

The Role of Papal Diplomats in the *Interregnum*'s Parliamentary Practice of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth (16th-17th centuries)

by *Dorota Gregorowicz*

The political system of Poland-Lithuania was exceptional in early modern Europe. Unlike in other European countries, where rulers tried to assert their absolute power, in Poland-Lithuania the monarchical system evolved towards a particular form of constitutional monarchy. The king did not enjoy full sovereignty, being subject to the privileges of the nobility, which constituted about ten percent of the entire society; a very high percentage compared to other countries. Nevertheless, both economic and cultural diversity were considerable within this social stratum. At the top were the magnates, particularly rich and powerful, able to influence the king's policy. Then, there was a mass of middle-class nobility, strengthened by the achievements of the Executionist movement¹ in the second half of the 16th century. The economic status of the nobility did not cause any differentiation from a jurisdictional point of view, but it often caused the development of patronage practices within the noble class. Besides, the so-called "noble democracy" was based mainly on the ideas of equality and tolerance. This reflected not only the political situation, but also the religious one. The Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth was a state in which the Reformation achieved considerable success. It became an asylum for Protestants from all over Europe; moreover, numerous Orthodox Christians, Jews and Tatars inhabited its territories. A part of the Catholic episcopate even supported a radical project to break from the Holy See and create its own national church. The idea was to unify the state from a religious point of view and thus reach a compromise with both the new Protestant confessions and with the Orthodox Church.

The free election of the king was a particularly distinctive element of the political system of the Polish Crown, from 1569, of *Rzeczpospolita Obojga Narodów*. This practice appeared after the extinction of the Piast dynasty and with the elevation of Władysław II Jagiełło to the throne in 1386. A dubious legitimacy of the new dynasty imposed the succession based on the free choice of the nobility, rather than the right of inheritance. Nevertheless, in consideration of the praxis of succession

to the crown in the bosom of the Jagiellonian dynasty, the term of free election lacked clear definition and regulation. This was until the crisis caused by the childless death of Sigismund Augustus in July of 1572. The state, without a ruler, had to be organised in an extraordinary way and, concomitantly, special juridical and religious regulations were needed. Differently from the Holy Roman Empire, in Poland-Lithuania there was no explicit document such as the Golden Bull of 1356, which clearly set the elective procedure.

The confusion of this orphaned society can be seen especially during the first *interregnum* (1572-1573), when the rules were yet to be decided. After the king's death, the archbishop of Gniezno (the primate of the Kingdom) called the so-called Convocation Sejm. During this assembly, the nobility had to decide the method, date and place of the future election². Not only, as nuncio Francesco Buonvisi (1626-1700), archbishop of Thessalonica, noted:

This Sejm is called a Sejm of spies, as everyone comes to know the aims of companion, so, even if it is impossible to know the real intentions, we will have a lot of light at least about the pretenders [to the throne]³.

The Election Sejms took place close to Warsaw, as the central point of Poland-Lithuania. They were chaired by the primate of the Kingdom. Senators and all noblemen participated in it *viriliter*, meaning all together, one next to the other. This practice was supposed to be the manifestation of an idealised "noble democracy", giving every nobleman the right to participate in the election, who could then individually confirm the act by signing it. At the beginning of the election procedure, voting occurred within the assemblies of individual provinces, and then the representatives from various territories presented their results among the senators. In order to elect a new sovereign, officially, a unanimous approval of the nobility was needed, but since the method of *aclamatio* was used, the small opposition was simply not taken into account. The middle class of nobles was often devoid of political orientation and became easily influenced by the aristocracy and foreign agents' (nuncios included) propaganda. Still, the royal free elections constituted the basis for the Golden Freedom and noble democracy legends. The idea of equality was strongly rooted in the noble consciousness, despite the presence of political tensions between the magnates and nobility.

The election ceremony concluded with the solemn singing of the anthem *Tē Deum Laudamus*. Then, the new elect was informed about

being chosen asking. The primate handed him the election decree during the final ceremony in Warsaw's Collegiate Church of St. John. At that point, the oath of *pacta conventa*⁴ followed.

The period of *interregnum* was to be officially finished with the act of coronation, which, at the same time, constituted the beginning of the Coronation Sejm. Before that ceremony, the newly elected king was obliged to warrant all the traditional laws of the Kingdom. They were gathered in a composite form of constitution, called *Articuli Henriciani*, which regarded the ancient privileges of the nobility, the prerogatives of the Sejm, the specific rights of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and the rule of *non praestanda oboedientia* towards the king in cases of inconsideration of the liberties of nobility. It also contained the principles of religious tolerance, included in the Warsaw Confederation of 1573⁵. Especially for this last reason, papal diplomats judged the *Articuli Henriciani* negatively. The Holy See also did not like the fact of warranting the king's position so strongly, as the monarch was a principal guarantor of the Catholic Church's interests in *Rzeczpospolita*.

The Holy See did not fully understand the parliamentary rules of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, especially the concept of unanimity of votes.

It seemed to me very difficult, not to say impossible – wrote nuncio Vincenzo Lauro (1523-1592), bishop of Mondovì – that in such a numerous congregation everyone consent in one candidate, at least if it would not be a Republic such as the Platonic one.

There were also some comparisons to other European elective realities present (the papacy and the Holy Roman Empire):

In the election of Pope, in which we arrive rarely to the number of fifty cardinals, there are enough two-thirds [of votes]. And in that of the Emperor, in which there are no more than seven electors, it is enough more than half. So that even more this one [Republic], which is so numerous, should regulate itself in the same way⁶.

After the extinction of the Jagiellonian dynasty, the royal free elections in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth were not only crucial events for the internal policy of the state, but they also had an extraordinary importance for the whole of Europe. "The royal election in Poland usually provided a thumbnail of the political situation of the whole Europe, an image that stirred up the interest of all the courts among the whole continent" – as K. J. Kartunnen noted⁷. As the geopolitical position of Poland-Lithuania was

particularly important for the Holy See, the problem of discontinuity of royal dignity became serious. From the Roman point of view, the presence of the large and politically strong territory of *Rzeczpospolita* constituted at that time a “bulwark of Christianity” and the cultural boundary of the Western world. On the other hand, the spread of Protestant ideas, the distrust of the Polish clergy towards the Council of Trent and the projects of the national council, alongside issues of greater international politics, required better regulation of relations between the papacy and Poland-Lithuania.

For these reasons, choosing a Catholic monarch of *Rzeczpospolita* became crucial for the Roman Court. A “suitable” ruler could better impose papal policies in this part of Europe. Moreover, through diplomatic activity, the Pope acted to achieve his religious aims. Among the main papal targets were: the creation of a new Catholic league, the reconversion of Orthodox Russia and Protestant Sweden and, finally, the further spread of the Catholic Reformation in Poland-Lithuania. It was also important for the Holy See to maintain the balance of political powers in the territory of Central and Eastern Europe.

The Papacy hoped that Poland-Lithuania would guarantee an effective defence against the permanent Ottoman danger to Catholic Europe. Nevertheless, Polish political interests and the well-being of the Holy See were not always the same. The *Antemurale Christianitatis* ideology was based on the assumption that a European community existed, founded on the idea of sharing a common faith. It did, but mainly as an ideal⁸. Certainly, as such, it strongly influenced the social and political mentality of people during the Catholic Reformation and contributed to the formation of stereotypes and a general vision of Poland-Lithuania in early modern Europe⁹. Despite this, for a long time, the nobility was not interested in entering an open conflict with Sublime Porte, appreciating friendly relationships with the sultan, traditionally cultivated since the Jagiellonian epoch.

Normally, the Holy See controlled the political developments of *interregna* through the activity of its apostolic nunciature. Nevertheless, there was a case for keeping a papal legate *a latere* during the first vacation of the throne in Poland-Lithuania (cardinal Giovanni Francesco Commendone in 1572-1573) and some attempts to introduce a legate in the *interregnum* after the death of Jan Kazimierz Vasa (1668-1669). This practice differed slightly from that of the Holy Roman Empire, where, for the *Reichstag*, it was customary to send a legate, representing papal authority more distinctly, and not, as in

the Poland-Lithuania, to use the ordinary apostolic nuncio (even if usually endowed with *potestate legati a latere*¹⁰). At any rate, nuncios from the imperial court, Graz and south Germany were also usually present during the deliberations of the imperial Diets. The sending of a legate was an important remnant of medieval times, when the Holy Roman Empire and the Roman Church complemented one another, even if, during the 14th and 15th centuries and then due to the Reformation, Empire became quite laicised¹¹.

Numerous nobles, especially Protestants, were reluctant towards the apostolic nuncios assisting political practices, particularly during *interregna*. They openly wished for the departure of papal diplomats, arguing that in the past there had been no need of such a representative of the Holy See assisting in internal political choices¹². This attitude was also common in the Holy Roman Empire, where some Protestant electors did not like the papal political influence during the Diets and even refused to participate in the apostolic benediction¹³. Instead, the Catholic factions usually defended the presence of papal diplomats, saying that, in the situation of religious differences present among the nobility, they wished for the presence of papal representatives, who would take care of the interests of Catholicism. Though even the Catholics were often not devoid of jealousy towards them¹⁴.

The aim of this analysis is to illustrate the papal nuncios' role in the *interregnum*'s parliamentary practice in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth (16th-17th centuries). I would like to focus on the key moments of the parliamentary life of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth without a sovereign: the Convocation Sejm, the Election Sejm and the Coronation Sejm. They can be categorised as particularly important public ceremonies, called by B. Stollberg-Riligner: *Solennitäten*¹⁵. Seven *interregnum* periods will be analysed: 1572-1573, 1575-1576, 1587, 1632, 1648-1649, 1668-1669 and 1673-1676. The intention is to describe the political role of papal ambassadors, but also to focus on the phenomenon of their ceremonial precedence. The examined topic is also connected with papal dominance ideology and its wish to influence every important international event. I would also like to refer to the issue of papal neutrality and the *padre comune* image. Moreover, it is important to highlight the effective role and the impact of the papal diplomacy on the practice of choosing the Polish free-elected kings. Occasionally, I will also bring up the parallel practices present during the deliberations of the imperial Diets, in order to find some similarities and differences present in papal diplomatic practice.

I

The Convocation Sejm¹⁶

It was an established norm to admit neither papal diplomats, nor other foreign ambassadors, to participate in the Convocation's assembly. Nevertheless, as further analysis will show, they usually participated in it indirectly. Moreover, nuncios often relied on an exception to this rule, due to the specific nature of the papal representatives' authority¹⁷.

Examples of papal diplomats influencing the Convocations are numerous. During the Convocation Sejm of January 1573, cardinal legate Giovanni Francesco Commendone, forced to remain in Sulejów Abbey until the beginning of the Election Sejm, was in fact not admitted to the Convocation. Yet, he sent his secretary, Anton Maria Graziani, to assist the assembly and to report the most significant information to his superior. This was even more important considering that first Convocation was supposed to decide the legal confirmation of tolerance and coexistence between religions among the nobility, in terms of the Warsaw Confederation¹⁸.

The Convocation Sejm of the year 1575 lasted only a few days¹⁹. Vincenzo Lauro participated in the opening Mass to the Holy Spirit. The nuncio, since the king was absent, held the first position on the right side of the choir, surrounded by bishops. At the end of the ceremony, the paten was given to him to be kissed. Then, Lauro descended from the dais and invited bishops to meet the primate, as proof of internal peace in the episcopate. After the Mass, the bishops went to the senate for the Convocation's discussion. Lauro, however, remained in the church. Only after the conclusion of the Sejm, he met with the primate Jakub Uchański to talk about the deliberations and to determine the tactics of their further steps towards the election²⁰. Moreover, the Convocation sent a special letter to Gregory XIII, in which they explained the reasons of the deposition of Henry the Valois and the need of a new election²¹.

At the time of Stephen Balthory's death, at the end of 1586, the new nuncio for Poland-Lithuania, archbishop of Naples Annibale di Capua (1544-1595) was appointed. He did not get to Warsaw in time for the Convocation Sejm, due to his sluggishness and obstacles encountered at the Polish-Lithuanian borders, which, at the time of *interregnum*, were guarded by armed guards. Even so, the withdrawing nuncio, Girolamo Bovio (1542-1596), bishop of Camerino, was still present in Warsaw during the Convocation. He had been fully aware of the proceedings of the Sejm, due to the informers present in the bishop of Warmia Marcin Kromer's²² environment. Since he was no longer engaged directly in political affairs,

he ordered the transfer of the upcoming correspondence to his successor, Di Capua, who was in Cracow at that time²³.

In 1632, nuncio Honorato Visconti (?-1645), archbishop of Larissa, was present in Warsaw during the Convocation assembly, but he did not take a direct part in the deliberations. Nevertheless, he reported with satisfaction a constant and common noble support for the candidature of prince Władysław Vasa, for whom Visconti officially propagandized in the name of the Pope²⁴. As usual, before the Convocation Sejm of 1632, the papal nuncio received a set of papal briefs. He pointed out that he would not use them during the Convocation, because on this occasion the nobility would not discuss any important political issues, except organizational ones. Visconti decided to wait until the Election Sejm for the delivery of the briefs²⁵.

Nuncio Galeazzo Marescotti (1627-1726), archbishop of Corinth, was not present at the deliberations of the Convocation of 1668, as it was a period of strong hostility towards foreigners and general xenophobia among Polish-Lithuanian nobles. The ambassadors arriving at the election were forbidden to approach the capital, if not at the Election Sejm for their public audience. However, Marescotti tried to influence the Convocation assembly indirectly, through his political friends. On that occasion, he also supported the idea of sending a special apostolic legacy to Poland-Lithuania, to better influence the future proceedings of the Election Sejm²⁶.

The main problem the papal diplomacy had to face during the Convocation Sejms was the inclusion of the Warsaw Confederation in traditional royal *iuramentum*. The act of the Confederation was supposed to guarantee freedom of religion for peacekeeping during the *interregnum* period. In 1573, when the Confederation had just been introduced, cardinal Commendone wanted to prove that the document was not valid, since almost all the bishops protested against it. The papal legate was ready to disapprove of it again during the Election Sejm, however, at the same time, he was afraid of the dissident party's reaction, risking a civil war²⁷. Vincenzo Lauro, too, allied with primate Uchański, acted strongly against the Warsaw Confederation. Even though Annibale di Capua did not arrive in time for the Convocation Sejm of 1587, he worked actively during the whole *interregnum* against the presence of the Warsaw Confederation in the royal oath²⁸. Religious problems were an important issue during the Convocation of the year 1632 as well. At that time, nuncio Visconti strongly supported the exclusion of Moscow's candidacy from the election. The nobles, however, did not like this type of interference

in their freedom, even if they did not intend to promote the Tsarevich seriously. A special delegation of four senators and six deputies was sent to the nuncio, assuring him that the Holy See should remain calm because the laws of Poland-Lithuania would forbid the elevation of dissenters to the throne. Additionally, the nobles emphasized that Visconti should not risk the deterioration of relations with Moscow in such a manner²⁹. During the Convocation Sejms of the years 1648, 1668 and 1674, due to the final triumph of the Catholic Reformation and re-established position of the Roman Church in Poland-Lithuania, religious matters were not so demanding anymore. By that time, the inclusion of the Warsaw Confederation to the royal oath had become a stable tradition, reluctantly accepted by the nuncios, but no longer with any real anxiety.

While the Convocations were supposed to decide the date and place of the future election, the curial instructions in relation to them were often connected to the efforts of accelerating or postponing the moment of choosing a new sovereign. Usually, the Holy See wanted the election as soon as possible. The *interregnum* in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth always meant a serious destabilisation of political relations in Central and Eastern Europe. A rapid conclusion of elections was even more urgent under conditions of war, such as in case of the siege of Smoleńsk by Moscow troops and the danger of a Tartar invasion in 1632, during the Cossack uprising in 1648, or in the wake of the war with the Ottoman Empire in 1674³⁰. However, there was an exception to this rule, during the *interregnum* of 1574-1576, when Henry de Valois secretly left Poland-Lithuania to ascend his deceased brother's throne in Paris. Initially, nobles were confused; the majority of the senate wanted to keep Henry on the throne, while the rest of the nobility was convinced that proclaiming *interregnum* would be necessary³¹. By influencing the primate, nuncio Vincenzo Lauro tried to delay the assembly of the Convocation Sejm, which would mean the immediate deposition of Henry de Valois. Nevertheless, after several months, both the nuncio and the primate realised that, due to the lack of hope for the return of the French king, a new Convocation assembly was needed³².

2

The Election Sejm³³

The election of a new king was accompanied by numerous religious rituals. The nobles believed that thanks to special liturgy and devotional practices, the act of choosing the new monarch would obtain divine inspiration and blessing. This conviction was perceptible during the Election Sejm's

opening ceremonies, Sunday Masses, everyday prayers and some special devotions *pro concordia et eligendo novo rege*, which occurred simultaneously in the whole Kingdom³⁴. It is not surprising that the papal nuncios held a special place in those celebrations.

On the eve of the Election Sejm, nuncios submitted the papal briefs to the Catholic senators. Their conventional content explained the Pope's point of view and his preferences for the upcoming election³⁵. The inaugural ceremony was the other important moment of the Sejm, in which papal diplomats used to actively take part. It initiated with a Sunday Mass and common singing of the *Veni Creator Spiritus* anthem³⁶. The invocation of the Holy Spirit during opening Masses was a practice also common in the Holy Roman Empire and, as B. Stollberg-Rilinger explains:

contributed to a "blessed beginning" of the meeting and one could see the "fundamentum necessarium totius actus", the necessary basis for all the procedure, that anchored it in the divine order and gave it its sacred authority³⁷.

Moreover, the safe keeping of the Holy Spirit should have protected them from divisions and guaranteed unanimous deliberations³⁸.

The most important moment of the Election Sejms for the papal nuncios was their public audience. The public hearing of apostolic diplomats and other ambassadors in general was characteristic of the whole political and parliamentary practice of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, not only during periods of *interregna*. This varied from the practice present during the deliberations of *Reichstag*, where the papal legates had frequent private audiences with the Emperor, without speaking publicly to the electors and the states of the Empire, if not during the separate meetings of Catholic factions. This derived from the differences in political traditions, but also from the religious character of both states. In Poland-Lithuania, albeit religiously disintegrated, it seemed that the Protestants still paid more respect to the Holy See's delegates³⁹. During the elections, the only case in which the Protestant nobility strongly opposed the papal diplomats' activity was the public audience of cardinal Commendone in 1573. Voivode of Cracow Jan Firlej interrupted the legate's speech then, claiming that the papal ambassador was not supposed to be the nobility's counsellor⁴⁰.

During the Election Sejms, all foreign representations had the right to verbally support their chosen candidates. The nuncios were traditionally the first to hold the oration, taking advantage of their ceremonial precedence, thanks to the sacredness of the papal authority they represented⁴¹. During the audiences of foreign diplomats, the space was always limited and the interest was large, so that only senators and a limited number of

nobility representatives coming from all the provinces were invited. The papal diplomats' speeches especially enjoyed high attendance. For this reason, their discourses were transcribed for the audience and distributed among all the assents⁴². Public audiences were held in the senatorial shed, situated in the election field. The nuncios, usually dressed in black robes with crosses on their chests, came to the place where the Sejm deliberated with the primate's private carriage, escorted by a large entourage of senators and equestrian nobility. This differed from *Reichstag* usages, where papal legates traditionally made their entrance to the Diet on mules⁴³. The official welcome was made by the primate of the Kingdom as *interrex*, accompanied by bishops and marshals (the only exception to this praxis was the election of 1674, when the primate, archbishop of Gniezno Kazimierz Florian Czarotorski, being in a poor health, was replaced by the bishop of Cracow Andrzej Trzebicki). As a next step, papal diplomats submitted three credential briefs: separately for secular and ecclesiastical senators, as well as for the nobility. Successively, the briefs were read aloud. Then the nuncios occupied the seat beside the *interrex*, in the vicinity of the archbishop of Lviv and the bishop of Cracow, over other clergymen (this differed from the praxis of the time in the Empire, where the legates, during official celebrations, were seated in front of the Emperor, thus being ceremonially elevated)⁴⁴. After that, sitting on ornate chairs, they read their oration. After the speech and receiving acknowledgments and the nobility's response (which was sometimes prepared even some days after the hearing), they were escorted to their living quarters in Warsaw by the same convoy that had brought them to the election field.

During the first *interregnum*, cardinal legate Giovanni Francesco Commendone held his audience and election speech on 8 April 1573. Conforming to papal directives, the legate did not mention any explicit candidate to the throne. His read oration lasted a few hours and was held in Latin. Commendone called for choosing one of the Catholic candidates, who would be ready to face the upcoming (as the Holy See wanted) war with the Ottoman Empire. Although the legate was sure that the election was not a good moment to discuss religious problems, Commendone protested against the reforms of the political system and the establishment of new rights, the Warsaw Confederation included. He defended the jurisdictional rights of the clergy and accentuated the impossibility of a peaceful coexistence of different creeds in one realm. The legate called for respecting laws, preserving internal peace in the Kingdom and for unanimous elections. He emphasized the role of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth for all of Christianity. Moreover, he

expressed admiration for the nobles that were able to organise the state's structures without the king and to maintain a relatively peaceful situation in the country. Commendone thus appreciated the political and social organization of *Rzeczpospolita*, which certainly flattered the entire nobility⁴⁵. The official reply of the Sejm to the cardinal was issued on April 21st. The nobility thanked him for the advice and promised to elect a new king who would be Catholic, obedient to the Holy See. Analogously, the Sejm sent letters directly to Gregory XIII⁴⁶.

During the Election Sejm of 1587, on 14 August, the papal diplomat, archbishop of Naples Annibale di Capua, held his public audience. The nuncio exalted the virtues of the late king Stephen Bãthory and appealed for the fast and unanimous choice of a new Catholic monarch, without opting for a particular candidate. Di Capua stressed the fact that the future ruler should be wedded on the Catholic faith. In this way, he refereed clearly against the candidature of the Swedish Prince, Sigismund, whose mother was Jagiellonian and Catholic, while his father John III descended from the Lutheran Vasa dynasty. During his oration, the nuncio offered papal support in case of war with the Ottoman Empire, wanting to encourage the election of a Habsburg archduke, which he personally supported. At the end of the speech, on behalf of the senate, the bishop of Przemyśl Wojciech Baranowski made a response and acknowledgments⁴⁷.

The public audience of Honorato Visconti was held on 22 October 1632. Visconti's oration lasted only an hour, which was very short, considering the canons. Papal diplomacy was not particularly involved in this election, being more interested in the military operations of the Thirty Years' War. Moreover, the Holy See was sure about the succession of the oldest son of the late king Sigismund III, prince Władysław Vasa. The nuncio openly supported his candidacy, praising Władysław's Catholic piety and bravery on the battlefield. Visconti also defended the Catholic Church's jurisdiction in Polish-Lithuanian territories. The speech was accepted favourably. At the mention of Pope Urban VIII, the nobility took off their caps and knelt down. The primate Jan Wężyk and the Marshal of the Sejm Jakub Sobieski gave a kind response and thanked him for the papal care⁴⁸.

Giovanni de Torres (1605-1662), archbishop of Adrianople, held his election speech on 31 October 1648. Firstly, the nuncio expressed the Pope's condolences for the death of the king Władysław, calling for preservation of internal peace and for the choice of a Catholic prince, in whose veins Jagiellonian blood flowed. It was a clear allusion to the pretenders from the Polish line of the Vasa dynasty. However, De Torres had no instruc-

tion to support a particular candidate, as only the royal brothers Karol Ferdynand and Jan Kazimierz had been competing. Despite this, the Holy See expressed its deep anxiety about the risk of a double election and the possible outbreak of an armed internal conflict. At the end of his oration, De Torres flattered the nobility, praising the institution of the free royal election⁴⁹.

Galeazzo Marescotti held his public audience on 4 June 1669, with an exceptionally high attendance. He arrived in the election field accompanied by a great entourage of seventy senatorial carriages and thousands of equestrian nobility. Marescotti delivered the papal blessing, and then called for the harmonious choice of a Catholic prince. Although he did not indicate a specific pretender (despite supporting Philip William of Neuburg and Christina of Sweden on the side-lines), he decidedly excluded the candidacy of Tsarevich. Reports from the Sejm state that even the dissident party listened to him with a great respect. On behalf of the nobility, the primate Mikołaj Prażmowski sent thanks to the papal envoy. Moreover, the Marshal of the Sejm Feliks Kazimierz Potocki went around all the representations of provinces, asking for their opinions about the volition of the Holy See, even though there had been no such custom before⁵⁰.

Francesco Buonvisi had his audience and election speech on 5 May 1674. During that Election Sejm, the nuncio, for the first time in the history of *interregna*, asked for the privilege of speaking from under the canopy. The nobility accepted this request, because of the high merits of Buonvisi in resolving internal conflicts between the late king Michał and his opposition. In the oration, the nuncio praised the Polish victory in Chocim⁵¹, then called for the preservation of internal peace and for the election of a Catholic monarch able to continue the battle against the Ottoman Empire. Moreover, he emphasized that Clement x had promised new subsidies for this war. The nuncio did not suggest any particular candidate, but warned against false converts. At the end of the speech, Buonvisi received acknowledgments from the bishop of Cracow Andrzej Trzebicki and from the Marshal of the Sejm Benedykt Sapieha⁵².

The only nuncio who did not hold a public audience was Vincenzo Lauro, during the Election Sejm of 1575. He did this for the sake of the Habsburg candidacy, supported at that time by the Holy See, as he himself was not perceived well by the nobility and his propaganda would only have made things worse for the Emperor. Moreover, by not participating in the election, Lauro wanted to avoid offending the French King Henry III, whose deposition from the Polish-Lithuanian throne was still prob-

lematic. In addition, the nuncio was asked to abstain from participation in the deliberations of the Election Sejm by the primate and episcopate⁵³. In the end, Vincenzo Lauro participated only in the opening Mass to the Holy Spirit and in Sunday Masses during the Election Sejm, but did not assist in the political deliberations⁵⁴.

Another important moment during the Election Sejm for the apostolic nuncios was the official nomination of the new king, taking place in Warsaw, in the Collegiate Church of St. John. In the course of this ceremony, the elect (himself or through ambassadors) warranted the *pacta conventa*. In the case of the first *interregnum*, cardinal Commendone did not witness the act of nomination personally. He did not want to impair the principles of free election with his presence⁵⁵. In December 1575 the double election took place – Emperor Maximilian II Habsburg and Stephen Bãthory, voivode of Transylvania, were chosen at the same time. It was important for the Holy See not to recognise the political actions of Bãthory. That would offend the Emperor, who Gregory XIII needed for the construction of the new Catholic league against the Ottomans. This was one of the reasons why Vincenzo Lauro did not take part in any of the acts of election and nomination⁵⁶. A division between two elected candidates also marked the election, which followed the death of Stephen Bãthory. On 19 August 1587, the Swedish prince Sigismund Vasa was elected. Three days later, on 22 August, the other part of the nobility chose the archduke Maximilian Habsburg. Nuncio Annibale di Capua was not present at the solemn nomination ceremony of Sigismund Vasa, neither did he appear at Maximilian's nomination. In his letters to the Roman Curia, Di Capua wrote:

I was not present; firstly, because I was not asked to be there, as the tradition says; secondly, for the reason that the election was not universal, but made only in one part of the senate, while the second part and the whole Lithuania were still in the field, to make another choice⁵⁷.

The first papal diplomat to attend the final ceremony of the royal nomination was Honorato Visconti, in 1632. On 14 November, the traditional ritual was performed in the Collegiate Church of St. John, where the newly elected king Władysław Vasa was personally accompanied by the nuncio⁵⁸. In 1648, after the election of Jan Kazimierz, Giovanni de Torres, together with the royal brother Karol Ferdynand, also escorted the elected monarch to the Church of St. John. A similar ritual repeated in 1669 and 1674. After the ceremonies, official congratulations from the Holy See's representatives to the newly elected sovereign followed⁵⁹.

During each Election Sejm, papal diplomats strenuously acted in various fields, such as: diplomatic courtesies, religious ceremonies, the defence of the Catholic Reformation and informative epistolary doings. In every case of *interregnum*, the nuncios were involved in creating a strong Catholic party. Their main goals were to restrict religious freedom, to defend the Catholic Church's jurisdiction and to put a Catholic monarch on the throne in Cracow. For example, during the Election Sejm of 1573, legate Commendone held a special dinner, where all the bishops and other Catholic senators were present. He also arranged the meetings of members of the episcopate. These practices were also common among the legates assisting the *Reichstag's* deliberations⁶⁰.

Moreover, at the time of the Sejms, as in the Empire, the nuncios received foreign embassies. They were visited by the ambassadors of princes striving for their own political interests, going for the support of the Holy See. Papal diplomats also used to privately meet the most important senators of Poland-Lithuania, heads of various parties (as in the case of *Reichstag* – Catholic electors and other Catholic princes of the Empire).

The nuncios conducted wide-range informational activity as well. Through their reliable people, present in the assemblies of various provinces, they were able to influence the nobility's opinion and shape it successfully.

Religious problems remained very important for the negotiations of papal diplomats. As stated above, during the second half of 16th century, the Warsaw Confederation persisted as the most problematic issue. During the Election Sejm of 1632, Honorato Visconti argued strongly for Uniate rights and against Orthodox ones⁶¹. Throughout the whole *interregnum* period of 1668-1669, Galeazzo Marescotti intensely opposed Moscow's candidate with his own and the Holy See's authority. His chancellery even issued a brochure entitled *Rationes militantes contra Moschum*⁶². Moreover, Marescotti helped to mandate the law, establishing that the king and queen of the Commonwealth had to have been Catholic before the election act. The aim was to exclude false converts. This proposal was successfully introduced⁶³. A few years later, in defence of this act, during the Election Sejm of 1674, there was a strong intervention of nuncio Buonvisi, opposing the proposal of Vice-Chancellor Andrzej Olszowski, who claimed that the conversion of the candidate to the throne could take place not before the election, but just before the coronation ceremony⁶⁴.

The papal diplomats were also involved in various religious activities. Similarly to legates during the imperial Diets, they participated in all the important devotions that surrounded the deliberations⁶⁵. They regularly

appealed to the local Church to organise special celebrations for the election. These prayers were also held in Rome. For instance, Annibale di Capua, on the eve of the Election Sejm of 1587, called for the organisation of a forty-eight-hour adoration of the Blessed Sacrament in the city of Warsaw⁶⁶.

3

The Coronation Ceremony⁶⁷

The coronation of the new monarch was a political, but also religious and sacralised ritual. Conventionally, it took place in Cracow's cathedral or the Wawel Royal Castle with great participation of clergy. The rite of coronation also marked the beginning of the Coronation Sejm, which officially closed the period of *interregnum*, to guarantee full king's rights for the newly elected.

The honour of the coronation of the new sovereign was traditionally assigned to the primate of the Kingdom, the archbishop of Gniezno, papal *legatus natus*. In 1589, Sixtus V reapproved this praxis⁶⁸, based on the privilege that had been assigned to Casimir Jagiellon in 1451.

Nevertheless, during the first *interregnum*, due to the presence of cardinal Commendone in Poland-Lithuania, the Pope wanted it to be the legate to execute the coronation of the new monarch⁶⁹. The traditional privileges *legati nati* were considered to be of secondary importance by Gregory XIII. Commendone was very sceptical of this papal concept, knowing that the primate was already afraid of losing his prestige because of the presence of the papal legate in Poland-Lithuania. Commendone noted that «[Uchański] pretends to the coronation of the king not only because of his office, but also because of the apostolic privilege, as well as for being the first senator of the Kingdom»⁷⁰. The legate was afraid that the disclosure of the Pope's intentions about the coronation of the new king would cause his expulsion from Poland-Lithuania⁷¹. It quickly became apparent in Rome that some serious barriers existed that prevented the legate's performing the coronation. The attention went to the risk of humiliation and loss of authority, which would affect the Holy See if the rivalry between the legate and the primate were won by the latter. Even if Commendone managed to force the Pope's will, it could cause protests among both the nobility and the clergy. That would be beneficial neither to the episcopate nor to the condition of the Catholic faith in Poland-Lithuania. Therefore, the final decision was left to the legate, as he was well-versed in the Polish internal situation and minds of the noblemen⁷². Soon, during the Convocation of the year 1573, the following privileges of the primate as *interrex* were confirmed: the right

to convene Sejms after the death of a king, the privilege of nomination of an elected king and, finally, the right of executing the rite of coronation⁷³. Commendone expressed the opinion that, in case of a successful choice of a Catholic monarch, the attempt of removing the primate's prerogatives concerning the coronation would only complicate things, unnecessarily offending not only Uchański, but also many other prelates⁷⁴. Cardinal Tolomeo Gallio, papal Secretary of the State, even though he still upheld that it would be better if the act of coronation were executed by the legate *a latere*, for the sake of papal authority, expressed papal respect for Commendone's decision of returning to Italy and leaving the coronation in the hands of the primate⁷⁵.

During the subsequent *interregna*, there was no longer doubt that the privilege of coronation of a new monarch belonged to the primate. Besides, the active participation of papal diplomacy in this ceremony was always an important matter of Roman prestige⁷⁶. During the coronations of the years 1574, 1633, 1649, 1669 and 1676, the nuncios participated directly in the celebrations, performing important ceremonial functions. They were absent during the coronations of the years 1576 and 1587 because of double elections, in which the Holy See did not want to appear partial.

Before the beginning of the ceremonies in Cracow, the apostolic nuncios would send papal briefs for the elected king, his family and the most important senators⁷⁷. On the first day of celebrations, the day before the actual coronation, after dinner, senators and other dignitaries escorted the elected sovereign to St. Stanislaus's church in Cracow. Then, the nuncios accompanied the newly elected monarch during a traditional Mass, celebrated by the primate. Afterwards, the future ruler was taken to the cathedral, where he remained for the evening vespers, to then be finally escorted back to the castle, accompanied again by papal diplomats and other public personas⁷⁸.

On the day of the coronation, the papal envoys sometimes participated in the common breakfast, sat at the table with the elected monarch, the primate and the most important senators⁷⁹. After that, there was a religious procession of bishops and other clergy to the castle. Meanwhile, in the presence of secular senators, the elected king was dressed in ceremonial clothing by the Grand Marshal of the Crown. When the ecclesiastics arrived at the royal chamber, the bishop of Cracow sprinkled the new ruler with holy water, praying. After that, the bishops of Cracow and Cuiavia took the king to the cathedral. Behind them, a procession with the participation of the nuncio, other foreign ambassadors, senators and courtiers followed. The elected monarch was asked to swear the royal

oath in front of the archbishop of Gniezno, who waited at the altar, and then to pray lying prostrate. Successively, he was anointed, which was the most significant moment of the church ceremony. The Mass and other celebrations followed, leading to the final act of coronation⁸⁰. Close to the main altar, next to the ceremonial throne of the crowned monarch, special chairs for the primate and for the nuncio were set (conversely, during the religious ceremonies of the imperial Diets, the legate's seat was located in front of the king, next to the altar)⁸¹. At the end of the whole celebration, the *Te Deum Laudamus* anthem was sung⁸².

After the coronation ceremonies, there was the traditional evening feast celebrated in the Wawel Castle. During this dinner, the apostolic nuncios had the special honour of sitting at the royal table with the regal family and the primate. In 1574, Vincenzo Lauro was the only foreign ambassador admitted to the king's table, but in the course of the 17th century, other envoys began to join the nuncios. In 1676, the feast was even more honoured by a firework show⁸³.

The apostolic nuncios did not participate in the third day of the coronation celebrations, when the official royal ride through the city and *homagium* in the Main Square of Cracow occurred.

In the years 1576 and 1587, papal diplomats did not participate in the coronation ceremonies at all. Vincenzo Lauro did not participate in the coronation of Stephen Bathory and Anna Jagiellon, as the only legitimate election for the Holy See was, at that time, the one created in Emperor Maximilian II. In this delicate political situation, Lauro, who could neither offend the Emperor, nor affront Bathory with not accepting his royal title, had to leave Poland-Lithuania, retiring to Wrocław, waiting for the situation to develop. He joined the royal court only in 1577, after the death of Maximilian II⁸⁴. A comparable situation occurred in 1587. Due to the divided election of Sigismund Vasa and the archduke Maximilian Habsburg, the race for the crown had started. Sixtus V recommended an absolute impartiality towards the two competing Catholic princes to his nuncio⁸⁵. Annibale di Capua was advised rather to spend his energies on a peaceful solution of the conflict and on preventing the new inclusion of the Warsaw Confederation in the royal oath⁸⁶. The Roman Curia let the nuncio decide himself whether to participate in the coronation celebrations. Cardinal Montalto advised Di Capua to come to Cracow in the case of unanimous consent of the nobility for one of the candidates. If the internal divisions persisted, he was supposed to stay away from the act of coronation personally⁸⁷. In the end, it was the Swedish prince to manage to arrive in Cracow before his rival and be crowned on 27 December 1587.

Annibale Di Capua, however, did not participate in the celebrations and delayed his arrival at the royal court for several months.

4

The Nuncios – Political Players or Ceremonial Figures?

The wide chronological range of events analysed above presents numerous elements both of continuity and breaks of papal policy towards elections in *Rzeczpospolita*. A permanent interest in the potential of the Polish-Lithuanian state in the war against the Ottoman Empire, as a strong ally of the Habsburgs, was politically essential for the Holy See. This is why 16th century elections were characterized by the papacy's constant support of the archdukes' candidacies. Instead, in the 17th century, the Holy See was willing to support any Catholic candidate, offering particular support to candidates who were willing to run the war with the Sublime Porte. Furthermore, the papacy hoped to strengthen the king's position in the political system of Poland-Lithuania, by introducing the *vivente rege* election modality, hoping it could solve the internal problems of the state.

The religious aspects of papal policy towards elections showed greater variability. The priority was to preserve the Polish-Lithuanian state under the Holy See's influence and to maintain it as a bastion of Catholicism in Central and Eastern Europe. The need to defeat the advance of the Reformation, the moods of religious tolerance and multi confessionalism disappeared at the turn of the 16th and 17th century, when the Counter-Reformation enjoyed its final triumph in Poland-Lithuania during the reign of Sigismund III Vasa. The position of Catholicism was stabilized, while the idea of religious expansion slightly lost its importance. The hopes for the Catholicization of Moscow by introducing the Tsarevich on the throne in *Rzeczpospolita* were very fervent in the 16th century, while in the 17th century they evolved into a fear of Orthodoxy's expansion. Moreover, with the loss of the Swedish crown by Sigismund III Vasa in 1599, the Pope's hopes for the re-conversion of Sweden finally vanished.

The activity of papal diplomacy during the *interregnum*'s parliamentary practice was very intense. Even if it was usually forbidden for the nuncios to participate in the Convocation Sejm, which decided on the *interregnum*'s organisational problems, they always tried to have an impact. The papal diplomats acted indirectly through their secretaries, auditors, trusted servants and political friends. The Convocation was often a place of discussion for important religious problems, regarding the internal peace of the Kingdom during the *interregnum* period. This aspect turned this assembly into a crucial one for the Holy See.

In the course of the Election Sejm, the nuncios were given the important role of presenting papal preferences and organising the ecclesiastical coalition in favour of the supported Catholic candidate. The culmination of the nuncios' participation in the deliberations was their public audience. Papal diplomats held their speeches in Latin. The orations included conventional content. The nuncios usually started with papal condolences for the death of the previous king, often applauding the late sovereign. Successively, they called for the maintain of internal peace within the Kingdom and for the election of a Catholic candidate, who would be able to bear the burden of fighting the infidels. The nuncios recurrently promised subsidies for the war with the Ottoman Empire. The other important and repeated element of the speeches was the issue of the protection of the ecclesiastical jurisdiction and religious domination of Catholicism in Poland-Lithuania. Moreover, some papal diplomats tried to sneak in favour of the noble masses, praising their system of government and the institution of the free royal election. Furthermore, during the 17th century, the nuncios were present during the nomination of the newly elected king, actively participating in the traditional celebrations in Warsaw's Collegiate Church of St. John.

The diplomatic activity of the apostolic nuncios during the Election Sejms was generally characterized by neutrality towards all the Catholic princes, or at least by maintaining the semblance of this. Of the seven elections analysed, only in 1632, during the elevation of Władysław Vasa to the throne, Honorato Visconti pointed out the exact papal preferences in his oration, praising Władysław. In other cases, papal diplomats recommended the election of a Catholic and capable monarch in general terms. For example, in 1573, cardinal Commendone supported both Henry of Valois and the archduke Ernest Habsburg. During the Sejm of 1575, Vincenzo Lauro, with fear of being accused of partiality and supporting Emperor Maximilian II, did not even attend the public audience. In 1587, though recommending the Habsburg candidacy on the side-lines, Annibale di Capua did not suggest a specific candidate in his official oration. In 1648, the support of the Pope was spread equally between the Vasa brothers. Galeazzo Marescotti was also able to keep himself neutral during the election of 1669. Finally, in 1674, despite strong pressure from the courts of Vienna and Paris, nuncio Buonvisi also managed to remain impartial. This *super partes* position of the Pope can be considered characteristic of Roman policy through out the whole period spreading from the end of the 16th century to the 17th century. Both religious and political aspects motivated this attitude⁸⁸. It was a sort of political tactic. The pa-

pal neutrality was in fact only superficial, as there were two key factors present in the Holy See's activity: defending its own civil and religious interests. This often meant equating the papacy's political line with the one of strongest Catholic power at that moment, concomitantly trying to maintain the appearance of *padre comune* of all Catholic princes⁸⁹.

During the Convocation and Election Sejms, the nuncios played an important, mostly political role. For the coronation act, at the beginning of the Coronation Sejm, the role of papal ambassadors changed into a ceremonial one. This role was strengthened by the highly religious connotation of the coronation ritual. The nuncios were present during the devotions in S. Stanislaus's Church in Cracow preceding the act of coronation. Then they took part in the convoy, escorting the elected monarch to the cathedral. They had the honour of participating in the ceremony in the immediate vicinity to the altar and to the king. Furthermore, they took part in the dinner that officially concluded the day of the coronation's celebration, having the right to sit at the royal table.

The most important task for the nuncios during the *interregna* was the activity of information. They had to frequently report to the Roman Curia, on everything that regarded the political evolution of both the internal situation in Poland-Lithuania and the diplomatic activities of foreign countries directly interested in the election. Moreover, papal diplomats had the task of collecting and describing the characteristics of the candidates to the throne.

Papal diplomacy during the parliamentary deliberations in the *interregnum* periods acted for defined political and religious aims. It lacked the important aspects of symbolic supremacy and papal authority, which were much more escalated in cases of papal legations, sent to the imperial Diets⁹⁰. The real impact of papal diplomacy on the royal elections in Poland-Lithuania depended on the arguments, which, at that time, were at the disposition of the nuncios and of the Holy See. Buonvisi's arguments, for example, consisted in subsidies for the war with the Ottoman Empire, so that they were extremely strong. On the contrary, a strong dissident opposition completely impeded the activity of Vincenzo Lauro in 1575. Still, the internal political divisions of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth greatly facilitated foreign interference in the elections, as well as the papal one. Their success depended on the individual political talent of a diplomat. The apostolic nuncios were usually personalities of an excellent cultural and political calibre. They were perpetually forced to manoeuvre between the instructions of the Holy See, the political interests of their "natural princes", their own ambitions and personal sympathies.

Balancing between the various factions, negotiating on the side-lines, keeping the appearance of neutrality – all these elements marked the dynamic activity of the nuncios in the time of *interregna* in the early modern Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. Papal diplomats tried to act neutrally, as they could not tarnish the authority of the Holy See. The *padre comune* position was in fact a real political instrument used by Rome to influence the most important events in European politics. Popes took advantage of their authority to form the opinion of their impartiality towards the Catholic rulers. The active participation in the *interregnum* rituals and practices was necessary to accentuate both the political and the religious authority of the Pope. The attitude of *padre comune*, in conjunction with the position of the mediator of European politics, allowed the Holy See to take an important place in the early modern system of international relations⁹¹.

The political context of the elections in Poland-Lithuania had evolved, along with the role that *Rzeczpospolita* played in the European arena. The Jagiellonian Empire, extending from the Baltic to the Black Sea, managed to maintain its political position under the rule of Sigismund III Vasa and his son Władysław, cooperating closely with the court of Vienna. The reigns of Jan Kazimierz and Michał Korybut Wiśniowiecki, however, led to a crisis of the state, putting its sovereignty into question and making the royal election an object of international political play. At that moment, however, the Holy See played a lesser political role as well. The Thirty Years' War and the Succession Wars at the turn of the 17th and 18th century annihilated the remnants of the idea of papal universalism. The evolution of the arbitration technique in international congresses turned out to be catastrophic for the international position of the papacy. The situation deteriorated further due to internal struggles within the Roman Curia, weakened moral authority and the financial failure of the Apostolic See. An additional difficulty was the affirmation of the confessional fragmentation of Europe. All these factors contributed to a gradual reduction of the impact of papal diplomacy on outcomes of the elections in Poland-Lithuania⁹².

Notes

1. The Executionist movement was a 16th-century political movement in the Kingdom of Poland and, after 1569, the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. The middle-class nobility opposed to the abuse of the existing laws by the magnates, and demanded the "execution", or actual implementation, of already existing legislature.

2. W. Konopczyński, *Konwokacje*, in *Studia historyczne ku czci Stanisława Kutrzeby*, vol. i, Nakł. Komitetu, Kraków 1938, p. 247.

3. F. Buonvisi to P. Paluzzi-Altieri, Warsaw 10 January 1674, in *Francesco Buonvisi, Nunziatura a Varsavia*, vol. 1, a cura di F. Diaz, N. Carranza, Istituto storico italiano per l'età moderna e contemporanea, Roma 1963 ("Fonti per la storia d'Italia", 75), nr 445, p. 428: «Si chiama questa la Dieta delli spioni perché ogn'uno viene per sapere i fini del compagno, onde, se bene non si penetrerà il vero dell'intentioni, si haveranno però gran lumi, almeno de' pretendenti».
4. The *pacta conventa* document was an agreement between the king and the Polish-Lithuanian nobility, in which the new monarch used to announce his promises and the political program.
5. Konopczyński, *Konwokacje*, cit., p. 253.
6. V. Lauro to T. Gallio, Warsaw 2 December 1575, in T. Wierzbowski, *Vincent Lauro, évêque de Mondovi, nonce apostolique en Pologne, 1574-1578*, Impr. de J. Berger, Varsovie 1887, nr 80, p. 297: «Mi pareva molto difficile, per non dir impossibile che in una congregazione tanto numerosa possano tutti consentire in un soggetto, se non fosse una repubblica simile a quella di Platone; Nella elezione del papa, nella quale rare volte arriva al numero di cinquanta cardinali, bastano i due terzi e in quella dell'Imperatore, che non ha più che sette elettori, basta uno sopra la metà, così molto più questa, ch'è numerosissima, dovrebbe regolarsi nella medesima maniera».
7. K. J. Karttunen, *Die Königswahl in Polen 1575*, Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, Helsinki 1915, p. 2: «Die Königswahl in Polen hat gewöhnlich ein Miniaturbild der politischen Situation in ganz Europa geboten, ein Bild, das an den Höfen des ganzen Kontinents Interesse erweckte». All the translations included in this text are done and interpreted by the author of the article.
8. G. Galasso, *Le relazioni internazionali nell'età moderna (secoli XV-XVIII)*, in "Rivista Storica Italiana", CXI, 1999, 1, p. 25; L. Bély, *L'art de la paix en Europe. Naissance de la diplomatie moderne. XVI-XVIII siècle*, PUF, Paris 2007, p. 21.
9. H. Olszewski, *The Ideology of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth as the Bulwark of Christianity*, in "Polish Western Affairs", XXXIII, 1992, 2, pp. 71-6, 85. Cfr. S. Graciotti, *L'antemurale polacco in Italia tra Cinquecento e Seicento: il barocchizzarsi di un mito*, in J. Ślaski (a cura di), *Barocco fra Italia e Polonia*, Panstwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, Warszawa 1977, pp. 303-24; W. Weintraub, *Renaissance Poland and Antemurale Christianitatis*, in "Harvard Ukrainian Studies", III-IV, 1979-80, pp. 920-30.
10. P. Blet, *Historie de la Représentation Diplomatique du Saint Siège des origines à l'aube du XIX^e siècle*, Archivio Vaticano, Città del Vaticano 1990, p. 355.
11. S. Vareschi, *La legazione del Cardinale Ludovico Madruzzo alla Dieta Imperiale di Augusta del 1582*, Società di studi trentini di scienze storiche, Trento 1990, pp. 221-3, 229.
12. T. Wierzbowski, *Uchańsciana, czyli zbiór dokumentów wyjaśniających życie i działalność Jakóba Uchańskiego, arcybiskupa gnieźnieńskiego, legata urodzonego, Królestwa Polskiego prymasa i pierwszego księcia, Jakób Uchański, arcybiskup gnieźnieński, (1502-1581): monografia historyczna*, vol. V, K. Kowalewski, Warszawa 1892, p. 494; S. Gruszecki, *Walka o władzę w Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej po wygaśnięciu dynastii Jagiellonów (1572-1573)*, PWN, Warszawa 1969, p. 120.
13. Vareschi, *La legazione*, cit., pp. 77-8; B. Stollberg-Rilinger, *Les vieux habits de l'Empereur. Une histoire culturelle des institutions du Saint-Empire à l'époque moderne*, Éditions de la Maison des sciences de l'homme, Paris 2013, p. 105.
14. Lauro to Gallio, Skierniewice 23 September 1574, in *Acta Nuntiaturae Poloniae, Vincentius Lauro (1572-1578)*, vol. IX/1, ed. M. Korolko, H. D. Wojtyska, Polska Akademia Umiejętności, Roma 1994, nr 160, p. 334; Biblioteka Książąt Czartoryskich w Krakowie (BCZ), Teka Naruszewicza 92, Dyaryusz Seymu Konwokacji Warszawskiej, 27 February 1587, c. 86; ivi, 3 March 1587, c. 126.

15. As *Solennitäten*, she identified coronations of new monarchs and emperors, fiefs' assignments or inaugurations of the Parliaments. *Solemnis* (that derives from *solus annus*) is in this case an opposite to quotidian. Cfr. Stollberg-Rilinger, *Les vieux habits de l'Empereur*, cit., pp. 5, 61.

16. The inquired Convocations: January 1573 (legate Giovanni Francesco Commendone), October 1575 (nuncio Vincenzo Lauro), February 1587 (nuncios Girolamo Bovio and Annibale di Capua), June-August 1632 (nuncio Honorato Visconti), July-August 1648 (nuncio Giovanni de Torres), November-December 1668 (nuncio Galeazzo Marescotti), February 1674 (nuncio Francesco Buonvisi).

17. A. di Capua to D. Azzolino, Cracow 14 February 1587, in A. Przedziecki, *Listy Annibala z Kapui, arcy biskupa neapolitańskiego, ... o bezkrólewiu po Stefanie Batorym i pierwszych latach panowania Zygmunta IIIgo*, Nakładem Ig. Klukowskiego Xięgarza, Warszawa 1852, p. 18; Di Capua to G. Bovio, Cracow 16 February 1587, in J. W. Woś, *Annibale di Capua nunzio apostolico e arcivescovo di Napoli (1544-1595). Materiali per una biografia*, s.e., Roma 1984, p. 96.

18. Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchiv, StAbt Polen 1 19, fasc. 1, G. F. Commendone to V. Pernstein, Sulejów 12 January 1573, c. 94; Archivio Segreto Vaticano (ASV), Segr. di Stato, Pol. 3, G. F. Commendone to Gallio, Sulejów 31 January 1573, cc. 63-4. Cfr. C. Keenan, *Polish Religious Toleration and Its Opponents: The Catholic Church and the Warsaw Confederation*, in D. Facca, V. Lepri (eds.), *Polish Culture in the Renaissance: Studies in the Arts and Political Thought*, Firenze University Press, Firenze 2013, p. 39.

19. During the *interregnum* that occurred after leaving Poland-Lithuania by Henry de Valois (1574-1576) there was another noble assembly called Convocation, which took place in Warsaw, in August and September of 1574. It discussed the question of announcing an official *interregnum* and the deposition of the king. This assembly set a deadline for Henry de Valois to come back to *Rzeczpospolita* and maintain the throne: May 12th 1575. Some historians also consider the assembly of Stężyca in May and June of 1575 a Convocation. Despite this, the Convocation that performed its conventional functions (established the place and the date of the upcoming election) was the one of October 4th 1575.

20. Lauro to Gallio, Warsaw 10 October 1575, in Wierzbowski, *Vincent Laureo*, cit., nr 71, p. 258: «Io dopo l'assenza del Rè ho preso sempre il primo stallo da man dritta del coro, dove suole star la persona del rè, e così feci quel dì, e appresso a me furono i vescovi per ordine, e al fin della messa venne da sé cerimonia, ch'egli non è solito fare eccetto al rè: a portar la patena per darla a baciare al nunzio apostolico». Cfr. Wierzbowski, *Uchańsiana*, vol. v, cit., pp. 556-60.

21. Polish-Lithuanian episcopate to Gregory XIII, Warsaw 6 October 1575, in *Vetera monumenta Poloniae et Lithuaniae gentiumque finitimarum historiam illustrantia*, 1410-1572, vol. II, ed. A. Theiner, Typ. Vaticanis, Roma 1861, p. 96. Cfr. P. Rybak, *Zjazd szlachty w Stężycy (Maj-Czerwiec 1575) na tle drugiego bezkrólewia*, Wyd. Adam Marszałek, Toruń 2002, p. 179.

22. Marcin Kromer (1512-1589) was a Polish bishop, diplomat, humanist and historian.

23. BCZ, Teka Naruszewicza 92, Dyaryusz Seymu Konwokacyi Warszawskiej, 27 February 1587, p. 86; *ivi*, 3 March 1587, p. 113; *ivi*, 8 March 1587, pp. 128-9; Dyaryjusze sejmowe z r. 1587, Warsaw 24 February 1587, in *Scriptores Rerum Polonicarum*, vol. XI, ed. A. Sokołowski, Kraków 1887 ("Wydawnictwo komisji historycznej Akademii Umiejętności w Krakowie", 38), p. 20.

24. H. Visconti to F. Barberini, Warsaw 15 July 1632, in *Vetera monumenta Poloniae et Lithuaniae gentiumque finitimarum historiam illustrantia*, vol. III, 1585-1696, ed. A. Theiner, Typ. Vaticanis, Roma 1863, pp. 395-6. Cfr. H. Wisner, *Władysław IV Waza*, Ossolineum, Wrocław 1995, p. 58.

25. ASV, Segr. di Stato, Pol. 45, Visconti to Barberini, Warsaw 3 July 1632, c. 10r. Cfr. W. Kaczorowski, *Stanowisko Stolicy Apostolskiej wobec elekcji królewicza Władysława*, in "Odrodzenie i reformacja w Polsce", XXIX, 1984, pp. 158-60.
26. ASV, Segr. di Stato, Pol. 82, G. Marescotti to G. Rospigliosi, Warsaw 5 December 1668, c. 481, ead.: Biblioteka Naukowa PAU i PAN w Krakowie (BPAU/PAN), Teka Rzymska 85, cc. 89-90. Cfr. M. Chmielewska, *Sejm elekcyjny Michała Korybuta Wiśniowieckiego 1669 roku*, Wydawnictwo Sejmowe, Warszawa 2006, p. 39.
27. ASV, Segr. di Stato, Pol. 3, Commendone to Gallio, Sulejów 31 January 1573, cc. 63-5r.
28. Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana (BAV), Chigi M II 43, Di Capua to Montalto, Warsaw 9 July 1587, cc. 255-8.
29. K. Przyboś, *Diariusz sejmiku konwokacyjnego 1668 roku*, Historia Iagiellonica, Kraków 2009, pp. 64-5.
30. S. Ochmann-Staniszevska, *Dynastia Wazów w Polsce*, Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warszawa 2007, p. 24.
31. Konopczyński, *Konwokacje*, cit., p. 255.
32. Ivi, p. 256.
33. The inquired Election Sejms: 5 IV 1573 – 20 V 1573 (legate Giovanni Francesco Commendone), 7 XI 1575 – 15 XII 1575 (nuncio Vincenzo Lauro), 30 VI 1587 – 22 VIII 1587 (nuncio Annibale di Capua), 27 IX 1632 – 13 XI 1632 (nuncio Honorato Visconti), 6 X 1648 – 20 XI 1648 (nuncio Giovanni de Torres), 2 V 1669 – 7 VII 1669 (nuncio Galeazzo Marescotti), 20 IV 1674 – 9 VI 1674 (nuncio Francesco Buonvisi).
34. U. Augustyniak, *Wazowie i "królowie rodacy"*. *Studium władzy królewskiej w Rzeczypospolitej XVII wieku*, Semper, Warszawa 1993, p. 69.
35. ASV, Segr. di Stato, Pol. 178, G. G. Panciroli to G. de Torres, Rome 11 September 1648, c. 97; ASV, Segr. di Stato, Pol. 182, Rospigliosi to Marescotti, Rome 2 March 1669, c. 102v; ASV, Segr. di Stato, Pol. 184a, Paluzzi-Altieri to Buonvisi, Rome 13 January 1674, c. 3, ead.: ASV, Segr. di Stato, Pol. 183, c. 255r; Paluzzi-Altieri to Buonvisi, Rome 11 April 1674, in Diaz, Carranza (a cura di), *Francesco Buonvisi*, vol. 1, cit., p. 478.
36. Historiography argues whether this religious office was an integral part of the Sejm, or, as evidenced by Jan Seredyka, only preceded it. As there was no formal obligation to participate in that inaugural Mass, it seems we can consider it rather as a part of the parliamentary ceremonial, not of the parliament in the strict sense. Cfr. J. Seredyka, *Nabożeństwa sejmowe w dawnej Polsce. Norma prawna czy ceremonialna?*, in *Theatrum ceremoniale na dworze książąt i królów polskich*. Materiały konferencji naukowej zorganizowanej przez Zamek Królewski na Wawelu i Instytut Historii Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego w dniach 23-25 marca 1998, red. M. Markiewicz, R. Skowron, Zamek Królewski na Wawelu, Kraków 1998, pp. 256-64.
37. Stollberg-Rilinger, *Les vieux habits de l'Empereur*, cit., pp. 26, 183: «Contribuait à un "bienheureux commencement", de l'assemblée et on y voyait le "fundamentum necessarium totius actus", le fondement nécessaire de toute la procédure, qui ancrerait celle-ci dans l'ordre divin et lui conférerait son autorité sacrale».
38. Ivi, pp. 94, 112.
39. L. Madruzzo to Gallio, Augsburg 30 June 1582, in *Nuntiaturberichte aus Deutschland. Nebst ergänzenden Aktenstücken. Dritte Abtheilung. 2 Band. Der Reichstag zu Regensburg 1576, der Pacificationstag zu Köln 1579, der Reichstag zu Augsburg 1582*, hrsg. von J. Hansen, Bottega d'Erasmus, Torino-Roma 1972³, nr 227, pp. 445-9.
40. Commendone to Gallio, Warsaw 9 April 1573, in T. Wierzbowski, *Uchańsciana, czyli zbiór dokumentów wyjaśniających życie i działalność Jakóba Uchańskiego, arcybiskupa gnieźnieńskiego, legata urodzonego, Królestwa Polskiego prymasa i pierwszego księcia, Poselstwa papieskie w Polsce, 1560-1581. Różne dokumenty z lat 1534-1592*, vol. IV, K. Kowalewski,

Warszawa 1892, p. 58; Avviso, Warsaw 16 April 1573, in *Elementa ad Fontium Editiones*, vol. xxvi, ed. by V. Meysztowicz, W. Wyhowska de Andreis, Institutum Historicum Polonicum Romae, Romae 1972, nr 27, p. 49; B. Heidenstein, *Dzieje Polski od śmierci Zygmunta do r. 1594 ksiąg XII*, vol. I, B. M. Wolff, Petersburg 1857, p. 61. Cfr. A. Śliwiński, *Stefan Batory*, M. Arcta, Warszawa 1922, p. 23; R. Przędziecki, *Diplomatie et protocole à la cour de Pologne*, vol. I, Les Belles Lettres, Paris 1934, p. 18.

41. M. A. Visceglia, *Il cerimoniale come linguaggio politico*, in Ead. (dir.), *Cérémonial et rituel à Rome (16.^e-19.^e siècle)*, École française de Rome, Roma 1997, pp. 122-3.

42. Skwarczyński, *Pierwsze trzy wolne elekcje*, cit., p. 125.

43. Stollberg-Rilinger, *Les vieux habits de l'Empereur*, cit., p. 105.

44. G. Delfin to Gallio, Regensburg 29 June 1576, in Hansen (Hrsg.), *Nuntiaturreich aus Deutschland*, III, 2, cit., nr 24, p. 66.

45. ASV, Segr. di Stato, Pol. 3, Commendone to Gallio, Sulejów 27 February 1573, cc. 83-5; Avis de Varsovie, 9 April 1573, in E. Noailles, *Henri de Valois et la Pologne en 1572*, vol. III, M. Lévy, Paris 1867, pp. 332-3; Avviso, Warsaw 16 April 1573, in Meysztowicz, Wyhowska de Andreis (eds.), *Elementa ad Fontium Editiones*, vol. xxvi, cit., nr 27, p. 49; ASV, Segr. di Stato, Pol. 172, Gallio to Commendone, Rome 16 May 1573, p. 96; J. Choisinin, *Pamiętniki o elekcji Henryka Walezyusza na króla polskiego*, Józef Zawadzki, Wilno 1818, pp. 186-7; G. F. Commendone, *Wiadomość o życiu kardynała Commendoni'ego*, in M. Malinowski, *Pamiętniki o dawnej Polsce z czasów Zygmunta Augusta obejmujące listy Jana Franciszka Commendone do Karola Boromeusza*, vol. I, R. Rafałowicz, Wilno 1851, pp. xli-ii; Heidenstein, *Dzieje Polski*, vol. I, cit., pp. 59-60; S. Orzelski, *Bezkrólewia ksiąg ośmioro czyli dzieje Polski od zgonu Zygmunta Augusta r. 1572 aż do r. 1576*, vol. I, ed. W. Spasowicz, B. M. Wolff, Petersburg 1858, pp. 41-3. Cfr. P. Fabisz, *Wiadomość o legatach i nuncjuszach apostolskich w dawnej Polsce (1075-1863)*, Nakładem Księgarni J. Priebatscha, Ostrów 1864, p. 169; E. Reinmann, *Die polnische Königswahl von 1573*, in "Historische Zeitschrift", XI, 1864, p. 108; A. Kraushaar, *Olbracht Łaski wojewoda sieradzki. Wizerunek historyczny na tle dziejów Polski XVI wieku*, vol. I, Gebethner i Wolff, Warszawa 1882, pp. 206-7; T. Wierzbowski, *Christophori Varsevicii Opuscula Inedita ad illustros viros epistolae caeteraque documenta vitam ac res gestas ipsius illustrantia*, Typis J. Bergeri, Warszawa 1883, pp. 40-2, H. Baudet, *Le Saint-Siège et la Suede durant la seconde moitié du XVI siècle: etudes politiques*, Typ. Plon-Nourrit et Cie, Paris 1907, p. 325; S. Plaza, *Próby reform ustrojowych w czasie pierwszego bezkrólewia (1572-1574)*, Uniwersytet Jagielloński, Kraków 1969, pp. 82-3; Gruszecki, *Walka o władzę*, cit., p. 253; S. Plaza, *Wielkie bezkrólewia*, Krajowa Agencja Wydawnicza, Kraków 1988, p. 13; A. Bues, *Polityka papieska wobec pierwszego bezkrólewia w Polsce*, in "Odrodzenie i Reformacja w Polsce", xli, 1997, p. 136; Keenan, *Polish Religious Toleration*, cit., p. 40.

46. «Ignotus ad rei memoriam refert orationes mense Aprilis 1573 Varsaviae ab oratoribus diversorum principum factas», in *Elementa ad Fontium Editiones*, vol. XII, ed. by V. Meysztowicz, Institutum Historicum Polonicum Romae, Romae 1964, nr 157, p. 242.

47. ASV, Segr. di Stato, Pol. 28, [Diarium electionis 1587], 14 August 1587, c. 151r; Discorso di Annibale di Capua al senato polacco-lituano, in J. W. Woś, *Fonti per la storia della nunziatura polacca di Annibale di Capua (1586-1591)*, Università degli Studi di Trento, Trento 1992, pp. 78-80; *Joachima Bielskiego Dalszy ciąg Kroniki Polskiej zawierającej dzieje od 1587 do 1598 r.*, ed. by F. M. Sobieszczański, S. Orgelbrand, Warszawa 1851, pp. 47-8; Sokołowski (ed.), *Dyaryjusz sejmowe z r. 1587*, cit., p. 107. Cfr. J. U. Niemcewicz, *Dzieje panowania Zygmunta III*, vol. I, Zygmunt Schletter, Wrocław 1836, p. 46.

48. C. Rocci to Barberini, Wien 20 November 1632, in *Nuntiaturreich aus Deutschland. Nebst ergänzenden Aktenstücken. Vierte Abteilung. 5 Band, Nuntiaturreich des Ciriaco Rocci. Ausserordentliche Nuntiaturreich des Girolamo Grimaldi: (1631-1633)*, hrsg. von R. Becker, Gruyter, Walter de, & Co., Tübingen 2013, p. 539. Cfr. Z. Sułowska, *Działalność nuncjusza Viscontiego w*

Polsce (1630-1635), in "Roczniki Humanistyczne", ix, 1960, 2, pp. 40-2; L. Podhorodecki, *Wazowie w Polsce*, Ludowa Spółdzielnia Wydawnicza, Warszawa 1985, p. 223; W. Kaczorowski, *Sejmy konwokacyjny i elekcyjny w okresie bezkrólewia 1632 r.*, Instytut Śląski, Opole 1986, pp. 290-1; Id., *Stanowisko Stolicy Apostolskiej wobec elekcji królewicza Władysława*, in "Odrodzenie i reformacja w Polsce", xxix, 1984, pp. 164-5; P. Duda, *Między Altmarkiem a Lutzen. Dyplomacja papieska wobec polityki Gustawa II Adolfa*, in *Nuncjatura Apostolska w Rzeczypospolitej*, red. T. Chynczewska-Hennel, K. Wiszowata-Walczak, Uniwersytet w Białymstoku, Białystok 2012, p. 248.

49. F. Gordon, *Elekcja Władysława Ivgo*, ed. by W. Kuczyński, Grono Historyczne Polskie, London 1854, p. 8; De Torres's election speech, 31 October 1648, in Theiner (ed.), *Vetera Monumenta Poloniae*, vol. III, cit., nr CCCXXII, p. 454; P. Piasecki, *Elekcja Władysława IV 27.IX-15.XI.1632*, in *Elekcje królów Polski w Warszawie na Woli 1575-1764: upamiętnienie pola elekcyjnego w 400-lecie stołeczności Warszawy*, red. M. Tarczyński, Oficyna Wydawnicza Rytm, Warszawa 1997, p. 142; J. S. Dąbrowski, *Diariusz Sejmu Elekcyjnego 1648 roku*, Historia Iagiellonica, Kraków 2013, pp. 118-20.

50. ASV, Segr. di Stato, Avvisi 115, Avviso di Varsovia, 4 June 1669, c. IIIIV; BPAU/PAN, Teka Rzymska 116, Avviso di Varsavia, 5 June 1669, cc. 53-54; Opisanie elekcyi króla Michała Korybuta Wiśniowieckiego z pisemka drukowanego w Rzymie roku 1669, przypisanego kardynałowi Orsini protektorowi Polski przez Jana Baptystę Gisleni, in E. Rykaczewski, *Relacje nuncjuszów apostolskich i innych osób o Polsce od roku 1548 do 1690*, vol. II, Biblioteka Polska w Paryżu, Berlin 1864, p. 355. Cfr. Chmielewska, *Sejm elekcyjny Michała Korybuta*, cit., pp. 203-4; A. Przyboś, *Michał Korybut Wiśniowiecki 1640-1673*, Wydawnictwo Literackie, Kraków 2007, p. 47.

51. The second Battle of Chocim was a battle held on the 11 November 1673, where Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth forces under Jan Sobieski defeated Ottoman Empire forces under Hussain Pasha.

52. ASV, Segr. di Stato, Pol. 90, Buonvisi to Paluzzi-Altieri, Warsaw 9 May 1674, cc. 258-60, id.: ivi, cc. 269-70; ivi, Tucci to Paluzzi-Altieri, Warsaw 9 May 1674, c. 255; Oratio habita in regiae electionis comitiis ab illustrissimo ac reverendissimo domino archiepiscopo Thessalonicensi, nuntio apostolico. 5 May 1674, in Theiner (ed.), *Vetera Monumenta Poloniae*, vol. III, cit., nr DCXLI, pp. 626-8; Opisanie elekcyi króla Jana III 21 Maja 1674 roku, in Rykaczewski (ed.), *Relacje nuncjuszów*, vol. II, cit., p. 419, n 1; F. Kluczycki, *Elekcja Jana III Sobieskiego 20.IV-09.VI.1674*, in Tarczyński (red.), *Elekcje królów Polski w Warszawie*, cit., p. 181. Cfr. L. von Pastor, *Storia dei papi dalla fine del Medio Evo compilata con sussidio dell'Archivio segreto pontificio e di molti altri Archivi*, vol. XIV: *Storia dei papi nel periodo dell'Assolutismo dall'elezione di Innocenzo X sino alla morte di Innocenzo XII (1644-1700)*, Parte I: *Innocenzo X, Alessandro VII, Clemente IX, Clemente X*, Desclée, Roma 1963³, p. 651; E. S. Kruszewski, *Duńska kandydatura do polskiego tronu (1673-1674): geneza i problem wyznaniowy*, Polski Uniwersytet na Obczyźnie, London 1985, p. 41.

53. Lauro to Gallio, Warsaw 26 May 1575, in *Acta Nuntiaturae Poloniae, Vincentius Lauro (1572-1578)*, vol. IX/2, ed. by M. Korolko, H. D. Wojtyńska, Polska Akademia Umiejętności, Roma 1999, nr 305, pp. 282-3.

54. Lauro to Gallio, Warsaw 13 November 1575, in Wierzbowski, *Vincent Laureo*, cit., nr 77, p. 276; Lauro to Gallio, Warsaw 14 December 1575, ivi, nr 84, p. 314; Lauro to Delfin, Warsaw 21 December 1575, ivi, nr 88, p. 326.

55. Commendone to Gallio, Warsaw 2 May 1573, in Wierzbowski, *Uchańsciana*, vol. IV, pp. 83-4; ASV, Segr. di Stato, Pol. 3, A. M. Graziani to Commendone, Warsaw 11 May 1573, cc. 184-5; Graziani to Commendone, Warsaw 14 v 1573, in Wierzbowski, *Uchańsciana*, vol. IV, cit., pp. 88-9.

56. Delfin to Gallio, Wien 13 May 1576, in *Nuntiaturberichte aus Deutschland. Nebst ergänzenden Aktenstücken. Dritte Abtheilung. 8 Band. Nuntiatur Giovanni Delfinos 1575-1576*, hrsg. von D. Neri, Niemeyer, Tübingen 1997, p. 177.

57. BPAU/PAN, Teka Rzymska 42, Dyariusz nuncyatury Hannibala z Kapui, c. 33; Di Capuao Montalto, Warsaw 20 August 1587, in Przeddziecki, *Listy Annibala z Kapui*, cit., p. 75, ead.: Woś, *Annibale di Capua nunzio apostolico*, cit., nr 62, p. 123: «Io non v'intervenire, si perché non m'invitarono, come è solito di farlo intendere et invitare il Nuntio, come ancora che non era eletto con universal consenso, ma da una parte sola del Senato, quando l'altra parte con tutti i Lituani erano in compagna per far altra nominatione».
58. Podhorodecki, *Wazowie w Polsce*, cit., p. 225.
59. Buonvisi to Paluzzi-Altieri, Warsaw 6 June 1674, in *Francesco Buonvisi, Nunziatura a Varsavia*, vol. II, ed. by F. Diaz, N. Carranza, Istituto storico italiano per l'età moderna e contemporanea, Roma 1963, pp. 66-8. Cfr. Z. Wójcik, *Jan III Sobieski*, Zamek Królewski w Warszawie, Warszawa 1991, p. 219.
60. Commendone to Gallio, Warsaw 30 April 1573, in Wierzbowski, *Uchańsciana*, vol. IV, cit., p. 80.
61. J. Dziegielewski, *O tolerancję dla zdominowanych. Polityka wyznaniowa Rzeczypospolitej w latach panowania Władysława IV*, PWN, Warszawa 1986, p. 61.
62. *Diariusz sejmiku koronacyjnego 1669 roku*, ed. by K. Przyboś, M. Ferenc, Historia Iagiellonica, Kraków 2004, p. IX. Cfr. Chmielewska, *Sejm elekcyjny Michała Korybuta*, cit., p. 66; Przyboś, *Michał Korybut Wiśniowiecki*, cit., p. 37.
63. ASV, Segr. di Stato, Pol. 182, Rospigliosi to Marescotti, Rome 6 July 1669, c. 112.
64. Buonvisi to Paluzzi-Altieri, Warsaw 6 June 1674, in Diaz, Carranza (a cura di), *Francesco Buonvisi*, vol. II, cit., nr 1, pp. 63-4.
65. Delfin to Gallio, Regensburg 29 VI 1576, in Hansen (Hrsg.), *Nuntiaturreichende aus Deutschland*, III, 2, cit., nr 24, p. 66.
66. BPAU/PAN, Teka Rzymska 42, Dyariusz nuncyatury Hannibala z Kapui, c. 32.
67. The inquired coronation ceremonies: February 21st 1574 (nuncio Vincenzo Lauro), May 1st 1575 (nuncio Vincenzo Lauro), December 27th 1587 (nuncio Annibale di Capua), February 6th 1633 (nuncio Honorato Visconti), January 17th 1649 (nuncio Giovanni de Torres), September 29th 1669 (nuncio Galeazzo Marescotti), February 2nd 1676 (nuncio Francesco Martelli).
68. ASV, Segr. di Stato, Pol. Add. II, Bulla Sixti Papae V. Qua declaratur Ius nominandi seu declarandi et Coronandi Reges Poloniae soli Archiepiscopo Gnesnensi Primati Regni, et nulli alteri Episcopo competere. Sixtus Episcopus Servus Servorum Dei. Ad perpetuam rei memoriam, cc. 228-31: «Ad tollendum verò diffidij et intestini belli periculum, nullus Episcoporum et Praelatorum, contra jus Archiepiscopi praedicti post renuntiationem ab eo factam, scilicet de persona catholica, et servatis Regni statutis et consuetudinibus, in Electione Regis audeat nominare, renunciare aut coronare alium in Regem, alioquin a regimine et administratione Cathedralis seu Metropolitanae Ecclesiae, cui praeest in perpetuum eo ipso suspensus, atque omnibus beneficijs Ecclesiasticis: quae quomodolibet obtinet privatus exitat, et nihilominus huiusmodi nominatio, renuntiatio aut Coronatio invalida et nulla censeatur, ac nullis sit roboris vel momenti». Cfr. S. Truchim, *Koronacje polskich królów elekcyjnych*, Księgarnia I. Zamecznik, Poznań 1931, p. 7.
69. ASV, Segr. di Stato, Pol. 172, Gallio to Commendone, Rome 28 October 1572, p. 37; ivi, Gallio to Commendone, Rome 2 November 1572, p. 41; Gallio to Commendone, Rome 15 November 1572, in Wierzbowski, *Uchańsciana*, vol. IV, cit., pp. 95-6.
70. Commendone to Gallio, Sulejów 2 October 1572, in Wierzbowski, *Uchańsciana*, vol. IV, cit., p. 46: «non pretende solo di havere a coronare il re per conto de la sua legatione, ma per privilegio apostolico et insieme come primo senatore del Regno». Cfr. Wierzbowski, *Uchańsciana*, vol. V, cit., pp. 512-4.
71. Commendone to Gallio, Sulejów 2 October 1572, in Wierzbowski, *Uchańsciana*, vol. IV, cit., p. 46.
72. Gallio to Commendone, Warsaw 15 November 1572, ivi, pp. 95-6.

73. Wierzbowski, *Uchańsciana*, vol. v, cit., p. 515.
74. Commendone to Gallio, Warsaw 19 April 1573, in Wierzbowski, *Uchańsciana*, vol. iv, cit., p. 70.
75. ASV, Segr. di Stato, Pol. 172, Gallio to Commendone [Rome, 1573], c. 101v; Commendone to Gallio, Warsaw 31 May 1573, in Wierzbowski, *Uchańsciana*, vol. iv, cit., p. 98.
76. ASV, Segr. di Stato, Pol. 91, Paluzzi-Altieri to F. Martelli, Rome 15 February 1676, cc. 402v-3r, ead.: ASV, Segr. di Stato, Nunz. Div. 153, p. 208; ASV, Segr. di Stato, Pol. 184a, cc. 137-8.
77. ASV, Segr. di Stato, Pol. 175, Barberini to Visconti, Rome 1 January 1633, pp. 36-7r, ead.: BPAU/PAN, Teka Rzymska 50, cc. 24-5.
78. J. Sobieski, *Diariusz sejmiku koronacyjnego w Krakowie w 1633 roku*, ed. by W. Kaczorowski, J. Dorobisz, Z. Szczerbik, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Opolskiego, Opole 2008, p. 59. Cfr. W. Kaczorowski, *Koronacja Władysława IV w roku 1633*, Wyższa Szkoła Pedagogiczna im. Powstańców Śląskich w Opolu, Opole 1992, p. 36; Id., *Akt koronacji Władysława IV Wazy*, in "Opolskie Studia Administracyjno-Prawne", 11, 2004, pp. 170-1.
79. ASV, Segr. di Stato, Pol. 57, De Torres to Panziroli, Cracow 23 January 1649, c. 18, ead.: BPAU/PAN, Teka Rzymska 74, cc. 13-7.
80. A. S. Radziwiłł, *Pamiętnik o dziejach w Polsce*, ed. by A. Przyboś, R. Żelewski, Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy, Warszawa 1980, p. 280; Sobieski, *Diariusz sejmiku koronacyjnego*, cit., pp. 71-2; ASV, Segr. di Stato, Pol. 93, Tucci to Paluzzi-Altieri, Cracow 9 February 1676, pp. 64-5. Cfr. Truchim, *Koronacje*, cit., pp. 9-18; Kaczorowski, *Koronacja Władysława IV*, cit., p. 37; Id., *Akt koronacji*, cit., p. 173.
81. Vareschi, *La legazione*, cit., p. 301.
82. Kaczorowski, *Koronacja Władysława IV*, cit., p. 37; Id., *Akt koronacji*, cit., p. 172.
83. Uroczystości i zabawy wyprawione w Krakowie, mieście stołecznem Królestwa Polskiego w czasie koronacji najjaśniejszego pana i króla Henryka Walezyusza brata Karola IX. Króla francuzkiego r. 1574 w miesiącu lutym, in A. Grabowski, *Ojczyście wspominki w pismach do dziejów dawnej Polski. Diaryusze, Relacje, Pamiętniki i t. p., służyć mogące do objaśnienia dziejów krajowych, tudzież listy historyczne do panowania królów Jana Kazimierza i Michała Korybuta oraz listy Jana Sobieskiego marszałka i hetmana wielkiego koronnego z rękopisów zebrane*, vol. 1, J. Cypcer, Kraków 1845, pp. 19-29; Akt koronacji króla Jmci Władysława IV roku 1633, Warsaw 6 February 1633, ivi, pp. 68-73; Radziwiłł, *Pamiętnik o dziejach*, cit., p. 282; M. Radoszewski, *Diariusz koronacyjnej Najjaśniejszego Władysława Zygmunta IV*, ed. by W. Kaczorowski, Z. Szczerbik, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Opolskiego, Opole 2002, p. 35; BAV, Barb. Lat. 4783, La superba e sontuosa entrata fatta dal nuovo Re di Polonia per la sua incoronazione, 1669, pp. 1-8; ASV, Segr. di Stato, Avvisi 115, Avviso di Craccovia, 6 October 1669, p. 185r; ASV, Segr. di Stato, Pol. 93, Tucci to Paluzzi-Altieri, Cracow 9 February 1676, pp. 64-5. Cfr. Przeddziecki, *Diplomatie et protocole*, vol. 1, cit., p. 18; Kaczorowski, *Koronacja Władysława IV*, cit., p. 41; Id., *Akt koronacji*, cit., pp. 178-9.
84. ASV, Segr. di Stato, Pol. 172, Gallio to Lauro, Rome 26 May 1576, pp. 616-7r. Cfr. Rykaczewski (ed.), *Relacje nuncyuszów*, vol. 11, cit., p. 290, n 1; Przeddziecki, *Diplomatie et protocole*, vol. 1, cit., pp. 18-9.
85. ASV, Segr. di Stato, Pol. 23, Montalto to Di Capua, Rome 7 October 1587, c. 109: «Quanto al caso che propone Vostra Signoria se alcuno di questi due elettj entrasse nel Regno et fusse coronato da la sua fattione, quello che convenisse fare à lej, non pare à noi poter di quà dare à Vostra Signoria certa regola. Essa ch'è sul loco, et che udirà l'animo de l'universale, si governerà con la prudenza, che con molta satisfattione di Nostro Signore ha fatto sin'hora: havendo consideratione à quello, che con le precedenti se l'è scritto; ch'essendo Sua Santità padre commune di tuttj, et

essendo li sudetti due Principi ambo catholicij, non può la Santità Sua se non haver cara la grandezza de l'uno, et del'altro, et riconoscere poi per Rè quello, che farà possessore del Regno»; BPAU/PAN, Teka Rzymska 42, Montalto to Di Capua, Rome 10 October 1587, cc. 77-8; ASV, Segr. di Stato, Pol. 23, Montalto to Di Capua, Rome 24 October 1587, c. 112v; ivi, Montalto to Di Capua, Rome 21 November 1587, c. 100. Cfr. E. Dubas-Urwanowicz, *Działalność polityczna Hannibala z Kapui w bezkrólewiu po śmierci Stefana Batorego*, in Chynczewska-Hennel, Wiszowata-Walczak (red.), *Nuncjatura Apostolska*, cit., p. 156.

86. ASV, Segr. di Stato, Pol. 23, Montalto to Di Capua, Rome 17 October 1587, p. 109r: «In questo caso de la divisione, et scisma di Polonia, uno di maggiori dispiaceri che senta il Nostro Signore è, che confederatione sia stata inserita ne le condizioni che s'han da far giurare à l'uno, et à l'altro. [...] La Santità Sua vuole che V. S. con tutta l'industria sua procuri di reputarla, et abolirla, et impedire, che il nuovo Rè non l'admetta, nè la giurj».

87. Ivi, Montalto to Di Capua, Rome 7 November 1587, c. 97: «In questo caso dovrà Vostra Signoria intravenire à la Coronatione, et in ogn'atto in che possa honorare il nuovo Rè, procurando che da lui si abbracci la protectione de la fede Catholica per aiutarla, et promuoverla con ogni suo potere. Quando si perseverasse ne la discordia, et che ciascheduna de le parti coronate, et mettesse in possessione il suo Rè, non potendosi dare in tal caso ordine di qua à Vostra Signoria con la prudenza sua si governerà in quel modo, che giudicherà più conveniente». Cfr. C. Nanke, *Z dziejów polityki Kuryi rzymskiej wobec Polski (1587-1589)*, Nakł. Towarzystwa Naukowego, Lwów 1921, pp. 38-9.

88. S. Andretta, *Ceremoniale e diplomazia pontificia nel XVII secolo*, in Visceglia (éd.), *Cérémonial et rituel*, cit., p. 211.

89. P. Prodi, *Il sovrano pontefice*, il Mulino, Bologna 1982, p. 309.

90. Stollberg-Rilinger, *Les vieux habits de l'Empereur*, cit., p. 106.

91. Prodi, *Il sovrano pontefice*, cit., p. 303; L. Bély, *La médiation diplomatique au XVII^e siècle et au début du XVIII^e siècle*, in *Armées et diplomatie dans l'Europe du XVII^e siècle*, PUF, Paris 1992, p. 132; A. Tallon, *Conflicts et médiations dans la politique internationale de la papauté*, ivi, pp. 118-9.

92. I. Cardinale, *Le Saint-Siège et la diplomatie: aperçu historique, juridique et pratique de la diplomatie pontificale*, Desclée, Paris 1962, p. 32; P. Prodi, *Diplomazia del Cinquecento. Istituzioni e prassi*, Pàtron, Bologna 1963, p. 137; L. von Ranke, *Storia dei papi*, Sansoni, Firenze 1965³, pp. 907-8; G. Mattingly, *Renaissance Diplomacy*, Penguin Books, London 1965³, p. 20; M. Caravale, A. Caracciolo, *Lo Stato Pontificio da Martino V a Pio IX*, UTET, Torino 1978, pp. 435, 465; Blet, *Historie de la Représentation Diplomatique*, cit., pp. 352, 385; B. Barbiche, *La diplomatie pontificale au XVII^e siècle*, in *Armées et diplomatie dans l'Europe du XVII^e siècle*. Actes du Colloque de 1996. Bulletin nr 16, Paris 1992, pp. 118-26; Bély, *La médiation diplomatique*, cit., pp. 48, 191-5, 211; Andretta, *Ceremoniale e diplomazia*, cit., pp. 221-2; M. F. Feldkamp, *La diplomazia pontificia. Da Silvestro I a Giovanni Paolo II: un profilo*, Jaca Book, Milano 1998, pp. 64, 67-8; B. Barbiche, S. de Dainville-Barbiche, *La diplomatie pontificale aux traités de Westphalie (1598-1648). Permanentes et ruptures*, in *L'Europe des traités de Westphalie. Esprit de la diplomatie et diplomatie d'esprit*, éd. par L. Bély, PUF, Paris 2000, pp. 555-9; L. Riccardi, *An Outline of Vatican Diplomacy in the Early Modern Age*, in *Politics and Diplomacy in Early Modern Italy. The Structure of Diplomatic practice, 1450-1800*, ed. by D. Frigo, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2000, pp. 106-8; A. Hugon, *Rivalités européennes et hégémonie mondiale, XVI^e-XVIII^e siècle*, A. Colin, Paris 2002, pp. 111-5, 142; A. Tallon, *Les missions de paix de la papauté au XVI^e siècle*, in *Guerres et paix en Europe centrale aux époques moderne et contemporaine. Mélanges d'histoire des relations internationales*

offerts à Jean Bérenger, éd. par D. Tollet, Presses de l'Université Paris-Sorbonne, Paris 2003, pp. 174-5; M. A. Visceglia, *Roma papale e Spagna. Diplomatici, nobili e religiosi tra le due corti*, Bulzoni, Roma 2010, p. 43; Ead., *The International Policy of Papacy*, in Ead. (a cura di), *Papato e politica internazionale*, cit., pp. 58-62; H. Schilling, *The Two Papal Souls and the Rise of an Early Modern State System*, *ivi*, p. 114; Id., *Konfesjonalizacja. Kościół i państwo w Europie doby przednowoczesnej*, Wydawnictwo Poznańskie, Poznań 2010, pp. 72-3, 460; M. Rosa, *La Curia romana in età moderna*, Viella, Roma 2013, p. 11; A. Tallon, *L'Europa del Cinquecento. Stati e relazioni internazionali*, Carocci, Roma 2013, pp. 165-6.