

TOMASZ KEMPA (*Toruń*)

THE ISSUE REGARDING “THE REFORM OF THE UNION” OF LUBLIN
IN LITHUANIAN POLICY IN THE PERIOD OF THREE *INTERREGNA*
FOLLOWING THE DEATH OF KING SIGISMUND AUGUSTUS (1572–1588)

Key words: the Union of Lublin, particularism, *interregnum*, the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth

In 1569 a new Polish-Lithuanian union was concluded in Lublin; the union strengthened the political, economic and cultural relationship between the Polish Crown and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. Both states were united in Krewo in 1385. Nevertheless, until 1569, the union was mostly personal – based on the stable rule of the Jagiellons. In Lublin it was converted into a closer federation of the two countries (both of which kept their names and territory) united from that moment on not only by one monarch elected by both Poles and Lithuanians, but also by one common noble parliament, common foreign policy and defence, the same monetary system (with distinct state treasuries) and similar administrative structures¹. Thus, in Polish historiography the Union of Lublin is referred to as the real union to emphasise the fact of there being a variety of real bonds connecting the two states and nations².

On the other hand, the circumstances of the conclusion of the new union influenced the divergent attitudes of the Poles and Lithuanians and affected the relations between the nations, which is reflected even in present times. That is why the circumstances and the final outcome of the negotiations in Lublin should be recalled here since they determined the policy carried out by the Lithuanians during the *interregna* and following the death of the last Jagiellon on the Polish-Lithuanian throne.

At the beginning of the second half of the 16th century, in the face of the war between Lithuania and Muscovy lasting from 1558, Lithuanian magnates, who

¹ It is interesting, though, that Lithuanian officials vowed the loyalty to Polish kings and the Polish Crown, *Akta unji Polski z Litwą 1385–1791*, ed. Stanisław KUTRZEBA, Władysław SEMKOWICZ, Kraków 1932, no. 148, p. 344; Henryk WISNER, *Rzeczpospolita Wazów*, vol. 3: *Sławne Państwo, Wielkie Księstwo Litewskie*, Warszawa 2008, p. 27.

² Stanisław KUTRZEBA, *Historja ustroju Polski w zarysie*, vol. 2: *Litwa*, Lwów–Warszawa 1921, p. 141.

held a powerful position in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and were accustomed to having a major influence on key political decisions concerning the future of the state, decided to transform the union in such a way as to “to achieve the guarantee of military help [from the Poles] without restricting the country’s sovereignty”³ as Henryk Wisner put it. It must be added that some leading Lithuanian magnates identified the interests of their families with the interests of the whole Lithuanian state. In other words, according to them what was good for them had to be good for the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. This kind of thinking may be traced in the correspondence of the most influential Lithuanian family – the Radziwiłłs⁴.

In the meantime, the Polish nobility (especially the politically active faction centred around the movement of the so called “execution of the laws”) and magnates tended to fall back on old union acts which stipulated the creation of one country so that the two countries – as expressed in the act of the union of 1 July 1569 – would become “one inseparable and identical body”⁵. The Polish king and the Grand Duke of Lithuania Sigismund Augustus⁶ supported those aspirations from 1562. As the negotiations encountered some resistance from the Lithuanians, the monarch decided to accelerate the talks. He mainly wanted to motivate the magnates of Lithuanian and Ruthenia (from the areas of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania) because the Lithuanian *szlachta* – according to the available sources⁷ – generally supported a closer union with Poland not only for military reasons, but also in the hope of achieving a stronger political position in the country in order to counterbalance the Lithuanian magnates. What inspired the Polish noblemen was the *szlachta* of the Crown and the actions and successes of the movement of the “execution of laws”.

The Polish monarch motivated the Lithuanian magnates in two ways. On the one hand, the king ensured them that Lithuania would not lose its sovereignty and the Lithuanians would keep all their freedoms and privileges. On the other hand, Sigismund Augustus tempted the Lithuanian and Ruthenian magnates to

³ Henryk WISNER, *Litwa. Dzieje państwa i narodu*, Warszawa 1999, p. 52.

⁴ Tomasz KEMPA, *Listy Radziwiłłów z okresu unii lubelskiej (1568–1569)*, *Zapiski Historyczne*, vol. 69: 2004, no. 4, p. 88.

⁵ *Akta unji*, no. 148, p. 343.

⁶ See more: Ewa DUBAS-URWANOWICZ, *Wkład Zygmunta Augusta w dzieło unii polsko-litewskiej*, [in:] *Unia lubelska z 1569 roku. Z tradycji unifikacyjnych I Rzeczypospolitej*, ed. Tomasz KEMPA, Krzysztof MIKULSKI, Toruń 2011, pp. 121–129.

⁷ See the petition of the *szlachta* to Sigismund Augustus gathered near Vitebsk in 1562: *XVI amžiaus Lietuvos ir Lenkijos politinės kultūros šaltiniai (1562 metų tekstai)*, parengė Jūratė KIAUPIENĖ, Vilnius 2008. The interpretation of the act: Oskar HALECKI, *Sejm obozowy szlachty litewskiej pod Witebskiem 1562 r. i jego petycja o unię z Polską*, *Przegląd Historyczny*, vol. 18: 1914, pp. 320–352; Jūratė KIAUPIENĖ, *Litewskie cechy kultury politycznej szlachty Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego w XVI wieku*, [in:] *Kultura Litwy i Polski w dziejach. Tożsamość i współistnienie. Materiały międzynarodowej konferencji zorganizowanej w dniach 15–17 października 1998*, ed. Jerzy WYROZUMSKI, Kraków 2000, pp. 71–74.

support a closer union with Poland by granting them various estates⁸. On the eve of the assembly in Lublin, the monarch made it clear that only those Lithuanian magnates who supported the union would be promoted to higher positions within the country.

At the same time, there were two Lithuanian families who held a leading position among the political elite of Lithuania – the Radziwiłł family and the Chodkiewicz family. Among the former, after the death of Mikołaj Radziwiłł “Czarny” [“the Black”] in 1565, the unquestioned leader was the Lithuanian chancellor and voivode of Vilnius Mikołaj Radziwiłł “Rudy” [“the Red”], while among the Chodkiewicz family the most influential person at the end of the 1560s remained the starost of Samogitia and the viceroy of Livonia – Jan Chodkiewicz. The latter was decidedly more inclined to accept the new closer relationship between Poland and Lithuania⁹. M. Radziwiłł “Rudy” is now considered to have been an opponent of the new union with the Crown, which was not entirely true. What is certain is that the Lithuanians in 1569 were quite willing to consolidate the union with Poland, but refused to accept the Polish terms and conditions. Thus, King Sigismund Augustus had to give the Lithuanians a written declaration before they arrived in Lublin that even if the talks with the Poles were to fall through, the Lithuanian magnates and *szlachta* would be allowed to leave Lublin¹⁰.

Nevertheless, the Lithuanians in Lublin in January–February 1569 were under enormous pressure exerted by both the Polish king and the Polish *szlachta* along with some crown senators. The Poles, including the king, were determined to finish the union negotiations successfully. To their disappointment, they found out that almost all Lithuanians had left Lublin secretly during the night of 28 February – 1 March having been encouraged by M. Radziwiłł “Rudy”. The decision was quick and probably not well thought-out; the Lithuanians left Lublin in a hurry¹¹. As wrote Mikołaj Krzysztof Radziwiłł “Sierotka” [“the Orphan”], even those who put forward the idea of the escape regretted it later, “A co sprawiło odjechanie ex zelo z Lublina naszych [...], jedno utracenie Wołynia z Podlasiem, to już luce meridiana clarius, pomnę ja, że żalowali sami ci, co byli odjechali” [“The departure of our people from Lublin caused [...] the loss of Volhynia and Podlachia is

⁸ Tomasz KEMPA, *Rywalizacja Chodkiewiczów i Radziwiłłów o pierwsze miejsce w elicie politycznej Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego w latach 60-tych i 70-tych XVI wieku*, [in:] *History, culture and language of Lithuania. Proceedings of the international Lithuanian conference, Poznań 17–19 September 1998*, ed. Grzegorz BŁASZCZYK, Michał HASIUK, Poznań 2000, pp. 197–199; Henryk LULEWICZ, *Gniewów o unię ciąg dalszy. Stosunki polsko-litewskie w latach 1569–1588*, Warszawa 2002, p. 28.

⁹ Tomasz KEMPA, *Rywalizacja*, pp. 198–199; Oskar HALECKI, *Dzieje unii jagiellońskiej*, vol. 2, Kraków 1920, p. 318.

¹⁰ O. HALECKI, *Dzieje*, vol. 2, p. 255; Tomasz KEMPA, *Mikołaj Krzysztof Radziwiłł Sierotka (1549–1616), wojewoda wileński*, Warszawa 2000, p. 53.

¹¹ Mikołaj Radziwiłł “Rudy” to Mikołaj Krzysztof Radziwiłł “Sierotka”, Lublin, 28 February 1569 (T. KEMPA, *Listy Radziwiłłów*, p. 98; idem, *Mikołaj Krzysztof Radziwiłł Sierotka*, p. 54; Marek FERENC, *Mikołaj Radziwiłł „Rudy” (ok. 1515–1584). Działalność polityczna i wojskowa*, Kraków 2008, pp. 336–338).

luce meridian clarius; those who had left regretted it later” – transl. A. Chabros]¹². Lithuanian leaders did not foresee the violent reaction of the Polish *szlachta* and the king. After the Lithuanian had departed, the Polish nobility started to urge the monarch to unite both countries himself and incorporate Volhynia and Podlachia into Poland. Sigismund Augustus agreed to their demand and ordered senators and envoys from Podlachia who were still present in Lublin to swear their loyalty to the Crown, as did most of them on 9 March. The formal incorporation document was prepared later, but was issued with the date of 5 March. On 27 May the privilege announcing the incorporation of Volhynia to the Kingdom of Poland (along with the land of Bratslav – Eastern Podolia)¹³ was issued. Another humiliation for the Lithuanians was the demand of the king that those Lithuanian magnates and *szlachta* owning estates in the incorporated lands should arrive in Lublin to swear their loyalty to the Crown and the Polish king under the threat of having the estates confiscated and the offices taken away¹⁴.

Taking away such huge areas from the Lithuanians was an unexpected blow. As wrote M. Radziwiłł “Rudy” calling Lithuanian dignitaries for negotiations in Vilnius, what had happened in Lublin was “against privileges, law and freedoms of Lithuanians”¹⁵. The decisions made by the Polish king and the Poles at the seym in Lublin led to a clear polarisation of viewpoints among the Lithuanian magnates despite the fact that during prior negotiations in Lublin they had opposed the Poles in solidarity (excluding individual speeches given by magnates from Volhynia¹⁶). The most influential Lithuanian dignitary – M. Radziwiłł “Rudy” – did not intend to continue negotiations with the Poles thinking that it would not change the course of events in Lublin¹⁷. At the same time, other Lithuanian magnates, includ-

¹² Mikołaj Krzysztof Radziwiłł “Sierotka” to Krzysztof Radziwiłł “Piorun”, Nieśwież, 19 August 1597, Biblioteka Polskiej Akademii Nauk w Kórniku (further: BKórn.), manuscript 11617 (the manuscript consisting of a hundred separated copies – collected in some briefcases – made by Stanisław Bodniak prior to the out break of WWII includes complete or fragmentary copies of the correspondence of the group of the so called Petersburg revindicated collection of archival sources which returned to Poland in the 1930s owing to the peace treaty between Poland and Bolshevic Russia concluded in Riga in 1921; unfortunately, most of the archival sources were destroyed by the Nazis after the Warsaw Uprising in 1944; the copies of the letters now kept in the Library of the Polish Academy of Sciences in Kórnik and the Library of the Polish Academy of Arts and Sciences and the Polish Academy of Sciences in Cracow are now particularly precious).

¹³ *Akta unji*, no. 97, 136, pp. 196–207, 300–308; H. WISNER, *Litwa*, p. 55.

¹⁴ Sigismund Augustus to Mikołaj Krzysztof Radziwiłł “Sierotka”, Lublin, [in March] 1569, *Listy króla Zygmunta Augusta do Radziwiłłów*, ed. Irena KANIEWSKA, Kraków 1999, no. 332, pp. 562–563; T. KEMPA, *Mikołaj Krzysztof Radziwiłł Sierotka*, pp. 55–57.

¹⁵ Mikołaj Radziwiłł „Rudy” to the Lithuanian Field Hetman Roman Sanguszko, 13 March 1596, *Archiwum książąt Lubartowiczów Sanguszków ze Sławuty*, vol. 7, ed. Bronisław GORCZAK, Lwów 1910, no. 260, p. 320.

¹⁶ Tomasz KEMPA, *Konstanty Wasyl Ostrogski (ok. 1524/1525–1608), wojewoda kijowski i marszałek ziemi wołyńskiej*, Toruń 1997, pp. 45–47.

¹⁷ Mikołaj Radziwiłł „Rudy” to Mikołaj Krzysztof Radziwiłł „Sierotka”, Vilnius, 1 June 1569, T. KEMPA, *Listy Radziwiłłów*, pp. 107–108.

ing the representatives of the Chodkiewicz family (Jan, Hrehory and Jerzy) and the bishop of Vilnius Walerian Protasiewicz maintained that further negotiations with Poland should take place so that the decision about the incorporation of Podlachia and Volhynia be revoked. In return for this they were willing to make concessions about the new union with Poland. Their standpoint prevailed during the assembly of Lithuanian magnates and *szlachta* in Vilnius at the end of March 1569¹⁸ from where envoys led by Jan Chodkiewicz were sent to Lublin¹⁹.

Eventually, the decisions about the incorporation of Podlachia and Volhynia were not revoked. On the contrary, Poland incorporated (under the privilege of 6 June 1568) the extended area of the Kievan land as requested by Volhynians (excluding the Mazyr district which remained within the borders of Lithuania)²⁰. In this way the Crown managed to share its borders with Muscovy, which later led to a greater involvement of the Poles in the eastern policy. Despite the next incorporation, the Lithuanians agreed to sign a new act of union with Poland the reasons being the pressure exerted by the Lithuanian *szlachta* and the fact that Lithuania was under military threat by Muscovy. It should be noted that for those Lithuanians who had returned to Lublin to finalise the negotiations about the new union, not signing the union act with Poland would have been a painful failure and would have weakened their position in Lithuania in relation to those Lithuanians who, like “Rudy”, had boycotted further negotiations. Originally M. Radziwiłł “Rudy”, like his nephew Mikołaj Radziwiłł “Sierotka”, treated the concessions to Poland as treason, but later he reconciled with the king and probably made a vow on the new union during his meeting with the king in Knyszyn in the autumn of 1569²¹.

The Union of Lublin – the resolutions of which were finally agreed on 29 June (the act was issued on 1 July) 1569 – introduced the election of one monarch common for both states who would be referred to as the King of Poland and the Grand Duke of Lithuania. The common ruler was to be crowned only once – in Cracow. The most important change in the mutual relationship between Poland and Lithuania became the creation of the common parliament (the seym) and the liquidation of the separate parliamentary institution in the Grand Duchy of Lithuanian. The Polish-Lithuanian seym of 1569 consisted of three parts: the king, the senate and the lower chamber consisting of noble envoys elected at *sejmiks*. The representatives of the Kingdom of Poland in the senate and the lower chamber significantly

¹⁸ O. HALECKI, *Dzieje*, vol. 2, p. 294.

¹⁹ Other members apart from Chodkiewicz included the following: the Lithuanian sub-chancellor Ostafi Wołłowicz, the castellan of Vitebsk Dominik Pac, the Lithuanian deputy cup-bearer Mikołaj Kiszka, the Lithuanian incisor (*krajczy*) Krzysztof Radziwiłł “Piorun” (H. WISNER, *Litwa*, p. 56).

²⁰ *Akta unji*, no. 138, p. 308–319; O. HALECKI, *Dzieje*, vol. 2, p. 313.

²¹ Mikołaj Radziwiłł “Rudy” to Mikołaj Krzysztof Radziwiłł “Sierotka”, Vilnius, 30 May 1569, T. KEMPA, *Listy Radziwiłłów*, pp. 104–105; Mikołaj Krzysztof Radziwiłł “Sierotka” to Mikołaj Radziwiłł “Rudy”, Kleck, 30 April 1569, BKórń., manuscript 1341, fol. 67; T. KEMPA, *Mikołaj Krzysztof Radziwiłł Sierotka*, p. 57; M. FERENC, op.cit., p. 155.

outnumbered the number of Lithuanian representatives. The Polish preponderance did not correspond with the population numbers of both countries despite the fact that it resulted from the administrative divisions in the Kingdom of Poland and Lithuania (where territorial divisions resembled the Polish model as a result of the reforms carried out in the years 1565–1566). Among 140 senators, only 27 were connected with the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, whilst among 114 members of the lower chamber (excluding representatives of Royal Prussia) only 44 were elected at Lithuanian *sejmiks*. The common senate did not admit representatives of Lithuanian royal families – members of the former Lithuanian council – including relatives of the Jagiellonians (princes of Slutsk) and district marshalls²². As Andrzej Rachuba pointed out, it can be stated that the Lithuanians were discriminated against in the common seym; on the other hand, as Andrzej B. Zakrzewski indicated – the disproportion between Polish and Lithuanian senators and envoys was attenuated by the rule of unanimity in votes²³.

Taking into consideration the circumstances in which the new union was concluded²⁴ and its final resolutions, the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, particularly the leading Lithuanian dignitaries, may well not have been elated. On the contrary, as wrote Mikołaj Naruszewicz, for the Lithuanians (at least for some Lithuanian magnates) the union meant: “pogrzeb i zgładzenie na wieczne czasy wolnej a udzielnej Rzeczypospolitej, niegdy[ś] Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego” [“the funeral and annihilation of the free and sovereign Lithuanian Rzeczpospolita, in the past the Grand Duchy of Lithuania” – transl. A.Ch.]²⁵. Many of them felt humiliated and accused Poland of imposing the union on Lithuania taking advantage of its weakness caused by the war with Muscovy and incorporating huge areas of land which used to belong to the Grand Duchy. In 1588 the son of “Rudy” – Krzysztof Radziwiłł “Piorun” [“Thunderbolt”] – reproached the Poles “abyśmy osłabiwszy [się], według woli Ich Mościów [Polaków – T.K.] do tego związku przyszli. Co więcej, Ich Mościowie sobie nullo iure przysądziili ziemię wołyńską, kijowską, braclawską i podlaską” [“for wanting to weaken the Lithuanians so that the lords [the Poles – T.K.] forced them to sign the union. What is more, Polish Lords usurped the Volhynian, Kievan, Bratslav and Podlachian territories nullo iure” – trans. A.Ch.]²⁶. The Grand Duchy of Lithuania lost over one-third of its

²² *Akta unji*, no. 152, pp. 373–375; H. LULEWICZ, *Gniewów o unię*, p. 23; H. WISNER, *Rzeczpospolita Wazów*, vol. 3, p. 18.

²³ Andrzej RACHUBA, *Wielkie Księstwo Litewskie w systemie parlamentarnym Rzeczypospolitej w latach 1569–1763*, Warszawa 2002, pp. 169–170; Andrzej B. ZAKRZEWSKI, *Wielkie Księstwo Litewskie (XVI–XVIII w.). Prawo – ustroj – społeczeństwo*, Warszawa 2013, p. 95.

²⁴ This is what Jan Chodkiewicz said to the Crown senators on 6 June 1569 negotiating with them the conditions of the union in Lublin: „Bogu i ludziom opowiadamy się, że non fraterne, ale violenter z nami procedujecie” [“We shall say to God and people that you treat us not non fraterne, but violenter” – transl. A.Ch.], cited from: H. LULEWICZ, *Gniewów o unię*, p. 24.

²⁵ Cited from: *ibid.*, p. 18.

²⁶ Cited from: H. WISNER, *Litwa*, p. 57.

territory (about 200,000 km²)²⁷. The Lithuanians felt rancour towards King Sigismund Augustus and directed their criticism mainly towards the king. According to Lithuanian magnates, the king submitted to the pressure of the Poles: “Nie było nic polskiej krwi w Panie naszym, jedna się litewska z włoską mieszała, a jedno, iż polska edukacja przystąpiła, duże Litwa to na siebie czuje i czuć będzie, jeśli Boże zmiłowanie nie przystąpi” [“there was no Polish blood in our King – only Lithuanian and Italian, but the Poles instructed the king, as Lithuania feels and will continue to feel unless God has mercy on us” – transl. A.Ch.]²⁸. Nevertheless, most accusations were directed against the king. As M.K. Radziwiłł “Rudy” wrote about the Poles’ insistence on the union (even before its final conclusion) under Polish conditions: “Że to już nie unią z nimi tworzyć, co by dwaj, Litwin z Polakiem, czynić między sobą mieli, ale co Polak sobie utworzył na swe dobro, a moje złe, to ty Litwinie poprzysiąż, wyznaj, potwierdź jego zwierzchność nad sobą, a swoje poddaństwo jemu” [“the union created with them is not a union between a Pole and a Lithuanian, but a Polish union established for the good of Poland and for the wrong of Lithuania; you Lithuanians swear, confess and confirm Polish supremacy and serfdom to the Pole” – transl. A.Ch.]²⁹. M.K. Radziwiłł “Sierotka” in a letter to his brother-in-law from the Crown Mikołaj Mielecki stated that the “union exasperated” the Lithuanians rather than “conciliated” them³⁰.

The sensation of extreme humiliation felt by the Lithuanian magnates – in contrast to the Polish enthusiasm about the union³¹ – significantly affected Polish-Lithuanian relations in the subsequent two decades, including the key periods of three subsequent *interregna* which took place in the Rzeczpospolita in the years 1572–1573, 1575–1576, 1586–1587. Several years after the Lublin seym, the Lithuanians often associated all the evil with the union and exaggerated its negative effects on the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, which is reflected in the words of M.K. Radziwiłł “Sierotka” written in the letter to his other Polish brother-in-law Jan Zamoyski: “Bo jako pomnę, od unii sprawy litewskie, jeśli nie ludibrio u dworu [królewskiego – T.K.] szły, tedy zawsze oscitanter, więc też za tym zguba przede

²⁷ H. WISNER, *Rzeczpospolita Wazów*, vol. 3, p. 8.

²⁸ Mikołaj Krzysztof Radziwiłł “Sierotka” to Mikołaj Radziwiłł “Rudy”, Knyszyn, 15 July 1572, Александр С. Трачевский, *Польское безкорольевье по прекращении династии Ягеллонов*, Москва 1869, appendix, no. 4, p. 92.

²⁹ Mikołaj Radziwiłł “Rudy” to Mikołaj Krzysztof Radziwiłł “Sierotka”, Vilnius, 1 June 1569, T. КЕМПА, *Listy Radziwiłłów*, p. 108.

³⁰ Mikołaj Krzysztof Radziwiłł “Sierotka” to Mikołaj Mielecki, Vilnius, 23 November 1572, Biblioteka Raczyńskich w Poznaniu, manuscript 80, no. 59, fol. 112–113; T. КЕМПА, *Mikołaj Krzysztof Radziwiłł Sierotka*, p. 59.

³¹ Yet, after some time after the conclusion of the union of Lublin Poles bore grudges against Lithuanians they didn’t want to participate in the costs of defending the whole Rzeczpospolita. As said Świętosław Orzelski, one of the *szlachta* leaders from Greater Poland, “Lithuanians sit in the seym pro forma and won’t contribute to any common help” (Świętosław ORZELSKI, *Bezkrólewia ksiąg ośmioro, czyli dzieje Polski od zgonu Zygmunta Augusta r. 1572 aż do r. 1576*, ed. Włodzimierz SPASOWICZ, vol. introductory, Petersburg 1858, p. 208).

drzwiami nasza [...]” [“as far as I remember since the time of the union Lithuanian matters have been treated with mockery by the [royal – T.K.] court or at least listlessly; which shall bring doom upon Lithuania [...]” – transl. A.Ch.]³². In the preserved Lithuanian correspondence one may find dozens if not hundreds of exaggerated expressions of this kind. It can be stated that it became customary among Lithuanian magnates of the period to complain about the Poles and the union³³.

What should be underlined is that the Lithuanians reacted badly to being mistaken for Poles by other Europeans, which happened very often as magnates and the *szlachta* from the Grand Duchy of Lithuania in the second half of the 16th century spoke the Polish language (with the exception of the noblemen of the old Ruthenian origin). Again, evidence for this may be found in a letter written by M.K. Radziwiłł “Sierotka” to his brother Jerzy from Italy: “Wasz Mość Litwin, nie Polak. Życz Wasz Mość narodowi swemu, aby też o nim wiedziano. Polacy mniemają, że nad nie nie masz, a Litwę radzi by potłumić. Wasz Mość racz gentem suam wywyższać, gdzie możesz [...]. Prze Bóg, niech Wasz Mość Litwinem, nie Polakiem, piszą” [“Sir, you are Lithuanian, not Polish. You should wish your nation to be recognised. The Poles think they are superior and want to suppress Lithuania. Do glorify your nation gentem suam wherever you can [...] for, Sir, you are Lithuanian, not Polish” – transl. A.Ch.]³⁴. This excessively negative attitude expressed mainly verbally towards the Poles may also be found later on (in the 17th–18th centuries) in the history of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, but the frequency of such comments would gradually diminish.

Nevertheless, it must be underlined that despite their heavy criticism, Lithuanian magnates did not want to break the Union of Lublin. Even the biggest critics of the union did not intend to undermine its foundations in the face of the war with Muscovites. In practice it meant that Lithuanian dignitaries did not wish to alter the content of the act of union of 1 July 1569 in which it read that its regulations “shall never be touched and modified”³⁵. The Lithuanian party underlined its

³² Mikołaj Krzysztof Radziwiłł “Sierotka” the Crown chancellor Jan Zamoyski, Nieśwież, 12 August 1577, *Archiwum Jana Zamoyskiego*, vol. 1, ed. Waclaw SOBIESKI, Warszawa 1904, no. 147, p. 163. In another letter to J. Zamoyski M.K. Radziwiłł “Sierotka” wrote about the “unfortunate union” which Poles had brought to Lithuania, 17 April 1587 from Miir, Российская национальная библиотека в Санкт Петербурге (further: RNB), Ф. 971, Оп. 2, the collection of autographs 125, no. 27, fol. 39–41; T. KEMPA, *Mikołaj Krzysztof Radziwiłł Sierotka*, p. 59.

³³ Benedykt Woyna to Radziwiłł “Sierotka” about the appointment for the Canon of Vilnius: “Wolałbym Litwina, co pacierz umie tylko, niżeli największego teologa Polaka” [“I would prefer a Lithuania who only knows how to pray than a Polish theologian” – transl. A.Ch.]; *Niedźwiedzice*, 4 December 1602, *Lietuvos mokslų akademijos biblioteka*, f. 139, no. 809, pp. 23–25; T. KEMPA, *Mikołaj Krzysztof Radziwiłł Sierotka*, p. 60, footnote 67; see also: Ewa DUBAS-URWANOWICZ, *Stosunek Korony do unii z Litwą w latach 1562–1574*, *Studia Podlaskie*, vol. 5: 1995, p. 18.

³⁴ Mikołaj Krzysztof Radziwiłł „Sierotka” to Jerzy Radziwiłł, Vilnius, 10 May 1577, BKórń., manuscript 1341, fol. 62v–63; Henryk WISNER, *Najjaśniejsza Rzeczpospolita. Szkice z dziejów Polski szlacheckiej XVI–XVII wieku*, Warszawa 1978, p. 17.

³⁵ *Akta unji*, p. 347.

intention to “reform the union”. This enigmatic term in fact meant an attempt to reclaim the lands lost for the benefit of the Crown in 1569 (Volhynia, the Kievan land, the land of Bratslav and Podlachia), which was the main reason why the Lithuanians felt humiliated. Although the incorporation of the territories into Poland did not directly concern the substance of the union of both countries, it was naturally connected with the union³⁶. Moreover, as one may conclude from the correspondence of Lithuanian magnates, some Lithuanians understood the term “reform of the union” in a broader context: as an improvement of mutual Polish-Lithuanian relations which, according to the Lithuanians, would lead to the Lithuanian becoming an equal partner to the Crown. The intention was to specify some provisions of the union for the benefit of the Grand Duchy of Lithuanian (the act of the union was in some points too general).

During all the three *interregna*, the Lithuanians postulated the reclaim of the lands taken away from them in 1569. They also expressed this to candidates to the Polish-Lithuanian throne³⁷. It must be noted that the situation in the lands incorporated into Poland varied. Podlachia was to a large extent Polonised thanks to settlers from Masovia who had been settling in Podlachia for a few centuries³⁸. The inhabitants of Podlachia considered it natural that the territory should belong to the Polish Crown³⁹. The Lithuanians were inclined to resign from their claims to Podlachia, for the part of it which included Brest and Kamianets remained within the boundaries of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania after 1569.

Undoubtedly, the Lithuanians were surprised that at the seym of Lublin the Volhynian *szlachta* eagerly supported Volhynia’s belonging to Poland. It turned out that the Volhynian magnates had not questioned Volhynia’ belonging to the Polish Crow and the ratification of the union⁴⁰. As M. Naruszewicz told M. Radziwiłł “Rudy”: “za prawdę Miłościwy Panie, ilem wyrozumiał już, o Podlaszany nic nie wątpiąc, że sami tego oderwania [od Litwy – T.K.] pragnęli, ale po panach Wołyńcach toż widzę, że też tak wielkiego gwałtu na się nie mieli, ale się sami

³⁶ Tomasz KEMPA, *Plany separatystycznej elekcji w Wielkim Księstwie Litewskim w okresie trzech bezkrólewi po wygaśnięciu dynastii Jagiellonów (1572–1587)*, *Zapiski Historyczne*, vol. 69: 2004, no. 1, p. 24.

³⁷ Jan Chodkiewicz to Piotr Zborowski, Lachowicze, 23 January 1573, BKórń., manuscript 11617; Jan Hlebowicz to Jan Chodkiewicz, Kraków, 8 May 1576, *Sprawy wojenne króla Stefana Batorego. Dyjaryjusze, relacje, listy i akta z lat 1576–1586*, ed. Ignacy POLKOWSKI, *Acta historica res gestas Poloniae illustrantia ab anno 1507 ad annum 1795*, vol. 11, Kraków 1887, pp. 32–35; Ś. ORZELSKI, *Bezkrólewia ksiąg ośmioro*, vol. 1, Petersburg–Mohylew 1856, pp. 90–91; T. KEMPA, *Mikołaj Krzysztof Radziwiłł Sierotka*, p. 75, 94; H. LULEWICZ, *Gniewów o unię*, pp. 125, 139, 148–149, 162–163, 191, 197, 277.

³⁸ Dorota MICHAŁUK, *Ziemia mielnicka województwa podlaskiego w XVI–XVII wieku. Osadnictwo, własność ziemska i podziały kościelne*, Toruń 2002, pp. 55–57.

³⁹ Oskar HALECKI, *Przylączenie Podlasia, Wołynia i Kijowszczyzny do Korony w roku 1569*, Kraków 1915, pp. 32–37; Józef MAROSZEK, *Dzieje województwa podlaskiego do 1795 roku*, Białystok 2013, pp. 127, 136–137.

⁴⁰ T. KEMPA, *Konstanty Wasyl Ostrogski*, pp. 48–49.

pospieszyli do tego” [“Your Grace, as far as I have understood, the people of Podlachia undoubtedly want to break away [from Lithuania – T.K.] and noblemen from Volhynia first did insist on that, but now they have rushed to do the same” – transl. A.Ch.].⁴¹ The *szlachta* of Volhynia believed that Poland would protect them more effectively against the Tatars or Muscovites. This conclusion may be drawn from the fact that Volhynians at the seym of Lublin put forward the initiative to incorporate also the Kievan land, which – as we know – did in fact take place⁴².

The Volhynian magnates were driven by different motives. It must be remembered that Volhyn was a territory from which many royal families of Ruthenian origin came. Some of them took pride in being the descendants of the Rurik dynasty. Volhynia enjoyed some autonomy in comparison with other lands; separate local conventions (sejms) were held in Volhynia, and the territory had its own unique offices such as the marshal of the Volhynian land⁴³. Volhynian magnates were of Christian Orthodox denomination and as such since the times of Władysław Jagiełło [Jogaila] they had been forbidden to hold the highest positions in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania such as the voivode and castellan of Vilnius and the voivode and castellan of Trakai⁴⁴. It was not until 1563 that King Sigismund Augustus lifted the ban⁴⁵. It must be underlined that this unequal treatment of the Orthodox Christians in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania did not result from the dominant position of the Roman Catholic Church, but was the effect of the Catholic Lithuanian magnates who were protecting their privileged position in the country. This was particularly visible during the rule of the last two Jagiellons, who had to confirm the previously mentioned ban a few times at the request of Catholic Lithuanian magnates (in 1529, 1547, 1551)⁴⁶. It was partly connected with the fact

⁴¹ Mikołaj Naruszewicz to Mikołaj Radziwiłł “Rudy”, Lublin, 11 June 1569, *Археологический сборник документов относящихся к истории северозападной Руси*, vol. 7, Вильна 1870, no. 26, p. 44. More about the attitude of Volhynians towards the seym in Lublin: Tomasz KEMPA, *Волинські і Люблінська унія 1569 року*, [in:] *Студії і матеріали з історії Волини*, ред. Володимир СОбчук, Кременець 2012, pp. 250–258.

⁴² O. NALESKI, *Dzieje*, vol. 2, pp. 310–311.

⁴³ Aleksander JABŁONOWSKI, *Pisma*, t. 4: *Wołyń, Podole, Ruś Czerwona*, Warszawa 1911, s. 12; Tomasz KEMPA, *Rusini wobec unii lubelskiej. Czy ruscy mogli i szlachta chcieli ściślejszego połączenia z Polską w 1569 roku?*, [in:] *Unia Lubelska. Unia Europejska*, ed. Iwona HOJMAN, Lublin 2010, p. 85.

⁴⁴ Lidia KORCZAK, *Litewska rada wielkksiążęca w XV wieku*, Kraków 1998, pp. 37, 49; T. KEMPA, *Rusini*, pp. 85–86. More about the restrictions concerning the distribution of the most important offices among Ruthenians see: Wiktor CZERMAK, *Sprawa równouprawnienia schizmatyków i katolików na Litwie (1432–1563)*, Rozprawy Akademii Umiejętności, Wydział Historyczno-Filozoficzny, vol. 44, Kraków 1903, pp. 348–405; Kazimierz CHODYNICKI, *Geneza równouprawnienia schizmatyków w Wielkim Ks. Litewskim. Stosunek Zygmunta Augusta do wyznania grecko-wschodniego*, *Przeгляд Historyczny*, vol. 22: 1919–1920, pp. 54–135.

⁴⁵ The privilege was issued in connection with the preparations to the union of Lublin also to encourage Orthodox magnates. See: *Monumenta reformationis Polonicae et Lithuanicae*, series 1, no. 1, Wilno 1925, no. 4, s. 14–19; *Акты относящиеся к истории западной России*, vol. 3, Санктпетербургъ 1848, no. 32, pp. 118–121.

⁴⁶ K. CHODYNICKI, *Geneza*, pp. 101–103; T. KEMPA, *Rusini*, pp. 86–87.

that the ban had been broken twice in relation to hetman Konstanty Ostrogski, who – as an Orthodox Christian – was first appointed the castellan of Vilnius in 1512, and in 1522 he became the voivode of Trakai⁴⁷.

The relations between Lithuanian and Ruthenian magnates from the lands incorporated into Poland in 1569 were not ideal and depended to a large extent on the personal connections between them. From the available source it may be inferred that leading Lithuanian dignitaries looked down on the Volhynians, which is illustrated by the words of M. Radziwiłł “Rudy” written to his nephew when he instructed him to act like a “Radziwiłł a Litwin urodzony, a nie Podlaszanin ani Wołyniec” [“Radziwiłł and a man born in Lithuania, not like a man from Podlachia or Volhynia” – transl. A.Ch.]⁴⁸ while taking decisions at the seym of Lublin. As can be seen, contrary to what Lithuanian dignitaries maintained, there were few bonds between Volhynian magnates and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. Some of the richest magnates, such as the Ostrogskis, were related to Polish families of magnates⁴⁹. Moreover, in the 16th century, prior to the union of Lublin, the Polish influence would spread in Volhynia⁵⁰. On the other hand, “native” Lithuanians acquired estates in Volhynia, as was the case with the Radziwiłłs, the Dorohojstajskis, the Chreptowicz family, the Kiszkas or the Sapiehas⁵¹. Some of the Volhynian magnates – such as Konstanty Ostrogski or Andrzej Wiśniowiecki – possessed estates in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania within the boundaries after 1569, which might have affected their attitude to the new union with Poland.

When King Sigismund Augustus died in July of 1572, the Lithuanians attempted to use the *interregnum* period in order to strengthen their position in the relationship with Poland. As “Sierotka” wrote to “Rudy”: “teraz jest czas upomnienia u panów braci [Polaków – T.K.] i lepszej unii” [“now it’s time for us to reprimand the lords – our brothers [the Poles – T.K.] and to improve the union” – transl. A.Ch.]⁵². This “reprimand” concerned the reclaim of the lands lost in 1569 along with other demands expressed to the Polish party.

⁴⁷ Aleksander ŁAPIŃSKI, *Zygmunt Stary a Kościół prawosławny*, Warszawa 1937, pp. 151–156; Tomasz KEMPA, *Dzieje rodu Ostrogskich*, Toruń 2002, pp. 37–38.

⁴⁸ Mikołaj Radziwiłł “Rudy” to Mikołaj Krzysztof Radziwiłł “Sierotka”, Vilnius, 30 May 1569, T. KEMPA, *Listy Radziwiłłów*, p. 105.

⁴⁹ The voivode of Kiev Konstanty Wasyl Ostrogski was married to Zofia – a daughter of the great crown hetman Jan Tarnowski. Ilia – the half-brother of Konstanty also married a Polish woman – Beata Kościelecka.

⁵⁰ Through marriages the following persons acquired lands in Volhynia: Olbracht Łaski, Michał Działyński, Mikołaj Łysakowski (Stanisław ZAJĄCZKOWSKI, *Wołyń pod panowaniem Litwy*, *Rocznik Wołyński*, vol. 2: 1931, p. 21; Tomasz KEMPA, *Możnowładztwo i szlachta z Wołynia wobec unii lubelskiej (1569)*, [in:] *Liublino unija: idėja ir jos tęstinumas / Unia lubelska: idea i jej kontynuacja*, sudarė Liudas GLEMŽA, Ramunė ŠMIGELSKYTĖ-STUKIENĖ, Vilnius 2011, p. 176). More about Polish influences in Volhynia at that time: Anna DEMBIŃSKA, *Wpływ kultury polskiej na Wołyń w XVI wieku (w łonie warstwy szlacheckiej)*, Poznań 1933.

⁵¹ O. HALECKI, *Przyłączenie*, p. 43.

⁵² Mikołaj Krzysztof Radziwiłł “Sierotka” to Mikołaj Radziwiłł “Rudy”, Knyszyn, 15 July 1572, A. Трачевский, op.cit., appendix, no. 4, p. 88.

In the context of the “improvement of the union” two issues were the most significant for Lithuanian dignitaries at the beginning of the *interregnum*. The first problem concerned the demonstration of total solidarity of all Lithuanians against the Polish party, notwithstanding all the differences, political divisions and personal conflicts which had occurred among Lithuanians. Jan Hlebowicz feared that “aby się nie cieszyli w Polsce, żeśmy tu sami z sobą w Litwie rozerwani” [“Poles would be glad that the Lithuanians are divided as a nation” – transl. A.Ch.]⁵³. On the other hand, leading Lithuanian dignitaries hoped that the Poles would meet their demands owing to divisions among Polish magnates in the period of the first *interregnum*. As was pointed out by Henryk Lulewicz, Lithuanian magnates underestimated the importance of the Polish *szlachta*, concentrating on establishing contacts with individual groups of the senators in the Crown⁵⁴, which reflected their attitude to the Lithuanian *szlachta*. The other problem concerned the necessity of convincing inhabitants of the lost lands (the *szlachta* and magnates) to support this claim. In practice, the Lithuanians had to persuade the magnates that it would be better for them to live in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania rather than in the Polish Crown. Both problems turned out to be very hard to deal with. While the Lithuanians managed to reach unanimity in the first issue especially during the period of the first *interregnum*, the second problem was much harder to solve. Let us have a closer look at both key issues.

The most important Lithuanian dignitaries, expecting the death of King Sigismund Augustus, a few months before his death led to the conclusion of the so-called family transaction involving three leading representatives of two competing families: the Radziwiłłs (“Rudy” and “Sierotka” as representatives of two lines of the family) and the Chodkiewicz family (the starost of Samogitia Jan)⁵⁵. The exact date of the conclusion of this family agreement remains unknown, but it must have been signed during the seym which commenced on 15 March 1572. The main initiator of the agreement was M.K. Radziwiłł “Sierotka” and the papal legate in Poland Giovanni Francesco Commendone⁵⁶ participated in it. The latter insisted

⁵³ Jan Hlebowicz to Jan Chodkiewicz, Mińsk, 14 January 1576, BKórń., manuscript 11617. Jan Karol Chodkiewicz expressed a similar fear in 1608: „Dawno Polacy na tym są, aby nas, wielkie familie w Litwie, poważniejszy do zniszczenia przywiedli, aby tak snadnie mogli według myśli Litwą kierować” [“For a long time Poles have wanted to drive us – the greatest Lithuanian families – to family feuds and destroy us to easily run Lithuania the way they want to” – trans. A.Ch.], cited from: H. WISNER, *Najjaśniejsza*, p. 17.

⁵⁴ Mikołaj Radziwiłł “Rudy” to Mikołaj Krzysztof Radziwiłła “Sierotka”, Vilnius, 1 August 1572, RNB, Φ. 971, On. 2, the collection of autographs 234, no. 66; H. LULEWICZ, *Gniewów o unię*, pp. 83–84.

⁵⁵ About the political and economic rivalry between the Radziwiłłs and the Chodkiewiczzs in the years 1560s–1570 see: T. KEMPA, *Rywalizacja*, pp. 195–219.

⁵⁶ Stefan GRUSZECKI, *Zmowa w podwarszawskim lesie w 1572 roku*, *Rocznik Warszawski*, vol. 6: 1967, p. 272; Wincenty ZAKRZEWSKI, *Po ucieczce Henryka. Dzieje bezkrólewia 1574–75*, Kraków 1878, p. 39; T. KEMPA, *Mikołaj Krzysztof Radziwiłł Sierotka*, p. 65.

that at the seym of 1572 (on the Day of Resurrection 6 April⁵⁷, both “Sierotka” (who already converted into Catholicism in 1566 without publicity⁵⁸) and J. Chodkiewicz would announce publicly their conversion from Calvinism into Catholicism. M. Radziwiłł “Rudy” remained a Calvinist. G.F. Commendone, sent to the Rzeczpospolita by Pope Pius V, aimed at establishing the pro-Habsburg party in the context of the upcoming *interregnum*. The “family transaction”, embracing the most important representatives of the most powerful magnate families in Lithuania, was one of the most essential elements of this plan. The signatories vowed “do gardła i utracenia ostatniej majątności jeden drugiego nie odstępować, ale od tych czasów wiecznie z sobą przestawać, przeciw każdemu nieprzyjacielowi [...], tak za żywota Pana naszego [Zygmunta Augusta – T.K.], jako i po żywocie [...]” [“to remain united until death or loss of the last estate, and to support each other against any enemy [...] both during the lifetime of Our Lord [Sigismund Augustus – T.K.] and after his death [...]” – transl. A.Ch.]. They promised each other not to reveal their secrets to third parties⁵⁹.

Taking into consideration the participation of the papal legate in the whole event, it must be added that this family pact was only a preliminary stage of the final agreement signed at the end of the seym by G.F. Commendone, J. Chodkiewicz and “Sierotka”. The latter two, in the presence of the papal legate and as representatives of Lithuania, pledged to support Emperor Maximilian II’s son – Archduke Ernest – as a candidate to the throne. It must be noted that M. Radziwiłł “Rudy” did not participate in this stage of the agreement. As a Calvinist he was not prepared to support the candidacy of the archduke who represented the family associated with Catholicism and its more radical “militant type”. That is why special arguments were needed to convince the influential Lithuanian magnate to support the Habsburg archduke. “Sierotka” – his nephew – provided such arguments to persuade his uncle. Finally, “Sierotka”, J. Chodkiewicz and M. Radziwiłł “Rudy” along with other Lithuanian magnates intended to conduct the election of Ernest in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and through his marriage with Anna Jagiellon, Sigismund Augustus’s sister, they wanted to impose upon the Poles not only the king, but also the conditions under which the union of Lublin should be maintained. The conditions included the reclaim of the lands taken away from Lithuania in 1569 and the permission to hold separate particular Lithuanian seyms. Leading

⁵⁷ Antonio Maria Graziani (Commendone’s secretary) to the cardinal Stanisław Hozjusz, 9 April 1572, *Iulii Pogiani Sunensis epistolae et orationes olim collectae ab Antonio Maria Gratiano ab Hieronymo Lagomarsinio e Societate Jesu*, vol. 4: (1565–1568), Romae 1758, p. 180; Giovanni Commendone to the cardinal Como (Tolomeo Galli), 9 July 1572, *Uchańsciana czyli zbiór dokumentów wyjaśniających życie i działalność Jakóba Uchańskiego, arcybiskupa gnieźnieńskiego...*, ed. Teodor WIERZBOWSKI, vol. 4, Warszawa 1892, p. 13; T. KEMPA, *Mikołaj Krzysztof Radziwiłł Sierotka*, p. 47.

⁵⁸ T. KEMPA, *Mikołaj Krzysztof Radziwiłł Sierotka*, p. 39–44.

⁵⁹ *Tranzakcja rodzinna pomiędzy Janem Chodkiewiczem a Mikołajem Radziwiłłem i jego synowcem Mikołajem Krzysztofem Radziwiłłem*, *Dziennik Warszawski*, vol. 7: 1827, pp. 284–290; T. KEMPA, *Mikołaj Krzysztof Radziwiłł Sierotka*, p. 65.

Lithuanian dignitaries were sure that “the Poles, as they did in the times of Sigismund I⁶⁰ will accept the same king as the Lithuanians”⁶¹. Just in case, at the meeting with G.F. Commendone, J. Chodkiewicz and “Sierotka” committed themselves to providing an army of 20 000 soldiers who would support the elector if need be. The papal legate tried to dissuade them from military action for fear it should lead to the dissolution of the union. He advised to leave the decision to the emperor and Ernest himself⁶². Contrary to appearances, the Lithuanians did not mean to break the union despite the risk the plan involved.

It should be emphasised that at the beginning of the *interregnum* after the death of Sigismund Augustus, the Lithuanian magnates were quite hostile towards the Poles. On the other hand, even the most radical of them such as “Sierotka” – the creator of the plan of the separate election of Archduke Ernest – wanted to maintain a close political bond with Poland. It was M.K. Radziwiłł who, a few days after the death of the king, instructed “Rudy” to make his envoys ensure “aby panowie bracia wiedzieli, że my nie tylko abyśmy mieli unię targać, ale ją jeszcze potwierdzamy, a dawamy znać o niebezpieczeństwach, które i Polsce, tak jako i Litwie, zaszkodzić mogą” [“that the Poles know that we not only refuse to tear the union, but we confirm it and shall let you know about the dangers that could threaten Poland and Lithuania” – transl. A.Ch.]⁶³. Thus, one of the most fundamental factors deciding about the intention to cooperate with the Crown were dangers from other countries, mostly from the Muscovites.

The Lithuanian magnates attempted to carry out the separate particular election of Archduke Ernest in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania especially during the first and second *interregnum* (1572–1573, 1575–1576⁶⁴). The plan reappeared for

⁶⁰ Thanks to the permission of the Lithuanian dignitaries for Sigismund Augustus to take the Lithuanian throne, King Sigismund led to his election *vivente rege* also to the Polish throne (1529), which was opposed by the Polish *szlachta*. Finally, Sigismund Augustus took the Lithuanian throne during the reign of his father in 1544. He took over the Polish crown after the death of Sigismund I in 1548.

⁶¹ *Zbiór pamiątek historycznych o dawnej Polsce*, vol. 1, ed. Julian Ursyn NIEMCEWICZ, Lipsk 1838, pp. 145–146. More about the plans to carry out a separate election in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania during the first three *interregna* after the death of Sigismund Augustus see: T. КЕМПА, *Plany*, pp. 23–61.

⁶² Mikołaj Krzysztof Radziwiłł “Sierotka” to Giovanni Commendone, Warszawa, 9 June 1572, *Россия и Италия. Сборник исторических материалов и исследований, касающихся сношений России с Италией*, т. 2, выпуск 2, изд. Евгений Ф. Шмурло, Петербург 1913, pp. 536–537; *Zbiór pamiątek historycznych o dawnej Polsce*, vol. 2, ed. Julian Ursyn NIEMCEWICZ, Lipsk 1839, pp. 145–146; S. GRUSZECKI, *Zmowa*, pp. 273–274; T. КЕМПА, *Mikołaj Krzysztof Radziwiłł Sierotka*, pp. 66, 80.

⁶³ Mikołaj Krzysztof Radziwiłł “Sierotka” to Mikołaj Radziwiłł “Rudy”, Knyszyn, 18 July 1572, A. Трачевский, op.cit., appendix, no. 5, pp. 93–94.

⁶⁴ *Akta zjazdów stanów Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego*, vol. 1: *Okresy bezkrólewi (1572–1576, 1586–1587, 1632, 1648, 1696–1697, 1706–1709, 1733–1735, 1763–1764)*, ed. Henryk LULEWICZ, Warszawa 2006, no. 32, pp. 108–111; H. LULEWICZ, *Gniewów o unię*, pp. 190–192; T. КЕМПА, *Plany*, pp. 36–37.

a very short time during the third *interregnum* when its main creator “Sierotka” and his brother the cardinal Jerzy Radziwiłł⁶⁵ tried to revive it to support another Habsburg – Archduke Maximilian. However, the plan did not succeed for several reasons. Firstly, the Habsburgs – particularly Emperor Maximilian II – opposed it as they feared that it might put off many of their advocates among the Polish magnates, and might eventually lead to a war between Poland and Lithuania⁶⁶. Anna Jagiellon did not wish to take part in the plan, either. During subsequent *interregna* her relations with Lithuanian dignitaries were quite cold⁶⁷. She even threatened to disclose the letters concerning the project of the separate election⁶⁸. Finally, some senators also resisted taking part in the execution of the plan (such as the bishop of Vilnius Walerian Protaszewicz, the subchancellor Ostafii Wołłowicz) as they did not want to spoil the good relations between the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and Poland.

This fear was visible, for instance, during the so-called scandal of Rudniki (the name comes from the convention of Lithuanians in Rudniki in September 1572). Political opponents of the Radziwiłłs and the Chodkiewicz family – the castellan of Minsk Jan Hlebowicz and the duke of Slutsk Jerzy Olelkowicz presented the Poles with a forged document trying to convince them that leading Lithuanian dignitaries had wanted to carry out a separatist election of the Muscovite tsar in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, which did not in fact take place. However, Lithuanian dignitaries undoubtedly breached the union of Lublin in Rudniki. Although the act of the union gave both states – the Crown and Lithuania – the right to send diplomatic envoys to other countries, it required the agreement of the other party⁶⁹. At the same time in Rudniki a few dignitaries decided to send envoys to Muscovy in the name of the whole Rzeczpospolita without consulting the Poles⁷⁰. Irrespective

⁶⁵ T. KEMPA, *Plany*, pp. 53–61.

⁶⁶ Maximilian II to Mikołaj Krzysztof Radziwiłł “Sierotka”, Prague, 7, 8 and 15 July 1575 (three letters), Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchiv in Wien, Polen, carton 25, fol. 6, 24, 51 (part VII); Maximilian II to Andrzej Dudycz, Prague, 10 July 1575, *ibid.*, Polen, carton 25, fol. 40 (part VII); W. ZAKRZEWSKI, *op.cit.*, p. 383; Teodor WIERZBOWSKI, *Zabiegi cesarza Maksymiliana o koronę polską (1565–1576) (Dokończenie)*, Ateneum, vol. 4 (16), Warszawa 1879, p. 80; T. KEMPA, *Mikołaj Krzysztof Radziwiłł Sierotka*, p. 99.

⁶⁷ It resulted from her claims to the legacy (movable and non-movable) collected earlier in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania by her mother – Queen Bona Sforza, and which Sigismund August left to his sisters (Ewa DUBAS-URWANOWICZ, *Konflikt Anny Jagiellonki z dostojnikami litewskimi w pierwszym bezkrólewiu po śmierci Zygmunta Augusta*, [in:] *Z dziejów Europy Środkowo-Wschodniej. Księga pamiątkowa ofiarowana prof. dr. hab. Władysławowi A. Serczykowi w 60 rocznicę Jego urodzin*, ed. eadem, Antoni MIRONOWICZ, Halina PARAFIANOWICZ, Białystok 1995, pp. 143–151; H. LULEWICZ, *Gniewów o unię*, pp. 194–195; T. KEMPA, *Plany*, pp. 28–29).

⁶⁸ Jakub Gosławski to Jan Chodkiewicz, Warszawa, 27 January 1573, BKór., manuscript 11617.

⁶⁹ *Akta unji*, p. 344; H. WISNER, *Rzeczpospolita Wazów*, vol. 3, p. 29.

⁷⁰ More about the convention in Rudniki and its consequences for the Polish-Lithuanian relations: Antanas TYLA, *The formation of Lithuanian eastern policy: the dietine of Rūdninkai, September 24–27, 1572*, Lithuanian Historical Studies, vol. 1: 1996, pp. 22–37; Henryk LULEWICZ, *Zjazd*

of the fact how far the Lithuanian political leaders – M. Radziwiłł “Rudy” and J. Chodkiewicz – had violated the regulations of the union, the case gave rise to heated reactions on both the Polish and Lithuanian sides. Many Lithuanian dignitaries (i.e. W. Protaszewicz and O. Wołłowicz) expressed their fears concerning the future of the union and Polish-Lithuanian relations⁷¹. The reaction of the Poles and some Lithuanian dignitaries astonished “Rudy” and J. Chodkiewicz to such a point that they decided to stop the Lithuanian envoy Michał Harabuda even though he was already on his way to Muscovy⁷². However, it must be underlined that the most significant aim of M. Harabuda’s mission was to prolong the armistice in the war with Muscovy (it was due to finish at the end of June 1573), which was of utmost importance for the Grand Duchy of Lithuania in the period of *interregnum*. The Lithuanians did not hesitate to start negotiations with the Muscovites again without the permission of the Poles in 1587 at the site of the election soon after the new monarch had been chosen (after the split election). The talks with the Muscovite envoys ended on 19 August in the signing of a fifteen-year truce in the name of the whole Rzeczpospolita despite the fact that the negotiations had taken place without the participation of the representatives of the Crown⁷³. It must be added that the Poles were unwilling to blow up the scandal of Rudniki, for they wanted to strengthen the union of Lublin⁷⁴, which was accepted by all Lithuanian magnates with great relief.

It is also worth noting that the Lithuanians tried to underline the unity in their “national” camp when they gathered for the election⁷⁵. They showed off their distinction from the Crown by setting up their camp in a separate place. It also happened at the convent of Stężyca where Henry III of Valois was dethroned⁷⁶. The attempts to evince the solidarity and unity against Poland were not always effective in the face of differences between Lithuanian magnates and the *szlachta*.

w Rudnikach we wrześniu 1572 r., *Przegląd Historyczny*, vol. 91: 2000, no. 3, pp. 203–219; T. KEMPA, *Mikołaj Krzysztof Radziwiłł Sierotka*, pp. 73–79; H. LULEWICZ, *Gniewów o unię*, pp. 91–107; Boris N. FLORJA, *Wschodnia polityka magnatów litewskich w okresie pierwszego bezkrólewia*, *Odrodzenie i Reformacja w Polsce*, vol. 20: 1975, pp. 53–59; Tomasz KEMPA, *Meandry działalności publicznej Jana Janowicza Hlebowicza*, [in:] *Przez kresy i historię po obrzeża polityki. Profesorowi Marcelemu Kosmanowi w półwiecze pracy naukowej*, vol. 1, ed. Iwona HOFMAN, Wojciech MAGUŚ, Toruń 2011, pp. 167–170.

⁷¹ Jakub Gosławski to Jan Chodkiewicz, Warszawa, 26 January 1573, BKórń., manuscript 11617; T. KEMPA, *Plany*, p. 31.

⁷² H. LULEWICZ, *Gniewów o unię*, p. 130.

⁷³ H. WISNER, *Rzeczpospolita Wazów*, vol. 3, p. 29; Tomasz KEMPA, *Lithuanian magnates and nobility towards the Sigismund Vasa’s candidature for the throne of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in 1587–1588* (in print).

⁷⁴ Jakub Gosławski to Jan Chodkiewicz, Warszawa, 21 January 1573, BKórń., manuscript 11617.

⁷⁵ T. KEMPA, *Mikołaj Krzysztof Radziwiłł Sierotka*, p. 266; H. LULEWICZ, *Gniewów o unię*, pp. 379–381.

⁷⁶ T. KEMPA, *Mikołaj Krzysztof Radziwiłł Sierotka*, pp. 97.

The second important issue from the point of view of the union's improvement in the subsequent *interregna* was the necessity to convince the magnates and the *szlachta* from the lands incorporated into the Crown in 1569 to support the idea of the lands being given back to the Grand Duchy of Lithuanian. This turned out to be a very tough task.

Despite the fact that the Lithuanians wanted to regain all the lands lost in 1569, at the beginning of the *interregnum* they focused mainly on regaining Volhynia⁷⁷. This was the most populated and the richest area of all the areas incorporated by Poland. Apart from that, the Lithuanians thought that the Volhynian magnates would be easier to cooperate with than the *szlachta* from other territories taken away from Lithuania⁷⁸. The Lithuanian dignitaries hoped that the Volhynian magnates might attract the *szlachta* not only from Volhynia, but also from the Kievan land and the land of Bratslav as many Volhynian magnates held their estates there along with their noble clientele (landless *szlachta*).

In July 1572 at the convent of Lutsk, the *szlachta* of Volhynia clearly supported the idea of Volhynia being a part of Poland. The envoy of Lithuanian dignitaries Aleksander Chodkiewicz, who was staying in Volhynia at that time, stated that “niemal wszystka szlachta wołyńska na tym terazniejszym zjachaniu swym, gdy czytano w uniwersale knyszynskim, że Wasz Mościowie [senatorowie litewscy – T.K.] o Wołyń i Podlasze na elekcyji mówić chcą, krzyknęła, iż nie chcą przysiąg swych łamać i przeciw sumnieniu swemu co poczynać i jakoż to wiem za pewne, że ich wielka część jest niezycliwych litewskiemu państwu” [“almost all the Volhynian *szlachta* at the convent shouted they would not break their vows and would not act against their conscience when the letters of Knyszyn were being read announcing that You Lords [Lithuanian senators – T.K.] wanted to speak about Volhynia and Podlachia at the election; I know it is certain that most of them do not support the Lithuanian state” – transl. A.Ch.]⁷⁹. The Kievan *szlachta* took a similar stand at the *sejmik* before the seym of 1572 prior to the death of Sigismund Augustus⁸⁰. Similar resolutions were signed at the convent of Hlyniany where the *szlachta* arrived from the Ruthenian lands of the Crown (mainly from the Podolian and Ru-

⁷⁷ Yet, the Lithuanian court treasurer Ławryn Woyna (a member of Jan Chodkiewicz's clientele (landless *szlachta*)) indicated the necessity for the leading Lithuanian politicians to communicate with “noblemen from Volhynia, the Kievan land, the Bratslav land and Podlachia” in the context of the future election of the monarch, Ławryn Woyna to Jan Chodkiewicz, Łomża, 28 September 1572, BKórń., manuscript 11617.

⁷⁸ Apart from that, Lithuanians diminished the significance of the Volhynian *szlachta* if Jan Chodkiewicz commented that representatives of a few ducal families (the Czartoryskis, the Ostrogskis, the Wiśniowieckis, the Zbaraskis) “have Volhynia in manibus”, a letter of Jan Chodkiewicz to an unknown recipient (not dated), BKórń., manuscript 11617.

⁷⁹ Aleksander Chodkiewicz to Jan Chodkiewicz, Dojlidy, 6 October 1572, BKórń., manuscript 11617.

⁸⁰ Karol MAZUR, *W stronę integracji z Koroną. Sejmiki Wołynia i Ukrainy w latach 1569–1648*, Warszawa 2006, p. 257.

thenian voivodeships along with delegates from Volhynia and the land of Belz)⁸¹. At the convocation seym in Warsaw in 1573 where the form, place and time of the future election was being discussed, “posłowie podlascy i wołyńscy opowiadali się, iż żadnym obyczajem do Litwy nie chcą” [“Podlachian and Volhynian envoys declared that they by no means wanted to be part of Lithuania” – transl. A.Ch.]⁸² – as said one of the members of J. Chodkiewicz’s clientele, Jakub Gosławski. Other Lithuanian envoys at the convocation, O. Wołłowicz and Paweł Pac, commented as follows: “Panowie Wołyńcy, Kianie [Kijowianie – T.K.], Braclawianie, Podlaszanie wiarę swą ku Koronie ofiarowali tak, że też naszemu poselstwu jako szcudłkiem w nos dali” [“Volhynian lords, Kievians, noblemen of Bratslav and Podlachia announced their loyalty to the Crown and thumbed their nose at us” – transl. A.Ch.]⁸³. At the coronations seym of Henry III Valois at the beginning of 1574 the envoys from the voivodeships incorporated into the Crown declared that they even “wołać pójść do niewoli raczej, niż wracać pod jarzmo Litwinów” [“prefer to go into captivity rather than return under the Lithuanian yoke” – transl. A.Ch.]⁸⁴. Moreover, during the first *interregnum*, the Volhynian *szlachta* cooperated closely with the *szlachta* of the Ruthenian and Beltz voivodeships located before 1569 within the boundaries of the Crown⁸⁵. Later, the cooperation developed and gave rise to migrations and settlement (particularly from the territories of the former Red Ruthenia – Halych to Volhynia)⁸⁶. It was a conscious or subconscious reference to the traditions of the common state within the monarchy of the Romanovichi – a branch of the Rurik dynasty in the 13th–14th centuries.

What were the results of the attempts made by Aleksander Chodkiewicz – the Lithuanian envoy – to convince the Volhynian magnates to support the plan to

⁸¹ About the conventions in Lutsk and Gliniany see: Biblioteka Czartoryskich w Krakowie (further: BCzart.), manuscript 80, no. 49; Biblioteka Jagiellońska w Krakowie, manuscript 3/52, pp. 28–35; Ewa DUBAS-URWANOWICZ, *Koronne zjazdy szlacheckie w dwóch pierwszych bezkrólewiach po śmierci Zygmunta Augusta*, Białystok 1998, pp. 39–40, 128, 135, 159; eadem, *Stosunek Korony*, p. 19; Михайло Грушевський, *Історія України-Руси*, т. 4, Київ 1993, pp. 419–420; K. MAZUR, op.cit., pp. 40–41, 233, 268.

⁸² Jakub Gosławski to Jan Chodkiewicz, Warszawa, 24 January 1573, BKórń., manuscript 11617. See also: H. LULEWICZ, *Gniewów o unię*, p. 129.

⁸³ Ostafi Wołłowicz, Paweł Pac to Lithuanian senators, Warszawa, 21 January 1573, Biblioteka Polskiej Akademii Umiejętności i Polskiej Akademii Nauk w Krakowie (further: BPAU-PAN), manuscript 8809, p. 43; H. LULEWICZ, *Gniewów o unię*, p. 129.

⁸⁴ Ś. ORZELSKI, *Bezkrólewia*, vol. 1, p. 262; K. MAZUR, op.cit., p. 259.

⁸⁵ Mikołaj Dorohostajski wrote to Jan Chodkiewicz: „panowie z województwa ruskiego i bełskiego często obsyłają się i postanowienia, które czynią na zjazdach swych, zawsze Ich Mościom panom wołyńskim oznajmują, wzywając rady i we wszem chcą się zgadzać z pany Wołyńcy” [“noblemen from the voivodeships of Ruthenia and Beltz consult each other and announce their decisions to Volhynian magnates wanting always to agree with the Volhynians” – transl. A.Ch.]. Mikołaj Dorohostajski to Jan Chodkiewicz, Dorohostaje, 9 November 1572, BPAU-PAN, manuscript 8809, pp. 148–150. See also: K. MAZUR, op.cit., pp. 268–269.

⁸⁶ Natalia JAKOWENKO, *Historia Ukrainy. Od czasów najdawniejszych do końca XVIII wieku*, transl. Ola HNATIUK, Katarzyna KOTYŃSKA, Lublin 2000, pp. 157–158.

return the annexed lands back to the Grand Duchy of Lithuania? At the aforementioned convent of Lutsk in 1572, A. Chodkiewicz met the voivode of Volhynia Bohusz Korecki, the voivode of Bratslav Andrzej Wiśniowiecki and Janusz Zbarski. Mikołaj Dorohostajski, a Lithuanian landowner with estates in Volhynia, was also present. According to A. Chodkiewicz, all these men were to declare that they “chcą być do tego chętliwymi, jakoby z Waszymi Mościami [litewskimi senatorami – T.K.] w starożytnej społeczności być mogli i drugich namawiając, którzy się nieco chęciami swemi gdzie indziej obrócili, aby tegoż animuszu przeciwko Rzeczypospolitej Litewskiej pospołu z nimi byli [...]. Przeto tedy Waszych Mości pilnie proszą wszech wobec, abyście im Wasz Mościowie tej rady dodali, jakoby oni oznajmiwszy wolą swą panom polskim, że przy Waszych Mościech przestawać chcą i gardł swych i majątności bezpieczni być mogli, gdzie tego Ich Mościowie widzieć nie będą, tedy z trudnością i wielkim niebezpieczeństwem swym odkrywać by się z tym mieli” [“are willing to live with You Lords [Lithuanian senators – T.K.] in the ancient community and to convince the others whose will goes to another direction to join us [...]. We do ask You Lords to ensure that when we express our willingness to Polish magnates to stay with You Lords, we could feel safe about our lives and estates even when You Lords are not looking, for difficulty and great danger will be faced by us” – transl. A.Ch.]⁸⁷.

The first part of the extract of A. Chodkiewicz’s letter may prove that at least some noblemen from Volhynia advocated the Lithuanian plans to “reform the union” and to return Volhynia (and other annexed territories) to Lithuania. Nevertheless, the reservation made at the end of the letter clearly points out that the Volhynian dukes were merely leading the Lithuanian dignitaries on with empty promises. It goes beyond doubt that that they did not intend to risk their political career. It must be added that during the *interregnum* none of the dukes mentioned in A. Chodkiewicz’s letter openly cooperated with the Lithuanians⁸⁸.

The most influential of the Volhynian magnates – the voivode of Kiev Konstanty Ostrogski – was the least willing to cooperate with the Lithuanians. At a private meeting with A. Chodkiewicz, he described his personal grievances against the Lithuanian magnates. However, he also stated that the Lithuanians “should not doubt his belief in the Rzeczypospolita of Lithuania”. He expressed his fear of not being left stranded afterwards “aby się wyrwawszy z tym przed swaty, na koszu potym nie został”⁸⁹ [of not being left stranded once he had put forward his claims – transl. A.Ch.]. In fact, K. Ostrogski did not intend to enter into any closer relations with the Lithuanian magnates. Although in March 1573 the voivode of Kiev ensured the Lithuanians that he intended to serve Lithuania like his ancestors, they were only meaningless promises. The Lithuanian court treasurer Ławryn Woyna, who was holding talks with the voivode of Kiev at that time, learnt that K. Ostrogski had sent

⁸⁷ Aleksander Chodkiewicz to Jan Chodkiewicz, 6 October 1572, BKórń., manuscript 11617.

⁸⁸ Т. Кемпа, *Волиняни*, p. 260.

⁸⁹ Aleksander Chodkiewicz to Jan Chodkiewicz, 6 October 1572, BKórń., manuscript 11617.

envoys to the Polish senators with the declaration that if the Lithuanians elected the “Muscovite to be their king”, he would help the Poles with his army in order not to allow the tsar to rule in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania⁹⁰. It was a reaction to the so-called “scandal of Rudniki” (see above). In practice, during the *interregnum* the voivode of Kiev insisted on maintaining the union of Lublin in its original form and defended Volhynia’s belonging to the Crown. Also at the coronation seym of Henry III Valoise, he gave a rousing speech approving of the union of Lublin and the incorporation of Ruthenian lands into the Crown in 1569⁹¹.

It seems that among all Volhynian magnates it was the voivode of Volhynia Michał Czartoryski who was favourably inclined towards the plan of returning the incorporated lands to the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. The reason might have been the fact that he was J. Chodkiewicz’s brother-in-law. During the second *interregnum* (1574–1575) he promised the Lithuanians to persuade the *szlachta* of Volhynia to return it to the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. Nevertheless, as suggested by H. Lulewicz, the political influence of the young duke was limited and there is no evidence that he was supported by a group of dissatisfied Volhynian *szlachta* who wanted Volhynia to belong to Lithuania. M. Czartoryski hoped to win J. Chodkiewicz’s trust by boasting of his political supporters⁹².

What is more, Lithuanian dignitaries were divided among themselves about the problem of issuing a written guarantee (they referred to it as “bail”) for Volhynians stating that they would oppose the Poles collectively even if such resistance should result in deteriorating the relations with the Crown. One of the dignitaries who were against signing such a guarantee was the bishop of Vilnius W. Protaszewicz⁹³. Despite all the above, “Rudy” and J. Chodkiewicz still insisted on persuading Volhynians to support the plan to “reform the union”: “A ktemu dobrze by było, abyś Wasz Mość chocia od siebie a ode mnie tylko raczył kazać napisac listy na Wołyń, jeden do książąt i wojewod, a drugi do szlachty, animując ich [...]” [“It would be good if you, my Lord, wrote letters in your name and my name to Volhynia, one to the dukes and voivodes, and the other to the *szlachta*, giving them courage [...]” – transl. A.Ch.]⁹⁴. – advised “Rudy” to J. Chodkiewicz in January 1573. Nevertheless, soon both of them must have learnt about the convocation in Warsaw during which the Volhynian and Podlachian *szlachta* that they belonged to the Crown. In later periods there exist no sources that would prove that Lithuanians tried to

⁹⁰ Ławryn Woyna to Jan Chodkiewicz, Wołkowysk, 4 March 1573, BKórn., manuscript 11617; Tomasz KEMPA, *Książęta Ostrogscy a kwestia unii polsko-litewskiej w XVI wieku*, Wrocławskie Studia Wschodnie, vol. 8: 2004, p. 61.

⁹¹ Ś. ORZELSKI, *Bezkrólewia*, vol. 1, p. 262; T. KEMPA, *Konstanty Wasyl Ostrogski*, pp. 49–50; idem, *Książęta Ostrogscy*, p. 61.

⁹² Michał Czartoryski to Jan Chodkiewicz, 18 April [1575], BPAU-PAN, manuscript 1885, fol. 97–98; H. LULEWICZ, *Gniewów o unię*, p. 202.

⁹³ H. LULEWICZ, *Gniewów o unię*, p. 105.

⁹⁴ Mikołaj Radziwiłł “Rudy” to Jan Chodkiewicz, Kojdanów, 3 January 1573, BKórn., manuscript 11617.

influence Volhynians again in order to win them over to the plan to re-incorporate Volhynia to Lithuania.

There is only one official document available that may, but does not have to, indicate that several Volhynian and Kievan magnates attempted to act according to the intentions of Lithuanian dignitaries a few months later. The document is a declaration issued at the election seym (30 April 1573) by an official French envoy the bishop Jean de Monluc where he declared – in the name of the future king Henry III Valois – his intention to maintain the rights and privileges of the Volhynian, Kievan and Bratslavian voivodeships and to reincorporate them into Lithuania⁹⁵. The recipients of the declaration were the most important dignitaries from the voivodeships: the voivode of Kiev K. Ostrogski, the voivode of Bratslav A. Wiśniowiecki, the voivode of Volhynia Bohusz Korecki, the castellan of Bratslav Wasyl Zahorowski, the castellan of Kiev Paweł Sapieha. All of them, with the exception of P. Sapieha, were connected with Volhynia and partly with the Kievan land as they held their estates there. The document also included a paragraph concerning the maintenance of privileges and freedoms of the “Greek religion”. The problem was that K. Ostrogski, the most influential dignitary, did not want to support the candidacy of Henry for religious reasons. On 11 May near Grochowo with a few non-Catholic magnates he attempted to elect another candidate to the Polish throne. Eventually, the group of “secessionists” not supported by the *szlachta* returned to the main election field and elected the French candidate⁹⁶. It seems that the creation of the declaration of 30 April might have taken place on the initiative of the leading Lithuanian dignitaries (perhaps even without asking the Volhynian dukes), for a few days earlier on 26 April 1573 the French envoys J. de Monluc and Guy de Lansac issued a document which guaranteed the maintenance of privileges and freedoms of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. The document also included the promise to reincorporate Volhynia, the Kievan land, the Bratslavian land and part of Podlachia into Lithuania⁹⁷.

Irrespective of how we would interpret the declaration of 30 April 1573, it did not change the positive attitude of the Volhynians towards the union of Lublin or Volhynia’s belonging to Poland. The majority of the politically active Volhynian *szlachta* and magnates from Volhynia, the Bratslavian land and the Kievan land expressed their positive attitude towards the decisions of the seym of Lublin. For most noblemen it was essential that the “incorporation privilege” sworn in 1569 by Sigismund Augustus guaranteed the autonomy of Volhynia and Ukrainian voivodeships within the Crown⁹⁸. It was the foundation of the future concept of

⁹⁵ BCzart., manuscript 309, no. 3, pp. 18–20; *Henri de Valois et la Pologne*, ed. Emmanuel H. NOAILLES, vol. 3, Paris 1867, pp. 402–404; H. LULEWICZ, *Gniewów o unię*, p. 139.

⁹⁶ Ś. ORZEŃSKI, *Bezkrólewia*, vol. 1, pp. 121–123; Stefan GRUSZECKI, *Walka o władzę w Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej po wygaśnięciu dynastii Jagiellonów (1572–1573)*, Warszawa 1969, p. 280; T. KEMPA, *Konstanty Wasyl Ostrogski*, pp. 69–70.

⁹⁷ BCzart., manuscript 309, no. 2, pp. 13–17; H. LULEWICZ, *Gniewów o unię*, p. 139.

⁹⁸ More: Tomasz KEMPA, *Ziemie ruskie inkorporowane do Korony w 1569 roku – odrębności*

Ruthenia as the third element of the Rzeczpospolita⁹⁹. For Volhynian magnates it was also important that the union had not changed the social hierarchy in Volhynia. Representatives of ducal families still constituted the majority there, for they owned large territories and estates. Jarosław Pełeński rightly points out that the union enabled Ruthenian magnates from the lands incorporated into Poland in 1569 to “acquire more significance and prestige”¹⁰⁰. Very soon, representatives of the most outstanding Volhynian families such as the Ostrogskis, the Zbaraskis, the Wiśniowieckis, the Zasławskis, and later the Czartoryskis were politically promoted and started to hold the highest positions in the country having become part of the political elite of Poland¹⁰¹.

In Podlachia, the Lithuanians did not manage to win the support for their plans. They encountered not only a hostile attitude from the local *szlachta*, but were also opposed by two local senators: the voivode of Podlachia Mikołaj Kiszka (from a very well known Lithuanian family) and the castellan of Podlachia Adam Kosiński¹⁰². Moreover, the *szlachta* of Podlachia supported the idea of a slow shift of borders for the benefit of Poland, which was caused by the fact that some noblemen with their estates in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania near the border with Poland, such as the Pole Kasper Dembiński (the son of the crown chancellor Walenty Dembiński), married to a Lithuanian Maryna Kopciówna, tried to make their estates fall under the jurisdiction of Polish offices and courts. They very often succeeded, which met with strong opposition from the Lithuanians¹⁰³ and resulted in the creation of border committees by the seym (in the years: 1579, 1589, 1591, 1596, 1598, 1601, 1607), the aim of which was to strictly define the borders between the Podlachian voivodeship belonging to the Crown and the Brest-Lithuanian voivodeship¹⁰⁴.

prawnoustrojowe i postawy szlachty ukraińskiej (ruskiej) do połowy XVII wieku, [in:] *Rzeczpospolita w XVI–XVIII wieku. Państwo czy wspólnota?*, ed. Bogusław DYBAŚ, Paweł HANCZEWSKI, Tomasz KEMPA, Toruń 2007, pp. 129–148.

⁹⁹ Natalia JAKOWENKO, *Ruś jako trzeci człon Rzeczypospolitej Obojga Narodów w myśli ukraińskiej I połowy XVII wieku*, [in:] *Unia lubelska i tradycje integracyjne w Europie Środkowo-Wschodniej*, ed. Jerzy KŁOCZOWSKI, Paweł KRAS, Hubert ŁASZKIEWICZ, Lublin 1999, pp. 79–83.

¹⁰⁰ Jarosław PEŁEŃSKI, *Inkorporacja ukraińskich ziem dawnej Rusi do Korony w 1569 roku. Ideologia i korzyści – próba nowego spojrzenia*, *Przegląd Historyczny*, vol. 65: 1974, no. 2, p. 259.

¹⁰¹ Tomasz KEMPA, *Magnateria ruska wobec unii lubelskiej (1569)*, *Białoruskie Zeszyty Historyczne*, vol. 16: 2001, p. 24.

¹⁰² Janusz Kiszka to Krzysztof Radziwiłł, Lubcz, 30 October 1572, Archiwum Główne Akt Dawnych w Warszawie, Archiwum Radziwiłłów, dz. V, 6759, fol. 1; O. HALECKI, *Dzieje*, vol. 2, p. 279, 305.

¹⁰³ Jerzy Ościk, the voivode of Mstislavl feared that „to oberwane [przez unię lubelską – T.K.] Wielkie Księstwo Litewskie dalej ukrócone nie było” [“the trimmed Duchy of Lithuania should lose even more territories in the future” – trans. A.Ch.], Jerzy Ościk to Jan Chodkiewicz, Wiżuny, 7 October 1576, BKórń., manuscript 11617; see also: Mikołaj Radziwiłł “Rudy” to Mikołaj Krzysztof Radziwiłł “Sierotka”, Dokudów, 11 November 1571, RNB, Ф. 971, Оп. 2, the collection of autographs 234, no. 58; H. LULEWICZ, *Gniewów o unię*, pp. 53–55, 295, 307, 319; M. FERENC, op.cit., pp. 381–384.

¹⁰⁴ D. MICHALUK, op.cit., pp. 40–46.

The opposition of the Podlachians against the re-incorporation of their province into Lithuania was so great that the Lithuanians quickly realised that their demands would not bear fruit and private contacts they limited themselves to expressing the necessity to re-incorporate into Lithuania only the remaining three voivodeships (the Volhynian, the Kievan and Bratslavian provinces). However, in official documents presented to the Polish party or to candidates to the throne they also insisted on Podlachia being returned to Lithuania. The demand to re-incorporate all the lost lands appeared regularly during the three *interregna*, but from the second *interregnum* it was put forward only formally¹⁰⁵, for Lithuanians had lost hope of success in view of the protests of the Poles and other inhabitants of the province. Later it was no longer expressed in official contacts with the Polish party or the king, but the Lithuanians knew how to remind the Poles about the humiliation they had experienced while the vast lands were taken away from them. When the Poles demanded that the Grand Duchy of Lithuania contribute in the costs of the defence of the lost lands against Tatars, the *szlachta* of Minsk instructed their envoys to the seym of 1601 “Ich Mościowie panowie koronni za wzięciem Wołynia, Podlasia i Kijowa na się przyjąć raczyli” [that the costs “were taken upon by You Lords along with the incorporation of Volhynia, Podlachia and Kiev” – transl. A.Ch.]¹⁰⁶. It is also a good example to illustrate how the Lithuanians distanced themselves from the matters of the Crown, which constituted a characteristic attitude for the Lithuanian policy in the period after the union of Lublin, as underlined by H. Lulewicz¹⁰⁷. It must be added that during the first two *interregna*, after the death of Sigismund Augustus when the Lithuanians knew they would not regain the lost lands, they insisted that the revenues from the provinces lost in 1569 be sent to the Lithuanian treasury¹⁰⁸. Naturally, their efforts were fruitless.

As a result, the most important Lithuanian demand made to “reform the union” during the period of three *interregna* after the death of Sigismund Augustus was never achieved. The Lithuanian magnates expressed also other demands towards Poland and candidates to the throne of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth (or to kings-electors). Some of the demands were practical, while others were only to add prestige to Lithuania.

Another “territorial” claim put forward by the Lithuanians during the three *interregna* was the demand to incorporate Livonia into Lithuania. The demand became particularly significant during the third *interregnum*. Originally, the status of the province which was the cause of a military conflict between the Grand Duchy of Lithuania (and soon the whole Rzeczpospolita) and the Muscovites, was not

¹⁰⁵ H. LULEWICZ, *Gniewów o unię*, pp. 283. Still, at the beginning of 1577, e.g. M. Radziwiłł “Rudy” seemed not to believe in the possibility of regaining Volhynia, see: Mikołaj Radziwiłł “Rudy” to Jan Chodkiewicz and Mikołaj Krzysztof Radziwiłł “Sierotka”, Kojdanów, 28 January 1577, BKórn., manuscript 11617.

¹⁰⁶ Cited from: H. WISNER, *Rzeczpospolita Wazów*, vol. 3, p. 9.

¹⁰⁷ H. LULEWICZ, *Gniewów o unię*, p. 63.

¹⁰⁸ T. KEMPA, *Mikołaj Krzysztof Radziwiłł Sierotka*, p. 76; H. LULEWICZ, *Gniewów o unię*, p. 148.

precisely defined. According to the Lithuanians, from 1566 – the seym of Grodno – Livonia was connected only with the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. The Poles did not agree with it as they considered the province to be a Polish-Lithuanian condominium. The status of the province was defined in this way at the seym of Lublin despite the protest of the Lithuanians¹⁰⁹. In practice, in the next few years Livonia was governed by both Lithuanian dignitaries (the Livonian viceroy from 1566 was Jan Chodkiewicz) and the Livonian *szlachta*¹¹⁰. However, the Lithuanians did accept such a distribution of power, for they wanted to hold all the offices of starost connected with the province and dismiss the local *szlachta* of German origin¹¹¹. The situation changed when the Muscovite army conquered most of Livonia (north of the Daugava river) in 1577 and the army of the Rzeczpospolita managed to regain the territory during the wars of Báthory (1579–1581). Stefan Báthory treated Livonia as a conquered territory, which did not force him to respect earlier regulations concerning Livonia made during the reign of Sigismund Augustus¹¹². As a result, the Lithuanians lost (1582) their influence in the province for the benefit of Poland and some Hungarian commanders participating in the war with Muscovy, which forced the Lithuanians to insist on Livonia being incorporated into the Grand Duchy of Lithuania¹¹³. The problem was solved in January 1588, which I shall discuss later on.

Some Lithuanian demands from the period following the union of Lublin concerned a clear delimitation of competence between Polish and Lithuanian officials in a such a way that Lithuania should not be harmed. At the seym of 1570 and 1571 there were conflicts between Poles and Lithuanians concerning the division of competence of the Polish and Lithuanian marshalls (the great crown marshall and the court marshall) despite the fact that “the order according to which crown and Lithuanian marshalls are to conduct” enacted soon after the union of Lublin (19 July 1569) stipulated that in Poland the most important were crown marshalls while in Lithuania the biggest competence was given to Lithuanian marshalls. However, the problem was that the kings spent most of their time in Poland, which did not provide Lithuanian marshalls with many opportunities to exercise their power. The Poles did not want to allow the Lithuanian marshalls to take over the responsibilities during the absence of the great crown marshall if the court marshall of the Crown was present at the court. The conflict of competence concerning

¹⁰⁹ *Źródłopisma do dziejów unii Korony Polskiej i Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego*, ed. Tytus DZIAŁYŃSKI, vol. 3, Poznań 1856, pp. 240–241; *Volumina legum*, vol. 2, ed. Jozafat OHRYZKO, Petersburg 1859, p. 94; M. FERENC, op.cit., p. 350.

¹¹⁰ H. LULEWICZ, *Gniewów o unię*, p. 52.

¹¹¹ Aleksander Chodkiewicz to Jan Chodkiewicz, Zygwald, 21 March 1578, BKórn., manuscript 11617.

¹¹² Ewa DUBAS-URWANOWICZ, *O nowy kształt Rzeczypospolitej. Kryzys polityczny w państwie w latach 1576–1586*, Warszawa 2013, pp. 52–53.

¹¹³ T. KEMPA, *Mikołaj Krzysztof Radziwiłł Sierotka*, p. 94; H. LULEWICZ, *Gniewów o unię*, pp. 307, 365, 382–384, 386, 405, 409, 412–414.

crown marshalls and their Lithuanian equivalents was not solved until 1647 when it was established that the priority of competence belonged to the great crown marshall irrespective of his whereabouts, then to his Lithuanian counterpart, next to the court crown marshall and finally to the Lithuanian counterpart of the latter¹¹⁴.

Another question which Lithuanians paid attention to in their relations with the Poles concerned the interference of some central and court officials of the Crown in matters of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. For example, the Crown chanceries – the major and the minor – usurped the right to issue official documents and letters to voivodeships or particular officials of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. As demanded by the Lithuanians, King Stefan Báthory prohibited Polish officials from acting within the scope of competence of their Lithuanian counterparts. It was one of the conditions made by Lithuanian dignitaries prior to recognising Báthory to be the monarch of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth¹¹⁵.

As I mentioned earlier, Lithuanians after 1569 lost their separate seym whose scope of duty was taken over by the general seym (*sejm walny*) despite the fact that the maintenance of a separate parliamentary system in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania constituted one of the most important demands during the negotiations at the seym of Lublin. Although during the *interregna* the Lithuanians did not express this demand in their negotiations with Poland, they invariably underlined the necessity of the existence of a separate Lithuanian seym in their contacts with the Habsburgs concerning the particular election of Archduke Ernest in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania¹¹⁶. It must be noted that it was a far-reaching demand which affected the foundations of the union of Lublin; that is why the Lithuanians refrained from discussing it with the Polish party. Irrespective of the legal solutions, the practice showed that although the most important decisions concerning the Rzeczpospolita and Lithuania were made at the general seym, in the first two decades after the union of 1569 in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania there appeared separate parliamentary institutions called Lithuanian convocations (or Vilnius convocations) starting from the convent of Vaukavysk in 1577¹¹⁷. They played an auxiliary role in making political decisions concerning the budget. Conventions were called irregularly (whenever necessary) by the king or voivodes of Vilnius¹¹⁸. The creation

¹¹⁴ BCzart., manuscript 79, no. 44, fol. 143; *Akta unji*, no. 155, 175, pp. 376–378, 395–397; Jan SEREDYKA, *Konflikt marszałków koronnych z litewskimi od unii lubelskiej do połowy XVII wieku*, [in:] *Świat pogranicza*, ed. Mirosław NAGIELSKI, Andrzej RACHUBA, Sławomir GÓRZYŃSKI, Warszawa 2003, pp. 211–221; Т. КЕМРА, *Миколай Krzysztof Radziwiłł Sierotka*, pp. 62–63; H. LULEWICZ, *Gniewów o unię*, pp. 47–51; H. WISNER, *Rzeczpospolita Wazów*, vol. 3, pp. 16, 139–140.

¹¹⁵ *Źródła dziejowe*, vol. 4: *Początki panowania w Polsce Stefana Batorego 1575–1577. Listy, uniwersały, instrukcje*, ed. Adolf PAWIŃSKI, Warszawa 1877, pp. 30–32; H. LULEWICZ, *Gniewów o unię*, pp. 282.

¹¹⁶ H. LULEWICZ, *Gniewów o unię*, p.200.

¹¹⁷ Иван И. Лаппо, *Великое княжество Литовское за время от заключения Люблинской унии до смерти Стефана Батория (1569–1586)*, Санктпетербург 1901, pp. 163–167; A. RACHUBA, op.cit., pp. 243–245.

¹¹⁸ Henryk WISNER, *Konwokacja wileńska. Z dziejów parlamentaryzmu litewskiego w czasach*

of Lithuanian convocations resulted from the actions undertaken by the Lithuanians during the *interregna* after the death of Sigismund Augustus. What I mean here is the fact of holding a series of conventions by the Lithuanian magnates and *szlachta* during which significant political decisions were made (including decisions affecting the relations with the Crown)¹¹⁹. When later it turned out that the Lithuanians did not feel the need to gather at separate Lithuanian convocations, the institution slowly disappeared in the second half of the 17th century. What is more, convocations were to some extent boycotted by the Lithuanian *szlachta*, for magnates had too big an influence on decisions made during convocations¹²⁰.

As the most important decisions concerning the whole Rzeczpospolita and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania were made at the general seym, the Lithuanians insisted that such seyms be held not only in the Crown. In fact, after 1569 general seyms took place in the Crown (mostly in Warsaw) despite the fact that theoretically, according to the act of the union of Lublin, the choice of the site of the seym belonged to the king and the “crown and Lithuanian council”. In practice, however, it was the monarch who decided where the general seym were to be held. The Lithuanians wanted every second (later every third) seym to take place in Lithuanian (in Grodno or Brest). Moreover, they urged the king to reside every third years in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania¹²¹. The latter demand took into account the division of the Rzeczpospolita not into two federal states – Poland and Lithuania- but into three provinces: Lesser Poland [Małopolska], Greater Poland [Wielkopolska] and Lithuania. Such a division was reflected in the fact that every third marshall of the seym was Lithuanian (elected – like the marshalls from Lesser Poland and Greater Poland – by all envoys). This rule was enforced from 1574 despite the protest of Lithuanians who wanted their representative to be a marshall of every second seym alternately with the representative of the Crown¹²². The demand to hold every third seym in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania (at least *de iure*) was not fulfilled until 1673 when the seym constitution solved this problem¹²³. In subsequent decades some seyms in the last quarter of the 17th century and in the 18th century took place in Grodno.

It should be added that for Lithuanians another very prosaic problem was essential; namely, Lithuanians (especially at the seym of 1570) competed with Poles about the distribution of inns in Warsaw where seym were held, which for them

Zygmunta III, *Czasopismo Prawno-Historyczne*, vol. 20: 1968, no. 2, pp. 75–80; Jan SEREDYKA, *Konwokacja wileńska, ale jaka?*, *Zeszyty Naukowe WSP w Opolu, Historia*, vol. 12: 1974, pp. 121–139; Henryk WISNER, *Sejm litewski czy konwokacja wileńska?*, *ibid.*, pp. 111–120; A. RACHUBA, *op.cit.*, pp. 243–284.

¹¹⁹ H. Lulewicz gave the complet documentation of the conventions, see in: *Akta zjazdów*, pp. 19–314.

¹²⁰ A.B. ZAKRZEWSKI, *op.cit.*, p. 265.

¹²¹ T. KEMPA, *Mikołaj Krzysztof Radziwiłł Sierotka*, p. 262; H. LULEWICZ, *Gniewów o unię*, pp. 148, 278.

¹²² H. LULEWICZ, *Gniewów o unię*, pp. 75–76, 161.

¹²³ *Volumina legum*, vol. 5, ed. Jozafat OHRYZKO, Petersburg 1860, p. 67.

was a matter of prestige. In later periods at least this issue ceased to arouse heated emotions¹²⁴.

As far as the composition of the seym of the Rzeczpospolita was concerned, the Lithuanians (who constituted a significant minority in the senate) wanted to extend the upper chamber adding to it Lithuanian district marshalls whose importance would be equal to crown minor castellans. However, the Polish party rejected the proposal¹²⁵. Later, when the personal conflict between M. Radziwiłł “Rudy” – J. Chodkiewicz and the late king Sigismund Augustus’s next of kin – Duke of Slutsk Jerzy Olelkowicz – was obviated, the Lithuanians struggled to allow him and his offspring to belong to the senate. Earlier dukes of Slutsk, like the other closest relatives of the king, were obligatorily members of the Lithuanian council of noblemen. Nevertheless, the Poles argued that the Duke of Slutsk would be the only one to sit in the senate owing to his title and not the office he held, which would constitute a dangerous precedence. For this reason, the Lithuanians did not manage to achieve anything in this matter¹²⁶. Lithuanian dignitaries remained underrepresented in the senate.

During the *interregna* the most essential Lithuanian demands concerned everything that could lead to the emphasis of the significance of the Grand Duchy of Lithuanian in the election of the common monarch. Thus, the Lithuanians wanted the election of the new monarch of the Rzeczpospolita to take place nearer the Lithuanian border – in Parczew (possibly also in Lithuania or Węgrów) – not near Warsaw had been the case. They argued that a long time ago both parties had agreed to choose “Parczew for the site of common seyms as was established in the times of the union”¹²⁷. H. Lulewicz points out that this repeatedly expressed demand in the subsequent *interregna* constituted indirectly the insistence on the reincorporation of the lost lands, for the territories incorporated into Poland had been situated on the Polish-Lithuanian border before 1569¹²⁸. It is not known to what an extent the Poles understood this allusion of Lithuanians. The truth is this demand was never fulfilled by Poland.

The Lithuanians also questioned the legality of convening a convocation assembly during the *interregna* (the time and site of the election were normally decided there) by the primate of Poland, who as early as the first *interregnum* acquired the title of *interrex* – the most important person in the Rzeczpospolita.

¹²⁴ H. LULEWICZ, *Gniewów o unię*, p. 65.

¹²⁵ H. WISNER, *Rzeczpospolita Wazów*, vol. 3, pp. 17–18; H. LULEWICZ, *Gniewów o unię*, pp. 87, 125, 278.

¹²⁶ More about the attempts of the dukes of Slutsk to be admitted to the senate: Tomasz KEMPA, *Zabiegi kniaziów Olelkowiczów słuckich o uzyskanie miejsca w senacie po 1569 roku*, *Odrodzenie i Reformacja w Polsce*, vol. 47: 2003, pp. 65–88.

¹²⁷ Ostafi Wołłowicz, Paweł Pac to theor Lithuanian senators, Warszawa, 21 January 1573, BKórń., manuscript 11617; T. KEMPA, *Mikołaj Krzysztof Radziwiłł Sierotka*, pp. 76, 79, 262; H. LULEWICZ, *Gniewów o unię*, pp. 87, 124, 135, 220; M. FERENC, op.cit., p. 417.

¹²⁸ H. LULEWICZ, *Gniewów o unię*, p.135.

The Lithuanian dignitaries cited the act of the union which in fact said nothing about convening convocations. They also maintained that if such a convention was to take place, its date should be consulted with them, while the primate Jakub Uchański believed that this right belonged exclusively to him as interrex. Finally, the Lithuanians wanted such a convention to be organised as close to the Polish-Lithuanian border as possible. The Lithuanians questioned the correctness of the procedure of convening convocations in all the three *interregna*, which resulted in their refusal to participate in convocation assemblies. They only sent their envoys who, being in a minority, were not capable of forcing through the Lithuanian demands¹²⁹. Moreover, the Lithuanians resisted participating in other important conventions and political events during the first three *interregna*. As rightly suggested by H. Lulewicz, the Lithuanian magnates in this way executed their “own project of the union rejected during the negotiations prior to the seym of Lublin by the Crown. The project assumed that common Polish-Lithuanian seyms should take place only in reference to the most important issues such as the election of a new king or in the event of war against a common enemy”¹³⁰ [transl. A.Ch.].

Undoubtedly, the Lithuanian magnates insisted on participating in the common election of the monarch. However, each time they put forward their far-reaching strictly defined conditions of participation, which forced the impatient Crown dignitaries in the second and third *interregna* to elect the monarch on their own, without any Lithuanian participation¹³¹. The Lithuanians opposed, arguing that the regulations of the union seym had been breached, which was not true¹³². The Lithuanian magnates willingly raised the question of their lack of participation in the election of Stefan Báthory during the third *interregnum*¹³³. After the split election of August 1587 during which two hostile groups of senators and noble electors chose respectively Sigismund III Vasa and Archduke Maximilian to become king, the Lithuanian dignitaries put forward a bizarre solution. They suggested that the monarch be elected at random from among three candidates: Sigismund III Vasa, Maximilian and the Muscovite tsar Fiodor. Obviously, the idea was categorically rejected¹³⁴.

Another point included in the act of the union of 1569, which was to underline the autonomy of the Grand Duchy of Lithuanian in the relationship with Poland, referred to retaining the title of the Lithuanian duke next to the title of the Polish

¹²⁹ H. WISNER, *Rzeczpospolita Wazów*, vol. 3, pp. 41–43; H. LULEWICZ, *Gniewów o unię*, pp. 123, 364–367; T. KEMPA, *Mikołaj Krzysztof Radziwiłł Sierotka*, pp. 75, 100.

¹³⁰ Henryk LULEWICZ, *Poselstwa polskie na Litwę*, [in:] *Dwór a kraj. Między centrum a peryferiami władzy*, ed. Ryszard SKOWRON, Kraków 2003, p. 197.

¹³¹ During the election in the third interregnum only two Lithuanian senators Mikołaj Krzysztof “Sierotka” and Jerzy Radziwiłł voted for Maximilian; so did the Lithuanian envoy – Aleksander Proński. The remaining Lithuanians did not take part in the vote despite the fact that they were present (T. KEMPA, *Mikołaj Krzysztof Radziwiłł Sierotka*, p. 268; idem, *Plany*, p. 56).

¹³² H. LULEWICZ, *Gniewów o unię*, pp. 136, 277–278, 385, 411.

¹³³ H. WISNER, *Rzeczpospolita Wazów*, vol. 3, pp. 44–45.

¹³⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 44.

king in the Polish-Lithuanian monarch's name. However, the union of Lublin lifted separate “accession” to the Lithuanian throne of a new monarch, which meant that the Lithuanians had to swear loyalty to the Polish king and the Crown. Thus, in practice there was always only one coronation, invariably taking place in Cracow with Polish regalia. H. Wisner mentioned the disappearance of the Lithuanian regalia of grand dukes after 1569¹³⁵.

During the first *interregnum* there was another important problem to solve – namely, how the announcement and the coronation of the new monarch of the Rzeczpospolita should look like. Should the Lithuanians play any role in those important moments? The Lithuanian magnates were very sensitive about the signs of the declining position of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania¹³⁶. They persisted in underlining the subjectivity of Lithuania in the Rzeczpospolita also in connection with the previously mentioned events. An interesting game was played between the Poles and Lithuanians when envoys were sent France to bring the king-electer Henry Valois in the second half of 1573. The majority of the envoys were Polish – among thirteen official envoys there were only some low-ranking Lithuanians without their most important people: the Lithuanian court marshall M.K. Radziwiłł “Sierotka” and the voivode of Kiev Aleksander Proński. Leading Lithuanian magnates such as “Rudy”, J. Chodkiewicz and “Sierotka” met in Masty (Lithuania) before the latter set off to France. They discussed the strategy of the Lithuanian envoys, who (particularly M.K. Radziwiłł) were to present the interest of Lithuania to the king-electer in an effective and firm way emphasising the separate identity of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania¹³⁷.

“Sierotka” put his strategy into action from the very beginning. As a court marshall whose rank was lower than the rank of the majority of the envoys from the Crown, he insisted on being allowed to act in front of the king-electer and the French court in second place after the bishop of Poznań Adam Konarski. However, the envoys from the Crown did not agree to his proposal saying that it would diminish the position of many of them. In view of the negative response from the majority of the Poles, M.K. Radziwiłł set off to Paris (from Międzyrzecze) alone not waiting for other envoys with the intention of taking care of the interests of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania in France on his own (additionally also the interests of the Catholic Church since most envoys were Protestants). He met Henry Valois before other envoys arrived in Paris. Nevertheless, it is doubtful whether he managed to get very far with his demands aimed at protecting the interests of Lithuania¹³⁸.

¹³⁵ Ibid., p. 15.

¹³⁶ See e.g.: H. LULEWICZ, *Gniewów o unię*, p. 125.

¹³⁷ T. KEMPA, *Mikołaj Krzysztof Radziwiłł Sierotka*, p. 82.

¹³⁸ Idem, *Poselstwo Rzeczypospolitej do Francji po Henryka Walezego: kwestia litewska oraz problem wyznaniowy*, [in:] *Kontakty, tradycje i stosunki polsko-francuskie od XVI do początków XX wieku. Zbiór studiów*, ed. Joanna ORZEL, Mariusz MRÓZ, Toruń 2012, s. 13–25; idem, *Mikołaj Krzysztof Radziwiłł Sierotka*, pp. 82–83.

When the other envoys reached Paris, M.K. Radziwiłł again insisted on being given a place next to the bishop of Poznań “aby się to tym nie znaczyło i przed Panem naszym przyszłym, żeby w czym miała być podlejsza Rzeczpospolita [Litewska – T.K.] i insza nasza, aniżeli Wasz Mości Polska” [“so as not to show in front of our future King that the [Lithuanian – T.K.] Rzeczpospolita be inferior to your Poland” – transl. A.Ch.]¹³⁹. Should the demand not have been fulfilled, he threatened to give a speech to the future king to defend Lithuania, for which he had „od panów litewskich dosateczną instrukcją i plenipotencyją” [the “consent, instruction and full powers from the Lithuanian lords” – transl. A.Ch.]¹⁴⁰. The envoys of the Crown argued that it would constitute a breach of the union. What is curious – “Sierotka” was not supported by the other Lithuanian envoy – A. Proński. In the face of the firm response of the Poles, M.K. Radziwiłł decided not to escalate the conflict while waiting for a better moment to highlight the Grand Duchy of Lithuania’s position of equality in relation to the Crown. He explained his behaviour to Lithuanian dignitaries with a note of solemnity and spitefulness towards the Poles: “o mojej tragedii, którom często musiał miewać ze swoimi kolegami, długo by pisać, bo Księstwo Litewskie najpodlejszym powiatem ówdzie miało być wszystkiej Korony [...], tak żem ja też dalej dał pokój, czekając lepszej okazji, gdzieby Księstwo Litewskie lepiej aniż przez miejsce i pristinum statum swoje mogło pokazać i to, że tej wielebnej Koronie we wszystkim równe” [“I would have to write a long time about my tragedy, for the Lithuanian Duchy was to become the worst district in all the Kingdom [...] so I stopped and waited for a better occasion to show the pristinum statum of the Lithuanian Duchy and that it is equal in everything to the Crown” – transl. A.Ch.]¹⁴¹. In the next stage of the talks with the French party, M.K. Radziwiłł protested (along with the bishops A. Konarski and Olbracht Łaski) – in the name of Catholics from the Grand Duchy of Lithuania – against the Warsaw Confederation (which provided freedom of religion to the Polish and Lithuanian *szlachta*), the acceptance of which was demanded by the Protestant envoys. However, the other Lithuanian envoy – A. Proński – opposed M.K. Radziwiłł as he was a Calvinist. Nevertheless, M.K. Radziwiłł managed to find an appropriate moment to emphasise the separate identity of Lithuania in the presence of King Henry Valois. “Sierotka” read separately (after the bishop A. Konarski who did so as the representative of the Crown) – in the name of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania – the edict of the election announcing Henry Valoise as the sovereign of the Rzeczpospolita. It must be added that the envoys from the Crown did not approve of Radziwiłł’s conduct and the Lithuanian magnate feared that the issue might be raised at the coronation seym of Henry Valoise in Cracow¹⁴², which did not happen

¹³⁹ *Diariusz poselstwa polskiego do Francji po Henryka Walezego w 1573 roku*, ed. Adam PRZYBOŚ, Roman ŻELEWSKI, Wrocław 1963, p. 104.

¹⁴⁰ *Ibid.*

¹⁴¹ Mikołaj Krzysztof Radziwiłł “Sierotka” to Jan Chodkiewicz, Paryż, 26 September 1573, BKórn., manuscript 11617.

¹⁴² “Sierotka” was proud to relate to the Lithuanian dignitaries what had happened in Paris: “gdy

after all. On the other hand, the Lithuanian demanded during the coronation that the new king not approve of all the rights accepted at the convocation of January 1573 “dopóki Polska nie wróci Litwie odjętych [w 1569 r. – T.K.] prowincji” [“until Poland has returned all the provinces taken away from Lithuania [in 1569 – T.K.]” – transl. A.Ch.]. Eventually, they gave up the unrealistic demand¹⁴³.

As far as the choice of a candidate to the common Polish-Lithuanian throne was concerned, the Lithuanians tried to approach the problem realistically. At the same time, as we could see from the example of the separate election of Archduke Ernest in Lithuania, they chose candidates that would support the execution of the plan to “reform the union”. For this reason, they rejected the election of a national candidate (popularly referred to as the “Piaśt” from the name of the old Piaśt dynasty ruling in Poland until 1370): “Są też niektórzy, co bardzo Piaśtem allegują, ale insze wtenczas czasy były, a też jako to wiem, że się Polak bardzo by nie rad kłaniał Litwinowi, tak też Litwin Polakowi, więc na to podobno nie przyjdzie, a też Boże uchowaj, aby przychodzić miało!” [“There are those who allege the Piaśt, but back then times were different and as far as I know a Pole would bow to a Lithuanian, nor would a Lithuanian to a Pole, so God forbid that this should come!” – transl. A.Ch.]¹⁴⁴. Let us add that the national candidacy was quite popular in the Crown, but it was widely believed that the choice of the “Piaśt” who came from Poland would definitely cool off the relations with the Lithuanians, which the Poles wanted to avoid¹⁴⁵.

It should also be mentioned that originally the Lithuanians felt a dislike for Stefan Báthory as the elected king of the Rzeczpospolita. This aversion did not only come from the fact that the Lithuanians did not participate in his election¹⁴⁶, but also from the fact that – at least according to the Radziwiłłs – Báthory owed his election to the Poles, for which reason he would support the interest of the Crown. “Sierotka” feared that – in the case of the final victory of Báthory over the emperor Maximilian II – the Lithuanians “do końca nie byli obróceni w chłopstwo, będąc kiedyś wolnymi ludźmi” [“be turned all into peasants having been once free peo-

był oddawan decret electionis, tam gdy książdz poznański odmówił, tamen ja też in presentia wiele tysięcy ludzi od Księstwa Litewskiego regimen oddał jako poseł i urzędnik litewski, a iż się musiało moderować, aby jaki wielki fasol w Polsce z tego za się nie urosł, tedy wszędziem Koronę Polską też wspominał” [when the election decree was given [to Henry in the presence of the King of France and the whole court], and when the bishop of Poznań [Konarski – the head of the envoys from the Rzeczpospolita] pronounced the formula [announcing that Valois became King], I, as a Lithuanian envoy and official, along with thousands of people, entrusted the power [over the Rzeczpospolita] to Henry [on behalf of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania], but I had to stress that I was doing this also in the name of the Rzeczpospolita so as not to generate brawls among envoys of the Crown], *ibid.*

¹⁴³ T. KEMPA, *Mikołaj Krzysztof Radziwiłł Sierotka*, pp. 83–87; *idem*, *Poselstwo*, pp. 25–32, 39–42.

¹⁴⁴ Mikołaj Krzysztof Radziwiłł “Sierotka” to Mikołaj Radziwiłł “Rudy”, Knyszyn, 15 July 1572, A. Трачевский, *op.cit.*, appendix, no. 4, pp. 91–92; T. KEMPA, *Mikołaj Krzysztof Radziwiłł Sierotka*, pp. 68, 263.

¹⁴⁵ H. LULEWICZ, *Gniewów o unię*, p. 229.

¹⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 230.

ple” – transl. A.Ch.]¹⁴⁷. However, it turned out that Stefan Báthory quickly managed to convince Lithuania magnates to his policy engaging the whole Rzeczpospolita into the war against Muscovy (in the years 1578–1581).

Official representatives of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania during the *interregna* did not limit themselves to presenting their demands to Poles, but they also expressed a long list of “grudges” against the Polish party which were mostly determined by political factors. The “grudges” were normally associated by Lithuanian dignitaries with the alleged breach of the union of Lublin by the Crown¹⁴⁸. At the same time, leading Lithuanian politicians used to think that “wszystkich panów rad litewskich i rycerstwa rady, mowy na koniec i prośby u panów braci a sąsiadów naszych [Polaków – T.K.] miesca nigdy nie mają ani mieli” [“all the speeches made by members of the Lithuanian council and knighthood and their requests have never been and will never be heard by our brothers and neighbours [the Poles – T.K.]” – transl. A.Ch.]¹⁴⁹. Naturally, the statement was much exaggerated taking into account the fact that Lithuanians frequently put forward demands which were so unrealistic that they could suppose they would never be fulfilled. The failure to meet their demands became a pretext to criticise “brother” Poles for the alleged breach of the union and not consulting Lithuanians about important matters concerning home and foreign policy.

Taking into consideration the concrete effects of the Lithuanian policy to “reform the union”, the Lithuanians won their biggest victory in January 1588. It was then that they presented the conditions under which they might agree to recognise Sigismund III Vasa as the sovereign of the Rzeczpospolita. Firstly, they managed to force the Poles to approve of the fifteen-year armistice with Muscovy negotiated by Lithuanians. Secondly, Livonia became part of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania – the king agreed to divide the province into two equal parts. One part was to fall under Lithuanian jurisdiction, while the other was to belong temporarily to the Crown. In both cases the Poles protested. Nevertheless, the biggest success of the Lithuanians was the acceptance of the new Lithuanian Statute by Sigismund III Vasa, for the document confirmed the independent legal identity of Lithuania¹⁵⁰,

¹⁴⁷ Mikołaj Krzysztof Radziwiłł “Sierotka” to Jan Chodkiewicz, Wilno, 20 March 1576, BKórń., manuscript 11617; T. KEMPA, *Mikołaj Krzysztof Radziwiłł Sierotka*, pp. 102–103.

¹⁴⁸ See e.g.: Jan Hlebowicz to Jan Chodkiewicz, Kraków, 8 May 1576, *Sprawy wojenne*, pp. 32–35; H. LULEWICZ, *Gniewów o unię*, pp. 382, 385.

¹⁴⁹ Mikołaj Radziwiłł “Rudy” to Jan Chodkiewicz, Wilno, 2 February 1576, BKórń., manuscript 11617.

¹⁵⁰ Earlier an important event was the creation of the Lithuanian Tribunal separate from the Crown in 1581 (a similar tribunal was established in the Crown in 1578). It was the highest court of appeal from local verdicts of the *szlachta* in Lithuania. During the negotiation in January 1588 in Warsaw it was decided to reorganize the Tribunal. Eventually, Samogitia fell under the Tribunal (earlier there had been plans to create a separate tribunal for this province). It was also decided that sessions of the tribunal were to be held twice a year: in Vilnius and alternately in Minsk and Navahrudak.

giving the Lithuanian state more autonomy within the Rzeczpospolita¹⁵¹. The Statute failed to mention the relationship between the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and the Polish Crown. Articles of the statute obliged the king to maintain the Grand Duchy of Lithuania within its historical borders, which also referred to the territories taken away by Poland in 1569 (chapter III, art. 4)¹⁵². Another important provision of the statute stipulated that Lithuanian offices should be held only by Lithuanians (chapter III, art. 12), while the act of the union of 1569 did not include such a reservation¹⁵³. Let us add that the Lithuanians put forward this claim to be approved of by candidates to the Polish-Lithuanian throne as early as the first two *interregna*¹⁵⁴. In practice, however, Poles held Lithuanian offices and vice versa. Nevertheless, the Lithuanians were highly principled. The best known conflict of this kind concerned the appointment of a Pole Bernard Maciejowski as the bishop of Vilnius, as decreed by Sigismund III in 1591. Prior to this event, a Lithuanian candidate – the cardinal Jerzy Radziwiłł – was appointed the bishop of Cracow. Lithuanian magnates did not want to recognise the appointment of B. Maciejowski – they also criticised the decision concerning Radziwiłł. The conflict lasted a decade and ended in victory for the Lithuanian party. B. Maciejowski did not take over the bishopric of Vilnius and in 1600 he became the bishop of Cracow (after Radziwiłł's death)¹⁵⁵.

The long reign of Sigismund III Vasa (1588–1632) alleviated the Polish-Lithuanian animosities. The frequent *interregna* leading to the destabilisation of the mutual relations between Poles and Lithuanians finished. The separate identity of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania resulting from the III Lithuanian Statute was finally confirmed during the reign of the Vasas¹⁵⁶. This is why the Lithuanians less frequently criticised the union with Poland and this, in turn, affected their attitude towards the Poles.

To recapitulate, it may be concluded that in a way the Lithuanians had waited until Sigismund Augustus died and then wanted to “reform the union”. The tool for carrying out the plan were the conventions of magnates and *szlachta* which took

¹⁵¹ H. WISNER, *Rzeczpospolita Wazów*, vol. 3, pp. 48–50; Mathias NIENDORF, *Das Grossfürstentum Litauen: Studien zur Nationsbildung in der Frühen Neuzeit (1569–1795)*, Wiesbaden 2006, p. 83.

¹⁵² *Статут Вялікага княства Літоўскага 1588. Тэксты. Даведнік. Каментарыі*, Мінск 1989, p. 114; Henryk WISNER, *III Statut w życiu państwowym Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego. Czasy Zygmunta i Władysława Wazów*, [in:] *Z dziejów kultury prawnej. Studia ofiarowane Profesorowi Juliuszowi Bardachowi w dziewięćdziesięciolecie urodzin*, Warszawa 2004, p. 384.

¹⁵³ *Cmamy*, pp. 118–199; H. WISNER, *Rzeczpospolita Wazów*, vol. 3, s. 35, 55, 237–239; Juliusz BARDACH, *Zatwierdzenie III Statutu litewskiego przez Zygmunta III Wazę*, *Czasopismo Prawno-Historyczne*, vol. 30: 1978, no. 2, p. 49.

¹⁵⁴ H. LULEWICZ, *Gniewów o unię*, p. 200.

¹⁵⁵ See more: Kazimierz LEWICKI, *Walka o biskupstwo wileńskie z końcem XVI w.*, [in:] *Prace historyczne w 30-lecie działalności profesorskiej Stanisława Zakrzewskiego*, Lwów 1934, pp. 295–311; Jan RZOŃCA, *Spór o biskupstwo wileńskie na sejmach schyłku XVI w.*, [in:] *Wilno i Wileńszczyzna jako krajobraz i środowisko wielu kultur*, vol. 2, ed. Elżbieta FELIKSIĄK, Białystok 1992, p. 23–52.

¹⁵⁶ A.B. ZAKRZEWSKI, op.cit., p. 272.

place during frequent *interregna*¹⁵⁷. It was during these conventions that the program of the reform of the union took shape. Still, it was the Lithuanian magnates that exerted the biggest influence on the “reform of the union”. As it turned out, in fact the “reform of the union” did not concern the foundations of the relationship between Poland and Lithuania. The Lithuanian dignitaries and *szlachta* did not aim at altering the content of the most important act of union signed on 1 July 1569. What is more, there is no evidence that any of the Lithuanian magnates intended to break away the union with Poland. What the Lithuanians wanted was to regain the territories taken away by the Crown in 1569: Podlachia, Volhynia, the Bratslav land and the Kievan land which, as we know, never took place. Another aspiration of the Lithuanian politicians was the confirmation and in some cases the extension of the autonomy of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania (for example, the prohibition preventing foreigners from holding Lithuanian offices – including the prevention of Poles from holding separate Lithuanian convocations). The momentous event for the autonomy of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania was the confirmation of the III Lithuanian Statute in 1588, which extended the sovereignty of Lithuania. The negative emotions between Poles and Lithuanians started to decrease. The Lithuanians became less critical of the Poles. However, it must be remembered that the criticism resulted from the humiliation inflicted on Lithuania in Lublin by the incorporation of vast territories belonging to the Grand Duchy of Lithuania into Poland. It influenced and still influences the general opinion concerning the Polish-Lithuanian union among our Lithuanian neighbours.

Translated from Polish by Agnieszka Chabros

¹⁵⁷ H. LULEWICZ, *Poselstwa*, p. 195–196.

PROBLEM „NAPRAWY UNII” LUBELSKIEJ W POLITYCE LITEWSKIEJ
W TRZECH PIERWSZYCH BEZKRÓLEWIACH
PO ŚMIERCI KRÓLA ZYGMUNTA AUGUSTA (1572–1588)

Streszczenie

Słowa kluczowe: unia lubelska, partykularyzm, bezkrólewie, Wielkie Księstwo Litewskie, Rzeczpospolita Obojga Narodów

Unia lubelska, zawarta w 1569 r. między Polską a Litwą, stworzyła z obu państw rodzaj federacji ze wspólnym władcą, wybieranym przez szlachtę z obu państw, a ponadto ze wspólnym parlamentem, a także jednolitą polityką zagraniczną i obronną. Odgrywający główną rolę w polityce Litwy magnaci – w przeciwieństwie do litewskiej szlachty – nie byli w pełni zadowoleni z tych unijnych postanowień. Wcześniej chcieli związku z Polską bardziej luźnego, z zachowaniem odrębnych systemów parlamentarnych przez oba państwa. Niemniej wyraźne poparcie króla Zygmunta Augusta dla idei planu ściślejszej unii, forsowanego przez Polaków, przesądziło o kształcie tej nowej unii. Dodatkowo w związku z zawarciem unii Wielkie Księstwo Litewskie utraciło w 1569 r. obszerne ziemie: kijowską, wołyńską, braśławską i podlaską, w sumie ponad 1/3 terytorium państwa. Właśnie ten fakt był dla litewskich dygnitarzy szczególnie upokarzający, gdyż odbyło się na żądanie Polaków, spełnione przez króla, a mimo ostrych litewskich protestów. Stąd po śmierci Zygmunta Augusta w okresie kolejnych bezkrólewi (1572–1573, 1575–1576, 1586–1587) czołowi magnaci litewscy, szczególnie Mikołaj Radziwiłł „Rudy”, Mikołaj Krzysztof Radziwiłł „Sierotka”, Jan Chodkiewicz, dążyli do odzyskania tych ziem, określając ewentualne urzeczywistnienie tych dążeń „naprawą unii”. Okazało się jednak, że bez dostatecznego poparcia ze strony szlachty i magnatów z tych inkorporowanych do Polski w 1569 r. ziem Litwini nie są w stanie zrealizować swego politycznego projektu. Pod terminem „naprawa unii” litewscy politycy rozumieli też jednak inne zmiany, które zapewniłyby Wielkiemu Księstwu Litewskiemu bardziej równorzędną pozycję w unii z Polską. Niewiele związanych z tym postulatów litewskich zostało jednak spełnionych przez polską stronę i kolejnych monarchów. Ważnym wydarzeniem z tego punktu widzenia stało się jednak zatwierdzenie przez króla Zygmunta III w 1588 r. nowej kodyfikacji prawa litewskiego (III Statut), która utwierdzała, a w pewnych punktach poszerzała nawet pole litewskiej autonomii.

DAS PROBLEM DER REFORM DER LUBLINER UNION IN DER LITAUISCHEN
POLITIK IN DEN ERSTEN DREI INTERREGNA
NACH DEM TOD KÖNIG SIGISMUND AUGUSTS (1572–1588)

Zusammenfassung

Schlüsselbegriffe: Union von Lublin, Partikularismus, Interregnum, Großfürstentum Litauen, Republik der beiden Nationen

Die 1569 zwischen Polen und Litauen geschlossene Lubliner Union machte aus den zwei Staaten eine Art Föderation mit einem gemeinsamen Herrscher, der vom Adel aus beiden Ländern gewählt wurde, darüber hinaus mit einem gemeinsamen Parlament sowie mit einer einheitlichen Außen- und Verteidigungspolitik. Die litauischen Magnaten als politisch führende Kraft im Großfürstentum Litauen waren – im Gegensatz zur litauischen Szlachta – nicht völlig zufrieden mit diesen Beschlüssen zur Union. Zuvor hatten sie einen eher lockeren Verbund mit Polen angestrebt, bei dem eigenständige parlamentarische Systeme in beiden Staaten erhalten geblieben wären. Dennoch gab die entschiedene Unterstützung König Sigismund Augusts für die Idee einer engeren Union, wie sie die Polen anstrebten, schließlich den Ausschlag über die Ausgestaltung der neuen Union. Zusätzlich verlor das Großfürstentum Litauen im Zusammenhang mit dem Abschluss der Union im Jahre 1569 weiträumige Territorien: Die Wojewodschaften Kiew, Wolhynien, Braclaw und Podlachien, insgesamt über ein Drittel des Staatsgebiets. Gerade dieser Umstand war für die litauischen Würdenträger besonders erniedrigend, denn dies geschah auf Verlangen der Polen, welches der König trotz der heftigen Proteste der Litauer erfüllte.

Aus diesem Grund strebten führende litauische Magnaten, insbesondere Mikołaj Radziwiłł „Rudy“, Mikołaj Krzysztof Radziwiłł „Sierotka“ und Jan Chodkiewicz danach, diese Länder zurückzugewinnen und bezeichneten die eventuelle Verwirklichung dieser Forderungen als „Reform der Union“. Es zeigte sich aber, dass die Litauer ohne hinreichende Unterstützung seitens der Szlachta und der Magnaten jener inkorporierten Gebiete ihr Projekt nicht umsetzen konnten. Unter dem Begriff „Reform der Union“ verstanden die litauischen Politiker jedoch auch andere Veränderungen, welche dem Großfürstentum Litauen eine stärker gleichrangige Stellung in der Union mit Polen gesichert hätten. Nur wenige der damit verbundenen litauischen Forderungen wurden jedoch von der polnischen Seite und den nachfolgenden Monarchen erfüllt. Ein bedeutendes Ereignis in dieser Hinsicht stellte allerdings die Bestätigung der neuen Kodifikation des litauischen Rechts (III. litauisches Statut) durch König Sigismund III. im Jahre 1588 dar, welches die Reichweite der litauischen Autonomie befestigten und in einigen Punkten sogar erweiterte.