

**'Le Parfait Ambassadeur'.
The Theory and Practice of Diplomacy
in the Century following the Peace of Westphalia**

Submitted for the degree of D.Phil
at the University of Oxford

Trinity Term 2006

Heidrun R I Kugeler

Magdalen College

Short Abstract

'Le Parfait Ambassadeur'. The Theory and Practice of Diplomacy in the Century following the Peace of Westphalia

Heidrun R I Kugeler

Magdalen College

D.Phil Modern History

University of Oxford

Trinity Term, 2006

This thesis examines the theory of diplomacy in the formative phase of the European states-system. From the viewpoint of the discourse on the 'ideal ambassador', it explores early modern diplomacy as cultural history encompassing ideas, discourses, perceptions and 'codes'. The scope of study is the century following the Peace of Westphalia (1648), and three states and regions (France, Britain, the Holy Roman Empire) serve as case studies for a comparative approach of diplomatic theory and practice.

In five parts, the adaptation of the theory and practice of diplomacy to the new demands of international relations after 1648 are considered. The first section sets the stage by illustrating that the mid-seventeenth century was regarded as a turning point in the practice of diplomacy. Part II examines diplomatic theory as a particular 'language' in its intellectual and socio-professional contexts. While published treatises on the 'ideal ambassador' build the core of this study, related genres of international law theory, ceremonial theory and political and state science are also taken into account. From the viewpoint of this diplomatic theory, the following section examines the ways in which the instruments and practices of diplomacy were aligned to the new framework. These ranged from changes in the structural framework of diplomacy to the evolution of norms and procedures of negotiation, international law and ceremonial.

Part IV reconsiders the issue of 'professionalism' in diplomatic theory with regard to the preparation and training of diplomats. Special attention is given to proposals for diplomatic 'academies', which are for the first time examined in comparison. Finally, section V recasts the findings of this thesis in a comparative perspective. It underlines that, with the emergence of a states-system, the techniques of diplomacy became formalised and uniform, constituting a common European diplomatic practice. Against the background of the different regional and structural conditions, the alleged model role of France in the evolution of diplomatic theory and practice is re-evaluated.

Long Abstract

'Le Parfait Ambassadeur'. The Theory and Practice of Diplomacy in the Century following the Peace of Westphalia

Heidrun R I Kugeler

Magdalen College

D.Phil Modern History

University of Oxford

Trinity Term, 2006

This thesis presents an examination of the theory of diplomacy in the formation-phase of the European states-system following the Peace of Westphalia.

While recent scholarship has once more turned to the 'formative phase' of the European states-system and international relations, it has neglected to evaluate the contemporary theoretical reflections and discourses on diplomacy. From the late medieval period, a genre existed which treated the diplomat and his functions under the heading of the 'ideal ambassador'. This literature depicts the evolution of diplomatic practice and culture, enabling us to reassess the emergence of a states-system from the viewpoint of the diplomatic corps.

In contrast to political scientists, who consider treatises of authors such as Wicquefort and Callières as predecessors of 'modern' international thought, this thesis endeavours to analyse the theoretical literature in the intellectual, cultural and socio-professional contexts of its time. For this purpose, an interdisciplinary approach is employed which combines

intellectual, cultural and political-administrative history. By taking up the outlook of the 'new diplomatic history', this study examines early modern diplomacy as cultural history encompassing ideas, discourses, perceptions and 'codes'. From the perspective of the discourse on the 'ideal ambassador', it seeks to contribute to our understanding of the early modern international system. It is argued that the emerging states-system was constituted through a growing diplomatic network, through a common diplomatic culture and 'language', and through the perceptions of its actors.

The scope of study is roughly the century following the Peace of Westphalia (1648). This period has been termed the foundation era of the European states-system and of 'classic diplomacy'. The changing framework of international relations towards a European system of resident diplomacy forced existing structures and techniques to adjust. Theorists of diplomacy regarded the treaties of 1648 as hallmarks of a new era of international relations. Around the mid-eighteenth century, they perceived that the transformation of the international system and diplomacy had come to a first conclusion, although particular issues of debate continued to be addressed in the late eighteenth and the early nineteenth century. On the other hand, historians have termed the core period of this study the 'Age of Louis XIV', considering France to be the first state to adapt its diplomatic service to the requirements of a European states-system. In this view, the culture, language and theory of diplomacy were shaped by France. This assumption, however, has not yet been substantiated in the context of a comparative approach. As this thesis examines transnational discourses and practices, a comparative outlook is indispensable. For this purpose, three states and regions (France, Britain, the Holy Roman Empire) are given special attention.

In five parts, this thesis traces the adaptation of the theory and practice of diplomacy to the new demands of international relations after 1648, enquiring how diplomats perceived and reacted to these changes. In this way, it seeks to show that reflections on the 'ideal diplomat' provided a link between the 'Republic of Letters' and the political-diplomatic sphere. In order to examine the complex relationship between the theory and practice of diplomacy in the emerging states-system, the analysis proceeds on five levels.

Part I sets the stage by illustrating that the mid-seventeenth century was regarded as a turning point in the practice of diplomacy. For theorists of the 'ideal ambassador', the emergence of a states-system became apparent in the decades between the congress of Nijmegen (1676-79) and the peace of Utrecht (1713-14), finding a first conclusion around the mid-eighteenth century.

Part II examines diplomatic theory as a particular 'language' in its intellectual and socio-professional contexts, in order to assess the extent to which it could mirror the practice of diplomacy. While published treatises on the 'ideal ambassador' build the core of this study, a number of hitherto unknown tracts and memoirs on diplomacy are considered. The analysis interweaves the discourse on the 'ideal ambassador' with the literature on international law, ceremonial theory and political and state science.

In Part III, the ways in which diplomacy and diplomats adapted to the new framework of the states-system are examined from the viewpoint of diplomatic theory. These ranged from changes in the structural framework of diplomacy to the evolution of diplomatic practices and procedures of international law and ceremonial. In order to assess the relationship between the theory and practice of diplomacy, the internal correspondence of the governmental sphere in France, Britain and the Holy Roman Empire is examined with regard to discussions on the diplomatic service and the reception of diplomatic theory. Furthermore,

memoranda on the organisation of the diplomatic service and compilations of ceremonial and legal customs are taken into account.

Part IV demonstrates that the discourse on the 'ideal ambassador' lay at the heart of a European-wide deliberation on how to reform the 'professionalism' of the diplomatic corps, notably in the area of preparation and training. This deliberation gained the attention of princes, councillors and diplomats as well as of distinguished *érudits* in the eighteenth century. Special attention is given to source material relating to the education and preparation of diplomats, including proposals for diplomatic 'academies', which are for the first time examined in comparison.

The last section recasts the findings of Parts I-IV in a comparative perspective. It underlines that, with the emergence of a states-system, the techniques of diplomacy became formalised and uniform, constituting a common European diplomatic practice. But how was this common practice established, which elements were fashioned by particular countries and then adopted by others? Bearing in mind the different regional and structural situations of the European states, this part considers processes and media of transfer and critically engages with the alleged model role of France in the evolution of diplomacy.

Within the restricted scope of a D.Phil thesis, it cannot be attempted to draw a complete picture of the practice and culture of diplomacy in early modern Europe. This thesis focuses on the viewpoint of diplomatic theorists and illustrates selected fields of interaction of theory and practice. Other aspects can only be touched upon briefly, as for example the public image of the diplomat, the relationship between diplomacy and war, and the links between diplomacy and the emerging consular service. Issues in need of extensive research, such as

the mentalities and identities of diplomats, or the patterns of recruitment and career, can only be raised with reference to diplomatic theory.

Nevertheless, the selected fields of analysis shed light on the overall relationship between the theory and practice of diplomacy in the formative phase of the states-system. The verdict that reflections on the 'ideal ambassador' remained a static casuistry with little correlation to the practice cannot be held. Treatises on the 'ideal ambassador' constituted the core of an early modern diplomatic theory that was a dynamic element in defining the diplomats' task as the pivotal agents of the states-system. The examination of diplomatic theory reveals that from around the turn of the eighteenth century, diplomats themselves construed their duties and identities within the wider context of a European states-system. This thesis is concerned with the consequences 'diplomates érudits' drew from the emergence of a states-system. They identified two main areas of change: firstly, the alignment of the norms and customs of negotiation, international law and diplomatic ceremonial to a common European political framework; and secondly, the appearance of a diplomatic corps with a particular 'language' and identity based on a cosmopolitan and aristocratic culture and early notions of professionalism.

Diplomatic theory recognised the crucial role international law and ceremonial played in the emerging states-system. The legal and ceremonial aspects of diplomacy constituted the cultural and technical framework for conducting international relations. At the same time, the diplomat's immunities and privileges were subjects of dispute between the emerging sovereign states, since they not only represented the bilateral relationship between two actors, but also mirrored the sovereigns' place in the international hierarchy of the 'société des princes'. The formative phase of the states-system was characterised by frequent clashes over the acknowledgment of diplomatic representatives and their precedence. To contemporaries,

these clashes revealed the ambivalent role of diplomatic ceremonial and law, which enabled and also complicated the conduct of international relations. The analysis of diplomatic theory supports the assumption that this process came to a conclusion after the mid-eighteenth century, when the endeavour prevailed to limit the conflict potential of ceremonial and to acknowledge the equality of sovereigns in international law.

Theorists of diplomacy regarded the intensification of diplomatic contacts and the accompanying structural transformations of information and communication as preconditions for a 'new diplomacy'. International relations were conducted in the European-wide framework of the states-system and were embodied in the interactions of the diplomatic corps. The functions, conduct and *mentalités* of this corps became the subject of a debate that span the political-diplomatic and the erudite-academic spheres. This thesis complements existing findings on the evolution of the diplomatic services by illustrating that the discussion on the 'ideal ambassador' took place in a wider context than has been hitherto assumed. Furthermore, it demonstrates that diplomatic theory stood at the forefront of a debate which was conducted both transnationally in the Republic of Letters and nationally in the different governmental spheres. In the development of a scientific framework of foreign policy, in the alignment of the procedural, ceremonial and legal aspects of diplomacy, and in the improvement of preparation and professionalism, the forward-looking character of diplomatic theory becomes apparent.

Diplomatic education and preparation came to achieve a pivotal place in reflections upon the 'ideal ambassador'. Diplomatic theory transformed the traditional catalogue of virtues and counsels of behaviour into a more specific and 'professional' portrait. In response to the greater role of the resident diplomat acting in a states-system, they developed a distinct negotiation theory based on 'prudence politique', the courtier's art, the knowledge of human

passions and the interests of states. This thesis argues that diplomatic theory in this manner could conceive a 'corps mentality' linked to the states-system and its balance of power. In the theorists' view, the diplomatic corps represented the relations between the system's actors and, through a convergence of interests and a common language and code of manners, contributed to the 'civilisation' of international relations.

From the turn of the seventeenth century, theorists of diplomacy came to understand the diplomats of Europe as a distinct community of state-servants with a particular function, culture and ethos. Although these were derived from the profile and culture of the courtly society and the 'nobilitas politica', theorists instilled increasingly specialised and 'professional' elements into the 'ideal ambassador'. By placing emphasis on criteria such as experience, knowledge and merit, they presented a collective vocational identity that should be valid both for the upper and for the lower ranks of diplomacy. In addition, they prescribed a corpus of specialist knowledge and experience, and developed suggestions for a diplomatic 'training'. Yet as they postulated diplomacy as a distinct 'profession', they went beyond the actual recruitment and career practice, standing at the vanguard of a 'professionalisation movement'. To a larger extent than has been hitherto assumed, the issue of diplomatic training occupied diplomats, *érudits*, councillors and princes across Europe. Although large-scale reforms of the training and career practice fell short in view of the social and political realities of the Old Regime, the improvement of diplomatic preparation was a shared experience of the states-system's actors. In this endeavour, the political sphere and the Republic of Letters were closely entwined, as in the case of diplomatic 'academies'. Although most projects were short-lived, the ideas and methods devised in these initiatives continued to be discussed and applied throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

The aspects considered in this thesis contribute to our understanding of the theory and practice of diplomacy in the emerging states-system. The modification of the 'ideal ambassador' and his 'art of negotiation' was a response to the changing structures and practices of diplomacy. In spite of the strong continuity of format and language, diplomatic theory accurately mirrored the norms and procedures of negotiation against the background of growing diplomatic administrative apparatuses and evolving legal norms and ceremonial practices. In all these fields, theorists perceived changes they interpreted as adaptations to the states-system. At the same time, it were these elements that constituted the system in the eyes of the contemporary theorists: not only a network of reciprocal and permanent representation delineated the system, but also the observance of the legal norms and ceremonial customs that constituted a common European diplomatic culture. By the mid-eighteenth century, diplomatic theory presented the practice of diplomacy as pillar of the states-system, as part of a European political culture, and as foundation of a collective and transnational mentality of the diplomatic corps.

**'Le Parfait Ambassadeur'.
The Theory and Practice of Diplomacy
in the Century following the Peace of Westphalia**

Submitted for the degree of D.Phil
at the University of Oxford

Trinity Term 2006

Heidrun R I Kugeler

Magdalen College

Acknowledgments

The research leading up to this thesis would not have been possible without the generous assistance of the Cecil Rhodes Trust and the Gerda Henkel Trust. I am also grateful to the Modern History Faculty of Oxford, to Magdalen College, to the Royal Historical Society, and to the Zacharov Trust and the FAZIT-foundation for travel and research grants.

For continuous advice and support, I am indebted to David Parrott, who has supervised this thesis, as well as to Hamish Scott and Winfried Schulze, who have accompanied its progress from the very beginning. Furthermore, I would like to express my gratitude to the members of the modern history faculty at Oxford, the history department of the Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität at Munich, and the German Historical Institutes at London and Paris for their support. In addition, I am grateful for helpful comments and advice to Leopold Auer (Vienna), Hester Baron (Oxford), Robin Briggs (Oxford), Laurence Brockliss (Oxford), Heinz Duchhardt (Mainz), Robert Evans (Oxford), Sven Externbrink (Marburg), Bernhard Gissibl, Thomas Gruber (Oxford), Eckhart Hellmuth (Munich), Michael Jucker (Münster), Grete Klingenstein (Vienna), Judith Matzke (Dresden), Christian Sepp, Corinna Streckfuss (Oxford), Joachim Wild, Georg Wolf and Cornel Zwierlein (all Munich).

Finally, I would like to express my thanks to the staff of the following institutions: Bodleian Library, Oxford; Cambridge University Archives; Public Record Office, London; British Library, London; Archives des Affaires Étrangères, Paris; Archives Nationales, Paris; Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris; Geheimes Hauptstaatsarchiv Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Berlin; Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin; Bayerisches Hauptstaatsarchiv, München; Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, München; Sächsisches Hauptstaatsarchiv Dresden; Niedersächsisches Hauptstaatsarchiv, Hannover; Niedersächsisches Staatsarchiv, Wolfenbüttel; Herzog-August-Bibliothek Wolfenbüttel; Universitätsbibliothek Göttingen; Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchiv, Wien; Hofkammerarchiv, Wien; Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Wien; Österreichisches Verwaltungsarchiv, Wien.

Contents

<i>Notes and Abbreviations</i>	iii
Introduction	1
Part I. The Framework: Diplomacy in the emerging States-System of Europe	10
Part II. The 'Ideal Ambassador'. A Theory of Early Modern Diplomacy	25
<i>Episode 1. The 'Honnête Espion' – Abraham de Wicquefort</i>	25
II.1. The 'Ideal Ambassador' and the <i>respublica litteraria</i>: the Intellectual Context of Diplomatic Theory	27
II.2. Tradition and Transformation. The 'Ideal Ambassador' in the Century following the Peace of Westphalia	47
II.3. The Functional Context of Diplomatic Theory	81
Part III. The Practice of Diplomacy in the States-System	98
<i>Episode 2. A Question of Honour – The Incident of 1661</i>	98
III.1. The Diplomatic Apparatus	100
<i>Episode 3. 'Les Différents des Ambassadeurs aux Champs Elisées'</i>	117
III.2. International Law and Diplomacy	119
III.3. Diplomatic Ceremonial and Congress Diplomacy	134

Part IV. A New 'Profession' and the State. Diplomatic Training in France, Britain and the Holy Roman Empire	157
<i>Episode 4. A Profession to be Pitied. George Stepney, Matthew Prior, Charles Whitworth</i>	157
IV.1. Diplomacy and 'Professionalism'	160
IV.2. 'L'École des Ambassadeurs'. Training Schemes and Diplomatic Academies in the Eighteenth Century	166
IV.3. A Professionalisation Movement?	237
 Part V. A Common Diplomatic Culture? How French was European Diplomacy?	 242
<i>Episode 5. 'Three French Ambassadors' – Diplomacy and the Public</i>	242
 Conclusion	 265
 Bibliography	 274

Notes and Abbreviations

If not otherwise stated, the page and folio numbers refer to 'recto' (r).

Quotations and titles are cited according to the original source, but abbreviations have been dissolved, and capitalisation and diacritic accents have been aligned to modern usage.

The following abbreviations are used.

AAE	Archives des Affaires Étrangères, Paris
AB	Acta Borussica. Denkmäler der Preußischen Staatsverwaltung im 18. Jahrhundert, ed. Königliche Akademie der Wissenschaften (Berlin, 1894 ff)
<i>AfK</i>	<i>Archiv für Kulturgeschichte</i>
<i>AHR</i>	<i>American Historical Review</i>
AN	Archives Nationales, Paris
BayHSTA	Bayerisches Hauptstaatsarchiv, München
BL	British Library, London
BN	Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Paris
BSB	Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Munich
Cal.SP	Calendar of State Papers Domestic (94 vols., London 1856-1964)
ch.	Chapter
CP	'Correspondance Politique' Series in the AAE
DBA	Deutsches Biographisches Archiv
DBI/DBE	Deutscher Biographischer Index – Deutsche Biographische Enzyklopädie, CD-Rom edition, Munich (C. Saur) 2001
ed.	editor
<i>EHR</i>	<i>English Historical Review</i>
<i>FBPG</i>	<i>Forschungen zur Brandenburg-Preussischen Geschichte</i>
Fonds Clair.	'Fonds Clairambault', Bibliothèque Nationale
Frankfurt	Frankfurt am Main
GSTA	Geheimes Hauptstaatsarchiv Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Berlin
HAB	Herzog-August-Bibliothek, Wolfenbüttel
HHSTA	Haus-, Hof und Staatsarchiv, Vienna
HKA	Hofkammerarchiv, Vienna
HMC	Historical Manuscript Commission
<i>JbGO</i>	<i>Jahrbücher für die Geschichte Osteuropas</i>
<i>JHM</i>	<i>Journal of Modern History</i>
MD	'Mémoires et Documents' Series in the AAE
<i>MIÖG</i>	<i>Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung</i>
MS	Manuscript
MS.fr.	Manuscrits français, Bibliothèque Nationale
NAF	Nouvelles Acquisitions Françaises, Bibliothèque Nationale
Niedersächs.HSTA	Niedersächsisches Hauptstaatsarchiv, Hanover
N.S.	New Series

PRO	Public Record Office, London
Öst.NB	Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Vienna
Öst.VA	Österreichisches Verwaltungsarchiv, Vienna
Oxford DNB	Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, ed. Oxford University Press, 2004; online edition, May 2005
praes.	Praeses (professor or examiner in juristic disputations and dissertations)
resp.	Respondens (student or candidate in juristic disputations and dissertations)
rev.	revised
<i>RHD</i>	<i>Révue d'Histoire Diplomatique</i>
<i>RHS, Camden Misc.</i>	<i>Royal Historical Society, Camden Miscellany</i>
SächsHSTA	Sächsisches Hauptstaatsarchiv, Dresden
SBB	Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin, Preußischer Kulturbesitz
SP	State Paper
STA Wolfenbüttel	Niedersächsisches Landesarchiv, Staatsarchiv Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel
trans.	translator
UB	Universitätsbibliothek
<i>ZfG</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft</i>
<i>ZfNRG</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für neuere Rechtsgeschichte</i>
<i>ZHF</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für Historische Forschung</i>
WBIS	World Biographical Information System, ed. K.G.Saur Press (online biographic dictionary)

Introduction

Legatus vir bonus peregre missus
ad mentiendum reipublicae causa¹

At the beginning of the twenty-first century, the question 'Who are the diplomats?' has attained a new significance. Are the 'pathetic heroes' of international politics 'still lying abroad', as the English ambassador Henry Wotton had observed around 1600?² The fundamental transformation of international politics since the end of the Cold War has led to a debate on the role and nature of diplomacy as the key instrument of international communication. At the same time, the transformation of European and global politics since 1989/90 have triggered a renewed interest in the historical development of the international system.³ In particular the formation-phase of the European states-system in the early modern period, when diplomatic activity intensified and foreign policy became established as a distinct field of state activity, once more attracts the interest of political scientists and diplomatic historians. In the wake of this renaissance, the debate on the diplomat's role has recently turned to early modern reflections on the 'ambassador and his functions'.⁴ The works of authors such as Abraham de Wicquefort or François de Callières are now counted among the 'classics of international thought' and serve not only as historical documents of the 'old

¹ Epigram attributed to Sir Henry Wotton, see J.Jusserand, 'The School for Ambassadors', *American Historical Review*, 27 (1922), p.439.

² See recent contributions to *Diplomacy and Statecraft*, e.g. R.Langhorne, 'Current Developments in Diplomacy: Who Are the Diplomats Now?' (1997), 1-15; R.Wolfe, 'Still Lying Abroad? On the Institution of the Resident Ambassador' (1998), 23-54; S.Sofer, 'Being a 'Pathetic Hero' in International Politics: The Diplomat as a Historical Actor' (2001), 107-12.

³ For instance J.Caporaso, 'Changes in the Westphalian Order: Territory, Public Authority, and Sovereignty', *Review of International Studies*, 2 (2000), 1-28; D.Blaney, N.Inayatullah, 'The Westphalian Deferral', *ibid.*, 29-64. From the viewpoint of early modern history: H.Duchhardt, 'Westphalian System'. Zur Problematik einer Denkfigur', *Historische Zeitschrift*, 269 (1999), 305-15.

⁴ See for example Y.Tavernier, 'Rapport d'information [...] sur le réseau diplomatique et le rôle des ambassadeurs', <http://www.assemblee-nationale.fr/rap-info/i3620.asp#P190_17746>; C.Jönsson, R.Langhorne (eds.), *Diplomacy* (3 vols., London, 2004), vol.i (Theory of Diplomacy), vol.ii (History of Diplomacy), vol.iii (Problems and Issues in Contemporary Diplomacy).

diplomacy', but also as sources for modern negotiation theory.⁵ This concentration on continuities and 'classics' in international thought, however, poses the danger of neglecting the historical context and the specific character of early modern 'international' politics.

Diplomatic Theory and the Historiography of Early Modern Diplomacy

The study of early modern diplomacy shared in the demise of traditional 'political history' after the Second World War, particularly in Germany and France.⁶ However, in the wake of the renewed interest in political history, historians, too, have turned back to the history of international relations and diplomacy.⁷ Several handbooks and collections of studies underline this.⁸ At the same time, the increasing amount of research on diplomatic history is accompanied by a conceptual and methodological renewal: a 'new diplomatic history' has been proposed that endorses an interdisciplinary approach and takes up the methods of social

⁵ See C.Brown et al. (eds.), *International Relations in Political Thought. Texts from the Ancient Greeks to the First World War* (Cambridge, 2002); G.Berridge et al. (eds.), *Diplomatic Theory from Machiavelli to Kissinger* (London, 2001). J.-C.Waquet has examined 'les nouveaux voyages' of Callières' treatise, particularly with regard to modern 'negotiation studies': *François de Callières: L'Art de négocier en France sous Louis XIV* (Paris, 2005), pp.13-38.

⁶ The current trends are outlined in W.Loeth, J.Osterhammel (eds.), *Internationale Geschichte. Themen, Ergebnisse, Aussichten* (Munich, 2000); E.Conze et al. (eds.), *Geschichte der internationalen Beziehungen. Erneuerung und Erweiterung einer historischen Disziplin* (Cologne, 2004). For the early modern period, see M.Hochedlinger, 'Die Frühneuzeitforschung und die 'Geschichte der internationalen Beziehungen'. Oder: Was ist aus dem 'Primat der Außenpolitik' geworden?', *MIÖG*, 106 (1998), 167-79; B.Simms, 'The Return of the Primacy of Foreign Policy', *German History*, 21 (2003), 275-92; and my introduction to *Internationale Beziehungen in der Frühen Neuzeit. Ansätze und Perspektiven*, eds. H.Kugeler, C.Sepp, G.Wolf (Munich, 2006), 9-35.

⁷ A similar trend can be observed in medieval history, see for example D.Berg et al. (eds.), *Auswärtige Politik und Internationale Beziehungen im Mittelalter (13. bis 16. Jahrhundert)* (Bochum, 2002); R.Schwinges, K.Wriedt (eds.), *Gesandtschafts- und Botenwesen im spätmittelalterlichen Europa* (Stuttgart, 2003).

⁸ Of the 'Handbuch der Geschichte der Internationalen Beziehungen', see H.Duchhardt, *Balance of Power und Pentarchie. Internationale Beziehungen, 1700-1785* (Paderborn, 1997). Furthermore, see L.Bély, *Les Relations internationales en Europe XVIIe-XVIIIe siècle* (Paris, 1992); of the 'Nouvelle histoire des relations internationales', see C.Gantet, *Guerre, paix et construction des états, 1618-1714* (Paris, 2003); J.-P.Bois, *De la paix des rois à l'ordre des empereurs, 1714-1815* (Paris, 2003). In English, apart from the classic G.Mattingly, *Renaissance Diplomacy* (Boston, 1955, repr.1988), see M.Anderson, *The Rise of Modern Diplomacy, 1450-1919* (London, 1993); K.Hamilton, R.Langhorne, *The Practice of Diplomacy. Its Evolution, Theory and Administration* (London, 1995); J.Black, *European International Relations 1648-1815* (Basingstoke, 2002).

and cultural history.⁹ Several case studies have already demonstrated the great potential of this approach for early modern diplomacy, as for example Lucien Bély's *Espions et ambassadeurs au temps de Louis XIV*, which combines the examination of the social and mental profile of international actors with the economic and cultural dimensions of foreign policy.¹⁰ Under the label of a 'cultural history of diplomacy', not only the mentalities, perceptions and stereotypes influencing foreign policy are explored, but also the symbolic and iconographic dimension of foreign politics, as well as to the role of diplomacy in cultural transfer.¹¹ Moreover, the languages and the concepts of thought shaping early modern international communication are beginning to receive attention, as historians of political thought turn to the links between international relations and the exchange of political ideas.¹² On the other hand, the modes and cultures of international communication, its networks and practices increasingly feature as subjects of studies.¹³

Finally, the 'new diplomatic history' seeks to combine the study of 'cultural factors' with a re-assessment of the framework and structures of international relations. The emergence of the European states-system is again viewed as one of the fundamental

⁹ See Loth/Osterhammel, *Internationale Geschichte*; P.Krüger, 'Internationale Beziehungen - Verfassung - Perzeption', in S.Externbrink, J.Ulbert (eds.), *Formen internationaler Beziehungen in der Frühen Neuzeit. Frankreich und das Alte Reich im europäischen Staatensystem* (Berlin, 2001), 21-33.

¹⁰ L.Bély, *Espions et ambassadeurs au temps de Louis XIV* (Paris, 1991); idem, 'Méthodes et perspectives dans l'étude des négociations internationales à l'époque moderne. L'exemple d'Utrecht (1713)', in R.Babel (ed.), *Frankreich im europäischen Staatensystem* (Paris, 1995), 219-34.

¹¹ See U.Lehmkuhl, 'Diplomatiegeschichte als internationale Kulturgeschichte: Theoretische Ansätze und empirische Forschung zwischen Historischer Kulturwissenschaft und Soziologischem Institutionalismus', *Geschichte und Gesellschaft*, 27 (2001), 394-423. See further B.Stollberg-Rillinger, 'Zeremoniell, Ritual, Symbol. Neue Forschungen zur symbolischen Kommunikation in Spätmittelalter und Früher Neuzeit', *ZHF*, 27 (2000), 389-405; S.Externbrink, 'Internationale Beziehungen und Kulturtransfer in der Frühen Neuzeit', in S.Trakulhun, T.Fuchs (eds.), *Das eine Europa und die Vielfalt der Kulturen. Kulturtransfer in Europa 1500-1850* (Berlin, 2003), 227-48.

¹² See for example the concept of 'political communication' endorsed by L.Schorn-Schütte (ed.), *Aspekte der politischen Kommunikation im Europa des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts. Politische Theologie - Res Publica-Verständnis - konsensgestützte Herrschaft* (Munich, 2004).

¹³ A useful introduction is H.Gräf, 'Funktionsweisen und Träger internationaler Politik in der Frühen Neuzeit', in J.Siegelberg, K.Schlichte (eds.), *Strukturwandel internationaler Beziehungen. Zum Verhältnis von Staat und internationalem System seit dem Westfälischen Frieden* (Wiesbaden, 2000), 105-23.

processes of the early modern period.¹⁴ Besides, historians of diplomacy have begun to re-evaluate the correlations between state-building, war and the international system, especially with regard to the structural conditions that determined the foreign policy of smaller actors such as the Empire's territories or the Italian states. While many of these aspects have been explored before, the claim of a comprehensive treatment of diplomacy in its wider social, intellectual and cultural contexts distinguishes the 'new' diplomatic history from its predecessors: instead of a 'return of the primacy of foreign policy', a conceptual extension and integration of diplomatic history into current historiographic trends of early modern studies can be discerned.¹⁵

Yet, despite this reorientation, one aspect has not yet received sufficient consideration among historians: the contemporary reflections and discourses on the diplomat and his functions, which constitute an early modern 'theory of diplomacy'. While individual treatises on the 'ideal ambassador' have been the subjects of study, attempts at an examination of the whole genre have been rare.¹⁶ Political scientists have edited the manuals by Wicquefort (1680/81) and Callières (1716).¹⁷ Yet, these treatises have been studied mainly as

¹⁴ For example U.Muhlack, 'Die Frühe Neuzeit als Geschichte des europäischen Staatensystems', in R.Dürr et al. (eds.), *Eigene und fremde Frühe Neuzeiten. Genese und Geltung eines Epochenbegriffs* (Munich, 2003), 23-41; P.Krüger (ed.), *Kontinuität und Wandel in der Staatenordnung der Neuzeit. Beiträge zur Geschichte des internationalen Systems* (Marburg, 1991); H.Kleinschmidt, *Geschichte der Internationalen Beziehungen. Ein systemgeschichtlicher Abriss* (Stuttgart, 1998).

¹⁵ In this way Simms, 'Return of the Primacy'. A conceptual extension had already been proposed by P.Renouvin, J.-B.Duroselle, *Introduction à l'histoire des relations internationales* (Paris, 1964).

¹⁶ A first list of treatises, albeit incomplete and mixed with juristic dissertations, has been drawn up by V.E.Grabar (Hrabar), *De legatis et legationibus tractatus varii* (Dorpat, 1905); idem, *De legatorum iure tractatum catalogus completus* (Dorpat, 1918). See also the articles by J.Jusserand, 'The School for Ambassadors', *AHR*, 27 (1922), 426-64; B.Behrens, 'Treatises on the Ambassador Written in the Fifteenth and Early Sixteenth Centuries', *EHR*, 2 (1936), 616-27. More recently, D.Frigo, 'Corte, onore e ragion di stato: il ruolo dell'ambasciatore in età moderna', in idem, *Ambasciatori e nunzi: figure della diplomazia in età moderna, 1450-1660* (Rome, 1999), 13-56; M.Bazzoli, 'Ragion di stato e interesse degli stati. La trattatistica sull'ambasciatore dal XV al XVIII secolo', *Nuovo Rivista Storica*, 86 (2002), 283-328.

¹⁷ Editions of François de Callières' *De la manière de négocier avec les souverains* (1716) have been prepared by H.M.Keens-Soper, K.W.Schweizer (New York, 1983, from the English transl. of 1716); A.Lempereur (Paris, 2002); J.-C.Waquet (Paris, 2005). Furthermore, Keens-Soper has edited *Abraham de Wicquefort. The Ambassador and his Functions* (Leicester, 2001, sic!), while A.Gruzinska and M.D.Sirkis edited *Antoine*

predecessors of 'modern' international thought, without sufficient contextualisation within their intellectual, cultural and socio-professional environment.¹⁸ Furthermore, the potential offered by an examination of diplomatic theory for the 'new diplomatic history' has not been exhausted. Although Keens-Soper has termed the theory of diplomacy a 'constitutional theory of the states-system', the few existing studies have not gone beyond this statement to discuss its importance for the practice and culture of diplomacy.¹⁹ The general verdict that reflections on the 'ideal ambassador' remained a static casuistry throughout the early modern period and only gradually followed the developments of diplomatic practice is in need of reassessment.

'Diplomatic practice' comprises the workings of diplomats abroad, their techniques of information gathering, representation and negotiation. In a wider sense, it also encompasses the structural framework of the diplomat's work: ceremonial honours and legal privileges as well as the central organisation of diplomacy with its modes of communication and administration. Although historians acknowledge that, after 1648, a 'modern' diplomatic practice and culture evolved in Europe, we are still insufficiently informed on how the conduct of diplomacy became aligned to the states-system.²⁰ This is also owing to the fact that only the diplomatic services of the main powers, such as France, Great Britain or Habsburg Austria, have been the subjects of study, while other states, notably the Empire's territories, are still under-researched. Furthermore, diplomatic history has been examined

Pecquet. Discourse on the Art of Negotiation (New York, 2004). Further editions by A.Lempereur of French treatises are in preparation.

¹⁸ In 'intellectual history', diplomatic theory has so far been neglected. Only W.Weber, *Prudentia Gubernatoria. Studien zur Herrschaftslehre in der deutschen politischen Wissenschaft des 17. Jahrhunderts* (Tübingen, 1992), examines remarks on diplomacy in political theory.

¹⁹ H.M.Keens-Soper, 'Wicquefort', in Berridge *et al.* (eds.), *Diplomatic Theory*, p.101.

²⁰ As a first overview, see the handbooks of Hamilton/Langhorne, *Practice of Diplomacy*; Anderson, *Rise of Modern Diplomacy*; W.Roosen, *The Age of Louis XIV: The Rise of Modern Diplomacy* (Cambridge/Mass., 1976).

from a national viewpoint, and few attempts have yet been made to identify transfers of ideas and techniques.²¹

Approach and Scope of Study

This thesis presents an examination of the 'theory of diplomacy' in the formation-phase of the European states-system following the Peace of Westphalia. Taking up the approach of the 'new diplomatic history', it studies early modern diplomacy as cultural history encompassing ideas, discourses, perceptions and cultural 'codes'. From the perspective of the discourse on the 'ideal ambassador', it examines the theory and practice of international relations in the emerging states-system. It argues that the system was constituted not only by intense diplomatic contacts, but also by the perceptions of its actors, and by a common diplomatic culture and 'language'.²² While historians of early modern international relations have mainly concentrated on the high sphere of government and the decision-makers of foreign policy, the 'theory of diplomacy' throws light on the viewpoint and the collective experience of an early-modern transnational elite: the diplomatic corps.

'Diplomatic theory' consists of written reflections that seek to document and transform the practice of diplomacy into a system of rules. Treatises on the 'Legatus', 'L'Ambassadeur' or 'l'Art de Négociier' constituted its core from the fifteenth to the late eighteenth century.²³ Apart from these treatises, unpublished tracts and manuals on the diplomat and his function have been identified, which were either written with publication in mind, or were not

²¹ On the concepts of a comparative 'European history' and cultural transfer see W.Schmale's introduction in idem (ed.), *Kulturtransfer. Kulturelle Praxis im 16. Jahrhundert* (Innsbruck, 2003); idem, 'Europäische Geschichte als historische Disziplin. Überlegungen zu einer 'Europäistik'', *ZfG*, 46 (1998), 389-405; cf. A.Landwehr, S.Stockhorst, *Einführung in die Europäische Kulturgeschichte* (Paderborn, 2004).

²² A history of the states-system as history of perceptions has been postulated by H.Kleinschmidt, *Geschichte der internationalen Beziehungen*, p.11.

²³ Around 25 treatises originating between 1590 and 1800 have been consulted, in addition to a number of earlier treatises.

intended for publication but conceived as more informal and private instructions. Moreover, entwined with the discourse on the 'ideal ambassador' were treatises of international legal theory, ceremonial theory and political and state science.

In order to assess the relationship between the theory and practice of diplomacy, the internal correspondence of the governmental sphere in France, Britain and the Holy Roman Empire is examined with regard to discussions on the diplomatic service and the reception of diplomatic theory.²⁴ Special attention is paid to debates on the education and preparation of diplomats, including proposals for diplomatic 'academies'. Furthermore, memoranda on the organisation of the diplomatic service, a number of instructions for diplomats, correspondence referring to the selection and payment of envoys, as well as compilations of ceremonial and legal customs have been taken into account.

The century following the treaties of 1648 has been termed the foundation era of the 'modern' state and 'classic diplomacy'. Although recent studies have stressed the evolutionary nature of the states-system since the emergence of resident embassies in the Renaissance, it still holds true that 1648 marked a significant turning point in the diplomatic history of Europe.²⁵ The changing framework of international relations towards a European system of resident diplomacy forced existing structures and techniques to adjust. In this light, the core period of this thesis has often been termed the 'Age of Louis XIV', as France was considered

²⁴ The following archives and libraries have been consulted: Archives Nationales, Paris (AN); Archives des Affaires Étrangères, Paris (AAE); Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris (BN); Public Record Office, London (PRO); British Library, London (BL); Bodleian Library, Oxford; Cambridge University Library, Cambridge; Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchiv, Vienna (HHSTA). Hofkammerarchiv, Vienna (HKA); Verwaltungsarchiv, Vienna (Öst.VA); Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Vienna (Öst.NB); Geheimes Staatsarchiv Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Berlin (GHSTA); Niedersächsisches Hauptstaatsarchiv, Hanover; Staatsarchiv Braunschweig, Wolfenbüttel; Herzog-August-Bibliothek, Wolfenbüttel (HAB); Universitätsbibliothek Göttingen; Sächsisches Hauptstaatsarchiv, Dresden; Bayerisches Hauptstaatsarchiv, Munich; Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Munich (BSB).

²⁵ See H.Duchhardt (ed.), *Der Westfälische Friede. Diplomatie - politische Zäsur - kulturelles Umfeld - Rezeptionsgeschichte* (Munich, 1998); J.Siegelberg, K.Schlichte (eds.), *Strukturwandel internationaler Beziehungen. Zum Verhältnis von Staat und internationalem System seit dem Westfälischen Frieden* (Wiesbaden, 2000).

to be the first state to adapt its diplomatic service to the requirements of a European states-system. Complementing a French political and linguistic-cultural hegemony in Europe, in this view, the culture, language and theory of diplomacy – encapsulated in the French term 'parfait ambassadeur' – were shaped by France.²⁶ This assumption, however, has not yet been substantiated in the context of a comparative approach. As this thesis examines transnational discourses and practices, a comparative outlook is indispensable. For this purpose, three states and regions (France, Britain, the Holy Roman Empire) will be given special attention.

Within the restricted scope of a D.Phil thesis, it is too much to attempt drawing a complete picture of the practice and culture of diplomacy in early modern Europe. While this thesis focuses on the viewpoint of diplomatic theorists, and illustrates selected fields of interaction of theory and practice, several aspects could only be touched upon briefly, for example the public image of the diplomat, the relationship between diplomacy and war, and the connections between diplomacy and the emerging consular service. Issues in need of extensive research, such as the mentalities and identities of diplomats, or the patterns of recruitment and career, could only be raised with reference to diplomatic theory. On the other hand, the exact extent and reception of the discussion on the 'diplomat and his function' is hard to assess, given the erratic nature of the source tradition: not all contributions to the debate on the 'ideal diplomat' found their way into print or into archives and libraries, while others may yet lie undiscovered among the mass of diplomatic correspondence.

In five parts, this thesis traces the adjustment of the theory and practice of diplomacy to the new demands of international relations after 1648, enquiring how diplomats themselves perceived and reacted to these changes. In this way, it seeks to assess if reflections on the

²⁶ See the introductory remarks in W.Roosen, 'La Diplomatie du XVIIe siècle - fut-elle française ou européenne?' *RHD*, 93 (1979), 5-15.

diplomat and his functions did indeed form a 'constitutional theory of the states-system', and how far they may have provided a link between the 'Republic of Letters' and the political-diplomatic sphere. In order to examine the complex relationship between the theory and practice of diplomacy in the emerging states-system, the analysis will proceed on five levels. Part I sets the stage by demonstrating that the mid-seventeenth century was regarded as a turning point in the conduct of diplomacy. For theorists of the 'ideal ambassador', the emergence of a states-system became apparent between the congress of Nijmwegen (1676-79) and the Peace of Utrecht (1713/14), finding a first conclusion around the middle of the eighteenth century. Part II examines diplomatic theory as a particular 'language' in its intellectual and socio-professional contexts, in order to assess the extent to which it could mirror the practice of diplomacy and represent a collective ethos of the diplomatic corps. While treatises and tracts on the 'ideal ambassador' build the core of this study, the wider tradition of literature on political and legal theory is taken into account. In Part III, the ways in which diplomacy and diplomats adapted to the new requirements of a European states-system are examined from the viewpoint of diplomatic theory. These ranged from changes in the structural framework of diplomacy to the evolution of international law and ceremonial. Part IV demonstrates that the discourse on the 'ideal ambassador' lay at the heart of a European-wide deliberation on how to increase the 'professionalism' of the diplomatic corps, notably in the area of preparation and training; a deliberation that gained the attention of princes, councillors and diplomats as well as of distinguished *érudits* in the eighteenth century. Finally, part V draws together the findings in a comparative perspective and recasts the alleged model role of France in the evolution of European diplomacy.

Part I. The Framework: Diplomacy in the emerging States-System of Europe

Les divers états de l'Europe sont un tout, dont les parties répondent les unes aux autres, a peu près comme les différentes lignes tirées d'un centre commun à la circonférence, et qu'à les regarder dans ce point de vue, l'Europe est une république générale [...]; tous les membres sont actuellement, ou sont du moins dans l'aptitude d'avoir des liaisons avec tous les autres.

Qu'enfin toutes les puissances de l'Europe font un corps politique, dont les membres travaillent par une union naturelle à la conservation du tout, tant qu'aucune intempérie n'en vienne troubler la bonne intelligence.²⁷

In 1731, Jean Sarraz du Francquesnay characterised the framework of European politics as a 'republic'. In his opinion, 'raison d'état' could no longer be the only guideline in the relations between states who were now so closely interlinked that any alteration in the system would affect every part of the 'political body'. Consequently, the conservation of the overall balance became the highest maxim of foreign policy. This formulation of the 'Balance of Power' still employed the language of the 'respublica christiana'. Yet it also denoted a fundamental change in the framework of international relations: in the view of Francquesnay and his contemporaries, the century following the treaties of 1648 witnessed an intensification of political, commercial and cultural contacts that transformed Europe into a true states-system.²⁸

Theorists of diplomacy perceived a significant transformation in the framework and scope of international relations. While their contemporaries turned to explore the principles of foreign policy, the 'balance of power' and the 'interests of state', writers on the 'ideal

²⁷ J.de la Sarraz du Francquesnay, *Le Ministre public dans les cours étrangères, ses fonctions et ses prérogatives* (Amsterdam, 1731), pp.111-2.

²⁸ On the problematic distinction between 'international system' and 'international society', see E.Luard, *The Balance of Power. The System of International Relations, 1648-1815* (London, 1991), pp.xii-xiii; G.Berridge, 'The Political Theory and Institutional History of States-Systems (review article)', *British Journal of International Studies*, 6 (1980), p.86.

ambassadeur' were interested primarily in the consequences for the function and behaviour of diplomats. The perception of a new era of international relations was the precondition and the justification for changes occurring in the discourse on diplomacy. Therefore, it is necessary to start by outlining the framework of diplomacy in the period following the Peace of 1648.

The seventeenth and eighteenth centuries saw the emergence of an international system that was composed of principalities and republics who were closely intertwined through civilisation, religion, law and political practice, and who were considered to be equal in sovereignty though different in power.²⁹ It had evolved out of an increasing political, commercial and cultural interaction and out of the attempts to balance Europe against the various attempts at hegemony and the 'Bellizität' inherent in the process of state building.³⁰ This process gave rise not only to standing armies, but also to an increasingly dense diplomatic network that was intended to provide information on other territories, to end as well as to prepare wars, to manage the changing coalitions, to negotiate dynastic alliances and peace settlements, and to represent the rank and splendour of princes. During the confessional conflicts of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the 'respublica christiana' was gradually transformed into a system whose actors were emerging as sovereign states with a degree of inner stability that enabled them to develop increasingly efficient and centrally controlled administrative, military and diplomatic services. Between the Peace of Westphalia (1648), the Peace of Utrecht (1713), and the end of the Seven Years' War (1763), historians have anchored the emergence of a multipolar states-system with the Balance of Power as its 'leading category'. Of course, the significance of 1648 needs to be weighed

²⁹ See for example E.Vattel, *Le Droit des gens, ou principes de la loi naturelle, appliqués à la conduite et aux affaires des nations et des souverains* (Leiden, 1758), pp.1, 109-10; A.Heeren, *Handbuch der Geschichte des Europäischen Staatensystems und seiner Colonien [...]*, 4th edn (2 vols., Göttingen, 1822), i, p.vi.

³⁰ J.Burkhardt, 'Die Friedlosigkeit der frühen Neuzeit. Grundlegung einer Theorie der Bellizität Europas', *ZHF*, 24 (1997), 510-74. On the problem of hegemony, see F.Bosbach, *Monarchia Universalis. Ein politischer Leitbegriff der Frühen Neuzeit* (Göttingen, 1988).

against the gradual evolution of multipolar sub-systems and 'systemic' thinking since the late medieval period.³¹ Moreover, the 'leading categories' Heinz Schilling has identified for the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries – confession, tradition, reason of state and dynasty – retained their importance after 1648.³² Nevertheless it still holds true that the negotiations of Münster and Osnabrück, where 167 plenipotentiaries were assembled, marked the beginning of a new era in international relations.³³ Although the Peace of Westphalia did not bring about universal stability and equilibrium, it was referred to as 'fundamental law' both in the context of the Holy Roman Empire and in Europe.³⁴ At the same time as the United Provinces and the Swiss Republic gained full independence, the Empire's estates officially acquired the 'ius armorum' and the 'ius foederis'. This allowed several territories, notably the electorates of Brandenburg(-Prussia), Saxony(-Poland), Bavaria and Hanover, to pursue an independent foreign policy after their recovery from the Thirty Years' War. After the end of the Seven Years' War (1756-63), the circle of sovereign actors was fully defined, and a hierarchy of 'great', secondary and small powers had surfaced.

³¹ See Berg *et al.* (eds.), *Auswärtige Politik im Mittelalter*. For the turn of the seventeenth century, see F.Beiderbeck *et al.* (eds.), *Dimensionen der europäischen Außenpolitik zur Zeit der Wende vom 16. und 17. Jahrhundert* (Berlin, 2003).

³² H.Schilling, 'Formung und Gestalt des internationalen Systems in der werdenden Neuzeit – Phasen und bewegende Kräfte', in P.Krüger (ed.), *Kontinuität und Wandel in der Staatenordnung der Neuzeit* (Marburg, 1991), 19-46. On the concept of the Balance of Power, see A.Strohmeyer, *Theorie der Interaktion. Das europäische Gleichgewicht der Kräfte in der frühen Neuzeit* (Vienna, 1994); M.Bazzoli, *L'Equilibrio di potenza nell'età moderna dal Cinquecento al Congresso di Vienna* (Milan, 1998); M.S.Anderson, 'The Balance of Power', in *idem*, *Rise of Modern Diplomacy*, 149-203. On the dynastic factor, see L.Bély, *La Société des Princes: XVIe - XVIIIe siècle* (Paris, 1999); R.Oresko, H.M.Scott, G.C.Gibbs (eds.), *Royal and Republican Sovereignty in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge, 1997).

³³ Cf. F.Dickmann, *Der Westfälische Friede*, 2nd edn (Münster, 1965).

³⁴ H.Duchhardt, 'Westfälischer Friede und internationales System im Ancien Régime', *Historische Zeitschrift*, 249 (1989), 529-43; *idem*, 'Das Reich in der Mitte des Staatensystems. Zum Verhältnis von innerer Verfassung und internationaler Funktion in den Wandlungen des 17. und 18. Jahrhunderts', in Krüger (ed.), *Das europäische Staatensystem*, 1-10. Cf. K.-H.Ziegler, 'Die Bedeutung des Westfälischen Friedens von 1648 für das europäische Völkerrecht', *Archiv des Völkerrechts*, 37 (1999), 129-52.

In the 1640s, it had become apparent that the arbiter-role of Papacy and Emperor had diminished.³⁵ In the course of the subsequent French attempts at hegemony and the resulting coalition and succession wars, as well as the Turkish advance in the later seventeenth century, and the upheavals in the North until 1721, Austria, Brandenburg-Prussia, Russia and Great Britain emerged as European Powers,³⁶ while rising secondary powers such as Savoy-Piedmont, Saxony, Hanover and Bavaria played significant parts on the international stage at various times. During the mid-eighteenth century wars, the ascent of the 'Great Powers' continued, foreshadowing the pentarchy of the nineteenth century.

A device of international relations used frequently after 1648 was congress diplomacy, leading for example to the treaties of Nijmegen (1679), Rijswijk (1697), Utrecht, Rastatt and Baden (1713-14), to the unsuccessful conferences at Cambray and Soissons in the 1720s, and to the treaties ending the Seven Years' War in Paris and Hubertusburg (1763).³⁷ In this period, a diplomatic 'corps' emerged at the major courts and congresses. At the same time as the right of legation became the exclusive prerogative of sovereigns, the diplomatic hierarchy was differentiated according to various grades of representation – comprising not only the 'legatus' or 'ambassadeur', but also 'envoyés', 'résidents', 'ministres' etc.³⁸

The incorporation of regional systems into a European states-system was mirrored in the spread of resident embassies. In addition to ad-hoc, 'extraordinary' embassies sent on

³⁵ C.Kampmann, *Arbiter und Friedensstiftung. Die Auseinandersetzung um den politischen Schiedsrichter im Europa der Frühen Neuzeit* (Paderborn, 2001).

³⁶ As introduction to this period, see D.McKay, H.M.Scott, *The Rise of the Great Powers 1648-1815* (London, 1983); H.M.Scott, *The Emergence of the Eastern Powers, 1756-1775* (Cambridge, 2001); Black, *European International Relations 1648-1815*; Duchhardt, *Balance of Power*.

³⁷ H.Duchhardt, 'Friedenskongresse im Zeitalter des Absolutismus. Gestaltung und Strukturen', in idem (ed.), *Forschungen und Quellen zur Geschichte des Dreißigjährigen Krieges* (Munich, 1981), 226-39; R.Langhorne, 'The Development of International Conferences, 1648-1830', in M.Donelan (ed.), *The Reason of States. A Study in International Political Theory* (London, 1978), 61-91.

³⁸ As a first introduction, see E.J.Markel, *Die Entwicklung der diplomatischen Rangstufen* (Erlangen, 1951).

specific occasions, from the late fifteenth century resident or 'ordinary' diplomats appeared, who stayed abroad for longer periods to negotiate, to represent, and, above all, to inform their masters.³⁹ The advent of permanent diplomatic representation has been located in the interactions of the Italian peninsula between 1454-94.⁴⁰ During the Habsburg-Bourbon rivalry and the confessional conflicts of the following two centuries, resident diplomacy gradually spread, often with disruptions and delays, across Europe. Diplomacy in the early modern period was dependent on a developing communication and media infrastructure with its postal and courier routes.⁴¹ It was still entwined with other networks appertaining to confessional allegiances, the military and commerce. Furthermore, the 'respublica litteraria' served as basis for international communication and information, contributing to a late-humanistic diplomatic culture.⁴² Ad-hoc embassies and a network of unofficial informants and agents continued to be employed. Yet after the Peace of Westphalia, resident embassies became permanently established in all major European capitals and courts, usually on a reciprocal basis. Already Cardinal Richelieu had realised 'que négociier sans cesse, ouvertement ou secrètement, en tous lieux, encore même qu'on n'en reçoive pas un fruit présent, et que celui qu'on en peut attendre à l'avenir ne soit pas apparent, est chose tout-à-

³⁹ On the development of resident diplomacy, a good overview is presented by Anderson, *Rise of Modern Diplomacy*, pp.1-20. See also O.Krauske, *Die Entwicklung der ständigen Diplomatie* (Leipzig, 1885). The papal diplomatic service constitutes a special case, see R.P.Blet, *Histoire de la représentation diplomatique du Saint-Siège. Des origines à l'aube du XIXe siècle* (Vatican City, 1982).

⁴⁰ See for example E.W.Nelson, 'The Origins of Modern Balance of Power Politics', *Medievalia et Humanistica*, 1 (1943), 124-42. On the question of the first resident ambassadors, see R.Fubini, 'La 'Résidentialité' de l'ambassadeur dans le mythe et dans la réalité: une enquête sur les origines', in L.Bély (ed.), *L'Invention de la diplomatie. Moyen âge - Temps modernes* (Paris, 1998), 27-35.

⁴¹ On the communicational framework, see J.Allen, *Post and Courier Service in the Diplomacy of Early Modern Europe* (The Hague, 1972); W.Behringer, *Im Zeichen des Merkur. Reichspost und Kommunikationsrevolution in der Frühen Neuzeit* (Göttingen, 2003).

⁴² See for example B.Nicollier-de-Weck, *Hubert Languet (1518-1581). Un réseau politique international de Melanchthon à Guillaume d'Orange* (Geneva, 1995); R.Kohlndorfer, *Diplomatie und Gelehrtenrepublik. Die Kontakte des französischen Gesandten Jacques Bongars, 1554-1612* (Berlin, 2006).

fait nécessaire pour le bien des estats'.⁴³ The establishment of permanent diplomatic representation across Europe was no rapid, irreversible or universal process, but was limited by the financial and personal resources of the emerging territorial states, and shaped not only by prestige but also by pragmatism.⁴⁴ All the same, after the Peace of Utrecht a dense network of permanent legations was in place, linking the European states in peacetime, while during wars, diplomatic representation was withdrawn or lowered to intermediary agents, but always remained ready to resume negotiations.

Permanent diplomatic representation was also a barometer for the integration of the eastern neighbours into the 'European' system.⁴⁵ Russia's integration and rise to a Great Power in the period 1695-1763 became apparent in the establishment of resident embassies and in the gradual adaptation to the norms of 'European diplomacy'.⁴⁶ In contrast, the Ottoman Empire did not reciprocate in sending resident embassies until the very end of the Old Regime, although a European diplomatic corps could be found in Constantinople as early as the seventeenth century.⁴⁷

In the development of European international law, the Peace of Westphalia also marked a turning point, although further amplification and clarification was necessary before the 'Droit public de l'Europe' could emerge in the eighteenth-century. This 'European law' evolved from the 'ius gentium' and 'droit des gens' as well as the individual public law of the

⁴³ *Le Testament Politique de Richelieu* [publ.1688], ed. F.Hildesheimer (Paris, 1995), p.33; cf. idem, 'Les Ouvrages de Richelieu à l'épreuve de la critique ou le problème de "l'auteur"', *RHD*, 119 (2005), 207-42; G.Berridge, 'Richelieu', in idem et al. (eds.), *Diplomatic Theory*, 71-87.

⁴⁴ Duchhardt, *Balance of Power*, p.21.

⁴⁵ The diplomatic practice of eastern Europe is still in need of research. On Poland, see for instance M.Servanski, 'La Diplomatie polonaise au dix-septième siècle', in Bély (ed.), *L'Invention de la diplomatie*, 167-75.

⁴⁶ See A.Bohlen, 'Changes in Russian Diplomacy under Peter the Great', *Cahiers du monde russe et soviétique*, 7 (1966), 341-58; M.Schulze-Wessel, 'Systembegriff und Europapolitik der russischen Diplomatie im 18. Jahrhundert', *Historische Zeitschrift*, 266 (1998), 649-69.

⁴⁷ See J.C.Hurewitz, 'Ottoman Diplomacy and the European State System', in Jönsson/Langhorne (eds.), *Diplomacy*, ii, 305-15; G.Berridge, 'Notes on the Origins of the Diplomatic Corps: Constantinople in the 1620s', *Clingendael Discussion Papers in Diplomacy*, 92 (2004), <http://www.clingendael.nl/publications/2004/20040500_cli_paper_dip_issue92.pdf>.

states of Europe and was positivistic in outlook: it sought to assemble the nations' consent, which was manifest in the form of treaties and customs regulating international communication.⁴⁸

Yet, even as sovereignty and legal equality were becoming fundamental principles of the states-system, a hierarchy of rank and precedence existed in the 'société des princes', which corresponded to 'prestige' as well as to political power. The ceremonial honours and precedence accorded to diplomats served not only to make this hierarchy visible, but also as a measure of the temporary political relationship between the system's actors.⁴⁹ The diplomats' interactions took place in a 'representative public sphere' and were interpreted by a European 'public'.⁵⁰ On a larger scale, this occurred first in Münster and Osnabrück, where ceremonial was specifically employed to demarcate the position of states and rulers within the international system; not only in front of the other actors' representatives, but also of a wider public that took an interest in the negotiations and was informed of their conduct, development and outcome by a substantial pamphlet, journal and treatise literature.⁵¹ In the later seventeenth century, diplomacy had become a theme 'à la mode' in newspapers, pamphlets, treatises, memoirs, as well as engravings, paintings, portraits, and maps.⁵²

⁴⁸ H.Duchhardt, 'Droit et Droit des Gens. Structures et métamorphoses des relations internationales au temps de Louis XIV', in Babel (ed.), *Frankreich im europäischen Staatensystem*, 179-90; E.Reibstein, 'Das 'Europäische Öffentliche Recht' 1648-1815', *Archiv des Völkerrechts*, 8 (1959/60), 385-420.

⁴⁹ Duchhardt, *Balance of Power*, p.22; Gantet, *Guerre, paix et construction des états*, p.20.

⁵⁰ Inspired by J.Habermas, *Strukturwandel der Öffentlichkeit* [1961], see A.Gestrich, *Absolutismus und Öffentlichkeit. Politische Kommunikation in Deutschland zu Beginn des 18. Jahrhunderts* (Göttingen, 1994). On diplomatic ceremonial, see Bély, *Société des princes*, ch.xx ('La Question du cérémonial'); J.Paulmann, *Pomp und Politik. Monarchenbegegnungen in Europa zwischen Ancien Regime und Erstem Weltkrieg* (Munich, 2000).

⁵¹ V.Gerhardt, 'Zur historischen Bedeutung des Westfälischen Friedens – Zwölf Thesen', in K.Bußmann, H.Schilling (eds.), *1648 - Krieg und Friede in Europa* (Münster, 1998), i, 485-89; A.Stiglic, 'Zeremoniell und Rangordnung auf der europäischen diplomatischen Bühne am Beispiel der Gesandteneinzüge in die Kongreß-Stadt Münster', in *ibid.*, 391-6.

⁵² See for example: *Diarium Europaeum [...]* (Frankfurt, 1659-83); *Theatrum Europaeum [...]* (Frankfurt, 1635-1738); *Mercure historique et politique, contenant l'état présent de l'Europe* (The Hague, 1686-1782). On diplomacy in the arts, a thesis is being prepared by D.Linnemann, *Das europäische Gesandtschaftswesen des 17. Jahrhunderts im Bild* (Münster).

In response to the growing interdependence of European politics, new academic disciplines emerged from the late seventeenth century, becoming established at German universities in the mid-eighteenth century. Those engaged in the discipline of the 'state science' were not only defining the changing structure of the Empire and providing a practical administrative science ('cameral sciences') for the new territorial states, but also sought to document the actual situation and relations of states in the European system. They examined the history, the geographical position, the demography, military and financial-economic strength of the European states, as well as their foreign policy and interests.⁵³

Furthermore, against the background of the French attempt at hegemony, from the late seventeenth century onwards a growing literature emerged on the Balance of Power, which replaced the concept of the 'respublica christiana' with the secular terms 'interest', 'system' and 'balance'. In addition, the literature on the 'Droit des Gens' added to the idea of Europe as a political, legal and cultural unity.⁵⁴ Marriages, alliances, wars, and peace treaties were expressions of the complex relationship between the ruling dynasties of Europe, and diplomats became main actors in the 'theatrum Europaeum'. Their names, sayings, memoirs, as well as parts of their correspondence, were disclosed in print.⁵⁵ Among the numerous publications of treaties, diplomatic documents and the diplomatic customs, the two most

⁵³ See H.E.Bödeker, 'Europe' in the Discourse of the Sciences of State in 18th Century Germany', *Cromohs*, 8 (2003), <http://www.cromohs.unifi.it/8_2003/bodeker.html>. The standard work remains H.Klueting, *Die Lehre von der Macht der Staaten. Das außenpolitische Machtproblem in der "politischen Wissenschaft" und in der praktischen Politik im 18. Jahrhundert* (Berlin, 1986).

⁵⁴ See H.Mohnhaupt, 'Europa' und 'jus publicum' im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert', in C.Bergfeld *et al.* (eds.), *Aspekte europäischer Rechtsgeschichte [...]* (Frankfurt, 1982), 207-32.

⁵⁵ For example: *Recueil de diverses relations rémarquables des principales cours de l'Europe. Écrites pour la plupart, par des ambassadeurs [...]* (Cologne, 1681); *Tablettes de tous les ministres publics des cours souveraines de l'Europe, avec leurs titres, noms, fonctions et adresses. Pour l'année 1731* (Amsterdam, 1731).

ambitious projects of the early eighteenth century were Dumont's 'Corps universel diplomatique', and Faber's 'Europäische Staats-Cantzley'.⁵⁶

As Europe developed into a political meta-framework and a 'communicative space', it was also increasingly perceived and constructed as a cultural unity, resulting in the emergence of a 'European consciousness' in the later seventeenth century.⁵⁷ Eighteenth-century 'philosophes' took up the concept of the 'corpus Europaeum' or 'republic' composed of independent but intertwined political entities, and contributed 'peace projects' for the continent.⁵⁸ 'European' identity was constituted also in demarcation to 'the other'. The Ottoman threat in the seventeenth century led to a renaissance of the 'universitas christianitas' concept, before the treaty of Carlowitz (1699) launched the gradual inclusion of the Ottoman Empire in international law.⁵⁹ Against a background of increasing interaction with the outer-European world, especially in commercial and cultural contexts, Europe and the non-European world were yet still regarded as two different international systems.⁶⁰

In several ways, the systems approach adopted by recent scholarship has contributed to a better understanding of the early modern states-system as a 'communicative framework' constituted by continuous interaction as well as by 'understandings, assumptions, learned skills

⁵⁶ J.Dumont, *Corps universel diplomatique du droit des gens; contenant un recueil des traitez d'alliance, de paix, de treve, de neutralité, de commerce [...]* (8 vols., Amsterdam, 1726-31), with five *Supplements* by J.Rousset de Missy, of which the *Cérémonial Diplomatique des Cours de l'Europe* forms vols. 4 and 5 (Amsterdam, 1739). A.Faber et al., *Europäische Staats-Cantzley [...]* (115 vols., Frankfurt etc., 1697-1760).

⁵⁷ See W.Schmale (ed.), *Studien zur europäischen Identität im 17. Jahrhundert* (Bochum, 2004); K.Bußmann, E.A.Werner (eds.), *Europa im 17. Jahrhundert. Ein politischer Mythos und seine Bilder* (Stuttgart, 2004). Cf. R.Pommerin, 'Stehende Diplomatie und Mächtesystem: Internationale Beziehungen im Ancien Régime', *Neues Archiv für sächsische Geschichte*, 67 (1996), 323-34.

⁵⁸ V.Steinkamp, *L'Europe éclairée. Das Europa-Bild der französischen Aufklärung* (Frankfurt, 2003); K.Malettke, 'Europabewußtsein und europäische Friedenspläne im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert', *Francia*, 21 (1994), 63-94.

⁵⁹ In general, see G.Heiss, G.Klingenstein (eds.), *Das Osmanische Reich und Europa 1683 bis 1788: Konflikt, Entspannung und Austausch* (Vienna, 1983).

⁶⁰ See for example H.Steiger, 'Recht zwischen Europa und Asien im 16. und 17. Jahrhundert?' in Bußmann/Werner (eds.), *Europa im 17. Jahrhundert*, 95-118. Cf. Kleinschmidt, *Geschichte der Internationalen Beziehungen*.

and responses, rules, norms, procedures, etc., which agents acquire and use in pursuing their individual divergent aims within the framework of a shared practice'.⁶¹ In this regard, particular importance must be attached to the aspect of perception, since the system existed first and foremost 'in the minds of the respective actors'.⁶²

Diplomacy played a crucial role in the states-system: not only did it provide a communicative infrastructure and a sophisticated system of continuous interaction; it also constituted part of a common political culture that comprised diplomatic practice, legal and ceremonial norms. Furthermore, diplomacy possessed a performative quality, as the inner hierarchy and the relations between the system's actors were made visible by the interactions of diplomats.⁶³ In this regard, the concepts and norms of diplomacy deserve further attention, as well as the perceptions of the diplomats themselves. How did they observe the emergence of a system in the crucial period between 1648 and the mid-eighteenth century, and which conclusions did they draw for the diplomat's task? For the emergence of a states-system also transformed the task and outlook of diplomats, who had to reside abroad for longer periods of time, and think and act in a wider framework that began to encompass the whole of 'Europe'.

This transformation was first perceived by theorists of diplomacy around the congress of Nijmegen (1676-79). The Dutch-born diplomatist Abraham de Wicquefort, who claimed to have witnessed the negotiations of Münster and Osnabrück himself, identified substantial changes in the conduct of diplomacy, which emanated from a 'new era' of international relations since the Thirty Years' War.⁶⁴ In 1716, the French treatise of François de Callières stated that

⁶¹ P.Schroeder, *The Transformation of European Politics, 1763-1848* (Cambridge, 1994), p.xii. See also Krüger, 'Internationale Systeme als Forschungsaufgabe', in idem (ed.), *Kontinuität und Wandel*, p.10.

⁶² Kleinschmidt, *Geschichte der Internationalen Beziehungen*, p.11. Cf. S.S.Tschopp, 'Das Unsichtbare begreifen. Die Rekonstruktion historischer Wahrnehmungsmodi als methodische Herausforderung der Kulturgeschichte', *Historische Zeitschrift*, 280 (2005), 39-82.

⁶³ Bély, *Espions et ambassadeurs*, pp.374-5, 747-8. Cf. J.Martschukat, S.Patzold, *Geschichtswissenschaft und 'Performative Turn'. Ritual, Inszenierung und Performanz vom Mittelalter bis zur Neuzeit* (Cologne, 2003).

⁶⁴ A.de Wicquefort, *L'Ambassadeur et ses fonctions* (2 vols., The Hague, 1680/81).

Richelieu's diplomacy had been the 'premier mobile' for the spread of alliances and constant negotiations across Europe, which heralded the advent of a new epoch of diplomacy.⁶⁵ In the same way, the French 'premier commis' Pecquet regarded the transition from an ad-hoc to a permanent 'négociation universelle' as fundamental change, while the French 'philosophe' and diplomatic secretary Mably in 1757 agreed that the mid-seventeenth century had been a watershed for the conduct of diplomacy and the emergence of a European system.⁶⁶ Finally, from the perspective of 1760, the Prussian diplomat Jacob von Bielfeld stressed the connection between resident diplomacy and the states-system: through diplomacy, each state would 'tienne immédiatement au système de l'Europe, c'est-à-dire, qu'il soit en connexion avec toutes les autres puissances, qu'il entretienne partout des ministres, et que ses négociations lui donnent une influence dans toutes les grandes affaires'.⁶⁷ While Wicquefort had already perceived a transformation of international relations, Callières was the first theorist to relate the growing interconnectedness between the states of Europe to the idea of an international system.

Tous les états dont l'Europe est composée ont entr'eux des liaisons et des commerces nécessaires qui font qu'on peut les regarder comme des membres d'une même république [...]. Ces liaisons et ces dépendances nécessaires qui se trouvent entre ces différents états obligent les souverains et ceux qui gouvernent d'y entretenir sans cesse des négociations pour découvrir tout ce qui s'y passe.⁶⁸

The language used by diplomatic theorists such as Callières or Francquesnay to describe the states-system derived from the traditional language of the 'respublica christiana'. At the same time, the mechanistic model of the system focusing on the Balance of Power was already recognisable, and, a few decades later, the 'theory of diplomacy' had joined with the 'interests

⁶⁵ F.de Callières, *De la manière de négocier avec des souverains* (Paris, 1716), pp.12-4. It is probable that this treatise was already written in 1697, see footnote 121.

⁶⁶ G.B.de Mably, *Des Principes des négociations pour servir d'introduction au Droit public de l'Europe: fondé sur les traités* (Amsterdam, 1757), p.10; A.Pecquet, *Discours sur l'art de négocier* (Paris, 1737), pp.xv-xvi.

⁶⁷ J.v.Bielfeld, *Institutions politiques* (2 vols., The Hague, 1760), ii, p.80.

⁶⁸ Callières, *De la manière*, p.8. Similarly, Francquesnay, *Ministre public*, pp.111-2, quoted above.

of states' and the 'droit public de l'Europe' in order to align the principles of negotiation with the European states-system.⁶⁹

The emergence of a states-system altered the function of diplomacy in the perception of the theorists of diplomacy. They justified reciprocal and continuous diplomatic representation from the necessity of communication and negotiation within the society of states. The concrete functions of diplomacy should serve a higher objective: since the medieval period, theorists had propagated its purpose as furthering peace and 'bonne correspondance' in the 'respublica christiana', and compared diplomats to angels, the heavenly messengers.⁷⁰ Although this claim continued to be applied, diplomacy had become an instrument of reason of state, and the diplomat had to be both a 'messenger du paix' and an 'espion honourable', had to 'negotiate his own affairs' and 'discover those of others'.⁷¹ Yet even as they perceived the emergence of a states-system, theorists employed the traditional language in order to assert that, more than ever, diplomacy served a goal beyond the individual interest of a state: to up-hold the overall balance and 'bonne foi' of the states-system.

Even if French theorists regarded Richelieu's politics as crucial for the emergence of a states-system, they agreed with Wicquefort on the importance of the Westphalian negotiations for the evolution of diplomacy, especially with regard to international law and ceremonial. The congress of Westphalia 'a donné un nouveau jour à plusieurs matières relatives au droit des

⁶⁹ For example in Mably, *Principes des négociations*, pp.15, 23-7; L.de Nourar, *Le Ministère du négociateur* (Amsterdam, 1763), p.xxi; but see already Franquesnay, *Ministre public*, p.232. Cf. B.Stollberg-Rillinger, *Der Staat als Maschine. Zur politischen Metaphorik des absoluten Fürstenstaats* (Berlin, 1986).

⁷⁰ See for example J.A.de Vera y Figueroa, *Le Parfait ambassadeur* [1620], 3rd edn of the French transl. of 1635 (Leiden, 1709), pp.28-9 and 145-7. On this aspect, cf. D.Ménager, *Diplomatie et théologie à la Renaissance* (Paris, 2001).

⁷¹ Callières, *De la manière*, p.85. See footnote 209.

gens, [...] et servi de modèle pour régler le cérémonial relatif à la dignité'.⁷² In the complex negotiations of Münster and Osnabrück, the 'janus-face' of diplomatic ceremonial had made its public entrance. The emergence of the states-system was accompanied by an unprecedented number of conflicts about ceremonial honours which required regulation and standardisation. In terms of congress diplomacy, the first step towards a regulation had been taken in Westphalia.⁷³

Although they regarded 1648 as the decisive moment in the evolution of international law and diplomatic ranks and ceremonial, theorists of diplomacy were aware that the process of standardisation was still underway in the later seventeenth century. Only after the Peace of Utrecht (1713) and the death of Louis XIV (1715) theorists established a direct correlation between the system of states, resident diplomacy and a 'European' diplomatic practice. Yet, the concept of 'Europe' and the borders of the 'states-system' were not static. The gradual incorporation of Russia, for example, could be traced in diplomatic theory with regard to the adaptation to European diplomatic practice. While the German writer Hoevelen in 1679 still regarded Poland, Muscovy and the Ottoman Empire as 'barbarians', Wicquefort already included them in his list of diplomatic customs, although he did not see them as fully incorporated into the European system; a development that was only gradually acknowledged by theorists in the eighteenth century.⁷⁴

⁷² F.C.v. Moser, *L'Ambassadrice et ses droits* (Berlin, 1754) p.11; Wicquefort, *L'Ambassadeur*, i, p.100. In this way, also F.C.v.Schmid, 'Der Gesandte', in idem, *Mundus christiano-bavaro-politicus*, iv (c.1711), fo.3. For the later eighteenth century, see also C.G.Ahnert, *Lehrbegriff der Wissenschaften, Erfordernisse und Recht der Gesandten* (2 vols., Dresden, 1784), i, p.17: 'Erst seit dem Westphälischen Friedens-Kongreß ist das Gesandtschaftswerk seiner jetzigen Gestalt näher gekommen.'

⁷³ See for example Callières, *De la manière*, p.243. Similarly, Bielfeld, *Institutions politiques*, ii, p.151; C.v.Martens, *Manuel diplomatique, ou précis des droits et des fonctions des agents diplomatiques* (Paris, 1822), p.89.

⁷⁴ C.v.Hoevelen, *Candorins vollkommener Teutsche Gesandte: Nach allen dessen genauesten Eigenschaften [...]* (Frankfurt, 1679), p.82; Wicquefort, *L'Ambassadeur*, i, pp.33-4. On p.475, however, he still applied the word 'barbares' to the Muscovites.

So far, the perspective of diplomatic theory corresponds to the findings of historiography, both with regard to a perceived transformation in the middle of the seventeenth century and with regard to the first formulation of a states-system and its principles around the time of the Peace of Utrecht. From the viewpoint of the theorists, the system appeared to be constituted chiefly by diplomacy with its network of continuous representation and a shared 'language' consisting of acknowledged practices of representation, diplomatic law and ceremonial. Seeking to raise a public awareness of the diplomat's function, these authors propagated the notion that resident diplomacy had become the best and principal means to conduct international communications, to balance the states' interests and to uphold the equilibrium of power in the system. In this context, they stressed the increased responsibility of diplomats since the Peace of Westphalia. With prolonged residence abroad, the conduct of envoys became more important, as they were forced to consider possible repercussions of their actions in a wider framework of European politics. Their behaviour became ever more significant for the interests and well being of states: 'Le salut des nations est entre les mains des ambassadeurs. Leurs desseins maintiennent le calme, ou soufflet le trouble'.⁷⁵ Callières argued that 'la fortune des plus grands états dépend souvent de la bonne ou de la mauvaise conduite et du degré de capacité des négociateurs qu'on y employe'.⁷⁶ Theorists deemed that, through the art of negotiation, diplomats could manage the 'affaires publiques' and maintain the balance of Europe. On the other hand, this idea also implied that diplomats exerted a monopoly on the conduct of international relations; theorists portrayed diplomacy as a self-contained world characterised by a homogenous social and cultural outlook. In 1751, Mably informed the readers of his *Principes des Négociations* that

⁷⁵ Nourar, *Le Ministère du négociateur*, p.xiv.

⁷⁶ Callières, *De la manière*, pp.1-2.

'tout l'Europe se connaît', referring to the network of diplomatic representatives residing at the various European courts, which now constituted a central pillar of the states-system.⁷⁷

From the perception of a transformation in the framework of international relations, theorists of diplomacy went further to identify the consequences for the diplomats' task and outlook. The emergence of a states-system placed unprecedented demands not only on the decision-makers of foreign policy, but also on the diplomatic apparatus, forcing it to align to a continuous and European-wide negotiation. How were these changes portrayed in the 'theory of diplomacy'?

⁷⁷ Mably, *Principes des négociations*, p.68.

Part II. The 'Ideal Ambassador'. A Theory of Early Modern Diplomacy

Episode 1. The 'Honnête Espion' – Abraham de Wicquefort

In 1675, a court case that had arrested the public attention of Europe came to a close: in the Dutch Republic, Abraham de Wicquefort was sentenced to life-long imprisonment; his goods and papers were confiscated.⁷⁸ The Dutch-born diplomat and agent of several princes had committed treason by passing on Dutch secrets of state to various recipients in Europe. In prison, Wicquefort, 'le ministre prisonnier', set down to write the *Mémoires touchant les ambassadeurs et les ministres publics*, which were published in 1676, and four years later turned into the famous treatise *L'Ambassadeur et ses fonctions*. In the meantime, Wicquefort had escaped from prison and found exile in Luneburg-Celle, where he died in 1682.

The author of the treatise heralded as the 'greatest manual on diplomatic practice' and the 'livre de chevet des diplomates sous l'ancien régime'⁷⁹ had led an adventurous life as diplomat, spy, érudit and newsbroker. Born into an Amsterdam bourgeois family in 1606, Wicquefort had studied law in Leiden before he moved to Paris.⁸⁰ Without an income of his own, he earned his livelihood by taking up low-ranking diplomatic employments in the service of various German princes, among them the Elector of Brandenburg and the Duke of Brunswick-Wolfenbüttel. In 1659, however, after a spell in the Bastille, Wicquefort was

⁷⁸ See D.Everwijn, *Abraham von Wicquefort en zijn proces* (Leyden, 1857). No comprehensive biography on Wicquefort exists. See the older studies of C.Rennert, *Abraham de Wicquefort, 1606-1682* (Halle, 1880); A.Waddington, 'Abraham de Wicquefort, ministre de Brandebourg en France en temps de Louis XIV', *Séances et Travaux de l'Académie des Sciences Morales et Politiques*, 58 (1902), 510-37.

⁷⁹ Berridge, 'Introduction', in idem *et al.* (eds.), *Diplomatic Theory*, p.7; P.Amigué, *L'Age d'or de la diplomatie* (Paris, 1963), p.303.

⁸⁰ On his family, see P.-F.Burger, 'Res Angusta Domi. Les Wicquefort et leurs métiers bien délicats entre Paris, Amsterdam et Paris', *Francia*, 27 (2000), 25-58.

forced to leave France, having affronted Mazarin with indiscrete comments.⁸¹ After moving to The Hague, where he enjoyed the patronage of De Witt, Wicquefort continued to occupy minor diplomatic posts for German princes and provided several foreign princes, ministers and diplomats with gazettes and secret news.⁸² For this business, he was finally convicted by the United Provinces, who argued that he was still subject to their jurisdiction. In his defence, Wicquefort began to compose a treatise on actual diplomatic practice under the law of nations that also protected the lower diplomatic ranks.

Wicquefort's life story reveals how closely diplomacy, news-gathering and scholarship were entwined in the seventeenth century. In choosing international affairs and negotiation as a profession, he embodied not only the 'honnête espion' that had come to be synonymous with the diplomat, but also the 'diplomate érudit' and cosmopolitan member of the 'respublica litteraria'. His publications included an account of the 'Fronde', a history of the Dutch Republic, and a translation of travel memoirs from Persia. Wicquefort's contribution to diplomatic theory has been regarded as crucial.⁸³ Only Callières' *De la manière de négocier avec des souverains* would surpass his encyclopaedic compendium of diplomatic practice, being a more rational and elegant synthesis that constituted a true negotiation theory.⁸⁴

⁸¹ See *Archives de la Bastille. Documents inédits recueillis. Règne de Louis XIV, 1659-1661*, ed. F.Ravaisson (Paris, 1866), pp.173-4. However, Wicquefort later received a small pension from Mazarin for providing him with news from The Hague, see Burger, 'Les Wicquefort', p.40. See also C.F.Haje, *De geheime correspondentie van Abraham de Wicquefort met den franschen minister De Lionne* (Gravenhagen, 1901).

⁸² Wicquefort's clients included Brunswick, Brandenburg, Sweden, Denmark, and Poland, as well as W.Temple, Lionne, and d'Estrades. For August of Brunswick's library, he also purchased and copied numerous books; cf. R.Mandrou, 'Abraham de Wicquefort et le Duc August 1646-1653: Sur les relations intellectuelles entre France et Allemagne, un siècle avant les Lumières', *Wolfenbütteler Beiträge*, 3 (1978), 191-233.

⁸³ Keens-Soper, 'Wicquefort', in Berridge *et al.* (eds.), *Diplomatic Theory*, p.92; cf. idem, 'Abraham de Wicquefort and Diplomatic Theory', *Diplomacy and Statecraft*, 8 (1997), 16-29; M.Bazzoli, 'L'Ideologia dell'ambasciatore nel tardo Seicento: L'Ambassadeur et ses fonctions di Abraham de Wicquefort', in G.Borrelli (ed.), *Prudenza civile, bene comune, guerra giusta. Percorsi della ragion di stato tra Seicento e Settecento* (Naples, 1999), 203-20.

⁸⁴ Keens-Soper, 'Callières and Diplomatic Theory', *Historical Journal*, 16 (1973), pp.507-8; A.Lempereur, 'Aux sources des théories de la négociation: L'oeuvre fondatrice de François de Callières', in idem (ed.), *François de Callières*, p.16.

In the century following the Peace of Westphalia, a substantial transformation occurred in the way diplomacy was considered. The treatises of Wicquefort and Callières were the twin beacons of this development. At the same time, their treatises stood in a wider context and tradition than has hitherto been held. The subsequent section will show that, although diplomatic theory was characterised by strong continuity in the language and methods it employed, it reacted to changes in the practice of diplomacy, adapting the 'ideal ambassador' to the new demands of the states-system.

II.1 The 'Ideal Ambassador' and the *respublica litteraria*: the Intellectual

Context of Diplomatic Theory

To write on the diplomat's functions in the century following the Peace of Westphalia meant to comply with the traditions of a genre well-established since the late fifteenth century; a genre that had developed its own literary and semantic traditions, but that was also influenced by its intellectual and literary environment. So far, scholarship has failed to embed treatises on the 'ideal ambassador' in a wider context.⁸⁵ This framework consisted of three levels: the discourse on the 'ideal ambassador'; related genres and literature touching on diplomacy; and, finally, the general literary and intellectual background of the *respublica litteraria*.

Diplomatic Theory between Political Ethics and Jurisprudence

With the spread of resident embassies since the fifteenth century, the diplomat's function became the subject of a particular genre of writings on the 'legatus' or 'ideal ambassador'

⁸⁵ A first attempt to relate the genre to wider intellectual trends has been made by M. Bazzoli, 'Ragion di stato e interesse degli stati. La trattatistica sull'ambasciatore dal XV al XVIII secolo', *Nuovo Rivista Storica*, 86 (2002), 283-328, albeit with a restricted focus. Cf. D. Frigo, 'Corte, onore e ragion di stato'.

which focused exclusively on the personnel, practices and norms of diplomacy, thus forming the kernel of an early modern 'diplomatic theory'.⁸⁶ Written reflections on the diplomat could take the form of distinct publications on the 'ideal ambassador', or of chapters within larger compendia of political theory. Furthermore, they encompassed short and more informal instructions not intended for publication but for the benefit of individual diplomats. In contrast to official diplomatic instructions, these tracts sought to describe the function and behaviour of the ambassador in a general and universal manner, independent from a particular mission. In addition, some works did not include specific chapters on diplomacy but nevertheless addressed their remarks to a target group that comprised diplomats. Consequently, reflections on diplomacy need to be distinguished according to their context in the *respublica litteraria*: were they intended for publication? Who were the authors and the target groups? Did the reflections focus exclusively on the diplomat, or treat him as sub-function of the 'aulicus politicus'? Did they assume the diplomats' viewpoint or that of the decision-makers of foreign policy?

Diplomatic theory was never institutionalised in the form of an academic and taught discipline, but was discussed within and through the means of the *respublica litteraria*. The discourse on the diplomat and his functions was part of a wider process of reflection which endeavoured to rationalise the increasing complexity of international relations, and which involved political theorists and philosophers, canonists, jurists and historians as well as princes, statesmen and councillors. The intellectual and literary infrastructure for reflections

⁸⁶ Until the late eighteenth century, the generic terms for 'diplomat' were 'legatus' or 'ambassador', as well as 'ministre public' and 'négociateur'. Cf. Part III. In this thesis, 'theory' denotes a systematic framework that is characterised by certain forms of organisation, argumentation and causation. 'Discourse' describes a sequence of statements or 'paroles' on a particular topic, typified by a conformity of subject, form, and 'language' (a set of vocabulary, metaphors and topoi). Cf. J.G.Pocock, 'The Concept of a Language and the métier d'historien: Some Considerations on Practice', in A.Pagden (ed.), *The Languages of Political Theory in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge, 1990), 19-38.

upon international relations and diplomacy in the early modern period was constituted by political philosophy and jurisprudence.

The legal framework of international relations had already been considered by medieval canonists, but only achieved a more prominent role in the 'Law of Nations' that emanated from the late-medieval reception and adaptation of Roman law and an ever-more elaborate conception of natural law.⁸⁷ Two aspects of diplomacy were considered in jurisprudence: the right to send diplomats ('ius legationis'); and the legal standing of diplomats, their immunities and exemptions. Several prominent writers on the 'droit des gens' included extensive sections on diplomacy, among them Gentili, Grotius, Bynkershoek and Vattel.⁸⁸ In the eighteenth century, the division between natural law and positivistic law was overcome in favour of an integrated approach that sought to define the legal framework of Europe in the form of a 'droit public de l'Europe'.⁸⁹ Based on norms erected by reason and with reference to authorities, customs and precedents, international law influenced the methodology of the 'ideal ambassador' genre, which always included sections on diplomatic law. The link between diplomatic theory and jurisprudence becomes all the more apparent in the bulk of small Latin academic disputations and dissertations on the 'Legatus', which formed a sub-discourse of international law and were produced in great number at the universities, especially in the Empire.⁹⁰ Still influenced by the scholastic method and based

⁸⁷ As an introduction, see W.Grewe, *Epochen der Völkerrechtsgeschichte* (Baden-Baden, 1984); W.Janssen, *Die Anfänge des modernen Völkerrechts in der neuzeitlichen Diplomatie* (Stuttgart, 1965); L. and M.Frey, *The History of Diplomatic Immunity* (Columbus, 1998).

⁸⁸ A.Gentili, *De legationibus libri tres* (London, 1585); H.Grotius, *De iure belli ac pacis* (Paris, 1625); C.v.Bynkershoek, *De foro legatorum [...]* (Leiden, 1721); Vattel, *Le Droit des gens*.

⁸⁹ See for example G.de Mably, *Le Droit public de l'Europe fondé sur les traités depuis la paix de Westphalie* (The Hague, 1746); J.J.Moser, *Grundsätze des jetzt üblichen europäischen Völkerrechts in Friedenszeiten* (Hanau, 1750); G.v.Martens, *Versuch über die Existenz eines positiven Europäischen Völkerrechts [...]* (Göttingen, 1787).

⁹⁰ There exists no study on the 'legatus' dissertations which were usually published under the name of the examining professor, and amounted to several hundreds between 1648 and 1763. Some examples can be found in F.Ranieri, *Juristische Dissertationen deutscher Universitäten im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert* (2 vols., Frankfurt, 1986); Grabar, *De legatorum iure*.

on quotations from authorities, these writings considered diplomatic law and recurrently cited theorists of diplomacy.

Apart from the diplomats' functions and legal standing, his virtues and behaviour constituted the main field of interest for reflections upon diplomacy. Seventeenth-century political theory still remained in the tradition of Aristotelian ethics and scholastic learning, and was essentially a 'practical philosophy' that generated a set of norms for the ethical behaviour of the ruling elites.⁹¹ For the strands of political as well as diplomatic theory, the 'mirrors of princes' served as starting-point by depicting an ideal-type of the ruler and his virtues.⁹² As representative of a prince, the diplomat was ascribed a part of these qualities. On the other hand, political theory treated diplomacy not as a distinct office but as a sub-function of the councillor, statesman and courtier. Accompanying the emergence of the territorial and bureaucratic state, the 'art of government' became a topic of increasing interest in the seventeenth century, as the growing number of treatises on governance, on 'political prudence', and on the 'politicus', the councillor and the minister of state illustrate. These treatises featured ethical and normative theories as well as practical advice on the administration and the conduct of politics. Although their focus lay in domestic politics, sections on alliances, war and diplomacy became more detailed.⁹³ Some seventeenth-century treatises began to include chapters on the diplomat and his functions modelled on the 'ideal

⁹¹ On the background, see M.Viroli, *From Politics to Reason of State: the Acquisition and Transformation of the Language of Politics, 1250-1600* (Cambridge, 1992); M.Scattola, *Dalla virtù alla scienza: la fondazione e la trasformazione della disciplina politica nell'età moderna* (Mailand, 2003); J.H.Burns (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Political Thought, 1450-1700* (Cambridge, 1991).

⁹² As good overview, see H.-O.Mühleisen, T.Stammen (eds.), *Politische Tugendlehre. Studien zum Fürstenspiegel der Frühen Neuzeit* (Tübingen, 1990). The model function of this genre for Renaissance diplomatic theory is underlined by O.Chaline, 'L'Ambassadeur selon les casuistes', in Bély (ed.), *L'Invention de la diplomatie*, pp.59-60.

⁹³ For the early seventeenth century, see for example G.Schönborner, *Libri VII politicorum [...]* (Leipzig 1614), chs.xxvii-xxix; A.Contzen, *Libri X politicorum [...]*, 2nd edn (Cologne, 1629), lib.vii, chs.33-37; C.Scribani, *Politicus christianus [...]* (Münster, 1625), ch.xxvi. Cf. Weber, *Prudentia gubernatoria*.

ambassador' genre.⁹⁴ Apart from treatises focusing on the instruments and personnel of government, early modern political theory comprised publications on political prudence, which increasingly included diplomacy in their remarks on adroit behaviour.⁹⁵

In the century following the Peace of Westphalia, political theory underwent a substantial transformation that would provide a new methodological framework for reflections on domestic and foreign politics. Seventeenth-century political theory centred on ethics and the theory of prudence, and reflected, under the influence of the reason of state, on the instruments of politics and their practical application between the poles of 'honestum' and 'utile'. At the end of the century, influenced by a more secular outlook and the 'Scientific Revolution', political theory developed into a 'science' that was aligned to the nature and requirements of the modern state, based on an empirical analysis of the states' present situation.⁹⁶ 'Sciences of state', 'Kabinettswissenschaft' and 'science du gouvernement' were terms for a constellation of new academic disciplines which evolved first at the Empire's 'reform universities' such as Halle and Göttingen. Around the mid-eighteenth century, the 'state science' comprised 'cameral sciences', the 'droit public' of the Empire and Europe, a pragmatic political prudence and ethics of decorous behaviour, and, finally, 'statistics' or 'Staatenkunde'. The foreign dimension of politics was most present in the 'droit des gens', the 'droit public de l'Europe', and the 'statistics', which sought to depict the states' relative power and interests by conducting a comparative analysis of their history, geopolitical situation,

⁹⁴ For example, J.Silhon, *Le Ministre d'état, avec le véritable usage de la politique moderne* (Paris, 1631); P.de Béthune, *Le Conseiller d'estat [...]* (Paris, 1632), repr. as *Diverses observations et maximes politiques [...]* (Paris, 1667); C.M.Grottnitz v.Grodnow, *Teutsch-gekleideter Regiments-Rath* (Stettin, 1647); J.Gailhard, *Concerning the Statesman, Or Him who is in Publick Employments [...]* (London, 1681).

⁹⁵ To name but two examples: C.Weise, *Politische Fragen, das ist: Gründliche Nachricht von der Politica [...]* (Dresden, 1696); N.H.Gundling, *Einleitung zur wahren Staatsklugheit [...]* (Frankfurt, 1751).

⁹⁶ See R.Stichweh, *Der frühmoderne Staat und die europäische Universität. Zur Interaktion von Politik und Erziehungssystem im Prozeß ihrer Ausdifferenzierung, 16.-18. Jahrhundert* (Frankfurt, 1991); H.E.Bödeker, 'Das staatswissenschaftliche. Fächersystem im 18. Jahrhundert', in R.Vierhaus (ed.), *Wissenschaften im Zeitalter der Aufklärung* (Göttingen, 1985), 143-62; J.Brückner, *Staatswissenschaften, Kameralismus und Naturrecht. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der politischen Wissenschaft im Deutschland des späten 17. und des frühen 18. Jahrhunderts* (Munich, 1977).

economic, demographic and military resources, as well as their foreign policy interests.⁹⁷

This 'science' was regarded as the basis for the 'Balance of Power' in the states-system. As a result, in the eighteenth century diplomatic theory would either be combined with the 'interests of state' and the 'droit public' or incorporated into manuals on state science by authors such as the Prussian diplomat Jacob von Bielfeld. His *Institutions politiques* featured an entire volume on foreign policy.⁹⁸

Apart from state science and political ethics, another literary field was of considerable importance to the development of diplomatic theory: the writings on courtly behaviour, which encompassed treatises on the courtier ('aulicus'), the 'honnête homme', and the forms of civility. Since Castiglione's *Cortegiano* (1582), this literature prescribed forms and norms of behaviour for the noble courtier and politician, which were, of course, also crucial for the diplomat in the 'société des princes'.⁹⁹ While the 'art of the courtier' had gradually developed into a central part of the nobleman's education and socialisation, from the turn of the eighteenth century the 'homme du monde' and 'honnête homme' became universal models for behaviour and 'decorum'.¹⁰⁰ The literature on the courtier overlapped with writings on the education of the aristocracy, which began to include chapters on the functions and qualities

⁹⁷ The place of foreign policy in the 'state science' awaits further investigation. See Klueting, *Die Lehre von der Macht der Staaten*. Cf. J.Stagl, M.Rassem (eds.), *Statistik und Staatsbeschreibung in der Neuzeit: vornehmlich im 16.-18. Jahrhundert* (Paderborn, 1980).

⁹⁸ Bielfeld, *Institutions politiques* (2 vols., The Hague, 1760, vol.3 Leiden, 1772), with several editions and translations into German, Spanish, English and Russian. See also G.de Réal, *La Science du Gouvernement [...]* (8 vols., Paris 1762-4).

⁹⁹ See for example E.Refuge, *Traité de la cour, ou instruction des courtisans*, 2nd edn (Paris, 1622 [1616]), transl. as *A Treatise of the Court or Instructions for Courtiers* (London, 1622); coupled with Walsingham's memoirs as *Arcana aulica, or, Walsingham's Manual of Prudential Maxims, for the States-man and Courtier* (London, 1652), repr. as *The Compleat Ambassador [...]*, ed. D.Digges (London, 1655). As introduction to this literature, see E.Bury, *Littérature et politesse. L'Invention de l'honnête homme, 1580-1750* (Paris, 1996); M.Beetz, *Frühmoderne Höflichkeit. Komplimentierkunst und Gesellschaftsrituale im altdutschen Sprachraum* (Stuttgart, 1990).

¹⁰⁰ See H.Scheffers, *Höfische Konvention und die Aufklärung: Wandlungen des honnête-homme Ideals im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert* (Bonn, 1980); R.Reichhardt, 'Der Honnête Homme zwischen höfischer und bürgerlicher Gesellschaft', *AfK*, 69 (1987), 341-70.

of a diplomat.¹⁰¹ Furthermore, the literature on civility, courtly etiquette, and polite communication was influential for diplomatic theory.¹⁰² On the other hand, the titles and formula used in communication between princes and their representatives were treated in the genre of the 'ideal secretary'. This literature had originated in Renaissance Italy and developed, in the eighteenth century, into a 'chancellery science' aimed at the secretaries of cabinets as well as the secretaries of embassies.¹⁰³ Finally, in the later seventeenth century, the titular and ceremonial aspects of diplomacy became the subject of a ceremonial theory that was closely linked to the emergence of the states-system and its hierarchy.¹⁰⁴ The often extensive manuals on ceremonial sought, firstly, to provide the historical background for conflicts of precedence; secondly, to document the different ceremonial customs of the European courts; and, thirdly, to present a normative guide for situations involving ritual and ceremonial.¹⁰⁵ Displaying a particular regard for diplomacy, they expanded the remarks on diplomatic ranks and ceremonial presented in the 'ideal diplomat' literature.

¹⁰¹ For instance: J.B.de Chevrement, *La Connoissance du monde ou l'art de bien élever la jeunesse pour les divers états de la vie* (Paris, 1694); W.Keith, *An Essay on the Education of a Young British Nobleman [...]. Some Observations on the Office of an Ambassador* (London, 1730); finally, see Stanhope, Earl of Chesterfield, *Lettres à son fils*, ed. M.Fumaroli (Paris, 1993).

¹⁰² On this literature, see Beetz, *Höflichkeit*; G.Braungart, *Hofberedsamkeit. Studien zur Praxis höfisch-politischer Rede im deutschen Territorialabsolutismus* (Tübingen, 1988).

¹⁰³ On the beginnings of the 'ideal secretary' genre, which has been largely neglected in scholarship, see D.Biow, *Doctors, Ambassadors, Secretaries: Humanism and Professions in Renaissance Italy* (Chicago, 2002). See for example the translation of Tasso's 'Messaggero' as *Le parfait secrétaire* (Paris, 1646); J.Menudier, *Le Modèle du parfait secrétaire [...]* (Jena, 1690); J.L.de Grimarest, *Traité sur la manière d'écrire des lettres et sur le cérémonial [...]* (Paris, 1709); C.A.Beck, *Versuch einer Staatspraxis oder Canzleyübung aus der Politik, dem Staats- und Völkerrecht* (Vienna, 1754).

¹⁰⁴ See M.Vec, *Zeremonialwissenschaft im Fürstenstaat. Studien zur juristischen und politischen Theorie absolutistischer Herrschaftsrepräsentation* (Frankfurt, 1998), albeit without a focus on diplomacy.

¹⁰⁵ For example, G.Leti, *Il Ceremoniale storico e politico* (6 vols., Amsterdam, 1685); G.Stieve, *Europäisches Hof-Ceremoniell [...]* (Leipzig, 1715); J.C.Lünig, *Theatrum ceremoniale historico-politicum [...]* (2 vols., Leipzig, 1719-20); J.B.v.Rohr, *Einleitung zur Ceremoniel-Wissenschaft der großen Herren [...]*, 2nd edn (Berlin 1733 [1728]); J.Rousset de Missy, *Le Cérémonial diplomatique des cours de l'Europe* (2 vols., Amsterdam, 1739, as supplement to Dumont's *Corps diplomatique*).

Diplomacy and the Republic of Letters

Diplomatic theory was thus anchored between the poles of political theory and jurisprudence, and discussed in the *respublica litteraria*.¹⁰⁶ Throughout the early modern era, the political-diplomatic and the erudite sphere were closely entwined, and most writers on diplomacy, politics and law were both political practitioners and scholars. The dissemination of diplomatic theory was furthered by the existence of universal languages, first Latin and then, from the late seventeenth century, French.¹⁰⁷ Despite the 'transnational' character of the *respublica litteraria*, regional and 'national' variations in the intellectual framework of diplomatic thought did exist. The influence of the 'raggione di stato' formed in Italy, and of Counter-Reformation political thought advanced by Spanish and Italian authors still influenced the contributions of southern European writers on diplomacy.¹⁰⁸ In the Empire, diplomacy was considered mainly in the context of imperial public law and politics ('Reichsrecht' and 'Reichspublizistik'), so that the distinction between political relations in the Empire and with actors outside its boundaries was often blurred. To a greater extent than in any other country, the Empire's universities contributed a great number of legal and political dissertations and treatises to diplomatic theory. Yet, with the exception of Hoevelen's *Der Teutsche Gesandte*, in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries the diplomat's function was considered merely as

¹⁰⁶ M.Braubach, *Diplomatie und geistiges Leben im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert* (Bonn, 1969), has investigated some links between diplomacy and intellectual life. Recently, diplomacy is being discovered as topic of literary representation in the *respublica litteraria*, see T.Hampton, 'The Diplomatic Moment: Representing Negotiation in Early Modern Europe', *Modern Language Quarterly*, 67 (2006), 81-102; M.Fumaroli, *La Diplomatie de l'esprit. De Montaigne à LaFontaine* (Paris, 1994).

¹⁰⁷ See below, Part V. On the use of the terms 'national' and 'transnational', see M.Krieger, "'Transnationalität' in vernationaler Zeit? Ein Plädoyer für eine erweiterte Gesellschaftsgeschichte der Frühen Neuzeit", *Geschichte und Gesellschaft*, 30 (2004), 125-36.

¹⁰⁸ For example, Vera, *El enbajador* ([sic!] Sevilla, 1620), French transl. *Le Parfait ambassadeur* (Paris, 1635); G.Bragaccia, *L'Ambasciatore* [...] (Padua, 1626); C.Benavente y Benavides, *Advertencias para reyes, principes y embaxadores* (Madrid, 1643); C.M.Carafa, *L'Ambasciatore politico christiano* [Mazzarino, 1690], in idem, *Opere politiche-christianae* (3 vols., Mazzarino, 1692), ii. Cf. Viroli, *From Politics to Reason of State*; R.Bireley, *The Counter-Reformation Prince. Anti-Machiavellianism or Catholic Statecraft in Early Modern Europe* (Chapel Hill, 1990).

sub-part of the 'politici' and councillors of the territorial states.¹⁰⁹ On the other hand, before the works of Mably, Nourar and Réal in the later eighteenth century, French authors had considered diplomacy only in the theory of courtly and polite behaviour. In contrast to the Empire, neither France nor Britain nor the south European countries possessed a comparable institutional academic environment, and lagged behind in the development of state science and 'droit public'.¹¹⁰

The great majority of works discussing diplomacy served a didactic function, since they were written either in the context of university teaching and noble academies, or they sought to provide a behavioural guide for the statesman, the courtier and the diplomat. Apart from the systematic theoretical works, the 'transnational' discussion on the diplomat and his functions comprised a number of other literary genres produced and disseminated in the *respublica litteraria*. In addition to encyclopaedic reference works,¹¹¹ these ranged from editions and collections of treaties such as Dumont's *Corps diplomatique*, to published diplomatic correspondence and memoirs. Some of these genres were quoted in diplomatic theory and recommended as further reading. Others, however, existed quite independently from the 'ideal ambassador' literature, since writing on diplomacy could be as profitable a pursuit as selling news and gossip.¹¹² In addition, diplomacy also provided a theme for fiction

¹⁰⁹ As introduction, see M.Stolleis, *Geschichte des öffentlichen Rechts in Deutschland*, vol.i: *Reichspublizistik und Policywissenschaft* (Munich, 1988); idem (ed.), *Staatsdenker im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert. Reichspublizistik, Politik, Naturrecht*, 3rd edn (Munich, 1995); Weber, *Prudentia gubernatoria*.

¹¹⁰ See Bury, *Littérature et politesse*; N.O.Keohane, *Philosophy and the State in France. The Renaissance to the Enlightenment* (Princeton, 1980). For Britain, see G.Brauer, *Theories of Gentlemanly Education in England, 1660-1775* (New York, 1959).

¹¹¹ For example, F.B.Félice, 'Des négociations, ou de l'art de négocier', in idem, *Dictionnaire de justice naturelle et civile [...]* (Yverdun, 1777-8), xiv,176-95; cf. footnote 296.

¹¹² Sometimes, these two activities were not too far apart, as the case of Wicquefort reveals, as well as the theorist G.Leti, see F.Barcia, *Un politico dell'eta barocca. Gregorio Leti* (Milan, 1987); and the works of C.Freschot (1640-1720), for example: *Les Intrigues secrètes du Duc de Savoye [...]* (Venice, 1705); *Histoire amoureuse et badine du congrès et de la ville d'Utrecht, en plusieurs lettres* (Liège, 1714).

and comedy, for religious writings, or for political comments and propaganda.¹¹³ Even several distinguished *philosophes* such as Montaigne, Bacon and LaBruyère contributed brief remarks on diplomacy and negotiation.¹¹⁴

However, the relationship between the Enlightenment *République des Lettres* and the discourses on diplomacy was ambiguous. Although the 'philosophes' regarded the states' interconnectedness through 'droit public' and commerce as beneficial to the 'bonne foi' and 'civilité européenne', they criticised the arbitrary will of princes in foreign policy, and regarded diplomacy as an 'école du mensonge et du secret', which stimulated intrigues and conflicts.¹¹⁵ This stood in contrast to the positive image of diplomacy portrayed by the theorists. Nevertheless, the influence of 'Enlightenment' thought reached a greater prominence in eighteenth-century diplomatic theory. By making public a part of the 'arcana imperii', and by furthering the education and knowledge of both the political-diplomatic elites and the 'European public', diplomatic theory sought to contribute to a 'civilisation' of international relations: reason, persuasion and civility, based on a true knowledge of the states' interests and treaties, should further peace and 'bonne foi' between the peoples of Europe.¹¹⁶

¹¹³ To name but two examples: P.Benedetti, *Il magico legato. Tragicomedia pastorale* (Venice, 1607); A.Lupa, *L'Ambasciatore invidiato* (Venice, 1639). Of the religious literature, see for example B.de Vestric, *Les Devoirs des ambassadeurs de Christ*, 2nd edn (Delft, 1694); cf. for the Renaissance period, Ménager, *Diplomatie et théologie*. On political propaganda, see for example the anonymous *L'Ambassadeur en colère, représenté par la lettre d'un Hollandois* (n.p., c.1674).

¹¹⁴ For example, M.de Montaigne, *Essais* [1588], ed. M.Rat (Paris, 1962), book i, ch.xvi; J.de la Bruyère, *Les Caractères ou les mœurs de ce siècle* [1688], ed. P.Kuentz (Paris, 1969), ch.xii.

¹¹⁵ See F.Gilbert, 'The "New Diplomacy" of the Eighteenth Century', in Jönsson/Langhorne (eds.), *Diplomacy*, ii, 251-79; M. Bélissa, 'La Diplomatie et les traités dans la pensée des Lumières: "Négociation universelle" ou "École du mensonge"?', *RHD*, 113 (1999), 291-317. Cf. L. and M.Frey, 'The Reign of the Charlatans is Over'. The French Revolutionary Attack on Diplomatic Practice', *JMH*, 65 (1993), 706-44.

¹¹⁶ This is exemplified in Mably, *Principes des négociations*. On Mably's own critical stance towards diplomacy, see M.Bazzoli, 'L'Ordine internazionale secondo Mably: dal Droit public de l'Europe ai Principes des négociations', in F.M.Pape (ed.), *Costituzione e diritti fondamentali in Mably* (Genoa, 2001), 43-58; J.-L.Lecerclé, 'Mably et la théorie de la diplomatie', *Studies on Voltaire and the Eighteenth Century*, 88 (1972), 899-913.

Treatises on the 'Ideal Ambassador' – a Discourse on Diplomacy

The intellectual and literary infrastructure of the *respublica litteraria* provided the context for the emergence of a theory of diplomacy. This also meant, however, that reflections on diplomacy were influenced not only by developments in diplomatic practice, but also by changes in the intellectual and methodological framework. The 'languages' of political and legal thought were taken up by the theorists of diplomacy, adapted to the specific situation of the diplomat and handed down from treatise to treatise, forming an increasingly specific 'language of diplomacy'.

Treatises on the 'ideal ambassador' appeared from the fifteenth to the eighteenth century. Bernard du Rosier's manuscript *Ambaxiator Brevilogus* of 1436 can be regarded as the first exponent, although some medieval canonists and jurists had already commented on the 'legatus'.¹¹⁷ The genre of the 'ideal ambassador' became more recognisable after the turn of the sixteenth century, when the first treatises appeared in print. The decades around 1700 were a particularly productive period with several Latin, Italian and Spanish contributions, as well as the first treatise in French by Jean Hotman.¹¹⁸ The first half of the seventeenth century saw further treatises appear.¹¹⁹ In the period following the Peace of Westphalia, self-contained treatises on the ambassador featured not only the widely disseminated oeuvres of

¹¹⁷ B. du Rosier, 'Ambaxiator brevilogus [...]' (1436), ed. Grabar, *De legatis*, 3-30. See further the (incomplete) list of treatises up to 1625 in *ibid.* Cf. R. Fubini, 'L'Ambasciatore nel XV secolo: due trattati e una biografia (Bernard de Rosier, Ermolao Barbaro e Vespasiano da Bisticci)', *Mélanges de l'Ecole Française de Rome. Moyen Age*, 108 (1996), 645-65.

¹¹⁸ For example: O. Maggi, *De legato libri duo*, 2nd edn (Venice, 1596 [1566]); C. Paschal, *Legatus opus*, 2nd edn (Paris, 1612 [1598]); K. Warszewicki, *De legatis et legationibus*, 2nd edn (Cracow, 1604 [1595]); J. Hotman de Villiers, *L'Ambassadeur* (Paris, 1603), repr. as *De la charge et dignité de l'ambassadeur* (1604), transl. as *The ambassador* (London, 1603); H. Kirchner, *Legatus [...]* (Lich, 1604).

¹¹⁹ Vera, *El enbajador* (Sevilla, 1620), French as *Le parfait ambassadeur* (Paris, 1635, repr. 1642 and 1709), Italian as *Il perfetto ambasciadore* (Venice, 1649). F. de Marselaer, *Khpykeion, sive legationum insigne [...]* (Antwerp, 1618), repr. as *De Legato libri due* in 1624; J. de Chokier, *Tractatus de legato* (Cologne, 1624); Bragaccia, *L'Ambasciatore*; A. Germoni, *De legatis principum et populorum libri tres* (Rome, 1627); Benavente, *Advertencias*. See also the unpublished tract of T. Rogers, *The Ambassador's Idea* (1638, BL Harleian MS 3365).

Wicquefort¹²⁰ and Callières,¹²¹ but also treatises in English by Howell, in German by Hoevelen, in Italian by Carafa, and in French by the Swiss-born Francquesnay¹²² and the 'premier commis' Pecquet.¹²³ Tracts intended for publication include the works of the French diplomat Chamoy and the Bavarian politician Schmid.¹²⁴ Furthermore, several of the older treatises were reprinted after 1648.¹²⁵ From among the political theorists of this period, authors such as Grottnitz, Galardi or Keith participated in the discourse,¹²⁶ while a number of informal tracts, usually written with a specific 'diplomatic beginner' in mind, were also

¹²⁰ A first draft were the *Mémoires touchant les ambassadeurs et les ministres publics* (Cologne, 1676, repr. 1679). Cf. the criticism of F. Galardi, *Réflexions sur les Mémoires pour les ambassadeurs [...]* (Ville-Franche, 1677). *L'Ambassadeur et ses fonctions* (The Hague, vol. i 1681, vol. ii 1680, sic!) saw numerous editions, e.g. in 1682, 1689, 1690, 1715, 1724, 1730 and 1746. Translations appeared in German (*L'Ambassadeur, oder Staats-Bothschaffter [...]*, 1682), and in English (*The Ambassador [...]*, 1716).

¹²¹ F. de Callières, *De la manière de négocier avec des souverains* (Paris, 1716), reprinted in 1716 and 1717; augmented into 2 vols. in 1750; German transl. in 1716 (*Der Staats-erfahrene Abgesandte [...]*, repr. 1757 and 1766), in 1717 (*Kluger, Minister und Geschickter Gesandten Staats-Schule [...]*) and in 1811 (*Die politische Unterhandlungskunst*); English transl. in 1716 (*The Art of Negotiating*, repr. 1738); Italian transl. in 1726 (*Della maniera di trattare affari [...]*); Russian transl. in 1772 and 1782-3. Cf. Waquet, Callières, pp. 270-1. It is probable that Callières' treatise was written already in 1697, see Waquet, Callières, pp. 75-6, 266; K. W. Schweizer, *François de Callières. Man of Letters and Diplomat* (Lewiston/N.Y., 1995), p. 17; Lempereur, Callières, p. 14.

¹²² J. Howell, *A Discourse on the Precedency of Kings [...]*, *A Distinct Treatise of Ambassadors* (London, 1664, repr. 1668, 1679); C. v. Hoevelen, *Candorins vollkommener Teutsche Gesandte [...]* (Frankfurt, 1679); Carafa, *L'Ambasciatore politico-christiano* (1690, repr. in idem, *Opere politiche-christianae*, ii, Mazzarino, 1692); [Anonym.] *Traité des Ambassades et des ambassadeurs* (Rotterdam, 1726); Francquesnay, *Le Ministre public*.

¹²³ A. Pecquet, *Discours sur l'art de négocier* (Paris, 1737), repr. as *De l'art de négocier avec les souverains* (The Hague, 1738), and in the *Mémoires manuels d'un ambassadeur [...]* (Frankfurt, 1764). As Pecquet's dedication refers to the recent peace of Europe, it could be argued that his treatise was begun already before 1737, possible even in the late 1710s. In that case, the long experience of Pecquet the elder as 'commis' could have influenced the work. Cf. footnote 314. Alternatively, the dedication might refer to the treaty of Vienna (1731), or to the end of the War of the Polish Succession (preliminaries 1736, treaty 1738). Without further evidence, no definite conclusion can yet be reached on the exact date and process of composition.

¹²⁴ L. Rousseau de Chamoy, *L'Idée du parfait ambassadeur* (1697), ed. L. Delavaud (Paris, 1912); [F. C. von Schmid], 'Der Gesandte', in idem, *Mundus christiano-bavaro-politicus*, iv [1711, BSB Cod. Germ. MS 4009]. I am grateful to Prof. F. Kramer, Munich, for providing me with a copy of the edition in progress. It is possible that this treatise was begun already by Franz Caspar's father, the Bavarian minister of state Caspar v. Schmid (d. 1693). Cf. E. Straub, 'Zum Herrscherideal im 17. Jahrhundert vornehmlich nach dem "Mundus Christiano-Bavaro-Politicus"', *Zeitschrift für Bayerische Landesgeschichte*, 32 (1969), 193-221.

¹²⁵ Reprinted were the treatises of Vera (French, 1709), Paschal (1649), Warszewicki (1666), Hotman (1703), and Marselaer (1662, 1664, 1666). See furthermore the publication of a sixteenth-century manuscript by F. Thynne, *The Perfect Ambassador, treating of the Antiquitie, Priviledges and Behaviour of Men belonging to that Function* (London, 1652).

¹²⁶ Grottnitz, *Regiments-Rath*; Galardi, *Traité politique concernant l'importance du choix exact d'ambassadeurs habiles [...]*, 2nd edn (Cologne, 1666 [1663]); Keith, *Observations on the Office of an Ambassador*.

modelled on the 'ideal ambassador' genre.¹²⁷ Around the mid-eighteenth century, French theorists such as Mably and Nourar, or the Prussian Bielfeld, continued the design of the 'ideal ambassador' treatise but coupled it with comments on international law, the 'interests of states' and state science.¹²⁸ Although the 'ideal ambassador' ceased to be the focal point for reflections upon diplomacy in the later eighteenth century, the tradition was continued in a number of treatises on the 'art of negotiation' and diplomatic law.¹²⁹

Fifteenth and sixteenth century treatises were usually titled 'Legatus' or 'De legatis', while seventeenth-century manuals also used corresponding forms of 'Ambassadeur' or 'Le parfait ambassadeur', and eighteenth-century authors employed the terms 'Ministre public' or 'Art de négocier'.¹³⁰ Until the end of the seventeenth century, 'ambassador' not only referred to the highest rank but also served as generic term for all diplomats. Only after 1800, 'diplomat' and 'diplomacy' were used in the headings of diplomatic theory.¹³¹

At first glance, treatises on the 'ideal ambassador' represent a uniform and conservative genre. As in other strands of political and legal theory, formal and semantic traditions had emerged that determined the manner in which reflections on the diplomat and his functions were expressed. This becomes particularly apparent in the catalogue of virtues that

¹²⁷ E.g. the anonymous *Testament politique d'un ministre étranger, à son fils, pour servir d'introduction à l'art de négocier* (London, 1764); *Schreiben eines Vater an seinen Sohn von den Pflichten und Eigenschaften eines Gesandten* (Brünn, 1770). Furthermore, see the 'Embajada española', ed. H.J.Chaytor, *RHS, Camden Misc.*, 14 (1926), 1-43, composed by a member of Ronquillo's embassy to England in the 1680s.

¹²⁸ Mably, *Principes des négociations*; Nourar, *Ministère du négociateur*; J.Bielfeld, *Institutions politiques*.

¹²⁹ C.F.de LaMaillardière, *Précis du droit des gens, de la guerre, de la paix, et des ambassades [...]* (Paris, 1775); C.G.Ahnert, *Lehrbegriff der Wissenschaften, Erfordernisse und Recht der Gesandten* (2 vols., Dresden, 1784); C.H.Römer, *Versuch einer Einleitung in die rechtlichen, moralischen und politischen Grundsätze über die Gesandtschaften* (Gotha, 1788); idem, *Handbuch für Gesandte* (Leipzig, 1791).

¹³⁰ 'Négociier' could also refer to the commercial 'négociant', see for example J.Savary, *Le Parfait négociant*, 5th edn (Paris, 1675).

¹³¹ J.M.v.Liechtenstern, *Was hat die Diplomatie als Wissenschaft zu umfassen und der Diplomat zu leisten?* (Altenburg, 1820); C.v.Martens, *Manuel diplomatique [...]* (Paris, 1822). In this tradition, see still E.Satow, *A Guide to Diplomatic Practice*, 2nd edn (London, 1922). On twentieth-century handbooks on diplomacy, see Berridge et al. (eds.), *Diplomatic Theory*, pp.125 ff. Cf. P.Ugarteche, *Diplomacia y literatura. Autores celebres y obras famosas* (Lima, 1961), pp.40-9

constituted the core of diplomatic theory. The 'ideal ambassador' literature formed a 'discourse' that was characterised by continuity in format, language and methodology. First of all, the genre presented a set outline that corresponded to a number of recurrent themes. Early modern diplomatic theory treated the subsequent questions: what are the origins and functions of diplomacy? Who can send diplomats? Which attributes, virtues, what education and knowledge should a diplomat possess? How should he conduct himself at foreign courts? What should be his relationship to his own prince and government, and which legal prerogatives did he enjoy abroad? This model form had already been present in Rosier's *Ambaxiator brevilogus* of 1436 and remained the framework for all subsequent treatises.¹³²

As a rule, axioms were stated 'a priori' and then discussed with reference to examples and authorities, including the Bible and classical authors. Diplomatic theory was, above all, a casuistry that sought to incorporate the historical and contemporary practice of diplomacy into a system of ethical norms and rules of behaviour.¹³³ By citing previous treatises as authorities, the cohesion within the discourse was strengthened, and predecessors also provided a supply of examples. Some authors openly acknowledged that their treatises were a compilation of older works.¹³⁴ Other theorists, however, did not indicate the sources they had used for their treatises, a method that could lead to accusations of plagiarism.¹³⁵ In addition, an assortment of authorities from the areas of religious, philosophical, political and legal thought were quoted.

¹³² In contrast, unpublished and more informal treatises did not adhere to this format.

¹³³ Cf. Chaline, 'L'Ambassadeur selon les casuistes'.

¹³⁴ The author of the *Traité des ambassades* admitted that he was going to 'ramasser ici tout ce que j'ai trouvé d'épars dans ces divers ouvrages [...] en copiant un grand nombre d'auteurs' (preface, unpaginated). From the frequency of reference, the main works cited within the genre were, in order, Paschal, Vera, Wicquefort and Callières.

¹³⁵ Hotman had been accused by 'Colazon' [C.Paschal] of plagiarising his treatise, see Colazon, *Notes sur un petit livre premierement intitulé L'Ambassadeur [...]* (Paris, 1604). As a consequence, Hotman disclosed his sources in the 1613 edn; cf. L.Bély, 'La Polémique autour de L'Ambassadeur de Jean Hotman: culture et diplomatie au temps de la paix de Lyon', *Cahiers d'histoire* (2001/02), 326-54.

Apart from continuity in outline and method, the discourse on the 'ideal ambassador' was characterised by persistent 'languages' or 'registers', which comprised recurring vocabulary, topoi, stereotyped phrases and metaphors. The continuity of language is most noticeable in the catalogue of virtues and the counsels of behaviour. The 'ideal ambassador' was constituted by three elements: a canon of ethical knowledge that comprised virtues and qualities; a corpus of factual knowledge detailing the 'connoissances' and skills necessary for the diplomatic function; and norms of prudent behaviour.¹³⁶ These elements were strongly influenced by political theory, whose languages and concepts they adapted to the situation of the diplomat. For example, the aim of diplomacy was described as furthering 'good correspondence', peace and 'bonne foi', while the diplomat was compared with the 'heavenly messenger' or described the 'pacific actor'. In this way, the language of the 'respublica christiana' continued to be employed.¹³⁷ Topoi taken from political theory furthermore included the metaphor of international politics as ocean, on which the diplomatic 'pilot' had to navigate; the metaphor of the theatre and of the diplomat as 'actor'; or the labelling of the diplomat as the 'eyes, ears and hands' of his prince.¹³⁸

Such elements reveal a high degree of continuity and traditionalist outlook of the discourse on the 'ideal ambassador', which continued to determine the genre in the century following the Peace of Westphalia, even in exponents such as Wicquefort or Callières. The longevity of these traditions has contributed to the assumption that diplomatic theory was a

¹³⁶ This corresponds to the 'politicus' literature, see W. Weber, 'Die Erfindung des Politikers. Bemerkungen zu einem gescheiterten Professionalisierungskonzept der Politikwissenschaft des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts', in Schorn-Schütte (ed.), *Aspekte der politischen Kommunikation*, 347-70.

¹³⁷ On the 'pacific actor' and related expressions ('ministre pacifique', 'conciliateur des princes', 'médiateur de l'amour') see for example Vera, *Parfait Ambassadeur*, edn.1709, p.29; Howell, *A Distinct Treatise*, p.179; Wicquefort, *L'Ambassadeur*, ii, p.9; Nourar, *Ministère du négociateur*, p.xxi.

¹³⁸ On the diplomat as 'pilot', see e.g. Vera, *Parfait Ambassadeur*, edn.1709, p.21-2; Wicquefort, *L'Ambassadeur*, i, p.185; Carafa, *Ambasciadore*, p.11. On the diplomat as 'actor', see Hotman, *Ambassadeur*, p.61; Wicquefort, *L'Ambassadeur*, ii, p.3. Callières, *De la manière*, pp.23-4. On the diplomat as 'eyes, hands and ears', see Hotman, *Ambassadeur*, p.61; Howell, *A Distinct Treatise*, p.182; Wicquefort, *L'Ambassadeur*, ii, p.3.

static and idealistic form of reflection that responded only slowly to the changes in diplomatic practice.¹³⁹ However, underneath the level of semantic and formalistic continuity, the discourse responded to the developments occurring in diplomatic practice. The driving force for transformations in the discourse was the authors' perception of changes in the function and practice of diplomacy in the states-system.

The Authors: 'Diplomates Érudits'

The representation of the practice of diplomacy was filtered through the eyes of a group of writers who reflected upon their own occupation, and whose profile, context and intentions influenced the portrait of the 'ideal ambassador'. Who were the theorists of diplomacy? A prosopographic analysis reveals that they exemplified the type of 'learned diplomat' who combined direct or indirect experience of diplomacy with a participation in the intellectual exchange of the *respublica litteraria*.¹⁴⁰ In nineteen of twenty-six cases considered, they brought forth other publications, ranging from philosophical, historical and linguistic works to tracts and pamphlets on contemporary politics. For example, Howell composed the Instructions for forreine travell and edited the notebooks of the former master of ceremonies, John Finnet.¹⁴¹ Callières wrote on French language and literature, whilst Pecquet translated Italian literature into French and commented upon Montesquieu's thought.¹⁴²

¹³⁹ For example, Behrens, 'Treatises on the Ideal Ambassador', p.627; for the time before 1620 also Mattingly, *Renaissance Diplomacy*, pp.188-90. In this line, albeit more differentiated, Keens-Soper, 'Callières and Diplomatic Theory', pp.488-9; Berridge, 'The Theory and Practice of Negotiation in the 17th and 18th Centuries', *Quaderni di Scienza Politica*, 4 (2004), p.315.

¹⁴⁰ In the following, twenty-six authors are considered, who either published self-contained treatises in the period 1647-1764, or included substantial sections on the 'ideal ambassador' in their writings. In addition, the authors of unpublished treatises and of treatises that were reprinted during this period are taken into account.

¹⁴¹ On Howell, see D.R.Woolf, 'Howell, James', *Oxford DNB*.

¹⁴² See Schweizer, *François de Callières*; Waquet, *Callières*; idem, 'Alle origini delle teorie contemporanee della diplomazia e della negoziazione? François de Callières e la sua Manière de négocier avec les souverains (1716)', *Rivista storia italiana*, 116 (2004), 767-93. On Pecquet, see the introduction in A.Gruzinska,

Of the twenty-six theorists, the majority (nine) were of French nationality, five were from the Holy Roman Empire, three from Great Britain (two English, one Scottish), three were Dutchmen and two Spaniards.¹⁴³ Apart from authors of reprinted treatises, Carafa represented the only Italian author in this period, in stark contrast to the time before 1648. The late sixteenth century Polish author Warszewicki, on the other hand, remains the only known eastern European theorist.¹⁴⁴ Consequently, diplomatic theory in this period was dominated by authors from western Europe, with the Empire playing an increasingly important role.¹⁴⁵ On the other hand, treatises were disseminated through the *respublica litteraria*, including the northern and eastern peripheries of the European states-system. The use of Latin and later of French aided the spread and discussion of diplomatic theory, as did the translation of many treatises into Italian, Spanish, English and German. The 'ideal ambassador' discourse was thus constituted by writers from different 'national' backgrounds, who used the erudite sphere as platform for their reflections on diplomacy. Although all treatises published were levelled at a wider audience – the courtly and erudite public and the diplomats of Europe – they often displayed a particular concern for the diplomatic service of their own country. For example, Hotman's primary concern was to instruct future French diplomats, whereas Kirchner and Hoevelen addressed their tracts to the Empire's nobility.

M.D.Sirkis (eds.), *Antoine Pecquet. Discourse on the Art of Negotiation* (New York, 2004), as well as C.Piccioni, *Les Premiers commis des affaires étrangères au XVII et XVIIIe siècles* (Paris, 1928), pp.206-12.

¹⁴³ The nationality of de la Sarraz (Serraz) du Francquesnay is unclear. It seems that his father's family came from Switzerland, while his mother's had lands in France. As Huguenots, they fled to the Dutch Republic, where Francquesnay spent most of his life and served as secretary to the Portuguese general Count Taroucca, ambassador at Utrecht and Cambray, to whom his treatise is dedicated. On the Basnage-Francquesnay family, see G.Cerny, *Theology, Politics and Letters at the Crossroads of European Civilization: Jacques Basnage and Baylean Huguenot Refugees in the Dutch Republic* (Dordrecht, 1987); E.-A.Mailhet, *Jacques Basnage théologien, controversiste, diplomate et historien, sa vie et ses écrits* (Geneva, repr.1978 [1880]). The origins of the anonymous *Traité des ambassades* probably also lie in the Netherlands.

¹⁴⁴ See A.Tamborra, *Krzysztof Warszewicki e la diplomazia del Rinascimento in Polonia* (Rome, 1965).

¹⁴⁵ If the numerous academic dissertations on the 'legatus' are included, the Empire's contribution to (legal) diplomatic theory must be ranked higher.

Galardi was occupied with the performance of Spanish diplomats, and Callières and Pecquet with that of their French compatriots.¹⁴⁶

Among the nineteen authors on whom we have biographical information, nine served as diplomats, among them 'career diplomats' such as Wicquefort and Chamoy, who spent most of their life abroad, rising from the lowest ranks (agent and secretary) to those of resident and envoy.¹⁴⁷ This group also includes Callières, who had passed through smaller appointments before becoming plenipotentiary at the congress of Rijswijk and secretary to the royal council.¹⁴⁸ Other theorists merely devoted a small part of their career to diplomacy: the highest rank of extraordinary ambassador is represented solely by the Italian Carafa, while some authors (Howell, Francquesnay) had gained experience in diplomacy as personal secretaries to ambassadors or as officially appointed secretaries of legation (Bielfeld).¹⁴⁹ Others were employed in the central administration of diplomacy, for example Mably, Bielfeld or the 'premier commis' Pecquet, who spent his entire career in the 'bureaux des affaires étrangères'.¹⁵⁰ A small minority was not directly involved in diplomacy, but was

¹⁴⁶ Then again, later editions and translations could add other dedications and target groups. For example, the German translations of Wicquefort and Callières were aimed at the Empire's nobility. In contrast, the unpublished and more informal instructions were usually aimed at a specific person, often the son or the successor of a diplomat.

¹⁴⁷ Chamoy had begun his career as secretary to Pomponne in Sweden (1665-8), where he remained for twenty years as resident. In 1698, he was sent to the Diet in Regensburg, where he stayed until 1702. A 'gentilhomme ordinaire de la chambre du roi', he died in 1711, cf. Delavaud's introductory remarks to the edition.

¹⁴⁸ Cf. Schweizer, *Callières*.

¹⁴⁹ Carafa had served as extraordinary ambassador to Rome, cf. A. Vitellaro, *Carlo Maria Carafa: un principe siciliano della Controriforma* (Messina, 2001). In addition to travels as commercial agent, Howell had been secretary to the Earl of Leicester, ambassador to Denmark. The Prussian Bielfeld, on the other hand, negotiated both in the Empire and in Britain before he turned to administrative positions in Prussia, cf. entry 'D073-790-9', *WBIS*.

¹⁵⁰ Mably had acted as secretary to the minister Cardinal Tencin, in addition to being involved in diplomatic negotiations in Paris, cf. J.K. Wright, *A Classical Republican in Eighteenth-Century France. The Political Thought of Mably* (California, 1997). This group also includes Grottnitz, who had been a member of the Bavarian secret council (cf. entry 'D488-397-9', *WBIS*) and the Bavarian councillor Schmid, whose father had been closely involved in the direction of foreign policy, cf. L. Hüttel, *Caspar von Schmid (1622-1693), ein kurbayerischer Staatsmann aus dem Zeitalter Ludwigs XIV* (Munich, 1971).

made up of observers of diplomacy and foreign policy (Galardi) or of clients or acquaintances of diplomats.¹⁵¹

For most theorists, their diplomatic occupation was only one part of their political, administrative, or academic career. While the diplomatic missions of Callières and Bielfeld, for example, laid the foundations for their advancement in political and administrative offices, for Prince Carafa an embassy was only an interlude in his career as governor. Ten theorists held offices in the political administration of their countries, while only one served in the military, and one came from a mercantile background.¹⁵² Following in the steps of their predecessors - often distinguished humanists such as Torquato Tasso, Charles Paschal, or Antonio de Vera - several theorists were renowned writers and *érudits*, as for example Callières, who was a member of the Académie française, or the Enlightenment *philosophe* Mably. Two authors, Wicquefort and Galardi, earned their living by selling information and news on foreign politics. In contrast to the period before the mid-seventeenth century, lawyers and clerics no longer dominated the group of theorists, even if several authors had undergone religious or legal training.¹⁵³ On the other hand, three theorists wrote in the context of noble and academic education (Hoevelen, Keith, Gundling), of whom only Gundling, however, held a university post.¹⁵⁴ Academic studies could be found in the

¹⁵¹ Galardi spent most of his life at the courts of France and Britain (see entry 'S044-353-3', *WBIS*), while Hoevelen claimed to have witnessed the negotiations of Westphalia in the retinue of the papal nuncio (*Teutsche Gesandte*, p.17), cf. entry 'D352-503-3', *WBIS*. No diplomatic experience could be associated with Keith, Nourar and de Réal, cf. W.A.Speck, 'Keith, Sir William, fourth baronet', *Oxford DNB*; and *WBIS*, entries 'F115739', 'F152175'.

¹⁵² These could range from charges in the foreign ministry (Pecquet), secretaries to the royal cabinet (Callières), councillors (Grottnitz, Schmid) and 'maîtres des requêtes' (Nourar) to colonial governors (Keith). According to Réal, *Science du Gouvernement*, viii, pp.440-1, Galardi had been a captain of the Spanish cavalry; an assumption that is supported by the combination of remarks on diplomacy and the army in his treatise. Howell had worked several years as commercial agent.

¹⁵³ The religious profile could still be influential: Galardi's criticism against Wicquefort, as well as Carafa's ideal of the 'ambasciadore politico-christano' were influenced by their Counter-Reformation background.

¹⁵⁴ Gundling was a lawyer and professor of philosophy at Halle from 1705 onwards. His brother, Jakob Paul, taught law and history at the noble academy of Berlin instituted in 1705, before he became president of the academy of sciences; see *WBIS*, entries 'D490-156-0', 'D490-159-3'.

educational background of many theorists, while others had been educated in colleges or noble academies. Most authors, furthermore, had travelled in several countries. Their educational and professional background was, of course, dependent on social context and rank. While the highest social stratum was embodied by Prince Carafa, the majority of theorists were drawn from the service nobility, the 'noblesse de robe'.¹⁵⁵ This category included families from the middle and lower nobility in the service of the king, such as the Chamoy and the Callières, as well as the Pecquet and Bielfeld, who had been ennobled more recently. On the other hand, about a quarter of the theorists were commoners serving in the lower diplomatic ranks. Although their national context was diverse, these writers exemplified the type of 'learned diplomat' in the service of the state. As the majority of writers did not spend their entire career in diplomacy but performed other political and administrative offices, the authors' socio-professional 'milieu' resembled that of theorists of related genres, who often acted as political and legal advisors and occasionally as diplomats. However, the greater degree of experience in diplomacy, the participation in a specific discourse and a particular motivation for writing about diplomacy set these authors apart from other theorists. Embedded in a wider intellectual framework, their treatises on the 'ideal diplomat' constituted an increasingly distinct and professional discourse. Written from the viewpoint of the diplomatic *corps*, their treatises claimed to represent not only the collective experience of diplomacy, but also a collective diplomatic ethos that was derived from the 'new diplomacy' in the states-system. This particular group of 'diplomates érudits' perceived a fundamental change in the conduct of international relations after 1648, which brought them to adapt the conventionalised texture of the 'ideal ambassador' to the new function and practice of diplomacy.

¹⁵⁵ The old aristocracy is represented for example by the Scottish baronet Keith, or the Lower Saxon knight Hoevelen, cf. footnote 151.

II.2. Tradition and Transformation. The 'Ideal Ambassador' in the Century following the Peace of Westphalia

Les qualités d'un négociateur sont aujourd'hui plus difficiles à réunir qu'elles n'étoient autrefois, parce que les intérêts réels, ou prétendus des princes, ou plutôt les combinaisons des mêmes intérêts, se sont multipliés, pour ainsi dire, à l'infini, et que l'usage de résider long tems dans un pais [...] est assès moderne.¹⁵⁶

This chapter traces the changes taking place in the discourse on the 'ideal ambassador' against the levels of continuity determining the discourse. From the perception of a fundamental transformation in the framework and practice of diplomacy, the authors of diplomatic theory went on to identify the consequences for the diplomats of Europe, their function and tasks, as well as their behaviour and collective identity. The new demands placed on diplomacy and diplomats resulted in three modifications: first, in an expansion and differentiation of the outline of diplomatic theory; secondly, in a discussion about the methodology of a 'science of diplomacy', which sought to recast the place of diplomacy in the *respublica litteraria*; and finally, in the adaptation of the 'ideal ambassador' to the new demands of the states-system, leading to the creation of a specialist and 'professional' ethos.

Expansion and Differentiation of Diplomatic Theory

Within the given format of the 'ideal ambassador', some aspects became more prominent and were differentiated into sub-parts, treating aspects of diplomatic practice which gained in importance with the establishment of a European-wide and permanent diplomatic network. From the mid-seventeenth century, diplomatic theory mirrored the emergence of a more differentiated diplomatic hierarchy. This was signalled by individual sections or even small

¹⁵⁶ Pecquet, *Art de négociier*, p.xvi.

chapters on the different ranks. Wicquefort was the first author to devote an entire chapter to the 'ministres du second ordre', attempting to codify their status in international law and ceremonial.¹⁵⁷ Subsequent authors followed suit, and Callières' treatise firmly established a hierarchy of three diplomatic grades (ambassador, envoy, resident), while Francquesnay and Bielfeld distinguished four ranks. This process of differentiation was also emulated by the genres of juristic treatises and ceremonial theory.¹⁵⁸

An important indicator for the incorporation of new elements was, moreover, the extension of comments regarding embassy personnel. Whereas earlier treatises had largely passed over the ambassador's 'familia' and 'domestiques', such sections were now substantially expanded, even branching out into self-contained treatises.¹⁵⁹ Following Wicquefort's *Ambassadeur*, a section on the embassy staff became a standard component of diplomatic theory. Two members of the entourage were given particular attention: the secretary and the wife of the ambassador. The secretary's function was not only treated in the 'ideal ambassador' genre, but also in self-contained tracts on the 'parfait secrétaire'. Following the Renaissance model of the 'ideal secretary', Menudier's *Modèle du parfait secrétaire* of 1690, for example, comprised instructions on public and diplomatic correspondence for a secretary, as well as 'necessary instructions for the cavaliers of an embassy'.¹⁶⁰ With the spread of resident embassies, the 'ambassadrice' made her appearance on the diplomatic parquet. Although diplomatic theorists denied women the opportunity to be diplomats, the increasing presence

¹⁵⁷ Wicquefort, *L'Ambassadeur*, i, ch.v. Earlier treatises, including Howell's 1664 tract, had only distinguished between ambassador and resident. On the particular hierarchy of papal legates and nuncios, see Wicquefort, *L'Ambassadeur*, ch.x.

¹⁵⁸ E.g. the disputations presided by P.Müller of Jena: *De Residentibus eorumque juribus* (1690); *De Legatis primi ordinis* (1692). Cf. J.J.Moser, 'Abhandlung von denen dormalen üblichen Gattungen derer Gesandten [...]', in idem, *Der Belgradische Friedens-Schluss [...]* (Jena, 1740); Stieve, *Europäisches Hof-Ceremoniell*, part iii; Lünig, *Theatrum ceremoniale*, i, part v.

¹⁵⁹ See already Hotman, *Ambassadeur*, ch.iv ('Ses domestiques'); Vera, *Parfait Ambassadeur*, edn.1709, part ii, §42. See also the unpublished treatise of Rogers, *Ambassador's Idea*, fos.50-61.

¹⁶⁰ J.Menudier, *Le Modèle du parfait secrétaire [...]* (Jena, 1690). The classical model was, of course, Tassos' 'Dialoghi', transl. as *L'Esprit ou l'ambassadeur, le secrétaire, et le père de famille [...]* (Paris, 1632, repr.1646).

abroad of women, often of noble rank, alongside their husbands led to an acknowledgment of their new role.¹⁶¹ Wicquefort regarded 'ambassadrice' as a diplomatic rank, and, some decades later, Frederick Carl Moser published *L'Ambassadrice et ses droits*, applying the 'ideal ambassador' format to the diplomat's wife!¹⁶²

Also gaining in importance was the area of ceremonial and precedence. Before 1648, reflections on ceremonial had been limited to remarks on the ambassador's entry and audience. In marked contrast, Wicquefort included several chapters on ceremonial, a move followed by subsequent authors.¹⁶³ This coincided with the appearance of systematic treatises on ceremonial in the decades between 1680 and 1740. A section of this 'ceremonial theory' was always devoted to diplomacy, elaborating the observations made in 'ideal ambassador' treatises.¹⁶⁴ Connected to the incorporation of ceremonial in diplomatic theory was the expansion of remarks on congress negotiation in the post-1648 period.¹⁶⁵ The legal aspects of diplomacy, on the other hand, had formed a standard part of the genre, but they could differ in extent: while Wicquefort, the 1730 *Traité*, and Francquesnay devoted the greatest part of their treatises to diplomatic law, Chamoy, Callières and Pecquet considered it only briefly, focusing instead on the 'art of negotiation'.

The sections on diplomatic ranks and their legal and ceremonial status also reveal that diplomatic theory sought to mirror the expansion of diplomatic activity across the states-system. Even if earlier treatises had endeavoured to portray a general picture of diplomacy, their focus

¹⁶¹ On womens' involvement in diplomacy, see Wicquefort, *L'Ambassadeur*, i, p.17.

¹⁶² F.C.Moser, *L'Ambassadrice et ses droits* (Berlin, 1754), already published as 'Die Gesandtin nach ihren Rechten und Pflichten' in idem, *Kleine Schriften [...]*, iii (1753), 133-331. Moser concentrated on the ambassadress' legal and ceremonial status.

¹⁶³ Wicquefort, *L'Ambassadeur*, i, chs.xviii-xxv.

¹⁶⁴ On this genre, see Vec, *Zeremonialwissenschaft*.

¹⁶⁵ For example, Wicquefort, *L'Ambassadeur*, ii, chs.xii-xiv; Francquesnay, *Ministre public*, ch.4.iv; Bielfeld, *Institutions*, ii, ch.viii. See also J.C.Wagenseil, *Tractatus politico historicus de moribus, ritus ac ceremoniis in aulis regum et principum legationibus congressibus et conventibus magnatum* ([Cosmopoli], 1687); J.C.Schleinitz, *Commentatio de negotio pacificationis inter gentes qua iura et officia pararii pacis ex actis publicis gentium et legatorum commentariis* (Helmstedt, 1731).

was often more regional and limited to south and west Europe.¹⁶⁶ Since the turn of the seventeenth century, however, diplomatic theory gradually extended its focus to encompass central, northern and eastern Europe. Again, Wicquefort's treatise provides a good example for how the 'ideal diplomat' now referred to a European-wide resident diplomacy: he listed the types of diplomats exchanged among the actors of the system and abutting powers, and included examples from all parts of Europe when treating ceremonial and international law.¹⁶⁷ Diplomatic theory even came to list the diplomatic customs of Russia, the Ottoman Empire, and, occasionally, the Near and Far East.

The genre of the 'ideal ambassador' was less static than revealed by a first glance. Developments in the practice of diplomacy were mirrored in variations of a given format. Wicquefort's treatise set the agenda for aspects to be included and expanded, such as the differentiated hierarchy of diplomatic ranks and embassy staff, ceremonial and congress diplomacy. Callières and Pecquet, on the other hand, introduced the 'art of negotiation', which was designed for the resident diplomat, and which became the focal point of reflections on diplomacy in the first half of the eighteenth century. While the outline of the 'ideal ambassador' genre remained the basis of eighteenth-century diplomatic theory, the format became more varied from the 1730s: diplomatic theory was combined with sections on international law and the interests of state, and incorporated into manuals on state science.¹⁶⁸

¹⁶⁶ Yet, already Warszewicki's treatise had considered the eastern fringes of sixteenth-century 'Europe', and many Venetian tracts had included remarks on the Ottoman Empire.

¹⁶⁷ For ceremonial, this had already been attempted by Rogers, *Ambassador's Idea*, fos.19-33^v; Benavente, *Advertencias*, pp.93-108.

¹⁶⁸ Notably in the treatises of Francquesnay, Mably, Bielfeld, Réal and Nourar.

'La Science de la négociation' - the Methodology of Diplomatic Theory

The impression of continuity stems mainly from the normative and casuistic character of the 'ideal ambassador' treatises using a stock of authorities and historical examples to justify and illustrate maxims of behaviour. This methodology provided an intellectual and scientific framework to grasp and describe changes occurring in the practice of international relations. Yet, it rendered the swift incorporation of developments more difficult, since the main focus lay on the compatibility of diplomatic practice with the traditions of ethics and history. After the mid-seventeenth century, however, the relationship between tradition and adjustment would become so stretched that theorists called for a different approach to incorporate the new quality of diplomacy in the states-system.

It is in this respect that Wicquefort's treatises constitute a turning point in diplomatic theory. Wicquefort renounced the traditional method of his predecessors, because he regarded it as 'inutile de tirer de l'histoire ancienne des exemples qui ne pourroient point servir à l'usage moderne'.¹⁶⁹ He furthermore disapproved of citing previous treatises, whose portrait of the 'ideal ambassador' he regarded as too general and outdated to describe the 'usages modernes'.¹⁷⁰ Wicquefort applied this criticism not only to the nature of examples and authorities used in diplomatic theory, but also to the methods of employing them. The new secular and modern treatment of the 'ideal ambassador' should, in Wicquefort's opinion, combine rational induction with empiricism. Consequently, he established a system of maxims induced from the historical evidence of the last two centuries and the current diplomatic customs of Europe. No longer should examples from antiquity or quotations from authorities support an argument; it needed confirmation through the contemporary practice of

¹⁶⁹ Wicquefort, *L'Ambassadeur*, i, p.4. All treatises published between 1600 and 1680 had employed examples from antiquity, in contrast to the informal and unpublished treatises.

¹⁷⁰ Wicquefort, *L'Ambassadeur*, i, p.4.

diplomacy.¹⁷¹ Already at the beginning of the seventeenth century, a growing scepticism had become noticeable among theorists, who attempted to combine the use of classical examples with their own experience and observation of international relations.¹⁷² The growing distance from the classical tradition coincided with the abandonment of Latin as the language of discourse in the seventeenth century. Moreover, in rejecting the recourse to antiquity, theorists of diplomacy were not only influenced by the contemporary 'Querelle des Anciens et des Modernes', but also by the general methodological shift associated with the 'Scientific Revolution' and the early Enlightenment.¹⁷³ The medieval and humanist conception of history which asserted the unchanging nature of mankind and legitimised the 'imitatio veteris' was confronted with perceptions of a new era in the international system. In particular the developments in diplomatic law and ceremonial could not be assimilated into the traditional mode. Wicquefort's example was taken up by the majority of subsequent writers who renounced examples drawn from the Bible, classical authors and other authorities to justify their statements.¹⁷⁴ Instead, they regarded the mid-sixteenth century, and, after 1700, the mid-seventeenth century as starting point for the present practice of diplomacy.¹⁷⁵ Historical examples remained the 'magistra vitae' and guidance for the diplomat's behaviour, but the

¹⁷¹ Ibid., p.2.

¹⁷² This is noticeable for example in the treatises of Hotman, Kirchner, and Vera, despite their use of classical examples.

¹⁷³ On the background, see S.Gaukroger (ed.), *The Uses of Antiquity. The Scientific Revolution and the Classical Tradition* (Dordrecht, 1991); H.G.Rötzer, *Traditionalität und Modernität in der europäischen Literatur. Ein Überblick vom Attizismus-Asianismus-Streit bis zur 'Querelle des Anciens et des Modernes'* (Darmstadt, 1979).

¹⁷⁴ Exceptions are Carafa's *Ambasciadore*, the anonymous *Traité* and, to a certain extent, Schmid's *Der Gesandte*, which combined an extensive number of recent examples with quotations from classical authors.

¹⁷⁵ There exists no study on the early modern concept of 'diplomatic history'. On the development of the concept of history, see R.Koselleck, 'Historia Magistra Vitae. Über die Auflösung des Topos im Horizont neuzeitlicher bewegter Geschichte', in idem (ed.), *Natur und Geschichte* (Stuttgart, 1967), 196-219; N.Hammerstein, *Ius und Historie. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des historischen Denkens an deutschen Universitäten im späten 17. und 18. Jahrhundert* (Göttingen, 1972).

changing demands which the conduct of foreign policy placed on its instruments led to a concentration on modern history and the actual practice of states.¹⁷⁶

Furthermore, the method of employing examples became a subject of debate. *Cum grano salis*, scholastic treatises had pursued a deductive approach and used examples to illustrate maxims that had been established *a priori* or from quotations of authorities; a method that was continued in legal dissertations until the mid-eighteenth century. Already by 1600, however, a shift towards a more empirical method became apparent that would finally dominate Wicquefort's treatise. First, Wicquefort drew his observations and maxims from recent historical examples, the present practice of international relations and his own experience. Next, he presented his findings either by offering a collection of examples and concluding a rule therefrom, or by justifying a hypothesis with historical evidence, observation and experience.¹⁷⁷ Yet while Wicquefort's encyclopaedic collection of diplomatic customs unquestionably marked a turning point, for it was the zenith of empiricism in diplomatic theory.¹⁷⁸ While subsequent authors concentrated on the present practice of diplomacy, they laid more stress on the system of axioms derived from a cognitive process based on empiricism, observation and evidence. If diplomatic theory in the eighteenth century continued to take the form of a system of maxims, it had, equally, become more functional and practical through its focus on the actual customs of diplomacy.

¹⁷⁶ Cf. A.Seifert, *Cognitio historica. Die Geschichte als Namensgeberin der frühneuzeitlichen Empirik* (Berlin, 1976). However, this did not yet equal the transition from 'exempla' to 'history', since diplomatic history continued to encompass a selection of individual situations and cases to illustrate the diplomat's behaviour. On the role of history in the formation of the states-system, cf. C.Kampmann, 'Geschichte als Argument. Historische Mythen im Wandel des frühneuzeitlichen Staatensystems', *ZHF*, 32 (2005), 199-220.

¹⁷⁷ Wicquefort's *Mémoires* of 1676 were a preliminary study for his *L'Ambassadeur*, which transformed the collection of diplomatic examples and practices into a more systematic treatise. See *L'Ambassadeur*, i, p.3.

¹⁷⁸ Wicquefort's method is judged disparagingly by Bazzoli, 'Wicquefort', pp.211-2; Keens-Soper, 'Wicquefort', in Berridge *et al.* (eds.), *Diplomatic Theory*, p.92. A collection of examples equalling Wicquefort's treatise was only attempted by Schmid's *Der Gesandte*.

So not until the second half of the seventeenth century did theorists openly reflect upon methodological questions of diplomatic theory and its place in the constellation of early modern sciences. As they called for a new treatment of diplomacy, they also embarked on a debate about the outlook, functions and limitations of a 'science of diplomacy'. While political theory developed into the state science from the later seventeenth century, diplomatic theory remained outside the academic curriculum, except as a subsection of international law. A group of theorists began to consider this situation unsatisfactory, claiming that the mounting importance of diplomacy in the states-system had to find its adequate expression and recognition in the form of a modern and distinct discipline. Callières was the first theorist to call for a 'science de la négociation'.¹⁷⁹ The term 'science' denoted both the 'knowledge' *about* diplomacy, postulating diplomacy as a distinct field of knowledge and discipline, and the methodology *of* this discipline, that is a 'scientific' method in the understanding of the time. This was still based on the tradition of the Aristotelian political 'scientia', but, under the influence of the 'Scientific Revolution', was combined with a new understanding of methodology as a systematic explanatory scheme of laws and maxims, based on logic and reason, and substantiated by evidence and observation. Consequently, eighteenth-century theorists began to refer to the 'science de négociation' as a distinct field of knowledge and a theoretical system that should constitute the basis for the conduct of diplomacy.¹⁸⁰

However, the concept of a 'diplomatic science' was problematic: diplomacy could not completely be grasped with the Cartesian 'esprit de système' or the 'raison' of the early Enlightenment. There could be no 'règles certaines' in diplomacy, no 'analysis according to

¹⁷⁹ Callières, *De la manière*, p.3. Similarly, Franquesnay, *Ministre public*, pp.5, 7, with reference to the general 'droit publique'. The term 'science diplomatique' was used only after 1800, see Martens, *Manuel diplomatique* (Paris, 1822), p.4.

¹⁸⁰ For example, Callières, *De la manière*, p.3; Mably, *Principes des négociations*, p.16; Nourar, *Ministère du négociateur*, preface, unpaginated.

the rules of mathematics'.¹⁸¹ Even as they called for a new status of diplomatic theory as a 'scientific' discipline, authors in the late seventeenth century were increasingly becoming aware of the limitations of diplomatic theory. The variety of situations, characters and interests which foreign policy had to take into account jeopardised the validity of any theoretical system. Accordingly, theorists were caught in the dilemma between general axiom and individual prudence and experience. The diplomat's task could not be wholly captured in a systematic 'scientia'; in its practical implementation, it was more than ever an 'art' that depended on individual talents. Chamoy believed that 'il n'est pas possible d'en donner des règles certaines, et c'est ce qui dépend autant des occasions et de la disposition des affaires, et des gens avec qui l'ambassadeur aura à négocier que de son habilité et de sa prudence'.¹⁸² This scepticism continued into the eighteenth century. Despite their call for a diplomatic science, Mably and Nourar doubted that the 'art de négociation' could be completely grasped in the form of a systematic science.¹⁸³

Thus, the general distinction between 'scientia' and 'ars' affected diplomatic theory in several ways: on one hand, the two terms referred to the approach, method of organisation and 'scientific' location of the discipline between 'system' and 'empiricism'; on the other, they related to the question whether the diplomat's 'qualités' could be acquired by science and study or were innate and attached to the noble status. Diplomatic 'art' was understood as the translation of theoretical knowledge into prudent behaviour. It depended on talents that were partly innate ('talens naturels') and partly developed by practice and experience ('talens

¹⁸¹ Wicquefort, *L'Ambassadeur*, i, p.3; Bragaccia, *Ambasciadore*, p.340.

¹⁸² Chamoy, *Parfait ambassadeur*, p.37. See already Vera, *Parfait ambassadeur*, edn.1709, p.21: 'De vrai les règles générales ne sont pas suffisantes pour gouverner les affaires particulières [...] il n'y a que deux maîtres pour cette doctrine, qui sont le naturel et l'expérience'.

¹⁸³ Mably, *Principes des négociations*, p.21; Nourar, *Ministère du négociateur*, p.v. See still Martens, *Manuel diplomatique*, pp.1-2.

acquises').¹⁸⁴ The prominent place of the terms 'expérience', 'esprit' and 'génie' in diplomatic theory illustrates that all authors subscribed to the idea of diplomacy as an art. However, theorists believed that a union of science and art was desirable. Their treatises should provide the corpus of knowledge about diplomacy and basic maxims of behaviour, which should then be implemented by the diplomat's 'génie' and 'prudence'. The ideal-type of the perfect ambassador was to remain at the heart of a diplomatic science.¹⁸⁵ But the status of diplomatic theory in the intellectual framework of the *respublica litteraria* needed to be elevated to a distinct discipline.

The call for a diplomatic 'science' can only be fully appreciated if developments in related disciplines are taken into account. To a certain extent, diplomatic theory mirrored the general trends of political science. With the rise of the doctrine of political prudence in the seventeenth century, the dichotomy between 'scientia' and 'ars' achieved a pivotal place, influencing the emergence of the empirical state science.¹⁸⁶ Yet even as late as 1760, the dichotomy of science and art prompted Bielfeld to state that 'tout est art, tout est système aujourd'hui', referring to the rationalist spirit that sought to capture the ever-changing reality in theoretical systems and mechanistic models. The 'esprit de système' had conquered reflections upon foreign politics, and the term 'system' was also applied to the interests of state and the balance of power.¹⁸⁷ On the other hand, diplomatic theory corresponded to the 'Staatenkunde' that championed the empirical method by subtracting the interests of states

¹⁸⁴ Callières, *De la manière*, pp.1-2; Pecquet, *Art de négocier*, p.3; Keith, *Observations on the Office*, pp.129-30. This was also expressed in the image of the 'pilot', cf. footnote 138.

¹⁸⁵ Wicquefort, *L'Ambassadeur*, i, pp.2-3; Chamoy, *Parfait ambassadeur*, p.44.

¹⁸⁶ Cf. M.Scattola, *Dalla virtù alla scienza: la fondazione e la trasformazione della disciplina politica nell'età moderna* (Milan, 2003).

¹⁸⁷ Bielfeld, *Institutions politiques*, i, pp.1, 4, 14; ii, pp.62, 78, 144. Bielfeld anchored the science of negotiation in a 'science des cabinets'. Francquesnay, *Ministre public*, p.103, had aligned it to a 'système complet des intérêts respectifs de tout les états'. On the background, see B.Stollberg-Rillinger, *Der Staat als Maschine. Zur politischen Methaphorik des absoluten Fürstenstaats* (Berlin, 1986).

from an analysis of their resources and strength.¹⁸⁸ At the same time, empiricism and the inductive method were also gaining importance in international law and ceremonial theory.¹⁸⁹ As diplomatic theory, the 'science of ceremonial' ('Ceremoniell-Wissenschaft') was anchored between the poles of legal theory and the doctrine of political prudence and decorum, seeking to find a position in the scientific setting adequate to the increased weight of ceremonial in the post-1648 period. From present customs and historical examples, it deduced a logical system of maxims. Yet in the claim of a 'scientific' treatment, the authors of ceremonial handbooks also shared their diplomatic colleagues' conflict between system and empiricism, between science and art.¹⁹⁰ The same dilemma could be observed in international law, where the issue of whether the 'droit des gens' was to be treated on the basis of natural law or on precedents and customs was a dominating subject of debate.¹⁹¹ The crucial importance of both international and national public law for the science of diplomacy became apparent when Wicquefort placed his new methodology in the context of legal theory.¹⁹² Although the treatises of Chamoy, Callières and Pecquet sought to emancipate the 'art of negotiation' from public law, the 'droit public de l'Europe' became the cornerstone of the 'science des négociations' from the 1730s onwards.¹⁹³

In the century following the Peace of Westphalia, we can thus identify three stages. At the beginning of this period, diplomatic theory had already developed into a distinct genre but was still considered a sub-section of political and legal theory. Wicquefort's treatise

¹⁸⁸ See Klueting, *Lehre von der Macht*, p.119, who, however, only refers to Bielfeld.

¹⁸⁹ See Wicquefort, *L'Ambassadeur*, i, p.2.

¹⁹⁰ See Stieve, *Europäisches Hof-Ceremoniell*, p.3: 'Je höher aber nun diese Scientz, und je gemeiner derer tägliche Praxis in und ausser den Höfen; je nöthiger aber auch zugleich beschwerlicher ist es, selbige auf einen festen Grund zu setzen, und in die Formam eines Systematis zu bringen'.

¹⁹¹ See Grewe, *Epochen des Völkerrechts*, ch.iv; Frey, *Diplomatic Immunity*, pp.185 ff.

¹⁹² Wicquefort, *L'Ambassadeur*, i, p.1. See also Francquesnay, *Ministre public*, preface and p.4.

¹⁹³ Notably in the *Traité des ambassades*, the treatises of Francquesnay, Mably, Réal, and in subsequent treatises of La Maillardiére (1775), Pacassi (1775), Römer (1788) and Martens (1822). On the 'droit public de l'Europe', see Reibstein, 'Das "Europäische Öffentliche Recht" 1648-1815'.

marks the second stage – a period of further emancipation from political theory, in which the system of precepts was now derived from a collection of customs, examples and experience. In this stage, two different forms of a 'science of diplomacy' were advanced: one transforming the 'ideal ambassador' into an encyclopaedia of diplomatic practice, the other putting more stress on the 'art of negotiation'.¹⁹⁴ Finally, the 'science of negotiation' was combined with the interests of states and the 'droit public de l'Europe' and integrated into a more comprehensive science of foreign policy, as the treatises of Francquesnay, Mably, Bielfeld and Nourar demonstrate. Although they abandoned the 'ideal ambassador' as focal point of diplomatic theory, the cohesion of the discourse was maintained by continuity in focus, format, and by drawing on previous treatises and on diplomatic history since the mid-seventeenth century.¹⁹⁵

In calling for a 'science des négociations', theorists endeavoured to establish diplomacy as an acknowledged field of scholarship that complied with current methodological trends, since these, in their concentration on present practice, were regarded as appropriate to depict the new quality of international relations. In this way, theorists also sought to raise the awareness of the learned European public with regard to diplomacy. Furthermore, the function of a diplomatic science was didactic: by presenting the current knowledge about diplomatic practice in a systematic form, it would become the basis of preparation for the diplomatic corps; either as the foundation of a discipline taught at universities and academies, or as guidance for individual study. Yet, by recasting the design

¹⁹⁴ For this reason, they often recommended Wicquefort's treatise as source of historical examples and current customs, or left it to the diplomat to extract maxims of behaviour from the study of modern history and the observation of European customs.

¹⁹⁵ This trend continued into the nineteenth century, see for example Ahnert, *Lehrbegriff der Wissenschaften*; Liechtenstern, *Diplomatie als Wissenschaft*; Martens, *Guide diplomatique*. Yet only with the institution of 'International Relations' chairs after the First World War did the 'science of foreign policy' achieve a firm place in the academic context.

of diplomatic theory, theorists also had to reconsider the traditional portrait of the 'ideal ambassador'.

Ideal Diplomat and 'espion honorable' – From Political Ethics to Diplomatic Prudence

The third layer of continuity concerns the language and the concepts of the 'ideal ambassador'. In order to arrive at a more differentiated picture of tradition and change in diplomatic theory, it is necessary to determine three aspects: the origins of the elements of continuity; the authors' motivation for creating an ideal-type; and the changes occurring underneath the level of semantic tradition. It will be demonstrated that alterations in the hierarchy and the conception of central components were related to developments in diplomatic practice. In this way, theorists not only managed to incorporate the new demands of the states-system into the ideal-type, but also went beyond the practice and transformed the catalogue of virtues into the ethos of a diplomatic 'profession'.

The Ideal Ambassador and Political Ethics

In the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, the model ambassador had been construed according to the model prince and the model 'politicus'. Semantic terms and concepts originally taken from political theory became stylistic traditions of the 'ideal ambassador' genre. A set of virtues was considered as being universally valid for the diplomat. As a good Christian, 'homme du bien' and 'honnête homme', he had to be sincere and just. As a representative and servant of a prince, he had to be loyal and faithful.¹⁹⁶ Furthermore, diplomacy was presented as the antipode to war, and the diplomat's function as substituting reason and persuasion for

¹⁹⁶ Theorists quoted the Bible, Prov.25/13. For example, Hoevelen, *Teutsche Gesandte*, p.118; *Traité*, preface.

force. Consequently, his virtues included wit, prudence and eloquence.¹⁹⁷ To the same extent as the literature on ministers, councillors and courtiers, a diplomatic treatise provided an instruction to act correctly on the political stage and was thus a 'tractatus ethicus-politicus' that comprised both the technical knowledge of the diplomat's function and his ethos.¹⁹⁸

Shaped in the humanistic period, diplomatic theory stood in the Aristotelian tradition of political virtue and prudence and deliberately created an ideal-type that should serve as model for imitation and perfection. Theorists realised that the circumstances of an embassy were diverse and unpredictable, obliging them to prescribe a comprehensive set of virtues and maxims in order to cover every possible situation. The problem of establishing definite maxims of behaviour found its expression in the image of the diplomat as 'pilot', who had to navigate on the ocean of international politics according to the winds of 'fortuna'. Carafa termed the diplomats' prudence 'con le sole carte da navigare, con le sole instruzione de' negozi'.¹⁹⁹

However, in the seventeenth century a debate commenced on the function of the 'ideal-type' and the catalogue of virtues. The widening scope and intensity of diplomacy, combined with longer periods of residence abroad, were placing ever more demands on the diplomat. While this made a model for orientation even more indispensable, it also rendered the attempt to provide valid maxims more difficult. This dilemma had already been expressed by Kirchner and Hotman, who regarded their predecessors' portrait of the diplomat as an utopian ideal that 'ne fut iamais parmy les hommes, car ils veulent qu'il soit théologien, astrologue, dialecticien, orateur excellent, scavant comme Aristotle, et sage comme

¹⁹⁷ Vera, *Parfait ambassadeur*, edn.1709, p.29.

¹⁹⁸ Cf. M.Stolleis, 'Grundzüge der Beamtenethik (1550-1650)', in idem, *Staat und Staatsräson in der Frühen Neuzeit* (Frankfurt, 1990), 197-231. The term 'ethos' is used in the sense of an attitude and outlook marked by ethical and moral norms.

¹⁹⁹ Carafa, *Ambasciadore*, p.11. This metaphor stemmed from the image of the ruler as 'gubernator' steering the state-ship, cf. I.Meichsner, *Die Logik von Gemeinplätzen, vorgeführt an Steuermannstopos und Schiffsmetapher* (Bonn, 1983).

Salomon'.²⁰⁰ As the task of the diplomat was becoming more demanding and requiring a specialist knowledge on top of the qualities a politician or courtier had to possess, theorists began to feel that the catalogue of virtues and the maxims of behaviour had to be referred more to the particular functions of diplomacy. This led to an intense discussion in the second half of the seventeenth century. Howell attacked previous authors for bringing forward 'such general notions' that could 'fit any other minister of state, or man of business'.²⁰¹ Wicquefort deplored the fact that his predecessors' ideal-type 'ne nous donnent que des lieux communs; de sorte qu'au lieu de former un ministre accompli, ils s'estendent sur des qualités, qui ne luy sont pas propres ny particulières, mais sans lesquelles on ne scauroit estre ny bon citoyen ny honneste homme'.²⁰² Yet, even as theorists began to call for a more specific treatment of the ideal ambassador, they retained the established ideal-type because they regarded it as a suitable didactic instrument.²⁰³ Indeed, the complexity of international relations in the emerging states-system demanded even greater levels of virtue and prudence, for the diplomat had to contend with more variables: the situations and interests of all the European states.²⁰⁴ Although theorists agreed with their predecessors that the diplomat's qualities had to comprise those of the courtly politician and accomplished statesman, they argued that a specialist ethos and qualification were necessary for the new type of diplomat acting in a states-system.²⁰⁵ A prerequisite for the emergence of a diplomatic ethos in the later seventeenth century was the transformation of the catalogue of virtues into a 'diplomatic prudence'. This was initiated by the incorporation of general trends of political theory in the first half of the seventeenth century.

²⁰⁰ Hotman, *L'Ambassadeur*, p.12; Kirchner, *Legatus*, p.15.

²⁰¹ Howell, *A Distinct Treatise*, preface.

²⁰² Wicquefort, *L'Ambassadeur*, i, p.2. This is emulated by Schmid, *Der Gesandte*, fos.1-2. The problem still engaged Pecquet, *Art de négocier*, p.62; Mably, *Principes des négociations*, p.235.

²⁰³ See Chamoy, *Parfait ambassadeur*, p.44; *Traité des ambassades*, p.107.

²⁰⁴ Pecquet, *Art de négocier*, pp.xv-xvi.

²⁰⁵ On the specialisation of the 'politicus', see Weber, 'Erfindung des Politikers'.

From Ethics to Prudence – The 'Espion Honorable' and the Machiavellian Challenge

As in other branches of political theory, the concept of 'prudence' was central to diplomatic theory and served as a reservoir for ideas associated with the reason of state, Neostoicism, and courtly behaviour.²⁰⁶ Theorists were concerned with the problem of 'utile' and 'honestum' in diplomacy, notably the question whether the diplomat could employ secrecy, dissimulation, lying and corruption in the execution of his function. How could he serve the interests of state and still remain an 'homme du bien'? From the turn of the seventeenth century, this issue achieved a pivotal place in diplomatic theory.²⁰⁷ Treatises began to display a more sceptical and dialectic treatment of the diplomat's function.²⁰⁸

The virtue of prudence not only became the focal point of concepts connected with the practices of secrecy, but also the means of bridging the conflict between 'utile' and 'honestum'. While the semantic field of 'probitas' and 'sinceritas' had been a standard component of the catalogue of virtues, the qualities connected with 'secretum' had only gradually become more prominent with the spread of resident embassies. Diplomats were carriers of secrets and had to fulfil a double-role in discovering secret information and in protecting the 'arcana' of their own prince. The task of gathering information was a main reason for establishing resident embassies. With the mounting mass of information to be collected and transmitted, the handling of secrets became a central function of the diplomat,

²⁰⁶ On the background, see Viroli, *From Politics to Reason of State*; M. Stolleis, *Arcana imperii und Ratio status. Bemerkungen zur politischen Theorie des frühen 17. Jahrhunderts* (Göttingen, 1980); G. Oestreich, *Antiker Geist und moderner Staat bei Justus Lipsius (1547-1606). Der Neustoizismus als politische Bewegung* (Berlin, 1989); G. Abel, *Stoizismus und die Frühe Neuzeit. Zur Entstehungsgeschichte modernen Denkens im Feld von Ethik und Politik* (Berlin, 1978).

²⁰⁷ The issue of secrecy in diplomacy has engaged Renaissance historians, see M. Bullard, 'Secrecy, Diplomacy and Language in the Renaissance', *Zeitsprünge*, 6 (2002), 77-97; J. Woodhouse, 'Honourable Dissimulation: Some Italian Advice for the Renaissance Diplomat', *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 84 (Oxford, 1994), 25-50.

²⁰⁸ Keith, *Observations on the Office*, p.51. Cf. Bazzoli, 'Ragion di stato', p.309.

who at the same time had to be much more deeply involved in the courtly society in order to discover a state's 'arcana'. The practices of secrecy comprised dissimulation, deceit, disguise, bribery and lying, and carried negative connotations with the reason of state developed by Machiavelli, Botero and others. As these practices came to be used more widely in diplomacy, the ideal-type of the virtuous and Christian 'pacific actor' became more problematic. This was mirrored in the frequent employment of the ironic expression 'espion honorable' by theorists of diplomacy.²⁰⁹ Furthermore, from around 1600 they amplified the sections on the practices of secrecy under the caption 'prudent behaviour'.²¹⁰ If this can be interpreted as a move towards a more practical outlook upon the catalogue of virtues, it also aggravated the theorists' dilemma of portraying the diplomat both in his actual function and as 'homme du bien'.

In the early seventeenth century, a compromise between 'honestum' and 'utile' became possible in the form of the ethically neutral 'prudence politique'. Following the Neostoicist Lipsius, the Spaniard Vera distinguished between several types of prudence in order to permit a certain degree of diplomatic dissimulation.²¹¹ By combining reason of state and Neostoicist thought, diplomatic theory argued that in conflicting situations, prudent behaviour could be detached from the Christian and moral code.²¹² How far the diplomat's

²⁰⁹ Wicquefort adopted the term from Commynes, see *Ambassadeur*, ii, p.10, whereas the *Embajada española* attributed it to the Spanish ambassador Ronquillo (p.30); cf. the manuscript 'Breves noticias, y prevenciones concernientes al ministerio publico en las cortes estrangeros' (1707), AAE, MD France 307, fo.207^v. See also Callières, *De la manière*, p.30.

²¹⁰ This corresponds to Bazzoli's interpretation in 'Ragion di stato'; cf. my article 'Ehrenhafte Spione. Geheimnis, Verstellung und Offenheit in der Diplomatie des 17. Jahrhunderts', in C.Benthien, S.Martus (eds.), *Die Kunst der Aufrichtigkeit im 17. Jahrhundert* (Tübingen, 2006), 127-48.

²¹¹ Vera, *Parfait ambassadeur*, edn.1709, pp.203-4. Cf. G.A.Davies, 'The Influence of Justus Lipsius in Juan Antonio de Vera y Figueroa's "Embaxador"', *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies*, 42 (1965), p.168; L.G.Arias, 'El Perfecto embajador segun Juan Antonio de Vera', *Anuario de la Asociacion Francisco de Vitoria* (1948), 333-81.

²¹² Cf. Frigo, 'Virtu politiche e "pratica delle corti": l'immagine dell'ambasciatore tra Cinque e Seicento', in C.Continasio, C.Mozzarelli (eds.), *Repubblica e virtù. Pensiero politico e monarchia cattolica fra XVI e XVII secolo* (Rome, 1995), 355-76; Bazzoli, 'Ragion di Stato', pp.303-4. Cf. H.Wessel, *Zweckmäßigkeit als Handlungsprinzip in der deutschen Regierungs- und Verwaltungslehre der frühen Neuzeit* (Berlin, 1978).

prudence had become transformed is apparent in Hoevelen's 1679 treatise, which praised diplomats versed in the arts of intrigue and secrecy. A year later, Wicquefort used the term 'honorable espionage' to describe the compromise between the private virtue of the diplomat and his public function.²¹³ At the end of the seventeenth century, the practices of secrecy, including espionage, had become fully established as part of the diplomat's function and were described in more detail.²¹⁴ Following Wicquefort, Callières depicted the diplomatic function as 'to negotiate the affairs of his prince and to discover those of others'.²¹⁵ At the same time, however, these practices had to be employed cautiously, in order not to compromise the diplomat's reputation.²¹⁶ As much as diplomatic theory accepted the practices of espionage and corruption, it continued to stress the importance of the diplomat's good reputation; and indeed more so after the spread of permanent diplomatic representation required a prolonged stay abroad: reputation constituted the basis for successful representation and negotiation. In the interests of state, the diplomat had to accomplish the balancing act between secret practices and the appearance of sincerity.

The adaptation of the ideal ambassador's prudence to the practice of resident diplomacy was connected with the absorption of courtly literature. Since the diplomat resided at foreign courts, he had to emulate the behaviour of the 'cortegiano' or 'aulicus' and become practiced in the arts of pleasing and dissimulation. As the courtier described by Castiglione, Gracian and Refuge, the diplomat needed to hide his thoughts and passions behind a mask of

²¹³ Wicquefort, *L'Ambassadeur*, ii, p.10; Hoevelen, *Teutsche Gesandte*, p.75.

²¹⁴ On the close links between diplomacy and espionage, see Bély, *Espions et ambassadeurs*, ch.I ('L'Information secrète dans le champ de la diplomatie'); E.Opitz, 'Diplomacy and Secret Communications in the Seventeenth Century. Some Remarks on the Method of Gaining News in the Age of Absolutism', in B.Huldt, W.Agrell (eds.), *Clio goes Spying. Eight Essays on the History of Intelligence* (Solna, 1983), 64-84.

²¹⁵ Callières, *De la manière*, p.85. Wicquefort, *L'Ambassadeur*, ii, p.10.

²¹⁶ Hoevelen, *Teutsche Gesandte*, p.105; Francquesnay, *Ministre public*, pp.177-8.

equanimity, while exercising the arts of civility, pleasing and insinuation.²¹⁷ In contrast to the courtier, however, the diplomat instrumentalised these arts in order to detect the court's secrets and the interests and passions of the persons exercising an influence on foreign policy. Furthermore, he had to protect his own secrets, while at the same time appearing sincere and open in order to maintain his reputation as 'honnête homme'. Thus, under the influence of the reason of state and the theory of courtly behaviour, the appearance of virtues became more important than the virtues themselves. The image of the diplomat as performer, often employed by Wicquefort, made clear that diplomacy was the art of acting on the stage of courtly politics.²¹⁸

As in other genres of political theory, therefore, the conflict between reason of state and Christian and moral ethics resulted in a transformation of the concept of prudence in the first half of the seventeenth century. Moreover, these trends were adapted to the specific situation of the diplomat, who differed from the 'politicus' and the 'courtier': not only was his behaviour determined by the balancing-act between private virtue and public function, but also by balancing the practices of secrecy with the up-holding of reputation and international communication. His prudence, therefore, was a 'diplomatic prudence'. This was the precondition for transforming the ideal-type of the ambassador into the ethos of the state-system's diplomatic *corps*.

Prudence, 'Confiance', and the Corps Diplomatique – Diplomacy in the States-System

The general dilemma between the 'utile' and 'honestum' of diplomacy, and the dichotomy between secrecy and sincerity remained a key feature of diplomatic theory in the following

²¹⁷ See for example Hoevelen, *Teutsche Gesandte*, p.110; Wicquefort, *L'Ambassadeur*, ii, p.5-6 Callières, *De la manière*, pp.21, 41-5.

²¹⁸ Wicquefort, *L'Ambassadeur*, ii, p.3. Cp. C.Carter, 'Wicquefort on the Ambassador and his Functions', *Studies in History and Politics*, 11 (1981/82), p.58.

decades.²¹⁹ Even at the end of the seventeenth century, this conflict could not be completely resolved, as the late discussion of Machiavelli in Carafa's *Ambasciadore politico-christiano* reveals. In the eighteenth century, the dilemma continued to occupy theorists, particularly in view of the Enlightenment criticism of diplomacy. Theorists were wary of the consequences dissimulation and dissembling entailed on the international stage. 'Verité et probité' figured prominently in their catalogue of virtues, and the 'qualités du coeur' were regarded as important as intellectual capacity.²²⁰ Around the turn of the eighteenth century, on the other hand, a new line of argument was introduced in diplomatic theory, which related the dichotomy between ethical maxims and prudent behaviour to the states-system.

The diplomat owed his prince obedience and was, in the pursuit of his interests, an instrument of the reason of state.²²¹ At the same time, the growing interdependence of the system's actors demanded the maintenance of international communication. Moreover, the diplomat's reputation determined his success in negotiation, and 'la réputation d'honnête homme est aussy nécessaire qu'en aucune autre profession'.²²² As a consequence, a certain atmosphere of confidence and trust ('confiance') and the appearance of honesty were crucial for successful resident diplomacy. Diplomats who were exposed for using lies, fraud and deceit jeopardised their credit and reputation and, consequently, endangered the success of their mission. Pecquet argued: 'Le succès du négociateur dépendant absolument de la confiance qu'il inspire, il lui est indispensable d'avoir des sentimens de candeur, de vérité et

²¹⁹ Howell, *A Distinct Treatise*, p.196.

²²⁰ This is most obvious in Pecquet, *Art de négocier*; cf. idem, *Parallèle du coeur, de l'esprit et du bon sens* (Paris, 1740). See also Francquesnay, *Ministre public*, pp.187-8; Nourar, *Ministère du négociateur*, p.xxiv.

²²¹ This was expressed in the concept of 'fidelity' that featured among the key virtues of the 'ideal ambassador'. Connected was the question whether the diplomat should obey his prince's orders if they were unethical, see Vera, *Parfait ambassadeur*, edn.1709, pp.166-93. Also treated was the question whether the diplomat could accept presents at the end of the mission, e.g. Wicquefort, *L'Ambassadeur*, i, 948-65. Cf. H.Duchhardt, 'Das diplomatische Abschiedsgeschenk', *AfK*, 57 (1975), 345-62.

²²² Chamoy, *Parfait ambassadeur*, p.22. See also Callières, *De la manière*, pp.35-8.

de probité'.²²³ Apart from an ethical foundation, probity and 'confiance' were now mandatory to the princes' interests: 'L'intérêt de leurs maîtres demande qu'ils apportent à l'exercice de leur ministère toute la probité possible'.²²⁴ Thus, at the same time as the practices of secrecy had become fully established in the diplomat's prudence, the semantic field of sincerity and probity was reorganised around the term 'confiance'.²²⁵ As the seventeenth century drew to a close, theorists maintained that diplomacy was not only necessary for the individual states' welfare but also for the overall balance of the system. This affected the conduct of diplomacy: with the spread of permanent representation, a *corps* of diplomats could be found at all major European courts and at the frequent congresses. In the diplomats' actions, a symbolical dimension was inherent, since their meeting, their behaviour towards each other, and their parting all threw light onto their sovereigns' relationship. The diplomatic corps shared common practices, interests and privileges.

Le corps des ministres étrangères dans uns pais forme une espèce de société indépendante dont les membres vivent entre eux proportionnement pour l'intimité à la manière dont leurs souverains sont ensemble; mais toujours avec politesse et honnêteté, même quand les maîtres sont en guerre. Conduits par des intérêts différens, et souvent opposés, ils ont cependant tous un objet commun qui consiste à connoître la pais ou ils sont, et à faire réussir les vues qui leur sont confiées. Ils sont liés en même-tems par une communauté de privilèges, dont l'infraction au préjudice de l'un devient la cause de tous.²²⁶

Hence, theorists in the eighteenth century argued that the diplomat had to align his behaviour to the 'société' and 'sociabilité' of the diplomatic corps symbolising the states-system. In their view, the new era of international relations demanded a balancing act between the pursuit of the interests of state and the cooperation and good relationship with other diplomats. 'Confiance' in this manner denoted a certain degree of openness between diplomats of

²²³ Pecquet, *Art de négocier*, p.6.

²²⁴ Francquesnay, *Ministre public*, p.187. See also Callières, *De la science du monde, et des connoissances utiles à la conduite de la vie* (Brussels, 1717), p.192. Cf. Jusserand, 'School for Ambassadors', p.461.

²²⁵ Chamoy, *Parfait ambassadeur*, pp.22, 33-4; Callières, *De la manière*, pp.46, 176; Francquesnay, *Ministre public*, pp.188-9, 202; Pecquet, *Art de négocier*, pp.6, 32, 80, 84, 154.

²²⁶ Pecquet, *Art de négocier*, p.134.

different states. Within the corps, the art of secrecy was subjected to different rules, allowing for continuous and polite communication and the exchange of news, as long as the 'arcana imperii' were not infringed: 'Tous les ministres étrangers qui résident à une cour établissent entr'eux une société dont le but principal est un commerce réciproque de nouvelles'.²²⁷ Even if their masters were at war, polite intercourse should be maintained.²²⁸ Concurrently, while the diplomat was a 'ministre public' who acted on the stage of European politics, the diplomatic sphere was separated from the public sphere by secrecy; a conviction that went against the Enlightenment concept of diplomacy.²²⁹ International relations were portrayed as being conducted by a specialist and multinational elite, whose close cooperation and communication should exert a civilising influence on European politics. The concept of 'diplomatic prudence' thus enabled theorists to transform the catalogue of virtues into a theory that became the basis for a new representation of the diplomatic function in the states-system. In combination with the term 'confiance', it became the foundation of a 'diplomatic ethos' in which secrecy, power politics and civilised behaviour were in unison. This ethos centred on the terms 'esprit', 'politesse' and 'art de négociation'.

An Ethos of European Diplomacy – the Art of Negotiating at Foreign Courts

Within the catalogue of virtues, theorists distinguished between the 'qualités du coeur' and the 'qualités d'esprit'. The intellectual virtues were either inborn or acquired by practice and experience. Within this arrangement, the term 'esprit' came to be linked to the 'art de négocier' that paid credit to the increased activity of permanent embassies and of congress

²²⁷ Bielfeld, *Institutions politiques*, ii, p.225. Cf. Chamoy, *Parfait ambassadeur*, pp.33-4; Francquesnay, *Ministre public*, pp.201-2.

²²⁸ Schmid, *Der Gesandte*, fo.221^v; Pecquet, *Art de négocier*, p.134.

²²⁹ For example, Callières, *De la manière*, p.206. Cf. J.-C.Waquet, 'Le Négociateur et l'art de négocier dans l'Europe des princes: du ministre public à l'envoyé secret', in B.Gaintot, P.Serna (eds.), *Secret et République, 1795-1840* (Clermont-Ferrand, 2004), 39-56.

negotiation. The prominent place of the term 'esprit' also indicates that in diplomatic theory, the 'ars' versus 'scientia' discussion continued into the eighteenth century.

Under the influence of Neostoic philosophy and the Baroque theory of passions, diplomatic theory conceived the 'art of negotiation' as a concept of eloquence, persuasion, esprit and psychological penetration.²³⁰ Theorists took over these concepts from manuals on courtly behaviour which described the techniques of insinuation, psychological penetration and the exploitation of human passions.²³¹ Diplomats residing at foreign courts had to accommodate themselves to different personalities, and to influence princes, ministers and courtiers through a knowledge of their passions and interests.²³² Innate 'esprit' and intellect, psychological penetration as well as eloquence acquired by training and experience were required in this art.²³³ The talents appertaining to negotiation were becoming more prominent in the portrait of the 'ideal ambassador', and, in the early eighteenth century, constituted the focal point of diplomatic theory. This resulted not only in the transformation of the catalogue of virtues into a theory of negotiation but also in the replacement of the title 'Parfait ambassadeur' by 'Art de négociier'.²³⁴ This art of psychological discernment and diplomatic acumen still influenced the article 'Des négociations, ou de l'art de négociier' in Félice's encyclopaedia, which described the diplomat's task according to 'principes relatifs à la théorie des passions'.²³⁵

²³⁰ The concept of 'esprit' was also influenced by Pascal's thought and often used similarly to 'génie'. On the distinction between the two terms, see Francquesnay, *Ministre public*, pp.139-44. Cf. Bury, *Littérature et politesse*.

²³¹ In this manner for example Refuge, *Traité de la cour*. On the psychological aspect of the courtly literature, cf. Scheffers, *Höfische Konvention*.

²³² Callières, *De la manière*, pp.20, 58, 150. See also idem, *Science du monde*, p.8; furthermore, Keith, *Observations on the Office*, p.55; Francquesnay, *Ministre public*, pp.157-8.

²³³ See the *Traité des ambassades*, p.137.

²³⁴ In the treatises of Callières, Pecquet, Mably, Bielfeld and Nourar. Pecquet even believed that 'everything in life is negotiation', *Art de négociier*, pp.vii-viii.

²³⁵ 'Des négociations, ou de l'art de négociier', in F.de Félice, *Dictionnaire de justice naturelle et civile [...]* (Yverdon, 1778), xiv, 176-95.

Further elements of courtly behaviour were attached to the terms 'prudence' and 'esprit'. This mirrored the general trend of aristocratic-courtly manners becoming an ideal of fashionable behaviour;²³⁶ for more than any other occupation, diplomacy was linked to the courtly stage of international relations in the 'société des princes'. The diplomats assembled abroad took part in the ceremonial and social life at court and formed a miniature courtly society among themselves.²³⁷ Consequently, the 'ideal ambassador' was required to possess the manners and the 'art d'un habile courtisan'. Wicquefort owned that he 'doit etre parfait galant-homme, c'est a dire un homme fait à la mode de la cour'.²³⁸ The importance of courtly manners in diplomacy was particularly stressed by the theorists Keith and Chesterfield, who perceived British diplomats to be lagging behind the French in this respect.²³⁹ Pecquet regarded aristocratic 'politesse' as a characteristic element of the diplomatic corps, which should contribute to the civilisation of the 'société internationale'.²⁴⁰ Thus, courtly-aristocratic virtues ('civilité, honnêteté, politesse') came to constitute a key element of the diplomatic 'language' and ethos. The diplomatic corps profited from the cosmopolitan outlook of the European aristocracy and its common 'code' of social manners and the French language.²⁴¹ Still, the courtier's gallantry and 'art de plaire' needed to be modified to fit the representative character of a diplomat who always had to possess a notion of 'gravité' in his comportment.²⁴² At the same time, the diplomat's appearance as an actor on the political stage emphasized the need for

²³⁶ Cf. Bury, *Littérature et politesse*; Reichhardt, 'Honnête homme'; Scheffers, *Höfische Konvention und Aufklärung*.

²³⁷ Bély, *Espions et ambassadeurs*, pp.374-5, 745. Theorists admitted that negotiating in republics required different strategies, although the ideal of courtly behaviour was held as universally valid. See for example Callières, *De la manière*, pp.156-7.

²³⁸ Wicquefort, *L'Ambassadeur*, ii, p.4. See also Callières, *De la manière*, pp.21, 26-7, 150.

²³⁹ Chesterfield, *Lettres à son fils*, pp.115, 181, 254; Keith, *Observations on the Office*, pp.55-6. For the diplomat, courtly behaviour included hosting dinners at his own house and attending social events at court, see for example Callières, *De la manière*, pp.25-7.

²⁴⁰ Pecquet, *Art de négocier*, p.134.

²⁴¹ Bély, *Espions et ambassadeurs*, pp.375-6.

²⁴² Wicquefort, *L'Ambassadeur*, ii, pp.4-5; Keith, *Observations on the Office*, p.55.

dissimulation.²⁴³ Moreover, diplomatic behaviour differed from courtly behaviour in so far as it had to be embedded in an analysis of the interests of states. As a consequence, eighteenth-century diplomatic theory combined the art of negotiation with sections on the situation and interests of states in the European system.

An analysis of the terms and expressions used in the catalogue of virtues reveals that, despite formal and semantic continuity, the portrait of the 'ideal ambassador' was transformed. In the course of adapting the 'ideal ambassador' to the new demands of a states-system, theorists incorporated trends of political theory and related literary genres, but adapted them to the specific requirements of resident diplomacy in the 'société des princes'. This included the incorporation of the practices of 'secrecy' in the concept of diplomatic prudence, while the antagonism inherent in the term 'espion honorable' met the demands of diplomacy based on intelligence as well as on reputation and 'confiance'. In response to the frequent and prolonged negotiations at the courts and congresses of Europe, a theory of negotiation was developed, tailored to the courtly society. To this was linked a belief in the civilising function of diplomacy which could balance the diverging interests of princes by reason and persuasion, politeness and trust among the *corps diplomatique* – a specific adaption of Enlightenment philosophy to diplomacy! The portrait of the 'ideal ambassador', although still related to the statesman and the courtier, became more specific and functional. At the same time, the catalogue of 'acquired virtues' and 'connaissances' would be transformed into a body of expert knowledge and a plan for the education and training of the diplomatic corps.

²⁴³ Wicquefort, *L'Ambassadeur*, ii, pp.140-1.

A Diplomatic Knowledge Base

Throughout the early modern period, diplomatic theory embraced a standard set of 'connaissances' derived from the liberal arts and the general syllabus of noble education: ancient and modern history, Latin rhetoric, classical and modern literature, philosophy and law, as well as manners and conversation.²⁴⁴ While the humanistic 'ideal ambassador' literature had championed classical rhetoric and the full canon of liberal arts, this ideal met with growing criticism in the seventeenth century. Already Hotman and Kirchner had disapproved of the generalist portrait of the diplomat and endeavoured to limit the 'connaissances' to history, civil and public law and Latin eloquence.²⁴⁵ Yet, the diplomat's knowledge was still compatible with that of any other statesman. Only in the decades after 1660 did theorists commence to develop a set of 'connaissances' specific to the task of a resident diplomat acting in the European states-system.

Firstly, the humanistic concentration on eloquence as an art of the perfect orator changed towards an eloquence that was incorporated in the art of diplomatic negotiation. While knowledge of Latin and classical literature was still presupposed, French became more important as the 'langue universelle' of international relations in the decades around 1700.²⁴⁶ Theorists also attached more importance to the knowledge of other modern languages such as Italian, German and English. For the purpose of gathering information and conducting complex and prolonged negotiations, linguistic knowledge was a definite asset and made the diplomat independent of interpreters.²⁴⁷ Furthermore, the diplomat had to be acquainted with

²⁴⁴ See for example J.C.Sagittarius (praes.), J.H.im Hof (resp.), *Speculum boni legati quod per modum disputationis* (Jena, 1647), pp.5-6.

²⁴⁵ Hotman, *Ambassadeur*, p.12. See also Kirchner, *Legatus*, pp.11-2.

²⁴⁶ Wicquefort, *L'Ambassadeur*, ii, pp.67-70; Pecquet, *Art de négocier*, p.xxxv. The continuing importance of Latin was acknowledged by Chamoy, *Parfait ambassadeur*, p.23; Gundling, *Staatsklugheit*, p.643.

²⁴⁷ Callières, *De la manière*, p.62. Francquesnay, *Ministre public*, pp.99-100, linked the knowledge of languages to the 'sociabilité' within the corps diplomatique. At the same time, Chamoy deplored the French diplomats' deteriorating foreign language skills, *Parfait ambassadeur*, p.24, similarly Pecquet, *Art de négocier*, pp.xxxv-vi.

the modes and forms of diplomatic correspondence. Theorists increasingly regarded the study of classical models and literature only as a preliminary step to developing a diplomat's style, to which should be added the reading of published collections of diplomatic correspondence.²⁴⁸ Among the models of diplomatic writing recommended most frequently were those of the French diplomats Jéannin, d'Ossat and Perron, of the English ambassador Walsingham, as well as the published memoirs relating to the negotiations of Westphalia.²⁴⁹

Secondly, the knowledge of history became more important. With the rejection of classical examples and authorities in favour of a concentration on contemporary practice, the focus shifted towards modern history, comprising the last two centuries.²⁵⁰ Within this field, theorists recommended the study of diplomatic history preserved in acts of negotiations, correspondence, and treaties.²⁵¹ On the other hand, the focus of historical learning was expanded geographically and adapted to the new framework: a diplomat had to become acquainted with the history, interests and relations of all European countries. Wicquefort had already embraced this 'diplomatic history' linked to the knowledge of the interests of states. In 1716, Callières demanded that the future ambassador should 's'instruire de l'état où se trouvent les affaires de l'Europe, des principaux interests qui y règnent et qui la divisent, la forme des divers gouvernemens qui y sont établis et des caractères des princes'.²⁵² The constitution and form of government, the characters and inclinations of princes and ministers, a state's military

²⁴⁸ See Wicquefort's criticism of Latin eloquence based on the study of literature, *L'Ambassadeur*, i, pp.164-8. See further Callières, *De la manière*, pp.52-4.

²⁴⁹ Wicquefort, *L'Ambassadeur*, i, pp.173-4. In the eighteenth century, theorists furthermore recommended Dumont's and Rousset's *Corps diplomatique*, e.g. Bielfeld, *Institutions politiques*, i, p.16; 'Plan d'étude' [c.1786], ed. A.Ruiz, 'Aux origines de la diplomatie contemporaine: De l'ambassadeur improvisé à la formation du spécialiste', *RHD*, 87 (1973), 38-95.

²⁵⁰ Wicquefort, *L'Ambassadeur*, i, pp.3, 169-70. Cf. Hoevelen, *Teutsche Gesandte*, p.44; Pecquet, *Art de négocier*, pp.xxxix-xliii. Theorists after the mid-eighteenth century took 1648 as a starting-point for 'modern' diplomatic history.

²⁵¹ Wicquefort, *L'Ambassadeur*, i, pp.78-9; Callières, *De la manière*, pp.50-5.

²⁵² Callières, *De la manière*, pp.169-70. Cf. Chamoy, *Parfait ambassadeur*, p.26; Pecquet, *Art de négocier*, p.xxxii-iii. On the model of Venetian 'relazioni' for the 'interests of state' and 'statistics', see I.Toscani, 'Etatistisches Denken und erkenntnistheoretische Überlegungen in den venezianischen Relationen', in Stagl/Rassem (eds.), *Statistik und Staatsbeschreibung*, 111-30.

and naval power, its commerce, natural and human resources, its geographical situation, alliances and wars: all these factors had to be taken into account in discovering the interests of states.²⁵³ Although previous treatises had required the diplomat to be familiar with the history, customs and interests of his host country, only from the 1680s was the knowledge of history, power and interests related to the states-system. In the early eighteenth century, the understanding of the position and interests of states had become an integral part of the diplomat's knowledge.²⁵⁴ In the following decades, the art of negotiation was combined with the interests of state and the 'droit public de l'Europe' to form a science of foreign policy that constituted the basis of the diplomat's knowledge and art.

Authors in the late seventeenth century disapproved of the ambassador as 'homo universalis' and rejected the notion that a pedantic study of philosophy, literature, arts and sciences was necessary beyond the basic knowledge befitting the courtly 'honnête homme'.²⁵⁵ The knowledge of law, on the other hand, became ever more important. Apart from the 'droit des gens', a diplomat had to be acquainted both with the laws of his country of residence and with the 'droit public de l'Europe', the legal foundation of alliances, claims and conflicts in the states-system.²⁵⁶ In addition, familiarity with ceremonial customs and rules of precedence acquired a higher standing. Again, Wicquefort's treatise was the first to list the ceremonial practices of his time, 'dont tout le monde sçait que la connoissance est également nécessaire et utile aux ministres publics'.²⁵⁷

²⁵³ The knowledge of commerce and trade did not figure prominently in diplomatic theory before the mid-eighteenth century. See then for example Mably, *Principes des négociations*, p.256.

²⁵⁴ Cf. Klueting, *Die Lehre von der Macht*. A predecessor of the 'interests of state' was, of course, Rohan's *De l'intérêt des princes et états de la Chrestienté* (Paris, 1635).

²⁵⁵ Hoevelen, *Teutsche Gesandte*, pp.44-5; Wicquefort, *L'Ambassadeur*, i, p.2; Callières, *De la manière*, p.63.

²⁵⁶ The history of treaties as basis of the 'droit public de l'Europe' was stressed by Callières, *De la manière*, p.50; Francquesnay, *Ministre public*, ch.2.viii; Nourar, *Ministère du négociateur*, p.286.

²⁵⁷ Francquesnay, *Ministre public*, p.101.

The humanist tradition of politics, ethics and language continued to constitute the basis of the diplomat's knowledge, supplemented by the polite learning championed in the 'honnête homme' literature. However, an increasingly specialised set of 'connaissances' was instilled into the portrait of the 'ideal ambassador', comprising law, modern languages, the history of negotiations and the subjects of the emerging state sciences (European history, 'droit public', statistics and the interests of state). In relating the catalogue of 'connoissances' to an increasingly distinct as well as demanding function, theorists portrayed diplomacy as a specialist 'language' and art; an art that required technical knowledge and practical experience.

Noble Education and Diplomatic Experience. A Programme of Diplomatic Education

How should the knowledge and prudence of the model ambassador be acquired? The methods of learning proposed by the treatises consisted of a theoretical ('étude, réflexion') and a practical part ('expérience, usage, habitude'). Yet again, the question whether the art of diplomacy was innate or acquired by study and experience occupied the theorists. As Hotman had done in 1603, most authors recommended a mixture of study and reading, conversation, travel and experience at court and in politics: the general programme of education for the 'nobilitas politica'.²⁵⁸ Theorists advised the diplomat to take the initiative himself in order to complement the instructions he received from his prince with additional knowledge: he was to seek advice as well as the necessary documents from his predecessor, to read a selection of papers relating to previous negotiations, and to make himself familiar with the country's history and the actual 'état de l'Europe'.²⁵⁹

²⁵⁸ Hotman, *Ambassadeur*, p.13.

²⁵⁹ For example, see Béthune, *Counsellor of Estate*, p.227; Chamoy, *Parfait ambassadeur*, p.27; Callières, *De la manière*, pp.135-8; Pecquet, *Art de négociier*, pp.62-8.

This general education and preparation remained at the heart of diplomatic prudence. Theorists agreed that a diplomat had to prove himself on the stage of domestic politics and at court before he could properly represent his country's interests abroad. Vera saw diplomacy 'comme un abrégé des plus belles charges et offices', and Hoevelen demanded that the diplomat was man of the world, a courtier and councillor.²⁶⁰ Yet, in the later seventeenth century a group of theorists claimed that neither the aristocratic education and socialisation nor the experience of the 'noblesse de robe' was adequate preparation for the new quality of diplomacy in the states-system. As a result, they called for a more specialised and formalised training. The theoretical part was understood as a life-long process of self-instruction for which the 'science of diplomacy' provided the foundation. Diplomatic theory contained the accumulated diplomatic experience in its accounts of diplomatic, legal and ceremonial customs, in addition to recommendations on further literature, published memoirs and correspondence.

Yet, while authors in the humanistic tradition had preferred 'hommes lettrez' as diplomats, Wicquefort and Callières warned of too much erudition and pedantry; the diplomat had to possess the 'usage du monde', know the world and the characters of men, and have gained experience in politics.²⁶¹ In the late seventeenth century, the term 'expérience' featured more prominently in diplomatic theory than ever before. The increased demands on a diplomat's competence made a practical apprenticeship an essential part of his preparation. A diplomat had to practice foreign languages, gain experience in the art of negotiation and in writing diplomatic correspondence, and become acquainted with diplomatic customs and the interests of states. This required a long process of learning, as 'la profession de négociateur demande

²⁶⁰ Vera, *Parfait ambassadeur*, edn.1709, pp.18-9; Hoevelen, *Teutsche Gesandte*, pp.42-3.

²⁶¹ Wicquefort, *Mémoires*, edn.1730, p.7; *L'Ambassadeur*, i, pp.164-8; Callières, *De la manière*, pp.63-4. See also Pecquet, *Art de négocier*, p.xiv, whose own career, in contrast, had been spent exclusively in the ministry's bureaux

des qualitez éminentes qui luy sont propres, ou une longue expérience qui ne s'acquiert que par les années et par les employs'.²⁶² Consequently, writers on the 'ideal ambassador' combined their programme of study with proposals on how to gain experience valuable for a diplomatic career. While they continued to advocate the general experience in politics, at court and in travels, they suggested an additional and more specific diplomatic 'apprentissage'. Thus, parallel to the calls for a diplomatic 'science', the empirical part of the diplomats' education gained in consequence.

Sojourns abroad, which fostered the necessary knowledge of languages and countries, were to be combined with experience in the embassies as secretaries, 'cavaliers' or 'gentilshommes'.²⁶³ In diplomatic theory, this proposal was raised for the first time in the second half of the seventeenth century, but was then employed in nearly every treatise. Theorists regarded the Venetian practice as a model. Young noblemen and gentlemen should acquire experience and technical knowledge specific to diplomacy and thus 'become absolute in the art of embassy'.²⁶⁴ Galardi elaborated that 'ce seroit comme leur séminaire, ou ces seigneurs, sous la direction d'un ministre éclairé, pourroient être instruits dans l'art des négociations'.²⁶⁵ In addition, theorists suggested that future diplomats should be attached to the central cabinets, bureaux or chancelleries dealing with foreign affairs, in order to become familiar with the principles of writing in state affairs and to instruct themselves on the papers and sources of diplomatic history contained in the archives. This proposition was advanced first by French theorists. Chamoy believed that 'les maisons des secrétaires d'estat deviendroient par

²⁶² Chamoy, *Parfait ambassadeur*, p.17.

²⁶³ See Callières' criticism of the Grand Tour, *De la manière*, pp.61-2.

²⁶⁴ Rogers, *Ambassador's Idea*, fo.14. See further Galardi, *Traité politique*, pp.110-1; Hoevelen, *Teutsche Gesandte*, p.60; Wicquefort, *L'Ambassadeur*, i, pp.176-7, 182-3; Chamoy, *Parfait ambassadeur*, p.18; Schmid, *Der Gesandte*, fo.16^v; Callières, *De la manière*, p.62; Pecquet, *Art de négocier*, pp.li-iii; Bielfeld, *Institutions politiques*, ii, pp.75-6.

²⁶⁵ Galardi, *Traité politique*, pp.109-10.

là des écoles, pour ainsy dire, de politique et de négociation, qui serviroient beaucoup à former de bons sujets', a suggestion taken up by Callières and Pecquet.²⁶⁶

'Faut-il relever une profession'?

As diplomatic theory increasingly applied prudence, virtues and knowledge to the specific demands of diplomacy in the states-system, it became necessary to create a corresponding programme of education and preparation. This programme was tailored to resident diplomacy and was no longer limited to the ambassadorial ranks, but regarded as applicable to all diplomats. In this way, theorists supplemented the criteria of birth and wealth with experience and technical knowledge: 'L'extraction noble est un singulier ornement [...]; mais ni la naissance [...] ni l'estude ne peuvent pas former un ambassadeur accompli sans l'expérience', argued Wicquefort.²⁶⁷ Against the background of the new demands placed on diplomacy in the states-system, theorists of various nationalities instrumentalised the term 'expérience' to criticise the widespread lack of training. For the first time in the history of diplomatic theory, writers criticised the diplomatic service of their own countries. Galardi stated that Spanish diplomats were inferior to the French, because their recruitment depended more on high birth and wealth than on merit and experience.²⁶⁸ However, Chamoy and Callières made the same observation for their country and attributed the poor professionalism of French diplomats to the nobility's lack of interest in gaining practical experience and a special education; a criticism even intensified by Pecquet in 1737.²⁶⁹ In the Holy Roman

²⁶⁶ Chamoy, *Parfait ambassadeur*, p.18. See also Callières, *De la manière*, pp.4, 64-5; Pecquet, *Art de négocier*, pp.xxx-xxxi; Bielfeld, *Institutions politiques*, i, pp.75-6, with reference to the Prussian practice.

²⁶⁷ Wicquefort, *L'Ambassadeur*, i, p.175.

²⁶⁸ Galardi, *Traité politique*, pp.13, 97. See also the Spanish *Embajada española*, p.4.

²⁶⁹ Chamoy, *Parfait ambassadeur*, p.22; Callières, *De la manière*, pp.3-4; Pecquet, *Art de négocier*, pp.xxiv-vi, 140.

Empire, disapproval of the choice and lack of professionalism of diplomats had already been voiced by Hoevelen and Schmid.²⁷⁰

Thus, within the catalogue of virtues and 'connoissances' a conflict emerged in the hierarchy of the terms 'naissance', 'richesse', 'mérite' and 'expérience', inducing some theorists to argue that 'la qualité n'estant pas une condition essentielle à un ambassadeur, on préfère le plus habile quoyque de moindre naissance au plus noble moins habile'.²⁷¹ Going beyond the actual practice, a group of writers called for a new type of diplomat, for 'une égale profession [...] sans distinction de naissance'.²⁷² How did this claim conform to the traditions of diplomatic theory?

Traditionally, the catalogue of virtues contained remarks on the 'external qualities' birth, social status, occupation and, indeed, the financial means of the diplomat. Theorists sought not only to establish the socio-professional background of the 'ideal ambassador', but also to reflect the practices of recruitment. They acknowledged that it was difficult to establish standards in this respect, since the choice of diplomats depended on the sovereign's will, and had to give consideration to the host country and to the subject of the embassy. Theorists listed an 'honnête condition' as an essential requirement for the model diplomat, and aligned his profile to the ruling elites. While earlier treatises had still included the clergy and common-born érudits, in the seventeenth century these professions were eclipsed by the advantages noble birth carried on the international stage. Furthermore, theorists agreed that the aristocratic order still provided the best education for diplomacy, including a cosmopolitan outlook and elegant

²⁷⁰ Hoevelen, *Teutsche Gesandte*, p.60. Schmid's remarks were modelled on Wicquefort, see *Der Gesandte*, fo.7.

²⁷¹ Chamoy, *Parfait ambassadeur*, p.22. On the increasing importance of 'merit' in the nobility's ethos, see J.M.Smith, *The Culture of Merit. Nobility, Royal Service, and the Making of Absolute Monarchy in France, 1600-1789* (Ann Arbor, 1996).

²⁷² Pecquet, *Art de négocier*, p.140.

manners.²⁷³ While the 'noblesse d'épée' was regarded as particularly suited for extraordinary and ceremonial embassies, the rise of the 'noblesse de robe' in the state service was also reflected in diplomatic theory, in particular with the increasing importance of the middle and lower ranks. In this respect, diplomatic theory followed general trends in the composition of the ruling elites, reflecting the process of increasing aristocratisation in the higher and middle levels of diplomacy, and mirroring the assertion of the academically trained service nobility in the lower ranks. For both social groups, theorists created an ethos combining noble culture, 'professional' elements and a 'corporate' identity tied to a distinctive body of knowledge.²⁷⁴

Theorists of diplomacy actually applied the terms 'profession', 'carrière' and 'métier' to diplomacy. Chamoy and Pecquet spoke of diplomacy as a distinct career – 'la profession de negociateur', while Callières demanded to 'rélever une profession jusqu'ici trop negligée parmi nous', a profession that 'peut être d'un si grand usage au service du roi'.²⁷⁵

In the decades around 1700, theorists of diplomacy were attempting to emancipate the 'ideal diplomat' from the courtly statesman, to establish diplomatic theory as a distinct 'science' portraying a specific task and 'language', and to represent the ethos of a profession acting in a states-system. The transformation of the traditional language enabled theorists to portray the changing practice of diplomacy and to present a more functional portrait of the diplomat. At the same time, they did not stop at mirroring the actual practice but went on to instill a distinctly professional quality into the ideal-type of the negotiator. The call for a diplomatic

²⁷³ See for example Rogers, *Ambassador's Idea*, fo.11^v; Hoevelen, *Teutsche Gesandte*, pp.3, 46; Pecquet, *Art de négocier*, p.138. For republics, on the other hand, theorists recommended to employ 'hommes lettrez', see Vera, *Parfait ambassadeur*, edn.1709, p.292. On Wicquefort's criticism of ecclesiastics in diplomacy, see *L'Ambassadeur*, i, ch. ix.

²⁷⁴ In this respect, the development of the diplomatic ethos corresponds to the definition of 'profession' and 'chivalry' in D.J.B.Trim, 'Introduction', in idem (ed.), *The Chivalric Ethos and the Development of Military Professionalism* (Leiden, 2003), 1-40.

²⁷⁵ Chamoy, *Parfait ambassadeur*, pp.17, 22; Callières, *De la manière*, p.65; Pecquet, *Art de négocier*, pp.xix, xxxiii, lvi, 140, 159. See also Francquesnay, *Ministre public*, p.203; Nourar, *Ministère du négociateur*, pp.i, xxv, 294. Cf. footnote 600.

'profession' was a deliberate strategy that has to be viewed against the functional context of diplomatic theory.

II.3. The Functional Context of Diplomatic Theory

Theorists of Diplomacy – Advocates of a Movement towards Professionalisation?

As outlined above, the available 'language' of diplomatic theory could be filled and employed in different ways, depending on the authors' intentions. Their biographical situation and personal interests influenced how much room they gave to the different components of the outline. The author's personal 'input' into diplomatic theory could furthermore take the form of a justification of his own conduct in diplomacy or of support for his country's foreign policy. Wicquefort's treatises, for example, served to justify his own position by evoking the law of nations for the new ranks of diplomacy.²⁷⁶ They also mark an example of theorists being partisan to their employers, as Wicquefort defended the electors' right to send ambassadors.²⁷⁷

Apart from the individual motivation and intentions of its authors, diplomatic theory reflected the perceptions and motives of a group of 'learned diplomats', who sought to formulate a collective diplomatic ethos, claiming to represent the identity and mentality of the European diplomatic corps. While theorists thus shared a common, group-specific motivation, two models of a diplomatic ethos competed among them, characterised by

²⁷⁶ Wicquefort's critic, Galardi, clearly realised this, as well as Wicquefort's defence of the Dutch Republic against Spain, see his *Refléxions sur les Mémoires*, pp.35 ff.

²⁷⁷ Not surprisingly, the author's national background also affected the choice of examples. While all treatises attempted to portray a European practice of diplomacy, the German treatises of Hoevelen and Schmid were especially concerned with the particular character of diplomacy in the Empire, while the French authors (Chamoy, Callières, Pecquet) for the most part referred to examples of French diplomacy. Then again, Rogers, Thynne and Howell gave more room to the sayings and actions of British ambassador, while the Italian and Spanish treatises of Bragaccia, Benavente and Carafa concentrated on the south European practice of diplomacy.

divergent emphases on the terms 'art' and 'science' as well as 'experience', 'birth', 'g nie' and 'merit'. These variations in the portrait of the ideal ambassador lay at the heart of a wider debate on the efficiency, professionalism and training of diplomats; a debate that commenced in the last decades of the seventeenth century and that would come to occupy princes, ministers, diplomats as well as *savants* in the eighteenth century. Within the *respublica litteraria*, diplomatic theorists were the first to address the question of professionalism and recruitment criteria in print.

The traditional view of diplomacy as a sub-division of the 'aulicus politicus' was shared by nearly all theorists before 1660, as well as by Howell, Hoevelen, Carafa and Keith after that date. Connected to this traditional view was a growing emphasis on the quality of noble birth, which mirrored the increasing aristocratic dominance of diplomacy. The talents traditionally connected to nobility only needed to be refined through educational assistance and personal experience, for example at a noble academy, at court, or during a Grand Tour. Treatises were tailored to the ranks of ambassadors filled by members of the old nobility. While these authors paid little attention to the middle and lower ranks of diplomacy, they insisted on diplomacy being an art that depended on innate talents traditionally linked to the nobility. As a consequence, they regarded noble education and socialisation at court as essential preparation for the diplomat.²⁷⁸ The traditional blend of 'nobilitas' and 'virtus' was instrumentalised to defend the nobility's monopoly of offices. The model ambassador continued to be a part of the 'aulicus politicus', and diplomacy one station in the acquisition of princely favours and high offices. Yet, even as they held on to the traditional image of the noble 'generalist', theorists were aware that a certain specialisation was indispensable to meet the demands of a permanent and European-wide diplomacy. Consequently, they supported the proposal that young noblemen should travel

²⁷⁸ E.g. Rogers, *Ambassador's Idea*, fo.10; Benavente, *Advertencias*, p.113; Howell, *A Distinct Treatise*, p.191; Hoevelen, *Teutsche Gesandte*, p.115; Carafa, *L'Ambasciadore*, p.24; Keith, *Observations on the Office*, pp.46-7.

abroad, not only on the Grand Tour, but also in the retinue of embassies.²⁷⁹ To the traditional programme of study reflected in noble academies, they added modern history and foreign languages.²⁸⁰

The second group of theorists in the century after 1648 represented the 'service nobility' occupying the middle and lower diplomatic ranks as well as the central administration. In some cases, their families were enjoying upward social mobility, as for example the Callières or the Pecquet.²⁸¹ Both in their socio-professional context and in their portrait of the model ambassador, they testified to the increasing importance of the middle and lower ranks in diplomacy. These authors criticised the practice of preparation and recruitment which, in their view, no longer matched the new demands of diplomacy. As Callières pointed out for France, 'des bons négociateurs [...] sont plus rares parmi nous, parce qu'on n'y a point encore établi de discipline et de règles certaines, pour instruire de bons sujets dans les connaissances nécessaires à ces sortes d'emplois'.²⁸² Although these theorists did not question the noble predominance in the higher diplomatic ranks, they criticised noble birth as sole qualification for diplomacy. They were particularly critical of the high aristocracy, who were least inclined to acquire the 'connaissances' and experience they prescribed, and hindered the emergence of career promotion up to the higher ranks of the diplomatic system. Theorists claimed that experience, merit and knowledge were as important as high birth and wealth in the recruitment of ambassadors and envoys.²⁸³ In consequence, these theorists both championed a more specific and rigorous preparation, and demanded that more attention

²⁷⁹ Hoevelen, *Teutsche Gesandte*, p.60.

²⁸⁰ Hoevelen addressed his treatise to students of noble academies (*Teutsche Gesandte*, p.115). Cf. Part IV.

²⁸¹ Apart from Callières and Pecquet, this group comprised Galardi, Wicquefort, Schmid, Chamoy, Francquesnay, Mably, Bielfeld and Nourar.

²⁸² Callières, *De la manière*, p.3. He also criticised the French preference for the military. Cf. L.Bély, "Le Roi mon maître". Le Service du roi à l'étranger vu à travers l'oeuvre de François de Callières', in J.Fouilleron *et al.* (eds.), *Société et idéologies des temps modernes* (Montpellier, 1996), p.497. Pecquet followed Callières' attack on the French diplomatic service, see *Art de négocier*, pp.xix-xx.

²⁸³ See also Galardi, *Traite politique*, pp.7, 95.

should be given to educating and promoting the able from amongst the lower ranks of the corps. Chamoy suggested that these should be regarded as steps in a diplomatic career, and 'dans le dessein d'acquérir cette expérience, les personnes de qualité de la cour [...] devroient ne pas dédaigner les emplois étrangers du second ordre'.²⁸⁴ Yet, even if Pecquet went on to demand a 'profession sans naissance', the majority of theorists still believed that the 'nobilitas politica' was best suited for diplomacy.²⁸⁵ The representative function of the diplomat and his residence at a foreign court made aristocratic manners as necessary as personal financial resources. Theorists paid tribute to this and extended the aristocratic-courtly culture to all diplomatic ranks, modelling the diplomatic corps mentality on the cosmopolitan outlook of the European aristocracy.

Still, they aimed at projecting a professional ethos into the ideal-type of the ambassador, which was oriented along objective and specific occupational criteria such as training, experience and merit. The doctrine of diplomatic prudence, a distinct ethos aligned to the states-system, a specific knowledge and a specific training: all these elements distinguished the diplomatic profession from other state servants. In their function and their collective mentality, diplomats had to be considered as 'une espèce particulière d'hommes, et une classe séparée'.²⁸⁶ In this light, diplomatic theory endeavoured to play the role of an 'institutional language': a language formulated and discussed within a certain group of state-servants, employed to articulate an exclusive collective mentality.²⁸⁷ In the decades around 1700, theorists for the first time postulated a functional elite whose defining criterion was not only a certain social status but also a professional qualification. Against the background of

²⁸⁴ Chamoy, *Parfait ambassadeur*, p.18. This was still argued by Nourar, *Ministère du négociateur*, p.293, who called for diplomats 'élevés par degrés et à proportion de leur capacité et de leur expérience'.

²⁸⁵ This becomes also apparent in the theorists' criticism of 'hommes lettrés' and ecclesiastics as diplomats, e.g. Wicquefort, *L'Ambassadeur*, i, pp.164-8; Bielfeld, *Institutions politiques*, ii, p.57.

²⁸⁶ Francquesnay, *Ministre public*, p.9; cf. Pecquet, *Art de négocier*, pp.xv-xvii.

²⁸⁷ Pocock, 'The Concept of a Language', p.23. See also Biow, *Humanism and Professions*, p.11, on the 'discursive practices' of professions.

the general trends of bureaucratisation and specialisation, a new combination of general education and particular qualification had emerged.²⁸⁸ Why did theorists of diplomacy venture beyond the practice they were seeking to represent? Their concept of diplomacy as profession has to be viewed as a reaction to the new demands faced by diplomacy in the states-system. It was deliberately conceived as an ideal, levelled at a particular audience and pursuing certain strategies.²⁸⁹

The Functions of Diplomatic Theory

The primary target group of diplomatic theory was the 'corps diplomatique', the present and future diplomats of Europe. In the first instance, theorists addressed their treatises to the diplomats of their own country, in particular with regard to the issue of professionalism. On the other hand, the collective ethos they developed was aimed at the European community of diplomats, since it described a practice they regarded as universal to the states-system. Consequently, one institutional context of diplomatic theory was the *corps diplomatique*. For the first time, theorists urged diplomats not only to regard themselves as members of a 'société' that upheld the international balance and 'bonne foi', but also to subscribe to the notion of a diplomatic career and, consequently, to gain the required qualifications.

On the other hand, theorists constructed the 'ideal ambassador' for the courtly and erudite public of 'Europe', with the intention of raising the recognition of diplomacy's importance for the welfare of the states and the overall system. By raising diplomatic theory to the status of a 'science', theorists endeavoured to elevate its place in the *respublica*

²⁸⁸ This corresponds to the general development of the 'politicus' discussed in M. Stolleis, 'Grundzüge der Beamtenethik (1550-1650)', and Weber, 'Die Erfindung des Politikers'.

²⁸⁹ The treatises' target groups can be inferred to some extent from their dedications and prefaces as well as the authors' biographical context. Often independent of their didactic objective was the dedication to princes, high ministers or patrons. Translations, on the other hand, were usually undertaken with new target groups in mind.

litteraria, and, ultimately, to incorporate diplomatic theory into the state science and the context of academic and didactic institutions.

Finally, theorists addressed their countries' governments, claiming that it was their responsibility to improve diplomatic training and career prospects. Traditionally, the 'ideal ambassador's qualities had been devised to serve as criteria for the prince's prudent choice of diplomats.²⁹⁰ This part of diplomatic theory was now instrumentalised to challenge the usual modes of recruitment.²⁹¹ The theorists' argumentative strategy was to convince the directors of foreign policy that a professionalisation of the diplomatic service lay in their own interests and would give them advantages on the international stage. In calling on governments to improve the preparation and career of diplomats, theorists brought forward proposals whereby diplomatic training would be attached to the chancelleries and bureaux of the emerging foreign departments, in order to create a pool of qualified diplomats. Early modern 'governments', particularly the emerging foreign ministries, thus constituted another institutional context for diplomatic theory.

Diplomatic theory in the century following 1648 reveals that the self-conception and the institutional language of a group of state-servants were being transformed, as theorists began to perceive the practice of diplomatic recruitment, training and career as insufficient in the light of the new demands of the states-system. With the growing permanence, complexity and interdependence of international relations in Europe, a new combination of the generalist qualifications of the 'nobilitas politica' and of specialist and technical knowledge became necessary. The challenge to adapt the diplomat's education, knowledge and ethos to the new

²⁹⁰ From the prince's viewpoint, see for example J.Duguet, *Institution d'un prince [...]* (London, 1739), ch.xxvi ('Choix des ambassadeurs').

²⁹¹ It has been argued that his criticism of the French recruitment practice induced Callières not to publish his treatise until after the death of Louis XIV, see Schweizer, *François de Callières*, p.17; Waquet, *Callières*, p.97.

demands became a subject of discussion among 'learned diplomats'. Consequently, it is justified to speak of a transformation of diplomatic theory in this period, a transformation that commenced in the decades between the Peace of Nijmegen and the Peace of Utrecht. Wicquefort was the first theorist to express the new practice of diplomacy. Yet, he did not break entirely with the discourse. Despite his criticism of the 'ideal ambassador', he still attempted to unite the traditional language with the changing diplomatic practice. This endeavour was continued by subsequent theorists in the decades around 1700 and found a first conclusion in the mid-eighteenth century, when diplomatic theory became firmly linked to the practice of a states-system. In addition to Callières' treatise, the contributions of Chamoy, Francquesnay, Pecquet and Bielfeld deserve particular attention as exponents of a 'constitutional theory of the states-system'.²⁹² And indeed, it was the core of 'ideal ambassador' treatises, the catalogue of virtues, which became the medium of a new, professional ethos at the turn of the eighteenth century. As a consequence, diplomatic theory would take the centre stage of a 'professionalisation movement'.

This leads to questions over the role diplomatic theory played in the contexts of the *respublica litteraria*, the governments and the European diplomatic corps. How influential were the ideas developed by theorists in the emergence of a common European diplomatic practice and culture?

The Spread and Reception of Diplomatic Theory

In order to attempt a first assessment of these questions, it is first of all necessary to consider the dissemination of diplomatic theory. Using the channels of the *respublica litteraria*, treatises were published, circulated, copied and extracted, reviewed and discussed across

²⁹² On the term, see Keens-Soper, 'Wicquefort', p.93; cf. idem, 'The Practice of a States-System', in M. Donelan (ed.), *The Reason of States* (London, 1987), p.30.

Europe. It has already been demonstrated that diplomatic theory was anchored in a wider context, involving diplomats, jurists, councillors and commis, scholars and *érudits*. The 'ideal ambassador' treatises played an important role in the wider discussion on diplomacy: they were both objects of collection and means of transfer of diplomatic norms and customs.

The detection of cases of transfer is methodologically difficult, given the nature of the source material consulted. To trace the exact spread and circulation of diplomatic theory alone would require research to an extent which goes beyond the scope of a single project. In particular the reception among diplomats and the ways in which diplomatic theory influenced their reflections and actions are difficult to establish. As a consequence, this section can only indicate some trends in the reception of diplomatic theory, with special attention to France, Britain and the Empire. The following chapters will illustrate that diplomatic theory served to link not only a transnational discourse and 'national' discussions on diplomacy, but also the theory and practice of diplomacy, the *respublica litteraria* and the political sphere.

An initial cursory investigation reveals that, even if the discourse on the 'ideal diplomat' was made up of comparatively few central publications, these were widely disseminated across Europe. It is not possible to establish the exact issue numbers of published treatises, or to trace the journey of each copy through the hands of buyers, readers and libraries.²⁹³ Nevertheless, a rough idea of the spread and reception of treatises can be gained by investigating the number of reprints and translations. While some treatises only saw one edition, the majority were reprinted several times, including a number of earlier treatises such as Vera's *Parfait Ambassadeur*. In the eighteenth century, the best-known exponents of the genre would become Wicquefort and Callières, whose treatises were

²⁹³ A rough idea of the spread of treatises can be gained from the electronic library catalogues now comprising the major European libraries. The picture may be blurred, however, as many items were acquired only after the period of study, often through dissolved private collections. The collections of libraries in eastern Europe still remain underexplored.

published numerous times and saw translations into English, German, Italian and Russian.²⁹⁴

An important indicator for the reception of diplomatic theory is the reference to treatises in other strands of literature, notably in political and legal theory, as well as in encyclopaedias and periodicals. Treatises were commented upon and reviewed in gazettes, journals, and academic newsletters, and thus made known to a wider 'public'.²⁹⁵ Sometimes, their ideas were the subject of intense discussion, as the immediate vindication of Wicquefort's *Mémoires* by Galardi demonstrates. On the other hand, several of the eighteenth-century encyclopaedias based their respective articles on 'ideal ambassador' treatises.²⁹⁶ The greatest number of references to the discourse, however, could be found in the literature on international law. Apart from the major works by authorities such as Grotius, the dissertations and disputations produced by the universities were a means to spread the ideas of diplomatic theorists. This holds especially true for the Empire, where the reception and discussion of the transnational discourse took place in the context of a blend of imperial and international law. Moreover, treatises were referred to in several publications of the emerging state science.²⁹⁷ In some cases, diplomatic theory even found its way into university teaching through private 'collegia' offered by professors of international politics and law in the eighteenth century; a development that could also be observed in the syllabus of noble academies in this period.²⁹⁸ Consequently, although diplomatic theory was not fully acknowledged as an academic discipline, the academic infrastructure contributed to the

²⁹⁴ See also the bibliographies of diplomatic and legal theory in Réal, *Science du Gouvernement*, viii (Amsterdam, 1764); D.H.Ompteda, *Litteratur des gesammten sowohl natürlichen als positiven Völkerrechts* (3 vols., Regensburg, 1785).

²⁹⁵ For example, *Annales Academiae Iuliae ex editis monumentis et manuscriptis observationibus compositi* (Helmstedt, 1726), pp.146-7.

²⁹⁶ For example, J.G.Walch, *Philosophisches Lexikon [...]* (Leipzig, 1762), pp.88-9, 1191-1217; E.Chambers, *Cyclopaedia, or an Universal Dictionary [...]* (London, 1728), i, pp.296-7, 318; ii, pp.554-5; J.H.Zedler, *Grosses vollständiges Universal-Lexicon [...]* (Halle, 1732-54), i, pp.117-20.

²⁹⁷ See for example Gundling, *Einleitung zur wahren Staatsklugheit*; G.Achenwall, *Die Staatsklugheit nach ihren ersten Grundsätzen entworfen* (Göttingen, 1761). See also Franckenberg's *Europäischer Herold*, edn.1705, ii, p.34, recommending Wicquefort.

²⁹⁸ See below, Part IV.

discussion and spread of its ideas. In addition, diplomatic treatises were also called upon by some of the tracts and pamphlets concerned with individual cases of international law; treatises of theorists like Wicquefort were used either as collections of 'exempla' and precedents or as authorities to defend or refute diplomatic immunities and the 'ius legationis'.²⁹⁹ Moreover, treatises on the ambassador were of particular interest to ceremonial theory, which employed them as collections of customs and precedents.³⁰⁰ Until the mid-eighteenth century, Wicquefort's treatise was certainly cited and discussed most frequently, particularly in the context of international law.

The links between the *respublica litteraria* and the political-diplomatic sphere encompassed not only the employment of *érudits* as diplomats, political advisors or legal councillors, or the scholarly interests of statesmen and diplomats, who often accumulated substantial libraries, but also the reception of diplomatic theory by the political elites. Although the exact spread and circulation of printed treatises and unpublished instructions is impossible to reconstruct, an examination of contemporary library catalogues of courts and chancelleries, as well as of noble families can shed further light on this. A first cursory glance at some of the library inventories of diplomats show that they regularly featured copies of Wicquefort, Callières, Vera, Francquesnay, Mably, or Bielfeld, as well as a number of diplomatic memoirs.³⁰¹ For example, the family library of the Austrian Count Harrach, ambassador to France and Spain, 'Obersthofmeister' and director of foreign policy, was one

²⁹⁹ To give just two examples: *Außführlicher Entwurf derer zwischen ißigem Pabste Innocentio XI. und Ludovico XIV [...] schwebender gefährlicher Irrungen [...]* (Leipzig, 1687), quoting Wicquefort; *Ein vornehmen Englischen Icti Gedancken von dem Tractament eines Minister und dessen Domestiquen [...]* (Jena, 1717), citing Kirchner, Hotman, Marselaer and Callières.

³⁰⁰ An analysis of treatises on ceremonial reveals that Wicquefort was referred to most frequently. Rousset de Missy's *Mémoires sur le rang et la préseance [...]* (Amsterdam, 1746) were composed 'pour servir de supplément à l'Ambassadeur et ses fonctions de M.de Wicquefort' (preface).

³⁰¹ See for instance the catalogue of Etherage's library, *Letterbook of Sir George Etheredge*, ed. S.Rosenfeld (London, 1928), 377 ff; and the library of the notorious French diplomat Chevalier(e) d'Eon, *Catalogue des livres rares et manuscrits précieux du cabinet de la Chevalière d'Eon [...]* (sic! London, 1791).

of the largest private collections of diplomatic theory.³⁰² Another example is the library of the Prussian and later Saxon master of ceremonies, Johann von Besser, who not only owned works by most exponents of diplomatic and ceremonial theory, but also made use of them in his attempts to compose manuals and treatises.³⁰³ Given the scarcity of sources and research on the reception of political and diplomatic theory by the political elites, the picture must remain incomplete, in particular regarding the actual use made of treatises by diplomats and decision-makers of foreign policy. As will be illustrated in Part IV, in some cases the employment of diplomatic theory in the preparation of diplomats can be established: treatises were recommended as study material and guideline for new diplomats,³⁰⁴ and used in various training schemes designed for the eighteenth-century foreign departments.

That diplomatic theory could serve as collection of 'European' customs of diplomacy becomes apparent in its reception in countries abutting the states-system. Under Peter I's reign, for example, Wicquefort was introduced to Russia by the diplomat Postnikov in 1710, who provided a manuscript translation in 1712. Other early eighteenth-century diplomats such as Matveev and Shafirov purchased treatises of Wicquefort, Vera, Callières, Kulpis and other authors of international law, for their own libraries, and perhaps also for the Czar's collection, for the university in Moscow and the Petersburg Academy. During Catherine's reign, the reception of diplomatic theory was further intensified.³⁰⁵ In the later eighteenth century, even an American diplomat and subsequent president, John Adams, instructed

³⁰² Öst.VA, Nachlass Harrach, MS 206 ('Catalogus librorum bibliothecae Harrachianae', 18th century); MS 347 ('L'Ambasciadore instruito'). See also the early eighteenth-century treatise on the embassadress' diplomatic ceremonial in Rome, MS 345.

³⁰³ Sächs.HSTA, Nachlass Besser 9 ('Realkatalog über die Bessersche Bibliothek'). On the role of Besser and other masters of ceremonies in the spread of diplomatic theory, see Part II.

³⁰⁴ For the early seventeenth century, see for example the Instruction to E.Barret (1625), recommending the works of Gentili, Pascal and Hotman, in BL, Harleian MS 1579, fos.56-58^v.

³⁰⁵ V.E.Grabar, *The History of International Law in Russia, 1647-1917. A Bio-Bibliographical Study*, trans. W.E.Butler (London, 1990), esp. pp.40, 47, 125-36; cf. H.M.Scott, 'Katharinas Russland und das europäische Staatensystem', in C.Scharf (ed.), *Katharina II., Rußland und Europa* (Mainz, 2001), 3-58.

himself on European diplomatic customs by purchasing treatises of Grotius, Wicquefort, Mably and Vattel, in addition to a number of printed diplomatic memoirs and Dumont's *Corps diplomatique*.³⁰⁶

Apart from printed treatises, the spread and reception of diplomatic theory can also be inferred from the dissemination of manuscripts, whether entire copies or extracts from diplomatic treatises, or small unpublished tracts in various national languages. In this respect, it is worth taking a look back to the early seventeenth century, when France, the Empire and even Britain saw the dissemination of Italian diplomatic theory. Manuscripts entitled 'Ricordi generali per ministri che negotiano', which probably originated in late-sixteenth century Venice, found their way across the Alps around 1600.³⁰⁷ They constituted the basis for French translations and variations titled 'Instruction générale' or 'Considerations sur la charge d'un ambassadeur'.³⁰⁸ These short manuscript tracts bore strong resemblance to 'ideal ambassador' treatises, and were, in the first half of the seventeenth century, often transmitted together with them, for example with extracts from Vera and Hotman.³⁰⁹ Apart from France, they were also disseminated in the Empire³¹⁰ and Britain.³¹¹ Until the early eighteenth century, Italian and Spanish manuscripts constituted a large part of diplomatic, political and ceremonial theory collected.³¹²

³⁰⁶ J. Adams, 'Travels, and Negotiations', sheet 32, 8 July 1778, <http://www.masshist.org/digitaladams/aea/cfm/doc.cfm?id=A2_32>.

³⁰⁷ For example, BN, MS.fr.3448; BN, Coll.Dupuy 136; cf. D.E.Queller, 'How to Succeed as an Ambassador: A Sixteenth Century Venetian Document', *Studia Gratiana*, 15 (1972), 653-67.

³⁰⁸ E.g. AAE, MD France 373; BN, MS.fr.15870. Another example is BN, MS.fr.3542; cf. E.Griselle, 'Un manuel du parfait diplomate au dix-septième siècle', *RHD*, 28-29 (1914-15), 772-81; correspondingly, BN, MSS.fr.18678 and 23517. See furthermore BN, MSS.fr.5668, 3691, 16806; BN, Clairambault 805.

³⁰⁹ See for example BN, Cinq Cents Colbert 99; similarly, AAE, MD France 2150. See furthermore BN, MS.fr.17824 for a compilation from Vera's treatise. Even P.de Béthune's remarks on the ambassador in his *Conseiller d'etat* (Paris, 1632), still shows parallels to the 'Instruction générale'.

³¹⁰ See for example Öst.NB, MS.6327.

³¹¹ For instance BL, Add.MSS 48154 and 8294. See also the copy of another Italian tract in BL, Harleian MS 6793; cf. Add.MS 30593.

³¹² E.g. AAE, MD France 307 ('Breves noticias [...] al ministerio publico en las cortes estrangeras', 1707). Of course, manuscripts of other national derivation were also collected, for example the memoirs of the English

From the turn of the eighteenth century, however, France took the lead in the manuscript production relating to diplomatic theory. In particular the institutional sphere of the 'secrétariat des affaires étrangères' gave rise to several tracts on the 'art de négocier'.³¹³ Among these, a 1720 draft of 'Réflexions sur la politique, sur l'art de négocier, sur les ambassadeurs' is of particular interest. Embracing the idea that life in general is determined by negotiation, for which qualities of both the mind and the heart are necessary, the tract bears resemblance to diplomatic theory, notably to Pecquet's later treatise. Thus, it might denote a first stage of this treatise.³¹⁴ The connections of the French theorists-diplomats Chamoy and Callières to Torcy's ministry, as well as the Pecquets' prominent position in the bureaux render it probable that sketches of their treatises were circulated among ministry officials: in the case of the first two authors, probably already before 1700, and in the case of the Pecquets, probably from the 1720s.³¹⁵ Furthermore, general instructions levelled at diplomats continued to be produced in this context until the late eighteenth century. The tradition of diplomatic theory was continued even after the French Revolution, for example through the work of Comte d'Hauterive.³¹⁶ In France, consequently, the administrative apparatus of foreign affairs formed an institutional context for the reception and production of diplomatic theory. Moreover, in addition to copies of treatises on the 'ideal ambassador',

master of ceremonies, Finnett, see BN, MS.fr.18540; a translation of Schweder's *Theatrum praetensiorum*, MD France 442-3; or works on German 'droit public', for example in AAE, MD Allemagne 66-7.

³¹³ See the draft for a treatise in BN, MS.fr.18540, which refers to Wicquefort and others, and might be connected to either the French masters of ceremonies or the writer Rousset de Missy, since it precedes a sketch of *Le Cérémonial des cours de l'Europe*. See also the 'Réflexions sur les connaissances nécessaires à un ministre, envoyée à M.de Blanc', AAE, MD France 251.

³¹⁴ The tract in AAE, MD France 458, fos.10-20, neither bears a signature, nor does its position in the volume indicate its authorship. Only in 1725 Pecquet the elder was succeeded by his son as premier commis; consequently, either Pecquet could have been the author, although the wider circle of the bureaux and attached érudits should not be excluded.

³¹⁵ Chamoy's manuscript treatise was dedicated to his patron, Pomponne. Cf. Delavaud's preface to the edition, pp.1-2; H.H.Rowen, 'Arnauld de Pomponne: Louis XIV's Moderate Minister', *AHR*, 61 (1956), 532-49. On Callières' environment, see also Wacquet, *Callières*, esp.pp.66-8, 70, 75-6, 176. On Pecquet, the new edition by A.Gruzinska and M.Sirkis (New York, 2004) provides no new information.

³¹⁶ On Hauterive, see footnote 703. See also the 'Plan d'étude', written in 1786-87 and edited by Ruiz, *RHD*, 87 (1973), who stresses its place in the 'cadre' of diplomatic treatises.

numerous works on international law, ceremonial and European history were collected in the bureaux and archives. With their help, ministry charges and *érudits* attached to the bureaux composed a large number of memoirs on the historical and contemporary practice of international relations; 'knowledge bases' on diplomatic customs, ceremonial and international law.³¹⁷

A comparable picture presents itself for Great Britain. Not only did printed works on the 'ideal ambassador' find their way into libraries, but they were also disseminated through and complemented by manuscript copies. These comprised extracts, translations or compilations from diplomatic theory;³¹⁸ small tracts and general instructions for diplomats, mostly of southern European derivation;³¹⁹ but also English contributions to diplomatic law³²⁰ and to the 'ideal ambassador', for example the 1638 *Ambassador's Idea*,³²¹ or the *Rules to be observed by a Foreign Minister* composed by the Earl of Clarendon in 1766.³²² Furthermore, diplomatic theory was disseminated and made use of in the secretariats of state.³²³ The state

³¹⁷ A.Baschet, *Histoire du dépôt des archives des affaires étrangères* (Paris, 1875), p.xxvi, has identified the bureaux's archives as 'l'académie de la littérature diplomatique'. However, there is no study on this literary production. See further Parts III and IV.

³¹⁸ E.g. BL, Sloane MS 1019 (a copy of Hotman, wrongly attributed to M.de Morinville); Sloane MS 3660 (translated extracts from Wicquefort); Add.MS 15195 (a Portuguese translation of Wicquefort, wrongly attributed to F.de Mello). Cf. the extracts from Wicquefort and other theorists of diplomacy, law and ceremonial in Williamson's papers, PRO, SP 9.

³¹⁹ Apart from the Italian 'Ricordi', see the reception of Spanish diplomatic-political theory, e.g. BL, Egerton MS 57; Add.MSS 18289 and 19041.

³²⁰ This had reached a pinnacle already in the decades around 1600. See for example BL, Add.MSS 34216 and 72473; and Cotton's *Of the Proceedings against Ambassadors* (1624), for example in Add.MS 48102. See further compilations of diplomatic law in BL, Egerton MS 2542; Stowe MS 195; PRO, SP 9/3-5, 166, 187.

³²¹ BL, Harleian MS 3365. The biographical context of this treatise is unclear; the author T.Rogers was connected either to the Earl of Portland or to the (second?) Duke of Lenox. See also the contemporary 'Discourse of Court and Courtiers' of E.Payton (1633), dedicated to James fourth Duke of Lenox, and combining courtly and diplomatic theory, Harleian MS 3364.

³²² BL, Add MS 34713. See F.Pollard, 'Villiers, Thomas, first earl of Clarendon (1709-86)', rev.R.D.E.Eagles, *Oxford DNB*.

³²³ C.L.Robertson, *A Short Title Catalogue of Books Printed Before 1701 in the Foreign Office Library* (London, 1966), lists only the English treatises of Walsingham/Digges and Howell. Williamson's papers in PRO, SP 9, however, support the assumption that a far wider range of published treatises was available in the secretariats of state.

paper office and the secretariat's archives served as points of collection and emulation of writings on diplomacy, in particular under Joseph Williamson.³²⁴

While the tracing of manuscript provenance and circulation in the former Holy Roman Empire is rendered difficult by its fragmentation and the often incomplete picture of literary tradition, the spread of diplomatic theory through manuscript copies can nevertheless be ascertained in several cases. The Imperial court and administration at Vienna in particular, as well as the libraries of Austrian statesmen and noble families such as the Harrach absorbed a great number of Italian and French tracts on negotiation, diplomatic law and ceremonial.³²⁵ Other states of the Empire, too, received manuscript copies pertaining to the transnational discourse on diplomacy, ceremonial and international law.³²⁶ On the other hand, German and Austrian contributions to diplomatic theory could also take the form of informal manuscript instructions,³²⁷ or even self-contained diplomatic treatises, such as the Bavarian *Mundus christiano-bavaro-politicus*. As in France, albeit to lesser degree, the Imperial ceremonial office in the 'Obersthofmeisteramt' served as a further collection point for tracts and manuscripts on diplomacy and ceremonial, and produced registers and memoirs,³²⁸ as did the smaller 'Zeremonienämter' of states such as Prussia and Saxony, notably under Johann von Besser. For Brandenburg-Prussia, furthermore, some links between the theory and practice of

³²⁴ See PRO, SP 9/166-7, 187, 200, 207. See A. Marshall, 'Williamson, Sir Joseph (1633-1701)', *Oxford DNB*. On the background: M.A. Thomson, *The Secretaries of State, 1681-1782* (Oxford, 1932).

³²⁵ E.g. Öst.NB, MS.14513 ('La Politique aisée [...]'), with a chapter on ambassadors. On Italian diplomatic and ceremonial theory, see for example HHSTA, STA Rom, Varia 26; Öst.NB, MSS 5766 and 6739; Öst.VA, Nachlass Harrach, MS 345.

³²⁶ See for example SBB, MS.ital.11 ('Istruzioni per un ambasciatore [...]'); MS.Gall.18 (copies of French ceremonial memoirs). Furthermore, the large collection of printed and manuscript copies in the HAB Wolfenbüttel deserves mention, which was assembled during this period, even with the help of Wicquefort, see Burger, 'Les Wicquefort', p.35.

³²⁷ See for example the Austrian *Schreiben eines Vaters an einen Sohn von den Pflichten und Eigenschaften eines Gesandten* (1770), written by 'J.F.E.v.G', with a small number of printed copies; consulted in the Öst.NB. See also the unpublished nineteenth-century treatise of F.Bertoni, HHSTA Vienna, MS Supp.1229/W1022, which was still based on eighteenth-century diplomatic theory.

³²⁸ See HHSTA, Obersthofmeisteramt, Ält.Zeremonialakten; cf. J.Duindam, 'Ceremonial Staffs and Paperwork at two Courts: France and the Habsburg Monarchy c.1550-1720', in K.Malettke, G.Chantal (eds.), *Hofgesellschaft und Höflinge an europäischen Fürstenhöfen in der Frühen Neuzeit* (Münster, 2001), 369-88.

diplomacy can be established with respect to individual councillors and scholars attached to the court.³²⁹ Frederick II himself addressed diplomacy in his political writings.³³⁰ As in other territories of the Empire, reflections upon the practice of diplomacy were related mostly to international law and ceremonial. That the key treatises on diplomatic and legal theory were beginning to be employed to defend the electors' right of legation and their diplomats' immunity from Imperial jurisdiction, on the other hand, is another instance of the increasing alignment of the Empire's diplomatic thought to the European discourse.³³¹

To trace further instances of transfer and circulation of diplomatic theory in Europe, particular in its eastern and northern regions, would go beyond the scope of this thesis. Yet, already from the few instances of print and manuscript circulation listed above, it can be inferred that treatises and tracts on diplomacy, ceremonial and international law were widely disseminated and received. In the seventeenth century the transnational discourse was still shaped to a great extent by south European theorists, yet contributions from other countries were enjoying a growing diffusion.

Three areas have been identified as contexts for the discussion and dissemination of diplomatic theory: the academic institutional context and the *respublica litteraria*; the European elites and the diplomatic corps; and the governmental sphere dealing with foreign affairs. While the following chapters concentrate on the place of diplomatic theory in the first

³²⁹ Apart from Bielfeld, theorists of diplomacy, international law and ceremonial, such as Wicquefort, Leti, Pufendorf, Zwanzig and J.J.Moser were at times attached to the Prussian government, see GHSTA, Rep.9, K lit.F, fascs.4, 7; Rep.92, Nachlass Zwanzig. A late eighteenth-century catalogue of the cabinet ministry's library included, in addition to Wicquefort, many eighteenth-century treatises and dissertations on international law, see Rep.9, F 5, fasc.5.

³³⁰ See for example his *Antimachiavell* [...], consulted in the German edn (Hanover, 1756), pp.382-8; and his *Politisches Testament*, written in 1752, ed. F.v.Oppeln-Bronikowski, 3rd edn (Munich, 1941), p.58.

³³¹ See for example Sächs.HSTA, Geh.Konferenz 892/4; Geh.Rat 8234/07; Geh.Rat 8236/07. Cf. GHSTA, Rep.1, IV.4E; Bayr.HSTA, Kasten Schwarz 4185, 12499 and 12507. See also STA Wolfenbüttel, 2 Alt 4435-37.

and third contexts, its role for the European political and diplomatic elites, however, is still in need of research. Who owned copies of the theoretical literature, and how did these influence the thinking, writing and acting of individuals and groups of noblemen, statesmen and diplomats? A promising perspective of future research in this respect would be the examination of the memoirs and public and private correspondence composed by diplomats, especially with regard to the 'language' employed to describe their functions, and regarding notions of 'professionalism' and corps mentality.

On the other hand, little attention has so far been paid to the reception and function of diplomatic theory in the institutional sphere of early modern governments, and its relation to the practice of diplomacy. However, the discourse on the 'ideal diplomat' and related genres of ceremonial and legal theory were closely entwined with the administrative apparatus of foreign policy. Part III will demonstrate the linkage between the theory and practice of diplomacy with reference to ceremonial, international law and the structures of the diplomatic services. Especially with regard to the issue of preparation and training, the links between diplomatic theory and practice, between the political sphere and the Republic of Letters, become apparent, as Part IV will illustrate.

Part III. The Practice of Diplomacy in the States-System

Episode 2. A Question of Honour – The Incident of 1661

In 1661, the Swedish ambassador prepared his public entry into London, which was to be accompanied, as usual, by the coaches of other diplomats. Yet trouble was anticipated, since the Spanish and the French ambassadors had orders to take precedence and were prepared to defend their right with men and arms. As the ambassadors' coaches appeared, the race for first place in the diplomatic corps began. A violent struggle ensued, but finally the Spanish coach triumphed, despite the efforts of the French ambassador, Comte d'Estrades.³³² In London, decrees were issued immediately to prohibit similar disorders.³³³ Meanwhile, Louis XIV was informed of the incident and threatened Philip IV with war. The Spanish king responded, through his ambassador, by suggesting that his diplomats would henceforth avoid such occurrences. In Paris, this was proclaimed as establishment of French precedence. Of course, this was neither intended nor accepted entirely by Spain, whose diplomats still held the first place in some courts, for example in Vienna. Yet, the European public regarded the events of 1661 as a conclusion of the long-drawn competition between Spain and France.³³⁴ To support this interpretation, the French claim to precedence was visualised in the arts, for

³³² On this incident and on the French-Spanish competition, see for instance Wicquefort, *L'Ambassadeur*, i, ch.xxiv; Rousset de Missy, *Mémoires sur le rang et la préseance*, ch.viii. On the embassy of d'Estrades, see also L.Lemaire, 'L'Ambassade du Comte d'Estrades à Londres en 1661. L'Affaire du 'Pas', *Annuaire-Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire de France*, 71 (1934), 181-226. Cf. AAE, MD France 1850, fos.28-31.

³³³ I.e. the decrees 'against disorders between retinues', PRO, SP 9/187 (1661), and 'forbidding foreign ambassadors to attend the reception of other ambassadors', BL, Egerton MS 2543, fo.85. On the diplomatic corps in London, cf. R.Clayton, *Diplomats and Diplomacy in London, 1667-1672* (Oxford University D.Phil thesis, 1995).

³³⁴ *Philosophia elegantiarum et ceremoniarum aulicarum [...]* (Frankfurt, 1689), p.11-2; Wicquefort, *L'Ambassadeur*, i, ch.xxiv; Callières, *De la manière*, pp.115-6; Lünig, *Theatrum ceremoniale*, i, pp.14-6.

example on coins, tapestries and the image in relief in the Versailles 'Escalier des ambassadeurs'.³³⁵

The conflict between France and Spain was only one of many rivalries that filled the dispatches of diplomats in the later seventeenth century. Louis XIV was most zealous in using diplomatic ceremonial to underline the French claim to political and cultural hegemony in Europe, seeking competition even with the Emperor.³³⁶ Of high significance in this matter was the diplomats' behaviour towards each other, which symbolised the ranks of their masters. Their interactions were closely watched, described and analysed by the European 'public', in order to discern changes in the hierarchy of the states-system – still a 'société des princes', in which power, rank and dignity were inextricably entwined. Contemporaries acknowledged the importance of diplomatic precedence and rank, increasingly so with the longer residence of several diplomats at one court. The ceremonial surrounding an embassy became more complex, since it had to symbolise the ranks of all sovereigns represented. This, of course, placed new demands on the diplomats, requiring them to observe ceremonial forms closely and to defend their master's rank on all occasions.

The extended length of residence abroad, the growing number of diplomats and the increasing complexity of international relations led to several structural transformations in the practice of diplomacy. These did not only comprise the improvement of communication and information structures, the bureaucratisation of the central administration, and the equipment of embassies, but also the legal and symbolic framework of diplomacy. The emergence of the states-system was accompanied by a growing theoretical literature,

³³⁵ Cf. P.Burke, *The Fabrication of Louis XIV* (New Haven, 1992).

³³⁶ Stieve, *Europäisches Hoff-Ceremoniell*, pp.106-7. Cf. K.Müller, *Das kaiserliche Gesandtschaftswesen im Jahrhundert nach dem Westfälischen Frieden, 1648-1740* (Bonn, 1976), pp.134-5; H.Duchhardt, 'Imperium und Regna im Zeitalter Ludwigs XIV', *Historische Zeitschrift*, 232 (1981), 555-81.

amongst which diplomatic theory was central in portraying the new demands faced by diplomacy and diplomats.

In the century following the Peace of Westphalia, theorists of diplomacy perceived and documented a transformation in the practice of diplomacy which they interpreted as an adjustment to a European-wide system. Until recently, historiography has studied the evolution of diplomacy from a national perspective, paying little attention to processes of exchange and standardisation.³³⁷ In order to assess the role of diplomatic theory in the emergent states-system, however, a comparative approach is required, since theorists endeavoured to portray a common practice of diplomacy. While historians have for the most part concentrated on the administrative side of foreign policy, theorists enquired how structural transformations altered the norms and conduct of diplomats. This chapter outlines the evolution of the practice of diplomacy and its alignment to the states-system from the viewpoint of diplomatic theory. In addition, archival material of French, English, and German-Austrian provenance has been consulted in order to explore the relationship between the theory and practice of diplomacy.

III.1. The Diplomatic Apparatus

In its description of the model embassy, diplomatic theory after 1648 reflected three areas which exemplified the final adjustment of diplomatic practice to the states-system: firstly, the establishment of resident embassies and the emergence of a differentiated hierarchy of diplomatic ranks; secondly, the growing complexity of the diplomats' functions (information,

³³⁷ A comparative approach is called for by W.Reinhard, *Geschichte der Staatsgewalt. Eine vergleichende Verfassungsgeschichte Europas von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart* (Munich, 1999).

representation, negotiation); and thirdly, the differentiation of the central administrative apparatus.

The Resident Diplomatic Network

Theorists agreed that resident embassies constituted a central pillar of the states-system. In the century following 1648, the network was extended and institutionalised across Europe. Diplomatic theory mirrored this development not only by aligning its remarks to the resident diplomat and particularly to the middle and lower ranks, but also by embedding them in the context of the states-system. Treatises provided overviews of all regular embassies sent and received, which show that by the time of the Nijmwegen congress (1676-79), the European system of sovereign states was already taking shape.³³⁸ France was the first power to extend its permanent network in the decades after 1648, being represented by 20 embassies in 1684, whereas in 1705, the number had risen to 32.³³⁹ Other states followed suit, albeit more slowly. While its representation abroad was well established before the Glorious Revolution, England began to institutionalise a European-wide resident network only after that date.³⁴⁰ Imperial Austria, too, began to increase its representation after the Peace of Westphalia, though it still lagged behind France in this respect. Restricted by financial pressures, Vienna generally exercised restraint in the number of resident posts and their rank.³⁴¹ It was the French diplomatic effort and competition that forced the Emperor to create and uphold an

³³⁸ See for example Wicquefort, *L'Ambassadeur*, i, chs.ii-vi; Schmid, *Der Gesandte*, chs.iv-v; Réal, *Science du gouvernement*, v, pp.33-97.

³³⁹ C.Picavet, *La Diplomatie française au temps de Louis XIV (1661-1715). Institutions, mœurs, coutumes* (Paris, 1930), pp.73-4; J.Baillou, *Les Affaires étrangères et le corps diplomatique français* (2 vols., Paris, 1984), vol.i: *De l'Ancien Régime au Second Empire*, pp.145-78. Cf. the 1648 list of French embassies in BN, MS.fr.20156; of French ambassadors 1661-85 in BN, MS.fr.2272; and of 1722 in AAE, MD France 1252.

³⁴⁰ For the state of English representation in 1680, see Wicquefort, *L'Ambassadeur*, i, pp.26-7; cf. P.S.Lachs, *The Diplomatic Corps under Charles II and James II* (New Brunswick, 1965), pp.3-14; D.B.Horn, *The British Diplomatic Service 1689-1789* (Oxford, 1961), pp.15-37.

³⁴¹ Müller, *Kaiserliches Gesandtschaftswesen*, pp.60-76.

extensive representation.³⁴² While France was increasing its diplomatic contacts with the Empire's estates,³⁴³ several electorates and some principalities also began to increase their representation, as far as their resources allowed. The Peace of Westphalia had marked the assertion of the territories' sovereignty, although the right to send ambassadors of the first rank was still disputed and only granted to the electors after the Peace of Nijmegen. Under the Great Elector and his successors, Brandenburg-Prussia began to enlarge its diplomatic service; a process intensified after the acquisition of the royal title in 1701.³⁴⁴ As with other German estates, however, this diplomatic expansion was interrupted and dependent on financial resources. This could even result in a temporary downgrading of posts, as under Frederick William I.³⁴⁵ The requirements of an emerging Great Power's status and interests, however, soon led to a resumption and extension of representation, which also included the northern and eastern regions of Europe. In a similar way, the electorate of Bavaria increased its network of correspondents, agents and diplomats. After the re-establishment of Wittelsbach rule in 1717, more resident embassies were added, but financial pressures often forced contractions of the network.³⁴⁶ A comparable development took place in Saxony: following a gradual expansion of resident embassies in the second half of the seventeenth

³⁴² See for example the resolution of 1692, HHSTA, Reichskanzlei 5e, fos.283-9; and the instruction to Colloredo of 1726, HHSTA, StK, Instruktionen 3, fos.114-5^v.

³⁴³ See L.Bély, 'Les Diplomates français dans le Saint-Empire au XVIIIe siècle', in J.Mondot *et al.* (eds.), *Deutsche in Frankreich, Franzosen in Deutschland 1715-89* (Sigmaringen, 1992), 15-26. On French policy in the Empire is well researched, see for example K.Malettke, *Les Relations entre la France et le Saint-Empire au XVIIe siècle* (Paris, 2001).

³⁴⁴ See M.Kohnke, *Das Preußische Kabinettsministerium. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Staatsapparats im Spätfeudalismus* (Berlin Univ. Diss.phil., 1967), pp.187-205; Scott, *Eastern Powers*, pp.143-6. The major posts were The Hague, London, Paris, St.Petersburg, Stockholm, Warsaw and Vienna, see GSTA, Rep.9, L4, fasc.10 (1739). On the consular and diplomatic representation in eastern Europe and the Baltic, see *ibid.*, Z Lit.E.

³⁴⁵ See the 1713 decree in AB, i, p.351 (14 March 1713); cf. the Austrian diplomat Schönborn-Buchheim's report in *ibid.*, pp.444-8 (2 May 1713).

³⁴⁶ BayHSTA, Rep.'Gesandtschaften'. See F.Kramer, 'Aspects du fonctionnement des légations dans les états de taille moyenne: Duché et électorat de Bavière (XVIe-XVIIIe siècles)', in Bély (ed.), *L'Invention de la diplomatie*, pp.184-6; V.Laube, 'Geheimnisverrat in Wien. Anmerkungen zu den organisatorischen Bedingungen frühneuzeitlicher Außenpolitik am Beispiel Kurbayerns', in H.Kugeler *et al.* (eds.) *Internationale Beziehungen in der Frühen Neuzeit. Ansätze und Perspektiven* (Munich, 2006), 212-36.

century and the personal union with Poland (1697), the decade after the Peace of Utrecht saw the establishment of a sizeable diplomatic apparatus.³⁴⁷ Hanover, too, extended its network in the pursuit of the electoral title granted in 1692 and the personal union with Britain effected in 1714.³⁴⁸

At the same time as resident diplomacy spread across Europe, older forms of diplomatic communication remained in place, for example extraordinary embassies, circular and multiple embassies sent to several courts, and networks of semi-official agents and spies. Although diplomatic theory acknowledged these forms, its authors advocated the official, reciprocal and permanent embassy as the primary form of the new era of diplomacy. On the other hand, their treatises reveal that the network was not static but varied in response to the actors' interests, shifting political alliances and frequent military conflicts. Nevertheless, after the Peace of Utrecht and the end of the Northern Wars, the network had found a quite stable form that not even the mid-eighteenth century conflicts could disrupt for long.

In the theorists' view, the institution of resident and reciprocal embassies also determined the system's extension. While the Ottoman Empire had long formed a part of the European alliance network and was receiving embassies from several European powers, theorists did not acknowledge it as a part of the states-system, because Constantinople did not reciprocate with diplomatic representation.³⁴⁹ The gradual incorporation of Russia into the eighteenth-century states-system, on the other hand, was symbolised by the establishment of

³⁴⁷ See the 'Gesandtschaftsreglement' of 1723, SächsHSTA, Geh.Rat 8236/13; see *ibid.*, Geh.Kabinett 1446/10 for the financing of these posts. The need to establish permanent embassies was expressed also in Count Flemming's note (c.1718), Geh.Kabinett, 3065, unpaginated. Cf. H.Kretschmar, 'Zur Geschichte der sächsischen Diplomatie', *Amt und Volk*, 3 (1932), p.37.

³⁴⁸ Cf. G.Schnath, *Geschichte Hannovers im Zeitalter der neunten Kur und der englischen Sukzession 1674-1714* (4 vols., Hildesheim, 1982).

³⁴⁹ Wicquefort, *L'Ambassadeur*, i, pp.33-4; Schmid, *Der Gesandte*, fo.88.

permanent embassies from the reign of Peter I onwards.³⁵⁰ Yet the borders of the system were subject to debate even among the theorists of diplomacy. This referred particularly to the eastern periphery, where ad-hoc embassies and low-grade agents prevailed until after the Peace of Nystad (1721).³⁵¹ Undoubtedly, the system was visibly delineated from actors further away, for example in the Near and Far East, where extraordinary embassies and commercial representatives would prevail until the nineteenth century.³⁵²

As foreign policy was beginning to be conceived in a European-wide system, resident embassies transformed the conduct of diplomacy. At all major courts and at the frequent congresses, a diplomatic 'corps' emerged, whose conduct had to be aligned to the interests of the system's actors. Diplomatic theory incorporated these new demands in its portrait of the ideal ambassador, paying credit to the increasing size of the legation and the importance of the embassy staff, as well as to the differentiation of diplomatic ranks.

The Diplomatic Hierarchy

Diplomatic theory after 1648 listed an unprecedented number of titles under the headings of 'legatus', 'ambassadeur' and 'ministre public'. The growing intensity and complexity of relations between the system's actors required a differentiated hierarchy. At the same time as the right to send diplomats was being restricted to sovereigns, diplomatic ranks also mirrored

³⁵⁰ Bohlen, 'Changes in Russian Diplomacy', 341-58; W.E.Butler, 'Anglo-Russian Diplomacy and the Law of Nations', in A.G.Cross (ed.), *Great Britain and Russia in the Eighteenth Century* (Newtonville, 1979), 296-305.

³⁵¹ For Poland, see N.Davies, 'Serenissima. Diplomacy in Poland-Lithuania', in idem, *God's Playground. A History of Poland* (Oxford, 1981), i, 373-411; Servanski, 'La Diplomatie polonaise au dix-septième siècle', 167-75; cf. R.Przedziecki, *Diplomatie et protocole à la cour de Pologne* (2 vols., Paris, 1934), i.

³⁵² These relations are still in want of research. Embassies from the Tatars or Persians were occasionally sent to Western Europe, see footnotes 515, 516. On the French consular service, see for example A.Mezin, *Les Consuls de France au siècle des Lumières, 1715-1792* (Paris, 1997); C.Windler, *La Diplomatie comme expérience de l'autre. Consuls français au Maghreb, 1700-1840* (Geneva, 2002).

the 'société des princes'.³⁵³ Since precedence and honours conferred to diplomats symbolised their masters' position in the hierarchy, any change was considered as critical to their dignity, and frequently resulted in quarrels. Treatises on diplomacy, on ceremonial and on precedence underline the fact that rank and ceremonial played a central part in the constitution of the states-system, because they mirrored shifts and competitions in the international hierarchy before the equality of sovereigns was firmly established.³⁵⁴ Several ranks or 'classes' emerged with different degrees of representation and ceremonial honours. These not only mirrored the rank of the sovereign and the nature of the mission but also the status and social hierarchy of diplomats: ambassadorial posts were usually filled with high-ranking noblemen, while members of the 'noblesse de robe' were appointed to second-rank posts.³⁵⁵ Often, it was considered more convenient to employ the lower ranks, not only for financial reasons, but also to evade an extensive ceremonial and potential conflicts about precedence.³⁵⁶

At the time of the Westphalian negotiations it had become generally accepted in legal and diplomatic theory that there existed two diplomatic classes. Even as the equality of sovereigns was gaining ground, it was an acknowledged custom that only princes with imperial or royal titles, and the great republics such as Venice sent diplomats of the first rank. Yet, the right to send ambassadors, as visible expression of full sovereignty and dignity, was

³⁵³ See B.Stollberg-Rillinger, 'Die Wissenschaft der feinen Unterschiede. Das Praezedenzrecht und die europäischen Monarchien vom 16. bis zum 18. Jahrhundert', *Majestas*, 10 (2003), 125-50; A.Wolf, 'Geographie und Jurisprudenz - Historia und Genealogie. Zum 'Theatrum praetensiorum...in Europa'', *Ius Commune. Zeitschrift für Europäische Rechtsgeschichte*, 14 (1987), 227-48.

³⁵⁴ On the differentiation of ranks, see Markel, *Entwicklung der diplomatischen Rangstufen*; Krauske, *Entwicklung der ständigen Diplomatie*; M.Vec, "Technische' gegen 'symbolische' Verfahrensformen? Die Normierung und Ausdifferenzierung der Gesandtenränge nach der juristischen und politischen Literatur des 18. und 19. Jahrhunderts', in B.Stollberg-Rillinger (ed.), *Vormoderne politische Verfahren* (Berlin, 2001), 559-88.

³⁵⁵ Yet diplomats of high social status could also be used in a bid to gain greater honours, as the case of many Imperial envoys shows, see Müller, *Kaiserliches Gesandtschaftswesen*, pp.134, 235-6.

³⁵⁶ Wicquefort, *L'Ambassadeur*, i, pp.110-1; Francquesnay, *Ministre public*, pp.22-3.

claimed by several other states, for example by the Empire's electorates and even by some principalities.³⁵⁷

In the century after 1648, the second class comprised a large number of new ranks: 'envoyé', 'envoyé extraordinaire', 'résident', 'ministre (plenipotentiaire)', 'agent', 'chargé d'affaires', 'secrétaire d'ambassade', etc. While these terms had become fully accepted in diplomatic theory around 1700, their division into a second and a third order only gradually emerged in the eighteenth century.³⁵⁸ Owing to the variations in ceremonial at different courts, the ranks still escaped a fixed and unanimous hierarchy, in particular with regard to envoys and residents. Callières stated that the 'résident' had begun to be considered lower than an 'envoyé', although several courts, among them France, had defended the equality of residents and envoys in previous decades.³⁵⁹ As a result, from the 1660s the attribute 'extraordinaire', previously denoting an ad-hoc character, was adopted by envoys as an honorary title, in order to assure their precedence over residents.³⁶⁰ Although the treatment of envoys and residents still varied, a distinction within the lower ranks was becoming more perceptible in the eighteenth century and was finally adopted in the regulations of 1815/18.³⁶¹ On the other hand, in order to allow for more nuances, additional ranks were introduced from

³⁵⁷ See the subsequent section.

³⁵⁸ The new ranks were introduced into diplomatic theory by Hoevelen and Wicquefort, while a more stable hierarchy is discernible already with Chamoy and Callières. The division into three classes was adopted by Francquesnay, Bielfeld and Réal. The papal ranks were divided into a particular hierarchy of legates, nuncios and internuncios, see Wicquefort, *L'Ambassadeur*, i, ch.x; Callières, *De la manière*, ch.vii.

³⁵⁹ Callières, *De la manière*, pp.69-71. On the French interests in this matter against the background of the competition with the Emperor, see AAE, MD 1852, fos.193-8^v ('Sur la compétence entre les envoyés et les résidents', 1713, with reference to Wicquefort). This equality was upheld at the courts of Denmark, Venice, Poland and Constantinople, see Markel, *Rangstufen*, p.64.

³⁶⁰ Wicquefort, *L'Ambassadeur*, i, pp.119-20; Kulpis, *De legationibus statuum Imperii*, pp.472-5.

³⁶¹ On varying practice and opinions, see for example J.J.Moser, 'Abhandlung von denen dormalen üblichen Gattungen derer Gesandten [...]', in idem, *Der Belgradische Friedens-Schluss [...]* (Jena, 1740). Bielfeld still placed the resident in both the second and the third class, *Institutions politiques*, ii, p.175. Cf. the 1742 memoir on ranks in AAE, MD France 317, fos.60-1.

the late seventeenth century: the titles of 'ministre' and 'ministre plenipotentiaire', for example, became frequently used forms in the eighteenth century.³⁶²

Another cause for variance had been the status of the lowest diplomatic ranks, the 'chargés', 'secrétaires', 'agents' and 'députés': as Wicquefort's treatise shows, their status as 'ministres publics' depended on their commission and accreditation.³⁶³ Evolving from the ambassador's personal secretary, the 'embassy secretary' became more important from the later seventeenth century. He could either be sent together with an ambassador, act as 'chargé d'affaires' in the absence of the former, or serve as secretary to a congress embassy.³⁶⁴ Independent 'chargés' became common in the course of the eighteenth century and were included in the third diplomatic class in 1815 as diplomats accredited with the ministry of foreign affairs. The importance that theorists attributed to the lower ranks in this period corresponded to their increasing use: the system of diplomatic representation was based on envoys, residents and ministers, while ambassadors were sent more rarely.

Diplomatic theory mirrored a trend to formalise and systematise the ranks used in the states-system.³⁶⁵ In the period of study, regional variations continued to persist, although a tendency towards a uniform and reciprocal treatment was clearly visible. The number of disputes about ranks peaked in the decades following the Peace of Westphalia, while contemporaries observed a general consensus around the mid-eighteenth century. Yet, the evolution of diplomatic ranks in the states-system found its formal conclusion only with the regulations of 1815/18. In Vienna and Aachen, a compromise was reached which linked

³⁶² Francquesnay, *Ministre public*, p.75; AAE, MD France, 1871, fos.120-30. Müller, *Kaiserliches Gesandtschaftswesen*, p.139. The attribute 'plenipotentiaire' was usually given to diplomats at a congress.

³⁶³ Wicquefort, *L'Ambassadeur*, i, ch.v. See further AAE, MD France 1852, fos.200-2 on chargés d'affaires, fos.203-7 on députés.

³⁶⁴ Francquesnay, *Ministre public*, pp.86-90. The origins of this rank probably lay in Rome, see Wicquefort, *L'Ambassadeur*, i, p.142.

³⁶⁵ See for example the references to Wicquefort in AAE, MD France 1852, fo.194; *ibid.* 1872, fo.263.

diplomatic status not merely to the international rank of states, but to the occasion of the embassy, the first arrival and the seniority within the diplomatic corps.³⁶⁶

The Diplomatic Function

From the perception of these structural transformations, diplomatic theorists observed that the tasks of diplomats were changing in response to an ever more intense and complex management of international relations. They based their new diplomatic ethos on the precept that the diplomats' responsibility had increased with the longer residence abroad and with the emergence of a 'corps diplomatique', whose organisation was directly related to the international hierarchy. In consequence, the diplomats' functions were becoming more complex, too, requiring them to take the interests and position of all actors into account. In practice, their duties were laid down in the instructions. All the same, a set of tasks and functions characterised every embassy and was summarised by diplomatic theory under the headings 'information', 'negotiation' and 'representation'.³⁶⁷ In each of these three categories, theorists perceived an intensification and adjustment to the post-1648 framework of diplomacy.

The task of representation of a ruler's rank and dignity was one of the diplomat's central functions.³⁶⁸ With the refinement and formalisation of the courtly society, with the longer sojourn of several diplomats in one place, issues of representation and ceremonial attained a pivotal place in diplomatic practice and theory. In all his actions the diplomat

³⁶⁶ See Markel, *Rangstufen*, pp.71, 76, and the appendix listing the 1815/18 regulations.

³⁶⁷ See also L.Bély, 'Représentation, négociation et information dans l'étude des relations internationales à l'époque moderne', in P.Milza, S.Bernstein (eds.), *Axes et méthodes de l'histoire politique* (Paris, 1998), 213-39; cp. W.Roosen, 'The Functioning of Ambassadors under Louis XIV', *French Historical Studies*, 6 (1970), 311-32.

³⁶⁸ Benavente, *Advertencias*, pp.359-60; Wicquefort, *L'Ambassadeur*, i, p.4; Keith, *Office of Ambassador*, p.50. Cf. H.Hofmann, *Repräsentation. Studien zur Wort- und Begriffsgeschichte von der Antike bis ins 19. Jahrhundert* (Berlin, 1974), pp.178-90.

expressed the hierarchy of the 'société des princes'.³⁶⁹ Diplomatic theorists displayed an ambivalent attitude towards this function. They echoed the standard phrase of diplomatic instructions to 'uphold a prince's dignity and honour', but they also perceived that this could hamper the flexibility and efficacy of the diplomat's other functions, which, as Wicquefort and Callières stressed, were first and foremost to 'traiter les affaires de son prince, et [...] découvrir celles d'autrui'.³⁷⁰

The topos of the 'espion honorable' served to express the functions of representation and information; one taking place before the eyes of the public, the other in secrecy. While the collection and transmission of information had been a central task of resident embassies since their establishment, in this area, too, theorists recorded an intensification. First of all, diplomats had to write more and more often. Theorists gave ample advice on the composition of instructions and the management of correspondence. Concurrently, governments issued regulations on the frequency, format and content of dispatches, on final reports modelled on the Venetian 'relazioni', on the use of ciphers and couriers, and on the correspondence between their own diplomats.³⁷¹ An augmented embassy staff and the establishment of legation archives around the turn of the eighteenth century were consequences of this surge in information management. In addition, diplomats had to provide more and more varied information on the situation and interests of all the system's actors. This included data forming part of the new discipline of 'statistics', comprising information on the decision-

³⁶⁹ The extent of the diplomat's integration into the court society becomes clear for example in AAE, MD France 1852, which treats his relations with all persons present at court.

³⁷⁰ Callières, *De la manière*, p.85; Wicquefort, *Mémoires*, edn.1730, pp.5-6, linked with criticism of the high nobility and of ceremonial embassies. On the criticism of diplomatic ceremonial, see below.

³⁷¹ For example in Prussia and Saxony, see the orders in GSTA, Rep.9, Z Lit.L, fasc.1 (1718); fasc.1a (1715 ff.); fasc.3 (1733 ff.); SächsHSTA, Geh.Kabinett 952.2 (1708-17); 952.3 (1733-40). Likewise in Savoy, see Frigo, *Piemonte*, pp.181-3.

making process, on military establishments and on commerce.³⁷² Finally, the diplomat had to use more sources to provide this information, as Wicquefort stressed, ranging from observation, 'gazettes' and gossip to the exchange of news with other diplomats, to court 'fêtes', dinners, presents, corruption and espionage.³⁷³ Although diplomatic theorists were reluctant to openly acknowledge the abundant use of espionage and bribery, their treatises reveal that in practice these means were employed, leading to a further sophistication of the intelligence networks.³⁷⁴

With the longer residence abroad, the nature of diplomatic negotiation changed and found its expression in diplomatic theory. The manners and strategies of negotiation had to be adjusted not only to the situation of the country and government, and the interests and character of the prince and his ministers, but also to the wider framework of the states-system. Of particular importance for the evolution of negotiation techniques were the multilateral congresses that entailed a complex system of full-powers, mediation, written and oral negotiation.³⁷⁵

Changes in these three aspects of the diplomatic function transformed the day-to-day duties and conduct of a diplomat, in particular with regard to his colleagues. Apart from an increasing competition for ranks, a need of cooperation became discernible, reflected in the theory's early conception of a corps mentality. At the same time, the transformation of the framework of diplomacy placed further strains and responsibility on the diplomats residing

³⁷² Chamoy, *Parfait ambassadeur*, p.34. See for example AAE, MD France 1990 ('Mémoire sur le commerce', fos.13 ff.); SächsHSTA, Geh.Kabinett 952.8 (decrees 1719-32); AB, iv, pp.595-6 (decree of 22 Aug.1724). In the course of the eighteenth century, some embassies were supplied with specialists and assistants in legal, commercial or military matters, see Müller, *Kaiserliches Gesandtschaftswesen*, pp.101-2.

³⁷³ Wicquefort, *L'Ambassadeur*, ii, ch.i.

³⁷⁴ See Opitz, 'Diplomacy and Secret Communications', 64-84; Bély, *Espions et ambassadeurs*, pp.51-287. Furthermore, see the tracts 'Of Intelligence' by T.Roe, PRO SP 201/17, fos.109-13^v, and 'Intelligence is the Soul of all Publick Business [...]' by D.Defoe in BL, Lansdowne MS 98, fos.229-32.

³⁷⁵ See below. On negotiation techniques, see Wicquefort, *L'Ambassadeur*, ii, chs.iii, xii; Chamoy, *Parfait ambassadeur*, pp.36-7; Callières, *De la manière*, chs.xvi-xviii; Francquesnay, *Ministre public*, ch.4.iii-iv.

abroad. They had to deliberate between instructions from home and changing circumstances abroad. Theorists were aware that the 'ideal ambassador' depended on the existing communication networks, on careful instruction, information and adequate financial resources.

The Central Administration of Diplomacy: Bureaucratisation and Specialisation

The increasing complexity of international relations and the mounting mass of information to be handled by resident diplomats entailed changes and reforms both in the diplomatic service and in the central administration. When Mably stated that diplomats could only be as good as their central direction, this was not only a criticism of the conduct of foreign policy by absolutist princes but also an understanding that the diplomat's scope of action was determined and limited by his prince and government.³⁷⁶ The theorists' remarks on the relationship of diplomats with their own and with the host government allow us to observe the evolution of a bureaucratic and increasingly 'professional' administration of foreign policy from the diplomats' viewpoint.

Diplomatic historians have regarded the post-1648 century as a crucial period in the emergence of a 'modern' apparatus. Recent studies are careful not to presuppose a Weberian ideal-type of bureaucratic administration, but pay attention to the evolutionary nature of this often ad-hoc, inconsistent and erratic process, which occurred at varying speed and intensity in different states. Nevertheless, their results still point to common features characterising the practice and organisation of diplomacy in Europe.³⁷⁷ From the chancelleries, embryonic 'foreign ministries'

³⁷⁶ Mably, *Principes des négociations*, p.22. Theorists advised the diplomat to obey his instructions and to seek advice from his government, see Howell, *A Distinct Treatise*, pp.197-9; Wicquefort, *L'Ambassadeur*, i, pp.348-51; ii, pp.98-119; Pecquet, *Art de négocier*, pp.85-7.

³⁷⁷ For an overview, see Reinhard, *Staatsgewalt*; Anderson, *Rise of Modern Diplomacy*; Duchhardt, *Balance of Power*. To a large extent, this also holds true for republican governments. For the Dutch Republic, see

were evolving: special departments or secretariats dealing more and more exclusively with foreign affairs, supported by nascent bureaucratic services directed by 'commis' or councillors. The French 'secretariat des affaires étrangères' under the Marquis de Torcy was the largest apparatus of its kind around 1700.³⁷⁸ The English administration, on the other hand, continued to be divided between two secretaries of state until the establishment of the Foreign Office in 1782.³⁷⁹ Reforms in the Austrian imperial administration of foreign policy culminated in the institution of the 'state chancellery' in the mid-eighteenth century. In the electorates of Brandenburg-Prussia, Bavaria, Saxony and Hanover, small cabinets with attached chancelleries took over the direction and administration of foreign affairs in this period.³⁸⁰ This process was fuelled by the needs of information and secrecy. The absolutist state required constant and universal information if it was to survive on the international scene, information that required a differentiated administrative apparatus. At the same time,

J.Heringa, *De Eer en Hoogheid van de Staat* (Groningen, 1961); M.Franken, 'The General Tendencies and Structural Aspects of the Foreign Policy and Diplomacy of the Dutch Republic in the Latter Half of the 17th Century', *Acta Historiae Neerlandica*, 3 (1968), 1-42.

³⁷⁸ On its organisation, see the various 'états des bureaux' (1575-1839) in AAE, Personnel I, Organisation. Cf. Baillou, *Affaires étrangères*; Picavet, *Diplomatie française*; C.Piccioni, *Premier commis*; J.-P.Samoyault, *Les Bureaux du secrétariat d'état des affaires étrangères sous Louis XV* (Paris, 1971); Baschet, *Histoire du dépôt*. I am grateful to S.Externbrink for providing me with the typescript of his study *Das Deutschlandbild der französischen Diplomatie im Siebenjährigen Krieg. Perzeption und Entscheidungsprozesse in der Außenpolitik Frankreichs, 1755-63* (Marburg.Univ. Habilitation, forthcoming), part II ('Die französische Diplomatie im 18. Jahrhundert).

³⁷⁹ See Horn, *British Diplomatic Service*; idem, 'The Machinery for the Conduct of British Foreign Policy in the 18th Century', *Journal of the Society of Archivists*, 3 (1969), 229-40; Thomson, *Secretaries of State*; C.R.Middleton, *The Administration of British Foreign Policy 1782-1846* (Durham, 1977).

³⁸⁰ See Müller, *Kaiserliches Gesandtschaftswesen*; E.Matsch, *Der Auswärtige Dienst von Österreich(-Ungarn) 1720-1920* (Vienna, 1980); G.Klingenstein, 'Institutionelle Aspekte der österreichischen Außenpolitik im 18. Jahrhundert', in E.Zöllner (ed.), *Diplomatie und Außenpolitik Österreichs* (Vienna, 1977), 74-93. For Prussia, see Kohnke, *Kabinettsministerium*; U.Müller-Weil, *Absolutismus und Aussenpolitik in Preussen: ein Beitrag zur Strukturgeschichte des preussischen Absolutismus* (Stuttgart, 1992); H.Scott, 'Prussia's Royal Foreign Minister: Frederick the Great and the Administration of Prussian Diplomacy', in idem *et al.* (eds.), *Royal and Republican Sovereignty*, 500-26. Cf. in general K.Jeserich (ed.), *Deutsche Verwaltungsgeschichte*, i (Stuttgart, 1983).

the chancelleries were headed by ever smaller cabinets, who, under the direction of the 'absolutist' prince, controlled foreign policy and the handling of information.³⁸¹

These secretariats and bureaux became the first points of contact for diplomats and acted as control stations for the flow of information.³⁸² The management of diplomatic correspondence lay in the hands of these department, whose head served as link to the king's cabinet.³⁸³ In 1760, the Prussian diplomat and theorist Bielfeld provided the most extensive description of the workings of a foreign ministry. Modelled on the Prussian cabinet ministry, Bielfeld discussed the correspondence with diplomats abroad, the handling of cipher keys, the management of the archives and the postal and courier systems, as well as the negotiations with foreign diplomats.³⁸⁴ In particular the latter aspect placed new demands on the departments with the establishment of resident diplomacy.³⁸⁵ Diplomatic theory touched upon the diplomat's relationship with his host government: he should become familiar with its decision-makers, their characters and interests, and use this knowledge in the 'art de négocier'.³⁸⁶ On the other hand, from the governments' perspective a 1724 treatise on the

³⁸¹ As case study, see V.Laube, 'Geheimnisverrat in Wien. Anmerkungen zu den organisatorischen Bedingungen frühneuzeitlicher Außenpolitik am Beispiel Kurbayerns', in Kugeler *et al.* (eds.), *Internationale Beziehungen*, 212-36.

³⁸² This included special departments overseeing post, espionage, and intelligence. See P.Fraser, *The Intelligence of the Secretaries of State and their Monopoly of Licensed News, 1660-1688* (Cambridge, 1956); Baillou, *Affaires étrangères*, pp.106-8; F.Stix, 'Zur Geschichte und Organisation der Wiener Geheimen Ziffernkanzlei', *MIÖG*, 51 (1937), 131-66. Of course, princes and ministers could still establish their own secret diplomacy, as did for example Louis XV or Prince Eugen of Savoy.

³⁸³ Callières, *De la manière*, p.92. Cf. Francquesnay, *Ministre public*, pp.205, 207; Pecquet, *Art de négocier*, p.57.

³⁸⁴ Bielfeld, *Institutions politiques*, ii, ch. III.

³⁸⁵ See the debate on limiting the Prussian ministry's contact with foreign diplomats under Frederic William I: GSTA, Rep.9, J3a, fasc.2 (1714). In 1728, a weekday was fixed to receive diplomats, *ibid.* Z Lit.L, fasc.1a, fo.68. At the same time, Frederic sought to limit his own contact with foreign diplomats, *ibid.*, fo.74^{r-v} (1730).

³⁸⁶ On the different forms of 'conferences' with the host department, see the *Embajda española*, p.29; Wicquefort, *L'Ambassadeur*, ii, ch.ii; *Traité des ambassades*, p.147; Francquesnay, *Ministre public*, pp.208-11. Cf. Pecquet, *Art de négocier*, pp.120-1, on the 'conduite en républiques'.

foreign minister's 'art de négocier' exemplified the fact that officials had to counter the diplomat's art.³⁸⁷

The relationship between the diplomat and his own prince and government was determined by obedience, mutual information and correspondence.³⁸⁸ Yet communication routes were slow before the advent of the telegraph, and the diplomatic letter was vulnerable to interception. Consequently, a number of methods were devised to safeguard its secrets, for example through ciphers.³⁸⁹ At the same time, the longer residence required that diplomats were kept up to date with events at home and in other parts of the states-system. Theorists perceived mutual information as a precondition of an effective diplomacy.³⁹⁰ The governments responded by establishing special agencies and procedures to correspond with diplomats and to provide newsletters and 'circulaires'.³⁹¹ Furthermore, diplomats were encouraged to correspond with their colleagues abroad.³⁹² This system of information was still far from complete, as the theorists' remarks reveal, and diplomats therefore depended on good connections in the department and on private correspondence.³⁹³

³⁸⁷ Composed by LeDran, see AAE, MD France 1852, fos.208-19'. This interesting tract resembled diplomatic theory in distinguishing between 'coeur' and 'esprit' in negotiation and in outlining a conduct of 'confiance' and 'secret'.

³⁸⁸ On the relationship of diplomat and prince, against the background of Callières' own biography, see L.Bély, "Le roi mon maître". Le service du roi à l'étranger vu à travers l'oeuvre de François de Callières', in J.Fouilleron *et al.* (eds.), *Société et idéologies des temps modernes* (Montpellier, 1996), 481-501.

³⁸⁹ See for example Callières, *De la manière*, ch.xx. Cf. Bély, *Espions et ambassadeurs*, pp.134-62; J.W.Thompson, S.Padener, *Secret Diplomacy. Espionage and Cryptography, 1500-1815* (New York, 1963).

³⁹⁰ Callières, *De la manière*, p.90; Francquesnay, *Ministre public*, ch.4.v. See also Horn, *British Diplomatic Service*, p.186; Fraser, *Intelligence*, p.68; and the complaint of a Saxon diplomat on insufficient information in SächsHSTA, Geh.Kabinett 3305 (3 Nov.1706). Examples for newsletters can be found *ibid.*, 3322, 3335-40.

³⁹¹ Roosen, *Age of Louis XIV*, pp.49-50. See for example the chancellery regulations in GSTA, Rep.9, L12, fascs.26-7. For the Imperial service, see HHSTA, Staatskanzlei, Interioria, Circularien. In 1751, the importance of informing diplomats was discussed again in Vienna, with special reference to diplomats residing in Russia, *ibid.*, Vorträge 67. Distance and scarce information proved a particular problem for Russian diplomats, see Bohlen, 'Changes', p.349.

³⁹² On the problem of secrecy, see PRO, SP 80/93 (7 Feb.1733, Robinson to Delafaye), cf. J.Black, *British Diplomats and Diplomacy 1688-1800* (Exeter, 2001), p.91.

³⁹³ Chamoy, *Parfait ambassadeur*, pp.34-5; Callières, *De la manière*, p.178; Francquesnay, *Ministre public*, pp.118-9.

The increased amount of information led to the establishment of special diplomatic archives.³⁹⁴ In France, the beginnings of these archives lay in the 1660s when the correspondence of returning diplomats was integrated into the ministry's papers. An institutionalised bureau was only erected in 1710.³⁹⁵ In Britain, the State Paper Office and the bureaux of the secretaries served as collection-point for diplomatic documents, especially under Williamson.³⁹⁶ In most of the Empire's territories the chancellery remained the main repository, in addition to those papers held in the cabinets.³⁹⁷ Apart from serving as repositories of the history and customs of negotiations, the archives and chancelleries became important in the training of future diplomats, as will be illustrated below. Abroad, embassy archives, usually connected with special embassy buildings, were being established from the early eighteenth century.³⁹⁸

Another structural factor was the embassy's provision with financial resources. The increase of the diplomatic service and its longer residence abroad became a new strain on the states' finances, as the maintenance of diplomats by the host state ('defrayal') was limited to extraordinary embassies.³⁹⁹ In all countries, the payment was irregular and often insufficient, forcing diplomats to advance their own funds, with reimbursement uncertain. Constant complaints were the result, which give the impression that diplomacy was still a loss-making activity, even if recent scholarship has underlined that other compensations, in the form of

³⁹⁴ Treatises gave advice on managing the diplomats' correspondence, as for example Wicquefort, *L'Ambassadeur*, ii, ch.x. On the central archives, see Bielfeld, *Institutions politiques*, ii, pp.62, 74.

³⁹⁵ See AAE, MD France 251; BN, Clairambault 519; cf. Baschet, *Archives*. For the collection of diplomatic correspondence in Saxony, see for example SächsHSTA, Geh.Rat 8287/4 (order of 11 Jan.1702).

³⁹⁶ See Thomson, *Secretaries of State*, p.145.

³⁹⁷ See for example the Prussian 'Reglement für die Geheime Kanzlei' (1699/1700) in C.W.Cosmar, *Geschichte des Königlich-Preußischen Geheimen Staats- und Kabinetarchivs bis 1806*, ed. M.Kohnke (Cologne, 1993). Furthermore, see GSTA, Rep.9, Z Lit.L, fasc.36 (14 Feb.1711); J3a, fasc.3 (1718-29), AB, i, pp.774-5 (June 1714).

³⁹⁸ See for instance the discussion in Vienna on establishing an embassy house with archives in Rome, HHSTA, Staatskanzlei, Vorträge 21 and 23 (1716-20), and in Madrid, *ibid.* 26 (1725). Cf. Anderson, *Rise of Modern Diplomacy*, pp.21, 94-5.

³⁹⁹ Usually for three days, see Schmid, *Der Gesandte*, fo.135^{r-v}; Callières, *De la manière*, p.67.

offices or patronage, were available to diplomats.⁴⁰⁰ Diplomatic theorists were obliged to retain 'wealth' in their catalogue of virtues, even though they called upon governments to improve levels and regularity of payment.⁴⁰¹ From a government's standpoint, on the other hand, the demands of the treasury often limited the scope of diplomacy and made the use of lower ranks more economical, particularly for smaller territories. Ways to improve the situation were, first, to establish special funds ('Legationskassen') and, second, to devise systematic regulations for payment. These were organised according to the diplomatic rank and divided into a monthly salary, a lump sum for travel, staff and furnishing, as well as a part payment of expenditure.⁴⁰² That government officials were aware of the problems caused by inadequate funding for the professionalism and loyalty of their diplomats is apparent in the discussions over remunerating embassy secretaries, as for example in France in 1711.⁴⁰³

Diplomatic theory indicates a growing awareness of the 'structural' factors in diplomatic efficacy, such as information and payment. In outlining the diplomat's relationship to his own and host government, theorists displayed an alertness to changes and reforms in the central administration, which they linked to the demands of the states-system. In their view, the support of the diplomatic service on the part of the government was still

⁴⁰⁰ See Duchhardt, *Balance of Power*, p.33; H.Droste, 'Unternehmer in Sachen Kultur. Die Diplomaten Schwedens im 17. Jahrhundert', in T.Fuchs, S.Trakulhun (eds.), *Das eine Europa und die Vielfalt der Kulturen. Kulturtransfer in Europa, 1500-1800* (Berlin, 2003), p.225.

⁴⁰¹ For example Wicquefort, *L'Ambassadeur*, i, pp.674-9; Chamoy, *Parfait ambassadeur*, p.19; Callières, *De la manière*, pp.30-1, 47-8. Cf. Duguet, *Institution d'un prince*, p.332. A comparison of diplomats' salaries in Europe was compiled by F.C.Moser, 'Abhandlung von den Appointemens, oder dem Gehalt der Gesandten', in idem, *Kleine Schriften*, i, 182-290.

⁴⁰² On the French establishment of 'trésoriers' for diplomacy in 1706-7, see AAE, MD France 307, fos.83-4. Cf. the list of salaries in BN, MS.fr.22726. For Britain, see PRO, SP 9/187 (regulation of 1635); SP 9/166 (allowances of 1665, plus a list of French diplomatic salaries, cf. SP 78/123); SP 9/156 (regulation of 1669); SP 44/72 (regulation of 1689). Cf. Lachs, *Diplomatic Corps*, pp.81-94. For the Emperor, see HKA, Protokolle Geh.Finanzkonferenz 4 (1718), 15 (1729), 16 (1730); Hoffinanz 437 (1673), 458 (1677), 819 (1719), which sought to actually decrease the spending on diplomacy by providing fixed regulations. Müller stresses that the practice was less uniform, *Kaiserliches Gesandtschaftswesen*, p.165. For Prussia, see Kohnke, *Kabinettsministerium*, pp.222-33. For Saxony, see SächsHSTA, Geh.Kabinett 1446/01 (1709 regulations); Geh.Kabinett 3065 (discussion of 1717); ibid. 1447 (1728 regulations); Geh.Rat 8236/13 (1723 regulations); Geh.Kabinett 1373/4 (regulations of 1748/61).

⁴⁰³ See Part IV.

insufficient in many aspects and encumbered its effectiveness and professionalism. Consequently, in their call for a new type of diplomat, theorists also sought to persuade governments to improve the structural framework of diplomacy. And indeed, this period witnessed a number of reforms and reform plans, which were brought up time after time and frequently echoed the theorists' demands.⁴⁰⁴

Apart from political direction and financial provision, the diplomat depended on his prince with regard to his status in international law and in ceremonial. Theorists considered the legal privileges and ceremonial honours of diplomats as structural features determining the day-to-day conduct of diplomacy. In these two areas, they also perceived fundamental transformations in response to the intensification of resident diplomacy in the states-system.

Episode 3. 'Les Différents des Ambassadeurs aux Champs Elisées'

Conflicts about the legal immunity and inviolability of diplomats had wide repercussions in the European states-system. Such cases were not only of interest to the diplomats and sovereigns affected by an infringement of the 'droit des gens', but concerned the entire international society. Each incident gave rise to a number of expert opinions, pamphlets, polemical treatises and dissertations, which presented interpretations to the European public. This literature could take on curious forms, as a tract of 1717 demonstrates.⁴⁰⁵

Interweaving classical Roman mythology with diplomatic practice, the satire is set in the underworld ruled by Pluto, where ancient and modern statesmen, scholars of international

⁴⁰⁴ For France, see for example the comments of Marquis de Bonnac, AAE MD France 310 (1715); the plan of the abbé St.Pierre, MD France 1251; and the anonymous memorandum on foreign affairs (1721-2), MD France 312-13. For Britain, see Stanyans's plan of 1712, PRO, SP 96/15; Harley's plan to Queen Anne (1710), BL, Stowe MS 248; and a memorandum of 1784, BL, Add.MS 57832. See furthermore the correspondence relating to the establishment of the cabinet ministry in Prussia, GSTA, Rep.9, J3a, fasc.4 (1728), and to the state chancellery in Austria, HHSTA, Staatskanzlei, Interioria 1. Cf. Part IV.

⁴⁰⁵ *Les Différents des ambassadeurs aux Champs-Elisées* (n.p., 1717), consulted in HAB Wolfenbüttel, Rq 161.

law and ambassadors are gathered, divided into 'ombres d'epée' and 'ombres de robe'. In the latter chamber, following a speech of Cicero, a dispute begins on the nature and extent of ambassadorial immunity, led by Grotius and Pufendorf. Grotius links diplomatic privileges to a 'droit des gens volontaire' observed by all civilised peoples, but he is ridiculed by Pufendorf, who, in turn, expands upon natural law as source of the diplomats' immunity. In his view, this also entails that a diplomat's own offence against the 'droit de la nature' forfeits his inviolability. Others enter into the debate, featuring those ambassadors to Elizabethan England who were convicted of conspiracies, as for example Mendoza, the Bishop of Ross, and the Polish envoy Jaline.⁴⁰⁶ They are joined not only by Queen Elizabeth herself, but also by English legal counsellors of that period. Parkins, Hotman and Gentili reason that a sovereign can exert jurisdiction on 'ambassadeurs criminels', even if it has become customary to send them back to their own prince. At this point, the story takes a fresh turn with the arrival of a new candidate for the underworld: a Swedish soldier and former secretary to the embassy at Rijswijk, who has come to communicate a new case concerning diplomatic immunity to the assembled corps diplomatique 'ancien et moderne'. Yet, having died as a military officer, he is denied entry into the diplomatic chamber and made to submit to an elaborate procedure of exchanging written memoirs and resolutions. His communication, however, makes clear the purpose of the satire: it supports the sovereign's right to defend himself against intriguing diplomats in the 'Gyllenborg' case of 1717. Gyllenborg, the Swedish envoy in London, was arrested and his papers captured under the suspicion of being involved in a Jacobite conspiracy.⁴⁰⁷ The comedy ends with Pluto ordering Charon to mix the waters of the Lethe into the diplomats' wine, in order to drive away memories of the past and

⁴⁰⁶ On the importance of this period of confessional strife for international law, see Frey, *Diplomatic Immunity*, pp.159-97.

⁴⁰⁷ Gyllenborg was released following the protests of other diplomats. See footnote 461.

establish peace and tranquillity in his realm. Thus, in the guise of a satire playing with the common cultural heritage and the diplomatic history of Europe, the piece sought to contribute to the debate surrounding a current case of international law. In its arguments, it mirrored the fundamental clash between the interests of state and the rights of sovereigns on one hand and the common interest of the international community on the other.

III.2. International Law and Diplomacy

The inviolability of messengers and legates had in principle been acknowledged since antiquity. With the end of the 'respublica christiana' and the emergence of the territorial state, it became even more necessary 'to bind Leviathan [...] by a network of international usage'.⁴⁰⁸

Developed from canon and Roman law, the early modern 'ius gentium' contained, next to the 'ius belli' and the 'ius mari', a section on the 'ius legatis et legationibus', which treated the right of a state to send embassies as well as the immunity of diplomats. Diplomatic immunities were linked to the principle of sovereignty: only sovereign princes or republics could send and receive diplomats who enjoyed the protection of the 'droit des gens' and could not be submitted to another jurisdiction, be arrested, punished or put to death. With the spread of resident embassies between 1500 and 1750, the conflict potential of diplomatic law grew immensely, often fuelled by confessional antagonism.⁴⁰⁹ In particular the status of diplomats who had violated the laws of other countries was a subject of debate. Secondly, the immunity from civil jurisdiction and the status of the embassy quarters and staff – in short, the consequences of resident diplomacy – had to be regulated. This process was a

⁴⁰⁸ E. Adair, *The Exterritoriality of Ambassadors in the 16th and 17th Centuries* (London, 1929), p.251.

⁴⁰⁹ In 1625, Grotius declared that it lay in every state's interest to accept resident embassies, *De iure belli ac pacis*, ed. W. Schätzel (Tübingen, 1950), p.17. On the central role of Grotius in international law, see H. Bull *et al.* (eds.), *Hugo Grotius and International Relations* (Oxford, 1992).

prerequisite for effective international communication and the emergence of the states-system as a body of shared norms and customs. Apart from legal casuistry, precedents and customs, the legal framework of international relations was made up by the bulk of accords and treaties, which formed a part of the 'droit public de l'Europe' highlighted by Mably and other eighteenth-century theorists.⁴¹⁰ In retrospect, theorists acknowledged that the Peace of 1648 marked a defining moment in international law, not only because it sought to establish a lasting peace settlement and lay the foundations of a balanced system based on territorial sovereignty, but also because it heralded the final stage of regulating diplomatic law.⁴¹¹

This process was accompanied by a growing number of treatises of international law by authorities such as Gentili, Grotius or Vattel. Like the theorists of international law, theorists of diplomacy considered uniform legal norms as a prerequisite for an effective diplomacy. Yet their perspective was slightly different, since it represented the viewpoint of the diplomatic corps.⁴¹² Historiography has neglected the role of this particular discourse, not least because of the different scholarly traditions of diplomatic history and international law.⁴¹³ On the other hand, recent scholarship is seeking to reassess the role and 'culture' of international law. Freys' monograph, for example, examines treatises on diplomatic law as reactions to cases and conflicts of diplomatic practice.⁴¹⁴ It argues that the standardisation of legal customs mirrored the emergence of the 'international society' surfacing in the

⁴¹⁰ Reibstein, 'Das "Europäische Öffentliche Recht" 1648-1815'; Mohnhaupt, "Europa" und "ius publicum" im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert'; R.Lesaffer, 'War, Peace, Interstate Friendship and the Emergence of the Ius Publicum Europaeum', in idem (ed.), *Peace Treaties and International Law in European History* (Cambridge, 2004), 87-113; M.Bélissa, 'Peace Treaties, Bonne foi and European Civility in the Enlightenment', in *ibid.*, 241-53.

⁴¹¹ See Duchhardt, 'Westphalian System'; K.-H.Ziegler, 'Die Bedeutung des Westfälischen Friedens von 1648 für das europäische Völkerrecht', *Archiv des Völkerrechts*, 37 (1999), 129-52.

⁴¹² See the series 'Classics of International Law', ed. J.B.Scott (New York, 1960) for the works of Suarez, Gentili, Grotius, Zouch, Rachel, Wolff and Vattel.

⁴¹³ See the handbooks of Janssen, *Die Anfänge des modernen Völkerrechts*; Grewe, *Epochen der Völkerrechtsgeschichte*. Bély's *Espions et ambassadeurs*, however, neglects diplomatic law.

⁴¹⁴ L. and M.Frey, *The History of Diplomatic Immunity* (Columbus, 2001); cf. the older study of Adair, *Exterritoriality*; furthermore, C.Barker, 'The Theory and Practice of Diplomatic Law in the Renaissance and Classical Periods', *Diplomacy and Statecraft*, 6 (1995), 593-615; E.Young, 'The Development of the Law of Diplomatic Relations', *British Yearbook of International Law*, 40 (1964), 141-82.

seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.⁴¹⁵ While an examination of diplomatic theory confirms that the post-1648 century represents indeed the last stage of a development that had begun with the emergence of resident embassies, Freys' argument needs to be differentiated.

Wicquefort's treatise was composed from the principle that diplomacy required new legal norms based on the actual practice of states; norms that were still inadequately outlined in legal theory.⁴¹⁶ Consequently, a distinction has to be drawn between legal theory and diplomatic theory, taking into account the different perspective and more practical outlook of the latter, which led to a swifter, if sometimes less systematic and theoretically sound incorporation of changes. At times this resulted in different interpretations of cases. More often than legal scholars, the 'learned diplomats' placed the needs of diplomacy over the rights of the individual states, justifying diplomatic immunity from the interests of the system as a whole. In this context, the verdict that diplomatic theory always remained behind the practice has to be reconsidered. In many conflicts about diplomatic law, theorists were involved either indirectly as cited authorities or directly as advisers, or indeed, as Wicquefort, as an involved party. What is more, diplomatic theory was already pointing beyond the still varied practice by delineating the states-system as a system of common legal norms. The following paragraphs will outline the fields in which an alignment of the practice and theory of international law to the states-system became visible to theorists of diplomacy after 1648.

The Foundations of Diplomatic Law

Since no superior authority and arbiter was acknowledged after the end of the 'respublica christiana', it became crucial for theorists to justify the existence of a law superseding the

⁴¹⁵ Frey, *Diplomatic Immunity*, pp.207-8, at the same time putting into perspective the watershed of 1648 and stressing that eighteenth-century practice was still varied, p.284.

⁴¹⁶ See Keens-Soper, *Wicquefort. The Ambassador*, p.ix. On the shortcomings in Wicquefort's methodology, cf. Bazzoli, 'Wicquefort', pp.211-2.

'raison d'état' of individual sovereigns. In the early modern period, various concepts were employed to support the immunities of diplomats, ranging from canon and Roman law to natural law and customary or 'positivistic' law.⁴¹⁷ Of course, these concepts could be used to either support or to contest the diplomat's privileges, for example by insisting on a state's right of self-defense according to natural law.⁴¹⁸ Following Grotius, natural law and customary law became the two pillars of the 'ius inter gentes', which, despite its claim to universality, was more and more aligned to the boundaries of 'Europe'. Both concepts regarded customs and precedent cases as the basis of international law, since they expressed the nations' consent.⁴¹⁹ Nevertheless, the Law of Nations was not completely separated from the states' own laws which delineated diplomatic privileges by regulations and decrees.⁴²⁰ Together with international treaties, this body of laws and customs constituted the 'droit public de l'Europe'. International law was not fixed and static but variable, shaped by explicit consent, such as treaties, or by implicit consent, such as precedents going down into custom.⁴²¹ This meant that privileges once granted to a diplomat could be claimed by his successors, and thus slowly become part of the customary law of nations.

The methods used to establish diplomatic immunities could range from late-scholastic reasoning to an induction of customs from recent 'exempla' and cases. This corresponded to the endeavours of diplomatic theorists after 1648 to base diplomatic theory on the actual practice of states. While Wicquefort was more radical than the authors of international law in

⁴¹⁷ See Janssen, *Anfänge*; K.-H.Ziegler, 'Pluralisierung und Autorität im europäischen Völkerrecht des Spätmittelalters und der Frühen Neuzeit', *ZHF*, 30 (2003), 533-53; H.Steiger, 'Ius bändigt Mars. Das klassische Völkerrecht und seine Wissenschaft als frühneuzeitliche Kulturercheinung', in R.Asch *et al.* (eds.), *Krieg und Frieden*, 59-85.

⁴¹⁸ For example, Grotius, *De iure belli*, p.311.

⁴¹⁹ Grotius, *De iure belli*, p.15; *Traité des ambassades*, p.15.

⁴²⁰ See the list of regulations on diplomacy in the post-1648 period in G.F.v.Martens, *Erzählungen merkwürdiger Fälle des neueren Europäischen Völkerrechts [...]* (Göttingen, 1800), pp.330 ff.

⁴²¹ S.Rachel, *De iure naturae et gentium dissertationes* [1676], ed. J.B.Scott (New York, 1964), p.170; Pecquet, *Art de négocier*, pp.133; Francquesnay, *Ministre public*, p.2.

this respect, the positivistic element was becoming stronger in international law, too, in order to capture and define the changing practice of international relations.⁴²² At the same time, and influenced by Grotius, diplomatic theorists used natural law theory in order to tie the necessity of diplomatic communication to the 'common good': in their view, the balance of the overall system. Even more than legal scholars, theorists of diplomacy endorsed the 'functional necessity theory' by stressing the importance of enabling the diplomat to carry out his function.⁴²³ Furthermore, central to diplomatic theory was the 'representative character theory' that accorded personal immunity to the diplomat as representative of a sovereign. After 1648, this immunity was extended to the lower diplomatic ranks, and all 'ministres publics' were endowed with credentials.⁴²⁴ Finally, this immunity needed to comprise the embassy household, since, as Wicquefort argued, it had become necessary to the functioning of diplomacy. This was achieved by the 'extritoriality theory' advocated by Grotius and generally accepted at the end of the seventeenth century.⁴²⁵ By linking the necessity of resident diplomatic representation to the 'common good' of the states-system, theorists of diplomacy thus applied the argumentative strategies of international law to the new framework of diplomacy.

The Evolution of Diplomatic Immunities

Even before the Peace of Westphalia, the main areas of conflict in international law resulting from the spread of resident embassies had become visible. These concerned the diplomat's

⁴²² Grewe, *Epochen*, pp.414-20.

⁴²³ For example, Hotman, *Ambassadeur*, p.78; Wicquefort, *Mémoires*, edn.1730, p.10; similarly, Bielfeld, *Institutions politiques*, ii, p.167. On the 'functional necessity theory', cf. Barker, *Diplomatic Law*, p.604.

⁴²⁴ See Wicquefort, *L'Ambassadeur*, i, p.3.

⁴²⁵ Grotius, *De iure belli*, pp.312-3; cf. Adair, *Exterritoriality*, p.5-14. See for instance Howell, *A Distinct Treatise*, p.188; Wicquefort, *Mémoires*, edn.1730, p.83; Callières, *De la manière*, p.101; Franquesnay, *Ministre public*, p.56.

personal immunity from criminal and civil jurisdiction, the extritoriality of his embassy domicile, the exemption from customs tolls, and the immunities of his staff.⁴²⁶ The century after 1648 saw the final assertion of immunities necessary for the conduct of a European-wide resident diplomacy. On one hand, individual states issued an increasing number of regulations to anchor diplomatic law in their own 'droit public'; on the other, the tight diplomatic network and the principle of reciprocity strengthened the tendency towards standardisation.

The personal inviolability of the diplomat was firmly endorsed by international law, including an exemption from criminal jurisdiction.⁴²⁷ But could not a state punish a foreign diplomat who had broken the country's laws and committed a crime against the 'société humaine', such as murder or conspiracy?⁴²⁸ Wicquefort regarded the diplomat's sovereign as his only judge, to whom he should be returned, and who should appease the offended state.⁴²⁹ This corresponded to the tendency to grant criminal immunity in such cases, especially since the famous Mendoza case in England (1584).⁴³⁰ In theory, a diplomat was also inviolable in times of war, and could not be arrested in retaliation, although theorists were aware that this was not always acknowledged in practice.⁴³¹ The inviolability also included the diplomats'

⁴²⁶ See Adair, *Exterritoriality*; and Frey, *Diplomatic Immunity*, pp.119 ff., who distinguish between 'personal' and 'territorial' immunities.

⁴²⁷ Wicquefort, *L'Ambassadeur*, i, pp.808-11, recalling the Dutch resolution of 1651; C.v.Bynkershoek, *Traité du juge competent des ambassadeurs, tant pour le civil, que pour le criminel, traduit du Latin par Jean Barbeyrac* (The Hague, 1723), p.114.

⁴²⁸ Howell, *A Distinct Treatise*, p.87; Wicquefort, *Mémoires*, edn.1730, p.60; Callières, *De la manière*, p.107.

⁴²⁹ Wicquefort, *L'Ambassadeur*, i, pp.817-23; Callières, *De la manière*, p.107; Francquesnay, *Ministre public*, p.37. For the different opinions of jurists, see Bynkershoek, *Juge*, pp.13-4, 45-6, 149; J.C.B.Feindes, *Unstreitiges Recht [...] einen Gesandten [...] zu arrestiren [...]* (Hamburg 1719). Of course, satisfaction depended on the political situation, see Müller, *Kaiserliches Gesandtschaftswesen*, p.144.

⁴³⁰ On this case, which most theorists cited as precedent and which had involved both Gentili and Hotman as legal advisors, see Hotman, *Ambassadeur*, pp.84-6; Wicquefort, *L'Ambassadeur*, i, pp.818-25; Frey, *Diplomatic immunity*, pp.159-60, 167-9. On diplomatic law in England, see furthermore R.Cotton, *On the Privileges of Ambassadors* (1624), for example the copy in BL, Add.MS 34216.

⁴³¹ See for example Benavente, *Advertencias*, p.247; Schmid, *Der Gesandte*, fos.260^v-62^v. Cf. Frey, *Diplomatic Immunity*, pp.139, 242.

journey to his post, for which he obtained passports.⁴³² In order to enjoy this immunity, the diplomat had to be accepted by the receiving state. This led to problems when the acknowledgment of his sovereign was disputed,⁴³³ or when he was a subject of the host state, as Wicquefort experienced himself in the Dutch Republic.⁴³⁴

Yet, cases concerning the diplomat's immunity from criminal jurisdiction were far less frequent than conflicts about civil jurisdiction. In particular the chronic debts incurred by resident diplomats led to an increasing number of conflicts. Here, the theory of functional necessity stood against the state's protection of its own interests. A consensus on whether a diplomat could be called to account for debts was not reached until well into the eighteenth century. The practice remained varied, and arrests for debt did occur, even if diplomats were always released.⁴³⁵ Following the detention of the Russian ambassador Matveev by his creditors in London in 1709, Queen Anne's statute reinforced diplomat's immunity.⁴³⁶ It explicitly mentioned all 'public ministers' and their staff.⁴³⁷ Following Wicquefort, diplomatic theory argued that personal immunities should be granted to the new diplomatic ranks.⁴³⁸ Conflicts about civil immunities, however, continued to occupy practitioners and theorists of diplomacy in the following decades. Frequent abuses of exemptions finally led to a reduction

⁴³² See Wicquefort, *L'Ambassadeur*, i, ch.xvii; Callières, *De la manière*, p.128; Bielfeld, *Institutions politiques*, ii, pp.185-6.

⁴³³ On the assassination of the Cromwellian Commonwealth's diplomats in 1649-50, see Schmid, *Der Gesandte*, fos.328-29^v; A.de Hierro, *The Process [...] in the Court of Spain upon the Death of Anthonie Ascham [...]* (n.p., 1651), with reference to diplomatic theory.

⁴³⁴ See Bynkershoek, *Juge*, p.52. On the Dutch resolutions (1681, 1727) which denied these immunities to its own subjects, see Martens, *Erzählungen*, pp.345, 349. For Prussia, see GSTA, Rep.9 Z. Lit.L, fasc.1, fo.42 (1746).

⁴³⁵ For example, the Brandenburg resident in London, Schelzer, was arrested for debts in 1657 but later released, see Wicquefort, *L'Ambassadeur*, i, pp.136-7.

⁴³⁶ Following Peter I's protest, the statute was passed, see PRO, SP 104/264-266, 268-9; SP 34/37. Cf. Schmid, *Der Gesandte*, fos.280-84^v; D.H.Kemmerich, *Grund-Sätze des Voelcker-Rechts von der Unverletzlichkeit der Gesandten [...]* (Erlangen, 1710). On comparable laws, see the appendix to Martens, *Erzählungen*.

⁴³⁷ Foreign diplomats were required to send in lists of their domestics. On this and ensuing conflicts, see PRO, SP 104/264-9; PRO, FO 83/1656.

⁴³⁸ See Wicquefort, *Mémoires*, edn.1730, pp.4-5; Bynkershoek, *Juge*, p.5.

of civil and territorial immunities in most states, a measure supported even by diplomatic theorists, those stout defenders of the necessity theory.

The example of the 'franchise' serves to illustrate this point. It had become customary that the property and goods needed by an embassy were not only immune from confiscation but also exempt from customs tolls. This 'droit de franchise' did not strictly form a part of international law but was granted voluntarily by individual states, often reciprocally. While in some countries the franchise only comprised the domicile itself ('franchise de l'hôtel'), in other countries it had come to enclose entire districts ('franchise du quartier'), as in Madrid, Rome or Venice.⁴³⁹ Conflicts surfaced regularly, since these franchises were often abused by embassy members to trade and smuggle, to hide offenders and to withdraw whole districts from the state's jurisdiction. The quarrel over the franchise in Rome in the 1660s was not only instrumentalised in the conflict between Louis XIV and the Papacy, but also instigated a papal bull abolishing the franchise (1687).⁴⁴⁰ For foreign diplomats, this entailed an exemption restricted to certain declared goods, or a replacement by a fixed annual sum; a solution that was embraced, with regional variations, by other states.⁴⁴¹ In regulating the franchise, states sought information on the customs of other countries in order to align and establish reciprocal rules. The reduction of the 'Akzisefreiheit' in Prussia in 1749, for example, was preceded by such enquiries.⁴⁴² Such measures, on the other hand, often met with the

⁴³⁹ For the Dutch Republic see Wicquefort, *L'Ambassadeur*, i, p.898. For Madrid, see the *Embajada española*, p.39; Callières, *De la manière*, p.103. See also the 1682 case in Portugal, PRO SP 89/15, fos.43-4.

⁴⁴⁰ See BN, Clairambault 293 ('Mémoire sur la franchise [...]'), fos.233 ff. Cf. F.de Bojani, 'L'Affaire du 'Quartier' à Rome à la fin du dix-septième siècle. Louis XIV et le Saint-Siège', *RHD*, 22 (1908), 350-78. Cf. Schmid, *Der Gesandte*, fo.272; HHSTA, Staatskanzlei, Vorträge 21, fo.14. See also *Außführlicher Entwurff derer zwischen itzigem Pabste Innocentio XI und Ludovico XIV [...] Mißhelligkeiten [...]* (Leipzig, 1687), with reference to Wicquefort; *Du droit des franchises des quartiers de Rome [...]* (Amsterdam, 1688).

⁴⁴¹ *Embajada española*, p.39; Callières, *De la manière*, p.104. Cf. E.Vercamer, *Des franchises diplomatiques et spécialement de l'exterritorialité [...]* (Paris, 1891). See also AAE, MD France 1871, fos.38-45.

⁴⁴² GSTA, Rep.9, Z Lit.L, fascs.2, 38-39, with a 1705 collection of European customs. Correspondingly, SächsHSTA, Geh.Kabinett 952.6, contains a 1716 collection of custom exemptions, to which the Saxon court should be adapted (fo.9); again in the 1740s, see Geh.Kabinett 892.4.

opposition of the diplomatic corps, who referred to the established 'custom' and acted in unison to defend their privileges.⁴⁴³

Another aspect of the territorial immunity granted to diplomats was the protection of their domicile and its inhabitants from jurisdiction, since they were 'quasi extra territorium'. In this way, the embassy house could serve as 'asyle aux malheureux' by hiding wanted persons from the local jurisdiction, often coreligionists.⁴⁴⁴ The exterritoriality further comprised the right of free religious practice in the embassy chapel. Especially in the century before 1648, but also occasionally afterwards, these aspects led to clashes fuelled by confessional strife.⁴⁴⁵ In some cases, the host country would breach the immunity of the embassy if the diplomat did not consent to deliver wanted persons. Even diplomatic theory criticised this abuse: 'La maison d'ambassadeur ne peut donner securité qu'à lui et à ses domestiques, et ne peut servir d'azyle aux étrangers, que du consentement du souverain du lieu, qui peut estendre ou restreindre ce privilège comme il veut; parce qu'il ne fait pas partie de droit des gens'.⁴⁴⁶ In this respect, diplomatic theory followed international law theorists who regarded the right of asylum and franchise as emanating from a sovereign's tolerance.⁴⁴⁷

While in theory, the embassy staff had already enjoyed immunity around the time of the Westphalian negotiations, the 'Sà case' (1654) showed that this was not yet universally acknowledged. After committing murder, the brother of the Portuguese ambassador Dom Pantaleone de Sà had been executed in London, on the grounds that he was not accredited as a

⁴⁴³ See for example the correspondence in SächsHSTA, Geh.Kabinett 952.6.

⁴⁴⁴ Hotman, *Ambassadeur*, pp.450-1; Wicquefort, *Mémoires*, edn.1730, p.83; Callières, *De la manière*, p.102.

⁴⁴⁵ See W.R.Trimble, 'The Embassy Chapel Question, 1625-1660', *JMH*, 18 (1946), 97-107; B.J.Kaplan, 'Diplomacy and Domestic Devotion: Embassy Chapels and the Toleration of Religious Dissent in Early Modern Europe', *Journal of Early Modern History*, 6 (2002), 341-61. See also BL, Stowe MS 195 (1674); Cal.SP Domestic 1678, 6-25 Dec.1678.

⁴⁴⁶ Wicquefort, *L'Ambassadeur*, i, p.875; Bielefeld, *Institutions politiques*, ii, p.168. The domicile's inviolability was breached in the cases 'Schlieben' (Denmark, 1702), 'Ripperda' (Spain, 1726) and 'Springer' (Spain, 1757), see Frey, *Diplomatic Immunity*, pp.219-21.

⁴⁴⁷ Bynkershoek, *Juge*, pp.89, 143; see Adair, *Exterritoriality*, p.217. Cf. the eighteenth-century 'Projet d'abolir réciproquement le droit d'azyle' in France and Britain, AAE, MD France 1871, fos.318-9.

member of the embassy.⁴⁴⁸ As a result, theorists drew a distinction within the embassy entourage between staff necessary for the embassy's function and those not officially attached to it.⁴⁴⁹ A member of the embassy could, they argued, only be delivered if the diplomat consented to it. On the other hand, the diplomat himself had no jurisdiction over his staff in matters of life and death, which was the privilege of a sovereign.⁴⁵⁰ With regard to the domestics' inviolability, the practice remained varied until well into the eighteenth century.⁴⁵¹

Diplomatic theory confirms that the first decades of the eighteenth century saw the final alignment of diplomatic immunities to the states-system: the diplomat and his staff were granted extensive immunities necessary for the execution of his functions. On the other hand, territorial immunities, in particular the franchise, were limited, because in practice they went beyond the embassy's boundaries and involved the host state's subjects. The exact regulation of territorial immunity was left to the individual states, who issued similar decrees in the following decades. From the viewpoint of diplomatic theorists, the process of formalising and standardising the legal framework reached a first conclusion in the 1730s. Even if conflicts over diplomatic law continued in the eighteenth century, a general compromise between international law and civil and public law had been reached.⁴⁵² In the eyes of diplomatic theorists, the norms and practice of international law had – whether by political expediency or by reciprocity – become standardised and uniform to such a degree that they constituted a body

⁴⁴⁸ See Frey, *Diplomatic Immunity*, pp.230-7; idem, 'The Bounds of Immunity: the Sà Case. Politics, Law and Diplomacy in Commonwealth England', *Canadian Journal of History*, 25 (1990), 41-60.

⁴⁴⁹ Wicquefort, *L'Ambassadeur*, i, p.881; Francquesnay, *Ministre public*, p.58; Bielefeld, *Institutions politiques*, ii, p.202; Bynkershoek, *Juge*, pp.157-8.

⁴⁵⁰ Grotius, *De iure belli*, p.315; Rachel, *De iure naturae*, p.199; *Traité des ambassades*, p.92; Bynkershoek, *Juge*, p.161. An extended jurisdiction was advocated by Wicquefort, *L'Ambassadeur*, i, pp.890-3.

⁴⁵¹ Cf. Müller, *Kaiserliches Gesandtschaftswesen*, pp.149-50; T.Funck-Brentano, 'Le Droit des Gens et les immunités diplomatiques au XVIIIe siècle', *RHD*, 6 (1892), 548-67. This subject had already been discussed around 1600 in Britain and France, see BN, MS.fr.18428. See also the case of the reciprocal arrest of the French and Austrian secretaries in 1681, HHSTA, STA Frankreich, Varia 7. Again, such cases were closely observed by other states, as the Bavarian reports on arrests of secretaries and domestics show, BayHSTA, Kasten schwarz 4186 ('Jura legatorum'), with numerous references to diplomatic and legal theory.

⁴⁵² While Adair regards this process as concluded in the 1720s, Frey recognises a more or less uniform practice only after the mid-eighteenth century, *Diplomatic Immunity*, p.249.

of norms and customs unique to the states-system. The reciprocal restriction of the franchise since the 1680s underlines this trend towards adaptation and standardisation, which sprang from the increasing interdependence and diplomatic contacts of the system's actors.

The constitutive character of international and diplomatic law for the states-system was stressed especially with reference to actors on the fringes or outside the system.⁴⁵³ In addition to the reciprocity of resident diplomacy and the equality of sovereigns, the acceptance of diplomatic immunity determined the integration of the periphery into the system. In the theorists' opinion, the number of violations of diplomatic law in seventeenth-century Russia and the Ottoman Empire demonstrated that these states had not yet become fully integrated into the system, even if the treaty of Carlowitz (1699) launched a new epoch in relations with Constantinople.⁴⁵⁴ Their gradual incorporation into the system after 1700, especially in the case of Russia was mirrored in the reception and alignment of international law.⁴⁵⁵ Beyond the periphery, however, the systems of international law remained fundamentally different until the late nineteenth century, with the exception of the United States of America.⁴⁵⁶

The body of theoretical literature also served as a guideline in conflicts about diplomatic law. Theorists of diplomacy were not only cited in the reports of legal counsellors

⁴⁵³ Although theorists acknowledged that the principle of diplomatic inviolability was accepted 'chez toutes les nations et mesme entre les plus barbares' (Chamoy, *Parfait ambassadeur*, p.41), they perceived a lesser degree of diplomatic security and immunity in these parts, see Hoevelen, *Teutsche Gesandte*, p.72; Wicquefort, *L'Ambassadeur*, i, pp.475-81, 814-5; Schmid, *Der Gesandte*, fos.266, 285, ch.xix. In 1764, Real revised this view for the Ottomans, *Science du gouvernement*, v, p.98; an opinion not shared by J.v.Pacassi, *Ueber die Gesandtschaftsrechte* (Vienna, 1775), p.172.

⁴⁵⁴ Müller, *Kaiserliches Gesandtschaftswesen*, pp.145-6; J.C.Hurewitz, 'Ottoman Diplomacy and the European States-System', in Jönsson/Langhorne (eds.), *Diplomacy*, ii, 305-15; K.-H.Ziegler, 'The Peace Treaties of the Ottoman Empire with European Christian Powers', in Lesaffer (ed.), *Peace Treaties and International Law*, 338-64.

⁴⁵⁵ See Butler, 'Anglo-Russian Diplomacy'; Graber, *International law in Russia*. Cf. Part V.

⁴⁵⁶ On the reception of diplomatic theory by American elites, see footnote 306. On international legal theory and practice, see J.Elliott, *American Diplomatic Code* (2 vols., London, 1833). The role of international law in the relations with non-European actors is gaining new attention, see J.Osterhammel, 'Krieg und Frieden an den Grenzen Europas und darüber hinaus', in R.Asch et al. (eds.), *Frieden und Krieg*, 443-65; H.Steiger, 'Recht zwischen Europa und Asien im 16. und 17. Jahrhundert?' in K.Bußmann, E.A.Werner (eds.), *Europa im 17. Jahrhundert* (Stuttgart, 2004), 95-118.

or the pamphlets discussing individual cases, but also by diplomats themselves. This was even the case in the Empire, where the amalgamation of imperial and international law gave rise to a vast number of publications on the status of embassies. Apart from the standing of diplomats at the Imperial Diet,⁴⁵⁷ and the regulation of the franchise and customs duties,⁴⁵⁸ a subject of debate in the Empire was the immunity of electoral diplomats from the jurisdiction of the 'Obersthofmarschall' and the 'Reichshofrat' in Vienna. Around 1700, respective cases were argued with reference to diplomatic theory.⁴⁵⁹ Clashes between imperial law and diplomatic immunity had generated widespread attention in the decades following 1648, for example in the arrest of Prince Fürstenberg by the Emperor, who claimed jurisdiction over him even though he acted as a French diplomat.⁴⁶⁰ The interpretation of cases relating to diplomatic immunities not only depended on legal norms but also on the political interests of the parties involved. Cases could be turned into political instruments, as for example in the conflict between France and the Papacy, or in the incident of the Swedish envoy in 1717: Gyllenborg was arrested in London not only on suspicion of being involved in a Jacobite conspiracy, but also to 'force England into the war with Sweden in which Hanover was already involved'.⁴⁶¹ While championing international law as precondition for an effective diplomacy in the states-

⁴⁵⁷ See N.Leiher, *Die rechtliche Stellung der auswärtigen Gesandten beim Immerwährenden Reichstag zu Regensburg* (Aachen, 2003).

⁴⁵⁸ See Müller, *Kaiserliches Gesandtschaftswesen*, pp.160-1. See also the abolition of the 'Akzisierungsfreiheit' in Hanover (1723-4), HHSTA, Staatskanzlei, Vorträge 25, fos.78-9.

⁴⁵⁹ See a diplomat's written justification of 1694 in BayHSTA, Kasten schwarz 4185, referring to Kulpis, Wicquefort and others. Cf. SächsHSTA, Geh.Rat 8234/7, 8236/7; HHSTA, Reichshofkanzlei, Immunitäten, Miscellanea 5, fasc.32; AAE, MD France 1872, fo.93.

⁴⁶⁰ The case was even negotiated at Nijmegen, see M.Braubach, *Wilhelm von Fürstenberg (1629-1704) und die französische Politik im Zeitalter Ludwigs XIV* (Bonn, 1972); J.T.O'Connor, *Negotiator out of Season. The Career of Wilhelm Egon von Fürstenberg 1629 to 1704* (Athens, Georgia, 1978). Wicquefort referred to the case in order to support his own position in the Dutch Republic, *Mémoires*, edn.1730, pp.16-7; *L'Ambassadeur*, edn.1681, i, pp.278-9. Cf. the *Traité curieux sur l'enlèvement du Prince de Furstenberg [...]* (Ville France, 1676); and BN, MS.fr.15870, for a collection of related pamphlets.

⁴⁶¹ Adair, *Exterritoriality*, p.65. See PRO, SP 104/247; PRO, FO 881/78 ('Expulsion of foreign ministers from various courts, 1717-1812'); *Ein vornehmen Englischen Icti Gedancken von dem Tractament eines Minister und dessen Domestiquen [...]*, German trans. (Jena, 1717), with reference to diplomatic theory.

system, theorists were aware that it served as a channel for political tensions, as did the 'ius legationis'.

The 'ius legationis' in the States-System

In 1676, the head of the English embassy mediating the Peace of Nijmwegen, Sir Leoline Jenkins, prepared a set of questions to Joseph Williamson, his former diplomatic colleague and now secretary of state. Jenkins included the question whether the electors and princes of the Empire and the Duke of Lorraine 'can send an ambassador? And if [they] can, what rank he is to hold? how to be treated?' Williamson's answer referred to the criterion of sovereignty that determined the 'right of embassy'. Yet, the status of newly sovereign states was still uncertain in this respect, similarly to princes whose sovereignty was contested or whose territories were occupied. Jenkins referred to the right to send diplomats of the first rank, which belonged, he believed, only to crowned princes and the Republic of Venice. Although Williamson replied that the electors were entitled to send ambassadors and had on several occasions done so, he admitted that their representatives were not always accorded full ceremonial honours.⁴⁶²

The decades following the Peace of 1648, which had acknowledged the sovereignty of the Dutch Republic and practically accepted the sovereignty of the Empire's territories, saw the conclusion of the 'family' of sovereigns constituting the states-system.⁴⁶³ The system's actors, including the large number of small territories in the Empire and Italy, possessed the 'ius legationis'. Yet, even if this right was generally acknowledged, their claim

⁴⁶² PRO, SP 9/187, fos.923-5, 945-50.

⁴⁶³ On the concept of sovereignty, see M.Ross *et al.* (eds.), *Law, Power, and the Sovereign State: The Evolution and Application of the Concept of Sovereignty* (Pennsylvania, 1995).

to send diplomats of the first rank ('ius legationis primi ordinis') was still debated.⁴⁶⁴ Only gradually were the electors' ambassadors accorded comparable ceremonial honours to imperial and royal diplomats. Just how much importance was accorded to the assertion of this privilege becomes apparent in the accompanying considerable theoretical and pamphlet literature. In diplomatic theory, particularly in the decades between 1648 and 1714, questions concerning the right of legation occupied a central place.

In discussing the various concepts of sovereignty and 'ius legationis', theorists often took the side of pretenders to the full 'droit d'ambassade': Wicquefort, for example, defended the rights of the Dutch Republic as well as of the Empire's electors. Until 1648, Spain had refuted the United Provinces' sovereignty and the 'public character' of its diplomats and considered them as 'vassals' and 'rebels'. Only the treaty of 1648 enabled the Dutch Republic to send and receive ambassadors, even if it would mostly use low-ranking diplomats.⁴⁶⁵

Like the supporters of the electors' right of legation at the Nijmegen congress, among them Leibniz,⁴⁶⁶ Wicquefort defended the full sovereignty of the Empire's territories, but limited the 'ius legationis primi ordinis' to the electors.⁴⁶⁷ In practice, this right was still refuted or diminished, not only by the Emperor but often also by France, depending on its

⁴⁶⁴ For the Empire, see F.v.Besold, *Das Bündnisrecht der deutschen Reichstände bis zum Westfälischen Frieden* (Bonn, 1974); E.W.Böckenförde, 'Der Westfälische Friede und das Bündnisrecht der Reichstände', *Der Staat*, 8 (1969), 449-78.

⁴⁶⁵ Howell, *A Distinct Treatise*, p.186; Wicquefort, *Mémoires*, edn.1730, pp.28-9.

⁴⁶⁶ For example, C.Fürstenerius [G.W.Leibniz], *De iure suprematus ac legationis principum Germaniae* (Amsterdam, 1677); *Lettre d'un desintéré [...] touchant le titre d'ambassadeur, avec lequel les princes d'Allemagne desirent d'envoyer leur ministres au congrès de Nimwegen [...]* (Aachen, 1677); *Entretien [...] sur la question du temps agitée à Nimwege; touchant le droit d'ambassade [...]* (Düsbürg, 1678). Cf. *Déduction de raisons en vertu dequelles le droit [...] appartient aux princes de l'Empire joint. Avec la refutation d'un [...] lettre d'un desintéré [...]* (Cologne 1677); *Annotata über die fürgefallene Quaestion ob unsere Reichs-Fürsten befuget, Ambassadeurs zuschicken [...]* (1681).

⁴⁶⁷ Wicquefort, *L'Ambassadeur*, ch.iv. See also his *Discours historique de l'élection de l'Empereur et des électeurs de l'Empire* (1658), attached to the *Ambassadeur* in the 1690 and 1730 edns. Cf. Hoevelen, *Teutsche Gesandte*, pp.66-7; Schmid, *Der Gesandte*, ch.xi; J.G.Kulpis, *De Legationibus Statuum Imperii Commentatio [...]* (Giessen, 1679), ch.x. The matter was furthermore discussed in the 'legatus' dissertations, for example P.Müller (praes.), *Dissertatio de principum Germaniae legationibus* (Jena, 1678). Still critical of the electors' right were Howell, *A Distinct Treatise*, p.188; Chamoy, *Parfait ambassadeur*, pp.15-6.

political interests. Wicquefort criticised this policy, being aware that France would set an example for other European courts.⁴⁶⁸ The congress of Nijmwegen marked a turning point in this respect, since it led to the acknowledgment of the electoral right to send ambassadors, even if foreign states only began to reciprocate with the elevation of electorates such as Brandenburg-Prussia, Saxony-Poland and Hanover in the decades around 1700.⁴⁶⁹ The Empire's princes, in contrast, could not enforce this privilege, even though influential principalities such as Brunswick had sought wide support for their claims.⁴⁷⁰

These brief remarks serve to demonstrate that theorists regarded the 'ius legationis' as a barometer both for the acknowledgment of a sovereign by the community of states and for shifts in the hierarchy of the system. While diplomatic theory between 1648 and 1714 exemplified the dynamic and instable character of the system's hierarchy, subsequent theorists displayed less attention to matters of rank; a further example supporting the view that the principle of equality had become firmly acknowledged and a relative stability in the hierarchy of states had been reached, foreshadowing the pentarchy of the nineteenth century.⁴⁷¹

While it lay in the power and 'droit public' of individual states to regulate a substantial part of international law, a tendency towards reciprocity and standardisation was becoming apparent, which the theorists of diplomacy related to the emergence of the states-system. This also was perceptible with regard to diplomatic ceremonial that was closely entwined with the 'ius legationis' and that underlined the intricate hierarchy of the 'société des princes'.

⁴⁶⁸ Wicquefort, *L'Ambassadeur*, i, pp.83-107. Cf. R.Pillorget, 'La France et les états allemands au congrès de Nimègue (1678-1679)', in *The Peace of Nijmwegen, La Paix de Nimegue: 1676-1678/79* (Amsterdam, 1980), 225-36.

⁴⁶⁹ For Prussia, see B.Stollberg, 'Höfische Öffentlichkeit. Zur zeremoniellen Selbstdarstellung des brandenburgischen Hofes vor dem europäischen Publikum', *FBPG*, N.S. 7 (1997), pp.173-5.

⁴⁷⁰ See for example StA Wolfenbüttel, 1Alt A IV, 2/11; 1Alt 6, 75-77 (mission of Bülow to London, 1677-8); 1Alt 12 (representation at Nijmwegen, 1677). For consultation and alignment among German princes in matters of rank and ceremonial, see the correspondence in 2Alt 4435-7.

⁴⁷¹ Cf. Schroeder, *Transformation of European Politics*, pp.5-11; Duchhardt, *Balance of Powers*, pp.7-19.

III.3. Diplomatic Ceremonial and Congress Diplomacy

Autre-fois la forme l'emportoit presque sur le fonds, on
pointilloit sur le cérémonial, sur la langue et les termes
d'un traité, le vestibule étoit plus grand que la maison;
mais de nos jours tout est uni, applani, facile.⁴⁷²

The Enlightenment criticism of Ancien Régime diplomacy not only centred on the arbitrary will of princes and the insincerity of their diplomats, but also related to the convoluted court and diplomatic ceremonial. Although theorists such as Callières, Francquesnay, Pecquet and Bielfeld painted a 'professional' portrait of diplomacy, they, too, were apprehensive of the role of ceremonial in international relations. In their view, after the 1640s, ceremonial had permeated diplomatic relations to an unprecedented degree, often hampering the actual work of diplomats.⁴⁷³ Now, more diplomats resided in one place at the same time, and their masters' ranks had to be represented not only in relation to one actor, but also towards the representatives of other powers. Ceremonial became the barometer for the position of sovereigns in the system and was charged with legal and political claims. For rulers of uncertain status, ceremonial symbolised and constituted their position as sovereign actors on the international stage. Linked with the 'ius legationis', ceremonial was not only a precondition for international communication, but also an instrument of politics and a potential source for conflict. Diplomats were instructed to defend their master's honour and rank with all means. Louis XIV in particular employed diplomatic ceremonial as part of his policy. At the same time, more and more subtle differentiations were introduced, such as new diplomatic ranks, which increased the complexity and formalism of ceremonial, putting ever-mounting demands on the diplomats to act in conjunction with an expanding set of rules.

⁴⁷² Francquesnay, *Ministre public*, p.189.

⁴⁷³ Ibid.; Mably, *Principes des négociations*, pp.277-8; Bielfeld, *Institutions politiques*, ii, pp.171, 234.

Theorists responded by providing more detailed advice on diplomatic ceremonial. Yet they were also concerned with this development; and Bielfeld even feared that 'le cérémonial réduit l'ambassadeur à l'état d'automate, et lui fait manquer chaque jour des occasions de réussir dans ses desseins'.⁴⁷⁴

The heightened attention to ceremonial in the theoretical literature of that period corresponds to the hypothesis of modern scholarship that in the initial phase of the states-system, ceremonial constituted a 'language' or 'code' in which the different pretensions and the hierarchy of the 'société des princes' were expressed.⁴⁷⁵ Court ceremonial provided the basis of a European diplomatic culture. At each court, the state of the international hierarchy could now be observed in the conduct of diplomats. In contrast to traditional historiography which regarded diplomatic ceremonial as 'inflated and pointless squabbling',⁴⁷⁶ recent scholarship is turning again to the symbolic dimension of international relations.⁴⁷⁷ While scholars acknowledge the importance of ceremonial as a common language of the early modern states-system, the relationship of this common culture and code to diplomacy is still in need of research, in particular regarding the correlation between the practice and the theory of ceremonial.⁴⁷⁸

Diplomatic ceremonial comprises 'the mass of interrelated procedures, traditions, rights' which determined firstly, the wording used 'when one sovereign wrote to another' (chancellery ceremonial), secondly, the ceremonial treatment of diplomats by the host court,

⁴⁷⁴ Bielfeld, *Institutions politiques*, ii, p.171.

⁴⁷⁵ See for example Bély, *Espions et ambassadeurs*, pp.747-8.

⁴⁷⁶ Cf. the historiographical remarks in Vec, *Zeremonialwissenschaft*, pp.1-9.

⁴⁷⁷ This coincided with the rediscovery of N.Elias, see J.Duindam, *Myths of Power: Norbert Elias and the Early-Modern European Court* (London, 1994). On recent scholarship, see B.Stollberg-Rillinger, 'Zeremoniell, Ritual, Symbol. Neue Forschungen zur symbolischen Kommunikation in Spätmittelalter und Früher Neuzeit', *ZHF*, 27 (2000), 389-405; W.Paravicini, 'Zeremoniell und Raum', in idem (ed.), *Zeremoniell und Raum [...]* (Sigmaringen, 1997), 11-27; cf. Paulmann, *Pomp und Politik*; Bély, *Société des princes*.

⁴⁷⁸ On ceremonial theory, see Vec, *Zeremonialwissenschaft*. Despite his excellent introduction into the theories of ceremonial, Vec neglects diplomatic theory and does not explore the correlation between practice and theory.

and thirdly, the conduct of diplomats towards each other in 'performing official or even unofficial acts'.⁴⁷⁹ In the later seventeenth century, the need to record and formalise ceremonial became ever more apparent, in order to systematise the customs of Europe, to spread the knowledge about the different court ceremonials and thus to avoid further conflicts. Diplomatic and ceremonial theories provide an extensive compilation of diplomatic ceremonial practice which has not yet been adequately considered. Sections on ceremonial not only served as collection of curious anecdotes and trivial niceties, but were central to the emergent states-system. In the 'société des princes', dignity, rank and precedence were symbolic assets, aspects of power, and instruments that could be used to secure claims and to further political interests. At the foreign court or congress, the diplomat, as 'actor', assumed the role of his sovereign in ceremonial. Consequently, his treatment was observed, reported and reflected upon with meticulous attention.

The hierarchy of diplomatic ranks emerged in order to differentiate the hierarchy of the system's actors. While theorists agreed that the ambassador, as personal representative of his sovereign, was entitled to the greatest ceremonial honours, the lower ranks – originally introduced to evade extensive and costly representation – were also integrated into the court ceremonial, as Wicquefort's treatises show. Whereas ambassadors preceded envoys, who preceded residents, within a diplomatic class the sender's rank determined the honours paid to diplomats in the various stages of an embassy: the entry, the audience at court, the calls paid to and received by other diplomats, the visits to the princely family, the seating order at table or in chapel, the order of coaches, the number of horses, etc. At court and in the courtly society of the diplomatic corps, each gesture and address were subject to an increasingly rigid ceremonial. While attempts were made to link the order of 'visites' to the order of arrival, the

⁴⁷⁹ W. Roosen, 'Early Modern Diplomatic Ceremonial. A Systems Approach', *JMH*, 52 (1980), 452-76, taking up social science approaches.

simultaneous presence of diplomats gave rise to a vast number of conflicts about precedence, which could even end in bloodshed, as for example in 1661.

In consequence, many courts created the offices of 'master of ceremonies' and 'introduceur des ambassadeurs', whose tasks included supervising the ceremonial of foreign diplomats. They derived from the court marshal office and also were a response to the intensified diplomatic interchange, in France⁴⁸⁰ as well as in other countries.⁴⁸¹ From the mid-seventeenth century, these officers composed extensive memoirs and registers on diplomatic ceremonial both at their own court and abroad, thereby creating internal encyclopaedias of diplomatic practices and precedents. These were not only for their own use, but also for diplomats, whom they provided with extracts.⁴⁸² In some cases, such manuscripts were even published, or copied and sold to other masters of ceremonies.⁴⁸³

⁴⁸⁰ On the regulations relating to these often hereditary offices in France since 1585, see BN, Clairambault 805, fos.327 ff; cf. N.de Saintot's memoirs in AAE, MD France 1830-31; and LeDran's memoir on the 'introduceur' (1733), MD France 1852, fos.138-56. The thesis of M.-L.Nguyen, *Les Grands Maîtres des Cérémonies et le service des cérémonies à l'époque moderne, 1585-1792* (Paris-IV Sorbonne thèse, 1999), pays little attention to diplomatic ceremonial. Cf. the older study of F.Alcan (ed.), *Les Introduceurs des ambassadeurs, 1585-1900* (Paris, 1901), and also L.Bély, 'Souveraineté et souverains: La Question du cérémonial dans le relations internationales à l'époque moderne', *Annuaire-Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire de France* (1994), 27-43. For a comparative view, see J.Duindam, 'Ceremonial Staffs and Paperwork at two Courts: France and the Habsburg Monarchy, c.1550-1720', in K.Malettke, C.Grell (eds.), *Hofgesellschaft und Höflinge an europäischen Fürstenhöfen* (Münster, 2001), 369-88; A.J.Loomie, 'The Conducteur des Ambassadeurs of Seventeenth-Century France and Spain', *Revue Belge de Philologie et d'Histoire*, 52 (1975), 333-56.

⁴⁸¹ For Austria, where ceremonial was still managed by the 'Obersthofmeister', see HHSTA, Staatskanzlei, Interoria 12, fos.43-8; Hofarchiv, Obersthofmeisteramt. Cf. H.C.Ehalt, *Ausdrucksformen absolutistischer Herrschaft. Der Wiener Hof im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert* (Munich, 1980), pp.114 ff. On Bavaria, see S.Klingensmith, *The Utility of Splendor: Ceremony, Social Life and Architecture at the Court of Bavaria, 1600-1800* (Chicago, 1993); P.C.Hartmann, 'Zum Gesandtschaftszeremoniell an den Höfen von München, Wien, Madrid und Versailles im 18. Jahrhundert', in *Études d'histoire européenne. Mélanges offerts à René et Suzanne Pillorget* (Angers, 1990), 149-57. A key figure in the Empire is Johann v.Besser, ceremonial master in Berlin and Dresden, see below.

⁴⁸² For example, AAE, MD France 1837 ('Mémoires pour les ambassadeurs et ministres de France en diverses cours'). For LeDran's memoirs on ceremonial, see MD France, 1850-5, 1871-2, 1971. See further the list of notes in AAE, MD France 1852, fos.138-59; and Saintot's memoirs in MD France 1817-48. Ceremonial manuals further include, in Britain, the notebooks of Finnett (-1627) and of the Cotterell family, masters of ceremonies 1660-1758, see PRO Lord Chamberlain's Office, 5/1-3; cf. Williamson's notes in PRO, SP 9. For Prussia and Saxony, see Besser's volumes in SächsHSTA, Oberhofmarschallamt and Zeremonienmeister. Wicquefort commented upon the memoirs of Finnett and Girault, *L'Ambassadeur*, i, p.2.

⁴⁸³ For example, Finnett's memoirs were edited by the diplomatic theorist Howell in 1656, and translated into German by G.S.Treuer in 1728. Besser's treatise on the 'Ambassadeur', modelled on Wicquefort, was probably composed for publication, SächsHSTA, Zeremonienmeister, II.17. Besser also had access to a copy of Saintot's

Under Louis XIV, France appeared not only most effective in exploiting diplomatic ceremonial, but also most conscientious about recording its practice. In the early eighteenth century, a vast collection of memoirs and extracts had emerged, including those composed by the archivist and 'commis' Nicolas LeDran from diplomatic sources and theoretical literature.⁴⁸⁴ As diplomatic and ceremonial theory, these collections reveal that the decades between 1648 and 1714 laid the foundations for the practice of diplomacy in the states-system.

The following paragraphs will first compare the theoretical foundations of diplomatic ceremonial in the different genres, before turning to the theorists' perceptions of the role and development of ceremonial in the states-system. The section will conclude with an overview on congress diplomacy, which theorists regarded as crucial for the evolution of a common ceremonial 'code' in international relations.

Diplomatic Theory and the 'Science of Ceremonial'

Sixteenth-century theorists of diplomacy had included remarks on the ambassador's public entry and audience, and had pointed to the 'contestations de préséance' between the Habsburgs and France. Only after the mid-seventeenth century, however, did diplomatic theory feature substantial sections on ceremonial, intended to provide guidance to the diplomat in the 'thicket of etiquette' now surrounding his stay abroad.⁴⁸⁵ While in 1680, Wicquefort still deplored the absence of a theory of ceremonial, a century later Bielfeld could

memoirs, which had been purchased, see the preface to *ibid.*, I.8. Saintot's memoirs were also known in Britain, see for example BL, Egerton MSS 774-7.

⁴⁸⁴ On LeDran, see footnote 648.

⁴⁸⁵ Howell's treatise was attached to a tract on rank and precedence, while Hoevelen and Wicquefort included larger sections on ceremonial in their treatises.

speak of a 'science du cérémonial'.⁴⁸⁶ This 'science' should enable the diplomat to avoid conflicts of precedence.⁴⁸⁷

Precedence and ceremonial were justified by theorists firstly from the necessity of representing sovereigns, whose personal meetings would create substantial problems,⁴⁸⁸ and secondly from the general human ambition.⁴⁸⁹ Finding its greatest dissemination in the Empire, ceremonial theory was composed by diplomats, ceremonial masters, instructors at noble academies or 'Hofmeister' charged with the education of noblemen.⁴⁹⁰ In contrast to diplomatic theory, their treatises did not focus exclusively on diplomacy which they considered in a wider context of social relations and the 'ius praecedentiae'. Nevertheless, the diplomatic corps and the courtly nobility were the main audience of this genre. Like diplomatic theory, the 'science of ceremonial' was not institutionalised academically, but strove for the status of an independent discipline between the poles of jurisprudence ('ius publicum', 'ius legatis' and 'ius praecedentiae') and political ethics (decorous behaviour and prudence).⁴⁹¹ In this form, ceremonial theory was only short-lived and lost its importance with the assertion of positivistic state science in the mid-eighteenth century.⁴⁹² Both ceremonial and diplomatic theory thus reached their zenith in the post-1648 century. The emergence of the former, as well as the transformation of the latter emanated from the

⁴⁸⁶ Bielfeld, *Institutions politiques*, ii, p.235.

⁴⁸⁷ See also Pecquet, *Art de négocier*, pp.100-1.

⁴⁸⁸ See L.Bély, 'Les Rencontres des princes (XIVe-XVIIIe siècles)', in R.Babel, J.-M.Moeglin (eds.), *Identité régionale et conscience nationale [...]* (Sigmaringen, 1997), 161-76; cf. Paulmann, *Pomp und Politik*.

⁴⁸⁹ Lünig, *Theatrum ceremoniale*, i, p.1335; Bielfeld, *Institutions politiques*, ii, p.236. On the influence of the theory of passions ('Affektenlehre'), see Vec, *Zeremonialwissenschaft*, p.143; T.Rahn, 'Psychologie des Zeremoniells. Affekttheorie und -pragmatik in der Zeremoniellwissenschaft des 18. Jahrhunderts', in idem, J.Berns (eds.), *Zeremoniell als höfische Ästhetik in Spätmittelalter und Früher Neuzeit* (Tübingen, 1995), 74-98.

⁴⁹⁰ See the biographical entries in Vec, *Zeremonialwissenschaft*.

⁴⁹¹ On the 'ius praecedentiae', see for example J.A.Crusius, *Tractatus politico-juridico-historicus de praeeminentia [...]* (Bremen, 1666); B.Stosch, *Von dem Praecedenz- oder Vorder-Recht aller Potentaten und Republiken in Europa [...]* (Jena, 1677); Z.Zwanzig, *Theatrum Praecedentiae [...]* (Berlin, 1706). Cf. B.Stollberg-Rillinger, 'Die Wissenschaft der feinen Unterschiede. Das Praezedenzrecht und die europäischen Monarchien vom 16. bis zum 18. Jahrhundert', *Majestas*, 10 (2003), 125-50.

⁴⁹² Vec, *Zeremonialwissenschaft*, pp.117-31.

perceived and experienced complexity of international relations. As in international law, ceremonial conventions and the precedence of ranks were established by custom and by precedent, and amended by individual regulations, for example in the form of court ceremonials or treaties regulating precedence.⁴⁹³ Historical examples and actual customs thus constituted the basis of ceremonial theory, necessitating a compromise between systematic form and empirical compilation, and between legal reasoning and prudent behaviour.⁴⁹⁴

Theorists listed the rudiments of 'distinctions réelles' between sovereigns, which included seniority and dignity of the dynasty, the extent of prerogatives, and the size and power of the state.⁴⁹⁵ These criteria were also employed in conflicts of precedence. Not only were diplomats instructed to use both gestures and arguments to defend their rank, but pamphlets and the arts were also employed to substantiate claims.⁴⁹⁶ In the contests over ceremonial surrounding the congress of Nijmegen, it was argued that only the actual possession should determine precedence.⁴⁹⁷ This maxim was propagated by Louis XIV, who contested the traditional precedence of imperial Austria and Spain, acting as the instigator of change in ceremonial. On the other hand, the persistence of tradition becomes apparent in the case of the Republic of Venice, whose ambassadors were still accorded royal honours in the

⁴⁹³ Wicquefort, *Mémoires*, edn.1730, pp.140, 153; Lünig, *Theatrum ceremoniale*, i, p.2.

⁴⁹⁴ Pecquet, *Art de négocier*, p.101; Lünig, *Theatrum ceremoniale*, i, p.1316; Rohr, *Einleitung zur Ceremoniel-Wissenschaft*, 2nd edn (Berlin, 1733 [1728]), p.1.

⁴⁹⁵ Lünig, *Theatrum ceremoniale*, i, pp.9-10; Francquesnay, *Ministre public*, ch.1.iii; Bielfeld, *Institutions politiques*, ii, p.240.

⁴⁹⁶ Notably in the long-drawn competition between Habsburg and France. See for example A.Aubery, *Des justes prétensions du Roi sur l'Empire* (Paris, 1667). Cf. D.Briesemeister, 'Der publizistische Rangstreit zwischen Spanien und Frankreich in der Frühen Neuzeit', in J.Albrecht (ed.), *Translation und interkulturelle Kommunikation [...]* (Mainz, 1987), 315-38; F.B.Polleross, 'Sonnenkönig und österreichische Sonne. Kunst und Wissenschaft als Fortsetzung des Krieges mit anderen Mitteln', *Wiener Jahrbuch für Kunstgeschichte*, 40 (1987), 239-56. See also AAE, MD France 1817-18 and 1850, with frequent references to Wicquefort and Lünig.

⁴⁹⁷ 'In rebus ceremonialibus, neque rationem neque potentiam, neque dignitatem, sed solam possessionem sufficere'. *Philosophia elegantiarum et ceremoniarum aucularum [...]* (Frankfurt, 1689), p.48.

mid-seventeenth century, notwithstanding its political decline; a prerogative which led to conflicts with the newly-sovereign German electors.⁴⁹⁸

In the justification of precedence, theorists of diplomacy and ceremonial took part in wider debates which occupied the European 'respublica litteraria' and the decision-makers of foreign policy alike. Again, treatises were employed as authorities and reference books in arguing a ceremonial case. Furthermore, in extracting rules and customs from the practice of ceremonial, the treatises supported the tendency towards formalisation and alignment of ceremonial honours. And, indeed, soon after Louis XIV's reign, theorists perceived that diplomatic ceremonial had achieved a degree of standardisation that made it, in conjunction with resident diplomacy and international law, a pillar of the states-system. The declining number of ceremonial conflicts and the subsiding interest of theorists after the mid-eighteenth century underline the fact that a general consensus was being reached on the role of ceremonial in the states-system.

Diplomatic Ceremonial in the States-System: 'Janus Frivole' and European 'Language'

In the long conflict between France and Spain, which reached a conclusion with the Peace of the Pyrenees and the events of 1661, the political significance of ceremonial as an instrument of foreign policy had become apparent to contemporaries. Yet, although Louis XIV celebrated the 1661 incident as marking the establishment of French supremacy in Europe, his ambassadors could not always claim precedence: within the same diplomatic rank, the Emperor came first, and competition between Habsburg and France continued into the eighteenth century.⁴⁹⁹ Theorists were aware that France employed diplomatic precedence and

⁴⁹⁸ Wicquefort, *L'Ambassadeur*, i, ch.v; Schmid, *Der Gesandte*, fos.186^v-87.

⁴⁹⁹ Callières regarded the French precedence already as established, *De la manière*, pp.114 ff. For the imperial position, see Müller, *Kaiserliches Gesandtschaftswesen*, pp.134-5; Duchhardt, 'Imperium und Regna'.

rank to further its hegemonic ambitions, thus charging ceremonial with a political content that forced other states to take up the competition of ranks. Around the turn of the century, France's pioneer role in ceremonial had become largely acknowledged, and most courts now looked to Versailles for the treatment of foreign diplomats, in addition to the traditional model of the Papal court at Rome.⁵⁰⁰

With respect to the electors' ambassadors, the Emperor was reluctant to consent treating them with a royal ceremonial, having managed to avoid the claim in Westphalia. France, on the other hand, used the issue as a political lever, for example by granting particular diplomatic honours to Brandenburg during periods of alliance, yet at other times reducing the ceremonial accorded to electoral diplomats in Paris.⁵⁰¹ Wicquefort interpreted this as a calculated differentiation and exploitation of ceremonial.⁵⁰² Only after the congress of Nijmegen were Brandenburg and other electoral ambassadors gradually acknowledged as immediately following crowned sovereigns in rank.⁵⁰³ With the elevation of Brandenburg-Prussia in 1701, its diplomats finally received all royal honours, and states reciprocated in sending ambassadors to Berlin.⁵⁰⁴

Contemporaries regarded the ceremonial treatment of diplomats as an indicator for the acknowledgment of newly-sovereign states as well as for shifts in the hierarchy of the states-

⁵⁰⁰ Cf. A.Pialoux, 'Rome, théâtre des relations diplomatiques au XVIIIe siècle', *RHD*, 118 (2004), 251-80.

⁵⁰¹ Wicquefort, *L'Ambassadeur*, i, ch.v. Cf. Callières, *De la manière*, pp.119-21. The Great Elector had termed Louis XIV the 'arbitre de l'Europe' in 1679, see McKay/Scott, *Rise of the Great Powers*, p.36. On the political background, see K.P.Decker, *Frankreich und die Reichsstände 1672-75. Die Ansätze zur Bildung einer "Dritten Partei" in den Anfangsjahren des Holländischen Krieges* (Bonn, 1981); A.Sinkoli, *Frankreich, das Reich und die Reichsstände, 1697-1702* (Frankfurt, 1995); G.Pages, *Le Grand Electeur et Louis XIV, 1660-1688* (Paris, 1905).

⁵⁰² Wicquefort, *L'Ambassadeur*, i, pp.105-7; *Philosophia elegantiarum*, p.15; Lünig, *Theatrum ceremoniale*, i, p.4. On the title 'excellency', see A.F.Glasey, *Neue Jahrs-Gedancken vom Titel Excellenz [...]* (Leipzig, 1720).

⁵⁰³ Lünig, *Theatrum ceremoniale*, i, p.11; *Ceremoniale Brandenburgicum [...]* (Dortmund, 1699), pp.7, 48. On this work, see Vec, *Zeremonialwissenschaft*, pp. 15-24. Cf. R.Pillorget, 'La France et les états allemands au congrès de Nimègue (1678-1679)', in *The Peace of Nijmegen*, 225-36. Cf. *Dénouement de la question qu'il y atouchant le cérémoniel entre les ambassadeurs de France et ceux de Brandebourg, qui se trouvent présentement au traité de paix à Nimegue* (Aachen, 1677).

⁵⁰⁴ Cf. Stollberg-Rillinger, 'Höfische Öffentlichkeit'.

system. Diplomatic ceremonial was also an indicator of the political climate: the official and pompous entry of an ambassador demonstrated that two countries were entertaining good relations, whereas the abrupt departure of diplomats or a ceremonial slight could hint at deteriorating relations. The demeanour of diplomats towards each other further indicated the relationship of their masters: if at war, they would avoid meeting in public. At the same time, ceremonial could mirror, albeit in slow motion, the decline of states. Apart from the case of Spain, contemporaries noted this for Venice, which fell from the first into the second category of ranks in the eighteenth century.⁵⁰⁵

Theorists of diplomacy increasingly related rank and ceremonial to the system as a whole. With the assertion of resident diplomacy, ceremonial mirrored the relationship of several actors at the same time. Accordingly, treatises began to provide abstracts of the hierarchy of ranks in the states-system as well as collections of the ceremonial customs at the European courts. Theorists acknowledged that ceremonial practice would always vary according to the 'goût des nations et cours', requiring the diplomat to 's'accomoder aux règles du pais'.⁵⁰⁶ Consequently, diplomats and governments had to be informed about ceremonial at other courts, particularly when a court issued new regulations. For example, in Brandenburg-Prussia the acquisition of the royal title entailed a new court ceremonial (1702), as did the change of dynasty in Spain fifteen years later.⁵⁰⁷ Diplomats themselves were instructed to act as collectors of information about ceremonial,⁵⁰⁸ while copies or extracts of the manuals of ceremony masters served as another means of dissemination of

⁵⁰⁵ *Finnetti philxenis* [...], ed. G.S.Treuer, p.100; *Embajada española*, p.23; *Philosophia elegantiarum*, p.19; Callières, *De la manière*, p.68. On the background, see A.Zannini, 'Economic and Social Aspects of the Crisis of Venetian Diplomacy in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries', in Frigo (ed.), *Politics and Diplomacy in Early Modern Italy*, 109-46.

⁵⁰⁶ Wicquefort, *L'Ambassadeur*, i, pp.628-9; Moser, *Ambassadrice*, p.20.

⁵⁰⁷ See Stollberg-Rillinger, 'Höfische Öffentlichkeit'. The aversion of Frederick William I against ceremonial required yet another adjustment, see for example the 1713 report of the Imperial diplomat Count Schönborn-Buchheim, AB, i, esp.p.448, or Withworth's report of 1716, PRO, SP 90/7. On the Spanish regulation of 1717, see Martens, *Erzählungen*, p.331. See *ibid.*, p.378, for the regulations on ceremonial in the U.S.A. (1783).

⁵⁰⁸ See for example SächsHSTA, Geh.Kabinett 892.4 (regulations of 1741/44); furthermore, Grabar, *International Law in Russia*, p.98, for the reign of Catherine II. See also D.Frigo, *Principe, ambasciatori e "jus gentium"*. *L'amministrazione della politica estera nel Piemonte del Settecento* (Rome, 1991), p.183, for Savoy.

ceremonial practice.⁵⁰⁹ As in matters of diplomatic law, there also were instances of collaboration and cooperation with regard to diplomatic ceremonial; the electors and princes of the Empire, for example, would often confer and consult on ceremonial and exchange regulations and memoirs.⁵¹⁰ Moreover, masters of ceremonies sometimes exchanged memoirs in order to avoid ceremonial problems and to ensure a reciprocity of treatment.⁵¹¹

For the emergence of the diplomatic corps, consultation and cooperation in matters of ceremonial were also integrative factors. Theorists elevated 'confiance' and 'politesse' to maxims of diplomatic prudence, and individual instructions would often advise diplomats to follow the examples of other representatives or to confer with their colleagues in matters of ceremonial.⁵¹² Even though the sovereign states did not acknowledge any arbiter, in practice, the papal nuncio recurrently took this role for the (Catholic) diplomatic corps in conflicts over precedence and honours.⁵¹³

Theorists in this period perceived a tendency towards adjustment and standardisation of diplomatic ceremonial, which coincided with a growing endeavour to avoid or at least to curtail conflicts of precedence. Even though they maintained that a diplomat had to adapt to the different court ceremonials, their treatises show that ceremonial honours were becoming more uniform in the

⁵⁰⁹ See footnote 483 for the dissemination of Sainctot in Brandenburg, Saxony, and England. The eighteenth-century treatise of Rousset (*Cérémoniel diplomatique*) was also based on Sainctot, see AAE, MD France 1871, fo.20; MD France 251, fos.293-5. Extracts of French ceremonial books were given for example to the English diplomat Trumbull, see R.Clark, *Sir William Trumbull in Paris, 1685-86* (Cambridge, 1938), p.135, or to the Imperial diplomat Sinzendorf, see HHSTA, StA Frankreich, Berichte 26, fo.82.

⁵¹⁰ See for example SächsHSTA, Geh.Rat 8234/2 and Obersthofmeister 1, for the correspondence between Saxony, Brandenburg-Prussia and also Bavaria. STA Wolfenbüttel, 2Alt 4435-37, provides examples for the collaboration and exchange between Brunswick, Brandenburg, Saxony, Hanover and the Palatinate.

⁵¹¹ See for example the memoirs sent by the French 'introduceur' to Cott(e)rell, the English ceremonial master: PRO, Lord Chamberlain's Office 5/2, fos.81 ff.

⁵¹² For instance at the congress of Nijmegen, see BL, Harleian MS 1514, fo.160; for Riswick, see PRO, SP 103/95, fo.819. See furthermore the consultation of the English ambassador Stair with other diplomats in Paris in 1719, PRO, SP 78/163, fos.128-63. Cf. HHSTA, Staatskanzlei, Vorträge 26, fo.60 (1725); SächsHSTA, Geh.Kabinett, 952/2, fo.2^{r-v} (1708).

⁵¹³ For example, HHSTA, StA Frankreich, Berichte 26, fos.16-21 (1685); HHSTA, Obersthofmeisteramt, Ält.Zeremonialakten, Varia 19 (1699-1700), fo.237^v. In 1815, the nuncio's preeminence in protocol was officially established, see Markel, *Rangstufen*, p.88.

states-system. This included new elements and figures such as the ambassadress, whose ceremonial was gradually regulated after 1648.⁵¹⁴

That ceremonial had become a common European 'code' was apparent to contemporaries also with regard to actors on the periphery of the system. Analogous to the theorists' observations on diplomatic law, Ottomans and even Russians were still considered as 'barbarians' when it came to diplomatic ceremonial. Western observers regarded it as ostentatious and often incompatible with the equality of sovereigns,⁵¹⁵ and its pomp and 'orientalism' gave rise to literary and artistic depictions.⁵¹⁶ Diplomatic ceremonial in Constantinople was a complex system uniting Oriental and Western forms.⁵¹⁷ How competitions of ranks affected the relations with the Ottoman Empire became apparent at the 1699 congress of Carlowitz, where a special conference building was erected in order to enable the simultaneous entrance of all parties.⁵¹⁸ In the case of Russia, the Czar's pretension to the imperial title led to conflicts in the early eighteenth century, notably with the Emperor.⁵¹⁹ The uncertainty of ceremonial treatment of diplomats in Russia in this period also

⁵¹⁴ See footnote 162. Moser regarded 1648 as commencement of a more regulated ceremonial, and France as model, *Ambassadrice*, pp.11-2. Cf. AAE, MD France 1831, fos.176 ff; MD France 1851, fos.291-302; HHSTA, StA Frankreich, Berichte 26, fos.95-99; STA Rom, Varia 26, fos.411 ff; Staatskanzlei, Interoria, Generalia 12, fo.86.

⁵¹⁵ Hoevelen, *Teutsche Gesandte*, pp.59, 82, 208, 224; Wicquefort, *L'Ambassadeur*, i, pp.475-84; Schmid, *Der Gesandte*, fo.266, still including Poland, cf. fo.319^v. On Muscovite and Tatar embassies in Berlin, see SächsHSTA, Geh.Rat 8234/2, fos.76-82; H.Saring, 'Tatarische Gesandtschaften an den kurbrandenburgischen Hof', *FBPG*, 46 (1937), 374-80.

⁵¹⁶ Apart from descriptions of 'oriental' embassies in Europe, such as the *Ausführliche Relation von dem [...] in Franckreich angelangten Persianischen Ambassadeurs, Mehmed Riza-Beg* (Augsburg, 1716), the great number of travel writings emerging in connection with embassies beyond Europe has not yet been adequately considered. This also applies to the works of arts depicting the entries of Ottoman, Persian or Maroccan embassies in Europe; see for example 'Louis XIV reçoit l'ambassadeur de Perse, Mehmed Ryza Beg, 19 fev.1715' (Coypel, Musée de Versailles); and the privilege 'pour faire en cire et exposer en public les ambassadeurs de Siam, Maroc, Moscovie, Alger [...] for the painter A.Benoist (1688), BN, MS.fr.10654, fo.68.

⁵¹⁷ Schmid, *Der Gesandte*, fo.164^v.

⁵¹⁸ R.Langhorne, 'The Development of International Conferences, 1648-1830', in M.Donelan (ed.), *The Reason of States. A Study in International Political Theory* (London, 1978), p.71. For Poland, see Przewdziecki, *Diplomatie et protocole à la cour de Pologne*.

⁵¹⁹ Schmid, *Der Gesandte*, fo.247; Bielfeld, *Institutions politiques*, ii, pp.238-9; PRO, SP 9/168 ('State of the dispute about giving the title of Emperor to the Czar'). On ceremonial in Russia, see C.Garnier, "Wer meinen Herrn ehrt, den ehre ich billig auch". Symbolische Kommunikationsformen bei Gesandtenempfangen am Moskauer Hof im 16. und 17. Jahrhundert', *Jahrbuch für Kommunikationsgeschichte*, 7 (2005), 27-51; Grabar, *International Law in Russia*, pp.54-5, 93. Cf. C.Roll, *Auswärtige Politik und politisches Weltbild. Zar und Kaiser in der europäischen Politik des 17. Jahrhunderts* (Konstanz Univ. Habilitation, 2003).

resulted from the gradual adaption of Muscovite practice to the forms used in other European courts.⁵²⁰ Ceremonial not only mirrored the integration of states on the periphery of the system, but was also of crucial importance in the relations between actors possessing different 'cultures' of diplomacy. Theorists of diplomacy delineated the states-system with the criteria of certain ceremonial 'codes'. While misunderstandings and misinterpretation characterised the ceremonial surrounding the sporadic diplomatic and consular relations with countries in Africa and the Near and Far East, recent scholarship stresses that ritual and ceremonial were not rigid cultural systems but allowed for compromise.⁵²¹

In the mid-eighteenth century, however, the attention towards ceremonial decreased. Treatises on ceremonial were integrated into positive law and state science,⁵²² while conflicts about precedence lessened and were sometimes even avoided by the complete abandonment of ceremonial.⁵²³ In contrast to the treatises of Wicquefort and Schmid, theorists after the Peace of Utrecht reduced their notes on ceremonial, stating that it was now fairly regulated at each court and had become 'simple et claire'.⁵²⁴ The struggles over ceremonial which had occupied practitioners and theorists of international relations in the late seventeenth century were now regarded as 'objets assez frivoles'.⁵²⁵ On one hand, this criticism was linked to the increasing role of the lower diplomatic ranks, which theorists had endorsed since Wicquefort. On the other,

⁵²⁰ See for example PRO, SP 91/6, for a 1709 report of Whitworth from Russia, which stated that 'the Czar has alter'd the ancient maxims of his government to the method of other European courts' (fos.287^v, 350^{r-v}).

⁵²¹ See for example D.Kolodziejczyk, 'Semiotics of Behaviour in Early Modern Diplomacy: Polish Embassies in Istanbul and Bahçesaray', *Journal of Early Modern History*, 7 (2003), 245-56; C.Windler, 'Diplomatic History as a Field for Cultural Analysis: Muslim-Christian Relations in Tunis, 1700-1840', *Historical Journal*, 44 (2001), 79-106; A.Krischner, 'Können Rituale gesammelt werden? Vormoderne Aufschreibesysteme für symbolisches Handeln in außereuropäischen Gesellschaften', *Trans*, 15 (2004), <http://www.inst.at/trans/15/Nr/06_2/krischer15.htm>.

⁵²² For example, F.C.Moser, *Teutsches Hofrecht [...]* (2 vols, Frankfurt 1754-5). Cf. Vec, *Zeremonialwissenschaft*, pp.117-31.

⁵²³ Cf. Stollberg-Rillinger, 'Wissenschaft der feinen Unterschiede', pp.149-50.

⁵²⁴ Francquesnay, *Ministre public*, p.189; *Traité des ambassades*, pp.144-5; Pecquet, *Art de négocier*, p.76.

⁵²⁵ Bielfeld, *Institutions politiques*, ii, pp.155, 169, 234; Mably, *Principes des négociations*, pp.277-8, citing the memoirs of W.Temple.

it reflected a growing ambivalence regarding the role ceremonial had come to play in diplomacy, as well as a response to the Enlightenment criticism of diplomacy.

In retrospect, theorists realised that the charging of diplomatic ceremonial with political and legal content, pushed especially by France under Louis XIV, had led to an excessive permeation of diplomacy with symbolism and formalism that threatened to impede effective negotiations. The diplomat's freedom of action had become restricted, since any deviation from the established ceremonial might constitute a precedent. Not only the flexibility but also the secrecy of diplomacy was becoming endangered, as princes, ministers and the European courtly and erudite public followed each gesture of a diplomat in order to decode his sovereign's rank and claims.⁵²⁶ Theorists were caught in a dilemma: while they insisted on the exact observance of ceremonial, they feared that 'la paix, le bonheur des peuples, le repos de l'Europe, étoient des objets qu'on ne faisoit marcher qu'après le cérémonial d'une visite'. Consequently, they argued to 'n'employer aux négociations importantes que des ministres du second ordre'.⁵²⁷ Yet with the inclusion of envoys, residents and ministers into the court ceremonial, the quandary applied to all diplomats. Furthermore, incidents such as the events of 1661 exposed the fact that an insistence on ceremonial and precedence could go against the interests of the system as a whole, fostering conflict between diplomats and between sovereigns.⁵²⁸ As a result, theorists condemned undue and excessive

⁵²⁶ Wicquefort, *Mémoires*, edn.1730, p.6; Francquesnay, *Ministre public*, p.134; Bielfeld, *Institutions politiques*, ii, pp.170-1, 260.

⁵²⁷ Bielfeld, *Institutions politiques*, ii, p.155. See also Wicquefort, *L'Ambassadeur*, i, pp.109-11; Rohr, *Ceremoniell-Wissenschaft*, edn.1733, p.4. The criterion of effectiveness, however, was used more in diplomatic than in ceremonial theory, see for example Francquesnay, *Ministre public*, pp.74-5.

⁵²⁸ Nevertheless, it has been argued that ceremonial provided an alternative to military conflict and contributed to the 'civilisation of international relations', see the remarks in Paulmann, *Pomp und Politik*, pp.30-7. Even if Louis XIV used the incident to threaten Spain with war, ceremonial no longer served as trigger for conflicts, see Duchhardt, *Balance of Power*, p.32.

claims, urging diplomats to content themselves with the established rank.⁵²⁹ The picture these 'learned diplomats' drew of diplomacy depicted ceremonial as necessary evil but endeavoured to show, tinted by Enlightenment thought, that eighteenth-century diplomacy had become more simplified and 'rational'. In disdaining excessive ceremonial, they echoed the *philosophes'* criticism, which was also influenced by a negative view of human passions.⁵³⁰ This was furthermore linked to the criterion of economy, a concern most courts shared.⁵³¹ Theorists of diplomacy did not defy the courtly-aristocratic culture of diplomacy in general, but they disapproved of excessive ceremonial if it hampered actual negotiations. The consequence they drew from the 'double aspect' of this 'janus frivole' was, first, to further the knowledge about ceremonial,⁵³² and, second, to advise diplomats on how to handle ceremonial with flexibility.

Strategies of Conflict Management: Congress Diplomacy and the 'Round Table'

Diplomatic ceremonial had become inextricably linked to the international hierarchy. At the same time, in order to enable an effective negotiation, an entire system of evasive manoeuvres was developed in order to circumvent and curtail ceremonial. These strategies of conflict management, as mirrored in diplomatic theory, were part of a collective learning process of the European states and centred on the development of congress diplomacy.

⁵²⁹ Wicquefort, *L'Ambassadeur*, i, p.626; Francquesnay, *Ministre public*, p.137; Pecquet, *Art de négocier*, p.103. Bielefeld, *Institutions politiques*, ii, p.170. See even AAE, MD France 1872, fos.112-3.

⁵³⁰ See footnote 489; Lünig, *Theatrum ceremoniale*, i, p.1; Rohr, *Ceremoniell-Wissenschaft*, edn.1733, pp.4-5. Cf. B.Stollberg-Rillinger, 'Zeremoniell als politisches Verfahren. Rangordnung und Rangstreit als Strukturmerkmal des frühneuzeitlichen Reichstags', in J.Kunisch (ed.), *Neue Studien zur frühneuzeitlichen Reichsgeschichte* (Berlin, 1997), p.128. Vec, *Zeremonialwissenschaft*, pp.162-70, stresses the tradition of court criticism.

⁵³¹ Cf. Vec, *Zeremonialwissenschaft*, p.7; V.Bauer, *Hofökonomie. Der Diskurs über den Fürstenhof in Zeremonialwissenschaft, Hausväterliteratur und Kameralismus* (Vienna, 1997).

⁵³² Bielefeld, *Institutions politiques*, ii, p.235.

With the emergence of a 'corps diplomatique', theorists became concerned with the harmony and cooperation within the community that they regarded as a civilising force in the states-system. Even if they required the diplomat to defend his master's honour,⁵³³ they provided advice on how to avoid conflicts about precedence and ceremonial with his colleagues. Wicquefort, Callières and Pecquet counselled the diplomat to distinguish between an insult to his person and to his sovereign, reminding him that 'dignité n'est qu'un rôle'.⁵³⁴ Higher than the competition over pomp and ceremony, Callières placed the 'honnête homme' ideal, who, through civility and sensitivity, retained his flexibility in the ceremonial maze. Like Wicquefort, eighteenth-century theorists argued that the 'harmonie entre les ministres publics' had to be upheld at all cost.⁵³⁵ Nevertheless, theorists agreed that the best means to avoid conflicts within the corps remained an adherence to established custom.

If a conflict of precedence seemed inevitable, theorists suggested that a diplomat should absent himself by feigning indisposition. This was also advisable if the diplomats' masters were at war.⁵³⁶ To appear 'incognito' at preliminary negotiations was another way of avoiding ceremonial,⁵³⁷ as was the assumption of temporary equality expressed in a simultaneous entry,⁵³⁸ or the meeting 'in loco tertio'.⁵³⁹ Finally, an expedient to circumvent ceremonial was to send low-ranking diplomats or even unofficial and secret negotiators,

⁵³³ This required the diplomat's cunning and even bodily ability, as the Brandenburg envoy and later ceremony master Besser demonstrated in London in 1684, where he gained precedence over the Venetian ambassador, see Stollberg-Rillinger, 'Höfische Öffentlichkeit', p.164.

⁵³⁴ Callières, *De la manière*, p.183; Wicquefort, *L'Ambassadeur*, ii, pp.3-5; Chamoy, *Parfait ambassadeur*, p.31; Pecquet, *Art de négocier*, p.110.

⁵³⁵ Wicquefort, *L'Ambassadeur*, i, p.626; Callières, *De la manière*, p.183; Chamoy, *Parfait ambassadeur*, p.33; Pecquet, *Art de négocier*, p.134. Francquesnay, *Ministre public*, p.173; Bielfeld, *Institutions politiques*, ii, p.19.

⁵³⁶ Wicquefort, *Mémoires*, edn.1730, pp.166-7; Schmid, *Der Gesandte*, fo.33; Bielfeld, *Institutions politiques*, ii, p.242.

⁵³⁷ Chamoy, *Parfait ambassadeur*, p.30; Rohr, *Ceremoniell-Wissenschaft*, edn.1733, p.390; Maillardière, *Précis du Droit des Gens*, p.197. Cf. HHSTA, Staatskanzlei, Vorträge 21, fo.16^v (1716); Stollberg-Rillinger, 'Höfische Öffentlichkeit', p.154.

⁵³⁸ See Lünig, *Theatrum ceremoniale*, p.30, who refers to the meeting of French and Spanish representatives on a river island in 1659. On a similar meeting in 1673, see BN, Clairambault 805, fo.22.

⁵³⁹ Wicquefort, *Mémoires*, edn.1730, p.167; Callières, *De la manière*, p.128. Cf. HHSTA, STA Frankreich, Berichte 26, fo.18 (1698).

although these persons were rarely mentioned in 'ideal ambassador' treatises.⁵⁴⁰ Increasingly practised was furthermore the temporary abandonment of ceremonial, if it was understood that this would not constitute a 'préjudice' to the sovereigns' honour.⁵⁴¹ Such strategies were applied mostly during congresses, which provided ample potential for conflict over rank and ceremonial.

In the period between 1643 and 1815/18, multilateral negotiation developed as a means of preventing and also of ending conflicts.⁵⁴² Scholars have studied the large conferences, above all the Westphalian negotiations;⁵⁴³ yet many congresses remain under-researched.⁵⁴⁴ The frequent succession of multilateral gatherings after 1640 constituted a new challenge for diplomacy and diplomats.⁵⁴⁵ This concerned not only the legal framework of congress diplomacy, for example the acknowledgment of passports and full powers, the status of mediators, the status of the congress location, or the ratification,⁵⁴⁶ but also the techniques of multilateral negotiation and, above all, diplomatic ceremonial. The diplomats'

⁵⁴⁰ See Wicquefort, *L'Ambassadeur*, i, pp.868-9; Stieve, *Europäisches Hoff-Ceremoniell*, p.5; Maillardière, *Précis du droit des gens*, p.329.

⁵⁴¹ See for example HHSTA, STA Frankreich, Berichte 26, fo.8 (1685); GSTA, Rep.81 (Paris) 3, fo.67 (1668). Cf. Bielefeld, *Institutions politiques*, ii, p.242.

⁵⁴² Wicquefort was the first theorist to include larger sections on congress negotiation and treaties. On the development of congress diplomacy, see Langhorne, 'The Development of International Conferences'; Duchhardt, 'Friedenskongresse im Zeitalter des Absolutismus'.

⁵⁴³ See for example H.Duchhardt (ed.), *Der Westfälische Friede. Diplomatie - politische Zäsur - kulturelles Umfeld - Rezeptionsgeschichte* (Munich, 1998); idem (ed.), *Bibliographie zum Westfälischen Frieden* (Münster, 1996); L.Bély (ed.), *L'Europe des Traités de Westphalie. Esprit de la diplomatie et diplomatie de l'esprit* (Paris, 2000); R.Babel (ed.), *Le Diplomate au travail. Entscheidungsprozesse, Information und Kommunikation im Umkreis des Westfälischen Friedenskongresses* (Munich, 2004).

⁵⁴⁴ In particular the congresses of the eighteenth century. On individual congresses, see for instance *The Peace of Nijmegen, La paix de Nimegue* (Amsterdam, 1980); H.Duchhardt (ed.), *Der Friede von Rijswijk 1697* (Mainz, 1998); L.Bély, *Espions et ambassadeurs*, for Utrecht; K.-H.Lingens, 'Kongresse im Spektrum der friedenswährenden Instrumente des Völkerrechts: Cambrai und Soissons als Beispiele frühneuzeitlicher Diplomatie', in H.Duchhardt (ed.), *Zwischenstaatliche Friedenswahrung in Mittelalter und Früher Neuzeit* (Cologne, 1991), 205-26.

⁵⁴⁵ On the time before 1648, see R.Lesaffer, 'The Westphalian Peace Treaties and the Development of the Tradition of Great European Peace Settlements prior to 1648', *Grotiana*, 18 (1997), 71-95; J.C.Russell, 'Peacemaking: The Conventions and the Machinery', in idem, *Peacemaking in the Renaissance* (London, 1986), 67-89.

⁵⁴⁶ See for example J.M.Jones, *Full Powers and Ratification. A Study in the Development of Treaty-Making Procedure* (Cambridge, 1949); K.-H.Lingens, *Internationale Schiedsgerichtsbarkeit und Ius publicum Europaeum 1648-1794* (Berlin, 1988); L.Schilling, 'Zur rechtlichen Situation frühneuzeitlicher Kongreßstädte', in Duchhardt (ed.), *Städte und Friedenskongresse* (Cologne, 1999), 83-107.

behaviour towards each other served to mirror the progress of negotiations and to enact the 'société des princes' before the congress society, their governments, and the onlookers and reporters: 'Leur conduite sera d'autant plus observé qu'elle sera exposé aux yeux de toute l'Europe'.⁵⁴⁷ As claims and conflicts about the 'ius legationis', rank and precedence permeated every stage from the preliminary negotiations to the signature of the treaty, ceremonial often prolonged and complicated the negotiations.

The long-drawn negotiations of Westphalia, the largest and 'first' assembly of early modern Europe,⁵⁴⁸ not only transformed the style of negotiation, but also revealed the fundamental difficulty of ceremonial. For example, the dispute between France and Sweden over the privilege of being called on first resulted in splitting-up of the congress into two cities (Münster and Osnabrück). And visits among diplomats in general were an issue of conflict, including the order in which they were received and paid, the according of titles and precedence, and the treatment of embassies composed of several diplomats.⁵⁴⁹ Furthermore, the claims of the Empire's electors to send plenipotentiaries prolonged the acknowledgment of passports in preliminary negotiations, and caused precedence conflicts with Venice.⁵⁵⁰ Disputes over titles and ranks continued to slow down the negotiations, and solutions had to be found for the position of the mediators (the papal nuncio and the Venetian ambassador), the order of entrance into the assembly rooms, the seating arrangements, and, finally, the

⁵⁴⁷ AAE, MD France 446, fo.12, with regard to the congress of Cambrai. Onlookers featured theorists of diplomacy, for example Hoevelen and Wicquefort in Westphalia, and, in all probability, Francquesnay at Utrecht and Cambray. Various memoirs and collections were published, see for instance the *Actes et mémoires de la négociation de la paix de Münster* (4 vols., Amsterdam, 1680); [...] *de Nimègue* (4 vols., Amsterdam, 1679-80), [...] *de Ryswick* (4 vols., The Hague, 1699-1707); *Actes [...] concernant la Paix d'Utrecht* (6 vols., Utrecht, 1712-5); *Mémoires [...] du Congrès de Cambrai* (n.p., 1723).

⁵⁴⁸ K.Repgen counts 109 delegations: 'Der Westfälische Friede: Ereignis und Erinnerung', *Historische Zeitschrift*, 267 (1998), p.630.

⁵⁴⁹ Wicquefort, *L'Ambassadeur*, i, ch.xxvi; Stieve, *Europäisches Hoff-Ceremoniell*, p.362.

⁵⁵⁰ Wicquefort, *L'Ambassadeur*, i, pp.352-66; Schmid, *Der Gesandte*, fo.191^{r-v}; Stieve, *Europäisches Hoff-Ceremoniell*, p.358. Cf. W.Becker, *Der Kurfürstenrat. Grundzüge seiner Entwicklung in der Reichsverfassung und seine Stellung auf dem Westfälischen Friedenskongreß* (Münster, 1973), pp.169-213.

language of treaties and the sequence of signatures.⁵⁵¹ While the Westphalian negotiations had developed some arrangements, problems relating to ceremonial recurred in all subsequent congresses, requiring the international society to develop compromises or strategies to circumvent it. Even the Imperial Diet, from 1663 a permanent diplomatic congress, faced comparable difficulties, since it was the stage for precedence conflicts between the Empire's electors and the princes.⁵⁵²

Theorists of diplomacy presented examples of strategies that had been adopted to defuse conflicts about ceremonial in multilateral negotiations.⁵⁵³ In Nijmegen (1676-79), copies of the treaty were signed simultaneously, while in the course of the negotiations, the visits between diplomats were increasingly freed from ceremonial and used for actual negotiations.⁵⁵⁴ As in Münster and Osnabrück, disputes between the embassy domestics were kept out of the negotiations and assigned to the city magistrates.⁵⁵⁵ Rijswijk (1697-98) saw the first use of the round table and a further reduction of ceremonial in favour of informal discussions; a development continued in Utrecht, Rastatt and Baden, where unofficial negotiations accompanied the conferences.⁵⁵⁶ The negotiations of Utrecht once more revealed that political interests influenced the role ceremonial played in congress diplomacy: if a

⁵⁵¹ Wicquefort, *L'Ambassadeur*, ii, ch.xii. Cf. L.Bély, 'La Négociation comme idéal et comme art: un modèle westphalien?', in idem (ed.), *Traité de Westphalie*, 603-12; A.Stiglic, 'Zeremoniell und Rangordnung auf der europäischen diplomatischen Bühne am Beispiel der Gesandteneinzüge in die Kongreß-Stadt Münster', in K.Bußmann, H.Schilling (eds.), *1648 - Krieg und Friede in Europa* (Münster, 1998), i, 391-6.

⁵⁵² See R.Reiser, *Adliges Stadtleben im Barockzeitalter. Internationales Gesandtenleben auf dem Immerwährenden Reichstag zu Regensburg* (Munich, 1969); Leiher, *Rechtliche Stellung der auswärtigen Gesandten*; cf. Stollberg-Rillinger, 'Zeremoniell als politisches Verfahren'.

⁵⁵³ On the evolution of 'effective' congress diplomacy, see Bély, *Espions et ambassadeurs*, p.375, who regards this process as largely concluded after the congress of Utrecht. Other scholars observe this only for the end of the eighteenth century, see Anderson, *Rise of Modern Diplomacy*, p.66; Langhorne, 'Development of International Conferences', pp.64-5. Cf. H.Duchhardt, 'Peace Treaties from Westphalia to the Revolutionary Era', in Lesaffer (ed.), *Peace Treaties*, 45-58.

⁵⁵⁴ Bielfeld, *Institutions politiques*, ii, pp.152, 156. On Nijmegen, see B.Neveu, 'Nimegue ou l'art de négocier', in *The Peace of Nijmegen*, 236-59.

⁵⁵⁵ Wicquefort, *L'Ambassadeur*, i, pp.893-4. In Utrecht, this was extended to traffic, for example the arrival of coaches, see *Actes [...] concernant la Paix d'Utrecht*, i (Utrecht, 1712), pp.193-4; Bielfeld, *Institutions politiques*, ii, p.158.

⁵⁵⁶ Bielfeld, *Institutions politiques*, ii, p.156; Maillardière *Précis du Droit des Gens*, p.97.

common desire to reach a settlement prevailed, ceremonial was abandoned 'sans préjudice', or the official conferences were circumvented by secret and direct negotiations.⁵⁵⁷ In the latter case, the congress would become a mere 'affaire de fête et de cérémonie'.⁵⁵⁸ On the other hand, conflicts over ceremonial could also be exploited to slow down or thwart negotiations, as the congresses of Cambray and Soissons in the 1720s exemplify.⁵⁵⁹ Hence, ceremonial continued to be a potential encumbrance in the eighteenth century, even if it was more and more reduced, for instance in the conferences held in Aachen (1748), in Paris and Hubertusburg (1763).⁵⁶⁰ Only in the course of the 1815 and 1818 negotiations, precedence and ceremonial were firmly regulated in accordance with the diplomatic class and the date of arrival, by alternation or ballot.⁵⁶¹

Historiography has regarded congress diplomacy before 1815/18 as an ineffective instrument of conflict management, not least because it could not be freed from ceremonial conflicts and seemed to place the social enjoyment of diplomats above the peace of Europe: 'le congres s'amuse'. This view, however, neglects two central aspects of Ancien Régime diplomacy. Firstly, ceremonial was the necessary language and code of the early modern 'société des princes' and was inevitably linked to the actors' position in the emergent system of sovereign states. Secondly, the 'affaires de fête et de cérémonie' not only served a purpose in enacting and symbolising the state of affairs to the European public; the differentiated system of formal occasions and social gatherings, of festivities, dances, banquets and promenades also provided ample opportunities to exchange information, advance the negotiations and to

⁵⁵⁷ Bielfeld, *Institutions politiques*, ii, p.151. Cf. Duchhardt, 'Friedenskongresse', p.234.

⁵⁵⁸ Francquesnay, *Ministre public*, p.218.

⁵⁵⁹ Bielfeld, *Institutions politiques*, ii, p.155. Cf. Langhorne, 'Development of International Congresses', p.73; Duchhardt, 'Friedenskongresse', pp.236-7; Lingens, 'Cambrai und Soissons'. Issues of rank could still be instrumentalised, for example by Napoleon in 1813, see Hamilton, *Practice of Diplomacy*, p.67.

⁵⁶⁰ On the congresses of Aachen (1748), Paris and Hubertusburg (1763) and 1779 (Teschen), see Langhorne, 'Development of International Congresses', pp.71-5; Duchhardt, 'Friedenskongresse', pp.233, 239.

⁵⁶¹ For instance: Martens, *Guide diplomatique*, pp.92-8. Cf. Paulmann, *Pomp und Politik*, p.71; Anderson, *Rise of Modern Diplomacy*, p.66; Hamilton, *Practice of Diplomacy*, p.79.

ascertain the common social and cultural background of the corps diplomatique, which formed the basis of the 'art de négocier'.⁵⁶² Mably's view that 'toute l'Europe se connaît' referred to the diplomatic corps that convened at the congresses.⁵⁶³ For the collective identity of the corps, these gatherings were highly instrumental, fostering an aristocratic and cosmopolitan culture that was not incompatible with effective negotiation in the theorists' view: it created a common bond and contributed to 'civilise' international relations through politeness and 'confiance'. Furthermore, the congresses were not only the basis of the 'droit public de l'Europe' and the 'lieux de memoire' of a European consciousness,⁵⁶⁴ but also a decisive factor in the evolution of a European practice and 'language' of diplomacy.⁵⁶⁵ Theorists stressed the congresses' role as 'scholam ceremoniarum' and as 'excellente école dans laquelle un esprit attentif peut apprendre presque tout le manège et en même-temps tout l'essentiel des négociations'.⁵⁶⁶

Theorists of diplomacy perceived a gradual stabilisation of the international hierarchy after the Peace of Utrecht. Already in Callières' treatise, but more distinct in those of Francquesnay and Pecquet, the ceremonial honours accorded to the different diplomatic ranks mirrored a certain degree of formalisation and standardisation. Nevertheless, while ceremonial had become a distinct part of the European culture of diplomacy, it remained ambivalent as a barometer of both the political climate and the hierarchy of ranks, which could not be completely separated from negotiations. While an attempt to limit the influence

⁵⁶² As case studies, see M.-F.Renaudin, 'L'Échec du Congrès de Cologne 1673-1674. De la fête au drame', *RHD*, 118 (2004), 223-49; Bély, *Espions et ambassadeurs*, for the congress of Utrecht; Reiser, *Internationales Gesandtenleben*, for the Imperial Diet.

⁵⁶³ Mably, *Principes des négociations*, p.68.

⁵⁶⁴ On 1648 as 'lieu de memoire', see Repgen, 'Der Westfälische Friede: Ereignis und Erinnerung'; H.Duchhardt, 'Der Westfälische Friede als lieu de mémoire in Deutschland und Europa', in Bußmann/Schilling (eds.), *1648 - Krieg und Friede*, i, 41-7.

⁵⁶⁵ On the languages of multilateral negotiations, see G.Braun, 'Une tour de Babel? Les Langues de la négociation et les problèmes de traduction au congrès de la paix de Westphalie (1643-1649)', in Babel (ed.), *Le Diplomate au travail*, 139-72.

⁵⁶⁶ Francquesnay, *Ministre public*, p.218; J.Brunnemann (praes.), *Dissertatio iuris publici de iure ceremoniali circo legatos* (Halle, 1739), p.8.

of ceremonial over diplomacy could already be observed after the collapse of the French attempt at hegemony, only after the late-eighteenth century 'transformation of European politics' did a consensus become possible, backed by the Great Powers.⁵⁶⁷

In this light, the critical stance of eighteenth-century theorists towards ceremonial not only displayed the influence of Enlightenment thought upon diplomatic theory, but also reflected an increasing awareness of the overall balance of the states-system. The theorists' expertise and advice on how to avoid conflicts of precedence and ceremonial displayed a particular approach to the evolution of ceremonial from the negotiations of Westphalia. By integrating ceremonial into the diplomatic 'prudence', diplomatic theory endeavoured to contribute to the standardisation of diplomatic practice.

Conclusion

Diplomatic theorists mirrored the transformation and adjustment of the structures, language and apparatus of diplomacy to the conduct of international relations in a states-system. In their view, the states-system was not only a political framework, but also a body of common diplomatic customs, legal norms and ceremonial codes. The diplomatic corps, surfacing at all major courts and at the frequent congresses, was defined by these elements of a 'European' practice and culture. The viewpoint of diplomatic theorists substantiates the view that in the period between 1648 and 1714, the outline of the eighteenth-century states-system emerged, but was still characterised by instability. The conduct of diplomacy had become linked to shifts in the overall hierarchy of ranks and power. In the decades following the Peace of Utrecht, a greater degree of stability became visible, exemplified in a growing consensus

⁵⁶⁷ See Schroeder, *Transformation of European Politics*, esp. pp.3-11, 517 ff; Luard, *Balance of Power*, pp.129-47.

about diplomatic customs and procedures, the immunities of diplomats, and the role of ceremonial. By the mid-eighteenth century, a common practice of diplomacy had fully emerged. With the assertion of the concept of sovereignty, precedence and rank appeared no longer as matters of law and tradition, but emanated from subjective estimations and political considerations.⁵⁶⁸ On the other hand, the integration of actors on the fringes of the system was reflected in the adoption of this practice and cultural 'code'. Yet, to define the extent of the states-system with diplomatic criteria proved difficult for the theorists, as actors from the eastern periphery possessed a 'hybrid' culture of diplomacy, uniting 'modern' with traditional or even 'exotic' elements.

Meanwhile, theorists of diplomacy were becoming the early representatives of a reform movement which sought to combine the aristocratic culture of diplomacy with the criterion of 'professionalism'. As early as the 1670s, theorists perceived that a European-wide and permanent diplomacy placed unprecedented demands both on the administration of diplomacy and on the diplomats themselves. Consequently, their demands on the 'ideal ambassador' mounted: he had to possess a greater and more specialised knowledge about the 'interests of states' and the complex system of legal and ceremonial norms, privileges and claims. The chief consequence theorists drew from these demands was to call for a special diplomatic preparation. This deduction coincided with a growing awareness among the 'governments' of early modern Europe, i.e. the princes, ministers and councillors directing and administering diplomacy. 'Reform debates' ensued in most countries, which took up suggestions of diplomatic theorists. The central issue of this reform movement was the preparation and training of diplomats, the keystone of diplomatic 'professionalism'.

⁵⁶⁸ See also Stollberg-Rillinger, 'Wissenschaft der feinen Unterschiede', p.143.

Part IV. A New 'Profession' and the State. Diplomatic Training in France, Britain and the Holy Roman Empire

Episode 4. A Profession to be Pitied. George Stepney, Matthew Prior, Charles Whitworth

Theorists of the 'ideal ambassador' endeavoured to impart a representative portrait of the diplomatic *métier* in the states-system, claiming to mirror the collective identity of the diplomatic corps. But did their portrait of an emergent 'profession' correspond to the diplomats' own views on their occupation? The examination of identities and perceptions with regard to notions of professionalism and corps mentality constitutes a part of the 'new' diplomatic history that is sensitive to the cultural and mental milieu of international actors.⁵⁶⁹ Of particular interest in this respect are the lower and middle ranks of diplomats, who spent most of their life in negotiations, and whose increasing importance was reflected in diplomatic theory.⁵⁷⁰

Representatives of this group are George Stepney, Matthew Prior, and Charles Whitworth, three 'career diplomats' of the Old Regime.⁵⁷¹ Having attended Westminster school and studied at Cambridge, all three commenced as diplomatic secretaries. Stepney held numerous posts as secretary, minister and envoy in the Empire. Despite his expert knowledge, however, he was never appointed to a prestigious post. Whitworth, his apprentice, also started his diplomatic career in the Empire before he was posted to Russia, where he finally became ambassador. After several other assignments, he returned to an Irish

⁵⁶⁹ See in general, R.Frank, 'Mentalitäten, Vorstellungen und internationale Beziehungen', in Osterhammel/Loth (eds.), *Internationale Geschichte*, 159-85.

⁵⁷⁰ See H.T.Gräf, 'Funktionsweisen und Träger internationaler Politik in der Frühen Neuzeit', in Siegelberg/Schlichte (eds.), *Strukturwandel internationaler Beziehungen*, 105-23.

⁵⁷¹ See L.and M.Frey, 'Stepney, George (1663-1707)'; F.M.Rippy, 'Prior, Matthew (1664-1721)'; D.D.Aldridge, 'Whitworth, Charles, Baron (1675-1725)', all in *Oxford DNB*. Cf. H.L.Snyder, 'The British Diplomatic Service during the Godolphin Ministry', in Hatton/Anderson (eds.), *Studies in Diplomatic History*, 47-68.

peerage and entered Parliament in 1722, taking up a last commission at the Congress of Cambrai. Prior, on the other hand, pursued a diplomatic career parallel to his activities as poet and government employee. After serving as secretary in Paris and The Hague, he was charged with the secret negotiations leading up to the peace of Utrecht.

The three diplomats were united in discontent with their situation. Financial problems, isolation abroad and failing advancement cast a gloom over their lives, as becomes palpable in Stepney's correspondence. He acknowledged that his long experience in the Empire made him 'thus fitted for forraigne employments' that it was 'most adviceable to stick by them'. Although 'willing to renew my lease of wandring, [...] wherever I am sent, from Muscovy to the Mogul', he considered himself 'no considerable gainer by a forraign employment'.⁵⁷² Stepney felt 'like a gipsey' in 'a civill banishment', without satisfactory financial provision. His being 'the only Englishman who had a full knowledge of these courts' had not helped him to attain a better post.⁵⁷³ He saw himself forced 'to play the mercury till a more favourable conjuncture offer some moderate settlement for me at home, which I wou'd infinitely prefer to this shadow of greatness in a strange country'. His promotion, Stepney came to realise, was barred by social rank.⁵⁷⁴ The King's choice, he concluded, was 'directed by some considerations at home more than by [...] skill in the businesse abroad'.⁵⁷⁵

Prior, too, regarded diplomacy as a 'kind of banishment' which could be undergone only in the hope of a proper employment at home.⁵⁷⁶ Whitworth had a similar account to give after more than a decade of service in the Empire and Russia: 'I have waited several years, onely for an occasion to go out of the forreign employment with a good grace [...]; for

⁵⁷² PRO, SP 105/54, letter to Blathwayt, Dresden, 10/20 July 1694, fos.36, 38.

⁵⁷³ Ibid., fos.37-38^v.

⁵⁷⁴ SP 105/54, letter to Trumbull, 7/17 July 1695, fo.110.

⁵⁷⁵ Ibid. See also the advice to his friend Montagu, 7 Aug.1694, SP 105/82, fos.229-30.

⁵⁷⁶ Horn, *British Diplomatic Service*, p.87. Cf. C.K.Eves, *Matthew Prior, Poet and Diplomatist* (New York, 1939). Prior did hold appointments that secured him additional income, for example as undersecretary of state.

otherwise it would not have been very agreeable, to be coupled there with Poles and Moscovites'. He considered it 'too great a discouragement to have the drudgery of business continually left on my bords, whilst the posts of pleasure and reputation are disposed in favour of others'.⁵⁷⁷ Despite having become an expert on Russia, Whitworth saw his time abroad as characterised by financial and health problems, an uncomfortable and isolated life.⁵⁷⁸

Nevertheless, even if their expectations were not fulfilled, Stepney, Whitworth and Prior all managed to develop expertise in their field, to be charged with important negotiations, and to rise from the rank of secretary to that of envoy or even ambassador. Furthermore, they were well-known scholars and figures of public life.⁵⁷⁹ In this way, the trio exemplifies the type of diplomat praised by the theorists: learned, experienced, knowledgeable, rising by degree. Their own perception of the diplomatic *métier*, however, was more critical. Their self-image was, of course, motivated by particular interests, which often led them to exaggerate their situation. Nonetheless, it reflected the actual practice of recruitment and career in diplomacy, which was determined by status, wealth and patronage rather than knowledge and experience. As so many of their colleagues in the lower and middle ranks of diplomacy, the three were 'career diplomats against their will', who remained in the service for a long part of their life, but in due course wished for a secure position at home.⁵⁸⁰

By creating an 'ideal ambassador', theorists attempted to present diplomacy as a responsible and attractive career and to counter the prejudice that 'l'état de négociateur' was a

⁵⁷⁷ SP 90/13, letter to Tilson, 14/25 March 1721, unpaginated.

⁵⁷⁸ Cf. J.M.Hartley, *Charles Whitworth. Diplomat in the Age of Peter the Great* (Burlington, 2002), pp.9-10.

⁵⁷⁹ In contrast to Prior, Stepney's activities as poet and pamphleteer, and Whitworth's publications, such as the *Account of Russia as it was in the year 1710*, are less well known.

⁵⁸⁰ On this term, see also Müller, *Kaiserliches Gesandtschaftswesen*, p.212.

volatile and insecure occupation.⁵⁸¹ To some degree, their portrait of an emerging diplomatic profession was an idealisation of the often-contrary recruitment and career practice; yet it also bore relation to the beginnings of a process that may be termed the 'professionalisation' of the diplomatic service. At the heart of this process lay a mounting degree of criticism of the actual preparation and recruitment practice. This criticism was voiced not only by disappointed 'career diplomats' such as Stepney, Whitworth and Prior, but also came to occupy the political sphere as well as the Republic of Letters.

The 'ideal ambassador' of the late seventeenth century began to combine the nobility's ethos with a new professional and service mentality. For the first time, theorists addressed their own governments to raise 'une profession jusqu'ici trop négligée parmi nous'.⁵⁸² The following part seeks to assess the role of diplomatic theory in the process of 'professionalisation' with particular regard to training and preparation, which theorists had identified as central criteria of the 'new diplomat'. The case studies of France, Britain and several territories of the Empire serve to underline the extent to which this process was a collective experience of the state-system's actors.

IV.1. Diplomacy and 'Professionalism'

The term 'professionalisation' can be found in many overviews on the post-1648 diplomatic services, although it is normally used with reservation.⁵⁸³ The notion of 'profession' as developed by sociologists such as Max Weber focused on the emergence of the nineteenth-

⁵⁸¹ Pecquet, *Art de négocier*, pp.xx-xxiii; cf. Hoevelen, *Teutsche Gesandte*, pp.231-2.

⁵⁸² Callières, *De la manière*, p.65.

⁵⁸³ For example, Black, *British Diplomats*, pp.31, 157; Horn, *British Diplomatic Service*, p.13; Anderson, *Rise of Modern Diplomacy*, pp. 81-7; Duchhardt, *Balance of Power*, p.26.

century civil service ('Beamtentum').⁵⁸⁴ Generally, the 'rise of the professions' as exclusive occupational groups is tied to the post-revolutionary period.⁵⁸⁵ Nevertheless, attempts have been made to trace the beginnings of 'professions' back to the Renaissance.⁵⁸⁶ Sociologists and historians alike have endeavoured to identify the following criteria of a 'profession': occupational structures and identity; formal hierarchy and recognised career paths; permanence; formal procedures for payment; expertise and education; efficiency; and distinctive self-conceptualisation.⁵⁸⁷ To link the process of 'professionalisation' to these criteria has the advantage of taking both the composition and the *mentalités* of a vocational group into consideration. In this respect, the issue of diplomatic 'professionalisation' has to be connected with the general study of the early modern nobilities. With respect to social and functional elites and their vocational cultures, however, diplomacy has not yet received sufficient attention.⁵⁸⁸ It is generally acknowledged that, in the century after 1648, the diplomatic service was characterised by seemingly contradictory developments. Scholars have identified a process of 'aristocratisation' that increasingly tied diplomacy to the social and cultural milieu of the European nobilities. At the same time, there was also a growing need for trained specialists to cope with the mounting complexity of international affairs.⁵⁸⁹ If one applies the Weberian notion of 'professionalism' to diplomacy, the use of aristocratic 'amateur' diplomats seems to be at odds with the progressive bureaucratisation of the central

⁵⁸⁴ On the historiographical traditions, see Reinhard, *Staatsgewalt*, pp.15-29, 128-9, 189-96; cf. H.Hattenhauer, *Geschichte des Beamtentums* (Cologne, 1980).

⁵⁸⁵ For example M.S.Larson, *The Rise of Professionalism. A Sociological Analysis* (Berkeley, 1977); D.Rüchemeyer, 'Professionalisierung. Theoretische Probleme für die vergleichende Geschichtsforschung', *Geschichte und Gesellschaft*, 6 (1980), 311-25.

⁵⁸⁶ For instance D.Biow, *Doctors, Ambassadors, Secretaries: Humanism and Professions in Renaissance Italy* (Chicago, 2002); for the military, D.J.B.Trim (ed.), *The Chivalric Ethos and the Development of Military Professionalism* (Leiden, 2003).

⁵⁸⁷ See Trim, 'Introduction', in idem, *Chivalric Ethos*, pp.6-11.

⁵⁸⁸ See W.Reinhard (ed.), *Power Elites and State Building* (Oxford, 1996); idem, *Staatsgewalt*.

⁵⁸⁹ Cf. W.Weber, 'Die Erfindung des Politikers'.

administration of foreign policy.⁵⁹⁰ Only recently has scholarship commenced to reconsider this 'double nature' of diplomacy in the 'société des princes'.⁵⁹¹

Diplomatic theory underlines the fact that the diplomatic corps represented the social and political elites.⁵⁹² While late-humanist theorists had often portrayed the 'ideal diplomat' as cleric or erudite, in the post-1648 century the portrait shifted towards the 'aulicus politicus', the noble politician. Diplomacy was tied to a European court culture based on social status and aristocratic manners. At the same time as the nobility's ethos became aligned to a 'culture of merit' in the prince's service, noble education and socialisation were being considered the best preparation for a diplomat.⁵⁹³ The higher diplomatic ranks were dominated by the 'noblesse d'extraction' and 'noblesse d'épée' serving at court and in the army. However, they did not regard diplomacy as a career, but only as a step in the advancement at court and in royal patronage.⁵⁹⁴ At the same time, the rise of the 'noblesse de robe', academically trained and experienced in the state service, extended to the field of diplomacy, notably the central administration and the lower diplomatic ranks.⁵⁹⁵ As the above-mentioned episode has shown, these often were 'career diplomats against their will', who pursued diplomacy for the sake of finding a desirable employment at home. Although they could rise from the post of secretary to the rank of resident or envoy, advancement to the ambassadorial level was rare. Still, the rise of the 'noblesse de robe' placed new demands on

⁵⁹⁰ For example, Roosen, *Age of Louis XIV*, pp.66-7; Anderson, *Rise of Modern Diplomacy*, pp.88-9; Duchhardt, *Balance of Power*, p.26.

⁵⁹¹ See for example H.M.Scott, 'Diplomatic Culture in Old Regime Europe' (extended draft), *Cultures of Power, 1700-1815. A Conference in Honour of T.C.W.Blanning*, Cambridge, 14-17 Sept.2005; Bély, *Espions et ambassadeurs*.

⁵⁹² Bély, *Espions et ambassadeurs*, pp.291-309.

⁵⁹³ See J.M.Smith, *The Culture of Merit. Nobility, Royal Service, and the Making of Absolute Monarchy in France, 1600-1789* (Ann Arbor, 1996); Bury, *L'Invention de l'honnête homme*.

⁵⁹⁴ Müller, *Kaiserliches Gesandtschaftswesen*, pp.189-91, 195-200; Horn, *British Diplomatic Service*, pp.90-93, 106.

⁵⁹⁵ For the sake of brevity, the terms 'noblesse d'épée' and 'noblesse de robe' are applied as generic terms, even if the particular constitution of the elites in Britain and in the Empire would require a more differentiated terminology. Cf. the contributions on France, Britain, Prussia and Austria in H.M.Scott (ed.), *The European Nobilities in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries* (2 vols., London, 1995).

the old nobility, forcing its members to obtain more specific qualifications. Although life-long diplomatic 'careers' remained largely absent, historians have identified elements of 'professionalism' in diplomacy: experience and longevity in the diplomatic service; a regular hierarchy of ranks; more regular salaries; and prospects of promotion to both the diplomatic and ministerial level.⁵⁹⁶

Douglas Biow embraces a wider definition of 'profession' as a state of mind and a specific activity, based upon a common culture of education and communication, but negotiated in distinct professional discourses, such as diplomatic theory.⁵⁹⁷ Yet, such an approach must be anchored in the practices of recruitment, payment and career, in order to determine when, how and why an occupation was transformed into a profession. More than for any other occupation, including the military, it has proved problematic for historians to evaluate the 'professionalism' of diplomacy in early modern Europe, and to fix a particular time for the advent of a diplomatic 'profession'. Such an endeavour runs the risk of an anachronistic and teleological focus. Nevertheless, it is important to investigate when the diplomatic corps became 'professional', that is, when it acquired the criteria of a modern 'profession'.⁵⁹⁸

The medieval and early modern periods employed the term 'profession' with respect to social orders, while the term 'métier' pertained mainly to artisan occupations. In the eighteenth century, 'profession' still comprised both status and occupation; in the words of the *Encyclopédie*, it was the 'état, condition, métier qu'on embrasse, dont on fait son

⁵⁹⁶ For example: Anderson, *Rise of Modern Diplomacy*, pp.80-7; Horn, *British Diplomatic Service*, pp.13-4; Müller, *Kaiserliches Gesandtschaftswesen*, p.212.

⁵⁹⁷ Biow, *Doctors, Ambassadors, Secretaries*. He refers to sixteenth-century treatises on the 'ideal ambassador'.

⁵⁹⁸ This is also postulated by Trim, 'Introduction', in idem, *Chivalric Ethos*, p.12. For a definition of 'profession' and 'professional', see *ibid.*, pp.5-14.

apprentissage, son étude, et son exercice ordinaire'.⁵⁹⁹ While in seventeenth-century diplomatic theory, 'office' and 'function' were being used to describe the task of the diplomat, the first employment of 'profession', 'carrière' and 'métier' as terms denoting a specific vocation occurred around 1700.⁶⁰⁰ In 1737, Pecquet went as far as to postulate 'la profession de négociateur' as a life-long career in the state service.⁶⁰¹ As demonstrated above, diplomatic theory not only introduced terms such as 'profession' or 'career', but also presented a number of criteria which should delineate the 'ideal ambassador' from the noble politician. While basing the diplomatic profession on the social and cultural background of the aristocracy, it incorporated an exclusive ethos as well as technical knowledge, vocational experience, merit, and career advancement. Thus, diplomatic theory presented a professional self-conceptualisation of the diplomatic corps which was aligned to an increasingly formal hierarchy of ranks and a distinct body of knowledge. On the other hand, the theorists' difficulties in distinguishing the diplomat from the noble and wealthy 'aulicus politics' reveal that their portrait could not yet encompass all criteria of 'professionalism': sufficient and systematic payment, recognised career paths and permanence in the service did not characterise the diplomatic corps in the century following the Peace of Westphalia.⁶⁰² The most important features of the new diplomatic profession were, in the theorists' view, expertise and education: a distinctive body of knowledge, divided into a practical ('expérience') and a theoretical part ('connaissances').

⁵⁹⁹ *Encyclopédie, ou Dictionnaire raisonné des sciences, des arts et des métiers* (Paris, 1751-80), <<http://portail.atilf.fr/encyclopedie>, p.13:426>.

⁶⁰⁰ Already Wicquefort had ironically referred to the 'métier d'un espion', *L'Ambassadeur*, ii, p.11, while Chamoy spoke of 'la profession de négociateur', *Parfait ambassadeur*, pp.17, 22. See further Schmid, *Der Gesandte*, fo.112; Callières, *De la manière*, pp.63-5; Francquesnay, *Ministre public*, p.203; Pecquet, *Art de négocier*, pp.xix, xxxiii, lvi, 140, 159; Nourar, *Ministère du négociateur*, pp.xxv, 294.

⁶⁰¹ Pecquet, *Art de négocier*, pp.xix, xxx, xxxiii, lvi, 158-60. Cf. Bély, *Espions et ambassadeurs*, p.312, for negative connotations of the concept of a diplomatic 'métier' and 'profession', which was regarded as incompatible with noble 'honnêteté'.

⁶⁰² See the list of 'professional' criteria in Trim, 'Introduction', in idem, *Chivalric Ethos*, pp.6-11.

The main shift towards a 'professional' ethos in diplomatic theory occurred with the call for a specialist and formal education process – a diplomatic training.

In the theorists' opinion, expertise and experience should determine both the recruitment of diplomats and their advancement to higher posts. However, in practice, technical and practical knowledge often proved less important than status, wealth, personal associations and influence. The general education and experience of the 'aulicus politicus' and the 'noblesse de robe' were regarded as sufficient grounding for diplomacy, to be amended by an ad-hoc preparation through instructions.⁶⁰³ Only a few diplomats would be 'initiated' by their relatives or patrons, or would seek to acquire specific knowledge in order to further their career.⁶⁰⁴

Yet both the progressing inclusion of the nobility into the state service and the ascent of a new service elite gave rise to new demands of preparation, knowledge and experience. Educational traditions and institutions, such as Grand Tour, noble academies and universities, had to cater for these new demands. Developments in the preparation of diplomats were entwined with the reform of the university and academy curricula, especially in the fields of law, history, languages, and state science. Apart from identifying the theoretical and practical knowledge, from the later seventeenth century theorists also began to give suggestions on how to improve the methods of preparation. These featured an apprenticeship in the embassy retinue, as cavaliers or secretaries, as well as the establishment of the rank of embassy

⁶⁰³ See H.de Ridder-Symoens, 'Training and Professionalization', in Reinhard (ed.), *Power Elites*, 149-72. See also, albeit without reference to diplomacy, W.Fischer, 'Rekrutierung und Ausbildung von Personal für den modernen Staat: Beamte, Offiziere und Techniker in England, Frankreich und Preußen in der frühen Neuzeit', in R.Koselleck (ed.), *Studien zum Beginn der modernen Welt* (Stuttgart, 1977), 194-217.

⁶⁰⁴ See for example C.G.Picavet, 'La "Carrière" diplomatique en France au temps de Louis XIV (1661-1715)', *RHD*, 27 (1923), pp.394-5; C.Béchu-Benazet, 'Les Ambassadeurs français au XVIIIe siècle: formation et carrière', in Bely (ed.), *Invention de la diplomatie*, pp.342-4; idem, 'La Formation d'un ambassadeur au XVIII siècle: Vergennes', *RHD*, 101 (1987), 215-25; Horn, *British Diplomatic Service*, pp.139-40.

secretary as training post and first career step in a diplomatic 'cursus honorum'.⁶⁰⁵ While this should provide for a more specific experience, theorists also suggested institutionalising the theoretical preparation in the foreign departments and chancelleries.⁶⁰⁶

And indeed, these suggestions became the subject of discussions in the governments of Europe. The issue of having a corps of qualified and prepared diplomats at hand achieved a pivotal place among the reform plans devised and discussed for the diplomatic service in the early eighteenth century. These reform discussions were, notwithstanding regional and constitutional divergence, part of a common process of adapting the diplomatic service to the states-system. Especially with regard to the five Great Powers of the later eighteenth century (France, Austria, Britain, Prussia, and Russia), common features can be observed. The interests of theorists, governments, councillors, and scholars and *érudits* converged in the matter of educating and preparing the diplomatic corps.

IV.2. 'L'École des Ambassadeurs'. Training Schemes and Diplomatic Academies in the Eighteenth Century

Diplomatic Academies and Apprenticeships: a Common Reform Debate

The perception of new challenges to the diplomatic service, such as the intensification and prolongation of diplomatic contacts, the mounting mass of information, the bureaucratisation of the diplomatic apparatus, and the growing complexity of the diplomatic function, made the issue of preparation and training the major focus of a 'professionalisation' debate. Although discussions and projects relating to diplomatic training are crucial for our understanding of

⁶⁰⁵ For example, Chamoy, *Parfait ambassadeur*, p.28; Callières, *De la manière*, pp.140-1; Bielfeld, *Institutions politiques*, ii, pp.75-6; Réal, *Science du gouvernement*, i, pp.vi-vii.

⁶⁰⁶ See footnote 266.

the professionalisation of diplomacy, only two schemes have so far been credited with scholarly attention.⁶⁰⁷ The general notion that there existed no formal course of study to prepare for diplomacy eclipses the existence of debates and schemes, which, even if mostly unsuccessful, point to an increasing awareness about the importance of diplomatic preparation.

Training schemes can be divided into four elements: the general theoretical preparation, that is the study of law, languages and diplomatic history; secondly, specific diplomatic 'academies' featuring work on diplomatic documents; thirdly, programmes for gaining experience in the retinue of an embassy; and finally, the institution of the post of embassy secretary. In seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Europe, the term 'academy' could refer to learned societies as well as to higher schools, such as noble academies.⁶⁰⁸ In the context of diplomatic training, the terms 'académie politique', 'Staatsakademie', or 'séminaire de négociation' were employed for semi-institutionalised forms of teaching and training. In the eighteenth century, furthermore, the terms 'nursery', 'pepinière' and 'Pflanzschule' referred to the nurturing of state-servants, echoing the theorists' conviction that the art of diplomacy could be acquired through study and experience.

When reform debates and schemes for 'academies' or embassy secretaries are considered, it emerges that the training of diplomats had become an issue of discussion in all parts of the states-system. Some of the recurrent themes had been considered and probed since the beginnings of resident diplomacy in Renaissance Italy, but only in the eighteenth century they reached wider prominence in a 'reform debate'. The common, 'European'

⁶⁰⁷ I.e. French 'Académie politique' and the Strasbourg 'Staatsakademie', cf. below.

⁶⁰⁸ See for example J.H.Zedler, *Grosses, vollständiges Universal-Lexicon aller Wissenschaften und Künste* (Leipzig, 1732-54), s.v. 'Academie', <http://mdz.bib-bvb.de/digbib/lexika/zedler_fos.158-61>. On 'political academies' as Enlightenment societies discussing politics, see E.Briggs, *The Political Academies of France in the Early Eighteenth Century* (Cambridge University Ph.D thesis, 1931).

character of this phenomenon is underlined by the contemporaneous nature of the 'national' debates. At the same time, there existed not only regional varieties in the implementation and extent of training schemes, but also centres and peripheries of discussion in Europe. While in the eighteenth century, France would become the pacesetter and model, theorists agreed that the beginnings of a diplomatic 'training' lay in Renaissance Italy.

In Venice, the practice of accompanying embassies was known since the fifteenth century, as was, for the lower ranks, the secretarial work in the chancelleries. Although diplomacy was not a distinct career, it was an established part of the 'cursus honorum'.⁶⁰⁹ A particular form of institutionalised diplomatic training, furthermore, was established in Rome in 1701. This 'political academy' stands somewhat outside the general discussion on diplomatic professionalism: it was devised for the particular situation of papal diplomacy with its combination of secular and spiritual functions.⁶¹⁰ Canon law and religious history formed the curriculum. The academy's importance increased in the later eighteenth century, and it came to rear future cardinals, popes, papal secretaries and diplomats.⁶¹¹

Apart from the Italian antecedents of diplomatic training, the reform debate that occupied western and central Europe from the later seventeenth century also stretched to the northern and eastern parts of the states-system. Among the first countries to introduce the posts of embassy and chancellery secretaries as training-ground for diplomacy was Sweden. Already during the Thirty Years' War, and instigated by chancellor Oxenstierna, the senate

⁶⁰⁹ Mattingly, *Renaissance Diplomacy*, pp.97-8. On the Venetian diplomatic service in the post-1648 century, see Zannini, 'The Crisis of Venetian Diplomacy'.

⁶¹⁰ No attempt has yet been made to place the papal academy in the context of early modern diplomatic professionalisation. From the papal side of view, see G.B.Montini (ed.), *La Pontificia Accademia Ecclesiastica 1701-1951* (Vatican city, 1951); A.Martini, 'La Diplomazia della Santa Sede e la Pontificia Accademia Ecclesiastica', *Civiltà Cattolica*, 102 (1951), 372-88. On the papal diplomatic service, see L.Riccardi, 'An Outline of Vatican Diplomacy in the Early Modern Age', in Frigo (ed.), *Politics and Diplomacy in Early Modern Italy*, 95-107.

⁶¹¹ See J.M.García (ed.), *Pontificia Accademia Ecclesiastica: Terzo Centenario, 1701-2001* (Vatican, 2003).

had discussed the preparation of state-servants.⁶¹² It was proposed that young noblemen should study political and diplomatic documents in the chancellery, before advancing to diplomatic, political and military charges.⁶¹³ The appointment of 'secrétaires de commission' to embassies was adopted from the 1660s.⁶¹⁴

The 'Académie Politique' and Training Schemes in Eighteenth-Century France

These antecedents of diplomatic training were taken up and combined with the theorists' suggestions in the establishment of the 'Académie Politique' in Paris in 1712.⁶¹⁵ In the seventeenth century, France had witnessed several schemes for noble academies, which did not, however, offer a course deliberately designed for diplomats.⁶¹⁶ The development of international law and political science at the universities lagged behind that of its neighbours, particularly the Empire.⁶¹⁷ Consequently, the French reform discussion would not be anchored in an academic context but tied to the foreign ministry. In the institutional sphere of the 'secrétariat des affaires étrangères', discussions about the training and career of diplomats intensified around the turn of the eighteenth century and, in the next two decades, involved

⁶¹² On the Swedish diplomatic service, see S.Tunberg, C.-F.Palmstierna (eds.), *Histoire de l'administration des affaires étrangères de la Suede* (Uppsala, 1940); S.Björkman, 'Diplomates suédois au XVIIe siècle', in Bély (ed.), *L'Europe des Traités de Westphalie*, 503-16; H.Droste, *Teilhabe als Verdienst. Zur Lebenswelt schwedischer Diplomaten im 17. Jahrhundert* (Kiel Univ. Habilitation thesis, 2002).

⁶¹³ C.-F.Palmstierna, '1611-1648', in Tunberg/Palmstierna (eds.), *Affaires étrangères*, pp.66-8.

⁶¹⁴ A.Munthe, '1648-1710', in *ibid.*, p.133. He refers to a chancellery edict of 1661. For the development of these posts, see A.Forssell, '1721-1809', in *ibid.*, esp. pp.335-42.

⁶¹⁵ G.Thuillier has outlined the history of the establishment, although he does not use all available sources and fails to integrate the French debate into a comparative framework: 'L'Académie politique de Torcy', *RHD*, 97 (1983), 54-74; *La Première école d'administration. L'Académie politique de Louis XIV* (Geneva, 1996). Cf. J.Klaits, 'Men of Letters and Political Reform in France at the End of the Reign of Louis XIV', *JMH*, 43 (1971), 577-97; H.Keens-Soper, 'The French Political Academy: A School for Ambassadors', *European Studies Review*, 2 (1972), 329-55.

⁶¹⁶ See N.Conrads, *Ritterakademien in der Frühen Neuzeit. Bildung als Standesprivileg im 16. und 17. Jahrhundert* (Göttingen, 1981), pp.23-86. Count Hauterive, who collected material on the academy in the early nineteenth century, regarded the 'Collège des Quatre Nations' as its predecessor, AAE, MD France 2168, fo.19. This is not substantiated, however, by the study of B.de Faucompret, *Les Pensionnaires du collège Mazarin ou des Quatre Nations: 1688-1794* (Paris, 1992).

⁶¹⁷ On the curriculum in France, see W.Rüegg (ed.), *Geschichte der Universität in Europa*, ii (Munich, 1996), pp.116-7; L.Brockliss, *French Higher Education in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries* (Oxford, 1987).

actors from the highest levels of government, such as the Marquis de Torcy, the Marquis d'Huxelles and Cardinal Dubois; erudite councillors such as LeGrand and the abbé Renaudot; functionaries of the 'bureaux' such as the elder Pecquet and LeDran; French diplomats such as the Marquis de Bonnac; and authors of diplomatic treatises such as Chamoy, Callières and Pecquet the younger.

In the first decades of the eighteenth century, when France was straining all its resources to defend its hegemony in the wars and negotiations relating to the Spanish Succession, criticism of the diplomatic service mounted. In court and government circles, its efficiency and professionalism was questioned to an unprecedented degree. Probably as soon as the treaty of Rijswijk had been concluded, the yet unpublished treatises of Chamoy and Callières circulated in the ministry. Internal memoirs drew attention to the preparation of diplomats who too often had 'nulle connoissance des emplois où ils sont destinés'.⁶¹⁸ Torcy himself was aware of the problem. The Marquis, who had received a thorough education designed for a foreign secretary, realised that 'bien peu de gens voulaient suivre une route stérile qui ne produisait que des chagrins, la ruine et souvent le déshonneur de ceux qui s'y engageaient'.⁶¹⁹ He had in mind the lesser ranks of diplomacy, whose importance for the service he apprehended. His diary reveals that in 1711 he advised Louis XIV to appoint embassy secretaries. These appointments should not only provide an element of professionalism and continuity in the service, but also ensure the secrecy of French diplomacy, which was threatened by secretaries quitting the service in search for better-paid

⁶¹⁸ BN, Clairambault 519, fo.389 ('De l'utilité de l'arrangement des papiers [...]'). This memoir can be attributed to Saint-Prest or LeGrand and originated around 1710. On the preparation of French diplomats in the mid-seventeenth century, see A.Tischer, *Französische Diplomatie und Diplomaten auf dem Westfälischen Friedenskongress. Außenpolitik und Richelieu und Mazarin* (Münster, 1999), pp.62 ff.

⁶¹⁹ *Journal inédit de Jean-Baptiste Colbert Marquis de Torcy [...] 1709, 1710 et 1711*, ed. F.Masson (Paris, 1884), p.124. On Torcy, cf. J.C.Rule, 'A Career in the Making: the Education of Jean-Baptiste Colbert, Marquis de Torcy', *French Historical Studies*, 19 (1996), 967-96; F.Duffo, *Jean-Baptiste Colbert, Marquis de Torcy, ministre des affaires étrangères sous Louis XIV* (Paris, 1934).

employment.⁶²⁰ The theorists Chamoy and Callières also suggested the institution of embassy secretaries, predicting that 's'en formeroit de bons ouvriers à présent si rares et si nécessaires en ces sortes d'employs'.⁶²¹ The suggestion had already put forward in 1666 by Courtin, ambassador to England, who referred to the practice of Spain and England to 'donner des secrétaires à tous les ambassadeurs'.⁶²² The focus on the secretaries proved crucial in the design of the French academy. On the other hand, the scheme of a 'seminary' to train embassy secretaries was indebted to two proposals that had come to the attention of the ministry in 1696.

The first project was concerned with the employment of ambassadors after their return.⁶²³ Their expertise should be used in a 'chambre diplomatique' to advise the king. This council should furthermore serve as a diplomatic school for sons from noble and rich families.⁶²⁴ Following this preparation, they should rise from secretary to resident and ambassador, thus providing a well-trained cadre of diplomats and foreign policy advisors. The idea of establishing a council of diplomatic both as an advisory body and as seminary for future diplomats was also advocated by the 'Testament de Charles V de Lorraine'. This script was probably composed by the Imperial councillor Heinrich von Stratman in 1687 and published around 1696.⁶²⁵ It was originally designed for the Habsburg government, but found its way into the hands of those who conceived the French academy. Ironically, the reform

⁶²⁰ *Journal de Torcy*, pp.124 and 380-1; cf. Thuillier, *École d'administration*, pp.27-8.

⁶²¹ Callières, *De la manière*, p.141; Chamoy, *Parfait ambassadeur*, pp.18, 28. Callières referred to the previous practice in France as well as to the Swedish 'secrétaires de commission'.

⁶²² AAE, CP Angleterre 87, fo.126, cf. Thuillier, *École d'administration*, p.28.

⁶²³ BN, Fonds Arnoul 21443, fos.274-77, cf. Thuillier, *École d'administration*, pp.5-11, who infers the 'intendant' P. Arnoul as author.

⁶²⁴ Thuillier, *École d'administration*, pp.6, 9-11.

⁶²⁵ BN, Clairambault 519, fos.285-305; *Testament politique de Charles de Lorraine et de Bar. Déposé entre les mains d'Empereur Leopold [...] en faveur du Roy d'Hongrie et ses successeurs arrivans à l'Empire* (Leipzig, c.1696). The publication was probably arranged by Lorraine's secretary, the abbé de Chèvremont. Further editions appeared in 1697, 1744 and 1760. Count Stratman (or Strattmann, 1637-93) entered the Imperial service in 1676 and served as diplomat to Nijmegen and Rijswijk, and later as Imperial councillor. See WBIS, entry 'D482-261-7'.

proposal was initiated by the need to counter the French dominance in European politics. It suggested establishing an 'académie de politiques' linked to the emperor's cabinet. Foreign policy should be discussed in weekly conferences.⁶²⁶ Sons of ministers and young noblemen were to be attached to this council, but persons 'du merite mesme sans naissance' should not be excluded.⁶²⁷ From this academy, diplomats at the major European courts were obliged to select an assistant, who carried out the functions of an embassy secretary.⁶²⁸ After their return, the 'chargés' should serve in the academy before they were appointed as diplomats.⁶²⁹

The reception of this project in the reform-orientated circle around Torcy is confirmed by a memoir of c.1711, which weighs the 'Projet de Lorraine' against a first draft of the academy statutes ('Projet du Louvre').⁶³⁰ It took over the method of weekly conferences, but did not yet limit the target group, just referring to 'ceux qui se sentiront quelque goût pour les affaires estrangères', and suggesting to appoint six students with a pension and the title of 'conseiller' or 'secrétaire'. For the practical part of training, the students should be attached to embassies, receive a pension and report to the secretary of state. Similar to the former project, the French proposal outlined a career path for the secretary-diplomat, rising from smaller to greater courts. After the end of their diplomatic career, the former students should serve in the administration of foreign policy.⁶³¹

According to a later memoir dating from the 1770s, the establishment of embassy secretaries was a subject of some discussion in the French government: Louis XIV's secretary

⁶²⁶ BN, Clairambault 519, fos.286, 301.

⁶²⁷ Ibid., fo.287.

⁶²⁸ Ibid., fo.289. The memoir went on to list the six principal courts, e.g. Constantinople, Rome, Warsaw, London, Madrid and Paris, outlining for each the character of the diplomat and the 'ministre en second'.

⁶²⁹ Ibid., fo.298.

⁶³⁰ 'Projet sur l'estude et les ouvrages des papiers du ministere', BN, Clairambault 519, fos.317-9. The memoir's location in the dossier suggests that the reception took place in Torcy's circle, probably through LeGrand.

⁶³¹ Ibid.

Noblet had proposed to appoint 'conseillers d'ambassade' in 1707.⁶³² In 1710, Pecquet the elder apparently took up this plan and suggested assigning twenty 'conseillers secrétaires d'ambassade' to the ministry.⁶³³ As in Torcy's proposal of 1711, the target group of the scheme was the subaltern staff of diplomacy.⁶³⁴

Apart from the discussion on embassy secretaries and the reception of diplomatic theory and earlier training proposals, the academy statutes were shaped by the suggestions of the abbé LeGrand. LeGrand sought to combine diplomatic training with work in the archives and the establishment of a 'science of foreign policy' featuring diplomatic history and 'droit public'.⁶³⁵ His memoir of 1711 strongly resembled Callières' treatise: it criticised the French art and science of negotiation, drew parallels to the military service and attacked the 'négligence' towards the diplomatic profession.⁶³⁶ LeGrand even went on to create an ideal-type of the future secretary-diplomat in the theorists' fashion, although not without stating that 'j'ay bien peur qu'on marquant icy les qualitez que je leur souhaiterois, je ne donne l'idée de l'homme qui ne se trouve point'.⁶³⁷ The academy's curriculum mirrored the suggestions of theorists: it should comprise the study of history, international law (Grotius, Pufendorf), model copies of diplomatic correspondence as well as modern languages. The plan linked the academy with the establishment of a science treating 'les interests de la France par raport aux divers estats de l'Europe' and the 'étude du droit public'. Especially with reference to the

⁶³² 'Note historique sur le service interieur [...]', AAE, MD France 2186, fos.48-9, c.1770/71. Nothing more is known of this plan. Piccioni, *Premier commis*, pp.186-7, informs us that Noblet succeeded his father to the post of 'secrétaire du Roi' in 1685 and became commis in 1698, after having acted as secretary in Rome and Poland.

⁶³³ 'Note historique', MD France 2186, fo.49. The proposal could not be identified. Cf. footnote 314.

⁶³⁴ MD France 2168, fos.51C-E [*sic!*]. See also the statutes redrafted by the abbé Renaudot in BN, NAF 7487, fo.392. On Renaudot, who was a close friend of Callières, cf. Bély, *Espions et ambassadeurs*, pp.331-2; WBIS, entry 'F153188'.

⁶³⁵ Abbé J.LeGrand, ecclesiastical and diplomatic historian, was attached to the foreign ministry from 1705 as Torcy's 'conseiller historique' and worked in the archives. In 1720 he succeeded Saint-Prest as their director. He had some diplomatic experience, having served as secretary to the embassy in Portugal and as advisor to the abbé d'Estrées. See WBIS, entry 'F112276'.

⁶³⁶ 'Autre projet en 1711', BN, Clairambault 519, fos.321-32 as draft, fos.333-52 as 'Projet d'estude'.

⁶³⁷ *Ibid.*, fo.333^v.

latter, LeGrand stressed the need to follow the example of neighbouring countries in reforming the study of law.⁶³⁸ The stress on a 'science' of foreign policy that comprised the interests of state, public law and diplomatic history runs through his contributions to the academy.⁶³⁹ Linked to this was another function of the academy: it should serve LeGrand's and Saint-Prest's plans to collect, order and extract the French diplomatic documents in the newly established 'dépôt des affaires étrangères' (1710).

Instigated by the proposals of LeGrand, Clairambault⁶⁴⁰ and Saint-Prest,⁶⁴¹ Torcy had presented a scheme to the King in 1710, which established diplomatic archives and initiated the compilation of 'mémoires' of past negotiations.⁶⁴² In this project, six 'élèves' were to work under Saint-Prest's supervision, in order to acquire 'connoissances nécessaires pour pouvoir estre employé de la part du Roy dans les cours estrangères'.⁶⁴³ The connection between diplomatic archives and training was already established at this point. LeGrand had envisaged the academy partially as a historical institute and applied his own historiographical experience to Louis XIV's reign.⁶⁴⁴ He championed a 'diplomatic history' that 's'appliqueroit moins à raconter des faits et descrire des batailles qu'à descouvrir la source et la cause des mouvements et des guerres, dont l'Europe a esté agitée pendant le dernier siècle'.⁶⁴⁵

⁶³⁸ Ibid., fos.333/4 and 333/8 [sic!].

⁶³⁹ See his 'De la manière d'estudier l'histoire', BN, Clairambault 519, fos.353 ff.

⁶⁴⁰ The genealogist and historian P.de Clairambault was another advisor to Torcy. He was closely acquainted with LeGrand and also took part in the discussions leading to the academy, see Baschet, *Histoire du dépôt*, pp.106-7; Keens-Soper, 'French Political Academy', p.334; *WBIS*, entry 'F40268'.

⁶⁴¹ J.Y.de Saint-Prest, legal scholar and archivist, had joined the department in 1682 and later acted as secretary to Torcy. In 1710 he was appointed director of the archives, in 1711 director of the academy. He died in 1720. See Piccioni, *Premier commis*, pp.183-6, who also lists a number of his memoirs on the history of negotiations.

⁶⁴² AAE, MD France 251, 'Projet pour faire une histoire sur les dépêches [...]', fos.81-97, continued as 'Idée du travail [...]', fos.121-6, and 'Moyens de remplir l'idée [...]', fos.127-131; cf. 'Sur le fond [...]', fos.132-3. On the archives, cf. Baschet, *Histoire du dépôt*.

⁶⁴³ MD France 251, fo.135.

⁶⁴⁴ BN, Clairambault 519, 'Projet de former un corps d'histoire [...]', MD France 251, fos.81 ff. Cf. LeGrand's 'De la manière d'estudier l'histoire' and the copy of Fresnoy's 'Méthode pour étudier l'histoire [...]' in Clairambault 519.

⁶⁴⁵ Clairambault 519, 'Autre projet', fo.333/9 [sic!]. Cf. the plan attributed to Saint-Simon, 'Projet d'une histoire des traités depuis Vervins à Nîmes' (1679), AAE, MD France 374.

Comparable to the emerging 'state science' in the Empire, this project endeavoured to treat foreign policy as a historical-empirical phenomenon.⁶⁴⁶ Against the background of this historiographical project, LeGrand sketched out a first plan, assigning a particular negotiation to each member of staff. This method was later adopted in the academy.⁶⁴⁷ Both Saint-Prest and LeDran composed numerous memoirs on the history of negotiations, international law and ceremonial.⁶⁴⁸ These works would, in turn, serve to instruct academy students.

In his proposal, LeGrand had suggested advancing the study of public and international law, including the 'droit public de l'Europe'. There existed neither a university chair nor books by French authors, apart from a poor translation of Grotius.⁶⁴⁹ This placed France at a disadvantage, 'au lieu que les Anglais, les Allemands et d'autres peuples ont commenté et expliqué le traité du droit de la guerre et de la paix [i.e. Grotius, H.K.], et ont depuis composé tant de livres sur cette matière que cela fait aujourd'hui une bibliothèque entière'.⁶⁵⁰ Another memoir outlined the work on the sources of diplomatic law, especially international treaties, in order to build a true 'corps de droit public' on the basis of Wicquefort's treatise.⁶⁵¹

The various proposals were discussed within Torcy's circle and resulted in a first draft of the academy statutes. It is hard to tell from the available source material the degree of participation and influence of theorists. Pecquet's father, who dominated the bureaux as premier commis in the 1710s, must have been acquainted with the scheme. Callières was

⁶⁴⁶ Klaits, 'Men of Letters', p.594, points to the model of Pufendorf's blend of history, politics and law.

⁶⁴⁷ Clairambault 519, 'Projet pour le travail [...]', fos.397 ff.

⁶⁴⁸ N.LeDran, attached to the archives, commis from 1711, premier commis from 1725 and director of the archives from 1730, produced numerous memoirs on foreign policy, especially on the history of treaties and ceremonial in the MD France series. See Samoyault, *Bureaux*, p.101; Piccioni, *Premier commis*, pp.218-9. Saint-Prest composed several 'mémoires historiques et politiques', cf. Samoyault, *Bureaux*, pp.102-8.

⁶⁴⁹ Barbeyrac's Grotius translation was only published in 1724. Cf. J.Jusserand, 'Grotius étudié par les secrétaires d'ambassade français en 1711', *Bibliotheca Visseriana*, 8 (1929), 1-2.

⁶⁵⁰ BN, Clairambault 519, fo.333/4. Klaits attributed this to the King's suspicion of the study of modern history: 'Men of Letters', p.595.

⁶⁵¹ Clairambault 519, 'De l'utilité de l'arrangement', fo.388.

familiar with members of Torcy's circle, in particular the abbé Renaudot. Furthermore, his position as secretary to the 'conseil du Roi' from 1697 suggests proximity with Torcy himself, for whom he composed several memoranda.⁶⁵² Apart from his earlier proposals, the influence of Chamoy, who died in 1711, is difficult to substantiate, although it is probable that one of his sons attended the academy.⁶⁵³ Of the drafts Torcy demanded from his advisors, those of LeGrand, Saint-Prest and Renaudot have survived. In 1711, the academy's statutes were approved by Torcy and Louis XIV.

Torcy was to choose six young men, who were to be instructed by Saint-Prest and his secretary Dupuis.⁶⁵⁴ They were supposed to work on the dispatches and papers in the 'dépôt du Louvre', in addition to their 'études particulières'. The academy's target group was a much debated issue. LeGrand sought to limit it to noble and rich families, attaching importance to their personal qualities. Yet, he also advocated widening the focus to incorporate future residents, envoys and even ambassadors.⁶⁵⁵ In the final version of the statutes, the number of students was raised to twelve: six 'pensionnaires' and six 'surnuméraires', 'jeunes gens de bonne famille' with a 'fortune suffisante' and a pension of 1,000 francs, who should become embassy secretaries.⁶⁵⁶ The academy set to work in 1712.

As Saint-Prest's account reveals, the syllabus consisted of four parts: firstly, the work on archival material and the composition of memoirs on diplomatic history; secondly, the reading of publications on diplomatic theory and international law, especially Grotius, Pufendorf, and Wicquefort; thirdly, the study of languages (Italian, Spanish and German);

⁶⁵² See Schweizer, *François de Callières*, pp.15, 71, who even suggests that the publication of Callières' treatise might have been encouraged by the new academy.

⁶⁵³ See below.

⁶⁵⁴ C.Dupuis was officially appointed as secretary to the academy in 1715, see AAE, MD France 2168, fo.33^v. He succeeded Saint-Prest as 'garde des registres' in 1720, see Samoyault, *Bureaux*, p.283.

⁶⁵⁵ Clairambault 519, fos.440-2.

⁶⁵⁶ Hauterive, 'Note sur l'école fondé en 1712', MD France 2168, fo.19. See also LeGrand's letter to Torcy, BN, Clairambault 519, fo.438.

and finally, conferences under the director's supervision.⁶⁵⁷ In the conferences, the students would present memoirs on various matters of diplomatic history and international law, and discuss Saint-Prest's own compositions on the 'state of Europe' and the history of treaties.⁶⁵⁸ In the second year, they also studied accounts of previous negotiations – a method favoured by diplomatic theory. The curriculum incorporated current events: the negotiations at Utrecht formed already a part of the syllabus.⁶⁵⁹ In the third and fourth year, the 'élèves' studied the principal dynasties and their pretensions, the history of the European states and their negotiations, as well as diplomatic ceremonial.⁶⁶⁰ One version of the statutes had proposed to teach them the 'devoirs d'un bon secrétaire d'ambassade', although we are not informed on particulars.⁶⁶¹ Thus, the academy embraced a curriculum comparable to that developed by diplomatic theory.

No official list has survived of the academy's students, and it is difficult to identify the persons referred to by Saint-Prest and Hauterive. Several participants are known to have entered the diplomatic career in the capacity of embassy secretaries, rising to residents and envoys. These included Chamoy, probably a son of Rousseau de Chamoy, who became embassy secretary in Regensburg,⁶⁶² and Blondel, career diplomat and expert on the

⁶⁵⁷ AAE, MD France 251, 'Projet des exercices', fos.178-82.

⁶⁵⁸ Ibid., fo.176. Thuillier regards the 'méthode de la conférence' as crucial innovation of the academy: 'Pour une théorie de la conférence', *Revue administrative*, 286 (1995), 422-6. This method had already been proposed by the drafts of Lorraine and Arnoul.

⁶⁵⁹ MD France 2168, fos.30-1. In his 'Projet des exercices', Saint-Prest elaborated on the syllabus, setting up six fields of study, one for each student: five had to work on a European region, the sixth on diplomatic law, ceremonial and the 'maximes de la bonne politique', BN, Clairambault 519, fo.418.

⁶⁶⁰ MD France 251, fos.31-3.

⁶⁶¹ BN, NAF 7487, fo.398^v.

⁶⁶² See J.Ulbert, *Frankreichs Deutschlandpolitik im zweiten und dritten Jahrzehnt des 18. Jahrhunderts. Zur Reichsperzeption französischer Diplomaten während der Regentschaft Philipps von Orléans (1715-1723)* (Berlin, 2004), p.64.

Empire.⁶⁶³ Moreover, it has been speculated that the later secretary of foreign affairs, the Marquis d'Argenson, attended the academy.⁶⁶⁴

Saint-Prest reported to Torcy on the students' progress. Apparently, the marquis was satisfied with the academy's workings and often attended the 'conferences' himself.⁶⁶⁵ His successor from 1715, the Marchal d'Huxelles, at first approved of the academy, which continued its teaching in a satisfactory way until 1717, adding the 'droit germanique' to its syllabus.⁶⁶⁶ However, disorders were becoming visible in 1718. Saint-Prest admitted that the students were not applying themselves enough to the archival work.⁶⁶⁷ As a result, Huxelles instructed him to reform the academy, and demanded to be informed more regularly about their progress.⁶⁶⁸ Yet, the new secretary of state, Cardinal Dubois, soon displayed dissatisfaction with the academy.⁶⁶⁹ And a year after Saint-Prest's death in 1721, he closed the academy and dismissed the students, 'étant informé du peu d'utilité de leurs travaux au dépôt et sachant qu'ils abusaient des connoissances qu'ils y avaient acquises, pour [p]résider la critique dans le public des opérations du ministère'.⁶⁷⁰

The suppression can be attributed to several reasons. First of all, the students' disinclination to an assiduous work dominated by reading, extracting archival material and

⁶⁶³ See P.Fould, *Un diplomate au XVIIIe siècle: Louis-Augustin Blondel* (Paris, 1914); S.Externbrink, 'Von Versailles nach Wien. Zum Deutschlandbild bei Louis-Augustin Blondel', in T.Hoepel, M.Middell (eds.), *Deutschlandbilder, Frankreichbilder 1700-1840* (Leipzig, 2000), 75-92.

⁶⁶⁴ Thuillier, *École d'administration*, pp.93-4; Keens-Soper, 'French Political Academy', p.353; Baschet, *Archives*, p.137. R.de Paulmy, Marquis d'Argenson (1694-1757) was intendant in the 1720s, before becoming secretary for foreign affairs in 1744, cf. *WBIS*, entry 'F4846'. However, there is no evidence in the sources that a 'Argenson' attended the academy.

⁶⁶⁵ 'Memoire de [...] les assemblées du cabinet du Louvre' (1712-18), MD France 2168, fos.28-39. Cf. Hauterive's 'Note sur l'école', *ibid.*, fos.19-22. On N.de Blé, Marshal d'Huxelles, who had risen in the army before negotiating in 1710-14, see J.Ulbert, *Frankreichs Deutschlandpolitik*, pp.27-31.

⁶⁶⁶ MD France 2168, fos.28, 33^v, 35.

⁶⁶⁷ MD France 251, fos.135-6. Cf. MD France 2168, fo.35^v.

⁶⁶⁸ According to Hauterive, MD France 2168, fo.12^v. Huxelles' comments on the academy are not documented, except in a letter to Saint-Prest of 10 Sept.1717, MD France 251, fo.171. Saint-Prest composed a 'Projet du rétablissement', MD France 251, fos.175-83.

⁶⁶⁹ MD France 2168, fo.38.

⁶⁷⁰ 'État des bureaux [...] sous l'abbé Dubois', 1718-23, *ibid.*, fo.47. Cf. MD France 251, fos.136-7.

composing memoirs hampered the academy from within, putting into question Saint-Prest's authority and his method of diplomatic training. Secondly, Torcy's enthusiasm for the scheme gave way to indifference and lack of ministerial support. This was linked to a third issue: the question of secrecy seems to have been a central reasons for the closure. From the beginning, there had been a degree of unease with imparting secrets of state to students 'qui [...] ne servient pas grand scrupule de révéler ce qu'ils auroient appris'.⁶⁷¹ Although Torcy had argued that diplomatic secrecy would best be served by creating a professional cadre of state servants and even managed to persuade Louis XIV of this plan, an institutionalised training in the archives containing the *arcana imperii* was considered hazardous and collapsed at the earliest hint of abuse. With reference to the fundamental problem of *arcanum* and public criticism, the Marquis d'Argenson later compared this to the suppression of the Entresol academy.⁶⁷² Finally, it has been argued that the academy was unsuccessful because the notion of a formalised diplomatic training and career went against the established practice of recruitment and patronage serving the interests of the high nobility.⁶⁷³

Nevertheless, the academy did become a role model for subsequent discussions about diplomatic training, not only in France, but also in other European countries. In the Republic of Letters, it had become known soon after its inception: the *Amsterdam Gazette* and the *Mercure historique* printed reports in early 1712.⁶⁷⁴ These were taken up by Addison, the editor of *The Spectator*, who informed the English public that 'from this seminary are to be chosen secretaries of embassies, who by degrees may advance to higher employments'. However, this account bore a satirical tone when reporting that 'speculative statesmen' taught

⁶⁷¹ BN, Clairambault 519, fo.453.

⁶⁷² *Journal et Mémoires de Marquis d'Argenson*, ed. E.J.B.Rathery (Paris, 1859), i, p.103.

⁶⁷³ Cf. Thuillier, *École d'administration*, p.111; Klaitz, 'Men of Letters', p.590.

⁶⁷⁴ *Mercure historique*, 1712, lii, p.292.

'young Machiavels' the 'negative arts', including 'the art of opening letters'. French diplomats were the true 'espions honorables' in Addison's view.⁶⁷⁵

After the closure of the academy in 1722, the issue of diplomatic training continued to remain a concern of the French government. Criticism of the diplomatic service had already been raised at the change of government after Louis XIV's death, when the Marquis de Bonnac, French ambassador, claimed that poor preparation, payment and career perspectives were responsible for the lack of professional diplomats.⁶⁷⁶ In 1722, a 'Mémoire pour l'établissement d'une académie de politique' once more complained of the French neglect of the 'science' of foreign affairs.⁶⁷⁷ It formulated a plan of study quite similar to the suppressed academy, albeit with a wider target group: 'une telle académie formeroit des envoyez, des ambassadeurs, des plenipotentiaires, et des secrétaires et ministres d'état, des chanceliers et autres premiers officiers de la couronne'.⁶⁷⁸ The proposal included a detailed list of volumes of political theory and diplomatic history, featuring Wicquefort as well as selected memoirs on negotiations and treaties.⁶⁷⁹

Even the abbé Saint-Pierre embraced the idea of a diplomatic training in his plans to reform the French government. These came to the ministry's attention in 1722.⁶⁸⁰ Saint-Pierre suggested 'académies politiques', both as advisory councils and as institutions for diplomatic

⁶⁷⁵ *The Spectator*, xxxv, 19 Feb.1712.

⁶⁷⁶ AAE, MD France 310, fos.265-7 (1715). Bonnac (1672-1738) served in Constantinople, Spain, Switzerland, Poland and the Empire. He also proposed to reform the 'jeunes de langue' scheme, see below. Cf. WBIS, entry 'D321-890-8'.

⁶⁷⁷ AAE, MD France 2168, fos.14-7. The author of this piece is unknown, but a connection to the former academy is likely.

⁶⁷⁸ MD France 2168, fo.14^v.

⁶⁷⁹ See also a 'Mémoire sur les moyens de perfectionner le gouvernement du côté de la négociation', MD France 312, fos.113-8. The memoir bears neither date nor signature; it probably originated in 1723-24. It called for a 'pépinière d'excellens negotiateurs', drawing a parallel between the diplomatic and the military service. Cf. the 'Lettre contenant des réflexions sur les connoissances nécessaires à un ministre [...]', c.1719, MD France 251, fos.1-17.

⁶⁸⁰ 'Nouveau plan du gouvernement', MD France 1251, fos.36-58.

training.⁶⁸¹ Hauterive mentions further memoirs of the 1720s by former students of the academy such as LeRoy, Lagau and Melon,⁶⁸² as well as the 'premier commis' and diplomatic theorist Pecquet the younger.⁶⁸³ The perceived neglect of the 'science of foreign policy' also gave rise to a rather different institution in the 1720s: the 'Club Entresol', which discussed international affairs, the system of government, trade and legal matters. Its members included reform initiators such as Saint-Pierre, as well as ambassadors and future foreign secretaries, for example the Marquis d'Argenson or the brothers Saint-Contest. Even the retired Torcy attended some meetings.⁶⁸⁴ Although the Entresol was not concerned with diplomatic training, it carried on the academy's function of promoting the knowledge of the interests of state. Its suppression in 1731 mirrored the concern with secrecy that had contributed to the end of the 'académie politique'.⁶⁸⁵

The discussion was rekindled after the end of the Seven Years' War, at the same time as the debate about diplomatic training would gain increasing prominence in the states of the Empire. Around the mid-eighteenth century, the French department of foreign affairs had fully evolved into a bureaucratic ministry. The 'connaissances' propagated by theorists and reformers had become of increasing importance for the administrative staff, too, for example the knowledge of diplomatic documents, the interests of state, and foreign languages. As in other countries, the boundaries between the diplomatic service and the central administrative staff remained fluid, and the commis frequently took on diplomatic assignments.⁶⁸⁶ In practice, the 'bureaux' could provide some form of training for diplomats, as could the

⁶⁸¹ Ibid., fo.36^v.

⁶⁸² MD France 2168, fos.12^v-13. There is no further evidence on these proposals.

⁶⁸³ According to Hauterive, Pecquet redrafted a 'Projet de Statutes', which, however, is lost (MD 2168, fo.13).

⁶⁸⁴ Childs, *Entresol*, pp.6-7. Cf. Briggs, *Political Academies of France*.

⁶⁸⁵ Childs, *Entresol*, pp.3, 7-8, 132-3.

⁶⁸⁶ On the diplomatic experience of the administrative staff, see Samoyault, *Bureaux*, pp.159-78. After the mid-eighteenth century, the premier commis were expected to have gained experience in embassies, in contrast to their predecessors such as the Pecquet and the LeDrans. Of twenty-six premier commis in the eighteenth century, only six were of noble birth, cf. Piccioni, *Premier commis*; Baillou, *Affaires étrangères*.

practice of young noblemen accompanying embassies.⁶⁸⁷ From the 1760s, calls were raised to regulate this practice in the form of an 'academy'.

In 1764, Réal's treatise once more deplored the neglect of state science and training: 'Il n'y a dans cette monarchie ni académie de politique, ni cabinet d'état, ni chairs de droit public, ni professeurs de droit des gens, ni règle certaine, pour élever de bons sujets'.⁶⁸⁸ After listing the customs of other European countries in preparing their diplomats, Réal went on to recommend the appointment of embassy secretaries and the work on 'papiers des négociations étrangères'.⁶⁸⁹ Within the foreign ministry, the brothers Gérard, former students of the Strasbourg academy, diplomats and premier commis, took up earlier suggestions.⁶⁹⁰ Conrad-Alexandre recommended the creation of a 'noviciat politique' attached to the 'bureaux', where the candidates should work on diplomatic correspondence and familiarise themselves with diplomatic practice.⁶⁹¹ In a memoir of 1786, Gérard reflected upon the practice in northern Europe, the Empire and Russia, where 'gentilshommes [...] se destinent dès leur plus jeune age à ces emplois', either in the chancelleries or in the embassy retinues.⁶⁹² In contrast to his former plan, however, Gérard now envisaged the military academy as institutional framework for the education of embassy secretaries.⁶⁹³ A final memoir called for 'une institution propre à former des secrétaires d'ambassade'.⁶⁹⁴ Their

⁶⁸⁷ See Béchu, 'Ambassadeurs français', pp.342-4; idem, 'La Formation d'un ambassadeur'.

⁶⁸⁸ Réal, *Science du gouvernement*, i, fo.xix.

⁶⁸⁹ Ibid., fo.xx.

⁶⁹⁰ The family Gérard came from Alsace. Conrad-Alexandre had been embassy secretary in the Empire before becoming premier commis in 1766. He was the first diplomat to the U.S.A. in 1778 and was anobled upon his return. His younger brother Gérard de Rayneval also served as embassy secretary and resident in the Empire, and was appointed premier commis in 1774. See Samoyault, *Bureaux*, pp.288-9; Piccioni, *Premier commis*, pp.247-50.

⁶⁹¹ Gérard to Duc d'Aiguillon, 16 Dec.1771, AAE, Personnel I/33, fos.35-7.

⁶⁹² 'Plan d'instruction relative à l'art des negociations pour les élèves de l'école royale militaire [...] par Gérard', MD France 2168, fos.52-7. Thuillier attributes this memoir to Hennin, but the author was probably Conrad-Alexandre, who was involved in the 'école militaire', see Samoyault, *Bureaux*, p.288. The project corresponds to the suggestions of 1723/24 in MD France 312.

⁶⁹³ MD France 2168, fos.54-56.

⁶⁹⁴ Ibid., fos.58-68. This memoir might have been written by either brother Gérard.

occupation was still considered as 'une carrière aussi désagréable'. On the other hand, Gérard admitted that the training had to be confined to the subaltern staff, because 'nos ambassadeurs et nos ministres ne sont pas d'une trempe à s'assujettir à aucune institution régulière. La génie de la nation et du siècle s'y opposent!'. As a consequence, he proposed to establish the rank of 'conseiller d'ambassade' and oblige the nobility to fill minor posts before heading embassies.⁶⁹⁵ In 1788, eight 'conseillers' were appointed.⁶⁹⁶

All these proposals took up the ideas that had been formulated around 1700. In this respect, it is also worth mentioning the 'Plan d'étude et de conduite pour un jeune homme qui se destine aux affaires étrangères', which was composed by a member of the foreign ministry in 1786/87.⁶⁹⁷ Although this memoir falls into the category of an informal treatise, its institutional context and the curriculum it devised place it the same class as the above-mentioned proposals. Apart from (diplomatic) history, the interests of states and the 'droit public', the memoir recommended the study of diplomatic treatises (Mably and Bielfeld) and treaty collections.⁶⁹⁸ Another late eighteenth-century 'Projet d'une école politique' still criticised the lack of a 'science de politique' and proposed not only to establish a university chair in public law and to appoint language and history teachers, but also to create a 'pépinière', 'où le ministre puisse trouver dans tous les temps un nombre suffisant de sujets instruits, sûrs, et éprouvés pour remplir les places même les plus en sous-ordre des affaires étrangères'.⁶⁹⁹ In contrast to former projects, this plan put more stress on acquiring

⁶⁹⁵ Ibid., fos.65^v-66. The scheme of 'conseillers d'ambassade' had been probed already in 1771-74, cf. Baillou, *Affaires étrangères*, p.205.

⁶⁹⁶ See Baillou, *Affaires étrangères*, p.207; cf. the 'Note historique sur le service interieur', MD France 2168, fos.48-51^v.

⁶⁹⁷ Ed. by A.Ruiz, 'Aux origines de la diplomatie contemporaine: de l'ambassadeur improvisé à la formation du spécialiste', *RHD*, 87 (1973), 38-95.

⁶⁹⁸ Ibid., pp.94-5.

⁶⁹⁹ AAE, MD France 2186, fos.70-8, undated.

knowledge about 'commerce', which had become the 'base des intérêts politiques'.⁷⁰⁰ The students should later serve as embassy secretaries and diplomats as well as consuls.⁷⁰¹ Thus, for the first time the education of the diplomatic and the consular staff were combined. The discussion about the preparation of diplomats continued into the revolutionary period. In the early nineteenth century, the practice of attaching future diplomats to the foreign ministry and the embassies abroad finally became established.⁷⁰² Hauterive's 'Conseils à un élève du ministère des relations extérieures' once more underline the longevity of the reform discussion.⁷⁰³

In identifying shortcomings in the preparation of French diplomats, the eighteenth-century discussion reveals that the 'model function' of French diplomacy was not uncontested. The issue of secrecy, the absence of an academically instituted 'science of foreign policy', and the noble dominance of the upper ranks of diplomacy obstructed the re-establishment of Torcy's academy. Nonetheless, practical experience attained a higher position in the French diplomats' preparation. At the same time, the 'Académie politique' became the role model for debates on diplomatic training in eighteenth-century Europe.

⁷⁰⁰ Ibid., fo.74^v. Cf. the previous 'Mémoire sur le commerce' (c.1700), MD France 1990, fos.13-8.

⁷⁰¹ MD France 2186, fos.75-7.

⁷⁰² For this period, see also the 'Note des aspirans et élèves diplomatiques [...]', MD France 2186, fos.87-93.

⁷⁰³ MD France 2186, fos.132 ff. Hauterive managed to implement his project in conjunction with the 'école des archives', see A.Meininger, 'D'Hauterive et la formation des diplomates', *RHD*, 89 (1975), 25-69. Hauterive had been a 'gentilhomme d'ambassade' in Constantinople before he became director of the first political division in 1799 and 'garde des archives' in 1807. See *WBIS*, entry 'F89032'.

Diplomatic Preparation in Great Britain: Modern History and Languages

It is generally acknowledged that the professionalism of English and British diplomats in the eighteenth century was a source of repeated criticism.⁷⁰⁴ In the last years of the seventeenth century, for instance, Viscount Lonsdale deplored the defective education of future diplomats: 'To that negligence are we grown that it is not so much as thought of to educate any in qualifications for foreign ministry or embassy, so that in reality, we are the scorn and contempt of all the courts of Europe; having scarce anybody that understands anything relating to our own, or the common interest of princes'.⁷⁰⁵ As in France, diplomatic theory fuelled this criticism. The editor of the English translation of Callières (1716) complained of the neglect in the choice, preparation and treatment of English diplomats. In his view, this was partly due to defects in the general education; he claimed that 'in all foreign countries, most of the gentry, even those of the highest rank, and greatest estates, study at least the first elements of the civil law, and the law of nations, of history, and of the interests of the respective princes of Europe'. Consequently, 'gentlemen of this country [...] should apply themselves early to such studies'. At the same time, he demanded a distinct career outline and an encouragement that good service would be rewarded upon return.⁷⁰⁶ Among British theorists of diplomacy, the best ways of preparing diplomats were debated. While some advocated the study of subjects relating to the 'science of foreign policy' as developed in the Holy Roman Empire, others ranked higher the aristocratic and courtly education according to

⁷⁰⁴ See the examples in Black, *British Diplomats*, pp.50-63; Horn, *British Diplomatic Service*, pp.122-4. Criticism of the diplomatic service was often used against the current government, cf. J.Black, 'The British State and Foreign Policy in the Eighteenth Century', *Trivium*, 23 (1988), 127-48.

⁷⁰⁵ *Memoir of the Reign of James II* (York, 1808), pp.viii-ix. Lonsdale had entered Parliament in 1677, was a member of the Privy Council, the Treasury Board, and Leader of the Commons, see J.V.Beckett, 'Lowther, John, first Viscount Lonsdale (1655-1700)', *Oxford DNB*.

⁷⁰⁶ Callières, *The Art of Negotiating with Sovereign Princes [...]* (London, 1716), preface to the English reader, pp.xi-xii.

the French model, as for example William Keith and Lord Stanhope, earl of Chesterfield.⁷⁰⁷ Moreover, in his 'Rules to be observed by a Foreign Minister' (1766), Thomas Villiers, Earl of Clarendon, recommended the continental practice of attaching young gentlemen to embassies, in addition to the study of international law, history, languages, and the treatises of Wicquefort and Pecquet.⁷⁰⁸

As the eighteenth century progressed, journalists and pamphleteers took up the criticism of diplomatic preparation: in 1760, *The Monitor* called for diplomats 'who have given proofs that they are capable of conducting, with ability and dexterity, that important business of negotiation'. Apart from experience, they should possess 'a perfect knowledge of the interests, pretensions and connections of the several European states; a well-grounded skill in the principles of public law [...]; a thorough acquaintance with the commerce, [...] and a clear apprehension of the rights, pre-eminences and just claims of their own sovereign'.⁷⁰⁹ Within the government and in the two secretariats of state, diplomatic recruitment also became an issue of increasing concern. In 1734, for example, William Wyndham, minister under Queen Anne and Tory leader, criticised Walpole for appointing diplomats who did not possess sufficient knowledge or qualifications.⁷¹⁰ Charles Jenkinson observed in 1758, while serving in the secretariat, that one reason for the inadequate preparation of diplomats was the absence of a science of foreign policy and international law in Britain: 'Though the English are very great politicians, they have, I believe, fewer books

⁷⁰⁷ This was combined with calls for diplomats of high noble status, who were ascribed more authority on the international stage, see for example Black, *British Diplomats*, p.43.

⁷⁰⁸ BL, Add.MS 34713, fos.279-89. Clarendon held several appointments in the Empire before returning to domestic politics, see A.F.Pollard, 'Villiers, Thomas, first Earl of Clarendon (1709-86)', *Oxford DNB*.

⁷⁰⁹ *The Monitor, or British Freeholder*, 5 Jan.1760, pp.1405-6. Cf. *ibid.*, 17 Oct.1761, p.1970, for criticism of the British performance in the 'art of negotiation'. Similar criticism can be found for example in *The Present State of the Nation*, 3rd edn (Dublin, 1768), p.98; and in P.Thickness, *A Year's Journey through the Pais Bas and Austrian Netherlands*, 2nd edn (London, 1778), p.245.

⁷¹⁰ According to Black, *British Diplomats*, p.52. Cf. S.W.Baskerville, 'Wyndham, Sir William, third Baronet (c.1688-1740)', *Oxford DNB*.

on public law or anything that relates to foreign policy than any other nation in the world'.⁷¹¹ Diplomats partook in this debate: in the later eighteenth century, Robert Murray Keith, army officer and career diplomat, demanded that 'the King should brede his foreign ministers from the cradle to that calling'.⁷¹² Throughout the eighteenth century, criticism of standards of diplomatic professionalism and calls for a reform continued. The British debate can be compared to the situation on the continent, but it was conducted in wider circles than in France, and often partisan in nature, mirroring the internal situation in a limited monarchy and parliamentary government.

The French academy had become known in Britain immediately after its inception in 1712.⁷¹³ Despite his satirical commentary in *The Spectator*, Addison acknowledged that there was no English counterpart 'at Smyrna or St. James' to 'furnish out as able envoys and secretaries as an academy that is set apart for that purpose'.⁷¹⁴ Yet, parallel to the French attempts to institutionalise diplomatic training, a reform discussion began in Britain, which featured similar proposals and strategies.

In 1712, the diplomat Abraham Stanyan presented his 'Reflections upon the management of our foreign affairs' to Bolingbroke's ministry.⁷¹⁵ He criticised the fact 'that little care has been taken in the choice of the persons whom the crown has generally employed in forreign courts as to their qualifications either in relation to their course of

⁷¹¹ Quoted according to Black, *British Diplomats*, p.52.

⁷¹² *Memoirs and Correspondence (official and familiar) of Sir Robert Murray Keith*, ed. G.Smyth (London, 1849), ii, p.442. Cf. A.du Toit, 'Keith, Sir Robert Murray, of Murrayshall (1730-95)', *Oxford DNB*. See also Lord Auckland's criticism in 1796, *Journal and Correspondence of William, Lord Auckland [...]*, iii (London 1861), pp.329-31.

⁷¹³ *The Spectator*, xxxv, 19 Feb.1712.

⁷¹⁴ Ibid.

⁷¹⁵ PRO, SP 96/15. No response to this proposal can be identified. From a merchant family background, Stanyan had studied law and made diplomacy his career, starting as secretary in Constantinople. Through Trumbull's patronage, he was appointed embassy secretary to Venice and Paris. In 1705, he became envoy to the Swiss cantons; in 1716, envoy to Vienna; in 1717, ambassador to Constantinople. Cf. P.Woodfine, C.Gapper, 'Stanyan, Abraham (c.1669-1732)', *Oxford DNB*.

studys, genius, or experience'.⁷¹⁶ Stanyan lamented that diplomats were paid badly, forgotten when abroad and, upon their return, neither given a domestic post nor a pension. This neglect he attributed to the recruitment practice based on considerations of birth and political and party allegiance instead of experience and capacity.⁷¹⁷ In order to improve the situation, Stanyan proposed to establish a 'council of state of forreign affairs' composed of former diplomats – a plan similar to the 'Projet Lorraine' and the French discussion.⁷¹⁸ This council should not only serve as advisory body on foreign policy, but also as diplomatic chancellery as well as training ground for future diplomats.⁷¹⁹ Stanyan only briefly outlined the diplomats' 'connaissances', including Latin and French, international law, history, and in particular 'the history of treatys and negotiations'. Yet, he did not specify a curriculum or a method of training, but left it to the council to recommend 'some proper regulations on this subject'.⁷²⁰ In the meantime, he proposed to send young persons abroad in order to become acquainted with foreign courts and negotiations. In this way, the government would 'hav' men ready upon all ocasions skill'd in negotiations'.⁷²¹ Although Stanyan's reflections were not taken up by the ministry, they reveal that schemes comparable to the French reform debate were contemplated in early eighteenth-century Britain. This is further underlined by a reform proposal of twelve years later, which concentrated on two key features of diplomatic training: modern history and languages.

At the instigation of Edmund Gibson, Bishop of London, and Lord Townshend, secretary of state, George I founded two Regius chairs at the universities of Oxford and

⁷¹⁶ SP 96/15, fo.1.

⁷¹⁷ Ibid., fos.7-8, 11-14. As a remedy, a special fund should be set up to disburse the diplomats (fo.22). Foreign affairs should be allotted to one, domestic affairs to the other secretary of state, fo.49.

⁷¹⁸ Ibid., fos.4, 16-9. The councillors should have served seven years abroad, 'in quality at least of envoy', and should be chosen on the ground of 'experience in forreign affairs' (fo.11).

⁷¹⁹ As in France, the connection with diplomatic archives was made by Stanyan: these would not only serve as a method of instructing new diplomats, but also 'be of very great advantage to the essence of history itself', fo.17.

⁷²⁰ Ibid., fos.20-1.

⁷²¹ Ibid., fos.38-9, naming the Venetian practice as model.

Cambridge in 1724.⁷²² Gibson had suggested to appoint professors for modern history and languages, as well as a number of 'king's scholars', in order to contribute to a reform of the scholastic university curriculum and to educate future church and state servants attached to the new ministry;⁷²³ 'and the service of the state by reason of continual correspondence with foreign courts and agencies therein, requiring in a peculiar manner the knowledge of the modern or living languages, both in speaking and writing'.⁷²⁴ This was linked to criticism of the preparation of the young nobility and gentry, who, in want of a proper institution to teach these subjects, went abroad, often under the guidance of foreigners. Not only was this a reflection of the debate whether or not the *Grand Tour* was advisable, but it also related to the question of loyalty and secrecy in the diplomatic service, which had occupied the Marquis de Torcy.⁷²⁵ In contrast to France, on the other hand, it was the universities which were to provide 'constant supplys of learned and able men to serve the publick both in church and state' – under more immediate royal inspection.⁷²⁶

To this end, the two Regius professors for modern history each instructed twenty scholars and maintained subordinate language teachers for French, Italian and German. Later, the secretaries of state would undertake to employ the scholars in their *bureaux* or in

⁷²² In connection with diplomatic training, this institution has been referred to only by Horn, *British Diplomatic Service*, pp.131-2, and Black, *British Diplomats*, p.7.

⁷²³ C.Firth, *Modern Languages at Oxford 1724-1929* (Oxford, 1929), p.3. On Gibson, see S.Taylor, 'Gibson, Edmund (1669-1748)', *Oxford DNB*.

⁷²⁴ George I to the Vice-Chancellor of Cambridge, 16 May 1724, signed by Townshend; and to the University of Oxford, PRO SP 44/152, fos.1-2.

⁷²⁵ Ibid. On the *Grand Tour*, see J.Black, *The British Abroad. The Grand Tour in the Eighteenth Century* (Stroud, 1992).

⁷²⁶ Townshend to the Vice Chancellor of Cambridge, undated, PRO SP 44/152, fo.30. Cf. the royal edict, signed by Townshend, 18 May 1724, *ibid.*, fo.16. Cf. E.Bill, *Education at Christ Church, Oxford, 1660-1800* (Oxford, 1988), p.57. The universities' response emphasises this once more, embracing the idea that 'there shall be a sufficient number of academical persons well versed in the knowledge of foreign courts, and well instructed in their respective languages [...] able to furnish you with a constant supply of persons every way qualified for the management of such weighty affairs and negotiations', Chancellor of Cambridge to Townshend, 19 May 1724, PRO SP 44/152, fos.9-10; cf. *ibid.*, fo.13, for Oxford.

embassies.⁷²⁷ The first professors were David Gregory and Samuel Harris.⁷²⁸ Lists of scholars were drawn up for Oxford⁷²⁹ and for Cambridge.⁷³⁰

The scheme subsisted from 1725 to 1728. Annually, the professors and their teaching staff reported to Townshend and Newcastle on the students' progress.⁷³¹ Gregory's first account provides a good idea of the curriculum. Apart from language teaching in French, Italian and, in some cases, German or Dutch, the students chose from English and European history, international law, chancellery practice in English, Latin and French, as well as from church history. The reports from Oxford, however, also unveiled problems: several students could not keep pace and abandoned the scheme, while others used the scholarship only as an 'ornamental part' to their chosen profession; usually the church.⁷³² On the other hand, some had already embarked on a diplomatic and administrative career, as clerks in Townshend's office or as secretaries abroad.⁷³³

The scheme fell into disuse after the first group of scholars had left in 1728.⁷³⁴ From what we know, only six finally obtained employments as secretaries.⁷³⁵ Gregory was

⁷²⁷ Letter to the Chancellor of Cambridge, 16 May 1724, SP 44/152, fo.3.

⁷²⁸ SP 44/152, fo.24. Cf. J.W.Clark, *Endowments of the University of Cambridge* (Cambridge, 1901), pp.185-6. Neither of the professors had diplomatic experience. Gregory, a graduate of Oxford, had travelled abroad and was fluent in several languages. A Whig supporter with connections to the court, he became dean of Christ Church, see E.T.Bradley, rev. S.J.Skedd, 'Gregory, David (1695/6-1767)', *Oxford DNB*. Harris, a clergyman, educated at Peterhouse, Cambridge, held the post 1724-33, see S.Lee, rev. S.J.Skedd, 'Harris, Samuel (1682-1733)', *Oxford DNB*.

⁷²⁹ SP 44/152, letters of appointment of Dec.1724; 31 Jan.1726; 22 Nov.1726.

⁷³⁰ Ibid., letters of appointment of 27 Feb.1725; 31 Jan.1725; 30 Apr.1727. See also O.Browning, 'King's Scholars in Modern History and Modern Languages, 1724-1727', *The Cambridge Review* (1897), 117-9, 145-7.

⁷³¹ See SP 44/152 for the Cambridge reports to Newcastle, 14 Oct.1725, fos.55-7; to Townshend, 3 March 1727, fos.74-5; and the Oxford reports to Newcastle, 28 Oct.1725, fos.59-61; to Townshend, 3 Nov.1726, fos.70-1.

⁷³² Report of 28.Oct.1725, *ibid.* fos.59-61; report of 3 Nov.1726, *ibid.*, fos.70-1.

⁷³³ These were W.Chetwynd and G.West from Oxford, and W.Titley and J.Snow from Cambridge, see the reports of 3 Nov.1726, *ibid.*, fo.71, and of 3 March 1727, SP 44/152, fos.74-5; cf. J.C.Sainty, *Officials of the Secretaries of State 1660-1870* (London, 1973), pp.59-62.

⁷³⁴ See Clark, *Cambridge*, p.84; Browning, 'King's Scholars', p.146. See also Gibson to [a secretary of state], 29 Nov.1727, SP 36/4, fo.45.

⁷³⁵ G.West and J.Dale worked in the secretariat of state. The former was employed under Townshend, before devoting himself to religious writing, cf. P.Wilson, 'West, Gilbert (1703-56)', *Oxford DNB*. W.Chetwynd was sent to the Empire, J.Snow to Sweden, and W.Titley to Savoy before he became resident minister in Denmark 1729-66. Cf. G.Norgate, 'Titley, Walter (1698-1768)', *Oxford DNB*. In addition, J.Burnaby worked in the

convinced that a more careful choice of students would have contributed to a successful development of the scheme, but 'several gentlemen were put upon His Majesty's institution, who have neither any inclination to the study of history and languages nor any genius to make any advancement therein'.⁷³⁶ Furthermore, the secretaries of state were unwilling or unable to procure employment for the scholars.⁷³⁷ That the Regius chairs, which continued after 1728, did not become centres of diplomatic training was also due to the conservative outlook of the universities in terms of curriculum and method. Thus, the education and preparation of British diplomats was left to the individual initiative.⁷³⁸

As in France, state science was not taught at British universities, even if political arithmetic and political economy gradually became established as disciplines.⁷³⁹ Nevertheless, and to a higher degree than in France, many diplomats had attended universities. In addition to Oxford and Cambridge, the Scottish universities in Edinburgh and Aberdeen were noted for their focus on modern languages.⁷⁴⁰ Furthermore, continental noble academies could be attended in the course of the Grand Tour, on which more and more British noblemen and gentlemen embarked in the eighteenth century.⁷⁴¹

ministry, became secretary at Paris and Stockholm, and minister to the Swiss Cantons. H.Bland became secretary in Constantinople.

⁷³⁶ SP 36/6, fo.72^{r-v}, Gregory to Townshend, 24 May 1728.

⁷³⁷ Firth, *Modern Languages*, p.14; Black, *British Diplomats*, p.7; Horn, *British Diplomatic Service*, pp.131-2.

⁷³⁸ The education of British diplomats has not attracted much attention, apart from the remarks in Horn, *British Diplomatic Service*, and Black, *British Diplomats*. On the general curriculum, see F.Watson, *Beginnings of the Teaching of Modern Subjects in England* (London, 1909); G.Brauer, *Theories of Gentlemanly Education in England, 1660-1775* (New York, 1959).

⁷³⁹ Klueting, *Lehre von der Macht*, p.30. Cf. Ruegg (ed.), *Geschichte der Universität in Europa*, ii, esp.116-7, 122-6, 480-6; S.Woolfe, 'Statistics and the Modern State', *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 31 (1989), 588-604.

⁷⁴⁰ See Horn, *Scottish Diplomats, 1689-1789* (London, 1944), pp.12-3; idem, 'Edinburgh University and the Diplomatic Service, 1714-89', *Edinburgh Journal* (1944), 27-33.

⁷⁴¹ See Black, *The British Abroad*. Cf. O.Walker, *Of Education, Especially of Young Gentlemen* (Oxford, 1672), cf. Brauer, *Theories of Gentlemanly Education*, p.35; J.Gailhard, *Two Discourses. The First Concerning a Private Settlement at Home after Travel. The Second Concerning the Statesman, or Him who is in Publick Employments*, 2nd edn (London, 1682), i, esp. p.181.

However, the need to establish a more practice-orientated curriculum, which would prepare the British gentleman for the state service in the military, the government and the embassies became ever more pressing. A growing number of proposals brought forward by theorists and educational reformers from the later seventeenth century underlines this. The programme of noble education proposed by Stanhope, earl of Chesterfield, aimed at a diplomatic-political career. He suggested travelling and the study of modern European history, politics and languages. Above all, Chesterfield stressed the 'art of pleasing' and 'polite knowledge' in the preparation for diplomacy, a concern shared by other theorists of noble education.⁷⁴² In 1757, *The Centinel* called for an 'academy' to form statesmen and prepare them in the art of negotiation, in order to defend Britain's interests abroad. The imaginary institution comprised a 'dancing school', a 'geography school', an 'ambassador's school' (in which Wicquefort's treatise should be studied as well as the situation and interests of states, and the art of negotiation), and a school for the 'modern art of treaty-making'.⁷⁴³

Although no further attempts were made to institutionalise diplomatic training in the eighteenth century, the practice of preparation gradually improved in Britain. As in other countries, young gentlemen increasingly travelled abroad in order to improve their language skills and their knowledge of other countries. The *Grand Tour* was sometimes transformed into an apprenticeship in the retinues of embassies.⁷⁴⁴ Apart from gathering experience abroad, some British diplomats began their career in the secretaries' office. This had been the case with Stanyan, whose colleague Matthew Prior had argued in 1694 that 'from a seat in the office one may leap abroad after having learnt the routine'.⁷⁴⁵ Finally, the practice of using

⁷⁴² Chesterfield, *Lettres à son fils*. Cf. Brauer, *Theories of Gentlemanly Education*, pp.37, 95, 153-9.

⁷⁴³ *The Centinel* [ed. T.Francklin], 27 Nov.1757, cf. Black, *British Diplomats*, pp.33-4.

⁷⁴⁴ Horn, *British Diplomatic Service*, p.131. On the other hand, the 1724 proposals had criticised the practice of travelling abroad, see PRO, SP 44/152, fo.2. There was debate in the theoretical literature on the benefits of the Grand Tour, see Brauer, *Theories of Gentlemanly Education*, pp.167-87.

⁷⁴⁵ Cited according to Horn, *British Diplomatic Service*, pp.141-2.

the post of secretary as entrance into the diplomatic service became more widespread from the late seventeenth century.⁷⁴⁶ As in France, the official establishment of the post took place only in the 1780s. Attached to the newly-created Foreign Office, and inspired by 'the practice of other nations', these posts should encourage 'gentlemen of suitable rank and proper qualifications to enter into the diplomatic line'. They were to 'begin at the inferior residences [...] in the natural expectation of succeeding to the principal ones', and 'gentlemen thus regularly trained in the school of politics and who may have given proof of their abilities, will undoubtedly become ministers in their turn'.⁷⁴⁷ After the establishment of the Foreign Office (1782), these modes of preparation became more uniform. Yet, on a large scale the appointment of embassy secretaries and 'attachés' was only introduced after 1815, and the issue of diplomatic training remained a concern in the nineteenth century.⁷⁴⁸

The attempts to render the British diplomatic service more professional, especially in the field of education and training, were part of the same process and the accompanying theoretical reflection as on the continent. Ensuing schemes and debates were to some extent instigated by the suggestions of diplomatic theory, but also by the perceived need to counter the diplomatic skill of other countries, notably of France; a motivation that became palpable around the time of the Utrecht negotiations and the institution of the French academy. Compared to France, however, attempts at establishing a distinct foreign service were less numerous and less high-ranking in the concerns of the secretariats of state, not least because

⁷⁴⁶ Cf. M. Lane, 'The Diplomatic Service under William III', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 4th series, 10 (1972), pp.92, 106; Horn, *British Diplomatic Service*, p.37; Black, *British Diplomats*, p.156. See also the note of Townshend to Saphorin in Vienna, who should introduce Charles Harrison to the diplomatic métier: 'Il apprendra avec plaisir son métier de vous, il étudie vos leçons, et tachera de se former sur votre modèle', 22 Aug.1724, PRO, SP 80/48, unpaginated. This practice was also recommended by theorists, see Rogers, *Ambassador's Idea*, fos.24^v, 28^v, 52; Gailhard, *The Statesman*, p.184.

⁷⁴⁷ See the 'Memorandum on the creation of the post of Secretary of Embassy (1786/87)', PRO, FO 366/525, unpaginated. On the beginnings of this practice, see the council memorandum of 1635, which had ruled that 'secretaries of ambassages' should receive no extra allowance, because 'it is but a new custome brought in of late, and a double charge [...]', PRO, SP 9/187, fo.450. After 1815, embassy secretaries were appointed to all missions, see C.R. Middleton, *The Administration of British Foreign Policy 1782-1846* (Durham, 1977), p.217.

⁷⁴⁸ See Middleton, *Administration of British Foreign Policy*, pp.214 ff.

the recruitment practice in a limited monarchy was dominated even more by domestic and party concerns. The plans to align noble education to diplomacy and to institute a part of the diplomatic preparation at the universities were only partly successful and lagged behind the successful blend of academic and noble education in the Empire. Yet, the early eighteenth-century discussion prepared the agenda for the reforms implemented after the establishment of the Foreign Office.

Diplomatic Training and Noble Academies in Imperial Austria

The alignment of the Imperial foreign service to a resident, European-wide diplomacy took place in the century following the Peace of Westphalia.⁷⁴⁹ As in France and England, diplomacy was not regarded as a career in its own right, but as an intermediary step to a more rewarding office at the court in Vienna, in the numerous Imperial institutions or in the Habsburg dominions. Even more than in France, the high nobility from the Austrian lands and the Empire dominated diplomacy, while the lower nobility and bourgeoisie could only fill the ranks of secretaries and residents.⁷⁵⁰ The recruitment was complicated by the intricate division of power in Vienna.⁷⁵¹ Although the Austrian emperors had many rewards, posts and titles to bestow, even for them it proved at times difficult to find 'subjects who are qualified for such a post, and, if they are, who actually would want to be burdened with an embassy'.⁷⁵²

Given the Austrian nobility's reluctance to make diplomacy their career, noblemen from other

⁷⁴⁹ Müller, *Kaiserliches Gesandtschaftswesen*, pp.60-86; Matsch, *Auswärtiger Dienst*, p.105; K.Malettke, 'Les Diplomates de l'Empereur: une contribution à la recherche sur les élites politiques aux XVIIe et XVIIIe siècles', in J.-M.Boehler *et al.* (eds.), *Les Élités régionales (XVIIe-XXe siècle): Construction de soi-même et service de l'autre* (Strasbourg, 2002), 25-33; J.Bérenger, 'La Diplomatie impériale', in Bély (ed.), *L'Invention de la diplomatie*, 125-38.

⁷⁵⁰ For the 240 diplomats between 1648 and 1740, Müller provides the following allocation: 61% from the high nobility, 22% from the lower nobility, and 12% commoners (*Kaiserliches Gesandtschaftswesen*, p.235). On the background, cf. J.v.d.Horn Melton, 'The Nobility in the Bohemian and Austrian Lands, 1620-1780', in Scott (ed.), *European Nobilities*, ii, 110-43.

⁷⁵¹ See Müller, *Kaiserliches Gesandtschaftswesen*, pp.22-33, 215-33; cf. Ehalt, *Wiener Hof*.

⁷⁵² Report of the 'Geheimer Rat', 10 Feb.1650, HHSTA, Staatskanzlei, Vorträge 2, fo.98.

parts of the Empire or foreigners were often employed.⁷⁵³ Yet, it was still the case in 1721 that 'the Emperor, who has more than two hundred officers, two hundred chamberlains, and over a hundred secret councillors, is often hard pressed to find among them an ambassador'.⁷⁵⁴ Before his accession in 1711, Charles VI himself had commented on the deficient qualification of diplomats, suggesting 'that it would be good to learn from one's enemies; so we should endeavour to have some persons with all the ministers at foreign courts, who instruct them in negotiations, and raise them to become diplomats'.⁷⁵⁵

As a rule, there was no special training for diplomats beyond the general noble education: private tutoring by a 'Hofmeister', attendance of noble academies in Austria, the Empire or abroad, and a *Grand Tour*.⁷⁵⁶ The 'service nobility' and lower charges were mostly educated in Latin schools and at the universities' legal faculties. Afterwards, the Austrian government and court in Vienna, as well as the Imperial institutions, such as the 'Reichshofrat' and the 'Reichshofkanzlei', offered experience in politics. Furthermore, the political stage of the Empire could serve as training-ground, notably the Imperial Diet. As in other countries, the informal practice of accompanying embassies as 'cavaliers' or 'gentilshommes' provided another opportunity to travel and gain experience in diplomacy.

The rank of secretary, on the other hand, was filled with functionaries of a different social background. Although several secretaries managed to advance to residents, the secretarial post did not yet have the function of an official apprenticeship, even if it constituted a professional element in the service. The importance of qualified and

⁷⁵³ See Müller, *Kaiserliches Gesandtschaftswesen*, pp.237-9.

⁷⁵⁴ The Danish envoy Berkentin to Christian VI, 16 Apr.1721, quoted in Müller, *Kaiserliches Gesandtschaftswesen*, p.181. Müller stresses the absence of a strong 'noblesse de robe' in Austria, which resulted in the small number of 'career' diplomats, *ibid.*, p.186.

⁷⁵⁵ '...undt als Minister nachzigleten', Charles to Wratistlaw, Barcelona, 31 July 1711, in 'Correspondenz des Königs Karl III von Spanien (Karl VI.) mit Wratistlaw', ed. A.v.Arnoeth, *Archiv für Österreichische Geschichte*, 16 (1856), p.206. See also Bartenstein's report, 2 Aug.1728, HHSTA, Staatskanzlei, Vorträge 27, fo.4^v.

⁷⁵⁶ Müller, *Kaiserliches Gesandtschaftswesen*, pp.244-5; cf. H.Engelbrecht, *Geschichte des österreichischen Bildungswesens*, ii (Vienna, 1983).

experienced secretaries had already been realised by Count Portia in 1650: 'If the ambassador is only there to cut a fine figure, it is even more necessary to attach a knowledgeable secretary to him, who is the clockwork of the embassy, while the ambassador is the clock's hand'.⁷⁵⁷ From the turn of the eighteenth century, and parallel to the reforms in the central direction of foreign affairs, attempts were made to improve the preparation of diplomats. As an early move in this direction, the proposal attributed to the Imperial councillor Straatman, published as the legacy of Charles de Lorraine (1687/96), has to be mentioned once more, since it was addressed to the Habsburg emperors. As outlined above, in order to counter the French dominance, it proposed to establish a council of diplomatic experts as an advisory body for foreign policy and as a training school for embassy secretaries.

In the early eighteenth century, only a few 'Gesandtschaftssekretäre' were appointed, often opposed by the treasury ('Hofkammer').⁷⁵⁸ To improve the overall professionalism of the Imperial diplomatic service by establishing the post of embassy secretary as training ground became the concern of the directors of foreign policy from 1730. In 1732, Johann Christoph von Bartenstein, head of the secret chancellery and main foreign policy advisor, suggested appointing Imperial secretaries to all embassies.⁷⁵⁹ These should not only ensure the continuity and secrecy of the legations' chancelleries, but also turn out future diplomats. A full implementation of this scheme, however, was opposed not only on financial grounds, but also by some ambassadors who were unwilling to admit an independent officer into their

⁷⁵⁷ Count Portia to Lamberg, 1650, quoted according to Müller, *Kaiserliches Gesandtschaftswesen*, p.96. Portia had been ambassador to Venice in 1647-52.

⁷⁵⁸ See for example the 'Bezahlungsreglement' of 1728, HKA, Reichsakten 171, fos.516-7.

⁷⁵⁹ Memoir of 23 Nov.1732, HHSTA, Staatskanzlei, Vorträge 36, fos.257^v-58. Bartenstein (1690-1767), son of a Strasbourg professor, entered the Austrian government in 1715. He was advisor on foreign policy to Charles VI and later Maria Theresia, without actually possessing diplomatic experience. He also directed the state chancellery's archives (set up in 1741) and composed several tracts for the education of the future Joseph II. When Kaunitz took over the Staatskanzlei in 1752, Bartenstein became vice president of the 'Directorium', see *WBIS*, entry 'D728-571-4'; M.Braubach, 'Johann Christoph Bartensteins Herkunft und Anfänge', *MIÖG*, 61 (1953), 99-149.

retinue.⁷⁶⁰ Yet, Bartenstein continued to address the want of trained diplomats during the following years, and proposed reforms to Maria Theresia. Some of them bore resemblance to the schemes devised in France: future diplomats should either serve as embassy secretaries or gain practical experience in the 'Staatskanzlei' responsible for foreign affairs.⁷⁶¹ In a 1742 memorandum to Uhlfeld, who had been appointed official director of foreign affairs, Bartenstein repeated this proposal and pointed to the examples of France, Saxony and other countries.⁷⁶² In 1745, his suggestions were finally taken up: on Maria Theresia's orders, he was to recommend suitable candidates for training in the chancellery.⁷⁶³ Yet, the scheme was not officially instituted, maybe because the Silesian Wars brought other concerns to the forefront. Bartenstein resumed his suggestions in 1749 and proposed, in connection with a reorganisation of the state chancellery's archives, to train seven young gentlemen.⁷⁶⁴ By linking diplomatic education with work on archival documents, his plan bears strong resemblance to the French academy as well as to the contemporary Prussian 'pepinière'.

Despite his criticism of Bartenstein's leadership, Count Kaunitz took up his suggestions on diplomatic training.⁷⁶⁵ In 1751, he suggested turning the recently reformed 'Staatskanzlei' into a 'pepinière' for young noblemen who should gain practical experience

⁷⁶⁰ Müller, *Kaiserliches Gesandtschaftswesen*, p.98.

⁷⁶¹ See G.Klingenstein, 'Kaunitz contra Bartenstein. Zur Geschichte der Staatskanzlei 1749-1753', in H.Fichtenau, E.Zöllner (eds.), *Beiträge zur neueren Geschichte Österreichs* (Vienna, 1974), 243-63. See also his proposal to train candidates for diplomacy in the Empire, 26 Oct.1743, HHSTA, Staatskanzlei, Vorträge 53, fo.74.

⁷⁶² Draft of c.1742, HHSTA, Staatskanzlei, Interioria 1, fos.13-4. The parallels to Kaunitz's later suggestions are striking. The reference to France, England, Spain and Saxony is curious, since in neither court the practice was uniform in this respect. On Saxony, see below; on Spain, see D.Ozanam, *Les Diplomates espagnols du XVIIIe siècle. Introduction et répertoire biographique, 1700-1808* (Madrid, 1998), pp.70-93.

⁷⁶³ Bartenstein to Maria Theresia, 31 Aug.1745, HHSTA, Staatskanzlei, Vorträge 55, fo.33.

⁷⁶⁴ Ibid., fos.55-60, report of Bartenstein, 21 May 1749.

⁷⁶⁵ Wenzel Anton Count Kaunitz (1711-94) entered the Imperial service in 1735, acted as envoy to Turin, as councillor in the Austrian Netherlands and as plenipotentiary to the congress of Aachen (1748). Following an embassy to Paris (1750-53), he was appointed state chancellor and directed the 'renversement des alliances'. He continued to dominate Austrian foreign policy under Joseph II. See WBIS, entry 'D444-717-2'; G.Klingenstein, *Der Aufstieg des Hauses Kaunitz* (Göttingen, 1975); L.Schilling, *Kaunitz und das Renversement des Alliances. Studien zur außenpolitischen Konzeption Wenzel Antons von Kaunitz* (Berlin, 1994).

before serving as diplomats; a practice, he argued, which had already been successfully applied in France and in Saxony.⁷⁶⁶ He also linked the training of future statesmen and diplomats to the establishment of archives.

L'affaire essentielle et principale, c'est de travailler pour la postérité et de faire un établissement [...] que retire des archives [...] les notions utiles et qui puisse servir à l'avenir de pépinière aux ministres et subalternes, qui doivent nous succéder, d'école enfin capable de nous faire espérer que nous ne manquerons jamais de sujets.⁷⁶⁷

At the same time, the scheme to attach noblemen to embassies was not lost from view. In a discussion of 1749, Kaunitz and other councillors agreed that 'the most able ministers abroad should be given one or more young cavaliers, who should acquire routine experience in foreign affairs'.⁷⁶⁸ Kaunitz himself was accompanied on his embassies by young noblemen such as Zinzendorf and Starhemberg, who later became diplomats.⁷⁶⁹

Parallel to the discussion on a diplomatic apprenticeship, suggestions were brought forward on how to institutionalise the theoretical education of future state-servants in universities and academies. The foundation of several academies in mid-eighteenth century Vienna was, to some degree, connected to the debate about diplomatic training.⁷⁷⁰ Apart from the 'Theresian military academy', a noble academy was created in 1746, at first under the direction of the Jesuits, and from 1749 as 'Theresianische Ritterakademie'. This institution was devised with a practical focus on the Imperial state service.⁷⁷¹ In addition to the general

⁷⁶⁶ *Correspondance secrète entre le Comte Kaunitz-Riedberg et le Baron de Koch 1750-52*, ed. H.Schlitter (Vienna, 1899), xiv, undated letter [late 1751], pp.257-8. See also Klingenstein, 'Kaunitz contra Bartenstein', p.257. Klingenstein also points to the French secretariat as model for Kaunitz's reforms in the state chancellery: 'Institutionelle Aspekte', p.87. In how far Kaunitz was informed about the Prussian 'pépinière', on the other hand, is not documented.

⁷⁶⁷ *Correspondance Kaunitz*, p.159.

⁷⁶⁸ 'Konferenzvota über das Auswärtige System', 18 March 1749, HHSTA, Staatskanzlei, Vorträge 62, fos.335^v-36. On the implementation of these suggestions, no further information is available.

⁷⁶⁹ G.Klingenstein, 'Kaunitz contra Bartenstein', p.258; Müller, *Kaiserliches Gesandtschaftswesen*, pp.244-6.

⁷⁷⁰ On Austrian noble academies in the seventeenth century, albeit without reference to diplomacy, cf. Engelbrecht, *Geschichte des Bildungswesens*.

⁷⁷¹ See J.Schwarz, 'Geschichte der [...] Theresianischen Akademie [...]', *Jahresbericht des Gymnasiums der k.k.Theresianischen Akademie* (Vienna, 1890), 1-110. Owing to restructuring, the academy's archives were

education provided by the Jesuits, modern languages and legal studies were offered by professors from Vienna University. The professor of public law, Christian August Beck, had provided a first draft for a reorganisation of the academy, which was examined by a commission of Imperial councillors and approved in 1752.⁷⁷² In the following years, Johann Justi taught 'Cameral- und Commercialwesen', Johann Picker lectured on legal practice, and, analogous to the 'Staatsakademie' at Hanau, Professor Beck instructed the pupils in law and chancellery practice, probably relying upon his *Versuch einer Staatspraxis oder Kanzleyübung aus der Politik, dem Staats- und Völkerrechte*.⁷⁷³ Although the academy was in first place established to educate state-servants for the domestic administration, it was also designed to provide a first schooling for the diplomatic service.⁷⁷⁴ Moreover, the curriculum was amended with optional subjects: Beck suggested lecturing on international law, the diplomatic history of the European states, and the history of treaties. In addition, the draft of 1752 proposed to create a 'diplomatic manual', although nothing further is known about this plan.⁷⁷⁵ In 1758, the institute was merged with another noble-political academy founded in 1746: the 'Savoyische Ritterakademie'.⁷⁷⁶ Several late-eighteenth century diplomats counted among the students of the two institutes.⁷⁷⁷ Apart from the academies of noble and political

inaccessible. But see HHSTA, Staatskanzlei, Wissenschaft 5, fos.197^v-200^v; cf. E.Guglia, R.Taschner, *Das Theresianum in Wien. Vergangenheit und Gegenwart* (Vienna, 1996).

⁷⁷² C.A.v.Beck (1720-81) was appointed professor of law at the Theresian academy in 1748. He also instructed the future Joseph II in public law. See *WBIS*, entry 'D730-528-7'.

⁷⁷³ Justi (1717-71), celebrated cameralist and political economist, also influenced Joseph II's reforms, although he left Austria already in 1754. His best-known work is *Der Grundriss einer guten Regierung* (Frankfurt, 1759), cf. Klueting, *Lehre von der Macht*, p.85.

⁷⁷⁴ J.Schwarz, 'Die niederen und höheren Studien an der k.k.Theresianischen Akademie in Wien', *Jahresbericht [...]* (Vienna, 1903), p.9. A member of the committee was Bartenstein.

⁷⁷⁵ Schwarz, 'Studien', p.10.

⁷⁷⁶ J.Schwarz, *Geschichte der Savoy'schen Ritter-Akademie in Wien vom Jahre 1746 bis 1778* (Vienna, 1897).

⁷⁷⁷ For example, the diplomat van Swieten was a student of the academy. Guglia only gives an overview of the first pupils, *Theresianum*, pp.95, 98; cf. Schwarz, 'Studien', pp.11-6.

education, another academy was connected with the diplomatic service: the 'Oriental Academy' founded in 1753.⁷⁷⁸

These examples serve to demonstrate that in Imperial Austria a growing concern about the preparation of diplomats was noticeable in the century after 1648. The issues raised and the strategies devised conformed to those of other countries, in particular of France: practical experience should be gained in the retinue of embassies; the embassy secretary should become a training post; and a 'pepinière' in the chancellery should provide an institutionalised apprenticeship. However, the extent of their implementation remains unclear, given the absence of studies on the diplomatic service in the second half of the eighteenth century.⁷⁷⁹ Elements of professionalism did enter Austrian-Imperial diplomacy, notably in the form of embassy secretaries and of informal apprenticeships abroad and in the chancelleries. On the other hand, it is apparent that the practice did not change substantially in the direction of a distinct diplomatic career, given the great percentage of diplomats from the highest ranks of society and government in the Imperial service.⁷⁸⁰

In the mid-eighteenth century discussion on diplomatic training, both Bartenstein and Kaunitz referred to the practice of other states. While they acknowledged the French practice as model in this respect, their suggestions also bear striking resemblance to the reform discussion of Austria's rival and opponent, Brandenburg-Prussia.

⁷⁷⁸ See below.

⁷⁷⁹ I am grateful to Prof. G.Klingenstein, Vienna, for an informal discussion on this matter. The study of Matsch, *Auswärtiger Dienst*, does not provide further information on this point.

⁷⁸⁰ See also Béranger, 'Diplomatie impériale', p.135.

Diplomatic Training in Brandenburg-Prussia: Embassy Secretaries and the 'Pepinière'

Although the central administration of Prussian foreign policy has received attention in the light of the rapid process of state building, no study exists on the Prussian diplomatic service.⁷⁸¹ Recruitment and career practice in Brandenburg-Prussia were no exception to other territories of the Empire in being determined by patronage and proximity to the king, by wealth and, progressively more so under Frederick II, by social status. In the seventeenth century, Brandenburg's diplomatic representation outside the Empire had been conducted mainly by low-ranking residents and agents, among them Wicquefort. The territorial, military and political expansion from the reign of the Great Elector, the gradual emancipation from the Empire and the acquisition of the royal title in 1701 forced Brandenburg-Prussia to adapt its diplomacy to the standing of a European power.⁷⁸² Yet it proved difficult to find suitable candidates among the landed and often impoverished 'Junker' families.⁷⁸³ The class of state servants, in which 'old nobility' and the 'noblesse de robe' ('Beamtenadel') were merged, comprised a small number of families who served in the central and provincial administration, the army and diplomacy.⁷⁸⁴

In Brandenburg as well as in other territories of the Empire, the initial preparation of state servants usually included attending universities. From the turn of the eighteenth century, the curriculum began to incorporate public law, modern history, cameral sciences and state

⁷⁸¹ For the sixteenth century, see E.-T.Thiele, *Das Gesandtschaftswesen im Preußen des 16. Jahrhunderts* (Göttingen, 1954), which is also in need of revision. On the period of study, see, in general, Kohnke, *Kabinettsministerium*; Scott, *Eastern Powers*, pp.143-51; Müller-Weil, *Absolutismus und Aussenpolitik*.

⁷⁸² See O.Hauser (ed.), *Preußen, Europa und das Reich* (Cologne, 1987); A.Schindling, 'Kurbrandenburg im System des Reiches während der zweiten Hälfte des 17. Jahrhunderts. Eine Problemskizze', *FPBG*, N.S. 7 (1987), 33-46.

⁷⁸³ On the Prussian nobility, see E.Melton, 'The Prussian Junkers, 1600-1786', in Scott (ed.), *European Nobilities*, ii, 71-109. On the nobility at court in the seventeenth century, cf. P.Bahl, *Der Hof des Großen Kurfürsten. Studien zur höheren Amtsträgerschaft Brandenburg-Preußens* (Cologne, 2001).

⁷⁸⁴ On the Prussian service nobility, see H.Hüffer, 'Die Beamten des älteren preußischen Kabinetts', *FBPG*, 5 (1892), 157-90; H.M.Sieg, *Staatsdienst, Staatsdenken und Dienstgesinnung in Brandenburg-Preußen im 18. Jahrhundert, 1713-1806* (Berlin, 2003).

science, as for example at the Prussian 'reform universities' Halle and Frankfurt/Oder. For the territorial nobility, the general education furthermore comprised travels in the Empire and perhaps the Netherlands and France.⁷⁸⁵ A small number of Prussian diplomats also attended noble academies in and outside the Empire, in particular before 'Ritterakademien' were instituted in Berlin and Brandenburg in 1705.⁷⁸⁶ In the Berlin academy, the professors Gundling, Herttenstein and Pfeiffer offered seminars in public and international law and the history of the European states.⁷⁸⁷ In Brandenburg, Kemmerich lectured on international law, political-diplomatic history, 'Staatenkunde', political prudence, and on ceremonial. This syllabus aimed at future diplomats who should, in addition, read Wicquefort, selected diplomatic memoirs and Callières' treatise *La Science du monde*.⁷⁸⁸ Thus, comparable to Austria, eighteenth-century noble academies in Brandenburg-Prussia provided a part of the 'connoissances' advocated by diplomatic theorists.

The issue of having a supply of candidates available for diplomatic postings attained an unprecedented level of attention in the late 1720s. Baron von Ilgen, Frederick William's cabinet minister and director of foreign policy, brought forward a proposal to counter the lack of qualified diplomats.⁷⁸⁹ This should be done by setting up posts of 'Legations-Secretarii'. As elsewhere, individual cases of secretaries being appointed to the Prussian embassies and

⁷⁸⁵ Cf. Kohnke, *Kabinettsministerium*, p.80. Most of the ministers and secretaries in the department had diplomatic experience, *ibid.*, pp.81, 108-9. On the education of the ministerial staff, see B.Schminnes, *Bildung und Staatsbildung. Theoretische Bildung und höhere Staatsverwaltungstätigkeit. Entwicklungen in Preußen im 18. und frühen 19. Jahrhundert* (Cleve, 1994).

⁷⁸⁶ See Conrads, *Ritterakademien*, pp.347-8; GHSTA Berlin, Rep.9, K n, fasc.2. Cf. Frederick II's 'Instruction pour la direction de l'Académie des Nobles à Berlin', in *Oeuvres de Frédéric le Grand*, ed. J.Preuss (Berlin, 1857), ix, p.79.

⁷⁸⁷ J.P.Gundling, *Kurtzer Entwurff, womit bey der Fürsten- und Ritter-Academie in Berlin [...] sein Vorhaben bekannt machet* (Cölln a.d.Spre, 1705); J.H.Herttenstein, *Kurtzer Vorbericht das Natürliche und Völcker-Recht betreffend [...]* (Cölln, c.1705).

⁷⁸⁸ D.H.Kemmerich, *Neu-eröffnete Academie der Wissenschaften, zu welchen vornehmlich Standes-Personen nützlich [...]* (3 vols., Leipzig, 1711-4), i, pp.219, 230-1, 240, 257; *idem*, *Anleitung zur Staatswissenschaft der heutigen Welt* (3 vols., Leipzig 1712-3).

⁷⁸⁹ H.R.v.Ilgen (1654-1728) had studied law and state science, entered the Brandenburg government in Minden, participated at the peace negotiations of St.Germain (1678) and was appointed to the 'Secret Chancellery' in 1679. From 1711 he directed Prussian foreign policy. See *WBIS*, entry 'D448-589-6'.

to the department of foreign affairs are documented from the late seventeenth century.⁷⁹⁰ This practice should now become more uniform. In 1726/27, Ilgen initiated a survey in order to compile a list of young gentlemen in the provinces, 'who qualify for embassies to foreign courts'.⁷⁹¹ Both noble and bourgeois candidates should be taken into consideration for a diplomatic career starting with the post of embassy secretary.⁷⁹² Although the provincial governments could contribute only a few names, the lists reveal the qualifications regarded as suitable for diplomacy: university studies of law, the knowledge of French (and other languages such as Italian), good writing skills, and travel experience.⁷⁹³ The small number of candidates was attributed to the fact that most noblemen had entered the army as officers, while the bourgeois youth either served as soldiers or did not possess enough wealth to acquire the qualifications.⁷⁹⁴ Ilgen's secretary Canngießer regarded them as less suited for diplomacy, 'since they usually lack the means and are less respected at foreign courts than noblemen, whose birth will provide them with a better 'entrée' everywhere and give them more chances to discover something, and thus better serve their master'.⁷⁹⁵ The scheme was not taken further until a year later, when Ilgen summed up his ideas in a series of memoranda composed shortly before his death in late 1728.

On Frederick William's request, Ilgen provided several memoirs on the future management of 'public affairs', including the diplomatic service.⁷⁹⁶ He began by stating that

⁷⁹⁰ See for example Rep.9, L4a, fasc.5 for the appointments of secretaries. The situation in Prussia is complicated by the fact that the title 'Legationsrat' or 'Conseiller d'ambassade' was also given to persons in the central administration and used equivalent to 'Hofrat', see the appointments in Rep.9, J12, J16 and L4.

⁷⁹¹ See the order of 15 July 1726, Rep.9, L4, fasc.6, fo.2. His secretary Canngießer had already supplied Ilgen with a first list in 1726, comprising c.50 names, Rep.9, Z L, fasc.1, fo.14.

⁷⁹² See a copy of the order (15 July 1726) in Rep.9, L4, fasc.9, signed by the King.

⁷⁹³ See the replies in Rep.9, L4, fasc.7 (Prussia), fasc.8 (Cleve, Minden, Stettin), fasc.9 (Neumark).

⁷⁹⁴ Rep.9, L4, fasc.7, unpaginated, letter of Fischhausen, undated.

⁷⁹⁵ Letter to Ilgen, 11 Jan.1727, Rep.9, L4, fasc.6, fo.1^v. On Canngießer, who had been secretary in Vienna, at the 'Reichskammergericht' and at the Imperial Diet, see *WBIS*, entry 'D352-549-6'.

⁷⁹⁶ The king's original request (9 Oct.) does not survive, but Ilgen referred to it on 10 Oct.1728, Rep.9, J3a, fasc.4, fo.4. He also provided a memorandum on the general direction of foreign affairs, recommending to keep the number of people involved small, see his 'Immediatbericht', 5 Nov.1728, *Acta Borussia*, iv.2, pp.388-93.

the personnel for embassies and the chancellery's foreign bureaux ('Expeditionen') could be recruited from the various branches of government and the army. He listed a handful of candidates both from the nobility and from the 'Bürgerstand', probably based on the above-mentioned survey. In addition, Ilgen recommended employing those who had already acquired diplomatic experience.⁷⁹⁷ As necessary qualifications, he listed the 'science' of the interests and laws of Brandenburg-Prussia and foreign countries, and the knowledge of modern languages. These qualifications were required both for diplomats and for ministers in the department of foreign affairs.⁷⁹⁸ Ilgen advised paying more attention to the education and preparation of future diplomats and attaching them as secretaries to the embassies or the department – according to the model of the Emperor.⁷⁹⁹ From this 'Pepinière oder Baumschule' future diplomats should be selected. Thus, the first idea of a 'pepinière', similar to the French and Austrian schemes, envisaged a semi-institutionalised practice of training in the form of secretaries attached to the department and the embassies.⁸⁰⁰ Nevertheless, it was not designed as a uniform and systematic training, but as a solution to the immediate need arising from Ilgen's retirement and the vacancies in the department. For the time being, he recommended his own secretaries, Thulemeier and Canngießer.⁸⁰¹ After Ilgen's death, the directors of the new 'Kabinettsministerium', Borcke, Podewils and Cnyphausen, took up his suggestions, stressing the importance of preparing ministers and diplomats.⁸⁰² Yet, the

⁷⁹⁷ Memorandum to the King, Britz, 26 Oct.1728, Rep.9 J3a, fasc.4, fos.7-16, ed. in *Acta Borussica*, iv.2, pp.378-87. Cf. R. Koser, 'Die Gründung des Auswärtigen Amtes durch König Friedrich Wilhelm I. im Jahre 1728', *FBPG*, 2 (1889), pp.164-7.

⁷⁹⁸ *Acta Borussica*, iv.2, pp.379-81.

⁷⁹⁹ *Acta Borussica*, iv.2, pp.383-5. On the archives, see C.W. Cosmar, *Geschichte des Königlich-Preußischen Geheimen Staats- und Kabinettsarchivs bis 1806*, ed. M. Kohnke (Cologne, 1993).

⁸⁰⁰ *Acta Borussica*, iv.2, p.385.

⁸⁰¹ Thulemeier (1683-1740), son of a Prussian administrator, had studied in Halle before becoming Ilgen's secretary. He directed the cabinet archives and, in 1732, became 'Wirklicher Geheimer Rat' in the foreign office, see *WBIS*, entry 'D716-118-7'.

⁸⁰² Letter to the King, 22 Nov.1728, Rep.9, J3a, fasc.4, fos.60-4. Kohnke, *Kabinettsministerium*, pp.45-8, stresses Ilgen's role in setting-up the 'Kabinettsministerium' or 'Department des affaires étrangères', which was

attempts of 1726-28 did not yield many results, not least because of the strict economy prescribed by Frederick William.⁸⁰³ On an individual basis, however, the practices of travelling and serving in subaltern posts became more widespread. For example, in 1729, the Prussian diplomat in Poland, Viebahn, was instructed to take on the 'Legationsrat' Grumbkow 'in order to let him acquire the necessary experience and 'connaissance' of foreign courts'.⁸⁰⁴

However, the concern to have qualified and trustworthy persons at hand remained. In 1737, Podewils reported that the King had acknowledged this need.⁸⁰⁵ In 1739, salaried posts of embassy secretaries were established at The Hague, London, Paris, Petersburg, Stockholm, Warsaw and Vienna, according to 'the example of other states'.⁸⁰⁶ Once more, Frederick William I's main concern was the cost of this plan. His ministers duly provided a budget draft amounting to 400 Reichsthaler *per annum*, but suggested employing candidates with sufficient wealth.⁸⁰⁷ The next step was to consult the Prussian diplomats if they were content with their own secretaries, who, in that case, were to be appointed embassy secretaries and 'chargés d'affaires'.⁸⁰⁸ Consequently, the scheme did at first not attract new candidates to diplomacy, but catered for the subaltern staff already employed. Naturally, most diplomats answered in the affirmative, seeking to retain their own loyal staff and to be relieved of the financial burden. Only the posts in Paris, London and Warsaw were filled with new

modelled on the 'Staats-Konferenz' in Vienna. On Borcke, Podewils and Cnyphausen, see the biographies in Kohnke, *Kabinettsministerium*, appendix. All three had diplomatic experience.

⁸⁰³ See Kohnke, *Kabinettsministerium*, p.191; P.Baumgart, 'Zur Gründungsgeschichte des Auswärtigen Amtes in Preußen (1713-1728)', *Jahrbuch für die Geschichte Mittel- und Ostdeutschlands*, 7 (1958), 229-48.

⁸⁰⁴ Borcke and Cnyphausen to Viebahn, 11 June 1729, Rep.9, J16, fasc.15, unpaginated. The suggestion had originally been made by Viebahn's uncle, who offered to pay for his expenses.

⁸⁰⁵ Podewils to [?], 24 Nov.1737, Rep.9, L4a, fasc.5, fo.11.

⁸⁰⁶ See Rep.9, L4, fasc.10, and the draft of 29 June 1739, *ibid.*, unpaginated.

⁸⁰⁷ Letter to the King, 3 July 1739, *ibid.* See also Podewils' letter to the King, 4 July 1739, *ibid.* In the margins to a memorandum of 29 June 1739, Frederick William I had written: 'Wo soll die Kosten herkommen und wieviel [soll] man zahlen?'. He reduced the sums in the plan of 6 July 1739, *ibid.*

⁸⁰⁸ Circular order to the Prussian diplomats, 11 July 1739, Rep.9, L4, fasc.10, unpaginated.

candidates.⁸⁰⁹ The scheme was partly successful, as several of the secretaries later rose to diplomats.⁸¹⁰

In addition to the posts of 'Legationssekretäre', from the outset of Frederick II's reign (1740), individual appointments of 'attachés' to the department were made; a practice that became semi-institutionalised in the 1747 'pepinière'.⁸¹¹ With the title of 'conseiller de legation' or 'conseiller d'ambassade', young noblemen were attached to the department, either to be sent abroad or to be employed in the chancellery and archives. For example, the young Baron Korff was appointed in 1740 'afin qu'il aie occasion de se former au maniement des affaires publiques'.⁸¹² The same appointment was conferred upon the later diplomatic theorist Bielfeld.⁸¹³ In 1747, after the second Silesian War, Frederick II decided to transform this practice into a 'pepinière' under Podewils' supervision.⁸¹⁴ The original suggestion seems to have come from the King himself.⁸¹⁵ On the occasion of the death of the state minister Borck and the illness of the councillor Weinreich, the lack of qualified persons had once more become apparent. Podewils approved of the idea 'de préparer de bonne heure de jeunes gens de naissance pour les employer soit à l'expédition des affaires, soit aux missions à des cours étrangères'. He claimed that this was 'un objet que je ne perds point de vue, et je suis

⁸⁰⁹ See the cabinet ministers' reports of 22 Aug. and 18 Nov.1739, *ibid.* Cf. Rep.96, 4E 3, report of 22 Aug.1739, unpaginated.

⁸¹⁰ See Koser, 'Gründung', p.185.

⁸¹¹ See Rep.9, J16, fasc.29 ('Legationssekretäre und Eleven 1740-55').

⁸¹² Frederick II to Podewils, 8 Dec.1740, *ibid.*, fo.3. For further appointments, see *ibid.*, fos.16-21.

⁸¹³ Appointment of 13 Dec.1740, *ibid.*, fo.5. As a freemason, Bielfeld had come into contact with the young Frederick. He had been embassy secretary in Hanover and London, returned to Berlin in 1741 as 'Legationsrat' and became educator of the prince August Ferdinand and curator of the Prussian universities. Gravely in debt, he had to leave his offices in 1755 and retire to his estates, see *WBIS*, entry 'D073-790-9'.

⁸¹⁴ This institution is briefly mentioned by Kohnke, *Kabinettsministerium*, pp.69, 191, 195-8, and by Koser, 'Gründung', pp.183-90. The Pomeranian Podewils (1695-1760) had commenced his career as 'Geheimer Kriegerat' and had been sent on diplomatic missions to the Northern courts. Together with Thulemeier and Borcke, he directed the cabinet ministry and continued as councillor of foreign affairs under Frederick II. See *WBIS*, entry 'D341-133-X'.

⁸¹⁵ The original letter of Frederick II of 10 March 1747 is lost. See Podewils' reply of the same day, Rep.9, J16, fasc.30, unpaginated.

constamment attentif à chercher des sujets propres à remplir ce place'.⁸¹⁶ Again, the provincial governments were ordered to provide information on young noblemen who had attended university and possessed sufficient funds. Ten 'élèves' were to be attached to the department and employed in the chancellery. The king added that, if they turned out not to have 'assez de capacité pour être employez un jour à des affaires publiques et à des missions', he would find them employment in other branches of government.⁸¹⁷ Podewils and his colleagues, Mardefeld and later Finckenstein, should examine possible candidates to find out if they were 'du bois, dont on peut faire un habil mercure', pending the King's approval.⁸¹⁸ The ten students should swear an oath to secrecy and receive a pension of 300 Reichsthaler.⁸¹⁹ The proposal, however, elaborated neither on the duration of the traineeship nor on the methods of training.

Ilgen's original suggestions served as precursor for this scheme, which now was exclusively aimed at the nobility.⁸²⁰ Although no immediate transfer is traceable in the sources, the similarities to the French 'Académie politique', to the Austrian suggestions and to Moser's Hanau academy are striking. Bielfeld's later account in his *Institutions politiques* once more underlined the parallels to the French academy: the ten councillors of legation were admitted to conferences on current events, worked in the department's chancellery reading dispatches and composing diplomatic memoirs, and were then attached as secretaries

⁸¹⁶ Ibid.

⁸¹⁷ Frederick to Podewils, 12 Apr.1747, *ibid.* Cf. the letter of Frederick's cabinet secretary Eichel of 6 Aug.1747, *ibid.* According to Eichel, Prussia was in want of 'some skilful subjects [...] to be employed in embassies at foreign courts'.

⁸¹⁸ Letter of Frederick to Podewils, 25 March 1747, *ibid.* Cf. Mardefeld's and Finckenstein's biographies in Kohnke, *Kabinettsministerium*, appendix. Finckenstein, confidant of Frederick II and diplomat to various countries, acted as state minister 1749-99.

⁸¹⁹ Podewils' letter of 29 March 1747, Rep.9, J16, fasc.30. The pensions were to be taken from the 'Legationskasse'. Cf. Podewils and Mardefeld to the King, 11 Apr.1747, *ibid.*

⁸²⁰ Both Kohnke, *Kabinettsministerium*, p.195, and Koser, 'Gründung', p.186, refer to the French academy as precursor. Yet, it also needs mention that Ilgen's suggestions regarded the Imperial diplomatic service as 'model'.

to embassies.⁸²¹ In his *Testament Politique* of 1752, Frederick II proudly referred to this 'nursery for diplomats'.⁸²² The scheme became soon known in Prussia and resulted in several applications from ministers, generals and the aristocracy to employ their sons and nephews.⁸²³

The first 'élèves du department des affaires étrangères' were appointed in March 1747. At least five of them later served as diplomats,⁸²⁴ and Hertzberg even rose to the rank of cabinet minister.⁸²⁵ In 1752 and 1753, the 'corps des conseillers d'ambassade' was again to be filled with 'de jeunes gens sages, raisonnables, posés, qui eussent de l'acquis, et dont il y eût à espérer, qu'on en pourra faire quelque chose'.⁸²⁶ The case of the student Destinon, however, hints at internal problems of discipline and secrecy: Destinon left the academy and fled from Berlin; and the King complained: 'Je suis nullement content de ce qu'on n'a pas eu plus d'attention sur la conduite des jeunes gens, qui j'ay placé conseillers d'ambassade et qu'on les a abandonnés et laisse agir selon leur propre fantaisie'.⁸²⁷ Although we are not informed about the interior working of the scheme, some exercise essays survive, which suggest that the students worked on diplomatic dispatches and other sources contained in the ministry's

⁸²¹ Bielfeld, *Institutions politiques*, i, p.77.

⁸²² *Politische Testamente*, ed. Oppeln-Bronikowski, p.58.

⁸²³ See Rep.9, J16, fasc.30.

⁸²⁴ See the list of names of 29 March 1747, Rep.9, J16, fasc.30, unpaginated. Apart from Hertzberg, these were Knyphausen, diplomat to Paris and London; [B]aseler, diplomat to Copenhagen; Voss, diplomat to Dresden; and Goltz, diplomat to Russia.

⁸²⁵ Hertzberg (1725-95), a member of the old Pomeranian nobility, was son-in-law to Knyphausen. After studying law, history and state science in Halle, he began to work as 'élève' in the cabinet's archives, whose director he became in 1750. In 1763, he negotiated the Peace of Hubertusburg and later became cabinet minister, see *WBIS*, entry 'D580-644-1'.

⁸²⁶ Letter to the King, 11 Feb.1752, Rep.9, J16, fasc.29, fo.74. Letter to the King, 11 March 1753, *ibid.*, fo.86.

⁸²⁷ Frederick to Finckenstein, 29 June 1755, Rep.9, L4, fasc.12, unpaginated. Destinon, the son of a diplomat in Prussian service, did not receive a pension and, frustrated, quit the service and fled to Russia. See Finckenstein's letter to the King of 20 June 1755, *ibid.*

archives, comparable to the French academy.⁸²⁸ Their memoirs treated diplomatic history since 1701, some of them even underlining present claims of Prussia.⁸²⁹

The 'pepinière' was still in existence after the Seven Years' War.⁸³⁰ In a report of 1767, Finckenstein and Hertzberg listed several vacancies of embassy secretaries and 'conseillers'. Again, most of the candidates were relatives of government ministers or army officers. However, the scheme seems to have fallen into neglect prior to 1775, when Frederick II again referred to 'les embarras dans le choix des sujets pour les postes dans l'étranger'. This should be countered by a re-established 'pepinière' and a better recruitment and supervision of the students: 'Il faut que le département s'applique à bien former les jeunes gentilshommes, qui desirent d'entrer dans cette carrière, et de n'y admettre que des personnes qui annoncent des talents et du génie'.⁸³¹ Once more, these reflections were sparked off by an ad-hoc need of successors to diplomatic posts. This time, Frederick II included a career outline for the students who, after returning from the universities, were to be attached as secretaries to the embassies and the department. After completing 'leur course politique', they would be employed as diplomats or in other branches of government.⁸³² Hertzberg and Finckenstein, on their part, complained of being unfairly criticised of having neglected the establishment.⁸³³ The reason for its abandonment, they argued, had been the lack of funds.⁸³⁴

⁸²⁸ See for example Rep.9 J16, fasc.36, 'Extrait des négociations pour la Paix d'Utrecht tiré des actes des archives de Berlin, par Henry de Borcke, Conseiller de Legation', [20 July] 1756. Cf. the compositions of Finckenstein on the acquisition of Teckenburg and the Prussian complaints against the Emperor (1756), fasc.37; of Buch on Bartholdi's negotiations for the Prussian crown in 1700 (1755/56). More 'Diplomatische Probearbeiten' of 1755-57 are contained in Rep.9, J16, fascs.38-41.

⁸²⁹ Preface to an extract on the diplomatic correspondence of Chambrier, Rep.9 J16, fasc.41, unpaginated.

⁸³⁰ See Rep.9, J16 fasc.44, for appointments of 'conseillers de legations', 1757-80.

⁸³¹ Frederick to Hertzberg, 9 Sept.1775, Rep.9, J16, fasc.51, unpaginated. See also Finckenstein's letter to the King of 5 March, in which he complained about 'la difficulté de trouver des sujets propres pour les missions étrangères', Rep.96, 200H, unpaginated.

⁸³² Frederick to Finckenstein, 12 Sept.1775, Rep.9, J16, fasc.51, unpaginated.

⁸³³ See the replies of Finckenstein and Hertzberg, 12 Sept.1775, as well as their letter of 14 Sept.1716, all *ibid.* The term 'carrière' was also used in their letter of 17 Sept.1776, *ibid.* They mention the diplomats Alvensleben, Keith and Bismarck as former students.

The difficulty of finding suitable candidates, furthermore, was attributed to the fact that most still preferred a career in the military or the justice and finance departments to 'la carrière coûteuse des affaires étrangères'.⁸³⁵ In the reinstituted 'pepinière des futurs ministres et secrétaires d'ambassade', only four students were given a pension, while others were assigned as supernumeraries.⁸³⁶

A further attempt to reform the training scheme was made after the accession of Frederick William II in 1786. Finckenstein and Hertzberg still complained that 'nous manqueront toujours de sujets propres pour les missions étrangères'. They advocated 'de rétablir la pepinière de jeunes gentilshommes de bonne espérance et de fortune'.⁸³⁷ Consequently, several appointments were made in 1786 and 1787.⁸³⁸

A final attempt to establish a proper seminary in the department was undertaken in 1788, when von Sendt presented his plan 'to instruct the councillors of legation in all that is necessary for public affairs'.⁸³⁹ This interesting project encompassed a curriculum remarkably similar to Torcy's academy. Three times a week, the 'conseillers' would gather in their teacher's house, where they were instructed in six subjects: state and chancellery practice, international law, treaties and alliances, 'Staatskunde' (the interests of states), and German constitutional law. They should become acquainted with the respective sources and publications and were instructed to write upon these matters. No information is available on

⁸³⁴ 'Plan des changemens à faire à l'état de la Caisse de Legation', Rep.9, J16, fasc.51, unpaginated. Cf. the letter of Finckenstein and Hertzberg, 17 Sept.1776, *ibid.*

⁸³⁵ Letters to the King of 17 Sept.1776, and 8 March 1777, *ibid.*

⁸³⁶ Letter to the King, 22 June 1777, *ibid.*

⁸³⁷ Letter to Frederick William II, 27 Aug.1786, Rep.9, J16, fasc.53, unpaginated. The new king approved of this plan, see his margins to another letter of the ministers of 27 Aug.1786, *ibid.*

⁸³⁸ See Rep.9, J16, fasc.53.

⁸³⁹ 'Pro Memoria', 31 July 1788, Rep.9, J16, fasc.53, unpaginated. No biographical information on Sendt could be identified.

whether this plan was taken up in practice. The Prussian 'pepinière', nevertheless, continued until 1806.⁸⁴⁰

The effect these training projects had on the 'professionalism' of Prussian diplomats are difficult to judge. Despite the introduction of a semi-institutionalised preparation, the recruitment of diplomats continued to be dominated by birth, patronage and wealth.⁸⁴¹ Yet some observations can be made from the reform discussion after 1720. Although Prussia's style of diplomacy was in many aspects different to that of other Great Powers,⁸⁴² parallels to the reform discussion in Austria and France are noticeable and suggest that the discussion in Berlin was part of a general debate. Several times the cabinet ministers referred to 'the example of other countries'. The establishment of embassy secretaries and of the diplomatic 'pepinière' can be compared to the French academy of 1712 as well as to the contemporary academy at Hanau and the Viennese reform schemes. As in other countries, the continuity of the reform discussion throughout the eighteenth century is remarkable, but also points to the fact that the preparation of diplomats was still considered deficient for the new role of a European power. Under Frederick I, Frederick William I and Frederick II, the increase of the diplomatic service and the evolution of a diplomatic career were pushed forward but repeatedly taken back again. Not only was a wide-reaching reform hampered by the lack of funds, but rulers and cabinet ministers were also unwilling to compromise the control and secrecy of foreign policy, and their powers of patronage. Thus, the reforms remained piecemeal and determined by the ad-hoc want of diplomats. Frederick II sought to employ the old Brandenburg-Prussian nobility in diplomacy, even at the subaltern level. Their preparation came to encompass university studies, in particular law and state science, and subaltern

⁸⁴⁰ Rep.9, J16, fascs.54, 72, 73, 79, 80. These sources relate to the appointment and career of individual 'conseillers'.

⁸⁴¹ Kohnke, *Kabinettsministerium*, p.200.

⁸⁴² Scott, *Eastern Powers*, esp. pp.143-6; cf. idem, 'Prussia's Royal Foreign Minister'.

experience in the royal service. Thus, the amalgamation of old nobility and service nobility in Prussia appears to have been successful in diplomacy, too.⁸⁴³

The available evidence does not support the assumption that the Prussian attempts at diplomatic training were directly influenced by diplomatic theory. However, a strong congruence between the overall theoretical discourse and the Prussian discussion exists. The training methods explored in Prussia corresponded to the 'connaissances' expected by diplomatic theory. Although there is no direct proof that treatises formed a part of the curriculum, they probably were available to the students, at least in the second half of the eighteenth century: a 1798 inventory of the ministry's library lists Wicquefort and several other treatises on ceremonial and international law of the post-1648 century.⁸⁴⁴ The interlink between diplomatic theory and practice, furthermore, is apparent in Bielfeld's manual on foreign policy, which became one of the best-known treatises of late eighteenth-century Europe, uniting the 'ideal ambassador' with the Prussian practice of diplomacy.

Diplomatic Training, Universities and Noble Academies in the Holy Roman Empire

Following the acknowledgment of their 'ius legatis' after 1648, several lands of the Empire, notably the electorates, endeavoured to widen their diplomatic scope. The issue of having sufficiently trained diplomatic personnel at hand did consequently acquire increasing urgency. Yet the particular nature of diplomacy in the Empire gave a distinct outlook to the diplomatic services: for the representation at the Imperial Diet, at the Imperial institutions and at the regional 'Kreistage' a cadre trained in public law had already evolved before the question of a 'European' diplomacy arose.

⁸⁴³ Müller-Weil, *Absolutismus und Außenpolitik*, pp.215-6.

⁸⁴⁴ Rep.9, F5, fasc.5, on the occasion of the acquisition of the library of Steck.

Apart from the preparatory theoretical education offered by universities and 'Ritterakademien', there were several other ways to gain practical experience in diplomacy. Given the number and variety of the Empire's territories, a comprehensive account must give way to an analysis of some of the most important states. Even if the intensity of discussion did not reach the levels of Austria and Prussia, similar forms of preparation and training were explored and gradually established in many electorates and principalities. This included apprenticeships in the legations at the Imperial Diet, experience in embassies as 'cavaliers', or appointments of embassy secretaries ('Legationssekretäre'). The electorates of Bavaria and Saxony may serve as examples for this practice.⁸⁴⁵

As a consequence of its ambitious politics, Bavaria substantially increased its diplomatic network in the post-1648 century.⁸⁴⁶ The territorial nobility dominated the upper ranks.⁸⁴⁷ On the other hand, a growing number of diplomats completed legal studies and gained experience in the administration, even in subaltern diplomatic and secretarial posts, as Schmid underlines in his treatise.⁸⁴⁸ The rank of embassy secretary gradually gained in importance in the Bavarian diplomatic service, especially at the Imperial Diet, and became a career step that could lead up to the post of envoy.⁸⁴⁹ Furthermore, the knowledge of public law became a standard qualification for the higher state service and for diplomacy. Although there existed no specific theoretical and practical preparation for the diplomatic service before 1802, international law and state science were introduced at the university of

⁸⁴⁵ Another case of comparison would be the electorate of Hanover (from 1692), on which the best account remains G.Schnath, *Geschichte Hannovers im Zeitalter der Neunten Kur und der Englischen Sukzession 1674-1714* (4 vols., Hildesheim, 1982). Most of the Hanoverian foreign department's archives, however, have been destroyed in 1942.

⁸⁴⁶ For want of a monograph on the Bavarian diplomatic service, see Kramer, 'Aspects du fonctionnement'.

⁸⁴⁷ On the high-ranking diplomats at the Imperial Diet, see W.Fürnrohr, *Kurbaierns Gesandte auf dem Immerwährenden Reichstag* (Munich, 1971).

⁸⁴⁸ Schmid, *Der Gesandte*, fo.16^{r-v}. Schmid had advocated the Venetian practice of attaching young gentlemen to embassies, which would be a diplomatic 'Pelzschuell'.

⁸⁴⁹ Kramer, 'Aspects du fonctionnement', p.190.

Ingolstadt in the mid-eighteenth century, initiated by Johann Adam von Ickstatt.⁸⁵⁰ In the later eighteenth century, the Strasbourg academy was attended by a number of Bavarian diplomats.⁸⁵¹

The all-pervasive nature of the discussion triggered in the early eighteenth century becomes apparent in the late establishment of a Bavarian 'pepinière' in 1802.⁸⁵² Against the background of the general administrative reforms under Montgelas, and inspired by the model of Napoleonic France, a scheme for a diplomatic training school was discussed after 1800.⁸⁵³ In 1802, the archivist Eckartshausen proposed to give free lectures to the 'référéndaires' working in the department for foreign affairs.⁸⁵⁴ Although this plan was abandoned as early as 1803 with Eckartshausen's death, a semi-institutionalised training was established, and Montgelas decreed the introduction of entry exams and a list of necessary qualifications in 1805.⁸⁵⁵ In 1810, however, the departmental 'pepinière' was abandoned in favour of an entry examination in political history and languages conducted by the 'Kreiskommissariate'.⁸⁵⁶ The qualifications examined after 1801 encompassed personal traits, including 'Hoffähigkeit', and 'connaissances' such as German law and state science, international law, modern history, the situation of the states of Europe, its treaties and

⁸⁵⁰ Ickstatt (1702-76), advisor of the Bavarian Electors and director of Ingolstadt university, lectured on public and international law and directed the reorganisation of the university, see F.Kreh, *Leben und Werk des Reichsfreiherrn Johann Adam von Ickstatt* (Paderborn, 1974). In his *Kurtzer Entwurff einer vernünftigen Lehr-Art wornach unsere Teutsche Adelige und andere, insonderheit Catholische Academische Jugend ihre Studia Iuris auf Universitäten mit Nutzen einrichtet [...]* (Munich, c.1746).

⁸⁵¹ Kramer, 'Aspects du fonctionnement', p.191.

⁸⁵² BayHSTA, Kasten schwarz 9397-9412 ('Diplomatische Pflanzschule'). Cf. J.Rudschies, *Die bayerischen Gesandten 1799-1871* (Munich, 1993), pp.39-44.

⁸⁵³ On the reforms in France and in other states after 1800, see the overview in M.Erbe, *Revolutionäre Erschütterung und erneuertes Gleichgewicht. Internationale Beziehungen 1785-1830* (Paderborn, 2004), pp.56-9.

⁸⁵⁴ BayHSTA, Kasten schwarz 9397. Unfortunately, the contents of Eckhartshausen's lecture plans are not known. On Eckhartshausen, see *WBIS*, entry 'D380-432-1'.

⁸⁵⁵ See for example the 'Prüfungs-Protocoll' of F.v.Luxburg in 1802, BayHSTA, Kasten schwarz, 9398.

⁸⁵⁶ Rudschies, *Die bayerischen Gesandten*, p.41.

congresses, French and additional languages, as well as the rights and duties of diplomats.⁸⁵⁷

On the other hand, entry into the diplomatic service without having passed an exam remained possible, and the financial situation of the candidates continued to be taken into account.⁸⁵⁸

As well as Bavaria, the electorate and kingdom of Saxony(-Poland) also increased its diplomatic service in the century following 1648.⁸⁵⁹ Yet, there was not a discussion on the preparation of diplomats comparable to Prussia, even though the Saxon diplomatic service was named as model in Vienna and Paris.⁸⁶⁰ As far as the sources in Dresden reveal, such a scheme was never introduced on a large scale. Although proposals to attach young noblemen to embassies were brought forward, only a few cases are known in which 'Gesandtschaftskavaliers' accompanied embassies.⁸⁶¹ In 1733, for example, Ponickau went to Petersburg in this capacity, and in 1741, the future diplomat Vitzthum accompanied Count Loss to Paris.⁸⁶² As in other territories in the eighteenth century, the post of embassy secretary gradually became an option to 'faire les premiers pas dans cette carrière honorable'.⁸⁶³ Some candidates worked on foreign affairs in the archives of the 'Geheime Kanzlei' before commencing their career as embassy secretaries.⁸⁶⁴ Several appointments of 'conseillers de legation' were made,

⁸⁵⁷ See the examination protocols in BayHSTA, Kasten schwarz, 9398-9412.

⁸⁵⁸ Rudschies, *Die bayerischen Gesandten*, pp.55 ff. The same conclusion is drawn for Britain by Middleton, *Administration of British Foreign Policy*, pp.227-8.

⁸⁵⁹ A study of the Saxon diplomatic service is being prepared by J.Matzke, Dresden, to whom I am indebted for advice and information. Cf. the account of H.Kretzschmar, 'Zur Geschichte der sächsischen Diplomatie', *Amt und Volk*, 3 (1932), 36-9.

⁸⁶⁰ Bartenstein and Kaunitz considered Saxony as model for the training of diplomats in the state chancellery, HHSTA Vienna, Staatskanzlei Interioria 1, fos.13^v-14; *Correspondance secrète Kaunitz-Koch*, pp.257-8. In 1786, Gérard referred, among others, to Saxony as model for this practice, AAE, MD France 2186, fo.53.

⁸⁶¹ Sächs.HSTA, Geh.Kabinett 1446/1, fo.251: 'Und seynd hierbey die Envoyés gehalten, ein ieder einen jungen von Adel, welchen sie zu Ihrer Königl[ichen] M[ajestät] Diensten zu gebrauchen vor fähig erachten, und dannenhero zu Dero hohen Approbation vorzustellen haben, mit freyer Tafel, und wenn es seyn kann, auch mit freyen Logiamente ohne dieserwegen etwas anzurechnen, zu versorgen'.

⁸⁶² See DBA, i, 971, pp.346-50; Sächs.HSTA, Geh.Kabinett 2736, fo.34.

⁸⁶³ J.J.Pallard of Genf, 14 Aug.1767, in recommending his son to work as embassy secretary to the resident Petzolt in Vienna, Sächs.HSTA, Geh.Kabinett 952/11, fo.2.

⁸⁶⁴ See Sächs.HSTA, Geh.Kabinett 641/1 (1765-1813). Unfortunately, no volume for the period before 1765 survives.

but this scheme never went as far as the Prussian 'pepinière'.⁸⁶⁵ Thus, while there were possibilities of preparation for diplomats in the embassies and the chancellery, these training schemes did not become universal.

These practices of gaining experience in diplomacy were, to a varying extent, known in other territories of the Empire as well. In the early eighteenth century there already existed a notion of hierarchy and career in the lower ranks of diplomacy, which included the posts of secretary, embassy secretary and councillor of legation. These ranks were occupied mostly by the legally trained 'noblesse de robe'. Training schemes in the Empire were not exclusively aimed at future diplomats, but comprised diplomacy in the universal preparation for territorial, Imperial and foreign politics. The usual preparation of diplomats comprised studies in German law and experience in territorial administration and politics.⁸⁶⁶ As has been shown in Part I, the new 'state science', which sought to analyse the framework of politics both domestic and foreign, was developed and discussed at the Empire's universities. The linkage between academic curriculum, noble education and the preparation of state-servants was particularly pronounced.⁸⁶⁷ From the later seventeenth century, the old nobilities of the Empire were increasingly drawn into state service and began to merge with the 'Beamtenadel'. At the same time, the requirements of a 'courtly' diplomacy in the 'société des princes' gave rise to a more elitist and aristocratic education provided by noble academies, which thrived in the Empire in the century following the Peace of Westphalia. In both

⁸⁶⁵ The title was also given to embassy secretaries to allow them a higher standing in the diplomatic corps, see for example Geh.Kabinett 952/1, fos.47-8. Cf. the appointments 1699-1813 in *ibid.*

⁸⁶⁶ On the relationship between 'noblesse de robe' and the old nobility, see also Weber, 'Erfindung des Politikers'; *idem*, "Ein vollkommener fürstlicher Staats-Rath ist ein Phoenix". *Perspektiven einer politischen Ideengeschichte der hohen Beamten-schaft*, *ZHF*, 21 (1994), 221-33.

⁸⁶⁷ Cf. R.Stichweh, *Der frühmoderne Staat und die europäische Universität. Zur Interaktion von Politik und Erziehungssystem im Prozeß ihrer Ausdifferenzierung* (Frankfurt, 1991); F.Paulsen, *Geschichte des gelehrten Unterrichts auf den deutschen Schulen und Universitäten*, 3rd edn (Leipzig, 1919), i.

institutional frameworks, the curriculum was adapted to the new demands of political and international relations.

With the aim of aligning the academic curriculum to the education of future state-servants, a reform debate had commenced in the late seventeenth century, which gained in momentum after 1700 and resulted in the first 'reform universities' of Halle, Göttingen and Jena. These integrated the new disciplines of modern history, positivistic law and 'ius publicum', statistics, 'Staatenkunde' and 'cameral sciences' into the curriculum.⁸⁶⁸ With their focus on the actual practice of political relations, these disciplines also provided an introduction to diplomacy. In particular the university of Göttingen became a centre of the new combination of law, politics and history from the mid-eighteenth century.⁸⁶⁹ Among the advocates of the new state science were Schöpflin, Koch, Moser, Achenwall, and Pütter, whose names are also connected with political-diplomatic academies. In various universities, professors and publicists provided publications, additional lectures and private seminars ('collegia') on the new disciplines and on the current political developments of Europe.⁸⁷⁰ In Halle, for example, Nicolaus Gundling offered seminars on the congresses of 1648 and 1714 and the interests of states.⁸⁷¹ In Jena, Christian Buder introduced a 'Staatenkolleg' in the 1720s.⁸⁷² In the case of Johann Jacob Moser and Johann Daniel Schoepflin, such courses

⁸⁶⁸ See Bödeker, 'Staatswissenschaftliche Fächersystem'; idem, 'Europe in the Discourse of the Sciences of State'.

⁸⁶⁹ See F.Frensdorff, *Die ersten Jahrzehnte des staatsrechtlichen Studiums in Göttingen* (Göttingen, 1887). On the beginnings of this development, see A.Seifert, 'Conring und die Begründung der Staatenkunde', in M.Stolleis (ed.), *Hermann Conring (1606-1681). Beiträge zu Leben und Werk* (Berlin, 1983), 201-14.

⁸⁷⁰ See J.Voss, *Universität, Geschichtswissenschaft und Diplomatie im Zeitalter der Aufklärung. Johann Daniel Schöpflin, 1694-1771* (Munich, 1979), p.160.

⁸⁷¹ See N.H.Gundling, *Eröffnung eines Collegii über den jetzigen Zustand von Europa* (Halle, 1712). His brother Jakob Paul taught at the noble academy in Berlin, see footnote 154. Gundling (1671-1729) later became Prussian councillor, see *WBIS*, entry 'D490-159-3'.

⁸⁷² See Voss, *Schoepflin*, p.160. On Buder, who also published *De bibliothecis publicum ad usum legatis* (Jena, 1723), see 'Buder, Christian Gottlieb', *DBI/DBE*. J.J.Moser, *Anleitung zu dem Studio Juris junger Standes- und anderer Personen*, 3rd edn (Jena, 1743), p.116, mentions several 'Staaten-Collegia'.

were the precursors of academy projects.⁸⁷³ Often, the seminaries would also take the form of 'Zeitungskollegien', in which current gazettes and newspapers on the state and politics of the Empire and Europe were discussed with relation to state science.⁸⁷⁴ In this context, the 'science of foreign policy' obtained a place in the education of future statesmen and diplomats.

The reception of the French academy proved a stimulating influence for the discussion. The erudite public knew of Torcy's foundation not only through accounts in the newspapers *Mercure historique*, *Amsterdam Gazette*, and *Europäische Fama*,⁸⁷⁵ but also through the *Séjour de Paris*, written by the German Nemeitz in the 1710s. The author attributed the French perfection of diplomacy to schemes like this academy, while terming French diplomats 'les honnêtes espions'. He concluded that 'd'où vient aussi que la France ne manque jamais de politiques habiles et expérimentez'.⁸⁷⁶ Nemeitz regarded this as a model to imitate.⁸⁷⁷ A similar conclusion was drawn in the 1726 issue of the almanac of Helmstedt university: a report by Professor Treuer brought to the attention of the German academic community 'several seminaries or societies [...] who specialise in raising the youth to negotiations and politics'.⁸⁷⁸ These schemes, featuring Torcy's academy, combined an

⁸⁷³ See also Moser's plans for Vienna, Bamberg and Mannheim, and Schöpflin's plans for Brussels: R.Rürup, *Johann Jacob Moser. Pietismus und Reform* (Wiesbaden, 1965), p.93; A.Krause, 'Schöpflin und die gelehrten Gesellschaften', in J.Voss (ed.), *Strasbourg, Schoepflin et l'Europe au XVIIIe siècle* (Bonn 1996), p.74.

⁸⁷⁴ Bödeker, 'Staatswissenschaftliche Fächersystem', p.159. Such 'Zeitungskollegien' were for example given by Thomasius in Halle, by Struve in Jena, and by Achenwall in Göttingen. See Voss, *Schoepflin*, p.159; L.Hiller, *Die Geschichtswissenschaft an der Universität Jena in der Zeit der Polyhistorie, 1674-1763* (Jena, 1937), pp.186-7, 208. Cf. H.Bosse, 'Die Gelehrte Republik', in H.-W.Jäger (ed.), *'Öffentlichkeit' im 18. Jahrhundert* (Göttingen, 1997), p.60.

⁸⁷⁵ Rürup, *Moser*, p.90, footnote 135.

⁸⁷⁶ J.C.Nemeitz, *Séjour de Paris, c'est à dire, instructions fidèles, pour les voyageurs de condition*, 2nd edn (Leiden, 1727), p.342. Nemeitz was employed as educator to young noblemen, whom he accompanied on their Grand Tour, see DBE/DBI, 'Nemeitz, Joachim Christoph'.

⁸⁷⁷ 'Il seroit à souhaiter, que d'autres puissances suivissent un exemple si louable, en laissant fouiller dans leurs archives, feuilleter et lire à la jeunesse les actes de leurs royaumes', Nemeitz, *Séjour de Paris*, pp.343-4.

⁸⁷⁸ *Annales Academiae Iuliae [...]* (Helmstedt, 1726), fos.131-7, quoting the *Mercure historique* of 1712 and the *Séjour de Paris*. G.S.Treuer (1683-1743) lectured in Leipzig, Helmstedt, Göttingen, and at the noble academy in Wolfenbüttel, see DBI/DBE, 'Treuer, Gottlieb Samuel'.

academic education with practical experience in chancellery work and diplomacy. Treuer recommended imitating the 'académie politique'. He proposed the study of international law, of collections of 'acta publica' and diplomatic customs, the study of diplomatic memoirs and treatises (Wicquefort, Callières, Vera, and Stieve on ceremonial). In this way, the students should be instructed in the 'negotiorum fundamentis' and the 'prudentia politica' endorsed by Thomasius.⁸⁷⁹

While the universities became the main centre of discussion on the new subjects of political education, noble academies also played a role in this development.⁸⁸⁰ From around 1700, some of the newly established or reformed 'Ritterakademien' began to offer, in conjunction with 'polite knowledge' and languages, courses on the knowledge necessary to the noble state-servant and diplomat.⁸⁸¹ Apart from the academies in Brandenburg, Berlin and Vienna, a focus on diplomacy was for example introduced in the Hanoverian noble academies, particularly in Wolfenbüttel,⁸⁸² or in the Silesian-Prussian academy in Liegnitz.⁸⁸³

The mid-eighteenth century saw several attempts in the Empire to introduce a more pragmatic and specific education for state servants in general and diplomats in particular. Apart from the state-founded institutions in Vienna and Berlin, two academies were erected by distinguished *érudits* and 'Staatswissenschaftler': Moser and Schoepflin. Their projects underline the linkage between universities, noble academies and diplomatic training. In contrast to the 'national' training schemes attached to the foreign ministries, these projects

⁸⁷⁹ *Annales Academiae Iuliae*, fos.146, 149-50.

⁸⁸⁰ On noble academies in the Empire, see Conrads, *Ritterakademien*; K.G.Schönfelder, *Standeserziehung zwischen Separation und Scolarisation. Das Phänomen der Ritterakademien im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert in Deutschland* (Klagenfurt Univ. Diploma thesis, 1998).

⁸⁸¹ Paulsen, *Geschichte des Gelehrten Unterrichts*, p.522; Brückner, *Staatswissenschaften*, pp.102-3.

⁸⁸² See K.Bleek, *Adelserziehung auf deutschen Ritterakademien. Die Lüneburger Adelsschulen 1655-1850* (2 vols., Frankfurt, 1977). In Wolfenbüttel, law and history of the Empire and the states of Europe were taught in addition to geography and genealogy. Cf. STA Wolfenbüttel, 43Alt 2/1.

⁸⁸³ See P.Mainka, *Die Erziehung der adligen Jugend in Brandenburg-Preußen. Curriculare Anweisungen Karl Abrahams von Zedlitz und Leipe für die Ritterakademie zu Liegnitz* (Würzburg, 1997), on the reforms of the 1770s, when statistics, 'Staatskunst' and European history were introduced.

were aimed at the noble and erudite public of both the Empire and of Europe. In particular the Strasbourg academy with its cosmopolitan outlook can be considered the pinnacle of diplomatic education in the Republic of Letters, in which the interests and politics of princes were becoming the subject of discussion and teaching. Yet, this development stood in contrast to the states' endeavour to ensure the secrecy of their foreign policy by limiting the access to the bureaux and chancelleries of foreign affairs. In fact, the risks an institutionalised training constituted for the states' 'arcana' proved a decisive factor hampering the implementation of academy projects. On the other hand, the two spheres shared the objective of improving the general education of the diplomatic personnel, and, as a result, collaborated in several cases.

Johann Jacob Moser, the University of Göttingen and the Hanau 'Staatsakademie' (1749-51)

Johann Jakob Moser (1701-85) had begun his career as lecturer in law in Tübingen.⁸⁸⁴ Without a fortune of his own, his life was determined by frequent changes of residence and employment. After a sojourn in Vienna in 1721-26, he became councillor in Württemberg and professor at the Tübingen noble academy. In 1736, he was appointed to the Prussian university of Halle. Moser also acted as expert on several legal cases and was experienced in the Empire's diplomacy.⁸⁸⁵ After serving as director of the chancellery in Hesse-Homburg, he returned to Württemberg as councillor to the estates. With more than 500 publications on legal and political as well as on theological subjects, Moser was numbered among the most

⁸⁸⁴ Cf. Rürup, *Moser*.

⁸⁸⁵ For example at the Imperial elections in Frankfurt in 1741-2 and 1745, see *ibid.*, p.9.

prolific representatives of the new positivistic public law, state science and European international law.⁸⁸⁶

Moser was aware of the deficiencies in the education and preparation of diplomats and diplomatic staff in the Empire. He decried the lack of a 'sufficient knowledge of the actual customs and laws of European diplomacy', since the theoretical and practical basis of diplomacy was neither imparted in noble academies nor integrated in the university curriculum. Moser perceived that there was demand for a specialised preparation with a pragmatic focus. In Vienna, for example, he had seen 'how eager young noblemen and the sons of Imperial ministers were, entering diplomacy, to know of a person who could instruct them in this area'.⁸⁸⁷ He had even been asked to provide lessons for several European noblemen who were to be employed in diplomacy.⁸⁸⁸ As the schemes discussed in Vienna and Berlin, Moser aimed at providing a preparation both for the staff of the central administration and for the diplomatic personnel. He had been involved in several projects to erect or reform noble academies.⁸⁸⁹ In 1734, he also had proposed to teach the diplomatic history and constitution of the states of Europe in 'Staaten-Collegia'.⁸⁹⁰ Moser supported the idea of 'pepinières' uniting theoretical and practical education. To this purpose, international law and the interests of the states of Europe should build the core of learning, supported by the study of archival material ('acta publica').⁸⁹¹ Furthermore, Moser insisted on the

⁸⁸⁶ Cf. the list of principal publications in *ibid.*, pp.255-68.

⁸⁸⁷ Moser's memoir of 7 Apr.1749, UB Göttingen, Nachlass Pütter 37, fos.54^v-55^v.

⁸⁸⁸ The resulting memoir on the 'observantiae inter gentes Europae modernas', Moser claimed, had been favourably received and sent to Count Ostermann in St.Petersburg, where it was translated into French and served to educate the Russian nobility. Moser also recounted that he composed an essay on European state affairs for the prince of Denmark, *ibid.*, fo.54.

⁸⁸⁹ For example the 'Ritterakademie' in Soroe, a 'Staats-Schule' in Vienna (planned 1721-26), 'Collegia' in Tübingen, and an academy in Ludwigsburg (1756), see Rürup, *Moser*, pp.234-44.

⁸⁹⁰ Moser, *Anleitung zu dem Studio Iuris*, pp.116-7. On the influence of 'Reichspatriotismus' and the Pietist concept of state service and education, see Rürup, *Moser*, pp.92, 95.

⁸⁹¹ Moser, *Einladung an die Herren Studiosos zu seinen künftig zu haltenden Lectionibus publicis und Collegiis privatis* (Halle, 1736), pp.404-5, 408-9.

importance of 'chancellery practice' for diplomatic personnel. This comprised the various types of official and diplomatic documents, similar to the theory on the 'ideal secretary'.

A chance to implement his plans came in 1749. The Hanoverian minister of state and curator of Göttingen University, Baron Münchhausen, invited both Moser and the Göttingen professor of law, Pütter, to provide suggestions for an academy.⁸⁹² This project was at first linked to the university of Göttingen.⁸⁹³ In their correspondence of 1748-49, Münchhausen, Pütter and Moser discussed plans 'how young noblemen could be attracted to Göttingen and be prepared in state and chancellery affairs in a better way than anywhere else in Europe'.⁸⁹⁴ Pütter's project focused exclusively on the 'ius publicum' of the Empire.⁸⁹⁵ Moser, on the other hand, insisted on a more practical outlook of the academy and favoured an establishment detached from the university.⁸⁹⁶ In this academy, Pütter should teach 'Teutsche Staatsklugheit', while his colleague Achenwall was to treat recent European political history, the fundamental laws and interests of the states of Europe, their alliances and treaties, as well as European international law and ceremonial.⁸⁹⁷ A third professor should instruct in the skills necessary for chancellery and embassy staff, based on archival sources.⁸⁹⁸ Finally, the material of study should not only include diplomatic treatises (Wicquefort, Callières), but

⁸⁹² G.A.v.Münchhausen (1688-1770) had studied law in Jena, Halle and Utrecht before entering the Hanoverian service in 1716. He acted as diplomat to the Imperial Diet in 1728. Münchhausen was the founder and first curator of the university of Göttingen. In 1765, he became Hanoverian prime minister, see 'Münchhausen, Gerlach Adolph', *DBI/DBE*.

⁸⁹³ Frensdorff, *Staatsrechtliches Studium*, pp.5-6. J.S.Pütter (1725-1807), principal representative of German public law, had been teaching in Göttingen since 1746. He was closely acquainted with Achenwall, see *WBIS*, entry 'D568-665-6'.

⁸⁹⁴ This correspondence is contained in UB Göttingen, Pütter 37; Moser's quotation on fo.28.

⁸⁹⁵ Pütter to Münchhausen, 23 Dec.1748, Pütter 37, fos.2-8, with a 'Plan wornach ich ohngefähr meine künfftige Arbeit einzurichten gedächte'.

⁸⁹⁶ 'Pro memoria' attached to a letter to Münchhausen, 14 March 1749, *ibid.*, fo.28. Moser stated that he had made a first draft 'vor etlichen Jahren', fo.28.

⁸⁹⁷ G.Achenwall (1719-72) was lecturer in Marburg and professor of philosophy and law in Göttingen from 1747. He developed Conring's state science into the more historical and comparative 'Staatenkunde', cf. *WBIS*, entry 'D597-407-1'. Achenwall married Moser's daughter in 1745, see Rürup, *Moser*, p.84. Among his numerous publications, see for example *Geschichte der heutigen vornehmsten europäischen Staaten im Grundrisse* (Göttingen, 1754); *Die Staatsklugheit nach ihren ersten Grundsätzen entworfen* (Göttingen, 1761).

⁸⁹⁸ Moser's report (copy), undated, Pütter 37, fos.15-7; cf. his letter to Pütter, undated, fo.26.

also the publications suggested by diplomatic theory: treatises on international law and ceremonial, collections on diplomatic history, published memoirs and correspondence. In addition, the works of Pütter, Achenwall and Moser would provide a useful basis.⁸⁹⁹ Moser's focus lay less on the theory of diplomacy than on its practice, especially its secretarial aspects. Correspondingly, Achenwall saw the teachers' function to go further than the treatises of Wicquefort, Stieve and others, and to transport the theory's maxims and rules into a practical science ('Staats-Cantzley-Praxis').⁹⁰⁰ As in the French academy, the work on archival material and diplomatic documents should constitute the core of diplomatic training.

However, disparate views on the curriculum and the institutional framework led to Moser's withdrawal from the Göttingen scheme in 1749.⁹⁰¹ Pütter carried out his plans in Göttingen in the form of private courses beginning in 1749.⁹⁰² Moser, on the other hand, chose the small principality of Hesse-Hanau for his 'Staats- und Cantzley-Academie', which allowed him more autonomy, and whose capital provided freedom of religion and a small court.⁹⁰³ His second academy proposal was based on the Göttingen project and included three classes: German law and 'Staatsklugheit'; European state affairs and international law; chancellery and diplomatic practice. This curriculum should be supplemented with courses on 'Cameral- und Comercien-Wesen' and 'Militair-Sachen'. The political and legal situation

⁸⁹⁹ During the Hanau period, Moser published for example the *Einleitung zu denen neuesten Teutschen Staats-Angelegenheiten [...]*; *Einleitung zu denen Cantzley-Geschäften [...]*; *Vermischte Abhandlungen aus dem Europäischen Völker-Recht, wie auch von Teutschen und anderen Europäischen Staats-, desgleichen von Cantzley-Sachen* (all Hanau, 1750).

⁹⁰⁰ UB Göttingen, Nachlass Achenwall 177, fo.120, undated. Written probably by Achenwall, a compilation of teaching material is included, doubtless for the use of the academy. Theorists of diplomacy, international law and ceremonial are listed, including Wicquefort, Callières, Hotman, Marselaer, Grotius, Pufendorf, and Stieve, as well as publications on diplomatic practice, featuring Dumont's *Corps diplomatique*.

⁹⁰¹ See Frensdorff, *Staatsrechtliches Studium*, pp.22, 27. Cf. Pütter's 'Unmaßgebliche Gedanken [...]', 24 March 1749, Pütter 37, fo.30.

⁹⁰² See the advertisement 'Practicum iuris publicum [...]', Pütter 37, fos.69 ff. Cf. his *Vorbereitung zu einem Collegio practico iuris publici* (Göttingen, 1749); *Nähere Vorbereitung zur Teutschen Reichs- und Staats-Praxis [...]* (Göttingen, 1750).

⁹⁰³ Moser's memoir, Homburg, 7 Apr.1748, Pütter 37, fos.54-6. In a letter of 26 June 1749, Moser also referred to his own financial difficulties as a motive for this move, Pütter 37, fo.67. Furthermore, he had become director of the chancellery in the adjoining territory of Hesse-Homburg.

of the Empire and Europe were treated with the help of current periodicals. Access to Moser's extensive library, which undoubtedly included diplomatic treatises, was provided. The classes should last half a year, and the fees were scaled according to social rank, plus an extra fee for additional instruction on travelling, on individual courts and their ceremonial. Diplomacy featured prominently in the curriculum. Apart from diplomatic law and ceremonial, the duties and behaviour of diplomats were dealt with, their correspondence, the different forms of embassies as well as the negotiation of treaties.⁹⁰⁴ Probably, Moser regarded his academy project in line with the former 'académie politique' and the contemporary Prussian 'pepinière'.⁹⁰⁵ In how far Torcy's academy served as model for the Hanau project remains unclear, yet parallels existed in the focus on the secretarial duties of diplomacy and the work on archival material.

The Hanau academy set to work in late 1749.⁹⁰⁶ It attracted considerable interest in the Empire, and Moser proudly attached the comments of several personages to a first report to Münchhausen in October 1749, among them Imperial councillors such as Colloredo, Khevenhüller, Cobenzl and Seckenberg.⁹⁰⁷ Apart from these comments, the *Frankfurter Gelehrte Zeitung* of 1750 greeted the two institutions in Hanau and Göttingen as hallmarks of an academic reform.⁹⁰⁸

⁹⁰⁴ *Nähere Anzeige der Teutschen Staats-Sachen, so bey dieser Academie abgehandelt werden; Nähere Anzeige derer Europäischen Staats-Sachen [...]; Nähere Anzeige derer Cantzley-Sachen [...]* (all Hanau, 1749). Cf. the *Wiederholte Nachricht von einer Staats- und Cantzley-Academie* (Hanau, 1749).

⁹⁰⁵ Rürup, Moser, p.93. Moser knew of both the French academy and the Prussian Pepinière through the newspaper *Europäische Fama*, in particular vols.148 (1747) and 167 (1749). He was probably also familiar with Treuer's remarks in the Helmstedt Annales of 1726.

⁹⁰⁶ Rürup, Moser, p.88.

⁹⁰⁷ Letter of 18 Oct.1749, Pütter 37, fo.96, with 'Copien und Extracte einiger [...] Antwortschreiben'.

⁹⁰⁸ *Frankfurtische Gelehrte Zeitung*, 11 Dec.1750, cf. Rürup, Moser, p.91. There were several offers to transfer the academy to other locations such as Marburg, Erfurt, and Göttingen, see *ibid.*, pp.88-9.

The academy concentrated on the young 'nobilitas politica' of the Empire.⁹⁰⁹ During its short duration (1749-51), it was quite successful in attracting students.⁹¹⁰ Moser's son Frederick Carl Moser, another theorist of international law and diplomacy, and Professor Iber were employed as instructors, in addition to Ludwig Martin Kahle, professor in Göttingen.⁹¹¹ However, the institution suffered from financial difficulties, and closed with Moser's move to Württemberg in 1751. His plans to transfer the academy to Stuttgart failed.⁹¹² In Göttingen, on the other hand, the development of state science and diplomatic subjects continued: apart from Pütter and Achenwall, Georg Friedrich Martens resumed Moser's plans and lectured and published on diplomacy and international law in the late eighteenth century.⁹¹³

Despite its short duration, the Hanau academy received an impressive amount of attention and appraisal, which reveal its prominent place in the Empire's discussion on university reform and the training of state-servants. Moreover, in its function, target-group and curriculum it was linked to the overall deliberation on diplomatic training, displaying evident parallels to projects in France, Austria and Prussia, as well as to the Strasbourg academy.

⁹⁰⁹ See Rürup, *Moser*, p.88.

⁹¹⁰ See Moser's letter to Münchhausen, 14 Nov.1749, Pütter 37, fo.104^v. Cf. Rürup, *Moser*, p.88.

⁹¹¹ See Frensdorff, *Staatswissenschaftliches Studium*, p.20, 29; Rürup, *Moser*, p.88. Iber had assisted the Dutch envoy in Berlin and had travelled in the Dutch Republic and in Britain, cf. *WBIS*, entry 'D448-444-1'. On F.C.Moser (1723-98), whose numerous publications on diplomacy only date from after the end of the academy, see *WBIS*, entry 'D744-351-X'. Kahle had been professor in the philosophy faculty since 1737, and later joined the legal faculty, cf. *WBIS*, entry 'D442-969-1'.

⁹¹² Frensdorff, *Staatswissenschaftliches Studium*, p.32; Rürup, *Moser*, p.89.

⁹¹³ Cf. Marten's *Ébauche d'un cours politique et diplomatique sur les rapports conventionnels des premières puissances de l'Europe [...]* (Göttingen, 1796). Martens also published the *Précis du droit des gens modernes de l'Europe [...]* (2 vols., Göttingen, 1789). See *WBIS*, entry 'D463-301-X'. His son, Carl Martens, published the *Manuel diplomatique* (1822), *ibid.*, entry 'F124890'.

Johann Daniel Schoepflin and the Strasbourg 'Europäische Staatsschule' of 1752

Only four years after Moser's academy had closed, another 'Staatsakademie' was created, which was to become the best-known school for diplomats in late eighteenth-century Europe and the pinnacle of a 'public' diplomatic training.⁹¹⁴ The Strasbourg academy, too, bore parallels to Torcy's academy, and it became closely connected to the French ministry of foreign affairs.⁹¹⁵ Its success can be attributed in part to the reputation and contacts of its director. The Alsatian Johann Daniel Schöpflin (1694-1771) had been appointed professor of history in Strasbourg in 1720. He became a noted member of the Republic of Letters and the academy-movement.⁹¹⁶ Not only did Schoepflin correspond with érudits, ministers and diplomats in several countries; he also had diplomatic experience in the service of France and was associated with the French foreign ministry under Chauvelin, for which he composed several memoranda. From 1741, he held the post of 'historiographe et conseiller du roi'.⁹¹⁷ Like Moser, Schoepflin had considerable experience in noble education and possessed many contacts among the European nobilities.⁹¹⁸ On his sojourn in Vienna in 1738, for example, he was consulted on the education of several Austrian aristocrats and, in 1747, even offered a post at the newly-established noble academy.⁹¹⁹ Against the background of Schoepflin's

⁹¹⁴ The academy has been researched by J.Voss: *Universität, Geschichtswissenschaft und Diplomatie im Zeitalter der Aufklärung. Johann Daniel Schöpflin (1694-1771)* (Munich, 1979); 'L'École diplomatique de Strasbourg: l'ENA de l'Ancien Régime?', in idem, B.Vogler (eds.), *Strasbourg, Schoepflin et l'Europe au XVIIIe siècle* (Bonn, 1996), 205-14.

⁹¹⁵ J.Voss, 'L'École diplomatique de Strasbourg et son rôle dans l'Europe des Lumières', in Bély (ed.), *L'Invention de la Diplomatie*, p.363.

⁹¹⁶ On Schoepflin's vita, see Voss, *Schoepflin*.

⁹¹⁷ Voss, 'L'Europe des Lumières', p.364.

⁹¹⁸ For example, he had educated the Austrian Harrachs in Rome, see G.Klingenstein, 'Johann Daniel Schöpflin und Wien', in Voss/Vogler (eds.), *Strasbourg, Schoepflin et l'Europe*, p.133. Among his correspondants were Senckenberg in Vienna and d'Argenson in Paris, see J.Voss, 'Schoepfliniana. Briefe an Meerman in Rotterdam, an von Senckenberg in Wien und an d'Argenson in Paris', *Francia*, 30 (2003), 21-43.

⁹¹⁹ Klingenstein, 'Schöpflin und Wien', p.130.

standing, it is not surprising that there also were some contacts with the leaders of the Hanau-Göttingen-scheme, notably with Achenwall.⁹²⁰

The free Imperial city and later semi-autonomous French town of Strasbourg provided an ideal location for Schoepflin's project. As in the Göttingen-Hanau scheme, the academy was largely independent of a state government but attached to a university, at first in the form of additional courses, later as an independent institute. Schoepflin taught private courses on the history of the Empire and the states of Europe to young noblemen in the 1730s and 40s.⁹²¹ In 1752, these courses were transformed into a more institutionalised context and subsequently referred to as 'Europäische Staatsakademie'.⁹²² Apart from Schoepflin, the academy employed Christoph Koch, who succeeded Schoepflin as director in 1771,⁹²³ Christian Friedrich Pfeffel,⁹²⁴ the Strasbourg professor Lorenz, and Schoepflin's secretary André Lamey.⁹²⁵ The academy's objective was to improve the education of the European nobilities through a reformed curriculum of political and historical science. The curriculum comprised public and international law, the history of the states of Europe, as well as statistics. To a greater extent than any other academy, Strasbourg specialised in European diplomatic history since 1648.⁹²⁶ Like the theorists of diplomacy, Schoepflin and his collaborators regarded the knowledge of the interests of states, diplomatic history and

⁹²⁰ Voss, *Schoepflin*, p.161.

⁹²¹ Voss, 'L'Europe des Lumières', p.365.

⁹²² Voss, *Schoepflin*, p.160.

⁹²³ See H.Sproll, 'Christoph Wilhelm Koch (1737-1813): Jurist und Historiker an der Straßburger Universität und am Theologischen Seminar', in Voss/Vogler (eds.), *Strasbourg, Schoepflin et l'Europe*, 83-109.

⁹²⁴ Voss, *Schoepflin*, p.160. Pfeffel (1726-1807) had studied law and history in Strasbourg and in 1749 became a councillor to the Saxon envoy to Paris. 1758-61 he represented France at the Imperial Diet, and, from 1767, acted as legal councillor to the French king. He had supplied a 'Méthode sur le droit public' to the ministry in 1729, see AAE, MD France 251, fos.193 ff. Cf. *WBIS*, entry 'F144148'.

⁹²⁵ Voss, *Schoepflin*, p.163. Lamey later became the secretary of the noble academy in Mannheim in 1763, cf. *WBIS*, entry 'F103587'.

⁹²⁶ Voss, 'L'Europe des Lumières', p.369.

international law as basis of a diplomatic prudence. In addition, more traditional subjects of noble education such as languages, classics and natural sciences were also offered.⁹²⁷

Teaching material included recent German publications on the 'Staatenkunde'⁹²⁸ and the instructors' own publications. These represented the new state science, European diplomatic history and the 'Droit public de l'Europe'. The absence of these 'sciences' in France and elsewhere in Europe made the Strasbourg academy particularly attractive.⁹²⁹ Through his many contacts, Schoepflin advertised the academy and managed to draw noblemen from across Europe to Strasbourg.⁹³⁰ The academy instructed young princes as well as future ministers and diplomats from the Empire, France, Russia, Poland, Sweden, Denmark, Britain and the Netherlands, thus offering an attractive international meeting-place for the European aristocracy. It is estimated that around 350 passed through the academy.⁹³¹

Two groups are of particular interest: a considerable number of Russian noblemen were instructed in the customs and history of European diplomacy.⁹³² On the other hand, Schoepflin's contacts to the French ministry of foreign affairs were also reflected in the academy's audience. Encouraged by the ministry, from the 1760s many future diplomats and government officials frequented the academy which had become the true successor of Torcy's earlier attempt.⁹³³ Among the employees of the French foreign ministry were the Alsatian

⁹²⁷ See for example the diary of the Austrian diplomat L.Cobenzl, quoted in Voss, *Schoepflin*, pp.165-6.

⁹²⁸ For example, Schmauss, *Einleitung zur Staatswissenschaft* (1741/42); Achenwall, *Abriß der neuesten Staatswissenschaft der vornehmsten europäischen Reiche* (1749); cf. Voss, *Schoepflin*, p.176. Whether diplomatic treatises were used remains uncertain.

⁹²⁹ See Koch, *Discours sur l'ancienne gloire littéraire de la ville de Strasbourg* (Strasbourg, 1809), p.19, cf. Voss, 'L'Europe des Lumières', p.366-8.

⁹³⁰ Voss, *Schoepflin*, p.164. For example, Schoepflin asked his friend Schumacher, librarian of the Russian Imperial Academy, to recommend the institution, see Voss, 'L'École diplomatique', p.208.

⁹³¹ Voss, 'L'Europe des Lumières', pp.367, 370-1.

⁹³² J.Voss, 'Les Étudiants de l'Empire russe à l'université de Strasbourg au XVIIIe siècle', in C.Grau (ed.), *Deutsch-russische Beziehungen im 18. Jahrhundert: Kultur, Wissenschaft und Diplomatie* (Wiesbaden, 1997), 351-74.

⁹³³ Voss, 'L'Europe des Lumières', pp.363, 367; idem, 'L'École diplomatique', pp.205-6.

family Pfeffel and the brothers Gérard.⁹³⁴ The diplomat Louis Philippe de Ségur referred to the academy as 'ce fut là que nous nous formâmes à l'étude de la diplomatie'.⁹³⁵ In the late eighteenth century, pupils of the academy included a significant number of the European diplomatic and political corps in the age of the French Revolution, among them Metternich and Montgelas.⁹³⁶

The academy's success can partly be attributed to Schoepflin's renown and contacts across Europe, and partly to the successful combination of noble education, new academic disciplines such as 'Staatenkunde' and 'Staatshistorie' and diplomatic training. Although the academy was firmly anchored in the specific debate on university reform in the Empire, it managed to become a true European political academy. Its appeal for the governments of Europe, as the case of the French foreign ministry illustrates, lay in its provision of the necessary general knowledge and qualifications for diplomacy. It continued to flourish until the end of the Ancien Régime.⁹³⁷

Diplomatic Training in Russia

The reform debate on diplomatic training also stretched to the fringes of the states-system, symbolising Russia's incorporation into the European system and the practice of diplomacy. Under Peter the Great and his successors, the emerging 'Eastern Power' considerably increased its diplomatic representation.⁹³⁸ As a consequence, reforms were required not only in the central administration, resulting in the establishment of the ambassadorial chancellery

⁹³⁴ Voss, *Schoepflin*, p.182; E.Buddruss, 'Les Élèves de Schoepflin au ministère des affaires étrangères à Versailles', in Voss/Vogler (eds.), *Strasbourg, Schoepflin et l'Europe*, 215-24.

⁹³⁵ Cited in Voss, 'L'École diplomatique', p.212. On Ségur, see *WBIS*, entry 'F164803'.

⁹³⁶ Voss, 'L'École diplomatique', p.213.

⁹³⁷ Voss, 'L'École diplomatique', p.214. In 1799, attempts at a reorganisation were made by former collaborators such as Pfeffel, but the academy was discontinued after 1800.

⁹³⁸ Scott, *Eastern Powers*, pp.152-8. Cf. Bohlen, 'Changes in Russian Diplomacy'; B.Meissner, 'Die zaristische Diplomatie. Der Gesandtschafts-Prikaz', *JbGO*, 4 (1956), 237-45.

in 1709 and the 'College of foreign affairs' in 1718, but also with regard to the diplomatic service.⁹³⁹ In Peter I's early reign, many foreigners, especially Germans, were employed as diplomats and translators, a fact that points to the lack of Russian nobles versed in European affairs and languages.⁹⁴⁰ As a consequence, several schemes for training were considered.

Just before setting out on the 'Grand Embassy' of 1697-98, Peter had sent 60 young nobles abroad to learn Western languages and the customs of politics and navigation.⁹⁴¹ In the entourage of his embassy, many noblemen travelled through Europe.⁹⁴² In the next decades, several diplomats commenced by accompanying their relatives on embassies.⁹⁴³ For the lower diplomatic ranks, career advancement existed in so far that the translators and secretaries of Russian ambassadors, often foreigners, could rise to the rank of resident.⁹⁴⁴ On the whole, however, the Russian diplomatic service was still dominated by the old Muscovite nobility, and opportunities of social mobility were scarce. The want of qualified diplomatic personnel remained a particular problem in Russia, and efforts to train diplomats were continued after Peter's death. To send young aristocrats abroad as 'nobles of the embassy' to study languages and learn diplomatic customs was regarded the best way of training, as an order of Elizabeth in 1742 shows: 'We have found it necessary to confirm to all our ministers [...] that you are to watch over and supervise the nobles of the embassy so that they may

⁹³⁹ See Grabar, *International Law in Russia*, p.51.

⁹⁴⁰ Bohlen, 'Changes in Russian Diplomacy', p.353; E.Amburger, 'Das diplomatische Personal des russischen auswärtigen Dienstes unter Peter I', in R.v.Thadden *et al.* (eds.), *Das Vergangene und die Geschichte* (Göttingen, 1973), pp.306-7; D.Altbauer, 'The Diplomats of Peter the Great', *JbGO*, 28 (1980), 1-16.

⁹⁴¹ Amburger, 'Das diplomatische Personal', p.299; Bohlen, 'Changes in Russian Diplomacy', p.347.

⁹⁴² See Grabar, *International Law in Russia*, pp.46-7; cf.Scott, *Eastern Powers*, p.158.

⁹⁴³ See Grabar, *International Law in Russia*, pp.38-50; Amburger, 'Das diplomatische Personal', pp.305-6.

⁹⁴⁴ See Bohlen, 'Changes in Russian Diplomacy', p.303.

properly enter the civil service'.⁹⁴⁵ Yet, inadequate payment hampered the practice, and only under Catherine II (1762-96) it became more systematic and uniform.⁹⁴⁶

There also were attempts at organising a diplomatic academy. It seems that two proposals were brought forward in the reign of Peter I: an anonymous 'proposal for founding an academy of politics', and a 'memorial of Baron Nirod' on a diplomatic school.⁹⁴⁷ However, the teaching of international law and modern history became instituted in Russia only after Peter's reign at the newly founded Petersburg Academy of Sciences and later at the University of Moscow. The German *érudit* and former diplomatic secretary Friedrich Heinrich Strube began his lectures on natural and international law and modern European history in 1748.⁹⁴⁸ In addition, he proposed to create a diplomatic 'school' in the form of private classes to young noblemen: 'I shall instruct the noble youth to the advantage of those being sent to foreign courts'.⁹⁴⁹ This initiative mirrored the plans of Göttingen and Hanau, although it remains unclear to which extent it was implemented.⁹⁵⁰ Under Catherine II, who ordered translations of the treatises of Wicquefort and Callières, another attempt was made to provide for a preparation at the Imperial Academy. Georg Friedrich Müller, professor of history, was entrusted with developing such a plan in 1765.⁹⁵¹ His syllabus treated the

⁹⁴⁵ Circular rescript of 5 Apr.1742, quoted in Grabar, *International Law in Russia*, p.91.

⁹⁴⁶ Ibid., p.91. Scott, *Eastern Powers*, p.158, mentions the table of appointments of 1779, which listed two students in each embassy. For the reign of Catherine II, see also idem, 'Katharinas Russland und das europäische Staatensystem', in C.Scharf (ed.), *Katharina II., Rußland und Europa. Beiträge zur internationalen Forschung* (Mainz, 2001), 3-58.

⁹⁴⁷ Grabar, *International Law in Russia*, p.53. Unfortunately, Grabar neither provides more details on these projects nor does he examine whether they were influenced by the French academy.

⁹⁴⁸ On Strube (c.1704-90), who had studied in Halle, see W.E.Butler, 'F.E.Strube de Piermont and the Origins of Russian Legal History', in J.M.Hartley, R.Bartlett (eds.), *Russia in the Age of Enlightenment: Essays for Isabel de Madariaga* (London, 1990), 125-41.

⁹⁴⁹ Grabar, *International Law in Russia*, p.106.

⁹⁵⁰ Grabar refers back to the French 'Académie Politique' as model, albeit without giving evidence, *ibid.*

⁹⁵¹ Ibid., p.107. G.F.Müller (F.Iwanowitsch, 1705-83), historian, explorer and archivist, was born in Westphalia and studied literature and history in Leipzig. He went to Petersburg in 1725, where he taught history at the academy and became historiographer under Catherine I. Cf. J.L.Black, *Gerhard Friedrich Müller and the Imperial Russian Academy* (Montreal, 1986); P.Hoffmann, *Gerhard Friedrich Müller (1705-1783): Historiker, Geograph und Archivar im Dienste Rußlands* (Frankfurt, 2005). Müller's links to Göttingen were strengthened

'statistics' of the principal European states and their political relations; the office and privileges of a diplomat with respect to international law and ceremonial; and practical exercises in French, including the composition of diplomatic letters.⁹⁵² Although the project was not realised, Müller continued to promote the theoretical foundation of foreign policy and its teaching in Russia. He secured Catherine's consent for a collection of treaties and diplomatic customs modelled on Dumont.⁹⁵³ In 1779, he furthermore suggested a 'Staats-Academie' in imitation of Moser's academy, of Marten's lectures in Göttingen, and probably also of the Strasbourg academy.⁹⁵⁴

Already from these cursory remarks it becomes clear that schemes comparable to those of western Europe were considered in eighteenth-century Russia. This discussion was fuelled not only by the perceived necessity to reform the diplomatic service, but also by the ties of the Republic of Letters. Furthermore, the academy proposals coincided with the reception and translation of diplomatic theory, international law and state science. Although information on the designed curricula is scarce, the influence of the Empire is particularly noticeable, underlined both by the model role of the teaching at Göttingen and Strasbourg and by the role of German *érudits* such as Strube and Müller.

Beyond the States-System: Diplomatic Training and the 'Jeunes de Langue'

The case of Russia illustrates that in the eighteenth-century states-system, common, 'European' standards of diplomacy and diplomatic training were evolving, which enabled the diplomatic corps to communicate within a common framework of historical tradition,

by the sojourn of Schlözer, professor in Göttingen and former student of Pütter and Achenwall, at the Academy in 1761-67.

⁹⁵² Grabar, *International Law in Russia*, p.107.

⁹⁵³ The project was continued into the following century, see *ibid.*, p.186. Müller was also employed in the Russian foreign ministry, where he oversaw the archives.

⁹⁵⁴ Grabar, *International Law in Russia*, p.186. Once more, no further information on the project is available.

languages, practices and cultural codes. At the same time, however, the increasing contacts with actors on the fringes and outside the states-system, notably the Ottoman Empire, made an expert diplomatic and consular service imperative.⁹⁵⁵ This deliberation was connected with the debate on diplomatic 'connaissances' and training in the states-system. On the other hand, it also revealed the fundamental difference between diplomatic culture in Europe and beyond. Postings outside of the states-system required specific 'connaissances', including Oriental languages and commercial knowledge. The increasing importance of the diplomatic and consular posts in the Ottoman Empire, as well as the difficulties of language and cultural barriers rendered the matter of trustworthy interpreters and secretaries vital for the protection of political and commercial interests.

Throughout the early modern period, European embassies employed 'dragomans': interpreters versed in the three oriental languages (Ottoman, Arabic, Persian).⁹⁵⁶ This, however, brought about problems of secrecy and loyalty, so that attempts were made to substitute them by the states' own subjects. Yet again, secrecy, reliability and professionalism were the issues of debate. To raise experts in the practice of negotiating in non-European countries, however, proved even more difficult than forming 'habiles négociateurs' for European politics. The ensuing debates were part of the general reform discussion in several aspects: they concentrated on the subaltern diplomatic personnel; the preparation comprised languages, history and diplomatic practice; and the projects brought forward devised apprenticeship schemes and academies.

⁹⁵⁵ European embassies resided in Pera, a district of Constantinople, while consular posts had been established in the main five trading cities under Ottoman control: Smyrna, Tripolis, Aleppo, Saida and Alexandria. Cf. G.Heiss, G.Klingenstein (eds.), *Das Osmanische Reich und Europa 1683 bis 1788: Konflikt, Entspannung und Austausch* (Vienna, 1983); B.Spuler, 'Europäische Diplomaten in Konstantinopel bis zum Frieden von Belgrad (1739)', *JbGO*, 1 (1936), 229-62, 383-440.

⁹⁵⁶ M.de Testa, A.Gautier, *Drogmans et diplomates européens auprès de la Porte Ottomane* (Istanbul, 2003); S.G.Marghetitch, *Étude sur les fonctions des drogmans des missions diplomatiques ou consulaires en Turquie* (Istanbul, 1993); A.de Groot, 'Die Levantinischen Dragomanen. Einheimische und Fremde im eigenen Land (1453-1914)', <[http://www.let.leidenuniv.nl/tcimo/tulp/ Research/ahdg1.pdf](http://www.let.leidenuniv.nl/tcimo/tulp/Research/ahdg1.pdf)>.

At first, a small number of students was attached to the embassies in Constantinople and the consulates in the Levant. Small 'schools' emerged, sometimes in conjunction with missions.⁹⁵⁷ In the French 'enfants des langues' scheme established by Colbert in 1669, six French youths were sent to the Capuchins in Constantinople and Smyrna for three years.⁹⁵⁸ Soon, however, it was regarded desirable to transfer the teaching to France, at least in the form of a preparatory course. In 1700, Louis XIV decreed that twelve young Christians from the Orient were to study at the Collège Louis-le-Grand in Paris. This scheme, however, did not yet bring the desired results.⁹⁵⁹ On the instigation of the Marquis de Bonnac, who had already been involved in the discussion on diplomatic training, in 1721 the Regent decided to recruit ten secretaries among the sons of dragomans or merchants in the Levant, have them study at Louis-le-Grand and then send them to Constantinople. In addition, French subjects should be taken into the scheme.⁹⁶⁰ Apart from Latin, Italian and Greek, the curriculum in the 'école de jeunes de langues' included Oriental languages, the general interests of states, the basics of commerce, history and geography, as well as Ottoman laws and customs.⁹⁶¹ The combination of general education, Oriental languages and diplomatic practice became the standard curriculum for all subsequent training schemes. Furthermore, the education of the 'jeunes de langue' was connected with the general advancement of Oriental languages, as

⁹⁵⁷ See HHSTA, Staatskanzlei, Interoria, 55, fo.15. Cf. A.Joukava, "Ein Glück für jeden fremden Mann, der selbst mit Türken sprechen kann". Zur Sprachausbildung vor und kurz nach Etablierung der Orientalischen Akademie', in O.Rathkolb (ed.), *250 Jahre. Von der Orientalischen zur Diplomaten Akademie in Wien* (Innsbruck, 2004), 29-46. The beginnings of this scheme date back to the sixteenth century, see Testa, *Drogmans*, pp.13, 56.

⁹⁵⁸ See A.Pippidi, 'Drogmans et enfants de langue: la France et Constantinople au XVIIIe siècle', in F.Hitzel (ed.), *Istanbul et les langues orientales* (Paris, 1997), 131-40.

⁹⁵⁹ See BN, NAF 7487, fos.513-22, for the correspondence relating to the 'instruction des enfants de langue'. Bonnac pointed out the deficiencies of the Capuchin teaching (fo.513) and proposed a curriculum that included the customs of diplomatic and commercial negotiation as well as the tasks of a diplomatic secretary (fos.513-4). The abbé Renaudot, collaborator of the diplomatic academy and Oriental scholar, was probably also involved in this discussion.

⁹⁶⁰ This institution turned out several dragomans and diplomats, see G.Troupeau, 'Deux cents ans d'enseignement de l'arabe à l'école des langues orientales', *Chroniques Yéménites*, 6 (1997), <<http://cy.revues.org/document116.html>>; Baillou, *Affaires étrangères*, i, pp.178-84.

⁹⁶¹ Testa, *Drogmans*, p.13.

dictionaries were written for the schools, and several professors became renowned orientalists.⁹⁶² After the French Revolution, a new 'école des langues Orientales' was founded in Paris in 1795.⁹⁶³

In Austria, it had been the practice to send candidates for the eastern diplomatic and consular staff to Constantinople to learn Oriental languages and law.⁹⁶⁴ From 1674, this practice was referred to as 'Sprachknaben-Institut', similar to the French 'enfants de langue' scheme.⁹⁶⁵ Following an initiative of the 'Hofkriegsrat' in 1753, Kaunitz devised a project to transfer this training to Vienna – perhaps inspired by the French 'école des langues'.⁹⁶⁶ A project was developed by the Jesuit Josef Franz, who in 1753 became director of the 'Oriental Academy'.⁹⁶⁷ The curriculum included Turkish, Arab and Latin, geography, history, chancellery and diplomatic practice, and Ottoman customs and culture. This instruction was rounded off by an apprenticeship in Constantinople, where the students should become familiar with the conduct of negotiations.⁹⁶⁸ The academy was successful in turning out a number of diplomats and consuls during the following decades. It continued throughout the nineteenth century and was converted into the Consular Academy in 1898 and into the Diplomatic Academy in 1964.⁹⁶⁹

⁹⁶² See for example BN, NAF 7487, fos.518-9.

⁹⁶³ Troupeau, 'Deux cents ans d'enseignement de l'arabe'.

⁹⁶⁴ Matsch, *Auswärtiger Dienst*, p.76. Cf. M.Kurz et al. (eds.), *Das Osmanische Reich und die Habsburgermonarchie in der Neuzeit* (Vienna, 2005).

⁹⁶⁵ See E.Schlöss, 'Von den Sprachknaben zu den Anfängen der Orientalischen Akademie', *Wiener Geschichtsblätter*, 56 (2001), 70-6.

⁹⁶⁶ Joukava, 'Sprachausbildung', p.32; V.v.Starkenfels Weiss, *Die Kaiserlich-königliche orientalische Akademie zu Wien* (Vienna, 1839), p.4.

⁹⁶⁷ Franz had served as secretary to the embassy in Constantinople. Cf. E.Petritsch, 'Die Anfänge der Orientalischen Akademie', in Rathkolb (ed.), *250 Jahre*, 47-64. See Franz's memoir on the 'erection of a seminary for Oriental languages' of 1753, HHSTA, Staatskanzlei, Interioria 55, fo.38.

⁹⁶⁸ Joukava, 'Sprachausbildung', p.34. See Franz's report on the students' progress in 1754, HHSTA, Staatskanzlei, Interioria 55, fo.48^v.

⁹⁶⁹ On the students, who included Baron Thugut (1736-1818), the subsequent director of Austrian foreign policy, see Petritsch, 'Anfänge', pp.51-2.

In contrast, Great Britain continued to employ foreign dragomans until the end of the eighteenth century, before it began to train its own secretary-interpreters.⁹⁷⁰ Venice, on the other hand, had already established a school for 'giovani di lingua' in the bailo's residence in Constantinople, which was still active in the mid-eighteenth century. Following the examples of France and Austria, the idea of an academy was taken up in Venice again in 1786; but the senate preferred to keep the school at Pera.⁹⁷¹

The debates of training the representatives acting in the states-system and those negotiating beyond, were closely interlinked and involved the same circles of reformers as well as similar forms of training and curricula. Nevertheless, they were distinguished by the fundamental 'connaissance' of Eastern languages and customs, a point that required the European governments to continue relying on cultural intermediaries such as the dragomans. In contrast to the Levant, in the mid-eighteenth century, diplomatic contacts with Russia had already progressed from consular and ad-hoc diplomatic representation, from linguistic difficulties and cultural misunderstandings to a largely assimilated diplomatic practice. While the Ottoman Empire was an important political factor in the states-system, the issue of diplomatic training underlines that the diplomatic system was bound to the framework of 'Europe', whose diplomatic corps shared cultural and linguistic codes, a cosmopolitan outlook as well as, increasingly, a common 'knowledge base' of European political history and law.

⁹⁷⁰ For the nineteenth century, see A.Cunningham, 'Dragomania. The Dragomans of the British Embassy at Constantinople', in E.Ingram (ed.), *Allan Cunningham, Eastern Questions in the Nineteenth Century. Collected Essays* (London, 1993), ii, 1-22; G.Berridge, 'English Dragomans and Oriental Secretaries: the Early Nineteenth Century Origins of the Anglicization of the British Embassy Dragomans in Constantinople', *Diplomacy and Statecraft*, 14 (2003), 137-52. Cf. A.C.Wood, 'The English Embassy at Constantinople, 1660-1762', *EHR*, 40 (1925), 533-61.

⁹⁷¹ F.Lucchetta, 'L'ultimo progetto di una scuola orientalistica a Venezia nel Settecento', *Quaderni di studi arabi*, 3 (1985), 1-43; I.P.F.Casa, 'L'École vénitienne des 'Giovani di Lingua'', in F.Hitze (ed.), *Istanbul et les langues orientales* (Paris, 1997), 109-22.

IV.3. A Professionalisation Movement?

Were the instigators of these reform discussions the champions of a transnational 'movement' characterised by common objectives, common forms of action, continuity and coherence?

Reflections and schemes centring on a more specific and professional preparation of the diplomatic personnel intensified to an unprecedented level from the turn of the eighteenth century. Precursors could be found earlier, notably in southern Europe. Suggestions in this direction were disseminated in diplomatic theory from the 1660s and then especially from the 1690s. The 'professionalisation debate' in France reached a first pinnacle in the 1710s, whereas Britain and the states of the Empire began to take similar steps from the 1720s. In the Empire, the mid-eighteenth century marks a high point of discussion, leading to academy foundations in Austria, Prussia, Hanau, and Strasbourg. Nevertheless, in all countries the debate continued throughout the eighteenth century and even beyond: nineteenth-century reforms relating to diplomatic training and professionalism, such as the Bavarian 'pepinière' scheme, continued to mirror the suggestions of the century after 1648.

The intensity of debate varied from country to country and was influenced not only by the extent of diplomatic representation, but also by the different constitutions of government. Even if the written record can be misleading, the extent of reflection appears greatest in France, where it brought about numerous proposals by foreign ministry officials, diplomats and *érudits* throughout the eighteenth century. In Britain, on the other hand, the debate did not attain a comparable reform momentum prior to 1782, even if it was linked to a wider political debate. For the territories of the Empire, the picture has to be differentiated once more. In Imperial Austria and in Prussia, several projects were put forward and discussed at the highest level of government. In other territories, such as Saxony, Bavaria, or the smaller principalities, the archival record does not point to a similar discussion, and, although

comparable training methods gradually became established, they remained on a lower level. The particular constitution of the Empire gave rise to a number of autonomous projects at universities and noble academies, which reached great prominence in the mid-eighteenth century.

On the whole, the extent of debate was never wide-ranging and continuous; it was conducted sporadically and mostly within the foreign ministries. On the other hand, its importance should not be underestimated, since the issue of diplomatic training occupied monarchs, secretaries of state and other officials as well as diplomats. What is more, in many instances the involvement of *érudits* and pedagogues can be traced – from Torcy's councillors to the university professors Moser and Schoepflin, to the members of the Russian academy of sciences, to Orientalists, and to clerics such as Gibson or the Jesuits in Austria. The issue of diplomatic training linked the governmental and diplomatic sphere and the Republic of Letters. Moreover, through the accompanying theoretical literature, through newspapers and gazettes, and through the contacts and correspondence of *érudits*, the academy planners and the European 'public' were informed about the key issues of the debate.

In this respect, diplomatic theory served both as an instigator of reform and as a medium of transfer. Not only did it contribute to a dissemination of the first ideas of diplomatic professionalism and a diplomatic 'curriculum'; its suggestions were also incorporated into training schemes and academy plans, and treatises were even used as study material. Both the set of 'connaissances' and the means of acquiring the special knowledge and experience outlined by theorists reappeared in the reform discussions. Diplomatic history, languages, international law and statistics formed the basis of the 'new' diplomat's education, to which were added experience in the embassies and in the archives and chancelleries of the emerging foreign ministries. Furthermore, the majority of training

schemes concentrated on the lower and subaltern ranks, which theorists regarded as pillars of an effective and 'professional' diplomacy. In this respect, the connections between diplomatic theory, chancellery practice, legal theory and state science once more become apparent. Finally, diplomatic theory and the discussion on diplomatic training were linked by the fact that several theorists stood in close connection with diplomatic academies, as for example Chamoy, Callières, the families Pecquet and Moser, and Bielfeld.

To a certain degree, the various discussions on diplomatic training thus did form part of a common reform debate and involved theorists and reformers from across the states-system. In the governmental sphere, the training schemes were tailored to the particular situation of each country and diplomatic service. On the other hand, theorists of diplomacy and *érudits* such as Moser or Schoepflin perceived themselves as standing in a wider context – that of the European states-system and international society. The many parallels between the different training schemes underline that the diplomatic and erudite elites perceived European politics to be subjected to common rules and systems of knowledge.

Then again, among the common features of the reform movement were also the opposition and resistance to training schemes. The influence of social status, wealth and patronage continued to deter a selection and advancement according to criteria of knowledge and experience, in particular for the higher ranks of diplomacy. In every training scheme, the question whether diplomacy was an art tied to the noble status, or a science to be acquired by study and experience, recurred.

This leads to the question if the reform debate managed to influence the practice of diplomatic training and contribute to a 'professionalisation' of the European diplomatic corps. Many proposals were not realised, and most academies were short-lived. Although they contributed to a gradual improvement of preparation, they did not change the overall practice.

Until the later nineteenth century, diplomacy did not become a profession based on entry exams and regular advancement. And even if diplomatic assignments became more sought after in the course of the eighteenth century, diplomacy was not an attractive career prospect: 'In our way of life we have nothing to animate us but glory and the consciousness of having done our duty'.⁹⁷² This statement compared to the picture drawn by Stepney and his colleagues, as well as to the prejudice against the diplomatic career which Pecquet and other theorists of diplomacy sought to counter. Yet it obscures that other rewards than financial profit were to be expected from diplomacy. Apart from the 'shadow of glory' abroad, which Stepney ironically referred to, and the honour of serving one's prince, which Pecquet accentuated, the attraction of travelling and living in a cosmopolitan aristocratic setting, and, more importantly, the hope of rewarding posts and offices and patronage induced both noblemen and commoners to venture abroad.⁹⁷³

If the future members of the 'pentarchy' (Austria, Britain, France, Prussia and Russia) reveal common features in the improvement of diplomatic training, the failure of wide-reaching training schemes can also be attributed to common characteristics: financial problems, the old nobility's resistance against training programmes, the reluctance of ministers to abandon their powers of patronage, and the aversion of absolutist princes to compromise the secrecy of their cabinets and chancelleries all hampered the 'modern' idea of training diplomats. Nevertheless, the discussion on diplomatic training, launched by theorists of diplomacy and pertaining to wide circles of eighteenth-century governments and the Republic of Letters, did bring about results. It created and reinforced an awareness that the new demands of the states-system required a specialist diplomatic corps. Concurrently,

⁹⁷² T. Robinson to W. Titley, 1 Apr. 1729, cited in Black, *British Diplomats*, p. 1. Cp. Pecquet, *Art de négocier*, pp. xx-xxiii, 160.

⁹⁷³ See for example Black, *British Diplomats*, pp. 101-14; Horn, *British Diplomatic Service*, pp. 85-106; Müller, *Kaiserliches Gesandtschaftswesen*, pp. 179-94; cp. Droste, 'Unternehmer in Sachen Kultur'.

among the circles of 'reformers', the realisation spread that an improvement of training had to be accompanied by improved payment and career prospects.⁹⁷⁴ Although the latter aspect was responsible for the failure of many projects, the ideas and methods devised in these initiatives continued to be discussed and tested throughout the eighteenth century and even beyond. When the reforms after the end of the Ancien Régime are considered,⁹⁷⁵ the 'modern' character of the debate in the post-1648 century becomes apparent.

⁹⁷⁴ On the repercussions of this debate in southern Europe, see, for Savoy-Piedmont, D.Frigo, *Principe, ambasciatori e 'jus gentium'. L'amministrazione della politica estera nel Piemonte del Settecento* (Rome, 1991); and for Spain, Ozanam, 'Introduction, in idem, *Les Diplomats espagnols*.

⁹⁷⁵ As overview, see Erbe, *Revolutionäre Erschütterung*, esp.44-62; W.Baumgart, *Europäisches Konzert und nationale Bewegung. Internationale Beziehungen 1830-1878* (Paderborn, 1999), esp.134-45; for France, Baillou, *Affaires étrangères*, ii; for England, S.T.Bindoff, 'The Unreformed Diplomatic Service 1812-60', *Transactions of the RHS*, 4th series, 18 (1935), 143-72; for Austria, Matsch, *Auswärtiger Dienst*.

Part V. A Common Diplomatic Culture? How French was European Diplomacy?

Episode 5. 'Three French Ambassadors' – Diplomacy and the Public

Harlay, Crécy, Callières,
Ont fait la paix,
Quels plenipotentiaires!
Vit on jamais
De gens plus nobles que ceux ci?
Charivari.

En un seul jour
On rendu trente deux villes
Et Luxembourg,
A Peine ont ils sauvé Paris,
Charivari.

Admirons tous la prudence,
Ils ont rendu
Ce que tot ou tard la France
auroit perdu.
Villeroi auroit envor fait pis
Charivari.

Harlay, Callières et Crécy
Ne sont ils pas gens fort habiles
Harlay, Callières et Crécy
N'ont ils pas bien réussi
Ces ministres ont appris
Leur maximes dans l'évangile
A rendre plus qu'on n'a pris.
Harlay, Callières et Crécy
Admirons ces beaux esprits,
S'ils ont rendu plus de cent villes,
N'ont ils pas gardé Paris?
Harlay, Callières et Crécy.⁹⁷⁶

The performance of diplomats was subject not only to the comments and criticism of their governments, but also to the censure of the European 'public' who was informed about their achievements and failures by the ever-increasing number of periodicals, pamphlets and tracts. The French satirical ode above, for example, criticised the outcome of the negotiations at Rijswijk and the performance of the French plenipotentiaires Harlay, Crécy, and François de Callières. By turning the attributes of the 'habile négociateur' into ridicule, it condemned the loss of several *Réunion* gains. Thus, the piece is not only of interest because it denigrated the performance of French diplomats, but also because it illustrates that to slate the competence

⁹⁷⁶ 'Three French Ambassadors', copy in PRO, SP103/96, unpaginated.

of diplomats could be a way to criticise a state's foreign policy. In the 'age of absolutism', it was difficult to discuss foreign policy, and censorship was particularly strict on this matter.⁹⁷⁷ With the possible exceptions of Great Britain and the Dutch Republic, the role of 'the public' in the shaping of foreign policy and diplomacy was small. Nevertheless, as recent scholarship has outlined, even before the mid-eighteenth century the 'public' was becoming an increasingly important factor in international relations, and princes, ministers and diplomats calculatedly used the media of diplomatic ceremonial and the pamphlet press to support their foreign policy.⁹⁷⁸ The increasing journal and pamphlet literature on European politics, the academic and erudite engagement with international relations, contemporary history and state science, as well as the discussion of reform proposals relating to the diplomatic service all underline the growing linkage between the the political-diplomatic and the courtly and erudite public spheres, which transcended the late-humanist political culture of the decades before 1648.⁹⁷⁹ Although diplomacy was conducted in the close realm of cabinets and covert negotiations, from the later seventeenth century it began to attain a place in the emerging 'information society'. The names, social position and, indeed, the character traits of the diplomatic *corps* became a matter of 'public' interest.⁹⁸⁰ The performance of diplomats was also an issue of discussions, of pamphlets, periodicals, satires and elegies. In this respect, a 'cultural diplomatic history' will need to examine how far the theorists' portrait of the 'ideal

⁹⁷⁷ See Reinhard, *Geschichte der Staatsgewalt*, pp.390-5, who lists the relevant literature (p.606).

⁹⁷⁸ On the emerging 'public sphere', see A.Gestrich, *Absolutismus und Öffentlichkeit*; C.Kampmann, 'Geschichte als Argument. Historische Mythen im Wandel des frühneuzeitlichen Staatensystems', *ZHF*, 32 (2005), pp.201-3; E.Everth, *Die Öffentlichkeit in der Außenpolitik von Karl V. bis Napoleon* (Jena, 1931); cf. T.Blaning, *The Culture of Power and the Power of Culture. Old Regime Europe 1660-1789* (Oxford, 2002). The concept of the 'representative public' has been developed by J.Habermas, *Strukturwandel der Öffentlichkeit. Untersuchungen zu einer Kategorie der bürgerlichen Gesellschaft*, 4th edn (Neuwied, 1969).

⁹⁷⁹ For the later seventeenth century, see for example G.Dethlefs, 'Schauplatz Europa. Das "Theatrum Europaeum" des Matthaeus Merian als Medium kritischer Öffentlichkeit', in Bußmann/Werner (eds.), *Europa im 17. Jahrhundert*, 149-80; M.Baumanns, *Das publizistische Werk des kaiserlichen Diplomaten Franz Paul Freiherr von Lisola (1613-1674). Ein Beitrag zum Verhältnis von absolutistischem Staat, Öffentlichkeit und Mächtepolitik in der Frühen Neuzeit* (Berlin, 1994). For early-eighteenth-century France, see also J.Klaits, *Printed Propaganda under Louis XIV. Absolute Monarchy and Public Opinion* (Princeton, 1976).

⁹⁸⁰ Cf. D.Jones, *Splendid Encounters. The Thought and Conduct of Diplomacy* (Chicago, 1984).

diplomat', the government's views on diplomatic professionalism, and the diplomats' self-portraits compared to 'public' depictions of the diplomat.

The 1697 ode criticised the accomplishment of French diplomats who, nonetheless, were already deemed as superior in the art of negotiation to their colleagues from other countries. Scholarship has suggested that French diplomacy was most efficient in adapting to the new demands of the states-system, thereby constituting a model for other states. Corresponding to the French general political and cultural hegemony in the age of Louis XIV, European diplomacy, in this view, was predominantly French.⁹⁸¹

A century after the Peace of Westphalia had been concluded, theorists of diplomacy perceived that Europe had become a system of shared norms, rules and procedures of diplomacy: a common diplomatic practice and culture. But how was this process of integration and alignment shaped? Did the adaption of the diplomatic apparatus to the new demands of the states-system occur simultaneously and coherently in all parts of Europe, or did states such as France indeed act as models for the 'new diplomacy'? The evolution of diplomatic organisation and practice took place between the poles of a common European practice and the contributions of individual states. While older historiography regarded the dominant power of the time as the model for the diplomatic practice of the other states – and for the post-1648 century this meant France – recent studies put more stress on common features in this process.⁹⁸² In order to identify parallels as well as regional and national differences, though, a comparative approach is required which reconsiders the evolution of

⁹⁸¹ For instance: H.Nicolson, *The Evolution of Diplomatic Method* (London, 1964), p.53; C.S.Blaga, *L'Évolution de la diplomatie* (Paris, 1938), p.57; Keens-Soper, 'Callières and Diplomatic Theory', pp.491-2; Horn, *British Diplomatic Service*, p.125; Picavet, 'Carrière diplomatique', p.383; A.Ostrower, *Language, Law and Diplomacy* (2 vols., Philadelphia, 1965), i, pp.109-10; M.S.Anderson, *Europe in the Eigtheenth Century 1713-1783* (London, 1961), p.241; Luard, *Balance of Power*, p.45.

⁹⁸² For example, Reinhard, *Geschichte der Staatsgewalt*, p.42; cf. the handbooks of Anderson, *Rise of Modern Diplomacy*; Keith/Hamilton, *Practice of Diplomacy*; Duchhardt, *Balance of Power*.

diplomatic practice and state building as 'histoire croisée'.⁹⁸³ For diplomacy, so far only William Roosen has attempted to establish a catalogue of criteria comparing the advent of 'professional' elements in the diplomatic services of Europe.⁹⁸⁴ This approach contributes a further illustration of the common and composite nature of diplomatic practice, even if it fails to address the processes and means through which it was formed and disseminated. Admittedly, from the source material available to diplomatic historians, routes of transfer and processes of adaption can be reconstructed only in a few cases. In this respect, the viewpoint of diplomatic theory can provide an interesting angle: on one hand, it sought to represent the common denominator of diplomatic practice in the states-system; on the other, its authors were embedded not only in the transnational communities of the diplomatic corps and the *respublica litteraria*, but also in 'national' diplomatic services and governments. The following section will reconsider the fields of adaptation sketched out in this thesis, in order to ascertain perceptions of 'models' and instances of transfer which accompanied and shaped the emergence of a common European diplomatic practice.

Diplomatic theory regarded French foreign policy in the 1640s as the impetus for the establishment of a European-wide resident diplomatic network. Theorists pointed to the Italian, especially Roman and Venetian antecedents of resident diplomacy since the late fifteenth century, as well as to the Habsburg-French antagonism in the sixteenth century as impulses in this direction. Nevertheless, they identified France as 'primum mobile' of the

⁹⁸³ In general, see M.Werner, B.Zimmermann, 'Vergleich, Transfer, Verflechtung. Der Ansatz der 'Histoire Croisée' und die Herausforderung des Transnationalen', *Geschichte und Gesellschaft*, 28 (2002), 607-36; W.Schmale, *Historische Komparatistik und Kulturtransfer. Europageschichtliche Perspektiven für die Landesgeschichte* (Bochum, 1998); J.Paulmann, 'Internationaler Vergleich und interkultureller Transfer. Zwei Forschungsansätze zur europäischen Geschichte des 18. bis 20. Jahrhunderts', *Historische Zeitschrift*, 267 (1998), 649-85.

⁹⁸⁴ W.Roosen, 'La Diplomatie du XVII^e siècle. Fut-elle française ou européenne?', *RHD*, 93 (1979), 5-15. Roosen compares the establishment of archives, the information of diplomats, the choice of secretaries, regular payment, forms of preparation, and corruption.

diplomatic network's transformation in the mid-seventeenth century; Richelieu 'fut le premier qui reconnut bien la nécessité d'une négociation permanente avec les principales puissances de l'Europe, et même des autres parties du monde [...]; c'est la création du tableau de l'état actuel de l'Europe'.⁹⁸⁵ The growing diplomatic representation illustrated that France was a dynamic element in the system. This was also realised by the Emperor and his ministers, who viewed the great number of French ambassadors and ministers as a challenge forcing Austria to increase its own representation abroad.⁹⁸⁶ If France continued to outnumber other states in this respect until the War of the Spanish Succession, after the Peace of Utrecht the diplomatic networks of the principal Powers became adjusted in number and extent.

Parallel to the rapid extension of its diplomatic network, France also transformed its administrative apparatus quickly into a substantial bureaucratic service during the seventeenth century. The foreign ministry under Torcy has been termed exemplary for early eighteenth-century Europe.⁹⁸⁷ Yet, diplomatic theory made no direct comment on a French model in this respect; and theorists regarded various countries as innovators in diplomatic administration and organisation. Treatises of southern European origins still saw the Papal, Venetian or Spanish organisation as admirable.⁹⁸⁸ Usually, theorists took their own country's administration as point of reference, although they also turned their attention to the organisation of other states. Bielfeld based his 'modèle pour l'arrangement du département

⁹⁸⁵ Bielfeld, *Institutions politiques*, ii, p.6; Callières, *De la manière*, p.12; Mably, *Principes des négociations*, p.10; Frid, *Dissertatio de legatis*, p.2; Ahnert, *Lehrbegriff der Wissenschaften*, p.6; cf. [Richelieu], *Testament politique*, pp.33-4; Achenwall, *Staatsklugheit*, pp.298-9.

⁹⁸⁶ See also HKA, *Hoffinanz* 437 (1673), fo.320.

⁹⁸⁷ Hotman, *Ambassadeur*, p.71; Mably *Principes des négociations*, p.74. Cf. W.Doyle, *The Old European Order 1660-1800*, 2nd edn (Oxford, 1992), p.268; Duchhardt, *Balance of Power*, p.39; Reinhard, *Geschichte der Staatsgewalt*, p.374.

⁹⁸⁸ Rome and other Italian states were also regarded as models of diplomatic organisation by the English translator of Callières, *Art of Negotiation*, preface p.ix. On the particular nature of the papal diplomatic apparatus cf. Riccardi, 'An Outline of Vatican Diplomacy'.

des affaires étrangères' on the Prussian administration.⁹⁸⁹ The parallels between this portrayed ministry and the French administration, on the other hand, underline that the evolution of diplomatic foreign ministries was part of the general process and shared experience of state-building in Europe. Features of 'modern' diplomatic administration, including special 'bureaux' handling correspondence, ciphers, archives and translation, were established in most countries in this period. This process diverged in time and scope, owing to the particular constitutions of government.⁹⁹⁰ In some cases, contemporaries referred to models in the administrative organisation of foreign affairs: for instance, the Prussian minister Ilgen regarded as model the imperial chancellery, which also served as example for other states of the Empire.⁹⁹¹ Then again, it is plausible that the reorganisation of the imperial chancellery under Kaunitz was to some extent influenced by the example of the French foreign ministry.⁹⁹²

The administrative apparatus of all major states was forced to adapt to the mounting mass of correspondence and information created by resident diplomacy. With regard to the 'structural' framework of diplomacy, i.e. the information and financial resources, a more differentiated picture of French superiority emerges. Like most theorists, Callières still regarded the Venetian practice of diplomatic correspondence, in particular the 'relazioni', as model and suggested 'il seroit fort utile d'imiter en cela l'ordre établi par la République de Venise'.⁹⁹³ And indeed, in the early eighteenth century, the model function of the Venetian

⁹⁸⁹ Bielfeld, *Institutions politiques*, ii, p.77.

⁹⁹⁰ Cf. Reinhard, *Staatsgeswalt*; Anderson, *Rise of Modern Diplomacy*; Duchhardt, *Balance of Power*.

⁹⁹¹ Kohnke, *Kabinettsministerium*, p.47, names the Saxon chancellery as a model for the Prussian cabinet ministry.

⁹⁹² See Klingenstein, 'Institutionelle Aspekte', p.87. On the influence of the French administrative model on Spain after 1714, see Ozanam, *Diplomates espagnols*, p.11.

⁹⁹³ Callières, *De la manière*, p.90. See also Hotman, *Ambassadeur*, p.65; Rogers, *Ambassador's Idea*, fo.25^v; Wicquefort, *L'Ambassadeur*, ii, pp.403-4; Schmid, *Der Gesandte*, fo.350; Nourar, *Ministère du négociateur*, p.294.

'relazioni' was still recognisable.⁹⁹⁴ In addition, with respect to regular newsletters sent out to diplomats, theorists referred to the Dutch and the English practices.⁹⁹⁵ With regard to intelligence, on the other hand, theorists were united in considering the French system of diplomats, spies, 'gratifications' and pensions superior to any other state in this period.⁹⁹⁶ France built upon the practices of information extraction developed notably in southern Europe and was able to intensify them with the help of financial means and growing political influence, in this way coming to 'regnant en tous les cours de l'Europe'.⁹⁹⁷ To match the French intelligence system became an obligation for other states, as English memoirs clearly realised: 'T'is plain that the French out do us at these two things, secrecy and intelligence'.⁹⁹⁸ Furthermore, governments were informed about the provision of other states' diplomats not only with information, but also with funds.⁹⁹⁹ The state-system's actors looked to each other in the process of adapting their apparatus and structural framework to the demands of the 'new diplomacy'. With regard to the aspects regarded as hallmarks of 'modernisation', France managed to take up and transform existing practices most swiftly and effectively in the later seventeenth century. Other states followed in the same way, as far as their resources allowed,

⁹⁹⁴ Bérenger, 'Diplomatie impériale', p.129; Müller, *Kaiserliches Gesandtschaftswesen*, p.24. Cf. the eighteenth-century instructions in Prussia and Saxony calling for 'Finalrelationen' according to the Venetian model: GSTA, Rep.9, Z Lit.K, fascs.1-3; Sächs.HSTA, Geh.Kabinett 952.02. See also Lachs, *Diplomatic Corps*, p.42, for the French and English emulation of this model.

⁹⁹⁵ For example, Bielfeld, *Institutions politiques*, ii, pp.195-6. See Roosen, 'Diplomatie du XVIIe siècle', p.10.

⁹⁹⁶ Bielfeld, *Institutions politiques*, ii, p.205. On the extensive Venetian apparatus, see P.Preto, *Il Servizi segreti di Venezia [...]* (Milan, 1994).

⁹⁹⁷ Wicquefort, *Mémoires*, edn.1730, p.80. See also Galardi, *Traité politique*, pp.13-4, 112; Wicquefort, *L'Ambassadeur oder Staats-Bothschaffter*, preface, unpaginated; Stosch, *Praecedenz-Recht*, pp.561-2; Bielfeld, *Institutions politiques*, ii, p.199; still Martens, *Manuel diplomatique*, p.111. Cf. *The Ambitious Practices of France [...]* (London, 1698); *Franckreichs Geist [...]* (Cologne, 1689).

⁹⁹⁸ Defoe, 'Maxims and Instructions' [1704], BL, Landsdowne MS.98, fos.229-32. See also Clarendon's 'Rules to be observed by a Foreign Minister'. On the English intelligence system, cf. Fraser, *Intelligence of the Secretaries of State*.

⁹⁹⁹ See for example the copies of French payment regulations in PRO, SP 9/166 and SP 78/123, which preceeded the English reform proposals of 1667-9, cf. Lachs, *Diplomatic Corps*, pp.83-4. Another example is the regulation of diplomatic presents in Prussia in 1747, modelled 'nach dem Fuß, wie solches in Franckreich, Engelandt, Hollandt und bey andern Puissancen mehr gebräuchlich ist', GSTA, Rep. 9, Z Lit.K, fasc.36, fo.10.

as could be observed in the reorganisation of the diplomatic apparatus in the eighteenth-century Empire.

A further 'common feature' of diplomacy after 1648 was the growing concern with the performance and professionalism of diplomats. As has been demonstrated for France, Britain and the Empire, internal criticism of the diplomatic service was a common phenomenon, and critics often referred to 'the example of other countries' in their calls for reform. Among the theorists publicising such views, Galardi pointed to the French superiority over Spanish diplomats, while Callières and Pecquet in turn deplored the French inattention towards the profession and 'science' of diplomacy. The English translation of Callières, on the other hand, regarded the diplomatic services of France and the Italian states as admirable, while the German translator of Callières pointed to the French model. Several theorists and reformers from Britain and the Empire regarded French diplomats as most successful in negotiation, since they exemplified two elements of diplomatic efficacy and 'professionalism': the type of the 'honnête espion' Addison attacked, and the courtly-aristocratic 'honnête homme' Chesterfield praised. Yet the key criteria of professionalism was a special diplomatic training. And it is with respect to these debates that the links between the states-system's actors appear particularly pronounced. Several common features have been identified in Part IV, ranging from academy curricula to training schemes. These parallels also draw attention to the question of models and transfer in the reform discussion. While instances of direct transfer are difficult to identify, they can nevertheless be inferred from the chronology of the debate, the dissemination of printed media, from personal links and from the networks of the Republic of Letters. The reception of the French 'Académie Politique' helped to spark off discussions in Britain and the Empire. The French project had in turn been influenced by an

intercepted Austrian memoir: Straatman's 'Testament de Lorraine'. In the Empire, Moser's and Schoepflin's extensive networks of correspondents and contacts to diplomats, *érudits* and government ministers not only helped them to implement their academy plans, which both bore resemblance to the former French academy, but they also brought their training schemes to the notion of reformers in Russia. In the case of Britain, the chronological vicinity of the reception of the French academy and Stanyan's proposals, as well as the reference to 'the example of other countries' in the establishment of embassy secretaries in 1786 point to a transfer of information and ideas from the continent. In all discussions, references were made to the practices of training in other countries, such as Venice,¹⁰⁰⁰ Sweden,¹⁰⁰¹ France and later also the Empire. This suggests a general awareness of projects in Europe.¹⁰⁰² In the cases of Austria, Prussia, and, to a lesser extent, in Saxony, the contemporaneity of projects in the 1730s and 40s suggests that the reform discussions were influenced by each other. Finally, in the case of 'oriental academies' and training schemes for the diplomatic-consular service, the examples of Austria and France underline yet again that reform schemes were characterised by parallels and mutual influence.

While Venice was still regarded as model for diplomatic practice and training by theorists of diplomacy, the influence of southern Europe declined in favour of the models of France and the Empire. Yet, the states of southern Europe continued to be involved in the general process of adjusting the diplomatic service to the new demands of the states-

¹⁰⁰⁰ For example, Rogers, *Ambassador's Idea*, fos.13-4; Wicquefort, *L'Ambassadeur*, i, pp.85-6; Schmid, *Der Gesandte*, fo.16^{r-v}; Callières, *De la manière*, p.62, referring to Italy and Spain; Réal, *Science du gouvernement*, i, p.vii.

¹⁰⁰¹ See Callières, *De la manière*, p.140; Bielfeld, *Institutions politiques*, ii, p.199; Réal, *Science du gouvernement*, i, p.vii. Cf. Gérard's suggestions in 'MD France 2168, fos.52-7.

¹⁰⁰² On England and Spain as models of diplomatic training, see Courtin's remark in AAE, CP Angleterre 87, fo.126, and Bartenstein's memorial in HHSTA, Staatskanzlei, Interoria 1, fos.13-4.

system.¹⁰⁰³ In late-eighteenth century Spain, for example, it was suggested that embassy secretaries be established according to the models of France, the Empire and Britain.¹⁰⁰⁴ In Russia, on the other hand, the adoption of a 'European' diplomatic practice led to multiple forms of transfer, in which the role of the Empire deserves mention, as well as the model function of the French court and diplomatic service,¹⁰⁰⁵ and the overall reception of 'western' legal and diplomatic theory. Whereas the French 'Académie politique' had served as reference-point for the debate in other countries, throughout the eighteenth century, notably in the Empire, from around the mid-century the Empire itself took the lead in the advancement of a special academic curriculum; an assessment supported by French perceptions. LeGrand and his collaborators had deplored the absence of a taught state science and international law in France; an opinion repeated not only by the theorists Pecquet and Réal, but also by late-eighteenth century reformers.¹⁰⁰⁶ Consequently, while France was the first state to implement the suggestions brought forward by theorists and reformers, the issue of diplomatic training illustrates the composite and universal character of a reform debate that spans the entire states-system.

The system's actors also sought information on the specification of the 'droit des gens' in the laws of other countries, as the example of the franchise ('Akzisefreiheit') has shown. Following the principle of reciprocity, in many cases the civil immunities granted to diplomats were aligned to that of other states, although regional differences persisted in the 'droit public de l'Europe'. One instance of alignment was the reduction of the 'franchise du

¹⁰⁰³ On the administrative reforms in Savoy after 1710, see Frigo, *Piemonte*, p.30, who regards the organisation of other countries, notably of France and Austria, as models for the Savoyard diplomatic service.

¹⁰⁰⁴ Wall's memorandum of 1763, quoted according to Ozanam, *Diplomats espagnols*, p.76.

¹⁰⁰⁵ On an attempt to imitate the French political academy in 1715, see Grabar, *International Law in Russia*, p.53.

¹⁰⁰⁶ Apart from the Empire's universities, the French debate also paid credit to the Dutch universities, see AAE, MD France 2168, memoir of 1722, fo.14^v.

quartier' from the 1680s, following the lead of Rome and Madrid;¹⁰⁰⁷ another was the adaption of the Prussian and Saxon 'Akzisierungsfreiheit' to the customs of other Powers in the mid-eighteenth century. The concurrent introduction of laws specifying the extent of diplomatic privileges points to reciprocity and transfer.¹⁰⁰⁸ Yet, the first example also illustrates that the alignment of international law was a political issue. It could be instrumentalised in order to stake political claims, to demonstrate supremacy, or to provoke a diplomatic break-up. Into the second category fall the instances in which the 'droit d'ambassade' was granted or refused to newly-sovereign states, for example to the German electors in Paris. The third category comprises situations in which the insult of a diplomat or the violation of international law led to a deliberate break of relations.¹⁰⁰⁹ Louis XIV was most assertive in instrumentalising and exploiting ambiguities about diplomatic immunities and the 'ius legationis'.¹⁰¹⁰ Wicquefort criticised French policy in this respect, being aware that it would set an example for other European courts.¹⁰¹¹ On the other hand, the evolution of international law from a shared classical Roman heritage and a body of precedents, customs and compromises renders it difficult to identify the individual states' influence. The 'droit des gens' and the 'droit public de l'Europe' were the products of an overall process of regulating international relations in the states-system.¹⁰¹² Of course, precedent cases could be interpreted and instrumentalised according to political interests. Nonetheless, the body of rules and customs constituting international law was regarded as superseding the interests

¹⁰⁰⁷ See also Wicquefort, *L'Ambassadeur*, i, p.416; Callières, *De la manière*, p.104. The *Embajada española* regarded Madrid as model in this respect, pp.38-9. See also AAE, MD France 1871 for a compilation of European franchise customs ('Mémoire sur les franchises', fos.48-55).

¹⁰⁰⁸ This becomes apparent when one compares the laws listed by Martens, *Erzählungen*, pp.330 ff; Vercamer, *Franchises diplomatiques*, pp.47 ff.

¹⁰⁰⁹ See for example Frey, *Diplomatic Immunity*, pp.133, 255.

¹⁰¹⁰ See H.Duchhardt, 'Droit et droit des gens. Structures et métamorphoses des relations internationales au temps de Louis XIV', in Babel (ed.), *Frankreich im europäischen Staatensystem*, 179-90.

¹⁰¹¹ Wicquefort, *L'Ambassadeur*, i, pp.41-53.

¹⁰¹² Cf. Mohnhaupt, 'Europa' und 'jus publicum'; Reibstein, 'Das 'Europäische Öffentliche Recht'.

and power of states, forming a truly 'European' framework of norms and traditions which delineated the states-system from its environment.

With regard to the contributions of individual states to the theory of international law, the picture must also be differentiated. Scholarship has underlined the role of the 'Spanish school' of international law¹⁰¹³ and of the English way of handling diplomatic law in the sixteenth century.¹⁰¹⁴ In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, on the other hand, it was first and foremost Dutch and German scholars who depicted the development of the international legal framework. Eighteenth-century reform discussions deplored the absence of contributions on international law in their countries, and regarded the Empire as model in this respect.¹⁰¹⁵ The case of Russia also reveals that the literature on international law was a medium of transfer for the norms and customs of 'European' diplomacy. This could either occur through the dissemination and translation of treatises, or through scholars and teachers of international law, or through the diplomats' own reports on the legal customs of other countries.¹⁰¹⁶

A comparable picture emerges when one considers the theory and 'science' of ceremonial in Europe after 1648. In the decades around 1700, the majority of publishing authors on ceremonial were from the Empire, although the collection of ceremonial customs and precedents in the governmental sphere was a growing phenomenon in all states. Under the auspices of masters of ceremonies such as Sainctot and archivists such as LeDran, the French court produced an unrivalled mass of ceremonial memoirs.¹⁰¹⁷ Diplomatic ceremonial was linked to court ceremonial, and the honours bestowed to diplomats consequently were subject to each court's regulation. This was acknowledged by theorists of diplomacy, who,

¹⁰¹³ See the preface to Vera, *Parfait ambassadeur* (Paris, 1642), p.2; cf. Grewe, *Völkerrecht*, pp.43-7.

¹⁰¹⁴ See Frey, *Diplomatic Immunity*, pp.149-75; in this tradition still stood Thynne, *Perfect Ambassador*; Howell, *A Distinct Treatise*.

¹⁰¹⁵ See also Réal, *Science du gouvernement*, i, p.xix. For Savoy, see Frigo, *Piemonte*, esp. pp.128-30, 132, 224.

¹⁰¹⁶ Cf. Grabar, *International Law in Russia*.

¹⁰¹⁷ See also Duindam's comparison of Vienna and Paris, 'Ceremonial Staff and Paperwork'.

nevertheless, perceived a trend towards standardisation that transformed ceremonial into a common 'language' of the states-system. In the process of formalisation and alignment, individual states could take the lead in shaping the honours accorded to the various diplomatic ranks, thus acting as arbiters and models of ceremonial practice. After 1648 the dominant influence of France became apparent. Versailles was generally acknowledged as the pace-setter in matters of ceremonial.¹⁰¹⁸ Louis XIV was perceived to be the driving force behind many changes of ceremonial, using diplomatic 'honours' as political tools. Not only did Versailles resolve to grant or refuse 'royal' honours to electoral diplomats according to its interests in the Empire, but it also employed conflicts of precedence to claim supremacy over Spain and even to attack the Emperor's rank in international society. The adroit instrumentalisation of the 1661 incident and the dispute about the status of imperial residents and envoys underline this.¹⁰¹⁹ The literature on ceremonial and the 'droit d'ambassade' looked to Versailles when assessing the status of new sovereigns.¹⁰²⁰ However, the imperial court, influenced by Spanish and Italian ceremonial traditions, proved more resistant to innovations instigated by France.¹⁰²¹ Furthermore, Paris did not become the exclusive 'arbiter' of diplomatic ceremonial; Rome was still considered the 'théâtre du monde' with regard to ceremonial,¹⁰²² and the Italian influence in matters of ceremonial

¹⁰¹⁸ Wicquefort, *Mémoires*, edn.1730, p.169-70; *L'Ambassadeur*, i, p.52; Schmid, *Der Gesandte*, fo.174^v; *Annotata über die Frage*, p.6; Moser, *Ambassadrice*, p.12. See also AAE, MD France 1850, fo.115^v; *ibid.* 1852, fo.171^v; BL, Add.MS 61699B, fos.1-2^v; GSTA, Rep.81, fasc.7 (1 Nov.1679), unpaginated.

¹⁰¹⁹ See Wicquefort, *L'Ambassadeur*, pp.343, 351; Stieve, *Europäisches Hof-Ceremoniell*, p.89; Mably, *Principes des négociations*, pp.74-5; Bielfeld, *Institutions politiques*, ii, p.240. From the French point of view, see LeDran's 1739 memoir in AAE, MD France 1850, fos.85-124.

¹⁰²⁰ For example, Müller, *De principum Germaniae legationibus*, fo.C3; Textor, *Synopsis iuris gentium*, p.93; Stosch, *Praecedenz- und Vorder-Recht*, pp.561-2; *Philosophia elegantiarum*, p.12.

¹⁰²¹ See C.Hoffmann, *Das spanische Hofzeremoniell von 1500-1700* (Frankfurt, 1985), pp.293-5; Duindam, 'Ceremonial Staff', p.194-5.

¹⁰²² See [Richelieu], *Testament politique*, p.7; Wicquefort, *L'Ambassadeur*, i, p.231; Carafa, *Ambasciadore*, pp.61 ff; Schmid, *Der Gesandte*, fo.68^v; Callières, *De la manière*, p.213; Treuer, *Finnetti Philxenis*, p.52; Stieve, *Europäisches Hof-Ceremoniell*, p.229; Lünig, *Theatrum ceremoniale*, p.6. See also the *Instruction des Ambassadeurs [...] dans la cour de Rome* (Cologne, 1681), unpaginated; BL, Stowe MS 135, fo.263: 'Sur l'exemple de Rome preques toutes les cours de la Chretienité se conforment'. Cf. M.Rosa, 'The 'World's Theatre': the Court of Rome and Politics in the First Half of the Seventeenth Century', in M.Visceglia, G.Signorotto (eds.), *Court and Politics in Rome, 1492-1700* (Cambridge, 2002), 78-98.

was strong in the Empire,¹⁰²³ as was the weight of the imperial court. Yet, despite persisting traditions, most courts introduced changes in their ceremonial in this period; changes that were part of the overall process of standardisation perceived by theorists.

Ceremonial customs could be transferred through the media of published treatises, manuscript copies of ceremonial registers, and the reports of diplomats themselves.¹⁰²⁴ It has been shown above that the French records of Saintot were acquired by the Prussian and later Saxon master of ceremonies, Johann von Besser, who was involved in the reform of ceremonial at these courts. Berlin and Dresden were influenced not only by the ceremonial of France, but also by that of the Emperor and of the Northern courts. Saintot's memoirs also made their way into Britain, where the influence of French ceremonial was notable as well. In turn, English ceremonial together with Danish ceremonial influenced the new Prussian ceremonial of 1702/03.¹⁰²⁵ Despite the different form of government, the French court also constituted a model for the Dutch Republic, whose ceremonial Wicquefort had regarded as ill-regulated.¹⁰²⁶ Russia, in the general alignment of its diplomatic practice to western Europe, also sought information on ceremonial customs and still regarded France as model in this respect.¹⁰²⁷ Consequently, even if France was not the only innovator and trendsetter in matters of ceremonial in this period, it was the most compelling one. In the Empire, theorists admitted that 'we Germans use to follow the French manner in

¹⁰²³ See A.F.Glasey, *Neue Jahrs-Gedancken vom Titel Excellenz [...]* (Leipzig, 1720), preface. See also S.Sienell, 'Der Wiener Hofstaate zur Zeit Leopolds I', in Malettke/Grell (eds.), *Hofgesellschaft und Höflinge*, p.90. For the Bavarian court, whose ceremonial displayed Austrian and Italian as well as French influence, see Klingensmith, *The Utility of Splendor*.

¹⁰²⁴ On the cooperation between the electorates in matters of ceremonial, see Sächs.HSTA, Geh.Kabinett 8234/02; between electorates and principalities: STA Wolfenbüttel, 2Alt 4435-37, which also illustrates the reception of French ceremonial customs in the Empire.

¹⁰²⁵ See Besser's remarks on the new Prussian ceremonial in Sächs.HSTA, Geh.Kabinett 8234/03, fo.146 (1705), naming England, Sweden, Denmark and Vienna as models. Schmid in turn stated that the Danish court was influenced by English and French ceremonial, *Der Gesandte*, fo.177.

¹⁰²⁶ Wicquefort, *L'Ambassadeur*, i, pp.67-8, criticising both the Polish and the Dutch Republics; cp. Franken, 'General Tendencies', p.21. Heringa, *Eer en Hogheid*, regards France as well as England and Venice as points of reference for Dutch ceremonial, pp.152-3, 545, although The Hague continued to differ from the general usage in several details.

¹⁰²⁷ See the reports of Whithworth on the new Russian ceremonial in 1709, PRO, SP 91/6, fo.287^v. On the imitation of French ceremonial under Elizabeth, see Grabar, *International Law in Russia*, p.98.

most matters of ceremonial'.¹⁰²⁸ They regarded the French influence as emanating both from the political power and the cultural radiation of the French court.

This last aspect leaves little doubt that that France's model function in diplomatic ceremonial was owed as much to the wide dissemination of French courtly manners and culture in this period.¹⁰²⁹ This influence, however, also created opposition and resistance: the German translator of Wicquefort, for example, criticised the emulation of French courtly manners and culture.¹⁰³⁰ A similar tendency can be discerned in late-seventeenth century treatises of German, English and south European derivation. They confronted the French model either with national dignity, as Galardi, the *Embajada*, Howell and Hoevelen, or with the classical and Renaissance tradition, as for example Carafa. Yet, by the mid-eighteenth century the French culture of behaviour had become the uncontested model of diplomatic conduct, and Chesterfield was not the only one who believed that 'un ministre Français aura le dessus sur un Anglais, en quelque cour d'Europe que ce puisse être. Les Français ont quelque chose de plus liant, de plus insinuant, de plus attirant'.¹⁰³¹ That this sense of superiority was beginning to form a part of French diplomatic identity becomes apparent in Chamoy's criticism of his compatriots' contempt of other 'mœurs et manières de vivre'.¹⁰³² In the theorists' view, the French style of diplomacy corresponded to the theory of courtly behaviour, which, having been fashioned by Castiglione and Gracian, had been expanded by French theorists in the seventeenth century. Linked to the ideal of the noble 'homme du

¹⁰²⁸ *Annota über die Frage*, p.5; see also Hoevelen, *Teutsche Gesandte*, p.87; Lünig, *Theatrum ceremoniale*, p.6.

¹⁰²⁹ See Burke, *Ludwig XIV*, pp.225-6. Cf. H.J.Lüsebrink, R.Reichardt (eds.), *Kulturtransfer im Epochen-umbruch: Frankreich-Deutschland 1770 bis 1815* (Leipzig, 1997); K.Malettke, *Frankreich, Deutschland und Europa im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert. Beiträge zum Einfluß französischer politischer Theorie, Verfassung und Außenpolitik in der frühen Neuzeit* (Marburg, 1994), both albeit without reference to diplomacy.

¹⁰³⁰ Wicquefort, *L'Ambassadeur oder Staats-Bothschaffter*, preface, unpaginated. See also Hoevelen, *Teutsche Gesandte*, pp.87, 102, criticising the French culture as 'un-teutsch'.

¹⁰³¹ Chesterfield, *Lettres*, pp.182-3. Similarly, Clarendon, 'Rules to be observed by a Foreign Minister', fo.284^v; C.Thomasius, *Welcher Gestalt man denen Frantzosen in gemeinem Leben und Wandel nachahmen solle? [...]* (Leipzig, 1701), esp. pp.6-7.

¹⁰³² Chamoy, *Parfait ambassadeur*, pp.24-5. See also Pecquet, *Art de négocier*, p.xxvi-vii.

monde' and 'honnête homme', the French type of the courtier-diplomat excelled by stylish appearance, insinuating manners, 'art de plaire' and conversation.¹⁰³³ Thus, France came to take the place of Italy and Spain, whose diplomats were had still been regarded as masters in the arts of courtly manners and negotiations by seventeenth-century theorists.¹⁰³⁴ On the other hand, this also meant that the Enlightenment criticism of 'professional' diplomacy centred on its French manifestation, which was condemned not only for being pompous and obsessed with etiquette – a characteristic formerly ascribed to the Spanish – but also as ethically questionable.¹⁰³⁵

In addition to ceremonial, manners and dress,¹⁰³⁶ theorists also regarded the 'art of negotiation' as being inspired by the courtly-diplomatic culture shaped by France. It was a widespread belief that regional and national styles of character, conduct and, consequently, negotiation existed. This belief was corroborated by diplomatic theorists, who regarded such variances not only as consequence of different constitutions and ways of life, but also of climate zones.¹⁰³⁷ Accordingly, the Spanish were characterised by formality and 'gravité', while Italians were cunning and refined in negotiations, and the French polite, easy and insinuating, whereas the Germans were phlegmatic and given to excessive drinking. By relating such stereotypes to a country's accomplishments in diplomacy, the French character came to be regarded as best fitted to negotiation.¹⁰³⁸ The substantiation of this perception in

¹⁰³³ Cf. Bury, *Littérature et politesse*; Scheffers, *Höfische Konvention und Aufklärung*.

¹⁰³⁴ For example Howell, *A Distinct Treatise*, p.201; Hoevelen, *Teutsche Gesandte*, pp.129, 142; in this way still Callières, *De la manière*, pp.43, 90.

¹⁰³⁵ See for example Galardi, *Traité politique*, pp.13-4; *Séjour de Paris*, edn.1727, p.342.

¹⁰³⁶ On the importance of dress as indicator of cultural adaption in diplomacy, see for example Bohlen, 'Changes in Russian Diplomacy', p.348.

¹⁰³⁷ See the enumeration of 'national' styles of negotiation, for instance in Rogers, *Ambassador's Idea*, fos.19-33; 'Testament Lorraine', BN, Clairambault 519, fos.291-8; Frederick II, *Politisches Testament* (1752), pp.58-9. See also Callières, *De la manière*, pp.42-3.

¹⁰³⁸ See for example Leti, *Ceremoniale*, pp.5-6, who praised the 'destrezza de Francesi nel negoziare'; cp. Wicquefort, *L'Ambassadeur oder Staats-Bothschaffter*, preface, unpaginated. Callières and Pecquet, however, criticised the French as wanting proper 'génie' and temper for negotiations: *De la manière*, pp.3-5; *Art de négocier*, pp.xvi-xix. Callières still regarded the temper of Spaniards and Italians as best suited for negotiation, p.43.

the practice of bi- and multilateral negotiation, however, was difficult to establish; while the French were able to push through many of their demands regarding the forms of negotiation since 1643, the remarks of diplomatic theorists underline that congress diplomacy developed as a collective instrument of international arbitration, negotiation and compromise. Yet the French diplomatic effort and success in late-seventeenth century European diplomacy underscored the belief in a superior French 'art de négocier', a notion that prevailed even beyond the period of study.

After the Peace of Utrecht had been concluded, a German theorist remarked that France had become predominant in Europe not only because of its power and cultural influence, but also because of its language: 'Es ist demnach die Frantzösische Sprache heut zu Tage, gleichwie die Frantzösische Macht und Mode allen andern praedominans, und fast, wie ehemahlen das Latein, lingua univeralis worden'.¹⁰³⁹ In the post-1648 century, French gradually replaced Latin as the language of the European elites, the *respublica litteraria*, and diplomacy.¹⁰⁴⁰ Latin remained important until the mid-eighteenth century, notably in the Empire and in northern and eastern Europe; and southern Europe proved particularly resistant to the French idiom.¹⁰⁴¹ The overall development, however, was clear: French was becoming the language of the diplomatic *corps*, the language of negotiation and, albeit more gradually,

¹⁰³⁹ Stieve, *Europäisches Hof-Ceremoniell*, p.348.

¹⁰⁴⁰ See F.C.Moser, *Abhandlung von den Europäischen Hof-und Staatssprachen, nach deren Gebrauch im Reden und Schreiben* (Frankfurt, 1750); cf. G.Braun, 'Frédéric-Charles Moser et les langues de la diplomatie européenne (1648-1750)', *RHD*, 113 (1999), 251-60; Bély, *Espions et ambassadeurs*, pp.450-5; Ostrower, *Language, Law and Diplomacy*; Scott, 'Diplomatic Culture'.

¹⁰⁴¹ See for example Stieve, *Europäisches Hof-Ceremoniell*, p.352. On the role of Latin, see Galardi, *Traité politique*, p.107; Chamoy, *Parfait ambassadeur*, pp.23-4; Schmid, *Der Gesandte*, fo.170^v; Callières, *De la manière*, p.65; Francquesnay, *Ministre public*, pp.98-9. Hoeverlen proposed to use Latin and German in the Empire, *Teutsche Gesandte*, pp.180, 210. Cf. Pacassi, *Gesandtschaftsrechte*, p.36. For eastern Europe, see Servanski, 'La Diplomatie polonaise', pp.173-4; on the increasing use of Russian next to Latin, French and German, see Grabar, *International Law in Russia*, pp.67-8, 107.

the language of treaties.¹⁰⁴² Already in 1681, Wicquefort remarked that 'la langue française a en quelque façon succédé à la Latine, et est devenue commune', and Pecquet could state fifty years later that 'nôtre langue soit devenue en quelque façon celle de toute l'Europe'.¹⁰⁴³ In some states, as for example in Prussia, it even replaced the national language in the diplomatic and administrative correspondence.¹⁰⁴⁴ As formerly Latin had done, the emergence of French as the language of the courtly and erudite European public also contributed to the dissemination and transfer of ideas and information about diplomacy, and became a core element of the political culture of the states-system, and a main feature of the collective identity of the diplomatic *corps*.

Diplomatic theory itself reflected the trend towards national languages in general and French in particular. Until the late sixteenth century, treatises had been composed in Latin. In the seventeenth century, English, Italian, Spanish and German theorists increasingly used their own language. At the same time, Wicquefort's treatise marked the beginning of French as language of international diplomatic theory. Even the academic Latin dissertations and German ceremonial theory increasingly used French expressions, while diplomatic theorists recommended the memoirs of French diplomats as universal models.¹⁰⁴⁵ Related discourses such as those pertaining to state science or international law, on the other hand, used German as well as French, as the works of Moser, Bielfeld, and the Göttingen and Strasbourg schools illustrate.

¹⁰⁴² See Bielfeld, *Institutions politiques*, ii, p.12; AAE, MD France 1852, fos.297-9. Cf. G.Braun, 'Une tour de Babel? Les langues de la négociation et les problèmes de traduction au congrès de la paix de Westphalie (1643-1649)', in Babel (ed.), *Le Diplomate au travail*, 139-72.

¹⁰⁴³ Wicquefort, *L'Ambassadeur*, i, p.34; Pecquet, *Art de négocier*, p.xxxv. See also J.Grimarest, *Traité sur la manière d'écrire des lettres, et sur le cérémonial [...]* (Paris, 1709), pp.204-5; Bielfeld, *Institutions politiques*, ii, p.13; Ahnert, *Lehrbegriff der Wissenschaften*, p.31; Martens, *Guide diplomatique*, p.18. Chamoy, however, warned French diplomats to rely too much on their own language, *Parfait ambassadeur*, pp.23-4.

¹⁰⁴⁴ See *Acta Borussica*, vi.2, p.7, order of 2 June 1740.

¹⁰⁴⁵ See for example, Wicquefort, *L'Ambassadeur*, i, pp.28, 82-3; Gundling, *Staatsklugheit*, p.651; Rusdorf, *Consilia et negotia politica*, preface, unpaginated; Chesterfield, *Lettres*, p.120. For the more extensive 'relazioni', on the other hand, the Venetian model continued to be referred to.

Despite the ascendancy of French as language of theoretical reflection, and notwithstanding the key role of French authors, diplomatic theory in the post-1648 century continued to be a 'European' discourse. Of course there were elements in the theoretical literature which were influenced by regional and national traditions. Apart from the reception of south European 'raggione di stato' and Counter-Reformation works in the seventeenth century, this was notably the influence of French literature on the courtier and the 'honnête homme' championed by Refuge or Chétardie. The development of the 'droit des gens' and the 'droit public', on the other hand, was furthered above all by writers of German and Dutch origins. Ceremonial theory and 'Staatenkunde' were also formed in the Empire, whose state science became a model for the European theory of foreign policy in the later eighteenth century.¹⁰⁴⁶ Consequently, the evolution of diplomatic theory in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries was shaped by traditions and contributions of various countries. Yet, one should avoid ascribing too much importance to 'national' schools of thought in this 'transnational' discourse.

Keens-Soper has regarded diplomatic theory after 1648, as represented by the treatises of Wicquefort and Callières, as expression of French diplomatic practice and thought.¹⁰⁴⁷ It is true that Wicquefort and other theorists of this time wrote from the perception of and experience with the predominant French diplomacy, acknowledging the lead of France in many aspects. French theorists such as Chamoy, Callières and Pecquet, furthermore, took their country's diplomatic apparatus as the prototype of diplomatic organisation and practice. Yet this observation could also be made for authors of other national derivation, with the possible exceptions of Wicquefort and Francquesnay. National

¹⁰⁴⁶ See for example Réal, *Science du gouvernement*, i, pp.xvi-xix; 'Plan d'étude', ed. Ruiz, p.70.

¹⁰⁴⁷ Keens-Soper, 'Wicquefort', p.93. In a similar way, although differentiating between a French model, an Italian model and the Dutch influence: Bazzoli, 'Wicquefort', cp. Carter, 'Wicquefort'.

origin, individual diplomatic experience and also a partisan stance for one's country shaped the theorists' view of diplomatic 'models'. Nevertheless, as has been stressed before, they all sought to present a common European portrayal of diplomacy. Part II has illustrated that published and unpublished treatises were disseminated and received across the European states-system.¹⁰⁴⁸ If one judges from the number of quotations, reprints and translations, it is true that the semi-French and French treatises of Wicquefort and Callières were the most influential contributions after 1680. However, several British contributions and the growing role of German writers in the discourse, as well as the continuing importance of Italian and Spanish treatises in the seventeenth century all point to the transnational character of the discourse.¹⁰⁴⁹ Like other theorists of this period, Wicquefort and Callières still valued the Italian, notably the Venetian, contribution to the 'science' and practice of diplomacy. The spread and reception of Venetian tracts in early-seventeenth century Europe underlines that the 'French school' of diplomatic theory stood in a tradition of thought which corresponded to the common heritage of the classical age and the Renaissance as well as to the collective experience of the states-system's actors.

Thus, while there are several cases in which a transfer of practices or ideas can be assumed, it remains methodologically problematic to study the development of diplomatic practice and theory from the viewpoint of models and transfer. It can be held, nevertheless, that in all fields of diplomatic practice which the theorists had identified as areas of change, a

¹⁰⁴⁸ The approach of 'political communication' has been suggested to re-assess the dissemination, mutual influence and transfer of political theories in early modern Europe, see Schorn-Schütte (ed.), *Politische Kommunikation*. An interesting case for examining intersecting influences would be Savoy, cf. Frigo, *Piemonte*, esp. pp. 219-28. For the reception of French, German as well as English political and legal theory in Russia, see Grabar, *International Law in Russia*; Butler, 'Anglo-Russian Diplomacy'.

¹⁰⁴⁹ On the Counter Reformation and neostiocist influence on diplomatic theory, see Davies, 'The Influence of Lipsius'; Bireley, *The Counter-Reformation Prince*; Frigo, 'Virtù politiche' e 'Pratica delle corti'. This was still recognisable in Carafa's *Ambasciadore*. On the 'Spanish school', see G. Arias, 'La doctrina diplomática expuesta por Gonzalo de Villadiego en su 'Tractatus de legato', *Cuadernos de historia diplomática*, 3 (1956), 275-324. Papal diplomatic theory constitutes a special case in this development, but still formed a part of the transnational discourse, as for example the treatises of Chokier (1624) and Germoni (1627) demonstrate. On the German 'politicus' literature and 'Regimentstraktate', see Weber, 'Staatsrath'; idem, *Prudentia gubernatoria*.

tendency towards standardisation and alignment became visible. In this process, various countries were perceived as being ahead at certain times, using the available instruments in a more effective way. In the perception of 'models' of diplomatic practice, 'power' and 'culture' were entwined, as for example in the case of France, although tradition and reputation continued to play a role, as the case of Venice has illustrated.¹⁰⁵⁰ If diplomatic theory perceived a French model in several areas of diplomacy, this was no exclusive expression of a 'French style of diplomacy'. Wicquefort's treatise, the first and most extensive portrayal of the 'new diplomacy', was a portrait of a European practice of diplomacy in which the various regional practices were becoming aligned. At the same time, his treatise was also a reaction to the instrumentalisation of diplomatic practice by France. Theorists realised that Louis XIV's France was the first state to adapt its diplomatic apparatus to the new states-system. While it thus became the pace-setter of diplomatic practice, it also turned diplomatic practice into a political weapon and attempted to mould legal and ceremonial customs in its favour.

Finally, the standardisation of diplomatic customs does highlight the various means of transfer. These could be specialists recruited from abroad, as for example in the case of Russia; scholars such as Moser and Schoepflin in the Empire, or Strube and Müller in Russia, who used their contacts and correspondence networks within the *respublica litteraria*; or, indeed, diplomats themselves, whose recorded experience of other countries could serve as means of transfer. Furthermore, books, manuscripts and gazettes were media of dissemination, whether as purchased volumes or as manuscript copies or in translation. Peter I's diplomats, for example, were instructed to purchase books on various matters, ranging from international law and diplomatic customs to military and naval arts and literature.¹⁰⁵¹

¹⁰⁵⁰ See also P. Preto, 'L'Ambassadeur vénétien: diplomate et "honorabile espion"', in Bély (ed.), *L'Invention de la diplomatie*, p.151; Toscani, 'Etatistisches Denken', p.111.

¹⁰⁵¹ Grabar, *International Law in Russia*, pp.36-7.

Diplomats could act as instruments of cultural transfer in several ways: they purchased books and manuscripts, pieces of art, exotic luxury goods; and through their correspondence they transmitted knowledge about political systems, foreign policy strategies, administrative reforms and military and technical innovations. Only recently has scholarship started to pay attention to diplomacy as a means of cultural transfer which facilitated the spread of cultural goods and ideas, and contributed to the emergence of a European culture.¹⁰⁵²

The role of diplomatic practice and theory is in need of re-assessment with regard to the emergence of a European political and diplomatic culture. 'Political culture' comprises systems of significant symbols, values, expectations and 'acquired programmes to regulate behaviour', as well as the embodiment of this behaviour in objectifications such as texts, works of art and architecture, or institutions. In this definition, it also applies to the areas under discussion in this thesis, since the norms, concepts and procedures of diplomacy can be regarded as 'cultural factors'.¹⁰⁵³ As such, they were themselves objects of cultural transfer and subject to 'perception, transfer, accommodation and integration [...] in a process of mutual exchange and communication', which formed and defined the European states-system.¹⁰⁵⁴ To the emergence of a common European diplomatic culture, diplomatic theory and related genres of international law, ceremonial and state science made a significant contribution: they contained and transmitted, in condensed form, the norms, customs, techniques and

¹⁰⁵² See Externbrink, 'Internationale Beziehungen und Kulturtransfer'; H.Droste, 'Unternehmer in Sachen Kultur. Die Diplomaten Schwedens im 17. Jahrhundert', in Trakulhun/Fuchs (eds.), *Kulturtransfer in Europa*, 205-26; H.Ilsøe, 'Gesandtskaber som kulturformidlende faktor: forbindelser mellem Danmark og England-Skotland o.1580-1607', *Historisk Tidsskrift*, 11 (1962), 574-600; T.Hörpel, 'Diplomatischer Dienst und Kulturtransfer. Die Wirkungen der Tätigkeit von Bernhard Wilhelm von der Goltz in Berlin und Paris', *Grenzgänge*, 2 (1995), 23-44. Cf. W.Schmale (ed.), *Kulturtransfer. Kulturelle Praxis im 16. Jahrhundert* (Innsbruck, 2003).

¹⁰⁵³ See W.Reinhard, 'Was ist europäische Kultur? Versuch zur Begründung einer politischen historischen Anthropologie', *Geschichte und Gesellschaft*, 27 (2001), 593-616; Blanning, *Culture of Power*, p.4, taking up the approach of Lynn Hunt.

¹⁰⁵⁴ Externbrink, 'Internationale Beziehungen und Kulturtransfer', p.230. See also W.Schmale, 'Europäische Geschichte als historische Disziplin. Überlegungen zu einer 'Europäistik'', *ZfG*, 46 (1998), 389-405.

'cultures' of conducting international relations. Although it remains difficult to ascertain their actual influence on the conduct of diplomacy, the increasing number and dissemination of these 'archives' of knowledge about diplomacy underline the close links between the theory and practice of international relations, between the Republic of Letters and the political-diplomatic sphere. In a constant process of accommodation, the events, customs and 'collective experience' of diplomacy entered into discourses and inventories, into manuscript memoirs and printed tracts, which were then again placed at the disposal of the actors of foreign policy and the European Public.

Conclusion

This thesis has endeavoured to demonstrate that treatises on the 'ideal ambassador' constituted the core of an early modern diplomatic theory that sought to define the diplomat's task as the pivotal agents within the increasingly complex field of international relations in the formative phase of the European states-system.

Both the nature of the international system and the ways in which international relations were conducted were transformed in the 'long century' between the Peace of Westphalia (1648) and the Peace of Hubertusburg (1763). Part I has shown that the growing interconnection and complexity of politics in Europe generated an upsurge in diplomatic representation and enhanced the significance of the legal and ceremonial aspects of diplomacy. Theorists realised that the increasing number of resident embassies and the mounting mass of information to be transmitted forced both the governmental apparatus and the diplomatic services into an alignment that would allow them to meet the demands of new structures of international communication. A further result was the emergence of a diplomatic corps at the courts and congresses of Europe. Around the time of the Peace of Utrecht, the transformation of the framework and structures of diplomacy had reached a level that permitted contemporary 'diplomates érudits' to formulate the principles of a states-system.

While the perception of an emerging states-system corresponds to the findings of the existing historiography, the analysis of diplomatic theory undertaken in this thesis provides further perspectives that have hitherto been largely ignored: written by 'learned diplomats', diplomatic theory was concerned with the consequences that this emergent states-system entailed for the tasks, the conduct and the *mentalité* of the diplomatic corps. In contrast to earlier periods, from the mid-seventeenth century onwards, the diplomat acted in a European

context and had to take into account the positions and interests of all actors. Longer residence abroad conferred more responsibility upon the diplomats – a development that was strategically exploited by theorists in order to enhance the public recognition of their profession. The examination of diplomatic theory has shown that from around the turn of the eighteenth century, diplomats themselves regarded their duties within the wider context of a European states-system.

In part II, the thesis has argued that diplomatic theory can be regarded as an 'institutional language' produced by and for a transnational community of state-servants. Situated between the diplomatic and governmental sphere on one hand, and the *respublica litteraria* on the other, diplomatic theory was embedded in wider developments and debates than has hitherto been assumed. The famous treatises of Wicquefort and Callières were beacons of a discourse that had evolved from the late medieval period. The importance of these two treatises can be inferred from the large number of reprints, translations and references in related genres and debates. Yet, not only did the ideas formulated in these treatises take up the contributions of previous authors, but they were also substantiated and developed further by theorists such as Chamoy, Pecquet, Francquesnay and Bielfeld.

Mirroring the general outlook of early modern political theory, an essential feature of diplomatic theory was to combine technical and ethical aspects of the diplomat's task. In this way, it presented a collective portrait of the European diplomatic corps to diplomats, to the decision-makers of foreign policy, and to the European learned public. This thesis has illustrated that reflections upon the 'ideal diplomat' mirrored the individual and collective interests of a group of 'learned diplomats' who combined diplomatic and political occupations with a participation in the intellectual exchange of the Republic of Letters. Furthermore, this discourse was at all times influenced by related genres of political theory and international

law, whose methods and concepts it applied to diplomacy, thereby fashioning an increasingly specific 'language' of diplomacy.

Using the language and the structure of the *respublica litteraria*, theorists of the 'ideal ambassador' sought to formulate the norms and procedures of diplomacy. This endeavour not only characterised related genres such as ceremonial theory, international law and the new state science, but also the unpublished and 'national' contributions to diplomatic thought, for example in the form of tracts, memoirs and compilations of cases and customs. These strands of diplomatic theory were archives of knowledge about diplomacy and stood in a close relationship with the practice of foreign policy: they were employed as reference works, argumentative aids and as study material in the preparation of diplomats. It has been shown that the diplomats' task became the subject of writing and discussion in the governmental sphere, particularly in the emerging foreign ministries. The discourse on the 'ideal ambassador' stood at the heart of these deliberations, which were conducted transnationally in the Republic of Letters, but also 'nationally' within the respective governmental spheres.

Even if reflections on the diplomat and his functions were characterised by a remarkable stability of format and language, this study has demonstrated that changes occurred underneath the level of continuity. These changes applied to the methods and concepts of treating the 'ideal ambassador' and constituted the precondition for grasping the new quality of international relations. With the growing complexity of the technical, legal and symbolic aspects of diplomacy, it became more difficult to set the 'art of negotiation' into a rational system. This resulted in a concentration on modern diplomatic history and an empirical induction of maxims from the actual practice of states. The changing approach led to a discussion on the outlook and function of a 'science des négociations'. Whilst reminiscent of the general dichotomy between 'scientia' and 'ars', this discussion was first and foremost an

attempt to emancipate diplomatic theory from the traditional framework of political and legal thought and to establish it as a distinct discipline within the new state science: from the 1730s and together with the interests of state and the '*droit public de l'Europe*', diplomatic theory formed a '*science of foreign policy*'. However, theorists did not achieve their goal of establishing diplomatic theory as a university and academy subject, even if it was introduced in a few institutions in the Empire.

This thesis has further been concerned with the consequences that '*diplomates érudits*' drew from the emergence of a states-system. They identified two main areas of change: firstly, the alignment of the norms and customs of negotiation, international law and diplomatic ceremonial to a common European political culture; and secondly, the appearance of a diplomatic corps with a particular '*language*' and identity based on a cosmopolitan and aristocratic culture and early notions of professionalism.

Part III has highlighted that diplomatic theory recognised the crucial role international law and diplomatic ceremonial played in this context. The legal and ceremonial aspects of diplomacy constituted the cultural and technical framework for conducting international relations. The diplomat's immunities and privileges were the subjects of dispute between the emerging sovereign states of Europe. The '*ius legationis*' and the ceremonial honours paid to diplomats represented not only the bilateral relationship between two actors, but mirrored the sovereigns' place in the international hierarchy of the '*société des princes*'. The formative phase of the system in the century following the Peace of Westphalia was characterised by frequent clashes over the acknowledgment of diplomats and their precedence, as notably the example of the Empire's electorates has shown. In particular Louis XIV instrumentalised diplomatic ceremonial to support his foreign policy. Clashes over precedence became a daily feature of diplomacy, revealing the '*double nature*' of ceremonial which enabled but also

complicated the conduct of international relations. The analysis of diplomatic theory has supported the assumption that this process was largely concluded in the mid-eighteenth century, when conflicts over precedence became less frequent.

Part IV has demonstrated that the diplomats' education and preparation came to achieve a pivotal place in reflections upon the 'ideal ambassador' in the century after 1648. Once more, theorists were at the forefront of the debate by transforming the traditional catalogue of virtues and counsels of behaviour into a more specific and 'professional' portrait. In response to the greater responsibility of the resident diplomat acting in a states-system, theorists developed a distinct negotiation theory based on 'prudence politique', the courtier's art, the knowledge of human passions and the interests of states. While taking into account the role of 'secret practices' in diplomacy, the 'art de négocier' also paid tribute to the importance of reputation and 'confiance'. It has been argued that diplomatic theory in this manner presented a conception of 'corps mentality' linked to the states-system and its balance of power. In the theorists' view, the diplomatic corps represented the relations between the system's actors and, through a convergence of interests and a common language and code of manners, contributed to the 'civilisation' of international relations.

From the turn of the seventeenth century, theorists of diplomacy came to understand the diplomats of Europe as a 'corps' and 'classe séparée', who formed a distinct community of state-servants with a particular function, culture and ethos. Although these were derived from the profile and culture of the courtly society and the 'nobilitas politica', diplomatic theory instilled increasingly specialised and 'professional' elements into the 'ideal ambassador'. As other genres of political thought, diplomatic theory was concerned with combining the generalist portrait of the noble politician with the beginnings of the bureaucratisation and professionalisation of foreign policy. By emphasising criteria such as experience, knowledge

and merit, it presented a collective vocational identity that would be valid for both the upper and the lower ranks of diplomacy. In addition to a 'diplomatic ethos' that united the demands of 'raison d'état' and the overall balance of the system, theorists prescribed a corpus of specialist knowledge and experience, and developed suggestions for a diplomatic 'training'. Yet as they postulated diplomacy as a distinct 'profession', they went beyond the actual recruitment and career practice. This thesis has argued that diplomatic theory stood at the centre of a 'professionalisation movement' which characterised reflections on the diplomatic service in the eighteenth century.

To a larger extent than has been hitherto assumed, the issue of diplomatic training occupied diplomats, *érudits*, councillors and princes across Europe. This has been underlined through case studies on France, Britain and the Holy Roman Empire. Ensuing debates and reforms in the governmental sphere were shaped by the common preoccupation on how to adapt the diplomatic service to the new framework of international relations. Although large-scale reforms of the training and career practice fell short in view of the social and political realities of the Old Regime, the improvement of diplomatic preparation was a shared experience of the states-system's actors. In this endeavour, the political sphere and the Republic of Letters were closely entwined, as in the case of diplomatic 'academies'. Several theorists of diplomacy were directly or indirectly involved in this process and, by devising apprenticeship schemes and courses of study, influenced the proposals and schemes discussed. Although most projects were short-lived, the ideas and methods devised in these initiatives continued to be discussed and applied throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

Yet the continuity of suggestions relating to the choice, training and professionalism of diplomats also indicates that the practice of recruitment and preparation could change only

gradually. The failure to translate the concept of a 'professional' diplomatic service into practice in the eighteenth century was foreshadowed by the theorists' difficulty in separating the 'ideal ambassador' from the courtly 'honnête homme' and the statesman. Nevertheless, the discussion of training and professionalism, launched by theorists of diplomacy, created and reinforced awareness that the new demands of the states-system required a specialist diplomatic corps. The demands on the 'ideal diplomat's experience and knowledge had changed, and the general preparation of the 'aulicus politicus' was regarded as insufficient for the demands of the states-system. Several examples have underlined that the self-perception of diplomats was also changing in this respect, although further research is required to back this supposition.

The instigators of the professionalisation debate were 'learned diplomats' representing the middle and lower ranks of diplomacy, which had come to constitute the base of a resident and European-wide diplomatic representation. The modification of the 'ideal ambassador' and his 'art of negotiation' was a response to the changing structures and practices of diplomacy. In spite of the strong continuity of format and language, diplomatic theory accurately mirrored the norms and procedures of negotiation against the background of the growing diplomatic service and administrative apparatus and the evolution of legal norms and ceremonial practices. In all these fields, theorists perceived changes, which they interpreted as adaptations to the new quality of the states-system. At the same time, it was these elements that constituted the system in the eyes of the 'diplomates érudits': not only did a network of reciprocal and permanent representation delineate the system; but the observance of the legal norms and ceremonial customs their treatises described came to constitute a common European diplomatic culture.

After the Peace of Utrecht, theorists came to perceive a degree of alignment and consensus about the extent of negotiation practice, diplomatic immunities and ceremonial privileges which enabled them to define the states-system as a common legal and ceremonial order. Several case studies have underlined that although regional differences continued to exist in the 'Droit public de l'Europe', the actors were aligning their customs to those of other states in order to establish regularity and reciprocity. Various 'models' emerge in this process, as has been expounded in Part V. In particular France was considered as motor and exemplar in the decades following the Peace of Westphalia. Yet, a focus on diplomatic theory underlines the fact that the adjustment of the instruments and norms of international relations was a common European experience. This became obvious to contemporaries in the frequent congresses that required compromises and agreement on the procedures, symbolic forms and legal rules of international negotiation.

On the other hand, the boundaries of this cultural-political system were subject to controversial debate, in particular with regard to the eastern periphery. While the Ottoman Empire only gradually came to acknowledge 'western' norms of international relations, the incorporation of Russia into the eighteenth-century states-system was mirrored in its adjustment to the diplomatic culture of 'European' diplomacy. The case of Russia also illustrates that the transfer of knowledge about diplomacy and its customs was facilitated by the theoretical literature on diplomacy, international law and ceremonial. As it presented a 'common denominator' of the norms and practice of diplomacy, diplomatic theory was collected and utilised in the governmental and diplomatic sphere. Both the application of diplomatic theory to disputes over ceremonial or legal privileges, and the production of memoirs and compilations by foreign ministry officials, archivists and ceremonial masters underline the correlation between the theory and practice of diplomacy.

By the mid-eighteenth century, diplomatic theory presented the practice of diplomacy as a pillar of the states-system, as part of a European political culture, and as a foundation of a collective and transnational mentality of the diplomatic corps. When Mably declared in 1757 that 'toute l'Europe se connaît', he was also referring to the role and responsibility of the diplomatic corps for the states-system's relations and balance.¹⁰⁵⁵ The international system, which was characterised by persistent dynastic, political and military conflicts, but also by a growing awareness of the overall balance of power, required a new level of diplomatic contacts and norms. Although the diplomatic system was not instituted to prevent wars and was often ineffective in ending them, a group of diplomatic experts propagated the civilising role of a diplomacy based on a common cultural code. On the part of the 'diplomates érudits', this was not only a response to the Enlightenment criticism of the conduct of international relations in the 'société des princes', but also a reaction to the growing interconnectedness of Europe. The norms and customs collected and systematised in these 'archives of knowledge' depicted a practice and culture of diplomacy that would shape international relations far beyond the end of the Old Regime.

¹⁰⁵⁵ Mably, *Principes des négociations*, p.68.

Bibliography

I. Manuscript and Archival Sources

Archives des Affaires Étrangères, Paris

Correspondance Politique, Angleterre, 87.

Correspondance Politique, Hollande, 232.

Mémoires et Documents, France, 4; 31; 122; 251; 306; 307; 308; 309; 310; 311; 312; 313; 317; 318; 364; 373; 374; 407; 418; 419; 445; 446; 458; 502; 511; 518; 524; 525; 761; 764; 928; 1247; 1251; 1252; 1253; 1255; 1256; 1257; 1259; 1278; 1286; 1289; 1290; 1334; 1817; 1831; 1837; 1839; 1850; 1851; 1852; 1853; 1871; 1872; 1873; 1969; 1970; 1990; 2136; 2150; 2186.

Mémoires et Documents, Allemagne, 96.

Mémoires et Documents, Autriche, 12.

Mémoires et Documents, Espagne, 19; 20; 241.

Mémoires et Documents, Prusse, 1; 2.

Mémoires et Documents, Rome, 13.

Mémoires et Documents, Suède, 16; 22.

Personnel, Decrets et Ordonnances, 1.

Personnel, Dossiers individuels, 26; 44; 55; 66.

Archives Nationales, Paris

Série M, 203; 204; 205.

Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Munich

MS Cod. Gall.152 ('L'Idée du parfait ambassadeur, à M.de Pomponne').

MS Cod.Germ.3009, 4006 a,b,c ('Mundus christiano-bavaro-politicus').

(Transcription provided by courtesy of Prof. Kramer and his staff, University of Munich)

Bayerisches Hauptstaatsarchiv, Munich

Gesandtschaften, 592.

Kasten Schwarz, 1; 4185; 4186; 6392; 6488; 9397; 9398; 9399; 9400; 9401; 9402; 9403; 9404; 11768; 11769.

Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris

Manuscripts français, 2525; 3448; 3542; 3691; 3932; 5668; 15870; 16806; 17824; 18428; 18540; 18678; 20156; 22726; 23338; 23517; 25136.

Collection Baluze, 147.

Collection des Cinq Cents de Colbert, 99.

Collection Dupuy, 136; 603.

Fonds Clairambault, 291; 292; 293; 519; 647; 805.

Mélanges Colbert, 56.

Nouvelles Acquisitions Françaises, 7487; 1046; 1047; 10634; 21443.

British Library, London

Additional MS, 8268; 8294; 8326; 15915; 19041; 28059; 30593; 34216; 34713; 40692; 48026; 48046; 48102; 48154; 57832; 61699B; 72473.

Egerton MS, 572; 1817; 2072; 2542; 3378.

Harleian MS, 1514; 1515; 1516; 1517; 1518; 1579; 3364; 3365; 6793.

Lansdowne MS, 98, 141, 811.

Sloane MS, 1019, 2144, 3660.

Stowe MS, 135, 185, 248, 570, 760.

Cambridge University Archives, Cambridge

University, CUR 39.14; O.XIV 260; Transcripts 24

Geheimes Hauptstaatsarchiv Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Berlin

Rep. 1, Abtl. 1, 17.

Rep. 9, Abtl. F, 5/5.

Abtl. J, 3/1, 3/23, 3/38, 3/53, 3/54, 3/83; 3a/1, 3a/2, 3a/3, 3a/4, 3a/5, 3a/25; 5/c; 12/5; 16/1, 16/5, 16/6, 16/7, 16/8, 16/15, 16/24, 16/27, 16/29, 16/30, 16/31, 16/32, 16/36, 16/37, 16/40, 16/41, 16/44, 16/46, 16/51, 16/52, 16/53, 16/54.

Abtl. K, f/1, f/4; n/2, n/8.

Abtl. L, 4/1, 4/2, 4/3, 4/4, 4/5, 4/6, 4/7, 4/8, 4/9, 4/10, 4/11, 4/12, 4/13; 4a/5, 4a/6; 12/2, 12/26, 12/27; 12a/2, 12a/8.

Abtl. Z, A/5, A/8, A/12, A/13; B/1, B/24, B/25; D/6; E2/3; E3/1; G/1, G/2; L/1, L/1a, L/2, L/3, L/4, L/7, L/11, L/22, L/33, L36, L37, L38, L39, L41; R2/6; U/1.

Rep. 11, Frankreich, 79a/14, 79a/16, 79a/19; 88b/1, 88b/2, 88b/3, 88b/5; 88c/1, 88c/2, 88c/3, 88c/4, 88c/5, 88c/6; 88d/1, 88d/2, 88d/3, 88d/4; 89/43, 89/78, 89/79.

Rep. 36, 2/40.

Rep. 81, London, 5;

Paris, II, 1; 2; 3; 4; 5; 6; 7; 8; 9.

Rep. 92, Podewils, 1; 2.

Grumbkow, 9.

Meinders, 4; 10.

Zwanzig, 4; 5.

Rep. 96, 4 E/ 1, 2, 3, 8; 74 J; F 75 E; F 75 F; F 75 G; 200 H.

Rep. 96B, 1.

Rep. 96C, 53; 89a.

Rep. 98A, 1; 14.

Rep. 131, K419 G2; K126 C5.

Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchiv, Vienna

Große Korrespondenz, 51; 86a; 94b; 95a; 95b; 256; 289; 400; 405; 406.

Collection Diplomatique, 35.

Staatenabteilung, Dänemark, 29; England, 63; Frankreich, Varia, 13; Italien, Toskana, 7;
Rom, Varia, 26 Ins. 13; 26 Ins. 14; Schweiz, 43; Spanien, 43; 47; 61.

Staatskanzlei, Wissenschaft, Kunst, Literatur, 7.

Instruktionen, 3.

Vorträge, 4; 5; 6; 7; 21; 23; 25; 26; 27; 36; 37; 53; 55; 61; 62; 67.

Interoria, 1; 12; 13; 55,

Circularien, 1.

Personalien, 5; 9; 10; 11.

Repertorium N, 12; 15; 34; 67; 109.

Hofarchiv, Ältere Zeremonialakten, Varia: 19.

Alte Akten des Oberhofmarschallamts: 1.1.

Österreich Staat, 1.

Handschriften, Supp. 1229/W 1002.

Reichskanzlei, Immunitäten, Miscellanea: 5 A 23.

Instruktionen, Vorträge: 5e.

Friedensakten: 111; 112.

Herzog-August-Bibliothek, Wolfenbüttel

Augusteische MS 1789; 1888; 1943; 2247.

Hofkammerarchiv, Vienna

Protokolle der Geheimen Finanzkonferenz: 4; 15; 16.

Hofffinanz, rot: 437; 458; 819.

Reichsakten: 168; 169; 170; 171.

Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Vienna

Handschriften 4143; 5766; 6327; 6739; 7046; 7224; 7254; 7255; 8748; 12019; 14513.

Österreichisches Verwaltungsarchiv, Vienna

Nachlass Harrach, Historica 794; 850.

Harrach, MS 183; 206; 345, 347.

Oxford University Archives, Bodleian Library, Oxford

WPß/11/1-2

Long Box 28-29

Niedersächsisches Staatsarchiv, Hannover

Cal. Br.11, E 1557, 1696; 1706; 1763.

Cal. Br.21, 801.

Cal. Br.24, 21; 22; 25.

Niedersächsisches Staatsarchiv, Wolfenbüttel

1 Alt, A IV.Varia Fb. 2/11.

6/Dänemark/69.

6/England/75, 76, 77.

12/30; 12/67.

2 Alt, 513; 602; 1600; 2847; 3040; 3041; 3050; 3516; 3626a; 3626b; 4435; 4436; 4437.

43 Alt, 2/1; 2/2.

Public Record Office, London

Foreign Office (FO), 83/12; 83/1656; 95/589; 366/525; 366/542; 366/669; 881/78.

Lord Chamberlains' Office, 5/2.

State Papers (SP) 9: 2; 3; 4; 5; 13; 14; 15; 38; 49; 54; 82; 84; 156; 165; 166; 167; 168; 169; 187; 201/17; 207/1/29; 211; 252.

SP 34: 20/86; 37/16.

SP 36: 6; 20; 22; 37.

SP 44: 72; 152.

SP 45: 8; 21.

SP 78: 83; 123; 163.

SP 79: 1.

SP 80: 48; 63; 93.

SP 84: 159; 183.

SP 89: 5; 15; 20; 31.

SP 90: 7; 13.

SP 91: 3; 6.

SP 96: 15.

SP 100: 67.

SP 103: 78; 79; 95; 96.

SP 104: 200; 246; 247; 257; 258; 259; 260; 261; 262; 263; 264; 265; 266; 267; 268; 269.

SP 105: 26; 27; 30; 31; 54; 60; 82; 84; 247; 257; 258.

SP 107: 13.

SP 110: 6.

SP 113: 53.

SP 118: 136; 138.

SP 119: 352.

SP 130: 1.

Sächsisches Hauptstaatsarchiv, Dresden

Oberhofmarschallamt, E/1.

Zeremonienmeister, I: 7a; 7b; 7c; 8a; 8b; 8c; 8d; 9a; 9b; 9c; 10; II: 11; 14; 17; 18; 19.

Geheimes Kabinett, 3305; 3065; 3322; 3235; 3442; 641/1; 892/4; 952/01; 952/02; 952/03; 952/04; 952/05; 952/06; 952/07; 952/08; 952/09; 952/10; 952/11; 1373/4; 1446/01; 1446/10; 30110.

Geheimer Rat, 4519/2; 7208/29; 8088/13; 8233/04; 8234/02; 8234/03; 8234/07; 8236/07; 8236/10; 8236/13; 8236/17; 8236/18; 8236/19; 8236/20; 8237/05; 8237/10; 8237/11; 8252/5; 8287/4; 10472/6; 12019.

Geheimes Konsilium, 1724; 4704; 4707; 4595.

Nachlässe, Johann von Besser 7; 9.

Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin

MS gall.18; MS ital.11.

Universitätsbibliothek Göttingen

Nachlässe, Achenwall, 177; Michaelis, 326; Pütter, 35, 37, 47.

II. Printed Primary Sources

Achenwall, A., *Vorbereitung zur Staatswissenschaft der heutigen fürnehmsten europäischen Reiche und Staaten, worinnen derselben eigentlichen Begriff und Umfang in einer bequemen Ordnung entwirft und seine Vorlesungen darüber ankündigt* (Göttingen, 1748).

— *Abriß der neuesten Staatswissenschaft der vornehmsten europäischen Reiche* (Göttingen, 1749).

— *Geschichte der heutigen vornehmsten europäischen Staaten im Grundrisse* (Göttingen, 1754).

— *Die Staatsklugheit nach ihren ersten Grundsätzen entworfen* (Göttingen, 1761).

Ahnert, C.G., *Lehrbegriff der Wissenschaften, Erfordernisse und Recht der Gesandten* (2 vols., Dresden, 1784).

Acta Borussia. Denkmäler der preußischen Staatsverwaltung im 18. Jahrhundert (Berlin, 1894 ff). *Abt. 1: Die Behördenorganisation und die allgemeine Staatsverwaltung Preußens im 18. Jahrhundert*. Vol.1 (1701-July 1714, eds. G.Schmoller, O.Krauske, 1894); vol.2 (July 1714-1717, eds. G.Schmoller, O.Krauske, V.Loewe, 1898); vol.3 (Jan.1718-Jan.1723, eds. G.Schmoller, O.Krauske, V.Loewe, 1901); vol.4.1 (Jan. 1723-1725, eds. G.Schmoller, W.Stolze, 1908); vol.4.2 (Jan.1726-Dec.1729, eds. G.Schmoller, W.Stolze, 1908); vol.5.1 (Jan.1730-Dec.1735, eds. G.Schmoller, W.Stolze, 1910); vol.5.2 (Jan.1736-May 1740, eds. G.Schmoller, W.Stolze, 1912); vol.6.2 (May 1740-1745, eds. G.Schmoller, O.Hintze, 1901); vol.7 (Jan.1746-May 1748, eds. G.Schmoller, O.Hintze, 1904).

Actes et mémoires de la négociation de la paix de Münster (4 vols., Amsterdam, 1680).

Actes et mémoires des négociations de la paix de Nimègue, ed. A.Moetjens (4 vols., Amsterdam, 1679-80).

- Actes et mémoires des négociations de la paix de Ryswick*, ed. J. Bernard (4 vols., The Hague, 1699-1707).
- Actes, mémoires et autres pieces authentiques concernant la Paix d'Utrecht* (6 vols., Utrecht, 1712-5).
- L'Ambassadeur en colère, représenté par la lettre d'un Hollandois* (n.p., c.1674).
- The Ambitious Practices of France, or a Relation of the Ways and Methods used by them to attain to that Supream Grandeur. As also, The Secret Intrigues of the French King's Ministers at the Courts of most of the Princes and States of Europe* (London, 1698).
- Annales Academiae Iuliae ex editis monumentis et manuscriptis observationibus compositi. Semestre Recimum* (Helmstedt, 1726).
- Annotata über die fürgefallene Quaestion ob unsere Reichs-Fürsten befuget, Ambassadeurs zuschicken. Unter eines fürnehmen Ministri Schrifften gefunden, und durch den Druck publiciret* (n.p., 1681).
- Archives de la Bastille. Documents inédits recueillis. Règne de Louis XIV (1659-1661)*, ed. F. Ravaisson (Paris, 1866).
- Aubery, A., *Des justes prétensions du Roi sur l'Empire* (Paris, 1667).
- Außführlicher Entwurff derer zwischen itzigem Pabste Innocentio XI. und Ludovico XIV. Könige in Franckreich, Rechts schwebender gefährlicher Irrungen und Mißhelligkeiten, wegen der von Franckreich für seine zu Rom würcklich residirende Ambassadeurs und Ober-Staats-Ministres mit Bestand zu praetendiren befugt-vermeynter Freyheits-Berechtigungen, zusamt denen bisher darinnen ergangenen Acten und Actitäten. Mit Anhang zweyer vornehmen und hocherleuchteten I[u]ctorum und Politicorum, Ziegleri und Wicquefortii, unvorgreifflich und unpartheylich Special- und General- aus denen Geschichten, und dem darinnen enthaltenen Völcker-Rechte geführten Ermessens* (Leipzig, 1687).
- Ausführliche Relation von dem [...] in Franckreich angelangten Persianischen Ambassadeurs, Mehmed Riza-Beg* (Augsburg, 1716).
- Ayrault, P., *L'Ordre, formalité et instruction iudiciaire, dont les anciens Grecs et Romains ont usé des accusations publiques [...] conféré au stil et usage de nostre France. Divisée en quatre livres*, 4th edn (Lyon, 1642) [1587].
- Barbaro, E., 'De officio legati', ed. V.E. Grabar, *De legatis et legationibus tractatus varii* (Dorpat, 1905), 65-70.
- Beck, C.A., *Versuch einer Staatspraxis oder Kanzleyübung aus der Politik, dem Staats- und Völkerrechte* (Vienna, 1754).
- Benavente y Benavides, C., *Advertencias para Reyes, Principes, y Embaxadores* (Madrid, 1643).
- Benedetti, P., *Il magico legato. Tragicomedia pastorale* (Venice, 1607).
- Béthune, P.de, *Le Conseiller d'estat, ou recueil des plus générales considérations servant au maniement des affaires publiques [...]* (Paris, 1632).

- *Diverses observations et maximes politiques de M. de Béthune, employé en plusieurs ambassades considérables sous les règnes d'Henry IV et de Louis XIII* (Paris, 1667).
- Bielfeld, J.v., *Institutions politiques* (2 vols., The Hague, 1760, vol.3 Leiden, 1772).
- *Des Freyherrn von Bielefeld Lehrbegriff der Staatskunst* (2 vols., Leipzig, 1761).
- *The Elements of Universal Erudition, Containing an Analytical Abridgment of the Sciences, Polite Arts, and Belles Lettres* (3 vols., London, 1770).
- Bragaccia, G., *L'Ambasciatore* (Padua 1626).
- Brunnemann, J. (praes.), *Dissertatio iuris publici de iure ceremoniali circo legatos* (Halle, 1739).
- Bruyère, J.de la, *Les Caractères ou les mœurs de ce siècle* [1688], ed. P.Kuentz (Paris, 1969).
- Buder, C.G., *De bibliothecis publicum ad usum legatis* (Jena, 1723).
- Bynkershoek, J.v., *De foro legatorum tam in causa civili quam criminali, liber singularis* (Leiden, 1721).
- *Traité du juge competent des ambassadeurs, tant pour le civil, que pour le criminel*, trans. J.Barbeyrac (The Hague, 1723).
- Callières, F.de, *De la manière de négocier avec les souverains* (Paris, 1716).
- *Der staatserfahrene Abgesandte, oder Unterricht, wie man mit hohen Potentaten in Staats-Sachen klug tractiren soll*, trans. J.R.Rappio (Leipzig, 1716).
- *The Art of Negotiating with Sovereign Princes; of the Usefulness of Negotiations, of the Choice of Ambassadors and Envoys; and of the Qualifications necessary for Succeeding in those Employments*, trans. G.Straham (London, 1716).
- *De la science du monde, et des connoissances utiles à la conduite de la vie* (Bruxelles, 1717).
- *Kluger Minister und Geschickter Gesandten Staats-Schuls, oder Unterricht, wie man mit grossen herren und Potentaten Staats-Sachen Klugich tractiren soll [...]* [trans. M.G.Weidmann] (Leipzig, 1717).
- *De la manière de négocier avec les souverains. Nouvelle édition, considerablement augmentée par M. xx* (2 vols., London, 1750).
- *Die politische Unterhandlungskunst oder Anweisung mit Fürsten und Republicken zu unterhandeln, Aufgestellt von dem Staatsmann in der Einsamkeit* (Leipzig 1811).
- *The Art of Diplomacy*, eds. K.Schweizer, H.M.Keens-Soper (New York, 1983).
- *François de Callières. De la manière de négocier avec les souverains*, ed. A.Lempereur (Paris, 2002).
- *François de Callières: L'Art de négocier en France sous Louis XIV*, ed. J.C.Wacquet (Paris, 2005).
- Carafa, C.M. de, 'L'Ambasciatore politico christiano' [1690], in idem, *Opere politiche-christianae* (3 vols., Mazzarino, 1692), ii.

- Catalogue des livres rares et manuscrits précieux du cabinet de la Chevalière d'Eon, ci-devant ministre plenipotentiaire de France en Angleterre, à la Paix de 1763, etc. Présentement à Londres, et retournant à Paris [...]* (sic! London, 1791).
- The Centinel*, ed. T.Francklin, 1757.
- Ceremoniale Brandenburgicum, oder Khur-Brandenburgische Ceremoniel Designation [...]* (Dortmund, 1699).
- Chambers, E., *Cyclopedia, or an Universal Dictionary of Arts and Sciences [...]* (London, 1728), i, 296-7 (s.v. 'Embassador'), 318 (s.v. 'Envoy'); ii, 554-5 (s.v. 'Minister').
- Chesterfield, Lord, Earl of Stanhope, *Lettres à son fils, 1750-52*, ed. M.Fumaroli (Paris, 1993).
- Chevremont, J.B.de, *La Connoissance du monde ou l'art de bien élever la jeunesse pour les divers états de la vie* (Paris, 1694).
- Chokier, J. v., *Tractatus de Legato* (Cologne, 1624).
- Chamoy, L. Rousseau de, 'L'Idée du parfait ambassadeur' [1697], ed. L.Delavaud (Paris, 1912).
- Colazon [C.Paschal], *Notes sur un petit livre premièrement intitulé L'Ambassadeur. Depuis De la charge et dignité de l'ambassadeur [...]* par le Sieur de Villiers Hotman (Paris, 1604).
- 'Les Conseils de l'Ambassadeur Leon Noel a un jeune diplomate', ed. R. du Saint-Quentin, *RHD*, 64 (1950), 171-81.
- Contzen, A., *Libri X politicorum in quibus de perfectae Reipublicae forma, itemque seditione et bello, tractatur*, 2nd edn (Cologne, 1629).
- 'Correspondenz des Königs Karl III von Spanien (Karl VI.) mit Wratislaw', ed. A.v.Arnetz, *Archiv für Österreichische Geschichte*, 16 (1856), 3-224.
- Correspondance secrète entre le Comte Anton Wenzel Kaunitz-Riedberg et le Baron Ignaz de Koch 1750-52*, ed. H.Schlitter (Vienna, 1899).
- Costeker, J.L., *The Fine Gentleman, or the Complete Education of a Young Nobleman* (London, 1732).
- The Courtier's Calling; Shewing the Ways of Making a Fortune and the Art of Living at Court according to the Maxims of Policy and Morality. In Two Parts, the First concerning Noblemen, the Second concerning Gentlemen* (London, 1675).
- Crusius, J.A., *Tractatus politico-juridico-historicus de praeeminentia, sessione* (Bremen, 1666).
- Déduction de raisons en vertu dequelles le droit de donner le caractère d'ambassadeur appartient aux princes de l'Empire joint. Avec la refutation d'un écrit publié depuis peu, sous le nom de Lettre d'un desinteressé à un sien amy, touchant le titre d'ambasaduer, avec lequel les princes de l'Empire desirent d'envoyer leurs ministres au congrès de Nimwegen* (Cologne 1677).
- Defoe, D., *The Compleat English Gentleman* [1728], ed. K.Bülbring (London, 1890).

Dénouement de la question q'il y a touchant le cérémoniel entre les ambassadeurs de France et ceux de Brandebourg, qui se trouvent présentement au traité de paix à Nimegue (Aachen, 1677).

(*Philhemi Irenici Elisii*) *Diarium Europaeum*, ed. M.Meyer (45 vols., Frankfurt, 1659-83), i.

Les Différents des ambassadeurs aux champs elisées (n.p., 1717).

Dolet, E., *De Officio Legato* (Lyon, 1541), eds. J.Reeves, J.Dunlap, 'Etienne Dolet on the functions of the Ambassador', *American Journal of International Law*, 27 (1933), 80-95.

Du droit des franchises des quartiers de Rome, où logent les ambassadeurs de France, et les nullitez de l'excommunication que le Pape a fulminé contre M. de Lavardin. Avec des réflexions sur le XII canon du II conseil de Lyon, touchant la régale (Amsterdam, 1688).

Duguet, J., *Institution d'un prince* (London, 1739).

Dumont, J., *Corps universel diplomatique du droit des gens; contenant un recueil des traitez d'alliance, de paix, de treve, de neutralité, de commerce [...]* (8 vols., Amsterdam, 1726-31).

'L'Éducation d'un diplomate'. *Conseils à un élève du ministère des relations extérieures*, *RHD*, 15 (1901), 161-224.

Ein vornehmen Englischen Icti Gedancken von dem Tractament eines Minister und dessen Domestiquen, welche an dem Orthe, wie Selbige in Gesandschafft sich befinden, etwas verbrochen, Wegen der Solidité anjetzo in teutscher Sprache mitgetheilet [...] (Jena, 1717).

'Embajada española', ed. H. J.Chaytor, *Royal Historical Society, Camden Miscellany*, 14 (1926), 1-43.

[Etheredge, G.], *Letterbook of Sir George Etheredge*, ed. S.Rosenfeld (London, 1928).

Faber, A. et al. (eds.), *Europäische Staats-Cantzley*, [...] (115 vols., Frankfurt etc., 1697-1760), i, ii.

Feindes, J.C.B., *Unstreitiges Recht eines Fürsten, Staats, oder Freyen [...], einen Gesandten [...] bei Schändung seines sonst inviolablen Characters, in Verübung sonst sträfflicher Mißhandlungen, insonderheit gegen den Staat, zu arrestiren, und seinen Souverainen und Obern zurück zu schicken, oder: Im Bürgerlichen und Völcker-Rechte, absonderlich in Praxi Poltica aller Nationen, so wohl des Alterthums, als gegenwärtiger Zeit, begründete Befugnis S[eine]r K[öniglichen] Hoheit in Frankreich, den Spanischen Ambassadeur Printzen von Cellamare, jüngsthin in Versicherung und Verwahrung zu nehmen* (Hamburg 1719).

Félice, F.B., 'Des négociations, ou de l'art de négocier', in idem, *Dictionnaire de justice naturelle et civile [...]* (Yverdon, 1777-8), xiv, 176-95.

[Finnett, J.] *Some Choice Observations of Sir John Finett, Knight, and Master of the Ceremonies to the two last Kings; touching the Reception and Precedence, the Treatment and Audience, the Punctilios and Contests of Forren Ambassadors in England*, ed. J.Howell (London 1656).

- *Finnetti philxenis. Ritter Johann Finets Ceremonien-Meisters zu Zeiten Jacobi I. und Caroli I. in Engelland, Auserlesene Anmerckungen betreffend die Reception, Präcedentz, Tractirung, Audientzen, wie auch vorgefallene Kleinigkeiten und Streitigkeiten zwischen auswärtigen Gesandten in Engelland. Mit einer Vorrede des H[err]n Prof. Treuers Von der Historie des politischen Ceremoniels versehen [...], ed. G.S.Treuer (Braunschweig, 1728).*
- Franckenberg, F.L.v., *Europäischer Herold, oder zuverlässige Beschreibung derer Europäisch-Christlichen Kayserthums, Königreiche, freyer Staaten und Fürstenthümer*, 2nd edn (2 vols., Leipzig, 1705), ii, pp. 33-5.
- Franckreichs Geist oder des Jetzt-regierenden Königs Lodovici des XIV. allergeheimste Staats-Maximen, aus dero Secretesten Cabinet hervorgesuchet und bey gegenwärtigen Conjuncturen dem gantzen Europa offenbahret. Worinnen zugleich enthalten, wie die Cron Franckreich, vermittelt seiner Abgesandten, Envoyen, Residenten und andern dergleichen Bedienten mehr, so allendhalben an denen Fürstlichen Höfen, gleich denen Bienen umher schwärmen, sich auf den allgemeinen Europaeischen Regierungs-Wagen zuzwingen vermeinet* (Cologne, 1689).
- Frankfurtische Gelehrte Zeitung*, 1750.
- Franquesnay, J. de la Sarraz du, *Le Ministre public dans les cours étrangères: Ses fonctions et ses prérogatives* (Paris, 1731).
- Freschot, C., *Les Intrigues secrètes du Duc de Savoye. Avec une relation fidelle des mauvais traitements qu'en a reçû M. de Phelippeaux ambassadeur de France, contre le Droit des Gens* (Venice, 1705).
- *Histoire amoureuse et badine du congrès et de la ville d'Utrecht, en plusieurs lettres* (Liège, 1714).
- Friedrich II. von Preußen, *Antimachiavell, oder Versuch einer Critik über Nic. Machiavells Regierungskunst eines Fürsten. Nach des Herrn von Voltaire Ausgabe ins Deutsche übersetzt*, 2nd edn (Hanover, 1756).
- *Die Politischen Testamente*, ed. F.v.Oppeln-Bronikowski, 3rd edn (Munich, 1941).
- *Oeuvres de Frédéric le Grand*, ed. J.Preuss (31 vols., Berlin, 1846-57).
- Fürstenerius, C. [G.W.Leibniz], *De iure suprematus ac legationis principum Germaniae* (Amsterdam, 1677).
- *Lettre d'un desinteressé à un sien amy, touchant le titre d'ambassadeur, avec lequel les princes d'Allemagne desirent d'envoyer leur ministres au congrès de Nimwegen, et les différences, que quelques-uns tachent de susciter entre les électeurs de l'Empire et les susdits princes* (Aachen, 1677).
- *Entretien de Philarete et d'Eugene, sur la question du temps agitée à Nimwegue; touchant le droit d'ambassade des électeurs et princes de l'Empire* (Duisburg, 1678).
- Gailhard, J., *The Compleat Gentleman, or Directions for the Education of Youth as to their Breeding at Home and Travelling Abroad. In Two Treatises* (London, 1678).
- *Concerning the Statesman, Or him who is in Publick Employments. Being the last Part of the Institution of Youth* (London, 1681).

- *Two Discourses. The first concerning a Private Settlement at Home after Travel. The Second concerning the Statesman, or Him who is in Publick Employments* (London, 1682).
- Galardi, F., *Traité politique concernant l'importance du choix exact d'ambassadeurs habiles, avec l'utilité des ligues, et du rétablissement des ordres militaires en Espagne. Par une déduction curieuse des princes qui s'en servirent judicieusement, avec les événemens touchant une maxime si consommée*, 2nd edn (Cologne, 1666 [1663]).
- *Réflexions sur les Mémoires pour les ambassadeurs et response au ministre prisonnier, avec des exemples curieux et d'importantes recherches* (Ville-Franche, 1677), repr. in Wicquefort, *L'Ambassadeur et ses fonctions* (Amsterdam, 1730).
- Gentili, A., *De legationibus libri tres* (London, 1585).
- Germoni, A., *De legatis principum et populorum libri tres* (Rome, 1627).
- Glasey, A.F., *Neue Jahrs-Gedancken vom Titel Excellenz, worinnen der ehemahlige und heutige Gebrauch dieses Titels gezeigt* (Leipzig, 1720).
- Grabar (Hrabar), V.E. (ed.), *De legatis et legationibus tractatus varii* (Dorpat, 1905).
- *De legatorum iure tractatum catalogus completus* (Dorpat, 1918).
- Grimarest, J.L. de, *Traité sur la manière d'écrire des lettres et sur le cérémonial [...]* (Paris, 1709).
- *Recueil de Lettres serieuses et galantes [...]. Instruction nécessaire à tous gentil-hommes à la suite d'un ambassadeur* (Paris, 1725).
- Grottnitz v.Grodnow, C.M., *Teutsch-gekleideter Regiments-Rath* (Stettin, 1647).
- Grotius, H., *De iure belli ac pacis* (Paris, 1625), ed. W.Schätzel (Tübingen, 1950).
- Gundling, J.P., *Kurtzer Entwurff, womit bey der Fürsten- und Ritter-Academie in Berlin der hohen und adelichen Jugend er mit Antretung seiner Profession sein Vorhaben bekant machet* (Cölln a.d.Spre, 1705).
- Gundling, N.H., *Eröffnung eines Collegii über den jetzigen Zustand von Europa* (Halle, 1712).
- *Einleitung zur wahren Staatsklugheit. Aus dessen mündlichen Vortrags [...] von Zuhörern [...] zusammengetragen [...]* (Frankfurt, 1751).
- Heeren, A. *Handbuch der Geschichte des Europäischen Staatensystems und seiner Colonien [...]*, 4th edn (2 vols., Göttingen, 1822 [1809]).
- Herttenstein, J.H., *Kurtzer Vorbericht das Natürliche und Völcker-Rect betreffend, mit welchem denen durchlauchtigen, hoch- und wohl-gebohrnen Herren Academicis seine bey der von I[hrer] K[öniglichen] M[ajestät] in Preussen etc. al[ler]gn[ädigst] angerichteten Fürsten und Ritter-Academie, über gedachte beyde Rechte dieses erste halbe Jahr über zu haltende Lectiones anzeigt* (Cölln a.d.Spre, c.1705).
- Hierro, A.de, *The Process and Pleadings in the Court of Spain upon the Death of Anthonie Ascham, Resident for the Parliament of England, and of John Baptista Riva his Interpreter, who were Kill'd [...]. Sent from Madrid from a Person of Qualitie and Made English* (n.p., 1651).

- Hotman et Villiers, J.de, *L'Ambassadeur* (Paris, 1603).
- *De la charge et dignité de l'ambassadeur*, 2nd edn (Paris, 1613 [1604]).
 - *The Ambassador*, trans. J.Shawe (London, 1603).
 - *A Basket Full of Rich Jewels: For the Ornament and Adorning, both of the Minde and Habite, of the Most Absolutest Ambassador, or Professed Statest. Furnished with many Worthy Examples, most Short an Pithy Histories, and Well Advised Counsailes, Concerning Princes, and State Businesse* (London, 1609).
- Hoevelen, C.v., *Candorins vollkommener Teutsche Gesandte: Nach allen dessen genauesten Eigenschafften, wie nemlich selbiger in denen vor, bey, und nach der ihme auffgebürdeten Verrichtung vorzufallen gewöhnlichen Begebenheiten gebührligst zu sein selbst eigener Ehre und unserblichem Ruhm sich zu verhalten treu-meinend vorgestellt* (Frankfurt, 1679).
- Howell, J., *A Discourse on the Precedency of Kings [...]. To Which is Adjoined A Distinct Treatise of Ambassadors* (London, 1664).
- Instruction des ambassadeurs de S[a] M[ajesté] Très Chrestienne, qui doivent faire la fonction, et soutenir ce caractère dans la cour de Rome* (Cologne, 1681).
- 'Instruction générale des ambassadeurs', ed. E.Griselle, *RHD*, 28-29 (1914-15), 772-81.
- Ickstatt, J.A.v., *Kurtzer Entwurff Einer Vernünfftigen Lehr-Art wornach unsere Teutsche Adeliche und andere/insonderheit Catholische Academische Jugend ihre Studia Juris auf Universitäten mit Nutzen einrichtet [...]* (Munich, c.1746).
- Journal and Correspondence of Willliam, Lord Auckland, with a Preface and Introduction by the Bishop of Bath and Wells* (4 vols., London, 1861-2).
- Journal inédit de Jean-Baptiste Colbert Marquis de Torcy, ministre et secrétaire d'état des affaires étrangères, pendant les années 1709, 1710 et 1711*, ed. F.Masson (Paris, 1884).
- Journal et Mémoires de Marquis d'Argenson*, ed. E.J.B. Rathery (9 vols., Paris, 1859), i.
- Justi, J.H.G.v., *Der Grundriss einer guten Regierung in fünf Büchern verfasset* (Frankfurt, 1759).
- Keith, R.M., *Memoirs and Correspondence (Official and Familiar) of Sir Robert Murray Keith*, ed. G.Smyth (2 vols., London, 1849).
- Keith, W., *An Essay on the Education of a Young British Nobleman, after he Leaves the Schools. To which are Added, Some Observations on the Office of an Ambassador* (London, 1730).
- Kemmerich, D.H., *Grund-Sätze des Voelcker-Rechts von der Unverletzlichkeit der Gesandten samt einer Relation von dem Affront, welcher dem Moscowitischen Abgesandten in Engelland Anno 1708 erwiesen, und der darauf erfolgten Satisfaction, wie auch einer kurtzen Untersuchung dieser Affaire nach solchen Grund-Sätzen* (Erlangen, 1710).
- *Neu-eröffnete Academie der Wissenschaften, zu welchen vornehmlich Standes-Personen nützlich können angeführet, und zu einer vernünfftigen und wohl-anständigen Conduite geschickt gemacht werden* (3 vols., Leipzig, 1711-4).

- *Anleitung zur Staatswissenschaft der heutigen Welt* (3 vols., Leipzig 1712-3).
- Kirchner, H., *Legatus: cunctis tum in jurisprudentiae, politicarumque artium studiis, tum in reip[ublica] administratione versantibus lectu scitus, et scitu necessarius* (Lichae 1604).
- Koch, C.W., *Abrégé de l'histoire des traités de paix entre les puissances de l'Europe depuis la paix de Westphalie* (4 vols., Strasbourg, 1796-97), i.
- *Discours sur l'ancienne gloire littéraire de la ville de Strasbourg* (Strasbourg, 1809).
- Kulpis, J.G., *De legationibus statuum imperii commentatio [...]* (Giessen, 1679).
- Leti, G., *Il Ceremoniale historico e politico* (6 vols., Amsterdam, 1685).
- Liechtenstern, J.M.v., *Was hat die Diplomatie als Wissenschaft zu umfassen und der Diplomat zu leisten?* (Altenburg, 1820).
- Lünig, J.C., *Theatrum ceremoniale historico-politicum, oder Historisch und Politischer Schau-Platz aller Ceremonien, so wohl an europäischen Höfen als auch sonst bey vielen illustren Fällen beobachtet worden* (2 vols., Leipzig, 1719-20).
- Lupa, A., *L'Ambasciatore invidiato* (Venice, 1639).
- Mably, G.Bonnot de, *Des principes des négociations pour servir d'introduction au Droit public de l'Europe: fondé sur les traités* (Amsterdam, 1757).
- *Le Droit public de l'Europe fondé sur les traités conclus jusqu'en l'année 1740. Nouvelle édition, augmenté de remarques historiques, politiques, et critiques, par M. Rousset* (2 vols., Amsterdam, 1748 [1746]).
- Maggi, O., *De legato libri duo*, 2nd edn (Venice, 1596 [1566]).
- LaMaillardière, C.F. de, *Précis du droit des gens, de la guerre, de la paix, et des ambassades. Première partie de la bibliothèque politique, à l'usage des sujets destinées aux négociations* (Paris, 1775).
- Marselaer, F.de, *Khpykeion, sive legationum insigne [...]* (Antwerp, 1618).
- *Legati libri due* (Brussels, 1624).
- Martens, C.v., *Manuel diplomatique, ou précis des droits et des fonctions des agents diplomatiques* (Paris, 1822).
- Martens, G.F.v., *Versuch über die Existenz eines positiven Europäischen Völkerrechts [...]* (Göttingen, 1787).
- *Précis du droit des gens modernes de l'Europe, fondé sur les traités et l'usage. Auquel on a joint la liste des principaux traités conclus depuis 1748 jusqu'à présent, avec l'indication des ouvrages, où ils se trouvent* (2 vols., Göttingen, 1789).
- *Ébauche d'un cours politique et diplomatique sur les rapports conventionnels des premières puissances de l'Europe [...]* (Göttingen, 1796).
- *Erzählungen merkwürdiger Fälle des neueren Europäischen Völkerrechts [...]* (Göttingen, 1800).
- [Lowther, J., Viscount Lonsdale], *Memoir of the Reign of James II* (York, 1808).
- Mémoires manuels d'un ambassadeur, publiés durant la Diette à Francfort pour l'élection d'un Roi des Romains. De l'art de négocier avec succès pour l'avantage de son*

- souverain. Par Monsieur P., nouvelle édition, publiée par le Sr. P.J.H. Augmentée d'instructions très courtes pour les apprentifs ministres. Par le Chevalier D.C. (Frankfurt, 1764).
- Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire du Congrès de Cambrai. Ou l'on voit l'origine, et l'examen des difficultez qui en ont retarde l'ouverture par rapport aux investitures d'Italie* (n.p., 1723).
- Memoirs and Correspondence (Official and Familiar) of Sir Robert Murray Keith*, ed. G.Smyth (London, 1849).
- Menudier, J., *Le Modèle du parfait secrétaire, pour les beaux esprits* (Jena, 1690).
- *Le Modèle du parfait secrétaire, pour les beaux esprits [...] avec un recueil d'instructions nécessaires pour les gentils-hommes à la suite d'un ambassadeur, et un avis dans le voyage en France, pour les princes, et autres gens de qualité. Joint un formulaire des titres [...] de l'Europe* (Jena, 1703).
- Mercure historique et politique, contenant l'état présent de l'Europe* (The Hague, 1686-1782), lii (1712).
- The Monitor, or British Freeholder*, 1760-61 (London).
- Montaigne, M.de, *Essais* [1588], ed. M.Rat (Paris, 1962).
- Moser, F.C.v., *Abhandlung von den Europäischen Hof-und Staatssprachen, nach deren Gebrauch im Reden und Schreiben* (Frankfurt, 1750).
- *Kleine Schriften, Zur Erläuterung des Staats- und Völcker-Rechts, wie auch des Hof-und Cantzley-Ceremoniels* (12 vols., Frankfurt, 1751-67).
- 'Abhandlung von den Appointemens, oder dem Gehalt der Gesandten', in *ibid.*, i (1751), 182-290.
- 'Die Gesandtin nach ihren Rechten und Pflichten' in *ibid.*, iii (1753), 133-331.
- *L'Ambassadrice et ses droits* (Berlin, 1754).
- *Teutsches Hofrecht, enthaltend eine Systematische Abhandlung von der Geschichte des teutschen Hof-Wesens, von den Rechten eines Regenten, [...] von den persönlichen Rechten, Titulaturen [...]* (2 vols, Frankfurt 1754-5).
- Moser, J.J., *Einladung an die Herren Studiosos zu seinen künftig zu haltenden Lectionibus publicis und Collegiis privatis* (Halle, 1736).
- 'Abhandlung von denen dormalen üblichen Gattungen derer Gesandten und anderer öffentlicher Personen', in *idem*, *Der Belgradische Friedens-Schluss zwischen Ihro Römisch-Kayserl. Majestät und der Ottomanischen Pforte; mit Beylagen und Anmerckungen [...]* (Jena, 1740).
- *Grund-Sätze des jezt-üblichen Europäischen Völcker-Rechts in Friedens-Zeiten* (Hanau, 1750).
- *Anleitung zu dem Studio Juris junger Standes- und anderer Personen*, 3rd edn (Jena, 1743).
- *Entwurff einer Staats- und Cantzley-Academie oder einer nähern Anleitung und Zubereitung junger von Universitäten oder Reisen kommender Printzen, Grafen,*

- Cavaliers und anderer Personen zu der Europäischen, besonders der Teutschen Staats-Klugheit, zu dem jetzt-üblichen Europäischen Völcker-Recht in Friedens- und Kriegs-Zeiten, zu denen neuesten Europäischen, besonders denen Teutschen comitial-judicial- und extrajudicialen Staats-Angelegenheiten und Streitigkeitne, zu allen Arten von Staats- und Cantzley-Aufsätzen und zu der in einem wohlgeordneten Cantzley-Collegio, auch bey Congressen, Conferentien u.w. üblichen Handels-Weise (Hanau, 1749).*
- *Nähere Anzeige der Teutschen Staats-Sachen, so bey dieser Academie abgehandelt werden (Hanau, 1749).*
 - *Nähere Anzeige derer Europäischen Staats-Sachen, so bey dieser Academie abgehandelt werden (Hanau, 1749).*
 - *Nähere Anzeige derer Canzley-Sachen, so bey dieser Academie abgehandelt werden (Hanau, 1749).*
 - *Wiederholte Nachricht von einer Staats- und Canzley-Academie (Hanau, 1749).*
 - *Einleitung zu denen Canzley-Geschäften, zum Gebrauch der hanauischen Staats- und Canzley-Academie (Hanau, 1750).*
 - *Einleitung zu denen neuesten Teutschen Staats-Angelegenheiten, zum Gebrauch der Hanauischen Staats- und Cantzley-Academie (Hanau, 1750).*
 - *Vermischte Abhandlungen aus dem Europäischen Völcker-Recht, wie auch von Teutschen und anderen Europäischen Staats-, desgleichen von Canzley-Sachen (3 vols., Hanau, 1750).*
 - *Lebens-Geschichte Johann Jakob Mosers, von ihm selbst beschrieben, 4 vols. (Offenbach, 1768, Frankfurt, 1783).*
- Müller, P. (praes.), *De principum Germaniae legationibus*, disp. H.Knorn (Jena, 1678).
- *De residentibus eorumque juribus*, disp. C.W.Hilken (Jena, 1690).
 - *De legatis primi ordinis*, disp. T.Sutorius (Jena, 1692).
- Nemeitz, J.C., *Séjour de Paris, c'est à dire, instructions fidèles, pour les voyageurs de condition, comment ils se doivent conduire, s'ils veulent faire un bon usage de leur tems et argent, durant leur séjour à Paris; comme aussi une description suffisante de la cour de France, du parlement, de l'université, des académies et bibliothèques; avec une liste des plus célèbres savans, artisans, et autres choses remarquables, qu'on trouve dans cette grande et fameuse ville*, 2nd edn (2 vols., Leiden, 1727 [1718]).
- Nourar, L.de, *Le Ministère du négociateur* (Amsterdam, 1763).
- Ompteda, D.H., *Litteratur des gesammten sowohl natürlichen als positiven Völkerrechts* (3 vols., Regensburg, 1785).
- Pacassi, J.v., *Ueber die Gesandtschaftsrechte* (Vienna, 1775).
- Paschal, C., *Legatus opus*, 2nd edn (Paris, 1612 [1598]).
- Peacham, H., *The Compleat Gentleman. Fashioning him Absolute in the most Necessary and Commendable Qualities concerning Minde, or Bodie, that may be Required in a Noble Gentleman* (London, 1622).

Pecquet, A., *Discours sur l'art de négocier* (The Hague, 1737).

— *De l'art de négocier avec les souverains* (Paris, 1738).

— *Parallèle du coeur, de l'esprit et du bon sens* (Paris, 1740).

— *L'Esprit des maximes politiques, pour servir de suite à L'Esprit des loix, du Président de Montesquieu* (Paris, 1757).

— Antoine Pecquet. *Discourse on the Art of Negotiation*, eds. and trans. A.Gruzinska and M.D.Sirkis (New York, 2004).

Philosophia elegantiarum et ceremoniarum aulicarum, oder kluge und vernünfftige Kunst-Regeln worauf die Höfflichkeiten und Ceremonien, welche unter den Gesandten heuttag verübet und in Acht genommen zu werden pflegen, gegründet zu seyn [...] (Frankfurt, 1689).

Die Politischen Testamente der Hohenzollern, ed. R.Dietrich (Cologne, 1986).

The Present State of the Nation, 3rd edn (Dublin, 1768 [1768]).

Pufendorf, S., *De iure naturae et gentium libri VIII*, 2nd edn (Frankfurt, 1684 [1672]).

Pütter, J.S., *Vorbereitung zu einem collegio practico iuris publici* (Göttingen, 1749).

— *Nähere Vorbereitung zur Teutschen Reichs- und Staats-Praxis, nebst Eröffnung einer neuen Art von Vorlesungen über die neuere Reichs-Historie*, (Göttingen, 1750).

Rachel, S., *De iure naturae et gentium dissertationes* [1676], ed. J.B.Scott (New York, 1964).

Réal de Curban, G.de, *La Science du gouvernement. Ouvrage de morale, de droit et de politique, qui contient les principes du commandement et de l'obéissance; où l'on réduit toutes les matières de gouvernement en un corps unique, entier dans chacune de ses parties et où l'on explique les droits et les devoirs des souverains, ceux des sujets, ceux de tous les hommes, en quelque situation qu'ils se trouvent* (8 vols., Paris, 1761-4).

Recueil de diverses relations remarquables des principales cours de l'Europe. Écrites pour la plupart, par des Ambassadeurs [...] (Cologne, 1681).

Recueil des instructions aux ambassadeurs et ministres de France depuis les traités de Westphalie jusqu'à la Révolution française, ed. Centre National de la Recherche Scientif (31 vols., Paris, 1884 ff), i (Autriche, ed. A.Sorel, 1884); xvi (Prusse, ed. A.Waddington, 1901); xxiv-xxv (Angleterre 1-2, ed. J.Jusserand, 1929).

Refuge, E., *Traité de la cour, ou instruction des courtisans*, 2nd edn (Paris, 1622 [1616]).

— *A Treatise of the Court or Instructions for Courtiers. Digested into two Books*, trans. J.Reynolds (London, 1622).

— *Arcana aulica, or, Walsingham's Manual of Prudential Maxims, for the States-man and Courtier* (London, 1652).

[Richelieu, A.de] *Testament Politique* [Amsterdam, 1688], ed. F.Hildeheimer (Paris, 1995).

Rohan, H.de, *De l'interest des princes et estats de la Chrestienté* (Paris, 1635).

- Rohr, J.B.v., *Einleitung zur Ceremoniel-Wissenschaft der großen Herren [...]*, 2nd edn (Berlin 1733 [1728]).
- Römer, C.H., *Versuch einer Einleitung in die rechtlichen, moralischen und politischen Grundsätze über die Gesandtschaften* (Gotha, 1788).
- *Handbuch für Gesandte* (Leipzig, 1791).
- Rosier, B.du, 'Ambaxiator Brevilogus' (MS, n.p., 1436), ed. V.E.Grabar, *De legatis et legationibus tractatus varii*, Dorpat 1905, 3-30.
- Rousset de Missy, J., *Cérémonial diplomatique des cours de l'Europe* (2 vols., Amsterdam, 1739).
- *Mémoires sur le rang et la préséance entre les souverains de l'Europe et entre leurs ministres représentans suivant leurs différens caractères* (Amsterdam, 1746).
- Sagittarius J.C. (praes.), *Speculum boni legati quod per modum disputationis*, resp. J.H.im Hof (Jena, 1647).
- Savary, J., *Le Parfait négociant*, 5th edn (Paris, 1675).
- Schleinitz, J.C., *Commentatio de negotio pacificationis inter gentes qua iura et officia pararii pacis ex actis publicis gentium et legatorum commentariis* (Helmstedt, 1731).
- Schmauß, J.J., *Einleitung zu der Staats-Wissenschaft, und Erleuterung des von ihm herausgegebenen Corporis iuris gentium academici und aller andern seit mehr als zweyen Seculis her geschlossenen Bündnisse, Friedens- und Commerciën-Tractaten* (2 vols., Leipzig, 1741, 1747).
- Schönborner, G., *Libri VII politicorum in quibus methodice digestis ars bene constituendi feliciterque administrandi* (Leipzig 1614).
- Schreiben eines Vater an seinen Sohn von den Pflichten und Eigenschaften eines Gesandten. Von J.F.E.v.G.* (Brünn, 1770).
- Schweder, C.H., *Theatrum historicum praetensionum et controversiarum, oder historischer Schauplatz der Ansprüche und Streitigkeiten hoher Potentaten und anderer regierenden Herrschafften in Europa. Suppliret und continueret von A.F.Glasey*, 2nd edn (2 vols., Leipzig, 1727 [1712]).
- Scribani, C., *Politicus christianus* (Münster, 1625).
- Silhon, J., *Le Ministre d'état, avec le véritable usage de la politique moderne* (Paris, 1631).
- The Spectator*, xxxv (London, 1712).
- Stieve, G., *Europäisches Hof-Ceremoniell, worinnen Nachricht gegeben wird, was für eine Beschaffenheit es habe mit der Praerogativ, und dem daraus fliessenden Ceremoniel [...]* (Leipzig, 1715).
- Stosch, B., *Von dem Praecedenz- oder Vorder-Recht aller Potentaten und Republiken in Europa, samt einer sonderbaren Zugabe von der Hoheit des Ertz-Hertzoglichen Hauses Österreich* (Jena, 1677).
- [Straatman, Henri de], *Testament politique de Charles de Lorraine et de Bar. Déposé entre les mains de l'Empereur Leopold à Presbourg le 29 Novembre 1687 en faveur du Roy*

- d'Hongrie et ses successeurs arrivans à l'Empire* [ed. Abbé de Chevreumont] (Leipzig, [1696]).
- Tablettes de tous les ministres publics des cours souveraines de l'Europe, avec leurs titres, noms, fonctions et adresses. Pour l'année 1731* (Amsterdam, 1731).
- Tasso, T., *Il Messaggero. Dialogo del Signor Torquato Tasso* (Venice, 1582).
- *L'Esprit ou l'ambassadeur, le secrétaire, et le père de famille. Traitez excellens de Torquato Tasso* (Paris, 1632).
- Testament politique d'un ministre étranger, à son fils, pour servir d'introduction à l'art de négocier* (London, 1764).
- Theatrum Europaeum, Oder außführliche und wahrhaftige Beschreibung aller und jeder denckwürdiger Geschichten, so sich hin und wieder in der Welt, fürnemblich aber in Europa und Teutschland [...] zugetragen haben* (Frankfurt, 1635-1738), i.
- Thickness, P., *A Year's Journey through the Pais Bas and Austrian Netherlands*, 2nd edn (London, 1778).
- Thomasius, C., *Welcher Gestalt man denen Frantzosen in gemeinem Leben und Wandel nachahmen solle? Ein Collegiugm über des Gratians Grund-Reguln, vernünfftig, klug und artig zu leben* (Leipzig, 1701).
- Thynne, F., *The Perfect Ambassador, treating of the Antiquitie, Priviledges and Behaviour of Men belonging to that Function*, 2nd edn (London, 1652 [1578]).
- Traité curieux sur l'enlèvement du Prince de Furstenberg, avec des exemples et des réflexions importantes touchant l'immunité des ambassadeurs* (Ville France, 1676).
- Traité des Ambassades et des ambassadeurs* (Rotterdam, 1726).
- Vattel, E., *Le Droit des gens, ou principes de la loi naturelle, appliqués à la conduite et aux affaires des nations et des souverains* (Leiden, 1758).
- Le Vayer, F.La Mothe, *Legatus seu de legatione legatorumque privilegiis officio ac munere libellus* (Paris, 1579).
- Vera y Figueroa, J.A.de, *El enbajador* (sic! Sevilla, 1620).
- *Le Parfait ambassadeur*, transl. Lancelot (Paris, 1642 [1635]).
- *Le Parfait ambassadeur* (Leiden, 1709).
- *Il Perfetto ambasciadore*, trans. M.Zicata (Venice, 1649)
- *Idea del perfetto ambasciatore. Dialoghi storici e politic, portati nuovamente dall'idioma francese nell'italiano* (Venice, 1654).
- Vestric, B.de, *Les Devoirs des ambassadeurs de Christ*, 2nd edn (Delft, 1694).
- Wagenseil, J.C., *Tractatus politico historicus de moribus, ritus ac ceremoniis in aulis regum et principum legationibus congressibus et conventibus magnatum* ([Cosmopoli], 1687).
- Walch, J.G., *Philosophisches Lexikon [...]* (Leipzig, 1762), 88-9 (s.v. 'Ambassadeurs'), 1191-1217 (s.v. 'Gesandter').
- Walker, O., *Of Education, especially of Young Gentlemen* (Oxford 1672).

- [Walsingham, F.], *The Compleat Ambassador, or two Treaties of the Intended Marriage of Qu[een] Elizabeth of Glorious Memory; Comprised in Letters of Negotiation of Sir Francis Walsingham [...]*, ed. D.Digges (London, 1655).
- *Mémoires et instructions pour les ambassadeurs, ou lettres et négociations de Walsingham, ministre et secrétaire d'état, sous Elisabeth Reine d'Angleterre. Avec les maximes politiques de ce ministre, et des rémarques sur la vie des principaux ministres et favoris de cette princesse. Traduit d'anglois* (Amsterdam, 1700).
- Warszewicki, K., *De legatis adeundis oratio*, 2nd edn (Cracow, 1604 [1595]).
- Weise, C., *Politische Fragen, das ist: Gründliche Nachricht von der Politica. Welcher Gestalt vornehme und wohlerzogene Jugend hierinne einen Grund legen, sodann aus den heutigen Republiken gute Exempel erkennen, endlich auch in practicablen Staats-Regeln den Anfang treffen soll* (Dresden, 1696).
- Wicquefort, A. de, *Mémoires touchant les ambassadeurs et les ministres publics par L.M.P.* (Cologne, 1676).
- *Mémoires touchant les ambassadeurs et les ministres publics par L.M.P.* (The Hague, 1677).
- *L'Ambassadeur et ses fonctions* (2 vols., The Hague, 1680/81).
- *L'Ambassadeur, oder Staats-Bothschaffter und dessen hohe Fonctions, und Staats-Verrichtungen. Durch [...] Herrn de Wicquefort herauß gegeben. Nunmehr aber in unsere Hoch-Teutsche Sprach übersetzt [...]*, transl. L.Sauter (2 vols., Frankfurt, 1682).
- *L'Ambassadeur et ses fonctions [...] augmentée des Replixions sur les mémoires pour les ambassadeurs. De la réponse à l'auteur. Et du Discours historique de l'élection de l'empereur, et des électeurs par le même auteur* (2 vols., Cologne, 1690).
- *The Ambassador and his Functions [...]*, transl. by John Digby (2 vols., London, 1716).
- *L'Ambassadeur et ses fonctions [...]. Mémoires [...] touchant les ambassadeurs et les ministres publics. Replixions sur ces mémoires. Discours du même Wicquefort de L'élection de l'empereur et des électeurs de l'Empire. Traité du juge competent des ambassadeurs, traduit du Latin de M. de Bynkershoek [...]* (2 vols., Amsterdam, 1730).
- *Discours historique de l'élection de l'Empereur et des électeurs de l'Empire* (1658), repr. in *ibid.*, vol.ii.
- Zwanzig, Z., *Theatrum Praecedentiae, oder eines theils illustrer Rang-Streit, Rang-Ordnung, wie nemlich die considerablen Potenzen und Grandes in der Welt nach Qualität ihres Standes, Namens, Dignität und Characters sambt und sonders in der Praecedent, in dem Rang und Tractamente streitig seynd und competiren* (Berlin, 1706).

III. Printed Secondary Works

- Abel, G., *Stoizismus und die Frühe Neuzeit. Zur Entstehungsgeschichte modernen Denkens im Feld von Ethik und Politik* (Berlin, 1978).
- Adair, E.R., *The Exterritoriality of Ambassadors in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (London, 1929).
- Agrell, W., Huldt, B. (eds.), *Clio Goes Spying: Eight Essays on the History of Intelligence* (Malmö, 1983).
- Alcan, F. (ed.), *Les Introduteurs des ambassadeurs, 1585-1900* (Paris, 1901).
- Allen, E.J.B., *Post and Courier Service in the Diplomacy of Early Modern Europe* (The Hague, 1972).
- Altbauer, D., 'The Diplomats of Peter the Great', *Jahrbücher für die Geschichte Osteuropas*, 28 (1980), 1-16.
- Amburger, E., *Geschichte der Behördenorganisation Rußlands von Peter dem Großen bis 1917* (Leiden, 1966).
- 'Das diplomatische Personal des russischen auswärtigen Dienstes unter Peter I.' in R.v.Thadden *et al.* (eds.), *Das Vergangene und die Geschichte. Festschrift für Reinhard Wittram zum 70. Geburtstag* (Göttingen, 1973), 298-311.
- Amiguet, P., *L'Age d'or de la diplomatie* (Paris, 1963).
- Anderson, M.S., *Europe in the Eigtheenth Century 1713-1783* (London, 1961).
- *The Rise of Modern Diplomacy, 1450-1919* (London, 1993).
- 'The Balance of Power', in *ibid.*, 149-203.
- André, L., *Louis XIV and Europe* (Paris, 1950).
- Aretin, K.O. von, 'Das Heilige Römische Reich im Konzert der europäischen Mächte im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert', in G.Schmidt (ed.), *Stände und Gesellschaft im Alten Reich* (Stuttgart, 1989), 81-91.
- Arias, L. Garcia, 'El Perfecto embajador segun Juan Antonio de Vera', *Anuario de la Asociacion Francisco de Vitoria* (1948), 333-81.
- 'La Doctrina diplomatica expuesta por Gonzalo de Villadiego en su "Tractatus de legato"', *Cuadernos de historia diplomatica*, 3 (1956), 275-324.
- Asch, R.G., *Nobilties in Transition. Courtiers and Rebels in Britain and Europe* (London, 2003).
- with W.E.Voss, M.Wrede (eds.), *Frieden und Krieg in der Frühen Neuzeit. Die europäische Staatenordnung und die außereuropäische Welt* (Munich, 2001).
- Autrand, F., 'L'Enfance de l'art diplomatique: La rédaction des documens diplomatiques en France XIVE-XVe siècles', in L.Bély (ed.), *L'Invention de la diplomatie, Moyen Age - Temps modernes* (Paris, 1998), 207-24.
- Babel, R. (ed.), *Frankreich im europäischen Staatensystem* (Sigmaringen, 1995).

- (ed.), *Le Diplomate au travail. Entscheidungsprozesse, Information und Kommunikation im Umkreis des Westfälischen Friedenskongresses* (Munich, 2004).
- with W.Paravicini, (eds.) *Le Grand Tour. Adeliges Reisen und europäische Kultur vom 14. bis zum 18. Jahrhundert* (Stuttgart, 2005).
- Bahl, P., *Der Hof des Großen Kurfürsten. Studien zur höheren Amtsträgerschaft Brandenburg-Preußens* (Cologne, 2001).
- Baillou, J., *Les Affaires étrangères et le corps diplomatique français* (2 vols., Paris, 1984), i: De l'Ancien Régime au Second Empire.
- Barber, P., *Diplomacy. The World of the Honest Spy* (London, 1979).
- Barbiche, B., 'Les Légats à latere à l'époque moderne et le personnel des légations', in L.Bély (ed.), *L'Invention de la diplomatie, Moyen Age - Temps modernes* (Paris, 1998), 283-94.
- Barcia, F., *Un politico dell'eta barocca. Gregorio Leti* (Milan, 1987).
- Barker, C., 'The Theory and Practice of Diplomatic Law in the Renaissance and Classical Periods', *Diplomacy and Statecraft*, 6 (1995), 593-615.
- Baschet, A., *Histoire du dépôt des archives des affaires étrangères* (Paris, 1875).
- Battifol, L., 'Le Charge d'ambassadeur au dix-septieme siècle', *RHD*, 15 (1911), 339-55.
- Bauer, V., *Hofökonomie. Der Diskurs über den Fürstenhof in Zeremonialwissenschaft, Hausväterliteratur und Kameralismus* (Vienna, 1997).
- Baumann, A., et al. (eds.), *Reichspersonal. Funktionsträger für Kaiser und Reich* (Cologne, 2003).
- Baumanns, M., *Das publizistische Werk des kaiserlichen Diplomaten Franz Paul Freiherr von Lisola (1613-1674). Ein Beitrag zum Verhältnis von Absolutistischem Staat, Öffentlichkeit und Mächtepolitik in der Frühen Neuzeit* (Berlin, 1994).
- Baumgart, P., 'Zur Gründungsgeschichte des Auswärtigen Amtes in Preußen (1713-1728)', *Jahrbuch für die Geschichte Mittel- und Ostdeutschlands*, 7 (1958), 229-48.
- Baumgart, W., *Europäisches Konzert und nationale Bewegung. Internationale Beziehungen 1830-1878* (Paderborn, 1999).
- Bazzoli, M., *Il Piccolo stato nell'età moderna. Studi su un concetto della politica internazionale tra XVI e XVIII secolo* (Milan, 1990).
- *L'Equilibrio di potenza nell'età moderna dal Cinquecento al Congresso di Vienna* (Milan, 1998).
- 'L'ideologia dell'ambasciatore nel tardo Seicento: L'Ambassadeur et ses fonctions di Abraham de Wicquefort', in G.Borrelli (ed.), *Prudenza civile, bene comune, guerra giusta. Percorsi della ragion di stato tra Seicento e Settecento. Atti del convegno internazionale (Napoli, 22-24 maggio 1996)* (Naples, 1999), 203-20.
- 'L'Ordine internazionale secondo Mably: dal Droit public de l'Europe ai Principes des negociations', in F.M.Pape (ed.), *Constituzione e diritti fondamentali in Mably* (Genoa, 2001), 43-58.

- 'Ragion di stato e interesse degli stati. La trattatistica sull'ambasciatore dal XV al XVIII secolo', *Nuovo Rivista Storica*, 86 (2002), 283-328.
- Becker, W., *Der Kurfürstenrat. Grundzüge seiner Entwicklung in der Reichsverfassung und seine Stellung auf dem Westfälischen Friedenskongreß* (Münster, 1973).
- Beetz, M., *Frühmoderne Höflichkeit. Komplimentierkunst und Gesellschaftsrituale im altdeutschen Sprachraum* (Stuttgart, 1990).
- Behrens, B., 'Treatises on the Ambassador written in the Fifteenth and Early Sixteenth Centuries', *EHR*, 2 (1936), 616-27.
- Behringer, W., *Im Zeichen des Merkur. Reichspost und Kommunikationsrevolution in der Frühen Neuzeit* (Göttingen, 2003).
- Beiderbeck, F., Schulze, W., Horstkemper, G. (eds.), *Dimensionen der europäischen Außenpolitik zur Zeit der Wende vom 16. und 17. Jahrhundert* (Berlin, 2003).
- Bélissa, M., *Fraternité universelle et intérêt national (1713-1795). Les Cosmopolitiques du droit des gens* (Paris, 1998).
- 'La Diplomatie et les traités dans la pensée des Lumières: "Négociation universelle" ou "École du mensonge"?' *RHD*, 113 (1999), 291-317.
- 'Peace Treaties, Bonne foi and European Civility in the Enlightenment', in R.Lesaffer (ed.), *Peace Treaties and International Law in European History. From the Late Middle Ages to World War One* (Cambridge, 2004), 241-53.
- Bell, G., *A Handlist of British Diplomatic Representatives, 1509-1688* (London, 1990).
- Bély, L., *Espions et Ambassadeurs au temps de Louis XIV* (Paris, 1991).
- *Les Relations internationales en Europe, XVIIe-XVIIIe siècle* (Paris, 1992).
- 'Les Diplomates français dans le Saint-Empire au XVIIIe siècle', in J.Mondot et al. (eds.), *Deutsche in Frankreich, Franzosen in Deutschland 1715-89* (Sigmaringen, 1992), 15-26.
- 'Souveraineté et souverains: La question du cérémonial dans les relations internationales à l'époque moderne', *Annuaire-Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire de France* (1994), 27-43.
- 'Méthodes et perspectives dans l'étude des négociations internationales à l'époque moderne. L'exemple d'Utrecht (1713)', in R.Babel (ed.), *Frankreich im europäischen Staatensystem* (Paris, 1995), 219-34.
- 'Le Roi mon maître'. Le Service du roi à l'étranger vu à travers l'oeuvre de François de Callières', in J.Fouilleron et al. (eds.), *Société et idéologies des temps modernes* (Montpellier, 1996), 481-501.
- 'Les Rencontres des princes (XIVe-XVIIIe siècle)', in R.Babel, J.-M.Moeglin (eds.), *Identité régionale et conscience nationale en France et en Allemagne du Moyen Age à l'époque moderne. Colloque historique franco-allemand, 6-8 octobre 1993* (Sigmaringen, 1997), 161-76.

- 'Représentation, négociation et information dans l'étude des relations internationales à l'époque moderne', in P. Milza, S. Bernstein (eds.), *Axes et méthodes de l'histoire politique* (Paris, 1998), 213-39.
- (ed.), *L'Invention de la Diplomatie, Moyen Age - Temps modernes* (Paris, 1998).
- *La Société des princes: XVIe - XVIIIe siècle* (Paris, 1999).
- (ed.), *L'Europe des Traités de Westphalie. Esprit de la diplomatie et diplomatie de l'esprit* (Paris, 2000).
- 'La Négociation comme idéal et comme art: un modèle westphalien?', in *ibid.*, 603-12.
- 'La Polémique autour de "L'Ambassadeur" de Jean Hotman: Culture et diplomatie au temps de la paix de Lyon', *Cahiers d'histoire*, 20 (2001), 326-54.
- with B.Barbiche, '1589-1789', in L.Bély et al. (eds.), *Dictionnaire des ministres des Affaires étrangères* (Paris, 2005), 1-204.
- Benazet-Bechu, C., 'La Formation d'un ambassadeur au XVIII siècle: Vergennes', *RHD*, 101 (1987), 215-25.
- 'Les Ambassadeurs français au XVIIIe siècle: formation et carrière', in L.Bély (ed.), *L'Invention de la diplomatie, Moyen Age - Temps modernes* (Paris, 1998), 333-48.
- Bérenger, J., 'La Diplomatie impériale', in L.Bély (ed.), *L'Invention de la diplomatie, Moyen Age - Temps modernes* (Paris, 1998), 125-38.
- Berg, D., Kintzinger, M., Monet, P. (eds.), *Auswärtige Politik und Internationale Beziehungen im Mittelalter (13. bis 16. Jahrhundert)* (Bochum, 2002).
- Berney, A., *König Friedrich I. und das Haus Habsburg 1701-1707* (Munich, 1927).
- Berridge, G.R., 'The Political Theory and Institutional History of States-Systems (review article)', *British Journal of International Studies*, 6 (1980), 82-9.
- with M.Keens-Soper, T.Otte (eds.), *Diplomatic Theory from Machiavelli to Kissinger* (London, 2001).
- 'Grotius', in *ibid.*, 50-69.
- with M.Keens-Soper, T.Otte, 'Introduction', in *ibid.*, 1-6.
- 'Machiavelli', in *ibid.*, 7-31.
- 'Richelieu', in *ibid.*, 71-87.
- 'English Dragomans and Oriental Secretaries: The Early Nineteenth-Century Origins of the Anglicization of the British Embassy Drogmanat in Constantinople', *Diplomacy and Statecraft*, 14 (2003), 137-52.
- 'The Theory and Practice of Negotiation in the 17th and 18th Centuries', *Quaderni di Scienza Politica*, 4 (2004), 315-31.
- Besold, F.v., *Das Bündnisrecht der deutschen Reichstände bis zum Westfälischen Frieden* (Bonn, 1974).
- Bill, E.G.W., *Education at Christ Church, Oxford, 1660-1800* (Oxford, 1988).

- Bindorff, S.T., 'The Unreformed Diplomatic Service 1812-60', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 4th series, 18 (1935), 143-72.
- Biow, D., *Doctors, Ambassadors, Secretaries: Humanism and Professions in Renaissance Italy* (Chicago, 2002).
- Bireley, R., *The Counter-Reformation Prince. Anti-Machiavellianism or Catholic Statecraft in Early Modern Europe* (Chapel Hill, 1990).
- Bittner, L., Hausmann, F., Santifaller, L.(eds.), *Repertorium der diplomatischen Vertreter aller Länder seit dem Westfälischen Frieden* (3 vols., Oldenburg, etc. 1936-65). Vol.i: 1648-1715 (1936); vol.ii: 1716-1763 (1950).
- Björkman, S., 'Diplomates suédois au XVIIe siècle', in L.Bély (ed.), *L'Europe des Traités de Westphalie. Esprit de la diplomatie et diplomatie de l'esprit* (Paris, 2000), 503-16.
- 'The British State and Foreign Policy in the Eighteenth Century', *Trivium*, 23 (1988), 127-48.
- *The British Abroad. The Grand Tour in the Eighteenth Century* (Stroud, 1992).
- *British Diplomats and Diplomacy 1688-1800* (Exeter, 2001).
- *European International Relations 1648-1815* (Basingstoke, 2002).
- Black, J.L., *Gerhard Friedrich Müller and the Imperial Russian Academy* (Montreal, 1986).
- Bлага, C.S., *L'Évolution de la diplomatie* (Paris, 1938).
- Blaney, D., Inayatullah, N., 'The Westphalian Deferral', *Review of International Studies*, 2 (2000), 29-64.
- Blanning, T., *The Culture of Power and the Power of Culture. Old Regime Europe 1660-1789* (Oxford, 2002).
- Bleek, K., *Adelserziehung auf deutschen Ritterakademien. Die Lüneburger Adelsschulen 1655-1850* (2 vols., Frankfurt, 1977).
- Blet, R.P., *Histoire de la représentation diplomatique du Saint-Siège, des origines à l'aube du XIXe siècle* (Rome, 1982).
- Blom, H.W. et al. (eds.), *Bibliography of Dutch Seventeenth Century Political Thought. An Annotated Inventory, 1581-1710* (Amsterdam, 1986).
- Bluche, J.-F., *L'Origine sociale des secrétaires d'État de Louis XIV, 1661-1715. Le Dix-septième siècle* (Paris, 1959).
- Böckenförde, E.W., 'Der Westfälische Friede und das Bündnisrecht der Reichstände', *Der Staat*, 8 (1969), 449-78.
- Bödeker, H.E., 'Das staatswissenschaftliche Fächersystem im 18. Jahrhundert', in R.Vierhaus (ed.), *Wissenschaften im Zeitalter der Aufklärung* (Göttingen, 1985), 143-62.
- Bohlen, A., 'Changes in Russian Diplomacy unter Peter the Great', *Cahiers du monde russe et soviétique*, 7 (1966), 341-58.
- Bois, J.-P., *De la paix des rois à l'ordre des empereurs. 1714-1815* (Paris, 2003).

- Bojani, F.de, 'L'Affaire du "Quartier" à Rome à la fin du dix-septième siècle. Louis XIV et le Saint-Siege', *RHD*, 22 (1908), 350-78.
- Bosbach, F., *Monarchia Universalis. Ein politischer Leitbegriff der Frühen Neuzeit* (Göttingen, 1988).
- Bosse, H., 'Die Gelehrte Republik', in H.-W.Jäger (ed.), 'Öffentlichkeit' im 18. Jahrhundert (Göttingen, 1997), 51-76.
- Braubach, M., 'Johann Christoph Bartensteins Herkunft und Anfänge', *MIÖG*, 61 (1953), 99-149.
- *Diplomatie und geistiges Leben im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert. Gesammelte Abhandlungen* (Bonn, 1969).
- *Wilhelm von Fürstenberg (1624-1704) und die französische Politik im Zeitalter Ludwigs XIV.* (Bonn, 1972).
- Brauer, G., *Theories of Gentlemanly Education in England, 1660-1775* (New York, 1959).
- Braun, G., 'Frédéric-Charles Moser et les langues de la diplomatie européenne (1648-1750)', *RHD*, 113 (1999), 251-60.
- 'Une tour de Babel? Les Langues de la négociation et les problèmes de traduction au congrès de la Paix de Westphalie (1643-1649)', in R.Babel (ed.), *Le Diplomate au travail* (Munich, 2004), 139-72.
- Braun, R., 'Staying on Top: Socio-Cultural Reproduction of European Power Elites', in W.Reinhard (ed.), *Power Elites and State-Building* (Oxford, 1996), 235-60.
- Braungart, G., *Hofberedsamkeit. Studien zur Praxis höfisch-politischer Rede im deutschen Territorialabsolutismus* (Tübingen, 1988).
- Briesemeister, D. 'Der publizistische Rangstreit zwischen Spanien und Frankreich in der Frühen Neuzeit', in J.Albrecht (ed.), *Translation und interkulturelle Kommunikation: 40 Jahre Fachbereich Angewandte Sprachwissenschaften der Johannes Gutenberg-Universität Mainz* (Mainz, 1987), 315-38.
- Brieskorn, N., Riedenauer, M. (eds.), *Suche nach Frieden. Politische Ethik in der Frühen Neuzeit* (2 vols., Stuttgart, 2000).
- Brizzi, G.P., *La Formazione della classe dirigente nel Sei-Settecento. I Seminario nobilium nell'Italia* (Bologna, 1976).
- Brockliss, L., *French Higher Education in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries* (Oxford, 1987).
- Brown, C., Nardin, T., Rengger, N. (eds.), *International Relations in Political Thought. Texts from the Ancient Greeks to the First World War* (Cambridge, 2002).
- Browning, O., 'King's Scholars in Modern History and Modern Languages, 1724-1727', *The Cambridge Review* (25.Nov., 9.Dec. 1897), 117-9, 145-7.
- Brückner, J., *Staatswissenschaften, Kameralismus und Naturrecht. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der politischen Wissenschaft im Deutschland. des späten 17. und des frühen 18. Jahrhunderts* (Munich, 1977).

- Bucher, B., *Abraham Stanyan 1705-1714. Die englische Diplomatie in der Schweiz zur Zeit des spanischen Erbfolgekriegs* (Zürich, 1951).
- Buddruss, E., 'Les Élèves de Schoepflin au ministère des affaires étrangères à Versailles', in J.Voss, B.Vogler (eds.), *Strasbourg, Schoepflin et l'Europe au XVIIIe siècle* (Bonn, 1996), 215-24.
- Bull, H., 'The Grotian Conception of International Society', in M.Wight, Butterfield, H.(eds.), *Diplomatic Investigations: Essays in the Theory of World Politics* (London, 1966), 51-73.
- (ed.), *Hugo Grotius and International Relations* (Oxford, 1992).
- Bullard, M.M., 'Secrecy, Diplomacy and Language in the Renaissance', *Zeitsprünge*, 6 (2002), 77-97.
- Burger, P.-F., 'Res Angusta Domi. Les Wicquefort et leurs métiers bien délicats entre Paris, Amsterdam et Paris', *Francia*, 27 (2000), 25-58.
- Burke, P., *The Fabrication of Louis XIV* (New Haven, 1992).
- Burkhardt, J., 'Die Friedlosigkeit der frühen Neuzeit. Grundlegung einer Theorie der Bellizität Europas', *ZHF*, 24 (1997), 510-74.
- Burns, J.H. (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Political Thought, 1450-1700* (Cambridge, 1991).
- Burschel, P., 'Das Eigene und das Fremde. Zur anthropologischen Entzifferung diplomatischer Texte', in A.Koller (ed.), *Kurie und Politik. Stand und Perspektiven der Nuntiaturberichtsforschung* (Tübingen, 1998), 260-71.
- Bury, E., *Littérature et politesse. L'Invention de l'honnête homme (1580-1750)* (Paris, 1996).
- Bußmann, K., Werner, E.A. (eds.), *Europa im 17. Jahrhundert. Ein politischer Mythos und seine Bilder* (Stuttgart, 2004).
- Butler, W.E., 'Anglo-Russian Diplomacy and the Law of Nations', in A.G.Cross (ed.), *Great Britain and Russia in the Eighteenth Century* (Newtonville, 1979), 296-305.
- 'Friedrich Strube de Piermont and the Origins of Russian Legal History', in J.M.Hartley, R.Bartlett (eds.), *Russia in the Age of Enlightenment: Essays for Isabel de Madariaga* (London, 1990), 125-41.
- Butterfield, H., 'Diplomatic Thought 1648-1815: The Quest for Order', in M.Donelan (ed.), *The Reason of States. A Study in International Political Theory* (London, 1987), 9-13.
- with M.Wight (eds.), *Diplomatic Investigations. Essays in the Theory of International Politics* (London, 1966).
- 'Diplomacy', in M.S.Anderson, R.Hatton (eds.), *Studies in Diplomatic History. Essays in Memory of David Bayne Horn* (London, 1970), 357-72.
- Caporaso, J.A., 'Changes in the Westphalian Order: Territory, Public Authority, and Sovereignty', *Review of International Studies*, 2 (2000), 1-28.
- Carter, C., 'The Ambassadors of Early Modern Europe: Patterns of Diplomatic Representation in the Early Seventeenth Century', in idem (ed.), *From the*

- Renaissance to the Counter-Reformation. Essays in Honour of Garrett Mattingly* (London, 1966), 269-95.
- 'Wicquefort on the Ambassador and his Functions', *Studies in History and Politics*, 11 (1981/82), 37-59.
- Casa, I.P.F., 'L'École vénitienne des "Giovani di Lingua"', in F.Hitzel (ed.), *Istanbul et les langues orientales. Actes du colloque Istanbul 1995* (Paris, 1997), 109-22.
- Cerny, G., *Theology, Politics and Letters at the Crossroads of European Civilization: Jacques Basnage and Baylean Huguenot Refugees in the Dutch Republic* (Dordrecht, 1987).
- Chaline, O., 'L'Ambassadeur selon les casuistes', in L.Bély (ed.), *L'Invention de la diplomatie, Moyen Age - Temps modernes* (Paris, 1998), 59-70.
- Chaytor, H.J., 'Embajada Española. An Anonymous Contemporary Spanish Guide to Diplomatic Practice in the Last Quarter of the Seventeenth Century', *Royal Historical Society, Camden Miscellany*, xiv (1926), 1-43.
- Childs, N., *A Political Academy in Paris, 1724-1731. The Entresol and its Members* (Oxford, 2000).
- Cinti, B., *Letteratura e politica in Juan Antonio de Vera ambasciatore spagnolo a Venezia (1632-1642)* (Venice, 1966).
- Clark, J.W., *Endowments of the University of Cambridge* (Cambridge, 1901).
- Clark, R., *Sir William Trumbull in Paris, 1685-86* (Cambridge, 1938).
- Conermann, K., 'Der Stil des Homanns. Zur Genese sprachlicher und literarischer Formen aus der höfisch-politischen Verhaltenskunst', in A.Buck et al. (eds.), *Europäische Hofkultur im 16. und 17. Jahrhundert* (3 vols., Hamburg, 1977), i, 45-56.
- Conrads, N., *Ritterakademien in der Frühen Neuzeit. Bildung als Standesprivileg im 16. und 17. Jahrhundert* (Göttingen, 1981).
- Conze, E., Lappenküper, U., Müller, G. (eds.), *Geschichte der Internationalen Beziehungen. Erneuerung und Erweiterung einer historischen Disziplin* (Cologne, 2004).
- Cosmar, C.W., *Geschichte des Königlich-Preußischen Geheimen Staats- und Kabinettarchivs bis 1806*, ed. M.Kohnke (Cologne, 1993).
- Craig, G., 'On the Nature of Diplomatic History. The Relevance of Some Old Books', in P.G.Lauren, *Diplomacy: New Approaches in History, Theory and Policy* (New York, 1979), 21-41.
- Croskey, R.M., *Muscovite Diplomatic Practice in the Reign of Ivan III* (New York, 1987).
- Croxton, D., *Peacemaking in Early Modern Europe. Cardinal Mazarin and the Congress of Westphalia, 1643-1648* (London, 1999).
- Cunningham, A., 'Dragomania. The Dragomans of the British Embassy at Constantinople', in E.Ingram (ed.), *Allan Cunningham, Eastern Questions in the Nineteenth Century. Collected Essays* (London 1993), ii, 1-22.
- Davies, G.A., 'The Influence of Justus Lipsius in Juan Antonio de Vera y Figueroa's "Embaxador"', *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies*, 42 (1965), 160-73.

- Davies, N., 'Serenissima. Diplomacy in Poland-Lithuania', in idem, *God's Playground. A History of Poland* (2 vols., Oxford, 1981), i, 373-411.
- Decker, K.P., *Frankreich und die Reichsstände 1672-75. Die Ansätze zur Bildung einer "Dritten Partei" in den Anfangsjahren des Holländischen Krieges* (Bonn, 1981).
- Delavaud, L., *Le Marquis de Pomponne, ministre et secrétaire d'état aux affaires étrangères* (Paris, 1911).
- 'La Diplomatie d'autrefois. "Conseils à un ambassadeur" de Pierre Danés', *RHD*, 18-19 (1914-5), 611-2.
- Dethan, G., 'Wicquefort et Callières à l'ombre de Mazarin?' in V.Barrie-Curien (ed.), *Guerre et pouvoir au XVIIe siècle* (Paris, 1991), 95-103.
- Dethlefs, G., 'Schauplatz Europa. Das "Theatrum Europaeum" des Matthaeus Merian als Medium kritischer Öffentlichkeit', in K.Bußmann, E.A.Werner (eds.), *Europa im 17. Jahrhundert* (Stuttgart, 2004), 149-80.
- Dewald, J., *Aristocratic Experience and the Origins of Modern Culture. France, 1570-1715* (Berkeley, 1993).
- *The European Nobility, 1400-1800* (Cambridge, 1996).
- Dickmann, F., *Der Westfälische Friede*, 2nd edn. (Münster, 1965).
- Donelan, M. (ed.), *The Reason of States. A Study in International Political Theory* (London, 1978).
- Dotzauer, W., 'Der publizistische Kampf zwischen Frankreich und Deutschland in der Zeit Ludwigs XIV. Der Publizist Antoine Aubery und seine Gegner (1667-1669)', *Zeitschrift für die Geschichte des Oberrheins*, 122 (1974), 99-123.
- Doyle, W., *The Old European Order 1660-1800*, 2nd edn (Oxford, 1992).
- Dreitzel, H., *Politischer Aristotelismus und absoluter Staat. Die "Politica" des Henning Arnisaeus (ca. 1575-1636)* (Wiesbaden, 1970).
- Droste, H., 'Unternehmer in Sachen Kultur. Die Diplomaten Schwedens im 17. Jahrhundert', in S.Trakulhun, T.Fuchs (eds.), *Das eine Europa und die Vielfalt der Kulturen. Kulturtransfer in Europa, 1500-1800* (Berlin, 2003), 205-26.
- Duchhardt, H., 'Das diplomatische Abschiedsgeschenk', *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte*, 57 (1975), 345-62.
- *Gleichgewicht der Kräfte, Convenance, Europäisches Konzert. Friedenskongresse und Friedensschlüsse vom Zeitalter Ludwigs XIV bis zum Wiener Kongress* (Darmstadt, 1976).
- 'Friedenskongresse im Zeitalter des Absolutismus - Gestaltung und Strukturen', in idem (ed.), *Forschungen und Quellen zur Geschichte des Dreißigjährigen Krieges* (Munich, 1981), 226-39.
- 'Imperium und Regna im Zeitalter Ludwigs XIV', *Historische Zeitschrift*, 232 (1981), 555-51.
- (ed.), *Politische Testamente und andere Quellen zum Fürstenethos der Frühen Neuzeit* (Darmstadt, 1987).

- 'Westfälischer Friede und internationales System im Ancien Régime', *Historische Zeitschrift*, 249 (1989), 529-43.
 - (ed.), *Rahmenbedingungen und Handlungsspielräume europäischer Außenpolitik im Zeitalter Ludwigs XIV* (Berlin, 1991).
 - (ed.), *Zwischenstaatliche Friedenswahrung in Mittelalter und Früher Neuzeit* (Cologne, 1991).
 - 'Droit et Droit des Gens - Structures et métamorphoses des relations internationales au temps de Louis XIV', in R.Babel (ed.), *Frankreich im europäischen Staatensystem* (Paris, 1995), 179-90.
 - with E.Ortlieb, M.Schnettger (eds.), *Bibliographie zum Westfälischen Frieden* (Münster, 1996)
 - 'Das Reich in der Mitte des Staatensystems. Zum Verhältnis von innerer Verfassung und internationaler Funktion in den Wandlungen des 17. und 18. Jahrhunderts', in P.Krüger (ed.), *Das europäische Staatensystem im Wandel. Strukturelle Bedingungen und bewegende Kräfte seit der Frühen Neuzeit* (München, 1996), 1-10.
 - *Balance of Power und Pentarchie. Internationale Beziehungen, 1700-1785* (Handbuch der Geschichte der Internationalen Beziehungen, iv) (Paderborn, 1997).
 - (ed.), *Der Friede von Rijswijk 1697* (Mainz, 1998).
 - (ed.), *Der Westfälische Friede. Diplomatie - politische Zäsur - kulturelles Umfeld - Rezeptionsgeschichte* (Munich, 1998).
 - 'Der Westfälische Friede als lieu de mémoire in Deutschland und Europa', in K.Bußmann, H.Schilling (eds.), *1648 - Krieg und Frieden in Europa* (Münster, 1998), i, 41-7.
 - '"Westphalian System". Zur Problematik einer Denkfigur', *Historische Zeitschrift*, 269 (1999), 305-15.
 - 'Grundmuster der internationalen Beziehungen in der frühen und späten Neuzeit', in J.Siegelberg, K.Schlichte (eds.), *Strukturwandel internationaler Beziehungen* (Wiesbaden, 2000), 74-85.
 - 'Die Formation der Wissenschaft von den internationalen Beziehungen. Christian Gottfrid Hoffmanns Entwurf einer Einleitung zu dem Erkenntniß des gegenwärtigen Zustandes von Europa von 1720', in S.Externbrink, J.Ulbert (eds.), *Formen internationaler Beziehungen in der Frühen Neuzeit Frankreich und das Alte Reich im europäischen Staatensystem* (Berlin, 2001), 37-42.
 - 'Introduction to Section I', in P.Krüger, P.Schroeder (eds.), *'The Transformation of European Politics, 1763-1848'. Episode or Model in Modern History?* (Münster, 2002), 25-9.
 - 'Peace Treaties from Westphalia to the Revolutionary Era', in Lesaffer (ed.), *Peace Treaties and International Law in European History. From the Late Middle Ages to World War One* (Cambridge, 2004), 45-58.
- Duffo, F., *Jean-Baptiste Colbert, Marquis de Torcy, ministre des affaires étrangères sous Louis XIV* (Paris, 1934).

- Duhamel-Lacoste, S., 'La Règne de Louis XIV vu par l'iconographie de la diplomatie', *RHD*, 113 (1999), 279-90.
- Duindam, J., *Myths of Power: Norbert Elias and the Early-Modern European Court* (London, 1994).
- 'Ceremonial Staffs and Paperwork at Two Courts: France and the Habsburg Monarchy ca. 1550-1720', in K.Malettke, C.Grell (eds.), *Hofgesellschaft und Höflinge an europäischen Fürstenhöfen in der Frühen Neuzeit (15.-18. Jahrhundert)* (Münster, 2001), 369-88.
- *Vienna and Versailles. The Courts of Europe's Dynastic Rivals, 1550-1789* (Cambridge, 2003).
- Duranton, H., Retat, P. (eds.), *Gazettes et information politique sous l'Ancien Regime* (Saint-Etienne, 1999).
- Edelmayer, F., 'Gesandtschaftsberichte in der Frühen Neuzeit', in J.Pauser *et al.* (eds.), *Quellenkunde der Habsburgermonarchie (16.-18. Jahrhundert). Ein exemplarisches Handbuch* (Vienna, 2004), 849-59.
- Ehalt, H.C., *Ausdrucksformen absolutistischer Herrschaft. Der Wiener Hof im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert* (Munich, 1980).
- Elias, N., *Höfische Gesellschaft*, 2nd edn. (Darmstadt, 1969).
- Ellis, K.L., 'British Communication and Diplomacy in the Eighteenth Century', *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*, 31 (1958-9), 159-67.
- Elliot, J., *American Diplomatic Code* (2 vols., London, 1833).
- Engelbrecht, H., *Geschichte des österreichischen Bildungswesens. Erziehung und Unterricht auf dem Boden Österreichs* (3 vols., Vienna, 1983), ii: *Das 16. und 17. Jahrhundert*.
- Erbe, M., *Revolutionäre Erschütterung und erneuertes Gleichgewicht. Internationale Beziehungen 1785-1830* (Paderborn, 2004).
- Espagne, M., 'Der theoretische Stand der Kulturtransferforschung', in W.Schmale (ed.), *Kulturtransfer. Kulturelle Praxis im 16. Jahrhundert* (Innsbruck, 2003), 63-75.
- Everth, E., *Die Öffentlichkeit in der Außenpolitik von Karl V. bis Napoleon* (Jena, 1931).
- Everwijn, D., *Abraham von Wicquefort en zijn proces* (Leiden, 1857).
- Eves, C.K., *Matthew Prior, Poet and Diplomatist* (New York, 1939).
- Externbrink, S., 'Von Versailles nach Wien. Zum Deutschlandbild bei Louis-Augustin Blondel (1696-1791)', in T.Hoepel, M.Middell (eds.), *Deutschlandbilder - Frankreichbilder 1700-1840* (Leipzig, 2000), 75-92.
- with J.Ulbert (eds.), *Formen internationaler Beziehungen in der Frühen Neuzeit. Frankreich und das Alte Reich im europäischen Staatensystem. Festschrift für Klaus Malettke zum 65. Geburtstag* (Berlin, 2001).
- 'Internationale Beziehungen und Kulturtransfer in der Frühen Neuzeit', in S.Trakulhun, T.Fuchs (eds.), *Das eine Europa und die Vielfalt der Kulturen. Kulturtransfer in Europa 1500-1850* (Berlin, 2003), 227-48.

- Faucompret, B.de, *Les Pensionnaires du Collège Mazarin ou des Quatre Nations: 1688-1794* (Paris, 1992).
- Firth, C., *Modern Languages at Oxford 1724-1929* (Oxford, 1929).
- Fischer, B., et al. (eds.), *Zwischen Wilhelmstraße und Bellevue. 500 Jahre Diplomatie in Berlin* (Berlin, 1998).
- Fischer, W., 'Rekrutierung und Ausbildung von Personal für den modernen Staat: Beamte, Offiziere und Techniker in England, Frankreich und Preußen in der frühen Neuzeit', in R. Koselleck (ed.), *Studien zum Beginn der modernen Welt* (Stuttgart, 1977), 194-217.
- Flick, M., 'La Pontificia Accademia Ecclesiastica nel rinnovamento conciliare', *La Civiltà Cattolica*, 119 (1968), 526-34.
- Fould, P., *Un diplomate au XVIIIe siècle: Louis-Augustin Blondel* (Paris, 1914).
- Frank, R., 'Mentalitäten, Vorstellungen und internationale Beziehungen', in J.Osterhammel, W.Loß (eds.), *Internationale Geschichte. Themen, Ergebnisse, Aussichten* (Munich, 2000), 159-85.
- Franken, M., 'The General Tendencies and Structural Aspects of the Foreign Policy and Diplomacy of the Dutch Republic in the Latter Half of the 17th Century', *Acta Historiae Neerlandica*, 3 (1968), 1-42.
- Franklin, A., *Les Origines du palais de l'Institut. Recherches historiques sur le Collège des Quatre-Nations d'après des documents entièrement inédits* (Paris, 1862).
- Fraser, P., *The Intelligence of the Secretaries of State and their Monopoly of Licensed News, 1660-1688* (Cambridge, 1956).
- Frensdorff, F., *Die ersten Jahrzehnte des staatsrechtlichen Studiums in Göttingen. Festschrift zur 150jährigen Jubelfeier der Georg-Augusts-Universität* (Göttingen, 1887).
- Frey, L., Frey, M., 'The Bounds of Immunity: the Sa Case. Politics, Law and Diplomacy in Commonwealth England', *Canadian Journal for History*, 25 (1990), 41-60.
- 'The Reign of the Charlatans is Over'. The French Revolutionary Attack on Diplomatic Practice', *JMH*, 65 (1993), 706-44.
- *The History of Diplomatic Immunity* (Columbus, 1998).
- Frigo, D., *Principe, ambasciatori e "jus gentium". L'amministrazione della politica estera nel Piemonte del Settecento* (Rome, 1991).
- 'Virtù politiche e "pratica delle corti": l'immagine dell'ambasciatore tra Cinque e Seicento', in C.Continiso, C. Mozzarelli (eds.), *Repubblica e virtù. Pensiero politico e Monarchia Cattolica fra XVI e XVII secolo* (Rome, 1995), 355-76.
- 'Politica estera e diplomazia: figure, problemi e apparati', in G.Greco, M.Rosa (eds.), *Storia degli antichi stati italiani* (Bari, 1996), 117-61.
- *Ambasciatori e nunzi: figure della diplomazia in età moderna (1450-1660)* (Rome, 1999).
- 'Corte, onore e ragion di stato: il ruolo dell'ambasciatore in età moderna', in *ibid.*, 13-56.

- (ed.), *Politics and Diplomacy in Early Modern Italy* (Cambridge, 2000).
- Fubini, R., 'L'Ambasciatore nel XV secolo: Due trattati e una biografia (Bernard de Rosier, Ermolao Barbaro e Vespasiano da Bisticci)', *Mélanges de l'École Française de Rome. Moyen Age*, 108 (1996), 645-65.
- 'La 'Résidentialité' de l'ambassadeur dans le mythe et dans la réalité: une enquête sur les origines', in L.Bély (ed.), *L'Invention de la diplomatie. Moyen age - Temps modernes* (Paris, 1998), 27-35
- Fuchs, T., Trakulhun, S. (eds.), *Das eine Europa und die Vielfalt der Kulturen. Kulturtransfer in Europa 1500-1850* (Berlin, 2003).
- Fumaroli, M., *La Diplomatie de l'esprit. De Montaigne à LaFontaine* (Paris, 1994).
- Funck-Brentano, T., 'Le Droit des Gens et les immunités diplomatiques au XVIIIe siècle', *RHD*, 6 (1892), 548-67.
- Fürnrohr, W., *Kurbaierns Gesandte auf dem Immerwährenden Reichstag. Zur bayerischen Außenpolitik 1663-1806* (Munich, 1971).
- Gantet, C., *Guerre, paix et construction des états 1618-1714* (Paris, 2003).
- García, J.M. (ed.), *Pontificia Academia Ecclesiastica: Terzo Centenario (1701-2001)* (Vatican City, 2003).
- Garnier, C., "Wer meinen Herrn ehrt, den ehre ich billig auch". Symbolische Kommunikationsformen bei Gesandtenempfangen am Moskauer Hof im 16. und 17. Jahrhundert', *Jahrbuch für Kommunikationsgeschichte*, 7 (2005), 27-51.
- Gaukroger, S. (ed.), *The Uses of Antiquity. The Scientific Revolution and the Classical Tradition* (Dordrecht, 1991).
- Gerhardt, V., 'Zur historischen Bedeutung des Westfälischen Friedens – Zwölf Thesen', in K.Bußmann, H.Schilling (eds.), *1648 - Krieg und Friede in Europa* (3 vols., Münster, 1998), i, 485-89.
- Geitner, U., *Die Sprache der Verstellung. Studien zum rhetorischen und anthropologischen Wissen im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert* (Tübingen, 1992).
- Gerbore, P., *Formen und Stile der Diplomatie* (Reinbeck, 1964).
- Gestrich, A., *Absolutismus und Öffentlichkeit. Politische Kommunikation in Deutschland zu Beginn des 18. Jahrhunderts* (Göttingen, 1994).
- Gilbert, F., 'The "New Diplomacy" of the Eighteenth Century', in C.Jönsson, R.Langhorne (eds.), *Diplomacy* (London, 2004), ii, 251-79.
- Gollwitzer, H., *Europabild und Europagedanke. Beiträge zur deutschen Geistesgeschichte des 18. und 19. Jahrhunderts* (Munich, 1951).
- Grabar (Hrabar), V. E., *De Legatis et legationibus tractatus varii* (Dorpat, 1905).
- *De Legatorum iure tractatum catalogus completus ab anno 1625 usque ad annum 1700* (Dorpat, 1918).
- *The History of International Law in Russia, 1647-1917. A Bio-Bibliographical Study*, trans. W.E.Butler (London, 1990).

- Gräf, H.T., 'Funktionsweisen und Träger internationaler Politik in der Frühen Neuzeit', in J.Siegelberg, K.Schlichte (eds.), *Strukturwandel internationaler Beziehungen. Zum Verhältnis von Staat und internationalem System seit dem Westfälischen Frieden* (Wiesbaden, 2000), 105-23.
- Grau, C. (ed.), *Deutsch-russische Beziehungen im 18. Jahrhundert: Kultur, Wissenschaft und Diplomatie* (Wiesbaden, 1997).
- Grewe, W.G., *Epochen der Völkerrechtsgeschichte* (Baden-Baden, 1984).
- Griselle, E., 'Un manuel du parfait diplomate au dix-septième siècle', *RHD*, 28-29 (1914-15), 772-781.
- Guglia, E., Taschner, R., *Das Theresianum in Wien. Vergangenheit und Gegenwart* (Vienna, 1996).
- Habermas, J., *Strukturwandel der Öffentlichkeit. Untersuchungen zu einer Kategorie der bürgerlichen Gesellschaft*, 4th edn. (Neuwied, 1969)
- Haertel, W., *Johann von Besser. Sein Leben und seine Werke. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der deutschen Hofdichtung* (Berlin, 1910).
- Haje, C.F., *De geheime correspondentie van Abraham de Wicquefort met den franschen minister de Lionnes* (Gravenhage, 1901).
- Hamilton, K., Langhorne, R., *The Practice of Diplomacy. Its Evolution, Theory and Administration* (London, 1995).
- Hammerstein, N., *Jus und Historie. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des historischen Denkens an deutschen Universitäten im späten 17. und 18. Jahrhundert* (Göttingen, 1972).
- Hampton, T., 'The Diplomatic Moment: Representing Negotiation in Early Modern Europe', *Modern Language Quarterly*, 67 (2006), 81-102.
- Hartley, J.M., *Charles Whitworth. Diplomat in the Age of Peter the Great* (Burlington, 2002).
- Hartmann, P.C., 'Zum Gesandtschaftszeremoniell an den Höfen von München, Wien, Madrid und Versailles im 18. Jahrhundert', in *Études d'histoire européenne. Mélanges offerts à René et Suzanne Pillorget* (Angers, 1990), 149-57.
- Hattenhauer, H., *Geschichte des Beamtentums* (Cologne, 1980).
- Hatton R., with M.Anderson (eds.), *Studies in Diplomatic History. Essays in Memory of David Bayne Horn* (London, 1970).
- *Louis XIV and Europe* (London, 1976).
- Hauser, O. (ed.), *Preußen, Europa und das Reich* (Neue Forschungen zur brandenburgisch-preussischen Geschichte, 7) (Cologne, 1987).
- Heiss, G., with G.Klingenstein (eds.), *Das Osmanische Reich und Europa 1683 bis 1788: Konflikt, Entspannung und Austausch* (Vienna, 1983).
- Hellmuth, E., *Naturrechtsphilosophie und bürokratischer Horizont. Studien zur preußischen Geistes- und Sozialgeschichte des 18. Jahrhunderts* (Göttingen, 1985).
- Heringa, J., *De Eer en Hoogheid van de Staat* (Groningen, 1961).

- Hildesheimer, F., 'Les Ouvrages de Richelieu à l'épreuve de la critique ou le problème de "l'auteur"', *RHD*, 119 (2005), 207-42.
- Hillebrand, W., 'Das Gesandten- und Agentenwesen des Herzogtums Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel am Ende des alten Reiches 1764-1806/07,' *Braunschweigisches Jahrbuch*, 44 (1963), 119-60.
- Hiller, L., *Die Geschichtswissenschaft an der Universität Jena in der Zeit der Polyhistorie (1674-1763)* (Jena, 1937).
- Hinsley, F.H., 'The Concept of Sovereignty and the Relations Between States', in J.C.Farrell, A.P.Smith (eds.), *Theory and Reality in International Relations* (New York, 1967), 58-68.
- Hintze, O., 'Die Entstehung der modernen Staatsministerien. Eine vergleichende Studie', in *Otto Hintze: Staat und Verfassung. Gesammelte Abhandlungen zur allgemeinen Verfassungsgeschichte*, ed. G.Oestreich (Göttingen, 1962).
- 'Der österreichische und der preußische Beamtenstaat im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert', in *ibid.*, 321-59.
- Hitzel, F. (ed.), *Istanbul et les langues orientales* (Paris, 1997).
- Hochedlinger, M., 'Die Frühneuzeitforschung und die 'Geschichte der internationalen Beziehungen'. Oder: Was ist aus dem 'Primat der Außenpolitik' geworden?', *MIÖG*, 106 (1998), 167-79.
- Hoffmann, C., *Das spanische Hofzeremoniell 1500-1700* (Frankfurt, 1985).
- Hoffmann, P., *Gerhard Friedrich Müller (1705-1783) – Historiker, Geograph und Archivar im Dienste Rußlands* (Frankfurt, 2005).
- Hofmann, H., *Repräsentation. Studien zur Wort- und Begriffsgeschichte von der Antike bis ins 19. Jahrhundert* (Berlin, 1974).
- Holtz, S., *Bildung und Herrschaft. Zur Verwissenschaftlichung politischer Führungsschichte im 17. Jahrhundert* (Leinfelden, 2002).
- Horn, D.B., *Scottish Diplomats, 1689-1789* (London, 1944).
- 'Edinburgh University and the Diplomatic Service, 1714-89', *Edinburgh Journal* (1944), 27-33.
- 'The Diplomatic Experience of Secretaries of State, 1660-1852', *History*, 41 (1956), 88-99.
- *Rank and Emolument in the British Diplomatic Service* (London, 1959).
- *The British Diplomatic Service 1689-1789* (Oxford, 1961).
- 'The Machinery for the Conduct of British Foreign Policy in the Eighteenth Century', *Journal of the Society of Archivists*, 3 (1969), 229-40.
- Hörpel, T., 'Diplomatischer Dienst und Kulturtransfer. Die Wirkungen der Tätigkeit von Bernhard Wilhelm von der Goltz in Berlin und Paris', *Grenzgänge*, 2 (1995), 23-44
- Huldt, B., Agrell, W. (eds.), *Clio Goes Spying. Eight Essays on the History of Intelligence* (Solna, 1983).

- Hüttl, L., *Caspar von Schmid (1622-1693), ein kurbayerischer Staatsmann aus dem Zeitalter Ludwigs XIV.* (Munich, 1971).
- Hüffer, H., 'Die Beamten des älteren preußischen Kabinetts', *FBPG*, 5 (1892), 157-90.
- Hurewitz, J.C., 'Ottoman Diplomacy and the European State System', in C.Jönsson, R.Langhorne (eds.), *Diplomacy* (London), ii, 305-15.
- Ilse, H., 'Gesandtskaber som kulturformidlende faktor: forbindelser mellem Danmark og England-Skotland o.1580-1607', *Historisk Tidsskrift*, 11 (1962), 574-600.
- International Congress of the Tricentennial, *The Peace of Nijmegen, La paix de Nimegue* (Amsterdam, 1980).
- Janssen, W., *Die Anfänge des modernen Völkerrechts in der neuzeitlichen Diplomatie* (Stuttgart, 1965).
- Jarren, V., 'Die Vereinigten Niederlande und das Haus Österreich 1648-1748: Fremdbildwahrnehmung und politisches Handeln kaiserlicher Gesandter und Minister', in idem, H.Gabel (eds.), *Kaufleute und Fürsten. Außenpolitik und politisch-kulturelle Perzeption im Spiegel niederländisch-deutscher Beziehungen 1648-1748* (Münster, 1998), 39-354.
- 'Europäische Diplomatie' im Zeitalter Ludwigs XIV. Das Beispiel Johann Daniel Kramprichs von Kronenfeld (1622-1693)', *Jahrbuch für Europäische Geschichte*, 3 (2002), 101-32.
- Jeserich, K. (ed.), *Deutsche Verwaltungsgeschichte*, i (Stuttgart, 1983).
- Jones, D., *Splendid Encounters. The Thought and Conduct of Diplomacy* (Chicago, 1984).
- Jones, J.M., *Full Powers and Ratification. A Study in the Development of Treaty-Making Procedure* (Cambridge, 1949).
- Jönsson, C., Langhorne, R. (eds.), *Diplomacy* (3 vols., London, 2004).
- Joukava, A., '"Ein Glück für jeden fremden Mann, der selbst mit Türken sprechen kann". Zur Sprachausbildung vor und kurz nach Etablierung der Orientalischen Akademie', in O.Rathkolb (ed.), *250 Jahre - Von der Orientalischen zur Diplomaten Akademie in Wien* (Innsbruck, 2004), 29-46.
- Jusserand, J.J., 'The School for Ambassadors', *AHR*, 27 (1922), 426-64
- 'Grotius étudié par les secrétaires d'ambassade français en 1711', *Bibliotheca Visseriana*, 8, (1929), 1-2.
- *L'École des Ambassadeurs* (Paris, 1934).
- Kampmann, C., *Arbiter und Friedensstiftung. Die Auseinandersetzung um den politischen Schiedsrichter im Europa der Frühen Neuzeit* (Paderborn, 2001).
- 'Geschichte als Argument. Historische Mythen im Wandel des frühneuzeitlichen Staatensystems', *ZHF*, 32 (2005), 199-220.
- Kaplan, B.J., 'Diplomacy and Domestic Devotion: Embassy Chapels and the Toleration of Religious Dissent in Early Modern Europe', *Journal of Early Modern History*, 6 (2002), 341-61.

- Keens-Soper, M., 'The French Political Academy: A School for Ambassadors', *European Studies Review*, 2 (1972), 329-55
- 'François de Callières and Diplomatic Theory', *Historical Journal*, 16 (1973), 485-508.
- 'The Practice of a States-System', in M.Donelan (ed.), *The Reason of States* (London, 1987), 15-35.
- with K.W.Schweizer, 'Callières and the Development of Diplomatic Theory', in K.W.Schweizer, *François de Callières* (Lewiston, N.Y., 1995), 73-111.
- 'Abraham de Wicquefort and Diplomatic Theory', *Diplomacy and Statecraft*, 8 (1997), 16-29.
- 'Abraham de Wicquefort and Diplomatic Theory', in *Abraham de Wicquefort. The Ambassador and his Functions*, ed. idem (Leicester, 1997), vii-xvii.
- 'Callières', in G.Berridge *et al.* (eds.), *Diplomatic Theory from Machiavelli to Kissinger* (Basingstoke, 2001), 106-23.
- 'Wicquefort', in *ibid.*, 88-105.
- Keohane, N.O., *Philosophy and the State in France. The Renaissance to the Enlightenment* (Princeton, 1980).
- Klaits, J., 'Men of Letters and Political Reform in France at the End of the Reign of Louis XIV', *JMH*, 43 (1971), 577-97.
- *Printed Propaganda under Louis XIV. Absolute Monarchy and Public Opinion* (Princeton, 1976).
- Klashorst, G.O.van de, *et al.* (eds.), *Bibliography of Dutch Seventeenth Century Political Thought. An Annotated Inventory, 1581-1710* (Amsterdam, 1986).
- Klein, T., 'Conservation reipublicae per bonam educationem. Leben und Werk Hermann Kirchners (1562-1620)', *Academia Marburgensis*, 1 (1977), 182-230.
- Kleinpaul, J., *Das Nachrichtenwesen der deutschen Fürsten im 16. und 17. Jahrhundert* (Leipzig, 1930).
- Kleinschmidt, H., *Geschichte der Internationalen Beziehungen. Ein systemgeschichtlicher Abriß* (Stuttgart, 1998).
- Klingensmith, S., *The Utility of Splendor: Ceremony, Social Life and Architecture at the Court of Bavaria, 1600-1800* (Chicago, 1993).
- Klingenstein, G., 'Kaunitz contra Bartenstein. Zur Geschichte der Staatskanzlei 1749-1753', in H.Fichtenau, E.Zöllner (eds.), *Beiträge zur neueren Geschichte Österreichs* (Vienna, 1974), 243-63.
- *Der Aufstieg des Hauses Kaunitz* (Göttingen, 1975).
- 'Institutionelle Aspekte der österreichischen Außenpolitik im 18. Jahrhundert', in E.Zöllner (ed.), *Diplomatie und Außenpolitik Österreichs* (Vienna, 1977), 74-93.
- 'Johann Daniel Schöpflin und Wien', in J.Voss, B.Vogler (eds.), *Strasbourg, Schoepflin et l'Europe au XVIIIe siècle* (Bonn, 1996), 128-62.

- Klueting, H., *Die Lehre von der Macht der Staaten. Das außenpolitische Machtproblem in der "politischen Wissenschaft" und in der praktischen Politik im 18. Jahrhundert* (Berlin, 1986).
- Kohlndorfer, R., *Diplomatie und Gelehrtenrepublik. Die Kontakte des französischen Gesandten Jacques Bongars, 1554-1612* (Berlin, 2006).
- Koller, A. (ed.), *Kurie und Politik. Stand und Perspektiven der Nuntiaturberichtsforschung* (Tübingen, 1998).
- Kolodziejczyk, D., 'Semiotics of Behavior in Early Modern Diplomacy: Polish Embassies in Istanbul and Bahçesaray', *Journal of Early Modern History*, 7 (2003), 245-56.
- Koselleck, R., 'Historia Magistra vitae. Über die Auflösung des Topos im Horizont neuzeitlicher bewegter Geschichte', in idem (ed.), *Natur und Geschichte. Karl Löwith zum 70. Geburtstag* (Stuttgart, 1967), 196-219.
- Koser, R., 'Die Gründung des Auswärtigen Amtes durch König Friedrich Wilhelm I. im Jahre 1728', *FBPG*, 2 (1889), 161-97.
- Kramer, F., 'Aspects du fonctionnement des légations dans les états de taille moyenne: Duché et Electorat de Bavière (XVIe-XVIIIe siècles)', in L.Bély (ed.), *L'Invention de la Diplomatie, Moyen Age - Temps modernes* (Paris, 1998), 177-92.
- Krause, A., 'Schöpflin und die gelehrten Gesellschaften', in J.Voss, B.Vogler (eds.), *Strasbourg, Schoepflin et l'Europe au XVIIIe siècle* (Bonn, 1996), 70-82.
- Krauske, O., *Die Entwicklung der ständigen Diplomatie* (Leipzig, 1885).
- Kreh, F., *Leben und Werk des Reichsfreiherrn Johann Adam von Ickstatt (1702-1776)* (Paderborn, 1974).
- Kretzschmar, H., 'Zur Geschichte der sächsischen Diplomatie', *Amt und Volk*, 3 (1932), 36-9.
- Krieger, M., '"Transnationalität" in vernationaler Zeit? Ein Plädoyer für eine erweiterte Gesellschaftsgeschichte der Frühen Neuzeit', *Geschichte und Gesellschaft*, 30 (2004), 125-36.
- Krippendorff, E., 'Die Erfindung der Außenpolitik', in J.Siegelberg, K.Schlichte (eds.), *Strukturwandel internationaler Beziehungen. Zum Verhältnis von Staat und internationalem System seit dem Westfälischen Frieden* (Wiesbaden, 2000), 61-86.
- Krischner, A., 'Ein nothwendig Stück der Ambassaden. Zur politischen Rationalität des diplomatischen Zeremoniells bei Kurfürst Clemens August', *Annalen des Historischen Vereins für den Niederrhein*, 205 (2002), 161-200.
- Krüger, P. (ed.), *Kontinuität und Wandel in der Staatenordnung der Neuzeit. Beiträge zur Geschichte des internationalen Systems* (Marburg, 1991).
- 'Internationale Systeme als Forschungsaufgabe', in *ibid.*, 9-18.
- (ed.) *Das europäische Staatensystem im Wandel: Strukturelle Bedingungen und bewegende Kräfte seit der Frühen Neuzeit* (München, 1996).
- 'Internationale Beziehungen - Verfassung - Perzeption', in S.Externbrink, J.Ulbert (eds.), *Formen internationaler Beziehungen in der Frühen Neuzeit. Frankreich und das Alte Reich im europäischen Staatensystem* (Berlin, 2001), 21-3.

- with P.Schroeder (eds.), *"The Transformation of European Politics, 1763-1848". Episode or Model in Modern History?* (Münster, 2002).
- Kugeler, H., 'Ehrenhafte Spione'. Geheimnis, Verstellung und Offenheit in der Diplomatie des 17. Jahrhunderts', in C.Benthien, S.Martus (eds.), *Die Kunst der Aufrichtigkeit im 17. Jahrhundert* (Tübingen, 2006), 127-48.
- with C.Sepp, G.Wolf (eds.), *Internationale Beziehungen in der Frühen Neuzeit. Ansätze und Perspektiven* (Munich, 2006).
- Kunisch, J., *Staatsverfassung und Mächtepolitik. Zur Genese von Staatenkonflikten im Zeitalter des Absolutismus* (Berlin, 1979).
- 'Kurfürst Friedrich Wilhelm und die großen Mächte', in G.Heinrich (ed.), *Ein sonderbares Licht in Teutschland: Beiträge zur Geschichte des Grossen Kurfürsten von Brandenburg (1640 - 1688)* (Berlin, 1990).
- Lachs, P.S., *The Diplomatic Corps under Charles II and James II* (New Brunswick, 1965).
- Lampe, J., *Aristokratie, Hofadel und Staatspatriziat in Kurhannover. Die Lebenskreise der höheren Beamten der kurhannoverischen Zentral- und Hofbehörden 1714-1760* (2 vols., Göttingen, 1983).
- Landwehr, A., 'Diskurs - Macht - Wissen. Perspektiven einer Kulturgeschichte des Politischen', *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte*, 85 (2003), 71-117.
- with S.Stockhorst, *Einführung in die Europäische Kulturgeschichte* (Paderborn, 2004).
- Langhorne, R., 'The Development of International Conferences, 1648-1830', in M.Donelan (ed.), *The Reason of States. A Study in International Political Theory* (London, 1978), 61-91.
- 'Current Developments in Diplomacy: Who are the Diplomats now?' *Diplomacy and Statecraft*, 8 (1997), 1-15.
- Lane, M., 'The Diplomatic Service under William III', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 4th series, 10 (1972), 87-109.
- Larson, M.S., *The Rise of Professionalism. A Sociological Analysis* (Berkeley, 1977).
- Laube, V., 'Geheimnisverrat in Wien. Anmerkungen zu den organisatorischen Bedingungen frühneuzeitlicher Außenpolitik am Beispiel Kurbayerns', in H.Kugeler et al. (eds.) *Internationale Beziehungen in der Frühen Neuzeit. Ansätze und Perspektiven* (Munich, 2006), 212-36.
- Lecercle, J.-L., 'Mably et la théorie de la diplomatie', *Studies on Voltaire and the Eighteenth Century*, 88 (1972), 899-913.
- Lehmkuhl, U., 'Diplomatiegeschichte als internationale Kulturgeschichte: Theoretische Ansätze und empirische Forschung zwischen Historischer Kulturwissenschaft und Soziologischem Institutionalismus', *Geschichte und Gesellschaft*, 27 (2001), 394-423.
- Lehsten, L.v., *Die hessischen Reichstagsgesandten im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert* (2 vols., Darmstadt, 2003).

- Leibetseder, M., *Die Kavalierstour. Adlige Erziehungsreisen im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert* (Cologne, 2004).
- Leiher, N., *Die rechtliche Stellung der auswärtigen Gesandten beim Immerwährenden Reichstag zu Regensburg* (Aachen, 2003).
- Lemaire, L., 'L'Ambassade du Comte d'Estrades à Londres en 1661. L'Affaire du 'pas'', *Annuaire-bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire de France*, 71 (1934), 181-226.
- Lempereur, A., 'Aux Sources des théories de la négociation: L'Oeuvre fondatrice de François de Callières', in idem (ed.), *François de Callières. De la manière de négocier avec les souverains* (Paris, 2002), 7-50.
- Lens, A.de, 'Ambassades et ambassadeurs d'autrefois', *RHD*, 66 (1951), 170-86.
- Lesaffer, R., 'The Westphalia Peace Treaties and the Development of the Tradition of Great European Peace Settlement prior to 1648', *Grotiana*, 18 (1997), 71-95.
- (ed.), *Peace Treaties and International Law in European History. From the Late Middle Ages to World War One* (Cambridge, 2004).
- 'War, Peace, Interstate Friendship and the Emergence of the Ius Publicum Europaeum', in *ibid.*, 87-113.
- Lindenfeld, D.F. *The Practical Imagination. German Sciences of State in the Nineteenth Century* (Chicago, 1997).
- Lingens, K.-H., *Internationale Schiedsgerichtsbarkeit und Ius publicum Europaeum 1648-1794* (Berlin, 1988).
- 'Kongresse im Spektrum der friedenswahrenden Instrumente des Völkerrechts: Cambrai und Soissons als Beispiele frühneuzeitlicher Diplomatie', in H.Duchhardt (ed.), *Zwischenstaatliche Friedenswahrung in Mittelalter und Früher Neuzeit* (Cologne, 1991), 205-26.
- Livet, G., 'Les Relations internationales aux XVIIIe siècle. Réflexions critiques et esquisse d'une méthodologie', *XVIIIe siècle. Problèmes actuels de la recherche*, 5 (1973), 97-109.
- Loomie, A.J., 'The Conducteur des Ambassadeurs of Seventeenth-Century France and Spain', *Revue Belge de Philologie et d'Histoire*, 52 (1975), 333-56.
- Loth, L., Osterhammel, J. (eds.), *Internationale Geschichte. Themen, Ergebnisse, Aussichten* (Munich, 2000).
- Luard, E., *The Balance of Power. The System of International Relations, 1648-1815* (London, 1991).
- Lucchetta, F., 'L'ultimo progetto di una scuola orientalistica a Venezia nel Settecento', *Quaderni di studi arabi*, 3 (1985), 1-43.
- Lüsebrink, H.J., Reichardt, R. (eds.), *Kulturtransfer im Epochenumbruch: Frankreich-Deutschland 1770 bis 1815* (Leipzig, 1997).
- Maier, H., 'Die Lehre der Politik an den deutschen Universitäten vornehmlich vom 16. bis 18. Jahrhundert', in D.Oberndörfer, *Wissenschaftliche Politik* (Freiburg, 1962), 59-110.

- Mailhet, E.-A., *Jacques Basnage, théologien, controversiste, diplomate et historien, sa vie et ses écrits* (Geneva, repr.1978 [1880]).
- Mainka, P., *Die Erziehung der adligen Jugend in Brandenburg-Preußen. Curriculare Anweisungen Karl Abrahams von Zedlitz und Leipe für die Ritterakademie zu Liegnitz* (Würzburg, 1997).
- Malettke, K., *Frankreich, Deutschland und Europa im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert. Beiträge zum Einfluß französischer politischer Theorie, Verfassung und Außenpolitik in der frühen Neuzeit* (Marburg, 1994).
- 'Europabewußtsein und europäische Friedenspläne im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert', *Francia*, 21 (1994), 63-94.
 - with C.Grell (eds.), *Hofgesellschaft und Höflinge an europäischen Fürstenhöfen in der Frühen Neuzeit (15.-18. Jahrhundert). Internationaler Kongreß Marburg-Versailles, 28.-30. September 2000* (Münster, 2001).
 - *Les Relations entre la France et le Saint-Empire au XVIIe siècle* (Paris, 2001).
 - 'Les Diplomates de l'Empereur: une contribution à la recherche sur les élites politiques aux XVIIe et XVIIIe siècles', in J.-M.Boehler et al. (eds.), *Les Élités régionales (XVIIe-XXe siècle): construction de soi-même et service de l'autre* (Strasbourg, 2002), 25-33.
- Mandrou, R., 'Abraham de Wicquefort et le Duc August 1646-1653: Sur les relations intellectuelles entre France et Allemagne, un siècle avant les Lumières', *Wolfenbütteler Beiträge. Aus den Schätzen der Herzog August Bibliothek*, 3 (1978), 191-233.
- Marghetitch, S.G., *Étude sur les fonctions des drogmans des missions diplomatiques ou consulaires en Turquie* (Istanbul, 1993).
- Markel, E.J., *Die Entwicklung der diplomatischen Rangstufen* (Erlangen, 1951).
- Martini, A., 'La Diplomazia della Santa Sede e la Pontificia Accademia Ecclesiastica', *La Civiltà Cattolica*, 102 (1951), 372-86.
- Martschukat, J., Patzold, S., *Geschichtswissenschaft und "Performative Turn". Ritual, Inszenierung und Performanz vom Mittelalter bis zur Neuzeit* (Cologne., 2003).
- Mathis, R., 'De la négociation à la relation d'ambassade. Simon Arnauld de Pomponne et sa deuxième ambassade de Suède (1671)', *RHD*, 119 (2005), 263-76.
- Matsch, E., *Der Auswärtige Dienst von Österreich(-Ungarn) 1720-1920* (Vienna, 1980).
- Mattingly, E., *Renaissance Diplomacy*, 2nd edn (New York, 1988).
- McKay, D., Scott, H.M., *The Rise of the Great Powers 1648-1815* (London, 1983).
- Meichsner, I., *Die Logik von Gemeinplätzen, vorgeführt an Steuermannstopos und Schiffsmetapher* (Bonn, 1983).
- Meininger, A., 'D'Hauterive et la formation des diplomates', *RHD*, 89 (1975), 25-69.
- Meissner, B., 'Die zaristische Diplomatie. A. Der Gesandtschafts-Prikaz', *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas*, N.S. 4 (1956), 237-45.

- Melton, E., 'The Prussian Junkers, 1600-1786', in H.Scott (ed.), *The European Nobilities in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries* (2 vols., London, 1995), ii, 71-109.
- Melton, J.v.d.Horn, 'The Nobility in the Bohemian and Austrian Lands, 1620-1780', in H.Scott (ed.), *The European Nobilities in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries* (2 vols., London, 1995), ii, 110-43.
- Ménager, D., *Diplomatie et théologie à la Renaissance* (Paris, 2001).
- Mergel, T., 'Überlegungen zu einer Kulturgeschichte der Politik', *Geschichte und Gesellschaft*, 28 (2002), 574-606.
- Mezin, A., *Les Consuls de France au siècle des Lumières (1715-1792)* (Paris, 1997).
- Middleton, C.R., *The Administration of British Foreign Policy 1782-1846* (Durham, 1977).
- Mohnhaupt, H., '"Europa" und "jus publicum" im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert', in C.Bergfeld et al. (eds.), *Aspekte europäischer Rechtsgeschichte. Festgabe für Helmut Coing* (Frankfurt, 1982), 207-32.
- Mondot, J., Valerie, J.-M., Voss, J. (eds.), *Deutsche in Frankreich, Franzosen in Deutschland 1715-89* (Sigmaringen, 1992).
- Montini, G.B. (ed.), *La Pontificia Accademia Ecclesiastica 1701-1951* (Vatican City, 1951).
- Mookerjee, G.K., *Diplomacy: Theory and History* (New Delhi, 1973).
- Motley, M., *Becoming a French Aristocrat: The Education of the Court Nobility, 1580-1715* (Princeton, 1990).
- Muhlack, U., 'Die Frühe Neuzeit als Geschichte des europäischen Staatensystems', in R.Dürr et al. (eds.), *Eigene und fremde Frühe Neuzeiten. Genese und Geltung eines Epochenbegriffs* (Munich, 2003), 23-41.
- Mühleisen, H.-O., with T.Stammen (eds.), *Politische Tugendlehre. Studien zum Fürstenspiegel der Frühen Neuzeit* (Tübingen, 1990).
- 'Weisheit-Tugend-Macht. Politische Ethik und politische Erziehung', in idem et al. (eds.), *Fürstenspiegel der frühen Neuzeit* (Frankfurt, 1997), 141-96.
- Müller, K., *Das kaiserliche Gesandtschaftswesen im Jahrhundert nach dem Westfälischen Frieden (1648-1740)* (Bonn, 1976).
- Müller-Weil, U., *Absolutismus und Aussenpolitik in Preussen: ein Beitrag zur Strukturgeschichte des preussischen Absolutismus* (Stuttgart, 1992).
- Münkler, H., *Im Namen des Staates. Die Begründung der Staatsräson in der Frühen Neuzeit* (Frankfurt, 1987).
- Murphy, O.T., 'À la Sublime Porte. La Préparation de Vergennes au ministère', *RHD*, 101 (1987), 227-38.
- Nelson, E.W., 'The Origins of Modern Balance of Power Politics', *Medievalia et Humanistica*, 1 (1943), 124-42.
- Neveu, B., 'Nimegue ou l'art de négocier', in *The Peace of Nijmegen, La Paix de Nimegue: 1676-1678/79* (Amsterdam, 1980), 236-59.

- Nicollier-de-Weck, B., *Hubert Languet (1518-1581). Un réseau politique international de Melanchthon à Guillaume d'Orange* (Geneva, 1995).
- Nicolson, H., *The Evolution of Diplomatic Method* (London, 1964).
- Nicklas, T., 'Macht - Politik - Diskurs. Möglichkeiten und Grenzen einer Politischen Kulturgeschichte', *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte*, 86 (2004), 1-26.
- O'Brien, D.H., 'Mazarin's Diplomatic Corps, 1648-1661', *North Dakota Quaterly*, 45 (1977), 31-42.
- Ochoa Brun, M.A., et al. (eds.), *Diplomacia y Humanismo* (Madrid, 1989).
- O'Connor, J.T., *Negotiator out of Season. The Career of Wilhelm Egon von Fürstenberg 1629 to 1704* (Athens, Georgia, 1978).
- Oestreich, G., *Antiker Geist und moderner Staat bei Justus Lipsius (1547-1606). Der Neustoizismus als politische Bewegung* (Berlin, 1989).
- Opgenoorh, E., 'Der Große Kurfürst, das Reich und die europäischen Mächte', in O.Hauser (ed.), *Preußen, Europa und das Reich* (Cologne, 1987), 19-31.
- Opitz, E., 'Diplomacy and Secret Communications in the Seventeenth Century. Some Remarks on the Method of Gaining News in the Age of Absolutism', in B.Huldt, W.Agrell (eds.), *Clio Goes Spying. Eight Essays on the History of Intelligence* (Solna, 1983), 64-84.
- Oresko, R., Scott, H.M., Gibbs, G.C. (eds.), *Royal and Republican Sovereignty in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge, 1997).
- Osiander, A., *The States-System of Europe, 1640-1990. Peacemaking and the Conditions of International Stability* (Oxford, 1994).
- Osterhammel, J., W.Loß (eds.), *Internationale Geschicht. Themen, Ergebnisse, Aussichten* (Munich, 2000).
- 'Einleitung: Krieg und Frieden an den Grenzen Europas und darüber hinaus', in R.Asch et al. (eds.), *Krieg und Frieden in der Frühen Neuzeit* (Munich, 2001), 443-65.
- Ostrower, A., *Language, Law and Diplomacy* (2 vols., Philadelphia, 1965).
- Ozanam, D., *Les Diplomates espagnols du XVIIIe siècle. Introduction et répertoire biographique (1700-1808)* (Madrid, 1998).
- Pagden, A. (ed.), *The Languages of Political Theory in Early-Modern Europe* (Cambridge, 1990).
- Pages, G., *Le Grand Electeur et Louis XIV, 1660-1688* (Paris, 1905).
- Paravicini, W. (ed.), *Zeremoniell und Raum. 4. Symposium der Residenzen-Kommission der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen veranstaltet gemeinsam mit dem Deutschen Historischen Institut Paris und dem Historischen Institut der Universität Potsdam, 25. bis 27. September 1994* (Sigmaringen, 1997).
- Pasquino, P., 'Politisches und historisches Interesse. Statistik und historische Staatslehre bei Gottfried Achenwall', in H.E.Bödeker, et al. (eds.), *Aufklärung und Geschichte*.

- Studien zur deutschen Geschichtswissenschaft im 18. Jahrhundert* (Göttingen, 1986), 144-68.
- Paulmann, J., 'Internationaler Vergleich und interkultureller Transfer. Zwei Forschungsansätze zur europäischen Geschichte des 18. bis 20. Jahrhunderts', *Historische Zeitschrift*, 267 (1998), 649-85.
- *Pomp und Politik. Monarchenbegegnungen in Europa zwischen Ancien Regime und Erstem Weltkrieg* (Munich, 2000).
- Paulsen, F., *Geschichte des Gelehrten Unterrichts auf den deutschen Schulen und Universitäten*, 3rd edn (2 vols., Leipzig, 1919).
- Petritsch, E.D., 'Die Anfänge der Orientalischen Akademie', in O.Rathkolb (ed.), *250 Jahre - Von der Orientalischen zur Diplomaten Akademie in Wien* (Innsbruck, 2004), 47-64.
- Pialoux, A., 'Rome, théâtre des relations diplomatiques au XVIIIe siècle', *RHD*, 118 (2004), 251-80.
- Picard, B., *Das Gesandtschaftswesen Ostmitteleuropas in der Frühen Neuzeit* (Graz, 1967).
- Picavet, C.G., 'La "Carrière" diplomatique en France au temps de Louis XIV (1661-1715)', *RHD*, 27 (1923), 383-408.
- 'Les Commis des affaires étrangères au temps de Louis XIV, 1661-1715', *Revue d'histoire moderne*, 1 (1926), 103-20.
- *La Diplomatie française au temps de Louis XIV (1661-1715). Institutions, moeurs, coutûmes* (Paris, 1930).
- Piccioni, P., *Les Premiers commis des affaires étrangères au XVII et XVIIIe siècles* (Paris, 1928).
- Pillorget, R., 'La France et les états allemands au congrès de Nimègue (1678-1679)', in *The Peace of Nijmegen, La Paix de Nimegue: 1676-1678/79* (Amsterdam, 1980), 225-36.
- Pippidi, A., 'Drogmans et enfants de langue: la France de Constantinople au XVIIIe siècle', in F.Hitzel (ed.), *Istanbul et les langues orientales. Actes du colloque Istanbul 1995* (Paris, 1997), 131-40.
- Pocock, J.G.A., 'The Concept of a Language and the métier d'historien: Some Considerations on Practice', in A.Pagden (ed.), *The Languages of Political Theory in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge, 1990), 19-38.
- Polleross, F.B. 'Sonnenkönig und österreichische Sonne. Kunst und Wissenschaft als Fortsetzung des Krieges mit anderen Mitteln', *Wiener Jahrbuch für Kunstgeschichte*, 40 (1987), 239-56.
- Pommerin, R., 'Stehende Diplomatie und Mächtesystem: Internationale Beziehungen im Ancien régime', *Neues Archiv für sächsische Geschichte*, 67 (1996), 323-34.
- Preto, P., *Il Servizi segreti di Venezia. Spionaggio e controspionaggio al tempo della Serenissima: cifrari, intercettazioni, delazioni, tra mito e realta* (Milan, 1994).
- 'L'Ambassadeur vénétien: diplomate et "honorable espion"', in L.Bély (ed.), *L'Invention de la diplomatie, Moyen Age - Temps modernes* (Paris, 1998), 151-66.

- Przedziecki, R., *Diplomatie et protocole a la cour de Pologne* (2 vols., Paris, 1934).
- Queller, D.E., 'Early Venetian Legislation Concerning Foreign Ambassadors', *Studies in the Renaissance*, 12 (1965), 7-17.
- 'How to Succeed as an Ambassador: A Sixteenth Century Venetian Document', *Studia Gratiana*, 15 (1972), 653-71.
- Rahn, T., 'Psychologie des Zeremoniells. Affekttheorie und -pragmatik in der Zeremoniellwissenschaft des 18. Jahrhunderts', in idem, J.J.Berns (eds.), *Zeremoniell als höfische Ästhetik in Spätmittelalter und Früher Neuzeit* (Tübingen, 1995), 74-98.
- Ranieri, F., *Juristische Dissertationen deutscher Universitäten im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert* (2 vols., Frankfurt, 1986).
- Rassem, M., Stagl, J. (eds.), *Statistik und Staatsbeschreibung in der Neuzeit vornehmlich im 16.-18. Jahrhundert. Bericht über ein interdisziplinäres Symposium in Wolfenbüttel* (Paderborn, 1980).
- Rathkolb, O. (ed.), *250 Jahre - Von der Orientalischen zur Diplomaten Akademie in Wien* (Innsbruck, 2004).
- Reppen, K., 'Der Westfälische Friede: Ereignis und Erinnerung', *Historische Zeitschrift*, 267 (1998), 615-47.
- Rees, J. et al. (eds.), *Europareisen politisch-sozialer Eliten im 18. Jahrhundert. Theoretische Neuorientierung, kommunikative Praxis, Kultur- und Wissenstransfer* (Berlin, 2002).
- Reeves, J.S. Dunlap, J.E., 'Etienne Dolet on the Functions of the Ambassador, 1541', *American Journal of International Law*, 27 (1933), 80-95.
- Reibstein, E., 'Das "Europäische Öffentliche Recht" 1648-1815', *Archiv des Völkerrechts*, 8 (1959/60), 385-420.
- Reichhardt, R., 'Der Honnête Homme zwischen höfischer und bürgerlicher Gesellschaft', *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte*, 69 (1987), 341-70.
- Reinhard, W. (ed.), *Power Elites and State Building* (Oxford, 1996).
- *Geschichte der Staatsgewalt. Eine vergleichende Verfassungsgeschichte Europas von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart* (Munich, 1999).
- 'Was ist europäische Kultur? Versuch zur Begründung einer politischen Historischen Anthropologie', *Geschichte und Gesellschaft*, 27 (2001), 593-616.
- Reiser, R., *Adliges Stadtleben im Barockzeitalter. Internationales Gesandtenleben auf dem Immerwährenden Reichstag zu Regensburg* (Munich, 1969).
- Renaudin, M.-F., 'L'Échec du congrès de Cologne 1673-1674. De la fête au drame', *RHD*, 118 (2004), 223-49.
- Rennert, C., *Abraham de Wicquefort, 1606-1682* (Halle, 1880).
- Renouvin, P., Duroselle, J.-B. (eds.), *Introduction à l'Histoire des Relations Internationales* (Paris, 1964).
- Reppen, K., 'Der Westfälische Friede: Ereignis und Erinnerung', *Historische Zeitschrift*, 267 (1998), 615-47.

- Riccardi, L., 'An Outline of Vatican Diplomacy in the Early Modern Age', in D.Frigo (ed.), *Politics and Diplomacy in Early Modern Italy* (Cambridge, 2000), 95-107.
- Ridder-Symoens, H.de, 'Training and Professionalization', in W.Reinhard (ed.), *Power Elites and State-Building* (Oxford, 1996), 149-72.
- Robertson, C.L., *A Short Title Catalogue of Books printed before 1701 in the Foreign Office Library* (London, 1966).
- Roosen, W., 'The Functioning of Ambassadors under Louis XIV', *French Historical Studies*, 6 (1970), 311-32.
- 'The True Ambassador: Occupational and Personal Characteristics of French Ambassadors under Louis XIV', *European Studies Review*, 3 (1973), 121-39.
- 'Seventeenth Century Diplomacy - French or European', *Proceedings of the Western Society for French History* (1976), 83-93.
- *The Age of Louis XIV: The Rise of Modern Diplomacy* (Cambridge/Mass., 1976).
- 'La Diplomatie du XVIIe siècle - fut-elle française ou européenne?' *RHD*, 93 (1979), 5-15.
- 'Early Modern Diplomatic Ceremonial: A Systems Approach', *Journal of Modern History*, 52 (1980), 452-76.
- 'How Good Were Louis XIV's Diplomats?', in K.W.Schweizer, J.Black (eds.), *Studies in History and Politics. Essays in European History in Honour of Ragnhild Hatton* (London, 1985), 89-102.
- M.Rosa, 'The 'World's Theatre': the Court of Rome and Politics in the first half of the Seventeenth Century', in M.Visceglia, G.Signorotto (eds.), *Court and Politics in Rome, 1492-1700* (Cambridge, 2002), 78-98.
- Ross, M., et al. (eds.), *Law, Power, and the Sovereign State: The Evolution and Application of the Concept of Sovereignty* (Pennsylvania, 1995).
- Rötzer, H.G., *Traditionalität und Modernität in der europäischen Literatur. Ein Überblick vom Attizismus-Asianismus-Streit bis zur "Querelle des Anciens et des Modernes"* (Darmstadt, 1979).
- Rowen, H.H., 'Arnauld de Pomponne: Louis XIV's moderate minister', *American Historical Review*, 61 (1956), 532-49.
- Rudschies, J., *Die bayerischen Gesandten 1799-1871* (Munich, 1993).
- Ruiz, A., 'Aux origines de la diplomatie contemporaine: de l'ambassadeur improvisé à la formation du spécialiste', *RHD*, 87 (1973), 38-95.
- Rüegg, W.(ed.), *Geschichte der Universität in Europa* (3 vols., Munich, 1996).
- Rule, J.C., 'A Career in the Making: the Education of Jean-Baptiste Colbert, Marquis de Torcy', *French Historical Studies*, 19 (1996), 967-96.
- Rürup, R., *Johann Jacob Moser. Pietismus und Reform* (Wiesbaden, 1965).
- Rüschmeyer, D., 'Professionalisierung. Theoretische Probleme für die vergleichende Geschichtsforschung', *Geschichte und Gesellschaft*, 6 (1980), 311-25.

- Russell, J.C., 'Peacemaking: The Conventions and the Machinery', in idem, *Peacemaking in the Renaissance* (London, 1986).
- Sainty, J.C., *Officials of the Secretaries of State 1660-1870* (Office-Holders in Modern Britain, ii), (London, 1973).
- Sallet, R., *Der diplomatische Dienst: seine Geschichte und Organisation in Frankreich, Großbritannien und den Vereinigten Staaten* (Stuttgart, 1953).
- Samoyault, J.-P., *Les Bureaux du secrétariat d'état des affaires étrangères sous Louis XV* (Paris, 1971).
- Saring, H., 'Tatarische Gesandtschaften an den kurbrandenburgischen Hof', *FBPG*, 46 (1937), 374-80.
- Satow, E. *A Guide to Diplomatic Practice*, 2nd edn (London, 1922).
- Scattola, M., 'Prudentia se ipsum et statum suum conservandi': Die Klugheit in der praktischen Philosophie der frühen Neuzeit', in F.Vollhardt (ed.), *Christian Thomasius (1655-1728). Neue Forschungen im Kontext der Frühaufklärung* (Tübingen, 1997), 33-63.
- *Dalla virtù alla scienza: la fondazione e la trasformazione della disciplina politica nell'età moderna* (Milan, 2003).
- Schalk, E., *From Valor to Pedigree. Ideas of Nobility in France in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (Princeton, 1986).
- Scheffers, H., *Höfische Konvention und die Aufklärung: Wandlungen des honnete-homme-Ideals im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert* (Bonn, 1980).
- Schilling, H., 'Formung und Gestalt des internationalen Systems in der werdenden Neuzeit - Phasen und bewegende Kräfte', in P.Krüger (ed.), *Kontinuität und Wandel in der Staatenordnung der Neuzeit* (Marburg, 1991), 19-46.
- Schilling, L., *Kaunitz und das Renversement des Alliances. Studien zur außenpolitischen Konzeption Wenzel Antons von Kaunitz* (Berlin, 1994).
- 'Zur rechtlichen Situation frühneuzeitlicher Kongreßstädte', in H. Duchhardt, *Städte und Friedenskongresse* (Cologne, 1999), 83-107.
- Schindling, A., 'Kurbrandenburg im System des Reiches während der zweiten Hälfte des 17. Jahrhunderts. Eine Problemskizze', in O.Hauser (ed.), *Preußen, Europa, und das Reich*, (Cologne, 1987), 33-46.
- Schlöss, E., 'Von den Sprachknaben zu den Anfängen der Orientalischen Akademie', *Wiener Geschichtsblätter*, 56 (2001), 70-6.
- Schmale, W., 'Europäische Geschichte als historische Disziplin. Überlegungen zu einer "Europäistik"', *Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft*, 46 (1998), 389-405.
- *Historische Komparatistik und Kulturtransfer* (Bochum, 1998).
- (ed.) *Kulturtransfer. Kulturelle Praxis im 16. Jahrhundert* (Innsbruck, 2003).
- *Studien zur europäischen Identität im 17. Jahrhundert* (Bochum, 2004).

- Schmid, A., 'Der "Mundus Christiano-Bavaro-Politicus". Zur Theorie des Hofes der bayerischen Wittelsbacher im Zeitalter des höfischen Absolutismus', in K.Malettke, C.Grell (eds.), *Hofgesellschaft und Höflinge an europäischen Fürstenhöfen in der Frühen Neuzeit (15.-18. Jahrhundert)* (Münster, 2001), 125-37.
- Schmidt, H., 'Die deutschen diplomatischen Vertreter bei der französischen Krone im 18. Jahrhundert', in J.Mondot (ed.), *Deutsche in Frankreich. Franzosen in Deutschland 1715-1789* (Sigmaringen, 1992), 27-38.
- Schminnes, B., *Bildung und Staatsbildung. Theoretische Bildung und höhere Staatsverwaltungstätigkeit. Entwicklungen in Preußen im 18. und frühen 19. Jahrhundert* (Kleve, 1994).
- Schnath, G., *Geschichte Hannovers im Zeitalter der Neunten Kur und der englischen Sukzession 1674-1714* (4 vols., Hildesheim, 1982).
- Schnur, R., *Die Rolle der Juristen bei der Entstehung des modernen Staates* (Berlin, 1986).
- Schorn-Schütte, L. (ed.), *Aspekte der politischen Kommunikation im Europa des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts. Politische Theologie - Res Publica-Verständnis - konsensgestützte Herrschaft* (Beihefte der Historischen Zeitschrift 38) (Munich, 2004).
- Schroeder, P., *The Transformation of European Politics, 1763-1848* (Cambridge, 1994).
- Schulze, W., 'Die Entstehung des nationalen Vorurteils. Zur Kultur der Wahrnehmung fremder Nationen in der europäischen Frühen Neuzeit', *Geschichte in Wissenschaft und Unterricht*, 46 (1995), 642-65.
- Schulze-Wessel, M., 'Systembegriff und Europapolitik der russischen Diplomatie im 18. Jahrhundert', *Historische Zeitschrift*, 266 (1998), 649-69.
- Schwarz, J., 'Geschichte der k.k. Theresianische Akademie von ihrer Gründung bis zum Curatorium Sr. Excellenz Anton Ritter von Schmerling, 1746 bis 1865', *Jahresbericht des Gymnasiums der k.k. Theresianischen Akademie in Wien* (1890), 1-110.
- *Geschichte der Savoy'schen Ritter-Akademie in Wien vom Jahre 1746 bis 1778* (Vienna, 1897).
- 'Die niederen und höheren Studien an der k.k. Theresianischen Akademie in Wien, i: Theresianische Organisation', *Jahresbericht des Gymnasiums der k.k. Theresianischen Akademie in Wien* (1903), 1-28.
- Schweizer, K.W., *François de Callières. Man of Letters and Diplomat* (Lewiston, N.Y., 1995).
- Schwinges, R., Wriedt, K. (eds.), *Gesandtschafts- und Botenwesen im spätmittelalterlichen Europa* (Stuttgart, 2003).
- Scott, H.M. (ed.), *The European Nobilities in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries* (2 vols., London, 1995).
- 'Prussia's Royal Foreign Minister: Frederick the Great and the Administration of Prussian Diplomacy', in idem, R.Oresko, C.Gibbs (eds.), *Royal and Republican Sovereignty* (Cambridge, 1997), 500-26.

- 'Katharinas Russland und das europäische Staatensystem', in C.Scharf (ed.), *Katharina II., Rußland und Europa. Beiträge zur internationalen Forschung* (Mainz, 2001), 3-58.
 - *The Emergence of the Eastern Powers, 1756–1775* (Cambridge, 2001).
 - 'Diplomatic Culture in Old Regime Europe' (extended draft), *Cultures of Power, 1700-1815. A Conference in Honour of T.C.W. Blanning*, Cambridge, 14-17 September 2005.
- Seifert, A., *Cognitio historica. Die Geschichte als Namensgeberin der frühneuzeitlichen Empirie* (Berlin, 1976).
- 'Staatenkunde - eine neue Disziplin und ihr wissenschaftstheoretischer Ort', in J.Stagl, M.Rassem (eds.), *Statistik und Staatsbeschreibung in der Neuzeit: vornehmlich im 16.-18. Jahrhundert*, (Paderborn, 1980), 217-48.
 - 'Conring und die Begründung der Staatenkunde', in M.Stolleis (ed.), *Hermann Conring (1606 - 1681). Beiträge zu Leben und Werk* (Berlin, 1983), 201-14.
- Servanski, M., 'La Diplomatie polonaise au XVI^e siècle', in L.Bély, *L'Invention de la diplomatie, Moyen Age - Temps modernes* (Paris, 1998), 167-75.
- Sheehan, M., 'The Development of British Theory and Practice of the Balance of Power before 1714', *History*, 73 (1988), 24-37.
- Sieg, H.M., *Staatsdienst, Staatsdenken und Dienstgesinnung in Brandenburg-Preußen im 18. Jahrhundert (1713-1806)* (Berlin, 2003).
- Siegelberg, J., Schlichte, K. (eds.) *Strukturwandel internationaler Beziehungen. Zum Verhältnis von Staat und internationalem System seit dem Westfälischen Frieden* (Wiesbaden, 2000).
- Sienell, S., 'Der Wiener Hofstaate zur Zeit Leopolds I.', in K.Malettke, C.Grell (eds.), *Hofgesellschaft und Höflinge an europäischen Fürstenhöfen in der Frühen Neuzeit (15.-18. Jahrhundert)* (Münster, 2001), 89-111.
- Simms, B., 'The Return of the Primacy of Foreign Policy', *German History* 21 (2003), 275-92.
- Sinkoli, A., *Frankreich, das Reich und die Reichsstände (1697-1702)* (Frankfurt, 1995).
- Smith, J.M., *The Culture of Merit. Nobility, Royal Service, and the Making of Absolute Monarchy in France, 1600-1789* (Ann Arbor, 1996).
- Snyder, H.L., 'The British Diplomatic Service during the Godolphin Ministry', in R.Hatton, M.S.Anderson (eds.), *Studies in Diplomatic History* (London, 1970), 47-68.
- Sofer, S., 'Being a 'Pathetic Hero' in International Politics: The Diplomat as a Historical Actor', *Diplomacy and Statecraft*, 12 (2001), 107-12.
- Sproll, H., 'Christoph Wilhelm Koch (1737-1813): Jurist und Historiker an der Straßburger Universität und am Theologischen Seminar', in J.Voss, B.Vogler (eds.), *Strasbourg, Schoepflin et l'Europe au XVIII^e siècle* (Bonn, 1996), 83-109.
- Spuler, B., 'Europäische Diplomaten in Konstantinopel bis zum Frieden von Belgrad (1739)', *JbGO*, 1 (1936), 229-62, 383-440.

- Stagl, J., with M.Rassem (eds.), *Statistik und Staatsbeschreibung in der Neuzeit: vornehmlich im 16.-18. Jahrhundert* (Paderborn, 1980).
- *A History of Curiosity. The Theory of Travel 1550-1800* (Chur, 1995).
- Stammen, T., 'Fürstenspiegel als literarische Gattung politischer Theorie im zeitgenössischen Kontext - ein Versuch', in idem et al. (eds.), *Politische Tugendlehre und Regierungskunst* (Tübingen, 1990), 225-85.
- Steiger, H., 'Ius bündigt Mars. Das klassische Völkerrecht und seine Wissenschaft als frühneuzeitliche Kulturerscheinung', in R.Asch et al. (eds.), *Krieg und Frieden in der Frühen Neuzeit* (Munich, 2001), 59-85.
- 'Recht zwischen Europa und Asien im 16. und 17.Jahrhundert?' in K.Bußmann, E.A.Werner (eds.), *Europa im 17. Jahrhundert* (Stuttgart, 2004), 95-118.
- Steinkamp, V., *L'Europe éclairée. Das Europa-Bild der französischen Aufklärung* (Frankfurt, 2003).
- Stichweh, R., *Der frühmoderne Staat und die europäische Universität. Zur Interaktion von Politik und Erziehungssystem im Prozeß ihrer Ausdifferenzierung (16.-18. Jahrhundert)* (Frankfurt, 1991).
- Stiglic, A., 'Zeremoniell und Rangordnung auf der europäischen diplomatischen Bühne am Beispiel der Gesandteneinzüge in die Kongreß-Stadt Münster', in K.Bußmann, H.Schilling (eds.), *1648 - Krieg und Friede in Europa* (3 vols., Münster, 1998), i, 391-6.
- Stix, F., 'Zur Geschichte und Organisation der Wiener Geheimen Ziffernkanzlei', *MIÖG*, 51 (1937), 131-66.
- Stollberg-Rillinger, B., *Der Staat als Maschine. Zur politischen Methaphorik des absoluten Fürstenstaats* (Berlin, 1986).
- 'Höfische Öffentlichkeit. Zur zeremoniellen Selbstdarstellung des brandenburgischen Hofes vor dem europäischen Publikum', *FBPG*, N.S. 7 (1997), 145-76.
- 'Zeremoniell als politisches Verfahren. Rangordnung und Rangstreit als Strukturmerkmal des frühneuzeitlichen Reichstags', in J.Kunisch (ed.), *Neue Studien zur frühneuzeitlichen Reichsgeschichte* (Berlin, 1997), 91-132.
- 'Zeremoniell, Ritual, Symbol. Neue Forschungen zur symbolischen Kommunikation in Spätmittelalter und Früher Neuzeit', *ZHF*, 27 (2000), 389-405.
- 'Die Wissenschaft der feinen Unterschiede. Das Praezedenrecht und die europäischen Monarchien vom 16. bis zum 18. Jahrhundert', *Majestas*, 10 (2003), 125-50.
- Stolleis, M., *Arcana imperii und Ratio status. Bemerkungen zur politischen Theorie des frühen 17. Jahrhunderts* (Göttingen, 1980).
- (ed.), *Hermann Conring (1606-1681). Beiträge zu Leben und Werk* (Berlin, 1983).
- *Geschichte des öffentlichen Rechts in Deutschland*, i: *Reichspublizistik und Policywissenschaft 1600-1800* (Munich, 1988).
- *Staat und Staatsräson in der Frühen Neuzeit. Studien zur Geschichte des öffentlichen Rechts* (Frankfurt, 1990).

- 'Grundzüge der Beamtenethik (1550-1650)', in *ibid.*, 197-231; originally in R.Schnur (ed.), *Die Rolle der Juristen bei der Entstehung des modernen Staats* (Berlin, 1986), 273-302.
- (ed.), *Staatsdenker im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert. Reichspublizistik, Politik, Naturrecht*, 3rd edn (Munich, 1995).
- Straub, E., 'Zum Herrscherideal im 17. Jahrhundert vornehmlich nach dem 'Mundus Christiano Bavaro Politicus'', *Zeitschrift für bayerische Landesgeschichte*, 32 (1969), 193-221.
- Strohmeyer, A., *Theorie der Interaktion. Das europäische Gleichgewicht der Kräfte in der frühen Neuzeit* (Wien, 1994).
- Tamborra, A., *Krzysztof Warszawicki e la diplomazia del Rinascimento in Polonia* (Rome, 1965).
- Testa, M.de, Gautier, A., *Drogmans et diplomates européens auprès de la Porte Ottomane* (Istanbul, 2003).
- Thiele, E.-T., *Das Gesandtschaftswesen im Preußen des 16. Jahrhunderts* (Göttingen, 1954).
- Thompson, J.W., Padener, S., *Secret Diplomacy. Espionage and Cryptography, 1500-1815* (New York, 1963).
- Thomson, M.A., *The Secretaries of State, 1681-1782* (Oxford, 1932).
- Thuillier, G., 'L'Academie politique de Torcy', *RHD*, 97 (1983), 54-74.
- 'Pour une théorie de la conférence', *Revue administrative* (1995), 422-26.
- *La Première école d'administration. L'Académie politique de Louis XIV* (Geneva, 1996).
- Tischer, A., *Französische Diplomatie und Diplomaten auf dem Westfälischen Friedenskongress. Außenpolitik und Richelieu und Mazarin* (Münster, 1999).
- Toscani, I., 'Etatistisches Denken und erkenntnistheoretische Überlegungen in den venezianischen Relationen', in J.Stagl, M.Rassem (eds.), *Statistik und Staatsbeschreibung in der Neuzeit: vornehmlich im 16.-18. Jahrhundert* (Paderborn, 1980), 111-30.
- Trim, D.J.B. (ed.), *The Chivalric Ethos and the Development of Military Professionalism* (Leiden, 2003).
- Trimble, W.R., 'The Embassy Chapel Question, 1625-1660', *JMH*, 18 (1946), 97-107.
- Tschopp, S.S., 'Das Unsichtbare begreifen. Die Rekonstruktion historischer Wahrnehmungsmodi als methodische Herausforderung der Kulturgeschichte', *Historische Zeitschrift*, 280 (2005), 39-82.
- Tuck, R., *Philosophy and Government, 1572-1651* (Cambridge, 1993).
- Tunberg, S., Palmstierna, C.-F. (eds.), *Histoire de l'administration des affaires étrangères de la Suede* (Uppsala, 1940).
- Ugarteche, P., *Diplomacia y literatura. Autores celebres y obras famosas* (Lima, 1961).

- *Frankreichs Deutschlandpolitik im zweiten und dritten Jahrzehnt des 18. Jahrhunderts. Zur Reichsperzeption französischer Diplomaten während der Regentschaft Philipps von Orléans, 1715-1723* (Berlin, 2004).
- Vec, M., *Zeremonialwissenschaft im Fürstenstaat. Studien zur juristischen und politischen Theorie absolutistischer Herrschaftsrepräsentation* (Frankfurt, 1998).
- "Technische" gegen "symbolische" Verfahrensformen? Die Normierung und Ausdifferenzierung der Gesandtenränge nach der juristischen und politischen Literatur des 18. und 19. Jahrhunderts', in B.Stollberg-Rillinger (ed.), *Vormoderne politische Verfahren* (Berlin, 2001), 559-88.
- Vercamer, E., *Des franchises diplomatiques et spécialement de l'exterritorialité. Étude de droit international et de législation comparée* (Paris, 1891).
- Vierhaus, R. (ed.), *Wissenschaften im Zeitalter der Aufklärung* (Göttingen, 1985).
- Villari, R., *Elogio della dissimulazione. La lotta politica nel Seicento* (Bari, 1987).
- Viroli, M., *From Politics to Reason of State: the Acquisition and Transformation of the Language of Politics 1250-1600* (Cambridge, 1992).
- Visceglia, M.A., Brice, C. (eds.), *Cérémonial et rituel à Rome, XVIe -XIXe siècles* (Rome, 1997).
- 'Il cerimoniale come linguaggio politico. Su alcuni conflitti di precedenza alla corte di Roma tra Conquencento e Seicento', in *ibid.*, 117-76.
- with G.Signorotto (eds.), *Court and Politics in Rome, 1492-1700* (Cambridge, 2002).
- Vitellaro, A., *Carlo Maria Carafa: un principe siciliano della Controriforma* (Messina, 2001).
- Voss, J., *Universität, Geschichtswissenschaft und Diplomatie im Zeitalter der Aufklärung. Johann Daniel Shöpfli (1694-1771)* (Munich, 1979).
- with B.Vogler (eds.), *Strasbourg, Schoepfli et l'Europe au XVIIIe siècle* (Bonn, 1996).
- 'L'École diplomatique de Strasbourg: l'ENA de l'Ancien Regime?', in *ibid.*, 205-14.
- 'Les Étudiants de l'Empire russe à l'université de Strasbourg au XVIIIe siècle', in C.Grau (ed.), *Deutsch-russische Beziehungen im 18. Jahrhundert: Kultur, Wissenschaft und Diplomatie* (Wiesbaden, 1997), 351-74.
- 'L'École diplomatique de Strasbourg et son rôle dans l'Europe des Lumières', in L.Bély (ed.), *L'Invention de la diplomatie, Moyen Age - Temps modernes* (Paris, 1998), 365-74.
- 'Schoepfli et les élites de son époque', in J.-M.Boehler (ed.), *Les Élités régionales (XVIIe-XXe siècle). Construction de soi-même et service de l'autre* (Strasbourg, 2002), 13-24
- 'Schoepfliana. Briefe an Meerman in Rotterdam, an von Senckenberg in Wien und an d'Argenson in Paris', *Francia*, 30 (2003), 21-43.

- Waddington, A., 'Abraham de Wicquefort, ministre de Brandebourg en France en temps de Louis XIV', *Séances et Travaux de l'Académie des Sciences Morales et Politiques*, 58 (1902), 510-37.
- Waquet, J.-C., 'Alle origini delle teorie contemporanee della diplomazia e della negoziazione? François de Callières e la sua Manière de négocier avec les souverains (1716)', *Rivista storia italiana*, 116 (2004), 767-93.
- 'Le Négociateur et l'art de négocier dans l'Europe des princes: du ministre public à l'envoyé secret', in B.Gaintot, P.Serna (eds.), *Secret et République, 1795-1840* (Clermont-Ferrand, 2004), 39-56.
- *François de Callières : L'art de négocier en France sous Louis XIV* (Paris, 2005).
- Watson, F., *Beginnings of the Teaching of Modern Subjects in England* (London, 1909).
- Weber, W., *Prudentia gubernatoria. Studien zur Herrschaftslehre in der deutschen politischen Wissenschaft des 17. Jahrhunderts* (Tübingen, 1992).
- '"Ein vollkommener fürstlicher Staats-Rath ist ein Phoenix". Perspektiven einer politischen Ideengeschichte der hohen Beamtenschaft', *ZHF*, 21 (1994), 221-33.
- 'Die Erfindung des Politikers. Bemerkungen zu einem gescheiterten Professionalisierungskonzept der Politikwissenschaft des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts', in L.Schorn-Schütte (ed.), *Aspekte der politischen Kommunikation im Europa des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts* (Munich, 2004), 347-70.
- Webster, C., *The Art and Practice of Diplomacy* (London, 1963).
- Werner, M., Zimmermann, B., 'Vergleich, Transfer, Verflechtung. Der Ansatz der Histoire croisée und die Herausforderung des Transnationalen', *Geschichte und Gesellschaft*, 28 (2002), 607-36.
- Weiss, V.v.Starkenfels, *Die Kaiserlich-königliche orientalische Akademie zu Vienna. Ihre Gründung, Fortbildung und gegenwärtige Einrichtung* (Vienna, 1839).
- Wessel, H., *Zweckmäßigkeit als Handlungsprinzip in der deutschen Regierungs- und Verwaltungslehre der frühen Neuzeit* (Berlin, 1978).
- Windler, C., 'Diplomatic History as a Field for Cultural Analysis: Muslim-Christian Relations in Tunis, 1700-1840', *The Historical Journal*, 44 (2001), 79-106.
- *La Diplomatie comme expérience de l'autre. Consuls français au Maghreb (1700-1840)* (Geneva, 2002).
- Wolf, A., 'Geographie und Jurisprudenz - Historia und Genealogie. Zum "Theatrum praetensiorum ... in Europa"', *Ius Commune. Zeitschrift für Europäische Rechtsgeschichte*, 14 (1987), 227-48.
- Wolfe, R., 'Still Lying Abroad? On the Institution of the Resident Ambassador', *Diplomacy and Statecraft*, 9 (1998), 23-54.
- Wood, A.C., 'The English Embassy at Constantinople, 1660-1762', *English Historical Review*, 40 (1925), 533-61.
- Woodhouse, J.R., 'Honourable Dissimulation: Some Italian Advice for the Renaissance Diplomat', in *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 84 (1994), 25-50.

- Woolfe, S., 'Statistics and the Modern State', *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 31 (1989), 588-604.
- Wrede, M., *Das Reich und seine Feinde. Politische Feindbilder in der reichspatriotischen Publizistik zwischen Westfälischem Frieden und Siebenjährigem Krieg* (Mainz, 2004).
- Wright, J.K., *A Classical Republican in Eighteenth-Century France. The Political Thought of Mably* (California, 1997).
- Young, E., 'The Development of the Law of Diplomatic Relations', *British Yearbook of International Law*, 40 (1964), 141-82.
- Zannini, A., 'Economic and Social Aspects of the Crisis of Venetian Diplomacy in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries', in D.Frigo (ed.), *Politics and Diplomacy in Early Modern Italy* (Cambridge, 2000), 109-46.
- Ziegler, K.-H., 'The Peace Treaties of the Ottoman Empire with European Christian Powers', in R.Lesaffer (ed.), *Peace Treaties and International Law in European History. From the Late Middle Ages to World War One* (Cambridge, 2004), 338-64.
- 'Die Bedeutung des Westfälischen Friedens von 1648 für das europäische Völkerrecht', *Archiv des Völkerrechts*, 37 (1999), 129-52.
- 'Pluralisierung und Autorität im europäischen Völkerrecht des Spätmittelalters und der Frühen Neuzeit', *ZHF*, 30 (2003), 533-53.
- Zöllner, E. (ed.), *Diplomatie und Außenpolitik Österreichs* (Vienna, 1997).

IV. Unpublished Theses

- Briggs, E., *The Political Academies of France in the Early Eighteenth Century* (Cambridge University Ph.D. thesis, 1931)
- Externbrink, S., *Das Deutschlandbild der französischen Diplomatie im Siebenjährigen Krieg. Perception und Entscheidungsprozesse in der Außenpolitik Frankreichs, 1755-63* (typoscript, Marburg.Univ. Habilitation)
- Clayton, R., *Diplomats and Diplomacy in London, 1667-1672* (Oxford University D.Phil thesis, 1995).
- Droste, H., *Teilhabe als Verdienst. Zur Lebenswelt schwedischer Diplomaten im 17. Jahrhundert* (Kiel Univ. Habilitation thesis, 2002).
- Kohnke, M., *Das Preußische Kabinettsministerium. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Staatsapparats im Spätfeudalismus* (Berlin Univ.Diss.phil., 1967).
- Roll, C., *Auswärtige Politik und politisches Weltbild. Zar und Kaiser in der europäischen Politik des 17. Jahrhunderts* (Konstanz Univ. Habilitation, 2003).
- Schönfelder, K.G., *Standeserziehung zwischen Separation und Scolarisation. Das Phänomen der Ritterakademien im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert in Deutschland* (Klagenfurt Univ. Diploma Thesis, 1998).

V. Electronic Resources

- Adams, J., 'Travels, and Negotiations', sheet 32, 8 July 1778, <http://www.masshist.org/digital%20adams/aea/cfm/doc.cfm?id=A2_32> (online edition) [acc. 30 April 2005].
- Berridge, G.R., 'Notes on the Origins of the Diplomatic Corps: Constantinople in the 1620s', *Clingendael Discussion Papers in Diplomacy*, 92 (2004) (online journal), <http://www.clingendael.nl/publications/2004/20040500_cli_paper_dip_issue92.pdf> [acc. 2 Feb.2006].
- Bödeker, H.E., '"Europe" in the Discourse of the Sciences of State in 18th Century Germany', *Cromos* 8 (2003) (online journal) <http://www.cromohs.unifi.it/8_2003/bodeker.html> [acc. 2 Feb.2006].
- Deutscher Biographischer Index – Deutsche Biographische Enzyklopädie (DBI/DBE)*, ed. C.Saur Press (cd-rom, Munich, 2001).
- Encyclopédie, ou Dictionnaire raisonné des sciences, des arts et des métiers*, ed. D.Diderot, J.Alembert (Paris, 1751-80), s.v. 'Ambassadeur', 'Négociation', 'Négociateur', 'Profession', <<http://portail.atilf.fr/encyclopedia>> [acc.1 Feb.2006].
- Groot, A.de, 'Die Levantinischen Dragomanen. Einheimische und Fremde im eigenen Land. Kultur- und Sprachgrenzen zwischen Post und West (1453-1914)', <<http://www.let.leidenuniv.nl/tcimo/tulp/Research/ahdg1.pdf>> [acc.2 Feb. 2006].
- Krischner, A., 'Können Rituale gesammelt werden? Vormoderne Aufschreibesysteme für symbolisches Handeln in außereuropäischen Gesellschaften', *Trans*, 15 (2004) (online journal), <http://www.inst.at/trans/15Nr/06_2/krischer%2015.htm> [acc.30 April 2005].
- Langhorne, R., 'History and the Evolution of Diplomacy', in Jovan Kurbalija (ed.), *Modern Diplomacy* (Malta, 1998), <http://www.diplomacy.edu/Books/diplomacy_book/langhorne/langhorne.htm> [acc. 30 Apr.2005].
- Nguyen, M.-L., *Les Grands Maîtres des Cérémonies et le service des cérémonies à l'époque moderne, 1585-1792* (Paris-IV Sorbonne thèse, 1999) <<http://www.eleves.ens.fr/home/mlnguyen/hist/gmc>> [acc. 30 Apr.2005].
- Oxford Dictionary of National Biography online*, ed. Oxford University Press (online biographic dictionary) <<http://www.oxforddnb.com>>.
- Tavernier, Y., 'Rapport d'information [...] sur le réseau diplomatique et le rôle des ambassadeurs' [20 février 2002] (online report), <http://www.assemblee-nationale.fr/rapinfo/i3620.asp#P190_17746> [acc. 5 Feb.2006].
- Troupeau, G., 'Deux cents ans d'enseignement de l'arabe à l'école des langues orientales', *Chroniques Yéménites* 6 (1997), <<http://cy.revues.org/document116.html>>.
- World Biographical Information System (WBIS)*, ed. K.G.Saur Press (online biographic dictionary), <<http://www.saur-wbi.de>>.
- J.H.Zedler, *Grosses, vollständiges Universal-Lexicon aller Wissenschaften und Künste* (Leipzig, 1732-54), <http://mdz.bib-bvb.de/digbib/lexika/zedler>, fos.158-61 [acc.2 Feb.2006].

This document was created with Win2PDF available at <http://www.win2pdf.com>.
The unregistered version of Win2PDF is for evaluation or non-commercial use only.
This page will not be added after purchasing Win2PDF.