophy of the University of Pardubice. He focuses on the history of the early modern period, in particular the history of the Habsburg courts, the Central European nobility and its lifestyle in the sixteenth–eighteenth centuries, with special emphasis on the history of travel of the early modern elite. The principal investigator in a research project 'Bohemian and Moravian Nobility in the Diplomatic Service of the Austrian Habsburgs (1640–1740)' funded between 2013 and 2017 by Grantová Agentura České Republiky (Prague, CZ); email: Jiri.Kubes@upce.cz

## APPENDIX

Národní archiv Praha, Česká dvorská kancelář, box 307, a copy of the instructions issued by the Queen of Bohemia to her delegation dispatched to Frankfurt am Main for the election of the new Holy Roman King and future Emperor, Vienna, 14 June 1745

Maria Theresia etc.

Instruction für die (tit.) grafen v[on] Wurmbrand, grafen Kevenhüller und baron Brandau etc., wie selbe von unser und der cron und Chur Böheim wegen bey der nacher Franckfurt am Mayn auf den 1. Junii dieses Jahrs angesetzten wahl eines röm[ischen] königs zum kayserthum denominirte anwalder und besondere bottscaffter sich zu verhalten haben werden.

Demnach auf ableben des lezt verstorbenen röm[ischen] kaysers Carl des 7 May[estät]t höchst seeligsten andenckens der hochwürdigste churfürt Johann Friderich Carl erzbischof zu Maynz<sup>1</sup> des hei[ligen] römischen reichs durch Germanien erzcantler, unser besonders lieber herr vetter, untern dato Maynz den 31. monats-tag Januarii dieses lauffenden jahrs nach erforderung des way[land] kaysers Carl des vierten goldenen bull<sup>2</sup> an uns einen offenen besigelten brief bey unserer könig[lichen] stadthalterey zu Prag durch ihren specialen gesandten<sup>3</sup> abgeben lassen und in solchen uns von wegen unser cron und Chur Böheim auf den 1. monats-tag Junii in eigener person oder durch unsere bottscaffter oder verweeser einen- oder mehr mit ganz vollen gewalt in bemelte stadt Franckfurth am Mayn zu erscheinen und nach denen hierüber aufgerichteten gesätzen mit anderen mit-churfürsten von der wahl eines römischen königs zum künftigen kayser zu handeln und überein zu kommen, auch allda bis zum ende derselben zu verharren und zu thun und zu gebahren, wie in denen heylsamen reichs-satzungen hievon geordnet wird, eingeladen und ersuchet;

<sup>1</sup> Johann Friedrich Karl von Ostein (1689–1763), between 1743 and 1763 the elector of Mainz.

<sup>2</sup> The Golden Bull of Emperor Charles IV (1356), one of the foundations of the Holy Roman Empire's legal system.

<sup>3</sup> The invitation for the Bohemian Elector was brought to Prague in March 1745 by the Mainz envoy Philipp Christoph Freiherr von und zu Erthal (1689–1748).

Und nun wir zu unseren bottschafttern zu sothaner wahl primo loco obgedachten Johann Wilhelm grafen v[on] Wurmbrand,<sup>4</sup> secundo loco den Johann Joseph gra[fe]n v[on] Kevenhüller<sup>5</sup> und tertio loco den Carl Ludwig freyherrn von Brandau<sup>6</sup> allergnädigst benennet und dieselbe mit der behörigen vollmacht versehen, damit sie auf vorbesagten ange-setzten wahl-tag eines römischen königs zum kayserthum nebst anderen churfürsten geist- und weltlichen gesandten und rätthen erscheinen und alles ihrer vollmacht gemäß mitabhandlen sollen.

Alß haben wir selbe ihres verhaltens willen ferner folgender gestalt zu instruiren gnädigst vor gut angesehen.

1.<sup>mo</sup> Werden sie drey könig[liche] chur-böhmische bottschafter ihre sachen dahin anstellen und sich zeitlich auf sothane reyß begeben, damit selbte insgesamt oder wenigstens der dritte gesandte, so bald als möglich, zu Frankfurth anlange, dergestalten, daß, wann nicht alle beysammen wären, der öffentliche einzug verschoben – auch dafern andere sich dessen nicht bedienen würden, gar ausbleiben kunte.

2.<sup>do</sup> Und wann nun dieselbe oder einer von ihnen angelanget seynd; sollen sie alsogleich nachfrag halten, wan[n] die churfürstliche sessiones ihren anfang nehmen werden, damit sie zeitlich ihre ankunfft bey Chur-Maynz als decano electoralis colegii anzeigen kunte, immassen, wann der erste gesandte auch noch nicht ankommen wäre und die sessiones sich anhebeten, der anderte und dritte gesandte an den chur-maynzischen hofmarschallen<sup>7</sup> die mithabende credentiales, um solche des churfürsten l[ie]bden zu überreichen, abgeben müssen. Wornach sie sich ratione ceremonialis (bevor sie bey Chur-Maynz die visita anzeigen und ablegen würden) des empfangs und rangs-halber wohl und genau unter der hand zuerkundigen hätten und wann das ceremoniale auf form und weis, wie andere könig[liche] gesandte vom churfürsten zu Maynz empfangen werden, seine richtigkeit hätte, da können sie gesandte

---

<sup>4</sup> Johann Wilhelm von Wurmbrand und Stuppach (1670–1750), the President of the Aulic Council under Charles VI.

<sup>5</sup> Johann Joseph von Khevenhüller (1706–1776), the Supreme Court Marshal of the Queen of Bohemia and Hungary.

<sup>6</sup> Karl Ludwig Hillebrand Freiherr von Prandau, a member of the Aulic Council under Charles VI.

<sup>7</sup> The Supreme Marshal of the Mainz elector was the abovementioned Baron Erthal.

um audienz ansuchung thuen und sich persönlich dahin verfügen, die mithabende vollmachten überreichen, zugleich aber, in abwesenheit des ersten gesandten, dessen spätere ankunft entschuldigen und dessen eheiste nachkunft versichern,

3.<sup>10</sup> Im übrigen aber vortragen, wie nach sie auf des churfürstens l[ie]bden gewöhnliches invitations-schreiben<sup>8</sup> nach innhalt der zuvor insinuirten königlich-böheim[ischen] churfürst[lichen] vollmacht zu dieser gesandtschaft wären abgeschicket worden, sie auch samt und sonders in commissis hätten, das von uns tragende besondere grosse vertrauen vorzustellen und weilen wir auf die von deroselben jederzeit verspürte beständige affection unser vornehmstes fundament setzten; so lebten wir ausser allen zweifel, des churfürstens l[ie]bden würden auch bey gegenwärtiger wahl die abgeschikte gesandtschaft ihnen lassen anbefohlen seyn, auch dero orts all- dasjenige, so zur beobachtung des dem königreich Böhme anhangenden churfürst[lichen] wahl- und andere rechtens nöthig und erforderlich seyn würde, mitbewürken helfen; worfür wir mit aller beständigen lieb und freundschaft gegen das churfürstens l[ie]bden ferner zu correspondiren nie aussetzen würden. Wo dann endlichen die gesandtschaft von des churfürstens l[ie]bden weitere befehl erwarten thäte, was deroselben zur mitbeförderung der wahl-sache an die hand zu geben beliebig seyn möchte, nach welchem dann, wann nemlich beyderseitige unterredungen geendiget seyn werden, die gesandtschaft wieder abtreten und in dem concertirten ceremoniali ihrer ruckweeg ins quartier nehmen kann.

4.<sup>10</sup> Was die übrige churfürsten und deren bottschaftere anlanget, werden sie gesandte, wie jezt schon erwehnt, auch bey denenselben ihre ankunft anzeigen und bey denen jenigen churfürsten, wo selbige das ceremoniale, wie bey Chur-Maynz, zu hoffen, wie auch bey denen anderen gesandten, von welchen sie ein gleichmässiges zugewarten hätten, ihre visiten und revisiten ablegen und mit allerseitiger vorstellung unserer gegen dieselbe und gegen derenselben hohen herren principalen tragender besonderer hochachtung und freundschaft die gewöhnliche complimenta abstaten; würde aber der erste gesandte noch bey zeiten

---

<sup>8</sup> Maria Theresa's invitation to the election was dated 31 January 1745, and it was delivered to the Bohemian Governor's Office in Prague in March.

ankommen können, werden diese visiten bey andere chur-fürsten und deren gesandten bis zu dessen ankunfft verschoben bleiben müssen; gleichwie dann

5.<sup>to</sup> auch, wofern ihme ersten gesandten einen öffentlichen einzug zu halten gefällig wäre, worinn er sich nach dem exempl anderer vor ihm ankommender gesandschaften zu richten haben wird, demselben die übrige zuvor angekommene zwey gesandte pro decore characteris mit ihren comitiva, pferd und wagen an die hand gehen würden, auch, wann sie sich noch nicht ins publicum gestellet, selbst mit ihme einziehen.

6.<sup>to</sup> Anreichend die etwann anwesende gesandschaften von fremden potenzen, als der general-staaten der vereinigten Niederlanden und dergleichen, weilen diese die rechte hand bey ordentlichen visiten prætendiren möchten, so würden sie nemlichen zwey erstere gesandte nur in loco tertio oder in privat-zimmern zusammenkommen und miteinander, was vorfallet, conferiren können.

7.<sup>mo</sup> Und dieweilen die cron Böheim zu allen churfürst[lichen] collegial-tägen und sessionibus zu admittiren ist, so sollen auch unsere bottschaftere sich jedesmahlen darbey mit einer von denen andern auch gebrauchenden comitiva fleißig einfinden und der erstere seinen ausgemessenen sitz inter electores, die andere aber an separirten orthen, suo tamen debito loco et ordine, hintereinander, wie es bishero gebräuchlich gewesen und der vergleich de anno sechzehen hundert drey und fünfzig ziel und maaß giebt, ihre stelle nehmen und nebst denen andern churfürst[lichen] gesandten erscheinen. Unser bottschafts-secretarius<sup>9</sup> aber, was darbey vorkommet, alles fleißig ad protocollum bringen. Worbey auch

8.<sup>vo</sup> dieses in obacht zunehmen, daß zwar der chur-böhmische erstere gesandte nach allen herren chur-fürsten, die in person erscheinen, seinen sitz hat, jedoch in ordine votandi sein jedesmahliges votum gleich nach denen geistlichen churfürsten abzulegen pfeget.

9.<sup>no</sup> Und in deme die materia capitulationis eine von denen vornehmsten seyn wird, über welche in denen churfürstlichen sessionibus dörfte delibrirt werden, herentgegen die capitulatio perpetua noch

---

<sup>9</sup> The delegation's secretary was Joseph Ignaz von Stang, the secretary of the Bohemian Court Chancellery.

nicht dergestalt zur perfection gekommen, daß selbe dermahlen angenommen werden könnte; hierorts auch nicht wissend, ob mann für diesesmahl die wahl-capitulation way[land] unseres hochgeehrtesten herrn vatters kay[serlichen] und könig[lichen] May[estätt]<sup>10</sup> oder aber des lezt verstorbenen kaysers<sup>11</sup> pro fundamento nehmen werde, mithin sich auch nicht wohl etwas gewißes und eigentliches vorschreiben lasset; so haben wir unsern bottschaftern nicht nur sub A. die monita, welche ehedessen bey der wahl capitulation way[land] unsers herrn vatters kay[serlichen] und könig[lichen] May[estätt] dahier gemacht, sondern auch in dem protocollo sub B. dasjenige, so bey der lezten wahl-capitulation erinnert worden, in extenso hier anschliessen wollen, mit dem weitem gnädigsten befehl, daß sie bottschaftere sich in beeden wohl ersehen, in sich ergebenden fällen sich eines sowohl als des anderen bedienen, mithin nach der ihnen beywohnenden prudenz, dexteritæt und in sachen besizender einsicht alle mittel und weege anzuwenden trachten sollen, damit eine solche capitulation verfasst werde, welche dem künfftigen kayser am allerwenigsten præjudicirlich seye. Solte aber

10.<sup>mo</sup> ein gar wichtiger casus vorfallen, den sie von selbst zu superiren und zu decidiren sich nicht getraueten, solchen werden sie (wann es die zeit leydet) an uns alsobald durch einen expressen gutächtlich gehorsamst berichten und die fernere allerg[nä]digste resolution darüber erwarten, oder aber da periculum in mora wäre und die zeit nicht zuliesse, unsere g[nä]digste resolution hierüber einzuholen, werden sie ihrem besten befund nach unsere jura und gerechtsame auf andere weege in salvo zu erhalten bedacht seyn. Wan[n] nun

11.<sup>o</sup> der wahl-tag selbst herbey kom[m]et und zu demselben von dem reichs-marschallen grafen v[on] Pappenheim<sup>12</sup> durch einen fourier angesagt wird, da hat unsere chur böhmische gesandschaft mit einer mehrern comitiva zu erscheinen und pfeget der erste nur allein inter electores zu reithen und zu sitzen, der and[er]e und dritte aber

<sup>10</sup> Emperor Charles VI, a Habsburg (1685–1740).

<sup>11</sup> Emperor Charles VII, a Wittelsbach (1697–1745).

<sup>12</sup> In 1745, the hereditary imperial marshal was Friedrich Ferdinand von Pappenheim (1702–1793), but due to his poor health he was eventually represented by his son, Friedrich Karl von Pappenheim (1726–1762). See *Vollständiges Diarium*, p. 184.



nebst zwey[en] cavalliern, welche zu zeügen mitgenom[m]en werden, dasselbigemahl hinter dem ersten zu stehen und denen præliminaribus actibus electionis, als der beaydigung des magistrats zu Franckfurth und dergleichen mit beyzuwohnen. Wan[n]s aber hiernächst

12.<sup>o</sup> zur würrklichen election komet, bleibt der erstere allein in conclave, alle übrige aber tretten ab, wo des churfürsten von Mayntz l[ie]bden die vota colligiren und wird alsdann der darinnen verbliebene erste gesandte von wegen der cron Böheim seine stim[m]e zum röm[ischen] könig unserm freundlichst geliebtesten herrn gemahl Francisco Stephano herzogen zu Lothringen und großherzogen v[on] Toscana<sup>13</sup> zu legen und darbey vorstellen, wie durch dessen ungezweifelt künftige glückliche regierung dem heiligen römischen reich und dem allgemeinen weesen ein sehr grosser vortheil zuwachsen werde.

13.<sup>io</sup> Nach vollbrachter und publicirter wahl solle die könig[liche] chur-böhmische gesandtschaft alsogleich durch einen expressen so wohl an uns, als unsers geliebsten herrn gemahls l[ie]bden die nachricht abgehen lassen, auf wessen person die wahl ausgefallen.

14.<sup>io</sup> Und so viel das ceremoniale unter ihnen selbst betrifft, da wird solches dergestalt zuhalten seyn, daß wann sie in corpore entweder in conferentien in des ersten gesandten quartier zusam[m]en kommen, oder auch auf das rathhaus, oder zu ablegung den visiten ausfahren und auch visiten in des ersten gesandten-haus empfangen thäten, die oberhand jedesmahlen dem ersten gesandten gebühren müsse.

Schlüsslichen werden sie sich in all-übrigen dergestalt verhalten und aufführen, daß sie in allem unser und unsers geliebtesten herrn gemahls höchstes interesse wohl und genau observiren, wie sie dann darüber von post zu post-tag ihre ordentliche relationes abzustatten haben.

Welchem allen dann sie gebührend nachzukom[m]en und hieran unseren allergnädigsten willen und meinung gehorsamst zu vollbringen wissen werden, wir verbleiben denenselben anbey samt und sonders mit könig[lichen] gnaden wohlgeuogen. Geben etc. Wien den 14. Junii 1745.

Instruction für die könig[liche] chur-böheim[ische] bottschaft zur bevorstehenden kaysers-wahl nacher Frankfurth.

---

<sup>13</sup> Emperor Francis I Stephen, Duke of Lorraine (1708–1765).