

The *Eastern European History Review* is an international and interdisciplinary annually online and open access peer-reviewed journal about studies on Central and Eastern Europe in the Modern Age (XIV–XIX). The Journal is also the expression of the Study Center CESPoM (Centro Studi sull'età dei Sobieski e della Polonia Moderna – Center Study on the Age of Sobieski and Modern Poland) of the University of Tuscia, born in 1997.

It publishes articles with significant approaches and original interpretations in all research fields concerning Central and Eastern Europe, with specific attention to the History Sciences.

This Special Issue of *Eastern European History Review* deals with the history of diplomacy and its executors – diplomats (ambassadors, legates, nuncios, internuncios, agents and others) – in the seventeenth century's Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth.

As a state conglomerate culturally and politically, closely connected to Western Europe, and for its specific institutional form of a “noble republic”, the Commonwealth has created, in the field of diplomatic practice, institutions, principles and ceremonies unique in the European context.

The focus of the volume is the historiographic stream of the *New Diplomatic History*, without withdrawing from classic approaches that remain an important field of research.

Tracing the salient moments and facts of the complex history of the seventeenth century of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, the volume – with the participation of authors from different parts of Europe and beyond – constitutes an international opportunity to reflect on issues and topics of old and new diplomatic history.

Diplomats and Diplomacy in the Early Modern Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth (XVII century) constitutes a result of the research activity and scientific collaboration inherent to the project directed by Dr Dorota Gregorowicz *The Holy See and the crisis of sovereignty of John II Casimir Vasa and Michael Korybut Wiśniowiecki's election (1660–1669)*, n. 2018/28/C/HS3/00176, financed by the National Science Centre, Poland.

Alessandro Boccolini

In copertina: Roman Postempki, *Jan III podpisuje traktat z Turkami w Żurawnie*, XIX Century
(Collection of National Museum in Warsaw)

euro 19,00

ISBN 978-88-7853-940-2



ISSN 2612-0402



EEHR

EASTERN EUROPEAN HISTORY REVIEW
Annually Historical Journal

n. 4/2021

Special issue

DIPLOMATS AND DIPLOMACY

IN THE EARLY MODERN POLISH-LITHUANIAN COMMONWEALTH (XVII CENTURY)

Edited by

Dorota Gregorowicz and Alessandro Boccolini



Director Emeritus

Gaetano Platania (Università degli Studi della Toscana)

Director

Alessandro Boccolini (Università degli Studi della Toscana)

Scientific Board

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

Matteo Sanfilippo (Università degli Studi della Toscana)

Rimvydas Petrauskas (Vilnius University)

Raffaele Caldarelli (Università degli Studi della Toscana)

Giordano Altarozzi (Petru Maior University of Târgu Mures)

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

Cesare La Mantia (Università di Trieste)

Prokhorov Andrei (Belarusian State University of Minsk)

Olexiy Sokyrko (Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv)

Rafał Quirini-Popławski (Jagiellonian University of Kraków)

Francesca De Caprio (Università degli Studi della Toscana)

Jarosław Pietrzak (Pedagogical University of Kraków)

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

Language Expert

Sonia Maria Melchiorre (Università degli Studi della Toscana)

Editorial Board

Tony Urbani (Università degli Studi della Toscana)

Małgorzata Trzeciak Cygan (University of Warsaw)

Giulio Merlani (University of Caen Normandy)



Università degli Studi della Tuscia

Centro Studi sull'Età dei Sobieski e della Polonia Moderna
(Study Center on the Sobieski Age and of Modern Poland)
www.cespom.eu

Proprietà letteraria riservata. La riproduzione in qualsiasi forma, memorizzazione o trascrizione con qualunque mezzo (elettronico, meccanico, in fotocopia, in disco o in altro modo, compresi cinema, radio, televisione, internet) sono vietate senza l'autorizzazione scritta dell'Editore.

Eastern European History Review è una rivista on-line peer-reviewed con lettori anonimi

Chiuso il 31-12-2021

Impaginazione a cura di: *Fabiana Ceccariglia*

ISBN: 978-88-7853-940-2

ISBN ebook: 978-88-7853-941-9

ISSN: 2612-0402 005

Permalink: <http://hdl.handle.net/2067/4631>

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

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

EASTERN EUROPEAN HISTORY REVIEW

a n n u a l l y h i s t o r i c a l j o u r n a l

~
n. 4/2021
Special Issue

DIPLOMATS AND DIPLOMACY IN THE EARLY MODERN POLISH-LITHUANIAN COMMONWEALTH (XVII CENTURY)

Edited by

Dorota Gregorowicz and Alessandro Boccolini



EASTERN EUROPEAN HISTORY REVIEW: LA RIVISTA

Il Comitato redazionale e scientifico è lieto di presentare al pubblico la rivista scientifica *Eastern European History Review*.

Con un carattere internazionale e interdisciplinare, una cadenza annuale e una fruibilità *open access* la rivista focalizza i propri interessi sulle dinamiche occorse nell'Europa Orientale durante tutta l'età moderna (XIV-XIX). *Eastern European History Review* è espressione del Centro Studi dell'Università della Tuscia CESPoM (Centro Studi sull'età dei Sobieski e della Polonia Moderna) nato nel 1997 per intuizione del Prof. Gaetano Platania, Direttore Emerito della Rivista.

L'iniziativa editoriale che presentiamo nasce dall'evidente mancanza in Italia di una rivista scientifica relativa alla storia dell'Europa centro-orientale in Età Moderna, nonostante la penisola abbia giocato un ruolo fondamentale per la Storia e la Cultura di una parte integrante del continente, a torto considerata come lontana e periferica.

Consapevoli di questo, il Comitato ha posto quale obiettivo primario della *Eastern European History Review* quello di offrire uno spazio di riflessione e di discussione su temi che appartengono alla storia dell'Europa centro-orientale, e insieme alle relazioni - politiche e culturali - che questa vasta area del Vecchio Continente ha avuto con l'occidente d'Europa, e l'Italia in particolare, incoraggiando il dialogo tra studiosi e esperti di settore, e tra differenti approcci della ricerca scientifica.

Il Comitato Redazionale e Scientifico

EASTERN EUROPEAN HISTORY REVIEW: THE JOURNAL

The Editorial and Scientific Board are proud delighted to present the *Eastern European History Review* under the aegis of Sette Città Editore.

The *Eastern European History Review* is an international and interdisciplinary annually online and open access peer-reviewed journal about studies on Central and Eastern Europe in the Modern Age (XIV-XIX). The Journal is also the expression of the Study Center CESPoM (Centro Studi sull'età dei Sobieski e della Polonia Moderna – Center Study on the Age of Sobieski and Modern Poland) of the University of Tuscia, born in 1997, from an idea of Prof. Gaetano Platania, today Director Emeritus of this journal.

It publishes articles with significant approaches and original interpretations in all research fields concerning Central and Eastern Europe, with specific attention to the History sciences.

The editorial initiative we present comes from the obvious lack of a journal, in Italy, concerning the history of Central and Eastern Europe during the Modern Age, this despite its fundamental role in the history and culture of that part of the continent, wrongly considered distant and peripheral.

Quite the contrary is true, in fact. Main objective of the journal is to create a space for reflection and discussion on topics pertaining to Central and Eastern Europe, but also relations with Continental Europe, encouraging dialogue between scholars and experts in the field, and between different approaches of scientific research.

The Editorial and Scientific Board

SOMMARIO/SUMMARY

Dorota Gregorowicz
Introduction

11

TECHNICAL ASPECTS OF DIPLOMATIC SERVICE

Dorota Gregorowicz
Diplomacy of the Commonwealth, Diplomacy of the King: the Peculiarity of Foreign Policy Making in the Seventeenth Century Poland-Lithuania.

19

Marius Sirutavičius
Partnership in a Union with Diverging Interests: Cooperation between the Kingdom of Poland and Grand Duchy of Lithuania in Diplomatic Activities at the Turn of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries.

35

Henryk Litwin, Paweł Duda
Correspondence of Warsaw Nuncio Antonio Santa Croce with Roman Catholic Bishops from 1629: Frequency, Intensity and Content.

45

Michał Salamonik
News Agents and Postmasters: Background Figures or Active Diplomats?

57

DIPLOMACY AS AN ART OF GREAT POLITICS

Miguel Conde Pazos
Spanish Diplomats in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth during the Thirty Years' War.

67

Ryszard Skowron
Palatinate: the Key to Europe. On the Art of Diplomacy of Władysław IV Vasa.

79

Aleksandra Ziober
The Last Years of the Reign of John Casimir Vasa and Interregnum after his Abdication in the Light of Reports of Francis Sanderson and Robert Yard.

101

Alessandro Boccolini
Diplomacy and Papal Politics during the "Unfortunate" Reign of Michał Korybut Wiśniowiecki.

111

DIPLOMATIC CEREMONIAL

Marta Szymańska
The Ceremonial of Receiving of Albrycht Stanisław Radziwiłł and his Stay at the Courts of Western Europe as a Royal Envoy during the Journey of Prince Władysław Vasa 1624–1625.

127

- Mariusz Sawicki
The Coronation Parliament of John III Sobieski in French-Language Reports Sent to London. 137
- Ewelina Sikora
Feasting and Fasting in Moscow: Peace Negotiation Between Poland-Lithuania and Muscovy as Seen Through Eating and Drinking Customs. 147
- Gaetano Platania
Michał Radziwiłł's Obedience Embassy in the Rome of Pope Innocent XI Odescalchi between Diplomacy and Ceremonial. 159
- DIPLOMATS IN ACTION**
- Uladzimir Padalinski
Diplomatic Activity as the Basis of Political Advancement and Material Reward in the Sixteenth-Century Grand Duchy of Lithuania: The Case of Mikhayla Haraburda. 173
- Tetiana Grygorieva
The "Decisive Embassy" of Prince Krzysztof Zbaraski to Constantinople (1622–1623) and European Diplomacy amidst the Thirty Years' War. 185
- Peter P. Bajer
The Career of Jerzy (George) Bennet, the Scottish Agent of the Radziwiłł Family. 199
- Aleksandra Skrzypietz
Between the King's Instructions and the Ambassador's Ambition. Melchior de Polignac's Cooperation with Polish Magnates. 219
- Claudia Curcuruto
Francesco Buonvisi and Opizio Pallavicini. Correspondences and Activities of Two Apostolic Nuncios in the Service of Pope Innocent XI Odescalchi (1676–1689). 231
- Mihalik Béla Vilmos
The King's Cousin, the Emperor's Bishop. Christian August of Saxe-Weitz as Mediator between Poland and the Holy See. 249

INTRODUCTION

The crisis of political history, particularly profound since the 1960s and the subsequent cultural turn, has penalised the scientific investigation of “international” relations¹ in the early modern period for many years². Over the last decades, though, there have been several calls for new methodological and conceptual approaches to diplomatic studies, some of them extraordinarily fruitful and inspiring³. Nowadays, as Tracey Sowerby observed, «the *New Diplomatic History*, no longer so new, has become a broad church. It has successfully integrated wider concerns into a field that was once dominated by the study of bureaucracy and foreign policy»⁴. Integrated, but not replaced, which is also essential to emphasise. That is mainly why scholars no longer consider diplomacy and foreign policy making as coterminous, but do assimilate plenty of different aspects diplomatic practice entailed.

One cannot notice that from the point of view of contemporary research on the early modern history of diplomacy, the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth constitutes an interesting phenomenon that has not been sufficiently developed yet, especially in the international forum of researchers along with their various historiographical traditions. There are still many blank spots in exploring this topic, which remain open to a contemporary historian. This special issue of *Eastern European History Review* seeks to encourage a more profound reflection on particularities and significance of the Polish-Lithuanian diplomatic practice in the early modern period, especially during the seventeenth century, by conveying into conversation an international set of scholars from Poland, Lithuania, Belarus, Ukraine, Hungary, Italy, Spain, Sweden and Australia, interested in various aspects of diplomatic history. By bringing consciousness of diplomatic agency to bear on various areas of cultural and political practice, our authors have pressed their research beyond the horizons of their “national histories” that continue to dominate most treatments of premodernity.

On the threshold of the early modern period, *Rzeczpospolita* found itself among the political entities that adopted the praxis of permanent diplomatic missions exchange very late (only in the eighteenth century), relying on the old system of extraordinary embassies, of medieval provenance. However, the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth was no exception on a European scale. The general rules for foreign relations’ conduct appeared similar in Portugal, Scotland, Hungary, Scandinavia (Sweden and Denmark), Switzerland, and several German states⁵.

Federico Chabod considered the permanent diplomatic service, next to the professional army and elaborated bureaucratic apparatus, as the basis for the affirmation of the “early modern state”⁶. *Rzeczpospolita* did not possess any of these elements, but can it be denied the character of statehood from a historical point of view⁷? Subsequently, for Matthew Smith Anderson, the history of early

1 I put the word “international” in quotation marks, considering the imperfection of this concept for the analysis of political relations in early modern Europe. Cf. Tracey A. Sowerby, “Early Modern Diplomatic History”, *History Compass*, 14, 9 (2016): 444.

2 Stefano Andretta, *L'arte della prudenza. Teorie e prassi della diplomazia nell'Italia del XVI e XVII secolo* (Roma: Binklink, 2006), 7.

3 Karl W. Schweizer and Matt J. Schumann, “The Revitalisation of Diplomatic History”, *Diplomacy & Statecraft*, 19, 2 (2008): 149-86; John Watkins, “Toward a New Diplomatic History of Medieval and Early Modern Europe”, *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies*, 38, 1 (2008): 1-14; Diana Carrió-Invernizzi, “A New Diplomatic History and the Networks of Spanish Diplomacy in the Baroque Era”, *The International History Review*, 36, 4 (2014): 603-18; Dorothea Nolde, “Was ist Diplomatie und wenn ja, wie viele? Herausforderungen und Perspektiven einer Geschlechtergeschichte der frühneuzeitlichen Diplomatie”, *Historische Anthropologie*, 21, 2 (2013): 180-98.

4 Sowerby, “Early Modern Diplomatic History”, 441.

5 Giuseppe Galasso, “Le relazioni internazionali nell’età moderna (secoli XV-XVIII)”, *Rivista Storica Italiana*, 111, 1 (1999): 10.

6 Federico Chabod, *Idea di Europa e politica dell’equilibrio* (Bologna: Mulino, 1995).

7 Adam Watson, *The Evolution of International Society. A Comparative Historical Analysis* (London-New York: Routledge, 1992), 185-86: «The kingdom of Poland had increased its power and influence by a dynastic union with Lithuania and expansion eastward, and had made itself the principal bulwark of Latin Christendom on the eastern marches. But the heterogeneous population, the dual governmental structure of Poland-Lithuania and the practice of elective monarchy prevented its consolidation into an effective stato». Cf. Jan Sowa, *Fantomowe ciało króla. Peryferyjne zmagania z*

modern diplomacy constituted a slow but increasingly evident evolution towards the system of permanent representation. He considered contacts between polities that failed to conform to that model «less developed ones, [...] where diplomacy was less important and diplomatic organisation more primitive». Anderson believed that from the point of view of diplomatic practice, one could speak of two “separate Europes” and that «between these two Europes there were as yet only slender links»⁸. Nowadays, historiography views the issue of permanent diplomatic posts in a significantly different way. As Riccardo Fubini suggests, the general deficiency of institutionalisation of the then diplomacy makes the equality of residency and modernity dubious⁹. Also, Sowerby appropriately stated that «the exchange of resident ambassadors did not extend across all of Europe. Rather, asymmetrical relations were not uncommon within Europe and continued to be so into the eighteenth century»¹⁰.

Therefore, nothing could be more erroneous than assuming the passivity of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth on the “international” arena of early modern Europe. The young Polish Vasa dynasty, the more as it functioned within the elective monarchy, manifested a strong need to affirm its position on the European forum. Moreover, the necessity to maintain intensive contacts with foreign partners was caused by the continuous involvement of *Rzeczpospolita* in armed conflicts on various fronts. Due to its geopolitical position, the vastness of the territory and the leading role for the implementation of the Catholic Reform, Poland-Lithuania occupied a distinctive part in the entire system of “international” relations of early modern Europe. All the more so, its specific tradition and political practice concerning the implementation of foreign policy, conducting diplomatic activity outside its borders, as well as accepting foreign legations *in loco*, requires further attention of contemporary historiography.

The special issue of *Eastern European History Review*, *Diplomats and Diplomacy in the Early Modern Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth (XVII century)*, opens with a group of articles regarding some general institutional and technical aspects of the functioning of the Polish-Lithuanian diplomatic service.

Dorota Gregorowicz (*Diplomacy of the Commonwealth, Diplomacy of the King: the Peculiarity of Foreign Policy Making in the Seventeenth Century Poland-Lithuania*) deals with the topicality of research on the history of diplomacy in the early modern Poland-Lithuania, in the context of scant development of permanent diplomatic missions. The article presents considerations on the subjectivity of the *ius legationis* in *Rzeczpospolita*. Gregorowicz reflects on the competencies of the monarch and of the Commonwealth (personified in the *sejm* and Senate councils) in this matter. To this end, she primarily analyses the content of the sixteenth – and seventeenth-century parliamentary constitutions regarding the conduct of foreign policy. Moreover, the article refers to political practice as a determining factor for the legal structure of Poland-Lithuania.

The Union of Lublin (1569), as the basis for the execution of a joint diplomatic activity of the early modern Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, is analysed by Marius Sirutavičius (*Partnership in a Union with Diverging Interests: Cooperation between the Kingdom of Poland and Grand Duchy of Lithuania in Diplomatic Activities at the Turn of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*). The author emphasises the initially divergent interests of both states in addressing the directions of the foreign policy of *Rzeczpospolita* (especially concerning contacts with Muscovy) and their influence on the functioning of the diplomatic service. Moreover, Sirutavičius draws attention to the evolution and gradual uniformisation processes of the Polish and Lithuanian visions of conducting foreign policy,

nowoczesną formą (Kraków: Universitas, 2011). According to Sowa, «the concept of the “ghost body of the King” [inspired by Ernst Kantorowicz] marks a notional horizon in which *Rzeczpospolita* presents itself as a non-existent state entity, or in the process of its disappearance, utterly unsuitable for any modern form of social, political and economic organisation, which took shape in Europe from the early modern age, with the nascent capitalism and parliamentarism» (285). Sowa’s perspective is certainly interesting, although historically not sustainable. Translation in English is of the author.

8 Matthew S. Anderson, *The Rise of Modern Diplomacy 1450–1919* (London-New York: Longman, 1993), 27–8.

9 Riccardo Fubini, *La “residentialité” de l’ambassadeur dans le mythe et dans la réalité: une enquête sur les origines* (Paris: PUF, 1998); Id., “Diplomacy and government in the Italian city-states of the fifteenth century (Florence and Venice)”, in *Diplomacy and Early Modern Culture*, eds. Robyn Adams and Rosanna Cox (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), 26–8.

10 Sowerby, “Early Modern Diplomatic History”, 442.

which took place in the initial period of the reign of Sigismund III Vasa, pointing to the multilateral origins of those developments.

The problem of the source material's characteristics for studying the history of diplomacy is discussed by nunciatures' specialists Henryk Litwin and Paweł Duda in a joint article *Correspondence of Warsaw Nuncio Antonio Santa Croce with Roman Catholic Bishops from 1629 – Frequency, Intensity and Content*. The researchers focused on the analysis of "internal" correspondence maintained by the apostolic nuncio with hierarchs of the Polish-Lithuanian Catholic Church, underlining its parallel importance in relation to the mainstream canals of diplomatic information exchange (between the Polish-Lithuanian periphery – nunciature's chancellery and Roman centre – Secretariat of State).

Finally, the first part of the book includes the reflection of Michał Salamonik on some non-institutional structures and mechanisms of diplomatic activity in the early modern Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, along with the case study on the diplomatic context of the postal and news-spreading duties of the Gdańsk merchant and postmaster Francesco Gratta [1613–1676] (*News Agents and Postmasters: Background Figures or Active Diplomats?*).

The second part of this book is devoted to diplomacy as to the art of great politics' conduct and to the geopolitical position of Poland-Lithuania in seventeenth-century Europe. The advantages of diplomatic negotiations as an alternative to pursuing *Rzeczpospolita's* foreign policy in the military field are highlighted here. This group of articles may seem of a more traditional topicality. Still, it is significant to accentuate its emphasis on the multilateral character of early modern diplomatic relations, strongly including the subject of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth.

Miguel Conde Pazos analyses the impact of the Catholic Monarchy's diplomacy on the involvement of *Rzeczpospolita* in the pan-European conflict (*Spanish Diplomats in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth during the Thirty Years' War*). This example perfectly illustrates the breadth of political, economic and dynastic interactions that were determined by the diplomatic activities of all major European countries, even those geographically distant from each other. Conde Pazos also draws attention to the personal profile of diplomats sent on specific missions and to their respective political culture, experience, and preparation for dedicated charges.

The role of political nuances and, at first glance, of less important elements in conducting a diplomatic activity is treated by Ryszard Skowron (*Palatinate: the Key to Europe. On the Art of Diplomacy of Władysław IV Vasa*). The author points to the role of a seemingly secondary German state, as well as to the complicated system of ties between single European states at that time, in the perspective of the implementation of the great political and dynastic plans of the Polish-Lithuanian monarch, primarily related to his efforts to reclaim the Swedish throne. In fact, it is worth observing how the interests represented and defended through early modern diplomatic negotiation were primarily dynastic, typical of the sovereign families that divided the European spaces between themselves¹¹. In his article, Skowron has distinguished two basic categories defining Władysław IV's foreign policy: peace tactics (diplomatic activity and matrimonial policy) and war (military involvement in connection with the events of the Thirty Years' War).

The English point of view on the last years of the Polish Vasas' rule and on the election of 1669 is presented by Aleksandra Ziober (*The Last Years of the Reign of John Casimir Vasa and Interregnum after his Abdication in the Light of Reports of Francis Sanderson and Robert Yard*). The author shows how the image preserved in diplomatic accounts of various backgrounds' services allows us to recreate the historical narrative for many research topics with more detail. Thus diplomacy becomes a way of acquiring knowledge about single courts and state entities. Ziober also refers to the degree of understanding of the particular form and functioning of the Polish-Lithuanian political structures in seventeenth-century Europe.

The universalist-political dimension of the Holy See's diplomats' activity during the short reign of Michał Korybut Wiśniowiecki (1669–1673) is discussed by Alessandro Boccolini (*Diplomacy and Papal Politics during the "Unfortunate" Reign of Michał Korybut Wiśniowiecki*). The author analysed the

11

Claudio Rosso, "Burocrazia, fiscalità, diplomazia", in *Storia d'Europa e del Mediterraneo. Dal Medioevo all'età della globalizzazione*, sez. 5: *Età moderna (secoli XVI–XVIII)*, vol. XII: *Popoli, stati, equilibri di potere*, ed. Roberto Bizzocchi (Salerno-Roma: Salerno Editrice, 2013), 43.

activity of the then apostolic nunciature primarily in the context of the relations between the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and the Ottoman Empire, as well as the papal vision of *Rzeczpospolita* as *Antemurale Christianitatis*.

As Barbara Stollberg-Rillinger observed, «another major theme within recent reassessments of early modern diplomacy has been non-verbal communication. The early modern diplomatic ceremonial was essential to the expression of hierarchies»¹². In fact, in the third part of the book, we deal with a set of texts referring to the issues of diplomatic ceremonial, as «in early modern European diplomacy, the relationship between the ceremonial symbols and the mechanisms of power was closer and carried more weight»¹³.

In Marta Szymańska's article, *The Ceremonial of Receiving of Albrycht Stanisław Radziwiłł and his Stay at the Courts of Western Europe as a Royal Envoy during the Journey of Prince Władysław Vasa 1624–1625*, the diplomatic role of the Lithuanian magnate, member of the Vasa Prince's retinue during Władysław's educational trip around Europe, as well as the diplomatic dimension of the entire enterprise, seemingly unrelated to the implementation of the Polish-Lithuanian foreign policy, are discussed. One of the key aspects of the study is how the ceremonial applied to the Prince's retinue members indicated the diplomatic nature of the expedition.

Mariusz Sawicki (*The Coronation Parliament of John III Sobieski in French-Language Reports Sent to London*) presents a picture of the anointing act and then the entire coronation *sejm* (1676) of the later victor from Vienna. The author shows the image that French diplomats, present at that time in Poland-Lithuania, created in their reports on the events of Sobieski's coronation: its political, social and ceremonial aspects. Interestingly, those reports were sent in London and not in Paris. Sawicki shows himself fully aware of the strengths and weaknesses of historical interpreting similar creation that any external observers could create.

Ewelina Sikora (*Feasting and Fasting in Moscow: Peace Negotiation Between Poland-Lithuania and Muscovy as Seen Through Eating and Drinking Customs*) takes up the theme of feasting as an essential element of Polish-Lithuanian diplomatic practice during the missions to Muscovy. The article constitutes an important contribution for developing further research on material culture in the field of the history of diplomacy¹⁴, also in the context of ceremonial treatments and traditional usages.

Finally, Gaetano Platania draws attention to the institution of obedience missions that Polish-Lithuanian kings traditionally sent to the papal court in order to certify their loyalty to the Catholic Church and its superior (*Michał Radziwiłł's Obedience Embassy in the Rome of Pope Innocent XI Odescalchi between Diplomacy and Ceremonial*). The author presents a case study, a picture of the *Rzeczpospolita's* envoy's entry to the Eternal City in 1680, putting Michał Radziwiłł's mission in the large political context of the Holy League's organisation. The ceremonial becomes here an authentic baroque, theatrical representation, still, by no means deprived of its political importance.

The last part of the book is devoted to a series of outstanding personalities of diplomats operating in the context of seventeenth-century *Rzeczpospolita*. Many scholars have adopted an actor-centred approach to inquiry early modern diplomacy, and such career case studies result as extremely useful. Placing ambassadors at the heart of the analysis offers a rich research perspective regarding the relationships they cultivated, their contacts and personal capacities, as well as the individual factor in conducting foreign policy that has always accompanied the great policy's sketches.

Uładzimir Padalinski develops the topic of the diplomatic activity of Mikhayla Haraburda (*Diplomatic Activity as the Basis of Political Advancement and Material Reward in the Sixteenth-Century Grand Duchy of Lithuania: The Case of Mikhayla Haraburda*). It is a specific case study of a multiple envoy of

12 Barbara Stollberg-Rillinger, "Zeremoniell, Ritual, Symbol: Neue Forschungen zur symbolischen Kommunikation in Spätmittelalter und Früher Neuzeit", *Zeitschrift für Historische Forschung*, 27, 3 (2000): 389-405. Cf. Sowerby, "Early Modern Diplomatic History", 445.

13 Jan Hennings, "The Semiotics of Diplomatic Dialogue: Pomp and Circumstance in Tsar Peter I's Visit to Vienna in 1698", *The International History Review*, 30, 3 (2008), 515.

14 Cf. Harriet Rudolph, "Entangled Objects and Hybrid Practices? Material Culture as a New Approach to the History of Diplomacy", in *Material Culture in Modern Diplomacy from the 15th to the 20th Century*, eds. Rudolph and Gregor M. Metzger (Oldenbourg: De Gruyter, 2016), 1-28.

the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth to Muscovy and Crimea. Padalinski shows the dynamics with which the involvement in the implementation of foreign policy could determine both the political career and the social status of a diplomat in the noble context of *Rzeczpospolita*. His study also provides an outstanding example of the Lithuanian ambassador's *cursus honorum*.

Krzysztof Zbaraski's Constantinopolitan mission is examined by Tetiana Grygorieva (*The "Decisive Embassy" of Prince Krzysztof Zbaraski to Constantinople (1622–1623) and European Diplomacy amidst the 'Thirty Years' War*). The article rejects the bilateral vision of Polish-Lithuanian and Ottoman diplomatic contacts, presenting the image of Zbaraski's expedition in a broad European context, including, *inter alia*, political relations of both countries with Transylvania, as well as their involvement in the events of the Thirty Years' War.

Peter P. Bajer presents a diplomatic career as a path of personal development and one of the ways to build a social position in the early modern *Rzeczpospolita*. The author observes the case of foreign newcomers or/and their families (based on the example of Scottish immigration), the desirable result of who was usually obtaining a noble status in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth (*The Career of Jerzy (George) Bennet, the Scottish Agent of the Radziwiłł Family*)¹⁵.

The diplomatic mission as a field for the realisation of personal interests of a diplomat, in addition to the tasks provided by representing his political superior, is presented by Aleksandra Skrzypietz (*Between the King's Instructions and the Ambassador's Ambition. Cooperation Between Melchior de Polignac and Polish Magnates*). The author shows how diplomatic feedback could have influenced the evolution of the instructions entrusted to ambassadors and, consequently, had a direct impact on their political activity. Skrzypietz presents Polignac not only as a performer but as a co-creator of the French political program towards the *Rzeczpospolita* ruled by John III Sobieski. Finally, she explains the difficulties encountered by ambassadors of foreign countries in approaching the complex political and social context of the early modern Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth.

The activities of diplomats of Pope Innocent XI in Poland-Lithuania and at the imperial court, as well as the nature of their regular contacts with the Roman Curia, are presented by Claudia Curcuruto (*Francesco Buonvisi and Opizio Pallavicini. Correspondences and Activities of Two Apostolic Nuncios in the Service of Pope Innocent XI Odescalchi. 1676–1689*). The author focuses on the communicative aspects of the activities of the apostolic nunciatures. She presents diplomats as mediators between radically different (geographically, politically, culturally) realities (not only on the line of the royal/imperial court and the papal court but also between local bishops and the Bishop of Rome – the pope). Finally, the issue of mediation, as one of the crucial elements of early modern diplomatic practice, is presented by Béla Mihalik on the example of the activity of a relative of the Polish-Lithuanian monarch Augustus II the Strong (1697–1706, 1709–1733) – Bishop of Győr, Christian August (*The King's Cousin, the Emperor's Bishop. Christian August of Saxe-Weitz as Mediator between Poland and the Holy See*). It is another text that highlights the problem of the personal interests of diplomats in carrying out their missions. In the case of Wettin, these were primarily the efforts to obtain the cardinal's hat. As observed by John Watkins, «the time has come for a multidisciplinary reevaluation of one of the oldest, and traditionally one of the most conservative, subfields in the modern discipline of history: the study of premodern diplomacy»¹⁶. Contemporary research on the history of diplomacy in the early modern *Rzeczpospolita* is doing quite well, but it still requires a reorientation and innovation of methodological approach. The history of diplomacy should no longer be seen as an abstract account of negotiations and treaties, disconnected from parallel social, economic and cultural aspects. Indeed, as this collection of studies demonstrates, historiography is continually discovering new research fields in matter. Among those contained in the presented volume, we can indicate: legal and institutional forms of early modern “international” relations, nature of diplomatic sources and character of the narrative present in the documents, multilaterality and complexity of the early modern interstate connections,

15 Recently on similar issues: Michał Salamonik, *In Their Majesties' Service. The Career of Francesco De Gratta (1613–1676) as a Royal Servant and Trader in Gdańsk* (Huddinge: Södertörns högskola, 2019); Wojciech Tygielski, *Dylematy włoskiego emigranta. Giovanni Battista Jacobelli (1603–1679), śpiewak i kapelan nadworny, kanonik warmiński* (Warszawa: Muzeum Pałacu Króla Jana III w Wilanowie, 2019).

16 Watkins, “Toward a New Diplomatic History”, 1.

their religious and confessional nature¹⁷, diplomatic ceremonial and non-verbal communication, tools and techniques used by ambassadors, *people* as direct implementers of the “art of diplomacy”, their *cursus honorum* and mechanisms of social advancement, cultural image expressed in diplomatic documents, social, economic, commercial and dynastic causes that determined political choices, as well as material culture in diplomacy¹⁸. This volume will undoubtedly contribute to the further development of contemporary analysis of these issues. We would like to continue to engage in new methods, ask additional questions, and rethink how early modern Polish-Lithuanian diplomacy is currently being studied.

Dorota Gregorowicz
University of Silesia in Katowice

¹⁷ Cf. *Confessional Diplomacy in Early Modern Europe*, eds. Roberta Anderson and Charlotte Backerra (London-New York: Routledge, 2021).

¹⁸ Cf. Daniela Frigo, “Politica estera e diplomazia: figure problemi e apparati”, in *Storia degli antichi stati italiani*, eds. Gaetano Greco and Mario Rosa (Roma-Bari: Laterza, 1996), 117.

Marta Szymańska
UNIVERSITY OF SILESIA IN KATOWICE (POLAND)

THE CEREMONIAL OF RECEPTION OF ALBRYCHT STANISŁAW RADZIWIŁŁ AND HIS STAY AT THE COURTS OF WESTERN EUROPE AS A ROYAL ENVOY DURING THE JOURNEY OF PRINCE WŁADYSŁAW VASA 1624–1625

ABSTRACT

Despite numerous publications regarding the journey of Prince Władysław Vasa to Western Europe (Bohemia, Austria, Germany, Netherlands, Italy) in 1624–1625, the topic still awaits its fully elaborated monography. One of the issues requiring in-depth reflection is the broadly understood diplomatic dimension of young Vasa's peregrination. The prince, travelling incognito, was officially a member of Albrycht S. Radziwiłł's diplomatic entourage. This arrangement caused many problems concerning diplomatic and ceremonial procedures in the ambassador-prince-host court triangle. This article aims to present relations in said arrangement, especially those related to preponderance during entries, stay and ceremonies taking place at the courts visited by the embassy. The analysis will be conducted primarily from the perspective of the role and functions of the ambassador. Therefore, its important component will also be the description of the political dimension of the journey, which will show Albrecht S. Radziwiłł's activities in this area, including relations and meetings with the rulers visited, as well as the political elite and ambassadors present at a given court.

KEYWORDS: Diplomatic ceremonial; Embassy; Stanisław Albrycht Radziwiłł; Władysław Vasa; Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth.

127



<http://hdl.handle.net/2067/46371>

In the years 1624–1625, Prince¹ Władysław Vasa made his grand tour of Western Europe. Officially, the tour's main purpose was to fulfil a vow he had made during his illness at the siege of Chocim (Kotyn). He vowed then that if he survived, he would go to Loreto and make a votive offering in the form of a golden statue of his patron saint². Historians usually perceive this journey as an educational one³ or pay special attention to its aspects related to Vasa's arts patronage⁴. The only person taking part in this trip (apart from the prince) in whom researchers were interested was the Grand Chancellor of Lithuania Albrycht Stanisław Radziwiłł. This interest, however, focused primarily on his leadership of the voyage, disregarding another function assigned to him by the king – of a diplomat with a specific mission to accomplish.

The only exception is a passage on the voyage of Prince Władysław, which Radosław Lolo included

1 The term "Prince" is used in the main text to refer to Władysław Vasa. In the quotations, however, it appears as a term for Stanisław Albrycht Radziwiłł because he bore the title of Prince of the Holy Roman Empire and was so titled by Jan Hagenaw and Stefan Pac in their accounts of the journey. In these cases, Radziwiłł's name was added in square brackets.

2 Adam Przyboś, *Podróż królewicza Władysława Wazy do krajów Europy Zachodniej w latach 1624–1625 w świetle ówczesnych relacji* (Kraków: Wydawnictwo Literackie, 1977), 14.

3 Władysław Czapliński, *Władysław IV i jego czasy* (Kraków: Universitas, 2008), 60–6; Zdzisław Pietrzyk, "Przyczynek do podróży królewicza Władysława Zygmunta Waza po Europie Zachodniej", *Studia Historyczne. Kwartalnik* 162, n. 3 (1998): 341–48; Henryk Wisner, *Władysław IV Waza* (Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 2009), 42–7; Stefania Ochmann-Staniszevska, *Dynastia Wazów w Polsce* (Warszawa: PWN, 2006), 246–48.

4 Karolina Targosz-Kretowa, *Teatr dworski Władysława IV (1635–1648)* (Kraków: Wydawnictwo Literackie 1965), 36; Jacek Zukowski, "Listy Władysława Waza i inne nieznane źródła do jego europejskiej peregrynacji z archiwami szwedzkich i niemieckich", *Kronika Zamkowa. Seria Nowa*, 68/2 (2015): 61–85; Ryszard Szmydki, *Artystyczno-dyplomatyczne kontakty Zygmunta III Wazy z Niderlandami Południowymi* (Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL, 2008), 104–10; Id., *Kontakty artystyczne królewicza Władysława Zygmunta Waza z Antwerpią. Misja Mathieu Roualta do Polski w 1626 r.* (Warszawa: Zamek Królewski, 2002).

in his 2004 book on the Polish nobility's stance towards the 'Thirty Years' War'. In this context, the author mentions Radziwiłł as the person who was at the head of the delegation sent by Sigismund III to Vienna on the occasion of the prince's journey. In that passage, Lolo presents Radziwiłł's mission as one of the stages of a diplomatic action undertaken by the king to ease the misunderstandings between him and the Emperor⁵, which arose from the Emperor's enlisting mercenaries from Poland⁷. Przemysław Deles, in his 2001 article outlining the political conditions of Władysław Vasa's travel⁸, also repeatedly draws attention to the "formula of the embassy"⁹ that the journey took on while the prince had to remain anonymous. Thus, the author notes the importance of Radziwiłł's role for the prince, who wanted to conceal his identity and the fact that the Chancellor described himself as an envoy. However, he confines himself to it and does not deal with Radziwiłł further when discussing the political aspects of the trip. The purpose of this article is to analyse Radziwiłł's diplomatic activity, the actual dimension of which has so far escaped the historians' attention. It was undoubtedly interconnected with and dependent on his function as the *director* of the voyage. Still, it cannot be treated solely as episodic activities merely supplementary to his main task. During this journey, Radziwiłł was a royal envoy entrusted with a diplomatic mission *tout court*. Numerous information showing the relations between Prince Władysław, Radziwiłł and the receiving courts, as well as by the fact that he was directly referred to as an envoy by his companions, confirm it. Moreover, he called himself this way as well.

The source base on which the researchers relied primarily consisted of the travel accounts by Jan Hagenaw, Stefan Pac, Samuel Twardowski and Albrycht Stanisław Radziwiłł collected and published by Adam Przyboś¹⁰. Moreover, correspondence exchanged between the members of the retinue and the royal court as well as letters written by the rulers of the visited countries and their entourage have also been preserved¹¹. This article is primarily based on travel accounts and instruction. What is more, royal letters that Radziwiłł is said to have passed on to various rulers were used. The travel accounts, although they were written down by only three of the prince's companions, contain a variety of information that enables the examination of the relationship between Prince Władysław, Radziwiłł, and the host rulers.

Most information about Radziwiłł's diplomatic activities can be found in Jan Hagenaw's account. According to Radziwiłł's notes, Hagenaw was his servant, whom the prince "appropriated"¹² for the duration of the journey. Przyboś refers to Hagenaw's letter to Sigismund III, writing that Hagenaw kept a travel journal by order of the king and was to hand it over to him on his return¹³. Hagenaw writes about what Radziwiłł did much more often than Pac does. He also pays more attention than Pac to the elements of diplomatic ceremonial applied to Radziwiłł: which hand the host offered to be shaken by the envoy when greeting him, who welcomed him and who the welcoming person was

5 Radosław Lolo, *Rzeczpospolita wobec wojny trzydziestoletniej. Opinie i stanowiska szlachty (1618–1635)* (Pułtusk: Wyższa Szkoła Humanistyczna im. Aleksandra Gieysztora, 2004).

6 Lolo, *Rzeczpospolita wobec wojny trzydziestoletniej*, 246.

7 *Lisowczycy* were mercenaries of Polish origin who were enlisted by Emperor Ferdinand II during the Thirty Years' War. The fact that they were not paid their soldier's pay resulted in them committing robberies in the lands of the Empire. See Adam Szelągowski, *Śląsk i Polska wobec powstania czeskiego* (Lwów: Księgarnia Polska B. Połonieckiego, 1904), 65–6, 119–27; Lolo, *Rzeczpospolita wobec wojny trzydziestoletniej*, 31, 98–100.

8 Przemysław Deles, "Polityczne uwarunkowania podróży królewicza Władysława Zygmunta Wazy po krajach Europy Zachodniej w latach 1624–1624", *Kronika Zamkowa. Seria Nowa*, 42/2 (2001): 87–106.

9 Deles, "Polityczne uwarunkowania", 93–5.

10 Przyboś, *Podróż królewicza*. The book consists of separate accounts by Hagenaw, Pac and Radziwiłł. Przyboś compiled them to form a chronologically coherent text: the description of each day of the journey consists of corresponding fragments of the three accounts. The footnotes refer to a fragment of a particular account found on the indicated page.

11 Żukowski (2015) lists correspondence preserved in: Riksarkivet in Stockholm, *Extranea IX, Polen*, n. 89, 92, 111 (copies of these documents in microfilm form are located in AGAD). See Żukowski, *Listy Władysława Wazy i inne nieznane źródła*, 85–118.

12 Albrycht Stanisław Radziwiłł, "Rys panowania Zygmunta III", in Przyboś, *Podróż królewicza*, 43.

13 Przyboś, "Wstęp", in Id., *Podróż królewicza*, 23.

accompanied by, whether he received refreshments and whether the accommodation offered to him was worthy of his person. Radziwiłł also paid attention to such details in his memoirs. Among other authors, Hagenaw wrote most about the private meetings which Radziwiłł had at foreign courts. Pac's attitude to this type of information is perfectly illustrated by two contrasting notes from 26 May 1624, when Pac stated: «For the last few days nothing worth noting happened»¹⁴, while Hagenaw, in addition to the brief news about Władysław having spent the whole day with Archduke Charles, also records Radziwiłł's audience with him¹⁵.

The collection of accounts published by Przyboś also contains the text of instruction from May 1624, addressed to Albrycht Stanisław Radziwiłł by Sigismund III Vasa. The king assigned him two functions: the headman of Prince Władysław's journey and royal envoy. Radziwiłł's first and foremost task was to protect the prince from any «danger that might threaten either the person or the honour and dignity of the Prince»¹⁶. The instruction proceeds to say that the main task was to make sure that Władysław, «having gained warlike fame with foreign kings, lords and peoples, despite being absent there, now being there he did not seem lesser to them». However, the majority of the instruction constitutes guideline on Radziwiłł's mission as an envoy.

At the beginning of instruction, the journey's route is specified, passing through Neisse, Prague or Vienna (depending on where the Emperor happens to be staying), Innsbruck, Brussels and Italy «if time and roads permit». A list of countries which travellers were not allowed to «without the express permission of His Majesty the King» was also drawn up. These countries were France, Spain, England, and the Netherlands, where it was dangerous to travel due to the Thirty Years' War's military activities. It is also worth noting the reservation that the king's will regarding the itinerary may change – there are several other passages in the instructions indicating constant contact between the retinue and the royal court –. The exchange of letters between the envoy and the royal court to keep the latter informed and receive new guidelines was the duty of every diplomat and one of the elementary aspects of his activity. Radziwiłł, as evidenced by the explicitly worded order to inform the royal court in detail about the course and effects of the visit to the court of the Infanta, was no exception to this rule.

The instruction sets out specific tasks that Radziwiłł was to perform as an envoy at the courts of the Emperor, the Archdukes, the Infanta, and the Grand Duke and Duchess of Tuscany. Outside of these places, he was bound by a general set of rules focusing on the prince's safety (both in terms of travel dangers and preserving his dignity). These tasks are no different from each other. At each of the courts he visited, Radziwiłł was expected to deliver letters of greetings from the king and queen and assure the hosts in his own words of the affection resulting from kinship.

The instructions regarding Radziwiłł's visit to the Emperor and the court of the Infanta stand out in terms of the number of intricate recommendations. Their detailed character and the use of words explicitly telling the envoy what to say prove that these were the guidelines for the formal diplomatic orations Radziwiłł was to deliver at these courts. At the Emperor's court, Radziwiłł's crucial task was to settle one of the most severe problems between the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and the Empire of that time – the aforementioned issue of taming by Sigismund III the *Lisowczy* troops enlisted by the Emperor –. In his oration, he was to present the Polish nobility's position towards the problem of *Lisowczy* and describe the actions taken by the king, the Great Crown Hetman and the *sejm* to stop their arbitrariness. Radziwiłł was provided with a Latin copy of the *sejm* constitution adopted in this matter to present to the Emperor what solutions would be implemented. He was to end his speech with an assurance that the king would keep his «pacts and alliances», which was supposed to guarantee the enforcement of the treaty on mutual assistance against the rebellious subjects concluded in 1613 between Sigismund III and Emperor Matthias I.

Equally detailed recommendations apply to the audience with Infanta Isabella. Radziwiłł was to

14 Stefan Pac, «Obraz dworów europejskich na początku XVII wieku», in Przyboś, *Podróż królewicza*, 58.

15 Jan Hagenaw, «Diariusz podróży zagranicznej królewicza Władysława, napisany przez Jana Hogenau», in Przyboś, *Podróż królewicza*, 58.

16 «Instrukcja króla Zygmunta III dla Albrychta Stanisława Radziwiłła, kanclerza litewskiego, dana w Warszawie w maju 1624 r.», in Przyboś, *Podróż królewicza*, 421.

bring greetings and assurances of kindness and friendship sent by the royal couple during the private audience. Again, it was written down what specifically the envoy was to say and what he was to emphasise in his speech, namely, how important a role in the close relations between the two courts was played by the support given to the Commonwealth during the war with Turkey by Isabella's late husband, Archduke Albert.

The instruction suggests that Radziwiłł was to interrupt performing his envoy function during his stay in Rome, as he received no instructions regarding his contact with the pope. Apart from a reminder of the extraordinary character of Rome, «the stage of the world», where «all words and deeds of the Serene Prince will be observed and noted down», the only instructions regarding Radziwiłł's duties in the Holy See tell him to make sure that the prince does not meet with anyone except the pope and cardinal Cosimo de Torres, the cardinal protector of the Commonwealth. The recommendations concerning the stay at the court of the Grand Duke and Duchess of Tuscany are described very laconically. The instruction orders Radziwiłł to greet them «in the same way as the other princes mentioned above» and resume the journey as soon as possible¹⁷.

As in any embassy case, Radziwiłł was provided with letters to consign to the rulers to whom he was conducting his mission. Letters from May 1624 addressed to Infanta Isabella, Archdukes Charles and Leopold, Emperor Ferdinand II, and Grand Duchess Maria Magdalena of Tuscany¹⁸, containing greetings and informing of the arrival of Prince Władysław, also mention Albert Stanisław Radziwiłł as the prince's companion. Although these letters' content implies that Radziwiłł was to perform diplomatic functions on behalf of the king, none of them, similarly to the instruction, mentions his diplomatic rank. However, a mention of it appears in the passport issued for him by Sigismund III. In this document, the king calls him *orator noster*¹⁹.

The way Radziwiłł was treated at the receiving courts also indicates that his role as envoy was not just a disguise allowing the prince to travel comfortably. Radziwiłł participated in ceremonial entrances prepared in his honour and typical of royal envoys, and was accommodated in sumptuous apartments. He also took pride of place at the table during public meals, and the first seats in carriages when he had to travel accompanied by the representatives of the host rulers. The scope of his diplomatic functions was most often linked to the degree of the prince's anonymity at a given stage of his journey. Still, this link disappeared at the courts mentioned in the instruction as places where Radziwiłł was to fulfil specific tasks as an envoy, and the prince did not appear incognito.

The entrances to the visited cities took place throughout the journey: the royal envoy entered, the prince entered, or the arrival to a given location was kept secret. Other ceremonial entries of Radziwiłł as an extraordinary envoy took place only in Munich and Brussels. In Stefan Pac's account of 26 July 1624, it is stated that during a meeting with the commissioners sent by the Elector of Bavaria to determine the way the entrance would take place, the prince explained: «that he did not need any entrances and extraordinary honours, not objecting, however, to going and receiving the Prince [Radziwiłł] in the usual way, as is the custom». Pac writes further that Duke Maximilian's marshal met them on their way to Munich with numerous horsemen and carriages; Radziwiłł and the prince took their places of honour in the first of them²⁰. The arrangement of the circumstances of the entrance to Brussels was analogous. When, despite the earlier agreements between Pac and the court of the Infanta, on their way from Leuven to Brussels the prince's retinue met the Infanta's horseman with the carriages

17 "Instrukcja króla Zygmunta III", in Przyboś, *Podróż królewicza*, 421-25. See Henryk Wisner, "Dyplomacja polska w latach 1572-1648", in *Historia dyplomacji polskiej*, vol. II: 1572-1795, ed. Zbigniew Wójcik (Warszawa: PWN, 1982), 31-32.

18 AGAD, MK, LL, 30, *Sigismund III Vasa Waza to Infanta Isabella, Governor of the Netherlands*, Warsaw 15 May 1624, ff. 109r-10v; Ibid., *Sigismund III Vasa to Archduke Charles, Bishop of Wrocław*, Warsaw, May 15 1624, f. r; Ibid., *Sigismund III Vasa to Archduke Leopold V*, Warsaw, 15 May 1624, f. 109v; Ibid., *Sigismund III Vasa to Emperor Ferdinand II*, Warsaw May 15 1624, f. 111r; ASF, *Fondo Mediceo*, II, 4292, *Sigismund III Vasa to Princess Mary Magdalene*, 15 May 1624, p. 486 (497). More letters can be found in Львівська наукова бібліотека імені В. Стефаника НАН України [Stefanyk National Scientific Library of Ukraine in Lviv], fond 5: 201, *Kopiarz materiałowy dotyczący stosunków zagranicznych Polski z lat 1619-1625*, ff. 281-301r.

19 AGAD, AR, II, *Passport issued by Sigismund III Vasa to Albrycht Stanisław Radziwiłł*, Warsaw May 15 1624, f. 888r.

20 Pac, "Obraz dworów europejskich", 106, 108.

and cavalry, Władysław asked them to «conduct the ceremonial [...] with the Prince [Radziwiłł]». Radziwiłł was given the first seat in the carriage, and this way, the entrance to Brussels took place²¹. The descriptions of his arrival in Munich and Brussels signal the Władysław's resistance to any ceremonies associated with his arrival in these cities. His eventual consent to the ceremonial entrances held in Radziwiłł's honour seems to have been a compromise between the prince's will and the host rulers' desire to manifest their wealth and glory by offering such a magnificent guest a proper reception²². However, the prince's solution could have been as beneficial for himself as it was for the receiving courts. Władysław followed his father's advice to conceal his identity as often as possible and thus avoided the dangers of lapses in his dignity. Prince Władysław's situation was exceptional and challenging from the ceremonial point of view. As the son of the elected king, he had no right to the title of heir to the Polish-Lithuanian throne. In contrast, his other titles, such as the heir to the Swedish throne or the throne of the tsar of Moscow, were subjects of ongoing conflicts and tensions between the Commonwealth and Sweden and Moscow. Besides, even if the Infanta's and Wittelsbach's courts were ready to welcome the prince as the successor to the Swedish and Muscovite thrones, it still constituted a severe problem, as probably no description of the ceremonial of receiving the heir to the throne existed at that time²³. King Sigismund III's entourage, as well as the rulers hosting Władysław, must have been aware of this. Preparing ceremonial entrances and greetings addressed to Radziwiłł as an envoy was a safer solution for both sides.

During his travels through numerous countries of the Reich, it was typical behaviour of their rulers to obey the prince's wishes concerning his anonymity and to receive Radziwiłł as the royal envoy at public ceremonies. In the free cities of the Reich, Radziwiłł was treated «according to the diplomatic custom». Representatives of the city authorities of Augsburg, Nuremberg, Cologne and Aachen welcomed Radziwiłł as a royal envoy and offered him food and wine. Similar welcomes took place in cities belonging to archbishops. Before the arrival in Salzburg, it was agreed that Radziwiłł would enter the city and be received by the archbishop, to whom the prince would only be privately introduced. According to Radziwiłł's account of the welcome in Salzburg, he wrote: «I came as the King's envoy and everyone did great honours to me». From Hagenaw's account, we learn about the five carriages sent for the envoy, for whom the first seat was saved in one of them. Radziwiłł also drew attention to the kindness he received from the Archbishop of Trier, Philip Christopher von Sötern, who greeted him in Koblenz by offering Radziwiłł his right hand to shake. The Chancellor stressed that this gesture was connected with his dignity as a royal envoy. The Bishop of Würzburg, Philip Adolf von Ehrenberg, welcomed Radziwiłł as an envoy as soon as he learnt who had arrived in his city, although the welcome was more modest than in the previous cases. Nevertheless, it was certainly not as inappropriate as the Archbishop of Mainz's reception, who, according to Radziwiłł, received them rudely and far too modestly²⁴.

The arrangements mentioned above regarding greetings exchanged by the prince and the archbishop of Salzburg draw attention to the «exchange of places» that repeatedly took place between the prince and Radziwiłł throughout the journey. It was very smooth and closely linked to the overriding principle organising how these two people travelled, namely that Władysław kept his anonymity as often as possible. The description of the visit to the archbishop's palace vividly depicts this principle of taking on roles, of constantly performing *commedia* as Radziwiłł himself called these actions. The prince made himself known to the archbishop in the latter's private chambers, but when they later visited

21 Pac, «Obraz dworów europejskich», 161-62.

22 Hagenaw, «Diariusz podróży zagranicznej», 105, 153; Pac, «Obraz dworów europejskich», 106, 160.

23 Travelling by heirs to a throne was a rare occurrence at this time. In 1623 Prince Charles of Wales visited the court of Madrid, and from an excerpt from the 1651 code of etiquette for the Spanish court published by Ryszard Skowron, we learn that those visits served as a model for the ceremonies related to them. Thus, there may have already existed tried and tested solutions, but they were certainly not popularized at European courts yet. See Ryszard Skowron, «Znak i liturgia władzy - ceremoniale i etykieta dworu hiszpańskiego», in *Theatrum ceremoniale na dworze księąt i królów polskich*, eds. Mariusz Markiewicz and Ryszard Skowron (Kraków: Zamek Królewski na Wawelu, 1999), 128-29.

24 Pac, «Obraz dworów europejskich», 99, 127-28, 137; Radziwiłł, «Rys panowania Zygmunta III», 10, 120, 125, 127-28, 133, 137; Hagenaw, «Diariusz podróży zagranicznej», 102-3; 127-28; 144-46; 153.

the palace side by side and passed the “porches” where people were gathered, the prince stopped, and Radziwiłł replaced him²⁵.

The situation which occurred at Antwerp offers equally substantial insight into the rules of the play. The accounts of Pac and Hagenaw show that Władysław arrived in that city without preserving anonymity. Their descriptions indicate the solemn welcome made by the townspeople and the city council, the recipient of which was the prince and not the envoy. They entered the city on 22 September. For the next three days, the prince visited its monuments and attractions without concealing his identity. It is evidenced, for example, by his visit to the Cathedral of Our Lady, where Władysław was greeted by «all the clergy and escorted to the choir in a procession». Afterwards, as planned, the prince went to the Spanish military camp near Breda, and Radziwiłł stayed in Antwerp. A day later, he was visited and officially welcomed by the mayor, some members of the city council, and a pensionary. When Władysław appeared in public as a prince, his majesty exceeded that of an envoy representing the reigning king, and it was to the prince that the most honourable treatment was due. However, the moment the prince “disappeared” from sight either by concealing his identity or, as happened in Antwerp, physically leaving a place, these honours were received by the second most important person in the arrangement, the royal envoy Radziwiłł²⁶.

The prince’s anonymity was also connected with the circumstances, and its scope varied depending on the situation. As the instruction indicates, the degree of anonymity was primarily determined by the closeness of kinship relationships with the ruler of the visited lands. The closer was the kinship relationships and relations with a given family member, the lesser the need to conceal prince’s identity. The first opportunity to meet his closest family was a journey across the Empire’s lands. Władysław visited his uncle, Emperor Ferdinand II, and his wife Eleonora, as well as two archdukes, Charles and Leopold. The difference in the way Radziwiłł was treated during these encounters was evident primarily during the greetings. Although both in Neisse and Vienna Radziwiłł performed tasks resulting from his role as envoy, the ceremonial entrances in his or the prince’s honour were replaced there by cordial hugs, and friendly greetings exchanged between Władysław and the members of the imperial family. There, Władysław was not treated “only” as a Polish prince but primarily as a close relative. The entrance to Saverne, the residence of archduke Leopold, took place in a similar fashion, although the archduke rode several miles outside the city to meet the prince, accompanied by his court and numerous noblemen.

At first glance, the circumstances of the prince’s visit to Florence do not deviate from this pattern either. Maria Magdalena Habsburg, Władysław’ aunt, was ruling there on behalf of the minor Grand Duke of Tuscany, Ferdinand II de Medici, her son. Although the prince explained to the commissioner sent to welcome him within the Grand Duchy’s borders that he wanted to enter incognito, a ceremonial welcome was prepared in his honour anyway. However, despite the evidence of friendship and respect shown by the Tuscan relatives of the prince, there can be noticed the much cooler feelings associated with kinship than in the case of the earlier meeting with the Emperor and the Archdukes. Although Władysław was greeted by the Grand Duke himself, accompanied by his younger brothers, and later welcomed on the palace’s steps by Archduchess Maria Magdalena²⁷, there is no mention of the warm embraces and enthusiastic greetings that took place in Neisse or Vienna.

The authors of the accounts use three terms when describing contacts between Radziwiłł and other people at the visited courts, and these are: “audiences”, “meetings”, and “conversations”. As already mentioned, Radziwiłł’s actions received the most attention from Hagenaw, who introduces the distinction between these types of interactions. He uses the word “audience” to describe the official interactions during which Radziwiłł fulfilled the tasks assigned to him by the king – both as an envoy and as a “director” of the voyage. Hence, Hagenaw also uses the term “audiences” when he refers to the conversations Radziwiłł participated in before his departure from Neisse to determine the further order of travel for the combined retinues of Prince Władysław and Archduke Charles.

25 Radziwiłł, “Rys panowania Zygmunta III”, 101.

26 Pac, “Obraz dworów europejskich”, 178-79, 183; Hagenaw, “Diariusz podróży zagranicznej”, 179-80, 185.

27 “Instrukcja króla”, in Przyboś, *Podróż królewicza*, 422-26. Cf. Pac, “Obraz dworów europejskich”, 74-6, 209, 334, 336; Radziwiłł, “Rys panowania Zygmunta III”, 209, 337; Hagenaw, “Diariusz podróży zagranicznej”, 75-6, 209.

The vast majority of information about Radziwiłł's audiences is retrieved from Hagenaw's account. These are laconic, one-sentence passages containing information about the time of the day when the audience took place or about its location. Only twice is a piece of information about the course of the audience recorded. One passage, written by Stefan Pac on 29 July 1624, states that during his stay in Munich Radziwiłł had an audience with Duke Wilhelm and his daughter-in-law, the wife of the Elector of Bavaria. At that time, he handed them letters from the king and queen. The second passage is related to an incident that occurred on 5 April 1625, when during Radziwiłł's audience with the Emperor, a bullet hit the window and shattered it, injuring the Chancellor. The description of such an exciting event had to be included in the account of the journey. Yet, the information given by Pac may imply three cases: Pac attended Radziwiłł's audience, the Chancellor himself told him about its course, or simply Pac described the usual course of an audience of a royal envoy at a foreign court²⁸.

According to the prince's tour accounts, Radziwiłł participated in eleven audiences at the courts of Neisse, Vienna, Munich, Bonn, Brussels, and Florence. These are the places designated by Zygmunt III in his instruction. The rule was that the first audience with a given ruler took place the day after the retinue had arrived at the court. An exception is the court of Archduke Charles in Neisse, where Radziwiłł received an audience two days after his arrival. Regardless of the form (as the "head" or the second after Władysław) in which the envoy's entrance into the city took place, a typical order of receiving an envoy at the courts of Western Europe was preserved. Hence, the day of the arrival was the day of adaptation and arranging the first audience's time, which was to officially begin the mission at the visited court.

In most cases, Radziwiłł was granted only one audience during his stay at a given court. Sometimes, however, as in Neisse, Florence and during his first stay in Vienna, the envoy obtained a second audience. In Vienna and Florence, these meetings constituted an opportunity for other retinue members to get to know the ruler and his family. In both cities, such a meeting took place immediately after Radziwiłł's first audience. In Vienna, «other companions and servants of the Serene Prince» greeted the imperial couple. In Florence, other members of the entourage accompanied the envoy at the meeting with Archduchess Maria Magdalena. The audience received by Radziwiłł in Neisse was utterly different. It was connected with the planned merger of the retinues of the Prince and Archduke Charles. During the audience, Radziwiłł was to learn about the «route and order of the journey» to Vienna²⁹.

The circumstances of the audiences at which Radziwiłł was received during Prince Władysław's journey indicate his function as an envoy. No other member of the entourage was granted private audiences with the rulers of the visited countries. A possibility of personal contact with the rulers was related to the role of diplomat. In his account of the stay in Munich, Stefan Pac explicitly indicates the relation between Radziwiłł's audience with Duke Wilhelm Wittelsbach and his role as a diplomat. He wrote that the Chancellor «had an audience with old Duke Wilhelm and his daughter-in-law, handed the letters from the Their Majesties the King and the Queen, and what he had commissioned, he carried off»³⁰. Although this is the only passage in which Pac states that Radziwiłł received an audience in connection with his role as envoy, it has to be assumed that any private audience obtained by Radziwiłł at least a day after his arrival at the court was related to fulfilling the same duty. Pac's lack of other descriptions of this kind is because he generally paid little attention to the activities of Radziwiłł as a diplomat.

Apart from the audiences, Radziwiłł also entered other interactions with rulers, diplomats and other people staying at the visited courts. Descriptions of some of these meetings point to their typically diplomatic nature, involving visits first paid by diplomats who happened to be staying at a given court. In Vienna, on 25 June 1624, the prince was visited by «the apostolic nuncio, the Right Reverend Mr

28 Pac, "Obraz dworów europejskich", 110; Hagenaw, "Diariusz podróży zagranicznej", 401; Radziwiłł, "Rys panowania Zygmunta III", 403.

29 Hagenaw, "Diariusz podróży zagranicznej", 60, 79.

30 Pac, "Obraz dworów europejskich", 110.

Caraffa, also the Spanish king's envoy, Count de Ognati³¹, and the Tuscan prince's envoy, Mr Altoviti». Three days later, Radziwiłł visited the apostolic nuncio and the Tuscan envoy. A similar pattern can be observed in Brussels, where on the day of the prince's arrival, he was greeted by the apostolic nuncio and the Spanish envoy. Two days later Radziwiłł paid a visit (only to the Spanish envoy on that day, because he «could not find the nuncio at home»), and in Florence: on 9 February 1625, the apostolic nuncio had an audience with the prince, and two days later Radziwiłł visited the nuncio³². Reciprocal visits by diplomats at foreign courts were a regular feature of diplomatic etiquette. Thus, the fact that Radziwiłł took part in these interactions clearly indicates his role as an envoy of Sigismund III.

These situations present Radziwiłł performing duties characteristic of an envoy carrying out his mission. As in many other aspects of this trip, an exception is Rome, where the prince himself revisited the cardinals who had visited him earlier³³. It was probably since Radziwiłł's function as an envoy completely disappeared in Rome. The descriptions of his stay in the Holy See, which take up much space, show him rather as a high-ranking nobleman. Together with his relatives he had met there, Radziwiłł fulfilled the social duties of a member of a family of international prestige. In his memoirs, as well as in Hagenaw's account, his role as protector and advisor to the prince is emphasized more strongly than before. At his instigation, Władysław asked the pope for the honour of seeing the Veil of St Veronica, which necessitated his appointment as a canon of St Peter's Chapter³⁴.

Apart from these courtesy calls, Radziwiłł participated in several meetings with important personages, which may have involved discussing political matters on the king's behalf. At the court of the Elector of Bavaria in Munich, the envoy met with Duke Wilhelm V Wittelsbach twice more after the welcome audience. On the day of his departure from Bonn for Cologne, Radziwiłł was visited by Ferdinand Wittelsbach, the Elector of Cologne, together with his brother Albert. In Vienna, Radziwiłł met privately with the Spanish envoy, Count de Oñate, and with the Chancellor of Bohemia. During his stay in Brussels, when Radziwiłł was ill and spent all days in his room, he was visited by Duke Arescot, Count Emden, and Cardinal Cueva³⁵. All these meetings were private (except perhaps the dinner with the Chancellor of Bohemia), which created favourable conditions for discussing matters that the king could entrust to Radziwiłł. The very fact that such meetings took place indicates Radziwiłł's role as envoy, which is the only explanation for his access to such top-ranking people and for the possibility of having private conversations with them.

In his memoirs from the journeys with the prince, the Chancellor frequently assessed the way he was received at the visited courts. The appearance of such assessments in Radziwiłł's account may have resulted from the fact that he was fully aware of his representational duties related to the function of an envoy. It can be assumed that he was familiar with Krzysztof Warszewicki's famous treatise *De legato et legatione* from 1595, in which the author included guidelines for diplomats on how best to carry out diplomatic missions in accordance with legal and customary norms. In his treatise, Warszewicki generally recommended modesty to the envoys but also noted that "representative reasons" required that the envoy «surround himself with more splendour than an ordinary man», which involved, for example, «occupying a place appropriate to his dignity». Therefore, Radziwiłł paid attention to

31 Iñigo Vélez de Guevara y Tassis, count de Oñate [1566–1644]. He was Spanish ambassador at the Savoy court (1603–1613), the imperial court (1613–1625; 1633–1637), and to the Holy See (1626–1628). During his mission at the imperial court, he supervised Polish affairs, including the issue of compensation for the Polish fleet sent to Wismar, the matter of Neapolitan sums, and Polish-Swedish relations.

32 Hagenaw, "Diariusz podróży zagranicznej", 82–3, 171, 354. Relatives met by Radziwiłł were his cousins, Alexander Ludwik and Jan Albrycht. Alexander Ludwik Radziwiłł [1594–1654] was the son of Mikołaj Krzysztof "Sierotka", voivode of Vilnius and Grand Marshal of Lithuania. He himself also held the office of Grand Marshal of Lithuania (1637–1654). He was also voivode of Połock and Brześć Litewski. Jan Albrycht Radziwiłł [1591–1626] was the son of Albrycht Radziwiłł, Grand Marshal of Lithuania, starosta of Kowno and Rumbory. He himself bore only the title of starosta of Upita. He died in Vilnius shortly after returning from abroad.

33 Hagenaw, "Diariusz podróży zagranicznej", 169; Radziwiłł, "Rys panowania Zygmunta III", 298.

34 They were his cousins, Alexander Ludwik and Jan Albrycht. Hagenaw, "Diariusz podróży zagranicznej", 293, 302; Pac, "Obraz dworów europejskich", 327.

35 Hagenaw, "Diariusz podróży zagranicznej", 112, 116, 143, 87, 88, 190–91.

whether how he was received corresponded to his dignity, and if he considered that this was not the case, he intervened. In Vienna, he found that the imperial court had placed him and Stefan Pac in a public inn, which constituted an offence to his dignity, so he rented an inn closer to the castle, which «added to their dignity»³⁶.

Nevertheless, the impropriety of this kind did not happen often. In most of the places he visited, Radziwiłł was treated in a way that distinguished him, even if only slightly, from the rest of the retinue. Apart from the question of ceremonial greetings, the specific treatment was also manifested in offering Radziwiłł more sumptuous lodging than one of the rest of the prince's companions or assigning him an honourable place at the table. When describing his stay in Munich, Hagenaw pays particular attention to the splendidly furnished suite in which the prince was accommodated, adding that «Radziwiłł was also given dazzling rooms in the same palace, namely, those in which Archduke Charles had previously lived». The distinction between Radziwiłł and the others is even more evident in the account from Koblenz, where Hagenaw stresses again that only Radziwiłł and Prince Władysław were accommodated in the Archbishop's Palace. At the same time, the rest of the entourage stayed in townsmen's houses. This information is followed by the note that «at the supper, as well as at the following stops, none of us except Prince Radziwiłł sat at the table of the noblest»³⁷, thus completing the image of the exceptional way his master was treated by the Archbishop of Trier.

Nonetheless, most descriptions of the circumstances of meals and lodging do not indicate the existence of a rule in depriving the rest of the prince's high-ranking companions of the access to a residence in palace rooms or the place at the table of the dignified host. Neither in Brussels, Rome, nor in Naples were the travellers offered accommodation of varying quality according to their rank. In all but Saverne, Koblenz and Munich, where the accounts record more ceremonial meals, Radziwiłł and the prince were also accompanied at the table by Stefan Pac, Adam Kazanowski, Łukasz Żółkiewski and Gerard Denhoff. They are not always mentioned by name, as Pac usually writes simply "we", but on the basis of other accounts, it can be concluded that these four people were, apart from Radziwiłł, the most important and the closest companions of the prince on his journey.

This group of individuals ranked just behind Radziwiłł in the hierarchy of importance. Some of the tasks they performed by the prince's orders are further evidence that Radziwiłł was distinguished from them by his high rank of royal envoy. Gerard Denhoff was sent several times as an envoy to discuss the circumstances of welcoming the retinue, for example, before arriving in Mainz and Florence. At the court of Infanta Isabella, Władysław sent Pac to arrange the details of the entrance into Brussels³⁸. If Radziwiłł were only the leader of the journey, nothing would prevent the prince from assigning him similar duties. Nevertheless, this could not be the case, as the dignity and prestige of the royal envoy required that preferably one of the members of the envoy's retinue acted as a runner.

36 Radziwiłł, "Rys panowania Zygmunta III", 77, 101, 135, 163, 307; Pac, "Obraz dworów europejskich", 77. Cf. Krzysztof Warszawicki, *O posle i poselstwach*, trans. Jerzy Życki (Warszawa: Księgarnia F. Hoesicka, 1935), 62, 89.

37 Hagenaw, "Diariusz podróży zagranicznej", 109, 139.

38 Radziwiłł, "Rys panowania Zygmunta III", 133; Hagenaw, "Diariusz podróży zagranicznej", 271, 153, 147.

ABBREVIATIONS

AGAD: Archiwum Główne Akt Dawnych w Warszawie.

AR: Archiwum Radziwiłłów.

MK: *Metryka Koronna*.

LL: *Libri Legationum*.

ASF: Archivio di Stato di Firenze.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Czapliński, Władysław. *Władysław IV i jego czasy*. Kraków: Universitas, 2008.

Deles, Przemysław. "Polityczne uwarunkowania podróży królewicza Władysława Zygmunta Wazy po krajach Europy Zachodniej w latach 1624–1624". *Kronika Zamkowa. Seria Nowa*, 42/2 (2001): 87–106.

Lolo, Radosław. *Rzeczpospolita wobec wojny trzydziestoletniej. Opinie i stanowiska szlachty (1618–1635)*. Pułtusk: Wyższa Szkoła Humanistyczna im. Aleksandra Gieysztora, 2004.

Ochmann-Staniszevska, Stefania. *Dynastia Wazów w Polsce*. Warszawa: PWN, 2006.

Pietrzyk, Zdzisław. "Przyczynek do podróży królewicza Władysława Zygmunta Waza po Europie Zachodniej". *Studia Historyczne. Kwartalnik*, 162 (1998): 341–48.

Skowron, Ryszard. "Znak i liturgia władzy - ceremoniale i etykieta dworu hiszpańskiego". In *Theatrum ceremoniale na dworze książąt i królów polskich*, edited by Mariusz Markiewicz, Ryszard Skowron, 123–147. Kraków: Zamek Królewski na Wawelu, 1999.

Szmydki, Ryszard. *Artystyczno-dyplomatyczne kontakty Zygmunta III Wazy z Niderlandami Południowymi*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL, 2008.

Szmydki, Ryszard. *Kontakty artystyczne królewicza Władysława Zygmunta Waza z Antwerpią. Misja Mathieu Roualta do Polski w 1626 r.* Warszawa: Zamek Królewski, 2002.

Targosz-Kretowa, Karolina. *Teatr dworski Władysława IV (1635–1648)*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Literackie, 1965.

Warszewicki, Krzysztof. *O pośle i poselstwach*, trans. Jerzy Życki. Warszawa: Księgarnia F. Hoesicka, 1935.

Wisner, Henryk. *Władysław IV Waza*. Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 2009.

Wisner, Henryk. "Dyplomacja polska w latach 1572–1648". In *Historia dyplomacji polskiej*, vol. II: 1572–1795, edited by Zbigniew Wójcik, 5–161. Warszawa: PWN, 1982.

Żukowski, Jacek. "Listy Władysława Waza i inne nieznane źródła do jego europejskiej peregrynacji z archiwami szwedzkich i niemieckich". *Kronika Zamkowa. Seria Nowa*, 68/2 (2015): 61–85.

PRIMARY SOURCES

AGAD

AR, II.

Metryka Koronna, Libri Legationum, 30.

Archivio di Stato di Firenze

Fondo Mediceo, II, 4292.

Stefanyk National Scientific Library of Ukraine in Lviv [Львівська наукова бібліотека імені В. Стефаника НАН України]

Fond 5: 201, *Kopiarz materialów dotyczących stosunków zagranicznych Polski z lat 1619–1625*.

PRINTED SOURCES

Przyboś Adam. *Podróż królewicza Władysława Wazy do krajów Europy Zachodniej w latach 1624–1625 w świetle ówczesnych relacji*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Literackie, 1977.