

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 (XV–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* addresses the complex and intense history of Christian-Ottoman relations in Central and Eastern Europe during the Early Modern Period. Tracing the salient moments and facts with battles, border issues, diplomacy and intelligence, the volume – with the participation of authors from different parts of Europe and Türkiye – constitutes an international opportunity to analyze topics that continually offer new study themes.

Central and South-Eastern Europe between the Christian world and the Ottoman world: conflicts, encounters and compromises (XVI-XVIII centuries), edited by the Turkish historian Canan Parmaksızoğlu Aksoy, is the result of research and scientific collaboration between the CESPoM Study Center and Vilmos Fraknói Vatican Historical Research Group (ELKH-PPKE-PTE).

Alessandro Boccolini
Director of EEHR

In copertina: Antonio Stom, *Alvise II Mocenigo a Costantinopoli*, (1710)
(Venezia, Palazzo Mocenigo)

euro 19,00

ISBN 979-12-5524-026-6



9 791255 240266 >

ISSN 2612-0402



9 772612 040002



CENTRAL AND SOUTH-EASTERN EUROPE

Edited by Canan Parmaksızoğlu Aksoy



EEHR
EASTERN EUROPEAN HISTORY REVIEW
Annually Historical Journal

n. 5/2022
Special issue

**CENTRAL AND SOUTH-EASTERN EUROPE
BETWEEN THE CHRISTIAN AND OTTOMAN WORLDS:
CONFLICTS, ENCOUNTERS AND COMPROMISES
(XVI-XVIII CENTURIES)**

Edited by
Canan Parmaksızoğlu Aksoy

Co-edited by
Katalin Nagy

Special Participation of
Vilmos Fraknói Vatican Historical Research Group (ELKH-PPKE-PTE)



Director Emeritus

Gaetano Platania (Università degli Studi della Tuscia)

Director

Alessandro Boccolini (Università degli Studi della Tuscia)

Scientific Board

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

Matteo Sanfilippo (Università degli Studi della Tuscia)

Massimo Carlo Giannini (Università degli Studi di Teramo)

Rimvydas Petrauskas (Vilnius University)

Giordano Altarozzi (Petru Maior University of Târgu Mures)

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

Michaela Valente (Università degli Studi di Roma "La Sapienza")

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)

Jarosław Pietrzak (Pedagogical University of Kraków)

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

Dorota Gregorowicz (University of Silesia in Katowice)

Michał Salamonik (Södertörn University)

Language Expert

Sonia Maria Melchiorre (Università degli Studi della Tuscia)

Editorial Board

Bogdana Nosova (Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv)

Francesco Vitali (Università degli Studi di Roma "La Sapienza")

Małgorzata Trzeciak Cygan (University of Warsaw)

Giulio Merlani (University of Caen Normandy)



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 31-12-2022

Impaginazione a cura di: *Fabiana Ceccariglia*

ISBN: 979-12-5524-026-6
ISBN ebook: 979-12-5524-011-2
ISSN: 2612-0402 006

Permalink: <http://hdl.handle.net/2067/49299>

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

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

EASTERN EUROPEAN HISTORY REVIEW

Annually Historical Journal

n. 5/2022
Special Issue

**CENTRAL AND SOUTH-EASTERN EUROPE
BETWEEN THE CHRISTIAN AND OTTOMAN WORLDS:
CONFLICTS, ENCOUNTERS AND COMPROMISES
(XVI-XVIII CENTURIES)**

Edited by
Canan Parmaksızoğlu Aksoy

Co-edited by
Katalin Nagy

Special Partecipation of
Vilmos Fraknói Vatican Historical Research Group (ELKH-PPKE-PTE)



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

SUMMARY

Canan Parmaksızoğlu Aksoy <i>Introduction</i>	9
Vilmos Fraknói Vatican Historical Research Group (ELKH-PPKE-PTE) <i>Presentation</i>	13
Katalin Nagy, Giulio Merlani <i>Gregorio XIII e l'Europa orientale: la visita apostolica del vescovo di Stagno Bonifacio de Stefani</i>	13
Florin Nicolae Ardelean <i>Contested Borderlands: war and territorial disputes between Transylvania and the Ottoman Empire (1594-1595)</i>	29
Gabriel-Felician Croitoru <i>The borders between Wallachia and the Giurgiu Kaza, an area of conflict and cooperation on the Imperial Ottoman Danube limes</i>	43
Tamás Kruppa <i>The written and oral disputes of István Szántó (Arator)</i>	59
Gábor Nemes <i>Instead of Anti-Ottoman help an Anti-Imperial League papal nuncio Giovanni Francesco Capi's mission of 1526</i>	71
Adrian Magina <i>"Nos Christiani qui habitamus in hac urbe Temesuar". Christians and Ottomans in Timișoara in the second half of 16th century</i>	83
Livia Magina <i>"Novitates de turcis scribit": spies and news about ottomans on borders of Transylvania and Southern parts up to 1526</i>	97
Valentin Cseh <i>The collapse of the border fortress system against the Ottoman Empire between 1521 and 1527</i>	111

Tamás Fedeles <i>From the army of King Matthias to the service of God. A case study on the role of the apostolic penitentiary in the promotions of clerics in the time of King Matthias Corvinus</i>	139
Viktor Kanász <i>Nuncio Girolamo Martinengo's reports on the military events of 1552</i>	161
Ágnes Szalai <i>Conflicts of joint sovereignty on the border of the Principality of Transylvania and the Ottoman Empire in the second half of the 17th century</i>	179
Piotr Chmiel <i>A third way. An attempt to reorient history of early modern Venetian/Italian connections with the Ottoman Empire and its borderlands</i>	199
Canan Parmaksızoğlu Aksoy <i>Events that took place in the relations between the Ottoman Empire and the Republic of Venice: from the Cretan War (1645-1669) to the Alliance of 1684 according to Ottoman and Venetian sources</i>	215
Harun Tuncer <i>"News in papers are not that much credible!". Abdulhamid I and the efforts to follow the European press</i>	231
VARIA SECTION	
Michał Hirsch <i>The role of cardinal protectors of the Polish Crown in embassies of obedience in the 16th century – preparations for missions, ceremonies and diplomacy</i>	251
Bibliocard Csák Krisztina Csilla <i>I Barberini e l'Europa</i> , Acta Barberiana, vol. 5, edited by Tusor Péter and Boccolini, Alessandro. Viterbo: Sette Città, 2022.	277

INTRODUCTION

The advance of the Ottoman Empire in Europe in the Modern Age posed a threat to many European states. The conquest of Constantinople (later İstanbul) during the reign of Sultan Mehmed II (the Conqueror) in the XV century, followed by the Otranto expedition and siege, the Ottoman advance in Central Europe during the reign of Sultan Suleyman I in the XVI century, particularly the Siege of Vienna, as well as the successes of Chief Admiral Barbaros Hayreddin Pasha in the Mediterranean and many other similar events generated a sense of anxiety and fear in Europe for centuries. As a matter of fact, the phrase *Mamma li Turchi!*, used by Italians even today in response to negative events, dates back to this historical Turkish threat and the negative feeling it generated, which has its roots in the XV and XVI centuries.

It is rather challenging to cover such a broad subject as the relations between the Ottoman Empire and European states in the Modern Age, especially between the 16th and 18th centuries, in an introduction. However, in order to understand the dynamics between the Ottoman Empire and the Christian world, it would be useful to go back a little further and give a brief overview of how the parties viewed each other as an introduction to the subject. Starting from the Late Middle Ages until the middle of the Modern Age, the East and the West, in other words, the two worlds comprised mostly of Muslims and Christians, were in constant interaction with each other in a relationship that alternated between wars and trade. However, the fear became a dominant emotion in this intense and dynamic relationship from the XV century onwards. Although the world order changed due to geographical discoveries, the main region where the conflict of control and domination took place was the Mediterranean and Central-Eastern Europe. On the one hand, there was the Western Christian world, which had entered a new era with the Thirty Years' War and the Peace of Westphalia, and on the other was the Ottoman Empire, which had conquered Byzantium and its culture. From another perspective, it can be deduced that the conflict between these two sides evolved from a clash of "civilizations" to a clash of "powers" and gained a stronger political character at least since the XVI century¹. At this point, it is necessary to underline the differences between Western historiography and Ottoman historiography. For a long time, contrary to what Western historiography suggests, the Ottoman Empire did not carry out its conquests with the aim of forcibly converting the peoples of the conquered regions to Islam, however mainly aimed to expand the borders of the Empire². The distinguished Turkish historian Professor Halil İnalcık provided in his works important information on Ottoman conquest policy. For example, how the Ottomans conquered the Christian Balkans and managed to establish themselves there for so long remain a historical question even today. According to the old theory, Ottoman rule was manifested by force and persecution and lasted

1 Franco Cardini, *Il Turco a Vienna. Storia del grande assedio del 1683* (Roma-Bari: Laterza, 2011), 4.

2 Marko Jacov, *L'Europa tra conquiste ottomane e leghe sante* (Città del Vaticano: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana), 255.

as a regime of exploitation under the control of a military class of Sipahi³. However, according to the current historical analysis derived from research based on Ottoman archive documents, the Ottoman Empire was able to persuade the local Christian populations to peace and reconciliation thanks to the principles of *istimalet*⁴ and *aman* which meant looking out for the people, especially non-Muslim subjects, and treating them with clemency. The Ottoman Empire always offered the opponent three chances to surrender, and if the offer was accepted, a sworn “ahdname”⁵ guaranteed the opponent’s security of life and property. These guarantees were rigorously implemented, and many conquests were accomplished by this way. In fact, speaking about the Balkans again, it is known that Orthodox Greeks and Slavs often viewed the Ottoman regime as a protector of their Church. In addition, one of the main reasons for the long-lasting Ottoman rule in the conquered lands was the Ottoman tax-land system. Unlike the old feudal system, this system guaranteed the peasant’s land use through the *mîrî* land (State owned land that was transferred to those who use the right of disposition) regime⁶.

The Ottomans have been called “Turks” by the Western world for centuries. In the Modern Age, fear for the “Turk” has manifested as activities and efforts of “marginalization”, “vilification” and therefore “disparagement”. Turks have been the main representative of the “other” for Europeans for centuries, from the very beginning of Muslim-Christian contact⁷. However, the Ottoman Empire was not only a source of fear for the Western world, but also a source of great curiosity and fascination. In the West, most literary scientific works were written against the Ottomans, who were described as “*infidel*”. Thus, for centuries, the Ottomans were not only unlikeable and feared by Europeans, but also appealing and attractive. In addition to being “foreigners” for historical and geographical reasons, their traditions became the focus of interest for researchers and scholars as they were

-
- 3 The most distinguished group of the household cavalry troops in the Ottoman military system. Erhan Afyoncu, “Sipahi”, *DİA*, 37 (2009): 256-58.
 - 4 The dictionary meaning of “*istimâlet*” is «to predispose, to appeal, to win the heart». In Ottoman chronicles it meant: «to look after the people, especially non-Muslim subjects, and be lenient towards them». Treating the people of conquered places well, protecting them, ensuring the security of life and property against external enemies, granting freedom in religious matters, facilitating taxation are the main elements of Ottoman *istimâlet*. See: Mücteba İlgürel, “İstimalet”, *DİA*, 27 (2001): 362.
 - 5 A document issued by the order of the rulers to grant special rights to certain states, groups and individuals. See: Mübahat S. Kütükoğlu “Ahidname”, *DİA*, 1 (1988): 536-40.
 - 6 Halil İnalcık, *Doğu Batı, Makaleler II* (Ankara: Doğu Batı Yayınları, 2008), 248, 96-110. On Ottoman provincial administration and the fief system, see also Halil İnalcık, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu Klasik Çağ (1300-1600)*, trans. Ruşen Sezer (İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 1995), 108-23. The work was first published in English. See Halil İnalcık, *The Ottoman Empire, Classical Age (1300-1600)* (London: Nicholson Publishing, 1973).
 - 7 Mustafa Soykut, *Papalık ve Venedik Belgelerinde Avrupa’nın Birliği ve Osmanlı Devleti (1453-1683)* (İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2007), 17, 24.

close or neighbors. In short, many works depicting the Ottomans and providing information about them appeared in the XVI and XVII centuries⁸. In many of these works, when Western historiography tried to explain the success of Ottoman progress, the concepts such as “religious fanaticism”, “oppression”, “persecution” were used, contrary to the information given above⁹.

Today it is still evident that such images persist in Western historiography. However a significant effort in consulting Ottoman and Turkish sources by historians would lead to a more objective perspective on the complex relationships between the Ottoman and Christian worlds.

The issue of Eastern European History Review titled *Central and South-Eastern Europe between the Christian and Ottoman Worlds: conflicts, encounters and compromises (XVI-XVIII centuries)*, contains 14 articles on the topic. This issue presents articles by researchers from different countries such as Italy, Hungary, Romania, Poland and Türkiye and was prepared in collaboration with *Vilmos Fraknói Vatican Historical Research Group* (ELKH-PPKE-PTE).

I extend my sincere appreciation to the director of EEHR, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Alessandro Boccolini for offering me the special editorship of this issue of the journal.

Dr. PhD. Canan Parmaksızoğlu Aksoy
National Defense University, Türkiye

8 Giovanni Ricci, *Ossessione turca. In una retrovia cristiana dell'Europa moderna* (Bologna: Il Mulino, 2002), 41; Soykut, *Papalık ve Venedik Belgelerinde*, 19-24.

9 İnalçık, *Doğu Batı, Makaleler II*, 248.

THE VILMOS FRANKÓI VATICAN HISTORICAL RESEARCH GROUP (ELKH-PPKE-PTE)

The *Vilmos Fraknói Vatican Historical Research Group* of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences and the Péter Pázmány Catholic University was established in the June of 2012 as the 'Impetus' Church History Research Group in the frame of the Church History Research Institute of the University founded by Rector Péter Erdő in 1999. It carries on independently the latter's publications (*Bibliotheca Historiae Ecclesiasticae Universitatis Catholicae de Petro Pázmány Nuncupatae*) and researches in Rome and in Vienna, with the involvement of academic and other funding sources. From 1st July 2017 onwards it performs its activity within the framework of the Supported Research Places Program of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences visualizing its goals and professional identity also in its name. The official name from 2022: ELKH-PPKE-PTE *Vilmos Fraknói Vatican Historical Research Group*.

Its examinations concentrate decisively on political, diplomatic, cultural and institutional history. Its priority task is the systematic publication and processing of sources that has been heavily neglected since the age of positivism. The Vatican collections serve as the primary place of research, completed by the relating material – primarily in thematic context – of the Hungarian and Vienna archives and manuscript collections. Its publications provide space to the results of revealing of sources and historiographic works according to their scholarly profile (*Collectanea Textuum et Studiorum*), and separately to the Hungarian researches in the Vatican due to its particular importance (*Collectanea Vaticana Hungariae*). The long-term aim of the research institute is to serve as the professional framework of the establishment and efficient operation of an independent Hungarian institute of history in Rome of purely scientific nature. Owing to its academic background it pays special attention to the education of the future historian generation, to the engagement of students in certain phases of its work.

The main international cooperative partners are: Università della Tuscia (CESPoM-Centro Studi sull'Età dei Sobieski e della Polonia Moderna), Universität Wien (Institut für Historische Theologie), Deutsches Historisches Institut in Rom, Università Pontificia Gregoriana (Facoltà di Storia e Beni Culturali della Chiesa), Archivio Apostolico Vaticano. The relevant common publications are published by Edizioni Setta Città and Duncker & Humblot

More info at: www.institutumfraknoi.hu

part of the embassy; the third part describes the assistance that protectors provided to envoys in relation to their diplomatic activity.

1. THE PROTECTORS' PARTICIPATION IN PREPARATIONS FOR THE DEPARTURE OF AN EMBASSY OF OBEDIENCE

Before envoys were sent to Rome, Polish rulers often approached protectors and asked them to help organise the mission. They sought advice on matters related to the person chosen to be the envoy or asked protectors about the planned form of the embassy and whether it would be deemed appropriate by the Holy See. After the tumultuous double election in Poland and the imprisonment of Archduke Maximilian II, Sigismund III Vasa wanted to make a declaration of obedience to Sixtus V as soon as possible to confirm his rights to the throne. Stanisław Reszka, a special envoy, had been sent to Rome beforehand to explain the situation in Poland. On 9th May 1586 at private audience, the pope declared that Sigismund III was the rightful king of Poland, but he also concluded that only the appearance of an obedience envoy from Poland at a public consistory could prevent the Habsburg faction, whose members did not recognise Vasa as king, from objecting¹⁹. However, due to difficulties with finding a suitable candidate for the mission, Sigismund III proposed that it should be done by Stanisław Reszka, who was staying in Rome. In accordance with the king's will, Reszka discussed this proposal with the pope and the cardinal protector. Apart from political reasons, it was also a matter of ceremony, because according to the rules, envoys who resided in Rome were not entitled to an official entry into the city. At the request of Sixtus V, Cardinal Farnese convened a commission of cardinals (Tolomeo Gallio, Girolamo della Rovere, Enrico Gaetani, Gaspare Mattei). The protector revealed to Reszka that in his opinion he should be the one to make the declaration of obedience. However, the pope and the Sacred College did not accept a more modest version of the obedience and decided that an official embassy needed to be sent from Poland²⁰.

The Holy See was interested in who would be chosen to be the obedience envoy. What mattered was his ancestry, titles granted to him in Poland, experience gained during diplomatic missions and his position at the royal court²¹. In 1550, Wawrzyniec Warmuntowski, a courtier and a confidant of Protector Farnese, wrote to the cardinal from Poland that Andrzej Czarnkowski had been chosen to be the envoy. Due to his excellent ancestry, merits and education in Italy, the Polish monarch believed that he would be warmly welcomed by the pope and the cardinal protector²². Similarly, in 1555 Sigismund Augustus regularly informed Alessandro Farnese about preparations for the embassy of obedience that was supposed to be sent to Paul IV and asked Vice-Protector Giacomo Puteo (del Pozzo) to help achieve

19 AAV, Nunziatura di Polonia, vol. 30, f. 96; Banaszak, *Z dziejów*, vol. 2, 199–200.

20 *Stanisłai Rescii Diarium 1583–1589. Archiwum do Dziejów Literatury i Oświaty w Polsce*, vol. 15, ed. Jan Czubek (Kraków: Akademia Umiejętności, 1915), 243–249.

21 Korzeniowski, *Stanisława Mińskiego (1563–1607)*, 446–47; Banaszak, *Z dziejów*, vol. I, 68–75.

22 Augustin Theiner, *Vetera Monumenta Poloniae et Lithuaniae gentiumque finitimarum historiam illustrantia [...]*, vol. II (Romae: Typis Vaticanis, 1861), 570.

the objectives of the embassy²³. In 1589, the mission was still being delayed due to Sigismund III Vasa's problems with finding an appropriate envoy. Alessandro Peretti di Montalto, who was the protector of Poland at that time, wrote to nuncio Annibale di Capua, who was staying in Poland, to urge the king to send an embassy, regardless of whether the envoy would be a clergyman or a layman²⁴.

When an envoy was finally chosen, he was given a number of documents before going to Rome. First of all, the king's envoy obtained a detailed instruction, credentials to the pope and recommendation letters to influential people residing in Rome, who could help organise the entry into the city and fulfil the diplomatic purposes of the mission²⁵. Naturally, the addressees of such correspondence were cardinal protectors, vice-protectors and members of the Congregation for Polish affairs.

In the instruction given to Tomasz Sobocki in 1537, he was ordered to visit trusted cardinals who could act as intermediaries in matters entrusted to him. The envoy was supposed to contact protector Antonio Pucci to discuss some political subjects²⁶. In an instruction issued in 1545, Mikołaj Myszkowski was ordered to visit protector Farnese before and after his audience with the pope. Moreover, the document specified the manner in which the envoy was supposed to greet the cardinal²⁷. In 1548, Marcin Kromer received credentials to the pope and protector and was obliged to consult Alessandro Farnese²⁸. Two years later protector Farnese was residing outside of Rome due to his conflict with Pope Julius III²⁹. He appointed vice-protector Bernardino Maffei, as his deputy. According to the instruction and letters of recommendation from King Sigismund, Maffei and friend of Poland cardinal Marcello Crescenzi were supposed to watch over Andrzej Czarnkowski³⁰.

Another strategy was adopted by king Stephen Báthory, who in 1597, gave Paweł

23 AGAD, MK, LL, vol. 12, f. 102v, and vol. 16, f. 185v.

24 AAV, Nunziatura di Polonia, vol. 23, f. 342.

25 The instructions for the legations have been preserved: Tomasz Sobocki 1537 in AGAD, MK, LL, vol. 6, ff. 4-13v; Mikołaj Myszkowski 1545/46 in BCz, Ms.285, f. 31-71v; Marcin Kromer 1548 in *Uchańsciana seu Collectio documentorum illustrantium vitam et res gestas Jacobi Uchański Archiepiscopi Gnesnensis [...]*, vol. II, ed. Teodor Wierzbowski (Drukarnia J. Bergera Warszawa 1885), n. 7, 12; Andrzej Czarnkowski 1550 in AGAD, MK, LL, vol. 12, f. 282v-304; Stanisław Maciejowski 1556 in AGAD, MK, LL, vol. 14, f. 299-300v; Paweł Uchański 1579 in AGAD, MK, LL, 21, f. 232-237v, and Wierzbowski, *Uchańsciana*, vol. III, 292-98; Andrzej Batory 1583 in *Monumenta Poloniae Vaticana*, vol. 5: *Alberti Bolognetti Nuntii Apostolici in Polonia epistolae et acta 1581-1585*, ed. Edward Kuntze and Czesław Nanke (Kraków: Polska Akademia Umiejętności 1923-1933), 525-27; Bernard Maciejowski in AAV, Nunziatura di Polonia, vol. 30, f. 191v, and Banaszak, *Z dziejów*, vol. I, 76-81.

26 AGAD, MK, LL, vol. 6, f. 4-13v; Banaszak, *Z dziejów*, vol. II, 20-7.

27 BCz, Ms. 85, f. 33v-34.

28 Wierzbowski, *Uchańsciana*, vol. 2, n. 7, 12.

29 Wojtyńska, *Papiestwo-Polska*, 278.

30 AGAD, MK, LL, vol. 13, f. 89. Only a letter to Cardinal B. Maffei survived.

Uchański a number of letters to cardinals and several were left without specific addressees³¹. It was the usual practice of the royal chancery in 16th century, which gave the envoy an opportunity to try to win over influential cardinals in Rome³². When Stanisław Maciejewski was sent to Rome in 1590, he had delegated his secretary Paweł Wołucki to the Eternal City before he departed himself because he wanted Wołucki to prepare everything for his arrival. Because of that, he wrote a letter to Cardinal Protector Alessandro Perreti di Montalto, asking him to help his servant make preparations for the arrival of the embassy³³.

One of the most important matters that an envoy had to settle before his departure was securing a temporary residence in Rome. Apart from rudimentary residential functions, it had to meet adequate representative requirements. Stanisław Miński wrote that an envoy's palace should have a large ballroom, a smaller dining room and an audience room with an adequate number of antechambers. Polish envoys had to look for appropriate premises on their own. In a letter from 1583, addressed to Giovanni Andrea Caligari, nuncio to Poland, Cardinal Tolomeo Gallo explained that papal legates were not accommodated for free in Poland, so there was no reason to do things differently when Poles visited Rome³⁴. Therefore, the cost of renting a palace had to be covered by the envoy, and the required sums were substantial. In 1573, Stanisław Reszka wrote that it had cost 360 scudi a year to rent a palace for Hosius in Rome³⁵. A few years later, Paweł Wolski, who came to Rome as the ambassador of the king of Poland, paid 550 ducats for a 12-month lease³⁶. The problem was that Romans did not want to rent palaces by the month and the shortest possible term was six months, but it was preferable to rent premises for the whole year and pay in advance. Stanisław Miński advised envoys to look for houses which had already been rented but were then left early by the tenants³⁷.

This is where cardinal protectors of the Kingdom of Poland came to the rescue because they were the best suited to look for residences. Roman cardinals often

31 AGAD, MK, LL, vol. 21, f. 232. Among the known addressees were Cardinals Giulielmo Sirleti and Stanisław Hozjusz.

32 Włodzimierz Stanisław de Broel-Plater, *Zbiór pamiątek do dziejów polskich*, vol. I (Drukarina Gazety Codziennej Warszawa 1858), 122-24. Such a practice was used in diplomatic contacts by Zygmunt Stary with Erazm Ciołek, who was staying in Rome.

33 AAV, Nunziatura di Polonia, vol. 31, ff. 254, 487; Augustino Theiner, *Vetera Monumenta Poloniae et Lithuaniae*, vol. III (Romae Tipis Vaticanis 1863), 170.

34 *Monumenta Poloniae Vaticana*, vol. VI: *Alberti Bolognetti nuntii apostolici in Polonia. Epistolae et acta 1581-1585*. Pars II: 1583, (Polska Akademia Umiejętności, Kraków 1938), 673-74.

35 *Z dworu Stanisława Hozjusza: listy Stanisława Reszki do Marcina Kromera, 1568-1582*, ed. Jadwiga Ambrozja Kalinowska (Olsztyn: Towarzystwo Naukowe im. Wojciecha Kętrzyńskiego, 1992), n. 45, 54-5.

36 *Monumenta Poloniae Vaticana*, vol. 4: I. A. *Caligarii nuntii apostolici in Polonia epistolae et acta 1578-1581*, ed. Ludovicus Boratyński (Kraków: Polska Akademia Umiejętności, 1915), 306.

37 Korzeniowski, *Stanisława Mińskiego (1563-1607)*, 447-48.

had a number of residences in the city. Apart from owning family palaces, which was a matter of honour for every respectful Roman family, cardinals were also given residences assigned to cardinal titles and other functions they performed³⁸. It is confirmed by a message written by nuncio Caligari in 1579, in which he asked protector Alessandro Farnese to prepare an apartment for a Polish envoy in the palace of the archpriest of St. Peter's Basilica or in the palace in Campo dei Fiori, as was customary³⁹. It seems that staying in the protector's palace was free. Cardinal Stanislaus Hosius spent a decade in Italy and for several years he stayed in the palace of the archpriest of St. Peter's Basilica for free, by courtesy of Cardinal Protector Farnese. Hosius also stayed for shorter periods of time in Farnese's family palace in Campo dei Fiori.⁴⁰

An exceptional situation took place in 1583, when Andrew Báthory, the nephew of King Stephan, was invited to stay at the Apostolic Palace in the Vatican by Gregory XIII. Báthory's mission was special in many respects. The envoy was in Rome to pay homage to the pope because Livonia had been incorporated into the Kingdom of Poland and when the obedience did not cover all the lands of a given country. It was usually treated as less official and envoys were refused certain privileges. However, in this case it was compensated by the fact that the envoy was a close relative of the ruler, which was highly appreciated in Rome. The special treatment of Andrew Báthory was also evident due to the pope's promise to appoint him cardinal⁴¹.

When all matters related to the trip were settled, the envoy could set off for Italy. When the envoy was approaching Rome, he sent his secretary to the city to inform the protector that the entourage would arrive soon. Then the cardinal sent someone from his court to greet the envoy and gave him a carriage, which was necessary to move around Rome in a way which did not offend the dignity of a royal envoy. The journey from Poland was made on horseback and in carts filled with baggage until the entourage reached a temporary residence on the outskirts of the city, in which everyone waited for the official entry. It was usually a suburban villa rented for a short term. In 1501, Erazm Ciołek stayed in a suburban house referred to as *villa*

38 Kalinowska, *Z dworu Stanisława Hozjusza*, n. 26, 32-33. In a letter to Kromer, Stanisław Reszka wrote that at the consistory held on 9 June 1570, Hosius was awarded the title of S. Anastasio. However, the cardinal's secretary had hoped for S. Pietro in Vincoli or another title associated with a palace or a comfortable apartment.

39 *Monumenta Poloniae Vaticana*, vol. 4, 127. «Scrivo al Signor Cardinale Farnese, come protettore del Regno, acciò accomodi questo nuovo ambasciatore di casa o dell'archipresbiteriato di S. Pietro o del palazzo di Campo di Fiore, come e suo solito [...]».

40 Kalinowska, *Z dworu Stanisława Hozjusza*, n. 35, 41-43. From his arrival in Rome in September 1569 until the summer of 1572, Hosius was staying in the palace of the archpriest of St. Peter's Basilica. It belonged to Alessandro Farnese, who was the archpriest at that time. As certified by Reszka, this residence was made available free of charge. Moreover, in summer the protector allowed Hosius to stay in his palace at Campo dei Fiori and welcomed the Pole in his residences in Grottaferata and Frascati.

41 Banaszak, *Z dziejów*, vol. II, 157-83.

*Alexandri Neronis*⁴². From the second half of the 16th century, the most popular place to stay was a villa built by Julius III (*villa Giulia*), located at via Flaminia. Paweł Uchański⁴³ stayed there in 1579 and seven years later it was occupied by Jan Dymitr Solikowski⁴⁴. At the end of the century, the residence became neglected, which is why Miński advised envoys to find another place to stay⁴⁵.

Soon afterwards, the protector arranged the first courtesy meeting between the royal envoy and the pope. The envoy visited the Vatican incognito and saw the protector for the first time. On the evening of 4 April 1579, Paweł Uchański arrived in the Eternal City and arranged a private audience with Gregory XIII with the help of Alessandro Farnese and Stanislaus Hosius⁴⁶. In 1594, Miński had an audience with the pope thanks to protector Montalto, who had introduced the royal envoy to the pope before he arrived⁴⁷. It was a courtesy meeting whose aim was to establish the date and hour of the official entry into the city and the official meeting with the pope and the Sacred College at a consistory. Then the envoy would go back to his villa on the outskirts of the city. This was the end of the first part of the protector's activity, which was organisational in nature.

2. THE PROTECTORS' PARTICIPATION IN THE OBEDIENCE CEREMONY

According to the ceremonial, the right to an official entry into Rome was granted to all obedience envoys, but there were certain exceptions. This privilege was refused to ambassadors who were permanently residing in Rome and to envoys who had already had the honour of entering into the city⁴⁸. Under this law, in 1560 Adam Konarski was refused the right to an official entry because he had been staying in Rome for a longer period of time as a representative of Sigismund Augustus. Bernard Maciejowski was another envoy who did not make an official entry into Rome when he made the declaration of obedience to Gregory XIV on behalf of Sigismund III for the second time (in 1591)⁴⁹. An exception from this rule was the second entry into the city by Erazm Ciołek in 1505, just four years after his first official entry. However, he ineffectively demanded this privilege in 1518, when he came to Rome as an ordinary envoy of Sigismund I the Old. At that time, despite the support of Leo X and Cardinal Protector Achille de Grassis, he did not manage

42 Johannan Burchard, *Diarium sive rerum urbanarum commentarii* (1483-1506), vol. III, ed. Louis Thuasne (Paris: E. Leroux Paris,), 120.

43 *Monumenta Poloniae Vaticana*, vol. 4, 158.

44 BAV, Vat.Lat. 12293, f. 237, and Vat.Lat 12326, f. 59-61; Banaszak, *Z dziejów*, vol. II, 190.

45 Korzeniowski, *Stanisława Mińskiego* (1563-1607), 448-49.

46 *Monumenta Poloniae Vaticana*, vol. 4, 163.

47 Korzeniowski, *Stanisława Mińskiego* (1563-1607), 449-50.

48 Banaszak, *Z dziejów*, vol. I, 95-6.

49 BAV, Vat.Lat., 12289, f. 140, and Vat.Lat., 12316, f. 220-27; Banaszak, *Z dziejów*, vol. II, 234.

to convince the master of ceremonies to grant him this privilege⁵⁰.

The first part of the official entry was the welcoming of members of the entourage in a suburban villa. In the morning on a scheduled date, the envoy welcomed anyone who wanted to honour the representative of the king of Poland. There were usually representatives of the papal court, the families of cardinals, members of households run by envoys who stayed in Rome permanently, Roman barons and nobles and Poles living in Rome. Undoubtedly, their envoys were sent by the cardinals protectors who wanted to receive the Polish ruler's retinue well. It seems that it used to be the duty of protectors. In 1501, Erazm Ciołek was welcomed by household members of cardinals Giovanni Battista Orsini and Juan Lopez, who were believed to be the friends of monarchs from the Jagiellonian dynasty in the Sacred College⁵¹. With time, all members of the College of Cardinals became obliged to send their representatives to welcome obedience envoys. In 1513, Leo X asked Paris de Grassis, his master of ceremonies, to encourage all cardinals to send their household members to greet envoys and to make sure that they are welcomed in the best possible manner⁵². Sometimes it was not enough to ask. Gregory XIII punished officials of the curia for absence in the envoy's entourage by depriving them of their monthly remuneration⁵³. Ferdinando de' Medici, a cardinal who sided with Poland, was very angry when he learnt that twelve of his courtiers had not joined the entourage of a Polish envoy in 1583⁵⁴. Sometimes cardinals boycotted this duty for political reasons. French cardinals and cardinals siding with France did not come to the official entry of the embassy sent by Stephen Báthory because they still believed that the rightful king of Poland was Henry of Valois⁵⁵. Another exception was the welcoming of envoy Andrew Báthory in 1583. He was welcomed by the families of Cardinal Protector Farnese, Vice-Protector Savelli and household members of the following cardinals: Innico d'Avalos d'Aragon, Tolomeo Galli and Filippo Boncompagni. Everyone rode out to meet the envoy far away from the city walls, up to the Milvian Bridge⁵⁶.

When everyone willing to participate in the official entry into the city was present in the suburban villa, the papal master of ceremonies formed the procession in accordance with the order of precedence and then everyone headed towards the city. An official delegation made up of bishops, officials of the curia and other dignitaries, including the Swiss Guard and an orchestra, was waiting for the representative of the king at the gate. On behalf of the pope, the apostolic prefect greeted the entourage and the rest of the welcoming delegation nodded to greet the envoy and then joined the entourage. The route started at the city gate and ended in the envoy's

50 BAV, Vat.Lat., 12275, f. 305; Ałła Brzozowska, *Biskup płocki Erazm Ciołek*, (Kraków: Universitas, 2017), 182.

51 Burchard, *Diarium*, vol. 3, 120.

52 Banaszak, *Z dziejów*, vol. I, 82-112.

53 *Monumenta Poloniae Vaticana*, vol. 4, 163.

54 *Monumenta Poloniae Vaticana*, vol. 4, 158.

55 BAV, Vat.Lat. 12313, f. 522; *Monumenta Polonia Vaticana*, vol. 4, 157-58.

56 *Monumenta Poloniae Vaticana*, vol. 6, 686.

residence in Rome. It was led in such a way as to get as close as possible to Castel Sant'Angelo, where salvos were fired to honour the pope's guest. The cannonade continued until the procession reached the residence. The last stage of the official entry was bidding farewell to the guests. The envoy greeted them by nodding his head and standing at the entrance to the house, which was similar to the welcoming ceremony. It was customary not to organise a feast or invite guests on the day of the entry. There was only a meal for Swiss guards and servants. Still another exception was made for Andrew Báthory, who was welcomed at the Apostolic Palace in the Vatican with the following cardinals: Protector Farnese, Vice-Protector Savelli and two cardinal-nephews, Filippo Boncompagni and Filippo Guastavillani. Cardinals also accompanied him at a welcoming audience with Gregory XIII⁵⁷.

The official entry of an envoy ended in his temporary residence in Rome. When it comes to 15 embassies that took place in the 16th century, we know about 9 locations in which Polish envoys stayed. Six of them were made available to envoys by cardinal protectors.

Jakub Burkhard notes that in 1501 Erazm Ciołek stayed in a house that used to belong to Georg Polikarp, former bull register master. The house was located at via Sanguinea, at the foot of Monte Giordano⁵⁸. The location near the main residence of the Orsini family in Rome suggests that it was Cardinal Giovanni Battista Orsini, one of the friends of the Jagiellonian dynasty in the Sacred College, who had found the residence for the representative of Alexander, the Grand Duke of Lithuania⁵⁹. Four years later, the same envoy stayed at *de Maximis* house for the time of his mission⁶⁰. During the protectorate of Cardinal Alessandro Farnese in the years 1545-1589, he provided accommodation for envoys sent by Polish rulers multiple times and in various residences under his care. In 1550, Andrzej Czarnkowski stayed in Palazzo San Giorgio, also known as Cancellaria, which was managed by Farnese as the Vice-Chancellor of the Church. This building was one of the most beautiful Renaissance residences in the Eternal City and the official seat of the Chancery of the Holy See⁶¹. By courtesy of the protector, in 1567 Paweł Barzi resided in the above mentioned palace of the archpriest of St. Peter's Basilica. The residence, erected during the pontificate of Paul II (1464-1471), occupied one wing of the four-sided portico in the atrium of the old basilica⁶². It was not one of the most luxurious residences, which was confirmed by Cardinal Hosius, who lived there for almost three years, but it was compensated by its prestigious location in the proximity of the basilica and the Apostolic Palace.⁶³ In 1579, Paweł Uchański had the honour of staying

57 *Monumenta Poloniae Vaticana*, vol. 6, 686.

58 Burchard, *Diarium*, vol. 3, 120.

59 Piero Tomei, *L'Architettura a Roma nel Quattrocento*, (Fratelli Palombi Roma 1942), 40.

60 Burchard, *Diarium*, vol. 3, 379.

61 Tomei, *L'Architettura*, 231-59.

62 Tomei, *L'Architettura*, 105-09.

63 Kalinowska, *Z dworu Stanisława Hozjusza*, 10-2. In 1569, Stanisław Reszka wrote that it was quite comfortable not only for Hosius, but also for his entire

in Palazzo Farnese, one of the most beautiful Roman palaces, by courtesy of the cardinal protector⁶⁴. The construction of the family residence had been inaugurated by Pope Paul III and finished in the 1570s by his grandson and namesake⁶⁵.

In 1586, Jan Dymitr Solikowski stayed in an unidentified residence near Monte della Trinità. A clue as to the palace in which he could have been staying can be found in an entry in the diary of Maciej Rywocki. Two years earlier, he had visited the area near the church of S. Trinità dei Monti and a Roman guide (*cicerone*) showed him a house on a piazza where Cardinal Hosius lived⁶⁶. It was probably palazzo Gabrielli, in which two Polish envoys stayed later in the 17th century: Paweł Wołucki in 1613 and Jerzy Ossoliński in 1633⁶⁷.

The official entry into the city by Bernard Maciejowski in 1590 ended in a residence called *apud Arcum di Portagalli in via Cursus*⁶⁸. This palace was also known as palazzo Fiano and was one of the buildings belonging to the church of St. Lawrence in Lucina. At the turn of the 16th century, this titular church was assigned to Giorgio de Costa, a cardinal from Portugal, who extended the residence. He made use of an antique triumphal arch standing next to the building, which was turned into a connector leading to his residences on the opposite side of the street. This is why the building was referred to as the palace by the Portuguese arch. In 1590, the cardinal assigned with the titular church of St. Lawrence in Lucina and the owner of the residence was Michele Bonelli, a member of the Polish congregation at the College of Cardinals and a friend of Stanislaus Hosius⁶⁹. It was most probably by courtesy of Bonelli that the Polish envoy could stay in that residence. The last of the discussed embassies to Rome took place in 1594 and stayed in a palace of the Orsini family in Campo dei Fiori (*palatium Ursinorum in Campo Floris*) by courtesy of Alessandro Peretti di Montalto, the new cardinal protector of Poland. Most probably, this cardinal asked Virginio Orsini, Duke of Bracciano and his brother-in-law, to make the residence available to the Polish envoy⁷⁰.

Any Roman residence occupied by the representative of the king during his

entourage because it had many rooms. An advantage of the residence was that the ailing cardinal could get inside St. Peter's Basilica without going outdoors.

64 BAV, Vat.Lat., 12313, f. 552v.

65 Clare Robertson, *'Il Gran Cardinale' Alessandro Farnese, Patron of the Arts* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992), 137-48.

66 *Macieja Rywockiego księgi perygrynackie. Archiwum do dziejów literatury i oświaty w Polsce*, vol. 13, ed. Jan Czubek (Kraków: Akademia Umiejętności, 1910), 44.

67 Osiecka-Samsonowicz, *Polskie uroczystości*, 73, 85.

68 Osiecka-Samsonowicz, *Polskie uroczystości*, annex n. 1, 124-25.

69 Adriano Prosperi, "Bonelli, Michele", in DBI, vol. 11 (1969) [https://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/michele-bonelli_%28Dizionario-Biografico%29/], (access: 3.03.2020)].

70 Stefano Boero, "Peretti Damasceni, Flavia", in DBI, vol.82 (2015) [[https://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/flavia-peretti-damasceni_\(Dizionario-Biografico\)/](https://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/flavia-peretti-damasceni_(Dizionario-Biografico)/)], (access: 3.03. 2020)].

diplomatic mission served as the Polish embassy in the Eternal City. The facade of the building was decorated with the coat of arms of the ruler and national colours. All representative rooms were supposed to be decorated with fabrics, which served as the lining for the walls and the ceiling. The reception hall was supposed to be lined with a cloth of gold and the dining room with sheets, light silk or leather, depending on the season. It was very expensive, so Miński advised envoys to buy fabrics in Naples, where they were significantly cheaper and of a better quality than in Rome⁷¹. It seems that in terms of interior fitting, Polish envoys could count on the help of Polish protectors. When in 1572 Catherine of Austria, Queen of Poland, the walls of Hosius's palace were covered with black fabrics borrowed from Cardinal Farnese and Francesco Sforza (Sti Georgii)⁷². The aim of all this was for the envoy sent by the king to retain adequate prestige. The official declaration of obedience started and ended in the residence and it was also the place in which the envoy received guests and organised parties. The houses of obedience envoys in Rome were also accessible to the public, whose members could admire the design of the rooms⁷³.

2.1 THE DECLARATION OF OBEDIENCE AT THE PAPAL CONSISTORY

Similarly, to the official entry into the city, the reception of Polish envoys coming to Rome to make a declaration of obedience usually took place at a public consistory. It was the highest honour for the pope's guest and such consistories were organised only in six cases: at the end of the canonisation process, when monarchs were received, for *pro fide et pace* envoys, for cardinals returning from the nunciature, for newly appointed cardinals and for embassies of obedience⁷⁴.

However, a public consistory was not allowed when only a part of the state declared its obedience. This privilege was refused to Erazm Ciołek in 1501 and to Mikołaj Myszkowski in 1546 because they were the envoys of the Grand Duke of Lithuania, and to Andrew Báthory, who came to Rome to declare the obedience of Livonia, which had recently been incorporated into the Kingdom of Poland. In such situations, envoys were received when a secret consistory was over, in the presence of cardinals, but without the participation of the public. A sensation was caused by Erazm Ciołek, who demanded to be received at a public consistory in 1518 even though he was an ordinary envoy. His efforts were supported by Cardinal Protector Achille de Grassis. However, the master of ceremonies did not find any reason to honour Ciołek in this way⁷⁵.

Being received at a public consistory had its political meaning, because it amounted to recognition of the legality of the power by the Holy See. It caused a lot of controversy in the case of Polish elected rulers. Gregory XIII's decision to welcome Stephen Báthory's envoy at an open meeting was opposed by Luigi d'Este and Nicolas de

71 Korzeniowski, *Stanisława Mińskiego (1563-1607)*, 448.

72 Kalinowska, *Z dworu Stanisława Hozjusza*, n. 101, 117-118.

73 Korzeniowski, *Stanisława Mińskiego (1563-1607)*, 450-451; Osiecka-Samsonowicz, *Polskie uroczystości*, 48-50.

74 Banaszak, *Z dziejów*, vol. I, 112-13.

75 Brzozowska, *Biskup płocki*, 182.

Pellevé, two cardinals siding with France. One day before the meeting, they went to Alessandro Farnese, the protector of Poland, and tried to convince him to persuade the pope to change his decision. They did not succeed, but they did manage to appoint a committee of cardinals (A. Farnese, G. Morone, T. Galli, F. Orsini, A. Sforza), which decided that a representative of France should be allowed to publicly protest at the consistory before the envoy arrived. However, cardinals rejected the demand for the pope to say that he accepted the declaration of obedience made on behalf of Stephen Báthory “without prejudice to the rights of the king of France”⁷⁶. Returning to the public consistory, on the date of the solemn meeting, nobles who were supposed to join the envoy’s entourage gathered in his residence at the appointed hour. According to the opinion of one of the papal masters of ceremonies, on the date of the consistory, the envoy was accompanied mainly by the friends and supporters of a given ruler, who came voluntarily. It always included the families of cardinals who had the closest ties to Poland, including members of the protector’s family. Similarly to the official entry, the cavalcade went next to Castel Sant’Angelo, where salvos were fired to honour the envoy and if the route was too short, there were illuminations on the way. This was the manner of honouring Paweł Barzi in 1567, who had a very short route from the Archpriest’s Palace to the Apostolic Palace⁷⁷.

During the official cavalcade of envoy Stanisław Miński in 1594, certain misconduct was observed by Cardinal Alfonso Gesualdo. He pointed out to the papal master of ceremonies that the envoy had ridden to the consistory accompanied by two lay officials rather than clergymen, as was customary. The master of ceremonies defended himself by stating that there were no suitable candidates. It was because only one bishop wanted to join the entourage and he was dressed too modestly. In this case, Cardinal Gesualdo laid the blame on Alessandro Perreti di Montalto, the protector of Poland, who should have found 8-10 notable prelates to assist the envoy on his way to the consistory⁷⁸.

Polish envoys were usually welcomed in the royal hall of the papal residence in the Vatican, but two Polish legates declared obedience in Palazzo San Marco (T. Sobocki in 1537 and Marcin Kromer in 1548), whereas one Pole did it in Lateran (Bernard Maciejowski in 1590)⁷⁹.

When the envoy arrived at the papal residence where the consistory was about to take place, he went to the apartments of one of the cardinals to change and get ready for the most important part of the ceremony: the official declaration of obedience. It usually took place in an apartment of a cardinal who was friendly disposed towards the envoy. In 1501, Erazm Ciołek stayed in the rooms of Cardinal Juan Lopez⁸⁰. In 1567, Paweł Barzi stayed in the apartment of Vice-Protector Giacomo Savelli. In the next years, Paweł Uchański stayed in the rooms of Vice-Protector Marcantonio

76 *Uchańciana*, vol. III, 306.

77 BAV, Vat.Lat., 12312, f. 459v.

78 BAV, Vat.Lat., 12318, f. 7v.

79 Banaszak, *Z dziejów*, vol. I, 115-16.

80 Burchard, *Diarium*, vol. 3, 120.

Maffei, whereas four years later Filippo Boncompagni, a cardinal-nephew, welcomed Andrew Báthory in his apartment⁸¹.

At that time, the pope, cardinals and other attendees were waiting for the envoy in the consistory hall, where the consistorial advocate was presenting one of the cases on the docket. When a sign was given by the master of ceremonies, four archbishops brought the envoy to the royal hall. Approaching the pope, the representative of the king bowed down three times and then climbed the ascended platform with the throne, where he kissed the foot and hand of the bishop of Rome. Then the envoy said some words of greeting and gave the pope credentials from the king, which were read out by the secretary of the Holy Father. This was the time for the culminating point of the ceremony: the official speech of obedience. The speech was usually given by king's envoy personal or professional orator. Among Polish diplomats sent to Rome in the 16th century, only two of them (Miński and Barzi) hired an orator, whereas all the others gave a speech themselves⁸².

When the oration was over, the papal secretary usually gave a response, in which he stated that the Holy Father and the College of Cardinals had accepted the monarch's declaration of obedience. However, in 1560 Pope Pius IV personally responded to the speech by Adam Konarski, which was regarded as extraordinary grace. In 1579, Alessandro Farnese tried to convince Gregory XIII to honour a representative of Stephen Báthory in this way, but in vain⁸³.

Then the master of ceremonies gave a sign for cardinals friendly disposed towards the envoy, led by the protector, and cardinals invited by the envoy to approach the papal throne. Sources refer to them as "confidentes" or "protectores" and their presence near the papal throne was supposed to honour the envoy and the ruler who had sent him during the declaration of obedience. It was a public manifestation of support and sympathy for the monarch and his kingdom by the members of the Sacred College. The number and rank of cardinals had an impact on how the embassy was assessed. Surrounded by friends and supporters of the kingdom, the envoy approached the throne once again and kissed the pope's foot, which resembled the entry ceremony. The pope lifted him from his knees and kissed him on the cheek. Then the pope declared that he was willing to extend his fatherly care to the king, his kingdom and the envoy.

It is worth emphasising that the first cardinal protectors of nations were appointed at public consistories, when envoys made declarations of obedience. When the declaration of obedience was made by Charles VIII in 1485, Cardinal Jean Balue was appointed the protector of France⁸⁴. The official appointment of Francesco

81 BAV, Vat.Lat., 12314, f. 424.

82 Banaszak, *Z dziejów*, 107; Korzeniowski, *Stanisława Mińskiego (1563-1607)*, 452.

83 *Monumenta Poloniae vaticana*, vol. 4, n. 161, 4.

84 «Credi jour a esté commande par le roy et de bouche a Mo Jehan Mesme l'expédicon de mons. le cardinal d'Angiers, pour poter à notere sqint père le pappe le pape l'obédience filialle quid lui doit. Item. Lettres pour ledit cardinal, pour estre protecteur en court de Romme, des droiz, fais et affaires du roy, et y avoir l'eul. Et pour ce que ledit cardinal a demande la procuracuion du roy audit Romme, et que le roy l'avoit ja donnee a l'evesque de Lesca, le roy lui a donne

Todeschini-Piccolomini as defender of interest of England in 1492 also took place at a public consistory⁸⁵. Moreover, it is believed that Cardinal Pietro Isvalies was appointed the protector of Poland around the time when Erazm Ciołek visited Rome in 1505⁸⁶.

The first known document mentioning Polish “confidentes” comes from 1567. When the declaration of obedience was made by Paweł Barzi, the throne of Pius V was surrounded by eleven cardinals⁸⁷. Twelve years later, Paweł Uchański asked fifteen cardinals to assist him⁸⁸. However, he was criticised by other members of the Sacred College, who believed that 6-8 cardinals would be enough to appropriately honour the Polish envoy⁸⁹. Nevertheless, in 1591 the throne of Gregory XIV was surrounded by twelve cardinals. Even though Bernard Maciejowski had asked five more to attend, they could not come for various reasons⁹⁰. Three years later, Stanisław Miński invited thirteen cardinals⁹¹. It is worth emphasising that regardless of the number of invited “confidentes”, the most important role in the group of cardinals was always played by the protector and vice-protectors.

When the declaration of obedience was made by everyone from the envoy’s entourage, the pope retired into what was referred to as the parament room. If the representative of the king was a lay man, he was given the privilege of carrying the Holy Father’s cape. If the representative was a clergyman, he followed the bishop of

ladite charge de protecteur». *Procès-verbaux des séances du Conseil de régence du roi Charles VIII pendant les mois d’août 1484 à janvier 1485*, ed. Adhelm Bernier (Paris: Imprimerie Royale Paris, 1836), 126-27.

85 Wilkie, *The Cardinal Protectors of England*, 18.

86 Hirsch, “Kardynałowie promotorzy, koronni, relatorzy”, 49.

87 Alessandro Farnese, Giacomo Savelli, Gaetano Morone, Gianantonio Capizucchi, Marco Sittico Altemps, Innico d’Avalos d’Aragona, Marcantonio Colonna, Guido Ascanio Sforza, Giovanni Francesco Commendone, Francesco Abbondio Castiglioni and Michele Bonelli. BAV, Vat.Lat., 12312, f. 459v;

88 Alessandro Farnese, Stanisław Hozjusz, Enrico Gaetani, Tolomeo Galli, Innico d’Avalos d’Aragona, Guido Ascanio Sforza, Gianfrancesco Gambara, Marcantonio Colonna, Flavio Orsini, Giulielmo Sirleto, Giovanni Francesco Commendone, Filippo Boncompagni, Ferdinando de’ Medici, Giovanni Vincenzo Gonzaga, Andrea di Austria. BAV, Vat.Lat., 12313, f. 522v.

89 BAV, Vat.Lat., 12313, f. 522v.

90 Alfonso Gesualdo, Nicolas de Pellevé, Giulio Antonio Santori, Giovanni Antonio Facchinetti, Agostino Valier, Vincenzo Laureo, Ippolito Aldobrandini, Paolo Emilio Sfondrati, Francesco Sforza di Santa Fiora, Alessandro Peretti di Montalto, Ascanio Colonna, Federico Borromeo and invited but absent: Giovanni Antonio Serbelloni, Tagliavia d’Aragona, Gabriele Paleotti, Enrico Gaetani i Scipione Gonzaga. BAV, Vat.Lat., 12289, f. 142v.

91 Alfonso Gesualdo, Pietro Aldobrandini, Cinzio Passeri Aldobrandini, Alessandro Peretti di Montalto, Francesco Sforza di Santa Fiora, Innico d’Avalos d’Aragona, Enrico Gaetani, Tolomeo Galli, Federico Borromeo, Michele Bonelli, Odoardo Farnese, Anton Maria Salviati, Antonmaria Sauli. Cf., Korzeniowski, *Stanisława Mińskiego (1563-1607)*, 453.

Rome, preceding prelates from his entourage⁹². This is how Archbishop Jan Dymitr Solikowski assisted the pope during the exit ceremony⁹³. When the pope took off liturgical garments, the envoy saw him off to the door leading to his apartments. This was the end of the official meeting, but sometimes the Holy Father invited the legate for dinner when the consistory was over. This exceptional honour was enjoyed only by Andrzej Czarnkowski (1550) and Stanisław Miński (1594). The former was invited to a meal by Julius III along with vice-protectors Maffei and cardinal Crescenzi. According to the custom described by Miński, the envoy had the honour to serve the pope during the meal; he gave the pope a towel to wash his hands, got down on his knee to pour his wine and when the dinner was over, he had the right to have a private conversation with the Holy Father⁹⁴.

On the way back from the consistory to the residence, the envoy was accompanied by an entourage made up of friends and officials from the papal court⁹⁵. Sometimes representatives of kings were invited for dinner by one of the cardinals right after the consistory or they organized the party themselves. The first case happened in 1505, when protector Pietro Isvalies hosted a dinner for the entourage of Erazm Ciołek at his palace⁹⁶. Whereas in 1579, after returning from the consistory, Paweł Uchański invited all of his friends to a party in Palazzo Farnese, which was illuminated with fireworks. To celebrate it, Cardinal Protector Farnese gave the envoy 30 barrels of wine⁹⁷.

At the end of the official ceremony of making a declaration of obedience, the envoy had to pay a specific amount to everyone who had their share in organising the official entry and the consistory. The master of ceremonies prepared a list of officials and made sure that everyone was paid a specific amount. In 1556, Stanisław Maciejowski paid the master of ceremonies 30 scudi in gold⁹⁸. Barzi wanted to give the master of ceremonies 100 scudi, even though he should have been given only half of this amount. To the displeasure of the master of ceremonies, Cardinal Farnese, who protected the envoy's finances, did not agree to this extravagance⁹⁹. Protectors were also awarded for their participation in embassies of obedience. In 1537, Tomasz Sobocki gave Protector Antonio Pucci 300 florins for his help during the embassy¹⁰⁰. In his guide, Stanisław Miński calculated in detail how much should be paid and to whom. In his opinion, at least 400 scudi ought to be spent on

92 Korzeniowski, *Stanisława Mińskiego (1563-1607)*, 453.

93 BAV, Vat.Lat., 1246, f 61.

94 Korzeniowski, *Stanisława Mińskiego (1563-1607)*, 453-54.

95 Banaszak, *Z dziejów*, vol. I, 152

96 Brzozowska, *Biskup płocki*, 118.

97 *Monumenta Poloniae Vaticana*, vol.4, 162.

98 BAV, Vat.Lat., 12294, f. 133.

99 BAV, Vat.Lat., 12312 f. 459v.

100 Kazimierz Hartleb, *Jan z Ocieszyna Ocieski jego działalność polityczna i dziennik podróży do Rzymu*, (Lwów: Towarzystwo dla popierania Nauki Polskiej, 1917), 129.

tips (*manice*) for palace officials from the papal court and for cardinals. The most eminent figures received gifts brought from Poland, in particular sable fur, which was highly appreciated in Rome, other types of fur and horses. One of the best horses was given by Miński to Cardinal Protector Montalto. The envoy who visited Rome in 1594 spent a total of around 5000 scudi on gifts¹⁰¹.

3. THE PROTECTORS' PARTICIPATION IN THE DIPLOMATIC ACTIVITY OF THE ENVOY

In accordance with the practice followed by the Curia, at the consistory officials arranged the time of a private audience with the Holy Father, which was an opportunity for the representative of the king to explain the purpose of his mission. Then the envoy could start performing his tasks, which included private audiences with the pope and meetings with cardinals. The bishops of Rome usually devoted one evening a week to audiences with envoys who resided permanently in Rome. Ambassadors waiting for the meeting entered in accordance with the order of precedence. When there was some urgent business, Polish envoys could communicate with the pope thanks to cardinal protectors, who acted as intermediaries¹⁰².

In the 16th century, matters which envoys were supposed to present to popes reflected the current policy of the Kingdom of Poland towards the Holy See. In the beginning of the century, it was predominantly political matters, in particular the conflict with the Teutonic Order, which was being settled in Rome. Two missions, led by Erazm Ciołek and Jan Łaski, were sent to the Eternal City to discuss that matter. The next envoys, such as Sobocki, Myszkowski and Kromer, followed the intentions of Jagiellonian rulers and tried to convince the Holy See to grant the Kingdom of Poland revenue from annates and Peter's Pence. During the reign of Sigismund Augustus, when the ideas of reformation were spreading in Poland and when there was an internal religious conflict, envoys brought up mostly religious matters. Andrzej Czarnkowski, Stanisław Maciejowski and Adam Konarski urged popes to resume the Council of Trent, asked them to send new nuncios to Poland, presented their demands for convening a national council in Poland and addressed other religious issues. For elective kings, who needed the Holy See to confirm their rights to the throne, the acceptance of the declaration of obedience was a goal in itself. This is why Paweł Uchański and Andrew Báthory were sent to Rome: the former to confirm the lawfulness of the election of Stephen Báthory and the latter to confirm the incorporation of Livonia into the Kingdom of Poland. The task of Bernard Maciejowski and Stanisław Miński was to confirm the ascension of Sigismund III to the throne of Poland and Sweden, respectively¹⁰³.

The embassy of obedience was the first contact between rulers, which is why it always served as a unique opportunity to fulfil the requests of the king, the queen, members of the episcopate and all subjects. Envoys always addressed numerous

101 Korzeniowski, *Stanisława Mińskiego (1563-1607)*, 461.

102 Hartleb, *Jan z Ocieszyna*, 115. In 1540, Jan Ocieski, an envoy sent by Queen Bona, had to arrange an audience with Protector Antonio Pucci first in order to meet the pope. The cardinal presented the matter to the bishop of Rome and arranged the date of the visit.

103 Banaszak, *Z dziejów*, vol. II, 236-45.

requests related to granting benefices, privileges and indulgences, as well as minor court cases and matters related to the canonization of Polish saints. Envoys often tried to obtain benefits for themselves from the bishops of Rome.

Returning to ceremonial matters, the envoy brought into the audience hall by the cardinal protector got down on one knee to greet the pope and then, when a sign was given, sat next to the pope and started a conversation. As stated by Stanisław Reszka, if the bishop of Rome got up and started to walk around the room, the envoy had to follow him, making sure not to overtake him. When the pope made a favourable decision, it was customary to kiss his foot as soon as possible, which symbolised a confirmation of his will¹⁰⁴. When it comes to benefices, Stanisław Miński advised envoys to collaborate with the cardinal protector and vice-protector, as well as other cardinals from the congregation for Polish affairs. To achieve the objectives of the mission determined by the Polish king, it was important to win the support of other influential cardinals. According to the advice given by Miński, it was necessary to pay frequent visits to the most important cardinals: cardinal-nephews, the vice-chancellor and the secretary of state. It was also in the interest of the envoy to maintain good relationships with the apostolic prefect, the papal datary and the governor of the city¹⁰⁵.

Courtesy duties of an envoy included visits to the most eminent figures in the Eternal City. It befitted a representative of the king of Poland to greet all members of the Sacred College and ambassadors of other kingdoms on behalf of the monarch. In Miński's opinion, visits were supposed to start with the dean cardinal and then the cardinal protector¹⁰⁶. On the date of the consistory, Andrew Báthory paid his first visit to F. Boncompagni, F. Guastavillani, cardinal-nephews of Gregory XIII, T. Galli, Secretary of State, and G. Boncompagni, Governor of the City. On the next day, he visited Protector Alessandro Farnese and Vice-Protector G. Savelli and other cardinals who were friendly disposed towards him¹⁰⁷. Luigi d'Este, Protector of France, did everything in his power to avoid the visit of Andrew Báthory due to the fact that Henry of Valois had protested against the election of the new king of Poland¹⁰⁸.

The splendour of the envoy required appropriate servants. Some of them came from Poland and others were hired in Rome. Miński advised envoys to take along no more than 14 officials (high-ranking courtiers). They were all supposed to be characterised by good manners, the knowledge of languages and customs and to be Catholics. When it came to officials, Miński mentioned a majordomo, a master of the house (*maestro di casa*), two secretaries, a doctor and a chaplain. The following servants were indispensable: a marshal (*scalco*), a cup-bearer (*trinciante*), a cupboard-keeper (*credentier*), a carver (*dispenser*), two cellar-keepers (*cantiner*, *bottiglier*), a steward (*spenditor*), a servant (*scopator*), a water-carrier (*facchino*) and two drivers. Apart

104 Czubek, *Stanisłai Rescii Diarium*, 30-32.

105 Korzeniowski, *Stanisława Mińskiego (1563-1607)*, 460.

106 Korzeniowski, *Stanisława Mińskiego (1563-1607)*, 454-55.

107 Czubek, *Stanisłai Rescii Diarium*, 7-8. P.D. Cesi, G.F. Commedone, G. Rusticucci, F. Sforza, A. Gesualdi, G.A. Gambarà, G.V. Gonzaga.

108 Czubek, *Stanisłai Rescii Diarium*, 687, 6; Banaszak, *Z dziejów*, vol. 2, 175-76.

from that, it was necessary to hire ten equerries (*palafrenieri*) and ten page boys, a coachman and a solicitor who would know how to get things done in Rome¹⁰⁹.

All servants were supposed to wear clothes in national colours. When officials and servants were chosen, the envoy should rely on the advice of the cardinal protector, because there were many swindlers and thieves in Rome. Cardinal Hosius was well aware of this fact. During the ten years he spent in the Eternal City (1569-1579), he often dismissed cooks¹¹⁰ and majordomos¹¹¹ guilty of misconduct.¹¹² In 1583, the matter of choosing a majordomo for the court of Andrew Báthory reached the pope himself. Stanisław Reszka, the secretary of the embassy, sought Sixtus V's advice on whether this function should be entrusted to Virgillio Crescenzi, a Roman patrician, a friend of Poland and a relative of Vice-Protector Marcello Cresenzi. The pope backed this choice and promised to support the efforts of Reszka¹¹³.

Returning to the courtesy duties of an envoy, when he paid an official visit to a cardinal, he surrounded himself with an entourage of officials, servants, Polish nobility and curial prelates, who eagerly volunteered to accompany him¹¹⁴. The envoy rode in a carriage and the entourage followed him. The cardinal's family welcomed the guest at the gate to the residence, whereas the cardinal himself was waiting for the envoy in the sitting room or the third room from the entrance. The cardinal usually greeted the guest by nodding and they sat together in a separate room, in which they could talk freely, whereas the family of the cardinal and members of the entourage occupied a different room. On the way out, the host saw the envoy off to the last door of the residence and servants saw him off to the carriage. Visits to ambassadors and other officials were very similar. It was considered proper for a cardinal or an ambassador to visit a Polish envoy who had honoured him earlier. As a representative of the king of Poland, the envoy could participate in a number of ceremonies at which the pope was present. A special distinction was allowing the legate to serve in liturgy. Envoys gave the Holy Father water to wash his hands during the mass or accompanied him by his throne. When the pope wanted to honour the representatives of the Polish king, he often granted them various titles. Lay men

109 Korzeniowski, *Stanisława Mińskiego* (1563-1607), 460.

110 Kalinowska, *Z dworu Stanisława Hozjusza*, 54-5. In letters to Kromer, Reszka mentioned «the disaster of the house». The cook Tomasz, who abused alcohol and wasted food, but it was difficult to hire someone better in Rome. This is why he asked Kromer to send a good cook from Poland.

111 Kalinowska, *Z dworu Stanisława Hozjusza*, 40-1. Venturellus Metellus, the Italian majordomo at Hosius's court, wrote denouncing letters about his employer to Sigismund Augustus, describing wastefulness and extravagance at the cardinal's house. As a result, Hosius fell into disfavour with the monarch and the majordomo was fired.

112 Kalinowska, *Z dworu Stanisława Hozjusza*, 61-2. In a letter to Kromer, Reszka informed him that a thief who had stolen a silver plate and a candlestick from Hosius's court at the beginning of 1570 was caught. He was a member of the cardinal's household and nobody expected that from him.

113 Czubek, *Stanislai Rescii Diarium*, 8.

114 Czubek, *Stanislai Rescii Diarium*, 7.

were usually granted the title of a knight and clergymen the title of a protonotary apostolic.

On Maundy Thursday in 1501, Erazm Ciołek participated in a papal mass celebrated by Cardinal Orsini, during which Iwan Sapiecha was made a knight by Alexander VI. Four years later, the bishop of Płock gave the pope water during the Easter Sunday mass and he had received a palm from the pope on Palm Sunday¹¹⁵. In 1513, right after the declaration of obedience, Pope Leo X made Stanisław Ostrogski a knight of St. Peter's¹¹⁶. Tomasz Sobocki was supposed to be granted the same title by Paul III, but he could not afford a gold chain which was required to be promoted. Protector Antonio Puccini helped the envoy by buying him the chain because he believed that it was not proper to ask the pope to do that¹¹⁷. In 1556, Stanisław Maciejowski was invited by Paul IV to the first anniversary of the pope's coronation¹¹⁸.

270 When the envoy settled all matters as instructed by the ruler, he could make preparations for his return. However, before leaving Rome, he had to ask the pope for permission to leave. Then he paid his last visits to cardinals and ambassadors and finally attended the last audience with the Holy Father. As a farewell gift, he received a special papal brief for the king and letters of recommendation from the pope and the protector. When Ciołek left Rome in 1501, Pope Alexander VI, Cardinal Orsini, Cardinal Ferrari and Cardinal Bernardino Lopez de Carvajal sent letters to prince Alexander to thank him for the declaration of obedience and to praise the envoy. It should also be noted that when envoys returned from their missions, rulers expressed their gratitude to protectors for their help provided during the embassy¹¹⁹. Sigismund Augustus sent letters to cardinal protectors Cresenzi and Maffei, in which he thanked them for their kindness and help provided to Andrzej Czarnkowski¹²⁰. Protectors exchanged letters with the ruler in which they thanked each other. It was the last element of the protectors' activities related to embassies of obedience.

CONCLUSION

In the 16th century, cardinal protectors of Poland were the key figures during embassies of obedience. Taking care of the representatives of rulers and making sure that they were appropriately introduced and honoured at the papal court were some of the basic duties of cardinal protectors. They advised and helped Polish rulers ever since the idea of a mission was born. Rulers sought their advice on the manner

115 Burchard, *Diarium*, vol. III, 381.

116 *Il Diario di Leone X di Paride de Grassi*, eds. Pio Delicati and Mariano Armellini (Roma: Tipografia della Pace di Filippo Cuggiani Roma 1884), 4.

117 Hartleb, *Jan z Ocieszyna*, 143.

118 *Relacye nuncyuszów apostolskich i innych osób o Polsce od roku 1548 do 1690*, vol. I, ed. Erazm Rykaczewski (Berlin-Poznań: Księgarnia B. Behra, 1864), 29; Banaszak, *Z dziejów*, vol. II, 84.

119 *Akta Aleksandra króla polskiego, Wielkiego Księcia Litewskiego (1501-1506)*, ed. Fryderyk Papee (Kraków: Polska Akademia Umiejętności, 1927), n. 39, 38.

120 AGAD, MK, LL, vol. 14, f. 32; Banaszak, *Z dziejów*, vol. II, 69.

of paying homage and on choosing the appropriate envoy. Prior to departure, representatives of the king wrote to them to discuss renting a temporary residence in Rome, which protectors often made available to guests at their own expense. It is worth noting the hospitality of Alessandro Farnese, who hosted royal legates in his residences three times. When an envoy was approaching the Eternal City, he received a carriage from the protector, who also acted as an intermediary in arranging the first audience with the pope.

At official celebrations, when the declaration of obedience was made, protectors had to make sure that Polish envoys were appropriately honoured and advised them on the intricacies of the papal ceremonial. On the day of the official entry into the city and when the envoy was seen off to the papal palace to participate in the consistory, the protectors' courtiers were the core of the envoy's procession. Just before the meeting with the bishop of Rome and the Sacred College, the envoy prepared himself to enter into the consistory in apartments belonging to the cardinal who defended Polish affairs. Finally, when the envoy was paying homage to the pope, which was the culminating point of the ceremony, the protector and trusted cardinals surrounded the papal throne, thereby expressing their support for the Polish ruler and his entire kingdom.

When the official part of the mission was over, protectors acted as intermediaries and supported the representative of the king in his diplomatic activity. They arranged the envoy's meetings with the pope and usually took care of minor matters related to benefices and church affairs. Apart from matters related to the organisation of a mission and ceremonies, cardinals supported envoys in less formal matters, thanks to which envoys felt protected. For example, Cardinal Farnese gave Uchański 30 barrels of wine for his party and prevented wastefulness when the master of ceremonies was being paid. Similarly, Antonio Pucci bought Sobocki a gold chain required for the accolade ceremony.

ABBREVIATIONS

AAV: Archivio Apostolico Vaticano

BAV: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana

AGAD: Archiwum Główne Akt dawnych w Warszawie

MK: Metrika Koronna

LL: Libri Legationum

BCz: Biblioteka Książąt Czartoryskich w Krakowie

DBI: Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani

BIBLIOGRAPHY

272

Andretta Stefano. "Ceremoniale e diplomazia pontificia nel XVII secolo", in *Cérémonial et rituel à Rome (XVIe-XIXe siècle)*, 201-22. Rome: Collection de École Française de Rome, 1997.

Banaszak, Marian. *Z dziejów dyplomacji watykańskiej. Poselstwa obediencyjne w latach 1534-1605*, voll. III. Warszawa: Akademia Teologii Katolickiej, 1975.

Brzozowska, Ała. *Biskup płocki Erazm Ciołek*. Kraków: Universitas, 2017.

Cotta-Schonberg, Michael. "Cardinal Enea Silvio Piccolomini and the Development of Cardinal Protectors of Nations". *Fund og Forskning*, 51, (2012): 49-76.

Drabina, Józef. "Kardynał protektor Polski w czasach Władysława Jagiełły". *Kwartalnik Historyczny*, 89/4 (1982): 665-72.

Sanfilippo, Matteo, and Péter Tusor, eds. *Gli "Angeli Custodi" delle monarchie: i cardinali protettori delle nazioni*, "Studi di storia delle istituzioni ecclesiastiche". Viterbo: SetteCittà, 2017.

Hartleb, Kazimierz. *Jan z Ocieszyna Ocieski jego działalność polityczna i dziennik podróży do Rzymu*. Lwów: Towarzystwo dla popierania Nauki Polskiej, 1917.

Hirsch, Michał. "Z dziejów kontaktów dyplomatycznych między Polską a papieżem na przełomie XV i XVI w. – pierwszy kardynał-protektor Polski" *Koło Historii*, 18 (2016): 43-65.

Hirsch, Michał. "Kardynałowie promotorzy, koronni relatorzy – o początkach polskiego protektoratu narodowego w Kolegium Kardynałów na tle europejskim". In *Sztuka roztropności. Dyplomacja Stolicy Apostolskiej wobec Rzeczypospolitej, Europy i świata w epoce nowożytnej i XX wieku, zbiór studiów*, edited by Krzysztof Ożóg and Ryszard Skowron, 33-52. Kraków: Polska Akademia Umiejętności 2020.

Hirsch, Michał. "Działalność Antonio Pucciego jako kardynała protektora Polski w świetle dziennika podróży do Włoch 1540-1541 Jana z Ocieszyna Ocieskiego". *Nasza Przyszłość*, 129 (2018): 39-65.

Makowski, Tomasz. *Poselstwo Jerzego Ossolińskiego do Rzymu w roku 1633*. Warszawa: Biblioteka Narodowa, 1996.

Marceau, Bertrand. "Cardinal Protectors and National Interests". In *A Companion to the Early Modern Cardinal, Brill's companions to the Christian tradition*, edited by Mary Hollingsworth, Miles Pattenden and Arnold Witte, 198-211. Leiden Boston: Brill, 2020.

Osiecka-Samsonowicz, Hanna. "Nieznane poselstwo obediencyjne biskupa Pawła Wołuckiego do papieża Pawła V w 1613 r.". In *Od Kijowa do Rzymu. Z dziejów*

- stosunków ze Stolicą Apostolską i Ukrainą*, edited by Mariusz R. Drozdowski, Wojciech Walczak and Katarzyna Wiszowata-Walczak, 183-97. Białystok: Instytut Badań nad Dziedzictwem Kulturowym Europy, 2012.
- Osiecka-Samsonowicz, Hanna. *Polskie uroczystości w barokowym Rzymie (1587-1969)*. Warszawa: Instytut Sztuki PAN, 2012.
- Osiecka-Samsonowicz, Hanna. *Ceremonie e feste polacche nella Roma barocca 1587-1696*. Roma: Accademia Polacca delle Scienze Biblioteca e Centro Studi, 2014.
- Platania, Gaetano. "Il viaggio politico. Il caso di Michele Casimiro Radziwill, principe polacco, a Vienna e Roma nella documentazione d'archivio". In *Il viaggio in testi inediti o rari*, edited by Fernands Roscetti, 69-139. Roma: Istituto Nazionale di Studi Romani, 1998.
- Poncet, Oliver. "The Cardinal-Protectors of the Crowns in the Roman Curia During the First Half of the Seventeenth Century: The Case of France". In *Court and politics in papal Rome*, edited by Gianvittorio Signorotto and Maria Antonietta Visceglia, PAGE. Cambridge: University Press, 2002.
- Prokop, Krzysztof Rafał. "Od kiedy kardynał Pietro Isvalies był protektorem Polski w Kurii Rzymskiej?". *Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego. Prace Historyczne*, 126 (1999): 89-100.
- Robertson, Clare. *'Il Gran Cardinale' Alessandro Farnese, Patron of the Arts*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992.
- Smółucha, Janusz. "Działalność Achilessa de Grassisa jako kardynała protektora Polski przy Stolicy Apostolskiej w latach 1511-1523". *Nasza Przyszłość*, 87 (1997): 147-65.
- Tomei, Pietro. *L'Architettura a Roma nel Quattrocento*. Roma: Fratelli Palombi, 1942.
- Walawender-Musz, Dominika. *Entrata księcia Radziwiłła do Rzymu, czyli triumf po polsku*. Warszawa: Muzeum Pałac w Wilanowie, 2009.
- Wilkie, E. Wiliam. *The Cardinal Protectors of England. Rome and the Tudors before the Reformation*. Cambridge: University Press, 1974.
- Wodka, Joseph. *Zur Geschichte der nationalen Protektorat der Kardinale ad der romischen Kurie*. Innsbruck-Leipzig: Verlag Felizian Rauch, 1938.
- Wodka, Jeseoph. "Deutschordensprotektorat und Protektorat deutscher Nation". *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte*, 34 (1947): 318-25.
- Wojtyska, Henryk Damian. *Papiestwo-Polska 1548-1563, dyplomacja*. Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego, 1977.
- Visceglia, Maria Antonietta, Brice, Catherine. "Introduction. Cérémonial et politique pendant la période moderne". In *Cérémonial et rituel à Rome (XVI^e-XIX^e siècle)*, Rome: Collection de École Française de Rome, 1997.
- Żelewski, Roman. "Dyplomacja polska w latach 1506-1572". In *Historia Dyplomacji Polskiej*, vol. I, ed. Marian Biskup, Krzysztof Górski. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, 1980.

PRINTED SOURCES

- Bernier, Adhelm, *Procès-verbaux des séances du Conseil de régence du roi Charles VIII pendant les mois d'août 1484 à janvier 1485*, Paris: Imprimerie Royale, 1836.
- Boratynski Lodovicus, ed. *Monumenta Polonia Vaticana*, vol. 4: I. A. Caligarii nuntii

apostolici in Polonia epistolae et acta 1578-1581. Kraków: Polska Akademia Umiejętności Kraków, 1915.

de Broel-Plater, Wodzimierz Stanisław, ed. *Zbiór pamiątek do dziejów polskich*, vol. I. Warszawa: Drukarzina Gazety Codziennej, 1858.

Burchard, Johannan, *Diarium sive rerum urbanarum commentarii (1483-1506)*, edited by Louis Thuasne, vol. III, Paris: E. Leroux, 1885.

Czubek, Jan, ed. *Macieja Rywockiego księgi perygrynackie. Archiwum do Dziejów Literatury i Oświaty w Polsce*, vol. 13. Kraków: Polska Akademia Umiejętności, 1910.

Czubek, Jan, ed. *Stanisłai Rescii Diarium 1583-1589. Archiwum do Dziejów Literatury i Oświaty w Polsce*, vol.15/1. Kraków: Polska Akademia Umiejętności, 1915.

Delicati, Pio and, Armellini Mariano, eds. *Il Diario di Leone X di Paride de Grassi*. Roma: Tipografia della Pace di Filippo Cuggiani, 1884.

Kalinowska, Jadwiga Ambrozja, ed. *Z dworu Stanisława Hozjusza: listy Stanisława Reszki do Marcina Kromera, 1568-1582*. Olsztyn: Towarzystwo Naukowe im. Wojciecha Kętrzyńskiego, 1992.

Korzeniowski, Józef, ed. *Scriptores Rerum Polonicarum*, vol. 13: *Stanisława Mińskiego (1563-1607) Sposób odprawowania poselstwa*. Kraków: Polska Akademia Umiejętności, 1889.

Kuntze, Edward and Czesław Nanke, eds. *Monumenta Polonia Vaticana*, vol. 5: *Alberti Bolognetti Nuntii Apostolici in Polonia epistolae et acta 1581-1585*. Kraków: Polska Akademia Umiejętności, 1923-1933.

Moroni, Gaetano. *Dizionario di Erudizione Storico-Ecclesiastico*, vol. 82. Venezia: Tipografia Emiliana, 1857

Papee, Fryderyk, ed. *Akta Aleksandra króla polskiego, Wielkiego Księcia Litewskiego (1501-1506)*, Kraków: Polska Akademia Umiejętności, 1927.

Rykaczewski, Erazm, ed. *Relacye nuncyuszów apostolskich i innych osób o Polsce od roku 1548 do 1690*, vol. I. Berlin-Poznań: Księgarnia B. Behra, 1864.

Theiner, Augustin, ed. *Vetera Monumenta Poloniae et Lithuaniae gentiumque finitimarum historiam illustrantia*, vol. II. Romae: Typis Vaticanis Romae, 1861.

Wierzbowski, Teodor, ed. *Uchańsciana seu Collectio documentorum illustrantium vitam et res gestas Jacobi Uchański Archiepiscopi Gnesnensis, legati nati, Regni Poloniae primatis ac primi principis, 1581*, vol. II. Warszawa: Drukarnia J. Bergera, 1885.