

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

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

Aleksandra Skrzypietz
UNIVERSITY OF SILESIA IN KATOWICE (POLAND)

BETWEEN ROYAL INSTRUCTIONS AND AMBASSADOR'S AMBITION. MELCHIOR DE POLIGNAC'S COOPERATION WITH POLISH MAGNATES

ABSTRACT

Melchior de Polignac was a French ambassador in Poland whose task was to carry out a few political aims, including the most important one – starting cooperation with the royal couple, especially with Marie Casimire de la Grange d'Arquien, in order to prepare the election for one of her sons. Louis XIV wanted to see one of John III Sobieski's sons on the throne, assuming that this would maintain good relations between Poland and France without spending money on a costly election fight. Initially, the ambassador pursued a lively cooperation with the court and he enjoyed the queen's trust, but towards the end of John III's life, he began cooperating with the magnates who convinced him that none of the princes would win the throne. From then on, Polignac started efforts for the election of a French prince. Louis XIV gave in to his arguments and put forward the candidature of Francis Louis, Prince de Conti, but he announced that he would not get financially involved in the election fight, he would not pay any gratifications until his cousin was enthroned. Polignac did not pass this information to his followers and tried to encourage them to take action by promising the payments. This was ongoing until the election when the bifurcated sympathies and strong support given to the Saxon, Frederick Augustus, triggered concerns of French supporters whether the payments would take place; at that moment, fantasies that Polignac used to feed his party were exposed. As a consequence, the party fell apart and Prince de Conti's chances were lost. The aim of this article is not only to present the activities of Melchior the Polignac in Poland, but also to draw attention to the fact that the magnates did not betray the French candidate, but fell victim to the false assurances of the ambassador who took advantage of both the king's trust as well as the French supporters in Poland.

KEYWORDS: Ambassador; France; Poland; Election; Money.

Melchior de Polignac (1661–1742) was well educated. Teachers valued highly his skills; he knew how to discuss matters effectively, but without stubbornness¹. In 1689, together with Emmanuel Théodose de La Tour d'Auvergne, Cardinal de Bouillon, he went for a conclave and tried to bring France closer to Alexander VIII, who was enchanted by him². He tried to ease tensions between France and the Holy See with the next Pope, Innocent XII³.

In 1693 he was sent to Poland. His task was to win over the royal couple to cooperate – Louis XIV would be ready to support one of Sobieski's sons, the one designated by Marie Casimire, at the election⁴. He was expected to persuade the king to Polish-Turkish treaty in order for the struggles with the High Porte to fall upon the Habsburgs.⁵ Polignac was to encourage John III to get closer to Denmark and

1 August de La Force, *Le grand Conti*, (Paris: Émil-Paul Frères, 1922), 143; Otto Forst de Battaglia, *Jan Sobieski król Polski*, trans. Krystyna Szyszkowska (Warszawa: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy, 1983), 334-35; Pierre Paul, *Le cardinal Melchior de Polignac, 1661–1741* (Paris: Allégre 1922), 1-5.

2 de La Force, *Le grand Conti*, 143; Jean-Christian Petitfils, *Louis XIV* (Paris: Perrin 2002), 468-71.

3 Paul, *Le cardinal Melchior de Polignac*, 6-19. Petitfils, *Louis XIV*, 468.

4 *Recueil des instructions données aux ambassadeurs et ministres de France depuis les traités de Westphalie jusqu'à la révolution française IV-V: Pologne*, vol. 1: 1648–1729, ed. Louis Farges (Paris: Ancienne Librairie Germer Baillière et C^e, 1888), 210-11; Karol Boromiesz Hoffman, "Historia upadku dynastii Sobieskich z nowych dokumentów", *Gazeta Polska*, n. 258 (1862).

5 Jacek Staszewski, "Elekcja 1697 roku", in *"Jak Polskę przemienić w kraj kwitnący..." Szkice i studia z czasów saskich*, ed. Jacek Staszewski, (Olsztyn: Ośrodek Badań Naukowych im. Wojciecha Kętrzyńskiego, 1997), 15-6.



Sweden through the accession to the alliance of the Crowns of the North, which was meant to revive trade between Poland and France; in particular, there were hopes to increase grain supplies to France struggling with the cold and poor harvest. Polignac was supposed to win over the queen's favour and support by awakening her hopes for her daughter's marriage⁶. The ambassador's main task was to work on preparations for the future election and making sure that in case of John III's death, Poland would not fall under the Austrian influence; therefore, cooperation with the Polish magnates also had to begin, but he had to start it carefully because he had been warned that they are very whimsical in their political sympathies⁷. The instruction clearly stated that the ambassador was expected to rely on the queen's advice and instructions, who was an experienced person, and knew the reality of Poland. Her knowledge in the political situation and the money that the Sobieski family should engage in the election were to facilitate the ambassador's efforts⁸. Moreover, Polignac also received an order to use the money carefully. The ambassador's first steps in Poland ended in failure; he did not manage to win the support of the castellan of Chełmno, Jan Jerzy Przebendowski, for the development of commerce, and failed to win the interest of the Primate, Cardinal Michał Radziejowski⁹. The first unofficial meeting with the queen went much better. Marie Casimire received the ambassador privately, in the garden, and only then a formal audience with the king took place¹⁰. After getting settled in the capital, where he arranged his place lavishly, trying to make an impression, Polignac tried to get in touch with the Polish magnates; he visited them, gave them gifts, tried to win over women's favour hoping that this way he could affect their husbands¹¹. He rendered small favours to them, acting as a go-between in contracts with France. He brought down from Paris a watch for Karol Stanisław Radziwiłł and flattered his mother, the king's sister, Katarzyna. He sought contact with Konstancja Lubomirska and her husband Hieronim, the Grand Treasurer of the Crown¹². However, not all of the ambassador's efforts were effective and not everyone was interested in meeting him and cooperating.

Still present at the court, the ambassador appeared in the king's company, whom he brought news from the world, descriptions of interesting events and phenomena, presented new books¹³. He flattered the queen and she made him her confidant even with the state matters, but she also required benefits from him¹⁴.

Social successes did not make it easier for the ambassador to carry out his tasks. Polignac encouraged the Poles in vain to increase the grain export to France¹⁵. Only Marie Casimire, who was interested

6 Farges, *Recueil des instructions*, 218-19.

7 Farges, *Recueil des instructions*, 211-16, 218; Forst de Battaglia, *Jan Sobieski*, 355-56.

8 Farges, *Recueil des instructions*, 216.

9 Roman Kawecki, *Kardynał Michał Stefan Radziejowski (1645-1705)* (Opole: Wydawnictwo Świętego Krzyża, 2005), 76; Paul, *Le cardinal Melchior de Polignac*, 21, 27-9.

10 Michał Komarzyński, *Maria Kazimiera d'Arquien Sobieska królowa Polski (1641-1716)* (Kraków: Wydawnictwo Literackie, 1983), 136-37.

11 Kazimierz Sarnecki, *Pamiętniki z czasów Jana Sobieskiego. Dziennik i relacje z lat 1691-1696*, ed. Janusz Woliński (Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 1958), 55; Michel de Mongrillon, *Pamiętnik sekretarza ambasady francuskiej w Polsce pod koniec panowania Jana III oraz bezkrólewia i wolnej elekcji po jego zgonie (1694-1698)*, ed. Łucja Częścik (Wrocław-Warszawa-Kraków-Gdańsk-Łódź: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 1982), 52-3; Jacek Staszewski, *O miejsce w Europie, stosunki Polski i Saksonii z Francją na przełomie XII i XVIII wieku* (Warszawa: PWN, 1973), 42.

12 Sarnecki, *Pamiętniki z czasów Jana Sobieskiego*, 118, 254, 269; Stanisław Edward Nahlik, *Narodziny nowoczesnej dyplomacji* (Wrocław-Warszawa-Kraków-Gdańsk: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 1971), 85; Karolina Targosz, *Sawantki w Polsce XVII wieku. Aspiracje intelektualne kobiet ze środowisk magnackich* (Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Retro-Art, 1997), 266; Staszewski, *O miejsce w Europie*, 42.

13 Farges, *Recueil des instructions*, 217; Karolina Targosz, *Jan III Sobieski mecenasem nauk i uczonych* (Wrocław-Warszawa-Kraków: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 1991), 97, 100-05.

14 Chrysostôme Faucher, *Histoire du cardinal de Polignac, contenant des détails sur ses différents négociations, tirés du dépôt des affaires étrangères, pour servir d'éclaircissement à une partie du règne de Louis XIV. et de Louis XV*, vol. I (Paris: D'Houry, 1777), 197; Komarzyński, *Maria Kazimiera d'Arquien Sobieska*, 136-37; Michał Komarzyński and Aleksandra Skrzypietz, "Z działalności ambasadora Wersalu na dworze Jana III (1696 rok)", in *Ojczyzna wielka i mała*, ed. Idzi Panic (Cieszyn: Polskie Towarzystwo Historyczne o/Cieszyn, 1996), 63.

15 Biblioteka Naukowa PAN i PAU, Kraków, *Teki Waliszewskiego*, vol. 6, 5016-19; Michał Komarzyński, *Jan III Sobieski a Bałtyk*, (Gdańsk: Wydawnictwo Morskie 1983), 96, 98-9; Id., *Polska w polityce gospodarczej Wersalu 1661-1715* (Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 1968) 82-107.

in it financially, tried to organise some deliveries¹⁶. The treaty with the Crowns of North was also not approved of in Poland. Although the queen signed the agreement, John III did not make effort to ratify it afraid of the opposition's counteraction¹⁷. The ambassador was also unsuccessful with convincing the king to the idea of a separate peace treaty with Turkey. Political rivalry was expressed through the fight for John III's favours – while keeping him entertained, seeking his attention and approval – between the papal envoy, Maurizio Vota, and the Venetian resident, Girolamo Alberti, against Polignac¹⁸.

Wishing to strengthen his position and influence, the ambassador got involved in finalising the marriage of Princess Theresa Kunegunda to Maximilian Emanuel, Elector of Bavaria. Initially Polignac was against this marriage, assuming that Sobieska's dowry would benefit the treasury of France's enemy, but Louis XIV demonstrated his foresight and a greater political sensitivity, and supported the idea of this matrimony¹⁹.

John III's deteriorating health made the ambassador, as well as Marie Casimire, prepared for the impending election. When an attempt was made to reconcile the conflicted Lithuanians in 1695, Polignac advised the queen, as a mediator, to seek agreement with the opposition and, first of all, with the Sapieha family who was hostile towards the Sobieski clan. It is unknown if he honestly thought that this was a route for strengthening the Sobieski family's position, or whether he tried to use the queen to reach the Sapieha family – who cooperated with the emperor – through the queen; they were the ones who blocked the project of a separate peace agreement with Turkey²⁰. The ambassador wanted to join the talks personally, but this offer was rejected by Primate Radziejowski and the Sapieha family. Polignac unsuccessfully tried to win them over for Louis XIV; they demanded a huge remuneration, but this proposal was rejected by the king who did not trust the Sapiehas²¹.

Rumours appeared at the time that Marie Casimire was going to marry the Great Hetman of Lithuania, Kazimierz Sapieha, who was still married, in order to ascend the throne together with him after the death of Sobieski. It is not known where these stories came from, but they were harmful to the royal family's interest because they triggered tensions between the queen and her husband, and the eldest son who feared his mother was ready to do so. Polignac received reports from Versailles that it would be most convenient for France if the queen remained on the throne. However, this was never Marie Casimire's intention²². It should be emphasised that the eldest prince, James, was married to the emperor's sister-in-law and his election would threaten Poland's future cooperation with the Habsburgs, and additionally it seems that Polignac could not stand him from the very beginning. Therefore, when Louis XIV accepted the support for James at the election, Polignac decisively rejected such option and assumed that this would be unfavourable for French interests. Meanwhile, the preserved documents indicate that the prince sought cooperation with Versailles and declared an

16 Ryszard Wołoszyński, *Polska w opiniach Francuzów w XVII wieku* (Warszawa: PWN, 1964), 21-2.

17 Komarzyński, *Jan Sobieski a Bałtyk*, 80-118; Komarzyński, *Polska w polityce gospodarczej Wersalu (1661-1715)*, 28-35.

18 Philippe Dupont, *Pamiętniki historii życia i czynów Jana III Sobieskiego*, trans. Beata Spieralska, ed. Dariusz Milewski (Warszawa: Muzeum Pałac w Wilanowie, 2011), 323; Woliński, *Kazimierz Sarnecki. Pamiętniki z czasów Jana Sobieskiego*, 69; Komarzyński, *Maria Kazimiera d'Arquien Sobieska*, 129-34; Aleksandra Skrzypietz, "Zabiegi posła francuskiego o odrębny pokój polsko-turecki w latach 1693-1697", *Balkanica Posnaniensa*, vol. 13 (2003): 95-100.

19 Woliński, *Kazimierz Sarnecki. Pamiętniki z czasów Jana Sobieskiego*, 51, 96; Komarzyński, *Maria Kazimiera d'Arquien Sobieska*, 146; Michał Komarzyński, *Teresa Kunegunda Sobieska* (Warszawa: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy, 1982), 21-3; Id., "Tajna misja ambasadora Jana III Sobieskiego w Brukseli (1695)", *Śląski Kwartalnik Historyczny. Sobótka*, nn. 1-2 (1992): 54.

20 Forst de Battaglia, *Jan Sobieski*, 356-59; Komarzyński, *Maria Kazimiera d'Arquien Sobieska*, 137-40.

21 Farges, *Recueil des instructions*, 218; Zbigniew Wójcik, *Jan Sobieski (1629-1696)* (Warszawa: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy, 1994), 504.

22 Aleksandra Skrzypietz, "Trzecie małżeństwo królowej Marii Kazimiery – u źródeł legendy", in *Maria Kazimiera Sobieska (1641-1716). W kręgu rodziny, polityki i kultury*, (Studia i Materiały, n. 6), eds. Anna Kalinowska and Paweł Tysza, (Warszawa: Zamek Królewski w Warszawie-Muzeum, 2017), 113-35.

agreement²³. However, Polignac encouraged Marie Casimire to abandon the interests of the eldest son and to support her middle son, Alexander. These encouragements which were rejected by the queen were sufficient for historiography to reproach her that it was that the youngest son would become a king. However, Alexander's candidature during the *interregnum* and election did not emerge at all²⁴. At the beginning of 1696 Polignac was not estranged from the queen, but he sought for contact with the opposition circles. It was most probably at that time that the Grand Treasurer of the Crown, Hieronim Lubomirski, convinced him that it was not worth supporting the Sobieski family at the election. Regardless of doubts expressed by Versailles, the ambassador put his trust in the magnates and started to pressure Louis XIV to appoint a French prince who could take over power in Poland²⁵. The Roman mission and first diplomatic experiences made Polignac adopt specific means of acting and implementing goals. He assumed that it was the most important to reach the representatives of the elites. He spoke to cardinals and the Pope in Rome. He believed that personal contact, charm, and skills in persuasion had the greatest significance and would bring results. He knew how to use his knowledge which he constantly developed, thus becoming an interesting conversationalist. He also probably knew how to listen and entertain with conversation, and therefore he was a welcome participant of chats and disputes. It is known that he discussed passionately and almost to tears, and since he was considered a polite and moderation-driven adversary, one can suspect that these emotions had a bit of meticulously directed theatricality. Thus, through knowledge and skills he won John III's friendliness.

In the ambassador's opinion, contacts with the senators were a path leading to success; he assumed that they would decide about the course of the election²⁶, though the instructions he had received from Versailles warned him against an excessive trust²⁷. Everyone forgot about the election of Michał Korybut Wiśniowiecki who had been considered a candidate of the noblemen and who had been chosen against carefully prepared scenarios²⁸. Polignac assumed that it was enough to win the support of the senators in order to make impact on the noblemen, and achieve the planned goal. He had been convinced that nothing could be achieved through the noblemen. It does not seem that the ambassador observed Poland's internal affairs and examined the course of previous elections. It seems that he relied on the experience of his friend, Cardinal Toussaint de Forbin Janson, whose mission brought success to France since John Sobieski became the king, but the circumstances of that time had been different. Polignac did not look around for conversationalists presenting various opinions, he did not accept the opponents' opinion. The most important matter was to convince everyone to his own arguments and every judgement which was in line with his own opinions was considered correct. This was also where the sources of his failure were located. Polignac was inclined to use lie or at least a convenient bending of truth, but it is difficult to understand how a man capable of double-dealing could not suspect his conversationalists of duplicity.

Polignac did not cease his efforts to convince Louis XIV to proposing a candidature of a French prince. The king emphasised that this notion would entail considerable expenses. However, the ambassador did not rest in his efforts to obtain consent for changing the existing plans to support the Sobieski family, with a clearly defined presupposition that France would provide them with diplomatic effort

23 NGAB, fond 694, opis 12 ms 291, *James Sobieski to Louis XIV, [s.l., s.n., s.d., f. 4; Aleksandra Skrzypietz, Jakub Sobieski, (Poznań: Wydawnictwo Poznańskie, 2015) 229-30.*

24 Aleksandra Skrzypietz, *Królewscy synowie – Jakub, Aleksander i Konstanty Sobiescy* (Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego, 2011), 288-92, 302.

25 SSA, loc. 14339, con. 19, *Melchior de Polignac do Forbin Jansona*, Warsaw 28 February 1696; Woliński, *Kazimierz Sarnecki. Pamiętniki z czasów Jana Sobieskiego*, 320, 324, 337, 388; Aleksandra Skrzypietz, *Francuskie zabiegi o koronę polską po śmierci Jana III Sobieskiego* (Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego, 2009), 58-59.

26 Skrzypietz, *Francuskie zabiegi o koronę polską*, 74, 78.

27 Farges, *Recueil des instructions*, 216-218.

28 Mieczysława Chmielewska, *Sejm elekcyjny Michała Korybuta Wiśniowieckiego 1669 roku* (Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Sejmowe, 2006), 59-91; Aleksandra Skrzypietz, *Franciszek Ludwik de Bourbon, książę de Conti – "obraný król Polski" Saga rodu Kondeszów* (Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego, 2019), 127-51.

and they would have to bear the election costs. Polignac assured Louis XIV that the benefits of a Frenchman's enthronement in Poland would be enormous. Nevertheless, the king demanded that the ambassador won Marie Casimire over for the plans of proposing a French candidate. He was ready to designate remunerations for the French supporters, but their beneficiaries – apart from the Primate, the Crown and Lithuanian Treasurers – were supposed to be selected by the queen²⁹. However, the money was to be paid out only after the election. This reservation was a result of events from 1669 when some of the magnates took money from a few candidates at the same time³⁰. This decision protected France from expenses, but at the same time reduced chances for success because, according to the ambassador, the success was to be brought through money³¹.

Polignac did not treat the king's recommendations quite seriously and stated that Marie Casimire did not want to cooperate with him³². Still full of doubts, Louis XIV authorized a small amount of 600'000 livres to be allocated to the Frenchman's election – paid after the election! Finally, he also named François Louis de Bourbon, Prince de Conti, as the candidate. Simultaneously, Louis XIV warned the ambassador to show restraint and not prevent Prince James to win the throne and not turn him into a enemy of France³³. He also insisted that Polignac did not break ties with Marie Casimire completely, but he did not listen to the king³⁴. This was the goal of the Polish magnates who started cooperating with him.

According to the ambassador, the Polish senators were delighted with Prince de Conti's candidature, but they feared the reaction from the noblemen. Therefore, it was decided to keep it secret for the time being, but Polignac insisted to have the money paid to the army, which was to make the noblemen grateful. He also complained that the lack of money did not allow him to act and he hoped that – in spite of the announcements – the king would send it. He also incurred debts in order to give gifts to his closest associates³⁵.

News of the ambassador's debts reached Versailles; Marie Casimire – full of regrets and eager for revenge – made sure of that³⁶. Wishing to control the diplomat's activities, Louis XIV sent François de Castagnères, the abbot of Chateaufort to Poland. The arrival of a new envoy did not hurt Polignac either in the eyes of the magnates, or the Sun King. The abbot, poorly informed on the situation on the election fight, accepted Polignac's messages that all the activities served the interests of France, and he sent this notion of affairs to Versailles, naively commending the ambassador's efforts and confirming their validity³⁷.

29 *Depesze księdza de Polignac posła francuskiego po śmierci Jana III króla polskiego. Z rękopismu cesarskiej biblioteki w Paryżu*, vol. 1-2, 41, 51 (Poznań: Księgarnia J. K. Żupańskiego, 1855), 5-9; Aleksandra Skrzypietz, "Ludwik XIV wobec kandydatury królewiczów Sobieskich do tronu polskiego", in *Polska-Francja-Europa. Studia z dziejów Polski i stosunków międzynarodowych*, eds. Maciej Forycki, et al. (Poznań: Wydawnictwo Instytutu Historii UAM, 2011), 172-73.

30 *Wyjątek z pamiętników hrabiego de Chavagnac legata do Polski po abdykacji króla Jana Kazimierza i w czasie elekcji króla Michała roku 1668*, in Julian Ursyn Niemcewicz, *Zbiór pamiętników historycznych o dawnej Polsce z rękopismów, tudzież dzieł w różnych językach o Polsce wydanych wraz z listami oryginalnymi królów i znakomitych ludzi w kraju naszym*, vol. IV, (Lipsk: Breitkopf and Haertel, 1838), 217, 221.

31 Aleksandra Skrzypietz, "O pieniądzach, których nie było na wojnę, której miało nie być", in *Pecunia nervus belli. Z dziejów dyplomacji i stosunków międzynarodowych w XV-XVIII wieku*, eds. Mariusz Markiewicz and Ryszard Skowron, Filip Wolański (Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego, 2016), 146-64.

32 *Depesze księdza de Polignac*, vol. 1, 4-9; Skrzypietz, "Ludwik XIV wobec kandydatury", 173-74.

33 *Depesze księdza de Polignac*, vol. 1, 5-9; Léon de Bastard: *Négociations de l'abbé de Polignac en Pologne concernant l'élection du prince de Conti comme roi de Pologne (1696-1697)* (Auxerre: Gustve Perriquet, 1864), 18.

34 Komaszyński, *Maria Kazimiera d'Arquien Sobieska*, 181.

35 *Depesze księdza de Polignac*, vol. 1, 15, 29-34.

36 Komaszyński, *Maria Kazimiera d'Arquien Sobieska*, 200-01.

37 *Depesze księdza de Polignac*, vol. 1, 65-8; Farges, *Recueil des instructions*, 231-43; de La Force, *Le grand Conti*, 150-51; Mariusz Sawicki, "Partia francuska na Litwie w latach 1696-1697 w świetle dokumentów i rachunków dyplomatów Ludwika XIV: przyczynek do dziejów elekcji Augusta II", in *Wokół wolnych elekcji w państwie polsko-litewskim XVI-XVIII wieku: o znaczeniu idei wyboru – między prawami a obowiązkami*, eds. Mariusz Markiewicz, Dariusz Rolnik and Filip Wolański (Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego, 2016), 373-87.

Having no money, Polignac decided to refer to the promises which should attract the supporters of France. He promised that Prince de Conti would make sure that the Turks returned Kamieniec-Podolski to Poland before he was crowned. When Louis XIV pointed out that it was infeasible, Polignac explained with brutal honesty that it was possible to persuade the Turks to hand over the fortress and that they would be able to take it back after the election. These words are the evidence for the ambassador's dishonesty, but his behaviour confirmed that, while being guile, he did not understand that others could fight with the same weapon. Similarly unacceptable promise was a declaration that Prince de Conti's wife would give up on her retinue if her husband was enthroned in Poland. Louis XIV reacted to this with outrage. He clearly stated that moral rules and keeping promises were extremely important for him. Such unrealistic promises deprived the ambassador of trust of the more critical voters and they discredited Louis XIV in the eyes of the Poles, damaging opinion about him³⁸. The ambassador acted in Poland almost in a political void. There are no traces of his interest in the activities of other foreign diplomats. The election triggered keen interest of many countries. Their representatives were in Poland and carried out a wide-ranging activities. In the meantime, Polignac showed no interest in their plans, he trusted the magnates who assured him they would choose the Frenchman. Only once Polignac wrote about a Bavarian envoy, Pompeo Scarlatti, accusing him of careless attitude towards the elector's choice for the throne, even though Maximilian Emanuel did not declare his candidature for the throne, and it was the envoy's task to support James Sobieski³⁹.

Meanwhile, the magnates waited for the payment and started to doubt France's good will, and Polignac position was being undermined by Marie Casimire who spread the news that no money would arrive from Versailles⁴⁰. Polignac thought that extending the time of the electoral battle would exhaust resources of the Sobieski family, but even France's supporters lacked patience and money; i.e. the Sapieha family really could not handle the expenses without the financial support. Thus, the French party started to fall apart⁴¹.

A blow to the ambassador's efforts was the emergence of Frederick Augustus Wettin's candidature, who – already in the election field – turned out to be the hope for many of those tired with the fierce rivalry between the Sobieski and de Conti⁴². When it turned out that the election was bifurcated – some of the noblemen spoke in favour of Price de Conti and some others supported Frederick Augustus (James Sobieski's candidature was virtually lost), the supporters of France demanded payments in order to confirm French goodwill. Meanwhile, Louis XIV's order – that the promissory notes previously sent to Gdańsk would be paid only when Prince de Conti was enthroned – was still in force and in France nothing certain was known about the election, news about the split reached the country and it was not clear who had won. Therefore, the elect did not leave, waiting for the information from the ambassador whose contacts with Versailles were interrupted by Marie Casimire⁴³. The queen-widow, forced by the supporters of France to leave Warsaw, went to Gdańsk, got settled in the house of a postmaster and took over French letters. It is surprising that the only means of contact for the French ambassador with Versailles was the official post, but this was in fact the case.

Polignac still tried to get more cash to strengthen his followers and he tried to win over Marie Casimire's support, whose interests he had betrayed earlier, acting against her son's candidature at

38 *Depesze księdza de Polignac*, vol. 1, 44, 48-9, 50, 56; Skrzypietz, *Francuskie zabiegi o koronę polską*, 115-16.

39 SSA, loc. 14339, conv. 19, *Melchior de Polignac do Forbin Jansona*, Warszawa 4 December 1696; Stanisław Orszulik: "Kandydatura elektora bawarskiego Maksymiliana III Emanuela do korony polskiej po śmierci Jana III", *Śląski Kwartalnik Historyczny*. Sobótka, n. 2 (1974): 234.

40 Komarzyński, *Maria Kazimiera d'Arquien Sobieska*, 200; Skrzypietz, *Francuskie zabiegi o koronę polską*, 169.

41 Aleksandra Skrzypietz, "Sapiehowie wobec elekcji księcia Conti", in *Sapiehowie epoki Kodnia i Krasiczyzna. Obrazy kultury polskiej*, ed. Krzysztof Stępnik (Lublin: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej, 2007), 371-90.

42 Electoral struggles was very brutal, *ad personam* arguments were used. Stanisław Orszulik, *Pisma polityczne bezkrólewia po śmierci Jana III Sobieskiego (1696-1697)*, Kraków, 1982 [typescript in Jagiellonian Library].

43 Centre des Archives diplomatiques de La Courneuve, Pologne, *Correspondance* 97, *François de Castagnères to Louis XIV*, [s.l.] 3 July 1697, f. 244; NGAB, fond 694, opis 12, ms 310, *François de Castagnères and Melchior de Polignac to Louis XIV*, Warsaw, 16 August 1697, ff. 1r-2r; NGAB, fond 694, opis 12, ms 154, *Maria Casimira to James Sobieski*, [s.l., s.d.] ff. 9r-12v; NGAB, fond 694, opis 12, ms 155, *Maria Casimira to James Sobieski*, [s.l., s.d.] ff. 1r-12r.

the prompting of the magnates. No wonder the queen-widow ridiculed these offers, presenting empty envelopes of the Versailles letters she had taken over.

The ambassador tried to console himself and explain that Wettin's supporters violated the law because their victory was announced not by the primate, but by Bishop of Cuiavia, Stanisław Dąbski, and the elect did not have the election diploma at his disposal because it was meant to be issued by the election's marshal, the Crown Chamberlain, Ludwik Bieliński, who was a supporter of the French candidate. Polignac assured that as soon as the Poles have a look at Prince Conti, they would immediately abandon his rival in order to accept the man worthy of the crown. He deluded either himself, Louis XIV, or his own supporters with hope that everything could be still saved even though he saw that his followers were withdrawing their support and many of them did not wait any longer for the arrival of the king-elect since they had considered the election of the Frenchmen as a lost case. There is no doubt that through manipulating his adherents and the king, presenting them the situation how he saw it, or how he wished to see it, insisting on putting forward the French candidature as certain, and then conducting a ruthless electoral fight, Polignac thwarted James Sobieski's changes for the throne; and it should be assumed that these chances were not inconsiderable and there are many indications that the prince enjoyed support among the noblemen. Polignac's personal ambitions to place the French candidate on the Polish throne, to win over his and Louis XIV's gratitude, to gain the magnates' support and to set the tone of political events, made the ambassador act against the orders he had received from Versailles and compromise the mission he had received.

The election of 1697 are encircled by a black legend⁴⁴. There is talk of enormous amount of money paid for supporting the French candidate and treason committed by the Poles who accepted gratification from France and did not support its candidate decisively enough. In the meantime, the ambassador squandered no money, but empty promises. France did not involve much money in this election and thus Polish voters abandoned its representative. Polignac's deceptive assurances unsupported by money were answered with the lack of readiness to put Poles and their own interests at risk, as well as their own position in the face of chaos and general uncertainty which emerged after the bifurcated election.

All these characteristics – a mix of foresight and readiness to choose easy routes, intelligence and naivety, and, most of all, dangerous self-confidence based on proneness to manipulation – made Polignac as much a dangerous opponent as a great loser. However, it should be added that even though he moved in his life between diplomatic success and royal disfavour, he eventually reached for high offices. It was his skills and personality that were giving him hope for triumph and, at the same time, were becoming a reason of his failures. Polignac was considered highly talented both in France and Poland. He had a gift of being liked, based on his personal charm and thorough education, which he zealously broadened⁴⁵. His knowledge in literature and eloquence were praised⁴⁶.

The mission in Poland presented talents, but also uncontrollable ambitions of Melchior de Polignac. In accordance with the instructions, he initially started cooperation with the royal couple and he tried to fulfil his ongoing tasks without greater success. He demonstrated decisively less intuition and skills in predicting than Louis XIV, which is indicated even by their approach towards Theresa Kunegunda Sobieska's marriage plans. At the beginning of 1696 the ambassador gave into the narratives of the Polish magnates who did not want to see any of the Sobieski family's princes on the throne. Polignac noticed an opportunity for the enthronement of the French candidate, and he most likely dreamt of playing a significant role by his side or winning Louis XIV's gratitude. Despite spending four years in Poland, Polignac probably did not notice that the ruler's position, and even the laws he had, did not let him pursue unhampered politics, and thus nothing guaranteed that he would be able to rule in accordance with France's expectations. Nevertheless, the willingness to achieve his own ambitions, to block the election of James Sobieski as a supporter of the Habsburgs' influences, made the ambassador

44 Władysław Konopczyński, *Dzieje Polski nowożytnej*, vol. 1 (Warszawa: "Pax", 1986), 506.

45 Saint-Simon, *Pamiętniki*, trans. Aleksander i Maria Bocheńscy, vol. 2 (Warszawa: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy, 1961), 31-5.

46 Sévigné, *Listy: wybór*, trans. Michał Mroziński and Anna Tatarkiewicz (Warszawa: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy, 1981), 374.

insist on the idea suggested to him by the magnates, and he probably believed that they were going to carry out his plans without realizing that he became a tool in their hands. He gathered around himself the followers representing the most important – although not all – magnate families and he stayed under the impression that he would bring his own elect to the throne due to their help. He did not pay attention to the noblemen's preferences, convinced that they would let the magnates lead. He did not quit his own projects even though their implementation was erasing the instructions he had received and orders coming from Versailles. These ideas required to overcome the resistance of Louis XIV who correctly assumed that the victory of one of the Sobieski family's members, willing to cooperate with France, would be the best solution and would give hope for securing French interests, as long as they could be carried out in the constantly weakening Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. Sobieski's election would also release Versailles from considerable expenses required for the election fight. However, the ambassador's insistence, prompted the king to present the French candidate. He also stipulated that no money would be sent to Poland until the Frenchman is enthroned, and this decision was met. He sent to Gdańsk promissory notes paid after the election, which Polignac could not cash in, and thus the payouts did not happen. Ultimately, this compromised the chances of Prince de Conti who left for his crown with a long delay. When he arrived in Gdańsk, his rival Augustus II had already been crowned. Some of the French supporters were ready to start a fight for placing their own candidate on the throne, and effectively break out a civil war, but only on the condition that they would be given the money and military support from France; quite conveniently, Prince de Conti had no intention to win the crown by shedding blood. Therefore, Polignac's mission ended in a failure. After returning to France, he was exiled from the court, which lasted for three years.

ABBREVIATIONS

NGAB: NGAB: Nacyjanalnyj Gistarycznyj Archiu Bielarusi, Minsk.
SSA: Sächsisches Staatsarchiv–Dresden.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

- Bastard, Léon de. *Négociations de l'abbé de Polignac en Pologne concernant l'élection du prince de Conti comme roi de Pologne (1696–1697)*. Auxerre: Gustve Perriquet, 1864.
- Chmielewska, Mieczysława. *Sejm elekcyjny Michała Korybuta Wiśniowieckiego 1669 roku*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Sejmowe, 2006.
- Faucher, Chrysostôme. *Histoire du cardinal de Polignac, contenant des détails sur ses différents négociations, tirés du dépôt des affaires étrangères, pour servir d'éclaircissement à une partie des règnes de Louis XIV. et de Louis XV.*, vol. 1. Paris: d'Houry, 1777.
- Forst de Battaglia, Otto. *Jan Sobieski król Polski*, translated by Krystyna Szyszkowska. Warszawa: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy, 1983.
- Hoffman, Karol Boromiesz. "Historia upadku dynastii Sobieskich z nowych dokumentów". *Gazeta Polska*, n. 258 (1862).
- Kawecki, Roman. *Kardynał Michał Stefan Radziejowski (1645–1705)*. Opole: Wydawnictwo Świętego Krzyża, 2005.
- Komaszyński, Michał, and Skrzypietz, Aleksandra. "Z działalności ambasadora Wersalu na dworze Jana III (1696 rok)". In *Ojczyzna wielka i mała*, edited by Idzi Panic, 61-9. Cieszyn: Polskie Towarzystwo Historyczne o/Cieszyn, 1996.
- Komaszyński, Michał. "Tajna misja ambasadora Jana III Sobieskiego w Brukseli (1695)", *Śląski Kwartalnik Historyczny. Sobótka*, n. 1-2 (1992): 117-22.
- Komaszyński, Michał. *Jan III Sobieski a Bałtyk*. Gdańsk: Wydawnictwo Morskie, 1983.
- Komaszyński, Michał. *Maria Kazimiera d'Arquien Sobieska królowa Polski (1641–1716)*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Literackie, 1983.
- Komaszyński, Michał. *Teresa Kunegunda Sobieska*. Warszawa: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy, 1982.
- Komaszyński, Michał. *Polska w polityce gospodarczej Wersalu 1661–1715*. Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 1968.
- La Force, August de. *Le grand Conti*. Paris: Émil-Paul Frères, 1922.
- Nahlik, Stanisław Edward. *Narodziny nowoczesnej dyplomacji*. Wrocław-Warszawa-Kraków-Gdańsk: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 1971.
- Orszulik, Stanisław. "Kandydatura elektora bawarskiego Maksymiliana III Emanuela do korony polskiej po śmierci Jana III". *Śląski Kwartalnik Historyczny. Sobótka*, n. 2 (1974): 231-48.
- Orszulik, Stanisław. *Pisma polityczne bezkrólewia po śmierci Jana III Sobieskiego (1696–1697)*. Kraków 1982 [typescript in Jagiellonian Library].
- Paul, Pierre. *Le cardinal Melchior de Polignac, 1661–1741*. Paris: Allégre, 1922.
- Petitfils, Jean-Christian. *Louis XIV*. Paris: Perrin, 2002.
- Sawicki, Mariusz. "Partia francuska na Litwie w latach 1696–1697 w świetle dokumentów i rachunków dyplomatów Ludwika XIV: przyczynek do dziejów elekcji Augusta II". In *Wokół wolnych elekcji w państwie polsko-litewskim XVI-XVIII wieku: o znaczeniu idei wyboru – między prawami a obowiązkami*, edited by Mariusz Markiewicz, Dariusz Rolnik and Filip Wolański, 373-87. Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego, 2016.
- Skrzypietz, Aleksandra. *Franciszek Ludwik de Bourbon, książę de Conti – "obronny król Polski" Saga rodu Kondeuszów*. Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego, 2019.
- Skrzypietz, Aleksandra. "Trzecie małżeństwo królowej Marii Kazimiery – u źródeł legendy". In *Maria Kazimiera Sobieska (1641–1716). W kręgu rodziny, polityki i kultury* (Studia i Materiały, nr 6), edited by Anna Kalinowska and Paweł Tyszka, 113-35. Warszawa: Zamek Królewski w Warszawie – Muzeum, 2017.
- Skrzypietz, Aleksandra. "O pieniądzach, których nie było na wojnę, której miało nie być". In *Pecunia nervus belli. Z dziejów dyplomacji i stosunków międzynarodowych w XV-XVIII wieku*, edited

- by Mariusz Markiewicz, Ryszard Skowron and Filip Wolański, 146-64. Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego, 2016.
- Skrzypietz, Aleksandra. *Jakub Sobieski*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Poznańskie, 2015.
- Skrzypietz, Aleksandra. "Ludwik XIV wobec kandydatury królewiczów Sobieskich do tronu polskiego". In *Polska-Francja-Europa. Studia z dziejów Polski i stosunków międzynarodowych*, edited by Maciej Forycki, Agnieszka Jakuboszczak, Jan Jurkiewicz, Igor Kraszewski and Mikołaj Pukaniec, 163-82. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Instytutu Historii UAM, 2011.
- Skrzypietz, Aleksandra. *Królewscy synowie – Jakub, Aleksander i Konstanty Sobiescy*. Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego, 2011.
- Skrzypietz, Aleksandra. *Francuskie zabiegi o koronę polską po śmierci Jana III Sobieskiego*. Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego, 2009.
- Skrzypietz, Aleksandra. "Sapiehowie wobec elekcji księcia Conti". In *Sapiehowie epoki Kodnia i Krasiczyna. Obrazy kultury polskiej*, edited by Krzysztof Stępnik, 371-90. Lublin: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej, 2007.
- Skrzypietz, Aleksandra. "Zabiegi posła francuskiego o odrębny pokój polsko-turecki w latach 1693–1697". *Balkanica Posnaniensa*, vol. 13 (2003): 95-100.
- Staszewski, Jacek. "Elekcja 1697 roku". In *Jak Polskę przemienić w kraj kwitnący...* Szkice i studia z czasów saskich, edited by Jacek Staszewski, 73-92. Olsztyn: Ośrodek Badań Naukowych im. Wojciecha Kętrzyńskiego, 1997.
- Staszewski, Jacek. *O miejsce w Europie, stosunki Polski i Saksonii z Francją na przełomie XII i XVIII wieku*. Warszawa: PWN, 1973.
- Targosz, Karolina. *Sawantki w Polsce XVII wieku. Aspiracje intelektualne kobiet ze środowisk magnackich*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Retro-Art 1997.
- Targosz, Karolina. *Jan III Sobieski mecenasem nauk i uczonych*. Wrocław-Warszawa-Kraków: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 1991.
- Wołoszyński, Ryszard. *Polska w opiniach Francuzów w XVII wieku*. Warszawa: PWN, 1964.
- Wójcik, Zbigniew. *Jan Sobieski (1629–1696)*. Warszawa: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy, 1994.

PRIMARY SOURCES

- Centre des Archives diplomatiques de La Courneuve
Pologne, Correspondance 97.
- NGAB
Fond 694, opis 12 mss 154, 155, 291, 310.
- SSA
Loc. 14339, con. 19.
- Biblioteka Naukowa PAN i PAU–Kraków
Teki Waliszewskiego, vol. VI.

PRINTED SOURCES

- Depesze księdza de Polignac posła francuskiego po śmierci Jana III króla polskiego. Z rękopismu cesarskiej biblioteki w Paryżu*, voll. 1-2. Poznań: Księgarnia J. K. Żupańskiego, 1855.
- De Voyer d'Argneson, Rene Luois (marquis), ed. *Mémoires et journal inédit du marquis d'Argenson ministre des affaires étrangères sous Louis XV*. Paris, 1857–1858.
- Częścik, Łucja, ed. *Mongrillon Michel de, Pamiętnik sekretarza ambasady francuskiej w Polsce pod koniec panowania Jana III oraz bezkrólewia i wolnej elekcji po jego zgonie (1694–1698)*. Wrocław-Warszawa-Kraków-Gdańsk-Łódź: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 1982.
- Farges, Louis, ed. *Recueil des instructions données aux ambassadeurs et ministres de France depuis les traités de Westphalie jusqu'à la révolution française IV–V: Pologne*, vol. 1: 1648–1729. Paris: Ancienne Librairie Germer Baillière et C^{ie}, 1888.
- Milewski, Dariusz, ed. *Dupont, Philippe. Pamiętniki historyi życia i czynów Jana III Sobieskiego*, translated by Beata Spieralska. Warszawa: Muzeum Pałac w Wilanowie, 2011.
- Saint-Simon, *Pamiętniki*, trans. Aleksander i Maria Bocheńscy, vol. 2. Warszawa: Państwowy Instytut

Wydawniczy, 1961.

Sévigné de, Pani. *Listy: wybór*, translated by Michał Mroziński and Anna Tatarkiewicz. Warszawa: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy, 1981.

Woliński, Janusz, ed. *Sarnecki Kazimierz. Pamiętniki z czasów Jana Sobieskiego. Diariusz i relacje z lat 1691–1696*. Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 1958.

Wyjątek z pamiętników hrabiego de Chavagnac legata do Polski po abdykacji króla Jana Kazimierza i w czasie elekcji króla Michała roku 1668, in Julian Ursyn Niemcewicz, *Zbiór pamiętników historycznych o dawnej Polsce z rękopismów, tudzież dzieł w różnych językach o Polsce wydanych wraz z listami oryginalnymi królów i znakomitych ludzi w kraju naszym*, vol. 4. Lipsk: Breitkopf and Haertel, 1838.