

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.

Uladzimir Padalinski
BELARUSIAN STATE UNIVERSITY (BELARUS)

DIPLOMATIC ACTIVITY AS THE BASIS OF POLITICAL ADVANCEMENT AND MATERIAL REWARD IN THE SIXTEENTH-CENTURY GRAND DUCHY OF LITHUANIA: THE CASE OF MIKHAYLA HARABURDA

ABSTRACT

In the second half of the sixteenth century, there was a sharp struggle for geopolitical hegemony in Eastern Europe. In order to protect its interests, the Grand Duchy of Lithuania had to pursue an active foreign policy, especially during the Livonian War. So diplomacy opened up wide opportunities for public service. The paper shows how diplomatic activity influenced the political career and material status of the nobility. The study is based on the case of Mikhayla Haraburda, who implemented the priorities of the Grand Duchy's foreign policy in practice for almost thirty years. From 1559 to 1586 he participated in 12 diplomatic missions to the Muscovite state and the Crimean Khanate. He rose through all the stages of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania diplomatic service: a messenger (1559, 1560, and 1561), a secretary of the grand legations (1563/1564, 1566, 1581/1582, and 1582), envoy (1571/1572, 1573, 1579, and 1580), and finally a grand envoy (1586). In the 1570s and 1580s, Haraburda was the most experienced diplomat of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. His career was related with the Grand Duchy Chancellery, where he served as a scribe (1559–1566) and a chief clerk (1566–1585). In 1585, he was appointed the castellan of Minsk and became the senator of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. Moreover, due to his activity, Haraburda received from the rulers numerous landed estates. As a result, he earned a high position within the Grand Duchy of Lithuania noble society. It may be stated that it was Mikhayla Haraburda's diplomatic activity that ensured his significant political career and land grants.

KEYWORDS: Diplomacy; Grand Duchy of Lithuania; Public service; Political career; Material status.

INTRODUCTION

There was a sharp struggle for geopolitical hegemony in Eastern Europe in the second half of the sixteenth century. To protect its interests, the Grand Duchy of Lithuania had to pursue an active foreign policy, especially during the Livonian War (1558–1582). The difficult foreign policy situation provided great opportunities for the public service, including the diplomatic one. The article examines the influence of diplomatic activity on the political career and material status of the middle nobility of the Grand Duchy. The research is based on the case of Mikhayla Haraburda, who had been putting into practice the priorities of the foreign policy of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania for almost thirty years. From 1559 to 1586, he participated in 12 diplomatic missions to the Muscovite state and the Crimean Khanate.

Despite such an outstanding public service, Haraburda's life and political activity have been barely been explored by historiography. Belarusian and Polish encyclopedias contain relatively detailed biographical articles about him¹. Mikhail Spirydonau, a Belarusian historian, used the example of the *Svisloch volost* gifted to Haraburda by the King of Poland and the Grand Duke of Lithuania Sigismund Augustus in 1568 to show the expansion of his land holdings². The main stages of his public service

1 Valeryy Pazdnyakow, "Гарабурда Міхаіл Багданавіч (?–12.7.1586)", in *Вялікае княства Літоўскае: Энцыклапедыя*, vol. 1, ed. Hyenadz' Pashkow (Мінск: БелЭн, 2005), 495; Kazimierz Lepszy, "Haraburda Michał h. Abdank (zm. 1586)", in *PSB*, vol. 9 (1960–1961), 288–90.

2 Mikhail Spirydonau, "Наданне Свіслацкай воласці Міхаілу Гарабурду: (Да праблемы скарачэння дзяржаўных уладанняў у Вялікім княстве Літоўскім у XV–XVI стст.)", in *Штогоднік Інстытута гісторыі Нацыянальнай*



are reflected in one of my articles³. However, the correlation between Haraburda's diplomatic activity, career progress, and material status strengthening has never been the subject of a special study. This article is based on various sources, both official documents and narrative sources. The materials from the Archive of the Grand Duchy – the *Lithuanian Metrica* – have played a key role among the primary sources⁴. Let it be stressed that several Haraburda's letters have survived, which provide important additional material for examining his role in the implementation of the foreign policy of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth⁵.

THE BEGINNING OF A DIPLOMATIC CAREER

Mikhayla Bahdanavich Haraburda came from an Orthodox Ruthenian (Belarusian) noble family, whose main estates were located in the territory of modern Belarus – in voivodeship of Polatsk (Połock) and Slonim district (voivodeship of Navahrudak/Nowogródek)⁶. Mikhayla had four brothers: Lukash, Siamyon, Antsuta, and Ivan. Such a large number of sons threatened the noble family with a significant subdivision of the land property. Apparently, it was this threat that pushed some of the brothers to active public service, namely, service in the Chancellery of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. In 1559, Mikhayla Haraburda, like his brother Lukash, worked as a scribe of the Chancellery⁷.

The beginning of Haraburda's public activity coincided with the beginning of the Livonian War⁸. The war gave the nobility an opportunity to prove themselves to the monarch in a wide scope of activities, not only in military operations. And diplomacy was one of such activities. Since the Chancellery performed some of the functions of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania's diplomatic service⁹, it was a perfect "springboard" for a political career during the war. In 1559, Mikhayla Haraburda was sent as a messenger to the Crimean Khanate¹⁰. Although messengers usually performed only current assignments in foreign policy, this mission was extremely important in the context of the outbreak of the war. Haraburda brought back a letter from the Crimean Khan Devlet Geray, which confirmed peace between the two states. Thereafter, the Grand Duchy of Lithuania was able to actively engage in the struggle with the Muscovite State for Livonia¹¹.

For the successful fulfillment of the mission and for the material losses incurred on the way from the Crimea, in March 1560, Sigismund Augustus granted the hereditary possession of the *putny*

акадэміі навук Беларусі, ed. Mikhail Kastysuk (Мінск: ІГ, 1999), 124-37.

3 Uladzimir Padalinski, "Міхайла Гарабурда–выбітны дыпламат Вялікага Княства Літоўскага другой паловы XVI ст.", in *Дипломатия Беларуси: прошлое и настоящее. Сб. материалов научного семинара*, ed. Andrey V. Rusakovich (Мінск: БГУ, 2016), 21-6, <http://www.elib.bsu.by/handle/123456789/156210>

4 Both archival and published books of the *Lithuanian Metrica* are referred to in the article.

5 AGAD, AR, V, n. 5019, 5020.

6 Pazdnyakow, "Гарабурда Міхаіл Багданавіч", 495; Spirydonaw, "Наданне Свіслацкай воласці", 125.

7 Pazdnyakow, "Гарабурда Міхаіл Багданавіч", 495; Darius Baronas, ed., *Lietuvos Metrika. Knyga Nr. 37: (1552–1561)* (Vilnius: Lietuvos istorijos instituto leidykla, 2011), 262, 282–283. I would like to note that later, in 1570, Haraburda's nephew Afanas Antsutavich Haraburda also became the scribe of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania Chancellery: Нацыянальны гістарычны архіў Беларусі ў Мінску (НГАБ/NGAB), фонд КМФ–18, воп. 1, спр. 257, арк. 2 v.

8 On the causes and the beginning of the Livonian War, see Andrey Yanushkevich, *Вялікае Княства Літоўскае і Інфлянцкая вайна 1558–1570 гг.* (Мінск: Медисонт, 2007), 21-32.

9 Alyaksandr Hrusha, *Канцылярыя Вялікага княства Літоўскага 40-х гадоў XV–першай паловы XVI ст.* (Мінск: Бел. навука, 2006), 41-2, 166-71.

10 Mikhail Obolenskiy and Ignatiy Danilovich, eds., *Книга посольская Метрики Великого княжества Литовского*, t. 1: 1545–1572 (Москва: Университетская Типография, 1843), 157-61. Back in 1558, his brother Lukash went to Moscow as a messenger of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. It is known that Lukash Haraburda had been participating in diplomatic relations with the Muscovite state since the 1530s: Obolenskiy and Danilovich, *Книга посольская*, t. 1, 146-47; Andrey Radaman, "Арганізацыя і склад полацкага земскага суда ў другой палове XVI–першай трэці XVII ст.", *Геральд-Літэранд*, n. 18 (2011): 27.

11 Obolenskiy and Danilovich, *Книга посольская*, t.1, 161-63; Yanushkevich, *Вялікае Княства Літоўскае і Інфлянцкая вайна*, 29.

boyars' lands in Polatsk voivodeship to Haraburda¹². Thus, the royal grant was not only a reward for the successfully completed assignment, but also a material incentive for further service. And in September 1560, the Chancellery scribe was entrusted with a new diplomatic mission. This time Mikhayla Haraburda was sent as a messenger to Moscow. He was to convey Sigismund Augustus' proposal for the cessation of hostilities in Livonia and peace negotiations to the Grand Prince of Moscow Ivan IV. It was an attempt to drag out time in order to strengthen the position of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania in the military conflict. The attempt proved to be unsuccessful¹³. In the next year (1561), Haraburda again went to the Crimean Khanate to persuade the Tatars to march against the Muscovite state. However, he failed to fulfill his task, because he was intercepted by the Muscovite voivode Daniil Abashev and did not get to Crimea¹⁴. Nevertheless, I believe that it was these missions, during which he faced unpredictable and unfavourable circumstances that helped Haraburda to show his potential and lay the foundation for the further diplomatic and political career.

IN THE FOREGROUND OF THE DIPLOMACY OF THE GRAND DUCHY OF LITHUANIA

Meanwhile, the position of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania in the Livonian War seriously deteriorated. In February 1563, Muscovite troops led by Ivan IV captured Polatsk, which was of strategic importance in this battle-ground¹⁵. The Muscovite state took the initiative in the war. The loss of Polatsk showed the weakness of the military organization of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. It needed a break to prepare for revenge. Already in the spring of 1563, the states concluded a temporary truce. Vilnius began the preparations to send the grand legation to Moscow. The Incisor (Pol. *krajczy*) Yuriy Chodkievich and the Hospodar Marshall Hrehory Vollovich were appointed as envoys, and Mikhayla Haraburda became the secretary of the legation¹⁶. Thus, Haraburda rose to a new higher level of the Grand Duchy's diplomatic service¹⁷. On the one hand, Haraburda's inclusion in the grand legation proved both his diplomatic skills and Sigismund Augustus' confidence in him. On the other hand, Mikhayla had a personal interest in participating in this mission. In February 1563, his brother Lukash with his whole family, as well as his nephew Aliaksandr Siamyonavich Haraburda were captured in Polatsk¹⁸. The mission opened a possibility to release at least some of the captives of war, including his relatives. The grand legation of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania was in Moscow from December 1563 to January 1564. However, the negotiations on a new truce ended in vain due to the fundamentally different requirements of both sides. The attempt to free Lukash Haraburda also failed, as Ivan IV demanded a huge ransom¹⁹.

Gradually the situation in the Livonian War stabilised. The Grand Duchy's troops defeated the Muscovite army at the Battle of Ula in January 1564, but they could not win Polatsk back. In 1565–1566,

12 Spirydonaw, "Наданне Свіслацкай воласці", 125; Baronas, *Lietuvos Metrika. Knuga Nr.*, 37, 359.

13 Obolenskiy and Danilovich, *Книга посольская*, t.1, 189-91, 192-95; Yanushkevich, *Вялікае Княства Літоўскае і Інфлянцкая вайна*, 42-5.

14 Lepszy, "Haraburda Michał", 288.

15 Yanushkevich, *Вялікае Княства Літоўскае і Інфлянцкая вайна*, 53-71.

16 Obolenskiy and Danilovich, *Книга посольская*, t.1, 227-41, 242-44, 247; Yanushkevich, *Вялікае Княства Літоўскае і Інфлянцкая вайна*, 71.

17 In the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, diplomatic assignments were carried out by great and minor envoys, secretaries of the grand legations, and messengers: Uladzimir Kananovich, "Дыпламатыя", in *Вялікае княства Літоўскае*, ed. Hyenadz' Pashkow, 610-11; Marius Sirutavičius, "The Phenomenon of Clientage and the Organisation of Diplomatic Activities in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania of the Second Half of the Sixteenth Century", *Legatio. The Journal for Renaissance and Early Modern Diplomatic Studies*, n. 2 (2018): 67.

18 Radaman, "Арганізацыя і склад полацкага земскага суда", 27; Al'bina Alyaksandrava, Vol'ha Babkova and Iryna Bobyer, eds., *Тастаменты шляхты і мяшчан Беларусі другой паловы XVI ст. (з актавых кніг Нацыянальнага гістарычнага архіва Беларусі)* (Мінск: БелЭн імя П. Броўкі, 2012), 379-81.

19 Obolenskiy and Danilovich, *Книга посольская*, t.1, 247-51; Yanushkevich, *Вялікае Княства Літоўскае і Інфлянцкая вайна*, 73-4; Lepszy, "Haraburda Michał", 288.

the hostilities turned into local skirmishes and treks to the frontier lands²⁰. Both sides needed a lull to prepare for further decisive actions on the fighting front. Diplomatic relations between the states were resumed. In the summer of 1566, another grand legation of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania was sent to Moscow. The castellan of Trakai (Troki) Yuriy Chodkievich and the voivode of Brest Yuriy Tyshkievich joined the legation. Haraburda was again appointed as the secretary of the legation. This time, the envoys were ready to seek a compromise to conclude a long-term truce, or even an everlasting peace, with the Muscovite state. However, Ivan IV's territorial claims, especially his claims on Livonia, resulted in declaring a truce between the states only until January 1567²¹. Moreover, the envoys were not able to secure the release of the captives. Despite Mikhayla Haraburda's personal efforts²², his brother Lukash and his nephew Aliaksandr still remained in Muscovite captivity.

On the eve of the 1566 mission, Haraburda was appointed to one of the highest posts in the Chancellery of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania – the post of the chief clerk²³. It was strong evidence of his achievements in public service and, first of all, in diplomatic activity. Moreover, throughout the 1560s, Sigismund Augustus granted him a lot of lands. Thus, in 1565, Haraburda received the village of Klimavichy as security for 36'000 Lithuanian *groszes*, and, in 1567, the villages of Klimavichy and Uhryn of Slonim district passed into his ownership. At the beginning of 1566, he lent 60'000 *groszes* and became the holder of the *Svislach volost* – a pretty large state estate in the Belarusian Dnieper region²⁴. In the fall of 1567, during the census of the troops of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, Haraburda provided 19 armed horsemen and 9 infantry soldiers from his estates and his wife's possessions. It allowed ranking him as a member of the middle nobility²⁵. And on 1 June 1568, during the General *sejm* in Hrodna, Sigismund Augustus gave the Svisloch volost to Mikhayla as hereditament²⁶. Haraburda's merits in diplomatic activity and his participation in important missions to the Crimean Khanate and the Muscovite state were especially emphasized in the privilege. This granting brought the clerk of the Grand Duchy closer to the wealthy nobility.

Mikhayla Haraburda, due to his career development, land grants, and good attitudes from the monarch, strengthened his position in the noble community. He maintained close contacts with the leaders of the Chancellery of the Grand Duchy: with the voivode of Vilnius Mikołaj Radziwiłł “the Red” and the Court Marshall Ostafiej Vollovich. In 1566–1579, they were a Chancellor and Vice-Chancellor, respectively²⁷. Part of his correspondence with Radziwiłł dated 1568–1570 has survived. Mainly, he conveyed information about events in foreign and domestic policy to the voivode of Vilnius²⁸. The chief clerk of the Grand Duchy repeatedly acted as a witness in various Ostafiej Vollovich's property transactions in 1567–1568²⁹. Haraburda, undoubtedly, enjoyed the authority and confidence of the

20 Yanushkyevich, *Вялікае Княства Літоўскае і Інфлянцкая вайна*, 74–96.

21 Obolenskiy and Danilovich, *Книга посольская*, t.1, 255–58; Yanushkyevich, *Вялікае Княства Літоўскае і Інфлянцкая вайна*, 97–9.

22 Radaman, “Арганізацыя і склад полацкага земскага суда”, 27–8.

23 Antoni Gąsiorowski, ed., *Urzednicy dawnej Rzeczypospolitej XII–XVIII wieku: Spisy*, t. 11: *Urzednicy centralni i dygnitarze Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego XIV–XVIII wieku. Spisy* (Kórnik: Biblioteka Kórnicka, 1994), 131–32.

24 Spirydonaw, “Наданне Свіслацкай воласці”, 125.

25 Stanislav L. Ptashitskiy, ed., *Русская историческая библиотека*, vol. 33: *Литовская Метрика. Отдел третий*, part 3: *Книги публичных дел. Переписи Литовского войска* (Петроград: Типография Главного Управления Уделов, 1915), 458. The criteria for division of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania nobility into material categories, see Uladzimir Padalinski, *Прадстаўніцтва Вялікага Княства Літоўскага на Люблінскім сойме 1569 года: удзел у працы першага вальнага сойма Рэчы Паспалітай* (Мінск: А.М. Янушкевіч, 2017), 150–53.

26 Spirydonaw, “Наданне Свіслацкай воласці”, 125–26, 129–32.

27 Gąsiorowski, *Urzednicy dawnej Rzeczypospolitej*, t. 11, 52, 147.

28 AGAD, AR, V, n. 5019, 1–8; n. 5020, 1–2. See also Tomasz Kempa, “Sekretarze królewscy na służbie u Radziwiłłów w drugiej połowie XVI wieku”, in *Patron i dwór: magnateria Rzeczypospolitej w XVI–XVIII wieku*, eds. Ewa Dubas-Urwanowicz and Jerzy Urwanowicz (Warszawa: DiG, 2006), 257–58; Raimonda Ragauskienė, *Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės kancleris Mikalojus Radvila Rudasis (Apie 1515–1584 m.)* (Vilnius: Seimo leidykla “Valstybės žinios”, 2002), 168, 309.

29 Flavian Dobryanskiy, ed., *Акты, издаваемые Виленской археографической комиссией*, t. 31: *Акты о литовских татарах* (Вильна: Русский Почин, 1906), 17–8, 20–2.

upper circles of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. Thus, the voivode of Smolensk Vasil Tyshkievich, in his will drawn up in 1570, appointed Mikhayla as one of the guardians of his wife and children³⁰. In October 1570, the clerk was among those people who confirmed the transfer of the village of Birzheli by the castellan of Navahrudak Hrehory Vollovich to the property of his third wife Duchess Magdalena Sangushko³¹. By the way, in 1563–1564, Mikhayla Haraburda and Hrehory Vollovich together went to Moscow as part of the grand legation of the Grand Duchy. One may assume that the joint fulfillment of the diplomatic mission helped to strengthen the informal networks between them.

Meanwhile, the geopolitical situation in Eastern Europe had changed significantly. The representatives of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and the Kingdom of Poland signed the Union of Lublin on 1 July 1569. The Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth was created. Pretty soon, during the Diet in Lublin, the personnel of the first grand legation of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth to the Muscovite state were determined. The legation had an important task – to inform Ivan IV that the union had been signed and to conclude a temporary truce with him. Initially, Haraburda was supposed to become the secretary of the legation, as he had already performed these functions twice and, of course, he had the relevant experience. However, the chief clerk flatly refused to go on that mission. In July 1569, the Land Treasurer Mikolaj Narushevich reported that Mikhayla Haraburda «in no way wants to go to Moscow, because he has already been there three times»³². As a result, royal secretary, the chamberlain of Navahrudak Andrej Kharytanovich-Obrynski was appointed as the secretary of the grand legation³³. The reason for such a point-blank refusal might have been Haraburda's fear that participation in another long and dangerous mission could negatively affect his economic conditions. In the spring of 1569, his brother Lukash was finally rescued from captivity and received material compensation at the Diet of Lublin³⁴.

In the winter of 1570–1571, the rumors about Ivan IV's death began to spread in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. Sigismund Augustus decided to send an envoy to Moscow, who could verify this information, and started a political campaign for his election as the Grand Prince of Moscow. Mikolaj Radziwiłł “the Red” suggested that Mikhayla Haraburda had to carry out such a delicate task³⁵. Although the rumors were not confirmed, at the end of 1571, he went on a new diplomatic mission to the Muscovite state. This time Haraburda already had the status of a minor envoy of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. Negotiations with Ivan IV covered the territorial disputes on Livonia and the violations by the Muscovite side of the terms of the truce concluded between the states in June 1570. Since the truce was already expiring in the summer of 1573, Haraburda had to raise the issue of concluding an “eternal peace” between the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and the Muscovite State. However, that mission did not produce any concrete results³⁶. It must be stressed that the Grand

30 Yulian Krachkovskiy, ed., *Акты, издаваемые Виленской археографической комиссией*, т. 22: *Акты Слонимского земского суда* (Вильна: Типография А.Г. Сыркина, 1895), 302-06, 400-08; Alyaksandrava, Babkova, and Bobyer, *Тастаменты шляхты і мяшчан Беларусі*, 355-66, 373-79. At the end of 1578, Haraburda became one of the guardians and defenders of the wife and son of Wojciech Paluski, the Hospodar Marshall and the chamberlain of Ashmiany: Alyaksandrava, Babkova, and Bobyer, *Тастаменты шляхты і мяшчан Беларусі*, 398-403.

31 Krachkovskiy, *Акты, издаваемые Виленской археографической комиссией*, т. 22, 318-20.

32 Pyotr Gil'tebrandt and A. Mirotvortsev, eds., *Археографический сборник документов, относящихся к истории Северо-Западной России*, т. 7 (Вильна: Печатня А. Сыркина, 1870), 48.

33 On the organization of the grand legation and the results of its activities in Moscow in 1570, see Obolenskiy and Danilovich, *Книга посольская*, т.1, 284-85, 290-301; Padalinski, *Прадстаўніцтва Вялікага Княства Літоўскага*, 66, 77-9; Yanushkevich, *Вялікае Княства Літоўскае і Інфлянцкая вайна*, 112-17.

34 Nevertheless, Lukash' family still remained in captivity: Vladimir Podolinskiy, “«И выступил с речью довольно искренней и горестной»: индивидуальное измерение Люблинского сейма 1569 года”, *Российская история*, п. 4 (2020): 101-02; Radaman, “Арганізацыя і склад полацкага земскага суда”, 27-8. M. Haraburda's nephew Aliaksandr returned from captivity, probably, only in the summer of 1570: Alyaksandrava, Babkova, and Bobyer, *Тастаменты шляхты і мяшчан Беларусі*, 380.

35 Irena Kaniewska, ed., *Listy króla Zygmunta Augusta do Radziwiłłów* (Kraków: Wydawnictwo Literackie, 1999), 587-89, 591-92, 594-95; Sirutavičius, “The Phenomenon of Clientage”, 78-9.

36 НГАБ, ф. КМФ–18, воп. 1, спр. 56, арк. 10v-11; Obolenskiy and Danilovich, *Книга посольская*, т.1, 312-13; Kaniewska, *Listy króla Zygmunta Augusta*, 600-03, 607-08; Lepšy, “Haraburda Michał”, 289.

Prince of Moscow expressed his wish that Ostafiej Vollovich and Mikhayla Haraburda should be the envoys of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in the further negotiations on eternal peace. One can only agree with the opinion of Kazimierz Lepszy, a Polish historian, that by the end of the reign of Sigismund Augustus, Mikhayla Haraburda had already been a real expert in relations between the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and the Muscovite state³⁷.

THE INTERREGNUM OF 1572–1573: A NOTORIOUS MISSION

Sigismund Augustus died in July 1572. After his death, the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth entered the first *interregnum*. A fierce political struggle over the candidacy and conditions for the election of a new King and Grand Duke broke out in the state, especially in the Kingdom of Poland³⁸. In such circumstances, the political elite of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania had to independently and promptly solve the problem of ensuring external security. Moreover, the term of the truce with the Muscovite state was coming to an end. Already in September 1572, during the Congress in Rudniki, a part of senators of the Grand Duchy decided to start negotiations with Moscow to discuss the possibility of electing Ivan IV's son Fyodor Ivanovich as a new King and Grand Duke. At the end of December 1572, the Congress of senators and noblemen of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania met in Vilnius. The Congress, without the consent of the Polish side, as it was required by the Union of Lublin (1569), sent a special envoy to negotiate with Ivan IV³⁹. Mikhayla Haraburda had to perform this extremely important mission. Obviously, he had not been chosen the envoy by accident. He had already accumulated a rich experience of diplomatic contacts with the Muscovites, enjoyed the confidence of the political elite of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, especially of Mikołaj Radziwiłł "the Red", and had a relationship of trust with Ivan IV⁴⁰.

The negotiations between Haraburda and Ivan IV took place in February 1573 in Novgorod. No specific agreements had been reached. On the one hand, the conditions on which Vilnius was ready to support the Muscovite candidate were unacceptable for Moscow. On the other hand, the territorial and political claims of the Grand Prince of Moscow were unacceptable to the ruling circles of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. And the envoy returned to the Grand Duchy in March 1573⁴¹. However, this diplomatic game allowed to neutralise the threat of military invasion by the Muscovite state into Livonia. Nobody seriously discussed the candidacies of Ivan IV and Fyodor Ivanovich for the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth elections in 1573⁴². And in this regard, Haraburda's visit should be called successful.

However, this diplomatic mission caused much speculation in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. For the sake of his political interests, Jan Hlebovich, the castellan of Minsk, provided the Polish side with false information about the purpose of Haraburda's visit to the Muscovite state. As a result, in the Kingdom of Poland, the political elite of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania was accused of secret contacts with the Muscovite state and attempts to elect Fyodor Ivanovich to the Grand Duchy's throne separately⁴³. I doubt that the upper circles of the Grand Duchy seriously considered the Muscovite

37 Lepszy, "Haraburda Michał", 289.

38 Tomasz Kempa, *Mikołaj Krzysztof Radziwiłł "Sierotka" (1549–1616), wojewoda wileński* (Warszawa: Semper, 2000), 68–73.

39 Henryk Lulewicz, *Gniewów o unię ciąg dalszy (Stosunki polsko-litewskie w latach 1569–1588)* (Warszawa: Neriton, 2002), 91–105, 109–12; Antanas Tyla, "The Formation of Lithuanian Eastern Policy: the Dietine of Rūdninkai. September 24–7, 1572", *Lithuanian Historical Studies*, n. 1 (1996): 22–37; Stanisław Grodziski, Irena Dwornicka, and Waław Uruszczak, ed., *Volumina Constitutionum*, vol. II (1550–1609), part 1: (1550–1585) (Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Sejmowe, 2005), 236.

40 Kempa, "Sekretarze królewscy", 257–58; Lepszy, "Haraburda Michał", 289; Sirutavičius, "The Phenomenon of Clientage", 79–80.

41 AGAD, AR, II, n. 89, 1–2; Lulewicz, *Gniewów o unię*, 112–13. The diary of negotiations, written by Haraburda, has survived till now: Władysław de Broel-Plater, ed., *Zbiór pamiętników do dziejów polskich*, t. 3 (Warszawa: Drukarnia Gazety Codziennej, 1858), 58–65.

42 Kempa, *Mikołaj Krzysztof Radziwiłł*, 79; Lulewicz, *Gniewów o unię*, 114.

43 Kempa, *Mikołaj Krzysztof Radziwiłł*, 73–8; Lulewicz, *Gniewów o unię*, 96–102, 127–31; Tyla, "The Formation of Lithuanian Eastern Policy", 31–4, 36.

candidate: his election could result in the restriction of political freedoms in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. Most likely, the negotiations with Ivan IV were aimed solely at preventing large-scale fighting in Livonia. Moreover, there is no reason to talk about any real plans to break the union with Poland⁴⁴. Mikhayla Haraburda was even forced to make a detailed report on his mission at the election *sejm* of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in the spring of 1573⁴⁵. The accusations of secret negotiations with the Muscovite state for the purpose of a separate election were extremely serious. They could end his diplomatic and official career. It might have been this scandal that prevented Haraburda for a long period, more than six years, from participating in the diplomatic missions of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth.

A NEW RISE DURING THE REIGN OF STEPHEN BÁTHORY

In 1576, Stephen Báthory, the voivode of Transylvania, became the King of Poland and the Grand Duke of Lithuania. The new king began his preparations for decisive military action against Ivan IV, whose troops occupied most of Livonia in the summer of 1577. In 1578, the General Diet of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth decided to renew the war with the Muscovite state⁴⁶.

In that situation, Haraburda's diplomatic experience and abilities could not remain unclaimed. Initially, however, he was sent to the southern direction. Haraburda went with a legation to Khan Mehmed Giray in June 1579. As a result of the mission, a truce was concluded with the Crimean Khanate, and the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth concentrated all its forces on the fight against the Muscovite state⁴⁷. Nevertheless, Stephen Báthory counted not only on the neutrality of the Tatars, but also on their participation in the war against Ivan IV. Therefore, at the beginning of 1580, the king asked Haraburda to go to Crimea again. Due to the unstable situation on the southern borders of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, he had to go there through Moldavia and Wallachia. However, he stopped for several months in Vinnitsa because of some organizational problems. He negotiated with the Crimean envoy there⁴⁸, but it is not known whether Haraburda managed to get to Crimea that very time. Although the Tatars did not organize a large-scale campaign against the Muscovite State⁴⁹, the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth managed to maintain peaceful relations with the Khanate during the final stage of the Livonian War. At that time, Haraburda also managed to prove himself in military operations. During the military campaign of 1581, he commanded the Tatar detachments of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. He also participated in the campaign of the castellan of Trakai, Vice-Chancellor Krzysztof Radziwiłł "the Thunderbolt" and the voivode of Smolensk Philon Kmita-Chernobylski in the distant lands of the Muscovite state⁵⁰. Apparently having earned Stephen Báthory's full confidence, Mikhayla Haraburda was soon again involved in diplomatic contacts with the Muscovite state.

Defeats in the military campaigns of 1579–1581 forced Ivan IV to seek a way to reconcile with Stephen Báthory. In December 1581, both states started peace negotiations mediated by Antonio Possevino, the

44 Lulewicz, *Gniewów o unię*, 101-02, 107-08.

45 Lepszy, "Haraburda Michał", 289; Tyla, "The Formation of Lithuanian Eastern Policy", 36.

46 Lulewicz, *Gniewów o unię*, 308-18. Let it be stressed that the clerks of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania Chancellery M. Haraburda and A. Kharytanovich-Obrynski, who had already had the experience of diplomatic missions to the Muscovy, were specially invited to participate in the work of the *sejm*: Ivan I. Ларро, *Великое княжество Литовское во второй половине XVI столетия. Литовско-русский совет и его сеймик* (Юрьев: Тип. К. Маттисена, 1911), приложения, 116.

47 Marek Ferenc, *Mikołaj Radziwiłł "Rudy" (ok. 1515–1584). Działalność polityczna i wojskowa* (Kraków: Towarzystwo Wydawnicze "Historia Iagellonica", 2008), 572-73; Jan Natanson Leski, *Epoka Stefana Batorego w dziejach granicy wschodniej Rzeczypospolitej* (Oświęcim: Napoleon V, 2014), 43.

48 AGAD, AR, V, n. 5019, 9-11; Biblioteka Kórnicka PAN, rkps. 1538, *akta do panowania Batorego*, k. 34.

49 Natanson Leski, *Epoka Stefana Batorego*, 67.

50 Reyngol'd Geydenshteyn, "Записки о Московской войне (1578–1582)", in *Рейнгольд Гейденштейн. Записки о Московской войне (1578–1582). Альберт Шлихтинг. Новое известие о России времени Ивана Грозного. Генрих Штаден. О Москве Ивана Грозного*, ed. Aleksandr Tsepkov (Рязань: Александрия, 2005), 213-14, 240-42; Natanson Leski, *Epoka Stefana Batorego*, 80, 84-5.

envoy of Pope Gregory XIII. The voivode of Bratslau (Braclaw) Janusz Zbarazhski and Court Marshall Albrycht Radziwiłł became the grand envoys of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, and Mikhayla Haraburda was appointed as the legation's secretary. On 15 January 1582, the negotiations ended with the signing of the Truce of Yam-Zapolsky for a period of 10 years. The Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth retained the northeastern lands of Belarus and almost all territory of Livonia⁵¹. However, the truce did not resolve all the contradictions in Livonia, in which not only the Commonwealth and the Muscovite state but also Sweden were involved. Therefore, in the spring of 1582, Stephen Báthory sent a new grand legation to the Muscovite state, and Haraburda was appointed its secretary for the fourth time. The negotiations took place in the summer of the same year. Their results, in general, satisfied the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth⁵². For a long time, the Muscovite state was excluded from the struggle for influence in the Baltic region.

Haraburda's active participation in the diplomatic missions of 1579–1582 was rewarded. In April 1582, the king issued a privilege to return the villages of Haradzets and Kolbcha, previously granted to some Polatsk noblemen for temporary possession, to the *Svislach volost*⁵³. Haraburda also made a huge step forward in his political career. In February 1585, during the General Diet, he was appointed the castellan of Minsk and, thus, he became a senator of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth⁵⁴. By the way, during this *sejm*, Haraburda took an active part in negotiations with Muscovite envoys⁵⁵. In the 1580s, he was undoubtedly the most experienced specialist in diplomatic relations with the eastern neighbour of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. The renowned chronicler, diplomat and lawyer Reinhold Heidenstein in his "Notes on the Muscovite War", published in 1584 in Cracow, described Mikhayla Haraburda as «a gifted person and a proficient one in the Muscovite affairs»⁵⁶.

In 1584, after the death of Ivan IV, Stephen Báthory made plans to subjugate the Muscovite state, and primarily by military means⁵⁷. In December 1585, the Senate of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth was convened in Hrodna. The monarch and the senators decided to send a «man of ability» to Moscow, who could not only skillfully conduct negotiations, but also scout out the sentiments of the Muscovite political elite⁵⁸. And Mikhayla Haraburda was such a person. A special instruction was drawn up in Hrodna. He was supposed to act in negotiations with the Muscovite state according to it. The envoy also received individual instructions from Stephen Báthory. But during the negotiations, he had to use his own «wise discretion», relying on his own «intelligence and sharpness»⁵⁹.

In April 1586, Haraburda was in Moscow already as the grand envoy of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. The negotiations covered a wide range of issues: from the return of the confiscated goods to the merchants of the Commonwealth to the possibility of signing a union between the two

51 Geydenshteyn, "Записки о Московской войне (1578–1582)", 250, 256–69, 278–79; Mikhail Pogodin and Dmitriy Dubenskiy, ed., *Книга посольская Метрики Великого княжества Литовского*, том 2: 1576–1583 (Москва: Университетская Типография, 1843), 209–45; Lulewicz, *Gniewów o unię*, 339–40; Natanson Leski, *Epoka Stefana Batorego*, 91, 97–107. In addition to it, in 1578–1579, Haraburda's nephew – Pyotr Antsutovich – went as a messenger to Moscow: Geydenshteyn, "Записки о Московской войне (1578–1582)", 81, 97; Pogodin Dubenskiy, *Книга посольская*, t. 2, 38–41.

52 Pogodin Dubenskiy, *Книга посольская*, t. 2, 248–74; Lepszy, "Haraburda Michał", 289; Sirutavičius, "The Phenomenon of Clientage", 80–1. During 1581–1583, Haraburda participated in the audiences of Muscovite envoys, as well as negotiations on the exchange of the war captives: Pogodin Dubenskiy, *Книга посольская*, t. 2, 136–39, 274–75, 280–83.

53 Spiridonaw, "Надання Свіслацкай воласці", 125–26.

54 Józef Wolff, *Senatorowie i dygnitarze Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego (1386–1795)* (Kraków: Druk. Anczyca i Spółki, 1885), 110.

55 Aleksander Czuczyski, ed., *Dyaryusze sejmowe roku 1585. W dodatkach: Ułamki dyaryusza sejmowego roku 1582, akta sejmikowe i inne akta odnoszące się do sejmu 1585 r.* (Kraków: Nakładem Akademii Umiejętności, 1901), 254, 256–57.

56 Geydenshteyn, "Записки о Московской войне (1578–1582)", 250.

57 Natanson Leski, *Epoka Stefana Batorego*, 133–34.

58 Michał Grabowski and Aleksander Przedziecki, ed., *Zróżdła do dziejów polskich*, t. 1 (Wilno: Nakł. i druk. J. Zawadzkiego, 1843), 63.

59 Algirdas Baliulis, ed., *Lietuvos Metrika. Knyga Nr. 593 (1585–1604). Diplomatinų reikalų knyga* (Vilnius: Lietuvos istorijos instituto leidykla, 2009), 19–25.

states⁶⁰. Although the negotiations had not produced concrete results, it was an important stage in the formation of Stephen Báthory's policy in relation to the Muscovite State. On 24 June 1586, Mikhayla Haraburda reported to the king on the results of his mission. But the same year, on 12 July he suddenly died of pneumonia⁶¹. That mission had certainly become the peak and final chord of his bright diplomatic career.

CONCLUSION

Mikhayla Haraburda's case was quite unique in the history of diplomacy of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania in the second half of the sixteenth century⁶². During his life, he passed all the levels of the diplomatic service: from a messenger to a grand envoy. Thanks to his activities, being a representative of the middle nobility, he managed to climb the career ladder from the scribe of the Chancellery to a senator. Numerous land grants were also a direct consequence of Haraburda's public service and implementation of the foreign policy objectives of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. At the same time, diplomatic missions that were carried out in emergency situations and had a general public outcry could put an end to all his career achievements.

60 Baliulis, *Lietuvos Metrika*. Knyga Nr. 593, 30-7; Lepšy, "Haraburda Michał", 289-90; Uładzimir Padalinski, "Szlachta Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego w misjach dyplomatycznych Rzeczypospolitej (ostatnie trzydziestolecie XVI w.)", in *Polska wobec wielkich konfliktów w Europie nowożytnej. Z dziejów dyplomacji i stosunków międzynarodowych w XV-XVIII wieku*, ed. Ryszard Skowron (Kraków: "Societas Vistulana", 2009), 248. I would like to note that there were no representatives of the Kingdom of Poland in the legation.

ABBREVIATIONS

НГАБ: Нацыянальны гістарычны архіў Беларусі ў Мінску [NGAB: Nacyjanalnyj Gistarycznyj Archiu Biełarusi, Minsk].

AGAD: Archiwum Główne Akt Dawnych w Warszawie.

AR: Archiwum Warszawskie Radziwiłłów.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alyaksandrava, Al'bina, Vol'ha Babkova and Iryna Bobyer, ed. *Tastamyenty shlyakhty i myashchan Byelarusi druhoj palovy XVI st. (z aktavykh knih Natsyyanal'naha histarychnaha arkhiva Byelarusi)*. Minsk: ByelEn. imya P. Browki, 2012. [Аляксандрава, Альбіна, Вольга Бабкова, and Ірына Бобер, ed. *Тастаменты шляхты і мяшчан Беларусі другой паловы XVI ст. (з актавых кніг Нацыянальнага гістарычнага архіва Беларусі)*. Мінск: БелЭн імя П. Броўкі, 2012].
- Baliulis, Algirdas, ed. *Lietuvos Metrika. Knyga Nr. 593 (1585–1604). Diplomatinijų reikalų knyga*. Vilnius: Lietuvos istorijos instituto leidykla, 2009.
- Baronas, Darius, ed. *Lietuvos Metrika. Knyga Nr. 37: (1552–1561)*. Vilnius: Lietuvos istorijos instituto leidykla, 2011.
- Broel-Plater, Władysław de, ed. *Zbiór pamiętników do dziejów polskich*, vol. 3. Warszawa: Drukarnia Gazety Codziennej, 1858.
- Czuczynski, Aleksander, ed. *Dyaryusze sejmowe roku 1585. W dodatkach: Ułamki dyaryusza sejmowego roku 1582, akta sejmikowe i inne akta odnoszące się do sejmu 1585 r.* Kraków: Nakładem Akademii Umiejętności, 1901.
- Ferenc, Marek. *Mikołaj Radziwiłł "Rudy" (ok. 1515–1584). Działalność polityczna i wojskowa*. Kraków: Towarzystwo Wydawnicze "Historia Iagellonica", 2008.
- Gąsiorowski, Antoni, ed. *Urzędnicy dawnej Rzeczypospolitej XII–XVIII wieku: Spisy*, vol. 11: *Urzędnicy centralni i dygnitarze Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego XIV–XVIII wieku. Spisy*. Kórnik: Biblioteka Kórnicka, 1994.
- Geydenshteyn, Reyngol'd. "Zapiski o Moskovskoy voyne (1578–1582)". In *Reyngol'd Geydenshteyn. Zapiski o Moskovskoy voyne (1578–1582)*. Al'bert Shlikhting. *Novoye izvestiye o Rossii vremeni Ivana Groznogo. Genrikh Shtaden. O Moskve Ivana Groznogo*, edited by Aleksandr Tsepkov, 7-314. Ryazan': Aleksandriya, 2005. [Гейденштейн, Рейнгольд. "Записки о Московской войне (1578–1582)". In *Рейнгольд Гейденштейн. Записки о Московской войне (1578–1582)*. Альберт Шлихтинг. *Новое известие о России времени Ивана Грозного. Генрих Штаден. О Москве Ивана Грозного*, edited by Александр Цепков, 7-314. Рязань: Александрия, 2005].
- Grabowski, Michał and Aleksander Przewdziecki, ed. *Zróżdła do dziejów polskich*, vol. 1. Wilno: Nakł. i druk. J. Zawadzkiego, 1843.
- Gil'tebrandt, Pyotr and A. Mirotvortsev, eds. *Arkheograficheskiy sbornik dokumentov, otnosyashchikhsya k istorii Severo-Zapadnoy Rossii*, vol. 7. Vil'no: Pechatnya A. Syrkina, 1870. [Гильтебрандт, Пётр and А. Миротворцев, eds. *Археографический сборник документов, относящихся к истории Северо-Западной России*, vol. 7. Вильно: Печатня А. Сыркина, 1870].
- Grodziski, Stanisław, Irena Dwornicka, and Waław Uruszczak, eds. *Volumina Constitutionum*, vol. II: (1550–1609), part 1: (1550–1585). Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Sejmowe, 2005.
- Hrusha, Alyaksandr. *Kancylyaryya Vyalikaha knyastva Litovskaha 40-kh hadow XV–pyershay palovy XVI st.* Minsk: Byel. navuka, 2006. [Груша, Аляксандр. *Канцылярыя Вялікага княства Літоўскага 40-х гадоў XV–першай паловы XVI ст.* Мінск: Бел. навука, 2006].
- Dobryanskiy, Flavian, ed. *Akty, izdavayemyye Vilenskoj arkheograficheskoy komissiyey*, vol. 31. Vil'no: Russkiy Pochin, 1906. [Добрянский, Флавиан, ed. *Акты, издаваемые Виленской археографической комиссией*, vol. 31. Вильно: Русский Почин, 1906].
- Kananovich, Uladzimir. "Dyplamatyya", In *Vyalikaye knyastva Litovskaye: Entsylapyedyya*, vol. 1, edited by Hyenadz' Pashkow, 610-11. Minsk: ByelEn, 2005. [Канановіч, Уладзімір. "Дыпламатыя", In *Вялікае княства Літоўскае: Энцыклапедыя*, vol. 1, edited by Генадзь Пашкоў, 610-11. Мінск: БелЭн, 2005].

- Kaniewska, Irena, ed. *Listy króla Zygmunta Augusta do Radziwiłłów*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Literackie, 1999.
- Kempa, Tomasz. "Sekretarze królewscy na służbie u Radziwiłłów w drugiej połowie XVI wieku". In *Patron i dwór: magnateria Rzeczypospolitej w XVI–XVIII wieku*, edited by Ewa Dubas-Urwanowicz and Jerzy Urwanowicz, 243–71. Warszawa: DiG, 2006.
- Kempa, Tomasz. *Mikołaj Krzysztof Radziwiłł "Sierotka" (1549–1616), wojewoda wileński*. Warszawa: Semper, 2000.
- Krachkovskiy, Yulian, ed. *Akty, izdavayemyye Vilenskooy arkheograficheskoy komissiyey*, vol. 22. Vil'no: Tipografiya A.G. Syrkina, 1895. [Крачковский, Юлиан, ed. *Акты, издаваемые Виленской археографической комиссией*, vol. 22. Вильно: Типография А.Г. Сыркина, 1895].
- Lappo, Ivan I. *Velikoye knyazhestvo Litovskoye vo vtoroy polovine XVI stoletiya. Litovsko-russkiy povet i yego seymik*. Yur'ev: Tip. K. Mattisena, 1911. [Лаппо, Иван И. *Великое княжество Литовское во второй половине XVI столетия. Литовско-русский повет и его сеймик*. Юрьев: Тип. К. Маттисена, 1911].
- Lepszy, Kazimierz. "Haraburda Michał h. Abdank (zm. 1586)". In PSB, vol. 9 (1960–1961), 288–90.
- Lulewicz, Henryk. *Gniewów o unię ciąg dalszy (Stosunki polsko-litewskie w latach 1569–1588)*. Warszawa: Neriton, 2002.
- Natanson Leski, Jan. *Epoka Stefana Batorego w dziejach granicy wschodniej Rzeczypospolitej*. Oświęcim: Napoleon V, 2014.
- Obolenskiy, Mikhail, and Ignatyi Danilovich, eds. *Kniga posol'skaya Metriki Velikogo knyazhestva Litovskogo*, vol. 1. Moskva: Universitetskaya Tipografiya, 1843. [Оболенский, Михаил, and Игнатий Данилович, eds. *Книга посольская Метрики Великого княжества Литовского*, vol. 1. Москва: Университетская Типография, 1843].
- Padalinski, Uladzimir. *Pradstawnitstva Vyalikaha Knyastva Litowskaha na Lyublinskim soymie 1569 hoda: udzyel u pratsy pyershaha val'naha soyma Rechypaspalitay*. Minsk: A.M. Yanushkyevich, 2017. [Падалінскі, Уладзімір. *Прадстаўніцтва Вялікага Княства Літоўскага на Люблінскім сойме 1569 года: удзел у працы першага вальнага сойма Рэчы Паспалітай*. Мінск: А.М. Янушкевіч, 2017].
- Padalinski, Uladzimir. "Mikhayla Haraburda – vybitny dyplamat Vyalikaha Knyastva Litowskaha druhoj palovy XVI st.". In *Diplomatiya Belarusi: proshloye i nastoyashcheye*, edited by Andrey V. Rusakovich, 21–6. Minsk: BGU, 2016. [Падалінскі, Уладзімір. "Міхайла Гарабурда – выбітны дыпламат Вялікага Княства Літоўскага другой паловы XVI ст.". In *Дипломатия Беларуси: прошлое и настоящее*, edited by Андрей В. Русакович, 21–6. Минск: БГУ, 2016. <http://www.elib.bsu.by/handle/123456789/156210>.
- Padalinski, Uladzimir. "Szlachta Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego w misjach dyplomatycznych Rzeczypospolitej (ostatnie trzydziestolecie XVI w.)". In *Polska wobec wielkich konfliktów w Europie nowożytnej. Z dziejów dyplomacji i stosunków międzynarodowych w XV–XVIII wieku*, edited by Ryszard Skowron, 245–62. Kraków: "Societas Vistulana", 2009.
- Pazdnyakow, Valeryy. "Haraburda Mikhail Bahdanavich (?–12.7.1586)". In *Vyalikaye knyastva Litowskaye: Entsylapyedyya*, vol. 1, edited by Hyenadz' Pashkow, 495. Minsk: ByelEn, 2005. [Пазднякоў, Валерый. "Гарабурда Міхаіл Багданавіч (?–12.7.1586)." In *Вялікае княства Літоўскае: Энцыклапедыя*, vol. 1, edited by Генадзь Пашкоў, 495. Мінск: БелЭн, 2005].
- Pogodin, Mikhail and Dmitriy Dubenskiy, eds. *Kniga posol'skaya Metriki Velikogo knyazhestva Litovskogo*, vol. 2. Moskva: Universitetskaya Tipografiya, 1843. [Погодин, Михаил and Дмитрий Дубенский, eds. *Книга посольская Метрики Великого княжества Литовского*, vol. 2. Москва: Университетская Типография, 1843].
- Podolinskiy, Vladimir. "«Ivystupils rech'yudovol'no iskrenney i gorestnoy»: individual'noye izmereniye Lyublinskogo seyma 1569 goda". *Rossiyskaya istoriya*, n. 4 (2020): 94–102. [Подолинский, Владимир. "«И выступил с речью довольно искренней и горестной»: индивидуальное измерение Люблинского сейма 1569 года". *Российская история*, n. 4 (2020): 94–102].
- Ptashitskiy, Stanislav, ed. *Russkaya istoricheskaya biblioteka*, vol. 33, part 3. Petrograd: Tipografiya Glavnogo Upravleniya Udelov, 1915. [Пташицкий, Станислав, ed. *Русская историческая*

- библиотека, vol. 33, part 3. Петроград: Типография Главного Управления Уделов, 1915].
- Radaman, Andrey. "Arhanizatsyya i sklad polatskaha zyeyskaha suda w druhoу palovye XVI–pyershay treti XVII st.". *Hyerol'd-Litherland*, n. 18 (2011): 21–36. [Радаман, Андрэй. "Арганізацыя і склад полацкага земскага суда ў другой палове XVI–першай трэці XVII ст.". *Герольд-Litherland*, n. 18 (2011): 21–36].
- Ragauskienė, Raimonda. *Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės kancleris Mikalojus Radvila Rudasis (Apie 1515–1584 m.)*. Vilnius: Seimo leidykla "Valstybės žinios", 2002.
- Sirutavičius, Marius. "The Phenomenon of Clientage and the Organisation of Diplomatic Activities in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania of the Second Half of the Sixteenth Century". *Legatio. The Journal for Renaissance and Early Modern Diplomatic Studies*, n. 2 (2018): 65–91.
- Svyazhynski, Uladzimir. "Histarychnyya zapiski" F. Yewlashowskaha. Minsk: Navuka i technika, 1990. [Свяжынскі, Уладзімір. "Гістарычныя запіскі" Ф. Еўлашоўскага. Мінск: Навука і тэхніка, 1990].
- Spirydonaw, Mikhail. "Nadannye Svislatskay volastsi Mikhailu Haraburdu (Da prablyemy skarachennya dzyarzhawnykh uladannyaw u Vyalikim knyastvye Litowskim u XV–XVI stst)". In *Shtohodnik Instytutu historyi Nacyanal'nay akademii navuk Byelarusi*, edited by Mikhail Kastsyuk, 124–37. Minsk: IH, 1999. [Спірыдонаў, Міхаіл. "Наданне Свіслацкай воласці Міхаілу Гарабурду (Да праблемы скарачэння дзяржаўных уладанняў у Вялікім княстве Літоўскім у XV–XVI стст.)". In *Штогоднік Інстытута гісторыі Нацыянальнай акадэміі навук Беларусі*, edited by Міхаіл Касцюк, 124–37. Мінск: ІГ, 1999].
- Tyla, Antanas. "The Formation of Lithuanian Eastern Policy: the Dietine of Rūdninkai. September 24–27, 1572". *Lithuanian Historical Studies*, n. 1 (1996): 22–37.
- Wolff, Józef. *Senatorowie i dygnitarze Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego (1386–1795)*. Kraków: Druk. Anczyca i Spółki, 1885.
- Yanushkevich, Andrey. *Vyalikaye Knyastva Litowskaye i Inflyantskaya vayna 1558–1570 hh.* Minsk: Medisont, 2007. [Янушкевіч, Андрэй. *Вялікае Княства Літоўскае і Інфлянцкая вайна 1558–1570 гг.* Мінск: Медисонт, 2007].

PRIMARY SOURCES

NGAB [НГАБ]

- KMF-18, inv. 1, n. 56, *Kniha zapisaw (1571, 1576–1578 hh.)*. [Нацыянальны гістарычны архіў Беларусі ў Мінску, КМФ–18, inv. 1, n. 56, *Кніга запісаў (1571, 1576–1578 гг.)*].
- KMF-18, inv. 1, n. 257, *Kniha sudnykh spraw (1569–1572 hh.)*. [Нацыянальны гістарычны архіў Беларусі ў Мінску, КМФ–18, inv. 1, n. 257 *Кніга судных спраў (1569–1572 гг.)*].

AGAD

- AR, II, n. 89, *List Waleryana, biskupa wileńskiego, Mikołaja Naruszewicza, podskarbiego ziemskiego, i Mikołaja Krzysztofa Radziwiłła, marszałka nadwornego, do Mikołaja Radziwiłła, wojewody wileńskiego, 21 marca 1573 r.*
- AR, V, n. 5019, *Listy Michała Haraburdy, 1570 r.*
- AR, V, n. 5020, *List Michała Haraburdy, 1568 r.*

Biblioteka Kórnicka PAN.

- Rękopis 1538, *Akta do panowania Batorego.*