

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

Marius Sirutavičius
VYTAUTAS MAGNUS UNIVERSITY (LITHUANIA)

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



http://hdl.handle.net/2067/46364

ABSTRACT

The Union of Lublin established the principle of common foreign policy and diplomatic activities of Poland and Lithuania. Nevertheless, due to differing political interests of the Union partners in late sixteenth century it was not always realised. Often the political elites of both countries were not able to agree on the preferred direction of foreign policy; Lithuanian representatives did not show initiative to develop diplomatic relations in the Western direction, while Polish politicians ignored the interests of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania while solving the problems of relations with Muscovy. Therefore, the cooperation when organising diplomatic contacts with particular countries was not constant. States acted separately mostly during *interregnum* periods, but the coordination of actions was not always successful when a common ruler was in power, countries were relatively independent when engaging on a lower level – parallel diplomatic contact sphere. However, during the last decades of the Sixteenth century we can observe certain changes – increased cooperation of the political elites of both states in the diplomatic sphere, especially after the *interregnum* of 1587. Analysis of these changes is the main topic of this article. By basing the research on the practice of diplomatic communication with Muscovy, we will examine various organizational aspects of diplomatic relations (preparation of diplomatic missions, receptions of envoys, preparation of documents, etc.) in order to answer these questions: what caused these changes? Were these changes caused by the integration following the Union and generational changes in Lithuanian elite? Were these changes caused by the increased Polish interest in the East?

KEYWORDS: Grand Duchy of Lithuania; Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth; Muscovy; Diplomacy; Radziwiłłs.

The Union of Lublin established the principle of common foreign policy and diplomatic activities in Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. This principle had to be based on cooperation and mutual compromises between the two states. Nevertheless, due to differing political interests political elites of both countries were not always able to agree on the most important goals of the foreign policy and the diplomatic activities that were conducted to realise those goals. The lack of common interest and the domination of the earlier tradition of statehood became clearer during the *interregnum* periods after the death of the monarch of Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth Sigismund August in 1572. During the first (1572–1573) and the second (1574–1576) *interregnum* periods union partners often took separate decisions to maintain diplomatic relations. Even when there was an agreement on the principle of common legations, there was sometimes no consensus on the goals of these diplomatic missions¹. This was caused not only by different political interests, but also due to lack of experience in cooperation with union partners, which became a serious issue when both states did not have a common monarch unifying them².

¹ Political conflicts between Poland and Lithuania, which created different outlooks on foreign policy and diplomatic activities were discussed by Polish historian Henryk Lulewicz. Most in-depth analysis of these problems are analysed in his monograph: Henryk Lulewicz, *Gniewów o unię ciąg dalszy. Stosunki polsko-litewskie w latach 1569–1588* (Warszawa: Neriton, 2002).

² This problem stems from the Act of Union of Lublin itself, which did not describe the method how the diplomatic

During the reign of Stephen Báthory conditions were more favourable to the evolution of a common tradition of diplomatic activities. Special attention was given to relations with Muscovy, where traditionally the Grand Duchy of Lithuania played the most important role. But during the military campaign which began in late 1570's and in the ensuing process of the pacification of interstate relations, Polish political community participated in these relations on a much grander scale than previously³. This is an important indicator, which shows the changes to separate Lithuanian and Polish diplomatic orientations and interest priorities in spheres of diplomatic activities. According to the usual practice, the Polish Crown curated diplomatic activities in the West and the South, while the Lithuania dominated the Eastern direction.

This paper analyses the effects of these trends for later period by making an assumption, that the strengthening of integrational factors deepened the cooperation of the union partners in the diplomatic sphere. The main topics for this analysis were the ability to reconcile interests, inclusion into diplomatic spheres where the states previously did not participate in and trust in union partners. More attention will be given to extraordinary situations – the experiences of *interregnum* of 1587 or the diplomatic activities when the monarch of the Commonwealth Sigismund III Vasa left the country. This way we analyse the situations when the union provisions were challenged or changes in diplomatic activities. The narrative is constructed from the perspective of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, by evaluating the transformations of the traditions of its diplomatic at the turn of the sixteenth and seventeenth century.

It could be stated that the experience of the *interregnum*, which began after the death of Stephen Báthory in late 1586 in the Commonwealth became the most important stimulus to look for signs of integration in Polish and Lithuanian diplomatic spheres. This experience shaped changes for the coming decades. During the first two *interregnums*, Lithuanian political elite showed relatively independent positions in organising and maintaining relations with foreign countries, thus creating a conflict with the political community of the Polish Crown. However, at the beginning of the third *interregnum* we can observe new trends. Lithuanian officials, when maintaining relations with Muscovy vital to the state's interests sought the support of their union partners for their actions and decisions. In early 1587 the highest officials of the state gathered to the diet of Grodno (Hrodna), independently took a decision to send a legation to Muscovy; however, it was envisioned as a common Polish and Lithuanian diplomatic mission. When nominating diplomatic representatives the principle of parity was followed, thus the Commonwealth was to be represented by a Polish representative with the diplomat agent from Lithuania⁴. The goals of the mission was negotiated by the delegates of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, which were sent to the Warsaw convocation *sejm* – a meeting of the parliament to prepare the election of the new ruler⁵.

Union partners succeeded in coordinating their positions in regards to the Muscovite legation, which was sent in the winter of 1587 to present the official proposal to elect the Muscovite monarch Fyodor

activities had to be organised and conducted in the new polity – the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. As the Polish researcher Henryk Wisner noted, the Act of Union, allowed each of the Union states – Poland and Lithuania to send diplomatic legations after it informed the Union partner, and received consent. However, the act does not specify whom has to take decisions related to the goals of the mission, and in whose name the diplomatic representatives had to be performed. There was no question that it had to be done in the name of the ruler, but there was a confusion whether it had to be done in the name of both states in the Commonwealth. Henry Valois in his 1573 Treaty (the so-called *pacta conventa*) with Polish and Lithuanian communities formulated clear principles of organisation and responsibility for the diplomatic activities. In it the initiative for diplomatic relations was given to the monarch, but it had to be conducted with the consent and the knowledge of the common institution for Poland and Lithuania – the Senate –. See Henryk Wisner, *Rzeczpospolita Wazów, t. 2: Wojsko Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego, dyplomacja, varia* (Warszawa: Neriton, 2004), 236.

3 There was an exceptional case – negotiations conducted in 1581–1582 after a military campaign with Muscovite diplomatic representatives. They were conducted not by high level Lithuanian officials, who traditionally organised and conducted negotiations with the Muscovites, but by the Great Hetman of the Polish Crown and Chancellor Jan Zamoyski: Marius Sirutavičius, *Diplomatinės veiklos organizacija Lietuvos Didžiojoje Kunigaikštystėje 1569–1604* (Kaunas: Vytauto Didžiojo universitetas 2018), 76–8.

4 Lulewicz, *Gniewów o unię ciąg dalszy*, 359.

5 *Dyjaryjusz sejmowe r. 1587: sejmy konwokacyjny i elekcyjny*, ed. August Sokołowski (Kraków: Czcionkami Drukarni Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, 1887), 233, 236, 239–40.

Ivanovich to the throne of the Commonwealth. Senators gathered in Warsaw granted a mandate to Lithuanian officials to receive Muscovite diplomats in the Lithuania independently and, after hearing them, to send them back. Polish Senators recommended consulting with Polish side should any important questions arise⁶. This shows the relative trust from the Polish side to the political community of the Lithuania, which was lacking during the earliest interregnums. Of course, the union partners did not agree to all Lithuanian initiatives. Poland refused to nominate their representatives to a meeting between the Commonwealth and Muscovy on the border to solve territorial disputes, which was arranged with the Eastern neighbour a year earlier. This decision was interpreted as ignoring the interests of the Grand Duchy. There were proposal in Lithuania to appoint negotiators independently, without the consent of the Poles. However, the only real result from these plans were some rather drastic statements⁷.

These disagreements did not end the cooperation between the Polish and Lithuanian politicians. Grand Duchy of Lithuania officials provided information about the reception of the aforementioned Muscovite legation and sought to share the responsibility for the decision-making with Union partners. The fact that Lithuania consulted with the Polish Crown regarding the proposal of Fyodor Ivanovich as a candidate in the election for the throne was presented by the Lithuanian representatives as an argument that they represent the entire Commonwealth, not only the Grand Duchy. The unity of the political communities of both states was declared by stating that «We with Poland are of a single mind - what we, Lithuanian councillors [think] Polish Council thinks, what the Polish council [thinks], we, Lithuanian council think»⁸. It was not an empty statement and it is proven by the fact that the diplomatic mission was sent only after receiving the approval of Polish and Lithuanian senators for an official reply to the Muscovite proposals.

Relations between Poland and Lithuania went sour during the election *sejm* in the second half of 1587, because of the disagreements about the relations with Muscovy. During the *sejm*, competing parties formed, which supported different pretenders to Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, and there was a risk of two separate rulers being elected at the same time. During this political turmoil, only representatives of Lithuania showed interest in negotiations with Muscovite grand envoys who arrived to the election *sejm* in summer of 1587. Polish officials were passive, and, finally, after they rejected the extension of truce with Muscovy, Lithuanian delegates independently decided to complete the negotiations with Muscovite diplomats and to sign a truce for fifteen years. Contrahents of this truce, representing the Commonwealth were the highest officials of Grand Duchy of Lithuania, but in the treaty Polish Crown was included as a party of a treaty⁹. After this, *sejm* declared two winners of the royal election – Maximilian III of Austria and the son of the King of Sweden Sigismund Vasa, armed confrontation between both pretenders and their supporters began. This conflict made cooperation between Lithuanian representatives and highly fractured political community of Polish Crown very difficult. Lithuanian political elite independently took decisions regarding the maintenance of diplomatic relations until Sigismund Vasa established himself on the throne of the Commonwealth in early 1588¹⁰.

Historiography on numerous occasions raised the question of the legitimacy of unilateral agreement between Lithuanian senators and Muscovy in 1587 in the name of the Commonwealth. It is obvious that this problem was understood by the Lithuanian delegates who drafted the treaty. They hoped to use the situation of dual election and to trade the acceptance of the treaty with Muscovy for the recognition of the election of the monarch. Despite constant pressure from Lithuanian political community, it was only achieved after several years. As the relations with the Ottoman Empire worsened, the *sejm* of 1590 took decisions to prepare for a military campaign against the Turks. Lithuanian delegates raised an ultimatum by stating that they will not approve the *sejm*'s decisions on war taxes

6 AGAD, AR, II, n. 171, *Polish and Lithuanian senators to K. Radziwiłł*, 25 February 1587.

7 Sirutavičius, *Diplomatinės veiklos organizacija*, 148.

8 RGADA, *Muscovite book of legations*, n. 79, vol. 17, ff. 203r, 424r. AGAD, AR, II, n. 178, *Letters by Polish and Lithuanian senators regarding the official reply to the Muscovite diplomats*.

9 *Dyjuryjsze sejnowe r. 1587*, 131-32, 141-42, 157, 206-07. Treaty texts: LM 593, 89, 92; LM 594, 84, 86.

10 Sirutavičius, *Diplomatinės veiklos organizacija*, 152-57.

until the ruler commits to peace with Muscovy and sends diplomatic envoys to negotiate peace or the confirmation of the truce signed in 1587. Lithuanian representatives received a promise from the King to solve the problem of diplomatic relations with the Eastern neighbour, but as the Poles did not approve of it, they were not able to transform this promise into a commitment in an official decision by the *sejm*. As they did not completely trust the union partners and the ruler, Lithuanian delegates left their representatives in Warsaw, who had to wait until Sigismund fulfilled his promise. As the ruler delayed sending this diplomatic mission, these representatives presented a protest with an ultimatum, that the decisions of the *sejm* will not be followed as long as this promise was not fulfilled¹¹. Finally, Lithuanians achieved their goal – Sigismund Vasa that autumn sent diplomats to Muscovy, who in early 1591 signed a twelve-year truce with the Eastern neighbour¹².

Conflicting interests, which became visible in the *sejm* of 1590, were caused by differing preferences in Polish and Lithuanian foreign policy. Consequently the level of activities in different geographic directions varied greatly. Lithuania continued to prioritise Muscovy, while all other fields of diplomacy remained in the Polish sphere. This caused a lack of common interest when deciding important problems to union partners. However, integrating factors could not be ignored as well – work in common parliamentary structure – *sejm*, attempts by the ruler to interest the political communities of both states in diplomatic activities and personal relations between individual members of Polish and Lithuanian political elites and the effect of these relationships on common policy were all important. The problem of particularism remained, but we can observe certain changes already in the 1590's. Early in his reign, Sigismund Vasa made a lot of effort to include Lithuanian senators to legitimise his own rule during Bytom – Będzin negotiations with the Habsburgs, who still refused to recognise the legitimacy of his election. In a Negotiating Commission, created in 1588, Grand Duchy had to be represented by five high-level officials, but Lithuanian representatives kept avoiding this duty, as they did not want participate in these negotiations due to financial or political concerns. However, the ruler managed to sway a Lithuanian Senator, voivode of Brest Krzysztof Zenowicz to join the Commission. During these negotiations representatives of the Commonwealth gathered in Będzin delegated him to meet Habsburg representatives in Bytom¹³.

When maintaining relations with the Habsburgs, monarch had more success when cooperating with the Lithuanian principal noble family – the Radziwiłłs and in particular with the Catholic branch of the family. Representatives of this noble house were entrusted with important diplomatic missions. In the summer of 1589, Bishop of Vilnius, Jerzy Radziwiłł together with the palatine of Cracow Mikołaj Firlej, was sent to Prague to participate in the ratification of Bytom – Będzin treaty. J. Radziwiłł's brother, the Great Marshall of Grand Duchy of Lithuania, Albrycht in 1592 was nominated for the legation to the Emperor Rudolf II. During this mission, A. Radziwiłł and the representative of the Polish Crown, Bishop of Cuiavia Hieronim Rozdrażewski, signed the matrimonial treaty with the Habsburgs, for Sigismund Vasa to wed the daughter of Archduke Charles II, Anna Habsburg¹⁴. The trust of the monarch for the Catholic branch of the Radziwiłł family was shown by the decision to nominate the youngest brother Stanisław Radziwiłł in 1590 for a mission to Rome to state the obedience of Sigismund to the Pope Sixtus V. However, Stanisław refused to participate in this mission due to high

11 Paweł Kasztelan, *Polsko-moskiewskie stosunki dyplomatyczne przełomu XVI/XVII wieku*, (PhD diss. Adam Mickiewicz University: Poznań, 2014), 180-81, https://repozytorium.amu.edu.pl/bitstream/10593/13943/1/Pawel_Kasztelan_Polsko-moskiewskie_stosunki_dyplomatyczne.pdf. Protest of Lithuanian delegates in the *sejm* of 1590, Władysław Konopczyński, *Liberum veto. Studium porównawczo-historyczne* (Kraków: zapomoga Kasy im. J. Mianowskiego, 1918), Annex, 432.

12 *Sigismund Vasa's truce with Fyodor Ivanovich*, January 1591, in LM 593, 121-26; LM 594, 141-47.

13 Aleksandra Barwicka-Makula, *Od wrogości do przyjaźni. absburgowie austriaccy wobec Polski w latach 1587-1592*, (PhD diss., University of Silesia in Katowice, 2019), 235, 238-39, 255-57, <https://sbc.org.pl/dlibra/publication/100959/edition/95002/content>. Even during these negotiations Lithuanian senators wanted to use them to insure the interests of their country. They aimed to include their main concern into the instruction of the Commission – to ensure that the Emperor did not cooperate with Muscovy against the Commonwealth –, Karol Żojdź, *Stronnictwo Zygmunta III Wazy w Wielkim Księstwie Litewskim w latach 1603-1621* (PhD diss., University of Warsaw, 2018), 54-5. <https://depotuw.ceon.pl/bitstream/handle/item/2837/3100-DR-HI-132515.pdf?sequence=1>

14 Barwicka-Makula, "Od wrogości do przyjaźni", 299-30, 353-55.

costs of such a mission¹⁵. Due to the same reason, the eldest of the brothers: voivode of Trakai (Troki) Mikołaj Krzysztof Radziwiłł “the Orphan” also refused the same mission in 1592¹⁶.

These cases show that personal relations with the monarch conditioned the inclusion of members of the political elite of the Lithuania into wider diplomatic activities. This is confirmed by the growing stature of the Chancellor of Grand Duchy of Lithuania Lew Sapieha in the diplomacy of the Commonwealth in the last decade of the sixteenth century. During the early reign of Sigismund Vasa the relations between L. Sapieha and the King were not particularly close, but within a couple of years, the Chancellor became one of the most important confidants of the King. As the head of Lithuanian Chancellery, he was one of the most important organisers of relations with Muscovy. The trust the ruler had for L. Sapieha as a politician, organiser and a diplomat is shown by the fact that he was entrusted with heading the Great Legation to Moscow in 1600¹⁷. Chancellor was also active in directions of diplomatic activities, where Lithuanian officials were usually not that active. In 1593, when Sigismund Vasa was mired in affairs of inheritance of the Swedish throne, the royal court had created plans to send the Chancellor with a mission to Sweden. L. Sapieha motivated his refusal to participate in this diplomatic mission because of poor health or sickness¹⁸. However, at the end of the *sejm* of 1596, he, with other senators participated in preparation of a legation to meet with Swedish political elite. Because of this, a representative of Grand Duchy of Lithuania, Mikołaj Sapieha, a relative of the Chancellor, was included in the mission to Sweden¹⁹. In regards to L. Sapieha specifically, the usual separation of official duties between spheres of diplomatic activity between Polish and Lithuanian officials was not followed. After the Union, the maintenance of relations with the Crimean Khanate was transferred to the Polish Chancellery, but Sigismund Vasa occasionally consulted with L. Sapieha in regards to these diplomatic relations. For example, in 1597 monarch forwarded the Chancellor a letter from the Crimean Khan, with a request for L. Sapieha to add to the preparation of the reply and discussed the possible yearly tribute to the Tatars with him²⁰.

L. Sapieha was personally involved in taking decisions of the question Polish–Lithuanian Commonwealth joining the anti-Ottoman coalition, and this, most probably included more Lithuanian senators into negotiations to create the Holy League with Habsburgs. In the negotiating commission created during the *sejm* of 1595, M. K. Radziwiłł “the Orphan”, voivode of Minsk Jan Abramowicz, Land Treasurer of Grand Duchy of Lithuania Dmitri Chalecki and several other less prominent nobles from Lithuania were included together with L. Sapieha and Polish representatives²¹. When compared to Bytom – Będzin negotiations, where only one senator of Grand Duchy was present, we can see much greater interest from Lithuanian political elite in the affairs of the Commonwealth. Same Lithuanian representatives were nominated to negotiate anti-Ottoman coalition during the *sejm* of 1596. However, M. K. Radziwiłł “the Orphan” left the commission because of personal reasons. Negotiations failed in both instances, but, it was agreed to include an idea, raised during the proceedings of the Sejm, to include Muscovy into the coalition against the Ottomans, and this was beneficial to Lithuania. With the help of the Chancellery of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, legation documents were prepared, and a Lithuanian diplomatic courier was assigned to deliver these documents to Moscow²².

15 Marian Banaszak, *Z dziejów dyplomacji watykańskiej: poselstwa obediencyjne w latach 1534–1605*, t. 2: *Dzieje poselstw polskich* (Warszawa: Akademia Teologii Katolickiej, 1975), 219–20; Tomasz Kempa, *Mikołaj Krzysztof Radziwiłł Sierotka (1549–1616), wojewoda wileński* (Warszawa: Semper, 2000), 277.

16 Leszek Jarmiński, “Trudne starania o wysłanie posła Zygmunta III Wazy z obediencją do papieża Klemensa VII”, *Odrodzenie i Reformacja w Polsce*, 41 (1997): 170–71; Kempa, *Mikołaj Krzysztof Radziwiłł*, 283.

17 Sirutavičius, *Diplomatinės veiklos organizacija*, 89–90.

18 L. Sapieha to M. K. Radziwiłł, 11 March 1593, in ADR, 213–14; Arkadiusz Czwołek, *Piórem i buławą. Działalność polityczna Lwa Sapiehy, kanclerza litewskiego, wojewody wileńskiego* (Toruń: Wydawnictwo Naukowe UMK, 2012), 96–7.

19 *Dyaryusze Sejmowe r. 1597*, 185–96; Czwołek, *Piórem i buławą*, 111.

20 *Sigismund Vasa to L. Sapieha*, 6 July 1597, in ADS, 237.

21 Decision of the *sejm* to create a Negotiation commission, March 1595: AGAD, AR, II, n. 295; L. Sapieha to K. Radziwiłł, 28 March 1595, in ADR, 217; Czwołek, *Piórem i buławą*, 105.

22 Sigismund Vasa’s decision regarding the formation of the Negotiation Commission, [before 8 May 1596], *Elementa ad*

Lithuanian senators were even more active towards international affairs during the *sejm* of 1597. However, Lithuanian delegates were sceptical in regards to possibility of forming a wide coalition against the Ottomans, and proposed sending envoys to the Sultan to sign a new treaty. They regarded normalization of relations with Muscovy as a more important issue, much more important than the question of the Holy League. Lithuanians reminded their Union partners that the truce agreement with the Eastern neighbour is due to expire and encouraged them to send a diplomatic mission to Muscovy²³. These positions show, that even when involved into problems of international politics, Lithuanian politicians strived to find approval for diplomatic actions in the Eastern direction which was a priority for Lithuania, in exchange for support in solving problems more important to Poland, for example relations with the Ottomans or the Crimean Khanate.

Common affairs were more effectively solved with the help of interpersonal contacts between Polish and Lithuanian high ranked officials. During the last decade of the sixteenth century and early seventeenth century, we can observe constant collaboration in the fields of foreign policy and diplomacy between several most influential representatives from the political communities of both states. Constant opposition to the monarch brought the Great Hetman of the Polish Crown and Chancellor Jan Zamoyski and voivode of Vilnius and Great Hetman of Grand Duchy of Lithuania Krzysztof Radziwiłł “the Thunder” closer together. These magnates constantly exchanged information about relevant questions of interstate relations and their views on international politics. In order to garner support for military action against the Turks, J. Zamoyski in 1589–1590 periodically provided information to K. Radziwiłł about military threat from and the diplomatic relations with the Ottomans and the Crimean Khanate²⁴. At the same time the idea to send a diplomatic mission to Muscovy in 1597 was realised when voivode of Vilnius and the Chancellor of Grand Duchy of Lithuania closely cooperated with the Polish magnate. Portion of the documents for the future legation was prepared by J. Zamoyski, who was one of the creators of the idea of a union with Muscovy. Following these ideas, future agreements with Muscovites were to be prepared²⁵. Due to various political circumstances, the Great Legation of the Commonwealth headed by L. Sapieha set for Muscovy only in 1600, but J. Zamoyski and K. Radziwiłł with the Chancellor of Grand Duchy of Lithuania played the most active roles in forming its goals. These two magnates were the first ones whom L. Sapieha informed about the course and the results of the legation²⁶.

Peculiarities of cooperation between the highest ranked officials of Poland and Lithuania are most strikingly revealed in extraordinary situations. These happened when Sigismund Vasa left for Sweden and representatives of the political elite had to take decisions regarding diplomatic activities independently. However, contrary to *interregnum* periods, the provisions made in *sejm* of 1593 regulated these activities. They formulated a legal notion that if a monarch is absent from the Commonwealth foreign legations are forbidden to enter the country. Only exceptions were made to Ottoman, Tatar and Muscovite envoys. The first ones were authorized to be received in Warsaw by the Archbishop of Gniezno, who had to call the closest senators to the audience. Muscovite diplomats had to be received and heard in Vilnius, by the Lithuanian senators. However, official replies to the legations had to be prepared after informing the union partners and receiving their consent²⁷.

fontium editiones, t. 27: *Res Polonicae ex Archivo Mediceo Florentino II pars*, eds. Walerian Meysztowicz and Wanda Wyhowska de Andreis (Romae: Institutum Historicum Polonicum Romae, 1972), 92; Kempa, *Mikołaj Krzysztof Radziwiłł*, 286; Czwołek, *Piórem i buławą*, 110–11.

23 *Dyaryusze Sejmowe r. 1597*, 10, 56–9, 62–6, 169, 428–29, 438; Sirutavičius, *Diplomatinės veiklos organizacija*, 58.

24 *J. Zamoyski to K. Radziwiłł*, 16 July 1589, in ADR, 98–9; *J. Zamoyski to K. Radziwiłł*, 1 January 1590, in ADR, 99–100; *J. Zamoyski to K. Radziwiłł*, 1 July 1590, in ADR, 101–03.

25 *J. Zamoyski to K. Radziwiłł*, 13 August 1597, in ADR, 129; *J. Zamoyski to K. Radziwiłł*, 13 September 1597, in ADR, 131.

26 Kazimierz Tyszkowski, *Poselstwo Lwa Sapiehy w Moskwie 1600 r.* (Lwów: Towarzystwo Naukowe, 1927), 37; *L. Sapieha to K. Radziwiłł*, 2 October 1600, in ADS, 252–53; *L. Sapieha to K. Radziwiłł*, 3 December 1600, in ADR, 227–28; *L. Sapieha to J. Zamoyski*, 16 March 1601, in ADS, 258–59.

27 *Volumina Legum: przedruk zbioru praw staraniem XX. pijarów w Warszawie od roku 1732 do roku 1782*, vol. II (Petersburg: Ohryzki, 1589), 342.

Situation from early 1594 shows how these provisions were implemented in practice. Despite the prohibitions by the *sejm*, a diplomatic agent of Emperor Rudolf II arrived in Poland to request help in the fight against the Ottomans. Archbishop of Gniezno Stanisław Karnkowski organised a meeting by the senators in Warsaw. The Archbishop began wide consultations, which were to include Lithuanian senators. S. Karnkowski personally informed K. Radziwiłł “the Thunder” about the arrival of the Emperor’s representative and forwarded documents brought by the envoy for him to be acquainted with. He also asked the magnates’ opinion regarding the reception of the future Habsburg diplomatic mission, which was difficult to organise because of the absence of the monarch²⁸. J. Zamoyski and L. Sapieha were included in these talks and they clearly objected to this reception as long as Sigismund Vasa has not returned to the Commonwealth²⁹. At the same time, highest officials were cooperating when receiving an Ottoman envoy. S. Karnkowski urged K. Radziwiłł to come to the reception of the diplomatic mission, because, according the provisions of the *sejm*, Senators from both nations had to be represented. If the voivode of Vilnius was not able to participate, he asked to state his positions and to persuade at least some Lithuanian senators to come³⁰. Although he did not convince K. Radziwiłł “the Thunder” to come, but L. Sapieha arrived at the audience, which took place in Warsaw, and he emphasised the importance of “mutual consilia” principle that was stated in the Union, in a letter to J. Zamoyski³¹. Similar talks and coordination of positions between Polish and Lithuanian officials took place in 1598, when as the monarch left the country and Crimean diplomatic mission had to be received urgently³².

Lithuanian political leaders consulted with the Poles when maintaining relations with the Eastern neighbour, thus following the provisions of *sejm* of 1593. In the spring of 1594, diplomatic courier sent by the the Muscovite monarchs’ council – Boyar Duma arrived in Lithuania. K. Radziwiłł “The Thunder” who took care of the courier intended to use the provision by independently receiving and sending a legation. However, L. Sapieha advised him not to take independent actions and to share responsibility. Diplomatic mission was also addressed to S. Karnkowski and J. Zamoyski, therefore L. Sapieha informed the Archbishop of Gniezno and the Chancellor of Poland about the courier’s arrival. There were no disagreements regarding the acceptance of the audience in Vilnius between Polish and Lithuanian officials. However, positions differed regarding the representative to be sent to the Boyar Duma. The plan by the voivode of Vilnius to send a courier to Moscow, and to later send a reply via diplomatic envoy was rejected by J. Zamoyski. He proposed to keep the Muscovite until the return of the monarch. Lithuanian officials took into account the position of the Polish magnate and the courier was only sent home when Sigismund Vasa returned³³.

This particular episode of relations with Muscovy could be characterised as parallel diplomacy.³⁴ This method handling international matters followed the principles that evolved in early sixteenth century, when a tradition of diplomatic contacts between the Lithuanian highest state officials and members of Council of Muscovite monarch – Boyar Duma began. These contacts were usually used when restarting diplomatic relations, beginning the cycle of diplomatic relations after a military conflict or other types of disagreements, and was sometimes used to solve minor problems. Formally the responsibility

28 AGAD, AR, V, n. 6454, S. Karnkowski to K. Radziwiłł, 14 February 1594, 15-7.

29 L. Sapieha to K. Radziwiłł, 26 February 1594, in ADS, 81-2; L. Sapieha to K. Radziwiłł, 22 March 1594, in ADR, 215; J. Zamoyski to K. Radziwiłł, 20 March 1594, in ADR, 109-11.

30 AGAD, AR, V, n. 6454, S. Karnkowski to K. Radziwiłł, 12 April 1594, p. 19; AGAD, AR, V, n. 6454, S. Karnkowski to K. Radziwiłł, 13 April 1594, 21-3.

31 L. Sapieha to J. Zamoyski, 25 March 1594, in ADS, 83.

32 J. Zamoyski to K. Radziwiłł, 29 August 1598, in ADR, 137-38; L. Sapieha to K. Radziwiłł, 16 September 1598, in ADS, 197-98; J. Zamoyski to K. Radziwiłł, 13 October 1598, in ADR, 138.

33 L. Sapieha to K. Radziwiłł, 3 April 1594, in ADS, 85-6; L. Sapieha to J. Zamoyski, 3 June 1594, in ADS, 90; L. Sapieha to K. Radziwiłł, 18 June 1594, in ADS, 91; L. Sapieha to K. Radziwiłł, 13 December 1594, in ADS, 97.

34 In general, parallel diplomatic practices can be defined as a semi-official activities supporting, complementing, correcting or duplicating the diplomacy between the heads of states. More on the model of parallel contacts see Sirutavičius, *Diplomatinių veiklos organizacija*, 30-4, 92-115.

during these relations was transferred to their participants – officials of Grand Duchy (after the Union – Lithuanian and Polish senators) and the members of the Boyar Duma. Thus, monarchs could disown their actions and decisions at any point in time. This created an opportunity for rulers to change their positions more freely and to maintain diplomatic contacts even during difficult inter-state conflicts³⁵. Parallel diplomatic communication could not be described as independent diplomatic activity, as it was tightly intertwined with diplomacy conducted in the name of the monarchs both in the Commonwealth and Muscovy. The monarch was often the main initiator of these contacts, and the reply to the representatives of the other side was coordinated with the ruler. This could explain why, the senators of Poland and Lithuania did not dare to send back the diplomatic envoy of the Boyar Duma independently, without the consent of Sigismund Vasa. However, intensive consultations by the officials of both sides show changes in this sphere. Parallel diplomatic contacts with Muscovy after the Union of Lublin was an exclusive sphere of activities of the political elite of Lithuania. Although diplomatic missions to the Boyar's Duma from 1590's were sent in the name of Polish and Lithuanian political communities, but Muscovite missions were most often addressed only to the high-level officials of Grand Duchy of Lithuania. Muscovy took notice of the new, post-Union reality only in the last decade of the century, when the representative of the Polish Crown were added as permanent addressees of the missions³⁶.

At this time Polish officials were more actively involved in parallel diplomatic contacts. Therefore, Lithuanian politicians had to coordinate their actions not only with the monarch, but also with the representatives of the Polish Crown. For example in autumn of 1592 only L. Sapieha participated in the reception of Muscovite Boyar's courier in Warsaw. Therefore, the only active participants of the audience were J. Zamoyski and voivode of Cracow M. Firlej. It is likely that they, while consulting with the monarch and the Chancellor of Grand Duchy of Lithuania prepared the official reply to Muscovites³⁷. Growing cooperation of the union partners in this field is demonstrated by the circumstances of the trade conflict with Muscovy, which began at the turn of the century. Disagreements began in 1598, when Lithuanian merchants were captured in Moscow. In order to solve this issue K. Radziwiłł attempted to find support of the J. Zamoyski. The latter advised to send a diplomatic envoy to the Muscovite political elite and promised to get the consent of the monarch to such a diplomatic mission³⁸. This problem remained relevant in later years and could begin serious complications in interstate relations, when voivode of Vilnius in 1602 decided to take retaliatory measures and to arrest Muscovite merchants who traded in Lithuania. L. Sapieha, who persuaded K. Radziwiłł to abandon harsh retaliatory measures, quenched the conflict. The Chancellor coordinated these actions with the Polish Vice-Chancellor Piotr Tylicki, who also maintained the position that these problems were best solved by using parallel diplomatic contacts³⁹. According to information L. Sapieha provided to J. Zamoyski about a courier from Moscow, we can observe that a certain level of cooperation in parallel diplomacy was continued even on the eve of the False Dmitry I adventure⁴⁰. However as the political crisis began in Muscovy the conditions for diplomatic communication changed dramatically and would require a separate discussion.

In summary, we could state that the aforementioned cases prove the trends of convergence in Polish and Lithuanian diplomatic actions. Traditional separation of diplomatic activity spheres and different foreign policy preferences remained on the organisational plane. This caused issues when solving problems of diplomatic relations more relevant to a single union partner. However, a much more active involvement of members of political elites of both states to the spheres of diplomatic activities,

35 Sirutavičius, *Diplomatinės veiklos organizacija*, 92-5.

36 Sirutavičius, *Diplomatinės veiklos organizacija*, 108.

37 RGADA, *Muscovite book of legations*, 79, vol. 22, ff. 259r-63v; LM 593, 187.

38 J. Zamoyski to K. Radziwiłł, 11 July 1598, in ADR, 134.

39 L. Sapieha to K. Radziwiłł, 21 August 1602, in ADS, 333-35; L. Sapieha to K. Radziwiłł, 28 August 1602, in ADR, 231; P. Tylicki to L. Sapieha, 5 September 1602, in ADS, 339; P. Tylicki to L. Sapieha, 19 September 1602, in ADS, 344; Czwołęk, *Piórem i buławą*, 172.

40 Biblioteka Kórnicka PAN, MSS, n. 1539, vol. 75, J. Zamoyski to L. Sapieha, 20 August 1604, 171.

where previously members of the elite did not participate is observed. The interest field of Lithuanian political community was much narrower, there was more interest in regional relations with the Holy Roman Empire, Crimean Khanate and Sweden. At the same time Polish participation in the Eastern direction with Muscovy increased significantly, now included the field of parallel diplomacy, where Lithuanian elite previously dominated. Integration processes caused intertwining of diplomatic activities, which, in turn, was stimulated by common parliamentary structures, the monarch, who united two political communities, personal relations between various Polish and Lithuanian officials, and the growing need for interoperability when solving problems of foreign policy.

ABBREVIATIONS

ADR: *Archiwum domu Radziwiłłów: listy ks. M. K. Radziwiłła Sierotki, Jana Zamoyskiego, Lwa Sapiehy*, [...], ed. Polkowski, 1895.

ADS: *Archiwum Domu Sapiehów. Listy z lat 1575–1606*, ed. Prochaska, 1892.

AGAD: Archiwum Główne Akt Dawnych w Warszawie.

AR: Archiwum Warszawskie Radziwiłłów.

LM 593: *Lietuvos Metrika. Knyga Nr. 593 (1585–1604)*, [...], ed. Baliulis, 2009.

LM 594: *Lietuvos Metrika. Knyga Nr. 594 (1585–1600)*, ed. Baliulis, 2006.

RGADA: Rossiiskii Gosudarstvennyi Arkhiv Drevnikh Aktov.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

44

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

Baliulis, Algirdas, ed. *Lietuvos Metrika. Knyga Nr. 594 (1585–1600)*. Vilnius: Lietuvos istorijos instituto leidykla, 2006.

Banaszak, Marian. *Z dziejów dyplomacji watykańskiej: poselstwa obediencyjne w latach 1534–1605. t. 2: Dzieje poselstw polskich*. Warszawa: Akademia Teologii Katolickiej, 1975.

Barwicka-Makula, Aleksandra. *Od wrogości do przyjaźni. absburgowie austriaccy wobec Polski w latach 1587–1592*. PhD diss., University of Silesia in Katowice, 2019. [<https://sbc.org.pl/dlibra/publication/100959/edition/95002/content>].

Czwołek, Arkadiusz. *Piórem i buławą. Działalność polityczna Lwa Sapiehy, kanclerza litewskiego, wojewody wileńskiego*. Toruń: Wydawnictwo Naukowe UMK, 2012.

Jarmiński, Leszek. "Trudne starania o wysłanie posła Zygmunta III Wazy z obediencją do papieża Klemensa VII". *Odrodzenie i Reformacja w Polsce* 41 (1997): 169–75.

Kasztelan, Paweł. *Polsko-moskiewskie stosunki dyplomatyczne przełomu XVI/XVII wieku*. PhD diss., Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań, 2014. [https://repozytorium.amu.edu.pl/bitstream/10593/13943/1/Paweł_Kasztelan_Polsko-moskiewskie_stosunki_dyplomatyczne.pdf].

Kempa, Tomasz. *Mikołaj Krzysztof Radziwiłł Sierotka (1549–1616), wojewoda wileński*. Warszawa: Semp, 2000.

Konopczyński, Władysław. *Liberum veto. Studium porównawczo-historyczne*. Kraków: zapomoga Kasy im. J. Mianowskiego, 1918.

Lulewicz, Henryk. *Gniewów o unię ciąg dalszy. Stosunki polsko-litewskie w latach 1569–1588*. Warszawa: Neriton, 2002.

Meysztowicz, Walerian, and Wyhowska de Andreis, Wanda, eds. *Elementa ad fontium editiones*, T. 27: *Res Polonicae ex Archivo Mediceo Florentino II pars*. Romae: Institutum Historicum Polonicum Romae, 1972.

Polkowski, Ignacy, ed. *Archiwum domu Radziwiłłów: listy ks. M. K. Radziwiłła Sierotki, Jana Zamoyskiego, Lwa Sapiehy*. Kraków: nakładem Księcia Antoniego Radziwiłła; z drukarni Wł. L. Anczyca i Spółki, pod zarządem Jana Gadowskiego, 1885.

Prochaska, Antoni, ed. *Archiwum Domu Sapiehów. Listy z lat 1575–1606*. Lwów: nakład rodziny, z drukarni Zakładu Narodowego im. Ossolińskich, 1892.

Sirutavičius, Marius. *Diplomatinės veiklos organizacija Lietuvos Didžiojoje Kunigaikštystėje 1569–1604*. Kaunas: Vytauto Didžiojo universitetas, 2018.

Sokołowski, August, ed. *Dyaryjusze sejmowe r. 1587: sejmy konwokacyjny i elekcyjny*. Kraków: Czcionkami Drukarni Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, 1887.

Tyszkowski, Kazimierz. *Poselstwo Lwa Sapiehy w Moskwie 1600 r*. Lwów: Towarzystwo Naukowe, 1927. *Volumina Legum: przedruk zbioru praw staraniem XX. pijarów w Warszawie od roku 1732 do roku 1782*, vol. II. Petersburg: Ohryzki, 1589.

Wisner, Henryk. *Rzeczpospolita Wazów. t. 2: Wojsko Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego, dyplomacja, varia*. Warszawa: Neriton, 2004.

Żojdź, Karol. *Stronnictwo Zygmunta III Wazy w Wielkim Księstwie Litewskim w latach 1603–1621*. PhD diss., University of Warsaw, 2018 [<https://depotuw.ceon.pl/bitstream/handle/item/2837/3100-DR-HI-132515.pdf?sequence=1>].