

GEGEN DEN PARADEYSGARTTL UND LORENZENBERG

The composition of the living quarters of the Archdukes and Archduchesses during their stays at Prague Castle (1723–1793)

Martin Halata

The present thesis addresses the stays of the Habsburg Archdukes and Archduchesses at Prague Castle between 1723 and 1793. This time period was selected considering that in 1723, the main administrative office of the royal residence was occupied by the significant court official Johann Heinrich Dienebier (+1748). In the same year, the Archduke's stay is documented for the first time. In 1793, the Archduchess-Abbess's apartment was established on the second floor of the main accommodation building, marking the last documented change in the Archduke's lodging at the Castle until 1918. The stays occurred in the residential apartments, representing the best of the residential accommodation. These apartments were situated on individual floors, typically on the south side of the Castle buildings and their windows faced both the Prague suburbs and overlooked the Petrin hillsides and the southern residential gardens. In official documents and planning documents, the location of the apartments used to accommodate the monarch and his family was specified as '*gegen den Paradeysgartl und Lorenzenberg*.'¹

In addition to the Habsburg Archdukes and Archduchesses, the dissertation examines the residential context of the Archdukes of Saxony, who stayed at the castle from 1737 to 1738² as members of the Wettin dynasty. This dynasty had been allied to the Habsburgs since 1719. Archduchess Maria Josepha of Habsburg (1699–1757) became the wife of the Saxon Elector (Archduke) Frederick Augustus, the son of the King of Poland. Their lodgings took place in the second most important accommodation of the Prague royal residence, the Rosenberg Palace.³

¹ The most adequate translation is "apartment(s) with windows overlooking Petrin Hill and the Garden of Eden" Cf. *Gegen den Paradeysgartl und Lorenzenberg*. NB: dies seint die Kayser und höchste Zimmer. APH, fond SPS, sign 111/3, 111/4, HBA, box. 103, inv. no. 1980, box. 104, inv. no. 2011. In the following text, I have prepared the footnotes according to ISO 690.

² Members of the Saxon court also stayed at the Rožmberk Palace in 1740, but no archival sources are available on the accommodation context or the length of the stay.

³ KROLL, Frank-Lothar. *Die Herrscher Sachsens. Markgrafen, Kurfürsten, Könige. 1089-1918*. München: Verlag C.H.Beck, 2004, p. - HAMANN, Brigitte. *Habsburgs: a biographical encyclopedia*. 2nd ed.

Prague was not a residence with regular residency dates within the court residences system, as it fell under the hereditary residences of the family in the neighbouring crown lands.⁴ The regularly occupied residences during the Theresian period included the Hofburg in winter (from January to Easter) and Schönbrunn (from mid-April to the end of October), followed by a subsequent return to the central Viennese residence. Laxenburg was a regular destination, along with , followed by Pressburg, Mannersdorf, Schloss Hof, and the castle at Holič.⁵ In the same period, the residence in Prague, along with Innsbruck, Linz, Graz, Melk, and Klagenfurt, were among the residences where the monarch and her court stayed for up to a dozen nights. In comparison, she spent hundreds of days in Pressburg or Laxenburg, and her days in the main residences, the Hofburg and Schönburg, are estimated to be between 6,000 and 7,109 nights. Maria Theresa reigned 14,649 days until her death.⁶

The Archdukes and Archduchesses were members of the ruling dynasties of Habsburg and Habsburg-Lorraine until 1918.⁷ The imperial children, officially referred to as the young nobility (*Junge Herrschaft, Junge Gesellen*),⁸ shared a common ayah, while residing in the children's. The staff also included a chamberlain, a chamber shoemaker, and a chamber doorkeeper, and each child had their own chambermaid and maid.⁹ The heirs to the throne were given their ayah simultaneously with their *Hofstaat*, who, of course, must have enjoyed the favour of the imperial parents. The position of aya and ayi was highly obligatory, serving

Translated by Milan KOUŘIMSKÝ, translated by Milada KOUŘIMSKÁ. Prague: Brána, 2001. ISBN 80-7243-109-9, pp. 288–289.

⁴ BECK, Marina. *Macht - Räume Maria Theresias.: Funktion und Zeremoniell in ihren Residenzen, Jagd - und Lustschlössern*. Berlin - Munich: Deutscher Kunstverlag, 2017. ISBN 978-3-422-07384-5, p. 146.

⁵ BECK, Marina. *Macht - Räume*, pp. 149–160.

⁶ BECK, Marina. *Macht - Räume*, p.146–147.

⁷ At the same time, it was a secondary title of the Habsburg monarchs between 1453 and 1918 (Austrian branch) and from the beginning of the 16th century until 1931 (Spanish branch). VOCELKA, Karl, and Lynne HELLER. *The life of the Habsburgs: culture and mentality of one family*. Prague: Plejáda, 2012. ISBN 978-80-87374-94-8, pp. 141–147.

⁸ The official name of the imperial children was *Ihrer Regierenden und Catholischen Majestät Durchleuchtigist Junge Herrschaft*. In written office speeches, the children are sometimes referred to as *Junge Gesellen*. Individually, they were then addressed as *Durchlauchtigiste Erz-Herzogin* or *Durchlauchtigister Erz-Herzog*. Cf. official titles in the period under review in *Kaiserlicher Hof - und - Ehrenkalender auf das Jahr nach unsers Seeligmachers Jesu Christi Geburt* (etc.), zum Gebrauch der Kaiserlichen Hof-Statt/Regierung wie auch Land-Ständen einegrichet und in solche Form gebracht, etc., Wien. See list of Vienna archival holdings used.

⁹ SAMMER, Evelyn Melinda. *Herzliche Mutterliebe-strenge Staatsräson.: Die Erziehungsstill Maria Theresias im Rahmen der Vorbereitung ihrer Kinder auf künftige Herrscherrolle*. 2021. Karl-Franzens-Universität Graz. Thesis supervisor Alois Kernbauer, pp. 69–70.

as the lifelong guides of their wards.¹⁰ For ayi, it was a coveted court career for older courtiers or noble widows.¹¹ A dynasty can generally be described as a succession of related persons, rulers belonging to the same family, governing one or more regions by historical right. A dynasty maintains its economic or power influence at a particular period of history, achieved through various means. Belonging to a dynasty is determined in a strictly patrilineal manner.¹² The Habsburg dynasty, which called itself the House of Austria (*Casa Imperial d’Austria*¹³ – *domus Austriae, casa d’Austria, casa de Austria, maison d’Austriae*) after its most important country, Austria, from the middle of the 14th century, split into the split into the Austrian and Spanish lineages between 1521 and 1522.¹⁴ The oldest male descendant of the primogeniture was usually considered the heir to the throne, the crown prince, from 1621/1623.¹⁵ Prague Castle served a stopping point before the next destination of the court journey or was directly the destination of the court journey. This typically occurred on the occasion of a court festival (coronation, hereditary tribute) in Prague, or the place became a temporary accommodation on the court’s journey to the next destination. During the court visit, the Prague royal residence functioned as a living accommodation.

¹⁰ KALMÁR, János. 3.2. Die Hofstaat der Thronfolger im 18. Jahrhundert. In: HOCHENDLINGER, Michal, Petr MAŤA and Thomas WINKELBAUER. *Verwaltungsgeschichte*, pp. 258–264 -KUBISKA, Irene, and Michael PÖLZL. *Die Karrieren des Wiener Hofpersonals 1711-1765: Eine Darstellung anhand der Hofkalender und Hofparteiprotokolle*. Innsbruck-Wien - Bozen: Studien Verlag, 2013. ISBN 978-3-7065-5324-7, pp. 103–104.

¹¹ BASTL, Beatrix. Courts of Habsburg Archprincesses and Archdukes. In: BASIL, Beatrix, Simona BINKOVÁ and Lenka BOBKOVÁ et al. *The Habsburgs*, p. 501. ISBN 978-80-7422-572- KUBISKA, Irene and Michael PÖLZL. *Die Karrieren des Wiener Hofpersonals 1711-1765: Eine Darstellung anhand der Hofkalender und Hofparteiprotokolle*. Innsbruck-Wien-Bozen: Studien Verlag, 2013. ISBN 978-3-7065-5324-7, p. 158.

¹² Cf. VANNI, Luciano. *Renovation.: Habsburg-Lorraine Palaces in the 18th Century: the Prague Castle, the Royal Palace in Brussels, and the Palazzo Pitti in Florence*. Princeton, 2023. Princeton University. Thesis advisor Thomas DaCosta Kaufman, pp. 16–17.

¹³ The Austrian historian Friedrich Polleros notes this name for the early 17th century. Its occurrence is documented by an inscription on an Italian engraving from 1605. POLLERROSS, Friedrich. *Die Repräsentation der Habsburger (1493-1806)*. Petersberg: M.Imhof Vlg., 2023. ISBN 978-3-7319-1229-3, pp. 17, 23, 62.

¹⁴ WINKELBAUER, Thomas. Dynastische Erbfolge und länderspezifisches Thronfolgerecht. IN: WINKELBAUER, Thomas, HOCHENDLINGER, Michael and Petr MAŤA, ed. *Verwaltungsgeschichte der Habsburgermonarchie in der Frühen Neuzeit*. Band 1/1: Hof und Dynastie, Kaiser und Reich, Zentralverwaltungen, Kriegswesen und landesfürstliches Finanzwesen, Böhlau Verla, Wien, 2019, pp. 83–84.

¹⁵ In principalities and dukedoms with the title of crown prince or hereditary prince. Erbprinz, in: *Meyers Konversations-Lexikon, Leipzig 1897, Vol. 5, p. 874*, HENGERERER, Mark. 3.1. *Die Hofstaaten der Thronfolger im 16. und 17. Jahrhundert*. In: pp. 254-255. ISBN 978-3-205-20766-5. In: WINKELBAUER, Thomas, HOCHENDLINGER, Michael, and Petr MAŤA, ed. *Verwaltungsgeschichte*, p. 254.

The seventy years, 1723–1793,¹⁶ which the thesis traces, marked an almost continuous play on the scene of the Prague residence for the symbolic maintenance and confirmation of the fundamental law of the Habsburg monarchy, the pragmatic sanction of the succession (1713). The implications of this law were consistently emphasized during the aforementioned years of the imperial court's stay in Prague and were at the forefront of all expressions of power and their representation. Rightly, the Prague residence may be called the stage of the European play for the maintenance of this fundamental dynastic law.

The presence of Archdukes and Archduchesses in the royal residence during the years 1722–1744 was already pointed out by Antonín Podlaha in the 1920s. He noted that there are numerous notes in margin on the plans from the 18th century that specify the rooms used by the Archdukes and Archduchesses.¹⁷

The same collection of plans was used by Milada Vilímková as part of a series of building and historical surveys. Her postulates are still widely quoted today as a starting point for further studies on the architecture of the Castle and its structural and historical development.¹⁸ Milada Vilímková touched on the topic of archducal visits only marginally at that time, without exclusively focusing on the timeframe of 1723–1793. Vilímková is, however, the first author to contextualize the personality of Jan Jindřich Dienebier, an actor in the castle building office.¹⁹

The topic of court travels of the young nobility and adult Archdukes and Archduchesses (of the Habsburg and related dynasties) in connection with their accommodation stays and the conditions of their residential apartments in Prague 1723 to 1793 has not been systematically addressed in recent Czech historiography. The arrivals of specific Archdukes and Archduchesses at the Prague royal residence until 1748 have, however, been marginally in

¹⁶ I define the time period from the arrival of the building clerk in the service of the Residential Building Office in 1722, or his major engagement at the royal coronation in 1723, marking his first archducal accommodation circumstance, to the creation of the suite of the Archduchess-Abbess of the Theresian Institute of the Nobility, Marie Anne, in 1793.

¹⁷ PODLAHA, Antonín. Plans and drawings kept in the office of the Prague Castle Administration. *Monuments Archéologiques*. Prague: Archaeological Commission at the Czech Archaeological University, 1921, 1920-1921 (XXXII), p. 77.

¹⁸ This is what BIEGEL, Richard, has recently stated. Imports in Czech architecture of the mid-18th century. In: MACEK, Petr, Richard BIEGEL and Jakub BACHTÍK. *Baroque Architecture in Bohemia*. Prague: Charles University in Prague, Karolinum Publishing House, 2015. ISBN 978-80-246-2736-6.-

VILÍMKOVÁ, Milada. *Prague Castle - South Wing: History*. SHP, SURPMO Prague, December 1972

¹⁹ VILÍMKOVÁ, Milada. *Builders of palaces and temples: the Dietzenhofers Kryštof and Kilián Ignác*. Prague: Vyšehrad, 1986, esp. pp. 188–191.

some explored works. The presence of Maria Anna and Maria Theresa in Prague as part of the coronation journey of Charles VI and Elisabeth Christina (1723) was mentioned by the authors of the monograph ‘Charles VI and Elisabeth Christina: The Czech Coronation 1723’ in the context of their thesis on the dynastic strategies of the imperial couple.²⁰ The activities of Johann Heinrich Dienebier in the service of the imperial envoy Jan Václav Gallas have been addressed by two authors. Martin Krummholz summarizes the known and completely new findings of archival research on Dienebier’s role as Gallas’s *Hofmeister* in his master’s diplomatic mission.²¹ Jiří Kubeš, the editor of a monograph on imperial diplomats, included chapters on Dienebier’s engagements in London and Rome in his book. He places the personality of the later building scribe in the environment of court society and provides an inspiring insight into his possible courtly relations and the influence he could have enjoyed thanks to them in his post-1722 activities.²²

Since the accommodation processes of the Archdukes and Archduchesses took place on the floor plans of the court apartment of the south wing and other accommodation locations of the royal residence in Prague, it was necessary to turn our attention to theoretical works in this field. From the perspective of the composition of the noble suite, the contributions of Jiří Kubeš were crucial.²³ In connection with J. Kubeš, we also mention the work of the Austrian historian Christian Benedik, who addresses a similar topic but for the apartments of the Vienna Hofburg.²⁴

Based on the knowledge derived from inventories studied for the purposes of monument care, the work of Eva Lukášová and Vendula Otavská has also yielded valuable results. The

²⁰ VÁCHA, Štěpán, Irena VESELÁ, Vít VLNAS, and Petra VOKÁČOVÁ. *Charles VI and Elizabeth Christina*, p.2934.

²¹ KRUMMHOLZ, Martin. Gallas Hofmeister Johan Heinrich Dienebier (1667-1748). *Theatrum Historiae*. Pardubice: UPCE, 2011, 2011(9), pp.375–395.

²² KUBEŠ, Jiří, ed. *On behalf of the Emperor: the Czech and Moravian aristocracy in Habsburg diplomacy 1640-1740*. Prague: NLN, Lidové noviny Publishing House, 2018, pp. 9–146. Czech history. ISBN 9788074225741.

²³ KUBEŠ, Jiří. Development of the residential unit, pp. 79–90. ISN 1802-8128, on the strategy of representation on the example of a noble palace, esp. KUBEŠ, Jiří. The palace of the Colloredo family of Wallsee in the Lesser Town. In: FEJTOVÁ, Olga, Václav LEDVINKA, and Jiří PEŠEK. *The Life of Prague Palaces: Aristocratic Residences as Part of the Urban Organism from the Middle Ages to the Threshold of Modern Times*. Prague: Scriptorium, 2009, pp. 171–193. ISBN 978-80-86852-30-0- regarding the sequence of the noble suite and its decoration, esp. KUBEŠ, Jiří. Residence of Jan Jiří Jáchym hr. Slavata of Chlum and Kosumberk (1634–1689) in transformation. *Scientific Papers of the University of Pardubice - faculty of Humanities*. Pardubice: UPCE, 2003, 2003 (Series C9).

²⁴ Cf. BENEDIK, Christian. Die herrschaftlichen Appartements.: Funktion und Lage während der Regierungen von Kaiser Leopold I., bis Kaiser Franz Joseph I. *Österreichische Zeitschrift für Kunst und Denkmalpflege*. 1997, vol. 51/1997, no. 3/4, pp. 552–570.

passages by Eva Lukášová on the methodology of working with historical inventories of castle residences are particularly inspiring, while Vendula Otavská discusses the surviving furnishings and their interior use within the context of a historical residential unit.²⁵

Austrian historiography pays intensive attention to the members of the Habsburg dynasty in general, and specifically to the Archdukes and Archduchesses who were present in the royal residence in Prague during their court travels. Methodologically, the basic studies on the subject of court journeys during the Carolingian and Theresian periods are the works of the Austrian historian Hans Leo Mikoletzky.²⁶ Monika Zellmann's qualifying thesis also provided significant insights into court travel in the post-1740 period concerning archducal journeys.²⁷ The court travels *al incognito* of Joseph II were the focus of Wolfgang May's work. He placed his thesis in the broad context of the travels of sovereigns under travel secrecy. May also summarised Joseph's habits on *al incognito* journeys, during which the monarch almost never stayed in official residences or aristocratic mansions or monastic residences.²⁸ Similarly, experts on the Josephine theme, Hans Leo Mikoletzky²⁹ and Karl Gutkas, provide commentary on the subject.³⁰ Monika Czerninová has also popularised Joseph's court travels.³¹ She makes a rare mention of Joseph II's stay at the Prague royal residence in the company of Archduke Leopold (1764), unfortunately without providing a source or reference to an archival source.³² On the other hand, this account of Joseph II's journey is not mentioned in a relatively recent work on the subject of Josephine journeys, Roland Kratz's qualifying thesis.³³ The cavalry journey of Maria Theresa's youngest son,

²⁵ LUKÁŠOVÁ, Eva, and Vendula OTAVSKÁ. *Aristocratic Interior*, pp. 7–74, 85 ff.

²⁶ MIKOLETZKY, Hans Leo. Hofreisen unter Karl VI. *Mitteilungen des Österreichischen Instituts für Geschichtsforschung*. Wien: Universität Wien, 1952, 1952(60), 265-285. ISSN 0073-8484-

²⁷ ZELLMANN, Monika. *Hofreisen unter Maria Theresias*. 1965. Dissertation. Universität Wien, Philosophische Fakultät. Supervisor Prof. Zöllner, Hantsch.

²⁸ MAY, Wolfgang. *Reisen "al incognito." Zur Reisetätigkeit Kaiser Josephs II.* In: *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung*, Wien- München, 1985, p.59 ff.

²⁹ MIKOLETZKY, Lorenz. *Kaiser Joseph II. Herrscher zwischen den Zeiten*. Göttingen-Zurich: Muster-Schmidt Vlg., 1979. ISBN 3-7888-0107-5.

³⁰ GUTKAS, Karl. *Kaiser Joseph II. Eine Biographie*. Wien-Darmstadt: Peter Zsolnay Vlg., 1989. ISBN 3-552-04128-1.

³¹ CZERNIN, Monika. *Der Kaiser reist incognito. Joseph II. und das Europa der Aufklärung*. Munich: Penguin Verlag, 2021. ISBN 978-3-328-60057-2.

³² Here also an extensive survey of works on the travels of Joseph II, CZERNIN, Monika. *Der Kaiser reist incognito*. p. 331–340. The visit of Joseph II and his brother Leopold to Prague in 1764 is documented in the inventory of the monarch's stays in Bohemia and Moravia (1620–1792), featured in J. Hrbek's book.

³³ KRATZ, Roland. *Die Reisen Josephs II.* Master thesis, supervisor Univ. -Prof.Mag. Dr. phil. Alois Kernbauer. Karl-Franzens-Universität Graz, 2014.

Archduke Maximilian Franz, to the Austrian Netherlands in 1774, during which he also appeared and stayed in Prague, was comprehensively treated by Max Braubach in a monograph on this Habsburg archduke.³⁴ At this point, I also mention the work of the Czech author Milan Šmerda, who addressed Joseph's journey to the Czech lands and Saxony (1766). Here, too, the journey of Joseph and his brother, the Archduke, to the royal residence is not mentioned.³⁵

Sandra Hertel dedicated an exhaustive monograph to the Archduchess Regent of the Austrian Netherlands, Maria Elisabeth, and in the course of further studies she also noted her successor as Regent, Archduchess Maria Anna, sister of Maria Theresa.³⁶ The accommodation of Archdukes and Archduchesses in court apartments is a particular focus of Austrian historiography for dynastic residences located in present-day Austria. The Theresian period is well treated for the Hofburg in Innsbruck and for the second main residence Schönbrunn, as well as or for the residences in Laxenburg or the hunting and resting estates of Hof and Holitsch.³⁷ The issue of the so-called subsidiary residences—among the important residences, let us mention today's Bratislava (Pressburg) and Budapest (Ofen)—is only very marginally, even scarcely, covered for the 18th century, and if so, only for the Theresian period after 1740. Prague as a royal residence is always treated only marginally and with inaccuracies.

Since the accommodation of Habsburg princesses and princes, both children and adults, took place at Prague Castle as a royal residence from 1723 to 1793, a selection from the so-called residential research had to be considered.³⁸ Research on the Viennese dynastic residence

³⁴ BRAUBACH, Max. *Maria Theresias jüngster Sohn: Max Franz. Lester Kurfürst von Köln und Fürstbischof von Münster*. Wien-München: Verlag Herold, 1961.

³⁵ ŠMERDA, Milan. The Journey of Emperor Joseph II to the Czech Lands and Saxony. *Journal of the Moravian Matrix*. 2005, vol. CXXIV, No. 1, pp. 83–107.

³⁶ HERTEL, Sandra. *Maria Elisabeth: Österreichische Erzherzogin und Statthalterin in Brüssel 1725–1741*. Wien-Köln-Weimar: Böhlau, 2014. ISBN 978-3-205-79480-6- HERTEL, Sandra. Maria Anna: Statthalterin Maria Theresias in den Österreichischen Niederlanden. In: TELESKO, Werner, Sandra HERTEL, and Stefanie LISBOTH. *Die Repräsentation Maria Theresias: Herrschaft und Bildpolitik im Zeitalter der Aufklärung*. Wien: Böhlau Verlag, 2020, pp. 380–389. ISBN 9783205231813.

³⁷ BECK, Marina. *Macht-Räume*, p.149–160.

³⁸ HELMUT, Lorenz and Anna MADER KRATKY. *Die Wiener Hofburg 1705–1835: Die kaiserliche Residenz vom Barock bis zum Klassizismus*. Wien: VÖAGW, 2016. ISBN 9783700178439, similarly OTTILINGER, Eva B., and Liselotte HANZL. *Kaiserliche Interieurs: Die Wohnkultur des Wiener Hofes im 19. Jahrhundert*. Wien: Böhlau Wien - MMD Wien, 1997. ISBN 3-205-98680-6. or TELESKO, Werner, Richard KURDIOVSKY, and Andreas NIERHAUS. *Die Wiener Hofburg und der Residenzbau in Mitteleuropa im 19. Jahrhundert: monarchische Repräsentation zwischen Ideal und Wirklichkeit*. Wien: Böhlau, 2010. ISBN 32-057-8393-X.

network is addressed at the Austrian Academy of Sciences (ÖAW), which launched an editorial series on the eight-hundred-year history of the Vienna Court Castle in 2018.³⁹ The project is entitled *Die Wiener Hofburg. Forschungen zur Planungs-, Bau- und Funktionsgeschichte*.⁴⁰ Although the research, as indicated by its title, primarily focuses on the planning and building strategies of the commissioners and builders of the Viennese capital, it has not overlooked the results of the research on residences and the theme of *Wohnkultur*. These aspects are summarized in this series under the term ‘Functional History’ (*Funktionsgeschichte*). The overlapping perspectives of research on residences are evident, for example, in Volume 3 of this monumental series, edited by Helmut Lorenz and Anna Mader-Kratka for the period 1705–1835.⁴¹

In its passage for the period 1723–1749 (or 1755), the work relies on a comparison of written sources and plan collections, employing a rigorous heuristic criticism of archival sources. Methodologically, a valuable source could not be used to state and define the composition of the living quarters, which are the room inventories. Room inventories for the period 1722–1748 have not survived for the south wing, and were probably not kept due to the infrequent presence of the court.⁴² Instead, the so-called revision room inventories, created by the building scribe-housekeeper for his own use until retirement from the building office, proved to be a good source.⁴³ The situation is very different in the years 1749–1775 when the efficiency of the Dienebier office disappeared with its representative, and therefore there are no longer any revision inventories or related plan documents. From 1775 onwards, when a strong personality arrived at the residence, i.e. the new castle inspector Ernst Rudolph, the

³⁹ <https://www.oeaw.ac.at/detail/news/von-den-habsburgern-bis-zur-republik-800-jaehrige-baugeschichte-der-wiener-hofburg-erforscht> [on-line, retrieved on 3.10.2020.]

⁴⁰ Cf: <https://verlag.oeaw.ac.at/die-wiener-hofburg-seit-19181> [on-line, retrieved on 3.10.2020]

⁴¹ HELMUT, Lorenz, and Anna MADER KRATKY. *Die Wiener Hofburg 1705–1835: Die kaiserliche Residenz vom Barock bis zum Klassizismus*. Wien: VÖAGW, 2016. ISBN 9783700178439.

⁴² It aligns with the historical record only from the extended stay of a family member in the royal residence, specifically in 1809–1810, have inventories of their apartment been preserved. Three decades later, inventories were systematically maintained following the inventory reform led by the court furrier Vincenzo Caballini. Cf. HALATA, Martin and Daniela KARASOVÁ. In: PRIMUSOVÁ, Adriana, ed. *On four legs: seating furniture of Prague Castle: [11.4.-16.7.2006, Queen Anne’s Summer Palace, Prague Castle: catalogue*. 2006. Prague: Prague Castle Administration, 2006, ISBN 80-86161-97-8, pp. 13–14, 30-50, 66, 70, 77.

⁴³ The term ‘(revision) errand inventories’ is a working designation for a specific type of concept inventory type originating from the Building Department’s archives. This type of inventory was improvised during the inspection of court apartments, serving as a tool in the accommodation process. Unlike the descriptive form typical of the late 18th century setting during Ernst Rudolph’s period, the walkthrough inventory was never transcribed.

heuristic situation was again adjusted in favour of the extension of archival sources, and even a considerable number of inventories of various types began to appear. Particularly important for the purposes of this thesis were the so-called takeover inventories, by which the new inspector summarised the status quo of collections or furniture, but also the so-called *fundus instructus*.⁴⁴ For the period after 1755, on the other hand, there are hardly any plans of residential floors. On the one hand, the plans were drawn up under the responsibility of the court builders, specifically Nicola Pacassi and his associates; on the other hand, Ernst Rudolph was not as skilled in architectural drawing as Johan Heinrich Dienebier.⁴⁵ There are few surviving plans—they are available in the Albertine Collection in Vienna and in the castle archives.⁴⁶

Based on these facts, the working method of comparative heuristics of archival sources crystallized.⁴⁷ For the purpose of the dissertation, it was necessary to reconstruct, at least in my comparative documents, the original registry of the building office of 1722–1748 and to determine, on the basis of concordance lists, which written sources relate to specific plan documents in the order of hundreds of pieces. It was a heuristic challenge that yielded a clear result in defining the composition of residential spaces by the mid-eighteenth century. The basic sources of the written administrative plane include documents such as purchase orders, bills of sale, receipts or requests for reimbursement of goods delivered. In addition, the books of reports (*Berichte*) and accounts (*Wochen Zettel*) are available from the time of the Dienebier building authority. The primary source replacing the inventory lists are the meticulously written documents that the building scribe kept for the individual accommodation events of 1723, 1725, 1743, and 1744, in which the lists of prized pieces of apartment furnishings—espaliers, lamps, ceremonial furniture, and interior textiles—stand

⁴⁴ All the materials and instruments stored in the castle warehouses.

⁴⁵ On Dienebier's possible architectural work cf. VILÍMKOVÁ, Milada. *Builders of palaces and temples*, p.160–178.

⁴⁶ For a list of these, cf. VILÍMKOVÁ, Milada. *Prague Castle-South Wing: History*. Prague, December 1972, p. 130 ff.

⁴⁷ At this point, I present the editorial rules that I used in the eventual citation of archival sources according to the original language, i.e. German. See ŠTOVÍČEK, Ivan. *Principles of editing modern historical sources from the early 16th century to the present: preparing scientific editions of 16th–20th century documents for the needs of historiography*. Prague: Archival Administration of the Ministry of the Interior of the Czech Republic, 2002. ISBN 80-86466-00-0.- In the text, I adhered to the toponymic names as presented in the archival sources, retaining the German language conventions of the 17th and 18th centuries, while explicating the apartment systems and the general topography of the Prague residence. Residential toponymic terms are enclosed in round brackets, formatted in italics, and applied following the mentioned principles.

out. Unfortunately, the absence of apartment inventories in the case of Prague Castle makes it impossible to identify them with *in situ* preserved pieces of furniture.

For the Rosenberg Palace, the source situation in the first half of the 18th century is identical as far as the archival material in the Prague Castle Archives is concerned: the written records and the now separately stored plan documents were once kept together in a functional manual registry because they were also created by Johann Heinrich Dienebier.⁴⁸ However, a completely unique room inventory from 1746 has been preserved for the Rosenberg residence, emphasizing the furnishing of the palace with court textiles and also partly noting the existence of court furniture. It was compiled as a summary with references to the previous period 1737–1746, seeming to be an inventory that summarized several older (and probably non-existent today) inventories of the Rosenberg residence at the time when it served as a second accommodation location. The inventory of the Rosenberg House is thus of inestimable comparative value also for the main accommodation sites of the southern wing.⁴⁹ To understand the manifestations of the representation of power, I could not study the iconographic material, which is not available for the Prague residence. However, I could rely on the graphic albums of the first half of the 18th century. In 1719, the Dresden court painter Raymond Le Plat created an important iconographic source depicting the interiors of the Vienna Hofburg on the occasion of the wedding of the daughter of Joseph I, Maria Josepha to Friedrich Augustus of Saxony Wettin. The veduta piana nobile of the Amalienburg show a sparsely populated interior, but from Le Plat's perspective, the courtly 'valuables' are accentuated: the mouldings, tapestries, and curtains over the windows and doors. The hanging paintings are not depicted; instead, the canopied throne or the central lighting fixtures, the many-armed chandeliers made of crystal, are underlined. Salomon Kleiner then produced a graphic album of views of the palace of Eugene of Savoy, the Upper and Lower Belvedere, between 1731 and 1740. However, these iconographies helped me to understand the perception of what the courtier (and 18th century man in general) saw as worthy of attention as a manifestation (i.e., representation) of the sovereign's majesty, his power, wealth, and abilities.⁵⁰ A certain risk, however, arises in the inventiveness of the author of the drawing. This is the case, for example, in the views of the Belvedere of Eugene

⁴⁸ Prague Castle Archives, HBA Fund, Old Plan Collection.

⁴⁹ Praha, National Archives, fund Stará manipulace, K 1/83, fol. 329–338.

⁵⁰ HUSSLEIN-ARCO, Agnes. Salomon Kleiner und seine Radierfolge über die Gartenschlösser des Prinzen Eugen von Savoyen. In: KLEINER, Salomon. *Das Belvedere*. Wien: Belvedere Wien, 2010, nestr. ISBN 978-3-901508-82-0.

of Savoy mentioned here, where, although the views of his chambers show interiors equipped with only a few essential ceremonial pieces of furnishings, a study of the surviving inventories has confirmed the much larger number of objects with which Eugene of Savoy surrounded himself.⁵¹ Despite this handicap, however, the iconographic sources are an essential source of information that can be well grasped by a good interpretive method.⁵² For the part of the research that had to deal with the context of the court journey to the Prague residence, or the court retinue involved, it was possible to use the lists of the traveling *Hofstaat*, stored in the files of the former court staffs in the archives in Vienna and Prague. Printed court calendars with lists of all the members of the *Hofstaat* were also used to proofread this source. However, the year 1744 remains a vacant one when the court calendar was probably not even published in pocket size, but it is certainly not available in any of the memory institutions.⁵³ A whole range of additional historical factuality also in the sense of mutual corrigenda sources is also to be found in the Ältere Zeremonialakten (ÄZA), in the Austrian State Archives, in the Department of Household, Court, and State Archives.⁵⁴ For the second half of the 18th century, new types of sources were added for the work. A new type of source, the room inventory, appeared for the south wing at the end of the same century, or around 1800. While parallels with errand inventories do exist, the early 19th century already emphasized the precise description of individual pieces of furnishings in a particular area of the archducal floor, and thus we are not bound to comparisons with other sources, such as graphic albums, as in the Dienebier era. Some of the above-mentioned pieces of Marie Anna's apartment are most probably preserved *in situ* or in the castle

⁵¹ HUSSLEIN-ARCO, Agnes. Salomon Kleiner, unpaginated.

⁵² Similarly LUKÁŠOVÁ, Eva, and Vendula OTAVSKÁ. *Aristocratic Interior*, p. 12.

⁵³ Wien, HHStA, ÄZA, box 32–43 (1723–1744). The court calendars for the period 1725–1739 are accessible in the library of the Austrian State Archive, or in the Household, Court, and State Archives. I have conducted a thorough examination of these calendars at the Library of the City of Vienna. Cf. among others KUBISKA, Irene. *Der Kaiserliche Hof – und Ehrenkalender zu Wien als Quelle für die Hofforschung.: Eine Analyse des Hofpersonals in der Epoche Kaiser Karl VI. (1711–1740)*. Wien, 2009. Thesis. Universität Wien. Thesis supervisor prof. Mag. Dr. Martin Scheutz. - KUBISKA, Irene, and Michael PÖLZL. *Die Karrieren des Wiener Hofpersonals 1711–1765: Eine Darstellung anhand der Hofkalender und Hofparteiprotokolle*. Innsbruck-Wien-Bozen: Studien Verlag, 2013. ISBN 978-3-7065-5324-7.

⁵⁴ Wien, Österreichisches Staatsarchiv (ÖStA), department Haus-, Hof-, Haus- und Staatsarchiv, Oberste Hofmeisteramt (OMeA), Ältere Zeremonialakten (ÄZA), box. 31,32, 33, 36, 41, 43 (period 1723–1744).

collections to this day, as confirmed by the analysis of the Prague Castle seating corpus from 2005.⁵⁵

After the death of the scribe Johann Heinrich Dienebier, the type of sources that the author of the work called the revision errand inventory disappeared, but the basic types of sources of his period are still kept. These are, in particular, the so-called weekly registers (*Wochenzetteln*), in which the progress of the rebuilding of the south wing between 1755 and 1791 can be traced, and the weekly reports (*Berichte*).⁵⁶ Often, however, these data are completely chaotic and need to be compared with plan documents up to the middle of the 18th century because we know that the building actions were not so drastic as to ‘revolutionise’ the layout and are relevant in relation to the ongoing reconstruction.⁵⁷ Sources that then record specific accommodation situations as they occurred after the completion of the rebuilding of the south, approximately in 1761, are also newly located in the Castle Inspectorate collection, in addition to the Old Plan Collection⁵⁸ and the Court Building Office.⁵⁹ In addition, this office was required from 1792 to maintain a plan archive for immediate service.⁶⁰ As for the period 1723–1748, the sources are also located in the central archive, the National Archives in Prague. Here, I worked not only with the holdings of the Theresian Noblewomen Institute,⁶¹ but also with the materials for the building of the Archduchess-Abbess’s apartment (*Damenstiftapartement*) from the 1790s onwards. The agenda of arranging court travel was handled by the Presidium of the Bohemian Governorate, and through its financial department (*camerale*), massive and financial injections passed not only into the establishment of this apartment on the second floor of the southern wing but also investments related to its ceremonial and representational furnishings.⁶²

⁵⁵ Cf. PRIMUSOVÁ, Adriana, ed. *On four legs: seating furniture of Prague Castle: [11.4--16.7.2006, Queen Anne’s Summer Palace, Prague Castle: catalogue*. Prague: Prague Castle Administration, 2006. ISBN 80-861-6197-8.

⁵⁶ Prague Castle Archives, HBA.

⁵⁷ The chaotic nature of the data on the Theresian reconstruction is stated, among others, by VILÍMKOVÁ, Milada. *Prague Castle-South Wing: History*. Prague, December 1972, p. 122.

⁵⁸ Here plans of the individual floors of the South wing after reconstruction, sig.157 A /22-25.- to the reconstruction process according to the so-called Wochenzettel SVOBODA, Jiří. *The Theresian Reconstruction of the Castle (1755-1775)*. Internal typescript. Prague Castle Archives, undated. (1968).

⁵⁹ Reports on the arrivals of some members of the dynasty in 1754–1786, HBA, cards 103-106.

⁶⁰ APH, Chateau Inspection, Carton No. 1–8, SVOBODA, Josef. *Chronology of Prague Castle. Part I*, Prague: KPR-internal press, 1972, p.92, 106.

⁶¹ Praha, National Archives, Theresian Institute of Nobility

⁶² All Praha, National Archives, České gubernium-Camerale, fund České gubernium-Presidium.

The following research questions were then framed for the dissertation over an extensive set of sources and literature for the period 1723–1793 (or even slightly later):⁶³

1. Which members of the young nobility stayed in the Prague hereditary residence during the period under review and for what purpose?
2. Where exactly were the Archdukes and Archduchesses accommodated in Prague royal residence?
3. Were the accommodation conditions in terms of the configuration of the ceremonial apartment the same for the adult and the minor young nobility?
4. Did the accommodation processes of these members of the dynasty take place strictly within the floor distances of both accommodation locations? And finally,
5. In which contexts were the apartments of the young nobility located at the moments of their arrivals? How did they fulfil their dual mission—to represent their inhabitants with noble expressions of power that were reflected in the so-called residential culture of the Habsburg court?

The author prefaces the answers to these questions with the assertion that the questions were relevant, since the answers in the form of the present thesis give a clear picture of the composition of the living spaces of the young nobility during the years under study. The thesis also explores and how these spaces changed in accordance with Maria Theresa's dynastic-representational strategy after 1755. Furthermore, it examines the approach taken to equip these spaces with ceremonial inventory. In the case of adults, the inventory reflected their position within the dynastic hierarchy; for the children's population, it allowed for flexible care by the appropriate elements of the *Hofstaat*, or, in other words, for the members of the children's chamber.

The period under study is divided into two periods, 1723–1753 and 1755–1793. The periodization is not artificial but arises from the actual state of the entire residence. Around, 1755, Maria Theresa subjected the residence to her idea of leaving her permanent representative in the person of the archduchess-abbess of the newly founded Theresian Institute of Nobility. Simultaneously, it aligns with the enduring desire of the monarch to be remembered as a quality family builder in dynastic history.

⁶³ To analyze the residential arrangements of Archduchess Marie Anne between 1793 and 1800, I have employed, for comparative purposes, the inventories of her apartment compiled after 1800, following her departure from the Prague royal residence.

In the period under review, seven stays of the Archduchesses and Archdukes in the royal residence in Prague and one in the House of Rosenberg could be reliably documented. These stays took place in the southern wing of the royal residence (1723, 1725, 1743, 1744, 1753, 1791, 1793); however, the circumstances of the accommodation in three cases remain unclear: the stays of Archdukes Joseph and Leopold (1763), respectively. The contours of their stay in terms of accommodation locations in the residence are not yet known. However, in the case of Franz, it is noted at least that he was accommodated in the archducal suite on the second floor. An exceptional accommodation situation occurred in the case of Archduke Maximilian in 1774, and no further parallel for this case is found in the period under review. Similarly, it is quite unclear when exactly the daughter of the monarch, Archduchess Marie Christine, was accommodated in 1793.

During the first period, only the Archduchesses stayed in the southern wing of the royal residence, either as a stopover on their next trip or to accompany their parents. All stays were always on the grounds of large court roads of an interterritorial ceremonial character. So-called '*lustreisen*', i.e. journeys that fulfilled the aristocratic or monarchical everyday life in terms of leisure time, were not recorded.⁶⁴ Although the Prague residence possessed a very valuable architectural corpus, places for leisure (extensive court gardens), as well as quality hunting opportunities, whether in the erratic district (in the Star Summer Palace, on the chamber estates), or on the nobleman's grounds.⁶⁵ The distance between Vienna and Prague was not ideal for organizing a 'fun' trip here, especially when the dynasty had various accommodation options near its main residence.

The tier distinction was flexibly changed according to the position of the Archduke or Archduchess in the dynastic hierarchy. Until 1748, during their visits, minor archduchesses were accommodated on the first floor (i.e., the archducal floor), while adult female members of the ruling dynasty in their position as regents of the Austrian Netherlands had a large royal suite on the second floor plan.

The under-age archduchesses who had to be taken care for were given a small apartment in the middle of the first floor enfilade, which was connected to the chambers of their servants

⁶⁴ The division of paths into these two categories is presented by KULCSÁR, Krisztina. Die Quellen zu den Hofreisen im Habsburg-Lothringischen Familienarchiv aus den Jahren 1766 bis 1788. In: PAUSER, Josef, Martin SCHEUTZ, and Thomas WINKELBAUER. *Quellenkunde der Habsburgermonarchie (16th–18th Jahrhundert): Ein exemplarisches Handbuch*. MIOG, Ergänzungsband 44. Wien München: R. Oldenbourg Verlag, 2004,. ISBN 3-7029-0477-8.

⁶⁵ HRBEK, Jiří. *Hunting pastimes on the estates of the Czech nobility*, in. *Ruler's Majesty: The Habsburgs as Czech Kings in the 17th and 18th Centuries*. Prague: NLN, s.r.o. in cooperation with the Historical Institute of the CAS, 2021. ISBN 978-80-7422-804-9, pp. 394- 414.

and the higher staff, among which the apartment of the governess, the ayah, had a privileged position. The bedroom was therefore assigned to the minor archduchesses as the most important room, while the other rooms were occupied by the *Hofstaat*, which ‘animated’ the children’s archducal everyday life. Although the archduchesses were assigned an average of 31 rooms, their Prague residential daily life took place in five (1723) to six rooms (1743), including the archducal oratory in the domestic chapel of St. Wenceslas. The two visiting archduchesses-regents were provided with extensive second-floor royal apartments. An enfilade of 43 rooms (1725, 1744) contained internal suites *de commodité* for the favourites of the two female regents in both stays. Both of them had furnished retreats around the bedrooms. Retirades as functional resting and private rooms within a large apartment are seen as a significant contribution of the Habsburg dynasty to apartment systems and as a hallmark of Habsburg residential systems—their occurrence can now be documented in the royal residence in Prague. The residence of Maria Charlotte of Lorraine, sister of Francis I Stephen of Habsburg-Lorraine (1753), is significant in terms of the tracing of accommodation strategies. As the Archduchess was also one of Maria Theresa’s favourite relatives, she was assigned an apartment on the royal floor of the south wing. It is thus confirmed that the floor distinction did exist *pro forma* in all heuristic sources (or at least theoretically), but according to the request of the court, or with sovereign, it was modified in view of its vision of dynastic representation and, of course, on its orders in favour of the protégé.

A similar situation prevailed in the second accommodation location, Rosenberg Palace. Here, until the mid-18th century, the Dresden court was almost exclusively accommodated (1737), while the Saxon princes had until the 1740s a large suite on the so-called royal floor, the centre of which was again the bedrooms roughly in the centre of the suite on the *Junge Gesellen* floor. However, this floor of the Rosenberg Palace is also special in that only the male members of the young nobility and their *Hofstaaten* stayed there during the period in question, while the female members of the court stayed at the Lobkowitz Palace. This may be explained by the fact that historically, there was no floor or palace area for the *fräulein* in the House of Rosenberg. On the other hand, the middle wing, the *Frauenzimmerstock*, became a very special accommodation for the higher officials of the Lobkowitz house and the clergy in the years under review, while the ground floor housed services of a craft nature. A women’s *Hofstaat* was to be housed there only once (Archduchess Marie Anne, 1755). This suggestion (which ultimately did not materialize) resonated with the original purpose of the wing for the separate accommodation of the female members of the *Hofstaat*, the

fraucimor, whose delineation in the accommodation arrangements would thus have continued the function of the residence wing in the 16th century. It also aligns with similar accommodation locations in other European residences from the 15th century at the latest.⁶⁶ On the contrary, throughout the period under study, the second floor of the so-called “building office house” served as a lodging and storage location for the laundry and wardrobe of the minor children of the imperial couple, as it was located in the closest distance from the minor children’s apartments and in direct corridor continuity with the archducal apartment of the southern wing.

The overall accommodation situation for the Archdukes and Archduchesses changed significantly in the second period, i.e., in 1755–1793. The southern wing, now referred to as the New Palace, was transformed into a three-storey residential building. Accommodations for the young nobility were now located on the second floor, the Archduke’s floor. In the late 1750s, the Archduke's enfilade on the second floor included 21 main-stroke rooms with an adjoining reserve suite in the Town Wing. Compared to the previous period (1723–1748}, the suite was now situated from east to west, with the ceremonially accented rooms located behind the main entrance from the second floor landing of the Queen’s Staircase. This reversal of the suite sequence to the east, as opposed to the previous western orientation of the most important rooms, occurred in connection with the rebuilding of the ceremonial staircase in Matthias Gate in the 1860s and the creation of a new service staircase in the Town Wing.

Therefore, although one might have expected that Archduke Maximilian to find a good base for his cavalier court tour there in 1773 (less than twenty years after the Theresian renovation), accommodation in the piano nobile of the Morzin Palace in Ostruhova Street was preferred. Here, the favourite son of the monarch was accommodated in a considerably smaller suite than was available in the New Palace. The reasons for the decision to move a prominent member out of the royal residence, which, moreover, was completely unoccupied by other members of the dynasty at the time, are unknown. The hypothesis that the Theresian reconstruction was not done well enough, or the premises were uninhabitable, and therefore required constant adjustments and further alterations that stretched into the 1890s, seems likely. The inability of the castle’s landlord to heat the apartment is also a possibility, a

⁶⁶ HOPPE, Stephan (ed.). *Bauliche Gestaltung und Lage von Frauenzimmerwohräumen*. In: HIRSCHBIEGEL, Jan, and PARAVICINI, Werner. *Das Fraunezimmer. Die Frau bei Hofe in Spätmittelalter und früherer Neuzeit*. Stuttgart: Jan Thorbecke Verlag, 2000, pp. 151–173.

situation known in the case of the previously mentioned stay of Archduchess Marie Christine (1793).

Another accommodation arrangement occurred on the occasion of the Emperor's coronation in 1791. As Archduke Franz and his sister occupied most of the more modern estate's floors, his sisters, Archduchesses Marie Anne and Marie Clementine, were accommodated outside the ceremonial enfilade suite been reserved for the archducal children after the Theresian renovation. Their eight-room abode did not even have an official ceremonial entrance. Thus, the apartment was not intended for dynastic representation and was merely a utilitarian dwelling during the court's stay at the residence. This replicated the accommodation model of the Viennese Hofburg, where older children were received a better apartment, while younger children had less attractive ones. Following the Viennese example, it is assumed that the younger archduchesses would eventually attend the ceremony with their older siblings in their archducal apartment on the west side of the archducal floor, including ceremonial furnishings.

Although it might have been assumed that the ideal state of affairs in terms of residential arrangements for the young nobility had been achieved with the creation of their own palace, and that this would be maintained by dynastic, courtly, and residential services, a change was brought about by the monarch's will in 1791. The Abbess of the Theresian Institute was henceforth to be only the Archduchess of the Habsburg dynasty, the permanent representative of the foundation's founder. However, an adequate apartment, the *Damenstiftapartement*, had to be provided for her residence, although the apartment in the foundation house had unquestionable qualities. This situation has a parallel in the system of court residences, namely in Innsbruck, with the difference that the Archduchess-Abbess also did not occupy her apartment in the Institute, and remained in the piano nobile (the Imperial Floor). Since there is no documented residence of the young nobility in the Prague residence immediately after the establishment of the Archduchess-Abbess's apartment, there is no documentary material to state how such an accommodation arrangement would have been handled by the residence and central accommodation authorities.

In response to the fifth question, regarding how dynastic representation manifested in the residential culture of the archducal apartments in Prague, the author must state that the material for studying this problem is available in Austrian historiography, whether in situ in the Vienna Hofburg or in other preserved sources of an iconographic nature. These sources can assist the historian where written archival material is lacking. Therefore, the author emphasizes the importance of the Salomon Kleiner Album of 1731–1740 for his work, I n

view of the above-mentioned iconographic void, this magnificent graphic monument, or rather its iconography, provides a visual reference for the so-called errand inventories of the apartments of Johann H. Dienebier. He created these inventories for his own use in the archducal, royal, and Rosenberg apartments in Prague at the time of his announced visit to the court. Solomon Kleiner's graphic treatment of the interiors of Eugene of Savoy is intended for the eye of the visitor, who perceives aesthetic value through the owner: his financial wealth, presented in his lavish living quarters, evokes justified respect for the scion's capital of power. In contrast, Dienebier perceived the interiors of the royal residence through his intellectual equipment as an educated member of court society.

During the work on the present thesis, it proved to be very useful to follow the source data on the manifestations of power representation in the so-called residential culture. In addition to confirming that the apartments were furnished with ceremonial furniture (especially ceremonial seating of all types), the probes also confirmed the diversity of the interiors, which represents not only contemporary interior taste but also the status of the apartment's occupant. For the period 1723–1748, the apartments of the adult archduchesses in the Prague residence contained noble precious textiles such as damask, brocade, or brocatelle. These textiles were also mentioned in the so-called courtly colour scheme, i.e., scarlet blush. Other colours, characteristic of both the Theresian and the subsequent period, are attested, i.e., green, grey, blue, and yellow. Fabrics of this colour scheme were used not only as 'spandrels' on the walls but also in the same colour scheme as covers for ceremonial seating and window fabrics. The furnishing of chambers in one predominant tone, called *en suite*, is one of the furnishing principles of the 18th-century exclusive apartment and is now also documented in the royal residence in Prague.

After 1755, or certainly in the 1780s and 1790s, paper wallpapers of various decorations were already installed on the walls of the apartment. Even in this type of wall decoration with decorated and glued paper, the Prague royal residence did not lag behind other European residences. If the character of the Prague residence as only occasionally inhabited was already evident in the furnishing of ceremonial furniture, this was, in the author's opinion, a phenomenon in which furniture was not sufficient, and some necessary pieces had to be borrowed ad hoc from other aristocratic residences, church inventories, or even the private homes of court officials. This shortage was, of course, pointed out by the residences

(and even in the following decades of the 19th century),⁶⁷ yet only in rare cases were the apartments furnished with new pieces made by prominent court craftsmen and suppliers.

Further research opportunities in similar topics, building on the completed research, are becoming clearer. The present work has provided a good idea of the composition of the living quarters of the Habsburg, Habsburg-Lorraine, and Wettin archdukes and archduchesses between 1723 and 1793 in the two main accommodation locations of the hereditary residence in Prague. A comparison with the available results of similar research for the Vienna Hofburg and other residences leads to the conclusion that the Prague archducal apartments of the South wing and the Rosenberg Palace are well locatable in 1723–1793, both in terms of their location in the floor distances and in terms of the composition of the apartment sequence. While the Viennese archducal apartments were never fixed to a single accommodation location, making their localization a difficult task for historical scholarship, in the Prague residence, the archducal apartments in the period under study always had a precisely defined place on the floor plan, first on the first and then on the second floor.

The other accommodation sites of the residences were not part of the research, and especially after the Theresian renovation, their ‘apartment and accommodation specialization’ is quite obvious. New apartment systems are also being profiled in other buildings throughout the Castle. Tracing how these changes were reflected after 1800 in accommodation strategies towards the Archdukes and Archduchesses, whose visits to the royal residence were much more frequent than before the end of the 18th century, could be a follow-up topic to the present work.

⁶⁷ The deficiency in ceremonial and more common furnishings became a matter of concern, exemplified by the French court of the last Bourbons (1832–1836). This issue was brought to the attention of the castle inspector Ernst Rudolph in correspondence with the central Viennese authorities.

Author's papers related to theses

HALATA, Martin a KARASOVÁ, Daniela. Židle a byrokracie z Hofburgu. In: PRIMUSOVÁ, Adriana (ed.). *Na čtyřech nohách: sedací nábytek Pražského hradu : [11.4.-16.7.2006, Letohrádek královny Anny, Pražský hrad : katalog*. 2006. Praha: Správa Pražského hradu, 2006, 13–14, 30–50, 66–70, 77. ISBN 80-86161-97-8.

HALATA, Martin a ŠULA, Michal. Císařský byt za Ferdinanda I. a Marie Anny (1848-1884). In: *Ferdinand V. Dobrotivý a umění jeho doby: [1. června - 9. září 2012, Královský letohrádek a Císařská konírna]*. 2012. Praha: Správa Pražského hradu, 2012, 53, 59, 190–212. ISBN 978-80-86161-74-7.

HALATA, Martin; ŠULA, Michal a KARASOVÁ, Daniela. *Na slunečné straně: Městský trakt Pražského hradu jako habsburské sídlo 1800–1918*. 2013. Praha: Gallery, 2013. ISBN 9-788086990880.

RUDOLPH VON WARTBURG, Joseph, HALATA, Martin a LIEBLOVÁ, Dagmar (ed.). *Pozdrav ze Schlossbergu: paměti Josefa Rudolpha z Wartburgu, syna hradního inspektora*. Paměť (Academia). Praha: Academia, 2013. ISBN 978-80-200-2234-9.

HALATA, Martin. Die Blondel'sche Burg. Zur Veränderung des Stils im Interieur des Kaiserlichen Appartements der Prager Burg in den Jahren 1848–1890. Blondelski grad. O spremembi sloga v cesarskem apartmaju praškega gradu v letih 1848–1890. In: LAVRIČ, Ana (ed.). *Patriae et orbi: Študije o srednjeevropski umetnosti : jubilejni zbornik za Damjana Prelovška = Essays on Central European art and architecture : festschrift in honour of Damjan Prelovšek*. 2015. Ljubljana: Založba ZRC, ZRC SAZU, 2015, s. 593–607. ISBN 9789612548735.

HALATA, Martin. Vězení více než palác. Pobyť dvora Karla X. na Pražském hradě. In: LENDEROVÁ, Milena. *Modrá krev v občanském století: Konzervace i destrukce stereotypů každodenního života a životních strategií v průběhu 19. století*. Pardubice: Univerzita Pardubice, 2022, s. 137–169. ISBN 978-80-7560-440-8.

LENDEROVÁ, Milena a HALATA, Martin. Jak strávit exil. Francouzský král Karel X. na Pražském hradě.: How to spend one's exile. The French king Charles X at Prague Castle. *ČČH: Český časopis historický*. 2022, roč. 120, č. 1, s. 37–79.

HALATA, Martin. Gegen den Paradeysgartl und Lorenzenberg. Zusammenstellung der Wohnräume der habsburgischen Erzherzoginnen während ihrer Aufenthalte auf der Prager Burg (1723-1744). *Bohemia - Zeitschrift für Geschichte und Kultur der böhmischen Länder*. 63, 2023, ISSN 0523-8587, v tisku.