

KRZYSZTOF R. PROKOP

DOI: 10.26106/VTJ4-WT66

STANISŁAW WOJEŃSKI'S WAY TO THE EPISCOPAL MITRE.
THE ADVENTUROUS CHURCH CAREER
OF THE SON OF THE RECTOR OF THE CRACOW ACADEMY

The manuscript collection of the Jagiellonian Library holds to this day “an excellently illuminated manuscript presenting the Wojeński family along with their genealogical tree” (Z. Pietrzyk)¹ under the title *Flamma rediviva e bustis et cineribus atavorum erumpens, olim factis, nunc exemplis Woienskiorum a Brzezie domum colustrans, ex veterum historiis, antiquis documentis, imperatorum, regum, principum privilegiis excitata anno salutis 1651* (Jagiellonian Library, MS 1890).² Its description reads: “A paper codex from 1651, in royal quatro, 3 unnumbered pages, 66 and 27 empty at the end. On the second unnumbered page: ‘Stanislaus, archidiaconus Pilecensis, Sacrae Regiae Maiestatis secretarius, Vladislao, decano Klecensi, Alexandro, Joanni et Ludovico a Brzezie Woienskiis, fratribus, salutem;’ on page 4: ‘Familiae origo;’ page 5 ‘Familiae in Regnum Poloniae adventus.’ A bust of Zadora, an ancestor of Wojeńskis on page 4v, Wojeńskis’ coat of arms on page 11r and a genealogical table on page 66r, ornately gilded and hand-painted; moreover, each page gilt-edged, each initial and chapter title gilded.”³ For anyone familiar with the realities of Old Polish society, this kind of relic is not surprising, as it was then common to boast one’s ancestors, to present magnificence of one’s own family and to preserve the details about them for posteriority. In this particular case, we have a somewhat

¹ Z. Pietrzyk, *Poczet rektorów Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego 1400–2000*, Kraków 2000, p. 174.

² W. Wisłocki, *Katalog rękopisów Biblioteki Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego*, vol. 1: *Wstęp • Rękopisy 1–1875*, Kraków 1877–1881, p. 451, no. 1890.

³ *Ibidem* (1890. FF V 6), where also the note: “On the frame with another hand «Joannis Zaiączkovic, m.p.».” See also reproduction in: Z. Pietrzyk, *Poczet rektorów Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego...*, p. 174, and below note 13.

different situation, since the aforementioned manuscript was made not with an intention of preserving someone's imposing line of descent for posterity, but to attest a fictitious genealogy of the man (and his kinship) who initiated its creation.

As a matter of fact, his intention brought about more than this document. Ten years later, in 1661, there was prepared another manuscript, very closely related to the previous one, titled *Genealogia familiae Woiensciorum*, which was described as "a manuscript *in folio* [with] 17 parchment charters, 14 paper ones, containing documents on Wojeński's family. In the first part, on the parchment charters, [there is] the original document [*sic*] of the King Sigismund III, in which there are incorporated as transsumpts documents concerning Wojeński's family issued by the King Stephen Báthory, the Emperor Ferdinand, Wenceslaus, Duke of Cieszyn, Władysław Jagiełło, and a document in Czech by Casimir Jagiellon. On one inside charter, there is the quartered shield of Wojeński's coat of arms and, on the reverse, tournament contests between two knights – both pictures painted in colour. Next, a long document transcribed from the Royal Register of the king John Casimir under the title: 'Genealogia avitae nobilitatis familiae generosorum Woienskiorum a Brzezie de armis Płomień seu Zadora, iuxta deductionem in comitiis generalibus Regni Varsaviensibus Sabbatho ante Dominicam Rogationum proxima anno Domini millesimo sexcentesimo sexagesimo primo, coram Sacra Regia Maiestate et omnibus Regni ordinibus factam per reverendum Stanislaum Woienski, archidiaconum Pilecensem, Sacrae Regiae Maiestatis secretarium, ex remissione venerabilis capituli ecclesiae cathedralis Cracoviensis.'⁴ Talking about this historical document in the past tense is due to the fact that – according to the information obtained by the author from the Cracow Cathedral Chapter Archives at Wawel, where that manuscript used to be preserved – it is now regarded as permanently lost, since it has not been found in the place in which it was supposed to be.

Apart from the above, which is otherwise troublesome for a researcher doing a query, the fact of the existence of two (or actually at least three, as we will find later) such closely related documents may raise a legitimate question of the context of their execution, which is in part indicated by the descriptions cited above. The researcher is even more intrigued if one considers that the result of actions taken by the clergyman mentioned here, aiming at proving a noble origin of his ancestors, were not confined to the mentioned manuscripts, but included also a number of falsified documents (forgeries), which were prepared and planted into the Crown Archive just

⁴ I. P o l k o w s k i, *Katalog rękopisów kapitulnych katedry krakowskiej*, vol. 1: *Kodexa rękopiśmienne 1–228*, Kraków 1884, p. 152 no. 211 (note at the end there: "Numer porządkowy 73"). With the mention in the quoted above title on the origin of the nobility completed during the Diet of 1661 ("deductio [nobilitatis] in comitiis generalibus Regni Varsaviensibus [...] anno Domini millesimo sexcentesimo sexagesimo primo, coram Sacra Regia Maiestate et omnibus Regni ordinibus [...] ex remissione venerabilis capituli ecclesiae cathedralis Cracoviensis") corresponds the presented further testimony by Bishop Stanisław Kazimierz Dąmbski (as an eyewitness) in Wojeński's information process.

at the time of inspection of this important public collection commissioned to him by the order of the Diet. Moreover, while engaging in this disgraceful activity, he was already an episcopal nominee, designated to oversee one of the dioceses in the Polish-Lithuanian-Russian lands, and thus a senator in spe of the Commonwealth of the Both Nations.⁵ All these facts taken together do incline us to look closer at the vicissitudes of life and particularly the ecclesiastical career of so controversial a figure, considered one of the close associates of King John III Sobieski in the first half of his reign. He is therefore a clergyman undoubtedly worth of a critical biography – which would be all the more interesting, since also the father of Stanisław Wojeński (which is our object of interest here) was truly a prominent person as one of the rectors of the Cracow Academy. Actually some facts from the *curricula vitae* of both the father or and the son used to be mixed up in literature.⁶

For obvious reasons, the present text does not aspire to fill up this gap in historiography and the intention of the author is merely to introduce into scholarly circulation a major collection of sources particularly related to the crucial moment in Wojeński's ecclesiastical career,⁷ which was his promotion to the bishopric of Kamieniec Podolski and a three-year long time lapse that passed between submitting a relevant supplication by the King (14th February 1677) and the moment when the Pope issued the appropriate nomination (19th February 1680), the reasons for which have not been properly accounted for in literature to date. Moreover, the author of the present study

⁵ Zygmunt Lasocki, whose study on falsifications in the Crown Archives will be referred to here more than once, wrote in the conclusion of his reflections: "It was common in the times of the panegyrist – and even more recent ones – to beautify the history of families and the family tree. Falsification of documents in order to satisfy the vanity of the nobility often happened. There have also been cases of false oaths and professional witnesses in proving noble genealogy [...], but for a clerical dignitary to be an almost professional forger of documents and perjurer it is probably only one infamous exception." (Z. L a s o c k i, *O falsyfikatach w Archiwum Skarbcza Koronnego*, "Miesięcznik Heraldyczny" 9, 1930, p. 192).

⁶ See below footnote 19.

⁷ Generally on his biography, see L. Ł ę t o w s k i, *Katalog biskupów, prałatów i kanoników krakowskich*, vol. 4, Kraków 1853, pp. 235–236; K. R. P r o k o p, *Biskupi kamienieccy od średniowiecza do współczesności. Szkice biograficzne*, Biały Dunajec–Ostróg 2007, pp. 224–237; i d e m, *Staropolskie sylwetki piłkarskie (XIV–XIX w.). Wybitne postaci wpisane w dzieje dawnej Piłicy*, Piłica 2013, pp. 169–178; W. R o s o w s k i, *Wojeński Stanisław biskup, ur. ok. 1613 w Krakowie, zm. 1685 w Warszawie*, [in:] *Encyklopedia katolicka*, vol. 20, Lublin 2014, col. 847–848; K. R. P r o k o p, *Rzymskokatolicki biskupi ordynariusze diecezji na ziemiach ruskich dawnej Rzeczypospolitej Obojga Narodów (do czasów I wojny światowej): Baków • Chełm (Krasnystaw) • Halicz • Kamieniec Podolski • Kijów • Lwów • Luck • Przemyśl • Żytomierz*, Warszawa–Drohiczyń 2014, pp. 428–430; i d e m, *Vademecum chronologiczno-bibliograficzne do badań nad hierarchią kościoła w Polsce i na ziemiach dawnej Rzeczypospolitej*, Kraków 2018, pp. 64 no. 498, 262 no. 35, 347, 487, 507, 614. Also: Z. L a s o c k i, *O falsyfikatach w Archiwum Skarbcza Koronnego*, pp. 179–180, 187nn.

was also inclined to believe that the main reason for the aforementioned delay in the positive consideration of the case in the Eternal City was the fact that the Polish royal court's efforts to fill the bishopric in Kamieniec Podolski at the time when Podole was under Turkish occupation were looked upon with reserve in the Roman Curia since any new bishop was doomed to the role of an exile deprived of both the capability of exercising jurisdiction on the territory canonically entrusted to him and the regular revenue brought by it (indispensable for keeping a life level worthy of this high dignity, to which Rome attached great importance).⁸ A query performed in the Vatican Archives allowed to determine that although the circumstances mentioned above could also be of some significance, in this particular case apparently the objections to the actual person of the King's candidate to the mitre turned out to be an essential (if not fundamental) obstacle, as among the accusations against him, there were also those of fabrication of his own pedigree and using forgeries in order to ascend to a rank within the Church. Thus the testimonies referred to below are directly related to the content of both the manuscripts mentioned at the beginning – the one from the Jagiellonian Library (preserved) and the other from the Wawel Archives of the Cracow Cathedral Chapter (probably irretrievably lost).⁹ However, before the materials collected during the query in Rome are cited, it is advisable first to briefly present the earlier life path of the titular Bishop of Kamieniec Podolski, who ruled this diocese in 1680–1685.

The date and place of birth of the protagonist of the present study are not certain, but he was presumably born in the 1610s (around 1613) in the royal capital city of Cracow. According to the pedigrees mentioned above, which he prepared in his own capacity and took many efforts to promote, the family of the later Bishop Ordinary of Kamieniec Podolski supposedly descended from the former nobility of Brzezie and constituted a branch of the same house to which the Lanckorońskis also belonged.¹⁰ As Stanisław Cynarski, the monographer of the family, writes in this context, “the antiquization of the Lanckorońskis genealogy was performed by Stanisław Wojeński, a canon from Cracow, the royal secretary and owner of estate near Włodzisław [*property of the Lanckoroński family*]. He knew well Wespazjan Lanckoroński [*the former Bishop Ordinary of Kamieniec Podolski in*

⁸ K. R. P r o k o p, *Biskupi kamieniecy...*, pp. 232–233; i d e m, *Staropolskie sylwetki pilickie...*, pp. 175–176; i d e m, *Rzymskokatolicki biskupi ordynariusze diecezji na ziemiach ruskich...*, p. 429.

⁹ See also: *Inwentarz rękopisów Biblioteki Zakładu Narodowego im. Ossolińskich we Wrocławiu*, vol. 2: *Rękopisy 7326–11930*, ed. coll., Wrocław 1949, p. 466, no. 11909/III.

¹⁰ See S. C y n a r s k i, *Dzieje rodu Lanckorońskich z Brzezia od XIV do XVIII wieku. Sprawy kariery urzędniczej i awansu majątkowego*, Warszawa–Kraków 1996. Cf. also T. L e n c z e w s k i, *Rus-soccy herbu Zadora. Zarys monografii rodu*, Warszawa 2005.

1670–1676]¹¹ and testified as a witness in the consistory trial in 1669 in connection with his appointment to the bishopric of Kamieniec Podolski.¹² [In fact] Wojeński was behind a myth about the Lanckoroński family originating from ancient Gaul, [as] in a *Flamma rediviva*, written in 1651, he stated that the Zador family descends from a governor of [Roman] Gaul, [which] information was adopted by Polish heraldists: Okolski, Niesiecki, and others.”¹³ In another place of his monograph, Cynarski points to one year later as the moment of the creation of the manuscript (1652),¹⁴ which was the subject of his study, yet in his description of this fictitious genealogy of the Lanckorońskis and Wojeńskis he probably relied not so much on the source itself as on its extensive summary by Zygmunt Lasocki, overlooking certain facts important for the entire situation. For the latter scholar did not draw from the manuscript preserved currently in the collection of the Jagiellonian Library (which otherwise was known to him), but from a less ornamented related document from 1652 of a much richer narrative content, whose further fate and present whereabouts are not known to

¹¹ For W. L a n c k o r o ń s k i's biography, who will be mentioned here more than once: A. P r z y - b o ś, *Lanckoroński Wespazjan herbu Zadora (ok. 1612–1677), biskup kamieniecki*, [in:] *Polski słownik biograficzny*, vol. 16, Wrocław–Warszawa–Kraków–Gdańsk 1971, pp. 455–457; S. C y n a r s k i, *Dzieje rodu Lanckorońskich...*, according to the index; K. R. P r o k o p, *Biskupi kamienieccy...*, pp. 209–224; i d e m, *Rzymskokatolicy biskupi ordynariusze diecezji na ziemiach ruskich...*, pp. 231–234.

¹² The contacts between the two clergymen are also, in a way, suggested by the testimonies in the source edition: *Causae Polonae coram Sacra Romana Rota XV–XVII saec.*, ed. C. B u k o w s k a - G o r g o n i, Roma 1995, pp. 430–432, 435–436 (see also pp. 485–486, 489, 492). Also Z. L a s o c k i, *O falsyfikatach w Archiwum Skarbcza Koronnego*, p. 187 (“Certain obligations of Wespazjan Lanckoroński, later Bishop of Kamieniec, towards Stanisław Wojeński are indicated by the fact that his brother Władysław applied for the Kamieniec canonry. Wojeński writes about it [himself] in his genealogy book”).

¹³ S. C y n a r s k i, *Dzieje rodu Lanckorońskich...*, p. 12. Ibidem, on pp. 27–28, the quoted author notes that “Stanisław Wojeński in his work *Flamma rediviva* included not only the genealogy of the Wojeński family, but also a likeness of the legendary ancestor of the Zadoras and the colourful coat of arms of the Lanckoroński family. The drawing shows the shield of the coat of arms divided into five fields. In the first and fourth field, red in colour, there is a crowned golden eagle. In the second and third field, blue in colour, there is a golden lion's head, facing to the right, which is aflame. In the fifth box, also blue, there is a crowned golden lion with a sword in its right paw. Wojeński was probably also the author of the Lanckoroński motto: *Flammans pro recto*. This is attested to by the work's entire argument and the title *Flamma rediviva* itself [...]” Zadora's drawing, included in Wojeński's work, was accepted and published in documents and iconography in the second half of the 17th century” (more ibidem, pp. 236–237: “The seventeenth-century panegyric and heraldic literature took over Wojeński's argument about the ancient beginning of the Zadoras,” and p. 241: “[The Lanckoroński family] had the motto *Flammans pro recto*. It is rather certain that the author of this motto was Stanisław Wojeński”).

¹⁴ S. C y n a r s k i, *Dzieje rodu Lanckorońskich...*, p. 32 (“Wojeński undoubtedly contributed to the dissemination and consolidation of the view of the French origin of the family [Lanckoroński because] he developed the Lanckorońskis' genealogy under the Latin title *Flamma rediviva* in 1652”).

the writer of these words, so it could be cited here only to the extent it was used by Lasocki.¹⁵

“I have laid my hands on a manuscript entitled *Genealogia domu Ichm[ościów] Panów Woienskich ex lib[ris] g[enerosi] Stanislai Rozanka, vicecap[itanei] c[astrensis] Cracovien[sis], roku 1652 zebrana, do której familii referuje się respective dom Ichm[ościów] Panów Lanckorońskich jako principalis ramus te genealogii tudzież Ichm[ościów] Panów Russockich, Chrzęstowskich etc., wszystkich de stemmate Zadora sive Płomieńczyk*. Until recently, this manuscript was kept in great reverence with one of the Zadora families, as a testimony of the ancient origin and great splendour of their descent. It has also a Latin title: *Flamma rediviva e bustis et cineribus atavorum erumpens, olim factis, nunc exemplis Woienskiorum a Brzezie domum colustrans, ex veterum historiis, antiquis documentis imperatorum, regum, principum privilegiis excitata, anno Domini MDCLII*, under which it was actually known to Niesiecki. The whole paper on the Wojeńskis family – except for some details concerning the most recent generation – as well as the oldest mentions about the Lanckoroński family in *Korona polska* – are based on this manuscript,” states Zygmunt Lasocki, further on pointing out that as it follows from the dedication made to his brothers, “the author of the manuscript was the Cracow canon Stanisław Wojeński, Secretary of His Royal Majesty, [who] besides extensive references to his ancestors, supported by multiple documents (there are forty of them in total), writes about himself as well, but not too much. [...] Apart from this Father Wojeński’s manuscript dated 1652, but actually extending at least to 1672, there is another one in the Jagiellonian Library, to which Dr. K[arol] Piotrowicz drew my attention. However, this earlier manuscript (dated 1651), much more ornate than the aforementioned one and including images of ancestors [...], is much more limited in content. The oldest document cited in it [...] dates back only to 1251, [while] the beautifully prepared family tree begins only with Stefan, the castellan of Wojnicz in 1300 (from this point on the same documents are cited that are to be found in the later manuscript of Father Wojeński, while it includes [in addition] a document concerning the Kaczycki family, which was not in in the latter).”¹⁶ However, the fictitious Lanckorońskis’ and Wojeńskis’ genealogy, recounted by Cynarski, that was inspired by Stanisław Wojeński dates back to the 11th century, and thus the alleged privileges from before mid-13th century, which were essential in claiming noble origins, could not in fact be taken from the manuscript preserved

¹⁵ Z. L a s o c k i, *O falsyfikatach w Archiwum Skarbcia Koronnego*, pp. 177–192.

¹⁶ As above., pp. 178–180 (as for this single “additional” forgery, “this is a transcript of Sigismund August’s diploma from 1557, containing a transumpt of Bolesław V the Chaste’s privilege from 1252 for Świętosław of Kaczyce and stating the ancient origin of the family of Stanisław Kaczycki – the mother’s grandfather of Father Wojeński – for whom it was issued”). Cf. *Herbarz polski Kaspra Niesieckiego S.J. powiększony dodatkami z późniejszych autorów, rękopismów i dowodów urzędowych*, vol. 9, publ. J. N. B o b r o w i c z, Leipzig 1842 [reprinted: Warszawa 1989], pp. 388–391.

in the Jagiellonian Library, the only one used as a source in the aforementioned monograph of the nobility from Brzezie according to its author.¹⁷

As he states, in his made-up genealogy, the later bishop of Kamieniec Podolski “tried to prove that the Lanckorońskis arrived to Poland from Brittany in the 11th century and that [also] the Wojeńskis originated from the Lanckoronskis’ house of the Zadora coat of arms. [...] Around 1060, a French knight named Zadora supposedly came to Poland and was endowed by the king with a tract of land near Cracow. Zadora established there a village called Bresse after his family estate in France, which was later polonized as Brzezie. [...] Zadora’s grandson was presumably Walter, son of Idzi, and Bishop of Wrocław from the first half of the 12th century. During the reign of Casimir the Great, there allegedly lived two eminent members of the family, brothers Zbigniew and Stanisław, [who] were rewarded for their faithful service by the King of Rome – according to the narrative of Wojeński – in 1355 [...] with countship as well as a golden eagle added to their coat of arms. Wojeński quoted this document *in extenso* in his pedigree; it can also be found in the castle records, into which it was entered in 1646 by Wespazjan Lanckoroński, the then rector of the Bobrowniki parish, and Przedbór of Brzezie. Wojeński asserts that beginning from Zbigniew’s sons, the Zador line ramified into two branches. The progenitor of the first (better known) one was to be Zbigniew [*junior*] – his descendants lived in Lesser Poland, [while] the descendants of Stanisław, called Weneta (Venetian), became the Wojeński family, who repeatedly changed their place of residence. They stayed abroad for a long time, hence the relatively poor knowledge of their whereabouts in Poland. Wojeński’s further argument is based on multiple documents from the 14th, 15th, and 16th centuries, which are included in the aforementioned manuscript, [however these] documents, used by Wojeński, turned out to be mere forgeries.”¹⁸ Already Walerian Nekanda Trepka (1584/1585–1640), the author of the once famous work *Liber generationis plebeanorum* (in historiography it came to be known under its more popular,

¹⁷ S. Cynarski, *Dzieje rodu Lanckorońskich...*, pp. 245, 248–249 (especially note 3 on p. 249).

¹⁸ *Ibidem*, pp. 32–33. Cf. more detailed: Z. Lasocki, *O falsyfikatach w Archiwum Skarbcza Koronnego*, pp. 178–179. See also *Katalog dokumentów pergaminowych ze zbiorów Tomasa Niewodniczańskiego w Biturgu*, J. Tomaszewicz, M. Zdaneek, ed. W. Bukowski, Kraków 2004, p. 27, no. 57 (alleged document dated Książ, 12th November 1437, where “Bartosz, judge, and Piotr, deputy judge of the Cracow land tribunal, attest that Mikołaj Wojeński, son of Andrzej, treasurer, sold the village of Lipno to Stanisław Lubomirski, son of Jakub, for 300 marks and two horses, armor, military wagon and six oxen. [It is] a modern fake”). As examples of dissemination of that fictitious genealogy of the Wojeński family in the literature of the subject, one can cite, for example: *Tomasza Święckiego historyczne pamiątki znamienitych rodzin i osób dawnej Polski*, vol. 2, published by J. Bartoszewicz, Warszawa 1859 [reprint: Warszawa 1983], pp. 310–311; *Polska encyklopedia szlachecka*, vol. 12, Warszawa 1938 [reprint: Warszawa 1994], p. 186 (“Wojeński [cf. Lanckoroński, Paszkowski, Rusocki, Włodzisławski], Zadora coat of arms. Of this family: Jan, castellan of Biecz 1413; Stefan, castellan of Wojnicz 1379; Stanisław, bishop 1677, †1685”).

blunt name *Liber chamorum*)*, who traced among his contemporaries descendants of burghers and plebeians that got elevated into nobility in various ways, had no shadow of a doubt concerning the future Bishop's ancestry, stating about his father Maciej as follows: "His name was Woniański, [though] others called him Wojnicki (sometimes Woiński), [and he came] from Kościan, a town in Greater Poland, a cobbler's son. After studying in Cracow for a couple of years, he took a hunchbacked woman as his wife, a daughter of a burgher named Kaczycki, and had several sons with her. After the marriage, his father-in-law sent him to Italy to learn for a doctor. He became a doctor of medicine in Cracow in anno 1637" (this is actually the date of the doctorate of the later Bishop Ordinary of Kamieniec).¹⁹

Stanisław Wojeński's father Maciej, referred to in the above quotation, who most often undersigned as Woniański (presumably from the village of Woniaś near Kościan), but sometimes also as Woniaśki, Woniański, Woiński, or just Wojeński, actually came from Kościan burghers. He was thus a native of Greater Poland, who went to Cracow to study and in the summer semester of 1608 matriculated at the Faculty of Liberated Arts. In the relevant entry, he was referred to as "Matthias Alberti Voinski Costensis dioecesis Posnaniensis."²⁰ This Albert (Adalbert) was replaced by his grandson with Andrzej, supposedly a royal colonel (*colonellus regius*),²¹ in his genealogy. As early as March 1610, Maciej Wojeński graduated as a mas-

* A sarcastic title with a made-up Latin word adapted from Polish. An English equivalent might read: "Liber commonorum" or "The Book of Commoners" (editorial footnote).

¹⁹ W. N e k a n d a T r e p k a, *Liber generationis plebeanorum* ("Liber chamorum"), publ. W. D w o r z a c z e k, J. B a r t y ś, Z. K u c h o w i c z, vol. 1, Wrocław 1963, p. 617, no. 2322; vol. 2, Wrocław 1963, p. 212, no. 2322. Also Z. L a s o c k i, *O falsyfikatach w Archiwum Skarbcza Koronnego*, pp. 184 (note 12) and 188–189 (there is another example of the confusion of facts relating in turn to the academic education of M. Woniański and S. Wojeński, as well as a quote from J. Majer's work on the professors of the Faculty of Medicine of the Cracow Academy, where concerning the surname the father of the later bishop we have: "Written in various ways, as Woiński, Woniański, Woniaśki – so many that one cannot even be sure what his actual name was, because even if we can see Woniaśki in his own writings, there again in the handwritten genealogy of his family the surname Wojeński appears").

²⁰ *Album studiosorum Universitatis Cracoviensis*, vol. 4: *Ab anno 1607 ad annum 1642*, ed. J. Z a t h e y, Cracoviae 1950, p. 6.

²¹ Zygmunt Lasocki, perceptive in his analyses and aptly exposing the falsifications contained in the fictitious genealogy of the Wojeński family, at that point apparently trusted the very arguments he criticised, believing that this was indeed the name of the paternal grandfather of the later Bishop of Kamieniec Podolski (which is contradicted by the quoted entry in the Cracow Academy registry). He notes: "His grandfather, Andrzej Wojeński, is referred to in a number of documents [in the manuscript *Flamma rediviva*] – including the marriage act concluded on 21st November 1582 in Kościan between 'generosus Andreas Venetius Woienski, Sacrae Regiae Maiestatis rothmagister, et Justina a Brzezno.' The veracity of the act is confirmed not only by a public notary present at the ceremony, but – quite incredibly – even by the Primate [Stanisław] Karnkowski! There is also a transcript of a document by Władysław IV of

ter of liberated arts and doctor of philosophy, after which he began lecturing at his maternal faculty as a *docent extraneus*. This shows his abilities as well as resourcefulness, which he demonstrated also at later stages of his academic career, eventually reaching the office of the University's Rector (and earlier a post of deputy chancellor). Soon he also started studying medicine and already in April 1610 he had an exam for the first degree, and in March 1613 for the second degree after which – to complete his education – he briefly went for the Apennine Peninsula. His destination was Padua, where he was entered into the Polish Nation's registry between 16 October and 15 December 1613, and a couple of months later, on 14 February 1614, graduated as a doctor of medicine and shortly thereafter return to Poland.²²

Still before his departure abroad, Maciej Wojeński (or Woniejski) married Ewa Kaczycka, daughter of Stanisław, whose surname was changed in the line of nobility of his son after he joined the Wawel Cathedral Chapter to Kacicka (and assigned to the Trąby [Horns] coat of arms). She gave her husband two sons, the elder of them was the future bishop (so he got his Christian name after his mother's father), and the younger was Władysław, the latter in his adult years joined the clergy too, coming to the dignity of the dean (or archdeacon) of Kielce.²³ Maciej's three other children, Jan, Aleksander and Ludwik Wojeński, were presumably born of his second wife, Aleksandra Barbara Ochocka. Although one can find an opinion in the literature that his second marriage remained childless, we think that the well-informed Kasper Niesiecki, the author of the armorial *Korona polska*, was right. As a Jesuit, he probably knew personally the youngest of the half-brothers of Bishop Stanisław

14th February 1643, in which the King states that the Crown Metric files contain a record of moving of Wawendorff estate in the district of Parnawa by Jerzy Fahrensbeck 'generoso Andree Woienski de Brzezie,' quoting a transumpt of a document by King Sigismund III of 31st January 1588 concerning this transaction. There is no trace of such an item in the Register of the Polish Crown from 1588, which has been very well preserved, while the Register from 1643 misses a certain number of pages, as the entries start as late as 14th March 1643. Apparently the pages which allegedly contained the document of Władysław IV concerning this transaction by Andrzej Wojeński were lost in some way. The royal secretary, Father [Stanisław] Wojeński, may have known something about it."

²² For the biography of Maciej Woneski vel Woniejski see, i.a., J. L a c h s, *Kronika lekarzy krakowskich XVII w.*, Poznań 1929, pp. 41–42; *Bibliografia polska*, vol. 33, ed. S. E s t r e i c h e r, Kraków 1939, pp. 328–329 (also p. 206); *Historia nauki polskiej*, ed. B. S u c h o d o l s k i, vol. 6: *Dokumentacja bio-bibliograficzna*, ed. L. H a j d u k i e w i c z, Wrocław–Warszawa–Gdańsk–Kraków 1974, pp. 763–764 ("Woniejski [Wojniejski] Maciej (ca. 1590–1648), son of Wojciech from Kościan, apparently took his surname from the village of Wonesiec [Woniejsć] near Kościan. He was supposed to have come from a noble family, but in fact was ennobled only in 1633"); Z. P i e t r z y k, *Poczet rektorów Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego...*, p. 174. Also W. W i s ł o c k i, *Katalog rękopisów Biblioteki Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego*, vol. 1, pp. 827–828, no. 3886.

²³ See *Klerycy z ziem polskich, litewskich i pruskich święceni w Rzymie (XVI – pocz. XX w.)*, ed. S. J u j e c z k a, Wrocław 2018, p. 81, no. 237 (Ladislaus Wojeński, Dean of Kielce).

Wojeński, Ludwik, born on 8 January 1634 (his parents' marriage used to be erroneously dated around 1640), who also joined the Society of Jesus and after holding high functions in the order, died in 1707 in Lublin. The aforementioned Aleksander Wojeński, born on 24 February 1628 in Cracow, was also counted among the spiritual sons of St. Ignatius Loyola, and died probably on 21st February 1661 in Gdów, where Stanisław was a rector (curate), which we will deal with later.²⁴ Aleksandra Barbara Ochocka presumably had a daughter Konstancja, who also entered the path of consecrated life and became a Bernardine nun in Cracow, assuming the monastic name of Salomea (later her example was emulated by Aleksandra Wojeńska, of monastic name Ludwika, born in 1680, daughter of Jan and Anna Mikołajczowska, thus a niece of Bishop Ordinary of Kamieniec).²⁵

After Maciej Worieski's return from Padua to Cracow, the city with which he remained bound until the end of his life, his career gathered momentum. In April of 1615, he was given a chair of anatomy at the faculty of medicine of the Cracow Academy, and in 1618 was additionally appointed as a physician of the Piotr of Poznań foundation. Quite unusual, however, was the nomination in 1619 of this relatively little-known professor as deputy chancellor of *Almae Matris Cracoviensis* by Bishop of Cracow Marcin Szyszkowski. Maciej Wojeński became famous in 1622, when combining medical knowledge with organisational talents during the plague raging in the city, he was able to prevent it from spreading, and then to quench the threat altogether. No wonder, therefore, that he was later elected mayor of Cracow, while being the city's councillor from 1619. All these promotions, however, did not satisfy his ambitions, so he sought ennoblement for himself and his descendants, in which he succeeded in 1633, when during the coronation ceremonies of Władysław IV in Cracow on 6 February, he was dubbed a so-called golden knight, which was tantamount to acceptance to the knightly estate²⁶ (he was then given the coat of arms of Płomień [Flame], the same as the

²⁴ L. Grzebień, *Słownik jezuitów polskich 1564–1990*, vol. 12, Kraków 1993 (typescript), p. 108 (Aleksander Wojeński “joined [the Society of Jesus] on July 24, 1649 in Rome, [and] most probably came to Poland in 1659. He died on February 21, 1661 in Gdów or on 12 or 14 of March, 1661 in Cracow”); *Encyklopedia wiedzy o jezuitach na ziemiach Polski i Litwy 1564–1995*, ed. L. Grzebień, Kraków 1996 [2004²], p. 753.

²⁵ M. Borkowska, *Leksykon zakonnic polskich epoki przedrozbiorowej*, vol. 2: *Polska Centralna i Południowa*, Warszawa 2005, pp. 217–218 (also p. 210 [Rozalia Wońska] and p. 248 [Justyna Wońska]).

²⁶ See J. M. Mićha, *Nobilitacje cudzoziemców: Gabriela Bekesza i Franciszka Wesseliniego*, “Rocznik Polskiego Towarzystwa Heraldycznego” 8, 19 (2008), p. 82 (ibid. note 56): “The title of ‘the gold knight’ (*equus auratus*) was considered a substitute of ennoblement, [nonetheless] T. Szulc is of the opinion that if the golden knighthood was not conferred together with ennoblement, it did not grant nobility rights to the recipient.” The study cited here: T. Szulc, «*Equus auratus*» w dawnej Rzeczypospolitej, “Acta Universitatis Lodziensis. Folia Iuridica” 38, 1988, pp. 59–97 (p. 79): “Wojeński, Cracow

coat of arms of Zadora of Brzezie nobility – but dignified even more by adding a royal sword).

Although the ennoblement was earned by more than twenty years of service at the Cracow Academy and certified by a diploma of 10 February 1633,²⁷ it did not have the confirmation of the Diet, which was considered essential for its legitimacy, and hence it was questioned by Wojciech Drachowski in 1638; nevertheless Maciej Wojeński managed to get through this troublesome situation.²⁸ In the following year,

councilor” – with reference solely to *Liber generationis plebeanorum* by W. N e k a n d a T r e p k a [see above note 19]).

²⁷ Z. L a s o c k i, *O falsyfikatach w Archiwum Skarbcza Koronnego*, pp. 183–184: „On account of the timeless merits of one of the members of the Cracow Academy, Maciej Wojeński, who had diligently performed his scholarly pursuits for over twenty years, on the third day after the coronation (Feb 7, 1633) of [king] Władysław IV, was conferred knighthood by the king and simultaneously – on royal authority – was together with all his progeny included in the nobility of the Kingdom of Poland. At the same time, the king declared that from a letter of Emperor Ferdinand II, Maciej Wojeński was known to him to be a nobleman of the Holy Roman Empire. [...] The king granted him permission to use the crest he was using in the Empire, exalting it with an addition of the royal sword; eventually, he announced he called him Plomenius Wojeński” (hereafter, there goes a remark: “this diploma of nobility [...] was referred to by M. Wojeński when Wojciech Drachowski accused him of a lack of nobility. [...] The dispute reached the king, who stated that on his coronation he had granted the nobility privilege to Maciej Wojeński and accepted him to the knightly estate, which had been done based on the rights of his Royal Majesty and of the long-standing customs of the Kingdom connected with the act of coronation. [Therefore] Drachowski was sentenced according to the laws of the Kingdom [however] from a legal point of view, it is uncertain whether the verdict was justified. In accordance with the 1601 constitution, the king was not in power to grant nobility without the consent of the Diet, while a customary right of ennoblement in the event of coronation was not mentioned there at all”). Also *Album armorum nobilium Regni Poloniae XV–XVIII saec. Herby nobilitacji i indygenatów XV–XVIII w.*, publ. B. T r e l i ń s k a, Lublin 2001, pp. 290–291, no. 723 (“Maciej Wojeński, Cracow burgher, came from Pszczyna [*sic*], and his family originates from Germany, where it was granted nobility by emperor Ferdinand II. The change of the surname to Plomienius Wojeński – Cracow, February 10, 1633”).

²⁸ See previous footnote. Also Z. L a s o c k i, *O falsyfikatach w Archiwum Skarbcza Koronnego*, p. 183: “In the Cracow land register [in the year 1647], there is a note with the heading *Woienski manifestatur*, [where] Maciej Wojeński states that on the third day after the coronation of His Majesty the King and with no action of his own, he was summoned by His Majesty’s *motu proprio* for the accolade and further that on the power of His Majesty *motu proprio* he was issued the privilege which he was obliged to accept with due respect. [...] Lest this privilege, however, cause any misconception regarding his ancient noble descent, he enters hereby this protestation and concurrent declaration of his ancient nobility affirmed by documents and his lineage. Somewhat unclear wording of the document made it evident that a bizarre error might have occurred resulting in the owner of so eminent descent being granted nobility by the then king Władysław IV, soon after the coronation, against his own will; at the time Maciej Wojeński humbly accepted this grace from the king and protested against the ennoblement only fourteen years later.”

1639, he was elected the rector of the Cracow University and he held this post for the next three semesters – until the autumn 1640.²⁹

Such an extraordinary biography of the father of the later Bishop proves that he was able to win trust and favour of high-ranking people, as he was supported by King Władysław IV or Bishop Marcin Szyszkowski. He was also to have particularly close contacts and good relations with the clergy, which could have led to as many as four of his five sons choosing to serve God in the future. Maciej Wojeński died in Cracow on 13th September 1648, obtaining the dignity of burgrave of Myślenice by the end of his life. During sixty years of his life he accrued a considerable fortune, which included, among others, three tenement houses in the royal capital city (two in the Main Square and one in Floriańska Street) and villages Minoga, Nowa Wieś, Rzeźuśnia, and Skalka. Owing to their father's prudence, the start of his children into adult life was greatly facilitated (nonetheless only one of his sons, Jan, married and had children, while the others, as already mentioned, became clergymen), although he did not leave all of the accumulated money to their disposal, having established e.g. a scholarship foundation for medical students in Cracow.³⁰

Being the eldest of the siblings, Stanisław turned out to continue in many ways the path set out by his father. He also studied at the Faculty of Liberated Arts in the Cracow Academy, where he matriculated still in his teen years in the winter semester of 1629 (“Stanislaus Matthiae Woyniesky, doctoris medicinae et consulis Cracoviensis, procancellarii Academiae, filius”).³¹ Anyway, it was probably in Cracow that he spent his childhood and youth and was to have closest bonds with this city through the rest of his life, although he got his education not only in the capital of the Kingdom of Poland, but also in the countries of the Reich and Bologna, where it was him and not his parent to obtain his doctorate in 1637; contrary to his father, he also dropped the surname Woneski *vel* Wojnieski (which forms appeared still in matriculation registry) in favour of Wojeński. The later bishop's church career and the people to drive his ascent have not been properly uncovered yet,³² but a number of important details can be found

²⁹ Z. Pietrzyk, *Poczet rektorów Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego...*, p. 174; *Poczet sołtysów, wójtów, burmistrzów i prezydentów miasta Krakowa (1228–2010)*, ed. B. Kasprzyk, Kraków 2010, s. 580, no. 472 (B. Kasprzyk).

³⁰ J. Michalewicz, M. Michalewiczowa, *Fundationes pecuniariae Universitatis Jagellonicae in saeculis XV–XVIII*, Kraków 1999, pp. 436–437, no. 785 (the fund for poor students of medicine).

³¹ *Album studiosorum Universitatis Cracoviensis*, vol. 4, p. 126 (“A.D. MDCXXIX, commutatione hiberna, in rectoratu quarto reverendi domini Danielis Sigonii Leloviensis”).

³² Cf. Z. Lasocki, *O falsyfikatach w Archiwum Skarbcza Koronnego*, p. 179–180: “It is not known where and when he was born. We do know, however, that he completed his studies at the university in Cracow and at various universities in Germany, stayed at the emperor's court, and subsequently studied

in the files of Stanisław Wojeński's information process for the dignity of Bishop Ordinary of Kamieniec, which will be discussed further on. Probably in 1645 (or maybe already in 1642), he became an archdeacon of Pilica (thus a prelate of that collegiate chapter), while in 1649 he was granted the title of (proto)notary apostolic (at the time, it did not give its holder the right to use a mitre and some other pontificals as it is the case today) and in the same year he was delegated by Bishop Ordinary of Cracow Piotr Gembicki to perform an inspection of the Pilica archdeaconry. Probably thanks to the support of queen Maria Ludwika Gonzaga, the wife of Władysław IV and John II Casimir, he became one of royal secretaries and was entrusted with various diplomatic missions, in which – on top of his innate skills – his command of foreign languages was of great help. He was particularly involved in the French affairs (also after the death of the queen in 1667), which also became apparent during the interregnum of 1668–1669, when he actively supported Prince of Condé's efforts to get the Polish throne. Wojeński was even to be entrusted with a responsible mission of going secretly to Hungary (this country is yet to appear many a time in this paper) in order to meet the French candidate for ruling the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and then securely bring him *incognito* through the lands of the Habsburgs to Poland. That political commitment would after years be raised against the clergyman by those who opposed his promotion to the episcopate (see below).

Wojeński had encountered serious adversities already earlier in his ecclesiastical career when he strived to be admitted into the Cracow Cathedral Chapter, customarily referred to as *seminarium episcoporum*, as in the 16th, 17th and 18th centuries there were many representatives of the episcopate of the Commonwealth of Both Nations among its members. The then archdeacon of Pilica also wished to belong to this body, but (despite he received an appropriate presentation from the king) it was pointed out at the subsequent sessions of the Chapter – on 24th and 31st July 1660 – that accepting this candidate was not possible due to difficulties in proving his noble origin.³³ Only

in Bologna. He was ordained priest in Rome. Having returned home, he was a king's secretary and was entrusted with a mission to the Prince of Condé in France by John II Casimir. He was of service to magnates, especially the Lubomirskis. For instance, as a substitute for the house of Lubomirski, he went to Frankfurt where the election of the emperor was taking place.” In the context of this information, it is worth noting that the father of the later Bishop of Kamieniec, Maciej Worieski, was the author of the commemorative print *Panegyrycus funebris super Joachimo Lubomirski, Dobcicensi capitaneo (Bibliografia polska, vol. 33, pp. 328–329)*, published in 1610 in Cracow.

³³ Cf. Z. L a s o c k i, *O falsyfikatach w Archiwum Skarbca Koronnego*, p. 180: “Having received the king's designation and an institution from the Cracow bishop, S. Wojeński came to take up the canonry, bringing witnesses for the demonstration of his nobility [...] however, was not accepted. Notwithstanding numerous documents attesting to the ancient descent and eminency of the Wojeński family, the chapter was very meticulous in verifying the demonstration [and] rejected the witnesses presented by S. Wojeński: one of them, Mokrski, on account that he was not kin but merely a brother-in-law of Wojeński; another – Bębnowski – for he was not a land-owner; witnesses from the part of the paternal

when after more than a year the aforementioned manuscript of *Genealogia familiae Woïensciorum*,³⁴ based on forgeries, was presented to the Diet of Warsaw in May 1661 along with a special document issued by King John II Casimir (surely it was just in these circumstances that the manuscript got into the Cracow Chapter Archives), the summoned witnesses testified under oath before the canons from the Wawel Chapter, confirming the knightly descent of Stanisław Wojeński; finally, on August 20, 1661, he was accepted to the canonry *fundi Rzemienczyce*,³⁵ while the details concerning his descent were written down into the Chapter's register as follows: "Perillustris et admodum reverendus dominus Stanislaus Woinski ex nobilibus parentibus, videlicet patre Matthia Woinski de Brzezie ex palatinatu et districtu Cracoviensi, armorum Płomiencyk, matre vero Eva Kaciczka ex palatinatu et districtu Cracoviensi, armorum Trąby, avia paterna Justina Brzezinska ex terra Dobrzynensi, armorum Kroże, avia materna Catharina Molendzionka, palatinatus Cracoviensis, armorum Griff, procedit existatque oriundus."³⁶ As Łętowski wrote in *Katalog biskupów, prałatów i kanoników krakowskich*: "he joined our chapter in 1661, having it difficult to prove

and maternal grandmothers, Brzeziński and Andrzej Molenda, were not accepted for the testimony either" (ibidem, p. 189, the author points out that the Molendas were "burghers of Myślenice who started to play noblemen in the first half of the 17th century").

³⁴ See above footnote 4.

³⁵ On this also Z. L a s o c k i, *O falsyfikatach w Archiwum Skarbcza Koronnego*, pp. 180–182: "Stanisław Wojeński umieścił w swoim rękopisie odpisy dokumentów dotyczących swojego procesu z kapitułą krakowską i wyvodu szlachectwa przed sądem sejmowym. Proces zakończył się zupełnym jego zwycięstwem, uznaniem jego pochodzenia od ośmiu pokoleń znakomitych i zasłużonych przodków, wreszcie kapitulacją kapituły, która go do grona swojego przyjęła. [...] Król trzymał oczywiście [w sprawie] stronę swojego sekretarza, używanego do tajnych zleceń, nadto zapewne urażony był nieuwzględnieniem swojej prezeny przez kapitułę. [Zarazem] Wojeński cieszył się protekcją możnych panów, jak Lubomirscy i Lanckorońscy – zwłaszcza ci [ostatni] byli związani z nim wspólnym interesem [mowa o fałszerstwie genealogii Zadorów], a przegraniem sprawy przez księdza Wojeńskiego i zakwestionowaniem dokumentów, którymi się wywodził, byłiby skompromitowani. [...] Po przegranej procesie kapituła zrezygnowała tedy z dalszej walki i dopuściła świadków do przysięgi, [a] był między nimi krewny Wojeńskiego po matce Molenda [i] jakiś kleryk mniejszych święceń Stocki, [którzy] po zaprzysiężeniu stwierdzili, że ojciec Stanisława był herbu Zadora, matka – Ewa Kaczycka – herbu Trąby, babka ojczysta – Justyna Brzezińska – herbu Kroje, babka macierzysta – Katarzyna Molendzianka – herbu Gryf."

³⁶ Archives of the Metropolitan Chapter of Cracow, AAct 15, ff. 379r–380v (dated 20th August, 1661: "Receptio illustrissimi et admodum reverendi domini Stanislai Woinski, archidiaconi Pilcensis, ad canonicatum fundi Rzemienczyce"); cf. ibidem, ff. 336v–337v i 338r–v (24th and 31st July 1660, respectively, where one can find more about difficulties for Wojeński to prove his nobility, who was then unable to provide the requested documents or to present suitable witnesses to the Chapter, as he had only two of them instead of required four, hence the reception was postponed "ad pleniorem numerum testum," i.e. when the requirement in the Chapter statutes to bring four witnesses to make a proper case is fulfilled). Published in: *Wypisy źródłowe do biografii polskich biskupów i opatów z czasów Rzeczypospolitej Obojga Narodów oraz niewoli narodowej doby zaborów (XVI–XIX w.)*, part 4, ed. K. R. P r o k o p, "Archiwa,

noble descent on his father side, [but] the Lanckorońskis helped him with his genealogy by considering [themselves] to be of the same kin as the Wojeńskis.³⁷ However, this “act of getting his way” was to bear grave consequences in the future, because it would never be forgotten by his confraters from the chapter.

Having well remembered this humiliating experience, when a dozen or so years later he was appointed to a deputation of the Diet for making inspection of the documents held in the Crown Treasury Archive, being already the king’s nominee for bishopry, Wojeński abused public trust of his function to plant a few counterfeit privileges, supposedly coming from the 11th to 15th centuries, into this central archival collection of the Kingdom of Poland in order to provide evidence for the fictitious origin of the alleged ancestors of the shepherd of the Kamieniec Podolski diocese (1678/1679). These forgeries were then duly listed in the Crown Treasury’s official inventory of 1682, which was produced by the Diet’s deputation, and only later researchers exposed clearly that they are outright mystification and its perpetrator could be readily guessed.³⁸ In consequence, the name of Stanisław Wojeński appeared on

Biblioteki i Muzea Kościelne” 85 (2006), p. 371. See B. S. K u m o r, *Dzieje diecezji krakowskiej do roku 1795*, vol. 1, Kraków 1998, p. 660, no. 14 (see also *ibidem*, vol. 4, Kraków 2002, p. 70, no. 2).

³⁷ L. Ł ę t o w s k i, *Katalog biskupów, prałatów i kanoników krakowskich*, vol. 4, p. 236 (*ibidem* the information that Stanisław Wojeński was supposedly a son of “Maciej, burgrave of Myślenice, of Zadora coat of arms, and Ewa Kaczycka, the last heiress from this line”). Following this falsified genealogy, in respect to the Wojeńskis the 19th century author also stated that “they [were] of the same house as the Lanckorońskis. Stanisław, employed at the times of Casimir the Great as an envoy to Venetians with a legation about the Hungarian king, came to be called *Venetius* for the merits earned in this mission. *Venetius* transformed in time into *Weneta*, and [eventually] Wojeński” (Łętowski probably took this etymology from the manuscript *Genealogia familiae Wojeńsciorum*). See also above footnotes 13 and 14.

³⁸ See above footnote 15. Also *Volumina legum. Prawa, konstytucje y przywileje Krolestwa Polskiego, Wielkiego Xięstwa Litewskiego y wszystkich prowincyi należących*, vol. 5: *Ab anno 1669 ad annum 1697*, Sankt Petersburg 1860 [reprinted: Warszawa 1980], p. 284, no. 103 (*Konstytucje seymu grodzińskiego za Jana III roku 1678. Rewizya xiąg i przywilejow w Skarbcu Krakowskim będących*): “At the Cracow session of the coronation Diet, with the consent of all the estates, a constitution *titulo* ‘The Revision of the Crown Treasury’ was adopted wherein [the fact was observed that] the commissars appointed to verify the privileges located in the Cracow Treasury had not brought their endeavor *ad effectum*, therefore, with the consent of all the estates, on the power of the said constitution, we appoint the following for the verification the privileges: from the Senate, reverend father Stanisław Woinski, designated for the bishop of Kamieniec; noble Paweł Stokowski, castellan of Oświęcim; *ex equestri ordine* born duke Karol Czartoryski of Klewań, Cracow chamberlain, and Marcin Dembicki, Sandomierz chamberlain; Jan Lipski, *starosta* [administrator] of Sandecz and Czchów; Marcin Ustrzycki of Unichów, pantler of Zakroczym; Stanisław Tagoborski, pocillator of Nowogród; [and] Piotr Oraczowski, who having all come to Cracow *pro die* 18. in the month of August *anno* 1679, will deliver, on the public cost, all the said records and privileges from the Treasury where they are kept to the vaults of the Warsaw castle as a most secure location and will verify and inventory them, for the efforts and troubles of which Lord High Treasurer of the Crown will devise a salary for the said commissars from the reg-

the pages of historical studies in not too favourable a light and he would be rather harshly judged by scholars. However, they were not the first to feel obliged to reveal to third parties the controversial activities of this clergyman, whose ethical choices can be seen at the least as ambiguous.

During the reign of King Michał Korybut Wiśniowiecki, his career did not advance, which was probably due to the fact that the later Bishop of Kamieniec joined the political camp supporting the French candidate to the Polish throne. *A contrario* under the rule of pro-French King Jan III Sobieski, who – what is more – knew from his youth (he studied with his brother at the Cracow Academy) Maciej Wonieski vel Wojeński, a professor, deputy chancellor and rector of *Almae Matris*, the father of Stanisław, opened up before the already about sixty-year-old Pilica archdeacon and cathedral canon of Cracow, who in the meantime also became the provost of Międzyrzecz and the curate in Otwinów (earlier he possessed a parish in Gdów, of which we will write later), a chance to step up still higher in the clerical hierarchy. When in July or August 1676 the former Bishop Ordinary of Kamieniec Podolski Wespazjan Lanckoroński, well known to Wojeński, died in exile in Warsaw (after Podolia was occupied by the Turks in 1672), to whose kin – apparently with his permission³⁹ – he once attributed himself, having made up Lanckoroński's and Wojeński's common ancestor, Jan III Sobieski, just crowned as a monarch, designated the son of the former rector of the Cracow Academy as a new bishop of Kamieniec Podolski, issuing the relevant royal supplication on 14th February 1677 (by the way, more than nine months later, on 27 November 1677, in a letter from Andrzej Trzebicki, the Shepherd of the Diocese of Cracow, Wojeński is mentioned as “nuper a serenissimo rege nominatus ad Ecclesiam Camenecensem episcopus”), on which basis the then (1675–1681) apostolic nuncio to the Commonwealth of Both Nations, titular Archbishop of Corinth (later Latin patriarch of Jerusalem and eventually cardinal) Francis (Francesco) Martelli, started the candidate's information process already on 22nd February that year in order to be able to dispatch the relevant documentation to Rome, where a binding decision in this case was to be made.⁴⁰

The files of this process preserved in the Vatican Archives in the “Archivio Concistoriale” ensemble (the series “Processus Consistorialis”)⁴¹ have been well

ular revenues. The eminent commissars are required to execute a report to the Crown Treasury as well as presenting the inventory of the privileges.” Cf. Z. L a s o c k i, *O falsyfikatach w Archiwum Skarbca Koronnego*, p. 189ff.

³⁹ See also *ibidem*, pp. 186–187 (also above footnote 12).

⁴⁰ See *Acta nuntiaturae Poloniae*, vol. 1: *De fontibus eorumque investigatione et editionibus • Instructio ad editionem • Nuntiorum series chronologica*, ed. H. D. W o j t y s k a, Romae 1990, pp. 275–276.

⁴¹ Archivio Segreto Vaticano [hereinafter: ASV], Archivio Concistoriale, Processus Consistorialis, vol. 79, ff. 98r–125v (*Processus super vita, moribus, doctrina et idoneitate perillustris et admodum reverendi domini, domini Stanislai Woienski, canonici ecclesiae cathedralis Cracoviensis, ad*

known for long and also microfilmed, thus they can be readily studied by scholars in Poland.⁴² However, to date, little attention has been paid to a manuscript consisting of 25 loose charters (50 unnumbered pages) – 27 by 20 centimeters in size – entitled *Summarium processus coram illustrissimo et reverendissimo domino nuntio apostolico in Regno Poloniae fabricati super statu Ecclesiae Camenecensis et qualitatibus reverendissimi nominati*, included (in the Vatican Archives) in the ensemble “Segreteria di Stato.” (“Polonia” series).⁴³ While on the one hand, it comprises the same documents as the “Processus Consistorialis” series (excluding those relating to the condition of the Diocese of Kamieniec Podolski, but concerning the nominee only), on the other hand, it contains other documents which are not in that series. This summary was prepared for the Sacred Consistorial Congregation (Sacra Congregatio Consistorialis) in Rome in connection with the obstacles that could prevent entrusting Stanisław Wojeński with the bishop’s dignity along with jurisdiction over the Diocese of Kamieniec, which became known already during the information process in 1677, hindering its positive completion for the next three years. Such a long delay in granting the papal commission obviously had a detrimental effect not only for the candidate to the mitre himself, but also for the Polish monarch, who put forward this candidacy and presented it to the Holy See in his own name, hence its rejection would have been a glaring slight for the sovereign of the Commonwealth of Both Nations. This is reflected in the preserved in the same ensemble and series original letter of the then Bishop Ordinary of Łuck Stanisław Kazimierz Dąbbski (*nota bene* one of the witnesses testifying in the information process of S. Wojeński), dated Lvov, 23rd June 1678, concerning the issue of considerable delay in confirming the candidate by the successor of St. Peter.⁴⁴ It was probably addressed (there is no clear indication in the source) to the then Cardinal-Protector of the Polish Crown in the Roman Curia Pietro Vidoni (a former nuncio to the Commonwealth of Poland in 1652–1660). Only by looking at the content of all these documents together, we can better discern (although certainly in a way that is far

supplicationem serenissimi regis Poloniae ad ecclesiam cathedralem Camenecensem promovendi) – assigned to the year 1680 (although the process was actually carried out in 1677, the date of the papal commission is decisive).

⁴² *Polskie procesy informacyjne przed prowizjami biskupów i opatów w seriach «Processus Consistoriales» i «Processus Datariae» Archiwum Watykańskiego (1588–1906)*, comp. W. Cichosz, H. Fokciński, U. Głowacka-Maksymiuk, M. Pukianiec, E. Reczek, K. Sadowska and T. Zdziech (*Katalog mikrofilmów i zapisów cyfrowych. Wykaz Papieskiego Instytutu Studiów Kościelnych w Rzymie i Punktu Konsultacyjnego w Warszawie*), Warszawa 2015, p. 38, no. 213. See also *Hierarchia Catholica medii et recentioris aevi*, vol. 3: *A pontificatu Clementis PP. IX (1667) usque ad pontificatum Benedicti PP. XIII (1730)*, ed. R. Ritzler, P. Sefrin, Patavii 1952, p. 138.

⁴³ ASV, Segreteria di Stato, Polonia, vol. Additamenta 6 [no page numbers].

⁴⁴ *Ibidem* (fascicule *Memoriali, biglietti e carte diverse 1674–1688*).

from gaining a complete comprehension of the matter) what led to such a long vacancy at the bishopry in Kamieniec Podolski, which lasted from the summer of 1676 until the early spring of 1680. As has already been mentioned, these testimonies allow us to extract quite a lot of previously unknown information concerning Stanisław Wojeński's *curriculum vitae*, in which there are still many significant gaps.

Due to vastness of the source material that needs to be taken into account, it is difficult to go fully through it in the scope of this study, which is of a contributory nature to some extent. Therefore the writer of these words decided to take an indirect approach, weaving pieces of information taken from these documents into the further narrative, while some texts constituting coherent wholes, whose summary (or paraphrase) would only distract the reader, are provided in the form of an annex to this paper which references them when appropriate. It certainly is some inconvenience for the user that in order to learn the sources, they have to interrupt reading the main text and "jump" to the source appendix at the end. However, including extensive quotations in Latin in the main text would not be (in our opinion) too convenient a solution, either, hence the decision to adopt this particular way of presenting the collected material. But one can reasonably hope (concluding *per analogiam*) that within a relevant volume concerning the diplomatic mission of the papal nuncio Martelli (to appear at an undefined, at least for the time being, future date) within the scope of the source series *Acta nuntiaturae Poloniae*, planned for dozens (if not hundreds) of volumes, the documentation of the information process of Stanisław Wojeński will be duly included (also in the form of an annex) so the users will have a comprehensive picture of the relevant sources. However, since it is impossible to predict when and if at all this material will be edited within the scope of the *Acta nuntiaturae Poloniae series* (the publishers of the nunciature files provide files from information processes for the bishoprics selected at their own discretion only as *exemplum* and not as an obligatory element of editing the documents relating to the activity of a particular nuncio), therefore the present publication does not seem to constitute an unjustified anticipation of the expected future achievements of the source editing in Poland, for the modern standards anyway far from satisfactory.

As mentioned above, following a presentation from King Jan III Sobieski issued in the monarch's chancery on Sunday [*sic*] 14th February 1677, containing the candidate's designation (as perceived by the Roman Curia, while the Polish side considered such an act to be actually an appointment)⁴⁵ for the bishop's see in Kamieniec Podolski, on Monday, February 22nd of the same year, the nuncio Francesco Martelli began the information process "super vita, moribus, doctrina et idoneitate domini Stanislai Woienski, canonici Cracoviensis, ac super statu Ecclesiae Camenecensis tam ante quam post deditionem factam Turcis," which was in his due competence as

⁴⁵ Por. B. Szadły, *Prawo patronatu w Rzeczypospolitej w czasach nowożytnych. Podstawy i struktura*, Lublin 2003, pp. 35–40.

a representative of the successor of St. Peter in the country. Unusual and probably not too common in such trials was the fact that right on its first day, a clergyman entitled to this kind of motions appeared before the nuncio (who by then already customarily resided in Warsaw as a royal residence) and requested from Archbishop Martelli abandoning the proceedings involving examination of the candidate's eligibility for episcopal dignity on the grounds that "dominus canonicus Woienski est irregularis propter multa enormia et gravissima crimina ab ipso perpetrata."⁴⁶ While *de facto* the very objecting to the monarch's nomination (designation) seems somewhat intriguing, it is downright astonishing that it occurred merely a week after it was made official – exactly (as mentioned above) on the day that the information process in the Warsaw nunciature began. So one can readily presume that the actions taken were supported by powerful and influential figures belonging to the top political elite of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, who were intimately familiar with what was going on at the royal court, as in such short a time they were aware of expediting of the monarch's document, as well as of the precise date when Archbishop Martelli intended to proceed with the candidacy.

From the content of the protest that the canon of Wiślica Stanisław Sadowski, acting as "instigator fiscalis curiae episcopi Cracoviensis," submitted to the nunciature and requested to be included in the files of the trial, it is clear that it was brought forward to "nomine illustrissimi et reverendissimi domini episcopi sive eiusdem curiae," i.e. Bishop Ordinary of Cracow Andrzej Trzebicki, whose position in ecclesiastical and political life can well account for the precise (as well as immediate) knowledge about the King's appointment to one of the bishoprics of the Commonwealth and the information process about to begin (anyway, there were probably more people wishing to squash the candidature – starting with the clerics close to the monarch, who hoped that the Kamieniec mitre would be conferred one of them). In justification of his protest, the instigator of Wojeński's denunciation put forward accusations against the candidate for the bishop's dignity in five paragraphs of different length, of which probably just the last one (i.e. the fifth) indicates the actual reason behind the objection to the nomination in certain circles – namely, that in his earlier efforts to enter the Cracow Cathedral Chapter, the nominee "finxit se esse nobilem testesque a se inductos peierare fecit, qui contrarium certo scientes, iurarunt ipsum ex nobilibus [parentibus] esse progenitum." And now this «cobbler's grandson» (to paraphrase the way that Walerian Nekanda Trepka referred to his parent) was about to rise to even higher prominence and become a member of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Both Nations as the Bishop Ordinary of Kamieniec.⁴⁷

Undoubtedly aware of the fact that – in the light of the Church law – non-noble origin was no canonical obstacle to claiming the bishop's dignity, and from the per-

⁴⁶ Cf. *Appendix I.1.*

⁴⁷ See above footnote 19.

spective of the Roman Curia, an accusation against Wojeński that he has burger roots would certainly not be considered as a disqualifying feature (in contrast to inciting witnesses to give false testimonies and resorting to deception, which was the main focus of the document), the earlier paragraph of the “complaint” indicated a much more significant circumstance that the candidate for the mitre “non est devotus, nam observatus fuit per multos tempus officium Divinum, videlicet horas canonicas, non recitasse, qua de re monitus [fuit] ab illustrissimo domino loci ordinario,” which was clearly undesirable in someone to become one of the “apostolic successors.” On the other hand, the opponents of Wojeński’s appointment were probably aware that such a charge would be difficult to prove during the process because many a clergyman from the royal entourage (and not only) would be more than ready to testify that the nominee for the bishopric of Kamieniec Podolski can be considered an exemplary and zealous priest, and declarations of this kind were actually to be found later in the files of the process. For this reason, in the second and third paragraphs of the canon Sadowski’s protest, the candidate for the mitre was presented as a troublemaker involved in acts of the anti-imperial opposition in Hungary, which aimed at deposing the Habsburgs from their rule over the lands of the Crown of St. Stephen and seeking help from the Turks.⁴⁸

Acting to the detriment of the Habsburg dynasty, which vitally supported the Papacy at the time – and moreover to an advantage of the Ottoman Empire (perceived at that time as a fundamental threat to the Old Continent) – was surely a cause for concern in the Roman Curia because it was not in the interest of the Holy See to nominate a bishop who would be seen as *persona non grata* at the imperial court, all the more so to a bishopric which territory remained under Turkish rule. When making such an allegation against Stanisław Wojeński, the authors of the “complaint” had in mind specifically the anti-Habsburg conspiracy in 1664–1671 of the palatine Francis (Ferenc) Wesselényi in the aftermath of the successful war with Turkey in 1663–1664, which opened the door to further offensive actions attempting to liberate the rest of the lands of the Crown of St. Stephen from the Ottoman yoke. “Meanwhile, instead of unleashing an offensive, the Viennese court rushed to make peace with the Turks at Vasvár (1664), [which] triggered a new wave of bitterness among the Hungarian nobility [as] the conduct of the Viennese court was widely regarded as a treason. In this atmosphere, some of the Hungarian gentlefolk tried to seek support in Turkey [...]. ‘The whole Christian world,’ wrote the palatine Wesselényi, ‘will be surprised that we are breaking away from our crowned King and making our master our greatest enemy, but there is no other way. [...] The so-called Wesselényi conspiracy has not reached [however] any wider scale, nor put into action any forces capable of putting up a fight, [but] has limited itself to a few magnates with adventurous plans, such as abduction and imprisonment of Emperor

⁴⁸ See *Appendix I.1*.

Leopold I. Thus, after the leader of the conspiracy, the palatine Francis Wesselényi, died, its other members [...] were unable to control the situation and, for fear of triggering peasant revolts, did not take any decisive action. [...] Wesselényi's conspiracy became [nevertheless] a convenient pretext for Emperor Leopold I establishing absolutism in Hungary' (W. Felczak).⁴⁹

The name Wesselényi also appears in the first paragraph of the protest, where the most serious accusation in terms of substance against the candidate for the mitre was made (taking into account that it was brought to the very forefront of those “*multa enormia et gravissima crimina*” which canon Stanisław Wojeński was supposed to have committed), namely the alleged necromancy (*negromantia*), which was incriminating for a clergyman. Considering that the term is rather rarely used today and some changes in its meaning could be observed in the course of the centuries, we should not limit ourselves to mentioning the suspicion of this kind of misconduct (if it is not too delicate a term in this context), but it seems right to elaborate on it; all the more so because the documentation of Wojeński's trial for the bishopric does not provide enough information to account for the guilt imputed to the later Bishop Ordinary of Kamieniec Podolski. As the author of a recent paper “«*Nekromancja*» w historii języka polskiego” notes: “even though the lexeme evoked has its roots far back in antiquity, it was confirmed surprisingly late in the Polish language, [because] only in Linde's *Słownik* [języka polskiego], [where it means] ‘to evoke souls from the other world.’ Necromancy was explained in an almost identical way in *Słownik wileński* (‘evoking spirits of the dead’), but this lexicon gave also the terms for necromancy practitioners, i.e. ‘nekroman’ and ‘necromantes.’ The first of these lexemes had a general meaning, since it referred to most people practicing magic, so the followers of both black and white magic as well as fortune-tellers, [while] the second word (*nekromantes*) [...] characterized ‘a person who through the black or white magic methods predicts a close death to someone along with its kind and precise day’” (Z. Krótki),⁵⁰ which could have been indeed the meaning of the accusations made against Stanisław Wojeński.

⁴⁹ W. Felczak, *Historia Węgier*, Wrocław–Warszawa–Kraków–Gdańsk–Łódź 1983², pp. 150–151 (also p. 160). See also *A History of Hungary*, ed. E. Pámlényi, London–Wellingborough 1975, pp. 166, 171; *Slovenské dejiny od úsvitu po súčasnosť*, Bratislava 2015, pp. 167–170 (subchapt. *Krátká vojna z Osmanskou ríšou a sprisahanie palatína Vešelénihó* – by I. Mrva); I. Mrva, *Politické dejiny Spiša v kontexte strednej Európy (1526–1711)*, [in:] *Historia Scepusii*, vol. 2: *Dejiny Spiša od roku 1526 do roku 1918*, ed. M. Homza, S. A. Sroka, Bratislava 2016, pp. 181–189 (subchapt. *Sprisahanie magiánov* [ibidem, p. 182, fig. 90 – a portrait of F. Wesselényi]). Also L. Kościelek, *Historia Słowacji*, Wrocław 2010, pp. 198nn; *Chronológia dejín Slovenska a Slovákov*, ed. V. Dangl, V. Bystrický, Bratislava 2014, p. 212 (under the date 23rd March 1667); and literature indicated in footnote 91.

⁵⁰ Z. Krótki, «*Nekromancja*» w historii języka polskiego, “*Studia Językoznawcze. Synchroniczne i Diachroniczne Aspekty Badań Polszczyzny*” 15 (2016), pp. 185–186 [the entire article on pp. 183–194]; ibidem further remark that “*nekromantes* were associated with both white and black magic, however the lexeme indicated exclusively a person who foretells the end of life, a fortuneteller or a magician.”

Significantly enough, the quoted author stresses – after the earlier literature – that “a necromancer should be an ardent Catholic, ‘as otherwise he will undoubtedly bring doom upon himself’” (how then does this relate to the accusation articulated in one of the subsequent paragraphs of the “complaint” that the clergyman in question is not pious enough and neglects God’s service?), supplying also a quote from literature that “every educated mind has delved into astrological research – a merchant or cardinal, a condottiere or a monk has often sought consolation in the prophecies of a necromancer,” in which a necromancer can also mean an astrologer.⁵¹ Notwithstanding that this aspect of meaning should also be taken into account in the accusation made against Wojeński, it does not change the fact that in the first place “the analyzed word [i.e. necromancy] undoubtedly characterized the entire, sometimes complicated, magical ritual, serving to gain knowledge through the souls of the deceased about what will happen in future, [while] evoking spirits for any other purposes does not fall within the scope of this analysis.”⁵² Then Z. Krótki notes that although “the very word *necromancy* indeed did not appear in the Polish lexical resources of the old and middle epoch, [but] actually the term *nigromancja* was used, [...] where *nigro* was ‘black’ and *mancja* ‘divination.’ Although nigromancy could be expected to denote evil predictions or black magic, already in Michał of Wrocław calendar from 1494, a quotation [...] was confirmed in which that word means ‘evoking spirits.’ Only a century later, necromancy became a taboo subject, [and] the reason behind this was probably the liquidation of the school of magic functioning in Cracow at the end of the 16th century” (further on there is a remark that “by the end of the Renaissance epoch, the school was closed down and its practitioners were repressed and tortured”).⁵³ The author concludes that “the necromancy described (and forbidden) in Scripture [as] a special kind of divination was practiced in Old Poland in the 15th, 16th and 17th centuries” and understood basically as “talking to the souls of the deceased, [however] in the case of magic sometimes it is not possible to draw a strict line between individual rituals. Necromancy should therefore be treated as a kind of introduction, a prelude to white or (more often) black magic.”⁵⁴ This was undoubtedly meant by those who for-

⁵¹ Ibidem, pp. 184 and 186.

⁵² Ibidem, p. 184. Ibidem, p. 190: “In the Middle Ages, the most frequent and popular term for evoking spirits was *nigromancja*.”

⁵³ Ibidem, pp. 186–187. Ibidem, p. 192: “In the 16th century, when a Cracow school of magic was established and started to attract Latin-speaking scholars from all over Europe, Latin *nigromantia* got adopted. Initially, the word was connected only with the academic idiom of the time. After the dissolution of the classified faculty of magic at the Cracow Academy, nigromancy has not been noted, it has become taboo.” See also R. Bugaj, *Nauki tajemne w Polsce w dobie odrodzenia*, Wrocław–Warszawa–Kraków–Gdańsk 1986. Moreover, M. Wawrzyniec, *Szkoła magii w Krakowie*, “Lud” n.s. 6, 26, 1927, pp. 69–70.

⁵⁴ Z. Krótki, «*Nekromancja*» w historii języka polskiego, p. 192. Cf. ibidem also a quotation from the work of ex-Jesuit Stanisław Poklatacki *Pogrom. Czarnoksiężskie błędy, latawców zdrady*

mulated the accusation against Wojeński for this type of practice, which could constitute an introduction *vel* a prelude (if to follow the above quotation) to other forms of the Church's completely forbidden practice of magical arts.⁵⁵

Coming back to our main topic, in the conclusion he made in his protest drawn into the files of the Warsaw nunciature, Sadowski demanded in the name of his principal (i.e. Bishop of Cracow) that the Nuncio F. Martelli “ex his rationibus” gave up “a conficiendo processu donec canonicus Woienski purgaverit se a tot obiectis sibi enormibus et gravissimis criminibus in iudicio illustrissimi domini loci ordinarii,” in which situation the diplomatic representative of the Holy See in the Commonwealth of Both Nations was not able to proceed to the next stages of investigating eligibility of the candidate for the mitre and recognizing the current state of the vacant diocese of Kamieniec Podolski, but deferred this case to Rome. In effect, it took half a year before, on 22nd August 1677 (i.e. after exactly six months), the titular Archbishop of Corinth got the opportunity to take another step in such a complicated matter by publishing a decree of the Consistorial Congregation in Rome of 16th July that year, issued “ad supplicationem domini Woienski, ad Camenecensem Ecclesiam promovendi,” by which it was nevertheless authorised to carry out an appropriate information process “super statu Ecclesiae Camenecensi et super qualitatibus eiusdem domini promovendi,” but at the same time setting a thirty-day deadline for “nomine illustrissimi et reverendissimi domini episcopi Cracoviensis sive eiusdem curiae” instigator Sadowski “ad deducendum coram dominatione sua illustrissima et reverendissima, tamquam apostolico delegato, quidquid habet contra ipsum dominum promovendum.”⁵⁶ Thus the apostolic delegate Martelli, designated

i alchimickie falsze (from 1595), where we read: “Nigromants have the audacity to present as a real thing that they resurrect the dead – singularly those who lived wantonly and lasciviously in their age or died a sudden death. However, nigromants cannot resurrect the dead as much as by virtue of confused senses they construct short-standing grotesques with their transient and false illusion. For had God admitted the fiend to the like power, then he would have allowed – if not in all entirety, at least in part – to employ the nigromantic science and to attest to the respectfulness thereof.”

⁵⁵ See i.a. B. Cz y ż e w s k i, *Nekromancja w wypowiedziach Kościoła od XIII wieku*, [in:] *Orygenes, Eustacjusz z Antiochii i Grzegorz z Nysy o wywoływaniu duchów*, ed. L. Nieściora, Kraków 2016, pp. 59–70; P. Wy g r a l a k, *Nekromancja w ocenie starożytnego Kościoła*, [in:] *Orygenes, Eustacjusz z Antiochii i Grzegorz z Nysy o wywoływaniu duchów*, ed. L. Nieściora, Kraków 2016, pp. 41–58. Also: *Religia. Encyklopedia PWN*, vol. 7, ed. T. G a d a c z, B. M i l e r s k i, Warszawa 2003, pp. 244–245 [also in: *Religie świata. Encyklopedia PWN (wierzenia – bogowie – święte księgi)*, Warszawa 2006, p. 583]; A. Z w o l i Ń s k i, *Wywoływanie duchów*, Radom 2007; i d e m, *Astrologia, wróżby, jasnowiedzenie i wywoływanie duchów*, Kraków 2008; S. Z a l e w s k i, *Obecność i działanie złych duchów podczas seansów spirytystycznych*, “*Studia Płockie*” 41 (2013), pp. 101–117. Cf. also R. K i e c k h e f e r, *Forbidden Rites. A Necromancer's Manual of Fifteenth Century*, State College [Pennsylvania] 1997; D. O g d e n, *Greek and Roman Necromancy*, Oxford 2001.

⁵⁶ See *Appendix I.2*.

to this matter, was to acquaint himself with hard evidence of guilt (and not only accusations), the delivery of which was expected from the aforesaid canon of Wiślica acting on behalf of the Bishop Ordinary of Cracow. However, it did not reach the Warsaw nunciature within the appointed period of time and therefore Wojeński appeared before the nuncio in person, requesting immediate commencing of regular proceedings. Indeed on the same day the Archbishop of Corinth accepted the testimony of the first two witnesses in the trial (about which we will talk later).

In the further part of the files handed over later by the Nuncio to the Eternal City, there is a document which refers to the chronologically earlier events that took place between 22nd August and 27th September 1677 and were directly related to the facts presented so far. After all, if the aforesaid decree of the Consistorial Congregation of 17th July that year was to have the desired effect and at the same time all was to be in accordance with the legally defined procedures, it had to be presented to the other party, i.e. to the person accusing Stanisław Wojeński of “gravissima crimina ab ipso perpetrata.” As we learn then, Marcin Leliński, a cleric (*clericus*) from the Diocese of Włocławek, who was given this task, searched for the canon Stanisław Sadowski in Cracow for three consecutive days from 15th September 1677 in order to hand over the relevant document (and to have this fact endorsed on a copy of the decree), but he was not let by the guards into the residence of the Bishops of Cracow, where the local consistory (*curia*) also had its seat, and as a consequence he was unable to accomplish the delivery, although he showed so much determination in performing his mission as to go to Wawrzeńczyce near Cracow, where the bishop’s manor house was located, “sed nec ibi dabatur ulla possibilitas intimandae citationis.”⁵⁷

Looking a bit ahead in relating the events, it should be stated that the nunciature did not limit themselves to one-off attempt to hand over the decree of the Consistorial Congregation to the other side, which is quite understandable because with no doubt it was expected at the Roman Curia that a thorough discernment would be made in the matter to what extent the accusations against the king’s nominee for the bishopric of Kamieniec Podolski are truthful, which could have been very difficult without the cooperation of those people who had put Wojeński into arraignment (or suspicion). Therefore, in another attempt to deliver the decree, Augustyn Watkiewicz *vel* Watkiewicz from the presbytery of the Gniezno archdiocese (this time not a *clericus*, but a priest) arrived in the diocese of Cracow in the late October 1677. Undoubtedly having beforehand gained a deeper insight into the matter, he went to Wiślica as the residence (*solitae residentiae*) of the instigator Stanisław Sadowski, and there in the first place left a copy of the decree “penes familia in domus eius” (and on the hands of the household members of the canon, who apparently was absent), and then paid a visit to the officiality of Wiślica, where, having presented the decree to the notary Krzysztof Marzewski (“notarius actorum cancellariae officialatus Vislicensis”), he

⁵⁷ See Appendix I.4.

was given a bad treatment – including short-term imprisonment – which caused a formal protest on the part of Watkiewicz, who made an appropriate note on this incident both on the original and on all copies of the decree of the Consistorial Congregation, so this note was duly included in the batch of documents of the information process carried out in the nunciature.⁵⁸

The process, as it was mentioned above, actually began on Monday, 27th September 1677, and first testimonies were given by two witnesses: the pantler of the Crown and the general governor of Cracow Jan Wielopolski (soon to be appointed Deputy Chancellor, and then Chancellor of the Crown) and general Franciszek (Francis) Andrault De Buy, the governor of Tczew. It does not seem reasonable to summarize here in detail everything that the testifying persons had to say about the candidate to the mitre during the verification proceedings; all the more so because the questions asked according to a uniform questionnaire usually received very similar answers. Nevertheless, it is worth to pay more attention to how the testimonies of witnesses bore on the issues related to the aforementioned accusation brought by instigator Sadowski. They were asked both about the descent of the candidate to the mitre (which corresponds to the fifth paragraph of the “complaint”), as well as about his piety and zeal in the service of the Church (fourth paragraph), whereas information relevant to the charges formulated in the second and third paragraphs (active support for the anti-Habsburg opposition in Hungary) appeared in the testimonies only in an indirect form while indicating various fields of activity or responsible missions Wojeński was entrusted with by his powerful principals. And the accusation of necromancy was not confirmed in the testimonies by a single word because on the one hand, the interrogations were carried out according to a fixed questionnaire (as mentioned above) which could not be supplemented *ad hoc* with additional questions for the purpose of a particular verification, while among the standard ones, for obvious reasons, there was no mention of a commitment to black magic (as it could in no way be presumed that a candidate for bishop’s dignity could engage in procedures so much in variance with the teaching of the Church),⁵⁹ and on the other hand, all but one witnesses (as it turned out) were favourably disposed to Wojeński, so even if they had heard about such accusations, they remained silent on the subject.

The first testimoner Jan Wielopolski (“dapifer Regni, capitaneus Cracoviensis, aetatis suae annorum 43”),⁶⁰ who got acquainted with the candidate to the bishopric of Kamieniec Podolski a quarter of a century earlier (“cognosco a 23.

⁵⁸ Ibidem.

⁵⁹ Listing of questionnaire questions in: ASV, Archivio Consistoriale, Processus Conistorialis, vol. 79, k. 99r–100r.

⁶⁰ *Herbarz polski Kaspra Niesieckiego...*, vol. 9, pp. 300–301; W. D w o r z a c z e k, *Genealogia*, cz. [2]: *Tablice*, Warszawa 1959, tabl. 153; *Urządnicy dawnej Rzeczypospolitej XII–XVIII wieku. Spisy*,

circiter annis perillustrem dominum Stanislaum Woienski, canonicum Cracoviensem, cum simus ex eodem Palatinatu”), stated on his descent only that satisfying the existing requirements in this respect was best demonstrated by the fact of his membership in the Cracow Cathedral Chapter (“scio natum esse ex legitimo matrimonio et honestis et catholicis parentibus, cum enim sit canonicus Cracoviensis, necessario debuit praecedere admissionem ipsius ad canonicatum probatio super dictis qualitatibus”). Nor did the pantler of the Crown in any way put in doubt the exemplary fulfilment of clerical obligations by the candidate (“scio ipsum esse frequentem in functionibus sui canonicatus Cracoviensis; item fuisse visitator archidiaconatus Pilcensis deputatum ab illustrissimo bonae memoriae [Petro] Gembicki, tunc episcopo Cracoviensi”), confirming also his education (“vidi testimonium Universitatis Bononiensis, in qua idem dominus canonicus promotus est ad doctoratum in utroque iure, quod testimonium puto datum esse anno 1637”) and the ecclesiastical benefices he got hold of (“quod sciam tria habere beneficia, videlicet canonicatum Cracoviensem, praeposituram Miedzyrzecensem et ecclesiam parochialem Otvinoviensem, et scio habere dispensationem apostolicam super pluralitate”).⁶¹

Testifying the same day as Wielopolski, General Franciszek Andrault De Buy (“capitaneus Derszaviensis”), who was also 43 years old (“aetatis suae annorum 43”)⁶² and had known Stanisław Wojeński for over two decades, namely from their joint stay at the court of the Grand Marshal (earlier Court Marshal) of the Crown Jerzy Sebastian Lubomirski (“iam ab annis 20 et ultra cognosco dominum canonicum Woienski, cum ipse tunc temporis esset apud illustrissimum excellentissimum dominum marescalcum Lubomirscium tamquam hospes et amicus, et ego militabam apud excellentiam suam”), in a similar vein referred to the fact that the clergyman belonged among the canons of Wawel Cathedral as an argument in the matter of his descent, but further pointed to the important circumstance that he had possessions in the Cracow province, having inherited estate from his mother (“cum idem dominus canonicus sit possessionatus in Palatinatu Cracoviensi et habeat bona dotalia reverendissimae matris, est argumentum, quod natus sit ex legitimo matrimonio et honestis parentibus, et multo magis cum sit canonicus Cracoviensis, cum ad canonicatum non introducantur nisi praevio rigoroso examine”). Similarly, when mentioning Wojeński’s doctorate in Bologna, he succinctly stated about his moral values and conduct:

ed. A. Gąsiorowski, vol. 10: *Urządnicy centralni i nadworniki Polski XIV–XVIII wieku. Spisy*, Kórnik 1992, according to index.

⁶¹ ASV, Archivio Consistoriale, Processus Conistorialis, vol. 79, k. 100v–101v (also in: ASV, Segreteria di Stato, Polonia, vol. Additamenta 6, b.p.).

⁶² *Herbarz polski Kaspra Niesieckiego...*, vol. 2, publ. J. N. Bobrowicz, Leipzig 1839 [reprinted: Warszawa 1989], p. 30; A. Boniecki, *Herbarz polski*, vol. 1, Warszawa 1899, p. 37; *Polska encyklopedia szlachecka*, p. 4, Warszawa 1936 [reprinted: Warszawa 1994], p. 101.

“Vidi ipsum semper ab omnibus aestimatum, neque unquam agnovi ipsum in vita aut moribus excessum.”⁶³

An even more significant position in the public life of the then Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth was held by the third witness testifying before the apostolic nuncio in the verification of Wojeński, as on Friday, 8th October 1677, the Grand Marshal of the Crown Stanisław Herakliusz Lubomirski (“princeps Sacri Romani Imperii, magnus Regni marescalcus”) appeared before the papal envoy in charge of the information process (“princeps Sacri Romani Imperii, magnus Regni marescalcus”)⁶⁴ and stated at the beginning: “Cognosco dominum promovendum ab ipsis inneuntibus annis, cum dominus ipsius pater esset familiaris domini avi et domini parentis mei eratque vir clarus et doctrina conspicuus.” Thus in a way he paid tribute to the memory of the deceased almost three decades earlier Maciej Wonieski *vel* Woiński, whose connections with the former generations of the Lubomirski family (we are talking about Stanisław, the province governor of Cracow in 1638–1649 and his son Jerzy Sebastian, the grand marshal and field hetman of the Crown) consisted probably in medical services, which were always highly valued at the magnate’s court, and on this basis we are entitled to conclude that Lubomirski must have known the Christian name (and surname) of the father of the nominee for the bishopric of Kamieniec Podolski. It is therefore significant that concerning the matter of his descent, the Grand Marshal of the Crown limited his testimony in the nunciature to a concise statement: “natus fuerit ex legitimo matrimonio atque honestis et catholicis parentibus,” thus not mentioning the name and especially the profession of Maciej Wonieski, while the word *familiaris* had a neutral overtone and did not determine the social status of a person so defined, the term *medicus* might raise suspicion of non-noble origin (although was not a decisive factor yet). In the conclusion of his speech during the information process, Stanisław Herakliusz Lubomirski said about the king’s nominee: “Existimo dominum promovendum esse idoneum ad bene regendum ecclesiam cathedralem, dum – ut supra dixi – pollet iis omnibus qualitatibus doctrinae, pietatis et prudentiae, quae in episcopo requiruntur.”⁶⁵

The day before, on 7th October 1677, the testimony in the nunciature was given by Tomasz Karol Wojewódka, “subdiaconus ex Palatinatu Podoliae,” who focused

⁶³ ASV, Archivio Consistoriale, Processus Conistorialis, vol. 79, k. 101v–102v (also in: ASV, Segreteria di Stato, Polonia, vol. Additamenta 6, b.p.).

⁶⁴ *Herbarz polski Kaspra Niesieckiego...*, vol. 6, publ. J. N. B o b r o w i c z, Leipzig 1841 [reprinted: Warszawa 1989], pp. 162–163; W. D w o r z a c z e k, *Genealogia*, part [2], tabl. 143; K. M a t w i j o w s k i, W. R o s z k o w s k a, *Lubomirski Stanisław Herakliusz herbu Szreniawa (ok. 1642–1702), marszałek wielki koronny, pisarz polityczny, poeta, prozaik, dramatopisarz*, [in:] *Polski słownik biograficzny*, vol. 18, Wrocław–Warszawa–Kraków–Gdańsk 1973, pp. 45–50; *Urządnicy dawnej Rzeczypospolitej...*, vol. 10, according to index.

⁶⁵ ASV, Archivio Consistoriale, Processus Conistorialis, vol. 79, ff. 106v–107v (also in: ASV, Segreteria di Stato, Polonia, vol. Additamenta 6, b.p.).

only on the state of the vacant Kamieniec Podolski diocese and not on the clergyman promoted to the pastoral office in it, hence it was omitted from the manuscript *Summarium processus coram illustrissimo et reverendissimo domino nuntio apostolico in Regno Poloniae fabricati super statu Ecclesiae Camenecensis et qualitatibus reverendissimi nominati*, as well as similar testimonies of Andrzej Świącicki (“custos Camenecensis”) given on 16th October and Krzysztof Stroynowski (“canonicus Camenecensis, praepositus Dąbrowicensis”) testifying on 21st October that year, all of whom were asked only about the situation of the bishopric without a shepherd in Podolia occupied by the Turks.⁶⁶ Unlike Wielopolski and De Buy, all those three clerics, as well as Crown Marshal Lubomirski, did not give their testimony in the permanent seat (*solita residentia*) of the nuncio or any of the ordinary offices of the Warsaw nunciature because in the meantime a serious plague broke out in Warsaw and its suburbs, which forced moving further procedural activities “off to the country.” Not only because of this, however, the process, atypical from its very beginning (after all, it began with a formal protest against its very initiation), was also in the further stages more complex than it was normally the case with most of the candidates for the mitre. In fact, “ad assumendas pleniores et uberiores informationes super vita, moribus et idoneitate domini promovendi” on 28th September 1677 the Nuncio Martelli subdelegated “in personam illustrissimi et reverendissimi domini Joannis Małachowski, episcopi Culmensis,” commissioning him to inquire further witnesses.⁶⁷

It was undoubtedly a matter of obtaining the most complete possible picture of the issue by the Roman Curia before making the final decision on filling the vacant bishopric in Kamieniec Podolski, while fully investigating the accusations made against Stanisław Wojeński. However, the subdelegation resulted no less importantly from the fact that the nuncio himself was simply not in position to question on the spot all the witnesses who were to be called to testify in the course of Wojeński’s verification. Although we do not know in detail the mechanism behind subpoenaing those and not other witnesses, there can be no doubt that before starting the verifi-

⁶⁶ ASV, Archivio Consistoriale, Processus Conistorialis, vol. 79, f. 105r–106v (the testimony of Wojewódka, who with regard to the circumstances of passing of the previous Bishop Ordinary of Kamieniec Podolski, Wespazjan Lanckoroński, stated: “Vacat sine dubio Ecclesia Camenecensi a quindecim circiter mensibus [*i.e. more or less from July 1676*], a quibus mortuus est illustrissimus dominus Lanckoronski, apud quem etiam tempore mortis fui”), 107v–109v (the testimony of Świącicki, who said on the same subject: “Vacat ecclesia cathedralis Camenecensis per obitum illustrissimi domini Vespasiani Lanckoronski, qui secutus mense Augusti anno 1676 in civitate Varsaviensi, quod est cuique notorium”), 109v–110v (the testimony of Stroynowski, who confirmed the fact that Bishop Lanckoroński died in Warsaw).

⁶⁷ *Ibidem*, f. 110r (also in: ASV, Segreteria di Stato, Polonia, vol. Additamenta 6, b.p.): “Subdelegatio facta ab illustrissimo et reverendissimo domino nuntio apostolico die 28. Septembris 1677 in personam illustrissimi et reverendissimi domini Joannis Malac[h]ovski, episcopi Culmensis et Pomesaniae, ad assumendas pleniores et uberiores informationes super vita, moribus et idoneitate domini promovendi.”

cation, the nunciature had already a clear idea of who could (and should) be called upon to testify in this case. It is symptomatic that all those who confirmed personal merits and qualifications to take on such a considerable responsibility by the King's candidate for the mitre were people who were closely related to the monarch and his policy and could not be expected to testify against the nominee of John III Sobieski. Moreover, the Lubomirskis and Wielopolskis were families which, as Z. Lasocki pointed out, were supposed to gain (in terms of splendour of their descent) from the historical falsifications made by the later Bishop of Kamieniec Podolski, hence we can speak of a kind of "community of interests."⁶⁸ In any case, at the end of February 1677, when the verification began, nothing seemed to impede accepting the testimonies of all planned witnesses on the spot in the Warsaw nunciature, but the unexpected six-month delay caused by S. Sadowski's aforementioned protest submitted to the files of the nunciature and then waiting for the decision of the Roman Consistorial Congregation as to how to proceed in this case brought further difficulties. In connection with his Baltic policy, on 21st May 1677 King John III Sobieski together with a number of dignitaries and a part of his court, left the Wilanów residence and set off along the Vistula River to Danzig, where he was to stay for an exceptionally long period of six and a half months (from 1st August 1677 to 14th February 1678). He was accompanied by the senators appointed to reside with the monarch as well as other representatives of the political elite of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth involved in international politics, among them church dignitaries who were expected to testify in the verification.⁶⁹

Parallel to the activities carried out by the apostolic nuncio, within a single day, namely on Saturday, 9th October 1677, the Bishop Ordinary of Culmsee Małachowski, who was authorized by him to take such steps, interrogated four witnesses: two bishops and two abbots (one of whom was actually a so-called commandant abbot, or *de facto* an administrator of the abbey), i.e. people highly positioned in the Polish ecclesiastical hierarchy, whose testimony was supposed to give

⁶⁸ Z. L a s o c k i, *O falsyfikatach w Archiwum Skarbcza Koronnego*, p. 191 ("The counterfeited documents, planted in the Crown Treasury Archives, were not intended to bring material benefits this time, as was the case with the demonstration of the nobility of Wojeński, but merely to satisfy his own vanity and presumably the vanity of his protectors. The Lubomirskis, whom he had long rendered many services, were keen to demonstrate their ancestors of the 11th and 12th centuries on senate positions, whereas actually it was not earlier than at the turn of the 16th century that this family of undoubtedly ancient nobility began to accumulate wealth thanks to salt mines and climb to higher dignities. And it was even more important for the Wielkopolskis to obliterate the traces of their descent from Cracow patricians, the Bochnars").

⁶⁹ I. a. A. S i e r a k o w s k i, *Pobył Jana III Sobieskiego w Prusach Królewskich w latach 1677 i 1678*, Toruń 1912; Z. W ó j c i k, *Jan Sobieski 1629–1696*, Warszawa 1983, pp. 239–240; C. S k o n k a, *Jan III Sobieski na Pomorzu Gdańskim*, Warszawa 1985 (esp. pp. 8–22); *Historia Gdańska*, vol. 3 part 1: 1655–1793, ed. E. C i e ś l a k, Gdańsk 1993, pp. 154–170.

greater substance to the matter in the eyes of Roman curialists. Thus, fulfilling the mission entrusted to them, “*illustrissimus et reverendissimus dominus episcopus Culmensis et Pomesaniae, commissarius illustrissimi et reverendissimi domini nuntii apostolici, volens ad ulteriorem executionem delegationis in personam suam per illustrissimum et reverendissimum dominum nuntium apostolicum factae devenire, mandavit vocari illustrissimos et reverendissimos dominos, dominum Stanislaum Dąbski, Dei et Apostolicae Sedis gratia episcopum Luceoriensem et Brestensem, dominum Stanislaum Świącicki, episcopum Chelmensis, ac perillustres et reverendissimos dominos Alexandrum Wolff, nominatum episcopum Livoniensem, abbatem Pelplinensem, et Joannem Witwicki, abbatem Plocensem, infulatum Olycensem, Gnesnensem canonicum, cancellariae Regni minoris regentem,*” all of whom had undoubtedly been notified earlier about the date of giving testimony, since they all “as one” arrived on time.⁷⁰

As the first of the four, testified Bishop Ordinary of Łuck (Luceoria) Stanisław Kazimierz Dąbski,⁷¹ whose answer to the question for how long he had known Wojeński deserves well to be quoted here, as it contains interesting (in the context discussed) information: “*Cognosco perillustrem et reverendissimum dominum Stanislaus Woienski, canonicum Cracoviensem, ad Ecclesiam Camenecensem promovendum, ab annis quindecim, quando deducebat nobilitatem in comitiis Regni Poloniae publice et fui eo tempore praesens.*”⁷² Although this is where the theme of proving himself to be of noble origin by the present nominee for the bishopric was raised, Dąbski limited himself to a schematic statement on his genealogy: “*Natus est ex honestis parentibus et legitimo matrimonio; parentes eius erant catholici.*” In the point concerning the priesthood of Wojeński, on the other hand, there is a piece of information which to some extent explains why the Bishop Ordinary of Łuck was called at all as a witness in this process, as we can read in the relevant fragment of the process files: “*Est presbiter a multis annis, quia in mea dioecesi Luceoriensi habet praeposituram Medzirzecensem et in dioecesi Cracoviensi habet alia beneficia, quae uti presbiter possidet*” (further on, there is a mention of a doctorate obtained in Bologna). As well as the other witnesses testifying before and after him, Stanisław Kazimierz Dąbski positively assessed the qualifications of the king’s nominee to take over the rule in the diocese envisaged for him without raising any objections to his moral attitude.⁷³

⁷⁰ ASV, Archivio Consistoriale, Processus Conistorialis, vol. 79, ff. 110v–111r (also in: ASV, Segreteria di Stato, Polonia, vol. Additamenta 6, b.p.).

⁷¹ The latest biographical entry of this hierarch in: K. R. P r o k o p, *Rzymskokatolicki biskupi ordynariusze diecezji na ziemiach ruskich...*, pp. 136–140.

⁷² See above footnote 4.

⁷³ ASV, Archivio Consistoriale, Processus Conistorialis, vol. 79, ff. 112r–v (also in: ASV, Segreteria di Stato, Polonia, vol. Additamenta 6, b.p.).

The second person giving testimony in Danzig before Jan Małachowski was Bishop Ordinary of Chełm (of Latin rite) Stanisław Jacek Świącicki,⁷⁴ whose statement on the circumstances in which he met S. Wojeński also deserves to be quoted: “Novi ab annis 20. et amplius perillustrem dominum, dominum Stanislaus Woienski, canonicum Cracoviensem, ad Ecclesiam Camenecensem promovendum, quando apud Sacram Caesaream Maiestatem fuit residens [missus] a serenissimo Joanne Casimiro, rege Poloniae.” The nominee for the bishopric of Kamieniec Podolski was therefore by no means an unknown person at the Habsburg court, since he was still on a diplomatic mission there under John II Casimir, which is worth bearing in mind in the context of accusations of conspiring against the Emperor. In turn, in the matter of the descent of the Cracow canon, Świącicki spoke in an extremely reticent manner, without going into details and referring to the public knowledge (“non est dubitandum quod sit natus ex legitimo matrimonio et ex catholicis parentibus, quia de hoc est publica fama et nullus aliter dicere poterit”), and similarly concluding only from indirect premises that he was a priest who had been ordained many years ago (“scio quod est presbiter ab annis triginta et duobus, nam id patet tam ex dispensatione Innocentii X, quam ex commissione illustrissimi et reverendissimi domini Petri Gembicki, episcopi Cracoviensi, qua illi commiserat visitationem archidiaconatus Pilecensis cum facultatibus amplis in dioecesi Cracoviensi”). He was also familiar with the fact that Wojeński had a doctorate in both civil and canon law (“promotus ad doctoratum in utroque iure in Academia Bononiensi”), as well as his ecclesiastical posts to date, in which context he stated: “Scio illum fuisse archidiaconum Pilecensem, ecclesias parochiales habuisse, et ad praesens canonicatum Cracoviensem et praeposituram Międzyrzecensem habere et varias commissiones ab illustrissimis et reverendissimis dominis episcopis Cracoviensibus, insuper et officium iudicis in Judiciali Tribunale Regni Poloniae, et electione venerabili capituli Cracoviensis tum illustrissimorum dominorum Petri Gembicki et Andreae Trzebicki, episcoporum Cracoviensium, ab illis varias commissiones demandatas tam ad praesidendum electionibus abbatum, quam et ad comitia seu dietas Palatinatus Cracoviensis” (and further about the three benefices it in his possession: “canonicatus Cracoviensis, praepositura Międzyrzecensis, ecclesia parochialis Otfinoviensis”). In assessing the personal characteristics of the candidate to the mitre as well as his ability to perform responsible tasks, the Bishop of Chełm once again referred to the fact that Wojeński had been entrusted with diplomatic missions (“certum est quod sit vir gravis, prudens et in rebus gerendis praestans, et legationes fungebatur a serenissimo Joanne Casimiro, rege Poloniae, ad

⁷⁴ See K. R. P r o k o p, *Rzymskokatolicy biskupi ordynariusze diecezji na ziemiach ruskich...*, pp. 381–385; i d e m, *Biskupi ordynariusze diecezji na ziemiach litewskich i białoruskich dawnej Rzeczypospolitej Obojga Narodów (do czasów I wojny światowej): Wilno • Żmudź • Inflanty • Smoleńsk • Mohylów • Mińsk • Wigry • Sejny (Augustów) • Janów Podlaski*, Warszawa–Drohiczyn 2015, pp. 244–247.

Sacram Caesaream Maiestatem et ad serenissimum principem Condeum in Galliam;” this presumably refers to the efforts to ensure the succession of the Polish throne after John II Casimir to the representative of the French ruling dynasty), as well as stressed his very good opinion concerning his personal conduct, stating: “De nullo unquam scandalo aut vitio eius scio, imo scio quod nullum scandalum commiserit, sed bene semper vixit et secundum suam vocationem semper processerit.” Thus, in a way he denied the accusations contained in the protest made by the instigator Sadowski, also formulating the final conclusion consistent with the above: “Maximi existimo esse utilem ad ecclesiam cathedralam Camenecensem.”⁷⁵

The third witness whose testimony was accepted on 9th October 1677 by Bishop Jan Małachowski was the abbot of Pelplin (and at the same time the king’s nominee for the Livonian bishopric, for which, however, he never received a papal commission) Aleksander Wolff zu Ludinghausen, also a close associate of John III Sobieski.⁷⁶ At the King’s court, he has the opportunity to enter into closer relations with Stanisław Wojeński, whom he had already known before (“novi et nosco perillustrem et reverendissimum dominum Stanislaus Woienski [...] ab annis viginti et amplius, adhuc ante bellum Suecicorum, sed modo melius novi a coronatione Sacrae Regiae Maiestatis Poloniae”). It is also from the monarch that he supposedly learned about the life path of the candidate to the mitre, important in the context of the process questionnaire. Particularly worth mentioning here seems to be a fragment concerning the controversial subject of Wojeński’s genealogy, about which A. Wolff zu Ludinghausen testified: “Audiavi a Sacra Regia Maiestate, quod sit natus in dioecesi Cracoviensi. Similiter audiavi a Sacra Regia Maiestate, quod sit natus ex legitimo matrimonio, ex catholicis parentibus, quia Sacra Regia Maiestas novi illius parentes et dixit esse et fuisse parentes eius bonos, sed praecipuae parentem eius fuisse hominem doctissimum et prudentissimum.” Bearing in mind that Maciej Woienski (Woinski), not mentioned here by name, died in 1648, the information that he was known to Jan Sobieski and respected by him must refer to the time when the future monarch was studying (together with his brother Marek Sobieski) at the Cracow Academy (he studied there in 1642/1643–1645/1646),⁷⁷ while the father of the later bishop of Kamieniec Podol-

⁷⁵ ASV, Archivio Consistoriale, Processus Conistorialis, vol. 79, ff. 112v–113v (also in: ASV, Segreteria di Stato, Polonia, vol. Additamenta 6, b.p.).

⁷⁶ *Herbarz polski Kaspra Niesieckiego...*, vol. 9, pp. 397–398; S. Kujot, *Opactwo pelplińskie*, Pelplin 1875, pp. 270–280, no. 32 (where on p. 276–279 about the sojourn of King John III Sobieski in Danzig, Pomerania); R. Frydrychowicz, *Geschichte der Cistercienserabtei Pelplin und ihre Bau- und Kunstdenkmäler*, Düsseldorf 1905, according to index (esp. pp. 107–108, no. 32). Moreover J. K. Dachnowski, *Herbarz szlachty Prus Królewskich z XVII wieku*, publ. Z. Penteck, Kórnik 1995, pp. 244–246; *Urządnicy dawnej Rzeczypospolitej...*, vol. 10, p. 37 (no. 104), 214.

⁷⁷ See H. Barycz, *Lata szkolne Marka i Jana Sobieskich w Krakowie*, Kraków 1939; K. Targosz, *Jana Sobieskiego nauki i peregrynacje*, Wrocław–Warszawa–Kraków–Gdańsk–Łódź 1985.

ski was the vice-chancellor (and in 1639–1640 also the rector) of the Academy.⁷⁸ Aleksander Wolff was also familiar with the fact that Stanisław Wojeński earned his doctor's degree in Bologna, which took place forty years earlier (i.e. in 1637), and stated that he had been ordained a priest: “Scio ipsum esse in sacris ordinibus constitutum et vidi pluries celebrantem sacrae missae sacrificia decantantem imo ille me ad ecclesiam Żółkwiensem introduxit” (for the testimonier used to hold a provost's office in Żółkiew, obtained from Sobieskis' patronage).⁷⁹

The last witness giving testimony in Danzig, Jan Stanisław Witwicki (a future member of the episcopate of the Commonwealth of Both Nations), “abbatiae Plocensis administrator seu commendatarius perpetuus, praepositus infulatus Olycensis, Gnesnensis [et] Varsaviensis canonicus, regens cancellariae Regni minoris” (thus a person associated with the monarch and his environment as closely as possible at that time),⁸⁰ who had known the nominee for the bishopric of Kamieniec Podolski for over a quarter of a century (“novi ante 25. annos perillustrem et reverendissimum dominum Stanislaus Woienski”), in the matter of his genealogy also resorted to indirect evidence, referring to the fact that the clergyman belonged to the Cracow Cathedral Chapter (“non est dubitandum quod sit natus ex catholicis et honestis parentibus, quia non susciperetur ad ecclesiam cathedrallem Cracoviensem nisi esset ex legitimis parentibus natus, et est in ecclesia cathedrali Cracoviensi canonicus”). He also mentioned a former mission of Wojeński “ad principem Condeum in Galliam” as well as said that “in electione regis Michaelis et in electione serenissimi moderni regis Poloniae secretarium fuisse, et reverendissimi domini Andreae Trzebicki, episcopi Cracoviensis, qui de tempore electionis serenissimi regis, subsecuta morte illustrissimi et reverendissimi domini Casimiri Floriani ducis Czartoryski, archiepiscopi Gnesnensis, vice archiepiscopales gerebat, secretarius fuisse,” thus pointing out the responsible functions that the present candidate for the mitre had been entrusted with in the past (he did not fail to mention his Bologna doctorate either). All of this was accompanied by a concise and unequivocal conclusion of Witwicki's testimony: “Puto esse dignissimum ad ecclesiam cathedrallem Camenecensem,”⁸¹ which, in this or similar wording, is repeated in the statements of all the seven witnesses testifying “super qualitatibus domini promovendi” (ten witnesses testified in total, however, three of them were asked only about the affairs of the Diocese of Kamieniec Podolski, and

⁷⁸ See above footnote 22.

⁷⁹ ASV, Archivio Consistoriale, Processus Conistorialis, vol. 79, ff. 113v–114v (also in: ASV, Segreteria di Stato, Polonia, vol. Additamenta 6, b.p.).

⁸⁰ Recently: K. R. P r o k o p, *Rzymskokatolicy biskupi ordynariusze diecezji na ziemiach ruskich...*, pp. 423–424. Also: *Kapituła kolegiacka w Olyce 1919–1940. Materiały*, comp. M. Dębowska, Kraków n.d., p. 27.

⁸¹ ASV, Archivio Consistoriale, Processus Conistorialis, vol. 79, ff. 114v–115v (also in: ASV, Segreteria di Stato, Polonia, vol. Additamenta 6, b.p.).

not about the person of the king's nominee). "Quibus omnibus et singulis peractis, illustrissimus et reverendissimus dominus episcopus Culmensis et Pomesaniae, ab illustrissimo et reverendissimo domino nuntio deputatus, pro finali suae delegationis executione praesentem procuracionem cum omnibus et singulis in eo contentis et insertis [...] clausum et obsigillatum ad illustrissimum et reverendissimum dominum nuntium apostolicum remitti mandavit" – as it was noted at the end of the part of the process files that resulted from the proceedings conducted in Danzig under the aforementioned subdelegation.

The next stage of the information process took place again before the apostolic nuncio – already in his permanent residence (due the end of the plague) – on 3rd November 1677, when before the diplomatic representative of the Holy See in the Commonwealth of the Both Nations "comparavit nobilis dominus Marcianus Czarkowski, vice et nomine perillustris et admodum reverendi Stanislai Woienski [...], et a magis magisque docendum de requisitis et idoneitate sui domini principalis produxit novem documenta publica," namely: 1) the diploma of Doctor of Both Laws ("privilegium doctoratus in utroque iure datum Bononiae, 24. Septembris 1637"); 2) the document conferring the dignity of apostolic (proto)notary ("privilegium prothonotariatus apostolici, datum Romae 22. Octobris 1649"); 3) the papal commission for the post of archdeacon of Pilica ("bullae apostolicae Innocentii PP. X super archidiaconatu Pilecensi, datum Romae, apud S. Petrum, anno Incarnationis Dominicae 1645, octavo Kalendas Martii, pontificatus anno primo"); 4) *facultates* given to Wojeński by the Bishop Ordinary *loci* for an inspection of the Pilica archdeaconry ("facultates archidiaconi Pilecensis et deputatio domini Woienski, tunc archidiacono, facta per illustrissimum et reverendissimum Petrum Gembicki, tunc episcopum Cracoviensem, ad visitandum praefatum archidiaconatum Pilecensem, datum Cracoviae, 14. mensis Junii anno Domini 1649"); 5) the Bishop's delegation with authorization to assist in the election of the coadjutor of the abbot of Wąchock ("commissio facta per modernum illustrissimum episcopum Cracoviensem [i.e. by A. Trzebicki] in persona domini Woienski pro assistendo electioni coadiutoris abbatiae Wąhocensis, datum Cracoviae, die 10. Junii 1667"); 6) the analogous delegation with authorization to assist in the election of the new abbot of Jędrzejów ("alias commissio facta per eundem modernum episcopum Cracoviensem in personam domini Woienski pro assistendo electioni abbatis Andreoviensis [...], datum Bodzentini, die 14. Januarii 1672"); 7) a letter from the Cracow Cathedral Chapter related to the election of Wojeński as its deputy to the Crown Tribunal ("litterae capituli Cracoviensis ad dominum Woienski, concanonicum, deputy iudicem in Tribunale Regni Lublinensi, datum Cracoviae, die 15. Julii anno 1667"); 8) the delegation from the same chapter to represent it by the present nominee for the bishopric of Kamieniec Podolski in the General Diet ("commissio nomine capituli Cracoviensis in persona domini Woienski, ut tamquam nuntius capitularis et totius cleri dioecesani intersit generalibus Regni comitis [...], datum Cracoviae, 2. Januarii 1677"); 9) a bequest made by Stanisław Wo-

jeński to the benefit of the Wawel Cathedral in Cracow with the intention of getting conducted there appropriate anniversary services after his death (“*inscriptio facta per dominum Woienski ad favorem capituli sui Cracoviensis in summa florenorum trium milium pro anniversario post mortem, de anno 1666*”).⁸²

On the same day, 3rd November 1677, the same Marcján Czarkowski appearing before the nuncio (“*proprio nomine illustrissimi domini Stanislai Wojenski*”) on “*pro dicto domino Woienski, ad cathedralem ecclesiam Camenecensem promovendo, contra reverendum dominum Stanislaum Sadowski, instigatorem curiae episcopalis Cracoviensis,*” reiterated the fact that the thirty-day period had already passed (“*dicto termino 30. dierum elapso*”) given to the instigator Sadowski “*ad deducendum coram dominatione sua illustrissima et reverendissima quidquid habet adversus dictum illustrissimum promovendum,*” by which deadline the expected incriminating evidence had not reached the nunciature.⁸³

This circumstance, however, does not mean that the other party thus considered themselves to lose the case and refrained from any further actions aimed at preventing Wojeński from being granted a papal commission for the bishopric of Kamieniec Podolski. Seeing that in spite of the submitted accusation, a formal information process was duly carried out and the selection of witnesses guaranteed a successful outcome for the king’s candidate from the examination of his moral values or his eligibility to take on so prominent a church post, his opponents – having the opportunity to do so – decided to counteract the promotion of Stanisław Wojeński to the bishopric by taking steps directly in Rome. As we also read in the final part of the process files under the date of 6th November 1677, once again “*coram illustrissimo et reverendissimo domino nuntio apostolico comparavit idem nobilis dominus Martianus Czarkowski, proprio nomine quo supra, et alias omni et attenta dilatione praefata per dominationem suam illustrissimam decretate cum valde intersit domini principalis sui, ne intra talem moram versetur in discrimine eiusdem existimatis contra quem instigatoris fiscalis Cracoviensis quasdam assertas informationes clanculum*

⁸² ASV, Archivio Consistoriale, Processus Conistorialis, vol. 79, f. 116r–v [transcript of doctor diploma], 118r [apostolic protonotary office], 118v–119r [dignity of archdeacon of Pilica], 119r [inspection of archdeaconry of Pilica], 119v–120r [election of the abbot-coadjutor in Wąchock], 120r [election of the abbot in Jędrzejów], 120v–122v [documents related to the Cracow Cathedral Chapter and the Wawel Cathedral] (also in: ASV, Segreteria di Stato, Polonia, vol. Additamenta 6, b.p.). Cf. *Deputaci Trybunału Koronnego 1578–1794. Spis*, vol. 3: 1661–1700, comp. L. A. W i e r z b i c k i, Warszawa 2017, p. 69 (also p. 98), where the deputy of the Cracow Cathedral Chapter to the Crown Tribunal in 1667 is erroneously identified as Stanisław Łubiński.

⁸³ ASV, Archivio Consistoriale, Processus Conistorialis, vol. 79, ff. 122v–123v (ibidem, under the same date 3rd November 1677: “*pro parte instigatoris fiscalis tribunalis praesentis nuntiaturae apostolicae fuit facta instantia, ut sibi reservaretur iura et actiones contra reverendum dominum Christophorum Marzewski, actuarium Wislicensem, pro assertis contumeliis ac violentiis illatis reverendo domino Augusto Watkiewicz, presbitero dioecesis Gnesnensis et executori citationis supra productae*”).

assumptas iam Romam transmississe iactavit. Ideo pro aliqua praeventiva instructione Sacrae Congregationis et ad omnem meliorem finem et effectum, petiit et instituit processum fabricatum claudi et sigillari clausumque ac sigillatum, ut moris est, sibi decerni et extradi omnis.” Accordingly, on the very day of 6th November of that year, the files containing the testimonies of witnesses and the other documents mentioned above were closed and notarized in order to be forwarded to the Eternal City for further action.⁸⁴

As already stated, the issue of the nomination encountered understandable in this situation obstacles in the Roman Curia and the next two years (i.e. 1678 and 1679) did not bring the anticipated papal commission for the bishopric of Kamieniec Podolski for Stanisław Wojeński, despite various efforts still being made on his behalf. It is evidenced by the aforementioned letter, dated Lwów, 23rd June 1678, from Archbishop Stanisław Kazimierz Dąbski, who had just testified in the information process, probably addressed to the cardinal-protector of the Kingdom of Poland Pietro Vidoni, where it was stated explicitly that “dominus episcopus Cracoviensis promotioni canonici [Wojeński] in Sacra Congregatione Consistorialis opposuit,” which was known to the king John III Sobieski and his closest officials. The author of the letter bluntly described the accusations made against Wojeński as calumnies and vilification of a man by all measures estimable, of great merit for the Church and the state and referred in many places to the recently conducted information process, whose result should speak for itself, while the group of witnesses to confirm the accusation raised serious doubts because they were exclusively “ex familiaribus et obligatis domini episcopi Cracoviensis.” However, perhaps inspired by the royal court, although apparently of private nature, Dąbski’s letter not only expressed an outrage over the situation that the monarch’s authority behind the nomination could be effectively counteracted by people of dubious reputation (“hoc Regia Maiestas summe apprehendit, praeferrī fidei suae regiae vilissimorum hominum falsa testimonia”), which was detrimental to the sovereign’s majesty (“Sua Maiestas Regia magno dolore conquaeratur de autoritate et reputatione sua in Urbe laesa”), but also contained unambiguous warnings to the helmsmen of the Holy Catholic Church. It was pointed out that if through such a show of disrespect, they put off the King who had just recently ascended to the throne, they would not be able to count on his favourable involvement in matters important for Catholicism in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth (and not only there), while there were a number of “tinderboxes” bringing about actual damages to the Church (also with regard to the Diocese of Kamieniec Podolski, since “cum contributio publica in praeteritis comitiis pro exulibus ex Podolia sancita, omisso episcopo et illius diaecesis clero, inter solos dividatur incolas sae-

⁸⁴ ASV, Archivio Consistoriale, Processus Consistorialis, vol. 79, ff. 124v–125r (also in: ASV, Segreteria di Stato, Polonia, vol. Additamenta 6, b.p.).

culares”).⁸⁵ Such words could then be read in the Eternal City as an almost explicit threat that if Wojeński’s candidature for the bishopric of Kamieniec Podolski were rejected, John III Sobieski would not fail to retaliate against the Holy See by initiating actions that Rome would probably prefer to avoid.⁸⁶

Unable to take a firm step, the Roman Consistorial Congregation postponed its final decision and in consequence, for a long time there was neither confirmation of Stanisław Wojeński to the bishopric nor definitive rejection of his candidacy by the successor of St. Peter. At the same time further materials were collected in an effort to more completely understand the matter, which resulted in preparing *Summarium processus coram illustrissimo et reverendissimo domino nuntio apostolico in Regno Poloniae fabricati super statu Ecclesiae Camenecensis et qualitatibus reverendissimi nominati* for the use of the Congregation. It contained not only, as the title would indicate, the documentation of the information process carried out in 1677 by the nuncio Martelli (while excluding the testimonies about the state of the Kamieniec Podolski diocese as they did not concern the person of S. Wojeński), which was the first part of the summary (*nota bene* incomparably more extensive than the other two parts), but also additional testimonies of relevance to the entire issue. All of them related to – to put it in a relatively delicate manner – the relationship between Stanisław Wojeński and the aforementioned Hungarian family of Wesselényi, which is not too surprising, since the family, involved in the antiimperial opposition in Hungary, appeared in the first two (out of five) paragraphs of the instigator Sadowski’s accusation as well as was referred to in the third paragraph of the “complaint.” It mentioned namely “Dominus Viselinus, palatinus Ungariae,” who Wojeński “induxit persuasionibus suis ad rebellionem contra Caesaream Maiestatem,” and when it came to light, “bona illius omnia confiscata [sunt] et uxor in sequestrum accepta, in quo fortassis hucusque detinetur,” which pained much the sons of the palatin who were not named (the above quote actually refers not to their mother but stepmother). Moreover, it is precisely “a domino Veselenio” that the nominee for the bishopric of Kamieniec Podolski was accused of necromancy, all of which, taken together, raises a justified question how that unfortunate acquaintance of the clergyman with Francis (Ferenc) Wesselényi, the palatine of Hungary in 1655–1657, had come about.

A total of four documents included in the form of transcripts in the second (three documents) and third part (one document) of the *Summary*, drawn up for the use of the Roman Consistorial Congregation, which dealt, among others, with epis-

⁸⁵ Cf. J. Stoliński, *Egzulanci podolscy (1672–1699). Znaczenie uchodźców z Podola w życiu politycznym Rzeczypospolitej*, Kraków 1994. See also *Akta sejmiku podolskiego «in hostico» 1672–1698*, publ. J. Stoliński, Kraków 2002 (where – as it can be concluded from the index – Bishop Stanisław Wojeński is not mentioned at all).

⁸⁶ See *Appendix III*.

copal appointments, allow for a partial explanation. In the first one, dated 23rd March 1677 in Cracow and addressed to “illustrissimo et reverendissimo domino Stanislao comiti [*sic*] a Brzezie Woienski, episcopo Camenecensi, Varsaviae,” the sender, undersigned as “Ladislaus Wesseleni, comes in Muran,” is responding to Wojeński’s letter of unknown content of 4th March, provoked by the mentioned in the first paragraph of the instigator Sadowski’s “complaint” allegation of practising necromancy, which is what the Hungarian magnate supposedly accused the present nominee for the bishopry in Kamieniec Podolski before Andrzej Trzebicki, Bishop Ordinary of Cracow. In his letter, Władysław (Laszlo) Wesselényi denies this, presenting the circumstances in which this kind of misunderstanding (or intentional misrepresentation of facts) had occurred. The same applies to the issue of Stanisław Wojeński’s alleged fomenting the anti-Habsburg opposition in Hungary, in which context there can be found an interesting detail connected with the later bishop of Kamieniec Podolski: “tempore Svetici belli habitabat in Murani.” Thus, we are talking about the period of the so-called Swedish Deluge (1655/1656),⁸⁷ when in the later years of the Wesselényi conspiracy, there was no longer any opportunity for direct contacts between the Hungarian palatine and the later nominee for the bishopric in Kamieniec Podolski.⁸⁸

Before attempting to organize the information obtained from this source and supplementing it with what is known from the literature, one should first consider the remaining documents from the *Summary*. It contains a letter from Bishop Trzebicki to Wojeński of 26th January 1672 and a transcript of the settlement of 13th May of the same year concluded “per mediationem illustrissimi principis et reverendissimi domini episcopi Cracoviensis.” This is *Concordia inter dominum Vesseleni et dominum Woienski* (in the relevant transcript “ex Polonico in Latinum transposita”), signed by both Stanisław Wojeński and Władysław (Laszlo) Wesselényi (“comes in Muran”), together with – as witnesses – Paweł Stokowski (“castellanus Osviecimensis”), Kazimierz Waxman (“canonicus Cracoviensis”), Stanisław Rozrażewski (“custos Cracoviensis”), and Franciszek Jordan (“capitaneus Dobczicensis”). The dispute and the subsequent agreement was related to Wojeński’s possession of the parish in Gdów and concerned the income generated by that parish. As he wrote in his declaration, “Vladislaus Wesseleni, comes in Muran, [...] facta est die hodierna concordia per mediationem illustrissimi principis domini episcopi Cracoviensis atque per illustrissimum et magnificum dominum castellanum Osviecimensem, magnificos dominum custodem Cracoviensem, dominum canonicum Waxman, dominum capitaneum Dobczicensem, mutuos ad hanc concordiam

⁸⁷ Cf. Z. L a s o c k i, *O falsyfikatach w Archiwum Skarbca Koronnego*, p. 180 (“During the Swedish invasion, [Stanisław Wojeński] took refuge in Hungary where he was of service to Polish exiles, [thanks to which] after the end of the war with Swedes, he was designated by the king for the Cracow canonry in 1660”).

⁸⁸ See *Appendix II*.

amicos,” on the basis of which (as stated further by the Hungarian magnate) “dominus canonicus Woienski quietavit me ex omnibus praetensionibus de quibus insertatae mihi erant actiones, etsi hucusque secundum adinventionem amicabilem his praetensionibus ob brevitatem temporis satisfieri non poterat. Ideo promitto hoc dicto canonico verbo nobili, quod eaque desiecta sunt aedificia ad scholam Gdovensem pertinentia prout et horreum cantoris restituere et reedificare iubeo quamprimum in moderno meo reditu ad Gdov.”⁸⁹

And next: “Recentes obventiones et obligationes ad ecclesiam Gdoviensem redere et restituere, et in posterum secundum contractum illa exolvere iubeo Pascuae pecullibus plebanilibus, et subditorum ac ministrorum ecclesiae non impendiam, sed ita libera manebunt prout ante fuerant. Debita pro legitibus et aliis rebus secundum regestrorum a me domino Stochi [*Paulus de Stok Stokowski, castellanus Osviecimensis*] datum solvere iubebo, et servitoribus, qui ex domo plebanali abrepti sunt, servitium continuare ad novem annum permittam, super quo manu propria me subscribo.”⁹⁰ The last document in the *Summary* (as *numerus tertius*) is also related to the case of the parish of Gdów and entitled *Sententia episcopi Cracoviensis ad favorem reverendissimi nominati* (it is obvious that in a source from 1672 Wojeński could not possibly appear as a “[Kamieniec] nominee”), which was a decree of the Bishop Ordinary of Cracow dated, Cracow, 1st June 1672 (“decretum illustrissimi et reverendissimi domini episcopi Cracoviensis anno millesimo sexcentesimo septuagesimo secundo, die vero Mercurii prima Junii, Cracoviae”), referring to the aforementioned settlement between the canon Wojeński, parish priest in Gdów (“Stanislaus a Brzezio Woienski, canonicus Cracoviensis, parochus in Gdow”), and Władysław (László) Wesselényi, whose title deed to the Gdów estate has not been anywhere articulated *expressis verbis* here.⁹¹ It is worth noting at this point that in the letter of Trzebicki to Wojeński of 26th January 1672, that Hungarian magnate is referred to as the “haereticus,” which could suggest that he belonged to the dissenters (Protestants), which would give the accusations of his attitude towards the affairs of the parish church in Gdów a comprehensible context, however in fact Wesselényi’s father, although originating from a Protestant family, converted to Catholicism in his youth, so it would be at least unexpected (though not impossible) for his descendants to take the side of the Reformation again.

The repeatedly mentioned here father was Franciszek (Ferenc) Wesselényi (son of Stefan and Katarzyna Derssfa), who lived in 1605–1667 and from the 1620s onwards took part in battles against the Turks. His war experience also included battles against the Tartars on the territory of the Commonwealth of Both Nations

⁸⁹ ASV, Segreteria di Stato, Polonia, vol. Additamenta 6, n.d.

⁹⁰ Ibidem, n.d. (descriptive date: “Datum in castro Cracoviensi die Lunae post festum Gloriosae Dei Ascensionis anno 1672”).

⁹¹ ASV, Segreteria di Stato, Polonia, vol. Additamenta 6, n.d.

(during the reign of Ladislaus IV Vasa) during which he supposedly commanded an auxiliary Hungarian unit. Thanks to his military talents, he managed to climb to the top of the social ladder, obtaining the title of count in 1646 (with the predicate of Wesselényi de Hadad), and a decade later (1655) receiving a nomination from Emperor Ferdinand III for the Palatine (*supremus capitaneus partium Regni Hungariae superiorum*) of the Crown of St. Stephen. He was also given the Order of the Golden Fleece by King Philip IV of Spain in 1662. In 1629, he married Zofia Bośniak (Bosnyák) from a military family, who gave him two sons, Adam (1630–1656) and Władysław (Laszlo), born in 1633 (thus about two decades younger than S. Wojeński). Their uncle and brother of Franciszek (Ferenc) was Mikołaj (Miklós) Wesselényi (1608–1666). Not only did he convert to Catholicism as Franciszek, but chose the clerical estate by joining the Jesuit Order (he later held the office of rector of the college in Bratislava and superior in Košice), under whose influence both brothers changed their confession (they also had three sisters). After becoming a widower, Wesselényi married Maria Szèchy (1610–1679) in 1644, who brought him in her dowry the Murań castle (Muráň *vel* Muránsky hrad) in Slovakia (at that time known as the Upper Hungary and belonging to the lands of the Crown of St. Stephen), situated in the area of Murań Karst (Muránská Plánina) on the top of Mount Cigánka (935 m.a.m.s.l.) and constituting the central point of a large estate (the so-called “Murań State”), once owned by Stefan Zapolya and acquired in 1612 by Thomas (Tamás) Szèchy, whose granddaughter was Maria (Mária). It was then inherited by his younger son (the elder one died while his father was still alive, *nota bene* he was buried “in Murán”), also calling himself “comes in Muran” and known to us from his feuds with Stanisław Wojeński, first a parson in Gdów and then a nominee for the bishopric of Kamieniec.⁹²

The participation of Franciszek (Ferenc) Wesselényi in fights against the Tartars within the borders of the Commonwealth under Władysław IV, finding shelter by Wojeński at the Hungarian magnate’s castle in Murań (1655/1656) during the turmoil of the Swedish “Deluge,” and finally the disputes over the right of patronage over the cure in Gdów and the duties resulting therefrom – all this makes one suspect some “common element” linking those apparently unrelated facts. This “keystone” seems to be just the Gdów property, constituting a part of the estate owned within the borders of the Polish-Lithuanian state by the Wesselényis, whose

⁹² For the genealogy of the Wesselényis (as well as biographies of the most eminent members of the family) i.a.: F. D e á k, *A Wesselényi család őseiről*, Budapest 1878; *Új Magyar lexikon*, vol. 6, Budapest 1962, p. 735; *Magyar életrajzi lexikon*, vol. 2, Budapest 1969, pp. 1042–1043; *Slovenský biografický slovník (od roku 833 do roku 1990)*, vol. 6, Martin 1994, p. 271; *Historia Scepusii*, vol. 2, according to index (esp. p. 740). Also *Encyklopédia slovenska*, vol. 3, Bratislava 1979, p. 639; vol. 5, Bratislava, pp. 471–472; *The Encyclopedia of Slovakia and the Slovaks. A Concise Encyclopedia*, Bratislava 2006, pp. 453, 738; and below footnote 94.

presence on the lands of the Commonwealth of Both Nations dates back to the reign of their countryman, King Stephen Báthory. Among the monarch's collaborators was – raised by him to the dignity of Transylvanian baron on 3rd April 1582 – Franciszek (Ferenc) Wesselényi (the elder),⁹³ who at the end of the 16th century owned (among other estates) the preserved to this day castle in Dębno (near Brzesko).⁹⁴ Endowed with the Polish peerage at the Diet in 1590,⁹⁵ baron Wesselényi appears

⁹³ In some publications he is referred to as the secretary of Stephen Báthory, but the studies on the Secretary Office of the monarch have actually no mention of F. Wesselényi (see esp. L. K i e n i e - w i c z, *Sekretariat Stefana Batorego. Zbiorowość i kariery sekretarzy królewskich*, [in:] *Spoleczeństwo staropolskie. Studia i szkice*, vol. 4, ed. A. I z y d o r c z y k, A. W y c z a ń s k i, Warszawa 1986, pp. 66–67 [the whole paper – pp. 33–69]; cf. i d e m, *Senat za Stefana Batorego*, Warszawa 2000, pp. 150, 178, 198, 238, 270, 282).

⁹⁴ L. L u c h t e r - K r u p i ń s k a, *Zamek w Dębnie*, Kraków 1985, p. 6 (“The castle was in possession of the Dębiński family until 1583. In this year, it was sold to the *starost* [*capitaneus*] of Lanckorona, Ferenc Wesselini (Wesselényi), of Hungarian origin, secretary [*sic*] and courtier of king Stefan Batory. On the order of the new owner, the old seat of the Odrowąż family of Dębno was turned into a Renaissance family residence (1586). It became a cultural center associated with the circle of Hungarian courtiers of king Batory. In 1589–1591, it hosted the greatest poet of the Hungarian Renaissance Bálint Balassi. It was actually in Dębno that the artist created his most charming love poems, dedicated to the fair wife of his host Anna [Sárkány (de Sarcandy)]. In 1608, Stefan i Paweł [Wesselényi], the sons of Ferenc, transferred the village to Jan Fraksztyn due to their heavy debts”). Cf. *Słownik geograficzny Królestwa Polskiego i innych krajów słowiańskich*, vol. 2, Warszawa 1881 [reprinted: Warszawa 1986], p. 21 (“around the year 1580, Dębno together with adjacent villages was bought by king Stefan Batory's favorite, a Hungarian, Ferenc Wesseleny, *starost* of Lanckorona; later, Dębno was transferred to the dukes Ostrogski”). See also below footnote 96 and *Katalog dokumentów pergaminowych ze zbiorów Tomasa Niewodniczańskiego...*, pp. 178–179, no. 354–356.

⁹⁵ *Album armorum nobilium Regni Poloniae...*, p. 231, no. 527 (“Franciszek Wesselini of Transylvania. Naturalized (Warsaw, April 7, 1590, at a Diet session) for the military achievement in the battles at Gdańsk, Połock, Wielkie Łuki and Psków during the reign of Stefan Batory [...]. On the basis of this document, a confirmation of the *indygenat* [naturalization] for Paweł Wesselini in 1609 [...] and for Paweł and Stefan Wesselini in 1612”); J. M i c h t a, *Nobilitacje cudzoziemców: Gabriela Bekesza i Franciszka Wesseliniego*, pp. 75–98 (ibidem, pp. 88–93 – *Aneks źródłowy nr 2*: “Sigimund III, King of Poland and Grand Duke of Lithuania, grants Polish nobility (*indygenat*) to Franciszek Wesselini of Hadad, *starost* [*capitaneus*] of Lanckorona, Siemno and Miel, senator of Transylvania”). Also J. S z y - m a ń s k i, *Herbarz rycerstwa polskiego z XVI wieku*, Warszawa 2001, p. 160. Cf. H. S t u p n i c k i, *Herbarz polski i imionospis zasłużonych w Polsce ludzi wszystkich stanów i czasów*, vol. 3, Lwów 1862, p. 173 (“Weseleni – the coat of arms of this family name [...] was brought to Poland by Franciszek Wesselini, who came from Hungary with king Stefan Batory, and by the king's grace was granted the post of *starost* of Lanckorona; †1587”); *Polska encyklopedia szlachecka*, vol. 1, Warszawa 1935 [reprinted: Warszawa 1994], p. 333 (“Wesselini, of his own coat of arms. A family of counts from Hungary, naturalized in Poland in the 16th century”); vol. 12, p. 110 (“Wesselini [Weseleni, Veselini], a Hungarian family of counts, naturalized in Poland in 1576. [*sic*]”).

also in the history of Gdów at that time, which long ago was pointed out in Waclaw Urban's interesting contribution *Wieś a plebania, czyli notatnik plebana z Gdowa z lat 1597–1604* (Village and parish, or the notebook of the Gdów curate of 1597–1604), where we read that Anna Sárkándy-Wesselényi, at the time claiming to be the owner of the Gdów estate, “belonged to a noble Hungarian family that was close to our monarch Stefan Batory and functioned at the border of Reformation and Catholicism; she was the wife of the treasurer Ferenc and the mother of István (Stefan), [while] the Wesselényis took over Gdów and the surrounding area after the Hungarian family Bekiesz;”⁹⁶ Stefan (István) Wesselényi mentioned in the quotation is in fact identical to Stefan, the father of the palatine Franciszek (Ferenc) and grandfather of Władysław (Laszlo), the successive owners of the local estates.⁹⁷

The modest-sized source used here, i.e. the notebook of the curate of Gdów (from around 1595 to before 1607) Jan Dębochowski (of Pabianice origin), which provides “a remarkable insight into the mechanism of collecting tithes” according to its publisher,⁹⁸ captures also the probable reasons of the aforementioned later frictions between Władysław (Laszlo) Wesselényi (owner of Gdów) and Stanisław Wojeński (parish priest in Gdów), caused by the failure of the former to fulfill its obligations as the protector of the local parish church.⁹⁹ It turns out that in this

⁹⁶ W. Urban, *Wieś a plebania, czyli notatnik plebana z Gdowa z lat 1597–1604*, “Przegląd Historyczny” 83, 1, 1992, pp. 93–94; also *ibidem* footnote 4 (the hole paper on pp. 93–104). See also: *Słownik geograficzny Królestwa Polskiego...*, vol. 2, pp. 532–533; A. Pawiński, *Polska w XVI wieku pod względem statystycznym*, vol. 4 – *Małopolska (Źródła dziejowe*, vol. 15), Warszawa 1886, pp. 61–62; *akta sejmikowe województwa krakowskiego*, vol. 1: 1572–1620, publ. S. Kutrzeba, Kraków 1932, p. 111 (7th–10th November 1584).

⁹⁷ See above footnotes 91 and 94. Also L. Zarewicz, *Lanckorona – monografia historyczna (według źródeł archiwalnych)*, Kraków 1885, p. 43 (“Kasper Bekiesz left his wife Anna de Sarcandy and two adolescent sons”), p. 45 (“A few years after the death of her husband, Anna Bekieszowa married Franciszek Wesseleny de Hadat, a high servant of Stefan Batory, who from the beginning of January 1583 signs as the *starost* [*capitaneus*] of Lanckorona, and later, during the Reign of Sigimund III, is granted *indygenat* [naturalization] at the general session of the Diet in Warsaw on April 7, 1580”), pp. 46–47 (“In 1583, Wesseleny bought two estates in Poland: Krzywaczka in the Cracow province [...], and Dębno with a brick castle [...]. In his full title, he signed: «Franciscus Wesseleny in Hadath et in Dębno liber baro ac haeres, Mieteliensis et Siemnensis capitaneus». [...] Notwithstanding Franciszek Wesseleny signed [also] as the *starost* of Lanckorona, the actual grantee of the tenure was his wife Anna de Sarcandy, [who] eventually transferred this crown land to Mikołaj Zebrzydowski in 1590”).

⁹⁸ W. Urban, *Wieś a plebania...*, p. 94 (*ibidem* further it is stated that “searches performed in the Archbishopric Archives in Cracow depict the internal situation of the parish and the rich Parish Archive in Gdów shows it in its entirety, therefore, it would be both workable and advisable to make a monograph of the Gdów Parish from the end of the Middle Ages to the 20th century”).

⁹⁹ Cf. B. Szady, *Prawo patronatu w Rzeczypospolitej w czasach nowożytnych...*, p. 89nn. Also S. Litak, *Parafie w Rzeczypospolitej w XVI–XVIII wieku. Struktura, funkcje społeczno-religijne i edukacyjne*, Lublin 2004 (esp. pp. 96–100).

matter he followed in the footsteps of his great-grandmother Anna Sárkándy-Wesselényi, whom Dębochowski mentions many times in this notebook – starting with the information at the very beginning about the income of the parish priest (“proventus ecclesiae Gdoviensis”). It states that as far as tithing is concerned: “Jejmość Pani Anna Zarkandi Wezelinowa [*sic*] żadnym sposobem nie kazała wytykać i poddanym zakazała, aby nie dawali wytykać, i musiałem pieniądze z nich brać. [Sama zaś] Wezelinowa Zarkandi i pieniędzmi nie chciała płacić. [Wprawdzie] z folwarku gdowskiego, z folwarku grzybowskiego, z folwarku stadnickiego, z folwarku kędzierskiego obiecowwała ze mną się zgodzić i mnie płacić, ale potym nic nie dała.”¹⁰⁰

Similar notes appear repeatedly in further parts of the notebook of the curate, who noted as for the year 1601 in reference to Gdów itself (“villa Gdow”): “ze dwora i z ról dworskich nie wziąłem nic w tym roku, bo nie chciała nic dać Jejmość Pani Wesselinowa,” which was also the case with the villages of Stadniki (“nie wziąłem nic i w tym roku, bo Jejmość Anna Zarkandi Wesselinowa nie chciała nic dać, a na ostatek kazała się pozywać”) and Kedzierzynek (“nie wziąłem nici w tym roku, bo Jejmość Pani Anna Zarkandi Wesselinowa nie chciała nic dać”)¹⁰¹ and it would not change in the following years (1602: “In villa Stadnicki [...] nie wziąłem nic w tym roku od Jejmości Paniej Anny Zarkandi Wesselinowej”).¹⁰² It was not until 1604 that things changed in a way, as apparently Dębochowski appealed to a higher instance (to which he was indeed “urged” by the owner herself), as there is an entry in his notepad that “na ten czas o te dziesięciny przed ichmości pany deputaty sprawej [jednak] nie było, [a to] dlatego, iż pryncypała nie było do tej sprawy, a zwłaszcza Jejmość Pani Anny Zarkandy Wesselinowej, bo umarła przed tą sprawą 23. Aprilis in hoc anno.”¹⁰³ The new owner of the Gdów estate was her aforementioned son, and Dębochowski noted in reference to him in the same year 1604 that “in hoc anno Jegomość Stefan Wesselin, odjeżdżając do Węgier, rozkazał panu Łososińskiemu, aby mi dał owsa ósm kop i z rolą, którą siano na dwór na przedewsiu, [bowiem] na tym miejscu był quondam plebański chmielnik.”¹⁰⁴

The above circumstance did by no means end the conflict between the parsonage and the manor in Gdów, since while Jan Dębochowski’s notes terminated in 1604 when Anna Sárkándy Wesselényi died and her inheritance was taken over by her son Stefan (István) – probably a Protestant (since in turn his sons, Francis

¹⁰⁰ W. Urban, *Wieś a plebania...*, p. 95.

¹⁰¹ *Ibidem*, pp. 99–100.

¹⁰² *Ibidem*, p. 101.

¹⁰³ *Ibidem*, p. 103.

¹⁰⁴ *Ibidem* (where in footnote 2 it is also stated that “Dębochowski sued [Anna] Wesselényi for the parish lands in 1604,” and “the date of death of A[nna] Wesselényi was not known to the Hungarian historiography”).

and Nicholas, converted to Catholicism, and also Urban mentions that the members of the Wesselényi family “functioned at the border of Reformation and Catholicism”¹⁰⁵ – at the very end of this manuscript, there are several short annotations made, later in a different hand, the first of which is: “Nota bene. Possessio durabat perceptio nis decimarum ab anno 1597 ad annum 1666.”¹⁰⁶ The publisher in his commentary limited himself to the remark that “the little diary of Father Dębochowski was read critically and supplemented by some parish priest from Gdów around 1666 (hand II),”¹⁰⁷ without making any attempt to determine identity of the clergyman who – apparently encountering difficulties of similar nature that were once experienced by the parson of Gdów at the turn of the 16th century – made the relevant entry most probably in 1666. Although the date of Stanisław Wojeński’s installation at the parsonage in Gdów is not known to the writer of these words (it would probably be possible to find it by browsing the files of the Cracow episcopal consistory from that time), there can be no doubt that in 1672, the year in which he reached the aforementioned agreement with Władysław (László) Wesselényi, he must already have resided in the parish for some time. Since – as it is clear from Wesselényi’s letter of 23rd March 1677 – the later bishop of Kamieniec Podolski “tempore Svetici belli habitabat in Murani,” it can be well assumed that he found refuge in Slovakia (Upper Hungary) with the Hungarian magnates during the Swedish “Deluge” precisely because he was known to them as the parson in the Gdów estate. In the wartime circumstances, when the Commonwealth was being ruined by the Swedish troops operating on its territory, uninhibitedly robbing church property and even exterminating the Catholic clergy, the dispute over tithing and the failure to fulfil the obligations arising from the custody over the parish church in Gdów, which had been going on for years, appeared less important and presumably did not disturb Wojeński during his stay in Murań. Afterwards, however, when the political situation had stabilised, it became a hot issue again, as indicated by both the note from 1666 and in particular the settlement of 1672.¹⁰⁸

¹⁰⁵ Remarkable in this context is the information provided by Ludwik Zarewicz that Stefan Wesselényi’s father and grandfather of palatine Franciszek and Jesuit Mikołaj, Franciszek (Ferenc) senior, was buried in the Franciscan church in Cracow, apparently due to the efforts of his aforementioned spouse (L. Zarewicz, *Lanckorona – monografia historyczna...*, pp 46–47: “He died on July 16, 1594 at forty years of age, [and] was buried in the church of the Franciscan fathers in Cracow, where the widow Anna de Sarcandy [Sárkány] placed a tomb for him. He left two sons of her: Stefan and Paweł, and three daughters: Anna, Elżbieta and Barbara”).

¹⁰⁶ W. Urban, *Wieś a plebania...*, p. 104.

¹⁰⁷ *Ibidem*, p. 94.

¹⁰⁸ In his editorial preface, Waclaw Urban stated that “it is unknown how this source [i.e. the notes of Gdów parson Jan Dębochowski] made it to the archives of the city of Cracow” (*ibidem*, p. 94). The

The documentation concerning the relationship between the Wesselényis and Stanisław Wojeński, including explanations on the issue of supposed involvement of the Cracow canon in the anti-imperial conspiracy in Hungary or the alleged practice of necromancy, was delivered in the form of transcripts to the Roman Curia and taken into account in deciding whether to include the controversial clergyman among the Catholic Episcopate. However, neither it nor the letters of recommendation (such as one issued in June 1678 by Bishop Stanisław Kazimierz Dąbmski) “overpowered” the counteraction to Wojeński’s nomination that was undertaken on behalf of Bishop Ordinary of Cracow Andrzej Trzebicki, who was entitled to speak in the matter since the unfortunate candidate for the mitre was, after all, the canon of the Cathedral Chapter in his diocese (and earlier also the archdeacon of Pilica and the parish priest of Gdów), hence the opinion of this hierarch could not be ignored in the Eternal City. Thus only Trzebicki’s demise on 28th December 1679 made a breakthrough in the case – all the more so because King Jan III Sobieski appointed to the vacant see of St. Stanislaus (Cracow) no one else but Jan Małachowski, the former Bishop Ordinary of Culmsee, who empowered by the nuncio’s delegation conducted a significant part of the information process of the candidate for the bishopric of Kamieniec Podolski, and therefore was well aware of the complexities of the case, personally probably not finding sufficient reasons to oppose the nomination. Only then, under the changed circumstances, could the decision of the Roman Consistorial Congregation signed by four cardinals of the Curia (and dated 22nd March [*sic*] 1680) be placed in the relevant process documents from more than two years ago: “Ex deductis in hoc processu credo Stanislaum videri dignum qui Ecclesiae Camenecensis in episcopum praeficiatur et pastorem.” On this basis, Pope Innocent X finally granted a commission for the bishopric in Kamieniec Podolski to Stanisław Wojeński, who was probably consecrated in Warsaw on Sunday, 26th May 1680.¹⁰⁹ In the light of the sources identified so far, the names of three consecrators through whose ministry this clergyman re-

fact that this relic piece got into the hands of Wojeński (as it was lent credence to above) may make it easier to find out when and how it was taken from Gdów to reappear later in the royal capital city of Cracow.

¹⁰⁹ He informed the Cardinal-Protector of Poland in the Roman Curia about the finalized bishop’s ordination in a letter dated Warsaw, 28th May 1680 (“reitero humillimas gratias meas eminentiae vestrae pro singulari eius benevolentia, gratia et protectione, qua mediante terminatum est iam negotium meum et consecratio personae meae in episcopum Camenecensem peracta”), which is also a supplication containing the following request: “Supplico eminentiae vestrae velit me autoritate sua fulciri, quatenus retentio ecclesiae parochiali Otvinovicensi mihi a Sua Sanctitate clementer concedatur. Cum hoc habeam beneficium de aliquo reditu quo sustentari possim, in praesenti episcopatus mei statu, sufficienter de sacerdotibus vicariis ecclesiae haec provisum est, nec per talem retentionem quidquam detrimenti passura” (ASV, Segreteria di Stato, Polonia, vol. Additamenta 6, n.d.).

ceived “the fullness of the priesthood” are not known, but it seems highly likely that his main consecrator could have been designated the new Bishop Ordinary of Cracow, Jan Małachowski (the papal approval of the translation was not obtained by him until 12th May 1681), and the function of co-consecrators was performed by two hierarchs who had previously been called as witnesses in the information process, i.e. Bishop Stanisław Kazimierz Dąbmski from Łuck and Stanisław Jacek Święcicki from Chełm.¹¹⁰

After waiting for so long and having experienced so many humiliations, but on the other hand, himself taking actions that were ethically at least doubtful (if not reprehensible), at the age of nearly seventy presumably (but surely still full of vitality, since a couple of years later he took part in the 1684 campaign of King John III Sobieski in Moldavia, from which he left an account that was published in print),¹¹¹ Wojeński was granted a bishop’s dignity, which back in the beginning of his ecclesiastical career could have seemed to him to be an unattainable goal. However, this did not mean that now all those who had previously opposed his elevation to the bishopric gave up and peacefully accepted their defeat, even though their names are now mostly long lost in oblivion. Certainly among them were some of Stanisław Wojeński’s confraters from the Cracow Cathedral Chapter,¹¹² although as early as in 1666 he established (with his own person in mind) anniversary services in the Wawel Cathedral, probably aiming to find in future eternal rest in the vaults of this respectable temple, as provided for the chapter statutes. However, eventually he was buried under the floor of the Camaldolese hermitage church in Bielany near Cracow, where to this day the grave of this hierarch is indicated by a marble plate with an appropriate coat of arms and engraved inscription – omitting (which is very meaningful in the context described above) the surname of the deceased – which reads: “Meriti constantia parati honores et vita laudabilis probatique mores Stanislai praesulis eximia virtus eo tecta lapide quiescunt hic intus.” On 10th March 1685 at the Wawel Cathedral, only an exequy for the peace of the soul of Stanisław Wojeński (who died on 21st February 1685 in Warsaw) took place, during which a sermon (published later as *Infula Camenecensis, parentali innexa cupresso, in dolentissimo obitu illustrissimi et reverendissimi domini, domini Stanislai a Brzezie Woienski, episcopi Camenecensis [...], ad sacram exequialium suffragiorum memoriam in ecclesia cathedrali Cracoviensi ritu lugubri famae post-*

¹¹⁰ As regards the criteria for the selection of the principal consecrator and co-consecrators, see also: K. R. P r o k o p, *Sakry i sukcesja święceń biskupich episkopatu Kościoła katolickiego w Polsce w XIX i XX wieku (na tle wcześniejszych okresów dziejowych)*, Lublin 2012, passim.

¹¹¹ *Bibliografia polska*, vol. 33, comp. S. E s t r e i c h e r, Kraków 1939, p. 207.

¹¹² About its make-up at that time: K. R. P r o k o p, *Herby kanoników krakowskiej kapituły katedralnej w księdze “Acta actorum capituli cathedralis Cracoviensis” z lat 1671–1684*, “Rocznik Polskiego Towarzystwa Heraldycznego” n.s. 7, 18 (2005), pp. 123–136.

humae [...] exhibita) was delivered by Andrzej Rudolf Margowski, a famous preacher at the time.¹¹³

* * *

Many times quoted here Zygmunt Lasocki wrote a few dozen years ago: “for Maciej Wojeński [*recte* Wonieski], a professor of the Cracow Academy and a doctor of medicine, a man of science and business (he made a considerable fortune and acquired several villages), the noble descent was not as indispensible as for his son, to whom it opened the door to his further career. [...] There actually existed a noble family of Wojeński (of Półkozic coat-of-arms), mentioned by Okolski – in the province of Podlasie near Bielsk Podlaski, there was a village of Wojeńcze inhabited by petty nobility [of the same name]¹¹⁴ – if, however, Father [Stanisław] Wojeński had originated from this family, he would not have had to resort to forgery and taking a false oath to prove his ancient nobility in order to ascend to the Cracow canonry, for which his father’s fresh (and moreover questionable) ennoblement was not enough. [...] His pursuit obviously required many years of studies, practices, measures and efforts, but it gave him – apart from a long line of ancestors – also true benefits: the Cracow canonry, the abbey of Lubin, and after a time the bishop’s mitre and a seat in the Senate [*in fact, he became the commendatory abbot of Lubin already as Bishop Ordinary of Kamieniec Podolski*].¹¹⁵ Yet Wojeński’s dream of founding a family, for which he had already fabricated numerous and excellent ancestors, did not come true. In his genealogy book, he recalls with regret that the children of his only married brother Jan, to whom all [other] brothers transferred their property, died young and there remained just one descendant – Franciszek Antoni, the only hope of the family, “in quo omnis spes domus continetur.” It is him, of course, that Father Wojeński had in mind when he called on the younger generation of the Wojeńskis to emulate the virtues of their progenitors, as they themselves followed in the footsteps of their ancestors – “prouit nos antenatorum nostrorum, ita vos nostras in agendo imitemini virtutes”

¹¹³ *Bibliografia polska*, vol. 22, comp. K. E s t r e i c h e r, Kraków 1908, pp. 157. Also *Liber mortuorum monasterii Lubinensis Ordinis Sancti Benedicti*, publ. W. K ę t r z y ń s k i, [in:] *Monumenta Poloniae Historica*, vol. 5, Lwów 1888, pp. 602, 612; L. Z a r e w i c z, *Zakon kamedulów – jego fundacje i dziejowe wspomnienia w Polsce i na Litwie*, Kraków 1871, p. 27. Cf. *Tomasza Święckiego historyczne pamiątki znamienitych rodzin...*, vol. 2, p. 311 (“Buried in Bielany near Warsaw [*sic*] in the Camaldolese church, he detailed the origin and progeny of his house in a book [*sic*] entitled *Flamma rediviva*, where he gathered ancient privileges and evidences from land registers”).

¹¹⁴ Cf. J. C i e c h a n o w i c z, *Rody rycerskie Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego*, vol. 5, Rzeszów 2001, p. 385. Also *Herbarz polski Kaspra Niesieckiego...*, vol. 9, p. 391.

¹¹⁵ *Acta nuntiatorum Poloniae*, vol. 34: *Opitius Pallavicini (1680–1688)*, part 1: *10 VIII 1680 – 29 III 1681*, ed. M. D o m i n - J a c h o v, Romae 1995, pp. 240–241, no. 212 (1st March 1681).

(it seems, however, that Franciszek Antoni did not live to see a more mature age either, because Niesiecki, who knows all the details about the Wojeńskis, does not mention anything about him, [so that] after the death of youngest brother of Stanisław – Ludwik, also a clergyman – in 1707, nothing more can be heard about the Wojeński family).¹¹⁶ Although the final remark below seems to be removed from scholarly objectivity, if *virtutes* that were given by Stanisław Wojeński to subsequent generations of his family as exemplary were to coincide with those with which he distinguished himself on his own path in life, striving *per fas et nefas* to achieve the desired eminence, then it can be seen as a bitter irony (and at the same time a historical justice) that only 22 years after the death of that Bishop Ordinary of Kamieniec Podolski, the history of the «Flammans» – the Wojeński family – came to an end.

Translated by Marek Krośniak

¹¹⁶ Z. L a s o c k i, *O falsyfikatach w Archiwum Skarbcza Koronnego*, pp. 187, 191–192 (see also p. 180: “The last document contained in the aforementioned manuscript [of 1652] is a 1670 donation by Wojeński of parts of the villages Minoga, Skalka and Nowa Wieś he was entitled to by inheritance to the younger brother of Jan Wojeński of Brzezcie, burgrave of the Cracow castle. This brother – the only married man in the family – had several children, who died in tender age, however, so only one son was left alive”).

❧ APPENDIX ❧

SUMMARIUM PROCESSUS CORAM ILLUSTRISSIMO ET REVERENDISSIMO
DOMINO NUNTIO APOSTOLICO IN REGNO POLONIAE FABRICATI SUPER STATU
ECCLESIAE CAMENECENSIS ET QUALITATIBUS REVERENDISSIMI NOMINATI

I.

Processus super vita, moribus, doctrina et idoneitate domini Stanislai Woienski, canonici Cracoviensis, ac super statu Ecclesiae Camenecensis tam ante quam post deditionem factam Turcis, fabricatus coram illustrissimo et reverendissimo domino Francisco Martello, archiepiscopo Corinthiensi et in Regno Poloniae nuntio apostolico.

1.

Die 22. Februarii 1677. Coram illustrissimo et reverendissimo domino Francisco Martello, Dei et Apostolica Sedis gratia archiepiscopo Corinthiensi, [...] nuntio apostolico, comparuit reverendus dominus Stanislaus Sadowski, instigator fiscalis curiae episcopi Cracoviensis, et nomine illustrissimi et reverendissimi domini episcopi sive eiusdem curiae produxit puncta quedam contra perillustrem et admodum reverendum dominum Stanislaum Woienski, canonicum Cracoviensem, contenta in folio per se comparentem subscripto, petens penes acta apostolicae nuntiaturae admitti et inseri, et fieri ac decerni, prout in eo quod est tenor sequentis, videlicet illustrissimus dominus nuntius apostolicus non potest procedere ad conficiendum processum in favorem domini Stanislai Woienski, canonici cathedralis Cracoviensis, ad effectum obtinendi Romae expeditionem sacrarum litterarum ad episcopatum Camenecensem iuxta nominationem serenissimi regis. Idque quia praefatus dominus canonicus Woienski est irregularis propter multa enormia et gravissima crimina ab ipso perpetrata.

Primum est quia negromantiam exercuit characteribusque negromanticis usus est prout hac de re accusatus fuit a domino Veselenio, quia etiam praefatis ipsius characteris negromanticis misit illustrissimo domino loci ordinario Cracoviensi, petens, cum pro tam enormi delicto puniri, quare citatus est nuper idem canonicus Woienski a fiscali curiae praedicti illustrissimi domini loci ordinarii ad videndum praedictum crimen ipsi obiectum probari, et penas, quas pro illo meruit, in eum decerni causaque haec pendet in iudicio eiusdem illustrissimi domini loci ordinarii ad reditum ipsius ex praesentibus comitis Cracoviam.

Secundum. Quia aliquos insignes in Ungaria personas, et praesertim quendam dominum Viselinum, palatinum Ungariae, induxit persuasionibus suis ad rebellionem contra Caesaream Maiestatem, prout hac de re filii praedicti domini palatini dolens conquesti sunt coram illustrissimo domino loci ordinario Cracoviensi, quando iam praedictum crimen perduellionis patris illorum copertum fuit bonaque illius omnia

confiscata et uxor in sequestrum accepta, in quo fortassis hucusque detinetur. Et hoc quoque crimine probando et deducendo ipsi idem canonicus Woienski citatus est ad illustrissimum dominum loci ordinarium Cracoviensem ab ipsius curiae fiscali.

Tertium. Quia anno 1674 idem canonicus Woienski contra praescriptum sacrum canonum negotiis saecularibus se immiscens, quendam Acachiam Gallum expediverat in Ungariam ad confirmandos ibi rebeliis haereticos, ut in suo nefario proposito contram Caesaream Maiestatem perseverarent, eundemque postea Acachiam reducem ex Ungaria fovebat secreto per aliquot septimanas in villa sua prope Cracoviam, consilia cum eo communicans de modo procurandi et dandi succursus eisdem rebelibus contra Caesaream Maiestatem. Evadere quando privatim per litteras monitus fuit ab illustrissimo domino loci ordinario Cracoviensi, ut ab eiusmodi machinationibus desisteret, respondit se nihil cum praefato Acachia practicasse, sed pro antiqua amicitia sua, quam cum illo habuit, concessisse ipsi locum substinendi ad tempus in praedio villae suae ad capiendum salubriorem aerem in eius infirmitatem. Quod quidem responsum ipsius non erat consonum veritati, nam sunt etiam nunc testes fide digni, qui eundem Acachiam noctu saepissime ex praedicta villa clandestine venientem Cracoviam ad eundem canonicum Woienski viderunt. Ex quo clandestino et frequentio illorum congressu, tam ex aliis coniecturis, firmiter praesumitur ea machinatos fuisse, quae his praemissa sunt.

Quartum. Quia non est devotus, nam observatus fuit per multos tempus officium Divinum, videlicet horas canonicas, non recitasse, qua de re monitus ab illustrissimo domino loci ordinario, nescitur si eas nunc recitat.

Quintum. Quia idem dominus Woienski ambiens canonicatum in ecclesia cathedrali Cracoviensi (cui secundum bullam Leonis X praeter quinque doctores non possunt esse canonici nisi nobiles cogiturque canonicus ad capitulum admittendus inducere testes, qui iurent eum notum esse ex patre, avo et avia tam paterna quam materna nobilibus), finxit se esse nobilem testesque a se inductos peierare fecit, qui contrarium certo scientes, iurarunt ipsum ex nobilibus patre, avo et avia tam paterna quam materna esse progenitum.

Ex his itaque rationibus rogo illustrissimum dominum nuntium apostolicum, ut a conficiendo praefato processu supersedeat, donec idem canonicus Woienski purgaverit se a tot obiectis sibi enormibus et gravissimis criminibus in iudicio illustrissimi domini loci ordinarii. Ego Stanislaus Sadowski, instigator, illustrissimi et reverendissimi domini episcopi Cracoviensis seu illius curiae nomine, quo supra, produxi. Die 22. Februarii 1677 productum in cancellaria nuntiaturae apostolicae pro domino instigatore illustrissimi domini episcopi Cracoviensis.

2.

Die 22. Augusti 1677. Pro perillustri et reverendissimo domino Stanislao Woienski etc. contra reverendum dominum Stanislaum Sadowski, instigatorem fiscalem curiae episcopalis Cracoviensis. Coram praefato illustrissimo et reverendissi-

mo domino Francisco Martello, nuntio apostolico, comparatum fuit et expositum, qualiter Sacra Congregatio Consistorialis sub die 16. Julii presentis anni 1677 ad supplicationem praedicti domini Woienski, ad Camenecensem Ecclesiam promovendi, decrevit committendum esse dominationi suae illustrissimae et reverendissimae, ut conficiat de more processum informativum super statu Ecclesiae Camenecensi et super qualitatibus eiusdem domini promovendi, cum praefixione termini triginta dierum promotori fiscali ad deducendum coram dominatione sua illustrissima et reverendissima, tamquam apostolico delegato, quidquid habet contra ipsum dominum promovendum.

3.

Die 27. Septembris 1677. Coram eodem illustrissimo et reverendissimo domino nuntio personaliter comparavit in palatio residentiae dominationis suae illustrissimae Varsaviae perillustris et reverendissimus dominus Stanislaus Woienski, canonicus Cracoviensis, et inhaerendo decreto Sacrae Congregationis Consistorialis datum die 16. Julii praesentis anni 1677 et alias pro sui parte et ad suam instantiam apud acta praesentia cancellariae nuntiaturae apostolicae originaliter producto, petiit et instetit praefatae dominationem suam illustrissimam et reverendissimam in eiusdem decreti executionem fieri inquisitionem super vita, doctrina et idoneitate aliisque requisitis ipsius comparentis ad ecclesiam cathedralem Camenecensem ex gratia sanctissimi domini nostri papae eiusque Sanctae Sedis Apostolicae et ad petitionem serenissimi et potentissimi Poloniae regis promovendi.

4.

Anno Domini 1677. Ego Martinus Lelinski, clericus dioecesis Vladislaviensis, [...] expeditus fui Gedano Cracoviam, ubi die 15. Septembris et per tres dies continue sequentes quaesivi reverendum dominum Stanislaum Sadovski, canonicum Vislicensem, promotorem fiscalem episcopatus Cracoviensis, ut ei praesentem citationem intimarem et copias eius relinquerem, sed cum me ad palatium episcopalem guardiae intrare impedirent, nulla ratione illuc ingredi nec dominum fiscalem citare potui. Monente postea illustrissimo et reverendissimo domino episcopo Cracoviensi, secutus sum aulam eius Wawrzyncyce [=Wawrzeńczyce] usque, sed nec ibi dabatur mihi ulla possibilitas intimandae citationis huius, in cuius rei fidem haec manu propria super authentica citatione et eius veris copiis annotavi.

Anno Domini 1677, die 24. Octobris. Ego Augustinus Watkiewicz, praesbiter archidioecesis Gnesnensis, accessi domum solitae residentiae in Wislica reverendi Stanislai Sadowski, canonici Vislicensis, promotoris fiscalis episcopatus Cracoviensis, ibique copias citationis praesentis paenes familia in domus eius reliqui. Eadem die accessi ibidem in Wislica cancellariam officialatus Vislicensis et reverendo Christophoro Marzewski, notario actorum cancellariae, eadem citationem intimavi [jest intimavit], sed ille contumeliose me tractavit et sub custodiam per

unam quasi horam posuit et detinuit, quousque ex oppido rediisset, quo acceptis a me copiis citationis praesentis iratus abiverat [jest abiuerat], et in continenti ibidem semper hac contumelia mihi ab illo illata coram adstantibus personis protestatus sum, in cuius rei testimonium haec super authentica citatione et eius veriis copiis annotavi.

II.

*Letter, dated Cracow, 23 March 1677,
Count Władysław (Laszlo) Wesselényi to the canon of Cracow,
Stanisław Wojeński, a nominee for the bishopric of Kamieniec Podolski*

Ex litteris illustrissimae dominationis vestrae, quarta Martii ad me datis, cum summa amaritudine mea percepi quomodo sua celsitudo dominus episcopus Cracoviensis causam illam pro qua me illustrissima dominatio vestra citaverat ad eundem dominum episcopum iterum postquam eam iudicasset restaurare velit in dishonorem vestrae illatis. Utinam mortuus fuisset antequam illa ex ore meo prodierunt per malam aliorum me instigantium informationem volens his me defendere contra actionem illustrissimae dominationis vestrae me intentatam negromantiam nunquam exercuit nec characteres mihi dedit, sed ille character, quem ego coram sua celsitudine episcopali praesentavi, erat figuram septem planetarum exprimens de hocque fueram sinistre informatus esse negromanticum, sed viso illo dominus episcopus ipse mihi dixit hunc characterem esse nugas, suasitque et potius reconciliationem illustrissimae dominationis omnibus modis quererem quam ipso domino episcopo mediante post latum decretum ab illustrissima dominatione obtinui, nec de parente meo quidquam dixi, imo inter discursum de rebus Hungaricis dixi ipsi, quod quando illustrissima dominatio in Murani tempore Svetici belli habitabat saepius hoc suadebat, ne unquam domini Ungari se subiiciant sub protectionem Turcicam, quin: quomodo potuisset piae memoriae parentem meum incitare in aliquod malum, cum sedecem forse annis eundem non vidit, sed et ante hos motus Hungaricos aliquot annis iam fuerat mortuus, et neque quidquam scivi in rebellionem parentis, qui suam fidelitatem erga Sacratissimam Maiestatem toti mundo palam demonstravit. [...] Humillimus et obsequissimus servus Ladislaus Wesseleni.

III.

*Letter, dated Lwów, 23rd June 1678,
Bishop of Luck Stanisław Kazimierz Dąmbski
(presumably) to Cardinal-Protector of the Polish Kingdom in the Roman Curia,
Pietro Vidoni*

Eminentissime et reverendissime domine et patrone colendissime!

Veneror omni cultu hanc eminentiae vestrae erga me gratiam, quod et benignum meis testimonis pro domino canonico Woienski assensum probuerit, et illa Sanctissimo Domino Nostro referre fuerit dignata. Non mihi fuit favoris in iis commendationibus, aut alicuius politici respectus ratio, sed iniustitiam, calumnias et traductiones manifestas, pati non licuit, et praecipue cum hoc sit aperto scandalo et damno, quod vir non vulgaris ac Ecclesiae Dei summe utilis arceatur a Senatu, et praesertim tempore, cum de Ecclesia Camenecensi statuendum sit, circa dislimitationem Podoliae, quae imminet: Turcis in singulis oppidis unam pro Catholicis reliquentibus ecclesiam. Sed cum et aurum, argentum et alia suppellex ecclesiarum dioecesis Camenecensis hinc inde per Poloniam dispersim habita, omni hora perditur et a conservatoribus dilapidatur. Cum contributio publica in praeteritis comitiis pro exulibus ex Podolia sancita, omisso episcopo et illius diaecesis clero, inter solos dividatur incolas saeculares. Habuit Regia Maiestas copias processus, quem dominus episcopus Cracoviensis promotioni canonici [Woienski] in Sacra Congregatione Consistorialis opposuit, evidenterque observavit ipsos testes fateri, se informationes scripto, quomodo deponi contra canonicum [Woienski] debeant habuisse. Nullus in eo processu testis [est] [urwana karta], nisi ex familiaribus et obligatis domini episcopi, usque ad octavum [testem], qui magister culinae eius est. Et hoc Regia Maiestas summe apprehendit, praeferrī fidei suae regiae vilissimorum hominum falsa testimonia. Nunquam enim haec toti genti Polonae de canonico [Woienski] persuaderi possunt, quae tam impudenter et obiiciuntur, quod et nonnulli testes palam iam revocant, ac se nunquam contra canonicum [Woienski] deposuisse asserunt. Nec mirum cum ipse dominus episcopus scrutator et eius fiscalis notarius processus fuerit. Hinc est quod Sua Maiestas Regia magno dolore conquaeratur de authoritate et reputatione sua in Urbe laesa, et ac si nihil unquam ex respectu eius et commendationibus agatur. Languescit ipsius regius animus exinde in defensione cleri, qui inaudita vilipendia iam patitur; ut bene notum eminentiae vestrae est de clero diaecesis Posnaniensis integre cum episcopo, ex Regno banito et proscrip̄to a Iudicibus Maioris Poloniae. De confederatione nobilitatis in Palatinatu Sandomiriensi contra dominum episcopum Cracoviensem, vix in effectum non deducta. De aliquot in personas ecclesiasticas in diversis palatinatibus commissis homicidiis, quod ante hac in Polonia vix auditum fuerat. De ecclesia Patrum Carmelitarum Gedani furore haereticorum dirruta et Sacra

Synaxi ac reliquiis sanctorum eiectis profanatis. Haec omnia pessima principia sunt, et sola ac unica protectione regia arceri possunt.

Paratus fuit canonicus [Woienski] iuxta decretum Sanctae Congregationis respondere fiscali episcopi Cracoviensis de obiecta, sed cum fiscalis in termino non comparuit, illustrissimus et reverendissimus dominus nuntius [apostolicus] iustificationem canonici in contumaciam non admittit, secretam sibi asserit in eo commissam ab Urbe inquisitionem. Quod quidem non in regio solum sed in totius Senatus animo summam parit perplexitatem, ac si non vitia canonici [Woienski], sed aliquae externorum factiones, in eo praeseferantur. Ego quidem concludere id apud me non audeo, sed quod non debeam ea eminentiae vestrae insinuare, et fides et religio desiderant, vereor enim exinde consequentias. Verum haec omnia altissimo subsint eminentiae vestrae iudicio mihi eam scribendi confidentiam, summa eminentiae vestrae erga me aperuit gratia. Maiestatem Divinam supplex oro, dignetur vestram eminentiam ad multos annos Sacro Sanctae Ecclesiae domus eius, et meae protectioni conservare. Datum Leopoli, 23. Junii anno Domini 1678. Devotissimus et obligatissimus servitor Stanislaus, episcopus Luceoriensis.

SUMMARY

Stanisław Wojeński – who was Bishop of Kamieniec in 1680–1685 – was the author of a printed account of the Polish-Turkish wars of 1684 and was one of the distinctive (albeit forgotten) figures of the Church and political life during the reign of King Jan III Sobieski. He was the son of the Rector of the Cracow Academy and received his education in Poland, Germany and Italy. Since the reign of King Jan II Kazimierz, he was active not only as a diplomat, but also as a Canon of the Cracow Cathedral and as the Archdeacon of the Collegiate Chapter in Pilica. In 1677, he was nominated Bishop of Kamieniec Podolski, which at that time was under the Turkish jurisdiction. However, it was not until three years later that his nomination received papal approval, the delay being due not only to the geopolitical situation of the Diocese of Kamieniec, which had temporarily been lost to the Turks by the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, but also to the fact that Wojeński had been accused – first before the Apostolic Nuncio in Warsaw and later in the Roman Curia itself – of necromancy, lack of personal piety, involvement in the anti-imperial opposition in Hungary (i.e. in today's Slovakia, which at that time belonged to the Lands of the Crown of Saint Stephen) and of having falsified his own descent (which was not in fact noble) in order to qualify for a senior Church dignitary. Of all these accusations, the last at least was true, as Wojeński's ancestors had actually been burghers in Kościan in Greater Poland. Because – on the one hand – the charges were made by Andrzej Trzebicki, who was Bishop Ordinary of Cracow, while – on the other hand – the Royal Court (including King Jan III Sobieski himself) showed intransigence in supporting the candidacy, it was a long time before a decision was eventually made in Rome (and then only after the death of Bishop Trzebicki in 1679). This article presents the most important aspects of Wojeński-

ki's case – which was atypical as far as the filling of episcopal vacancies in the seventeenth century Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth was concerned – with the aid of sources from the Vatican Archives (Archivio Segreto Vaticano), which have hitherto not been analysed in this particular context.

KEYWORDS:

biography of Stanisław Wojeński (ca. 1613–1680); Catholic episcopate of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in the 17th century; information processes for bishops; Polonica in the Vatican Archives

STANISŁAWA WOJEŃSKIEGO DROGA DO BISKUPIEJ INFUŁY. PERYPETIE KOŚCIELNEJ KARIERY SYNA REKTORA AKADEMII KRAKOWSKIEJ

STRESZCZENIE

Do wyróżniających, choć dziś już zapomnianych postaci życia kościelnego i politycznego doby panowania króla Jana III Sobieskiego, zaliczyć należy biskupa kamienieckiego z lat 1680–1685 Stanisława Wojeńskiego, autora drukowanej relacji z walk polsko-tureckich w roku 1684. Syn rektora Akademii Krakowskiej, wykształcony w Polsce, Rzeszy i Italii, już od czasów króla Jana II Kazimierza zaangażowany w działalność dyplomatyczną, kanonik katedry krakowskiej i archidiakon kapituły kolegiackiej w Pilicy, nominację ze strony monarchy na pozostającą wtedy pod panowaniem tureckim stolicę biskupią w Kamieńcu Podolskim uzyskał jeszcze w początkach roku 1677, wszakże na otrzymanie papieskiego zatwierdzenia musiał oczekiwać aż trzy lata. Zaważyła na tym nie tylko ówczesna sytuacja geopolityczna diecezji kamienieckiej, której terytorium zostało przejściowo utracone przez Rzeczpospolitą Obojga Narodów, ale również względy natury personalnej. Został on bowiem oskarżony przed nuncjuszem apostolskim w Warszawie, a następnie także bezpośrednio w Kurii Rzymskiej, o nekromancję, brak osobistej pobożności, zaangażowanie w antycesarską opozycję na Węgrzech (zarazem też wchodzącej ówczesnie w skład ziem Korony św. Stefana dzisiejszej Słowacji), wreszcie też o dokonane z premedytacją zafalszowanie własnego rodowodu, w rzeczywistości nieszlacheckiego, celem zapewnienia sobie otwartej drogi do osiągnięcia wysokich godności kościelnych, spośród których to zarzutów przynajmniej ów ostatni odpowiadał prawdzie (przodkowie S. Wojeńskiego byli bowiem mieszczanami w Kościanie w Wielkopolsce). Ponieważ z jednej strony czynnikiem sprawczym wysunięcia owych oskarżeń był ordynariusz krakowski Andrzej Trzebicki, z drugiej wszakże dwór monarszy (na czele z samym królem Janem III Sobieskim) okazał nieustępliwość i nie zaniechał forsowania odnośnej kandydatury, w Rzymie długo zwlekano z podjęciem ostatecznej decyzji – do momentu, kiedy zmarł wyżej wspomniany biskup Krakowa (1679). Niniejszy artykuł ukazuje najważniejsze odsłony tej nietypowej, gdy chodzi o obsadzanie stolic biskupich w XVII-wiecznym państwie polsko-litewskim,

sprawy, spożytkowując niewykorzystane dotychczas pod tym kątem materiały z Archiwum Watykańskiego (Archivio Segreto Vaticano).

SŁOWA KLUCZOWE

Stanisław Wojeński (ok. 1613–1680) – biografia, episkopat katolicki Rzeczypospolitej Obojga Narodów – XVII wiek, procesy informacyjne na biskupstwa, polonica w Archiwum Watykańskim