The criminal trial against the Hungarian Michael von Klement.

paulskin, ChatGPT

November 3, 2025

(English translation by ChatGPT - Footnote numbers correspond to the German edition; citations are omitted for clarity.)

The criminal trial against the Hungarian Michael von Klement.

An episode from the reign of Frederick William I. [1])

By Heinrich von Friedberg.

Among the documents whose publication we owe to the administration of the Prussian Secret State Archives there is a report from Minister von Podewils to Frederick the Great, entitled: "Memorandum concerning the intrigues and the trial of the notorious Klement under the reign of King Frederick William of glorious memory, towards the end of the year 1718 and the beginning of 1720." [1])

Already the fact that this report was written by the minister himself on the special order of the King, and that the author received the monarch's special thanks for it, shows how much importance was at that time attached to that Klement affair.

And even in our own day it has appeared of sufficient importance to the author of the **Twelve Books of Prussian History** to deserve, in his great work, a detailed treatment [2]).

That report by Minister von Podewils has indeed been made accessible to everyone through its publication in 1878 [3]); and, moreover, there are in the literature of memoirs as well as in historical works many scattered notices concerning that intrigue and the Klement trial—to repeat Podewils's own expression. Yet there is still lacking a comprehensive account based on the records of the trial itself), and supported by authentic documents. The following pages are devoted to an attempt to fill this gap.

In order better to understand and to judge more correctly the events from which that trial took its origin, as well as its individual details, it will be advisable first to recall the general political situation in which the European states found themselves at the close of the seventeenth and in the first quarter of the eighteenth century.

The disturbances arising from the Spanish succession and the conflict among the northern powers had not left even the young Kingdom of Prussia untouched. An end was to be brought to these by the peace negotiations opened at Utrecht in 1713. At that congress, besides France and Spain on one side, and Austria, England, and Holland on the other, Prussia too was represented. It wished there to assert its hereditary right to the Oranian possessions and further hoped to obtain the recognition of its royal title hitherto refused by Louis XIV.

As usually happens at such peace conferences, that together with the great also appear the small, so it was at the Congress of Utrecht.

Rákóczy, Prince of Transylvania, who by uprisings in Hungary and by alliances which he had known how to conclude with foreign powers had for years caused the Imperial Court grave internal and external embarrassment, now lived, driven from his homeland, in France, as a protégé of Louis XIV. From the negotiations at Utrecht he hoped, if not for reinstatement in his lost princely dignity, yet possibly for the restitution of his large family estates situated in Hungary and confiscated by Austria; and for the pursuit of this matter he had sent a young compatriot, Michael von Klement, who had followed him into exile in France, as his agent to Utrecht.

The formerly meagre and moreover often mutually contradictory accounts current about Klement have been confirmed by the documents concerning the history of Rákóczy and his foreign relations published by the Imperial Academy in Vienna in the **Fontes rerum Austriacarum**.

Johann Michael von Klement was born in 1689 in Hungary, the son of a Protestant **assessor juratus** of the Neuscholer Comitat. He had studied at Halle and Frankfurt an der Oder, and, scarcely nineteen years old, had entered the service of the Prince of Transylvania. His engaging personality and his uncommon attainments—he spoke and wrote, besides his native tongue, Latin, German, French and English—made him appear to the Prince particularly suited for diplomatic service, and he was employed by him in such missions in England, Holland, Spain, and also in Prussia. In Berlin he appeared for the first time in 1710 as Rákóczy's political agent. From a memoir addressed in February of that year to the King and his minister Ilgen, the commissions which he held for the Prussian court can be discerned. The King, it said therein, might, as "glorious defender of the righteous cause, most graciously be pleased, in view of so many hundreds of thousands of Hungarians and Evangelical Protestants groaning under an intolerable yoke, to take pity on this oppressed nation."

As a suitable intermediary for the negotiations to be conducted upon this question, the memorandum designated the cathedral and court preacher Jablonsky, since he had already previously "carried on political negotiations with His Serene Highness Prince Rákóczy." [1])

The at first sight remarkable circumstance of seeing a court preacher at the Berlin cathedral engaged in political negotiations, and that too with a vassal in rebellion against the Austrian imperial house, finds, according to some [2]), its explanation in the fact that Jablonsky, besides his office as Prussian court and cathedral preacher, also held that of a bishop of the Reformed Church in Hungary. In this latter capacity he would indeed have appeared well suited to act as intermediary between Rákóczy, the protector of the Protestants in Hungary, and the King of Prussia, the natural patron of all Protestants. Unfortunately, however, in the records we have found no confirmation of that episcopal dignity of Jablonsky, and although he himself gives detailed information about his career and his then official position, there is nowhere even the slightest indication that he held the office of bishop in the Reformed Church of Hungary. Klement therefore is likely to have referred to him as intermediary only on the basis of his earlier acquaintance with him.

Three years later we find the same Klement, under the name von Rosenau, active at Utrecht as Rákóczy's agent at the congress there. The Imperial Court was represented at that congress by a resident named von Hohen-

dorff, Prussia by Count Dönhoff. Klement knew how to establish friendly relations with both, and with the former—although he was his diplomatic opponent—so close that the latter conceived the wish to win the unusually gifted and extraordinarily adroit young man for Austrian service. In the former confidant of Rákóczy one might moreover hope to find a particularly valuable instrument against that still by no means harmless adversary. Rákóczy himself, by the outcome of the congress, had been deprived of his last hopes, and in any case for the immediate future had no tasks for his previous agent, and probably also scarcely the means to recompense him adequately. Hohendorff therefore found it not too difficult to make his recruitment efforts successful with Klement, and the latter resolved to leave the ship of Rákóczy's fortunes, stranded at Utrecht, and to seek a new one in Austria.

Equipped with good letters of recommendation from Hohendorff, he arrived in Vienna in 1715. Whether he went there already with the intention of betraying his former master, in particular of revealing his earlier relations with foreign powers, and whether he had already in Utrecht provided himself with the documents necessary for the execution of such a plan, may be left undecided. Even if one is not inclined to go so far in suspicion, one cannot dismiss the thought that with Klement a man entered Austrian service who was, as none other, in a position to give information about Rákóczy's relations with foreign courts; and among these the Prussian court at that time held no unimportant place. From Klement, therefore, information concerning this court was especially to be expected.

At the head of affairs in Vienna stood at that time, as president of the Court Council of War, Prince Eugene of Savoy, and into his vicinity Klement came. King Frederick William of Prussia and Prince Eugene were not strangers to one another. The former had, as crown prince, taken part under Eugene in the campaign in the Netherlands, and had returned home with a high admiration for the great general; Eugene in turn had given the young prince proofs of warm interest. These friendly relations between the two had, however, loosened in the course of time, particularly since the crown prince's father had assumed the royal dignity. Frederick William did not forget the malicious saying attributed to Eugene—that those imperial ministers who had advised their lord to recognise the Prussian crown deserved the hangman—and what annoyed him even more was that, as obliging friends had reported to him, the prince made mock of his former pupil in the art of war and of the constant drilling of his long grenadiers. Eugene, on the other

hand, could not forget that the King had once allowed his imperial contingent to remain quietly in the territory of Cologne, although he, under whose command it stood, had summoned it to join him.

The alienation that had gradually crept in over the years between the King and Prince Eugene was considerable enough, yet even greater was the tension that existed between the courts of Vienna and Berlin. In Vienna they took offence at Frederick William's efforts, evident on all sides, to emancipate his royal sovereignty as far as possible from the overlordly power of the Emperor; and in Berlin, for their part, it was thought that the Emperor did not observe towards the King that consideration to which the latter believed himself entitled as the most distinguished of the princes of the Empire. Frederick William was especially offended that the Emperor decided complaints brought to him from Prussian lands to the King's disadvantage without first hearing him, and issued those decisions in a form which he regarded as an encroachment upon his royal dignity. The latter was, for example, the case with the imperial letter of 28 February 1718, which, in response to a complaint from the knighthood concerning the King's decree on the allodification of fiefs, was addressed to the King and in which the latter was threatened with the annulment of his royal decree by the plenary power of the Emperor [1]). Even at the imperial courts of justice the King believed that no impartial judgement was to be found and therefore would not allow appeals to them, whereas the Emperor laid particular stress on maintaining this prerogative of his imperial right.

Such was the political atmosphere reigning between Vienna and Berlin when Klement—who meanwhile had been assured of amnesty for his participation in the Rákóczy affairs—arrived in the imperial city. "I was," he relates, "graciously received by His Serene Highness Prince Eugene, and by His Imperial Majesty Himself at the Prince's recommendation. To the latter, as well as to Prince Eugene, I had to give a detailed account of everything that had passed through my hands, and to deliver some correspondence relating to Prince Rákóczy. At times I also had the honour of informing His Imperial Majesty in person."

It would be unjust to the Emperor or to Prince Eugene to suspect that they themselves could have stooped to use Klement for the purpose of espionage, exploiting his knowledge of persons for spying against Prussia. Yet it was, in a manner of speaking, a law of necessity that, once Klement had entered Austrian service, he was almost inevitably compelled to perform in-

telligence duties there. Already in Utrecht Hohendorff had advised him to attach himself in Vienna chiefly to the Prince's confidential secretary, named Langelt [1]), and Klement had followed this advice so well that he was on the point of becoming his son-in-law. Was it not then natural that Langelt should do all he could—even without orders from his master—to extract from the former confidant of Rákóczy as much information as possible about the latter's connections with foreign courts, and therefore also about the negotiations he had carried on with the Prussian court? Moreover, Klement himself assures us that he had not been questioned by Langelt alone but "by the imperial ministers themselves, and sharply, as to what understanding Rákóczy had with King Frederick William, and that when he answered that whenever Rákóczy had presented himself in Berlin he had been advised of nothing else but to submit to the Emperor and make his accommodation with him as best he could, the imperial ministers had been dissatisfied with this, since they would gladly have had material with which to blacken Rákóczy and the King."

To this assertion of Klement's—made, after all, only later when he was a prisoner in a Prussian fortress—one need not give unconditional credence; yet it remains probable enough that he did not regard it as his task in Vienna to plead the cause of Prussian policy. At all events it is a fact that, since Klement's entrance into the service of Prince Eugene, an increased estrangement between Berlin and Vienna became apparent.

Confidence in Klement, however, did not grow in the same measure. Whether because more important and tangible information had been expected of him, or because—as some suppose—he fell under suspicion of not playing fair here either, as formerly with Rákóczy, enough that his position with Prince Eugene became insecure [1]), and, as the confidence of his patron waned, so too did the pecuniary support he had hitherto received from him. Klement therefore found himself, especially after Langelt's death, compelled, in order to save himself from the debtors' prison, to leave Vienna and seek his fortune elsewhere. He went to Holland, "where at that time," as it was said, "all the threads of politics met" [2]), and where he might therefore hope most readily to find a new field for his activity.

At first he sought, as he says, "through many moving letters" to regain the lost favour of Eugene; but as this did not succeed, he resolved, "abandoned by the Prince and deprived of all hope of softening him," to give up the imperial state and "to try his fortune at the court of Saxony." In Dresden

at that time Field Marshal Count Flemming was the leading minister, and just as Klement had formerly succeeded in Vienna in gaining a position of confidence with Prince Eugene, so now, in 1718, he achieved the same with Count Flemming. Not without self-satisfaction Klement relates how he assured the latter "that he would employ the talent bestowed on him by God for the good of the King of Poland and in the service of the Field Marshal, if they deemed him capable," and that he was well received, "especially because he knew the court of Vienna thoroughly, and could therefore communicate to the King of Poland many particulars concerning it."

He had, he says, gained Flemming's confidence particularly by being able to give him information about the Spanish project, "the arcana of Prince Eugene," and to procure secret correspondents in Vienna, for whose pay the marshal had saved his own money. Weber attests, from the Dresden archives, that the papers Klement supplied to Count Flemming—partly emanating, as alleged, from the secret chancery of Prince Eugene—filled a considerable file, and that Prussian-Brandenburg affairs were repeatedly discussed in them. Thus in one paper, entitled **Sentiments du Prince Eugene sur la situation des affaires de Sa Majesté Impériale**, dating from 1717–1718, it was set forth that Austria must above all strive to keep down the rising Brandenburg, and that if it continued "to trample upon the laws of the Empire and to mock them as usual," it should be surprised by the incursion of a strong army.

It is not the task of this account to pursue Klement's activity in Dresden more closely, especially as Weber's paper already provides ample information on that subject. For our purpose it suffices that Count Flemming, who had found in Klement a man capable of obtaining such useful intelligence in Vienna, believed he had also found in him one who could procure equally useful correspondents in Berlin. Provided with money and letters of recommendation, Klement set out thither in the summer of 1718, and, as formerly in Vienna, succeeded in enlisting several persons as correspondents for Dresden. The most important of these recruits was a certain Lehmann. He, an agent of the Weimar court, though not accredited to the Berlin court, was well versed in diplomatic and official circles—a mixture between diplomat and man of business, such as were not uncommon in those days.

A second recruit for the same service was a secretary of Field Marshal Count Wartensleben, named Bube; a third, Baron von Heidekamm, formerly a financial councillor under King Frederick I, dismissed by King Frederick

William—as he thought, unjustly—from office with a meagre pension, and now apparently eking out a living from the scanty proceeds of occasional informant's services rendered here and there; and finally a fourth, the secretary Wernicke, in the service of General von Grumbkow.

For some time the intelligence flowing from these Berlin sources had been transmitted into the Dresden channels, when Count Flemming, during a visit to Vienna—whither he had gone to negotiate an alliance between the Emperor and the King of Poland—was warned against Klement by Prince Eugene. The result was that the Saxon minister, made distrustful, kept Klement at a distance after his return from Vienna and finally cast him off entirely. Thus, by the middle of 1718, Klement found himself, as formerly in Vienna, once more in Dresden without employment and—what was worse—without means, faced almost with destitution.

He was not the man, however, to let himself be crushed by this new turn of fortune; rather, his old acquaintance with the Berlin court preacher Jablonsky and the new connections he had made in Berlin as Flemming's agent suggested to him, just as he had once exchanged Vienna for Dresden, so now to exchange Dresden for Berlin. With his accustomed caution he had retained copies of the more important papers that had passed through his hands, and, in possession of these, together with his intimate knowledge of the leading personalities at the courts of Vienna and Dresden, he could hope to find in Berlin a new stage for political activity.

He therefore did not yet sever, though they were already loosened, the still remaining threads, even when his Berlin plan had taken definite shape, but contented himself with meeting his correspondent Lehmann halfway between Berlin and Dresden, at Baruth, to discuss with him more precisely the plans soon to be carried out in Berlin. Above all, it seemed important to him to renew his old acquaintance with Jablonsky; for what he most desired was to reach the person of the King, and no one seemed to him better suited for realising this intention than the royal court and cathedral preacher. He therefore wrote to Jablonsky, asking him to deliver safely into the King's hands the enclosed letter addressed to His Majesty, "for the King's and the State's welfare and safety depend upon it."

Jablonsky hesitated to execute the commission outright, and therefore first disclosed the matter to the Privy Councillor von Marschall von Bieberstein, who was in the King's entourage; through his mediation the letter at

last reached the King's hands. Its contents appeared to him so important that he ordered Jablonsky to arrange a meeting with Klement by correspondence, and then to proceed to the appointed place in company with Minister von Knyphausen. This meeting took place on 12 September 1718 in the little town of Lübben, situated about halfway between Berlin and Dresden.

The commissioners were instructed by the King expressly to convey to Klement His Majesty's "thanks for the devotion he had shown," and at the same time to promise him, "in order to give him a real proof of this gratitude," that he should receive the 6,000 thalers he demanded for his disclosures as soon as he had fulfilled what he had promised. According to the report of Jablonsky contained in the records concerning the meeting at Lübben, he "at once, on greeting Klement, asked him whether he was still actually in the service of Prince Eugene; and when the latter boldly answered 'Yes!', he withdrew, believing he should leave the further negotiation to Herr von Knyphausen."

In the subsequent conversation with Knyphausen, Klement hinted at secrets which caused the minister to request that he come to Berlin, in order that what he had to disclose might be laid before the King himself "for further high consideration." Klement, as may be imagined, readily complied, arrived in Berlin on 13 September 1718, and lodged, in order to preserve the secrecy of his presence, at the minister's house. That the King might speak with him privately, Klement was taken the next day from Knyphausen's residence to a garden belonging to General von Linger outside the Weidendamm Gate, and there the King came, seemingly on a pleasure drive and attended only by a page and General von Forcade. The latter had to wait a full two hours before the garden while the conversation lasted. From the visible agitation with which the King re-entered his carriage, and from the almost threatening tone in which he forbade anyone to speak of his visit to the garden, it was easy to see that he had had an important encounter there and that what he had heard must have deeply shaken him.

The next day a second interview between the King and Klement took place in the same garden and under the same precautions. The secrets then revealed to the King, which for a long time remained hidden, were later brought to light by the ensuing events and, in particular, by the documents dealing with them; and since the understanding of what follows will be made easier by giving here in advance the essential, stripped-down content of what Klement confided to the King in those interviews, it shall now be

summarised.

Between the leading ministers in Vienna and Dresden, Prince Eugene and Count Flemming, Klement reported, a plan had been concerted to seize the King on a favourable occasion—most easily perhaps during a hunt at Wusterhausen—to occupy Berlin at the same time, to remove the Queen from the city, to hold the King in custody, to administer the country during his detention, and to place the Crown Prince under the guardianship of the Emperor.

Accomplices in this plot, he said, were high officials, generals, and ministers in Berlin, including persons of the King's immediate circle, among them, as the most important, Prince Leopold of Dessau and Minister von Grumbkow.

Such was the kernel of the revelation, whose shell consisted of secondary disclosures of political secrets—for example, that Count Flemming's recent journey to Vienna had been undertaken in order to facilitate the conclusion of a treaty, in firm hope of drawing the Emperor into a war with Prussia and the Czar.

However fantastic all this might appear, the name of the man who made the disclosures was known to the King from the days of Rákóczy; he knew also that Klement had for years enjoyed the confidence of Prince Eugene and now possessed that of Count Flemming. Moreover, the informant supported his statements by showing letters from Eugene, whose handwriting Frederick William believed himself to know well; and he disclosed a number of political secrets the accuracy of which the King was able from his own knowledge to verify. All this together sufficed to remove the appearance of improbability from these communications and make them seem credible. Finally—and above all—it must be remembered that the politics of that age did not exactly shrink from the use of means such as those which Klement declared to have been planned against the King. Not long before, indeed, a similar attempt at abduction had actually been made by Saxon officers against King Stanislaus, and another had even succeeded against Sobieski [1]). Why then should something similar not have been plotted against the King of Prussia?

And how great was the distrust with which the King was at that time filled toward the policy of the imperial court at Vienna is shown by a decree

he addressed on 4 October 1718 to the Prussian agent in Vienna, in which he wrote: "It is being discussed here whether His Imperial Majesty intends to occupy with His troops some of the Imperial cities of the Lower Saxon Circle, and in particular Goslar and Mühlhausen. We therefore graciously command you to inquire whether this rumour has any foundation, and if so, what the real purpose of the imperial court in this matter may be." [2])

What the King felt most keenly in Klement's revelations was the assertion that persons of his own immediate entourage—men of his unqualified confidence—were implicated in the plot against him and were even willing to act as instruments in its execution. It is therefore credible that from the day of his last interview with Klement he withdrew from everyone, even avoided his tobacco council, and treated his accustomed circle with manifest suspicion.

Klement, on the other hand, not only received the promised 6,000 thalers, but the King also conferred upon him, as an outward token of how highly he valued the information given, his order **de la Générosité** [3]).

Whether, as rumour had it, the King wished in addition to make Klement a present of a further 20,000 thalers, which the latter declined, is not recorded in the documents. Yet the rumour need not have been baseless nor merely set afloat in Klement's interest, for the refusal of such a gift might well have been calculated to strengthen belief in his disinterestedness and thereby to assure him still more of the King's confidence.

At all events, when Klement left Berlin—saying he was going to Vienna, whither important business called him, for "he was still in the Prince's secret service"—he possessed the King's confidence in the highest degree; and the latter did not doubt that from Vienna he would soon receive the papers promised as proof of his disclosures [1]).

Instead of those evidentiary letters, however, there arrived not from Vienna but from Cleves a letter from Klement to the King, stating that he was on his way to The Hague on Prince Eugene's business, and requesting that the King should send him, by a trusted messenger—preferably Jablonsky—12,000 ducats, which he needed to obtain the promised papers, said to be at that time held in custody in Holland. The Hague was, as already mentioned, then the place where all the threads of European politics converged, and it therefore seemed in itself not improbable that those political papers

might indeed be safely deposited there.

Whether the sudden demand for money caused the King an unpleasant surprise and thereby aroused his suspicion, or whether such suspicion had already lain dormant within him, he now broke the silence he had hitherto observed toward everyone and confided in that one of his ministers who stood closest to him—his "honest and faithful Ilgen," [1]) as he was wont to call him—without, however, abandoning his mistrustful attitude toward the other members of his circle.

No one had so deeply felt the weight of this mistrust as Prince Leopold. As soldier and prince alike he had reason to regard it as a humiliation, and one day, surprising the King, he addressed to him the question: by what offence he had incurred his disfavour? Pöllnitz lends the scene that is said to have taken place between the two princely gentlemen an almost dramatic character [2]): Leopold, he reports, entered the King's room unannounced; the latter, startled, grasped for his sword; whereupon Leopold, casting away his own, fell at the King's feet and implored him to say by what fault he had fallen into disfavour, declaring that he would not be treated as a prince of the Empire but as the King's subject, and offering his head as atonement if he had offended against him. The King, overcome by such devotion, embraced the prince and confessed what black suspicion had been brought against him. When the King had made this confession, the prince—supported by Ilgen's representations—succeeded in persuading him to summon Klement to Berlin, for there it would be possible to expose him as an impostor.

The request sent from Cleves to the King, that 12,000 ducats should, if possible through Jablonsky, be forwarded to him in Amsterdam, was seized upon as a pretext for putting this plan into effect. In a detailed report Ilgen set forth all the particulars of the procedure to be followed; and after the King had approved these by a marginal note [1]), Jablonsky was instructed to write to Klement that, by order of the King—who was at that moment away on a journey—he would come with Marschall to Amsterdam, where the requested 10,000 ducats would be paid to him, but that the promised papers were in return expected to be communicated.

Ilgen drew up for Marschall a set of instructions comprising twenty-four paragraphs, according to which he was to act; Jablonsky, however, was not to be made aware of them. These directed that Klement should, if possible by persuasion, be induced to come to Berlin; if this could not be achieved,

the Dutch authorities were to be requested to lend Marschall a strong hand for his arrest and for the seizure of his papers.

The King had expressed his approval of these instructions, which had been submitted to him for examination, with the limitation: "This is all right and good, except that they themselves are to use every possible means to get Klement within the Cleves frontier; as soon as he arrives, let his papers be securely kept and see him placed in a comfortable carriage, and with a good officer escort him from garrison to garrison to Potsdam—this is my express will. F. W."

Paragraph 7 of the instructions contained for Marschall—though likewise to be concealed from Jablonsky—the direction that, on reaching the Dutch frontier, he was to pretend to be indisposed and unable to continue the journey; Jablonsky was then to go on alone to Amsterdam and try to persuade Klement to come to Emmerich, where Marschall had remained behind; there he would receive the promised 10,000 ducats. Accordingly Marschall, feigning an attack of colic, actually stayed behind in Emmerich. [1])

Jablonsky proceeded from Emmerich to Amsterdam, where Klement was staying under the name von Neuendorff. When Jablonsky delivered his message, Klement showed little inclination to comply, indeed expressed his distrust of the whole affair in the words: "Either you are deceiving me, or Marschall is deceiving you, or the court is deceiving you both! But I shall henceforth look to my own safety."

This seemed to him little assured if he were to cross the Prussian frontier as invited, and he therefore refused to follow Jablonsky to Emmerich. Marschall, left behind there, had no choice but himself to go to Amsterdam and attempt to carry out the extreme measure authorised to him—to arrest Klement with the help of the Dutch authorities. This succeeded beyond expectation.

While Klement was conversing with Jablonsky—who, as already noted, was ignorant of all that had been arranged behind his back between the minister and Marschall in Berlin—the Schout entered the room with two court officers, arrested the "von Neuendorff," and took him to the town hall into custody. There Jablonsky, more astonished by the evening's event than Klement himself, visited him next day and implored him as a true friend to confess whether even a single document relating to the alleged abduction

and correspondence was genuine; whereupon Klement, deeply moved, lifted his eyes to heaven, tears running down his face, and said: "As truly as God lives in heaven, so truly is what I have spoken of this matter true."

Jablonsky then remarked that he could therefore with all the more confidence go to Berlin, since he was after all resolved to break with Prince Eugene. Klement had indeed already said so more than once; and when Jablonsky had asked why he wished to leave the service of so generous a prince, he had answered: "Not all the Prince's servants are happy; the most secret are the most unhappy, for their final reward is often a dagger or an Italian soup. A year ago my intimate friend Hohendorff warned me; I know too much of Prince Eugene's secrets to die a natural death."

Von Marschall, who also visited the prisoner and found him, as might be expected, depressed, succeeded in convincing him that he could do no better than accompany them to Berlin—especially as, if he would indicate the means by which the correspondents might be discovered, he would not only certainly receive the 10,000 ducats, but would be assured of the King's protection and grace, and would be granted an estate in Prussia for his retirement. Klement accordingly considered it wisest to comply and to show no sign of distrust, but so to demean himself that it should seem as if nothing had occurred between his departure and return to Berlin. There he did indeed by this display of confidence succeed in winning back the King's trust so far that he was granted permission to go once more to The Hague to obtain the still-missing written proofs.

Klement used the stratagem, as one place in the records states, "to request a Prussian officer as his companion, in order through him to send the originals of the papers to His Majesty." To this ruse was opposed another—devised chiefly at Prince Leopold's instigation—that the officer assigned to accompany him, Major du Moulin, received secret orders that, should he perceive Klement not to be in earnest about his promise or to attempt to escape his escort, he was to secure his person. Du Moulin considered the moment come when Klement, whom he had followed to Holland and kept under constant observation for four weeks, suddenly wished to return to Cleves to fetch papers he said he had forgotten at The Hague. Du Moulin objected to this return, and Klement judged it prudent not to insist, but to submit apparently without concern to continuing the journey to Berlin.

There he again took lodging with the Privy Councillor von Marschall (30

November 1718), and from that moment—formerly a man highly favoured by the King—he became the object of Prussian criminal justice.

It was a peculiar coincidence that only a few days before the commencement of the trial against him, the reforms which the King had considered necessary for the improvement of criminal justice in his realm had been completed. In July 1717 the Criminal Code drafted by the Criminal Councillor Berger—of the University of Frankfurt, a pupil of Brunnemann—and reviewed by the General Auditor Katsch and the General Fiscal Durham, had been introduced. The procedure adopted was the inquisitorial one. In connection therewith the limits of the sovereign's right of confirmation in serious criminal cases were defined and extended, and particularly the King's right to mitigate or to aggravate punishment was emphasised.

Two "Criminal Colleges" were then established: one for criminal cases arising from civil courts, the other for those originating in military courts and for the jurisdiction previously exercised by the Housevogtei in Berlin. To the latter college there was appointed—in June 1718, half a year before the period we are now concerned with—the former General Auditor Katsch, who was at the same time promoted to be Privy Councillor of War and State Minister for Criminal Matters [1]).

He was—so runs the entry in the investigatory records against Klement—summoned to the palace, where "partly in person and partly through Ilgen it was communicated to him what an important matter was in hand, of which he was to take information and proceed therein, but in the strictest secrecy."

To prepare him for this commission he was administered by Minister von Ilgen, in the King's presence, a "solemn oath," after which Klement was brought in "from an adjoining room into the Privy Council chamber." Here the King first spoke with him alone in the presence of Ilgen and Marschall, while Prince Leopold and Katsch "stood somewhat aside," although, as Katsch naïvely adds, "since most of the conversation was in French he would in any case have understood little of it." Presently the King called them both up, and "spoke back and forth with Klement on various matters," especially about letters from von Grumbkow. The King had various papers brought, including some in Grumbkow's hand, that Klement might point out which were his; but Klement could not identify them. Meanwhile, it is said, "Klement persisted and steadfastly maintained that he had seen letters

from Grumbkow and from Privy Councillor von Alvensleben [1]) relating to the denounced plot to abduct His Majesty's most sacred person."

After this first interrogation held by the King himself, Klement had to return to von Marschall's house, where he was kept under guard by General von Forcade and the necessary men. There he underwent further examinations before Katsch, concerned mainly with his origin, his relations with Eugene and Count Flemming, and his motives for the disclosures made to His Majesty; but nothing essential came to light that was not already known from the previous account.

The next day he was taken to the fortress of Spandau. However carefully all that had occurred so far had been shrouded in secrecy, the arrest of a foreigner in von Marschall's house and his transfer to Spandau soon became known and gave rise in the city to the wildest rumours [1]). The Austrian envoy von Voß reported to the Emperor: "It is believed that the person brought into Spandau is the Duke of Courland, or at least some other high prince, for the King has sent for his use an entire silver service and ordered that he be treated in princely fashion." Another diplomat, the Hanoverian resident Heusch, reported to his court in London: "The King has ordered that the governor, General von Schwendi, shall dine with the (unknown) prisoner alone, who, it is said, is very well served, even on silver."

This "great mystery," as another diplomatic report called it, seems to have greatly troubled the diplomatic corps, until at last the mysterious unknown revealed himself to be the simple Hungarian named Klement. In the first interrogation conducted at the fortress by Katsch and Minister von Knyphausen, they assured him in the King's name of "all royal grace and protection," and impressed upon him "how he could of himself perceive that his former information concerning His Majesty's most sacred person, life and safety, the welfare of His States, and the preservation of His treasure was of such importance that the King would spare no cost, even if he had to spend his whole treasury, to bring out certainty and truth." If he would tell the honest truth, he might count on the King's protection; if he could bring to light the plot and the projected treason, even though he himself were implicated in it, yet as the first informer he might confidently rely on royal grace.

Klement heard these admonitions "tranquilly" and everywhere gave the most precise answers to the questions put to him. To the inquiry who were the Emperor's secret correspondents in Berlin and whether he would "declare

their names," he replied: "Alvensleben, Grumbkow, Dohna, Mardefeld, von Marschall, Cocceji, Derschau, Sturm, Achenbach, Runkel, Danckelman, Lottum"—as many as occurred to him.

To a further question, "how, and by whom, the design to abduct His Majesty the King together with the treasury had been concerted," he answered: "Almost daily I spoke of it with Count Flemming, who, when His Majesty made his Prussian journey, said that he was sorry the coup had not then been made and the King carried off in passing through Poland." To Prince Eugene, he said, the same thing had been remarked, "that the abduction would have been very easy to carry out."

On urgent demand "whether he could and would maintain this," he affirmed: "Yes! that is true and clear. Count Flemming has often named to me von Grumbkow and Alvensleben" as accomplices; "both," he added, "had plotted and corresponded directly with Prince Eugene."

To the admittedly insidious question [1]): "whether he himself was not the one engaged for the execution of the design," he replied promptly: "My commission was to concur by counsel, not by assistance."

In a further examination (9 December 1718) he was confronted with the objection that it seemed incredible that ministers who enjoyed so much of the King's favour could be capable of plotting such things—treason and abduction. He declared: "As a Christian who has well learned his religion, all that I have stated is true. Prince Eugene showed me and let me read original letters of Herr von Grumbkow."

The interrogations conducted at Spandau were read aloud in Berlin to the King by Katsch—whenever His Majesty had not attended them in person—so that he was kept daily informed of the progress of the investigation. The proceedings at length appear to have yielded him results of such plausibility that he deemed the time come to go openly to the Prince with the matter. A few weeks earlier he had already sent Minister von Knyphausen to Vienna with the confidential[1]) commission to sound the Prince cautiously and give him to understand what suspicions had been raised against him in Berlin[2]). The Prince had not understood those hints—or rather, had not wished to understand them—and Knyphausen had returned to Berlin with nothing accomplished. Now that judicially recorded statements lay before him, the King believed he had firmer ground beneath his feet, and in that

conviction he addressed a letter[3]) to the Prince, in which, without any circumlocution, he declared to him that Klement, his former confidant, affirmed upon solemn oaths that the Prince had had the plan to seize him, the King, and that this plan—for which he had won over generals, ministers, and other officers in the King's service—would assuredly have been carried out had the said Klement not been smitten by conscience and therefore disclosed everything.

In the further course of the letter the King does indeed add that he is far from lending credence to these statements, since he cannot suppose that His Imperial and Catholic Majesty could be capable of such a course of action against him, any more than he can believe that the Prince would have consented to an enterprise unworthy alike of his birth and of the great name he has won in the world; the Prince should nevertheless not take it amiss if he addresses himself directly to him in order to obtain clarity in the matter.

Eugene felt himself most deeply embarrassed by this letter from the King and replied, under date of 14 January 1719, with the simple intimation that "he had delivered the letter to his Imperial master, who had most graciously resolved to cause it to be duly communicated, through his imperial councillor and resident at the court of Berlin, Vossius, in what manner such an occurrence was to be regarded and considered. He must therefore, in obedience to such imperial direction, await what His Imperial and Catholic Majesty should be pleased to do or forbear to do, both in the matter itself and for the vindication of his honour and satisfaction."

This reply—though signed, as was fitting, with "your most humble and obedient, Eugenio v. Savoy"—amounted to nothing other than that the Prince deemed it incompatible with his dignity to justify himself against such a charge and therefore left it to his lord and Emperor to procure him satisfaction for it.

He was even less restrained in his conversations with the Prussian envoy. Burchard reports: "The Prince is piqued that Klement's knavish trick has found so much belief with His Majesty that he has sent him such an ambiguous letter, wherein it is not dimly rubbed under his nose as though he were suspected as a voleur du grand chemin, treated therein as an empoisoneur and chef de bandits." [1])

And he gave full vent to his displeasure against Count Flemming. "God's

death," he said to him, "I am no king, but upon my faith, there is no king to whom I yield in nobility of sentiment and honour! I am not the man to undertake anything otherwise than at the head of an army and by order of my Emperor." [1])

To his earlier letter to the King the Prince had indeed added a second, under date of 28 December 1718, couched in less harsh terms than the first, yet still containing the following purport: "... For although I am but a private person, yet I am of such blood and temper that I in no wise yield, even to a king, in the true glory and honour toward which I have ever striven by the right path."

And as the Prince felt, so too did his master, the Emperor, regard the affront offered to his highest dignitary as an injury to himself[2]); and the reports of the Prussian envoy from that time are full of complaints about the painful situation in which he found himself. The Emperor thought "he might demand reparation for the King's having been willing to give some credence to such a false charge," and the envoy did not scruple most urgently to recommend that such reparation be granted. The Viennese court, Burchard reported, would consider as the best "reparation" if Klement—who after all was "a Hungarian subject"—were delivered up by Prussia, since he had sinned not so much against the Prussian majesty as against the Emperor.

To this demand, however, the King could least of all accede, if he was not to be untrue to the promise he had given Klement in writing, "that he should never be delivered up to Austria." [3]) The Austrian government was therefore offered, instead of the desired extradition, that the Austrian resident at the Berlin court, von Voß, should be admitted to the examinations conducted at the fortress with Klement, that he might satisfy himself with what loyalty the proceedings were conducted; he should further be free to submit any applications he might deem necessary in the interest of his court for the conduct of the investigation. Moreover, the King not only wrote a conciliatory letter to Eugene[1]), but also sent General von Borcke—who stood in his special confidence—expressly to Vienna with instructions to deliver explanatory and smoothing statements, in order to restore the good understanding which had been unfortunately disturbed by the letter to the Prince.

After this international excursus—somewhat anticipated in time—we may return to our proper task: the account of the trial.

As late as 5 December 1718 Klement, in reply to eighty-three questions put to him concerning the planned seizure of the King, the removal of the treasury, and the entry of Saxon soldiers into the capital of Prussia, as well as the accomplices and helpers of the plot at the King's court, had maintained his former statements, and persisted that everything he had hitherto alleged on those points was true; that the letters he had produced were genuine and in the hand of Prince Eugene and had been written to the co-plotters in Berlin—Leopold of Dessau, Grumbkow, and the others.

Then suddenly, seven days later, he addressed from his prison a letter to the King in which he retracted everything he had previously alleged against the King's servants and branded it as maliciously invented lies. "God," he wrote, "has granted me the grace to recognise His heavy hand lying upon me and to reflect upon eternity and the unsearchable ways of divine providence and the inconstancy of things in this world. ... And since I cannot, nor do I desire, to live after such an intrigue, I wholly and entirely submit myself to what Your Majesty may be pleased to decree, humbly beseeching you not to abandon me to Your Majesty's justice rather than to Your Majesty's righteous cause."

The letter was accompanied by a narrative which, in effect, constituted a recantation of all that he had hitherto alleged against the Prussian confidants of the King and a confession of his own guilt. The King referred both documents to Katsch, and on the following day the latter, together with Minister von Knyphausen, held an examination at the fortress, taking the contents of those papers as the basis.

In this interrogation the accused first gave for the record an account of his previous life—what services he had rendered to Rákóczy; how, after leaving him, he "came into the confidence of Prince Eugene," then fell into his disfavour because, instead of forwarding a correspondence to the Prince in the field, he "delivered it to the Emperor himself"; how thereby he came into distress, went to Dresden, gained the confidence of Count Flemming, and, at the latter's request, recruited secret correspondents in Vienna. He had then received the commission to recruit similar correspondents in Berlin and had found such persons in the Weimar resident Lehmann, in the secretary of Field Marshal von Wartensleben, named Bube, and in a certain von Heidekamm. The plan to "abduct" the King had emanated from Flemming and had been proposed in Vienna; for in Vienna as in Dresden there had been a suspicion that the King of Prussia had concluded an alliance with the

King of Sweden and the Czar of Russia, aimed against the German Emperor, against the King of Poland as Elector of Saxony, and finally against the King of England as Elector of Hanover; this was to be forestalled by the seizure of the King and the occupation of his lands.

That he had taken part in these intrigues against the King he confessed with expressions of deep remorse: "I cannot live any longer; I have deserved death."

However contrite Klement thus showed himself in his confession, and however earnestly he assured them that he had now told the pure truth, so many riddles remained to the King that he resolved once more to take part in person in the further proceedings. Accordingly we see him, on the morning of 17 December, already at the fortress, not only present at the new interrogation but repeatedly intervening directly with questions and exhortations—so to speak himself taking the part of inquisitor.

To the first question put to Klement—"whether he maintained that Count Flemming had projected the abduction of His Royal Majesty's person and treasury"—he replied with the asseveration: "I will die upon it; I maintain that Count Flemming has corresponded with Prince Eugene about such a project." The latter had been prepared to go so far with the design "if Hanover and Saxony would execute it," whereupon Flemming had undertaken to negotiate their assent.

When he was thereupon once more exhorted in conscience, he suddenly broke off and—greatly to the King's surprise—declared that the letters which he had hitherto produced as written by the hand of Prince Eugene had been written by himself; he could imitate the Prince's handwriting to a deceptive degree and had composed the letters upon that skill.

With this confession he confirmed a remark which the Prince had once made in conversation with the Prussian envoy: that the handwriting in the letters so closely resembled his own that he might himself believe he had written them; in general, "the rogue could almost make him believe there must be something in his allegation, he presented the matter in so plausible a fashion in many points."

This sudden and striking change in Klement's statements only made the King the more distrustful of what he advanced, and at the end of the

examination he ordered that "the inquisitus should be put under close confinement," for he had evidently not yet told the whole truth. The King was so intent upon the continuation of the examination that he would not defer it to the following day and therefore "took his meals" at the fortress. In the afternoon the broken-off interrogation was resumed, and Klement was reminded that, even if he now confessed to having himself fabricated the supposed letters of Prince Eugene, he nevertheless continued to maintain that there had been a plan to abduct the King; he was therefore now to state what, in fact, had been intended by that alleged abduction. He asked leave, in order to express himself with greater exactness, to answer in French, and declared in that language that the plan had by no means aimed at depriving the King for ever of any one of his dominions[1]); the intention rather had been to avert the harm which, through the King's evil counsels, threatened the Empire; for that purpose he was to be placed under the Emperor's guardianship; and Count Flemming had always stated only this as the purpose of the abduction; yet even to this Prince Eugene had been unwilling to agree, since it might entail too grave consequences; the Emperor could tolerate it if the King of Poland, as Elector of Saxony, would come to an understanding about it with the court of Hanover[2]).

The intention thus suddenly to make Prince Eugene appear entirely uninvolved and to shift the guilt solely to the Saxon minister was so obvious that the King thought to divert him from this line by earnestly exhorting the inquisitus "not further to provoke God, the great Judge on earth and in heaven; he was a child of death, as he knew himself to be, and his death sentence had been pronounced"!

Even to this admonition—which was little in keeping with the prescriptions of the criminal code—Klement adhered, saying that he had nothing further to confess than what he had already acknowledged; and the King, angered at the supposed stubbornness of the accused, left the fortress in the evening. Scarcely had this happened when Klement sent word to the commandant, asking leave to compose in his cell a written memorandum—if need be under an officer's supervision—in which he would reveal to the King the whole truth.

Leave was readily granted, and in a memorandum of fifty-two folio pages Klement repeated in part statements already known to us about his person and his diplomatic activity—especially that which he had undertaken in the service of Eugene and Count Flemming—and then anew confessed that the

accusations he had brought against others, especially the King's servants, had been falsely invented by him. On the basis of this memorandum a fresh interrogation was held on 4 January 1719 in the King's presence, in which His Majesty himself repeatedly put the questions; and Klement now came forward with the surprising confession that the entire story of the abduction had been his own malicious invention (Art. 10). Thus Count Flemming too was now exculpated. Pöllnitz[1]) and with him other writers—even Arneth[2])—relate that Klement was driven to his confession by fear of torture, the instruments of which had been laid out before him. In the records there is no support for the truth of this tale. They do show that, at the close of one interrogation held in the King's presence, the inquisitor once threatened him that, if he did not freely confess the truth, he would henceforth be dealt with "as a criminal"; nowhere, however, is there any indication that the executioner was sent for, that the instruments of torture were displayed before him, and that, overwhelmed by the sight, Klement fell at the King's feet and made a confession.

According to the records, everything proceeded far more simply. The admonitions that came from the King evidently made a greater impression upon the accused than the professional exhortations of the regular interrogators; psychologically it is understandable that he allowed himself to be moved by the former rather than by the latter to make a confession—or (what seems more probable) that he hoped by a confession elicited by the King himself the more readily to win His Majesty's grace.

In any event, by these confessions the earlier suspicions against Prince Eugene and the policy of the imperial court were laid to rest; and the previously given promise could now be fulfilled without prejudice to the administration of justice on this side: to admit the Austrian envoy to Klement's interrogation. To this end the inquisitor drew up 492 articles and communicated the draft to the envoy that he might enter his monita upon them. The observations made were, as the protocol says, "duly observed in the proper place," and were then taken as the basis of the examinations held in the envoy's presence. The King did not attend these later interrogations.

The result of the protocols—which extend in wearisome breadth and are well-nigh crushed under a mass of unnecessary matter—is that Klement there renewed his confession that the accusations brought against Prince Eugene were untrue and invented by himself; likewise, that the letters which he had produced as written by the Prince had been fabricated by him. In these

forgeries—he must persist in saying—Lehmann, Bube, and Heidekamm had taken part as his accomplices. That he had drawn so many high Prussian dignitaries into his accusations had been done in order to enhance the value of his statements in the King's eyes and "thereby to earn so much the larger sum of money."

One point from these examinations deserves to be noted: among the questions drafted and previously communicated to the Austrian envoy there had been one asking whether it was true that Count Flemming, on his journey to Vienna, had taken 75,000 ducats with him "in the hope of drawing the Emperor into a war with Prussia and the Czar"; and the Austrian envoy had requested that this question be struck out. The monitum was "duly observed in the proper place," which naturally had the consequence that, where no question was put, no answer needed to be given.

The examinations, continued over the course of months, were at length closed with the form of the litis contestatio[1]) modelled on contemporary civil procedure. In this Klement—although in an autograph writing of 187 folios he had once more confessed all his misdeeds—had nevertheless to answer two thousand four hundred and forty-two questions, and in so-called "additional articles" to supplement his answers in scarcely less compass!

In fairness, the final conclusion of the whole proceedings and the delivery of the judgment might now have been expected. But neither yet followed; for the King had demanded that the sentence against Klement should be pronounced simultaneously with that against his accomplices, Lehmann and von Heidekamm. Factual and legal obstacles, however, stood in the way of the execution of this royal will.

Lehmann, namely, on the day Klement was arrested, had contrived to evade Prussian criminal jurisdiction by flight and had made his way safely to Dresden. The Prussian government demanded his extradition thence by diplomatic means, since, as the King caused it to be stated, "so long as this man has not been brought hither, confronted with Klement, and in this manner all thoroughly sifted, there remains a great scruple both in the Emperor's mind and in Ours."

But the Elector of Saxony refused to comply with Prussia's demand, especially as, in the Klement affair, special cause for complaint had been given him; he must first receive "proportionate and striking satisfaction" for the

wrong done before he could consent to Lehmann's extradition.

This demand of the Elector was based on the following incident. Among the persons with whom Klement had associated in Berlin was the Polish-Saxon resident Wilhelmi, a diplomat duly accredited at the Prussian court. At the very moment of Klement's arrest there had, in the first heat, been carried out at that Wilhelmi's house a search; the cupboards had been forced and the papers found therein—belonging to the diplomat, who at that instant was out of his house at a gathering at the Austrian envoy's—had been seized and removed. The occurrence naturally caused the most painful sensation among all the diplomats accredited at Berlin[1]), and the Saxon court raised loud complaint. The correspondence upon this subject between King Frederick William and Augustus the Strong—conducted in part from person to person—fills a large dossier and is at times couched in terms as though the formal rupture of diplomatic relations between Prussia and Saxony were imminent. In the end nothing remained to the King of Prussia, whose agents had acted precipitately, but to offer a formal apology. Thulemeier[1]) was—so ordered the King—"to make his compliments to Wilhelmi and say it had been done in haste." In this form the required personal satisfaction was tendered to him, while the Saxon court received in writing the demanded "proportionate satisfaction." "I am," wrote King Augustus to King Frederick William after this had been done, "persuaded that the misunderstanding which has lasted so many months will now give place to a correspondingly closer harmony."

The cost of this restored harmony had to be paid by Lehmann. He was extradited and, in April 1719, brought as a prisoner to the fortress of Spandau.

There, confronted with Klement, he admitted as true everything that the latter had stated concerning his dealings with him, and in particular his participation in the forgery of the letters. The last of the confrontational examinations with both men comprises 276 articles and closes with the inquisitor's note "that, after the conclusion of the examination, the two, Klement and Lehmann, were reconciled with one another, in such wise that the former begged the latter's forgiveness if he had had to press him in this matter; to which Lehmann replied that he, in turn, heartily forgave him." In conclusion, the latter begged that His Majesty would spare his life, since he had not at the outset considered the matter in its true light and had not profited thereby, but had rather suffered loss.[1])

Just as the Austrian envoy had attended Klement's interrogation, so Resident Wilhelmi was present at Lehmann's interrogation, which was to count as a continuation of the verbal satisfaction accorded him for the wrong done him by the house-search. At the same time the electoral court was thereby also to be given proof of how well-founded the demand for extradition had in itself been.

After the conclusion of the investigative proceedings there would, according to the concepts of our modern criminal process, have had to follow a stage for the defence, all the more since the Criminal Ordinance of 8 July 1717 prescribed such a stage (Chap. 6 § 3). In the voluminous files, however, there are no actual defence writings in the sense of our present procedure, and it seems to have been thought that the countless letters and memoranda which Klement addressed from prison partly to the King himself and partly to the commission of inquiry might be allowed to count as such.

The director and councillors appointed to the Criminal College, together with "the commissioners named for these matters," [1]) on 19 January 1820 delivered their judgment against Johann Michael von Clement, convicted of the crime of lèse-majesté and other grave offences committed along with it, that he, because of the enormous crimes committed, should be led to his well-deserved punishment—for the example and abhorrence of others— to the place of execution on a knacker's cart, along the way to be pinched twice in the arm at two different places in the city with a glowing pair of tongs, and thereafter to be brought by the rope from life to death.

On sixteen pages the grounds of judgment are set out under ten numbers and essentially amount to the following: "The inquisitus has, by his own confession, issued a forged letter of Prince Eugene dated 29 July 1718, in which Prussian ministers are attacked as unfaithful men and His Royal Majesty's most sacred person is not spared, as though this letter had been written by the Prince; further, he has falsely stated that Count Flemming devised a project for the abduction of the King and the administration of his lands, communicated it to Prince Eugene for approval, and won helpers to execute the plan from among the King's servants."

From these admitted facts the judgment infers that the accused thereby not only committed blasphemous offences against His Imperial Majesty as head of the whole German Roman Empire and his territorial lord, but also against His Royal Majesty of Poland and Electoral Serene Highness of Sax-

ony, utpote electorem imperii; above all, however, that the accused has directed treasonous designs against His Royal Majesty in Prussia's sacred person; and no less that the accused has most criminally insulted His Serene Highness Prince Eugene by counterfeiting his hand, and has falsely accused various of the most eminent royal ministers and servants here of treason against the country." For all these "enormous crimes" no punishment other than death could be imposed.

The other judgment, against Lehmann, is somewhat shorter. In it he is found guilty "of the committed offence of impaired majesty and treasonous designs against the country," and it is ordered that, "after he has been pinched twice in the arm with a glowing pair of tongs, his head shall be struck off, his body quartered, and the parts affixed to the gallows." In the reasons it is emphasised as an aggravating circumstance that the accused was a born subject of the King—he came from Halle—whereas as a mitigating factor it is noted that the whole plan for abducting the King had been one invented by Klement and thus "the accused had undertaken nothing therein that properly belonged to him as an act."

Departing from the grounds in the decision against Klement, which cite no statute, Article 124 [1]) of the Carolina of Charles V is invoked in this judgment, plainly to motivate why the quartering was to be carried out only upon the corpse and not upon the living body, since only a milder case of treason was present.

Execution of the death sentences, which had been confirmed by the King, was delayed because a pledge had been given to the Viennese court that the judgment against Klement would be communicated to the Emperor so that he might present any "observations" he might have in the matter.

The communication had been made; but when the Austrian court gave no answer for six weeks, the King ordered on 16 March 1720 that "the sentences pronounced against the accused, and furnished with our most gracious confirmation in our own hand, shall be publicly executed here in Berlin on 18 April." [2])

According to the custom of the time, condemned criminals were informed of the day of their impending execution nearly a week in advance, and so it happened here. Klement used the interval to address a long letter—apparently to von Marschall—in which he sketched the contents of a

speech he intended to deliver from the scaffold "to the assembled people," should the circumstances and the state of his soul allow it. "Au cas que les circonstances et la situation de mon âme, qui dépendent des mouvemens divins de mon âme, me le permettront." [3])

The act of execution took place, as the King had ordered, on 18 April 1720. Klement delivered his speech from the scaffold "to the assembled people" and died, as the court protocol has it, "with great demonstration of devotion, until his breath failed."

Minister von Podewils says in his report—mentioned at the outset—to Frederick the Great: "Klement died with the calm of a philosopher and the firmness of a hero," but prudently adds, "if indeed it is permitted to apply these designations to him." The limitation thus made is not superfluous; for it would seem that his firmness on the scaffold, and the wish from thence to deliver his long, carefully prepared speech, are to be traced less to philosophical equanimity than to his having held fast, to the last moment, the hope that the King would yet—on the scaffold itself—cause to be announced to him the grace repeatedly promised during the investigation.

That the King had been almost inclined to this, and had only to abandon the thought because the courts of Vienna and Dresden, and Prince Eugene as well, demanded the execution, is attested by Podewils and narrated at greater length by Pöllnitz, allegedly on the strength of words heard from the King's own mouth. If Förster has the King take leave of Klement at the fortress of Spandau with the words: "Could I save you, I would straightway make you a Privy Councillor; as it is, I must have you hanged," [1]) one may well doubt that the King spoke such words; but it is established by the records that the said courts did in fact describe Klement's execution as a satisfaction that ought not to be withheld from them. [2])

Together with Klement and Lehmann, Baron von Heidekamm was brought from the fortress of Spandau to the place of execution, in order that upon him—though not the death penalty—the symbolic punishment of dishonouring by the executioner should be carried out.

This man has hitherto been mentioned only briefly (p. 395); now, however, the time has come to consider in more detail his person and the manner in which he became entangled in this trial. Klement, as noted above, had recruited him as a correspondent, and the investigation then initiated against

him took its starting-point from the accusation that, for payment, he had allowed himself to supply Klement with secrets of a dangerous nature; it soon, however, took the turn that the betrayal of political secrets receded behind the further accusation that he had used insulting speech about the King and the ministers, and had also besmirched the memory of the King's deceased mother with abusive talk.

The King's indignation—particularly at the latter—was great, and to make sure whether the man accused of such a misdeed had indeed uttered those abusive speeches, he was present at the first interrogation himself. To the question put to the accused whether he had not spoken disparagingly of the King and the ministers, he admitted that he had said to Lehmann and Bube that "the ministers did not understand their business"; he had also complained that for the services he had once rendered the King at Stralsund [1]) he received no more than the meagre recompense of a monthly allowance of 15 thalers, "on which he could not live."

He further admitted to having said that if one wanted anything from His Majesty one had to produce—or buy—a grenadier. On the other hand, even after he had been transferred to Spandau, he persisted in saying that he had never spoken disrespectfully of the King's mother or defamed her memory.

On 15 July the King—who had gone over to Spandau expressly for this purpose—had him brought in, addressed him—"very much exhorted to tell the truth," as the protocol of 15 July 1719 puts it—and obtained at least so much of an admission concerning the alleged speeches against the late mother that Heidekamm conceded that years before he had once been present at a conversation in which a certain Frau von Lingern, since deceased, had uttered defamatory talk about the late Queen, and that "from the above discourse he had possibly repeated this to Bube, in whom he suspected no ill."

That was a half-confession, from which the General Fiscal hoped to extract a whole one. Despite all the efforts of the commission of inquiry, however, Heidekamm persisted that he had nothing more to confess than what he had already said—"even if he were to be torn to pieces by ten horses."

They therefore proceeded to threaten the accused with torture. The protocol of 20 July offers a vivid—but equally repellent—picture of the manner in which the criminal process of those days believed itself entitled to apply this its last means of discovering the truth. The accused was first, according

to the protocol, led past the torture-chamber "that he might see the arrangements therein" and make his "reflection"; then, when this reflection led to no confession, a few hours later the executioner was brought in "that he might lay before him all the instruments belonging to the painful procedure and thereby frighten him."

When even this intimidation bore no fruit, the accused was, again a few hours later, questioned "in loco torturae" whether he would now confess; and when he persisted in his assertion that he had nothing to confess, "the retired executioner was called in again, that he might once more lay his instruments before the accused, take off his coat, and begin the torture."

"The executioner," says the protocol, "showed him the thumb-screw and was about to apply it." Then he was stayed, and "the accused was exhorted that he should not let it come to the beginning of martyrdom; he would be given much time to consider, but he might be sure that if he did not lay himself to the confession of the truth, what had now only been shown to him would unfailingly be carried out."

According to the records, the threatened procedure did not come to execution, and one has the impression that from the outset it was not seriously intended that it should, the inquisitor rather hoping, by arrangements for torture enacted before the accused's eyes, to frighten him and bring him to a confession. Moreover, it appears that what the records here report about the procedure employed against Heidekamm has been mistakenly transferred by Pöllnitz and others to the proceedings against Klement (p. 416).

When, even by the terrifying expedient of torture, no further confessions could be wrung from him beyond those already given, the commission of inquiry considered the files ripe for the pronouncement of judgment and handed them over to the Criminal College appointed by the King and reinforced by commissioners. The sentence proposed by that body went to the effect "that the accused, because of his divulgation and repetition of the statements, should indeed be spared the death penalty, but be condemned to close fortress arrest for life."

In the report seeking confirmation from the King, the commission motivated its proposal that no public punishment of the accused should take place by the consideration that it "feared that thereby opportunity would be afforded to inquire into the precise nature of the defamation of His Royal

Majesty's most holy person, which must be kept most carefully secret."

On the report submitted by Minister Katsch of 13 December 1719 the King refused the recommended confirmation of the judgment [1]). For it displeased him that to the condemned man— to use a concept borrowed from modern law—civil honours should be left, and that he should not rather be deprived of honour before entering upon his punishment.

The proposed sentence of lifelong deprivation of liberty was therefore confirmed with the addition "that the accused is to be declared infamous and dishonourable by the executioner, and proclaimed such; thereafter he is to receive a pair of slaps and several strokes with rods—without undressing—and that he is to be kept in prison for life."

On the day of this procedure, to be carried out upon the scaffold, Heidekamm—who, "by reason of his weakness," as the protocol has it, had to be carried to the scaffold on a sick-chair by "four street-masters"—was declared infamous and dishonourable by the executioner, received two slaps on the face, was struck twice with rods upon the back, and was then driven back to Spandau for perpetual imprisonment in the executioner's cart in the company of a knacker's assistant.

According to Pöllnitz's account he is said to have spent some years there "apparently quite content with his lot"; according to a remark found in the records—though quite lost in the files—it seems that he was transferred from Spandau to Peitz and died there.

The secretary Bube, so often mentioned by the accused in his interrogations, was, at the time when Klement was recruiting correspondents in Berlin, a secretary in the service of Field Marshal von Wartensleben. In that position he had frequent opportunity to spy out all kinds of important news in the house and in the chancelleries, to extract here and there something from the files, and to pass on what he had thus collected to Lehmann or sometimes directly to his employer Klement. Among the various services he had rendered in this way was also that he had, through Secretary Wernicke, helped him to the possession of a plan of the city of Berlin, which was to be used for the alleged planned surprise; he had also taken part in the oft-mentioned meeting at Baruth.

When action was taken against Klement, steps were taken at the same

time against this correspondent of his, though it was for the present deemed sufficient to place him under house arrest. Bube—conscious of his misdeeds—broke this arrest and, disguised as a woman, attempted to flee the city; he was recognised, seized, and delivered to the Hausvogtei.

There, in the interrogations first conducted with him, he had to answer several hundred questions; he confessed therein the criminal dealings with Lehmann laid to his charge, and was transferred to Spandau for continuation of the proceedings.

There he fell ill in the night of 13 to 14 July, and that so dangerously that the commandant of the fortress, General von Schwendi, considered himself obliged to inform the King by special courier that "the prisoner lay in great confusion," and a few hours later that "he had died in the presence of the summoned Minister von Ilgen and the other councillors."

The king ordered in his own hand upon this report: "To Katsch: have him opened and thereafter brought to Berlin on the knacker's cart, where he is to be laid on the wheel tomorrow. Wilhelm. The scoundrel has taken poison"; and at the same time the king wrote to Prince Leopold in Dessau: "God knows whether the villain hasn't taken poison... The Klement affair is as curious as anything one has ever heard in one's life... This much I can say: no great man was in on it—there were only the small-time scoundrels." 1) This latter remark was meant, it would seem, as a renewed apology for the grave suspicion once harbored against the prince himself.

The autopsy of the corpse ordered by the king provided no basis for the suspicion that Bube had died of poison; rather, the physicians declared that he had died of apoplexy (stroke). 2)

The punitive justice from which the living man had escaped by death was nevertheless to be executed upon the corpse, and in fact was carried out on it, just as the king had commanded in his order of July 14, 1719—countersigned by Katsch and addressed to the court councillor Lonicer, head of the Hausvogtei—according to which the execution took place on July 15.

The women's clothing with which Bube had attempted to effect his escape from the city had been procured for him by a Frau Schirrhöfer, née Graboin—wife of the adjutant among the Invalids in Peiß—and her daughter Elisabeth, both of whom, it seems, were his housemates. After he was

recognized and arrested despite his disguise, the former, as an accomplice in the attempted escape of an accused person, was herself taken into custody and subjected to criminal examination. The facts were simple, and the Criminal College was therefore able, after only a few days, to submit its opinion to the king (December 19, 1718): "that both accused persons, mother and daughter, be sent to the workhouse for a quarter of a year for their punishment, but first the mother be publicly exposed with a placard hung around her neck."

On Katsch's report, however, the king again aggravated the punishment proposed "in the opinion," condemning "both women to be sent to the workhouse for half a year, as an example to others and for their own well-deserved punishment, and, before that, that both, mother and daughter, be exhibited publicly for one hour with a placard stating the offense and the penalty."

Much harsher was the punishment pronounced by the king's decree upon another person entangled in this case, the secretary Wernicke. He seems to have occupied an intermediate position between private secretary to Minister von Grumbkow and a clerk in the latter's war chancellery. In any case, in this dual capacity he had frequent opportunity, both in von Grumbkow's house and in the minister's official writing rooms, to gather information that could be of value to Klement.

Thus, through Bube he had allowed the plan of the city of Berlin to fall into Klement's hands; he had let him himself read letters from Grumbkow to other ministers; and finally, in conversations he had had with Klement and Bube, he had joined in the loose talk they aired—that "the people had to pay so much (in taxes) that they could not bear it," that there was "much work and little pay," and the like, when they were together and "reasoned and talked."

There is no doubt that Wernicke had made himself guilty, by this admitted conduct, of a grave breach of trust and of misappropriations that called for severe punishment. The Criminal College[1]) viewed the matter, for once, with exceptional leniency and, in its opinion submitted to the king on August 3, 1719, believed it could chiefly adduce the following mitigating circumstance among those favorable to the accused: "that he had sworn neither to His Royal Majesty nor to von Grumbkow that he would keep secret what was entrusted to him and not make it public." It therefore recommended the light penalty of only three years' fortress arrest, during which the convict,

"in view of his weak bodily constitution, should be put to moderate labor only from time to time." The king did not share the Criminal College's view of the mitigating grounds and, by handwritten decree of August 5, 1719, aggravated the proposed punishment to read: "that said Wernicke, in place of the three years awarded him, shall receive twenty years of fortress arrest, and that, insofar as his bodily constitution—reportedly weak—permits, he shall be set to moderate fortress labor." This sharpening of the proposed punishment ordered by the king was indeed unusual. It seems, however, that the king was particularly offended that the commission had accepted, as a mitigating ground, the proposition that Wernicke had not sworn to keep secret what he learned, and that His Majesty wished to mark this principle, in particular, as a false and perverse one on the part of the commission.

With Wernicke the circle is closed of those persons who had to atone with their lives or with severe corporal punishments for their participation in Klement's capital crime. There remains yet a number of other persons whose fate ended indeed less tragically than that of those hitherto treated, but who must nevertheless be mentioned here, lest the picture we have attempted to present of the trial against Klement—and with it of this episode from the reign of Frederick William I.—remain incomplete.

For this we must revert to the year 1718, from which our account set out. After Klement's arrest, the king, as will be remembered, had ordered a house search at the Polish-Saxon chargé d'affaires Wilhelmi and had all the papers found there seized. Their examination, as the report submitted thereon by Minister Ilgen to the king (November 19, 1718) states, revealed that an active correspondence had taken place between the queen's Mistress of the Household and the Saxon Minister of the Interior, and that, in order not to entrust it to the post, it had often been conveyed by that Saxon chargé d'affaires.

At that time the high court office at the queen's side was held by a Frau von Blaspiel, wife of the Real Privy Councillor of State and War, the General Commissary von Blaspiel; the Saxon minister was a Herr von Manteuffel, who for several years had lived in Berlin as a Saxon diplomat. The very fact that the correspondence between the two had not been entrusted to the post but conveyed through the Saxon chargé already made it suspect, and this suspicion found support in the circumstance that one of the minister's letters to Wilhelmi, among those confiscated, contained the words: "Everything you do according to Frau von Blaspiel's instructions will be well done." 1)

Frau von Blaspiel was regarded as the queen's most intimate friend and was known to share, with all her heart, her mistress's aversion toward Minister von Grumbkow and likewise to be ill-disposed toward Prince Leopold of Dessau. The queen had warned her husband against both, because they were plotting ill against him, and, at the king's insistence, had had to admit to him that she had been prompted to this warning by her Mistress of the Household.

That now the admonisher against others' intrigues herself was found engaging in a correspondence with a foreign minister—and one conveyed by an accredited diplomat at the Berlin court—was enough to make the monarch, plagued by mistrust in those days, see even in his consort's Mistress of the Household a political intriguer. He felt the more justified in proceeding against her without leniency since one of her letters to Manteuffel even contained insulting remarks about the queen. Speaking of the queen, she had observed that "she was weak, changeable, and suspicious," 1) a remark the king took so ill that he wrote in the margin: "And how does this lady speak of my wife, as if she were a rag!"

Grumbkow and Prince Leopold—embittered, and not without reason, by the warning she had whispered to the queen—saw in these letters a favorable occasion to inflame the king against her, and they did indeed bring him to order that Frau von Blaspiel appear before him at once. She had dined with the queen and, upon entering the king's presence, found him surrounded by her adversaries, Leopold and von Grumbkow, and also Ilgen, Knyphausen, and Katsch, together with Court Councillor Thulemeier; it was immediately clear to her that an interrogation was intended (December 10, 1718).

In fact, before those assembled she was to give account and answer "whether she had had any correspondence with foreign ministers; whether her husband had known of it; whether such correspondence had concerned matters of importance—His Royal Majesty's person, the state, and the treasury," etc.—through a series of seventy-five questions which, in the methodical manner in which Katsch put them, contrasted quite unfavorably with the freshness and unforced manner in which Frau von Blaspiel knew how to answer them.

Yes, she replied, she had exchanged letters with a foreign minister, Herr von Manteuffel, but with her husband's knowledge; they had been anything

but concerned with His Majesty's person, state, and treasury; rather, they were entirely harmless and thoroughly unpolitical in nature. Pöllnitz and the Margravine of Bayreuth recount that, at this interrogation in the palace, a nasty scene played out between the king and Frau von Blaspiel—that he threatened her with death, while she, with a strength of character beyond her sex, compared him to Nero and Caligula, and hurled in the faces of Prince Leopold and Minister von Grumbkow that they had betrayed the king and even sought his life, that they were in general the curse of the land. 1)

The protocol taken of this interrogation contains nothing that could count as confirmation of this tale; but the protocols reporting the subsequent examinations show that Frau von Blaspiel, with unruffled composure and often not without irony, knew how to fend off the inquiring Katsch—who, with questions gradually swelling to the number of 188, strove in vain to drive her into a corner.

Since nothing could be extracted from her during the examinations in Berlin, she was taken to the fortress of Spandau, and the reports made at that time by the envoys to their courts could hardly speak of anything else than this event, which astonished court and city alike. 2)

The king was present at the first interrogation held there on December 17, 1718; but, for all Katsch's pressing, the accused maintained: "I cannot say anything other than what I have said." "God knows," she concluded, "that there is no evil in my heart, nor has there been. I must submit to God's and the king's will, but my conscience I cannot renounce." How sure she felt in this is shown, we may well take it, by the fact that from the fortress she wrote to Manteuffel asking him to send all her letters to the king—without deleting even a single word—so that he might convince himself of their content; for she would prefer that he read all the "fadaises" they contained than that he hold fast to a suspicion that broke her heart. 1) "The pleasure I have always found in writing to you is costing me dear," she concluded, "for I find myself in the fortress under a cruel suspicion which is pinned precisely upon the correspondence with you. Do not delay, therefore, in fulfilling my request; it is the only means of proving my innocence and saving me."

Indeed, the letters that reached the files of the Berlin archives—as well as those published by Weber from the Dresden archives—confirm Frau von Blaspiel's assurance that this correspondence concerned politics little if at all, but rather the chatter of a lady who wished gladly to continue in the

present a relationship with a friend of earlier days. According to the Margravine of Bayreuth's account, Manteuffel had been more than a friend to her during his Berlin sojourn; and if the portrait she paints of the lady is accurate, one may lend credence to her claim that the correspondence was at least politically innocent. 1)

In similar chatter, as the excerpts below show, the letters range for many pages: often not free of all manner of court and town gossip, and written in the tone of a frivolous woman of the world; but one will search them in vain for state-endangering secrets. How eager Katsch was to find such things may be shown by a small detail from his examinations. In one of the letters to Manteuffel, Frau von Blaspiel had written: "Do send me the continuation of the novel whose first volume amused me so much," and it took many answers to prior, leading questions before the inquisitor could be convinced that what was at issue was a French novel, the first part of which Manteuffel had sent from Warsaw to Frau von Blaspiel and whose second part she now desired.

Little by little even Katsch was overtaken by the feeling that he was toiling in vain at a task bordering on the comic, and he asked the king—"in accordance with the dear oath I have sworn, and out of the prompting of my conscience"—to have the further examination of Frau von Blaspiel discontinued. From the "carriage" she had shown in the proceedings, "she is a woman of great esprit," and if she had overstepped in her words about Prince Leopold and Minister von Grumbkow, she was willing to beg pardon for that, and this was sufficient; besides, "the exceedingly harsh proceedings might cause Her Majesty the Queen, in her blessed condition, some disturbance." Only with reluctance did the king accede at last to Katsch's motion and consent, on condition that Frau von Blaspiel offer the apology she had promised in solemn form. This was done at Spandau on January 4, 1719, where Frau von Blaspiel, in the presence of the king, all the ministers, Prince George of Hesse-Kassel, "item various officers and persons," begged the Prince of Anhalt-Dessau as well as the lieutenant generals von Grumbkow and von Löben most humbly for forgiveness.

She then had to execute a Urfehde letter under oath, assuring "that she would not, whether by herself or through others, take revenge for the arrest—which she had not unjustly suffered—upon His Majesty nor upon His Royal House, servants, lands, and people." She also had to promise "that she would betake herself to the Cleves lands, live there quietly, and not leave them, nor come into the court camp wherever His Majesty the King or Her

Majesty the Queen might be, without special permission."

How much the king cared that his consort's former Mistress of the Household should not meet—even merely in transit through Berlin—her former mistress is clear from the fact that she was expressly ordered not to touch Berlin; and if she needed any of her things from there, "one of her maids" could fetch what was necessary. When contemporary writers tell—and later repeat after them—that Frau von Blaspiel's imprisonment was unusually harsh, that she had neither light nor a bed in her cell, the records show the manifest contrary. For already on the day after she had been brought in (December 17, 1718), she wrote to her husband: she was quite well in her exile; only she regretted that he had sent his cook to her; he knew she usually ate so little that the least kitchen boy would have been sufficient for her; and if she were not afraid of offending him thereby, she would send him back. 2) A prisoner in a cell without light or bed would scarcely have found use for a cook.

On January 4, 1719, Frau von Blaspiel left the fortress and, together with her husband—who had been removed from his posts in Berlin—went to Cleves: some say to preside over the chamber there; others think, to retire thence to his estates. The banishment from the first position at court to the solitude of a small provincial town, imposed by the king's fiat, was certainly a very severe punishment for a pampered lady. It cannot, however, be described as entirely undeserved, since she was, after all, at fault in having, though the bearer of a high court office and thus doubly bound to caution, maintained a decidedly unseemly relationship with foreign diplomats and, moreover, in having lightly uttered accusations against the king's foremost servants for which, when it came to producing proof, she had none.

Lady von Blaspiel, according to the Margravine's report, was, if the information is correct, seen again by the King only a few years after her banishment, and treated graciously. Frederick the Great is even said to have recalled her from Cleves and, in order to please his mother, appointed her governess to his younger sisters[1]).

Next to the former Mistress of the Queen's Household, another high-ranking court and state official was drawn into serious misfortune through the Klement affair—or rather, Klement's case was used as a pretext to push this man, who enjoyed the King's special confidence, out of favour, and, if possible, out of office and honour altogether.

This was the President of the Court Chamber, Privy Councillor von Kameke. As head of the postal administration, he had suffered many vexations at the hands of von Grumbkow and belonged to that minister's most determined opponents.

On the very day when the King had Lady von Blaspiel arrested (10 December), Grumbkow reminded him that von Kameke was one of the lady's friends, and, as was said, had sent a warning to the Queen through her, advising Her Majesty to take care that the King should not learn of the sale of certain diamonds he had given her as gifts, for it would be brought to his knowledge — and that she must be careful not to quarrel with her husband. Such insinuations would at any time have sufficed to provoke the King's anger, and especially on that day when the dramatic scene at the palace had just taken place.

The King ordered that von Kameke be summoned. When he appeared, the King, in the presence of the ministers Ilgen, Knyphausen, and Katsch, addressed him directly: was he on friendly terms with Lady von Blaspiel? Upon Kameke's admission that he knew her, and further that he had heard of the Queen's sale of diamonds, Katsch began a series of questions so that Kameke could no longer doubt that a formal inquiry against him was intended.

His deeply indignant—perhaps overly forthright—answers irritated the King to such a degree that, as the record concludes, "His Majesty personally ordered von Kameke's arrest and instructed me thereafter to go to his quarters and inform General-Major de Forcade that Kameke was not to speak or write to anyone, and that, if he conversed with his wife, it should be done publicly and in the presence of the commanding officer."

The house arrest thus imposed lasted until 27 December. As Katsch's efforts during this time failed to elicit from him any statement that might be construed as an admission of guilt, the King ordered—as in the case of Lady von Blaspiel—that he be transferred to the fortress of Spandau. The only favour granted to him, as the Austrian envoy reported to his court, was that he was permitted, "out of special grace," to be taken there by night under escort of fifty gendarmes rather than by day.

There, on 28 December 1718, he underwent interrogation before a com-

mission composed of the ministers Ilgen, Knyphausen, and Katsch, and the councillors Duhram and Berger. He answered all the questions put to him as he had before. The final question ran: would His Excellency faithfully declare whether he knew anything of a dangerous design formed by certain foreign ministers against His Majesty? He replied that not a shadow of such a design was known to him. The commission, seeing nothing further to pursue, reported to the King that no grounds existed to prolong the detention.

From the fortress, Kameke addressed a letter to the King (31 December 1718), requesting permission to repeat in writing what he had already stated verbally to the commissioners: "It is the pure truth and without equivocation," he wrote, "and God is my witness that I know nothing beyond it; even if Your Majesty caused me to be questioned repeatedly by the ablest men in the world, I could add nothing, and their efforts to extract explanations of matters of which I am entirely ignorant would be in vain. According to every right in the world, I should have been heard beforehand to avert such an inquiry, and should have been made aware of the evidence, which must have been very strong before coming thus far against a man for whom all presumptions ought naturally to be favourable. But I have waived these formalities in order to shorten the affair."

With just and wounded dignity, Kameke asked how it could be that the King's sound and fair judgment had been misled by empty and vague suspicions to such an extent as to act against one who had stood beside him from earliest youth, and to whom he himself had once borne witness that he owed his life. "The abyss," he wrote, "into which Your Majesty's wrath has cast me—the bitter experience I have endured—has made life a burden to me. Grant me justice, as God may one day hear Your Majesty in your final hour."

A few days after receiving this letter (4 January 1719), the King ordered that the prisoner be released and sent back to Berlin. Yet some resentment clearly lingered in the monarch's mind; and although he could not deny Kameke his freedom and even permitted him, in the same order, to remain ten days among his family to set his domestic affairs in order, he required that at the end of that time he retire to his estates in Pomerania. The ministers informed him upon his release that "the King leaves you in possession of your salary as district governor but commands that you shall not meddle in His Majesty's affairs or those of the realm."

Kameke was also obliged, before leaving, to swear the usual oath of sub-

mission—declaring that he would seek no vengeance for his imprisonment either upon His Majesty or His Majesty's servants. At least one of those servants, it seems, had good reason to feel relieved by that undertaking.

A similar misfortune befell Baron von Danckelman. Among the persons whom Klement had named as participants in the alleged conspiracy of foreign ministers for the abduction of the King was also Danckelman, President of the War and Domains Chamber in Magdeburg and one of the well-known "Seven Brothers," highly respected throughout the land. The suspicion reached the King at a time when he was still inclined to believe Klement's early disclosures[1]), and it is therefore unsurprising that he also believed this one and immediately ordered proceedings against the accused.

Danckelman, then on official travel, was arrested and taken to the fortress of Spandau. One fact illustrates the character of the proceedings: among the papers seized from his broken desk and sent to Berlin was a printed dissertation by his son, recently submitted for a doctorate at the University of Halle, entitled **De pactis et mandati Principis captivi** ("On the Treaties and Commissions of a Captive Prince"). The use of the word **captivus** ("captive") appeared so suspicious that the King himself wrote: "Katsch, the Halle dissertation of Danckelman's son shall remain with the files, W." and required a German translation of the treatise to be presented to him.

In the pedantic scholarship of that age, the young author had discussed at length the question of what rights a captive prince might exercise. This was enough to rouse the King's mistrust. The commission (Duhram, Berger, Gerbet) was therefore ordered to question Danckelman "about the dissertation of his son—on what occasion he had fallen upon such a subject?" It even caused concern that in paragraph 2 the author had defined a captive prince not only as one taken prisoner in war, but also as one who, "outside of war, has fallen into the power of another prince." The suspicion that the paragraph might allude to the planned abduction of the King and its legal consequences was so far-fetched that the commission soon dropped it. As nothing else could be found against the prisoner, the report of 29 December 1718 declared all conjectures and suspicions void, and recommended that the King release him and assure him of continued favour. The King consented[1]), reinstated Danckelman in his offices, though not without requiring the same formal oath of forbearance.

To the group of courtiers drawn into the investigation belonged also a

chamberlain named von Troschke. Recommended in 1694, at the age of nine, as a page to the court of the Elector by the master of the horse, Froben, he had gradually risen to chamberlain under the new King.

One of the first acts of Frederick William I had been to abolish several court positions and to reduce the salaries of the rest[1]). Troschke's salary had been cut from 800 to 300 thalers, and he, like many others thus affected, became one of the discontented who grumbled against the "unkingly thrift" of the new ruler. He expressed his resentment not only in conversation but also in letters. During the searches that followed, such letters came to light, and this alone sufficed to justify a search of his own house. That search uncovered numerous letters, some from Saxon or foreign diplomats, others from ladies of the court such as Lady von Blaspiel and Countess Dönhoff, many even written in cipher. This last circumstance appeared so incriminating that he was arrested and, like the others, taken to Spandau.

A first interrogation took place on 28 December 1718, a second only on 1 April 1719, apparently because the mass of seized correspondence had first to be examined. When that was done, the King himself appeared at Spandau, accompanied by General von Gersdorf, to hear Troschke's answers to 178 questions. The result was that, although he admitted having carried on an extensive correspondence for years, its contents, he said, concerned trifles, and whenever he wrote of "public matters," they were only such as had already appeared in the gazettes.

The archives still contain hundreds of these letters, and they show that their author belonged to the more disaffected circles of Berlin society; yet nothing in them can be called criminal. Katsch himself seems to have been convinced of this when he reported to the King[1]): "What further shall be done with Troschke? Should he not be released upon oath and dismissal of the arrest?" The King evidently did not share that view, for Troschke was still a prisoner in Spandau as late as March 1721.

About that time, his brother, a landowner at Klempzig, began efforts to secure his release. To obtain it, he gave a written pledge to recruit three men—"one young fellow of twenty-three years, only a few fingers shorter than the front-rank grenadier, and two other tall fellows from his village"—for the King's grenadiers. This offer, accepted with the marginal note "Quickly to Potsdam," won Troschke's freedom after more than two years' confinement, though only after swearing the oath of submission.

The misfortune of imprisonment was spared the man who had stood closest to Klement, the court preacher Jablonsky; but he too did not escape the troubles that overtook everyone in Prussia who had dealings with Klement. It is therefore proper to recall how he became entangled in the affair.

Daniel Ernst Jablonsky, born in Danzig in 1660, studied theology at the University of Frankfurt[1]), became rector of the town school at Byrsen in Lithuania at nineteen, later deacon there, and in 1683 regimental chaplain at Magdeburg. In 1686 he became Polish preacher and rector at Lissa, in 1691 court preacher at Königsberg, and in 1693 preacher at the cathedral of Berlin and a member of the Consistory[2]).

As noted earlier, Jablonsky maintained close relations with Prince Rákóczy from Berlin. These, largely mediated by Klement, were lively and well attested in the documents published by the Imperial Academy of Sciences in Vienna. Personal ties also existed: one record notes that Jablonsky invited the Prince to stand godfather to one of his children, and that Klement stood proxy in his place.

After Klement's departure from Rákóczy's service, their correspondence had lapsed for some years; it was renewed from Dresden, at first by letter, later in person at Baruth, and ultimately led the King to select Jablonsky, together with Privy Councillor von Marschall, to travel to Amsterdam and escort Klement back to Berlin. When this mission was carried out and Klement found himself imprisoned, he suspected that Jablonsky had betrayed him, and resentment led him to revenge. He insinuated that Jablonsky had not served him gratuitously and finally declared that the preacher had received 1,500 ducats from him in Amsterdam on the very day before their return to Berlin.

Such a fact—moreover supplied with purported evidence—was in itself capable of casting suspicion upon the recipient of the money, and it made such an impression upon the King that he immediately ordered the ministers to "speak with Jablonsky about several points drawn from the Klement inquisitorial files and obtain his views on them."

This interview took place on 26 and 27 December 1718, out of regard for Jablonsky's clerical rank, in the residence of Herr von Katsch. Although the King's instruction had at first envisaged only a conversation, Katsch

nonetheless prepared sixty-four interrogatories as a guide, so that from the outset the interview differed little from the questioning of an accused person.

The first questions concerned Jablonsky's relations with Klement going back twelve years, the "negotiations" the latter had conducted with him on behalf of the Prince of Transylvania,[1] then moved on to the correspondence that had subsequently passed between them, and ended with a discussion of the meeting at Baruth and the events that followed that interview.

Particular weight in the questioning was placed on whether "someone had instilled hostile feelings in Herr Jablonsky against the Prince (Leopold)"; further, whether in conversations with Klement ill-talk had been uttered about the Prince and the Prussian ministers—especially the statement that "the Prince of Anhalt was the greatest misfortune in the country"; for these accusations too had been raised against Jablonsky.

In his replies he firmly rejected the suspicions advanced against him in the questions; however, the answers did not satisfy the King, who therefore ordered on 4 February 1719 that "until further notice Jablonsky is to refrain from his official duties," while the ministers were to pursue the matter further and, in particular, to establish what was the true state of affairs with those 1,500 ducats.

A petition then submitted to the King by Jablonsky—"to lift the inquisition imposed on him and the suspension from office" (7 February 1719)—was refused by order of 26 February 1719. For the King felt himself "most gravely offended that he accepted the 1,500 ducats and did not disclose this until Klement had done so"; nor would the King accept the plea now advanced against Klement, namely that he was "an informer regarding the highest and most eminent persons, partly fabricating false words, partly twisting true but innocent words into a false meaning," since it was precisely Jablonsky who had "produced Klement as a conscientious and credible man, thereby providing the initial cause of all the present complications, unrest, and confusion."

The King was not entirely wrong to trace the disturbances stirred up by Klement, which at the time agitated court and city, in the last resort back to Jablonsky. For in the end it was he who had brought Klement into the King's orbit and stood surety for him by presenting him as a "conscientious and credible man," that is, as someone whose statements the King could be-

lieve. In all likelihood, had Klement not been introduced by a highly placed clergyman, the King would not have received him, so that the mischief which followed the audience in Linger's Garden could indeed, in a certain sense, be traced back to Jablonsky.

After the order of 20 February had been issued, the examinations were resumed and, in accordance with the King's instruction, took as their main task the clarification of the still obscure business of the 1,500 ducats. The suspicion attached to this sum was that Klement had given it to the court preacher partly as thanks for services performed and partly to purchase further services.

The receipt of the sum was a fact; but Jablonsky succeeded in rebutting the suspicions derived from it. He did this most effectively in the defences he himself submitted to the commission at the close of the inquiry, in March 1719; for his justification it is best that we follow them.

At the outset of these papers—written with great warmth and divided into many paragraphs—he returns to the beginnings of his acquaintance with Klement in 1708 and its subsequent course, refers to the one hundred and fifty letters he had voluntarily submitted to the commission "to attest his serene conscience," exchanged with Klement up to 1716, and then gives, regarding the receipt of the 1,500 ducats, the following explanation, supplementing the answers he had given in examination.

From 1708 onwards he had, in Klement's then travels and undertakings—whose chief aim was the preservation of the Evangelical religion in Hungary and Transylvania—made one or another advance of money as required, "albeit without any interest or self-seeking."

"On the very day when, with Marschall, I came from Emmerich to Amsterdam (28 October 1718), Klement spoke with me about the useful placement of money partly in his possession, partly expected (meaning the sums from Berlin—partly already received, partly promised him—which Marschall would pay on receipt of the papers to be delivered). He declared, however, that before anything else he wished to pay his debts. He asked me," Jablonsky continues, "whether I had correspondence to Hungary and could remit funds thither, because, among others, he owed 2,000 thalers there to his former tutor, now rector in Pressburg, Matthias Bél."

"I replied that I had convenient means to remit money to Hungary via Vienna, named my correspondent in Vienna ... and promised faithfully to transmit whatever might be entrusted to me ... Thereupon Klement went back to his quarters."

"In the afternoon my host's (the banker) Gumbert's bookkeeper came into my room and said he had orders from Klement to pay me 1,500 ducats, and asked whether I would receive them. ... Recalling our forenoon's conversation ... I willingly accepted the sum offered, intending to speak with Klement about it when he returned."

"The next day the man who had brought the money came to me and asked whether I had counted it, for it seemed as if one parcel had been over-tipped ... I said: No; he should take it back, count it himself, and keep it until Klement came, with whom I wished to speak about it. He then took the money away ... Soon afterwards Marschall came, and after him Klement; shortly thereafter the schout entered and arrested Klement." By this, and because later at Emmerich Major Forrestier had intervened and "brouillé everything," his intention to speak with Klement about the matter was frustrated. Had I—he concludes in one of his defences—perceived Klement's true intention in sending that sum, "I should not have failed to say with Peter: Thy money perish with thee!"

Finally, he concedes that, in all these happenings, many probabilities converge that might arouse suspicion against him; yet he hopes the King will "look graciously upon his intention."[1]

This hope was not disappointed. For—as Katsch had to "report" to Prince Leopold in a letter of 19 July 1719 that had previously been reviewed by the King[1]—the King regarded the accused as justified in the main point, restored him to his offices, saw him, as the Saxon chargé d'affaires reported to his court, once more as a guest at the royal table, and again heard his sermons.[2]

In the letter of deprecation addressed to Prince Leopold by the King's command, Jablonsky declares: "If, as a weak man subject to many failings, I should have said something without premeditation or intent which moved Your Serene Highness to withdraw your highly-valued favour from me, I hereby humbly testify that all such things grieve me in the inmost soul, that I recant and abhor them all ... and I most humbly beg that Your High-

ness, following the great example of His Majesty the King in Prussia, will graciously allow the displeasure once conceived to fade, and be pleased to turn your precious favour to me again."

What the Prince replied to this petition, and whether he received the suppliant back into favour, the files do not reveal.

With Jablonsky the roster closes of all those who were entangled in Klement's trial—or, as it is commonly called, "the Klement intrigue"—and with him this account might also end, were it not tempting, at the close, to seek a psychological explanation of the man's character who was the cause of the drama here related and played the leading role in it.

I believe Klement would be wrongly judged if one simply called him an adventurer, or even a confidence-trickster of the common sort, whose enterprises aimed at nothing but getting money. He was certainly an adventurer; but of a kind in whom it is hard to draw a firm line between the fortune-seeking adventurer and the politician entrusted with serious business. He was neither one nor the other exclusively; rather he possessed both attributes, and in equal measure—only that, over a life full of incident, the adventurer got the better of the politician and, alas, of the honest man as well.

Employed in his youth by a prince on important political missions and thereby brought into contact with the foremost statesmen of the Continent and England, he found—after Rákóczi's fall—not only pardon for all he had done against Austria, but even entry into the service of the Imperial House and access to its mightiest statesman, Prince Eugene of Savoy. We do not know in detail the tasks on which he was engaged there; but that the assignments suggested to him—especially by Prince Eugene's subordinate agents—were not always beyond reproach is indicated by his intimacy with the prince's secretary, whose son-in-law he was to become.

From his activity in Vienna to the espionage services he unmistakably rendered at Dresden to the Saxon Count Flemming against the Prussian court was only a short step—but one that proved fatal to him.

In portraying that period of our national history, Ranke leaves open "to what extent plans to surprise, perhaps to seize, the King of Prussia were ever in earnest. But to set such plans going on one side and betray them on

the other; to fan into open flame the fire smouldering in Germany, so that Austria and England would be fully occupied—this would have corresponded well to Alberoni's intentions." From this our great historian infers that Klement's doings may well have been connected with Alberoni's schemes aimed at remodelling Europe.[1]

That, while still in Rákóczi's service, Klement had dealings with that Spanish minister is confirmed by our records too; and though we do not presume to draw from this the conclusion that, when he appeared in Prussia, Klement was a tool in Alberoni's world-embracing plan, yet, in light of the documents, it may be taken as certain that, when at Berlin he first divulged to the King Flemming's alleged designs, he was not acting as a mere swindler "out to earn a bit of money,"[1] but—alongside an undeniable desire for money and honours—was primarily pursuing political aims directed at Austria and Saxony, because he felt insufficiently valued, indeed unjustly treated, by both.

Only in the clash between the two parties at Berlin, which opposed each other in state and society—to repeat Ranke's words[2]—did he decline from political adventurer into political impostor, from that into plain swindler; and at last he had to die on the scaffold because the King—who would gladly have spared his life—had, for reasons of state, to withhold the promised mercy.

Yet it has not been the political aspect that has guided this attempt to furnish a fuller account of the trial against Klement; rather it has chiefly been the criminal-law, or more precisely the criminal-procedure, aspects that we have had in view. In his pioneering work on the constitutional law of Brandenburg-Prussia, Stölzel has described in detail the reforms carried out by Frederick William I in the administration of justice, and has shown how great, in particular, was the advance initiated in criminal justice by his Criminal Ordinance of 1717.

Klement's trial falls within this transitional period and therefore, in many particulars, still recalls the not-yet-completed era in which all criminal justice proceeded from the King alone as supreme judge, and in which he had not yet transferred it to regular courts rendering justice in his name. Thus in the present case also we still see the criminal college at times reinforced by commissioners; the King himself occasionally intervening in person in the investigative proceedings; and the punishments proposed in the draft judg-

ments being confirmed, or even sharpened, out of the plenary authority of the territorial lord and supreme judge, according to his conviction.

The foregoing account of the trial against Klement may therefore serve as a speaking contribution, drawn from authentic records, to our understanding of criminal justice in that age of transition.

Appendix I

The rescript issued by Emperor Charles VI on 20 February 1718 to King Frederick William I concerning the latter's ordered conversion of fiefs into freehold reads as follows:

"We cannot, to you as Elector of Brandenburg, refrain from stating that it has been credibly reported to us how, as regards your lands—those principalities and territories in your electoral house which, by the Peace of Münster and Osnabrück, came under your sovereignty—the knightly and provincial estates resident there are all to have their fiefs abolished in general.

"Likewise, from the said principalities, appeals to our supreme imperial courts are said to have been prohibited.

"As concerns, first of all, the abolition of the said feudal tenures, we cannot in any way see how your Electoral Serenity's knighthood could with the least justification be compelled thereto. Considering that such alteration of fiefs runs directly counter to the ancient German imperial constitution, to custom, and to feudal rights, and to the acquired and reserved liberties of the knightly and provincial estates; that thereby the nobility, instead of providing the knight-service to which they are bound in cases of public necessity, would be shifted into a perpetual peasant contribution and thus made almost equal to burghers and peasants; and that what is ordained for the preservation of the stock and name of families would now be turned into a promised succession tending towards the swift extinction of the estate of the nobility—this would redound to the evident disadvantage and harm of Your Serenity and your successors in the electorate and the other lands thereto belonging. Indeed it would draw, not only throughout the whole Roman Empire but also upon your rights, your conscience, and high renown, a very serious attention.

"Upon just as untenable a ground rests the prohibition of appeals to our supreme imperial courts, which derogates from our highest imperial jurisdiction, runs counter to salutary legal constitutions, and, to speak briefly, is of such a nature that, because of the far-reaching and dangerous consequences depending thereon, we can in no wise permit it, and still less can Your Serenity be well-advised in such a course.

"Finally, as regards the right, reserved in the aforesaid Peace of Münster and Osnabrück to the Magdeburg-Halberstadt and other lands, to maintain their rights and liberties in and out of court, it is not for you to forbid—whether to advocates and attorneys or to all others concerned—the invocation thereof, as this would run counter to German laws and liberties.

"We therefore, having regard to the aforesaid rights and to the laboriously won imperial seats and ordinances, hold ourselves bound in every way, by virtue of our imperial authority directed thereto and because of the detriment that would otherwise arise, urgently to remind you to desist forthwith, of your own accord, from all the above-mentioned proceedings standing on an evident lack of foundation; to leave the knighthood and provincial estates in their fiefs according to ancient custom; in no case to forbid or hinder appeals to our supreme imperial courts but rather to allow them free course in every instance; and, moreover, to let the estates and subjects everywhere enjoy the privileges confirmed in the oft-mentioned Peace of Westphalia. Otherwise we should be compelled, in the unforeseen contrary event, to proceed further to the measures ordained in the laws and imperial constitutions; and to quash and annul, ex officio and of imperial right, all the above-mentioned ordinances issued by Your Serenity as Elector of Brandenburg, as having a character to which no one is bound to pay the least obedience.

"We await without delay the fulfilment by Your Serenity and remain.

Vienna, 20 February 1718."

Appendix II

The papers which Klement had promised to procure for the King in original are listed in a specification placed on the file under twenty-two items; among them, for example, appears:

No. 1. Draft agreement between the Emperor and the King of Poland for a treaty in forma extensa, of which Klement dictated the summary at Lübben.
No. 2. The treaty supposed to have been concluded between the King of Prussia, the Tsar, and Sweden.
No. 3. The manifesto that was to have been published once the sacred person of His Majesty the King had been secured.
No. 4. The names of those surrounding the King who had betrayed him and were willing to contribute to his abduction.
No. 5. Their letters on this subject, by which their treachery could be proven.
No. 11. Letters conveying "certain information that the King of Prussia was universally hated by all his subjects," assuring the Prince that a general revolution would break out upon the slightest movement.
No. 12. Specification of the monies paid to the Berlin correspondents in October.
No. 14. Project of the administration already drafted for the government of His Majesty's lands after possession of his person should have been obtained.

Appendix III

From a report by Burchard to the King, 21 January 1719:
Prince Eugene spoke with extreme resentment about the first letter, saying publicly:
"La cour de Prusse me fait trop d'honneur pour me vouloir faire passer pour voleur du grand chemin, parricide et empoisonneur."
When someone replied that this was surely a mere misinterpretation, he rejoined:
"Non, non ! Je vous montrerai la lettre, et vous jugerez même que l'affaire est ainsi comme je vous dis."

Appendix IV

On 28 January 1719 the Austrian Resident Voß, by order of the Emperor, presented to the King a declaration replying to the royal letter sent to Prince Eugene. In it the Emperor protested:
"Since that royal letter would make it appear as if the plot had been carried out with His Imperial Majesty's knowledge and command, and thus cast the

chief suspicion upon His Majesty himself, His Imperial Majesty feels constrained to take proper steps—both for his own honour and on behalf of his minister and lieutenant-general, who through long and faithful service to the Empire has earned the highest esteem.
The suspicion and accusation thus laid upon His Imperial Majesty and upon His Highness the Prince, and the affront thereby inflicted, are the more intolerable because the tale was first contrived by a notorious vagabond and has now been sustained by Your Majesty's ministers, who credit the villain's false assertions as if they were truth. In consequence, His Imperial Majesty stands before the world as if compromised by this scoundrel's inventions, while the honour and good name of his faithful prince, servant, and other innocent persons have been unjustly sullied.
His Majesty of Prussia is therefore entreated to regard the entire course of events calmly and without resentment, and not to take amiss that His Imperial Majesty, for himself and for His Highness Prince Eugene, rightly demands due and temperate satisfaction."

Appendix V

Royal Declaration for Klement (Berlin, 13 December 1718)
The King declares that if Mr Klement makes a sincere and truthful confession of everything concerning the discovery of the conspiracy hitherto in question—as he offered in his letter of yesterday—he shall neither be surrendered nor ill-treated for it, but shall be tried according to the rules of justice by impartial judges whom His Majesty will appoint.
Signed in His Majesty's hand: F. Guilaume.
Countersigned: Ilgen.

Appendix VI

Letter from the King to Prince Eugene, 7 January 1719
I have received Your Highness's friendly-cousinly letter of 28 December and have read, with no little mortification, what a wholly unintended effect my earlier one of the 10th has produced.
My meaning was simply this: that, just as through my minister Cnyphausen I had at once informed Your Highness of the unfounded denunciations and forged documents supplied by the notorious Klement, I had never for a moment thought of ascribing to Your Highness the least share in them, but

rather wished that, since you know this wicked man, you might help to prove his falsehood the better. I believed I had expressed this intention quite clearly in my former letter. All the more did I find it necessary to address Your Highness because Klement then persisted obstinately in his story of a projected abduction against me, calling God himself to witness and vowing to live and die upon it. He had even so far convinced one of my first court preachers—who had long been acquainted with him—that the man scarcely doubted the truth of his tale.
Now that Klement has come to full recognition of his villainy and retracted all he said about the alleged plot against me, declaring it invented and baseless, I am causing him to be prosecuted with the utmost rigour and shall make such an example of him, and punish him so severely, that Your Highness and others offended by his false charges shall receive all the satisfaction that can be given.
I live in the confident hope that Your Highness will take pleasure in this explanation, dismiss every unfavourable opinion, and rather think of me as one who, having in former times employed his arms and the blood of his army with delight to add to Your Highness's glory—as the greatest captain of our age—will never henceforth conceive the slightest design to displease you. I trust in return that you will continue to me your affection and friendship, which I hold in the highest esteem.

From Burchard, Prussian envoy at the Viennese court, 18 January 1719:
"On Sunday I was admitted at once to Prince Eugene. I spoke with him at length; he replied that the assurances I conveyed from His Majesty were in direct contradiction to the contents of the letter of 10 December, wherein his reputation was most grievously attacked, and that he must have satisfaction from His Majesty's ministry. He grew more and more piqued, and in his impatience said several sharp things which I pretended not to understand.
When I came out into the antechamber I met Count Flemming, who asked me, 'Quelles nouvelles savez-vous de vos intrigues?' To which I merely answered, 'Votre Excellence sait bien que ce ne sont pas nos intrigues,'—and so the conversation ended."

Appendix VII

From Heusch's report of 17 December 1718 to his court:
"On that same Wednesday the Polish royal legation secretary von Wilhelmi—regularly accredited here—was invited to dine with the Imperial resident von Voß. At

that very hour the Privy Councillor von Cnyphausen, accompanied by a locksmith, entered the secretary's lodgings, broke open doors and cupboards by force, and carried away all the papers found there.
His Majesty told me himself that he had acted most unwillingly and only for very weighty reasons. He let me understand that the foreigner recently taken to Spandau was a Hungarian by birth who had formerly served Prince Eugene of Savoy—a shrewd rogue of extraordinary intelligence. The fellow had asserted, among other things, that the Emperor intended shortly to attack His Majesty in his own lands, which had obliged the King to take defensive measures and almost to anticipate the blow by striking first.
I further hear that this same foreigner alleged a complot and treason against the King's person and house, naming many generals, officers and officials, with the Prince of Anhalt-Dessau at their head. The Prince, still here in Berlin, is said to have been so disturbed and angered by the accusation that he has fallen ill. His Majesty, together with the ministers engaged in the inquiry, is said to have gone today to Spandau to conduct further examination. All these matters so occupy the court that nothing else is now thought of."

Appendix VIII

Burchard, 25 January 1719:
"Everyone here says it is absolutely necessary that Klement, as a triple offender of crimen laesae majestatis, should be punished as he deserves, and that according to his own country's custom the stake should be his lot."

Appendix IX

The Hanoverian resident Heusch, 17 December 1718, to his sovereign, the King of England:
"The entire city is in the utmost consternation, for very few know what the offences and accusations may be. Frau von Blaspiel's supposed crime lies in having corresponded with the Polish royal privy councillor von Manteuffel. I am firmly persuaded that she is innocent and intended nothing harmful; yet a grave charge is made of it.
It is easy to see that the Queen herself is deeply afflicted by Frau von Blaspiel's misfortune. Her Majesty allows all to proceed without interposing; the palace gates have for some days been kept so strictly closed that no one,

of whatever rank, may go out without the King's written permission. All are eager to see what further will follow."

Appendix X

From Burchard's report of 25 January 1719:
"I hear that His Majesty's court preacher Jablonsky is blamed for having formerly corresponded with the arch-rebel Rákóczi and his agent, for having proposed far-reaching designs, maintained intimacy with Klement, and received gifts and favours from Rákóczi—all manner of ill rumour by which the Protestant clergy are rendered odious to the Emperor. As the Secretary von Brockhausen told me today, the clergy of all three confessions ought to keep to their preaching and not meddle in worldly affairs. I suspect Klement will have passed along many originals from Jablonsky to this place."

In a note written by Minister Ilgen to Jablonsky in April 1711 concerning his dealings with Klement occurs the passage:
"These things made great bruit in Vienna, The Hague, Regensburg and elsewhere. People remark that one has allowed oneself to be led astray by a clergyman and school-pedant who ought to have stayed with the catechism and the colloquies of Erasmus. This weighs upon the royal court more than it excuses it, and I have often had to swallow such expressions already."

(Historische Zeitschrift N. F. vol. XXVI).