

Early Modern Diplomatic Studies

Introduction

Over the last decade there have been several calls for new methodological and conceptual approaches to diplomatic studies.¹ For some scholars of international relations this call was linked to a greater recognition that diplomats should be studied as part of international interaction, not least as a means of understanding the gap between theory and practice. Iver Neumann conducted an anthropological study of a modern foreign office as participant observer in an attempt to better understand the dynamics of international affairs,² while Paul Sharp suggested creating a 'diplomatic theory' of international relations rooted in what diplomats have said about the enterprise in which they are engaged.³ Broadly speaking scholars no longer view diplomacy and foreign policy as co-terminous. Rather they appreciate that how relations between polities were conducted was as important as the goals of the monarchs or heads of state involved in the relationship. Historians too have aimed to reassess diplomacy by focussing on diplomats' own experiences and thoughts on their activities.⁴

A willingness to engage in new methods and ask new questions has been at the heart of most calls to rethink how diplomacy is studied historically, whatever period is being addressed.⁵ While praising the increasing interaction between literary and historical studies, John Watkins called for scholars to adopt a broader multidisciplinary approach to early modern diplomatic studies.⁶ Although few scholars have so far achieved (or even attempted) this multidisciplinaryity, there have been considerable developments within early modern diplomatic studies over the last two decades with respect to the methods scholars have adopted and the range of subjects they have considered. This essay reviews some of these historiographical shifts predominantly with reference to the fifteenth, sixteenth, and early seventeenth centuries and suggests directions in which the field might profitably develop in the future. This period has traditionally been seen as crucial to the development of diplomatic practices, for it witnessed the emergence of a distinctive mode of diplomatic practice—the adoption of resident embassies by European powers. Recent developments in our understanding of this formative period therefore have the potential to inform how scholars of other periods approach issues such as diplomatic agency and long-term patterns of diplomatic development.

The origins of modern diplomacy?

Garrett Mattingly's seminal *Renaissance Diplomacy* (1955) long dominated studies of early modern diplomacy.⁷ Mattingly suggested that the origins of permanent diplomacy lay in the political upheaval of the Milanese wars of the mid-fifteenth century; this prompted Italian princes to send resident ambassadors in order to strengthen their alliances and coordinate their military efforts more effectively. The Peace of Lodi (1454) that followed created a political environment in which even polities whose legal relationship could be considered politically neutral felt the need to exchange ambassadors. Resident diplomacy only expanded north of the Alps, Mattingly argued, when the political uncertainties and then outbreak of war in Italy in the 1490s occasioned more diplomatic activity between Italian polities, while the expansionist rivalry between the French and Spanish monarchs led them to pursue closer alliances with their rivals' neighbours.⁸ Mattingly believed that the emergence of the fully-fledged modern system, however, followed the Peace of Westphalia (1648).⁹ In this, he was following an established orthodoxy that Westphalia inaugurated an international system that recognised territorial sovereignty, the principle of internal autonomy, the authority of a state to control its borders, and a system of international relations based on the notion of 'balance of power'.¹⁰

Many of these conclusions have been questioned over the last two decades. Mattingly's chronological framework has received compelling challenges, not least as the volume and geographical range of diplomatic activity in the later medieval period was more extensive than had previously been thought.¹¹ Studies of the Italian principalities and city states have problematized the notion that resident diplomacy became the norm in the wake of the Peace of Lodi, suggesting that some of the larger Italian polities did not introduce the regular use of resident ambassadors until after the Peace of Cateau Cambresis (1559), while some smaller republics did so later still.¹² Isabella Lazzarini's overview of Italy espied broad patterns based on the status and type of polity involved, arguing that the first-rank Italian powers adopted the use of residents between the 1460s and 1480s whereas some second-rank Italian powers sent longer-term envoys at an earlier date, but were more likely to operate through informal channels and found it more difficult to sustain the resident system. At the same time, she suggested that principalities were more likely to employ resident ambassadors than republics and oligarchies whose international relationships were more likely to be founded on trade.¹³ Rome, as the centre of the Catholic church, attracted resident diplomats earlier and in larger concentrations than elsewhere, but did not feel the need to reciprocate.¹⁴ A European exception, 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.¹⁵ Asymmetrical relations are more commonly associated with European diplomacy with non-European polities. The Ottoman sultans, for instance, increasingly received resident agents or diplomats from Europe, but did not engage in resident diplomacy until much later than their European counterparts because it did not suit their political needs.¹⁶ Even the form that resident diplomacy in Renaissance Europe took might owe more to non-European influences than was once believed—Daniel Goffman has conjectured that Italian-Ottoman contact might have shaped the development of resident diplomacy in Europe.¹⁷ Cumulatively, this scholarship has suggested the rejection of a teleological narrative in favour of a more multifaceted understanding of diplomatic developments, one that recognises that there were multiple moments of transition in different places, even within the Italian peninsula, not all of which produced enduring results. Meanwhile, historians and IR scholars alike have shown that the Peace of Westphalia was rooted in existing diplomatic practice and conceptual frameworks: the negotiators borrowed heavily from earlier conventions surrounding peace conferences, such as those resulting in the Franco-Spanish Treaty of Vervins (1598), while the terms of the Peace were rooted in traditional, mutually-accepted notions such as dynastic interest.¹⁸ Furthermore, Stephen Krasner has argued that many subsequent peace treaties violated the states-system in some way, while the principle that states should be free from foreign intervention was only explicitly articulated at the end of the eighteenth century.¹⁹ Westphalia cannot mark a watershed if on the one hand it merely developed pre-existing traditions and if on the other it did not actually articulate the states-system model that it was long believed to.

Other scholars have questioned just how modern the diplomacy that emerged during the early modern period was. For some of the smaller Italian states diplomatic activities co-existed with a range of other political duties and their diplomats might best be understood to have more in common with medieval *procuratores* than with the resident ambassadors of the modern world.²⁰ As Riccardo Fubini's work suggests, the lack of institutionalisation of diplomacy makes the equation of residency and modernity problematic.²¹ Any straightforward notion of the modern system emerging in this period is further problematized by a greater appreciation of the complexity of diplomatic conventions. Lucien Bély contended that the international community of the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries was still very much a 'society of princes' where foreign relations was influenced by the dynastic considerations of monarchs, which were not always easily reconciled with their

states' court protocols and growing—and centralising—administration.²² Certainly, the language of *amicitia*, or friendship, used in diplomatic negotiations and legal documents such as treaties indicates a mental framework in which the relationships between polities was conceived in terms of the friendships or enmities of princes or republics.²³ More generally, historians of diplomacy are increasingly turning from a focus on the state, constitutions and bureaucracies to look more closely at princely courts and dynasties. Nonetheless modern concerns live on implicitly in different guises. Many scholars feel the need to discuss whether the diplomatic corps they study underwent 'professionalization' in this period, often using factors such as man-hours, repeat missions, secularity, gentrification, or regional specialisation as benchmarks.²⁴ Several of these criteria have limited utility in helping us to understand early modern diplomacy, not least as the papacy oversaw a diplomatic machinery which provided training and clear career progression by the seventeenth century (in contrast to many secular powers), which brings into question any attempt to equate professionalism and secularity.²⁵ Meanwhile the notion of gentrification going hand in hand with professionalization is belied by Hamish Scott's picture of an increasingly homogenous, French, and aristocratic diplomatic culture of the 'long' eighteenth century.²⁶ And if, even after the introduction of foreign service examinations, several countries continued to make exceptions to the expected qualifications for those from the highest social ranks irrespective of educational credentials,²⁷ we might wonder if attempts to find 'modern' or 'professional' practices in the earlier period are misguided.

Early modern handbooks on ambassadors tended to emphasise skill sets and social standing.²⁸ Perhaps we could more profitably consider our diplomats' interpersonal and linguistic skills and their ability to adapt to the social world of the courts and princes to which they were sent, than assess them against anachronistic concepts. Indeed, André Krischer has pointed to ceremonial knowledge as a component of the 'professional' qualifications of city representatives, while highlighting that the factors constituting diplomatic 'professionalism' were temporally specific.²⁹ Hillard von Thiessen's notion of an ideal 'type-ancien' diplomacy based on shared aristocratic values, social networks, and bonds of obligation further highlights that contemporary cultural values often determined the suitability and efficacy of ambassadors.³⁰ This typology works well for the aristocratic diplomats who dominated the Baroque period, but a broader framework is needed to encompass the more varied social types of diplomats—including merchants and clerics—who were often less socialised into court culture.³¹

Diplomatic personnel and diplomacy as a social practice

The narratives of early modern state formation in which Mattingly's schema was rooted have been substantially complicated and nuanced by subsequent generations of scholars. Unsurprisingly, those working within national historiographical traditions that are more sceptical of the emergence of the state in the early modern period have adopted somewhat different approaches to the study of diplomacy. For some, talking about premodern 'international relations' is inappropriate as there was no nation state to conduct it; instead they urge us to think in terms of 'external relations'. Others suggest that we should interpret terms such as 'foreign policy' and 'diplomacy' expansively before the existence of nation states. As a result, some scholars have argued that urban entities could be engaged in 'diplomacy'.³² Conceptualising diplomatic activity as the social discourse between two entities allows a more permissive understanding of diplomacy as it de-emphasises the role of sovereignty.³³

Questioning where the boundaries of diplomatic agency lay, whether with respect to the types of political societies that could engage in it or with regard to the individuals or groups who could exercise it on their behalf, has been a marked feature of much recent scholarship.

This need to probe the limits of diplomacy is particularly acute in the case of complex political entities such as the Holy Roman Empire or Ottoman Empire, where the multivalent political relationships and hierarchies involved make it difficult to determine where internal imperial politics ended and relations between distinct polities began. At the very least, within such multifaceted polities there was a need for semi-autonomous towns, dukedoms, or provinces to engage in relations with one another. Studies of the Ottoman Empire have begun to give greater scrutiny to the ways in which these subordinate entities did so, demonstrating that their interactions were arenas for claiming relative status.³⁴ Imperial cities in Germany were also eager to stake their place within the inter-princely community and utilised a variety of strategies, including the textual and ceremonial means at their disposal, in order to do so.³⁵

A parallel development has been a broader conceptualisation of who might reasonably be considered to have possessed diplomatic agency. The realisation that states and proto-states could not be entirely autonomous actors has led to a broader interest in intermediaries in the early modern world.³⁶ Although many polities did adopt resident ambassadors before the seventeenth century, a substantial number of the individuals undertaking diplomatic assignments were not fully-accredited ambassadors. Recent investigations of the activities of agents, for instance, have pointed to the multiple roles many adopted: musicians, merchants, artists, antiquarians, and court entertainers might all take on diplomatic roles of varying degrees of officiality.³⁷ A deeper appreciation of the diplomatic process and the multiplicity of factors which helped to shape relations between polities is meanwhile emerging from studies of the varied contributions of those involved as translators, whether officially or unofficially in the diplomatic process, and those who hosted diplomats on their travels.³⁸

The proliferation of who might be considered diplomats has sprung from greater awareness not just of the mechanics of diplomacy, but also a reconceptualization of diplomacy as a socio-political process.³⁹ The appreciation that court politics was often determined by personal relationships—between the king and his consorts or courtiers and between different courtiers—that has increasingly marked political history since the 1980s was slower to emerge in studies of early modern international relations, even though the importance of interpersonal relations pervades early modern writing on diplomacy. Indeed Isabella Lazzarini has recently proposed that the new humanist discourses that diplomats were adopting in the fifteenth century permit us greater access to the ways in which emotion was used within inter-princely relations.⁴⁰ Many scholars have adopted an actor-centred approach to early modern diplomatic studies. Placing ambassadors at the heart of diplomatic analyses has suggested that successful diplomacy depended, at least in part, on the relationships they could cultivate, whether at their host court or with the monarchs they represented, or through their pre-existing contacts and personal resources.⁴¹ Indeed, the familial and patronage bonds of an individual diplomat could heavily impact his effectiveness and room for manoeuvre, perhaps explaining why some families seemingly decided to invest collectively in forging successful diplomatic careers.⁴²

Understanding diplomacy as a socio-political activity has brought much-needed attention to the roles of women in diplomatic processes. Previous studies focussed on the most prominent women involved in the relations between polities: queens regnant and regent,⁴³ but recent work has examined the influence wielded by queens consort, favoured royal mistresses, and the wives and sisters of the political elites. Although non-royal women were largely excluded from formal diplomacy, female courtiers were often vital intermediaries who helped to facilitate the diplomatic process.⁴⁴ When ambassadors were denied access to their political contacts at court, as occurred when Charles IX of Sweden limited the sociability of foreign ambassadors and domestic politicians, female courtiers attained greater agency as sources of information and brokerage.⁴⁵ Meanwhile, ambassadors' wives were important at an informal level helping to create links to important courtiers and other

diplomats, a role that took on new importance should the ambassador be absent for any reason⁴⁶ and on at least some occasions the ambassador and his wife acted as a ‘diplomatic working couple’.⁴⁷

Daniel Riches’s analysis of relations between Brandenburg and Sweden in the seventeenth century argued that there was a need to redefine “‘diplomat” broadly to include not only formally-credentialed representatives of governments, but also the number of officers, bureaucrats, clergymen, merchants and scholars involved in creating and servicing the relationship over time and giving it its particular flavour’.⁴⁸ Riches maintained that the transnational network of individuals collectively pursuing the same policy that he espied in Brandenburg-Swedish relations was somewhere between the social science notions of an ‘epistemic community’ (a network of experts united by shared beliefs) and a ‘transnational advocacy network’ (a network of activists who share a common principle or ideological commitment).⁴⁹ While this has usefully highlighted the extent and depth of networks that cut across political borders, we should be wary of applying anachronist social science models (as opposed to drawing upon social science methods), however loosely. Equally, Riches’ broad conception of ‘diplomat’ could easily be pushed too far: anyone who crossed a border or discussed international politics had the potential to influence or service international relations, but this did not make them diplomats. Extending the label to everyone who conversed with other political actors about foreign policy would create a very substantial diplomatic community indeed.

Meanwhile, a provocative essay by Michael Auwers has raised important questions about previous interpretations of artists’ international activities, contending that Peter Paul Rubens was primarily sent to foreign courts as a gift—the present being access to his artistic talents—and not as an informal negotiator whose status gave him informal access to the monarchs he painted.⁵⁰ Auwers’ theory has broader implications and suggests that in some cases, at least, we may have overestimated the diplomatic role of such non-state actors.

Modes of communication and cultural exchange

Another major theme within recent reassessments of early modern diplomacy has been non-verbal communication. Early modern diplomatic ceremonial was essential to the expression of diplomatic hierarchies.⁵¹ Building upon Barbara Stollberg-Rillinger’s notion of symbolic communication,⁵² recent studies have collectively demonstrated that polities used ceremony and ritual to negotiate international hierarchies and stake their claims to a favourable place in the international order.⁵³ Disputes over precedence could become a means by which powers jostled for position in lieu of open war.⁵⁴ Indeed, the contemporary concern with ceremonial issues was such that precedence and protocol had to be settled before major peace negotiations could discuss the terms of peace treaties; it might even act as a litmus test for the discussions that followed.⁵⁵ Where in the country, city, and palace an embassy was received, by whom, and how all communicated important messages about the prestige with which it (and the ruler sending it) was viewed; equally what diplomats and their hosts wore, the gestures individual politicians made, and the degree and type of hospitality they received all held symbolic meaning.⁵⁶

Analyses of diplomatic ceremonial have also proved useful in reassessing our understanding of diplomatic relationships between polities with vastly different normative systems, such as European diplomacy with non-European polities. It is often assumed that relations between polities that were evidently very different or that were cross-confessional in nature inevitably led to cultural clashes.⁵⁷ This has been seen as particularly true of European relations with non-European powers. Meanwhile, Sanjay Subrahmanyam has suggested that imperial competition did not necessarily lead to clashes, arguing that the Moghul, Ottoman, and Safavid empires were culturally commensurable, as they possessed overlapping cultural

zones and shared literary, military, and religious codes.⁵⁸ Cultural understanding, however, could be achieved over time through the diplomatic process, not least through discussions about and performance of ceremony. Christian Windler's analysis of French consuls in Tunis demonstrated that political actors from different normative systems could forge a shared understanding of political processes through repeated (and sometimes contested) diplomatic interactions.⁵⁹ Misunderstandings and clashes did sometimes occur. But diplomacy was a site of cultural exchange where polities learned about each other's codes and practices.⁶⁰ In other cases, political actors from seemingly different polities may have been more able to decode the ways in which hierarchies and status were expressed at foreign courts than was hitherto believed. Jan Hennings has shown that Russia, long thought to possess an idiosyncratic diplomatic culture, nevertheless participated in the European honour society. Moreover, he suggests that European and Russian diplomats were capable of negotiating the ceremonial system at play in diplomatic encounters: they may have contested aspects of protocol, particularly their place within it, but this was because they understood full well what that protocol denoted.⁶¹

Yet we should not confine our analyses of cross-cultural diplomacy to European relations with non-Europeans. A degree of cultural relativism was at play in any diplomatic encounter, even in intra-Asian and intra-European relations. It could take considerable cultural flexibility for European monarchs to negotiate with the Swiss cantons, for instance.⁶² Certainly, the ideas about cultural relativism that underpin much recent scholarship on extra-European diplomacy might profitably be applied to aspects of European interstate and inter-princely relations not merely to highlight the ways in which non-sovereign polities adapted themselves to a world of princes, but also to assess meaningfully the differences between seemingly similar courts. One profitable way to investigate this would be by examining cross-confessional diplomacy within Christian Europe as well as diplomacy between polities of different religions.⁶³ Another would be to examine the practices and experiences of the collective of diplomats from various polities at a particular court centre. Catherine Fletcher has taken a court-centric approach in her recent study of the development of resident diplomacy in Renaissance Rome, which has allowed her to explore different aspects of Roman diplomatic culture in some detail.⁶⁴ Applying the same framework to other courts could provide important insights into the ways in which diplomatic cultures developed, were transmitted, and impacted upon domestic political cultures.

Concurrently, the importance of embassies in cultural exchange has emerged in a different scholarly context: the art-historical interest in the role of diplomats in the circulation of works of art. During the seventeenth century and for much of the sixteenth, diplomats were art, or broader cultural, agents for their rulers and even for high-ranking domestic courtiers. Consequently, diplomats were not only important intermediaries of material cultures between polities, but also able to use art and material goods in order to advance their own political careers, particularly as collecting culture developed at European courts.⁶⁵

Recent studies of diplomatic gift exchanges have also highlighted the role of diplomacy in the transnational movement of material goods. Gifts were integral to international relations. They were given and received within a framework of reciprocity,⁶⁶ albeit one that was also marked by competition. They could be used, for instance, to promote a ruler's international image and cultural superiority.⁶⁷ Indeed, the items sent as gifts were often chosen due to the prestige attached to them: 'sovereign gifts' were a means of claiming status, equality, and authority within the international honour society.⁶⁸ Gift-giving constructed relationships between princes in multiple ways—their acceptance or refusal could be used to adjust the honour balance between rulers, or even to try to secure loans without making costly trade concessions.⁶⁹ In Islamic polities, the display of the gift was important to

the domestic, as well as the international status of the recipient;⁷⁰ how gifts were displayed and subsequently re-used within European diplomacy deserves further attention.

Diplomatic actors used the material and visual cultures available to them at early modern courts as an integral part of their diplomatic negotiations: this included former gifts. The diplomatic utility of portraits, for instance lay, at least in part, in a diplomat or ruler's ability to use them to complement or complicate the messages he or she was openly expressing.⁷¹ Just as we have become more attuned to the meaning of the spaces in which diplomatic interactions took place, so too must we pay greater attention to the wide variety of ways in which visual and material culture were integral to diplomatic practice⁷² and the ways in which visual, verbal and symbolic communication interacted and combine art-historical with anthropologically-inflected methods to do so.

Literature and diplomacy

Early modern diplomacy was in part a bureaucratic practice; successful diplomacy depended upon successful textual strategies. It was also a performative endeavour. No wonder, then, that John Watkins identified interdisciplinary work in literature and history as key to understanding it.⁷³ This is particularly true of some non-European diplomatic relationships where literary texts and poetical composition were integral, for instance relationships conducted within the 'Sinosphere'.⁷⁴ Meanwhile a renewed literary-critical focus on European diplomacy is substantially enhancing our understanding of the international context for literary texts. Timothy Hampton has compellingly shown that developments in Renaissance diplomacy had a profound effect on the composition and structure of numerous literary genres across a wide range of European cultures; it was by no means limited to the literary compositions of diplomats or former diplomats.⁷⁵ In contrast to new-historicist studies which often categorised any mediation of power relationships 'diplomacy', Hampton's 'diplomatic moment' has brought actual diplomatic negotiations, processes, and structures into much sharper focus within literary studies. The influence of diplomatic considerations on a text's production or the tropes within it has produced new interpretations of works from a broad range of literary genres including history plays, comedy, and poetry.⁷⁶

There are still significant areas in which much remains to be done. Given the focus on collecting, it is surprising that more has not been written about diplomats as bibliophiles and bibliographers. Few scholars have excavated the relationship between diplomacy and print,⁷⁷ despite Martin Lowry's suggestion that diplomats were instrumental in the spread of printing in the Italian peninsula.⁷⁸ Most existing scholarship focusses on diplomats sending books across borders.⁷⁹ Yet work on the relationship between diplomacy and the press in the modern period shows the benefits of excavating the relationship between diplomatic practices and print culture. It has been suggested, for instance, that the mass media of the nineteenth century made diplomatic expertise even more important.⁸⁰ We might ask how did diplomatic practice respond to the development of print, the impact of which was less expansive, but no less important? Or the emergence of the newspaper? And what can diplomacy add to our conceptualisation of early modern 'public' spheres?

Translation studies also seems ripe for a greater examination of diplomatic influences. The increasing emphasis on the cultural, intellectual, social and political contexts for early modern translation has led scholars to view translation as a form of authorship and a greater awareness of the links between different countries' literary cultures.⁸¹ However the role of diplomats—whether in sourcing, publishing, translating, or circulating translations—has attracted surprisingly little interest. Diplomats' part in providing source texts, securing their publication and translating them promises to be a rich vein of research for diplomatic historians and scholars of translation alike.⁸²

Literary analyses might simultaneously offer new insights into diplomatic attitudes and international developments, not least as the willingness to embrace a wider corpus of forms of writing has brought within the purview of literary critics several genres used by diplomatic historians, including ethnographic literature, correspondence, and even diplomatic and intelligence reports.⁸³ Considerations of diplomatic discourses have offered important insights into shifts in diplomatic practice, revealing conceptual developments in inter-princely relations and the adoption of humanist rhetoric and oratory.⁸⁴ Meanwhile investigations into royal correspondence have refined our understanding of the nuanced means by which rulers sought to persuade, cajole, and reprimand one another within the bounds of their 'friendship'. Several of these studies have begun to consider the material text.⁸⁵ Yet to understand fully the role of princely correspondence in shaping international relations we must also pay attention to the specific, not just the generic, purpose of their materiality and the ceremonial contexts into which they moved. Indeed, royal correspondence is illustrative of a broader point: the complexities of early modern diplomacy mean that its scholars need to be multidisciplinary in their approach not merely interdisciplinary.

Further routes forward

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. Practitioners draw on a wide range of methodological and theoretical approaches and are tackling a wide range of issues and relationships that scarcely featured when Mattingly wrote. Equally, they are analysing inter-princely relations over a much larger geographical expanse than was the case twenty years ago.⁸⁶ Relations between the Ottoman Empire and Europe have attracted especial interest.⁸⁷ This has occurred in tandem with a de-centring of Europe within studies of the early modern world more broadly.⁸⁸ The interest in the development of resident diplomacy as part of the emergence of 'modern diplomacy' necessarily set an agenda with a Euro-centric focus. Yet resident diplomacy was, at least until the eighteenth century, a European anomaly. Putting the spotlight on non-European diplomacy can not only help us to understand intra-Asian or intra-African diplomacy in their own right, but will shed light on why Europe was anomalous too. Diplomacy also has much to offer global history and its methods. Global history tends to focus on empire, long-distance trade, migration, biological exchange, material culture, and the globalization of knowledge, but rarely looks at diplomatic interactions. Yet studies of diplomacy can offer important insights into global connectedness and information communities.⁸⁹

Too often scholars analyse a diplomatic relationship by looking at it from one end of what was a two-way relationship.⁹⁰ Analysing it from the point of view of both partners will produce a more sophisticated understanding of specific international relationships. Even more importantly, more comparative studies will help the field to advance by creating a body of work that permits scholars to draw conclusions about bigger patterns in diplomatic practice based on religion, the type of polity and the region(s) in which diplomatic relations were occurring. They can offer a means of 'decentring' Europe without over-correcting or applying anachronistic notions of globalisation. But as anyone researching diplomacy knows, its study involves considerable geographical, disciplinary, and linguistic challenges. One way to create more comparative studies and achieve the multidisciplinary that the field requires is through more regular collaboration between colleagues. This should also help us to move outside the—often unstated—concerns of national scholarly traditions and develop new methods and approaches that draw on the best that each area of diplomatic studies has to offer.

Bibliography

- Adams, R., and Cox, R. (eds.), *Diplomacy and Early Modern Culture* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011).
- Akkerman, N., 'The Postmistress, The Diplomat, and a Black Chamber?: Alexandrine of Taxis, Sir Balthazar Gerbier and the Power of Postal Control', in R. Adams and R. Cox (eds.), *Diplomacy and Early Modern Culture* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), 172-88.
- Allinson, R., *A Monarchy of Letters: Royal Correspondence and English Diplomacy in the Reign of Elizabeth I* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012).
- Anderson, M. A., *The Rise of Modern Diplomacy 1450-1919* (London: Longman, 1993).
- Ari, B., 'Early Ottoman Diplomacy: Ad Hoc Period', in N. R. Yurdusev (ed.), *Ottoman Diplomacy: Conventional or Unconventional?* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004), 36-65.
- Auwers, M., 'The Gift of Rubens: Rethinking the Concept of Gift-Giving in Early Modern Diplomacy', *European History Quarterly*, 43/3 (2013): 421-41.
- Bajetta, C. M., Coatelen, G., and Gibson, J. (eds.), *Elizabeth I's Foreign Correspondence: Letters, Rhetoric, and Politics* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014).
- Barker, S., and Hosington, B. M. (eds.), *Renaissance Cultural Crossroads: Translation, Print and Culture in Britain, 1473-1640* (Leiden: Brill, 2013).
- Bastian, C., Dade, E., von Thiessen, H., and Keller, K., *Das Geschlecht der Diplomatie: Geschlechterrollen in den Außenbeziehungen vom Spätmittelalter bis zum 20. Jahrhundert* (Cologne: Böhlau, 2014).
- Behr, A., *Diplomatie als Familiengeschäft: Die Casati als spanisch-mailändische Gesandte in Luzern und Chur (1660-1700)* (Zürich: Chronos Verlag, 2015).
- Beem, C. (ed.), *The Foreign Relations of Elizabeth I* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011).
- Behrens-Abouseif, D., *Practising Diplomacy in the Mamluk Sultanate: Gifts and Material Culture in the Medieval Islamic World* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2014).
- Bell, G. M., 'Elizabethan Diplomacy: The Subtle Revolution', in M. R. Thorp and A. J. Slavin (eds.), *Politics, Religion and Diplomacy in Early Modern Europe* (Kirkville, Mo.: Sixteenth Century Journal Publishers, 1994), 267-89.
- Bély, L., 'Souveraineté et souverains: la question du cérémonial dans les relations internationales à l'époque moderne', *Annuaire-bulletin de la Société de l'histoire de France* (1993): 27-43.
- Bély, L., *Les relations internationales en Europe: XVIIe-XVIIIe siècles* (Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1992).
- Bély, L., *La société des princes, XVIe-XVIIIe siècles* (Paris: A. Fayard, 1999).
- Bély, L., *L'art de la paix en Europe: Naissance de la diplomatie moderne XVI^e-XVIII^e* (Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 2007).
- Berridge, G. R., 'Diplomatic Integration with Europe before Selim III', in Yurdusev (ed.), *Ottoman Diplomacy: Conventional or Unconventional?* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004), 114-30.
- Biase, C. di (ed.), *Travel and Translation in the Early Modern Period* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2006).
- Biow, D., *Doctors, Ambassadors, Secretaries: Humanism and Professions in Renaissance Italy* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002).
- Brauner, C., 'Ein Schlüssel für zwei Truhen: Diplomatie als interkulturelle Praxis am Beispiel einer westafrikanischen Gesandtschaft nach Frankreich (1670/71)', *Historische Anthropologie*, 21/2 (2013): 199-226.

- Brigden, S., *Thomas Wyatt: The Heart's Forest* (London: Faber and Faber, 2012).
- Burbank, J., and Cooper, F., *Empires in World History: Power and the Politics of Difference* (Princeton: Princeton University Press).
- Burke, P., and Po-chia Hsia, R. (eds.), *Cultural Translation in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007).
- Burschel, P., and Vogel, C. (eds.), *Die Audienz: ritualisierter Kulturkontakt in der frühen Neuzeit* (Cologne: Böhlau, 2014).
- Carrió-Invernizzi, D., 'A New Diplomatic History and the Networks of Spanish Diplomacy in the Baroque Era', *The International History Review*, 36/4 (2014): 603-18.
- Charry, B., and Shahani, G., *Emissaries in Early Modern Literature and Culture* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009).
- Contini, A., 'Aspects of Medicean Diplomacy in the Sixteenth Century', in D. Frigo (ed.), (ed.), *Politics and Diplomacy in Early Modern Italy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 49-94.
- Craigwood, J., 'Diplomats and International Book Exchange', in A. Thomason, S. Burrows and E. Dziembowski (eds.), *Cultural Transfers: France and Britain in the Long Eighteenth Century* (Oxford: Voltaire Foundation, 2010), 57-69.
- Cutler, A., 'Significant Gifts: Patterns of Exchange in Late Antique, Byzantine and Early Islamic Diplomacy', *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies*, 38/1 (2008): 79-101.
- Darwin, J., *After Tamerlane: The Rise and Fall of Global Empires* (London: Bloomsbury Press, 2000).
- DeSilva, J., and Fletcher, C. (eds.) 'Italian Ambassadorial Networks in Early Modern Europe', a special edition of the *Journal of Early Modern History*, 14/6 (2010).
- Externbrink, S., 'Humanismus, Gelehrtenrepublik und Diplomatie. Überlegungen zu ihren Beziehungen in der Frühen Neuzeit', in H. von Thiesen and C. Windler (eds.), *Akteure der Außenbeziehungen: Netzwerke und Interkulturalität im historischen Wandel* (Cologne: Böhlau, 2010), 133-49.
- Farooqi, N. R., 'Diplomacy and Diplomatic Practice under the Mughals', *The Medieval History Journal*, 7/1 (2004): 59-86.
- Fletcher, C., *Diplomacy in Renaissance Rome: The Rise of the Resident Ambassador* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015).
- Floor, W. and Herzig, E. (eds.), *Iran and the World in the Safavid Age* (London: I. B. Tauris, 2012).
- Frank, A. G., *ReOrient: Global Economy in the Asian Age* (London: University of California Press, 1998).
- Frigo, D. (ed.), *Politics and Diplomacy in Early Modern Italy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999).
- Frigo, D., "'Small States' and Diplomacy: Mantua and Modena', in D. Frigo (ed.), *Politics and Diplomacy in Early Modern Italy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 147-76.
- Fubini, R., 'La 'residentialité' de l'ambassadeur dans le mythe et dans le réalité: une enquête sur les origins', in L. Bély, I. Richefort (eds.), *L'invention de la diplomatie: Moyen Age-temps modernes* (Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1998), 27-46.
- Fubini, R., 'Diplomacy and Government in the Italian City States of the Fifteenth Century (Florence and Venice)', in D. Frigo (ed.), *Politics and Diplomacy in Early Modern Italy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 25-48.
- Gehring, D. S., *Anglo-German Relations and the Protestant Cause: Elizabethan Foreign Policy and Pan-Protestantism* (London: Pickering and Chatto, 2013).

- Geppert, D., *Pressekriege: Öffentlichkeit und Diplomatie in des deutsch-britischen Beziehungen, 1896-1912* (Munich: Oldenborg, 2007).
- Ghobrial, J.-P. A., *The Whispers of Cities: Information Flows in Istanbul, London and Paris in the Age of William Trumbull* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014)
- Godsey, W. D., 'The Culture of Diplomacy and Reform in the Austro-Hungarian Foreign Office, 1867-1914', in M. Mósslang and T. Riotte (eds.), *The Diplomats' World: A Cultural History of Diplomacy 1815-1914* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 59-81.
- Goffman, D., 'Negotiating with the Renaissance State: the Ottoman Empire and the New Diplomacy', in V. H. Aksan and D. Goffman (eds.), *The Early Modern Ottomans: Remapping the Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 61-74.
- Gross, L. 'The Peace of Westphalia, 1648-1948', *The American Journal of International Law* 42/1 (1948): 20-41.
- Hampton, T., 'The Diplomatic Moment: Representing Negotiation in Early Modern Europe', *Modern Language Quarterly*, 67/1 (2006): 81-102.
- Hampton, T., *Fictions of Embassy: Literature and Diplomacy in Early Modern Europe* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2009).
- Haug, T., *Ungleiche Außenbeziehungen und grenzüberschreitende Patronage. Die französische Krone und die geistlichen Kurfürsten (1648–1679)* (Cologne: Böhlau, 2015).
- Heal, F., *The Power of Gifts: Gift-exchange in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015)
- Hennings, J., 'The Semiotics of Diplomatic Dialogue: Pomp and Circumstance in Tsar Peter I's Visit to Vienna in 1698', *International History Review*, 30/3 (2008): 515-44.
- Hennings, J., 'The Failed Gift: Ceremony and Gift-Fiving in Anglo-Russian Relations (1662-1664)', in I. B. Neumann and H. Leira (eds.), *International Diplomacy vol. 1: Diplomatic Institutions* (London: Sage Publications, 2013), 91-110.
- Hennings, J., *Russia and Courtly Europe: Ritual and the Culture of Diplomacy 1648-1725* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, forthcoming).
- Hill, R., 'The Ambassador as Art Agent: Sir Dudley Carleton and Jacobean Collecting', in E. Chaney (ed.), *The Evolution of English Collecting* (London: Yale University Press, 2003), 240-255.
- Höfele, A., and Koppenfels, W. von (eds.), *Renaissance Go-betweens: Cultural Exchange in Early Modern Europe* (Berlin: Gruyter, 2005).
- Holberton, E., *Poetry and the Cromwellian Protectorate* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009).
- Howarth, D., *Images of Rule: Art and Politics in the English Renaissance, 1485-1649* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1997).
- Huffman, J. P., *The Social Politics of Medieval Diplomacy: Anglo-German Relations (1066-1307)* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2000).
- Isom-Verhaaren, C., *Allies with the Infidel: The Ottoman and French Alliance in the Sixteenth Century* (London: I. B. Tauris, 2011).
- Jacobsen, H., *Luxury and Power: The Material World of the Stuart Diplomat 1660-1714* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011).
- Jansson, M., 'Measured Reciprocity: English Ambassadorial Gift Exchange in the 17th and 18th Centuries', *Journal of Early Modern History*, 9/3-4 (2005): 348-70.
- Jansson, M., *Art and Diplomacy: Seventeenth-Century English Decorated Royal Letters to Russia and the Far East* (Leiden: Brill, 2015).

- Jörg, C., and Jucker, M. (eds.), *Spezialisierung und Professionalisierung. Träger und Foren städtischer Aussenpolitik während des späten Mittelalters und der frühen Neuzeit* (Wiesbaden: Reichert, 2010).
- Kampmann, C., Lanzinner, M., and Braun, G. (eds.), *L'art de la paix. Kongresswesen und Friedensstiftung im Zeitalter des Westfälischen Friedens* (Münster: Aschendorff, 2011).
- Kang, D. C., 'Hierarchy in Asian International Relations 1300-1900', *Asian Security*, 1/1 (2005): 53-79.
- Kármán, G., 'Sovereignty and Representation: Tributary States in the Seventeenth-century Diplomatic System of the Ottoman Empire', in G. Kármán and L. Kunčević (eds.), *The European Tributary States of the Ottoman Empire in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (Leiden: Brill, 2013).
- Kauz, R., Rota, G. and Niederkorn, J. (eds.), *Diplomatisches Zeremoniell in Europa und im Mittleren Osten in der Frühen Neuzeit* (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2009).
- Kebulusek, M., 'Book Agents: Intermediaries in the Early Modern World of Books', in H. Cools, M. Kebulusek and B. Noldus (eds.), *Your Humble Servant: Agents in Early Modern Europe* (Hilversum, 2006), 97-108.
- Kebulusek, M., and Noldus, B. (eds.), *Double Agents: Cultural and Political Brokerage in Early Modern Europe* (Leiden: Brill, 2011).
- Kelley, L. C., *Beyond the Bronze Pillars: Envoy Poetry and the Sino-Vietnamese Relationship* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2005).
- Krasner, S. D., 'Rethinking the Sovereign State Model', *Review of International Studies*, 27/5 (2001): 17-42.
- Krischer, A., 'Ein nothwendig Stück der Ambassaden. Zur politischen Rationalität des diplomatischen Zeremoniells bei Kurfürst Clemens August', *Annalen des Historischen Vereins für den Niederrhein*, 205 (2002): 161-200.
- Krischer, A., *Reichsstädte in der Fürstengesellschaft. Zum politischen Zeichengebrauch in der Frühen Neuzeit* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2006).
- Krischer, A., 'Syndici als Diplomaten in der Frühen Neuzeit. Repräsentation, politischer Zeichengebrauch und Professionalisierung in der reichsstädtischen Außenpolitik', in C. Jörg and M. Jucker (eds.), *Spezialisierung und Professionalisierung. Träger und Foren städtischer Außenpolitik während des späten Mittelalters und der frühen Neuzeit* (Wiesbaden: Reichert, 2010), 254-86.
- Krischer, A., 'Das Gesandtschaftswesen und das vormoderne Völkerrecht', in M. Jucker, M. Kintzinger, R. C. Schwinges, B. Stollberg-Rilinger (eds.), *Rechtsformen Internationaler Politik. Theorie, Norm und Praxis vom 12. bis 18. Jahrhundert* (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 2011), 197-239.
- Kühnel, F., 'Westeuropa und das osmanische Reich in der frühen Neuzeit', *Zeitschrift für Historische Forschung*, 42/2 (2015): 251-83.
- Kühnel, F., "'Minister-like Cleverness, Understanding and Influence on Affairs": Ambassadors in Early Modern Courtly Ceremonies and Everyday Business at the Turn of the Eighteenth Century', in T. A. Sowerby and J. Hennings (eds.), *Practices of Diplomacy in the Early Modern World c.1400-1800* (London: Routledge, forthcoming).
- Kugeler, H. R. I., "'Le parfait ambassadeur". The Theory and Practice of Diplomacy in the Century Following the Peace of Westphalia', D.Phil. diss. (University of Oxford, 2006).
- Lazzarini, I., 'Renaissance Diplomacy' in I. Lazzarini and A. Gamberti (eds.), *The Italian Renaissance State* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 425-43.

- Larazzarini, I., *Communication and Conflict: Italian Diplomacy in the Early Renaissance, 1350-1520* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015).
- Lesaffer, R., 'Amicitia in Renaissance Peace and Alliance Treaties (1450-1530)', *Journal of the History of International Law*, 4/1 (2002): 77-99.
- Levin, C., and Watkins, J., *Shakespeare's Foreign Worlds: National and Transnational Identities in the Elizabethan Age* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2009).
- Levin, M. J., *Agents of Empire: Spanish Ambassadors in Sixteenth-Century Italy* (New York, 2005).
- Lowry, M., 'Diplomacy and the Spread of Printing', in L. Hellings and J. Goldfinch (eds.), *Bibliography and the Study of 15th-century Civilisation* (London: Wolfeboro, 1987), 124-37.
- Lugutke, D., *Diplomatie als soziale Institution: brandenburgische, sächsische und kaiserliche Gesandte in Den Haag, 1648-1720* (Münster: Waxmann, 2010).
- Matar, N., *In the Lands of Christians: Arab Travel Writing in the Seventeenth Century* (London: Routledge, 2003).
- Mattingly, G., *Renaissance Diplomacy* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1955).
- Maxson, B. J., *The Humanist World of Renaissance Florence* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2013).
- May, N. F., 'Das diplomatische Zeremoniell bei den Kongressen von Münster/Osnabrück, Nimwegen und Ryswick (1643-1697) in vergleichender Perspektive', in C. Kampmann, M. Lanzinner, and G. Braun (eds.), *L'art de la paix. Kongresswesen und Friedensstiftung im Zeitalter des Westfälischen Friedens* (Münster: Aschendorff, 2011), 261-79.
- Mitchell, C., *Sir Thomas Roe and the Mughal Empire* (Karachi: Area Study Centre for Europe, 2000).
- Mori, J., *The Culture of Diplomacy: Britain in Europe c. 1750-1830* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2011).
- Mulligan, W., 'Mobs and Diplomats: The Alabama Affair and British Diplomacy', in T. Riotte and M. Mösslang (eds.), *The Diplomats' World: A Cultural History of Diplomacy, 1815-1914* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 105-32.
- Murai, S., 'Poetry in Chinese as a Diplomatic Art in Premodern East Asia', in Kenneth R. Robinson (ed.), *Tools of Culture: Japan's Cultural, Intellectual, Medical, and Technological Contacts in East Asia, 1000s-1500s* (Ann Arbor: Association for Asian Studies, 2009).
- Neumann, I. B., 'What does it mean to be a diplomat?' *International Studies Perspectives*, 6/1 (2005): 72-93.
- Neumann, I. B., *At Home with the Diplomats: Inside a European Foreign Ministry* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2012).
- Nexon, D. H., *The Struggle for Power in Early Modern Europe: Religious Conflict, Dynastic Empires, and International Change* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009).
- Norrmann, S., 'Im Dienste der Dynastie: Frauen als Mittlerinnen bei Heiratsverhandlungen im Schweden der 1690er-Jahre' in C. Bastian et al (eds.), *Das Geschlecht der Diplomatie: Geschlechterrollen in den Außenbeziehungen vom Spätmittelalter bis zum 20. Jahrhundert* (Cologne: Böhlau, 2014).
- Osborne, T., *Dynasty and Diplomacy in the Court of Savoy: Political Culture and the Thirty Years' War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002).
- Osborne, T., 'The Surrogate War between the Savoy and the Medici: Sovereignty and Precedence in Early Modern Italy', *International History Review*, 29/1 (2007): 1-21.
- Osiander, A., 'Sovereignty, International Relations and the Westphalian Myth', *International Organization*, 55/2 (2001): 251-87.

- Otte, T. G., 'Outdoor Relief for the Aristocracy? European Nobility and Diplomacy, 1850-1914', in M. Mósslang and T. Riotte (eds.), *The Diplomats' World: A Cultural History of Diplomacy 1815-1914* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 23-57.
- Parmelee, L., *Good newes from Fraunce: French anti-league propaganda in late Elizabethan England* (Woodbridge: University of Rochester Press).
- Pérez Fernández, J. M., 'Translation, Diplomacy and Espionage': New Insights into James Mabbe's Career', *Translation and Literature*, 23/1 (2014): 1-22.
- Platt, F. J., 'The Elizabethan Foreign Office', *The Historian* (1994): 725-40.
- Plöger, K., *England and the Avignon Popes* (London: Legenda, 2005).
- Powell, J., and Rossiter, W. (eds.), *Authority and Diplomacy from Dante to Shakespeare* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2013).
- Riccardi, L., 'An Outline of Vatican Diplomacy in the Early Modern Age', in D. Frigo (ed.), *Politics and Diplomacy in Early Modern Italy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 95-108.
- Richefort, I., 'Présents diplomatiques et diffusion de l'image de Louis XIV', in L. Bély and I. Richefort (eds.), *L'invention de la diplomatie: Moyen Age-temps modernes* (Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1998), 263-79.
- Riches, D., *Protestant Cosmopolitanism and Diplomatic Culture: Brandenburg-Swedish Relations in the Seventeenth Century* (Leiden: Brill, 2013).
- Riotte, T., and Mösslang, M. (eds.), *The Diplomats' World: A Cultural History of Diplomacy, 1815-1914* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008).
- Roosen, W., 'Early Modern Diplomatic Ceremonial: A Systems Approach', *Journal of Modern History*, 52/3 (1980): 452-76.
- Rossiter, W., *Wyatt Abroad: Tudor Diplomacy and the Translation of Power* (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 2014).
- Rothman, N., *Brokering Empire: Trans-Imperial Subjects between Venice and Istanbul* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2012).
- Russell, J. G., *Diplomats at Work: Three Renaissance Studies* (Stroud: Sutton, 1992).
- Santaliestra, L. O., 'Lady Anne Fanshawe, Ambadress of England at the Court of Madrid (1664-1666)', in G. Sluga and C. James (eds.), *Women, Diplomacy and International Politics since 1500* (London: Routledge, 2016), 68-85.
- Schilling, H., *Konfessionalisierung und Staatsinteressen: internationale Beziehungen 1559-1660* (Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh, 2007).
- Schülting, S., Müller, S. L., and Hertel, R. (eds.), *Early Modern Encounters with the Islamic East: Performing Cultures* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2012).
- Schweizer, K. W., and Schumann, M. J., 'The Revitalisation of Diplomatic History: Renewed Reflections', *Diplomacy and Statecraft*, 19/2 (2008): 149-86.
- Scott, H., 'Diplomatic Culture in Old Regime Europe', in H. Scott and B. Simms (eds.), *Cultures of Power in Europe during the Long Eighteenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 58-84.
- Sharp, P., 'For Diplomacy: Representation and the Study of International Relations', *International Studies Review*, 1/1 (1999): 33-57.
- Sharp, P., *Diplomatic Theory of International Relations* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009).
- Sowerby, T. A., "'All our books do be sent into other countreys and translated": Henrician Polemic in its International Context', *English Historical Review*, 121 (2006): 1271-99.
- Sowerby, T. A., "'A memorial and a pledge of faith": Portraiture and Early Modern Diplomatic Culture', *English Historical Review*, 129 (2014): 296-331.

- Stewart, A. D., *The Armenian Kingdom and the Mamluks: War and Diplomacy During the Reigns of Het'um II (1289-1307)* (Leiden: Brill, 2001).
- Stollberg-Rillinger, B., 'Zeremoniell, Ritual, Symbol, Neue Forschungen zur symbolischen Kommunikation in Spätmittelalter und Früher Neuzeit', *Zeitschrift für Historische Forschung*, 27 (2000): 389-405.
- Stout, F. J., *Exploring Russia in the Elizabethan Commonwealth: The Muscovy Company and Giles Fletcher the Elder (1546-1611)* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2015).
- Subrahmanyam, S., *Courtly Encounters: Translating Courtliness and Violence in Early Modern Eurasia* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2012).
- Suzuki, S., Zhang, Y., and Quirk, J. (eds.), *International Orders in the Early Modern World: Before the Rise of the West* (London: Routledge, 2014).
- Teschke, B., *The Myth of 1648: Class, Geopolitics, and the Making of Modern International Relations* (London: Verso, 2003).
- Um, N. and Clark, L. R. (eds.), 'The Art of Embassy: Situating Objects and Images in the Early Modern Diplomatic Encounter', special edition of the *Journal of Early Modern History*, 20/1 (2016).
- Urbach, K., 'Diplomatic History since the Cultural Turn', *The Historical Journal*, 46/4 (2003): 991-7.
- van Gelder, M., and Krstić, T. (eds.), 'Cross-confessional Diplomacy and Diplomatic Intermediaries in the Early Modern Mediterranean', special edition of the *Journal of Early Modern History*, 19/2-3 (2015).
- von Thiessen, H., *Diplomatie und Patronage: Die spanisch-römischen Beziehungen 1605-1621 in akteurszentrierter Perspektive* (Epfendorf: Bibliotheca-Academica-Verl., 2010).
- von Thiessen, H., 'Diplomatie vom *type ancien*: Überlegungen zu einem Idealtypus des frühneuzeitlichen Gesandtschaftswesens', in H. von Thiessen and C. Windler (eds.), *Akteure der Aussenbeziehungen: Netzwerke und Interkulturalität im historischen Wandel* (Cologne: Böhlau, 2010).
- von Thiessen, H. and C. Windler (eds.), *Nähe in der Ferne: personale Verflechtung in den Aussenbeziehungen der Frühen Neuzeit* (Berlin: Dunker & Humblot, 2005).
- von Thiessen, H. and C. Windler (eds.), *Akteure der Aussenbeziehungen: Netzwerke und Interkulturalität im historischen Wandel* (Cologne: Böhlau, 2010).
- Walsby, M., and Kemp, G. (eds.), *The Book Triumphant: Print in Translation in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (Leiden: Brill, 2011).
- Warren, C., *Literature and the Law of Nations, 1580-1680* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015).
- Watkins, J., 'Toward a New Diplomatic History of Medieval and Early Modern Europe', *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies*, 38/1 (2008): 1-14.
- Wieland, C., *Fürsten, Freunde, Diplomaten: die römisch-florentinischen Beziehungen unter Paul V. (1605-1621)* (Cologne: Böhlau, 2004).
- Wieland, C., 'The Consequences of Early Modern Diplomacy: Entanglement, Discrimination, Mutual Ignorance—and State Building', in A. Flüchter and S. Richter (eds.), *Structures on the Move: Technologies of Governance in Transcultural Encounter* (London: Springer, 2012), 271-85.
- Windler, C., 'Diplomatic History as a Field for Cultural Analysis: Muslim-Cultural Relations in Tunis, 1700-1840', *The Historical Journal*, 44/1 (2001): 79-106.
- Windler, C., *La diplomatie comme experience de l'autre: consuls francais au Maghreb (1700-1840)* (Geneva: Droz, 2002).

- Windler, C., 'Diplomatie als Erfahrung fremder politischer Kulturen: Gesandte von Monarchen in den eidgenössischen Orten (16. Und 17. Jahrhundert)', *Geschichte und Gesellschaft*, 32/1 (2006): 5-44.
- Yurdusev, A. N., 'The Ottoman Attitude Toward Diplomacy', in A. N. Yurdusev (ed.), *Ottoman Diplomacy: Conventional or Unconventional?* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004), 5-35.
- Yurdusev, A. N. (ed.), *Ottoman Diplomacy: Conventional or Unconventional?* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004).

I would like to thank Jan Hennings and the two anonymous reviewers for their comments and suggestions.

-
- ¹ See for example Schweizer and Schumann, 'The Revitalisation of Diplomatic History'; Watkins, 'Toward a New Diplomatic History'; Carrió-Invernizzi, 'New Diplomatic History'.
- ² Neumann, 'What Does it Mean to be a Diplomat?'; Neumann, *At Home with the Diplomats*.
- ³ Sharp, 'For Diplomacy'; Sharp, *Diplomatic Theory*.
- ⁴ See for instance Kugeler, "'La parfait ambassadeur'" on diplomatic theory.
- ⁵ For the later period see for example Urbach, 'Diplomatic History'; Riotte and Mösslang, *Diplomats' World*; Mori, *Culture of Diplomacy*.
- ⁶ Watkins, 'Towards a New Diplomatic History'.
- ⁷ Many subsequent surveys such as Anderson, *Rise of Modern Diplomacy*, 1-40 have relied heavily on Mattingly's work.
- ⁸ Mattingly, *Renaissance Diplomacy*, 61-86, 105-118.
- ⁹ *Ibid.*, 178.
- ¹⁰ See for example Gross, 'Peace of Westphalia'.
- ¹¹ For example Plöger, *England and the Avignon Popes*; Stewart, *The Armenian Kingdom and the Mamluks*.
- ¹² Frigo (ed.), *Politics and Diplomacy*, esp. Contini, 'Aspects of Medicean Diplomacy'.
- ¹³ Lazzarini, 'Renaissance Diplomacy'; Lazzarini, *Communication and Conflict*, 31-48.
- ¹⁴ Fletcher, *Diplomacy in Renaissance Rome*.
- ¹⁵ Haug, *Ungleichene Außenbeziehungen*. This was also often true of 'urban diplomacy'.
- ¹⁶ See for example Yurdusev, 'Ottoman Attitudes'; Ari, 'Early Ottoman Diplomacy'; Berridge, 'Diplomatic Integration'; Isom-Verhaaren, *Allies with the Infidel*.
- ¹⁷ Goffman 'Negotiating with the Renaissance State'.
- ¹⁸ Osiander, 'Westphalian Myth'; Lesaffer, 'Peace Treaties'; Teschke, *Myth of 1648*.
- ¹⁹ Krasner, 'Rethinking the Sovereign State Model', 18-24, 34-41.
- ²⁰ Frigo, "'Small States'".
- ²¹ Fubini, 'La residentialité'; Fubini, 'Diplomacy and Government', 26-8.
- ²² Bély, *La société des princes*; Bély, *Les relations internationales*. Osborne took a similarly personal approach in *Dynasty and Diplomacy*.
- ²³ Lesaffer, 'Amicitia'.
- ²⁴ See Bell, 'Elizabethan Diplomacy'; Platt, 'Elizabethan Foreign Office'; Jörg and Jücker (eds.), *Spezialisierung und Professionalisierung*.
- ²⁵ Riccardi, 'An Outline of Vatican Diplomacy';
- ²⁶ Scott, 'Diplomatic Culture', esp. 72-9.
- ²⁷ Otte, 'Outdoor Relief'; Godsey, 'Culture of Diplomacy'.
- ²⁸ For recent summaries of this literature see Fletcher, *Diplomacy in Renaissance Rome*, 36-58, Wieland, 'The Consequences of Early Modern Diplomacy', 274-9; Kugeler, 'Le parfait ambassadeur', 25-80.
- ²⁹ Krischer, 'Syndici als Diplomaten'.
- ³⁰ Von Thiessen, 'Diplomatie vom *type ancien*'.
- ³¹ For Von Thiessen's own critique of his model see *ibid.*, 492-503.
- ³² Jörg and Jücker (eds.), *Spezialisierung und Professionalisierung*.
- ³³ Huffman, *Social Politics*.
- ³⁴ Kármán, 'Sovereignty and Representation'.
- ³⁵ Krischer, 'Das Gesandtschaftswesen und das vormoderne Völkerrecht'; Krischer, *Reichstädte*.

-
- ³⁶ Charry and Shahani (eds.), *Emissaries in Early Modern Literature and Culture*; Höfele and Koppenfels (eds.), *Renaissance Go-betweens*. See also Rothman, *Brokering Empire*.
- ³⁷ Keblusek and Noldus (eds.), *Double Agents*.
- ³⁸ See van Gelder and Krstić (eds.), 'Cross-confessional Diplomacy'.
- ³⁹ See for example Lugutke, *Diplomatie als soziale Institution*.
- ⁴⁰ Lazzarini, *Communication and Conflict*, 213-34.
- ⁴¹ Von Thiessen and Windler (eds.), *Akteure der Außenbeziehungen*; von Thiessen and Windler (eds.), *Nähe in der Ferne*; Wieland, *Fürsten, Freunde, Diplomaten*.
- ⁴² von Thiessen, *Diplomatie und Patronage*. See also DeSilva and Fletcher (eds.), 'Italian Ambassadorial Networks'. For the later period see Behr, *Diplomatie als Familiengeschäft*.
- ⁴³ See for example Beem, *Foreign Relations*; Russell, *Diplomats at Work*, 94-152.
- ⁴⁴ Bastian et al. (eds.), *Das Geschlecht der Diplomatie*. See also the essays by Keller, Prietzel, Bastian and Dade in von Thiessen and Windler (eds.), *Akteure*. For two rare studies of women with very different formal diplomatic roles see Bély, *L'art de la paix*, 213-24; Akkerman, 'The Postmistress'.
- ⁴⁵ Norrhem, 'Im Dienste der Dynastie'.
- ⁴⁶ Santaliestra, 'Lady Anne Fanshawe'.
- ⁴⁷ Kühnel, "'Minister-like Clerversness'".
- ⁴⁸ Riches, *Protestant Cosmopolitanism*, 2.
- ⁴⁹ Ibid., 14-15.
- ⁵⁰ Auwers, 'Gift of Rubens'.
- ⁵¹ Roosen, 'Early Modern Diplomatic Ceremonial'; Bély, 'Souveraineté et souverains'.
- ⁵² Stollberg-Rilinger, 'Zeremoniell, Ritual, Symbol.'
- ⁵³ Krischer, 'Ein notwendig Stück der Ambassaden'; Hennings, 'Semiotics of Diplomatic Dialogue'.
- ⁵⁴ Osborne, 'Surrogate Wars'.
- ⁵⁵ See for example May, 'Das diplomatische Zeremoniell'.
- ⁵⁶ See Kauz et al., *Diplomatisches Zeremoniell*; Burschel and Vogel, *Die Audienz*.
- ⁵⁷ See for example Stout, *Exploring Russia*.
- ⁵⁸ Subrahmanyam, *Courtly Encounters*.
- ⁵⁹ Windler, *La diplomatie comme experience de l'autre*.
- ⁶⁰ Windler, 'Diplomatic History'.
- ⁶¹ Hennings, *Russia and Courtly Europe*.
- ⁶² Windler, 'Diplomatie als Erfahrung fremder politischer Kulturen'.
- ⁶³ There is a growing literature that examines, at least in part, the importance of religion within diplomatic relations. See for example; Schilling, *Konfessionalisierung und Staatsinteressen*; Nexon, *Struggle for Power*; Kampmann et al. *L'art de la paix*, part 5; Riches, *Protestant Cosmopolitanism*; Gehring, *Anglo-German Relations*; Gelder and Krstić (eds.), 'Cross-confessional Diplomacy'; Isom-Verhaaren, *Allies with the Infidel*.
- ⁶⁴ Fletcher, *Diplomacy in Renaissance Rome*.
- ⁶⁵ Howarth, *Images of Rule*, 234-45; Hill, 'Ambassador as Art Agent'; Keblusek et al., *Double Agents*; Levin, *Agents of Empire*, 183-99; Jacobsen, *Luxury and Power*.
- ⁶⁶ Jansson 'Measured Reciprocity'.
- ⁶⁷ Richefort, 'Présents diplomatiques'.
- ⁶⁸ Heal, *Power of Gifts*, 149-79.
- ⁶⁹ Hennings, 'Failed Gift'.
- ⁷⁰ Cutler, 'Significant Gifts'.
- ⁷¹ Sowerby, "'A memorial'".
- ⁷² This is one of the aims of Um and Clark (eds.), 'Art of Embassy'.
- ⁷³ Watkins, 'Toward a New Diplomatic History', 6-11.
- ⁷⁴ See for example Kelley, *Beyond the Bronze Pillars*; Murai, 'Poetry in Chinese'.
- ⁷⁵ Hampton, *Fictions of Embassy*; idem., 'Diplomatic Moment'.
- ⁷⁶ For example Levin and Watkins, *Shakespeare's Foreign Worlds*; Powell and Rossiter, *Authority and Diplomacy*; Warren, *Literature and the Law of Nations*, 62-95; Brigden, *Thomas Wyatt*; Holberton, *Poetry and the Cromwellian Protectorate*.
- ⁷⁷ Rare exceptions include Sowerby, "'All our books'".
- ⁷⁸ Lowry, 'Diplomacy and the Spread of Printing'.
- ⁷⁹ Parmelee, *Good News from Fraunce*, 27-52; Keblusek, 'Book Agents'; Craigwood, 'Diplomats and International Book Exchange'; Levin, *Agents of Empire*, 189-96.
- ⁸⁰ Mulligan, 'Mobs and Diplomats'; Geppert, *Pressekriege*.
- ⁸¹ For example Burke et al., *Cultural Translation*; Walsby and Kemp (eds.), *Book Triumphant: di Biase* (ed.), *Travel and Translation*; Barker and Hosington (eds.), *Renaissance Cultural Crossroads*.

⁸² See for example Rossiter, *Wyatt Abroad*; Pérez Fernández, 'Translation, Diplomacy and Espionage'.

⁸³ For example Adams and Cox (eds.), *Diplomacy and Culture*; Schülting et al. (eds.), *Early Modern Encounters with the Islamic East*; Matar, *In the Lands of Christians*.

⁸⁴ Lesaffer, 'Amicitia'; Biow, *Doctors, Ambassadors, Secretaries*, 99-152; Extembrink, 'Humanismus, Gelehrtenrepublik und Diplomatie'. Maxson, *Humanist World*, 86-127.

⁸⁵ Allinson, *Monarchy of Letters*; Bajetta et al., *Elizabeth I's Foreign Correspondence*; Jansson, *Art and Diplomacy*.

⁸⁶ Relevant studies include but are by no means limited to: Isom-Verhaaren, *Allies with the Infidel*; Mitchell, *Sir Thomas Roe*; Windler, *La diplomatie comme expérience de l'autre*; Behrens-Abousief, *Practising Diplomacy*; Farooqi, 'Diplomacy and Diplomatic Practice'; Floor and Herzig (eds.), *Iran and the World*, part II.

⁸⁷ For an overview of recent scholarship see Kühnel, 'Westeuropa und das Osmanische Reich'.

⁸⁸ For example Darwin, *After Tamerlane*; Frank, *ReOrient*; Burbank and Cooper, *Empires in World History*; Suzuki et al. (eds.), *International Orders*; Kang, 'Hierarchy in Asian International Relations'.

⁸⁹ For example Ghobrial, *Whispers of Cities*; Brauner, 'Ein Schlüssel für zwei Truhen'.

⁹⁰ Rare exceptions include Riches, *Protestant Cosmopolitanism* and Behrens-Abouseif, *Practising Diplomacy*.