

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 <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.

Duda Paweł, Litwin Henryk

UNIVERSITY OF SILESIA IN KATOWICE (POLAND), UNIVERSITY OF WARSAW (POLAND)

CORRESPONDENCE OF THE WARSAW NUNCIO ANTONIO SANTA CROCE WITH THE ROMAN CATHOLIC BISHOPS IN 1629: FREQUENCY, INTENSITY, CONTENT

ABSTRACT

This article is based on source material from the unique collection of correspondence of the Warsaw nuncio Antonio Santa Croce, stored in the Roman *Archivio di Stato* in the *Archivio Santacroce* ensemble under number 774 and containing 846 letters from the year 1629, addressed to the nuncio from various senders. The authors analyze the correspondence of the nuncio from the Roman Catholic bishops of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, consisting of 109 letters. 104 from the ordinary bishops and 5 from suffragan bishops. The analysis leads to the conclusion that the most regular and intensive correspondence was maintained with the nuncio by Archbishop of Gniezno Jan Wężyk and Bishop of Cracow Marcin Szyszkowski (presumably twice a month). Most of the other bishops approached the frequency of one letter per month, and this concerned the bishops of Vilnius, Cuiavia, Poznań, Płock, Samogitia, Łuck (Lutsk), Przemyśl and Chełm. The bishops present at the court, such as Bishop of Chełmno, Chancellor Jakub Zadzik or Bishop of Kamieniec Paweł Piasecki, made less frequent contact with the nuncio by letter. The bishops only sporadically addressed political issues in their letters and this was connected with the preparation for the *sejm*. Some hierarchs were interested in the Brest Union and referred to it in their letters. Most often, however, the bishops raised in their correspondence the issues of nominations for benefices, problems related to the discipline of the diocesan clergy and the issues of dispensations and facultates. The bishops' contact with the nuncio therefore concerned in the vast majority of cases ecclesiastical matters and the secular functions of hierarchs, as senators of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, only occasionally marked their presence in correspondence with the papal ambassadors.

KEYWORDS: Papal diplomacy; Correspondence of nuncio; Roman Catholic bishops; Church Elites; Antonio Santa Croce.

In research on the history of the Polish nunciature for several decades there has been a period of intensive editorial work initiated by the Polish Historical Institute in Rome, acting under the inspiration of Prof. Karolina Lanckorońska and according to the principles developed by Rev. Prof. Henryk Damian Wojtyśka. In the mid 1990s, the Polish Academy of Arts and Sciences took over the task of editing the correspondence of apostolic nuncios in Poland and continues it at present. The editions of subsequent volumes of *Acta Nuntiaturae Polonae* (ANP) are accompanied by numerous monographs and analytical studies based on the edited materials. The current recapitulation of these works was a scientific conference organized by the Polish Academy of Arts in 2019, the output of which appeared in print in 2020¹. This recapitulation led to the creation of a restrained balance sheet of the work done so far, showing above all the need for further research and development of spaces still little explored. This text is a modest attempt at a reconnaissance of an issue that has been little known so far due to a lack of adequate source material. The undersigned take up the subject of the nuncio's contacts with the local Roman Catholic hierarchy².

1 *Sztuka roztropności. Dyplomacja Stolicy Apostolskiej wobec Rzeczypospolitej, Europy i świata w epoce nowożytnej i XX wieku. Zbiór studiów*, eds. Krzysztof Ożóg and Ryszard Skowron (Kraków: PAU, 2020).

2 It is worth noting that Polish nunciaturists in their research attempted a prosopographical approach to the Polish episcopate based on the correspondence of papal diplomats: for example, see Jan Kopiec, "Nuncjusze papiescy o senacie



In the volumes of *Acta Nuntiaturae Polonae* concerning the period 1572–1648 published so far, correspondence between nuncios and bishops has appeared sporadically. Only in the volume devoted to nuncio Germanico Malaspina, prepared by Leszek Jarmański, can we find 29 such letters – 7 written to the Nuncio and 22 sent by him³. Most of these valuable finds (20) come from a manuscript containing registers of Malaspina's outgoing correspondence from the time of his Polish nunciature, held in Rome's Biblioteca Vallicelliana⁴. 5 letters from Primate Stanisław Karnkowski, on the other hand, are known from registers recorded in a volume owned by the Library of PAN-PAU in Cracow⁵. Jarmański found 2 letters from the nuncio to Bishop of Cuiavia Hieronim Rozrażewski in the Diocesan Archives in Włocławek⁶. The other 2 letters from Rozrażewski and Wawrzyniec Gościński, Bishop of Przemyśl, "wandered" into the files of the nunciature kept in the *Fondo Borghese* of *Archivio Apostolico Vaticano*⁷. This fascinating material was discussed in the introduction to the above-mentioned volume, but necessarily in a rather perfunctory manner⁸ and never became the basis for separate analyses.

In other volumes of the ANP from the period 1572–1648, correspondence with bishops does not appear at all⁹, or we find isolated examples of it, such as 4 letters from Bishop Stanisław Łubieński in the volume on Antonio Santa Croce and 8 more from the same hierarch in the volume on the nunciature of Honorato Visconti¹⁰. For the sake of order, we should also mention four letters from Vincenzo Lauro to Polish bishops collected from scattered sources¹¹, as well as one letter from the Archbishop of Gniezno Jan Wężyk, which "wandered" into the files of the nunciature of Mario Filonardi¹².

The continuation of research into the mission of Antonio Santa Croce opens up new possibilities for the analysis of the Polish nuncio's contacts with the local Latin hierarchy.¹³ In connection with the preparation for publication of the second volume of the correspondence of this nunciature, a very

Rzeczypospolitej", in *Senat w Polsce*, eds. Krystyn Matwijowki and Jan Pietrzak (Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Sejmowe, 1993), 148–157; Teresa Chynczewska-Hennel, "Elita polityczna Rzeczypospolitej w świetle "ankiety personalnej" nuncjusza Honorata Viscontiego", in *Władza i prestiż. Magnateria Rzeczypospolitej w XVI-XVIII wieku*, eds. Jerzy Urwanowicz and Ewa Dubas-Urwanowicz (Białystok: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu w Białymstoku, 2003), 125–137; Tadeusz Fitych, "Obraz biskupów polskich w oczach nuncjuszów papieskich z połowie XVII wieku", in *Od Kijowa do Rzymu. Z dziejów stosunków Rzeczypospolitej ze Stolicą Apostolską i Ukrainą*, eds. Dariusz R. Drozdowski, Wojciech Walczak and Katarzyna Wiszowata-Walczak (Białystok: Instytut Badań nad Dziedzictwem Kulturowym Europy, 2012), 469–509.

3 ANP, t. XV: *Germanicus Malaspina (1591–1598)*, vol. 1: (1 XII 1591–31 XII 1592), ed. Leszek Jarmański (Cracoviae: Academia Scientiarum et Litterarum Polona, 2000), 136, 172, 254, 255, 266, 268, 269, 277, 292, 301, 303, 304, 305, 314, 334, 336, 341, 349, 353, 360, 363, 380, 382, 284, 285, 413, 416.

4 Biblioteca Vallicelliana, L. 18, f. II, c. 8–24v.

5 BPAN, 1884, n. 486, 496, 497, 498, 500.

6 Archive of the Bishops of Kuyavia and Pomerania, *Acta Episcoporum*, 11, ff. 320, 321.

7 AAV, *Fondo Borghese*, III 18, ff. 35v–36; III 96 D, f. 209.

8 ANP, t. XV/1, XXXI–XXXII.

9 ANP, t. XVIII: *Franciscus Simonetta (1606–1612)*, vol. 1: (21 VI 1606–30 IX 1607), ed. Wojciech Tygielski (Romae: Institutum Historicum Polonicum Romae, 1990); ANP, t. XXII: *Giovanni Battista Lancellotti (1622–1627)*, vol. 1: (12 XI 1622–29 IV 1623), ed. Tadeusz Fitych (Cracoviae: Academia Scientiarum et Litterarum Polona, 2001); ANP, t. XXV: *Marius Filonardi (1635–1643)*, vol. 1: (12 II 1635–29 X 1636), ed. Teresa Chynczewska-Hennel (Cracoviae: Academia Scientiarum et Litterarum Polona, 2003).

10 ANP, t. XXIII: *Antonio Santa Croce (1627–1630)*, vol. 1: (1 III 1627–29 VII 1628), ed. Henryk Litwin (Romae: Institutum Historicum Polonicum Romae, 1996) 16, 182, 194, 215, and ANP, t. XXIV: *Honoratus Visconti (1630–1636)*, vol. 1: (20 IV 1630–26 VII 1631), ed. Wojciech Biliński (Romae: Institutum Historicum Polonicum Romae, 1992) 60, 185, 187, 224, 254, 283, 316, 318; all these letters from both volumes have been taken from manuscript 157 II of the Library of the National Ossoliński Institute.

11 ANP, t. IX: *Vincentius Lauro (1572–1578)*, vol. 1: (25 VII 1572–30 IX 1574), eds. Mirosław Korolko and Henryk D. Wojtyska, (Romae: Institutum Historicum Polonicum Romae, 1994), 213, 270, 296, 340, published on the basis of AAV, *Segreteria Stato. Polonia*, vol. 396, f. 61.

12 ANP, t. XXV: *Marius Filonardi (1635–1643)*, vol. 2: (1 XI 1636–31 X 1637), ed. Teresa Chynczewska-Hennel (Cracoviae: Academia Scientiarum et Litterarum Polona, 2006), 66.

13 For more on A. Santa Croce, see Alberto Tanturri, "Santacroce Antonio", in DBI, vol. 90 (2017); Henryk Litwin, *De Antonio Santa Croce nuntio eiusque sociis*, in ANP t. XXIII/1; Henryk Litwin, *Chwała Północy. Rzeczpospolita w polityce Stolicy Apostolskiej 1598–1648* (Warszawa: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy, 2018), 224–27.

interesting collection of documents has been explored, which includes 837 original letters addressed to the nuncio in 1629. These materials can be found in folder n. 774 of the *Archivio Santacroce*, complex stored in the *Archivio di Stato* in Rome. Among other things, there are 103 letters from Polish Roman Catholic bishops. 22 of them from January through March 1629 will be included in the above-mentioned edition of the second volume of the nunciature of Antonio Santa Croce prepared by the undersigned, which appear in print in 2021¹⁴. However, it is already worthwhile to take a look at the whole of this collection and to subject it to at least a preliminary analysis. A complete list of the bishops' letters is given in the table below¹⁵.

Surname and first name	Bishopric	Date	Location	Language	Nr.
Wołowicz Eustachy	EP. Vilmensis	1629.01.04	Di Besdesa	It.	1
Grochowski Achacy	EP. Luceoriensis	1629.01.05	Janoviae	Lat.	2
Woyna Abraham	EP. Samogitiae	1629.01.07	Miednices	Lat.	3
Nowodworski Adam	EP. Praemyliensis	1629.02.06	Brzozoviae	Lat.	4
Szyszkowski Marcin	EP. Cracoviensis	1629.02.12	Kielciis	Lat.	5
Szyszkowski Marcin	EP. Cracoviensis	1629.02.18	Kielciis	Lat.	6
Szyszkowski Marcin	EP. Cracoviensis	1629.02.19	Kielciis	Lat.	7
Nowodworski Adam	EP. Praemyliensis	1629.02.20	Brzozoviae	Lat.	8
Wężyk Jan	AEPP. Gnesnensis	1629.03.11	Squiernieviciis	Lat.	9
Szyszkowski Marcin	EP. Cracoviensis	1629.03.07	Kielciis	Lat.	10
Wężyk Jan	AEPP. Gnesnensis	1629.03.07	Squiernieviciis	Lat.	11
Szyszkowski Marcin	EP. Cracoviensis	1629.03.08	Kielciis	Lat.	12
Szyszkowski Marcin	EP. Cracoviensis	1629.03.09	Kielciis	Lat.	13
Lipski Andrzej	EP. Vladislaviensis	1629.03.14	Volboriae	Lat.	14
Woyna Abraham	EP. Samogitiae	1629.03.15	Vornis	Lat.	15
Łubieński Stanisław	EP. Plocensis	1629.03.16	Viscoviae	Lat.	16
Wężyk Jan	AEPP. Gnesnensis	1629.03.19	Squiernieviciis	Lat.	17
Łubieński Stanisław	EP. Plocensis	1629.03.20	Viscoviae	Lat.	18
Wężyk Jan	AEPP. Gnesnensis	1629.03.27	Squiernieviciis	Lat.	19
Tyszkiewicz Jerzy	EP. Suff. Vilmensis	1629.03.28	Vilnae	Lat.	20
Łubieński Stanisław	EP. Plocensis	1629.03.29	Brocoviae	Lat.	21
Konieczpolski Remigian	EP. Chelmensis	1629.03.31	Cumoviae	Lat.	22
Konieczpolski Remigian	EP. Chelmensis	1629.04.01	Cumoviae	Lat.	23
Lipski Andrzej	EP. Vladislaviensis	1629.04.14	Vladislaviae	Lat.	24
Wężyk Jan	AEPP. Gnesnensis	1629.04.14	Lovicii	Lat.	25
Szyszkowski Marcin	EP. Cracoviensis	1629.04.20	Lubluni	Lat.	26
Wężyk Jan	AEPP. Gnesnensis	1629.04.21	Lovicii	Lat.	27
Próchnicki Jan Andrzej	AEPP. Leopoliensis	1629.04.28	Leopoli	Lat.	28
Próchnicki Jan Andrzej	AEPP. Leopoliensis	1629.04.28	Leopoli	Lat.	29
Wężyk Jan	AEPP. Gnesnensis	1629.05.02	Lovicii	Lat.	30
Konieczpolski Remigian	EP. Chelmensis	1629.05.02	In curia Cumoviensi	Lat.	31
Tyszkiewicz Jerzy	EP. Suff. Vilmensis	1629.05.03	Vilnae	Lat.	32
Lipski Andrzej	EP. Vladislaviensis	1629.05.04	Vladislaviae	Lat.	33
Wężyk Jan	AEPP. Gnesnensis	1629.05.04	Lovicii	Lat.	34

¹⁴ ANP, t. XXIII/2.

¹⁵ Name of bishopric given in Latin; place of dating given according to source text.

Szyszkowski Marcin	EP. Cracoviensis	1629.05.08	Lublina	Lat.	35
Woyna Abraham	EP. Samogitiae	1629.05.09	Vilnae	Lat.	36
Wężyk Jan	AEPP. Gnesnensis	1629.05.11	Lovicii	Lat.	37
Lipski Andrzej	EP. Vladislaviensis	1629.05.15	Vladislaviae	Lat.	38
Szyszkowski Marcin	EP. Cracoviensis	1629.05.15	In Wałowice	Lat.	39
Wężyk Jan	AEPP. Gnesnensis	1629.05.16	Lovicii	Lat.	40
Schenking Otto	EP. Vendensis	1629.05.20	Suleoviae	Lat.	41
Nowodworski Adam	EP. Praemyliensis	1629.05.25	Brzozoviae	Lat.	42
Lipski Andrzej	EP. Vladislaviensis	1629.05.28	Vladislaviae	Lat.	43
Szyszkowski Marcin	EP. Cracoviensis	1629.05.30	Ilzae	Lat.	44
Łubieński Maciej	EP. Posnaniensis	1629.06.01	Posnaniae	Lat.	45
Śladkowski Abraham	EP. Suff. Chelmensis	1629.06.05	Lublina	Lat.	46
Szyszkowski Marcin	EP. Cracoviensis	1629.06.07	Ilzae	Lat.	47
Wołowicz Eustachy	EP. Vilmensis	1629.06.08	Di Vilna	It.	48
Szyszkowski Marcin	EP. Cracoviensis	1629.06.09	Ilzae	Lat.	49
Wężyk Jan	AEPP. Gnesnensis	1629.06.15	Lovicii	Lat.	50
Wołowicz Eustachy	EP. Vilmensis	1629.06.27	Vilnae	Lat.	51
Wężyk Jan	AEPP. Gnesnensis	1629.06.29	Lovicii	Lat.	52
Wężyk Jan	AEPP. Gnesnensis	1629.07.02	Lovicii	Lat.	53
Wężyk Jan	AEPP. Gnesnensis	1629.07.08	Lovicii	Lat.	54
Łubieński Maciej	EP. Posnaniensis	1629.07.12	Ciążimi	Lat.	55
Baykowski Jan	EP. Suff. Posnaniensis	1629.07.19	Posnaniae	Lat.	56
Woyna Abraham	EP. Samogitiae	1629.07.21	Olsadio	Lat.	57
Wężyk Jan	AEPP. Gnesnensis	1629.07.23	Lovicii	Lat.	58
Wężyk Jan	AEPP. Gnesnensis	1629.07.27	Lovicii	Lat.	59
Szyszkowski Marcin	EP. Cracoviensis	1629.07.29	Cracoviae	Lat.	60
Lipski Andrzej	EP. Vladislaviensis	1629.07.29	Chocii	Lat.	61
Wężyk Jan	AEPP. Gnesnensis	1629.07.30	Lovicii	Lat.	62
Szyszkowski Marcin	EP. Cracoviensis	1629.08.02	Kielciis	Lat.	63
Łubieński Stanisław	EP. Plocensis	1629.08.03	Brocovio	Lat.	64
Grochowski Achacy	EP. Luceoriensis	1629.08.06	Janoviae	Lat.	65
Wołowicz Eustachy	EP. Vilmensis	1629.08.10	Vilnae	Lat.	66
Łubieński Stanisław	EP. Plocensis	1629.08.15	Brocovio	Lat.	67
Wężyk Jan	AEPP. Gnesnensis	1629.08.20	Lovicii	Lat.	68
Konieczpolski Remigian	EP. Chelmensis	1629.08.20	Andreoviae	Lat.	69
Wężyk Jan	AEPP. Gnesnensis	1629.08.22	Lovicii	Lat.	70
Łubieński Stanisław	EP. Plocensis	1629.08.23	Pultovio	Lat.	71
Tyszkiewicz Jerzy	EP. Suff. Vilmensis	1629.08.23	Vilnae	Lat.	72
Zadzik Jakub	EP. Culmensis	1629.08.24	ex Castris ad Granfeltum	Lat.	73
Wężyk Jan	AEPP. Gnesnensis	1629.08.28	Lovicii	Lat.	74
Wołowicz Eustachy	EP. Vilmensis	1629.09.04	Di Vilna	It.	75
Piasecki Paweł	EP. Camenecensis	1629.09.07	Di Varsavia	It.	76
Grochowski Achacy	EP. Luceoriensis	1629.09.08	Janoviae	Lat.	77
Wołowicz Eustachy	EP. Vilmensis	1629.09.12	Di Vilna	It.	78

Szyszkowski Marcin	EP. Cracoviensis	1629.09.17	Słavcoviae	Lat.	79
Szyszkowski Marcin	EP. Cracoviensis	1629.09.18	Słavcoviae	Lat.	80
Nowodworski Adam	EP. Praemyliensis	1629.09.20	Brzozoviae	Lat.	81
Grochowski Achacy	EP. Luceoriensis	1629.09.20	Janoviae	Lat.	82
Łubieński Stanisław	EP. Plocensis	1629.09.24	Pultoviae	Lat.	83
Szyszkowski Marcin	EP. Cracoviensis	1629.09.24	Kielciis	Lat.	84
Szyszkowski Marcin	EP. Cracoviensis	1629.09.25	Kielciis	Lat.	85
Woyna Abraham	EP. Samogitiae	1629.09.29	Vilnae	Lat.	86
Wężyk Jan	AEPP. Gnesnensis	1629.10.05	Lovicii	Lat.	87
Łubieński Maciej	EP. Posnaniensis	1629.10.08	Łubnae	Lat.	88
Szyszkowski Marcin	EP. Cracoviensis	1629.10.21	A Bozentin	It.	89
Łubieński Maciej	EP. Posnaniensis	1629.10.21	Ciążimi	Lat.	90
Szyszkowski Marcin	EP. Cracoviensis	1629.11.11	Kielciis	Lat.	91
Lipski Andrzej	EP. Vladislaviensis	1629.11.21	Volboriae	Lat.	92
Nowodworski Adam	EP. Praemyliensis	1629.11.24	Brzozoviae	Lat.	93
Łubieński Stanisław	EP. Plocensis	1629.11.28	Varsaviae	Lat.	94
Konieczpolski Remigian	EP. Chelmensis	1629.11.29	Cumoviae	Lat.	95
Zadzik Jakub	EP. Culmensis	1629.12.01	Varsaviae	Lat.	96
Grochowski Achacy	EP. Luceoriensis	1629.12.02	Janoviae	Lat.	97
Zadzik Jakub	EP. Culmensis	1629.12.13	In villa Jablonna	Lat.	98
Grochowski Achacy	EP. Luceoriensis	1629.12.19	Janoviae	Lat.	99
Wężyk Jan	AEPP. Gnesnensis	1629.12.19	Squiernieviciis	Lat.	100
Łubieński Stanisław	EP. Plocensis	1629.12.21	Viscovie	Lat.	101
Szyszkowski Marcin	EP. Cracoviensis	1629.12.23	Cracoviae	Lat.	102
Wężyk Jan	AEPP. Gnesnensis	1629.12.26	Squiernieviciis	Lat.	103

These 103 letters from bishops of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth probably do not constitute the complete set of their correspondence addressed to the nuncio in 1629. This is because file 774 is an example of the rather careless work of the nuncio's chancellery. Secretarial annotations are extremely rare here. The letters were not arranged chronologically and were not paginated. It is known from other sources that the folder contained only some letters sent to the nuncio by the Secretariat of State and the Congregation for *Propaganda Fide*¹⁶, which are known from the registers. It must have been the same with the correspondence from other addressees. It is therefore difficult to assess the completeness of the collection in question. However, it must be assumed that it is high and that we have at our disposal material which illustrates in a panoramic way the problem of the nuncio's relations with bishops.

As the list presented in the table shows, almost all ordinary bishops operating in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth maintained with the nuncio correspondence contact. For obvious reasons, the sender does not include the nominal Bishop of Varmia, i.e. Prince John Albert Vasa, who was still a minor at that time. The second lack is more difficult to explain because it concerns Bishop Bogusław Radoszewski of Kyiv, who was a very active hierarch and devoted to missionary matters and support for the union¹⁷, which was, after all, an important object of interest for the nuncio. It is possible that most of the letters related to the Union and missionary issues were kept separately¹⁸. The remaining

¹⁶ Henryk Litwin, "Kąg korespondentów nuncjusza Antonio Santa Croce w świetle zbioru listy otrzymanych w roku 1629", in *Nuncjatura Apostolska w Rzeczypospolitej*, eds. Teresa Chynczewska-Hennel and Katarzyna Wiszowata-Walczak (Białystok: Benkowski Publishing & Balloons, 2012), 224.

¹⁷ Krzysztof R. Prokop, *Biskupi kijowscy obrządku łacińskiego XIV–XVIII w. Szkice biograficzne* (Białe Dunajce-Ostróg: Ośrodek "Wołanie z Wołynia", 2003), 62-5.

¹⁸ Litwin, "Kąg korespondentów", 224.

14 ordinary bishops were the authors of 98 letters. Five more units of correspondence are due to 3 auxiliary bishops.

For the most part, the ordinary bishops maintained regular correspondence with the nuncio. The most active were two hierarchs whose position within the episcopate of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth was particularly strong: the Primate, Archbishop of Gniezno Jan Wężyk, and Bishop of Cracow Marcin Szyszkowski. We note that their number of letters amounted to 23 and 21 respectively. So both bishops wrote to the nuncio on average once every two weeks. The intensity of contacts between the remaining bishops and the papal envoy was somewhat lower and basically comparable: Stanisław Łubieński, Bishop of Płock, sent 9 letters, Andrzej Lipski, Bishop of Cuiavia – 7, Eustachy Wołłowicz, Bishop of Wilno and Achacy Grochowski, Bishop of Łuck sent 6 letters each to the nuncio, Abraham Woyna, Bishop of Samogitia, Adam Nowodworski, Bishop of Przemyśl and Remigian Koniecpolski, Bishop of Chełm sent 5 letters each, while Maciej Łubieński, Bishop of Poznań sent 4 letters. The frequency of letter contacts with the nuncio of the Bishops of Chełmno Jakub Zadzik and Kamieniec Paweł Piasecki was low (3 and 1 letters respectively). At that time Zadzik held the office of the Deputy Chancellor of the Crown, while Piasecki was appointed a resident senator by the *sejm* of 1629. Both of them therefore spent most of the year in Warsaw and had the opportunity to have direct contacts with the papal representation. Their letters come mainly from the period when Antonio Santa Croce left Warsaw in fear of the plague (20 October–20 December 1629)¹⁹. Only one letter from Otto Schenking, Bishop of Wenden (Cēsis), has survived. It is clear from its contents that this was the first attempt by the hierarch to contact the nuncio, even though he had held the office of bishop for a long time (1593) and resided permanently in the Sulejów abbey, not too far from Warsaw. The matters of the small diocese, almost entirely occupied by the Swedes in 1629, apparently did not require frequent contact. Also, noticeable is the small number of letters (only 2) from the Archbishop of Lviv Jan Andrzej Próchnicki, a person who was strongly involved in the 1629 matter of the so-called “unification council” between the Union and Orthodoxy in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, which was of vital importance to the nuncio. This may be another argument in favor of the hypothesis that the letters concerning the union issues were collected separately and therefore the vast majority of them are missing from the already mentioned file 774 of the *Archivio Santacroce*.

Letters from auxiliary bishops are found sporadically in the collection – one from each of the sufragans of Poznań (Jan Baykowski) and Chełm (Abraham Śladkowski), and 3 from Jerzy Tyszkiewicz of Vilnius, who was one of the nuncio’s most important “experts” in matters of the union and relations with the Orthodox Church, and probably corresponded with Antonio Santa Croce more often than the letters in file 774 suggest.

Let us now turn to the subject of the bishops’ letters to the nuncio. When starting this analysis, it should be noted that in the majority of letters (96 out of 103 in total), the senders (apart from numerous courteous works) deal only with one issue. Only 2 letters dealt with three separate issues, and another 5 with two issues each. In total, 112 issues are raised in 103 letters. Three thematic circles of letters to the nuncio can be distinguished.

Most often, the bishops wrote about matters related to the papal ambassador’s decision-making abilities, resulting from the *facultates* granted to him and the powers defined in the instructions of the Secretariat of State and the Congregation for *Propaganda Fide*. A total of 52 such matters were raised, most often – in 19 cases – related to the nuncio’s prosecutorial and judicial functions. It should be recalled here that in accordance with the powers vested in him, the papal representative was authorized to conduct investigations and trials against disobedient and wicked clergy, to settle disputes in appellate instances in matters in any way falling under ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and to impose, but also to release from ecclesiastical penalties²⁰. In the bishops’ letters of 1629, cases of disobedient priests in dispute with the

19 In a letter dated 20 October, Santa Croce informed the Secretariat of State about the plague and his departure from the capital. For the next two months, the nuncio stayed in the provinces on the estates of the Mazovian nobility, and then at the royal residence in Nieporęt, before finally returning to Warsaw and staying at the residence of Jan Wężyk. Barberini, Warsaw 20 December 1629, AAV, *Segreteria di Stato. Polonia*, vol 42, ff. 121r–22r.

20 For a summary of the *facultates* of Antonio Santa Croce see ANP, t. XXIII/1, 9; they were identical in content to the earlier *facultates* of Vincenzo Lauro, see ANP, t. IX/1, 89–98; the same *faculties* were granted to Antonio Santa Croce’s

bishops appear frequently. Some of them were chronic and returned to the nuncio several times, such as the dispute of Bishop of Chełm Remigian Koniecpolski with his suffragan Abraham Śladkowski²¹, the persistent efforts of the Bishop of Samogitia Abraham Woyna to punish the recalcitrant canon of the Samogitian chapter Mikolaj Powetrius²², or the efforts of the Bishop of Łuck Achacy Grochowski to punish the disobedient parish priest Stanisław Urbanowicz²³. Several cases involved conflicts between laymen and clergymen, for example, over patronage (collation) or disputed rights to own a private chapel²⁴. The expectations of the nuncio to settle disputes over benefices and endowments, including those between diocesan and monastic clergy, were also frequent²⁵.

In addition to jurisdictional matters, the nuncio had the power to grant certain benefices connected with lower church offices and endowed with limited income.²⁶ In practice, this concerned some rectories in specific dioceses. Five times during the year 1629 the bishops turned to Antonio Santa Croce asking for the nomination of certain persons or requesting that the nuncio give them the right to appoint a parish priest in certain parishes²⁷.

A relatively common topic addressed by the hierarchy was the solicitation of dispensations. The nuncio had the authority to dispense from obstacles to priestly ordination and church benefices. In relation to the laity – to dispense from some obstacles to the sacrament of marriage²⁸. The bishops' correspondence more often concerned marriage dispensations for the laity (6 cases)²⁹ than exemptions from obstacles for the clergy (3 cases)³⁰. Hierarchs applied for both kind treatment of the affluent persons of that time (efforts of several bishops for a marriage dispensation for Stanisław Przyjemski, general *starosta* of Wielkopolska), and the little ones (a request of Archbishop Jan Wężyk in the case of Adam Wąsz, a shoemaker from Krzepice)³¹. The requests for dispensations for the clergy concerned the exemption from the obstacle of physical defects and combining benefices.

Facultates of the nuncio also provided for the possibility of granting certain special powers to the clergy – to grant indulgences and privileges³². 6 letters from bishops dealt with such matters. They were related to the granting of two types of authority – *absolvendi ab haeresis* and the consecration of church rooms, paintings and other church equipment. They were to be granted to diocesan priests selected by the bishops³³. We find only letters with requests for granting the powers. No thanks for arranging such requests were present. However, it is hard to doubt that this is a matter of chance. According to the papal nominative brief, matters of this kind should have been handled routinely. This is apparently how the bishops treated them, justifying their requests rather perfunctorily and generally with the needs of the diocese.

In the first half of the seventeenth century, a great deal of attention from the Holy See was focused

predecessor, Giovanni Battista Lancellotti. They have been discussed at length by Fr. Tadeusz Fitych in his work: *Struktura i funkcjonowanie nuncjatury Giovanniego Battisty Lancellottiego (1622–1627)* (Opole: Wyd. Świętego Krzyża w Opolu, 2005); for matters of orchard powers see pages 130–32.

- 21 The letters we refer to here are contained in a folder whose pages are unpaginated. For these reasons, we give the numbers of the letters in the footnotes from the index we publish here. N. 46, 69, 95.
- 22 N. 3, 15, 36, 86.
- 23 N. 2.
- 24 N. 13, 19, 48, 65, 77, 81.
- 25 N. 18, 21, 83, 88.
- 26 ANP, t. XXIII/1, 9; Fitych, *Struktura i funkcjonowanie*, 138–40.
- 27 N. 30, 34, 45, 66, 92.
- 28 ANP, t. XXIII/1, 9; Fitych, *Struktura i funkcjonowanie*, 133–38.
- 29 N. 11, 23, 55, 56, 58, 68.
- 30 N. 4, 23, 39,
- 31 N. 11, 55, 56, 58, 68.
- 32 ANP, t. XXIII/1, 9, Fitych, *Struktura i funkcjonowanie*, 141–44.
- 33 N. 22, 23, 35, 37, 42, 47.

on the reform of religious orders, especially mendicant ones. Nuncios at this time were usually given the authority to visit and reform monasteries³⁴, and their instructions included specific indications of actions that should be taken with regard to particular orders³⁵. Antonio Santa Croce's predecessor Giovanni Battista Lancellotti even received detailed instructions from Gregory XV on the difficult question of reform in the family of Franciscan orders³⁶. The Archbishop of Seleucia was also furnished with special recommendations in the form of instructions from the Congregation of *Propaganda Fide*³⁷. His correspondence on religious matters with representatives of individual congregations, visitators, general superiors in Rome, etc., is very abundant and probably worthy of a separate study. Here we will only note that the nuncio's interest in religious matters must have been known to the bishops, because they not infrequently raised this type of issue (7 letters). The Ordinary of Cracow, Marcin Szyszkowski, devoted as many as three of his letters to the scandalous incidents in the Cracow convent of the Conventual Franciscans, where the friars did not accept the prior assigned to them by the Provincial, and where the unfortunate candidate was thrown into a riot and beaten³⁸. Earlier the same hierarch had dedicated a letter to the reform of the same order³⁹. Bishop Eustachy Wołłowicz of Vilnius and his suffragan Bishop Jerzy Tyszkiewicz wrote to the nuncio about the need to send an inspector to the Lithuanian Bernardines.⁴⁰ In turn, Archbishop Jan Wężyk shared with the nuncio his thoughts about the excessive concentration of monasteries of mendicant orders in his main residence town of Łowicz⁴¹. Another important task of the nuncio, described in the documents initiating his mission, was to support the development of the Union of Brest. In this regard, the Congregation for *Propaganda Fide* prepared for Antonio Santa Croce specific, though perhaps not very detailed, recommendations in two special instructions (*instructio particularis*)⁴². The Archbishop of Seleucia delved into matters of care for the Uniate Church with commitment. Especially in 1629, when a "unification synod" of Greek Catholics and Orthodox was being planned, he devoted much attention to them, and his correspondence on these matters was very extensive. The undersigned will devote a separate analysis to this issue, and in this text we only draw attention to the bishops' consideration of the union theme (6 letters). At the end of the 1620s, the main "specialist" in matters of the union in the Roman Catholic episcopate of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth was a Suffragan Bishop of Vilnius Jerzy Tyszkiewicz. His 3 letters of 1629 addressed to Antonio Santa Croce concerned the preparations for the aforementioned joint synod of Uniates and Orthodox⁴³, which ultimately did not take place due to the nuncio's objections. This issue was also addressed in a letter by Jakub Zadzik⁴⁴, who was at the same time Bishop of Chełmno and Great Crown Chancellor, and in this case appeared rather in the latter capacity. The other two letters concerning the union issue came from Primate Jan Wężyk⁴⁵ and were his reaction to the papal brief received in May 1629 with an appeal for support for the Greek Catholic Church. A separate and important package of correspondence concerned matters related to the nuncio's role as an intermediary between the country of office and the Holy See. Such matters were mentioned in

34 For the Antonio Santa Croce, see ANP, t. XXIII/1, 9; for commentary on typical powers in this regard, see, Fitych, *Struktura i funkcjonowanie*, 129-30.

35 See, for example, General Instruction to nuncio Cosimo de Torres, *Die Hauptinstruktionen Gregor XV für die Nuntien und Gesandten an den europäischen Fürstenthöfen, 1621-1623*, t. 2, (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1997), 700-01.

36 Fitych, *Struktura i funkcjonowanie*, 185-87, 702-04.

37 ANP, t. XXIII/1, 3-7.

38 N. 80, 84, 85.

39 N. 49.

40 N. 72, 75.

41 N. 54.

42 ANP, t. XXIII/1, 3, 6.

43 N. 20, 32, 72.

44 N. 73.

45 N. 37, 40.

39 letters from bishops. Definitely, the most frequent – 21 – were various appeals for support in the matters related to staffing of benefices reserved for the Pope. Most of them (14) concerned canons in diocesan chapters. In addition, bishops asked for support for requests to appoint an auxiliary bishop in their diocese (2), to grant a rectory (2), an abbey (2) or a collegiate canonry (1)⁴⁶. The nuncio was also asked to recommend the granting of powers to clergy in cases belonging to papal competence (3 letters)⁴⁷. In 1629 Primate Wężyk sought the privilege of the provost of Strzelno to wear a mitre and asked the nuncio for support⁴⁸. There were also requests for assistance in contacting the curial circles in Rome in connection with the correspondence or planned travel (3 letters)⁴⁹.

The letters sent by the nuncio to the bishops in August 1629, reminding them of their obligation to visit *ad limina apostolorum*, fall into the same category. Antonio Santa Croce probably sent such a disciplinary summons to all the Ordinaries. The responses of five of them have survived, including that of Primate Wężyk, whose letter generally explained the situation of the hierarchs in the archdiocese by pointing out that the pontificates of most of them lasted less than four years, after which a visit was required, and that, in addition, the war with Sweden and the war in Italy were ongoing, so that the time for the performance of the duty was inconvenient⁵⁰. Bishops from Poznań, Płock, Łuck, and Przemyśl also invoked similar arguments in their letters, but they declared their readiness to travel if their arguments were not understood by the nuncio and Rome⁵¹.

Another group of letters in this category is related to the efforts of Sigismund III Vasa to grant the cardinal dignity to a candidate proposed by him – the previous nuncio Giovanni Battista Lancellotti – which was received with dissatisfaction in Rome. The correspondence on this subject between Antonio Santa Croce and the Secretariat of State was very abundant and lasted for almost the entire mission in Poland⁵². The bishops' letters of 1629 (6) were related to the final stage of the affair, when the cardinal's hat was finally placed on the head of the nuncio in Warsaw, not Lancellotti's but Santa Croce's. Bishops Wężyk, Szyszkowski, Zadzik and Grochowski took note of this finale with goodwill. Paweł Piasecki's letter was written even before the news about the cardinal's post reached Warsaw; moreover, its sender had supported the King earlier in his endeavours for Lancellotti.

Santa Croce also acted as an intermediary, at the request of the Pope, to help a Georgian mission led by Father Nicefor Irubakidze, which was passing through the Polish–Lithuanian Commonwealth on its way back from Rome. It went to Lviv, where it was helped by the local Archbishop Jan Andrzej Próchnicki, who informed the nuncio about it in his letter⁵³.

Finally, let us look at the third category of letters, related not so much to the nuncio's competencies as to his obvious interest in the internal politics of his country of office and current events that might have affected the situation of the Church in the Commonwealth. 21 letters of this kind can be identified. Only 2 of them (from Wężyk and Wołłowicz) concern matters related to the *sejm*⁵⁴, and there were 2 in 1629. Surprisingly few, considering the rather numerous presence of bishops at both *sejms*. As many as seven hierarchs took part in the January–February one, and four⁵⁵ in the November one. Apparently

46 N. 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 21, 24, 25, 31, 33, 38, 41, 43, 57, 59, 60, 66, 70, 74, 92.

47 N. 31, 62, 68.

48 N. 62.

49 N. 9, 50, 51.

50 N. 50.

51 N. 71, 82, 90, 93.

52 For more on this see Litwin, *Chwała Północy*, 226–27; Tadeusz Fitych, "Rekomendacje Zygmunta III Waza w sprawie kardynałatu Giovanni Battista Lancellotti nuncjusza apostolskiego w Polsce w latach 1622–1627", *Nasza Przyszłość*, vol. 91 (1999): 171–206.

53 N. 28.

54 N. 1, 100.

55 Anna Filipczak-Kocur, *Sejm zwyczajny z roku 1629* (Warszawa: PWN, 1979), 102–04; Jan Seredyka, "Senatorowie Rzeczypospolitej na sejmach 1629–1632", *Zeszyty Naukowe Wyższej Szkoły Pedagogicznej im. Powstańców Śląskich w Opolu*, History XVI (1979): 44–5.

the custom of pre-sejm “retreats” of bishops with the nuncio by letter did not catch on. Perhaps it was replaced by personal meetings during the Sejm. The bishops more often discussed matters related to sessions of the Crown Tribunal than sejm sessions. 4 letters informing about tribunals concerning disputes between the clergy and the laity can be identified, and their authors were twice the Primate and Szyszkowski and Woyna⁵⁶. 4 letters from the Bishop of Cracow were also related to the issue of interference between the clergy and the laity, informing the nuncio about actions taken by the secular authorities to free a nun who had been kidnapped from a monastery in Milan and held in Silesia⁵⁷.

The subject of the bishops’ correspondence was relatively often the war with the Swedes and the damage it caused to the state and the church (5 letters). This issue received most attention from Stanisław Łubieński, Bishop of Płock, who referred to the Swedish War three times in his letters⁵⁸. This was natural, since the Diocese of Płock was adjacent to the war theater and even a part of it. The Bishop of Wenden, Otto Schenking, who was the most severely affected by the actions of the Swedes, also devoted an extensive elaboration to these matters⁵⁹. The Primate also wrote to the papal envoy about the damage caused to the church by the war with the Protestant enemy. Among current events, the plague attracted the most attention of the bishops. This tragedy took place all over the country and claimed more victims than the war. We learn about its effects from 6 letters sent by the bishops of Cracow (2 letters), Płock (2 letters), Chełmno and Łuck⁶⁰.

In conclusion, the problem of cooperation between apostolic nuncio residing on the Vistula River and the hierarchs of the Roman Catholic Church in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in the modern era has not yet been studied by historians, mainly due to a lack of extant source material. The compilation of a collection of letters received by nuncio Antonio Santa Croce in 1629, stored in the *Archivio di Stato di Roma* in the section *Archivio Santacroce* in volume 774, opens new avenues of research in this regard. The volume in question contains 103 letters sent by Polish Roman Catholic bishops to the titular Archbishop of Seleucia. Although the collection itself does not contain any letters from the nuncio to the bishops, the content analysis of the preserved material allows us to find traces of such letters. A review of the correspondence leads to the conclusion that the subject of the contacts between the hierarchs of the Polish Church and the papal envoy was primarily ecclesiastical matters closely related to his judicial, procedural and dispensational powers, or the mediation between Warsaw and Rome in such matters. Most frequently, the issues discussed the distribution of benefices and trials before the nunciature’s court. Intrapolitical issues appeared in the correspondence much less frequently – in practice only in cases where there was a clash between the interests of laymen and ecclesiastical subjects. It is symptomatic of the fact that most of the letters concern current affairs and that the mentioned volume lacks any trace of more or less regular reports to the papal envoy on the state of particular dioceses. The problem of contacts and cooperation of papal representatives with the hierarchs of the Roman Catholic Church in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in early modern times still awaits a reliable study. This publication, according to the authors’ assumption, aims at showing the cognitive possibilities of the analysis of source materials connected with the papal diplomatic service.

56 N. 7, 27, 36, 53.

57 N. 5, 26, 44, 63.

58 N. 16, 41, 61, 64, 67.

59 N. 41.

60 N. 89, 91, 94, 96, 97, 101.

ABBREVIATIONS

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

AAV: Archivio Apostolico Vaticano.

BPAN: Biblioteka Naukowa PAN i PAU–Kraków.

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

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Chynczewska-Hennel, Teresa. “Elita polityczna Rzeczypospolitej w świetle “ankiety personalnej” nuncjusza Honorata Viscontiego”. In *Władza i prestiż. Magnateria Rzeczypospolitej w XVI–XVIII wieku*, edited by Jerzy Urwanowicz and Ewa Dubas-Urwanowicz, 125–50. Białystok: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu w Białymstoku, 2003.

Filipczak-Kocur, Anna. *Sejm zwyczajny z roku 1629*. Warszawa: PWN, 1979.

Fitych, Tadeusz. “Obraz biskupów polskich w oczach nuncjuszów papieskich z połowie XVII wieku”. In *Od Kijowa do Rzymu. Z dziejów stosunków Rzeczypospolitej ze Stolicą Apostolską i Ukrainą*, edited by Dariusz R. Drozdowski, Wojciech Walczak and Katarzyna Wiszowata-Walczak, 469–509. Białystok: Instytut Badań nad Dziedzictwem Kulturowym Europy, 2012.

Fitych, Tadeusz. “Rekomendacje Zygmunta III Waza w sprawie kardynalatu Giovanni Battista Lancellotti nuncjusza apostolskiego w Polsce w latach 1622–1627”. *Nasza Przyszłość*, vol. 91 (1999): 171–206.

Fitych, Tadeusz. *Struktura i funkcjonowanie nuncjatury Giovanniego Battisty Lancellottiego (1622–1627)*. Opole: Wyd. Świętego Krzyża w Opolu, 2005.

Kopiec, Jan. “Nuncjusze papiescy o senacie Rzeczypospolitej”. In *Senat w Polsce*, edited by Krystyn Matwijowki and Jan Pietrzak, 148–57. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Sejmowe, 1993.

Litwin, Henryk. “De Antonio Santa Croce nuntio eiusque sociis”, in ANP, t. XXIII/1.

Litwin, Henryk. *Chwała północy. Rzeczypospolita w polityce Stolicy Apostolskiej 1598–1648*. Warszawa: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy, 2018.

Litwin, Henryk. “Krąg korespondentów nuncjusza Antonio Santa Croce w świetle zbioru listy otrzymanych w roku 1629”. In *Nuncjatura Apostolska w Rzeczypospolitej*, edited by Teresa Chynczewska-Hennel and Katarzyna Wiszowata-Walczak, 209–22. Białystok: Benkowski Publishing & Balloons, 2012.

Ożóg, Krzysztof, and Skowron, Ryszard, eds. *Sztuka roztropności. Dyplomacja Stolicy Apostolskiej wobec Rzeczypospolitej, Europy i świata w epoce nowożytnej i XX wieku. Zbiór studiów*. Kraków: PAU, 2020.

Prokop, Krzysztof R. *Biskupi kijowscy obrządku łacińskiego XIV–XVIII w.. Szkice biograficzne*. Białe Dunajec-Ostróg: Ośrodek “Wołanie z Wołynia”, 2003.

Seredyka, Jan. “Senatorowie Rzeczypospolitej na sejmach 1629–1632”. *Zeszyty Naukowe Wyższej Szkoły Pedagogicznej im. Powstańców Śląskich w Opolu*, History XVI (1979): 43–54.

Tanturri, Alberto, *Santacroce Antonio*. In DBI, vol. 90 (2017).

PRIMARY SOURCES

AAV

Fondo Borghese, III 18, ff. 35–36v; III 96 D, f. 209.

Archiwum Diecezjalne we Włocławku

Acta Episcoporum, 11, f. 320, 321.

BPAN

1884, n. 486, 496, 497, 498, 500.

Biblioteca Vallicelliana

L. 18, f. II, c. 8–24v.

PRINTED SOURCES

- ANP, t. IX: *Vincentius Lauro (1572–1578)*, vol. 1: (25 VII 1572–30 IX 1574), edited by Mirosław Korolko and Henryk D. Wojtyska. Romae: Institutum Historicum Polonicum Romae, 1994.
- ANP, t. XV: *Germanicus Malaspina (1591–1598)*, vol. 1: (1 XII 1591–31 XII 1592), edited by Leszek Jarmański. Cracoviae: Academia Scientiarum et Litterarum Polona, 2000.
- ANP, t. XVIII: *Franciscus Simonetta (1606–1612)*, vol. 1: (21 VI 1606–30 IX 1607), edited by Wojciech Tygielski. Romae: Institutum Historicum Polonicum Romae, 1990.
- ANP, t. XXII: *Giovanni Battista Lancellotti (1622–1627)*, vol. 1: (12 XI 1622–29 IV 1623), edited by Tadeusz Fitych. Cracoviae: Academia Scientiarum et Litterarum Polona, 2001.
- ANP, t. XXIII: *Antonio Santa Croce (1627–1630)*, vol. 1: (1 III 1627–29 VII 1628), edited by Henryk Litwin. Romae: Institutum Historicum Polonicum Romae, 1996.
- ANP, t. XXIII: *Antonio Santa Croce (1627–1630)*, vol. 2: (1 VIII 1628–31 III 1629), edited by Paweł Duda and Henryk Litwin. Cracoviae: Academia Scientiarum et Litterarum Polona 2021.
- ANP, t. XXIV: *Honoratus Visconti (1630–1636)*, vol. 1: (20 IV 1630–26 VII 1631), edited by Wojciech Biliński. Romae: Institutum Historicum Polonicum Romae, 1992.
- ANP, t. XXV: *Marius Filonardi (1635–1643)*, vol. 1: (12 II 1635–29 X 1636), edited by Teresa Chynczewska-Hennel. Cracoviae: Academia Scientiarum et Litterarum Polona, 2003.
- ANP, t. XXV: *Marius Filonardi (1635–1643)*, vol. 2: (1 XI 1636–31 X 1637), edited by Teresa Chynczewska-Hennel. Cracoviae: Academia Scientiarum et Litterarum Polona, 2003.
- Die Hauptinstruktionen Gregor XV für die Nuntien und Gesandten an den europäischen Fürstenhöfen, 1621–1623*, t. 2. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1997.