

MARIUS SIRUTAVIČIUS

Vytautas Magnus University

THE PHENOMENON OF CLIENTAGE AND THE ORGANISATION OF DIPLOMATIC ACTIVITIES IN THE GRAND DUCHY OF LITHUANIA OF THE SECOND HALF OF THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY*

Abstract

Researchers of the sixteenth-century European diplomacy discuss diplomatic networks and daily life activities of ambassadors conditioned by the development of residential diplomacy. At the same time, historians of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth study diplomatic phenomena of a different kind since a resident mission system was not developed in Poland-Lithuania. The practice of temporary legations persisted and led to the development of distinctive features of envoys' diplomatic activities during their missions. It also is possible to see different circumstances when looking into the question of the professionalization of Polish-Lithuanian diplomats and their personal qualities relevant to their diplomatic missions. The study of this problem reveals that, in the case of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, a relatively strong patron-client relationship occurred as well as close links between the patronage system and organisation of diplomatic activities. Research into the practice of assigning envoys to diplomatic missions makes it possible to establish that almost all lower-rank envoys between the mid- and last decade of the sixteenth century were clients of the Radziwill family, dominating the political life of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania at that time. One of the main tasks of the Radziwill clients nominated as diplomatic envoys was to supply information to their patrons. At the same time, we can also see an attempt to control diplomatic communications with foreign countries. This group of Radziwill clients, who performed various diplomatic missions, is the subject of the analysis presented

* This work was supported by the Research Council of Lithuania (under the grant number LIP-007/2016).

in this article. I try to determine here the reasons for appointing particular clients as foreign envoys and see how their diplomatic functions influenced their future careers.

Keywords: Grand Duchy of Lithuania, Radziwill family, patron-client relationship, early-modern diplomacy, sixteenth century

Researchers of the sixteenth-century European diplomacy discuss the operations of diplomatic envoys, diplomatic networks, daily life activities of ambassadors and organisation of diplomatic households conditioned by the development of residential diplomacy. At the same time, historians of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth study diplomatic phenomena of a different kind since the resident mission system was not developed in Poland and Lithuania. However, diplomatic missions of lesser status were assigned to special agents and residents. Still, usually, they were personal agents of the ruler, who did not have the mandate to act on behalf of the Commonwealth. The primary model of the interstate contacts remained the practice of the temporary diplomatic missions, which determined the particulars of the activities, competences, skills and career opportunities of the foreign envoys. Due to late Christianization, the diplomatic representation system in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania had evolved late, not until the end of the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries. Main features of this system were formed by maintaining regular relations with neighbouring countries - Livonia, Crimean Khanate and Muscovy. Relatively well-documented contacts with neighbouring states allow us to glance into the practice of nominating diplomatic envoys, which will be the topic of this article. The paper will focus on the initial, preparatory stages of diplomatic missions without going into further details about travels, audiences, negotiations, international agreements and other aspects of diplomatic activities.

In the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, different diplomatic representatives were assigned to each legation. They were selected based on consideration of the nature of the mission and the level of representation, coordinating the required diplomatic rank of the mission with the social status of the appointed envoy. Preparation for the diplomatic service was made through experiences gained from engaging in diplomatic activities of other envoys. Before being assigned to the task abroad, future diplomats

were sent abroad as entourage members of the legation, with experienced diplomats escorting senior politicians in diplomatic journeys. Some members of legations gained practical knowledge when working at the Chancellery of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania.¹ Diplomatic envoy registers from the late fifteenth to mid-sixteenth century reveal a significant number of envoys, legation scribes and diplomatic couriers who had previously been employed as clerks at the Chancellery.² It was an old tradition – preparing for legations in which Chancellery was involved, provided clerks with the relevant skills required for the diplomatic assignments.³ We can also observe that, during this period, the majority of state foreign representatives sent to Muscovy were members of the Orthodox nobility from the Grand Duchy of Lithuania,⁴ in line with the general diplomatic strategy of Lithuania according to which contacts with other states were more effective in case of similarity of languages (therefore, translators were not required) and religion.

In order to gain the required experience as foreign envoy and to become professional, the future diplomat had to perform diplomatic assignments continuously. In the late fifteenth and early sixteenth

¹ *Historia dyplomacji polskiej*, ed. by Gerard Labuda, 5 vols (Warszawa: PWN, 1982–1999), I (1982), 747–48; Stanisław Grzybowski, ‘Organizacja polskiej służby dyplomatycznej 1573–1605’, in *Polska służba dyplomatyczna XVI–XVIII w.*, ed. by Zbigniew Wójcik (Warszawa: PWN, 1966), pp. 182–83.

² Register of Chancellery’s clerks sent to diplomatic missions: Aleksandr Grusha, *Kantsyilyaryiya Vyalikaga Knyastva Litovskaga 40-h gadov XV–pershey palovyi XVI st.* (Minsk: Belaruskaya navuka, 2006), pp. 166–71.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 41–2. For a more general view of the beginnings of the GDL Chancellery see other work by Grusha: Aleksandr Grusha, *Dokumentalnaia pismennost Velikogo Kniashhestva Litovskogo (konets XIV – pervaiia tret XVI v.)* (Minsk: Belaruskaya navuka, 2015). The significance of the chancellery officials in the state diplomatic activities in the sixteenth century in a comparative analysis between the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and Muscovy was discussed by Hieronim Grala: Hieronim Grala, ‘Diaci i pisarze: wczesnonowożytny aparat władzy w Państwie Moskiewskim i Wielkim Księstwie Litewskim (XVI – pocz. XVII w.)’, in *Modernizacja struktur władzy w warunkach opóźnienia. Europa Środkowa i Wschodnia na przełomie średniowiecza i czasów nowożytnych*, ed. by Marian Dygo, Sławomir Gawlas, Hieronim Grala (Warszawa: DIG, 1999), pp. 73–91.

⁴ A general list of diplomats nominated for missions to Moscow in the period between 1486 and 1569, see: Egidijus Banionis, *Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės pasiuntinių tarnyba XV–XVI amžiais* (Vilnius: Diemedis, 1998), pp. 204–26.

centuries, only a small number of people were appointed to perform diplomatic mission or missions. But within their midst, we can indicate a group of envoys who conducted more than three missions, which would qualify them as career diplomats. For example, Ivan Semenovich Sapieha could be regarded as a career diplomat. From the last decade of the fifteenth century to his death in 1517, he participated in a dozen foreign missions which made him a seasoned diplomat. Sapieha began his service as a diplomat while working as a scribe at the Chancellery of the Grand Duke in Lithuania. In 1497, he went with his first mission to Muscovy, in 1498 and 1499 he accompanied the envoys to Moscow as the scribe of the legations.⁵ In 1501, he was sent with the legation of the Grand Lithuanian Duke Alexander to Rome to represent Bishop Albert Tabor of Vilnius at an audience with the Pope regarding the implementation of the Church Union.⁶ During his fourth mission to Muscovy in 1503, Ivan Sapieha was sent as an official of a higher rank – several years before he was appointed to the office of chancellor of the Grand Duchess Helen. His official and diplomatic career continued successfully. In 1506, he acted as a diplomat during the negotiations with Muscovites and held the titles of the marshal of the court and the supreme secretary to the king; in 1506 and 1508, Sapieha was sent to Moscow as the second grand envoy.⁷ He continued diplomatic duties

⁵ A description in the Muscovite book of legations: *Sbornik imperatorskogo russkogo istoricheskogo obschestva* (hereafter cited as: SRIO), 148 vols (Saint Petersburg, 1867–1916), XXXV (1882), 231–34, 265–73, 280–88. A legation from Alexander to Ivan III the Great (10 May 1497), in *Lietuvos Metrika* (hereafter cited as: LM), 5 (1427–1506): Užrašymų knyga 5, ed. by Algirdas Baliulis, Artūras Dubonis, and Darius Antanavičius (Vilnius: LII leidykla, 2012), 236; LM 6 (1494–1506): Užrašymų knyga 6, ed. by Algirdas Baliulis (Vilnius: LII leidykla, 2007), 81; Banionis, pp. 209, 288–289.

⁶ Alexander VI's letter to Albert Tabor, 26 April 1501, in *Elementa ad Fontium Editiones: Brevia romanorum pontificum ad Poloniam spectantia ex minutis et registris pontificiis*, ed. by Henryk Damian Wojtyska CP, 76 vols (Rome: Institutum Historicum Polonicum Romae, 1966–1996), LXIV (1986), 90–93; Maria Michalewiczowa, 'Iwan Sapieha', in *Internetowy Polski Słownik Biograficzny*, <<https://www.ipsb.nina.gov.pl/al/biografia/iwan-sapieha>> [accessed 15 February 2018].

⁷ A description in the Muscovite book of legations: SRIO XXXV (1882), 363–412. A legation from Alexander to Ivan III the Great (September 1502) in LM 5 (2012), 309–11; *Pamiętniki historii Wschodniej Europy. Istoczniki XV–XVII vv.: 'Vypiska iz posol'skikh knig' o snosheniakh Rossiiskogo gosudarstva s Polsko-Litovskim za 1475–1572 gg.*

even after reaching the highest post in his career – the office of the palatine of Podlasia in 1513. The following year he was appointed head of a diplomatic mission to Livonia.⁸

Another important personality in the diplomatic service of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania was Bogusz Michał Bohowityn-Bohowitynowicz. He also started his career in the early sixteenth century in the Chancellery of the Grand duke of Lithuania. In 1500 and 1507, Bohowityn-Bohowitynowicz was sent to Moldavia as a legation's scribe, while in 1509 he was sent to Moscow as a scribe of the grand legation.⁹ Due to his extraordinary talents, he quickly rose through the ranks. In 1510, he was appointed to the office of the marshal of the court, and during two periods (1509 and between 1520 and 1530) he held the office of state treasurer.¹⁰ In the 1510s, Bohowityn-Bohowitynowicz dealt with diplomatic documents in the Grand Duke's Chancellery and was responsible for compiling a diplomatic part of the Lithuanian *Metrica* books.¹¹ The summer of 1515 he spent at the court of Holy Roman Emperor Maximilian I with a diplomatic mission assigned by King Sigismund I the Old, observing the evolution of diplomatic relations between the empire and Muscovy. During his short stay with the emperor, Bohowityn-Bohowitynowicz established good personal contacts at the Habsburg court and secured imperial mediations in the negotiations between the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and

ed. by Sigurd Ottovich Shmidt and Boris Nikolaevich Morozov, 9 vols (Moscow and Warszawa: Arkheograficheski tsentr, 1995–2012), II (1997), 86–88, 96–97, 105–06; *Urzednicy centralni i dygnitarze Wielkiego Ksiestwa Litewskiego XIV–XVIII wieku. Spisy*, ed. by Henryk Lulewicz and Andrzej Rachuba (Kórnik: Biblioteka Kórnicka, 1994), p. 237.

⁸ LM 7 (1506–1539): *Uzrasymy knyga 7*, ed. by Inga Ilarienė, Laimontas Karalius and Darius Antanavičius (Vilnius: LII leidykla, 2011), 259, 565; *Urzednicy centralni i dygnitarze*, p. 237; Banionis, pp. 180, 290.

⁹ A legation from Alexander to Stephan III the Great [1500], in LM 5 (2012), 281; Bogdan III the Blind's response to the envoys of Sigismund I the Old [1507], in LM 7 (2011), 70–71; LM 8 (1499–1514): *Uzrasymy knyga 8*, ed. by Algirdas Baliulis (Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidykla, 1995), 65–66; a legation from Sigismund I the Old to Vasily III Ivanovich, 31 January [1509], in LM 7 (2011), 145–47; *Pamiatniki istorii Vostochnoi Evropy*, pp. 108–10; Banionis, pp. 182, 214, 305–06.

¹⁰ *Urzednicy centralni i dygnitarze*, p. 200.

¹¹ Banionis, p. 306.

Muscovy.¹² Several years later, in 1517, he participated in complicated negotiations in Muscovy, which were mediated by the emperor's envoy Sigismund von Herberstein.¹³ In 1518, Bohowityn-Bohowitynowicz accompanied two Polish legates, Erazm Ciołek and Rafał Leszczyński, to the emperor's court to Augsburg for a second time.¹⁴ Most probably he was appointed to the office of the chief scribe of the chancellery after the death of Ivan Sapieha.¹⁵ At the same time, Bohowityn-Bohowitynowicz established himself as one of the most important officials in the diplomatic service of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and dealt with the relations with Muscovy. In 1520 and 1522, he participated in tense negotiations in Moscow, while in 1526 – through the mediation of the emperor's envoy Herberstein – Bohowityn-Bohowitynowicz negotiated a treaty with the representatives of Vasily III Ivanovich.¹⁶

The repeated assignment of the same official as a diplomatic envoy within the model of temporary diplomatic missions allows us to perceive certain trends of specialisation and professionalization of diplomacy. At the same time, a rising diplomatic rank of the same official reveals that diplomatic career and career in the officialdom were related, which

¹² *Acta Tomiciana: epistolarum, legionum, responsorum, actionum et rerum gestarum serenissimi principis Sigismundi Primi Regis Poloniae, Magni Ducis Lithuaniae per Stanislaum Gorski canonicum Cracoviensem et Plocensem collectarum*, 18 vols (Poznan, 1852–1999), III (1853), 417–18; Oskar Halecki, 'Die Beziehungen der Habsburger zum litauischen Hochadel im Zeitalter der Jagellonen', *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung*, 36 (1915), 606–07; Jūratė Kiaupienė, "Mes, Lietuva": *Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės bajorija XVI a.: viešasis ir privatus gyvenimas* (Vilnius: Kronta, 2003), p. 205.

¹³ A description in the Muscovite book of legations: SRIO XXXV (1882), 500–47.

¹⁴ A legation from Sigismund I the Old to Maximilian I, 7 June [1518], in LM 7 (2011), 362–63; A letter from Sigismund I the Old to Maximilian I [n.d.], Archiwum Główne Akt Dawnych w Warszawie (hereafter cited as: AGAD), Metryka Koronna, Libri Legionum 5, fol. 89r; *Codex diplomaticus Regni Poloniae et Magni Ducatus Lituaniae*, 3 vols (Vilnius, 1758–1564), I (1785), 26–27; Kiaupienė, p. 205.

¹⁵ Grusha, *Kantsyilyaryiya*, pp. 54, 147.

¹⁶ Descriptions in the Muscovite book of legations: SRIO XXXV (1882), 573–95, 621–42, 710–31; a legation from Sigismund I the Old to Vasily III Ivanovich [5 July 1520], in LM 7 (2011), 411; a legation from Sigismund I the Old to Vasily III Ivanovich [11 August 1526], in *ibid.*, 464–65; Sigismund Herberstein, *Zapiski o Moskovii*, ed. Anna Khoroshkevich, 2 vols (Moscow: Pamiatniki istoricheskoi mysli, 2008), I, 582–94, 689, 695; *ibid.*, II, 93, 104–06; Banionis, pp. 178, 215–217, 306.

proves that diplomatic activities made it possible for officials to attain new posts and pursue a political career. From the middle of the sixteenth century, however, this trend of specialization began to decrease. The number of diplomats who specialized in certain countries declined.¹⁷ The same persons were nominated as diplomatic envoys less often, and after the 1569 Union of Lublin until the end of the sixteenth century only one person – Michał Haraburda who began his diplomatic career in the 1550s – was appointed to more than a few diplomatic missions.¹⁸ These changes lead us to the main subject of the present article which is to find the circumstances and the factors determining the trends in nominating diplomatic envoys.

As it often turns out, several main changes in the state (including changes in foreign policy and diplomacy) resulted from the Union of Lublin, signed in 1569, which laid the groundwork for a new federated state – the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, ruled by a single sovereign. Formally distinct, Poland and Lithuania agreed to cooperate with each other on foreign policy and diplomatic activities. It changed the organisation of diplomacy in the two countries. Existing before the Union as separate diplomatic services, after 1569 the Lithuanian diplomacy became an integral part of the foreign service of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. It was also agreed that diplomatic missions would be organised according to the principle of parity – diplomatic envoys sent to foreign missions were to be nominated by both Poland and Lithuania; still, this practice was not always strictly observed. Although officials of both countries coordinated their actions, the process of appointing and preparing envoys for missions was conducted separately. It should not be forgotten that even after the 1569 Union, the king remained

¹⁷ Banionis, p. 139.

¹⁸ The first diplomatic assignments were carried out by Michał Haraburda while he was scribe at the Chancellery of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania – in 1559 he was sent to the Crimean Khanate with a message, in 1560 to Muscovy. In 1563 and 1566, he was secretary to the grand legations to negotiate peace with Muscovy. The legations documents are in the Book of Diplomatic Inscriptions in the Lithuanian Metrica: *Kniga posolskaya Metriki Velikogo Knyazhestva Litovskogo, soderzhaschaya v sebe diplomaticheskie snosheniya Litvyi v gosudarstvovanie korolya Sigizmundy-Avgusta (s 1545 po 1572 god)* (Moscow, 1843), pp. 168, 189, 247, 255; the descriptions in the Muscovite books of legations: SRIO LIX (1887), 625; *ibid.*, LXXI (1890), 189, 338.

the chief representative of the new political body in the international stage – diplomatic contacts with other countries were maintained and diplomatic envoys were appointed in his name and on his behalf. These prerogatives, however, were shared by the monarch and the highest officials of Poland and Lithuania – members of the Senate – which significantly limited the influence of the king on the foreign policy; the two parties competed for the leading role in organising diplomatic contacts.¹⁹

Such tendencies had already been evident before the Union of Lublin. In the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, for example, already from the late fifteenth century on, this prerogative had to be shared with the Lithuanian Council of Lords, consisting of the highest officials of the state. This institution sought to control the activities of the sovereign in the field of international relations and took an active part in organising diplomatic activities. Members of the Council of Lords also personally participated in diplomatic missions and receptions of foreign envoys in Lithuania. But the role of the king as the primary representative of the state was still important.²⁰ A co-dependency developed: the Council of Lords prepared and sent the envoy, but could not do this unilaterally, for an official document appointing the envoy from the king was required. Yet, the monarch had to negotiate the envoy to be sent by taking into account the candidates from the highest officials of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania.²¹ This practice began to change in the 1550s, when the command over the diplomatic service was concentrated in the office of the chancellor of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, with whom the king had to negotiate. The role of the chancellor increased due to the practice established in the early sixteenth century, that if the Council of Lords had been not in session, it was the chancellor who had the right to

¹⁹ Grzybowski, 'Organizacja', pp. 145–50; Stanisław Grzybowski, 'Udział senatu w kształtowaniu polityki zagranicznej Rzeczypospolitej w drugiej połowie XVI wieku', in *Senat w Polsce. Dzieje i teraźniejszość. Sesja naukowa, Kraków 25 i 26 maja 1993*, ed. by Krystyn Matwijowski and Jerzy Pietrzak (Warszawa: Kancelaria Senatu RP, 1993), pp. 65–66; *Historia dyplomacji polskiej*, ed. by Zbigniew Wójcik, 5 vols (Warszawa: PWN, 1982–1999), II (1982), 115.

²⁰ Lidia Korczak, *Litewska Rada wielkksiążęca w XV wieku* (Kraków: PAU, 1998), pp. 54, 61, 87.

²¹ Banionis, p. 73

select and send envoys to foreign countries. Members of the higher nobility who already held the office of palatine of Vilnius were usually awarded the office of chancellor. In this way, the highest offices of both central and territorial power of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania were accumulated in the hands of a single person. It ensured an exceptional position of this official among the members of the political elite.²² Duties of the chancellor included preparing and sealing diplomatic documentation. The king negotiated his positions with the chancellor regarding prospective envoys and couriers, their instruction, as well as hearing their reports and accepting foreign diplomatic agents. After the decisions of the 1565–66 *Sejm*, however, which established the office of the vice-chancellor, the aforementioned prerogatives had to be shared between these two officials.²³

From the mid-sixteenth century to the 1580s, the office of chancellor was held by members of the then-dominant magnate Radziwill family: Mikolaj Radziwill called 'The Black' and Mikołaj Radziwill called 'The Red'.²⁴ During their chancellorships, we observe a particular aspect of the diplomatic activities – a significant turnover of various diplomatic agents. When trying to investigate its reasons, it seems justifiable to answer the question of what criteria were followed by the chancellor when proposing a candidate to the monarch for a diplomatic mission? First of all, like in the earlier decades, the vast majority of diplomatic representatives (except for the diplomats of the highest rank, i.e. grand envoys) were persons associated with the Chancellery and the court. But other common features are not easily found – there were no general rules regarding their linguistic skills, education or religion. Although Radziwill 'The Black' and Radziwill 'The Red' were Protestants, diplomatic envoys who served under them were of Protestant, Catholic, and Orthodox confessions, while their education and linguistic competences varied.²⁵

²² Ibid., pp. 74–75.

²³ *Urzednicy centralni i dygnitarze*, pp. 146–147; Marek Ferenc, *Mikołaj Radziwill Rudy (ok. 1515–1584): działalność polityczna i wojskowa* (Kraków: Towarzystwo Wydawnicze „Historia Iagellonica”, 2008), p. 292.

²⁴ *Urzednicy centralni i dygnitarze*, p. 52.

²⁵ The register of the diplomatic envoys of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania: Uladzimir Padalinski, 'Szlachta Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego w misjach dyplomatycznych

Only when looking for informal associations with the person of the chancellor, some schemes start to emerge, revealing that a significant number of couriers and envoys were entangled in patron-client relations with the Radziwill family. For example, during the chancellorship of Radziwill ‘The Red’ (1566–79), more than a half of the persons nominated to diplomatic posts could be identified as clients of the chancellor or other members of the Radziwill family.²⁶ The Radziwills’ clients continued their participation in diplomatic missions as envoys when the son of the Radziwill ‘The Red’, Krzysztof Radziwill ‘The Thunder’, held the office of vice-chancellor in 1579–84.²⁷ It was continued in the later period – his allies, relatives and clients were later used for diplomatic missions by Leon Sapieha, appointed to the office of the vice-chancellor in 1585, and in 1589 – to the office of chancellor. During his early career, Sapieha was promoted by the Radziwill family

Rzeczypospolitej (ostatnie trzydziestolecie XVI w.)’, in *Polska wobec wielkich konfliktów w Europie nowożytnej. Z dziejów dyplomacji i stosunków międzynarodowych w XV–XVIII wieku*, ed. by Ryszard Skowron (Kraków: Societas Vistulana, 2009), p. 262. This register, however, does not include diplomatic agents of the lowest rank: couriers.

²⁶ Among the clients of Mikołaj Radziwill ‘The Red’ were: Waclaw Agryppa (Venclovas Agripa) and Andrzej Wolan (Andrius Volanas) who were sent to the emperor between 1573 and 1576; Teodor Skumin Tyszkiewicz (Teodoras Tiškevičius), Michał Haraburda (Mykolas Bogdanas Haraburda), Leon Buchowiecki, and Mateusz Protasowicz-Ostrowski, sent to Muscovy with various assignments between 1569 and 1579. The most comprehensive register of the clients and servants of Radziwill ‘The Red’ see: Raimonda Ragauskienė, *Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės kancleris Mikalojus Radvila Rudasis (apie 1515–1584 m.)* (Vilnius: Valstybės žinios, 2002), pp. 305–76.

²⁷ A majority of the diplomatic couriers sent to Muscovy with a diplomatic mission between 1579 and 1584 (Krzysztof Dzierżek, Mikołaj Burba, Eliasz Pielgrzymowski), and Haraburda mentioned above, who participated in the series of negotiation between 1581 and 1582, as well as Leon Sapieha, in 1584 sent to Muscovy as an envoy, are all regarded as clients of the Radziwill family: Tomasz Kempa, ‘Sekretarze królewscy na służbie u Radziwiłłów w drugiej połowie XVI wieku’, in *Patron i dwór. Magnateria Rzeczypospolitej w XVI–XVIII wieku*, ed. by Ewa Dubas-Urwanowicz and Jerzy Urwanowicz (Warszawa: DiG, 2006), pp. 257–58, 266–67; Raimonda Ragauskienė and Aivas Ragauskas, ‘Vieną ar dvi žmonas turėjo Augustinas Rotundas Meleskis (apie 1520–584 m.)? Nauji duomenys įžymiojo Vilniaus vaito biografijai’, *Lietuvos istorijos metraštis*, 2000 (2001), 26–28; *Urzednicy Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego. Spisy*, ed. by Henryk Lulewicz, Andrzej Rachuba, Przemysław P. Romaniuk, and Andzej Haratym, 5 vols (Warszawa: DiG, 2003–2018), III: *Księstwo Żmudzkie. XV–XVIII wiek* (2015), p. 206.

and was loyal to his former patrons for a long time.²⁸ The patron-client relations as a system for the diplomatic organisation was also used by the Lithuanian vice-chancellor (1566–79) and chancellor (1579–87) Ostafi (Eustachy) Wołłowicz – although no significant research into his network of clients has been conducted.²⁹

The overlapping of the diplomatic service and clientage network should first be examined through the patron-client relations, created from a constant, deliberate and informal arrangement between persons of unequal social status under which the stronger partner offered protection to the weaker one in return for various services. According to Lithuanian researcher Raimonda Ragauskienė, clientage system was highly developed in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania from at least the mid-sixteenth century, with its specific mode of operation. A traditional system of appointing to offices favoured the formation of clientage for the king appointed his supporters and persons whom they promoted to offices.³⁰ Protection was required to receive lands, peasants, and offices in the state administration; therefore, the patron-client relations highly influenced the nobility, which in itself was interlocked with a system of patronage and protection.³¹ There is no reason to presume that the king of Poland and the grand duke of Lithuania deliberately promoted this system at his court in the sixteenth century. We can only observe certain elements of the official patronage system, for example, privileges of ennoblement, where the monarch conferred the status of the nobility and granted land to different distinguished non-noble court officials. However, these instances of ennoblement were not common, and the

²⁸ On Leon Sapieha's early career, see: Arkadiusz Czwoltek, *Piórem i buławą. Działalność polityczna Lwa Sapiehy kanclerza litewskiego, wojewody wileńskiego* (Toruń: Wydawnictwo Naukowe UMK, 2012), pp. 21–51.

²⁹ Only few years ago the first publications on the clientele of Ostafi Wołłowicz appeared: Andrei Radaman, 'Klienty i 'priyatseli' Astafeia Bahdanavicha Valovicha u Navahradskim pavetse VKL u 1565–1587 hh'.', in *Unus pro omnibus: Valovichy u historyi Vialikaha kniastva Litouskaha XV–XVIII stst.*, ed. by Aliaksei Ivanovich Shalanda (Minsk: Medysont, 2014), pp. 284–96.

³⁰ Ragauskienė, *Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės*, pp. 157, 159.

³¹ Wojciech Tygielski, 'Klientela: więzi społeczne-grupy nacisku', in *Władza i społeczeństwo w XVI i XVII w. Prace ofiarowane Antoniemu Mączakowi w sześćdziesiątą rocznicę urodzin*, ed. by Marcin Kamler et al. (Warszawa: PWN, 1989), p. 139.

ruler did not attempt to form a stratum of nobility who operated mainly in the central government of the country (as in *noblesse de robe*). The most direct route to the career of an official led through the courts of most prominent nobles. Therefore, Lithuanian nobility actively sought for official duties in the administration of the largest landowners and attempted to receive officialdoms in the chancelleries of the most prominent nobility. Service to a noble ensured support in attempts to receive higher education, new lands and serfs, protected against enemies, and sometimes guaranteed further career at the royal court, in the state administration or courts of law.³² The main patrons in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania were only the most prominent members of the noble estate. They used their contacts at the court and personally intermediated on behalf of their people, while in the provinces they acted independently in creating a network of informal power. The system of clientage made it possible for members of the most prominent nobility to maintain their status and place within the ruling elite.³³

Based on the available source, it is difficult to discuss probable ‘specialisation’ of the clients, as the majority of them conducted various services, depending on the career of their patron, e.g. the office held by the patron. Clients were given various administrative tasks in the lands of the patron, managed their economy, participated in courts, gathered political information in the country and abroad. For example, Jan Hajka began his career at the court of the father of Mikołaj Radziwill ‘The Red’, Jerzy Radziwill ‘Hercules’ (1480–1541). In 1532–33, Hajka represented his patron in the court of law during the dispute with Queen Bona Sforza over the boundaries of their landholdings.³⁴ In 1536, he received his first diplomatic assignment – Hajka brought Jerzy Radziwill’s letter to Prince Ivan Ovchina Telepnev-Obolensky in Moscow.³⁵ Later on, he got an unusual task – he had to transport a hunting falcon from King Sigismund I the Old as a gift from the Polish king and the grand duke of Lithuania for the sultan. Hajka, while waiting for the legation to Turkey to assemble and the journey to begin, spent a long time living

³² Kiaupienė, p. 142.

³³ Ragauskienė, *Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės*, pp. 157, 158.

³⁴ Kiaupienė, pp. 143, 260.

³⁵ In the Muscovite book of legations: SRIO LIX (1887), 16.

in Krakow and taking care of the bird. During this time, he observed the life of the royal court in Krakow and informed his patron about more important events that took place at the court.³⁶ In the 1540s, he was accepted to the court, where he quickly rose up the ranks. After the Polish and Lithuanian monarch married Jerzy Radziwill's daughter Barbara and the court of the new queen was formed, Hajka was assigned to her court as the Ruthenian scribe of the queen.³⁷ Barbara Radziwill's death did not impede his further career – in 1554 he held the office of royal scribe, in principle equivalent to a secretary, while in 1564 he was appointed to the office of grand duke's marshal of the court.³⁸ During the chancellorship of Mikołaj Radziwill 'The Black' (from the 1550s to the 1560s), he was an active diplomat. In 1552, he was sent by the Council of Lords to deliver a letter to the boyar Duma. In 1556, he took part in negotiations with the Muscovite envoys in Vilnius. In 1558, he was appointed secretary to the grand embassy to Moscow, while at the end of 1560 he was nominated the second-rank grand envoy.³⁹ In the late 1560s, Hajka was involved in the negotiations over the union between the Polish Kingdom and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. He was sent several times with Lithuanian embassies to the Polish Crown to negotiate the conditions of the union, and in 1569 he was one of those who signed the Act of Lublin Union.⁴⁰

This short outline of Radziwill's client's career shows us various aspects of Jan Hajka's tasks assigned by his patrons. However, at the same time when Hajka was in the king's inner circle, acting as a secretary to the queen, and later on as a king's secretary, he was an active diplomat. This circumstance allows us to define a specific group of clients, whose field of activities encompasses mainly diplomatic relations. Researchers who examined the clientage network of Lithuanian Chancellor Mikołaj Radziwill 'The Red' have stated that those royal secretaries who were

³⁶ Letter from John Haika to George Radziwill 'Heracles', [n.d.]: AGAD, Archiwum Radziwiłłów (hereafter cited as: AR) V, 5080; Kiaupienė, p. 143.

³⁷ Ragauskienė, *Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės*, p. 321.

³⁸ *Urządnicy centralni i dygnitarze*, p. 209.

³⁹ Descriptions in Muscovite books of legations: SRIO LIX (1887), 362–69, 529–30, 563–80; *ibid.*, LXXI (1890), 23–46; *Kniga posolskaya Metriki* (1843), p. 150.

⁴⁰ Kiaupienė, p. 260.

closest to the king were the most beneficial clients of the network. As the state officials, they not only operated within the intimate environment of the king but also worked in the state Chancellery, thus being subordinate to the chancellor and vice-chancellor.⁴¹ Furthermore, Radziwill's clients – secretaries of the king – performed mostly clerical duties and often were the most active officials in the secretariat of the ruler.⁴² The importance of the office was underlined by the multiplicity of its functions: duties in the royal chancellery, preparation and management of political documents and correspondence, performing diplomatic missions and continuous residence close to the sovereign.⁴³ One of the most important services of this institutional clientage was the constant supply of information, exceeding the official competences of the office.

All clients sent their patron news about the current affairs at the court, the information regarding Radziwill's reputation at the court and, mainly, concerning domestic and foreign policy. When passing on the information to their patrons, royal secretaries maintained their patron-client relations, which is evident in personal letters. Sometimes this information was of critical value to the patron, for political successes depended on the timely information from the royal court when the noble was not present, as well as on the information from other places.⁴⁴ Therefore, chancellors and vice-chancellors attempted to appoint their clients as diplomatic envoys and diplomatic couriers, who had connections at the court.

The introduction of magnate clients into diplomatic activities could be illustrated by the example of the preparations for the legation to Moscow in 1571. The Radziwill's client, an experienced diplomat Michał

⁴¹ Ragauskienė, *Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės*, p. 162.

⁴² Kempa, 'Sekretarze królewscy', p. 248.

⁴³ Roman Żelewski, 'Organizacja koronnej służby dyplomatycznej za Zygmunta Augusta', in *Polska służba dyplomatyczna XVI–XVIII w.* (Warszawa: PWN, 1966), pp. 84–87; Andrzej Tomczak, 'Kilka uwag o kancelarii królewskiej w drugiej połowie XVI w', *Archeion*, 37 (1962), 239. More on the king's secretariat see: Leszek Kieniewicz, 'Sekretariat Stefana Batorego. Zbiorowość i kariery sekretarzy królewskich', in *Spółczesność staropolskie: studia i szkice*, ed. by Andrzej Wyczański and Anna Izydorczyk, 4 vols (Warszawa: PWN, 1976–1986), IV (1986), pp. 33–61.

⁴⁴ Ragauskienė, *Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės*, p. 167.

Haraburda, was appointed by the king as a diplomatic representative for this mission.⁴⁵ Sigismund Augustus had intensively negotiated this mission with the chancellor of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania Mikołaj Radziwill 'The Red'. His correspondence with the king shows that the minor envoy for this mission was assigned after being promoted by Radziwill. In his letter written in spring of 1571, Sigismund Augustus agreed to the candidature of Haraburda who was being promoted by the chancellor.⁴⁶ What is interesting is that this diplomat was given both official and special (secret and more detailed instruction) of the embassy, prepared by Radziwill 'The Red', with the consent of the king.⁴⁷ It emphasises the confidence Haraburda enjoyed, being – as it is speculated – closely associated with the Radziwill family since his youth, although this close association was more pronounced in the 1570s. In this decade, Haraburda spent a lot of time within the closest circle of Sigismund Augustus and became a valuable source of information about the events at the royal court he sent to Mikołaj Radziwill 'The Red'.⁴⁸ The trust Radziwill had in his client was demonstrated in a difficult time during the first interregnum. In late 1572, Radziwill 'The Red' and other members of Lithuanian political elite assigned Michał Haraburda a special mission: he was sent to Ivan the Terrible to explore his position on the election of a new king of the Commonwealth, and, if possible, to encourage him to enter the election as a candidate.⁴⁹ This mission

⁴⁵ *Kniga posolskaya Metriki* (1843), pp. 371–72.

⁴⁶ King Sigismund Augustus' letter to Mikołaj Radziwill 'The Red', 28 February 1571, in *Listy króla Zygmunta Augusta do Radziwiłłów*, ed. by Irena Kaniewska (Kraków: Wydawnictwo Literackie, 1999), p. 591; King Sigismund Augustus' letter to Mikołaj Radziwill 'The Red', 11 April 1571, in *ibid.*, pp. 594–95; King Sigismund Augustus' letter to Mikołaj Radziwill 'The Red', 20 May 1571, in Rafał Jaworski, 'Nieznana korespondencja króla Zygmunta Augusta z Mikołajem Radziwiłłem Rudym i Ostafim Wołłowiczem z lat 1550–1571 ze zbiorów Biblioteki Czartoryskich', *Studia Źródłoznawcze*, 44 (2003), 105.

⁴⁷ King Sigismund Augustus' letter to Mikołaj Radziwill 'The Red', 5 September 1571, in *Listy króla Zygmunta Augusta*, pp. 600–03; King Sigismund Augustus' letter to Mikołaj Radziwill 'The Red', 22 October 1571, in *ibid.*, pp. 607–10; Ferenc, pp. 378–79.

⁴⁸ Kempa, 'Sekretarze królewscy', p. 257.

⁴⁹ A letter sent by the senators of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania to Ivan IV the Terrible, 29 December 1572, in *Akta zjazdów Stanów Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego*, ed. by Henryk Lulewicz, 2 vols (Warszawa: Neriton, 2006–2009), I (2006), 49–52.

was not coordinated with the Polish Crown and ended in a scandal. Some members of the Lithuanian political elite were accused of secret pacts with Muscovy because they encouraged Ivan the Terrible or his son Feodor to be a candidate to the Commonwealth throne.⁵⁰ Negative reaction to this affair curtailed Haraburda's diplomatic activities and impeded his political career.⁵¹

Even during the grand legations to Muscovy, when the chancellor and vice-chancellor had little direct influence, as it was the Senate of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth who appointed the grand envoys, patrons were well-served by their wide networks of clients within the ranks of the royal secretaries. During the grand legations, appointments to the position of secretary to the embassy were made from the ranks of Lithuanian royal secretaries, and we are justified in thinking that the Radziwill's clients dominated here. Haraburda was also included in the grand embassy of 1570, but for some unknown reasons refused to go to Moscow.⁵² He was replaced by another royal secretary, Andrzej Charytonowicz-Obryński, from – according to the research – the closest circle of vice-chancellor Ostafi (Eustachy) Wołłowicz.⁵³ Haraburda was nominated as the secretary to the grand legations in the early 1580s – in 1581–1582 he negotiated peace or truce with the Muscovites in the village of Jam Zapolski near Pskov,⁵⁴ and in the spring of 1582 he went to Moscow to confirm the truce.⁵⁵

⁵⁰ More on this problem, see: Henryk Lulewicz, *Gniewów o unię ciąg dalszy. Stosunki polsko-litewskie w latach 1569–1588* (Warszawa: Neriton, 2002), pp. 96–108.

⁵¹ Padalinski, *Szlachta Wielkiego Księstwa*, p. 255.

⁵² Mikołaj Naruszewicz's letter to Mikołaj Radziwill 'The Red', 28 June 1569, in *Arheograficheskiy sbornik dokumentov, odnosyaschihsya k istorii Severo-Zapadnoy Rossii, izdavaemyiy pri upravlenii Vilenskogo uchebnogo okruga*, 14 vols (Vilnius, 1867–1904), VII (1870), 47–49.

⁵³ The instructions to the envoys sent to Muscovy [1569], in *Kniga posolskaya Metriki* (1843), pp. 290–92; a description in the Muscovite book of legations: SRIO LXXI (1890), 616–763; Radaman, p. 291.

⁵⁴ A report on the negotiations between envoys of Stephán Báthory and the diplomatic representatives of Ivan IV the Terrible, 13 December 1581 – 15 January 1582, in *Kniga posolskaya Metriki Velikogo knyazhestva Litovskogo, soderzhaschaya v sebe diplomaticheskie snosheniya Litvyi v gosudarstvovanie korolya, Stefana Batoriya s 1573 po 1580 god* (Moscow, 1845), pp. 213–30; a description of the negotiations' course in the Muscovite book of legations: Rossiiskii Gosudarstvennyi Arkhiv Drevnikh

The clients and associates who already received their official appointments were promoted to grand legations. We can assume that it was not a coincidence that Teodor Skumin Tyszkiewicz, who from his youth was associated with the Radziwill family and is considered to be one of their clients, was appointed secretary to the grand legation of 1577–1578.⁵⁶ King Stephán Báthory personally informed Chancellor Mikołaj Radziwill ‘The Red’ about the envoys nominated for this mission and asked for his opinion about the future mission.⁵⁷ Even when they did not hold the office of the chancellor or vice-chancellor, Radziwills had an influence on the appointment of the diplomatic representatives until the end of the sixteenth century. They maintained their status due to the chancellor of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania Leon Sapieha’s loyal stance towards his former patron’s family, as a former client. Some researchers also suggest that the new vice-chancellor Gabriel Wojna (appointed in 1589), who was promoted by Leon Sapieha, also associated himself with the Radziwills.⁵⁸ Therefore, the nomination of Wojna and his relative, the royal secretary Mateusz Wojna to the grand embassy to Moscow in 1590 was most probably coordinated with the

Aktov, Snosheniia Rossii s Polshei (hereafter cited as: RGADA, SRsP) 79, 13, fols 555r–623v; *Peregovory o mire mezhdu Moskvoi i Polshei v 1581–1582 g.: Materialy* (Odessa, 1887), pp. 51–84.

⁵⁵ Stephán Báthory’s mandate to the grand envoys of Poland and Lithuania sent to negotiate an inter-state agreement with Ivan IV the Terrible, 2 April 1582, in *Kniga posolskaya Metriki* (1845), p. 254; a letter of credence to Polish and Lithuanian envoys sent to Muscovy, 2 April 1582, in *ibid.*, p. 253; a description in the Muscovite book of legations: RGADA, SRsP 79, 14, fols 114v–295r.

⁵⁶ Stephán Báthory’s mandate for the grand envoys sent to negotiate peace, 10 March 1577, in *Kniga posolskaya Metriki* (1845), p. 25; Ragauskienė, *Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės*, p. 324.

⁵⁷ Stephán Báthory’s letter to Mikołaj Radziwill ‘The Red’, 3 January 1577, in AGAD, AR III, 3, fol. 35r; a copy also in Biblioteka Jagiellońska, 1000, fols 56r–57r; *Sprawy wojenne króla Stefana Batorego: dyjaryjusze, relacyje, listy i akta z lat 1576–1586*, prep. by Ignacy Polkowski (Kraków: Akademia Umiejętności, 1887), pp. 76–77.

⁵⁸ Uladzimir Padalinski, ‘Uplyu pratektsyianizmu na farmiravanne skladu kantsyliariyi i skarba VKL u aposhniai treti XVI st.’, <http://pawet.net/library/history/bel_history/padalinski/22/Уплыў_пратэксцыянізму_на_фарміраванне_складу_канцылярыі_і_скарба_ВКЛ_у_апошняй_трэці_XVI_ст.html> [accessed 28 October 2017].

palatine of Vilnius Krzysztof Radziwill ‘The Thunder’, with whom the chancellor consulted all most important domestic and foreign policy questions.⁵⁹ Sapieha consulted the palatine of Vilnius about the nomination of a diplomatic envoy in 1598 when he promoted his client Jan Korsak Hołubicki to be sent to Moscow.⁶⁰ It also reveals that Leon Sapieha, just as his predecessors, employed his associates, clients and relatives to perform diplomatic missions. At the same time, he could not ignore the interests of his powerful former patrons. Even when Leon Sapieha himself headed the legation to Moscow in 1600, royal secretary Elias Pielgrzymowski, a client of Vilnius Palatine Krzysztof Radziwill ‘The Thunder’, was included in the grand embassy as a secretary.⁶¹

Looking mainly at the services provided to the patron during diplomatic activities, we could make a conclusion that the patron-client system was used for the needs of the diplomatic service. But if we take a look at the remuneration for diplomatic missions, we could come to the opposite conclusion that the diplomatic service was exploited for the needs of the clientage network. The participation in diplomatic missions and serving in various diplomatic assignments allowed to achieve higher offices and pursue a political career and thus to expect sufficient material remuneration. But, as the client-patron relation came to dominate the social life of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, almost no new office and no new land grants were provided without the support of the magnates

⁵⁹ The instructions for the envoys sent to Moscow, 25 April 1590, in LM 593 (1585–1604 m.), *Diplomatinių reikalų knyga*, ed. by Algirdas Baliulis (Vilnius: LII leidykla, 2009), 111–15; a copy also in LM 594 (1585–1600), ed. by Algirdas Baliulis (Vilnius: LII leidykla, 2006), 107–11.

⁶⁰ Leon Sapieha’s letter to Krzysztof Radziwill ‘The Thunder’, 4 February 1598, in *Archivum domus Sapiehanae = Archiwum domu Sapiehów wydane staraniem rodziny*, vol. 1: *Listy z lat 1575–1606*, ed. by Antoni Prochaska (Lwów: nakładem rodziny, 1892), p. 181.

⁶¹ A letter of credence to Polish and Lithuanian Grand envoys sent to Muscovy, 13 July 1600, in LM 593 (2009), 202–06; a copy presented also in LM 594 (2006), 222–23; the instruction for the grand envoys sent to Moscow, [13 July] 1600, in LM 593 (2009), 211–17. Radziwill’s client described the course of this diplomatic mission in great detail in his diary: Elias Pielgrzymowski, *Poselstwo i krótkie spisanie rozprawy z Moskwą. Poselstwo do Zygmunta III*, ed. by Roman Krzywy (Warszawa: Neriton, 2010), pp. 27–212.

of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. Raimonda Ragauskienė, referring to the archival materials of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania Chancellery and Lithuanian Metrica, claimed that there was not a single privilege by a monarch when an office or lands or serfs were assigned to a noble just to his request without support by higher nobility of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania.⁶²

Relations between the patron, his client and the remuneration for the diplomatic service is shown by formulae which appear in the grants. For example, when granting an office of equerry to Piotr Wizgird, who in 1582 was on a diplomatic mission as a courier to Muscovy, it was stated that he received this as a reward for successful missions after he was recommended by the chancellor of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania Ostafi (Eustachy) Wołłowicz.⁶³ However, not all grants mention their patrons; yet, even in these cases the formula that it was granted after the intercession 'of some councillors of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania' proves the significant role of the client-patron relations in remuneration for diplomatic tasks. It is worth mentioning that also one's father's participation in diplomatic missions was useful to their sons. In 1577, Łukasz Buchowiecki was promoted by Chancellor Mikołaj Radziwiłł 'The Red' to receive a village in the starostvo of Mogilev. The main motive for this grant were the merits of the king's courtier Leon Buchowiecki (Łukasz's father) in military service and a diplomatic mission he performed a year ago.⁶⁴ But more and more often the rewards were granted to the participants of the diplomatic mission themselves. Sometimes patrons took care of their clients to be rewarded for the diplomatic service immediately after the mission. Eliaasz Pielgrzymowski, a client of vice-chancellor Krzysztof Radziwiłł

⁶² Ragauskienė, *Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės*, pp. 157, 158; Raimonda Ragauskienė, 'Radziviłł Ryzihiy i Radziviłł Sirotkka: preemstvennost klienturyi v Velikom Knyazhestve Litovskom v XVI v.', in *Na shliabah da vzaemarazumennyya. Navukovyj zbornik* (Minsk: Bjelaruski knigazbor, 2000), p. 209.

⁶³ Stephán Báthory's appointment of Piotr Wizgird to the office of equerry of Trakai, 16 April 1584, in *Metryika Vyalikaga Knyastva Litovskaga. Kniga 70 (1582–1585)*, ed. by Andrei Miatselski (Minsk: Belarускаia navuka, 2008), pp. 171–72.

⁶⁴ Stephán Báthory's grant to Łukasz Buchowiecki with the right to a village in the starostvo of Mogilev, 24 August 1577, RGADA, Litovskaia Metrika (hereafter cited as: RGADA, LM) 389, 59, fols 27v–28v.

‘The Thunder’, received a landholding in the Ashmyany district just after returning from the mission to Muscovy in 1583.⁶⁵ Leon Sapieha, then only a secretary to the king and a client of Krzysztof Radziwill, took an interest in granting this privilege. In a letter to his patron, he emphasised his efforts in trying to secure the reward for Pielgrzymowski.⁶⁶ After being appointed chancellor, Leon Sapieha also took an active interest in securing rewards for people within his closest circle. Most probably due to the chancellor’s efforts his relative Mikołaj Sapieha was awarded benefices and income from Gdansk’s customs for his diplomatic mission to Sweden in 1596.⁶⁷

The patrons’ support and efforts to provide a reward for their client is not the most important aspect of the problem in question. Prospects of a successful diplomatic service – the possibility of an individual official to be more visible in public life, an opportunity to make a mark in the case of a successful mission – were even more important, as they opened up new opportunities for further career. Therefore, among diplomatic representatives, we see members of the powerful Radziwill family, sons of the Mikołaj Radziwill ‘The Black’ – Albrycht Radziwill and Mikołaj Krzysztof Radziwill ‘The Orphan’, who both participated in their diplomatic missions when they were 24-year-olds. In 1573 Mikołaj Krzysztof Radziwill ‘The Orphan’ was a member of the Polish and Lithuanian delegation to France to accompany the newly-elected king, the brother of the King Henry Valois of France to the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. Following the instructions of the Lithuanian senators, which stated that he was to represent only the interests of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania at the court of the French monarch, the young Radziwill managed to get a private audience with the newly-elected monarch before other envoys and succeeded in establishing friendly

⁶⁵ Stephán Báthory’s grant to Elias Pilegrzymowski and his wife with the right to lifelong lease of a manor, 23 August 1583, in *Metryka Vyalikaga Knyastva Litovskaga*, p. 66; Padalinski, *Szlachta Wielkiego Księstwa*, p. 258.

⁶⁶ Leon Sapieha’s letter to Krzysztof Radziwill ‘The Thunder’, 12 September 1583, in *Archivum domus Sapiehanae*, p. 4.

⁶⁷ Mirosław Nagielski, ‘Mikołaj Sapieha h. Lis’, *Internetowy Polski Słownik Biograficzny*, <<https://www.ipsb.nina.gov.pl/a/biografia/mikolaj-sapieha-h-lis-wojewoda-nowogrodzki-zm-1638>> [accessed 10 February 2018].

relations with him.⁶⁸ His younger brother Albrycht Radziwill participated in an equally important diplomatic action. In 1581–1582, together with Haraburda and Polish diplomat Jan Zbaraski, he negotiated peace with Muscovite envoys as the second grand envoy in the village of Jam Zapolski. Negotiations, intermediated by papal legate Antonio Possevino, ended successfully, and in January 1582, a truce beneficial to the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth was concluded, thus ending the Livonian war.⁶⁹ Participation of young Radziwills in diplomatic missions provided an opportunity to impress the sovereign and to enter his closest circle as well as strengthen the Radziwills' position within the elite.⁷⁰

The fact that participation in diplomatic missions influenced the further career is demonstrated by the case of a long-time Radziwill client Jan Hajka. He reached his career heights in 1566, when for his achievements in the Chancellery and diplomatic service he was awarded the office of castellan of Brest.⁷¹ This office gave him a place in the Senate of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth after the Union of Lublin. Even as a senator he remained loyal to the Radziwill family and was known as a strong ally of the palatine of Vilnius and the Lithuanian chancellor Mikołaj Radziwill 'The Red' during the periods of first interregnums (1572–73, and 1575–76). He took part in a number of separate *Sejms* of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, in which Radziwill 'The Red' also participated and signed documents prepared by this official.⁷² Active participation in diplomatic activities also guaranteed a successful career to the long promoted Radziwill associate Teodor Skumin Tyszkiewicz.

⁶⁸ For more about the 1573 mission of the Polish and Lithuanian representatives to the newly elected King Henry Valois: Kiaupienė, pp. 210–16; Tomasz Kempa, *Mikołaj Krzysztof Radziwill Sierotka (1549–1616). Wojewoda wileński* (Warszawa: Semper, 2000), pp. 83–85. Publication of the diplomatic mission's diary: *Diariusz poselstwa polskiego do Francji po Henryka Walezego w 1573 roku*, ed. by Adam Przyboś and Roman Żelewski (Wrocław, Warszawa and Kraków: PAN, 1963).

⁶⁹ Jam Zapolski Truce, concluded in the name of Stephán Báthory, [15] January 1582, in *Kniga posolskaya Metriki*, vol. 2, pp. 236–42.

⁷⁰ Padalinski, *Szlachta Wielkiego Księstwa*, p. 250.

⁷¹ King Sigismund Augustus' grant to John Haika appointing him to the office of castellan of Brest, 11 March 1566: RGADA, LM 389, 50, fols 36v–38r.

⁷² *Urzednicy centralni i dygnitarze*, p. 209; Kempa, 'Sekretarze królewscy', pp. 250–251.

In 1576, the king of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth Stephán Báthory awarded him with the office of the court treasurer. The grant emphasises that Teodor Skumin Tyszkiewicz was appointed to the office for his good service at the royal court and good conduct during his diplomatic missions to Moscow. The grant also mentions his father's achievements during diplomatic assignments to the Crimean Khanate.⁷³ Also another Radziwill's client, a career diplomat Michał Haraburda was rewarded in 1584 for his lifelong achievements with the appointment to the office of castellan of Minsk, which gave him a place in the Senate of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth.⁷⁴ Successful mission by Leon Sapieha in 1584 to Muscovy gave him a stepping stone into the career of future chancellor of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. Supported by his patron Krzysztof Radziwill 'The Thunder' and explicit agreement of Chancellor Eustachy Wołłowicz, Leon Sapieha was appointed to the office of vice-chancellor in 1585.⁷⁵ In time, he became one of the most influential nobles in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth.

These are not individual instances – a majority of envoys who successfully completed their diplomatic missions managed to pursue a political or administrative career in the Commonwealth. This is why the very act of nominating a diplomatic envoy was important – a magnate appointing a noble as an envoy or a diplomatic courier could be regarded as a patron awarding his client. It helps to answer a question, why in the late sixteenth century there was such a significant turnover of people who conducted diplomatic missions. Clients of chancellors and vice-chancellors, who were suitable for diplomatic tasks, could number in dozens and they all had to be given an opportunity to present their abilities to perform diplomatic missions. This use of the diplomatic service for the needs of the client network caused the earlier tradition of specialization to wither away. However, there is no basis for arguing that

⁷³ Stephán Báthory's grant to Teodor Skumin Tyszkiewicz appointing him to the office of court treasurer of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, 6 July 1576, RGADA, LM 389, 56, fols 42v–43v; *ibid.*, 58, fols 1v–2r.

⁷⁴ Kempa, 'Sekretarze królewscy', p. 257.

⁷⁵ Czwołek, pp. 36–37; Stephán Báthory's grant to Leon Sapieha appointing him to the office of vice-chancellor of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, 2 February 1585, in *Metryka Vyalikaga Knyastva Litovskaga*, p. 238.

the model for transferring experiences and professional skills, common to non-residential diplomacy, ceased to exist when the same persons were appointed less often to perform diplomatic assignments. We can find source materials with the information about the participation of diplomatic representatives in entourages or as observers in negotiations before they were sent out on diplomatic missions.⁷⁶ At the same time, members of higher nobility without diplomatic training who were nominated as envoys, as we have already seen, were escorted by experienced officials of the chancellery or courtiers. We need not forget that the choice of the diplomats was affected not only by recommendations by the influential nobility or the social status of the house within the society. Their appointment needed to be reconciled with formal criteria of diplomatic communication, related to the status of the legation, which had to correspond to the rank of diplomatic representatives, ensured by the social status of the diplomat within their own society. Even when taking into account many other factors, we can safely state that the diplomatic service in the late sixteenth-century Grand Duchy of Lithuania was closely related to the patron-client system, which significantly affected its development.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Archival Sources

Archiwum Główne Akt Dawnych w Warszawie

Archiwum Radziwiłłów

III, 3

V, 5080

Metryka Koronna, Libri Legationum

5

⁷⁶ In-depth research into legation entourages is difficult with the existing source material, but even fragmentary information allows us to deduce that this practice existed. For example, a client of Albert Radziwiłł Mikolaj Burba a few years before his mission to Muscovy, in 1580, had been appointed to the position of provider of the Muscovite grand legation, an official responsible for the material provision to the foreign legation in Lithuania: RGADA, SRsP 79, 12, fol. 22r.

Biblioteka Jagiellońska
MS 1000

Rossiiskii Gosudarstvennyi Arkhiv Drevnikh Aktov
Litovskaia Metrika 389
50, 56, 59
Snosheniia Rossii s Polshei 79
12, 13, 14

Printed Primary Sources

- Acta Tomiciana: epistolarum, legationum, responsorum, actionum et rerum gestarum serenissimi principis Sigismundi Primi Regis Poloniae, Magni Ducis Lithuaniae per Stanislaum Gorski canonicum Cracoviensem et Plocensem collectarum*, 18 vols (Poznan, 1852–1999), III (1853)
- Akta zjazdów Stanów Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego*, ed. by Henryk Lulewicz, 2 vols (Warszawa: Neriton, 2006–2009), I (2006)
- Arheograficheskiy sbornik dokumentov, odnosyaschihsya k istorii Severo-Zapadnoy Rossii, izdavaemyiy pri upravlenii Vilenskogo uchebnogo okruga*, 14 vols (Vilnius, 1867–1904), VII (1870)
- Archivum domus Sapiehanae=Archiwum domu Sapiehów wydane staraniem rodziny. Listy z lat 1575–1606* (Lviv, 1892)
- Codex diplomaticus Regni Poloniae et Magni Ducatus Lituaniae*, 3 vols (Vilnius, 1758–1564), I (1785)
- Diariusz Poselstwa Polskiego Do Francji Po Henryka Walezego w 1573 Roku*, ed. by Adam Przyboś and Roman Żelewski (Wrocław, Warszawa and Kraków: PAN, 1963)
- Elementa ad Fontium Editiones: Brevia romanorum pontificum ad Poloniam spectantia ex minutis et registris pontificiis*, ed. by Henryk Damian Wojtyska CP, 76 vols (Rome: Institutum Historicum Polonicum Romae, 1966–1996), LXIV (1986)
- Herberstein, Sigismund, *Zapiski o Moskovii*, ed. Anna Khoroshkevich, 2 vols (Moscow: Pamiatniki istoricheskoi mysli, 2008)
- Jaworski, Rafał, 'Nieznana korespondencja króla Zygmunta Augusta z Mikołajem Radziwiłłem Rudym i Ostafim Wołłowiczem z lat 1550–1571 ze zbiorów Biblioteki Czartoryskich', *Studia Źródloznawcze*, 44 (2003), 91–108
- Kniga posolskaya Metriki Velikogo Knyazhestva Litovskogo, sodержaschaya v sebe diplomaticheskie snosheniya Litvyi v gosudarstvovanie korolya Sigizmunda-Avgusta (s 1545 po 1572 god)* (Moscow, 1843)
- Kniga posolskaya Metriki Velikogo Knyazhestva Litovskogo, sodержaschaya v sebe diplomaticheskie snosheniya Litvyi v gosudarstvovanie korolya, Stefana Batoriya s 1573 po 1580 god* (Moscow, 1845)
- Lietuvos Metrika* 5 (1427–1506): Užrašymų knyga 5, ed. by Algirdas Baliulis, Artūras Dubonis and Darius Antanavičius (Vilnius: LII leidykla, 2012)

- Lietuvos Metrika* 6 (1494–1506): Užrašymų knyga 6, ed. by Algirdas Baliulis (Vilnius: LII leidykla, 2007)
- Lietuvos Metrika* 7 (1506–1539): Užrašymų knyga 7, ed. by Inga Ilarienė, Laimontas Karalius and Darius Antanavičius (Vilnius: LII leidykla, 2011)
- Lietuvos Metrika* 8 (1499–1514): Užrašymų knyga 8, ed. by Algirdas Baliulis (Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidykla, 1995)
- Lietuvos Metrika* 593 (1585–1604 m.), *Diplomatinių reikalų knyga*, ed. by Algirdas Baliulis (Vilnius: LII leidykla, 2009)
- Lietuvos Metrika* 594: (1585–1600), ed. by Algirdas Baliulis (Vilnius: LII leidykla, 2006)
- Listy króla Zygmunta Augusta do Radziwiłłów*, ed. by Irena Kaniewska (Cracow: Wydawnictwo Literackie, 1999)
- Метрыка Вялікага Княства Літоўскага. Кніга 70 (1582–1585)*, ed. by Andrei Miatelski (Minsk: Belarusaika navuka, 2008)
- Памятники истории Восточной Европы. Источники XV–XVII вв.: 'Выписка из посольских книг' о сношении с Российского государства с Польско-Литовским за 1475–1572 гг.*, ed. by Sigurd Ottovich Schmidt and Boris Nikolaevich Morozov, 9 vols (Moscow and Warszawa: Arkheograficheski tseñtr, 1995–2012), II (1997)
- Peregovory o mire mezhdu Moskvoy i Polshei v 1581–1582 g.: Materialy* (Odessa, 1887)
- Pielgrzymowski, Eliaz, *Poselstwo i krótkie spisanie rozprawy z Moskwą. Poselstwo do Zygmunta III*, ed. by Roman Krzywy (Warszawa: Neriton, 2010)
- Sbornik imperatorskogo russkogo istoricheskogo obschestva*, 148 vols (Saint Petersburg, 1867–1916), XXXV (1882)
- Sbornik imperatorskogo russkogo istoricheskogo obschestva*, 148 vols (Saint Petersburg, 1867–1916), LIX (1887)
- Sbornik imperatorskogo russkogo istoricheskogo obschestva*, 148 vols (Saint Petersburg, 1867–1916), LXXI (1890)
- Sprawy wojenne króla Stefana Batorego: dyjaryjusze, relacje, listy i akta z lat 1576–1586* (Kraków, 1887)

Secondary Works

- Banionis, Egidijus, *Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės pasiuntinių tarnyba XV–XVI amžiais* (Vilnius: Diemedis, 1998)
- Czwołek, Arkadiusz, *Piórem i buławą. Działalność polityczna Lwa Sapiehy kanclerza litewskiego, wojewody wileńskiego* (Toruń: Wydawnictwo naukowe UMK, 2012)
- Grala, Hieronim, 'Diaci i pisarze: wczesnonowoczesny aparat władzy w Państwie Moskiewskim i Wielkim Księstwie Litewskim (XVI – pocz. XVII w.)', in *Moderнизacja struktur władzy w warunkach opóźnienia. Europa Środkowa i Wschodnia na przełomie średniowiecza i czasów nowożytnych* (Warszawa: DIG, 1999), 73–91
- Ferenc, Marek, *Mikołaj Radziwiłł Rudy (ok. 1515–1584): działalność polityczna i woj-skowa* (Kraków: Towarzystwo Wydawnicze „Historia Iagellonica”, 2008)
- Grusha, Aleksandr, *Dokumentalnaia pismennost Velikogo Kniazhestva Litovskogo (konets XIV – pervaiia tret XVI v.)* (Minsk: Belarusaika navuka, 2015)

- , *Kantsyliariya Vyalikaga Knyastva Litovskaga 40-h gadov XV–pershay palovyi XVI st.* (Minsk: Belaruskaya navuka, 2006)
- Grzybowski, Stanisław, ‘Organizacja polskiej służby dyplomatycznej 1573–1605’, in *Polska służba dyplomatyczna XVI–XVIII w.*, ed. by Zbigniew Wójcik (Warszawa: PWN, 1966), 145–201
- , ‘Udział senatu w kształtowaniu polityki zagranicznej Rzeczypospolitej w drugiej połowie XVI wieku’, in *Senat w Polsce. Dzieje i teraźniejszość. Sesja naukowa, Kraków 25 i 26 maja 1993*, ed. by Krystyn Matwijowski and Jerzy Pietrzak (Warszawa: Kancelaria Senatu RP, 1993), 61–73
- Halecki, Oskar, ‘Die Beziehungen der Habsburger zum litauischen Hochadel im Zeitalter der Jagellonen’, *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung* 36 (1915), 595–660
- Historia dyplomacji polskiej*, ed. by Gerard Labuda, 5 vols (Warszawa: PWN, 1982–1999), I (1982)
- Historia dyplomacji polskiej*, ed. by Zbigniew Wójcik 5 vols (Warszawa: PWN, 1982–1999), II (1982)
- Kempa, Tomasz, *Mikołaj Krzysztof Radziwiłł Sierotka (1549–1616). Wojewoda wileński* (Warszawa: Semper, 2000)
- , ‘Sekretarze królewscy na służbie u Radziwiłłów w drugiej połowie XVI wieku’ in *Patron i dwór. Magnateria Rzeczypospolitej w XVI–XVIII wieku*, ed. by Ewa Dubas-Urwanowicz and Jerzy Urwanowicz (Warszawa: DiG, 2006), 243–271
- Kiaupienė, Jūratė, ‘Mes, Lietuva: Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės bajorija XVI a.: viešasis ir privatus gyvenimas’ (Vilnius: Kronta, 2003)
- Kieniewicz, Leszek, ‘Sekretariat Stefana Batorego. Zbiorowość i kariery sekretarzy królewskich’, in *Spółczesność staropolskie: studia i szkice*, ed. by Andrzej Wyczański and Anna Izydorczyk, 4 vols (Warszawa: PWN, 1976–1986), IV (1986), 33–69
- Korczak, Lidia, *Litewska Rada wielkksiążęca w XV wieku* (Kraków: PAU, 1998)
- Lulewicz, Henryk, *Gniewów o unię ciąg dalszy. Stosunki polsko-litewskie w latach 1569–1588* (Warszawa: Neriton, 2002)
- Michalewiczowa, Maria, ‘Iwan Sapieha’, *Internetowy Polski Słownik Biograficzny* <<https://www.ipsb.nina.gov.pl/a/biografia/iwan-sapieha>> [accessed 15 February 2018]
- Nagielski, Mirosław, ‘Mikołaj Sapieha h. Lis’, *Internetowy Polski Słownik Biograficzny*, <<https://www.ipsb.nina.gov.pl/a/biografia/mikolaj-sapieha-h-lis-wojewoda-nowogrodzki-zm-1638>> [accessed 10 February 2018]
- 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*, ed. by Ryszard Skowron (Cracow: Societas Vistulana, 2009), 245–62
- , ‘Uplywy pratektyzianizmu na farmiravanne składu kantsyliariyi i skarba VKL u aposhniai treti XVI st.’, <http://pawet.net/library/history/bel_history/padalinski/>

- 22/Уплыў пратэక్షынізму на фарміраванне складу канцылярыі і скарба_ВКЛ_у_апошняй_трэці_XVI_ст.html> [accessed 28 October 2017]
- Radaman, Andrei, 'Klienty i 'prianseli' Astafeia Bahdanavicha Valovicha u Navahradskim pavetse VKL u 1565–1587 hh.', in *Unus pro omnibus: Valovichy u historyi Vialikaha kniastva Litouskaha XV–XVIII stst.*, ed. by Aliaksei Ivanavich Shalanda (Minsk: Medysont, 2014), 284–96
- Ragauskienė, Raimonda, *Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės kancleris Mikalojus Radvila Rudasis (apie 1515–1584 m.)* (Vilnius: Valstybės žinios, 2002)
- , 'Radzivil Ryzhii i Radzivil Sirotk: preemstvennost klienturyi v Velikom Knyazhestve Litovskom v XVI v.', in *Na sbliabah da vzaemarazumennya. Navukovy zbormik* (Minsk: Bjelaruski knigazbor, 2000), 209–15
- and Ragauskas Aivas, 'Vieną ar dvi žmonas turėjo Augustinas Rotundas Meleskis (apie 1520–1584 m.)? Nauji duomenys įžymiojo Vilniaus vaito biografijai', *Lietuvos istorijos metraštis* 2000 (2001), 20–54
- Urzednicy centralni i dygnitarze Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego XIV–XVIII wieku: spisy*, ed. by Henryk Lulewicz and Andrzej Rachuba (Kórnik: Biblioteka Kórnicka, 1994)
- Tomczak, Andrzej, 'Kilka uwag o kancelarii królewskiej w drugiej połowie XVI w', *Archeion* 37 (1962), 235–55
- Tygielski, Wojciech, 'Klientela: więzi społeczne – grupy nacisku', in *Władza i społeczeństwo w XVI i XVII w. Prace ofiarowane Antoniemu Mączakowi w sześćdziesiątą rocznicę urodzin* (Warszawa: PWN, 1989), pp. 261–82
- Urzednicy Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego: spisy*, ed. by Henryk Lulewicz, Andrzej Rachuba, Przemysław P. Romaniuk and Andrzej Haratym, 5 vols (Warszawa: DiG, 2003–2018), III: *Księstwo Żmudzkie. XV–XVIII wiek* (2015)
- Żelewski, Roman, 'Organizacja koronnej służby dyplomatycznej za Zygmunta Augusta', in *Polska służba dyplomatyczna XVI–XVIII w.* (Warszawa: PWN, 1966), 81–144

Marius Sirutavičius – PhD, Vytautas Magnus University; his scholarly interests cover the history of diplomacy; e-mail: m.sirutavicius@gmail.com