

The *Eastern European History Review* is an international and interdisciplinary annually online and open access peer-reviewed journal about studies on Central and Eastern Europe in the Modern Age (XIV–XIX). The Journal is also the expression of the Study Center CESPOM (Centro Studi sull'età dei Sobieski e della Polonia Moderna – Center Study on the Age of Sobieski and Modern Poland) of the University of Tuscia, born in 1997.

It publishes articles with significant approaches and original interpretations in all research fields concerning Central and Eastern Europe, with specific attention to the History Sciences.

This Special Issue of *Eastern European History Review* deals with the history of diplomacy and its executors – diplomats (ambassadors, legates, nuncios, internuncios, agents and others) – in the seventeenth century's Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth.

As a state conglomerate culturally and politically, closely connected to Western Europe, and for its specific institutional form of a “noble republic”, the Commonwealth has created, in the field of diplomatic practice, institutions, principles and ceremonies unique in the European context.

The focus of the volume is the historiographic stream of the *New Diplomatic History*, without withdrawing from classic approaches that remain an important field of research.

Tracing the salient moments and facts of the complex history of the seventeenth century of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, the volume – with the participation of authors from different parts of Europe and beyond – constitutes an international opportunity to reflect on issues and topics of old and new diplomatic history.

Diplomats and Diplomacy in the Early Modern Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth (XVII century) constitutes a result of the research activity and scientific collaboration inherent to the project directed by Dr Dorota Gregorowicz *The Holy See and the crisis of sovereignty of John II Casimir Vasa and Michael Korybut Wiśniowiecki's election (1660–1669)*, n. 2018/28/C/HS3/00176, financed by the National Science Centre, Poland.

Alessandro Boccolini

In copertina: Roman Postempki, *Jan III podpisuje traktat z Turkami w Żurawnie*, XIX Century (Collection of National Museum in Warsaw)

euro 19,00

ISBN 978-88-7853-940-2



ISSN 2612-0402



EEHR

EASTERN EUROPEAN HISTORY REVIEW
Annually Historical Journal

n. 4/2021

Special issue

DIPLMATS AND DIPLOMACY

IN THE EARLY MODERN POLISH-LITHUANIAN COMMONWEALTH (XVII CENTURY)

Edited by

Dorota Gregorowicz and Alessandro Boccolini



Director Emeritus

Gaetano Platania (Università degli Studi della Toscana)

Director

Alessandro Boccolini (Università degli Studi della Toscana)

Scientific Board

Irena Vaišvilaitė (Ambassador of the Republic of Lithuania to UNESCO)

Matteo Sanfilippo (Università degli Studi della Toscana)

Rimvydas Petrauskas (Vilnius University)

Raffaele Caldarelli (Università degli Studi della Toscana)

Giordano Altarozzi (Petru Maior University of Târgu Mures)

Giovanni Pizzorusso (Università degli Studi Gabriele d'Annunzio, Chieti-Pescara)

Cesare La Mantia (Università di Trieste)

Prokhorov Andrei (Belarusian State University of Minsk)

Olexiy Sokyrko (Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv)

Rafał Quirini-Popławski (Jagiellonian University of Kraków)

Francesca De Caprio (Università degli Studi della Toscana)

Jarosław Pietrzak (Pedagogical University of Kraków)

Marta Gołębek (Museum of King John III's Palace at Wilanów – Warsaw)

Language Expert

Sonia Maria Melchiorre (Università degli Studi della Toscana)

Editorial Board

Tony Urbani (Università degli Studi della Toscana)

Małgorzata Trzeciak Cygan (University of Warsaw)

Giulio Merlani (University of Caen Normandy)



Università degli Studi della Tuscia

Centro Studi sull'Età dei Sobieski e della Polonia Moderna
(Study Center on the Sobieski Age and of Modern Poland)
www.cespom.eu

Proprietà letteraria riservata. La riproduzione in qualsiasi forma, memorizzazione o trascrizione con qualunque mezzo (elettronico, meccanico, in fotocopia, in disco o in altro modo, compresi cinema, radio, televisione, internet) sono vietate senza l'autorizzazione scritta dell'Editore.

Eastern European History Review è una rivista on-line peer-reviewed con lettori anonimi

Chiuso il 31-12-2021

Impaginazione a cura di: *Fabiana Ceccariglia*

ISBN: 978-88-7853-940-2

ISBN ebook: 978-88-7853-941-9

ISSN: 2612-0402 005

Permalink: <http://hdl.handle.net/2067/4631>

EASTERN EUROPEAN HISTORY REVIEW
Via Santa Maria in Gradi 4 – 01100 Viterbo
www.easterneuropeanhistory.eu
eehr@unitus.it

Edizioni **SETTE CITTA**
Via Mazzini 87 – 01100 Viterbo
t. +39 0761 303020 – info@settecitta.eu

EASTERN EUROPEAN HISTORY REVIEW

a n n u a l l y h i s t o r i c a l j o u r n a l

~
n. 4/2021
Special Issue

DIPLOMATS AND DIPLOMACY IN THE EARLY MODERN POLISH-LITHUANIAN COMMONWEALTH (XVII CENTURY)

Edited by

Dorota Gregorowicz and Alessandro Boccolini



EASTERN EUROPEAN HISTORY REVIEW: LA RIVISTA

Il Comitato redazionale e scientifico è lieto di presentare al pubblico la rivista scientifica *Eastern European History Review*.

Con un carattere internazionale e interdisciplinare, una cadenza annuale e una fruibilità *open access* la rivista focalizza i propri interessi sulle dinamiche occorse nell'Europa Orientale durante tutta l'età moderna (XIV-XIX). *Eastern European History Review* è espressione del Centro Studi dell'Università della Tuscia CESPoM (Centro Studi sull'età dei Sobieski e della Polonia Moderna) nato nel 1997 per intuizione del Prof. Gaetano Platania, Direttore Emerito della Rivista.

L'iniziativa editoriale che presentiamo nasce dall'evidente mancanza in Italia di una rivista scientifica relativa alla storia dell'Europa centro-orientale in Età Moderna, nonostante la penisola abbia giocato un ruolo fondamentale per la Storia e la Cultura di una parte integrante del continente, a torto considerata come lontana e periferica.

Consapevoli di questo, il Comitato ha posto quale obiettivo primario della *Eastern European History Review* quello di offrire uno spazio di riflessione e di discussione su temi che appartengono alla storia dell'Europa centro-orientale, e insieme alle relazioni - politiche e culturali - che questa vasta area del Vecchio Continente ha avuto con l'occidente d'Europa, e l'Italia in particolare, incoraggiando il dialogo tra studiosi e esperti di settore, e tra differenti approcci della ricerca scientifica.

Il Comitato Redazionale e Scientifico

EASTERN EUROPEAN HISTORY REVIEW: THE JOURNAL

The Editorial and Scientific Board are proud delighted to present the *Eastern European History Review* under the aegis of Sette Città Editore.

The *Eastern European History Review* is an international and interdisciplinary annually online and open access peer-reviewed journal about studies on Central and Eastern Europe in the Modern Age (XIV-XIX). The Journal is also the expression of the Study Center CESPoM (Centro Studi sull'età dei Sobieski e della Polonia Moderna – Center Study on the Age of Sobieski and Modern Poland) of the University of Tuscia, born in 1997, from an idea of Prof. Gaetano Platania, today Director Emeritus of this journal.

It publishes articles with significant approaches and original interpretations in all research fields concerning Central and Eastern Europe, with specific attention to the History sciences.

The editorial initiative we present comes from the obvious lack of a journal, in Italy, concerning the history of Central and Eastern Europe during the Modern Age, this despite its fundamental role in the history and culture of that part of the continent, wrongly considered distant and peripheral.

Quite the contrary is true, in fact. Main objective of the journal is to create a space for reflection and discussion on topics pertaining to Central and Eastern Europe, but also relations with Continental Europe, encouraging dialogue between scholars and experts in the field, and between different approaches of scientific research.

The Editorial and Scientific Board

SOMMARIO/SUMMARY

Dorota Gregorowicz
Introduction

11

TECHNICAL ASPECTS OF DIPLOMATIC SERVICE

Dorota Gregorowicz
Diplomacy of the Commonwealth, Diplomacy of the King: the Peculiarity of Foreign Policy Making in the Seventeenth Century Poland-Lithuania.

19

Marius Sirutavičius
Partnership in a Union with Diverging Interests: Cooperation between the Kingdom of Poland and Grand Duchy of Lithuania in Diplomatic Activities at the Turn of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries.

35

Henryk Litwin, Paweł Duda
Correspondence of Warsaw Nuncio Antonio Santa Croce with Roman Catholic Bishops from 1629: Frequency, Intensity and Content.

45

Michał Salamonik
News Agents and Postmasters: Background Figures or Active Diplomats?

57

DIPLOMACY AS AN ART OF GREAT POLITICS

Miguel Conde Pazos
Spanish Diplomats in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth during the Thirty Years' War.

67

Ryszard Skowron
Palatinate: the Key to Europe. On the Art of Diplomacy of Władysław IV Vasa.

79

Aleksandra Ziober
The Last Years of the Reign of John Casimir Vasa and Interregnum after his Abdication in the Light of Reports of Francis Sanderson and Robert Yard.

101

Alessandro Boccolini
Diplomacy and Papal Politics during the "Unfortunate" Reign of Michał Korybut Wiśniowiecki.

111

DIPLOMATIC CEREMONIAL

Marta Szymańska
The Ceremonial of Receiving of Albrycht Stanisław Radziwiłł and his Stay at the Courts of Western Europe as a Royal Envoy during the Journey of Prince Władysław Vasa 1624–1625.

127

Mariusz Sawicki <i>The Coronation Parliament of John III Sobieski in French-Language Reports Sent to London.</i>	137
Ewelina Sikora <i>Feasting and Fasting in Moscow: Peace Negotiation Between Poland-Lithuania and Muscovy as Seen Through Eating and Drinking Customs.</i>	147
Gaetano Platania <i>Michał Radziwiłł's Obedience Embassy in the Rome of Pope Innocent XI Odescalchi between Diplomacy and Ceremonial.</i>	159
DIPLOMATS IN ACTION	
Uladzimir Padalinski <i>Diplomatic Activity as the Basis of Political Advancement and Material Reward in the Sixteenth-Century Grand Duchy of Lithuania: The Case of Mikhayla Haraburda.</i>	173
Tetiana Grygorieva <i>The "Decisive Embassy" of Prince Krzysztof Zbaraski to Constantinople (1622–1623) and European Diplomacy amidst the Thirty Years' War.</i>	185
Peter P. Bajer <i>The Career of Jerzy (George) Bennet, the Scottish Agent of the Radziwiłł Family.</i>	199
Aleksandra Skrzypietz <i>Between the King's Instructions and the Ambassador's Ambition. Melchior de Polignac's Cooperation with Polish Magnates.</i>	219
Claudia Curcuruto <i>Francesco Buonvisi and Opizio Pallavicini. Correspondences and Activities of Two Apostolic Nuncios in the Service of Pope Innocent XI Odescalchi (1676–1689).</i>	231
Mihalik Béla Vilmos <i>The King's Cousin, the Emperor's Bishop. Christian August of Saxe-Weitz as Mediator between Poland and the Holy See.</i>	249

INTRODUCTION

The crisis of political history, particularly profound since the 1960s and the subsequent cultural turn, has penalised the scientific investigation of “international” relations¹ in the early modern period for many years². Over the last decades, though, there have been several calls for new methodological and conceptual approaches to diplomatic studies, some of them extraordinarily fruitful and inspiring³. Nowadays, as Tracey Sowerby observed, «the *New Diplomatic History*, no longer so new, has become a broad church. It has successfully integrated wider concerns into a field that was once dominated by the study of bureaucracy and foreign policy»⁴. Integrated, but not replaced, which is also essential to emphasise. That is mainly why scholars no longer consider diplomacy and foreign policy making as coterminous, but do assimilate plenty of different aspects diplomatic practice entailed.

One cannot notice that from the point of view of contemporary research on the early modern history of diplomacy, the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth constitutes an interesting phenomenon that has not been sufficiently developed yet, especially in the international forum of researchers along with their various historiographical traditions. There are still many blank spots in exploring this topic, which remain open to a contemporary historian. This special issue of *Eastern European History Review* seeks to encourage a more profound reflection on particularities and significance of the Polish-Lithuanian diplomatic practice in the early modern period, especially during the seventeenth century, by conveying into conversation an international set of scholars from Poland, Lithuania, Belarus, Ukraine, Hungary, Italy, Spain, Sweden and Australia, interested in various aspects of diplomatic history. By bringing consciousness of diplomatic agency to bear on various areas of cultural and political practice, our authors have pressed their research beyond the horizons of their “national histories” that continue to dominate most treatments of premodernity.

On the threshold of the early modern period, *Rzeczpospolita* found itself among the political entities that adopted the praxis of permanent diplomatic missions exchange very late (only in the eighteenth century), relying on the old system of extraordinary embassies, of medieval provenance. However, the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth was no exception on a European scale. The general rules for foreign relations’ conduct appeared similar in Portugal, Scotland, Hungary, Scandinavia (Sweden and Denmark), Switzerland, and several German states⁵.

Federico Chabod considered the permanent diplomatic service, next to the professional army and elaborated bureaucratic apparatus, as the basis for the affirmation of the “early modern state”⁶. *Rzeczpospolita* did not possess any of these elements, but can it be denied the character of statehood from a historical point of view⁷? Subsequently, for Matthew Smith Anderson, the history of early

1 I put the word “international” in quotation marks, considering the imperfection of this concept for the analysis of political relations in early modern Europe. Cf. Tracey A. Sowerby, “Early Modern Diplomatic History”, *History Compass*, 14, 9 (2016): 444.

2 Stefano Andretta, *L'arte della prudenza. Teorie e prassi della diplomazia nell'Italia del XVI e XVII secolo* (Roma: Binklink, 2006), 7.

3 Karl W. Schweizer and Matt J. Schumann, “The Revitalisation of Diplomatic History”, *Diplomacy & Statecraft*, 19, 2 (2008): 149-86; John Watkins, “Toward a New Diplomatic History of Medieval and Early Modern Europe”, *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies*, 38, 1 (2008): 1-14; Diana Carrió-Invernizzi, “A New Diplomatic History and the Networks of Spanish Diplomacy in the Baroque Era”, *The International History Review*, 36, 4 (2014): 603-18; Dorothea Nolde, “Was ist Diplomatie und wenn ja, wie viele? Herausforderungen und Perspektiven einer Geschlechtergeschichte der frühneuzeitlichen Diplomatie”, *Historische Anthropologie*, 21, 2 (2013): 180-98.

4 Sowerby, “Early Modern Diplomatic History”, 441.

5 Giuseppe Galasso, “Le relazioni internazionali nell’età moderna (secoli XV–XVIII)”, *Rivista Storica Italiana*, 111, 1 (1999): 10.

6 Federico Chabod, *Idea di Europa e politica dell’equilibrio* (Bologna: Mulino, 1995).

7 Adam Watson, *The Evolution of International Society. A Comparative Historical Analysis* (London-New York: Routledge, 1992), 185-86: «The kingdom of Poland had increased its power and influence by a dynastic union with Lithuania and expansion eastward, and had made itself the principal bulwark of Latin Christendom on the eastern marches. But the heterogeneous population, the dual governmental structure of Poland-Lithuania and the practice of elective monarchy prevented its consolidation into an effective stato». Cf. Jan Sowa, *Fantomowe ciało króla. Peryferyjne zmagania z*

modern diplomacy constituted a slow but increasingly evident evolution towards the system of permanent representation. He considered contacts between polities that failed to conform to that model «less developed ones, [...] where diplomacy was less important and diplomatic organisation more primitive». Anderson believed that from the point of view of diplomatic practice, one could speak of two “separate Europes” and that «between these two Europes there were as yet only slender links»⁸. Nowadays, historiography views the issue of permanent diplomatic posts in a significantly different way. As Riccardo Fubini suggests, the general deficiency of institutionalisation of the then diplomacy makes the equality of residency and modernity dubious⁹. Also, Sowerby appropriately stated that «the exchange of resident ambassadors did not extend across all of Europe. Rather, asymmetrical relations were not uncommon within Europe and continued to be so into the eighteenth century»¹⁰.

Therefore, nothing could be more erroneous than assuming the passivity of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth on the “international” arena of early modern Europe. The young Polish Vasa dynasty, the more as it functioned within the elective monarchy, manifested a strong need to affirm its position on the European forum. Moreover, the necessity to maintain intensive contacts with foreign partners was caused by the continuous involvement of *Rzeczpospolita* in armed conflicts on various fronts. Due to its geopolitical position, the vastness of the territory and the leading role for the implementation of the Catholic Reform, Poland-Lithuania occupied a distinctive part in the entire system of “international” relations of early modern Europe. All the more so, its specific tradition and political practice concerning the implementation of foreign policy, conducting diplomatic activity outside its borders, as well as accepting foreign legations *in loco*, requires further attention of contemporary historiography.

The special issue of *Eastern European History Review*, *Diplomats and Diplomacy in the Early Modern Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth (XVII century)*, opens with a group of articles regarding some general institutional and technical aspects of the functioning of the Polish-Lithuanian diplomatic service.

Dorota Gregorowicz (*Diplomacy of the Commonwealth, Diplomacy of the King: the Peculiarity of Foreign Policy Making in the Seventeenth Century Poland-Lithuania*) deals with the topicality of research on the history of diplomacy in the early modern Poland-Lithuania, in the context of scant development of permanent diplomatic missions. The article presents considerations on the subjectivity of the *ius legationis* in *Rzeczpospolita*. Gregorowicz reflects on the competencies of the monarch and of the Commonwealth (personified in the *sejm* and Senate councils) in this matter. To this end, she primarily analyses the content of the sixteenth – and seventeenth-century parliamentary constitutions regarding the conduct of foreign policy. Moreover, the article refers to political practice as a determining factor for the legal structure of Poland-Lithuania.

The Union of Lublin (1569), as the basis for the execution of a joint diplomatic activity of the early modern Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, is analysed by Marius Sirutavičius (*Partnership in a Union with Diverging Interests: Cooperation between the Kingdom of Poland and Grand Duchy of Lithuania in Diplomatic Activities at the Turn of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*). The author emphasises the initially divergent interests of both states in addressing the directions of the foreign policy of *Rzeczpospolita* (especially concerning contacts with Muscovy) and their influence on the functioning of the diplomatic service. Moreover, Sirutavičius draws attention to the evolution and gradual uniformisation processes of the Polish and Lithuanian visions of conducting foreign policy,

nowoczesną formą (Kraków: Universitas, 2011). According to Sowa, «the concept of the “ghost body of the King” [inspired by Ernst Kantorowicz] marks a notional horizon in which *Rzeczpospolita* presents itself as a non-existent state entity, or in the process of its disappearance, utterly unsuitable for any modern form of social, political and economic organisation, which took shape in Europe from the early modern age, with the nascent capitalism and parliamentarism» (285). Sowa’s perspective is certainly interesting, although historically not sustainable. Translation in English is of the author.

8 Matthew S. Anderson, *The Rise of Modern Diplomacy 1450–1919* (London-New York: Longman, 1993), 27–8.

9 Riccardo Fubini, *La “residentialité” de l’ambassadeur dans le mythe et dans la réalité: une enquête sur les origines* (Paris: PUF, 1998); Id., “Diplomacy and government in the Italian city-states of the fifteenth century (Florence and Venice)”, in *Diplomacy and Early Modern Culture*, eds. Robyn Adams and Rosanna Cox (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), 26–8.

10 Sowerby, “Early Modern Diplomatic History”, 442.

which took place in the initial period of the reign of Sigismund III Vasa, pointing to the multilateral origins of those developments.

The problem of the source material's characteristics for studying the history of diplomacy is discussed by nunciatures' specialists Henryk Litwin and Paweł Duda in a joint article *Correspondence of Warsaw Nuncio Antonio Santa Croce with Roman Catholic Bishops from 1629 – Frequency, Intensity and Content*. The researchers focused on the analysis of "internal" correspondence maintained by the apostolic nuncio with hierarchs of the Polish-Lithuanian Catholic Church, underlining its parallel importance in relation to the mainstream canals of diplomatic information exchange (between the Polish-Lithuanian periphery – nunciature's chancellery and Roman centre – Secretariat of State).

Finally, the first part of the book includes the reflection of Michał Salamonik on some non-institutional structures and mechanisms of diplomatic activity in the early modern Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, along with the case study on the diplomatic context of the postal and news-spreading duties of the Gdańsk merchant and postmaster Francesco Gratta [1613–1676] (*News Agents and Postmasters: Background Figures or Active Diplomats?*).

The second part of this book is devoted to diplomacy as to the art of great politics' conduct and to the geopolitical position of Poland-Lithuania in seventeenth-century Europe. The advantages of diplomatic negotiations as an alternative to pursuing *Rzeczpospolita's* foreign policy in the military field are highlighted here. This group of articles may seem of a more traditional topicality. Still, it is significant to accentuate its emphasis on the multilateral character of early modern diplomatic relations, strongly including the subject of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth.

Miguel Conde Pazos analyses the impact of the Catholic Monarchy's diplomacy on the involvement of *Rzeczpospolita* in the pan-European conflict (*Spanish Diplomats in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth during the Thirty Years' War*). This example perfectly illustrates the breadth of political, economic and dynastic interactions that were determined by the diplomatic activities of all major European countries, even those geographically distant from each other. Conde Pazos also draws attention to the personal profile of diplomats sent on specific missions and to their respective political culture, experience, and preparation for dedicated charges.

The role of political nuances and, at first glance, of less important elements in conducting a diplomatic activity is treated by Ryszard Skowron (*Palatinate: the Key to Europe. On the Art of Diplomacy of Władysław IV Vasa*). The author points to the role of a seemingly secondary German state, as well as to the complicated system of ties between single European states at that time, in the perspective of the implementation of the great political and dynastic plans of the Polish-Lithuanian monarch, primarily related to his efforts to reclaim the Swedish throne. In fact, it is worth observing how the interests represented and defended through early modern diplomatic negotiation were primarily dynastic, typical of the sovereign families that divided the European spaces between themselves¹¹. In his article, Skowron has distinguished two basic categories defining Władysław IV's foreign policy: peace tactics (diplomatic activity and matrimonial policy) and war (military involvement in connection with the events of the Thirty Years' War).

The English point of view on the last years of the Polish Vasas' rule and on the election of 1669 is presented by Aleksandra Ziober (*The Last Years of the Reign of John Casimir Vasa and Interregnum after his Abdication in the Light of Reports of Francis Sanderson and Robert Yard*). The author shows how the image preserved in diplomatic accounts of various backgrounds' services allows us to recreate the historical narrative for many research topics with more detail. Thus diplomacy becomes a way of acquiring knowledge about single courts and state entities. Ziober also refers to the degree of understanding of the particular form and functioning of the Polish-Lithuanian political structures in seventeenth-century Europe.

The universalist-political dimension of the Holy See's diplomats' activity during the short reign of Michał Korybut Wiśniowiecki (1669–1673) is discussed by Alessandro Boccolini (*Diplomacy and Papal Politics during the "Unfortunate" Reign of Michał Korybut Wiśniowiecki*). The author analysed the

11

Claudio Rosso, "Burocrazia, fiscalità, diplomazia", in *Storia d'Europa e del Mediterraneo. Dal Medioevo all'età della globalizzazione*, sez. 5: *Età moderna (secoli XVI–XVIII)*, vol. XII: *Popoli, stati, equilibri di potere*, ed. Roberto Bizzocchi (Salerno-Roma: Salerno Editrice, 2013), 43.

activity of the then apostolic nunciature primarily in the context of the relations between the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and the Ottoman Empire, as well as the papal vision of *Rzeczpospolita* as *Antemurale Christianitatis*.

As Barbara Stollberg-Rillinger observed, «another major theme within recent reassessments of early modern diplomacy has been non-verbal communication. The early modern diplomatic ceremonial was essential to the expression of hierarchies»¹². In fact, in the third part of the book, we deal with a set of texts referring to the issues of diplomatic ceremonial, as «in early modern European diplomacy, the relationship between the ceremonial symbols and the mechanisms of power was closer and carried more weight»¹³.

In Marta Szymańska's article, *The Ceremonial of Receiving of Albrycht Stanisław Radziwiłł and his Stay at the Courts of Western Europe as a Royal Envoy during the Journey of Prince Władysław Vasa 1624–1625*, the diplomatic role of the Lithuanian magnate, member of the Vasa Prince's retinue during Władysław's educational trip around Europe, as well as the diplomatic dimension of the entire enterprise, seemingly unrelated to the implementation of the Polish-Lithuanian foreign policy, are discussed. One of the key aspects of the study is how the ceremonial applied to the Prince's retinue members indicated the diplomatic nature of the expedition.

Mariusz Sawicki (*The Coronation Parliament of John III Sobieski in French-Language Reports Sent to London*) presents a picture of the anointing act and then the entire coronation *sejm* (1676) of the later victor from Vienna. The author shows the image that French diplomats, present at that time in Poland-Lithuania, created in their reports on the events of Sobieski's coronation: its political, social and ceremonial aspects. Interestingly, those reports were sent in London and not in Paris. Sawicki shows himself fully aware of the strengths and weaknesses of historical interpreting similar creation that any external observers could create.

Ewelina Sikora (*Feasting and Fasting in Moscow: Peace Negotiation Between Poland-Lithuania and Muscovy as Seen Through Eating and Drinking Customs*) takes up the theme of feasting as an essential element of Polish-Lithuanian diplomatic practice during the missions to Muscovy. The article constitutes an important contribution for developing further research on material culture in the field of the history of diplomacy¹⁴, also in the context of ceremonial treatments and traditional usages.

Finally, Gaetano Platania draws attention to the institution of obedience missions that Polish-Lithuanian kings traditionally sent to the papal court in order to certify their loyalty to the Catholic Church and its superior (*Michał Radziwiłł's Obedience Embassy in the Rome of Pope Innocent XI Odescalchi between Diplomacy and Ceremonial*). The author presents a case study, a picture of the *Rzeczpospolita's* envoy's entry to the Eternal City in 1680, putting Michał Radziwiłł's mission in the large political context of the Holy League's organisation. The ceremonial becomes here an authentic baroque, theatrical representation, still, by no means deprived of its political importance.

The last part of the book is devoted to a series of outstanding personalities of diplomats operating in the context of seventeenth-century *Rzeczpospolita*. Many scholars have adopted an actor-centred approach to inquiry early modern diplomacy, and such career case studies result as extremely useful. Placing ambassadors at the heart of the analysis offers a rich research perspective regarding the relationships they cultivated, their contacts and personal capacities, as well as the individual factor in conducting foreign policy that has always accompanied the great policy's sketches.

Uładzimir Padalinski develops the topic of the diplomatic activity of Mikhayla Haraburda (*Diplomatic Activity as the Basis of Political Advancement and Material Reward in the Sixteenth-Century Grand Duchy of Lithuania: The Case of Mikhayla Haraburda*). It is a specific case study of a multiple envoy of

12 Barbara Stollberg-Rillinger, "Zeremoniell, Ritual, Symbol: Neue Forschungen zur symbolischen Kommunikation in Spätmittelalter und Früher Neuzeit", *Zeitschrift für Historische Forschung*, 27, 3 (2000): 389-405. Cf. Sowerby, "Early Modern Diplomatic History", 445.

13 Jan Hennings, "The Semiotics of Diplomatic Dialogue: Pomp and Circumstance in Tsar Peter I's Visit to Vienna in 1698", *The International History Review*, 30, 3 (2008), 515.

14 Cf. Harriet Rudolph, "Entangled Objects and Hybrid Practices? Material Culture as a New Approach to the History of Diplomacy", in *Material Culture in Modern Diplomacy from the 15th to the 20th Century*, eds. Rudolph and Gregor M. Metzger (Oldenbourg: De Gruyter, 2016), 1-28.

the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth to Muscovy and Crimea. Padalinski shows the dynamics with which the involvement in the implementation of foreign policy could determine both the political career and the social status of a diplomat in the noble context of *Rzeczpospolita*. His study also provides an outstanding example of the Lithuanian ambassador's *cursus honorum*.

Krzysztof Zbaraski's Constantinopolitan mission is examined by Tetiana Grygorieva (*The "Decisive Embassy" of Prince Krzysztof Zbaraski to Constantinople (1622–1623) and European Diplomacy amidst the 'Thirty Years' War*). The article rejects the bilateral vision of Polish-Lithuanian and Ottoman diplomatic contacts, presenting the image of Zbaraski's expedition in a broad European context, including, *inter alia*, political relations of both countries with Transylvania, as well as their involvement in the events of the Thirty Years' War.

Peter P. Bajer presents a diplomatic career as a path of personal development and one of the ways to build a social position in the early modern *Rzeczpospolita*. The author observes the case of foreign newcomers or/and their families (based on the example of Scottish immigration), the desirable result of who was usually obtaining a noble status in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth (*The Career of Jerzy (George) Bennet, the Scottish Agent of the Radziwiłł Family*)¹⁵.

The diplomatic mission as a field for the realisation of personal interests of a diplomat, in addition to the tasks provided by representing his political superior, is presented by Aleksandra Skrzypietz (*Between the King's Instructions and the Ambassador's Ambition. Cooperation Between Melchior de Polignac and Polish Magnates*). The author shows how diplomatic feedback could have influenced the evolution of the instructions entrusted to ambassadors and, consequently, had a direct impact on their political activity. Skrzypietz presents Polignac not only as a performer but as a co-creator of the French political program towards the *Rzeczpospolita* ruled by John III Sobieski. Finally, she explains the difficulties encountered by ambassadors of foreign countries in approaching the complex political and social context of the early modern Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth.

The activities of diplomats of Pope Innocent XI in Poland-Lithuania and at the imperial court, as well as the nature of their regular contacts with the Roman Curia, are presented by Claudia Curcuruto (*Francesco Buonvisi and Opizio Pallavicini. Correspondences and Activities of Two Apostolic Nuncios in the Service of Pope Innocent XI Odescalchi. 1676–1689*). The author focuses on the communicative aspects of the activities of the apostolic nunciatures. She presents diplomats as mediators between radically different (geographically, politically, culturally) realities (not only on the line of the royal/imperial court and the papal court but also between local bishops and the Bishop of Rome – the pope). Finally, the issue of mediation, as one of the crucial elements of early modern diplomatic practice, is presented by Béla Mihalik on the example of the activity of a relative of the Polish-Lithuanian monarch Augustus II the Strong (1697–1706, 1709–1733) – Bishop of Győr, Christian August (*The King's Cousin, the Emperor's Bishop. Christian August of Saxe-Weitz as Mediator between Poland and the Holy See*). It is another text that highlights the problem of the personal interests of diplomats in carrying out their missions. In the case of Wettin, these were primarily the efforts to obtain the cardinal's hat. As observed by John Watkins, «the time has come for a multidisciplinary reevaluation of one of the oldest, and traditionally one of the most conservative, subfields in the modern discipline of history: the study of premodern diplomacy»¹⁶. Contemporary research on the history of diplomacy in the early modern *Rzeczpospolita* is doing quite well, but it still requires a reorientation and innovation of methodological approach. The history of diplomacy should no longer be seen as an abstract account of negotiations and treaties, disconnected from parallel social, economic and cultural aspects. Indeed, as this collection of studies demonstrates, historiography is continually discovering new research fields in matter. Among those contained in the presented volume, we can indicate: legal and institutional forms of early modern “international” relations, nature of diplomatic sources and character of the narrative present in the documents, multilaterality and complexity of the early modern interstate connections,

15 Recently on similar issues: Michał Salamonik, *In Their Majesties' Service. The Career of Francesco De Gratta (1613–1676) as a Royal Servant and Trader in Gdańsk* (Huddinge: Södertörns högskola, 2019); Wojciech Tygielski, *Dylematy włoskiego emigranta. Giovanni Battista Jacobelli (1603–1679), śpiewak i kapelan nadworny, kanonik warmiński* (Warszawa: Muzeum Pałacu Króla Jana III w Wilanowie, 2019).

16 Watkins, “Toward a New Diplomatic History”, 1.

their religious and confessional nature¹⁷, diplomatic ceremonial and non-verbal communication, tools and techniques used by ambassadors, *people* as direct implementers of the “art of diplomacy”, their *cursus honorum* and mechanisms of social advancement, cultural image expressed in diplomatic documents, social, economic, commercial and dynastic causes that determined political choices, as well as material culture in diplomacy¹⁸. This volume will undoubtedly contribute to the further development of contemporary analysis of these issues. We would like to continue to engage in new methods, ask additional questions, and rethink how early modern Polish-Lithuanian diplomacy is currently being studied.

Dorota Gregorowicz
University of Silesia in Katowice

¹⁷ Cf. *Confessional Diplomacy in Early Modern Europe*, eds. Roberta Anderson and Charlotte Backerra (London-New York: Routledge, 2021).

¹⁸ Cf. Daniela Frigo, “Politica estera e diplomazia: figure problemi e apparati”, in *Storia degli antichi stati italiani*, eds. Gaetano Greco and Mario Rosa (Roma-Bari: Laterza, 1996), 117.

Alessandro Boccolini
UNIVERSITY OF TUSCIA (ITALY)

DIPLOMACY AND PAPAL POLITICS DURING THE “UNFORTUNATE” REIGN OF MICHAŁ KORYBUT WIŚNIOWIECKI

ABSTRACT

After a complex *interregnum*, on 19 June 1669, Michał Korybut Wiśniowiecki was elected the new king of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. Although the election was unanimous, a political rift soon emerged with a party opposing the new ruler. The internal conflict favoured the Ottomans, who invaded Ukraine. The *Infidels* conquered the Kamieniec Podolski fortress and forced the Warsaw court to sign a shameful treaty in Buchach in October 1672. This tragic news soon reached Rome, alarming the Holy See, which had always followed with great interest the events of that distant kingdom, known to be the last bulwark of Christianity. The article intends to retrace the dramatic phases experienced by the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth during the reign of Wiśniowiecki, in the light of the political and diplomatic actions carried out by Pope Clement X Altieri to support this *Antemurale Christianitatis*.

KEYWORDS: Holy See; Diplomacy; Clement X Altieri; Early Modern Poland; Ottomans.

INTRODUCTION

After a complex and hard-fought *interregnum*, on 19 June 1669, Michał Korybut Wiśniowiecki¹ was elected king of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth.

The news had reached Rome through an extraordinary courier by Monsignor Marescotti²; the nuncio was sent to Warsaw by the Holy See to facilitate a Catholic's election as King of Poland. Marescotti had managed to knock out the schismatic Muscovite candidate with great skill, paving the way for Wiśniowiecki's candidacy.

The election was greeted with great jubilation by Pope Clement IX Rospigliosi, who immediately congratulated the new king. Even the cardinal protector of the Kingdom, Virginio Orsini³, immediately wrote to the Polish sovereign. In particular, the cardinal informed Wiśniowiecki that the election that had just taken place had renewed hopes in Rome of seeing all the problems in that part of Europe resolved. For this reason, the Holy See hoped to:

vedere dalle sue mani gloriose debellato l'inimico commune et anco ad ogni maggior segno avvantaggiata la Religione in un Regno così potente e della quale n'è l'Antemurale, non potendosi scegliere tempo più oportuno di intraprendere con sicurezza di vantaggi e certe Vittorie hora che l'Ottomanno dopo

¹ See A. Przyboś, “Wiśniowiecki Michał Korybut”, in PSB, vol. 20 (1975), 605-09. Id., *Michał Korybut Wiśniowiecki, 1640–1673* (Kraków-Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Literackie, 1984); Ilona Czamańska, *Wiśniowieccy. Monografia rodu* (Poznań: Wydawnictwo Poznańskie 2007). Oreste F. Tencajoli, *L'elezione ed il matrimonio di un re di Polonia* (Milano: Pizzi, 1912), Andrea Honorati, *Michele Korybut Wiśniowiecki re di Polonia 1669–1673* (Ancona: s.n. 1992).

² The nuncio had sent an *straordinario* on the same day of the election (AAV, *Segreteria di Stato. Polonia*, vol. 83, Galeazzo Marescotti to Giacomo Rospigliosi, Warsaw 19 June 1669, f. 158r; AC, Archivio Orsini, I, *Corrispondenze [...]*, b. 229, G. Marescotti to Virginio Orsini, Warsaw 19 June 1669, c. 0036.). A few days later, he sent a letter to the Secretariat of State with more precise information (Ibid., Warsaw 25 June 1669, f. 212r-v). On Galeazzo Marescotti, see Giovanna Motta, *sub voce* in DBI, vol. 70 (2008), 75-8; Henryk Damian Wojtyńska, ANP, t. I: *De fontibus eorumque investigatione et editionibus Instructio ad editionem Nuntiorum series chronologica* (Romae: Institutum Historicum Polonicum, 1990), 267-68.

³ Irene Fosi, “Orsini Virgino”, in DBI, vol. 79 (2013), 215-19. Ead., “Il cardinale Virginio Orsini e la “Protezione” del regno di Polonia (1650-1676): note e documenti dall'Archivio Orsini”, in *Per Rita Tolomeo, scritti di amici sulla Dalmazia e l'Europa centro-orientale*, eds. Ester Capuzzo, Bruno Crevato-Selvaggi and Francesco Guida (Venezia: La Musa Talia, 2014) 229-244, Alessandro Boccolini, “Rzeczpospolita e Curia Romana. L'interregno del 1669 nelle carte di Virginio Orsini, cardinale protettore di Polonia”, in *Gli “Angeli Custodi” delle Monarchie: i cardinali protettori delle nazioni*, eds. Matteo Sanfilippo and Péter Tusor (Viterbo: Sette Città, 2019) 199-238.



lunghe guerre resta notabilmente debilitato [...] e sperare se hora che hora che sono armati li Principi Christiani si crede se attaccato per più parti che simil congiuntura sarà molto difficile che si possi havere in altri tempi di unire assieme tante circostanze favorevoli, onde la Maestà Vostra si renderebbe immortale con tutta questa gloriosa nobiltà e una natione sempre Vittoriosa. [...] e mentre il PP [*Pater Patrum*] con tanta sollecitudine paterna procura unire tutte le forze Christiane contro l'inimico commune è certo che Vostra Maestà non potria mai far la dimostrazione più obligante di questa perché non verrà mai una congiuntura simile né per la Santa Sede, né per l'Universale del Mondo, ond'io che sono antico ed obbligato servitore della Maestà Vostra, e di cotesto gran Regno e che vorrei vedere nella sua persona Reale ogn'augumento di gloria e di estimatione ho preso l'ardire rappresentarli tutto ciò perché si come ha cagionato gran rimbombo di allegrezza la sua felice elettione così le accrescerebbero gran nomi e le saria fondamento di una gran estimatione il vedersi nel bel Principio una intrapresa simile⁴.

After expressing personal congratulations on the election, Orsini reminded Michał of his obligations as a Catholic king with this solemn letter. The priority was the fight against the Turkish *infidels* who were stationed along the southern borders of the Commonwealth for too long, ready to invade the Kingdom and Christian Europe. However, we know that the election of this new ruler did not produce the desired effects, and, as Gaetano Platania wrote, the reign of Wiśniowiecki was “unfortunate”⁵. Immediately after Michał's election to the throne, the hope of peace and internal harmony, prefigured by his unanimous election⁶, was utterly disregarded. On the one hand, the internal political rift re-emerged, even more substantial, with a party opposing the new king, led by Jan Sobieski, who wanted to dethrone Michał; on the other hand, the Ottomans led by the vizier Michel Kaplan Paşa began to threaten the Commonwealth, invading the country and conquering the Kamieniec Podolski fortress – the natural gateway to the entire Polish-Lithuanian –. A military offensive forced the Warsaw court to sign a shameful treaty in Buchach (Bučač, Ukraine) in October 1672⁷.

The echo of these tragic events soon arrived in Rome, alarming the papal capital, which has always followed the events of that distant kingdom, the last Bulwark of Christianity, with great interest: a fear that felt Clement X Altieri, who had recently ascended to the papal throne⁸, but which extended to the whole city of Rome, including ecclesiastics, laity, and ordinary people⁹.

This article intends to retrace the dramatic events in Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth during the reign of Wiśniowiecki, in the light of the interest shown by the Holy See and the actions carried out by Pope Clement X Altieri to help this *Antemurale Christianitatis*. Therefore, Roman and Vatican sources are an integral and fundamental part of this analysis.

4 AC, Archivio Orsini, I, *Corrispondenze* [...], b. 248, V. Orsini to Michał Korybut Wiśniowiecki, Rome 8 August 1669, ff. 100r-101v.

5 Gaetano Platania, *Rzeczpospolita, Europa e Santa Sede tra intese e ostilità* (Viterbo: Sette Città, 2000), 79-117.

6 The Polish election had a significant impact in Europe and Rome in particular. Several reports on the event were printed. ASR, *Fondo Cartari-Febei*, vol. 82, *Ragguaglio dell'esito che ha havuto alli XIX Giugno la Dieta di Polonia con l'Elettione del nuovo Re* (In Venetia: appresso Gio. Pietro Pinelli, 1669), ff. 106r-07v; BAV, Ottob. Lat., 2494, *Ragguaglio dell'esito che ha avuto alli 19 giugno 1669 la Dieta di Polonia con l'elezione del Nuovo re* (Venezia 1669). Archivio Privato Famiglia Odiscalchi – Roma, II/A/5/, n. 35, *Elezione di Michele Korybut Wisniowiecki a Re di Polonia, 19 giugno 1669*, ff. n.n.

7 According to treaty in Buchach, the Commonwealth ceded territory of Podolia Voivodship and the southern Ukraine (Bratislav and Kyiv Voivodships) to the Ottomans. Warsaw agreed to pay a yearly tribute of 22'000 thalers. The nuncio, Angelo Maria Ranuzzi, defined this treaty as “so disgraceful” due to the clauses imposed by the Turks. [«pace così obrobriosa»]. AAV, *Segreteria di Stato. Polonia*, vol. 87, *Angelo Maria Ranuzzi a Paluzzo Paluzzi-Altieri*, Warsaw 12 October 1672, f. 269r-v. AAV, *Avvisi*, Warsaw 12 October 1672, f. 432v. In general, on the treaty, see Janusz Woliński, *Z dziejów wojen polsko-tureckich* (Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Ministerstwa Obrony Narodowej, 1983), 21-50.

8 On the conclave of 1670: Ludwing von Pastor, *Storia dei Papi* [...], vol. 14/1: *Dall'elezione di Innocenzo X sino alla morte di Innocenzo XII (1644-1700)* (Roma: Desclée, 1932), 628-44; Gianvittorio Signorotto, “Lo Squadrone Volante. I cardinali “liberi” e la politica europea nella seconda metà del XVII secolo”, in *La Corte di Roma tra Cinquecento e Seicento. “Teatro” della politica europea*, eds. Gianvittorio Signorotto and Maria Antonietta Visceglia (Bulzoni: Roma, 1998), 93-117.

9 The diary of Carlo Cartari, a Roman consistorial lawyer, is particularly interesting about the Romans' interest in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth events. This precious source includes a chronological span that goes from 1642 to 1691: it consists of 32 volumes containing Italian and European news (with attached printed documents of the time), mainly referring to the urban reality of Rome. The State Archives of Rome (*Archivio di Stato di Roma*) collected the entire Cartari collection: the volumes of the Diario nn. 82-84 refer to the years 1669-1673, during the reign of Wiśniowiecki.

BETWEEN DIPLOMACY AND POLITICS: THE ACTIONS OF THE HOLY SEE TO SAVE THE COMMONWEALTH

When in 1672, the Ottoman forces entered the southern territories of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, the Sultan's decision to act in those territories was not surprising to the most attentive observers of the time.

On the contrary, the danger of a Turkish invasion had been troubling the Polish-Lithuanian kingdom for several years. For example, between 1666 and 1667, a Tatar vanguard, allied with Constantinople, had managed to break through the Ukrainian borders, heralding a subsequent and massive incursion by the Turkish army.

This tragic news had reached Rome in all its tragedy through extraordinary couriers sent by the Warsaw court¹⁰. A privileged observatory to understand the drama of this moment is the figure of Virginio Orsini, as the cardinal protector of the Kingdom, to whom Ludovico Fantoni¹¹ – Italian secretary of the Polish king, and agent in Poland of the protector himself – had sent precise information:

Li Tartari in Ukraina mostrano di volersi render padroni di quella provincia et si ha luogo di sospettare che se l'intendino col Turco medesimo che si vorrà facilmente approfittare delle discordie e sconcerti che regnano fra la nobiltà che si mostra cieca tuttavia di non vedere li apparenti pericoli dell'interito della patria¹².

It is a letter which dramatic content was immediately confirmed by another addressed to the same cardinal by Cristoforo Masini¹³. Inside, the personal secretary of John Casimir Vasa described the extent of what happened to his Roman correspondent, foreshadowing a much worse situation for Poland. The information, dated 4 January 1667, was of the following content:

il turco si è affatto smascherato per mezzo dei suoi tartari, i quali con alcune truppe di Cosacchi hanno tagliato a pezzi 17 compagnie di cavallerie et altre XI, che andavano in rinforzo, sono state disperse [...]. Dicono che quando questi con la preda saranno in sicuro, un altro esercito verrà per fare una grande distruttione. Questo male è creduto improvviso da chi non si è voluto occupare nell'osservar gli andamenti dei Turchi da alcuni anni in qua¹⁴.

The invasion of the Kingdom by the Tatar army – behind which the “common enemy” of Christianity was hidden – had forced the Polish court to send its envoy to Christian princes to explore the possibilities of creating a united front against the Turkish *infidels*¹⁵.

Despite the intense diplomatic efforts made by Warsaw, the Christian powers were utterly indifferent to the Polish situation. To underline that was unheard also the request for subsidies asked the Holy See because already committed to helping Venice in the war of Candia¹⁶. Fortunately for the

10 AVV, *Segreteria di Stato. Polonia*, vol. 78, Antonio Pignatelli to Giulio Rospigliosi, Warsaw 29 December 1666, f. 339r-v. The same news: AAV, *Avvisi*, vol. 114, Warsaw 29 December 1666, f. 27v.

11 Ludovico Fantoni had been intimate Italian secretary of Władysław IV, then of John Casimir and finally of Michał Korybut Wiśniowiecki; from 1668 he was an agent of the cardinal protector Orsini. From 1655 to 1681, Canon of Vilnius and dean of Heilsberg Cathedral. Cf. Karolina Targosz, *Uczony dwór Ludwika Marii Gonzagi 1646–1667. Z dziejów polsko-francuskich stosunków naukowych* (Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 1975), 72–3.

12 AC, Archivio Orsini, I, *Corrispondenze* [...], b. 224, Ludovico Fantoni a Virginio Orsini, Warsaw 28 December 1666, c. 0295.

13 On Cristoforo Masini, personal and intimate secretary of John II Casimir Vasa: Laura Ronchi De Michelis, *sub voce* in DBI, vol. 71 (2008), 614–16; Domenico Caccamo, “Osservatori italiani della crisi polacca a metà Seicento. La Relazione di S. Cefali e le Replicazioni di C. Masini”, in Id. *Roma, Venezia e l'Europa centro-orientale* (Milano: Franco Angeli, 2010), 483–530.

14 AC, Archivio Orsini, I, *Corrispondenze* [...], b. 225, Cristoforo Masini to Virginio Orsini, Warsaw 4 January 1667, c. 0453. The then nuncio Pignatelli sent the same dramatic news: AAV, *Segreteria di Stato. Polonia*, vol. 80, Antonio Pignatelli to Giulio Rospigliosi, Warsaw 4 January 1667, ff 3–4r.

15 On the sending of Polish envoy to the significant European courts, and also to Rome, see AC, Archivio Orsini, I, *Corrispondenze* [...], b. 225, Cristoforo Masini to Virginio Orsini, Warsaw 4 January 1667, c. 0453, Ibid., b. 226, Ludovico Fantoni to Virginio Orsini, Warsaw 11 January 1667, c. 0165.

16 To John Casimir's request for subsidies, in a letter presented by Orsini (AAV, *Lettere di Principi*, vol. 94, John II Casimir

Commonwealth, the pressure on the south-eastern line ceased after the providential signing of the Andruszów¹⁷ treaty between Warsaw and Moscow: the prospect of a Polish-Muscovite alliance against the Turks was decisive in removing the Ottoman pressure from the Ukrainian borders for the moment. However, the Turkish threat would still emerge in 1672 when the king of Poland was Wiśniowiecki: both the failure to respect the clauses established at Andruszów between Poles and Moscovities and the inability of the new sovereign to maintain the internal peace in the kingdom favoured the incursion of the Ottoman forces into Ukraine. The conquest of the Kamieniec Podolski fortress highlighted to all Europe the decision of the Sultan to force entry to the Old Continent from the side of Poland.

Although the southern front of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth remained in constant tension, it should be emphasised that until 1672, the Holy See had lived in terror of a possible Ottoman invasion of the Christian world also by the Mediterranean, along the Adriatic coast of the Italian peninsula¹⁸.

While in the papal capital uncertain news of the Mediterranean front came, increasingly detailed *Avvisi* and letters reported tragic and alarming news from the eastern front: the recipients of these latest communications were the Secretariat of State through the papal nuncio, Monsignor Ranuzzi¹⁹, and the cardinal protector of the Kingdom of Poland, Virginio Orsini, by his Polish correspondent. For example, Ludovico Fantoni – royal secretary but also Orsini's agent in Poland – had represented the *infidels'* threatening presence on the southern border of the Commonwealth, starting from 1670:

Da Jassi di Valacchia con lettere da 20 marzo si ha che li Turchi non desistino dal far preparamenti per la guerra, fabbricando poste e carri per il cannone e monitioni, allestendo altre cose necessarie, continuando sempre la voce, che siano per muoversi contro la Polonia, e che siano per assediare Camenetz di Podolia²⁰.

A couple of months later, Francesco Gramignoli, an Italian merchant resident in Warsaw, and personal informer of Cardinal Orsini, confirmed this kind of news. He had written about the publication in Wallachia of a sultan's edict, which obliged Ottoman troops to march in the direction of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth²¹. Therefore, in the southern Ukrainian territories, the gathering of Turkish soldiers was a certainty for some time, as evidenced by the correspondence received from the cardinal himself: the total number was uncertain, but the communications reported thousands and thousands of fighters. Many letters, dispatches, and *avvisi* represented an increasingly tense situation. An Ottoman army of 150,000 soldiers forced men, women, and children residing between Lublin and Lviv to leave their lands²².

The same nuncio in Poland confirmed the alarming situation. According to the nuncio, 70,000 Turks

Vasa to Alexander VII, Warsaw 5 January 1667, f. 4), the pope had replied that the priority of the Holy See was to help Venice, at that moment engaged in the war in Candia. See Alessandro Boccolini, "Un "agente diplomatico" a Roma per la Rzeczpospolita: l'abate Paolo Doni al servizio di Jan II Kazimierz Waza", in *Gli agenti presso la Santa Sede delle comunità straniere e degli stati stranieri*, vol. I: secoli XV–XVII, eds. Matteo Sanfilippo and Péter Tusor (Viterbo: Sette Città, 2020), 249.

17 The easing of the Tatar/Turkish pressure with the treaty's signing was also foreseen by the nuncio when he informed the *Segreteria di Stato* of Peace established between Warsaw and Moscow. AAV, *Segreteria di Stato. Polonia*, vol. 80, Antonio Pignatelli to Giulio Rospigliosi, Warsaw 1 February 1667, f. 37r. On the treaty: Cfr. Zbigniew Wójcik, *Traktat andruszowski 1667 roku i jego geneza* (Warszawa: PWN, 1959).

18 As early as 1670 and throughout 1672, *Avvisi* about the powerful armament of the Ottoman navy reached Rome. The fear was that it could attack the Italian peninsula: «L'Armata turchesca tiene in timore la Christianità, essendo certo, che l'armamento è considerabile, et incerti li suoi disegni». ASR, Fondo Cartari-Febei, *Lettere di Carlo Cartari 1671–1689*, b. 33, f.n.n.

19 Francesca Boris, "Ranuzzi Angelo Maria", in DBI, vol. 86 (2016), 134–36. On his nunciature in Poland: Wojtyńska, ANP, t. I, 271–72.

20 AC, Archivio Orsini, I serie, *Corrispondenze* [...], b. 230, Ludovico Fantoni to Virginio Orsini, Warsaw 16 April 1670, c. 0351.

21 AC, Archivio Orsini, I, *Corrispondenze* [...], b. 231, Ludovico Fantoni to Virginio Orsini, Warsaw 4 June 1670, c. 0033. A large part of the diplomatic correspondence exchanged between cardinal Orsini and his Polish correspondents – from the election of Wiśniowiecki to the Ottoman conquest of Kamieniec Podolski – focuses on the Turkish question and the movements of enemy troops along the southern border of the kingdom.

22 AC, Archivio Orsini, I, *Corrispondenze* [...], b. 232, Francesco Gramignoli to Virginio Orsini, Warsaw 5 August 1671, c. 0465.

built a bridge over the Danube and another over the river Dniester²³. Not even the time to learn the Turkish advance on the eastern front, that the news of the Polish capitulation in Kamieniec reached Rome²⁴.

Cattivi avvisi portano le ultime lettere di Polonia e di Germania; cioè che in Polonia habbia il Gran Turco (che di persona si trova nel Campo, composta di dugento mila combattenti) pigliata (come ho accennato) la forte, e considerabile Piazza di Camenizza, e che perciò essendo il Re fuggito con la Regina nella Slesia, si possa dubitare che il Turco faccia acquisto delle altre Città di quel Regno, le quali (no havendo chi comandi, e proceda al bisogno urgentissimo) restano queste abbandonati. Dicesi che nell'istessa Piazza di Camenizza habbiano i Turchi fatta grande uccisione di nobili, e di putti; di quelli, acciò no vi sia chi possa far contrasto, e di questi, acciò non vi sia chi crescendo negli anni, possa fargli guerra. Il che si vivrà co timore aspettando d'intendere nuove funeste di altri progressi in quel Regno²⁵.

Having learned of the Ottoman breakthrough, Clement X immediately worked to find solutions that could counter the Turks' advance in that country considered the *Anthemurale Christianitatis par excellence* at the time. A kingdom that Pope Altieri knew well from having been there as the auditor of the papal nuncio, Monsignor Lancellotti²⁶.

Although the pontiff immediately showed himself personally interested in the situation in Poland, he learned of the treaty of Buchach signed by Wiśniowiecki with the Ottomans²⁷: a peace which clauses for Poland provided for the cession of the voivodships of Podolia, Braclaw, part of the territories adjacent to Kyiv, in addition to the obligation to pay a significant annual tax to the Sultan²⁸.

Faced with such a dramatic situation for Poland as for Christianity in general, Clement X implemented a series of actions – spiritual, political, and diplomatic– upon hearing the fatal news.

The first action – of a spiritual nature – consisted in the proclamation of an extraordinary jubilee²⁹. The bull, dated 5 November, is known under the title of *Inter Gravissimas*³⁰, and the reason for its publication is clear from its beginning: «Iubileum universal ad implorandum opem contra Turcas»³¹. In addition to the divine support requested with promulgating this plenary indulgence, Clement X intensified his efforts with other, more concrete strategies to fight the *infidels*.

In the first place, the Pope began to send subsidies to the Polish court, forcing the cardinals of

23 «I turchi avevano perfezionato il ponte sopra il Danubio e che preparavano materiali per farne un altro sopra il Neister e che l'armata ottomana numerosa di 70mila soldati in circa, e d'un grosso treno d'artiglieria ben pro-vista et altri attrezzi militari, si radunava ne' contorni di Baba con disegno di pigliar ben presto la marchia verso questa parte all'attacco di Caminiec». BAV, Barb. Lat., 6408, *Avvisi*, Warsaw 27 April 1672, f. 372r-v. Nuncio Ranuzzi represented the same situation: AAV, *Segreteria di Stato. Polonia*, vol. 87, *Angelo Maria Ranuzzi to Paluzzo Paluzzi Altieri*, Warsaw 20 April 1672, f. 129r-v.

24 BAV, Barb. Lat., 2595, *Relazione breve e Fedele della presa di Caminiez fatta dai Turchi nell'anno 1673 stesa da Stefano Gradi per relazione di Mattia Gondola, testimone oculare*, ff. 30-3r. Cf. Platania, *Rzeczpospolita*, 105. On Podolia conquered by the Turks: Dariusz Kołodziejczyk, *Podole pod panowaniem tureckim Ejalet Kamieniecki (1672-1699)* (Warszawa: Polczek 1994).

25 ASR, Fondo Cartari-Febei, *Diario*, vol. 84, f. 112r.

26 Cf. Pastor, *Storia dei Papi*, 645. Laura Ronchi De Michelis, "Lancellotti Giovanni Battista", in DBI, vol. 63 (2004), 297-98.

27 The correspondence sent by the nuncio to Rome (both to the Secretariat of State and the cardinal protector) testifies to the pressure exerted by the Turks on the Warsaw court to sign the treaty. AC, Archivio Orsini, I, *Corrispondenze* [...], b. 234, *Angelo Maria Ranuzzi to Virginio Orsini*, Warsaw 22 September 1672, c. 0561.

28 Cf. Platania, *Rzeczpospolita*, 105.

29 A few days before the call of the papal bull, Clement X wanted to sensitise the Catholic people on the severe events in Poland. On 27 October 1672, an edict was printed. BCasan., *Editi*, t. 12, *Ordine del Cardinal Vicario Gaspare Carpegna, col quale si indicano preghiere per la difesa del Regno di Polonia invaso dai Turchi* (Roma: Stamperia Camerale, 1672), 543.

30 For the full text of the papal bull, see *Bullarium Diplomatum et Privilegiorum Sanctorum Romanorum Pontificum Taurinensis Editio, cura et studio Collegii adlecti Romae Virorum S. Theologiae et Ss. Canonum Peritorum*, (Augusta Taorinorum: A. Vecco et sociis, 1869), 364-67. For the summary of the bull *Giubileo universale concesso dalla Sanità di N. S. Papa Clemente X per implorare il divino aiuto contro il Turco*, see AAV, *Bandi Scioliti*, a. 1672, n.n.; BAV, *Bandi*, t. 204, 139; BCasan., *Editi*, t. 12, 544-46.

31 *Bullarium* [...], 364.

the Sacred College and all the Roman clergy to contribute to the whole sum with a part of their ecclesiastical income³². In November 1672, Pope Altieri's resolution allowed the Roman court to allocate 100.000 florins (ca 27.250,27 *moneta romana*—Roman coin) to Warsaw, with the Nerli family as an intermediary in this operation in Vienna³³. In the following years, Clement X would strengthen this strategy by imposing taxes on all ecclesiastical property in Italy and abroad with a bull of March 1673, then extended for five years starting from 29 September 1674³⁴. In total, the economic subsidy plan wanted by Clement X would have allowed the Holy See to send about 146.731,94 of *moneta romana* to Poland, at least until June 1675: sums meticulously noted in some registers of the “Fondo Camerale” kept in the State Archives of Rome³⁵.

On the political and diplomatic front, the Pope decided to send his emissaries to the most significant European courts to explore the possibilities of creating a league of Christian princes to oppose the advance of the Ottomans in Eastern Europe. This plan – it must be specified – did not materialise: the European powers were not interested in undertaking military action against Constantinople for the moment; indeed, they believed that the war could not extend beyond Poland.

All the European courts consulted by Clement X expressed their refusal motivating their denial to the Pope based on “national” logics and interests. The court of Vienna had already strengthened the borders with the Ottomans in Upper Hungary, convincing itself that the confrontation with the *infidels* was only a “Polish question”. On the contrary, the court of Paris hoped that the Turks could remain threatening on the eastern front and then put pressure on the Habsburg territories, perhaps opening that “second eastern front” to the Empire, so desired by Louis XIV. The *Christianissimo* king continued to press the Holy Roman Empire on the continental side by invading the United Provinces to achieve this goal³⁶.

In this context, one should note the attempt of the Holy See to involve Muscovy in the anti-Turkish league project. There were chances of success if we consider that part of the southern territories of the Grand Duchy, in contrast to the Tsar, had asked the Sultan for protection. The geopolitical premises foreshadowed a diplomatic success for the Holy See because Tsar Alexei Michailovič had sent his ambassador – the Scottish baron Paul Menzies of Pitfodels (known as Paolo Menesio)³⁷ – to Clement X with the task of reactivating contacts between Rome and Moscow and discussing the League.

In the summer of 1672, the arrival of the Muscovite emissary in Rome was an extraordinary event that interested many Roman chroniclers. For example, Carlo Cartari, a consistory lawyer, followed the

32 ASR, Fondo Cartari-Febei, *Diario*, vol. 84, f. 110v. Wiśniowiecki informed the Holy See that the Polish clergy offered the tenth part of their ecclesiastical income for the war on the *Infidel* Turk. AC, Archivio Orsini, I, *Corrispondenza della Corte di Polonia* (sec. XVI–XVIII), b. 64: *Polonia* (1666–1787), *Michał Korybut Wiśniowiecki to Virginio Orsini*, Warsaw 29 March 1672, c. 0233.

33 ASR, Fondo Camerale II, *Decime*, b. 2, *Denari che sono stati rimessi in Polonia per aiuto di quella Corte contro l'Armi Ottomane, nell'infrascritta partita cioè dalla Santità di Nostro Signore Papa Clemente X*, ff. n.n.

34 «Il pontefice Alessandro VII aveva di già dati alla Repubblica Veneta per la guerra contro il turco, avendogli mandati la sua galera nel mar Egeo e Truppa ausiliaria nell'Illirico [...] dalli 9 marzo 1661impose sei decime sopra tutti li frutti e pensioni ecclesiastiche all'Italia e all'Isole adjacenti da riscuotersi [...] dentro un decennio in parte uguali ogn'anno [...]. La Santa memoria di Clemente X per riparare li nuovi progressi che minacciavano di fare i Turchi nella Polonia, oltre quelli che avevano già fatto in quel Regno e nell'Ungheria dopo aver mandato in detto Regno di Polonia tutto quel denaro che aveva, si rivolse al Sussidio del Clero d'Italia e dell'Isole adjacenti, onde con sua bolla alli 12 marzo 1673 impose tre decime sopra tutti i frutti de Beneficj Ecclesiastici o pensioni da pagarsi entro un quinquennio nel solito modo e forma non eccettuando dal detto pagamento che li Cardinali ed i caporali Gerosolimitani». ASR, *Fondo Camerale II Decime*, b. 2, *Decime ed impositioni Ecclesiastiche*, f. 1v. The Bull is dated 12 March 1673: ASR, *Bandi*, vol. 34, *Bolla di Clemente X, con la quale, per aiutare la gravissima guerra della Polonia contro i Turchi, s'indice una tassa di tre decime su tutti i benefici e le rendite ecclesiastiche*. The bull was renewed the following year: ASR, *Bandi*, vol. 32, f.n.n.

35 ASR, Fondo Camerale II: *Decime*, b. 2, *Denari che sono stati rimessi in Polonia [...]*, ff. n.n. A copy is kept in BAV, Barb. Lat., 6660, *Denari che sono stati rimessi in Polonia per aiuto di quella corte contro l'Armi Ottomane [...]*, f. 153r-v.

36 ASR, Fondo Cartari-Febei, *Diario*, vol. 84, f. 112v. To this annotated news, Cartari enclosed in his diary (ff. 105r-06v) a printed *Relazione* published in Rome: *Relazione del numero delle piazze che il che il Christianissimo Re di Francia Luigi XIV ha preso fin'ora agli Olandesi ne' Paesi Bassi con una breve descrizione di ciascheduna di esse*.

37 Cf. Gaetano Platania, “Diplomatici Moscoviti a Roma (1673)”, in *Sentieri Ripresi: studi in onore di Nadia Boccara*, ed. Id. (Viterbo: Sette Città, 2013), 299-321.

entire embassy conducted by Menzies, noting all its phases in his diary³⁸:

Venerdì 18 agosto giunse in Roma l'Ambasciator Moscovita alloggiato a spese della Camera (dicono per quaranta giorni) in un palazzetto a Monte Cavallo contiguo all'altro del Florenti. Si dice sia venuto (come è andato a gli altri principi d'Europa) per l'unione delle forze contro l'armi turchesche³⁹.

The lawyer followed Roman diplomacy at work with great interest, also noting the clauses under discussion among the diplomats:

L'inviato del Moscovita non è anco stato a baciare il piede a Nostro Signore. Si dice che faccia istanza che il papa procuri l'unione tra principi cattolici contro il turco, e che esso Moscovita promette di mantener per dieci anni 200 mila soldati. Che per sicurezza delle promesse maritarà quattro sue figlie con i principi di Germania. Che esso vuol corrispondenza col papa e perciò desidera di tener qua un suo Ministro e che il papa tenga colà un suo nunzio che sia superiore delli cattolici di quel regno⁴⁰.

However, after taking note of the audience (28 August)⁴¹ granted by the pontiff to the Tsar's ambassador, it is interesting to underline how the Roman diarist wrote nothing more about this embassy, except a quick note of Menzies' departure for Muscovy⁴². In his diary, Cartari does not clarify the reasons for the sudden departure of the ambassador, nor why it was impossible to conclude a treaty. However, we know that the diplomatic negotiations stopped immediately after presenting the request to the pontiff to recognize the title of Tsar to Alexei Mikhailovič officially⁴³. This request, unacceptable to Clement X, forced him to suspend diplomatic work in this field.

Considering the impossibility of creating a Christian coalition, Clement X decided to send his representative to the court of Warsaw to resolve the political divisions within the kingdom and induce the Polish-Lithuanians Commonwealth to wage war against the Ottomans.

After a long reflection, the pope identified Francesco Buonvisi⁴⁴ as the most suitable person for this mission, immediately sending him to Poland as extraordinary nuncio with precise instructions⁴⁵.

An assignment that the Cardinal Nephew, Paluzzi Altieri, had communicated to him in a letter dated 22 October 1676⁴⁶, specifying that the Pope's choice was motivated by the excellent political and diplomatic skills that he had already demonstrated in Cologne as ordinary nuncio. For Buonvisi, the Polish nunciature would have been divided into two distinct moments: extraordinary nuncio from 23 January to 15 July 1673, and ordinary nuncio until 30 August 1675, when the pope destined him to hold the prestigious position of the papal nuncio in Vienna, where he remained until 1686.

As soon as Buonvisi learned of his new appointment – notified to him in Cologne by the pontifical courier Giuseppe Miselli⁴⁷ –, he took the way to reach Warsaw.

38 See Armando Petrucci, "Cartari Carlo", in DBI vol. 20 (1977), 783-86; *La storia o le storie del Diario di Carlo Cartari avvocato concistoriale romano*, ed. Letizia Lanzetta (Città di Castello: Luoghi Interiori, 2019).

39 ASR, Fondo Cartari-Febei, *Diario*, vol. 84, f. 176v.

40 ASR, Fondo Cartari-Febei, *Diario*, vol. 84, f. 182r.

41 Cartari wrote that the Tsar's envoy carried with him a letter that "is in the Muscovite language" [«è in lingua moscovita»] (ASR, Fondo Cartari-Febei, *Diario*, vol. 84, f. 183r). Copy of this letter is kept in: BAV, Vat. Lat., *Lettera del Grand Duca di Moscovia a Papa Clemente X*, ff. 103r-106v.

42 ASR, Fondo Cartari-Febei, *Diario*, vol. 84, f. 186v.

43 AAV, *Segreteria di Stato. Polonia*, vol. Add. 13, ff. n.n. «no hebbe effetto questa pratica per la repugnanza di darsi al Gran Duca il titolo di Czar ne' Brevi Pontifici».

44 On the Francesco Buonvisi: Alessandro Boccolini, *Un Lucchese al servizio della Santa Sede. Francesco Buonvisi nunzio a Colonia, Varsavia e Vienna* (Viterbo: Sette Città, 2018). On his nunciature in Warsaw see *Francesco Buonvisi: Nunziatura a Varsavia*, 2 vols, eds. Furio Diaz and Nicola Carranza (Roma: Istituto Storico Italiano, 1965).

45 ASL, Archivio Buonvisi, II/66, n. 1, *Vita del Cardinale Francesco Buonvisi*, ff. n.n.

46 AAV, *Segreteria di Stato. Colonia*, vol. 220, *Paluzzo Paluzzi-Altieri a Francesco Buonvisi*, Rome 22 October 1672, ff. 224-25r.

47 Giuseppe Miselli [1637-1695] (known as *Burattino*) was one of the most expert couriers of the time. First in the service

Without explaining the route taken by the nuncio – we have the testimony of it in a document preserved in the Vatican Apostolic Library⁴⁸ –, Buonvisi arrived at the Polish court on 28 January 1673⁴⁹, after stopping in Vienna to persuade (in vain) Leopold I to help Poland⁵⁰.

The first audience granted by the king to the nuncio took place in an atmosphere of mutual distrust. In particular, Wiśniowiecki believed that the decision to send an “extraordinary” nuncio to Poland had been too solid and inappropriate interference in the kingdom’s internal affairs by the Holy See. Indeed, the sovereign was perfectly aware that Buonvisi would do everything to induce him to deal with his opponents, even forcing him to mitigate the uncompromising positions he had taken towards them. Soon, the king’s intolerance became a clear and direct aversion towards the papal representative. Buonvisi himself had confessed this feeling to the Secretariat of State when he wrote a long letter about the first audience with the Polish king⁵¹.

Despite this, the extraordinary nuncio represented to the king the urgencies and needs of the kingdom. Then, Buonvisi invited Michał to find a solution with the party of “grumblers” to reconcile the country, avoiding worsening the internal situation with the outbreak of a civil war. He immediately consulted the faction leaders opposing to the king, particularly Sobieski, the Great Hetman of the Polish Crown, and already highly esteemed within the Commonwealth. For Buonvisi, the primary need was to defuse the tensions arising after the request for the king’s resignation presented by the “grumblers” – as Giuseppe Miselli also reports in his autobiography⁵² –. Faced with the possibility of a civil war, the extraordinary nuncio tried to explain to the most influential figures of the kingdom that the political fracture of the country would have favoured the Turkish enemy, by now ready for a massive and total invasion of the southern Polish-Lithuanian territories. Ultimately Buonvisi understood that the protracted clash between Michał Wiśniowiecki and his opponents was inserted in a broader and more critical geopolitical and military context, particularly dangerous for the survival of the kingdom.

Supported by the Bishop of Cracow Andrzej Trzebicki [1607-1679]⁵³, the voivode of Vitebsk Jan

of the Grand Duke of Florence, then of the Holy See, he had crossed Europe several times: from Spain to France, to the Empire, England, Sweden and Poland. In 1674 Miselli was a direct witness of the election of Jan Sobieski. *Summa* of his countless travels is a guide published in 1682: *Il Burattino veridico overo Istruzione generale per chi viaggia [...]* (Roma: Michele Ercole, 1682). On him see *Autobiografia, 1637–1674. La vita di un corriere*. Giuseppe Miselli, ed. Furio Luccichenti (Roma: Leberit, 1993); Gaetano Platania, *Giuseppe Miselli tra la polvere delle strade e il lusso delle Corti* (Viterbo: Sette Città, 2014).

48 BAV, Fondo Chigi, ms. R.II.53, *Diario del viaggio di Monsignor Buonvisi mandato da Colonia in Polonia da Clemente X nel 1672*, ff. 42r-50r.

49 In his autobiography Miselli refers to the arrival of the extraordinary nuncio Buonvisi in Warsaw: «due leghe distante, venne questo Monsignore Ranuzzi ad incontrarlo e fatte le solite cerimonie e complimenti, si portorno dentro Varsavia». BAV, Ottob. Lat., 2246, *Raccolta della vita e nascita di me Giuseppe Miselli con alcuni avvertimenti et istruzioni necessarie per ben vivere nelle Corti fatta da me medemo Giuseppe Miselli dedicata ai mei figlioli*, f. 139r. Buonvisi communicated to the Secretariat of State that he had reached the Polish capital only on 1 February 1673. AAV, *Segreteria di Stato. Polonia*, vol. 89, *Francesco Buonvisi to Paluzzo Paluzzi-Altieri*, Warsaw 1 February 1673, f. 15r.

50 The Emperor showed Buonvisi great apprehension over the affairs of the Commonwealth. However, Leopold I confirmed the need to resolve the open problems with Louis XIV on the Rhine border. Without a continental peace [«pace generale»], the court of Vienna could never have helped that of Warsaw on the eastern front of Europe. Cf. Alessandro Boccolini, “Il viaggio da Colonia a Vienna di un abile diplomatico del XVII secolo: il lucchese Francesco Buonvisi”, in *Il viaggio e l’Europa incontri e movimenti da, verso, entro lo spazio europeo*, eds. Raffaele Caldarelli and Alessandro Boccolini (Viterbo: Sette Città, 2018), 31-45.

51 Regarding the hostility of the king towards him, Buonvisi wrote that «io poco fastidio me ne piglio poiché sono stato mandato non per adulare le passioni ma per rimediare ai mali». AAV, *Segreteria di Stato. Polonia*, vol. 89, *Francesco Buonvisi to Paluzzo Paluzzi-Altieri*, Warsaw 1 February 1673, ff. 18r-22v.

52 BAV, Ottob. Lat., 2246, *Raccolta della vita e nascita di me Giuseppe Miselli*, f. 139r.

53 Cf. Patrick Gauchat, *Hierarchia Catholica Medii et Recentioris aevi [...]*, vol. IV: *A pontificatu Clementis PP. VIII (1592) usque ad pontificatum Alexandri PP. VII (1667)* (Monasterii: typis Librariae Regensbergianae, 1935), 167, 175, 288; Piotr Nitecki, *Biskupi Kościoła w Polsce w latach 965–1999. Słownik biograficzny* (Warszawa: “Pax”, 1992), 211; Karolina Targosz, *Jan III Sobieski mecenasem sztuk i nauk* (Wrocław-Warszawa-Kraków: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 1991), 55, 60, 66, 251.

Chrapowicki [1612-1685]⁵⁴, and Queen Eleonora Maria Josefa of Habsburg [1653-1697]⁵⁵, the nuncio worked to reactivate communications between the opposing factions. Thanks to his eloquence, he demonstrated how the internal weakness of the Commonwealth would have represented a favourable conjuncture for the Turkish *infidels* to definitively conquer the Kingdom and then penetrate the "heart of Europe".

To avoid this, Buonvisi met the king and the rebel leaders several times, hoping to mediate and find a good agreement for both sides and, above all, that it would be profitable for the country. After protracted negotiations and mediations, the warring factions signed the "internal peace" articles on 12 March 1673, at the castle of Warsaw: a decisive act to reconcile the kingdom and prepare it for war against the Turkish army. Buonvisi immediately informed the Secretariat of State about this remarkable result, with a *straordinario* delivered to Clement X by Miselli: «Col consiglio di monsignor Ranucci ho risoluto di spedire Burattino con l'avviso della pace domestica conchiusa ieri con giubilo universale di tutti»⁵⁶. Just by reading the autobiography of the pontifical courier, we can appreciate the diplomatic work carried out by Buonvisi to achieve peace:

Se non fosse stata l'accuratezza di Monsignor Bonvisi, benché dalla parte del Re vi era il Generale di Lituania et altri amici Cosacchi, che in tutto ascendevano a 20 mila uomini, ma non così buona gente come quella del Sobieski e vedendo Bonvisi in così gran strettezza le cose, et egli non esser in ordine per andare di persona dalli malcontenti e per non ingelosire le parti et il Re, pigliò espediente di mandar me con diversi Brevi del Papa alli malcontenti et arrivato a Loguiz fui accolto benignamente da quei Polacchi e si puol dire che il presente viaggio fosse santo perché l'esortazioni del Papa intenerirono li Polacchi⁵⁷.

In Rome, the pontifical Curia welcomed this long-awaited result with great joy and congratulations. After receiving confirmation of what happened in the "sejm of pacification"⁵⁸, Clement X asked his extraordinary nuncio to focus on the Turkish question. In particular – and according to the instructions he had received before leaving Cologne –, Buonvisi had to prevent the Polish parliament from ratifying the Buchach treaty signed in 1672 and, therefore, declare war on the Ottomans. The papal court knew the difficulties inherent in this affair. For this reason, the pope and the cardinals followed with attention the evolution of the situation in Poland during the following weeks, living in great apprehension and concern. Promptly, Carlo Cartari captured in his diary this particular atmosphere:

È venuto avviso che due giorni dopo concluso l'aggiustamento tra i polacchi, era colà giunto un chiaus mandato dal Gran Turco al Re di Polonia a fargli istanza che in vigore della promessa fattagli l'anno passato (alla quale però non volsero acconsentire i nobili di quel regno), gli consegnasse alcune città e gli pagasse il tributo, altrimenti gl'intimava la guerra. Né fin'ora si sapeva la risposta che gli era stata data, ma si crede che li polacchi vorranno guereggiare trovandosi già con esercito poderoso di cavalleria⁵⁹.

54 Cf. Ryszard Mienicki, "Chrapowicki Jan Antoni", in PSB, vol. 3 (1937), 437-39. Until now, his Diary has been published in three separate publications: J. A. Chrapowicki, *Diariusz*, 1: *lata 1656-1664*, ed. Tadeusz Wasilewski (Warszawa: "Pax", 1978); 2: *lata 1665-1669*, eds. Andrzej Rachuba and Tadeusz Wasilewski (Warszawa: "Pax", 1988); 3: *lata 1669-1673*, ed. Leszek Andrzej Wierzbicki (Warszawa: DiG, 2009).

55 On the Queen Eleonore Maria Josefa of Austria: Kazimierz Piwarski, "Eleonora Maria Józefa", in PSB, vol. 6 (1948), 223-26; *Słownik władców polskich*, eds. Józef Dobosz, Jacek Jaskulski, Tomasz Jurek and Andrzej Kamieński (Poznań: Wydawnictwo Poznańskie, 1999), 103-04.

56 ASL, Archivio Buonvisi, II/8, *Francesco Buonvisi to Paluzzo Paluzzi-Altieri*, Warsaw 13 March 1673, f. 57r.

57 BAV, Ottob. Lat., 2246, *Raccolta della vita e nascita di me Giuseppe Miselli*, f. 139r-v.

58 Among the documents of the Buonvisi archive, there is a copy of the letter written by Wiśniowiecki to Clement X. The sovereign informed the pope of the kingdom's pacification and the intention to resume the war against the Turks. ASL, Archivio Buonvisi, II/67, n. 31, *Copia di lettera del Re Michele di Polonia a Sua Santità Clemente X*, Warsaw 12 March 1673, ff. n.n.; ASL, Archivio Buonvisi, II/67, *Conferma regia alla pace interna seguita fra il Re Michele e i Confederati*, (doc. n. 37), ff. n.n.

59 ASR, Fondo Cartari-Febei, *Diario*, vol. 84, f. 149v.

Despite this, Buonvisi, as a skilled and fine diplomat, knew how to animate the Poles to the Turkish threat. At first, he reminded them of the role always played by Commonwealth as an *Antemurale Christianitatis* against the *infidels*; then, he guaranteed a sum of money to arm the Polish-Lithuanian forces on behalf of the Holy See. On 8 April 1673, Buonvisi's strategy proved to be a success. The Sejm unanimously decided not to ratify the peace of Buchach and wage war against the Ottomans led by grand vizier Fazil Ahmed Köprülüzade [1635-1676]⁶⁰.

Avendo il Turco spedito un Chiaus alli polacchi per dimandargli la ratificazione del capitolato l'anno passato per la consegna di alcune piazze e per la prestazione del tributo, altrimenti proseguirebbe la guerra contro di loro. Questi gli avessero risposto che il regno di Polonia mai era stato tributario del turco, anzi che essi speravano di ricuperare l'occupatogli l'anno passato⁶¹.

120

Always in a close and direct contact with the Secretariat of State, Buonvisi had completed his post as extraordinary nuncio in just under three months from his arrival in Warsaw. For this reason, in the summer of 1673, Clement X decided to renew his mandate in Poland, recalling Monsignor Ranuzzi to Rome and appointing him ordinary nuncio. It should note how this decision was very unpleasant for Michał Wiśniowiecki, who had repeatedly asked cardinal protector, Virginio Orsini, to prevent Buonvisi's promotion as "ordinary", preferring Ranuzzi because more inclined to royal politics⁶². Having assumed the new post, Buonvisi gave great impetus throughout the long preparation phase of the war campaign. Testimony of the intense effort made by the Holy See is the correspondence exchanged between Buonvisi and the Secretariat of State, preserved in the Vatican Apostolic Archives.

CONCLUSION

To conclude, the actions of the Holy See with the sending of Buonvisi as extraordinary nuncio and the continuous payment of money was decisive in starting the anti-Turkish war campaign: armed the troops, on 11 November 1673, the Commonwealth's soldiers led by Sobieski defeated the Turks in the legendary battle of Khotyn (Chocim)⁶³.

Giunse avviso a Roma per staffetta a ciò spedita che il Sobieschi Generale delle Armi Polacche haveva non solo fatto sloggiare dalle trinciere, e dall'assedio di una Piazza principale in Polonia l'esercito Turchesco, ma che haveva cinta circa ventimila Turchi, fattene prigionieri circa 5 mila, acquistato cento pezzi di cannone, e fatto acquisto di un ricco bottino di Bassà, e di molti principali offitiali, che si trovavano nell'esercito, anzi che haveva perseguitato un altro Bassà, che con gran rinforzo di soldatesca veniva in soccorso dell'esercito Turchesco; e parimente l'avesse sbaragliato, e posto in fuga; restando la Piazza libera dall'assedio, e le Armi Polacche vittoriose⁶⁴.

The announcement of the victory arrived with a *straordinario* in Rome⁶⁵. More precise and detailed news, dispatches, and accounts of the long-awaited event followed this first communication. Cartari mentioned above – always careful to note down the information that reached Rome – becomes a unique

60 Caroline Finkel, *Osman's Dream. The Story of the Ottoman Empire, 1300-1923* (New York: Basic 2005), 278-81.

61 ASR, Fondo Cartari-Febei, *Diario*, vol. 84, f. 176r.

62 AC, Archivio Orsini, I, *Corrispondenza* [...], b. 64, Michał Korybut Wiśniowiecki to Virginio Orsini, Warsaw 28 June 1673, c. 0192.

63 For a concise but compelling picture of the battle, see Damian Orłowski, *Chocim 1673* (Warszawa: Bellona 2007). On the battle: BAV, Barb. Lat., 6410, *Relazione della vittoria insigne che l'armi Polacche et Lituane hanno ottenuto contro i Turchi alle ripe del fiume Dnistro in Valacchia il giorno di San Martino 1673*, ff. 414r-31v.

64 ASR, Fondo Cartari-Febei, *Diario*, vol. 84, f. 220r-v.

65 «Non poco ha rallegato il palazzo e tutta questa corte l'avviso mandato da monsignor nunzio apostolico in Polonia aver quell'esercito riportata grandissima vittoria sopra li Turchi». BAV, Barb. Lat., 6410, *Avvisi*, Rome 16 December 1673, f. 378r. ASR, Fondo Cartari-Febei, *Diario*, vol. 84, f. 220r-v.

and precious source to testify to the jubilation felt by the Roman Curia after receiving the good news of the Christian victory over the *infidels*⁶⁶. The Roman diarist noted the official celebrations wanted by Clement X to glorify the Polish military action against the "common enemy" of Christianity. On Sunday, 7 January 1674, Pope Altieri decided to honour the courage and virtues of the Poles with a *Te Deum* in the National Church of Poles in Rome, St Stanislao. The Pope would have repeated this solemn ceremony on 29 April in St Peter⁶⁷.

During this event, Clement X wanted to hang the Turkish banner conquered in battle by Jan Sobieski in the centre of the basilica; a tribute delivered to the same pope by Abbot Jan Chryzostom Benedykt Gniński [† 1715]⁶⁸ as a sign of the Commonwealth's gratitude towards the efforts of the Holy See⁶⁹.

The only one who could not rejoice in this incredible feat was King Wiśniowiecki. Despite having reached the battlefield near Lviv, already very ill, he would have died on 10 November 1673, without witnessing the Turkish defeat⁷⁰. The death of the king and the success achieved in Khotyn would have, forcefully and definitively, launched the figure of General Sobieski on the political scene of the time. Sobieski would be protagonist first in Poland as king elected in 1674, and then in Europe as the *Defensor Fidei* for having freed Vienna from the Turkish siege in 1683⁷¹.

66 Cartari dedicates many pages of his diary to the Polish victory of Khotyn. Among the pages we also find 2 Reports printed in Rome for the occasion: *Nuova, e vera Relatione della Guerra tra il Potentissimo Rè di Polonia, e il Gran Sultano Imperador de' Turchi* (Roma: per Giacomo Menichelli, 1673); *Copia di Lettera Polacca. Tradotta in italiano che serve di Relatione per la grande, e memorabile vittoria riportata dall'armi Polacche contro li Turchi [...], da Giuseppe Elmi*, (Roma: Stampa del Mancini, 1673).

67 ASR, Fondo Cartari-Febei, *Diario*, vol. 85, ff. 1v-2r.

68 Cf. Jan Perdenia, "Gniński Jan Chryzostom", in PSB, vol. 8 (1959–1960), 152–53.

69 ASR, Fondo Cartari-Febei, *Diario*, vol. 85, ff. 12v-3r.

70 ASR, Fondo Cartari-Febei, *Diario*, vol. 84, ff. 200r-01v. The news noted by the lawyer referred to a specific notice that had arrived in Rome: «è pervenuto corriere in palazzo con l'infausto avviso sulla morte del Re di Polonia, nuova che ha portato gran sentimento a Sua Santità stante le presenti emergenze trovandosi impiegate le armi polacche contro i Turchi». A.S.V., *Avvisi*, Warsaw 26 Novembre 1673. Cf. Platania, *Rzeczpospolita*, 114.

71 I want to point out the latest book by Gaetano Platania, *Scritti Minori (Saggi di storia Sobiesiana)* (Viterbo: Sette Città, 2021).

ABBREVIATIONS

AAV: Archivio Apostolico Vaticano.

ANP: *Acta Nuntiaturae Polonae*, t. I-LVII (Romae/Cracoviae: 1990–2021).

AC: Archivio Storico Capitolino–Roma.

ASR: Archivio di Stato di Roma.

Diario: Effemeridi Cartarie. Diario e cronache degli avvenimenti romani e pontifici in particolare e d'Europa in generale con allegati documenti a stampa e stampe, voll. 73–104.

BAV: Biblioteca apostolica Vaticana.

Barb. Lat.: *Fondo Barberino Latino*.

Ottob. Lat.: *Fondo Ottoboniano Latino*.

Vat. Lat.: *Fondo Vaticano Latino*.

BCasan.: Biblioteca Casanatense–Roma.

DBI: *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani*, 100 vols (Roma: Istituto della Enciclopedia Treccani, 1960–2020, 100).

PSB: *Polski Słownik Biograficzny*, t. I-LII (Kraków: PAN, 1935–2019).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Boccolini, Alessandro. “Un “agente diplomatico” a Roma per la Rzeczpospolita: l’abate Paolo Doni al servizio di Jan II Kazimierz Waza”. In *Gli agenti presso la Santa Sede delle comunità straniere e degli stati stranieri*, vol. I: *secoli XV-XVII*, edited by Matteo Sanfilippo and Péter Tusor, 229–52. Viterbo: Sette Città, 2020.

Boccolini, Alessandro. “Rzeczpospolita e Curia Romana. L’interregno del 1669 nelle carte di Virginio Orsini, cardinale protettore di Polonia”. In *Gli “Angeli Custodi” delle Monarchie: i cardinali protettori delle nazioni*, edited by Matteo Sanfilippo and Péter Tusor, 199–238. Viterbo: Sette Città, 2019.

Boccolini, Alessandro. *Un Lucchese al servizio della Santa Sede. Francesco Buonvisi nunzio a Colonia, Varsavia e Vienna*. Viterbo: Sette Città, 2018.

Bullarium Diplomatum et Privilegiorum Sanctorum Romanorum Pontificum Taurinensis Editio, cura et studio Collegii adlecti Romae Virorum S. Theologiae et Ss. Canonum Peritorum. Augusta Taorinorum: A. Vecco et sociis, 1869.

Boris, Francesca. “Ranuzzi Angelo Maria”. In DBI, vol. 86 (2016), 134–36.

Caccamo, Domenico. “Osservatori italiani della crisi polacca a metà Seicento. La Relazione di S. Cefali e le Replicazioni di C. Masini”. In Domenico Caccamo, *Roma, Venezia e l’Europa centro-orientale*, 483–530. Milano: Franco Angeli, 2010.

Chrapowicki, Jan Antoni. *Diariusz*, vol. 3: *lata 1669–1673*, edited by Leszek Andrzej Wierzbicki. Warszawa: DiG, 2009.

Chrapowicki, Jan Antoni. *Diariusz*, vol. 2: *lata 1665–1669*, edited by Andrzej Rachuba and Tadeusz Wasilewski. Warszawa: “Pax”, 1988.

Chrapowicki, Jan Antoni. *Diariusz*, vol. 1: *lata 1656–1664*, edited by Tadeusz Wasilewski. Warszawa: “Pax”, 1978.

Czamańska, Ilona. *Wiśniowieccy. Monografia rodu*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Poznańskie 2007.

De Michelis, Laura. “Masini Cristoforo”. In DBI, vol. 71 (2008), 614–16.

Diaz, Furio, and Carranza, Nicola, eds. *Francesco Buonvisi: Nunziatura a Varsavia*, 2 vols. Roma: Istituto Storico Italiano, 1965.

Dobosz Józef, Jaskulski Jacek, Jurek Tomasz, and Kamiński, Andrzej, eds. *Słownik władców polskich*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Poznańskie, 1999.

Finkel, Caroline. *Osman’s Dream. The Story of the Ottoman Empire, 1300–1923*. New York: Basic 2005.

Fosi, Irene. “Il cardinale Virginio Orsini e la “Protezione” del regno di Polonia (1650–1676): note e documenti dall’Archivio Orsini”. In *Per Rita Tolomeo, scritti di amici sulla Dalmazia e l’Europa centro-orientale*, edited by Ester Capuzzo, Bruno Crevato-Selvaggi and Francesco Guida, 229–44. Venezia, La Musa Talia, 2014.

Fosi, Irene. “Orsini Virginio”, in DBI, vol. 79 (2013), 215–19.

- Gauchat, Patrick. *Hierarchia Catholica Medii et Recentioris aevi [...]*, vol. IV: *A pontificatu Clementis PP. VIII (1592) usque ad pontificatum Alexandri PP. VII (1667)*. Monasterii: typis Librariae Regensbergianae, 1935.
- Honorati, Andrea. *Michele Korybut Wiśniowiecki re di Polonia 1669–1673*. Ancona: s.n. 1992.
- Kołodziejczyk, Dariusz. *Podole pod panowaniem tureckim Ejalet Kamieniecki (1672–1699)*. Warszawa: Polczek, 1994.
- Lanzetta, Letizia, ed. *La storia o/e le storie del Diario di Carlo Cartari avvocato concistoriale romano*. Città di Castello: Luoghi Interiori, 2019.
- Luccichenti, Furio, ed. *La vita di un corriere. Giuseppe Miselli*. Roma: Leberit, 1993.
- Nitecki, Piotr. *Biskupi Kościoła w Polsce w latach 965–1999. Słownik biograficzny*. Warszawa: "Pax", 1992.
- Mienicki, Ryszard. "Jan Antoni Chrapowicki". In PSB, vol. 3 (1937), 437–39.
- Motta, Giovanna. "Marescotti Galeazzo". In DBI, vol. 70 (2008), 75–8.
- Orłowski, Damian. *Chocim 1673*. Warszawa: Bellona 2007.
- Pastor (von), Ludwing. *Storia dei Papi [...]*, vol. 14/1: *dall'elezione di Innocenzo X sino alla morte di Innocenzo XII (1644–1700)*. Roma: Desclée, 1932.
- Perdenia, Jan. "Gniński Jan Chryzostom". In PSB, vol. 8 (1959–1960), 152–53.
- Petrucchi, Armando. "Cartari Cartari". In DBI vol. 20 (1977), 783–86.
- Piowski, Kazimierz, "Eleonora Maria Józefa". In PSB, vol. 6 (1948), 223–26;
- Platania, Gaetano. *Scritti Minori (Saggi di storia Sobiesiana)*. Viterbo: Sette Città, 2021.
- Platania, Gaetano. *Giuseppe Miselli tra la polvere delle strade e il lusso delle Corti*. Viterbo: Sette Città, 2014.
- Platania, Gaetano. "Diplomatici Moscoviti a Roma (1673)". In *Sentieri Ripresi: studi in onore di Nadia Boccara*, edited by Gaetano Platania, 299–321. Viterbo: Sette Città, 2013.
- Platania, Gaetano. *Rzeczpospolita, Europa e Santa Sede tra intese e ostilità* (Viterbo: Sette Città, 2000).
- Przyboś, Adam. *Michał Korybut Wiśniowiecki, 1640–1673*. Kraków-Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Literackie, 1984.
- Przyboś, Adam. "Wiśniowiecki Michał Korybut". In PSB, vol. 20 (1975), 605–09.
- Ronchi De Michelis, Laura. "Lancellotti Giovanni Battista". In DBI, vol. 63 (2004), 297–98.
- Signorotto, Gianvittorio, and Visceglia, Maria Antonietta, eds. *La Corte di Roma tra Cinquecento e Seicento. "Teatro" della politica europea*. Roma: Bulzoni, 1998.
- Targosz, Karolina. *Jan III Sobieski mecenasem nauk i uczonych*. Wrocław-Warszawa-Kraków: Ossolineum, 1991.
- Targosz, Karolina. *Uczony dwór Ludwika Marii Gonzagi 1646–1667. Z dziejów polsko-francuskich stosunków naukowych*. Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 1975.
- Tencajoli, Oreste F. *L'elezione ed il matrimonio di un re di Polonia*. Milano: Pizzi 1912.
- Wójcik, Zbigniew. *Traktat andruszowski 1667 roku i jego geneza*. Warszawa: PWN, 1959.
- Wojtyńska, Henryk Damian. ANP, t. I: *De fontibus eorumque investigatione et editionibus Instructio ad editionem Nuntiorum series chronologica*. Romae: Institutum Historicum Polonicum 1990.
- Woliński, Janusz. *Z dziejów wojen polsko-tureckich*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Ministerstwa Obrony Narodowej, 1983.

PRIMARY SOURCES

AAV

Segreteria di Stato. Polonia, voll. Add. 13; 78; 80; 83; 87.

Segreteria di Stato. Colonia, vol. 220.

Avvisi, vol. 114.

Lettere di Principi, vol. 94.

AC

Archivio Orsini, *Corrispondenze [...]*, bb. 64; 224; 225; 229; 230; 231; 232; 234; 248.

ASR

Fondo Camerale II, *Decime*.

Fondo Cartari-Febei, *Diario*, voll. 82-4.

BAV

Ottob. Lat., 2246, *Raccolta della vita e nascita di me Giuseppe Miselli con alcuni avvertimenti et istruzioni necessarie per ben vivere nelle Corti fatta da me medemo Giuseppe Miselli dedicata ai mei figlioli.*

Fondo Chigi, ms. R.II.53, *Diario del viaggio di Monsignor Buonvisi mandato da Colonia in Polonia da Clemente X nel 1672*, ff. 42-50r.