

The Burden of Authority – The Preparations for the Ambassadorial Mission to Constantinople of Baron Johann Ludwig von Kuefstein in 1628^{2*}

INTRODUCTION

To place this essay in context, it is worthwhile to begin the elaboration of the topic with a brief but suggestive introductory note. The quote below is the text of an oath by a true turncoat diplomatic “expert”, who was an interpreter, informer and, actually a spy. Marino Tudisi (Tudišević) from Dubrovnik, who was employed as an interpreter and confidant, recited the following words before the entrance into Constantinople of the ambassadorial mission of 1628–1629, pledging his loyal service to the Habsburg ambassador Baron Johann Ludwig von Kuefstein:

“I, Marino Tudisi, honouring God and the saints do solemnly take a vow at the request of his excellency the free Baron Lord Johann Ludwig von Kuefstein to His Majesty the Holy Roman Emperor Ferdinand II, our most honourable lord (to his appointed spokesman during the time of the diplomatic mission sent to the Sublime Porte). I firmly give my word and pledge to God and our Lord Jesus Christ’s immaculate Mother, the Blessed Virgin Mary, all the angels, God’s saints, and my Christian faith that in every negotiation in which his excellency makes use of my services so that I can be of use to his sacred spokesman and show my faith, I will fervently perform my work and labours. Lest I say anything at all of those matters that they have ordered to be confidential I [understood as directly] in the name of his reverent excellency [understood as or others] the spokesman for his reverent majesty, will not give any kind of indication. I will safeguard everything solemnly and loyally in the depths of my immaculate heart. Help me God, and these holy

* This article has been written within the framework of the work of the MTA–SZTE Research Group of the Ottoman Age (Eötvös Loránd Research Network). The research has been supported by the National Research, Development and Innovation Office (NRDI) (Nemzeti Kutatási, Fejlesztési és Innovációs Hivatal) through a grant (Thematic Excellence Programme (Tématerületi Kiválósági Program) 2020, NKFIH-1279-2/2020) of the Interdisciplinary Centre of Excellence (University of Szeged), the Department of Medieval and Early Modern Hungarian History (Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Szeged), MTA–SZTE Research Group of the Ottoman Age (Eötvös Loránd Research Network). János Szabados’s work has been supported by the New National Excellence Programme (Új Nemzeti Kiválósági Program, code nr. ÚNKP-20-4-II) of the Ministry for Innovation and Technology (Innovációs és Technológiai Minisztérium) from the source of the National Research, Development and Innovation Fund, via the NRDI. This paper is an enlarged, revised and, as well, updated version of the earlier published study in Hungarian: Brandl, – Szabados, “A megbízás terhe”.

Gospels of God. I have taken this vow most loyally on 21 November 1628, proclaiming it before his Excellency's confessor, Father Petrus Lubich, and Elias Seeauer, who have read through the pledge themselves. At Pontepiccolo."³

The vulnerability of Baron Kuefstein and the diplomatic mission is exemplified by the fact that Tudisi was so undependable that he had to bear evidence of his loyalty under oath. His services were indispensable from the viewpoint of the mission since knowledge of the Ottoman Turkish language could be considered essential in Habsburg–Ottoman diplomacy. At the same time, based on the surviving sources, it is not at all by chance that his vow took place at Pontepiccolo,⁴ prior to entering Constantinople. After all, he was not just a confidant of Kuefstein, but also maintained outstanding relations with other magistrates.⁵ According to his statement, he had admittance to the divan of the pasha of Buda and regularly reported to Venetian diplomats. This is just exacerbated by the fact that he is referred to as a personal agent of Count Michael Adolf von Althan in the sources uncovered up to now and not a loyal subject of the emperor. In addition to this, based on documents reviewed of the Aulic Chamber, he did not have an imperial letter of commission or pay, and even Althan himself noted to Baron Kuefstein that Tudisi followed his orders.⁶

THE FOCAL POINTS OF THE ARTICLE

This brief episode also clearly casts light on the difficulties for diplomatic missions going to Constantinople. Thus, it is not surprising that in the present article

³ “*Ego Martinus Tudisi ad requisitionem excellentissimae domini dominationi Joannis Ludovici libero baronis a Kuefstain, Sacratissimi Romani Imperatore Ferdinandi II. Domini Nostri Clementissimi [pro tempore ad Portem Ottomanicam oratoris] in conspectu Dei et Sanctorum Eius, sancte promitto ac per Deum intemeratam Matrem Domini N. Jesu Christi Beatissimam Virginem Mariam omnesque angelos et sanctos Dei, perque meam fidem Christianam firmiter me obligo. Ac juro me in omnibus illis negotiis, in quibus illustrissimae suae excellentiae meis servitiis ut suae Sanctissimae Maiestatis orator usurus sit, vel uti voluerit fidelem ac industriam operam navaturum neque quidquam ex iis quae mihi a Sua Illustrissima Excellentia Domino inquam Suae Maiestatis oratore n[omine] n[omine] secreto commissa fuerint ullo signo manifestaturum unquam, sed omnia sancte fideliter atque intemerate in cordis arcano conservaturum. Ita me Deus adjuvet et haec sancta Dei Evangelia. Hoc juramentum fidelissime praestitum est 21. die Novembris anno 1628 in praesentia illustrissime suae excellentiae eisdemque confessarii referendi Domini Patris Petri Lubich et Eliae Seeaueri, qui ipsi hoc perlegit. In Pontepiccolo.*” ELTE EKL, G4, Tom. V, pag. 547. The sentence “Help me God, and these holy Gospels of God” has been translated according to the English translation of the Profession of the Tridentine Faith (1564). Cf.: Schaff, ed., *Bibliotheca Symbolica*, vol. 2, pp. 208–210.

⁴ Pontepiccolo (Küçükçekmece) is a district of present-day Istanbul, which located in the European side of the city.

⁵ Tudisi's network of political relationships is quite complicated. For instance, he is mentioned as a loyal confidant of Count Michael Adolf von Althan. This information is strengthened by the Transylvanian envoy Mihály Tholdalagi, who precisely stated the same in his diary. Salamon, *Két magyar diplomata*, p. 161.

⁶ For a summary of Tudisi's activities, see: Brandl – Szabados, “A Janus-arcú diplomata”, pp. 85–102.

we are introducing the complex framework in which Baron Johann Ludwig von Kuefstein had to act as a “*homo novus*” of Habsburg–Ottoman diplomacy, deploying means of both trust and the exertion of pressure.

First, following the findings up to this point, we will outline the details of the political and diplomatic environment with consideration of the events during the ambassadorial mission. In connection with this, the extraordinary source materials that are presented as one of the most important parts of the paper should be stressed. This extensive source material makes it possible for us to discuss in principle the available documentary materials of Habsburg–Ottoman diplomatic missions to the fullest possible extent. Established on this, we will outline the relationships of Kuefstein and his entourage in the following section, in which the problems of the attempts at asserting influence, the vulnerability, and the duties indicated by the emperor will be examined. Due to the complexity of the subject, we will only concentrate on the first half of the diplomat’s diplomatic mission, from the emperor seeking him out (18 November 1627) to the arrival of the delegation in Constantinople (18 November 1628).⁷ The focal point of the present work is placed primarily on the examination of the diplomatic background work in preparation for the mission and the continuous court, political and social pressure surrounding this. In accordance with all this, we are seeking an answer to the question of which direction did the influence come from, what perceptible form did it take during the ambassador’s activities and how was he able to manage it. Baron Kuefstein’s vulnerability to the wartime relationships and the political circles in the court can be observed, and together these forced him to allow room for designs that differed from his own. It can also be seen how those mentioned came into conflict with social expectations and in the end, the diplomat’s intentions.

From this it can be seen obviously, that in addition to the imperial orders, there were several individuals with influence in the court that wanted to assert their own will, so he was significantly at the mercy of individuals with a broader understanding of the Ottoman Empire or who knew the Turkish language. In addition, the selection of the members of the delegation was also a challenge to him, and the aforementioned “lobbying activities” in connection with this can also be observed. Therefore, it can be shown in advance that the outlining of the system of diplomatic connections for a mission is also able to examine numerous general social phenomena and show the efforts of various factions to assert their interests.

⁷ The letter, which requests him to take part in the mission, was written by Anton Wolfradt, Abt von Krebmsünster on behalf of the monarch, and was sent from Prague on 18 November 1627. ELTE EKL, G4 Tom. V. pag. 1–4; the detailed chronology of the mission was made on the basis of his final report (*Finalrelation*) which had been written about the mission. See: Kuefstein, K. G., *Studien zur Familiengeschichte*, vol. 3, pp. 259–279; Certain works were utilising the diplomatic journal through the perspective of cultural history, see Teply, *Die kaiserliche Großbotschaft*.

THE POSSIBILITIES FOR EXAMINATION

A significant majority of research on diplomatic history presents a global perspective that looks at the issue from above. This is because in many cases the prominent political individuals decide on the actual shaping of the events (e.g. the palatine, the leadership of the Aulic War Council, etc.).⁸ However, at the same moment, a significant part of the diplomatic work and the carrying out of actions are performed by members of the lower-middle apparatus, whose roles and activities can only be grasped with a perspective of history from below.⁹ However, these individuals sometimes achieve a more significant role and can be forced to make independent decisions due to the specific arrangement of the events. This often contributes to certain important decisions not being made, thus in the case of the Treaty of Szőny, it was precisely the decisions that could not be agreed upon during the 1627 negotiation period or even later that were not decided (e.g., the joint problem of Vác and Bolondvár, the affiliation of submitted villages, the duration of the treaty, etc.).¹⁰

By examining the history of a peace negotiation or series of diplomatic events from this perspective, it is also possible to get a glimpse into the restricted environment and social system of relationships. Since the temporal and spatial contexts are reduced, the researcher may work with a significantly broader basis of sources, so a type of microhistorical and textological perspective and methodology. Naturally, this can only be employed if a unique source environment is available so that the lives and assignments of individual diplomats can be examined in depth.

⁸ It is possible to find examples for those works, which combines and amalgamates the use of this type of “macro” and “micro” or “organisational” and “individual” perspective and methodological toolbar even in the diplomatic history work of a single author, for the latter see: Kármán, *Erdélyi külpolitika*; Kármán, *A Seventeenth-Century Odyssey*; As an example of the latter, it is possible to mention the process of the 1627 Peace Treaty of Szőny that forms the basis of the mission, in which the Aulic War Council and the palatine played important roles. Brandl, et al., “Válogatott források”; Brandl et al., “Kommunikáció és híráramlás”.

⁹ The historical perspective of “people’s history” or “history from below” spread primarily based on the works of Lucien Febvre and then E. P. Thompson, and the subject of investigation swung in the direction of simple people. The new trends in diplomatic history, including the roles of individuals, is well summarised in: Strohmeier, “Trendek és perspektívák”, on the issue of “actor-centrism” in particular, see: pp. 182–84; Recent works concerning this topic, see: Cziráki, “„Mein gueter, väterlicher Maister””; Marton, “Péter Koháry’s Life”.

¹⁰ For these issues, see: Brandl, et al., “Válogatott források”, pp. 155–156, 165, 167, 171–173, 175–176, 181, 183, 188 and 190–191; a particularly good example of this is the Ottoman capture of Vác or the destruction of Bolondvár which was in the hands of the Ottoman. The problems surrounding these fortresses ended in a mutual discord, which could not be solved either in the Treaty of Gyarmat in 1625, in the first Treaty of Szőny in 1627, in the second Treaty of Szőny in 1642, or even in the Treaty of Constantinople of 1649. The question of these fortifications was mentioned in the article 2 of the 1625 Treaty of Gyarmat, cf.: Gévay, *Az 1625-diki május 26-dikán költ gyarmati békekötés cikkelyei*, p. 9; article 2 of the 1627 Treaty of Szőny, cf.: Gévay, *Az 1627-dik évi szeptember 13-án kelt szőnyi békekötés cikkelyei*, p. 12; article 4 of the 1642 treaty of Szőny, cf.: Majláth, *Az 1642-ik évi szőnyi békekötés*, p. 76–82, 400; article 4 of the 1649 Treaty of Constantinople, cf.: Szilágyi, *Rozsnyay Dávid*, Budapest, 1877, p. 175.

HISTORICAL ENVIRONMENT – OPPORTUNITIES FOR PEACE

In the series of Habsburg–Ottoman peace treaties, the 1627 Treaty of Szőny can be considered distinct from numerous aspects. Although the two empires tried to look at the other an equal political entity and continue the traditions of 17th-century peace treaties,¹¹ these negotiations present numerous new characteristics. The ceremonial framework and the process of ratification that had only been partially worked out previously are better defined by the parties, while at the same time a significant portion of the differences arose due to the specific political situation.¹²

The most important element of this special political environment for both sides was the effort to avoid war on multiple fronts. While Vienna was constrained by the everyday events of the Thirty Years' War,¹³ the Ottoman Empire not only had to face internal conflicts (the rebellions in the Crimean and in Anatolia), but also external enemies (the conflict with Safavid Persia).¹⁴ In part arising from this is that the political roles of powers living in the shadow of the empire increased, so Transylvania under the leadership of Prince Bethlen was able to exert a particularly important influence over events.¹⁵ It is precisely this seething political situation that made the peace important to other European powers as well. The convergence of high politics at Constantinople was also able to have a serious effect on the activities of the ambassador since the French, English, and Dutch envoys made intrigues against Kuefstein at the Sublime Porte.¹⁶

On the other hand, the result of the political situation was that the peace negotiations moved from the level of the emperors to the level of the “local leaders”. In this sense, the palatine of Hungary (Miklós Esterházy), the pasha of Buda (Mürteza), and the prince of Transylvania (Gábor Bethlen) were able to decide on numerous issues in the process of their joint negotiations, even though the latter could only influence the bargaining process informally. The result of this was that

¹¹ For this issue, see: Ernst D. Petritsch, “Zeremoniell bei Empfängen habsburgischer Gesandtschaften”; Strohmeyer, “Die habsburgisch-osmanische Freundschaft”; Strohmeyer, “The theatrical Performance of Peace”.

¹² For the description of the ceremony: Péter Koháry to István Pálffy, Komárom, 30 August 1627, or Gerhard von Questenberg to Ferdinand II, Komárom, 31 August 1627, Brandl, et al., “Válogatott források”, pp. 175–176, 178.

¹³ For a summary of the Thirty Years' War, primarily from the religious aspect, see: Schilling, *Konfessionalisierung und Staatsinteressen*, pp. 508–538; For the events, see: Gindely – Acsády, *Bethlen Gábor és udvara*, pp. 186–230; Franzl, *Ferdinand II*, pp. 222–239; Schilling, *Konfessionalisierung und Staatsinteressen*, p. 525; Höbelt, *Ferdinand III*, pp. 46–53; Hengerer, *Kaiser Ferdinand III*, pp. 64–72.

¹⁴ Römer, “The Safavid Period”, pp. 189–350, especially: pp. 266–68; Savory, *Iran under the Safavids*, Cambridge – London – New York – New Rochelle – Melbourne – Sidney: Cambridge University Press, 2007, pp. 85–91; Marton, “A Dissertation in Preparation”, the manuscript's pp. 3–5.

¹⁵ For Gábor Bethlen's indirect influence over the peace negotiations in Szőny, see: Salamon, *Két magyar diplomata*, passim; Brandl, et al., “Válogatott források”, pp. 157–58, 178–188, 193; For the course of the negotiations, also see: Marton, “„Szőnyből tudatjuk...”.

¹⁶ For the politics controversies of the envoys of the different states, see: Kuefstein, K. G., *Studien zur Familiengeschichte*, vol. 3, pp. 261, 267–269 and 275.

the treaty became a kind of “Hungarian internal matter”, but only on the level of practical diplomacy.¹⁷ Nevertheless, the influence of the hawks in the groups of elites from both empires can be said to be significant, since the possibility of a war on multiple fronts thereby became enticing. Political actors are found on both sides that either became doves during the peace process (the palatine and the pasha of Buda),¹⁸ or continuously represented a stance against peace (Bethlen, Althan),¹⁹ without even mentioning the foreign powers that had a clear interest in the outbreak of a Habsburg-Ottoman conflict (England, Holland, France).²⁰

THE PERSONA OF KUEFSTEIN IN HISTORIOGRAPHY

Serious professional interest has surrounded the diplomatic and political activities of the baron and later count, Johann Ludwig von Kuefstein, even without wide-ranging knowledge of the family and diplomatic correspondence that comprises the backbone of a unique source basis.

Several significant elaborations of Kuefstein’s life and career have already been published, but as will be seen, the inclusion of the materials held in Budapest will be essential to clarifying his profile in the future. A biography of the diplomat was compiled by one of his descendants, Karl Graf von Kuefstein, at the beginning of the 20th century.²¹ He was familiar with the ambassador to Constantinople based on the final report that closed his diplomatic mission and the records of the Aulic War Council. Later, Karl Teplý expanded our knowledge by utilising the ambassador’s journal and numerous documents held at the Archives of the Province of Upper Austria in his research. Relying on these documents and the artistic works created in connection with the diplomatic mission, he shed new light on the topic

¹⁷ By this, it should be understood that a significant portion of the actual negotiations took place between the Palatine of Hungary, the Pasha of Buda, and the Prince of Transylvania. It is also necessary to underline, that through the mediation of lower-level diplomats the former Kingdom of Hungary served as the site for these negotiations. This may be linked to the fact that Hungarian diplomatic activity on an imperial level also strengthened significantly by Miklós Esterházy holding the post of palatine and the effects of the Thirty Years’ War. Cf.: Hiller, “A Habsburg diplomáciában játszott magyar szerep”; However, it is important to note that the negotiating commissioners and even the palatine requested the opinion of the imperial court in every case. Brandl et al., “Kommunikáció és híráramlás”, pp. 123–124.

¹⁸ For the evaluation of the palatine’s opinion in connection with the Ottomans, see: Hiller, *Palatin Nikolaus Esterházy*, pp. 61–62; For Mürteza’s military campaign of 1626 and his orders on the signing of the treaty, see: Jászay, “A’ szőnyi béke”; Thallóczy et al., *Török-magyar oklevéltár: 1533–1789*, pp. 218–220; For the career of Mürteza, see: Sudár, “The Story of Mürteza Pasha”.

¹⁹ Gindely – Acsády, *Bethlen Gábor és udvara*, pp., 201–214; For Althan as the advocate for the (Catholic) Christians living in the Ottoman Empire, see: Tóth, “Athanasio Georgiceo”, p. 838, 848, 858; Molnár, “Végvár és rekatolizáció”.

²⁰ For the English, see: Roe, *The Negotiations of Sir Thomas Roe*, pp. 798–825; For the French, see: Hámori Nagy, “Források Bethlen Gábor két francia diplomatájáról”, 83–103; For the Dutch, see: Groot, *The Ottoman Empire*, p. 122.

²¹ Kuefstein, K. G., *Studien zur Familiengeschichte*, vol. 3, pp. 88–163, 239–300.

in the area of cultural history.²² The former employee of the Library and Archives of Eötvös Loránd University, Regina Donáth also published documents from his estate, but not in connection with the mission to Constantinople.²³ Harald Tersch collected the journals of the diplomat as documents presenting his personal, self-testimony as a type of review,²⁴ and Thomas Winkelbauer briefly presented Kuefstein's life in connection with typifying the careers of converts.²⁵ More recently, Klára Berzeviczy studied the journal, analysing the ceremony of the diplomatic mission.²⁶ It can be clearly seen that the works cited here only tried to evaluate the mission, based upon a single segment of the available source material. At the same time, for a detailed evaluation, it is necessary to compare the sources and study them in a complex manner, which can only be achieved through the joint evaluation of the documents. This is particularly true for the three completely parallel documentary materials (reports, journal entries, and correspondence), which supplement and interpret the information of one another. Based on the investigations up to now, it is possible to gain a great deal of information in connection with the life of the diplomat and his documentary legacy.

KUEFSTEIN'S LIFE AND DOCUMENTARY LEGACY

Baron Johann Ludwig von Kuefstein was born in 1582 and began a diplomatic career following his studies at university. He actively participated in contemporary politics as a Lutheran nobleman and mediated between the monarch and the protestant estates on several occasions as a diplomat. Then in 1627, he converted to Catholicism and after this, he earned the honourable duty of the ambassadorial mission to Constantinople. Following his return home, in 1630 he was appointed governor (*Landeshauptmann*) of Upper Austria, a post that he occupied until his death.²⁷

Due to his active political life, he left a considerable amount of archival documents for posterity, a large portion of which are held today at the Archives of the Province of Upper Austria.²⁸ Karl Graf Kuefstein did compile the biographies of his family members. Exactly on the basis of these archival sources as well on the copies of the reports on his forefather's ambassadorial mission to Constantinople of 1628–1629. The aforementioned biographer also utilises the appendices of this

²² Teply, *Die kaiserliche Großbotschaft*; a large portion of the works of art created about the ambassadorial mission are currently held in the collections of the Osmanenmuseum in Perchtoldsdorf, Karl Teply also provides information about them, *ibid.*, pp. 58–135.

²³ Donáth, “A diplomáciai titkosírás”; Idem, “Egy törökkori forrásgyűjtemény”; Idem, “Iratok a westfáliai békekötés történetéhez”, pp. 239–252.

²⁴ Tersch, “Hans Ludwig von Kuefstein”.

²⁵ Winkelbauer, *Fürst und Fürstendiener*, pp. 128–129.

²⁶ Berzeviczy, “Fragen des Zeremoniells während einer Gesandtschaftsreise”.

²⁷ For Kuefstein's biography and activities, see: Kuefstein, K. G., *Studien zur Familiengeschichte*, vol. 3, pp. 230–300; For the circumstances of his conversion, see: Winkelbauer, *Fürst und Fürstendiener*, pp. 128–129.

²⁸ OÖLA, HAW, Archivalien, Aktenband (AB) 18, Nr. 4., AB 26 Nr. 9; AB32 Nr. 14; HS Bände 1–29.

diplomatic mission which can be found in Vienna.²⁹ However, besides this, a considerable portion of Kuefstein's correspondence was also found in Budapest at the Library of the Eötvös Loránd University presumably through the diplomat's son, Gotthilf Kuefstein, who joined the Jesuit order.³⁰ This latter collection of documents with outstanding value as a source has been given little attention up to now,³¹ despite the fact that a detailed investigation of this unique material could enrich our knowledge of both political and cultural history. The full correspondence written during his diplomatic mission can be found in the fourth and fifth of the volumes to be detailed below. These were organised in part chronologically and in part based on their arrival through the postal system, but it cannot be determined whether these are the work of Kuefstein or his secretary. Due to the unique nature of this bequest, it is worthwhile here to provide a brief description of its content.³²

The first book of this documentary bequest of fourteen volumes (Tom. I–XIV) contains the results of Kuefstein's literary activities – for example, translations – and the documents of his early diplomatic activities performed as a Lutheran politician, but a description of China can also be found here. In the second volume, it is possible to read copies of the documentary materials from envoys that had previously been to the Ottoman Empire – Ludwig von Molardt and Johann Jakob Kurz von Senftenau – probably to prepare for his mission to Constantinople. The third volume contains the family correspondence written between 1622 and 1640, however, letters dated between 1632 and 1640 are not amongst the documents. In the fourth and fifth can be found Baron Kuefstein's correspondence written during his diplomatic mission to Constantinople, the former containing issues of lower political relevance and the latter may have served as the basis for writing both his journal and his final report. In the sixth volume, the minutia of the accounting for the financial matters of the diplomatic mission can be read, which may pique the attention of those interested in the micro perspective of economic history. The seventh book deals with correspondence between 1639 and 1643, that was for the most part with family, but also has a smaller portion of official letters – for example, an imperial decree and his draft response. In the eighth is his correspondence from the year 1643, and the ninth, which is in a quite bad condition, collects his family letters from between 1643 and 1645. In the following (Tom. X), it is possible to read the official correspondence of the diplomat from 1646–1647. The 11th volume encompasses his correspondence from the year 1648, which is the material that Regina Donáth selected from for her article,³³ but the correspondence

²⁹ ÖStA HHStA, Türkei I, (Turcica) Kt. 112. Bd. 1., 2.

³⁰ ELTE EKL, G4 Tom. I–XIV; For the provenance of the volumes, see: Donáth, “Egy törökkori forrásgyűjtemény”, p.194.

³¹ Regina Donáth, the former employee of the Eötvös Loránd University Library and Archives, was the first who published on the documents of this collection. Donáth, “A diplomáciai titkosírás”; Idem, “Iratok a westfáliai békekötés történetéhez”; The volumes were also mentioned by György Hölvényi in connection with literary history. Hölvényi, “Nochmals”.

³² We would like to thank to András Péter Szabó for drawing our attention to this outstandingly important collection of sources.

³³ Donáth, “Iratok a westfáliai békekötés”, p. 251.

also extends to documents related to Constantinople as well. The next (12th) volume contains the primarily official correspondence from between 1650 and 1652, while the 13th has these documents from between 1653 and 1655. The final volume (Tom. XIV) is a group of documents that contains the correspondence from between 1652 and 1656, and as a point of interest, it can be mentioned that based on the content of the letters, Kuefstein was also provided with a great deal of information related to the Hungarian frontier at this time from Vienna. From the information here, it can also be determined that the diplomat's correspondence preserved at Budapest can truly be considered a unique collection of sources, which naturally can only be properly evaluated when compared with other contemporary sources.

THE THEORETICAL POSSIBILITIES FOR AN INVESTIGATION INTO THE SOURCES OF AN AMBASSADORIAL MISSION TO CONSTANTINOPLE

To understand an ideal source environment for a diplomatic journey to Constantinople by a Habsburg envoy, we must outline the theoretical framework for the possibilities of the sources. Even though this cannot ever be fully achieved, it can be used as a point of reference during the identification of the sources. An outstanding opportunity for this is offered by the extraordinarily broad source basis that can be studied in connection with the ambassadorial mission of Johann Ludwig von Kuefstein. Although the ideal outlined here only depends in part on the materials from other ambassadorial missions, it still clearly demonstrates the general basis of sources for envoys in the 17th century. We have divided these source materials into three categories during our investigations: 1) the ambassador's own documentary materials; 2) official correspondence related to the mission with his employer and the authorities; 3) documents not issued by the mission or the employer but in effect parallel sources.

1) The ambassador's own documentary materials

In an ideal situation, the documentary materials of the ambassador would be comprised of numerous important and traditional elements. In the first half of the 17th century, envoys often kept diplomatic journals, which were dominated by daily events. In addition to these, due to the constant maintenance of contact, the most characteristic documents in the case of ambassadorial missions were the reports and the final report (*Finalrelation*) at the end of the mission. These often were a version of the earlier reports and the journal set in an official form, which in many cases also included the more important documents that had been created during the mission as appendices.³⁴ A significant portion of the envoy's materials are

³⁴ In the case of Johann Ludwig von Kuefstein there is an outstanding range of sources, which encompasses all three categories mentioned here. The diplomat's final report is available at the ÖStA HHStA, Türkei I. (Turcica) series with its appendices (instructions, correspondence with Habsburg and Ottoman officials) organized into two volumes. ÖStA HHStA, Türkei I. (Turcica) Kt. 112. Bd. I, II; The diary on the diplomatic mission to Constantinople can be found in Linz,

comprised of the incoming and outgoing correspondence maintained during the diplomatic trip, as well as the registration of financial accounts created during the mission. These supplement the letters that comprise the personal or family estate of the envoy and possibly the traces of literary activities (translations, writings). Although the latter are not directly linked to his diplomatic activities, they still disclose numerous details about the personality of the envoy and the circumstances of his mission.³⁵

2) Official correspondence related to the mission with his employer and the authorities

The documents we can list in the second category are those that come directly from the emperor through the Aulic War Council or its functionaries (its president, members of the Aulic War Council, the resident ambassador in Constantinople, etc.). The most important of these are the documents addressed directly to the ambassador, so his letter of appointment, the general orders and special orders, made in connection with delicate matters.³⁶ This also includes the correspondence with various officials subordinated to the Aulic War Council, such as documents arriving from interpreters or captains of castles. It is also possible to list here the items from other authorities acting on behalf of the emperor, thus the letters sent

under the reference code HS. 16 of the OÖLA, HA W, Archivalien; These types of documentary materials are also available in the case of other envoys from other missions in the first half of the 17th century, for example the correspondence and diplomatic report during the mission of Hermann Czernin in 1616–1617 (ÖStA HHStA, Türkei I (Turcica) Kt. 104., 105., 106., passim; ÖStA KA, HKR, KzLA, Kt. 56. Nr. 17, fol. 1–38); Ludwig von Molardt's reports and correspondence from his mission of 1619–1620 (ÖStA HHStA, Türkei I (Turcica), Kt. 107, 108; in duplicate: ELTE EKL, G4 Tom. II, pag. 63–482); the documentary materials from the diplomatic mission of Johann Rudolf Puchheim (ÖStA HHStA, Türkei I (Turcica) Kt. 113. Bd. I, II, III); the correspondence and diary of Hermann Czernin's ambassadorial mission of 1644–1645 (SOA v Třeboni, JH/RAČCh Kt. 48–54; Franz Tischer, *Zweite Gesandtschaftsreise des Grafen Hermann Czernin von Chudenic nach Constantinopel im Jahre 1644.*, (Neuhaus, 1879)); the correspondence and final report of Johann Rudolf Schmid's ambassadorial mission of 1650–1651 (ÖStA HHStA, Türkei I (Turcica) Kt. 123, 124, passim); the correspondence of every diplomatic mission was registered in the record books of the Aulic War Council. ÖStA KA, HKR, Prot. Bde. 260–261, 271–272, 290–293, 302–304; in the case of Kuefstein, one-line excerpts can be found in the record books and a few drafts of letters addressed to the court have also survived in copies. Cf.: ELTE EKL, G4 Tom. V, passim., ill. ÖStA HHStA, Türkei I (Turcica) Kt. 112, Bd. II.

³⁵ In the case of Kuefstein, the documentary materials are scattered. However, the majority of his correspondence related to his diplomatic mission to Constantinople is held in Budapest, where his translations can also be found: ELTE EKL, G4 Tom. I, IV, V, VI; In the case of other envoys, we have no knowledge of documents not closely linked to the diplomatic mission; so, for example, according to our knowledge, Hermann Czernin did not pursue literary activities similar to Kuefstein, Johann Rudolf Puchheim's family archives are wanting, and even in the case of Johann Rudolf Schmid, it was only his escort, Johann Georg Metzger that left notes behind: Huemer, „„Copy & Paste“ im Reisebericht der Frühen Neuzeit?"; About the journals of Kuefstein and Metzger, see: Huemer, „Von „knobloch und zwieffel“ zu den „bulgarischen weibspersohnen“.

³⁶ From amongst these documents the letter of appointment (instructions, etc.) preserved in the diplomatic correspondence can be pointed out as an example, and these types of documents can be found in the ELTE EKL, G4 Tom. V.

by the treasuries or the Palatine of Hungary. These are supplemented by the series of documents sent by the emperor but not addressed to the ambassador, which for the most part was for Ottoman dignitaries. Naturally, the most important document is the ratified copy of the peace treaty, and the arbitrary alteration of its contents represented an outstanding problem for many ambassadorial missions.³⁷

3) Documents not issued by the mission or the employer but in effect parallel sources

The parallel materials not directly linked to the documents of the diplomatic mission can provide significant insight into the reconstruction of events that do not otherwise appear in the aforementioned sources. It is possible to divide this group into two parts according to the viewpoint of the documents. (3a) There are, on the one hand, general diplomatic source materials about the mission (parallel diplomatic reports, diplomatic correspondence of other countries affecting the mission, e.g., Transylvania, Venice, England, etc.),³⁸ (3b) and on the other hand, those documents that only deal with the general objectives of the mission in part. These, in general, are petitions from various subjects of the Ottoman Empire or issues affecting the Christian faith (schisms, Franciscans, Jesuits, saints' relics)³⁹ or even delicate issues not of a political nature that have not been settled by previous diplomatic missions (e.g. personal debts of previous envoys).⁴⁰ Naturally, in terms of financial matters, there is an abundant amount of source material available at the archives of the Aulic Chamber.⁴¹

A database of the documentary materials of the 1627 Szőny peace process has been organised jointly by the colleagues of the MTA–SZTE Research Group of the Ottoman Age (Eötvös Loránd Research Network), which encompasses nearly

³⁷ The intentional differences in treaty versions had already led to problems since the first treaty between the two empires; the best-known case occurred on the occasion of the Treaty of Zsitvatorok: Bayerle, "The compromise at Zsitvatorok"; Nehring, "Magyarország és a zsitvatoroki szerződés"; For the Habsburg–Ottoman peace treaties, see: Papp, "Az Oszmán Birodalom", pp. 86–99, 91, 95–96; For the problems during the peace negotiations at Szőny in 1642, see the article by Krisztina Juhász in the present volume.

³⁸ Beside the great powers mentioned earlier, other parallel source materials have also survived, such as the Venetian diplomatic reports: Óváry, *Oklevéltár*, pp. 439–448, 693–784; or the Transylvanian correspondence: "Toldalagi Mihály levelei", pp. 248–258.

³⁹ An outstanding example of this is the case of the Franciscans from Sopron that accompanied Kuefstein, who were searching for the grave and remains of John of Capistrano and wanted to seek out relics; we are informed of this recurring topic through numerous letters; they were supported by Ferdinand II (e. g. ELTE EKL, G4 Tom. V. pag. 407–410), The baron even negotiated with Mürteza Pasha on the matter of the friars (ELTE EKL, G4 Tom. V. pag. 429–430.); to our knowledge, they were not successful.

⁴⁰ A good example of this is the debt of Michael Starzer that will be dealt with below. Michael Adolf von Althan to Johann Ludwig von Kuefstein, Prague, 23 February 1628, ELTE EKL, G4 Tom. IV, fol. 128–129.

⁴¹ ÖStA FHK, Sammlungen und Selekte Reichsakten Kt. 302 (Faszikel 185A) fol. 205–290.

2,000 items.⁴² A considerable portion of the collected material – nearly half – is comprised of correspondence arising during the diplomatic mission of Baron Kuefstein. A total of 846 letters between 18 November 1627 and 8 December 1629 can be linked to Kuefstein’s mission in the material that has been processed so far. Of these, the diplomat appears as the addressee in 580 and as the sender in 266.⁴³ From these data, it can be determined that although many drafts are contained in the documents held at the Eötvös Loránd University Library and Archives, not all of the baron’s responses can be found amongst the letters at our disposal. The missing ones can presumably be discovered in the archives of the addressees, which would demand further diversified research.

THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE DIPLOMATIC MISSION

Baron Johann Ludwig von Kuefstein received the honourable request from the emperor Ferdinand II on 21 November 1627, that he lead the ambassadorial mission taking the ratified version of the Treaty of Szőny signed on 13 September 1627, to Constantinople.⁴⁴ At first, the diplomat did not want to take the assignment, but then finally following personal negotiations with representatives of the monarch’s court, which was at that time in Prague, began the organisation of the diplomatic mission that placed a great burden and responsibility on him.⁴⁵ Since there arose differences in content in connection with the Ottoman version of the peace treaty,⁴⁶ the prescribed exchange of envoys on the border could not take place until the issue was clarified, even though the baron had set off in July 1628. The aforementioned ceremony was finally conducted on 26 September, at the Habsburg–Ottoman frontier between Komárom and Esztergom. Then, Kuefstein went on to Constantinople, and the Ottoman envoy, Recep Pasha continued his journey towards Vienna. Following Kuefstein’s long (about 1 week) visit with the pasha of Buda, the mission continued relatively smoothly and their entry into Constantinople was on 25 November. Due to the political situation – the hostile states made the negotiations more difficult and for a certain time he could not even leave his house – Kuefstein only set off back for Vienna 9 months later, on 18 August

⁴² The database reflects the status of the research as of September 2018. For more detail on the database and the distribution of correspondence during the peace process, see: Brandl et al., „Kommunikáció és híráramlás”, pp. 121–124.

⁴³ However, it is necessary to note that in the case of numerous documents there is uncertainty in terms of whether they actually functioned as letters. We only included these in part in the database.

⁴⁴ See the citations of footnote 5.

⁴⁵ For the negotiations, see: Teply, *Die kaiserliche Großbotschaft*, pp. 18–21; For the theoretical preparations of Kuefstein, see: Cziráki, „„Mein gueter, väterlicher Maister””, passim.

⁴⁶ For an overview of the problems of the treaty versions, see the following unnamed document: Anonymous description of the incorrect Turkish treaty version. s.l., s.d. 1628(?), ELTE EKL, G4 Tom. V. pag. 63–64; For the remedying of the problem, see: Brandl – Szabados, „A Janus-arcú diplomata”, p. 90.

1629, and he only arrived after another ceremonial exchange of envoys on 8 December.⁴⁷

THE CONTACTS OF KUEFSTEIN AND HIS ENTOURAGE – EFFORTS AT INFLUENCE AND THE ASSERTION OF INTERESTS

Kuefstein conducted correspondence with numerous individuals during the preparations for his diplomatic mission and during the journey. Here it is only possible to touch upon a few important individuals in detail in connection with the preparations for the mission and the journey to Constantinople, but his diplomatic correspondence included numerous characteristic groups. He conducted extensive correspondence not only with the Aulic Chamber and Aulic War Council, but also with various officials (captains-general and castle captains) and agents that assisted in his mission, such as in connection with the exchange of envoys, and were only subordinates to the Aulic War Council in part.⁴⁸ A portion of his letters logically come from the palatine, who played an important role⁴⁹ in the local matters of the peace negotiations (for example, the conducting of the negotiations at Szécsény and Buda⁵⁰), while Kuefstein conducted the correspondence between the empires. On the basis of this, it can be understood that he corresponded with numerous Ottoman officials as well, since the clearing up of the remaining issues fell to him, which included such matters as the duration of the treaty. The Ottomans would have supported peace for 25 years, but in the end, there was no agreement in this matter.⁵¹ Numerous objectives of his mission met with similar “success” as the issues of Vác or the duration of the treaty, while at the same time the peace was successfully ratified. In the following, emphasis is placed upon the correspondence that took place during the preparations for Kuefstein’s journey and that with the individuals that played a part in the preparations.

One of the most important people that Kuefstein corresponded with prior to his journey was the former resident ambassador in Constantinople, Michael Starzer (1610–1622),⁵² who he would have liked to bring with him on the trip, but this was not possible. However, their correspondence served the ambassador greatly,

⁴⁷ For the chronology of the diplomatic mission, see: Kuefstein, K. G., *Studien zur Familiengeschichte*, vol. 3, pp. 259–279; Těplý, *Die kaiserliche Großbotschaft*, pp. 26–54.

⁴⁸ It is possible to mention as an example the 40 letters that the captain-general of Komárom, Ernst von Kollonitsch, wrote to him on the matters of the exchange of envoys or other events in the period between 5 December 1627 and 21 December 1629, ELTE EKL, G4 Tom. V. passim.

⁴⁹ Miklós Esterházy sent a total of 7 letters to Kuefstein, for the most part in connection with the diplomat’s Hungarian escort and matters affecting the Kingdom of Hungary. Cf.: ELTE EKL, G4 Tom. IV and V, passim.

⁵⁰ For the negotiations at Szécsény and Buda, see: Stessel, “Adatok” 1–2; Marton, “On the Question of the Negotiations”; Marton, “„Az mint Isten tudnunk adja””; Marton, “Péter Koháry’s Life”; Marton, “A Dissertation in Preparation”.

⁵¹ Gerhard von Questenberg to Johann Ludwig von Kuefstein. Vienna, 18 August 1628, ELTE EKL, G4 Tom. V. pag. 141–152; for the lack of success of the negotiations, see: Juhász, “...gyümölcse pedig semmi nem volt”.

⁵² Spuler, “Die Europäische Diplomatie in Konstantinopel”, p. 330.

not only was he able to gain knowledge of the individuals involved in eastern diplomacy and their problematic affairs from the letters, but he also was able to receive fresh news of grand European politics from him in Prague. Kuefstein received a total of 36 letters from the former resident ambassador between 16 December 1627 and 17 June 1628,⁵³ but the responses are only known in part (presumably a portion of them can be found in the archival heritage of Starzer in the city of Sopron, which we have not yet had the opportunity to view).⁵⁴

The second significant individual of Habsburg–Ottoman diplomacy was Count Michael Adolf von Althan,⁵⁵ who was a constant participant in peace negotiations between 1606 and 1625 and it seems he strove to exert an influence on the composition of the diplomatic mission. He would have liked to have at least one of his men go along with Kuefstein. Sebastian Lustrier, the resident ambassador in Constantinople (1623–1629) at that time, could be considered one of his confidants. Althan and Lustrier were not necessarily set on the signing of the treaty either.⁵⁶

Baron Kuefstein had to face numerous difficulties when preparing for the diplomatic mission, such as the raising of finances or the compensation for the aforementioned inexperience. Only one of these will be dealt with in detail here, the selection of the personnel of the delegation, which is connected with the latter issue. Based on the data, it seems that during the selection of the staff, the fractional battles related to attitudes towards the Ottomans also played a role. During this, the supporters of peace included the president of the Aulic War Council, Rambaldo Collalto, the member of the Aulic War Council, Gerhard von Questenberg, and Johann Rudolf Schmid, and the people urging war were the elderly Melchior Klesl,⁵⁷ who had already been removed, the similarly elderly Michael Adolf von Althan and Sebastian Lustrier,⁵⁸ who was part of his group. Michael Starzer's role in this fractional battle has not yet been clarified. From the correspondence, it can be seen that both parties tried to gain Kuefstein's trust. In the future, it is worth discussing the areas of intersection that have proved to be uncertain based on the correspondence. These were the selection of the translator, the steward, and the

⁵³ The letters can be found at the Eötvös Loránd University Library and Archives: ELTE EKL, G4 Tom. IV. passim. The number was obtained from our database containing the correspondence of the Treaty of Szőny. Cf.: Brandl et al., „Kommunikáció és híráramlás”, p. 108; For the knowledge transferred by Starzer, see: Cziráki, „„Mein gueter, väterlicher Maister””, pp. 60–61.

⁵⁴ The estate can be found under the following reference code: MNL GyMSL SL, XIV/69.

⁵⁵ For Althan's life and activities, see: Winkelbauer, *Fürst und Fürstendiener*, pp. 134–140; Molnár, „Végyvár és rekatolizáció”.

⁵⁶ This is shown by Lustrier's reports on the subject, according to which they should take advantage of the Ottomans' other engagements and initiate an attack against them. Sebastian Lustrier to Ferdinand II, Constantinople, 25 and 30 May 1627, ÖStA HHStA, Türkei I. (Turcica) Kt. 111. Konv. 1, fol. 56, 67 and 65–66.

⁵⁷ For the anti-Ottoman policies in the 1610s represented by Klesl, see: Cziráki, „Szemelvények”; Cziráki, „Erdély szerepe”; For Klesl's removal: Cziráki, „Habsburg–Oszmán diplomácia a 17. század közepén”, pp. 838–839.

⁵⁸ Lustrier stressed the importance of the war in his letter written to the emperor. Cf.: the citations in footnote 56.

diplomatic secretary, as well as the choosing of experts that were included in the entourage, which had significant social prestige.

ON THE QUESTION OF APPOINTING THE INTERPRETER

Due to what has been mentioned and to Kuefstein's nature as a "homo novus" in connection with Habsburg–Ottoman diplomacy, the diplomat was in a quite dependent situation. It was for just this reason that it would have been necessary for a reliable person to go with him who was at home in the diplomatic labyrinth of the Ottoman Empire. Rational objectives guided the selection of the baron's delegation, but he was forced to compromise on some issues, which naturally had an impact on the success of the mission.

One of the most important positions from the perspective of the diplomatic mission was that of the translator since without this it was impossible in practice to communicate with the Ottomans. For this objective – even though Kuefstein originally wanted to bring the imperial interpreter, Michel d'Asquier, with him⁵⁹ – in the end he brought the interpreter from Győr, Ernst Házy, and Marino Tudisi, who was one of Count Althan's men from Dubrovnik and who the diplomat brought through the intercession of the count. The former's strength was more with the written word, while the latter proved to be more apt at verbal negotiations.⁶⁰

Thus, Marino Tudisi, who was mentioned at the beginning of the article, was one of the individuals that Kuefstein did not bring along of his own accord. Tudisi had been at the court of the pasha of Buda since 1622, as the agent of Michael Adolf von Althan. Since there is no information about him in the documents of the Aulic Chamber, presumably he was a private employee of the count. This is also reinforced on one occasion by Mihály Tholdalagi, and Althan himself talks about him to Kuefstein as if he owes obedience to the count.⁶¹ The man from Dubrovnik disappears from the documentation of the mission for reasons that are not yet known at the end of January 1629.⁶² This may be related to the oath of loyalty noted above, or to the fact that in the spring of 1628 a suit was filed against him in Prague or that the secret correspondent in Buda, Tomaso Orsini, was expelled by the pasha of Buda, Mürteza, and appeared in Constantinople in January 1629.⁶³

THE PROCESS OF HIRING OF THE STEWARD

The second important post was that of the steward, and Kuefstein first asked Michael Starzer to fill this position – in all certainty due to the experience he had

⁵⁹ OÖLA HAW, HS 16, fol. 10r; For d'Asquier's life and activities, see: Hamilton, "Michel d'Asquier".

⁶⁰ OÖLA HAW, HS 16, fol. 45.

⁶¹ "[...] *also ist er* [viz. Tudisi] *von mir bevolcht* [...]" Michael Adolf von Althan to Johann Ludwig von Kuefstein, Vienna, 11 September 1628, ELTE EKK G4 Tom. IV, fol. 354–355.

⁶² For Tudisi's activities in detail, see: Brandl – Szabados, "A Janus-arcú diplomata", pp. 85–93.

⁶³ For more details on this topic, see: Ibid, p. 91; Szabados, „*Ih awer befleise mih*", p. 51.

accumulated while being the resident ambassador in Constantinople – but he naturally placed conditions, for example in terms of the staff.⁶⁴ However, the greatest impediment proved to be that the former permanent envoy had left a rather large debt behind in both Constantinople and during his visit to Buda following that, so Ferdinand II did not allow him to travel back to the Ottoman capital.⁶⁵ After this, Count Althan recommended a person for this post as well, Paulo Mazza, who was also from Dubrovnik and previously would have delivered the copy of the Treaty of Gyarmat to Constantinople, but he was not allowed to travel past Buda. The objection in relation to him was his bourgeois origin, because based on certain information he had previously worked as a furrier, so they did not allow him to go on to Constantinople in 1625 either.⁶⁶ Although Mazza verified with witnesses that he was not a furrier,⁶⁷ he still did not get the position of steward. Starzer also recommended a certain Francesco Mazzafano from Parma.⁶⁸ However, in this case, Kuefstein did not listen to the incoming suggestions but selected his own steward, Hans Albrecht Pollender,⁶⁹ for the position, so in this issue – since presumably, it was irrelevant from the perspective of the peace process – he was able to choose freely.

THE APPOINTMENT OF THE DIPLOMATIC MISSION'S SECRETARY

The position of secretary had an exceptional role in the case of ambassadorial missions to Constantinople because in many cases the envoys entrusted their secretaries with performing sensitive or confidential tasks (this is also evidenced by

⁶⁴ For Starzer's response to Kuefstein's request, see: Michael Starzer to Johann Ludwig von Kuefstein, Prague, 16 December 1627, ELTE EKL, G4 Tom. V. pag. 31–38; for more details on this topic, see: Cziráki, „Mein gueter, väterlicher Maister”, pp. 60–81. passim.

⁶⁵ Johann Rudolf Schmid to Johann Ludwig von Kuefstein, Prague, 26 January 1628, ELTE EKL, G4 Tom. IV, fol. 53–54; Michael Starzer to Johann Ludwig von Kuefstein, s.l. (Prague?), s.d. (January 1626?) ELTE EKL, G4 Tom. IV, fol. 74–75; Cf.: Tepy, *Die kaiserliche Großbotschaft*, p. 24.

⁶⁶ For Althan's recommendations, see: Michael Adolf von Althan to Johann Ludwig von Kuefstein, Prague, 9 February 1628, ELTE EKL, G4 Tom. IV, fol. 98–99; Michael Adolf von Althan to Johann Ludwig von Kuefstein, Prague, 23 February 1628, ELTE EKL, G4 Tom. IV, fol. 128–129; For Mazza's previous matter and regarding his bourgeois origins, see: Michael Adolf von Althan to Johann Ludwig von Kuefstein, Prague, 11 March 1628, ELTE EKL, G4 Tom. IV, fol. 72; For Mazza's previous role, see: Michael Starzer to Johann Ludwig von Kuefstein, Prague, 19 February 1628, ELTE EKL, G4 Tom. IV, fol. 116–119; Schmid also mentioned the incident in 1648. Cf.: Cziráki, „Habsburg–Oszmán diplomácia a 17. század közepén”, p. 851.

⁶⁷ For the document written by the witnesses, see: The testimony of Giovanni Paulo Damiani, Matteo Sturani, Marino Tudisi, Simon Lukschich, Péter Horváth, Giovanni Caspar Michel against the bourgeois origins of Paulo Mazza Prague, 10 March 1628, ELTE EKL, G4 Tom. IV, fol. 154.

⁶⁸ Michael Starzer to Johann Ludwig von Kuefstein, Prague, 19 February 1628, ELTE EL G4 Tom. IV, fol. 116–119.

⁶⁹ Polender was employed by him from 2 August 1628, OÖLA HAW, HS 16, fol. 451. See also: Tepy, *Die kaiserliche Großbotschaft*, p.24; Cf.: Cziráki, „Ruha teszi a követet?”.

later missions⁷⁰). It seems that Kuefstein urged the introduction of this position in connection with these kinds of diplomatic missions. The diplomat had a rather particular opinion of Johann Rudolf Schmid,⁷¹ who was originally placed as his secretary, according to which he did not know Latin and was not able to write a proper draft, so he would not readily recommend him for the position of resident ambassador.⁷² Schmid sent a total of 16 letters in connection with the preparations for the diplomat's journey, in which he informed him of the events at the court.⁷³ Kuefstein's arguments were not verified by reality, because concerning the Ottoman Empire it was not primarily the abilities he criticised that played an important role, but instead his language skills (German, Italian, Turkish) and his proficiency at negotiating with the Ottomans. Schmid proved to be an outstanding expert in these matters, as is evidenced by his diplomatic career.⁷⁴ Finally, only two "normal" secretaries – Elias Seeauer and Franz Mossmüller⁷⁵ – went with Kuefstein, so he could not count on expert support in Turkish matters.

THE SELECTION OF EXPERTS

An important place was afforded amongst the members of the entourage to the experts responsible for the health of the ambassador and the provisioning of the diplomatic mission, as well as painters that saw to the visual recording of the journey. According to the sources, it seems that Kuefstein selected the personnel qualified for the aforementioned categories based on applications and recommendations. In the case of certain functions, several applicants came forward and submitted a kind of "professional résumé". This is seen in the case of the painter Hans Genningen for example, who submitted his application,⁷⁶ in addition to this, Valentin Mülner,⁷⁷ who was recommended by Starzer, also accompanied him and

⁷⁰ For example, Hermann Czernin's secretary, Erasmus Constantin Sattler, performed a rather confidential task during the diplomatic mission. Johann Friedrich Metzger was also entrusted with similar tasks during the time of the ambassadorial mission of Johann Rudolf Schmid (1650–1651). Cf.: Szabados, „*Ih awer befeleise mih*”, p. 67; Idem, *Die Berichte Hans Caspars*, p. 48.

⁷¹ Ferdinand II to Johann Ludwig von Kuefstein, Prague, 5 January 1628, ELTE EKL, G4 Tom. IV. pag. 69–72; cf.: Teplý, *Die kaiserliche Großbotschaft*, p. 24.

⁷² "...darunter auch der Rudolff Schmidt, so mitgehen solle, einer ist, vonn(?) in deme selbigen weder Lateinisch, Hungerisch reden, noch schreiben, auch kein formliches teutsches concept machen khan, waiß ich nicht, wie er einen secretarium, oder künfftigen residenten per forza vertreten solle." Johann Ludwig von Kuefstein to Gerhard von Questenberg. Komárom(?), 1 September 1628, ELTE EKL, G4 Tom. IV, fol. 229–230.

⁷³ Johann Rudolf Schmid's letters to Johann Ludwig von Kuefstein from Prague between 8 January and 5 April 1628, ELTE EKL, G4 Tom. IV. passim.

⁷⁴ For Schmid's life, see: Meienberger, *Johann Rudolf Schmid*; Cziráki, "Habsburg–Oszmán diplomácia a 17. század közepén", passim.

⁷⁵ Teplý, *Die kaiserliche Großbotschaft*, p. 24.

⁷⁶ Hans Genningen to Johann Ludwig von Kuefstein, s.l., s.d. (1628) ELTE EKL, G4 Tom. IV, fol. 214–215.

⁷⁷ Michael Starzer to Johann Ludwig von Kuefstein, Prague, 17 June 1628, ELTE EKL, G4 Tom. IV, fol. 279–280.

may have been an assistant to the other painter, Franz Hörman.⁷⁸ Bartholomeus Brundtl applied for the position of chef,⁷⁹ but Michael Funckh obtained the job ahead of him,⁸⁰ but unfortunately lost his life on the way.⁸¹ Wilhelm Birkman accompanied Kuefstein as an apothecary, since he was recommended by a relative, Arnoldus Birkman, for the mission, who the diplomat hired.⁸² Thus, on the basis of what is outlined here, Kuefstein had full authority to make decisions in terms of the staff.

CONCLUSIONS

From what is outlined in this essay, it emerges clearly how incredible the source basis for Johann Ludwig von Kuefstein's diplomatic mission is and what a complex mass of problems it is to trace the motivations of the various individuals. Although we did not have an opportunity to discuss every issue in detail, from the descriptions it is still apparent how many and what kind of factors influenced the composition of an ambassadorial mission to be sent to the Ottoman Empire, and thus its success as well. It is not by chance that these factors indirectly led to the partial failure of the mission. Although it was not possible to go over this in the present article, none of the other objectives appointed by the emperor was successfully accomplished besides the acceptance of the ratification. It is our opinion that the complex mass of problems outlined here also precisely contributed to this. These included the state of war and the fractional political battles arising from this as well as the envoy's lack of preparedness and the deficiencies of the diplomatic apparatus.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Archival sources

Austria

Österreichisches Staatsarchiv (ÖStA)

Finanz- und Hofkammerarchiv (FHKA)

Sammlungen und Selekte, Reichsakten, Karton 302

Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchiv (HHStA)

Türkei I (Turcica)

⁷⁸ Teply, *Die kaiserliche Großbotschaft*, p.59.

⁷⁹ Bartholomeus Brundtl to Johann Ludwig von Kuefstein, s.l., s.d. (1628) ELTE EKL, G4 Tom. IV, fol. 211.

⁸⁰ OÖLA HAW, HS 16, fol. 454.

⁸¹ Wolf Leuthkauff to Johann Ludwig von Kuefstein. Belgrade, 13 January 1629, ELTE EKL, G4 Tom. IV, fol. 450–451.

⁸² Arnoldus Birkman to Johann Ludwig von Kuefstein, Vienna, 18 January 1628, ELTE EKL, G4 Tom. IV, fol. 25; Arnoldus Birkman to Johann Ludwig von Kuefstein, Rossatz(?), 5 February 1628, ELTE EKL, G4 Tom. IV, fol. 77–78; Arnoldus Birkman to Johann Ludwig von Kuefstein, s.l., 2 February 1628, ELTE EKL, G4 Tom. IV, fol. 82–83; Wilhelm Birkman to Johann Ludwig von Kuefstein, s.l., s.d. (arrived 17 March 1628), ELTE EKL, G4 Tom. IV, fol. 182–183.

Kriegsarchiv (KA)
Hofkriegsrat Protokolle (HKR Prot.)
Hofkriegs-Kanzleiarchiv (KzIA)

Oberösterreichisches Landesarchiv (OÖLA)
Herrschaftsarchiv Weinberg (HAW)
Archivalien, Aktenband (AB)
Handschriften (HS)

Czech Republic

Státní oblastní archiv v Třeboni, oddělení Jindřichův Hradec (SOA v Třeboni JH)
Rodinný archiv Černínů z Chudenic (RAČCh), Karton 48–54

Hungary

Library and Archives of Eötvös Loránd University (ELTE EKL)

National Archives of Hungary (MNL)

Győr-Moson-Sopron County Archives, Sopron Archives (GyMSL SL)
XIV/69.

Published primary sources

- Brandl, Gergely – Göncöl, Csaba – Juhász, Krisztina – Marton, Gellért Ernő – Szabados, János, “Válogatott források az 1627. évi szőnyi békekötés történetéhez”, *Lymbus. Magyarástudományi Forrásközlemények* 15 (2017), pp. 151–203.
- Brandl, Gergely – Szabados, János, “A Janus-arcú diplomata – Marino Tudisi raguzai kalandor életútja supplicatiója tükrében”, *Levéltári Közlemények* 89 (2018), pp. 85–102.
- Cziráki, Zsuzsanna, “Szemelvények Melchior Khlesl és a bécsi Titkos Tanács 1611 és 1613 között keletkezett, erdélyi vonatkozású írásos véleményeiből”, *Levéltári Közlemények* 83 (2013), pp. 319–369.
- Donáth, Regina, “Egy törökkori forrásgyűjtemény az Egyetemi Könyvtár Kézirattárában. Néhány adat Karakas Mehemed budai pasa történetéhez”, *Az Egyetemi Könyvtár Évkönyvei* 2 (1964), pp. 193–212.
- Donáth, Regina, “Iratok a westfáliai békekötés történetéhez az Egyetemi Könyvtár Kézirattárában”, *Az Egyetemi Könyvtár Évkönyvei* 3 (1966), pp. 239–252.
- Franzl, Johann, Ferdinand II. Kaiser im Zwiespalt der Zeit, Graz – Köln – Wien: Verlag Styria, 1978.
- Gévay, Antal, Az 1625-diki május 26-dikán költ gyarmati békekötés cikkelyei, deákul, magyarul és törökül, Bécs, 1837.
- Gévay, Antal, Az 1627-dik évi szeptember 13-án kelt szőnyi békekötés cikkelyei, deákul, magyarul és törökül, Bécs, 1837.
- Hámori Nagy, Zsuzsanna, “Források Bethlen Gábor két francia diplomatájáról és uralkodása utolsó éveiről (1626–1633)”, *Lymbus. Magyarástudományi Forrásközlemények* 14 (2016), pp. 83–111.
- Juhász, Krisztina, “„...gyümölcse pedig semmi nem volt”. Esterházy Miklós véleménye 1642. február 28-án a szőnyi béke(tervezet) pontjairól”, *Levéltári Közlemények* 89 (2020), pp. 353–366.

- Marton, Gellért Ernő, „Az mint Isten tudnunk adja, oltalmazzuk vérünkkel is szegény hazánknak bástyáját...”: Magyar nyelvű levelek a Koháry-Coburg család levéltátaból”, *Aetas* 35/3 (2020), pp. 126–150.
- Marton, Gellért Ernő, “On the Question of the Negotiations Between the Habsburgs and the Ottomans at Szécsény and Buda (1628) through Palatine Miklós Esterházy’s letter to the head of the Hungarian negotiators”, *Rocznik Przemyski* 55, *Historia* 22/1 (2019), pp. 79–91.
- Óváry, Lipót, Oklevéltár Bethlen Gábor diplomáciai összeköttetései történetéhez a Venczei Állami Levéltárban, (Budapest: MTA Tört. Bizottsága 1886).
- Philip Schaff, ed., *Bibliotheca Symbolica Universalis. Creeds of Christendom, with a History and Critical notes*, 3 vols, 6th ed., New York – London: Harper and Brothers, 1931, *The Greek and Latin Creeds, with Translations*, vol. 2.
- Roe, Thomas, Sir, *The Negotiations of Sir Thomas Roe, in his Embassy to the Ottoman Porte, from the Year 1621 to 1628*, London: printed by Samuel Richardson, 1740.
- Salamon, Ferenc, *Két magyar diplomata a tizenhetedik századból*, Pest: Ráth Mór, 1867.
- Stessel, József, “Adatok az 1628. évi szécsényi alkudozás történetéhez”, 1–2, *Magyar Történelmi Tár* 4th series, 3 (1902), pp. 418–542 and 481–510.
- Szabados, János, *Die Berichte Hans Caspars (1640–1659) – Eine Quelledition*, PhD Dissertation, Manuscript in 2 vols, Szeged: Doctoral School of History, University of Szeged, 2018, vol. 2.
- Szilágyi, Sándor, Rozsnyay Dávid, az utolsó török deák történeti maradványai, Budapest: Eggenberger Ferdinánd, 1877.
- Thallóczy, Lajos – Krcsmárik, János – Szekfű, Gyula, eds., *Török–magyar oklevéltár: 1533–1789*, (Collected in the Archives of Constantinople, and translated to Hungarian by Karácson, Imre), Budapest: Szent-István-Társulat – Stephaneum Nyomda, 1914.
- “Toldalagi Mihály levelei Bethlen Gábor fejedelemhez”, in Mikó, Imre, gróf, ed., *Erdélyi Történelmi Adatok*, 3 vols, Kolozsvár, 1855–1858, vol. 1, 1855.

Literature

- Bayerle, Gustav, “The Compromise at Zsitvatorok”, *Archivum Ottomanicum* 4 (1980), pp. 5–53.
- Berzeviczy, Klára “Fragen des Zeremoniells während einer Gesandtschaftsreise. Einige Bemerkungen zum Reisebericht des. H. L. Freiherrn von Kuefstein” in Sára, Balázs, ed., *Quelle & Deutung I. Beiträge der paläographischen Tagung Quelle und Deutung I. am 27. November 2013*, Budapest: Eötvös-József-Collegium, 2014, pp. 53–70.
- Brandl, Gergely – Göncöl, Csaba – Juhász, Krisztina – Marton, Gellért Ernő – Szabados, János, “Kommunikáció és híráramlás: A Habsburg-oldal tárgyalási stratégiája az 1627. évi szőnyi békekötés során”, *Aetas* 33/4 (2018), pp. 108–124.
- Brandl, Gergely – Szabados, János, “A megbízás terhe. Johann Ludwig von Kuefstein báró konstantinápolyi nagykövetségének előkészítése 1628-tól”, in J. Újváry, Zsuzsanna, ed., *Oszmán–magyar viszony a 16–18. században. Tanulmányok a Magyar Királyság és az Oszmán Birodalom népeinek – magyarok, törökök, rácok, tatárok, zsidók, görögök és egyéb népek – hétköznapijairól; Egyén és közösség viszonya*, Budapest: Budapest: Szent István Társulat, Az Apostoli Szentszék Könyvkiadója, 2020, pp. 149–170.
- Cziráki, Zsuzsanna, “„Mein gueter, väterlicher Maister” – Wissenstransfer unter kaiserlichen Gesandten an der Hohen Pforte in der ersten Hälfte des 17. Jahrhunderts”, *Chronica* 19 (2020), pp. 42–83.

- Cziráki, Zsuzsanna, “Erdély szerepe Melchior Klesl fennmaradt írásos véleményeiben 1611–1616 között”, in Kármán, Gábor – Teszelszky, Kees, eds., Bethlen Gábor és Európa, Budapest: ELTE BTK Középkori és Kora Újkori Magyar Történeti Tanszék – Transylvania Emlékeiért Tudományos Egyesület, 2013, pp. 77–102.
- Cziráki, Zsuzsanna, “Habsburg–Oszmán diplomácia a 17. század közepén. Simon Reniger konstantinápolyi Habsburg rezidens kinevezésének tanúságai (1647–1649)”, *Századok* 149/4 (2015), pp. 835–871.
- Cziráki, Zsuzsanna, “Ruha teszi a követet? A Habsburgok 17. századi konstantinápolyi diplomatáinak magyar viseletéről”, *Művészettörténeti Értesítő* 69/1 (2020), pp. 15–35.
- Donáth, Regina, “A diplomáciai titkosírás XVII. századi használatához”, *Magyar Könyvszemle* 80/1 (1964), pp. 55–62
- Gindely, Antal – Acsády, Ignác, Bethlen Gábor és udvara, Budapest: Magyar Történelmi Társulat, 1890.
- Groot, Alexander H. de, *The Ottoman Empire and the Dutch Republic*, 2nd ed. (Uitgaven van het Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten te Leiden) 122, Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten, 2012
- Hamilton, Alastair, “Michel d’Asquier, Imperial Interpreter and Bibliophile”, *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 72 (2009), pp. 237–241.
- Hengerer, Mark, *Kaiser Ferdinand III. (1608–1657) Eine Biographie*, Wien – Köln – Weimar: Böhlau, 2012.
- Hiller, István, “A Habsburg diplomáciában játszott magyar szerep kérdései”, in Horn, Il-dikó – Lauter, Éva – Várkonyi, Gábor – Hiller, István – Szirtes, Zsófia – Balogh, Zsuzsanna – Pásztor, Katalin – Tamás, Máté, eds., *Művészet és mesterség: Tisztelgő kötet R. Várkonyi Ágnes emlékére*, 2 vols, Budapest: L’Harmattan, 2016, vol. 2, pp. 255–270.
- Hiller, István, *Palatin Nikolaus Esterházy: Die ungarische Rolle in der Habsburgerdiplomatie 1625–1645* (Wien – Köln – Weimar: Böhlau, 1992
- Höbel, Lothar, *Ferdinand III. (1608–1657) Friedenskaiser wider Willen*, Graz: Ares Verlag, 2008.
- Hölvényi, György, “Nochmals: „Der christliche Seneca“. Ein Fund wichtiger Kuefstein-Handschriften in Budapest”, *Wolfenbütteler Barock-Nachrichten* 12/1 (1985), pp. 25–26.
- Huemer, Anna, “„Copy & Paste“ im Reisebericht der Frühen Neuzeit? Intertextualität im „Türkischen Itinerarium“ des Johann Georg Metzger (1650)”, *Chronica* 19 (2020), pp. 84–112.
- Huemer, Anna, “Von „knobloch und zwieffel“ zu den „bulgarischen weibspersohnen“: Balkantopoi im Spiegel der Reiseberichte von Hans Ludwig von Kuefstein (1628/29) und Johann Georg Metzger (1650)”, in Endreva, Maria – Preitschopf, Alexandra – Baramova, Maria – Parvev, Ivan, eds., *Der Donaauraum als Zivilisationsbrücke. Österreich und der Balkan. Perspektiven aus der Literatur- und Geschichtswissenschaft, (Identifizierungen Poetiken des eigenen und seines anderen)* 6, Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann, 2020, pp. 75–92.
- Jászay, Pál, “A’ szőnyi béke, 1627”, *Tudománytár, Értekezések*, 4 (1838), pp. 167–274.
- Kármán, Gábor, *A Seventeenth-Century Odyssey in East Central Europe. The Life of Jakab Harsányi Nagy*, Leiden – Boston: Brill, 2016.
- Kármán, Gábor, *Erdélyi külpolitika a vesztfáliai béke után*, Budapest: L’Harmattan, 2011
- Kuefstein, Karl Graf von, *Studien zur Familiengeschichte*, 1–4. vols, Wien – Leipzig: Wilhelm Braumüller K. K. Universitäts-Verlagsbuchhandlung, Gesellschaft M. B. H., 1908–1928, In Verbindung mit der Landes- und Kulturgeschichte. 17. Jahrhundert, vol. 3. 1915
- Majláth, Béla, *Az 1642-ik évi szőnyi békekötés története*, Budapest, 1885.

- Marton, Gellért Ernő “A Dissertation in Preparation – Structure, Methodology, Approach and Content. The Peace Treaty of Szöny (1627) and Its Subsequent Territorial Negotiations (1628–1629) in Light of Péter Koháry’s Correspondence”, *Studia Universitatis Babeş-Bolyai, Historia* (2021). [article in press]
- Marton, Gellért Ernő, „Szönyből tudatjuk...”. Három magyar diplomata – Rimay János, Tassy Gáspár és Tholdalagi Mihály – követnaplójának összehasonlító elemzése az 1627. évi szőnyi békekötés kapcsán”, in J. Újváry, Zsuzsanna, ed., *Oszmán–magyar viszony a 16–18. században. Tanulmányok a Magyar Királyság és az Oszmán Birodalom népeinek – magyarok, törökök, rácok, tatárok, zsidók, görögök és egyéb népek – hétköznapijairól; Egyén és közösség viszonya*, Budapest: Szent István Társulat, Az Apostoli Szentszék Könyvkiadója, 2020, pp. 135–148.
- Marton, Gellért Ernő, “Péter Koháry’s Life and Correspondence – Outline for a Greater Synthesis”, *Rocznik Przemyski 56, Historia 25/1* (2020), pp. 25–36.
- Meienberger, Peter, *Johann Rudolf Schmid zum Schwarzenhorn als kaiserlicher Resident in Konstantinopel in den Jahren 1629–1643: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der diplomatischen Beziehungen zwischen Österreich und der Türkei in der ersten Hälfte des 17. Jahrhunderts*, Bern – Frankfurt am Main: Herbert Lang, Peter Lang, 1973.
- Molnár, Antal, “Végvár és rekatolizáció: Althan Mihály Adolf és a katolikus restauráció kezdetei Komáromban”, in Molnár, Antal, ed., *Elfelejtett végvidék, (Régi Magyar Könyvtár, Tanulmányok) 9*, Budapest: Balassi Kiadó, 2008, pp. 139–148.
- Nehring, Karl, “Magyarország és a zsitvatoroki szerződés 1605–1609”, *Századok 120/1* (1986), pp. 3–50.
- Papp, Sándor, “Az Oszmán Birodalom, a Magyar Királyság és a Habsburg Monarchia kapcsolattörténete a békekötések tükrében (vázlat és adatbázis)”, *Aetas 33/4* (2018), pp. 86–99.
- Petritsch, Ernst Dieter, “Zeremoniell bei Empfängen habsburgischer Gesandtschaften“ in Knauz, Ralph – Rota, Giorgio – Niederkorn, Jan Paul, eds., in *Diplomatisches Zeremoniell in Europa und im Mittleren Osten in der Frühen Neuzeit*, Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2009, pp. 301–322.
- Robert Savory, *Iran under the Safavids*, Cambridge – London – New York – New Rochelle – Melbourne – Sidney: Cambridge University Press, 2007
- Römer, Hans Robert, “The Safavid Period”, in Jackson, Peter – Lockhart, Laurence, eds., *The Cambridge History of Iran, 7 vols*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006 (reprint), *The Timurid and Safavid Period*, vol. 6, pp. 189–350.
- Schilling, Heinz, *Konfessionalisierung und Staatsinteressen: Internationale Beziehungen 1559–1660*, Paderborn – München – Wien – Zürich: Ferdinand Schöningh, 2007.
- Spuler, Bertold, “Die Europäische Diplomatie in Konstantinopel bis zum Frieden von Belgrad (1739), 3. Teil: Listen der in Konstantinopel anwesenden Gesandten bis in die Mitte des 18. Jhdts”, *Jahrbücher für Kultur und Geschichte der Slaven*, Neue Folge, 11/3–4 (1935), pp. 313–366.
- Strohmeyer, Arno, “Die habsburgisch-osmanische Freundschaft (16–18. Jahrhundert)”, in Strohmeyer, Arno – Spannenberger, Norbert, *Frieden und Konfliktmanagement in interkulturellen Räumen*, Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2013, pp. 223–238.
- Strohmeyer, Arno, “The theatrical Performance of Peace: Entries of Habsburg Grand Embassies in Constantinople (17th–19th Centuries)”, in Sariyannis, Marinos, ed. in ch., *New Trends in Ottoman Studies. Papers presented at the 20th CIÉPO Symposium Rethymno, 27 June – 1 July 2012*, Rethymno: University of Crete, Department of History and Archaeology – Foundation for Research and Technology-Hellas, Institute for Mediterranean Studies, 2014, pp. 486–494.

- Strohmeier, Arno, “Trendek és perspektívák a kora újkori diplomáciatörténetben: A konstantinápolyi Habsburg diplomaták esete”, (Transl. Kármán, Gábor), *Történelmi Szemle* 59/2 (2017), pp. 177–198.
- Sudár, Balázs, “The Story of Mürteza Pasha”, in Fodor, Pál – Kovács, Nándor Erik – Péri, Benedek, eds., *Serefe. Studies in Honour of Prof. Géza Dávid on His Seventieth Birthday*, (21st-century Studies in Humanities) Budapest: Research Centre for the Humanities, Hungarian Academy of Sciences, 2019, pp. 339–357.
- Szabados, János, „Ih awer befleise mih, daß ih sie beidte zue nahbarn mahen khan.” – Die Karriere des deutschen Renegaten (Hans Caspar) in Ofen (1627–1660) im politischen und kulturellen Kontext, PhD Dissertation, Manuscript in 2 vols, Szeged: Doctoral School of History, University of Szeged, 2018, vol. 1.
- Teply, Karl, *Die kaiserliche Großbotschaft an Sultan Murad IV. 1628. Des Freiherrn Hans Ludwig von Kuefsteins Fahrt zur Hohen Pforte*, Wien: Verlag A. Schendl, 1976.
- Tersch, Harald, “Hans Ludwig von Kuefstein”, in Tersch, Harald, ed., *Österreichische Selbstzeugnisse des Spätmittelalters und der Frühen Neuzeit (1400–1650). Eine Darstellung in Einzelbeiträgen*, Wien – Köln – Weimar: Böhlau, 1998, pp. 647–677.
- Tóth, István György, “Athanasio Georgiceo álrulás császári megbízott útleírása a magyarországi török hódoltságáról, 1626-ból”, *Századok* 132/4 (1998), pp. 837–858.
- Winkelbauer, Thomas, *Fürst und Fürstendiener. Gundaker von Liechtenstein, ein österreichischer Aristokrat des konfessionellen Zeitalters*, Wien – München: R. Oldenburg Verlag, 1999.