

TOMASZ AMBROZIAK (*Toruń*)

THE NECESSITY TO REEXAMINE THE QUESTION OF LITHUANIAN
PARTICULARISM DURING THE REIGN OF SIGISMUND III
AND WŁADYSŁAW IV*

Key words: the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, Polish-Lithuanian relations, political culture, regionalism, political identity, dietines' instructions

The problem of Lithuanian particularism (or separatism), the attitude of the Lithuanian *szlachta* to the relationship with the Polish Crown and to the common state – the Rzeczpospolita, and in a wider context – the problem of Lithuanian political identity is not new in historiography. Polish-Lithuanian relations in the Early Modern period, both before and after the conclusion of the union of Lublin, have always been a subject of constant interest within the historiography of Poland and other nations which refer to the tradition of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania or use it as an important reference point. The importance and topicality of the subject matter can be demonstrated by the series of scientific conferences with participants from Poland, Lithuania, Belorussia and Ukraine held recently. Further evidence of the significance of the issue are the numerous post-conference publications devoted to Polish-Lithuanian relations in the Early Modern period along with the causes and effects of the union of Lublin signed in 1569¹.

* The project has been financed from the funds of the National Centre for Science – decision no. DEC-2012/07/N/HS304134.

¹ For example compare: *Unia Lubelska z 1569 roku. Z tradycji unifikacyjnych I Rzeczypospolitej*, ed. Tomasz KEMPA, Krzysztof MIKULSKI, Toruń 2011; *Liublino unija: idėja ir jos tęstinumas. Tarptautinės mokslinės konferencijos, vykusios 2009 m. lapkričio 19–20 d. Vilniuje, Taikomosios dailės muziejuje, pranešimų pagrindu parengtas 20 mokslinių straipsnių rinkinys. Unia lubelska: idea i jej kontynuacja. Materiały z międzynarodowej konferencji naukowej, która odbyła się w dniach 19–20 listopada 2009 roku w Wilnie w Muzeum Sztuki Użytkowej*, sudarė / ed. Liudas GLEMŽA, Ramunė ŠMIGELSKYTĖ-STUKIENĖ, Vilnius 2011; the scope of the paper did not allow the author to present extensive research; yet, it can be found in other works, particularly in valuable and systematic reviews of the research on Lithuanian parliamentary and political system by Andrzej Zakrzewski; comp. Andrzej B. ZAKRZEWSKI, *Sejmiki Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego (połowa XVI – koniec XVIII w.)*, [in:] *Parlamentaryzm w Polsce we współczesnej historiografii*, ed. Juliusz BARDACH, Warszawa 1995, pp. 100–106; idem, *Sejmiki Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego XVI–XVIII w. Ustrój i funkcjonowanie: sejmik trocki*, Warszawa 2000, pp. 12–17; idem, *Osiągnięcia i problemy badań nad parlamentaryzmem Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego*, Teki Sejmowe, 2010, no. 1, pp. 40–52; idem, *Состояние и перспек-*

It might seem that the issue has been so thoroughly researched in literature that not much can be added to the findings of the researchers interested in this subject matter. However, it is worth taking a critical look at the viewpoints expressed in historiography, underlining the achievements of the research hitherto conducted and attempting to find answers to any remaining questions.

Let us commence with the basic question – how we understand the phenomenon of Lithuanian particularism. Unfortunately, it turns out that the term has not been precisely and explicitly defined yet. Crucially, the term “particularism”, which is a subject of interest of many branches of science (philosophy, political studies, sociology, legal studies or history) has various meanings and may be defined differently depending on the needs of a given area of knowledge. In some sciences (particularly in philosophy) the term has been presented in an abundant array of literature; nevertheless, how it is understood from their point of view is useless for the subject matter under discussion².

It should be noted that even the content of general dictionaries may be confusing and cause some of the problems which we shall address later in the article. This may be one of the main, but frequently unnoticed, reasons underlying the difficulties connected with the interpretation of the term. For instance, the classic *Słownik języka polskiego* edited by Witold Doroszewski understands the term “particularism” as a “tendency to separate from the whole, to maintain the features of a »partykularz« in a political and moral-intellectual sense” [transl. by Agnieszka Chabros]³. The term “partykularz” referred to in the definition above was characterised as the “place cut off from centres of intellectual life; a godforsaken place, the middle of nowhere, a backwater” [transl. A.Ch.]⁴. It is curious that the definition of the term included in *Słownik* is quite pejorative, which was noticed even by the authors themselves in the case of the term “partykularny” [“particular” – A.Ch.]⁵. Let us add that also in other languages, the definition of particularism can include

тивы современных польских исследований по истории Великого княжества Литовского, Петербургские славянские и балканские исследования, 2008, № 1 (3), pp. 101–114; idem, Wielkie Księstwo Litewskie (XVI–XVIII w.). Prawo – ustroj – społeczeństwo, Warszawa 2013, pp. 9–31.

² It is enough to indicate that in case of philosophy the term is used in ethics to define the viewpoint which rejects the existence of universal moral rules.

³ *Słownik języka polskiego*, ed. Witold DOROSZEWSKI (<http://doroszewski.pwn.pl/haslo/partykularyzm/>), available: 3 September 2014; it is interesting that among examples of the use of the term „particularism” in *Słownik* there is a sentence taken from the work by Antoni Prochaska, *Król Władysław Jagiełło*, where he stated that the motives of Vytautas’ conduct lay in „jego ciasnym poglądzie na sprawy zachodnie i ocenianiu ich ze stanowiska partykularyzmu litewskiego” [“in his narrow-minded attitude to western issues and judging them from the point of view of Lithuanian particularism” – transl. A.Ch.] (Antoni PROCHASKA, *Król Władysław Jagiełło*, vol. 2, Kraków 1908, p. 244).

⁴ *Słownik języka polskiego* (<http://doroszewski.pwn.pl/haslo/partykularz/>), available: 3 September 2014).

⁵ Emphasizing that „dziś często z odcieniem ujemnym” [“nowadays often in a pejorative meaning” – transl. A.Ch.]; the pejorative meaning of the term is also visible in various examples of its use provided by the author; *Słownik języka polskiego* (<http://doroszewski.pwn.pl/haslo/partykularny/>), available: 3 September 2014).

elements which the authors of *Słownik* defined as the “tendency to break away from the whole” [transl. A.Ch.]. One example may be the pre-revolutionary Russian *Энциклопедический словарь Брокгауза и Ефрона* where Wasilij Wodobozow, having defined the term “particularism” as a political tendency of separate parts of the state to run an independent political life, stated that its meaning almost overlaps with the meaning of the word “separatism”. According to him, what the Russian press refers to as signs of separatism, in the West is described as particularism. One example of particularism mentioned by him was the tendency of Ireland and other parts of the British Empire to break away from London⁶.

Other general dictionaries provide slightly different definitions of the terms and they are not always consistent. For example, *Uniwersalny słownik języka polskiego* published by PWN explains the term “partykularyzm” [“particularism”] in the following way: “the tendency to maintain one’s separate identity, to prefer matters concerning a given group, community, etc. or one’s own interests”⁷. On the other hand, the internet dictionary *Słownik języka polskiego* adds one more meaning: “the care for one’s own interests, the interests of one’s town, environment, etc. omitting the common interest”⁸. The term “partykularny” [“particular”] was defined in a similar way in both dictionaries – according to *Uniwersalny słownik języka polskiego* it means “referring to local issues, problems of a narrow group of people or individuals, not taking into consideration the interests of the general public” [transl. A.Ch.], whilst in the internet dictionary *Słownik języka polskiego* the adjective is understood as “taking into consideration the profits of one’s own community, region, etc. and not the general public” [transl. A.Ch.]. Hence, both dictionaries emphasise the dominance of one’s own interests over the interests of the general public; in the case of the term “partykularyzm”, the *Uniwersalny słownik języka polskiego* adds the “tendency to be separate”. A slightly different meaning of the term “partykularny” was given in the previously mentioned *Słownik języka polskiego* edited by W. Doroszewski, where it was explained as “referring to or belonging to a part of the country identified with »partykularz«, of a provincial, local nature” [transl. A.Ch.]⁹. The last definition renounces the “tendency to be separate” (which was mentioned in this dictionary in the definition of the word “partykularyzm”) and the element of putting one’s own interests before the interests of the general public. As a result, clear inconsistencies arise in how the terms “partykularyzm” and “partykularny” are understood, among others regarding those elements that are fundamental to our further analysis.

⁶ Василий Водобозов, *Партикуляризм*, [in:] *Энциклопедический словарь Брокгауза и Ефрона*, Т. XXII: *Оуэнъ – Патентъ о поединкахъ*, Санкт-Петербург 1897, pp. 886–887.

⁷ *Uniwersalny słownik języka polskiego*, ed. Stanisław DUBISZ [CD-ROM], version 2.0, Warszawa 2010.

⁸ *Uniwersalny słownik języka polskiego*, ed. Stanisław DUBISZ (<http://sjp.pwn.pl/slownik/2570801/partykularyzm>, available: 3 September 2014).

⁹ *Słownik języka polskiego* (<http://doroszewski.pwn.pl/haslo/partykularny/>, available: 3 September 2014).

The situation gets even more complicated by the fact that the term “partykularyzm” may be understood in two ways – subjectively and objectively. Objectively, the term may be understood as a characteristic feature of feudal law, comprising its personal and territorial qualities – in other words, lack of a universal nature of a feudal law, which “in some places led to the creation of a major number of local customary laws in a relatively small area” [transl. A.Ch.]¹⁰. Referring directly to the case of “Lithuanian particularism”, one may indicate the existence of legal institutions (in other words, objective legal frameworks) determining the distinction of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania from other areas of the Rzeczpospolita. Amongst the legal institutions of this kind we shall mention: the Lithuanian Statute, the Lithuanian Tribunal or – in the context of a political system – the convocation of Vilnius. Subjectively, the term “particularism” may be understood as a subjective attitude of a given person or a group of people to the objective legal or political reality. In reference to Lithuanian particularism, the case in point may be the attitude of the Lithuanian *szlachta* to the objective legal reality. As far as historical literature is concerned, such meaning seems to be most commonly used.

Another question which should be broached is the mutual relationship of the terms “Lithuanian separatism” and “Lithuanian particularism”. In historiography, those terms were used interchangeably for a very long time¹¹, which corresponds with the similar meaning of the terms “particularism” and “separatism” suggested by general dictionaries. For example, in the previously mentioned *Słownik języka polskiego* edited by W. Doroszewski the term “separatism” is understood as the “trend to separate from a whole, a group”¹², so it is practically identical as the term “particularism”, the definition of which was provided above. *Uniwersalny słownik języka polskiego*¹³ explains the term “separatism” almost identically – in this case far-reaching similarities between the term “separatism” and “particularism” may be also noticed.

On the other hand, in the most recent historiography there has arisen a tendency to differentiate between the terms “Lithuanian separatism” and “Lithuanian particularism”. Grzegorz Błaszczyk objected to abusing the former term, defining it as a “willingness to break away with the union and the tendency to create their

¹⁰ Katarzyna SÓJKA-ZIELIŃSKA, *Historia prawa*, Warszawa 2009, p. 37.

¹¹ A case in point is the title of the article by Kazimierz Lewicki devoted to the conflict about the appointment for the Vilnius bishopric at the end of the 16th century, where the following phrase was used: „echa separatyzmu litewskiego” [“the echoes of Lithuanian separatism”]: Kazimierz LEWICKI, *Walka o biskupstwo wileńskie z końcem XVI w. Echa separatyzmu litewskiego*, [in:] *Prace historyczne w 30-lecie działalności profesorskiej Stanisława Zakrzewskiego*, Lwów 1934, pp. 295–311; from the more recent literature – the article by Zbigniew Wójcik, devoted to “Lithuanian separatist tendencies”: Zbigniew WÓJCIK, *Tendencje separatystyczne w Wielkim Księstwie Litewskim w XVII wieku*, [in:] *Belarus – Lithuania – Poland – Ukraine. The foundations of historical and cultural traditions in East Central Europe. International Conference. Rome, 28 April – 6 May 1990*, ed. Jerzy KŁOCZOWSKI, Henryk GĄPSKI, Rome 1994, pp. 60–61.

¹² *Słownik języka polskiego* (<http://doroszewski.pwn.pl/haslo/separatyzm/>, available: 3 September 2014).

¹³ *Uniwersalny słownik języka polskiego*, ed. Stanisław DUBISZ [CD-ROM].

own separate Lithuanian state” [transl. A.Ch.]¹⁴. The researcher defined the term “Lithuanian particularism” as “awareness of the distinction of Lithuania from Poland, the willingness to maintain it and the defence of one’s own, sometimes selfish, interests” [transl. A.Ch.]¹⁵. He suggested that the criterion differentiating between both phenomena should be what Juliusz Bardach defined as the basis of “Lithuanian particularism” – namely the institutions such as the union of Lublin and the Lithuanian Statute¹⁶. Not long ago did Andrzej Zakrzewski define particularism in a similar way as “care for the interests of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, but without the tendency to break off the union with the Crown” [transl. A.Ch.]¹⁷. Presumably, he agreed with the standpoint of Gintautas Sliesoriūnas, who understood “Lithuanian separatism” as the “continuation of political forms contrary to the rules of the union of Lublin, the threat to break up the union as well as real steps aiming at loosening the union” [transl. A.Ch.]¹⁸.

We should basically agree with the suggestions put forward by the previously mentioned researchers, particularly those concerning the necessity to differentiate between both terms: “Lithuanian separatism” and “Lithuanian particularism”. However, it seems that we should define them more precisely. The definitions of Lithuanian particularism proposed above specify neither what kind of interests the Lithuanians wanted to defend, nor who should define such interests and in what way, which may lead to a free interpretation of the term. We should also examine the existence of additional (apart from the union of Lublin and the Lithuanian Statute) criteria which would allow the two terms discussed here to be differentiated, for the general nature of the act of the union allows a freedom of interpretation. Moreover, even the whole body of legal acts from the period of the seym of Lublin did not define thoroughly the rules governing the functioning of the Rzeczpospolita, nor the relations between the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, Polish Crown and their common institutions such as the king, the seym, etc. It should be also mentioned that during the first interregna after the death of Sigismundus Augustus there occurred essential alterations to both theory and practice of the political system of the state. Gradually, the Lithuanians managed to force some changes which enhanced the position of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. Successively, there also appeared institutions which were not stipulated by the union of Lublin such as the Vilnius convocation. Let us underline that the norms of the act of the union and the norms of further legal acts (even the norms of the Lithuanian Statute)

¹⁴ Grzegorz BŁASZCZYK, *Rzeczpospolita w latach 1569–1795. Węzłowe problemy stosunków polsko-litewskich*, Zapiski Historyczne, vol. 63: 1998, no. 1, p. 64.

¹⁵ Ibid., p. 65.

¹⁶ Juliusz BARDACH, *Konstytucja 3 Maja a unia polsko-litewska*, Przegląd Wschodni, vol. 82: 1991, no. 3–4, p. 397.

¹⁷ A.B. ZAKRZEWSKI, *Wielkie Księstwo Litewskie*, p. 263.

¹⁸ Gintautas SLIESORIŪNAS, *Problem separatyzmu Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego w końcu XVII wieku*, [in:] *Rzeczpospolita wielu narodów i jej tradycje*, ed. Andrzej LINK-LENCZOWSKI, Mariusz MARKIEWICZ, Kraków 1999, p. 85.

might have diverged, an example of which is the restriction in acquiring estates in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania stipulated by the Statute. Summing up, it seems that aforementioned researchers' suggestions as to differentiate the two terms go in the right direction; nevertheless, they need to be specified.

It must be noted that in recent years, the works of many researchers (Henryk Wisner¹⁹, Andrzej Zakrzewski²⁰ or Andrzej Rachuba²¹) have generated a kind of "catalogue" of signs of Lithuanian particularism. Let us remark that the researches concentrated on a subjective (in the meaning mentioned above) aspect of the problem – that is the demands of the Lithuanian *szlachta* (treated as a homogenous whole), revealing (applying the term proposed by A. Zakrzewski) its attitude to the distinction of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania within the Rzeczpospolita. The basic material for the categorisation are the instructions of Lithuanian dietines.

Not controverting the propriety of the content of the given "catalogue", it seems crucial to differentiate its individual points, since not every single sign of Lithuanian particularism can be treated with the same relevance. Thus, we shall distinguish the points which were fundamental for the way of thinking and constructing the image of the surrounding reality in the eyes of the *szlachta* from less significant elements which did not play such an important role. Besides, it is vital to indicate those aspects to which the Lithuanian *szlachta* paid particular attention during the

¹⁹ Henryk WISNER, *Przedsejmowy sejmik nowogródzki w latach 1607–1648*, Przegląd Historyczny, vol. 69: 1978, no. 4, pp. 677–693; idem, *Naprawa państwa w uchwałach sejmików Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego w pierwszej połowie XVII w.*, [in:] *Studia polsko-litewsko-białoruskie*, ed. Jerzy TOMASZEWSKI, Elżbieta SMUŁKOWA, Henryk MAJECKI, Warszawa 1998, pp. 33–50; idem, *Sejmiki litewskie w czasach Zygmunta III i Władysława IV. Konwokacja wileńska oraz sejmiki przedsejmowe i relacyjne*, Miscellanea Historico-Archivistica, vol. 3: 1989, pp. 61–86; idem, *Szlachta Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego wobec unii. Schyłek wieku XVI – lata dwudzieste XVII wieku*, [in:] *Unia lubelska: idea i jej kontynuacja*, pp. 261–267; idem, *Unia lubelska i statut litewski z roku 1588*, Zapiski Historyczne, vol. 51: 1986, no. 1, pp. 23–44; idem, *Konstytucje Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego w dobie Wazów*, Czasopismo Prawno-Historyczne, vol. 29: 1977, no. 2, pp. 207–218; idem, *Kilka uwag o Wielkim Księstwie Litewskim I połowy XVII wieku*, [in:] *Lietuvos valstybė XII–XVIII a.*, redkolegija: Zigmantas KIAUPA, Arturas MICKEVIČIUS, Jolita SARCEVIČIENĖ, Vilnius 1997, pp. 313–323.

²⁰ Andrzej B. ZAKRZEWSKI, *Sejmiki Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego XVI–XVIII w.*; idem, *Szlachta Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego wobec odrębności Litwy w ramach Rzeczypospolitej. W świetle instrukcji sejmikowych XVI–XVIII w.*, [in:] *Senoji Lietuvos literatūra*, kn. 6: *Senosios raštijos ir tautosakos sąveika: kultūrinė Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės patirtis*, Vilnius 1998, pp. 261–278; idem, *Państwo czy prowincja? Litwa w Rzeczypospolitej od unii lubelskiej po Sejm Wielki*, [in:] *Unia lubelska: idea i jej kontynuacja*, pp. 336–349; idem, *Między Unią Lubelską a Zareczeniem Wzajemnym Obojga Narodów – przemiany pozycji Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego w Rzeczypospolitej*, [in:] *Проблемы інтэграцыі і інкарпарацыі ў развіцці Цэнтральнай і Усходняй Еўропы ў перыяд ранняга Новага часу. Матэрыялы міжнароднай навуковай канферэнцыі, прысвечанай 440-годдзю Люблінскай уніі (Мінск, 15–17 кастрычніка 2009 г.)*, рэд. Сцяпан Ф. Сокал, Андрэй М. Януўкевіч, Мінск 2010, pp. 233–245; idem, *Paradoksy unifikacji prawa i ustroju Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego i Korony XVI–XVIII w.*, *Czasopismo Prawno-Historyczne*, vol. 51: 1999, no. 1–2, pp. 219–237.

²¹ Andrzej RACHUBA, *Wielkie Księstwo Litewskie w systemie parlamentarnym Rzeczypospolitej w latach 1569–1763*, Warszawa 2002; idem, *Litwini wobec integracji we wspólnej Rzeczypospolitej*, [in:] *Проблемы інтэграцыі*, pp. 204–219; idem, *Litwini wobec integracji we wspólnej Rzeczypospolitej – obrona tożsamości*, [in:] *Unia lubelska: idea i jej kontynuacja*, pp. 308–313.

dietines (if we limit ourselves to the analysis of Lithuanian dietines' acts), as well as those that were not of such vast importance. Such a goal may be achieved with the help of a quantitative analysis as suggested by A. Zakrzewski²². Even a quick look at the instructions of Lithuanian dietines allows us to conclude that various elements treated as signs of the particular attitude of the Lithuanians were articulated by them with varied intensity. The quantitative analysis of the demands may be one of the tools allowing us to define the main directions of Lithuanian particularism; still, the findings obtained from it should be treated with proper reservation.

Let us provide a few examples to give grounds to the thesis put forward above. In the light of the Lithuanian dietines' instructions, the opinion that the Lithuanians constantly and invariably demanded that Lithuanian offices be held by citizens of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania seems slightly exaggerated²³. In the given period there arose one very serious conflict reflected in the Lithuanian dietines' instructions – the conflict over the appointment of the bishop of Vilnius at the end of the 16th century²⁴. Subsequently, the question of the appointment to offices did not attract such a big interest from dietines – similar demands appeared only a few times, and were never prioritized. Not only are they placed in the farther parts of instructions, but they are also presented with the use of barely interesting or aggressive rhetoric.

Let us briefly scrutinize those demands. In 1600 the dietine of Wiłkomierz (Ukmergė) insisted that the office of the Lithuanian Field *Hetman* be given to a “good man, citizen and descendant of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania” [transl. A.Ch.]²⁵. In 1604 a similar demand was put forward at the dietine of Slonim where the Lithuanian *szlachta* required that the Great Lithuanian *Hetman* “come from our nation”; this laconic phrase used in the instruction may make us think that the chief purpose of the dietine was to appoint somebody to the vacant office and the question of appointing a Lithuanian to this position was of minor importance²⁶. In 1607 the dietine of Oszmiana (Ashmyany) motioned that the office of the Lithuanian subchamberlain and other vacant offices be given to “meritorious people of the Lithuanian nation”, arguing that a corresponding office in the Polish Crown had already been filled²⁷. In the same year other dietines (of Grodno, Navahrudak, Orsha, Polotsk, Vawkavysk) demanded the appointment of the subchamberlain

²² A.B. ZAKRZEWSKI, *Szlachta Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego*, p. 261.

²³ *Ibid.*, p. 263.

²⁴ K. LEWICKI, *op.cit.*; Jan RZOŃCA, *Spór o biskupstwo wileńskie na sejmach schyłku XVI wieku*, [in:] *Wilno – Wileńszczyzna jako krajobraz i środowisko wielu kultur. Materiały I Międzynarodowej Konferencji, Białystok 21–24 IX 1989 w czterech tomach*, vol. 2, ed. Elżbieta FELIKSIĄK, Białystok 1992, pp. 23–52.

²⁵ Российская национальная библиотека в Санкт-Петербурге (further: RNB), Ф. 971: Польские автографы из собрания П.П. Дубровского, Оп. 2, the collection of autographs 133, no. 41, fol. 125.

²⁶ Biblioteka Polskiej Akademii Umiejętności i Polskiej Akademii Nauk w Krakowie (further: BPAU-PAN), manuscript 365, fol. 14.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, fol. 20.

and *hetman*, but they did not indicate that the appointees should be Lithuanian²⁸. In 1618 the dietine of Navahrudak put forward the motion that elective district offices should be given to “ancient natives of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania”²⁹. In 1634 the dietine of Wilkomierz (Ukmergė) demanded Lithuanian offices to be appointed only to Lithuanians³⁰, and in 1641 the dietine of Navahrudak insisted on not giving offices in the Grand Duchy to citizens of the Polish Crown³¹. In the same year the dietine of Oszmiana (Ashmyany) required that Lithuanians exclusively be appointed administrators of the queen’s dower estates in Lithuania³².

Let us have a closer look at the quantity of the demands in individual years. In 1600 one-third of the instructions that we know of included the demand that Lithuanians should be appointed to Lithuanian offices. The instruction of Slonim of 1604 is the only one from the Grand Duchy of Lithuania to that seym. There are ten instructions available to us which were created prior to the seym of 1607; the aforementioned demand appears only in one of them – the instruction of Oszmiana. The remaining instructions might have mentioned the question of vacancies, but they said nothing about appointing them to Lithuanians. Prior to the seym of 1619 such a demand can be found in one out of three instructions known to us, and in 1634 – in one out of four. Only in 1641 was the examined question raised in two out of four instructions. Even in the years when the demand was put forward by the dietines, it appeared only in seven out of twenty-five instructions; moreover, we should remember that there were years when no dietine mentioned anything concerning Lithuanian offices.

As a result, it may be concluded that such demands were rather incidental, and the content of Lithuanian dietines’ instructions does not allow us to conclude that there were harsh tensions concerning the exclusive appointment of Lithuanians to offices. It is likely that it was not necessary to put forward similar claims, for Lithuanian offices were mostly given to Lithuanians or people connected with Lithuania for a long time. According to the findings of Andrej Radaman in the second half of the 16th century there did not take place any mass settlement of the Polish *szlachta* in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, nor did Poles take over district offices in Lithuania³³. Nevertheless, there were single cases of citizens of the Crown

²⁸ The instruction of Hrodna [“instrukcja grodzieńska”]: *ibid.*, fol. 334; the instruction of Hrodna [“instrukcja nowogródzka”]: *ibid.*, manuscript 360, fol. 202; the instruction of Orsha [“instrukcja orszańska”]: Biblioteka Czartoryskich w Krakowie (further: BCzart.), Teki Naruszewicza (further: TN) 103, no. 28, fol. 121; the instruction of Polotsk [“instrukcja połocka”]: BPAU-PAN, manuscript 360, fol. 190; the instruction of Vawkavysk [“instrukcja wołkowyska”]: Archiwum Główne Akt Dawnych w Warszawie, Archiwum Radziwiłłów, dział [section] II (further: AGAD, AR II), ks. [book] 12, fol. 335.

²⁹ AGAD, AR II, book 701, fol. 5.

³⁰ RNB, Ф. 971, Оп. 2, the collection of autographs 152, no. 66, fol. 145v.

³¹ BCzart., manuscript 375, fol. 607.

³² AGAD, AR II, book 1201, fol. 8.

³³ Андрэй Радаман, *Вяводскія і павятовыя земскія ўраднікі польскага паходжання ў Вялікім Княстве Літоўскім у 2-й палове XVI ст.*, [in:] *На шляху да праўды. Матэрыялы VIII Міжнароднай навуковай канферэнцыі «Шлях да ўзаемнасці» (Белавежа, 15–17 чэрвеня 2000 г.) і*

being appointed to Lithuanian offices, which led to conflicts³⁴. To recapitulate, although it is not our aim to deny the discussed phenomenon, we believe it necessary to define (as much as it may be possible) its actual scale.

Even more striking example of our thesis is the Lithuanian demand that seyms should take place alternately in the Crown and in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. It was one of the Lithuanian demands made during the first *interregna* after the death of Sigismund Augustus³⁵. We can find it even in the instruction of Samogitia for the coronation seym of Sigismund III Vasa, which required: “соймы абы альтернатим раз в Полще, а други раз в Литве бывали”. The instruction also suggested that in the first two weeks of the seym judicial matters from the Crown be dealt with, in the next two weeks – cases concerning Lithuania and Samogitia (!), and finally the last two weeks should be devoted to issues connected with the Crown. The proposal was supported by the argument that “на прошлых соймехъ не моглисе достигнути люди народу литовского в справах своих”³⁶.

After the coronation of Sigismund III, dietines virtually ceased to put forward such a demand. Until the death of Władysław IV – for the following sixty years – it appears only once – in the instruction of Pinsk for the convocation seym of 1632. The dietine suggested that seyms headed by a marshal of Lithuanian origin should be held in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. The site of the seym was to be Brest, “for it is a central town and adjacent to the voivodeships and territories of the Crown”³⁷ [transl. A.Ch.]. Naturally, we must remember about the problem of the incompleteness of sources – only a relatively small number of dietines’ acts from the Grand Duchy of Lithuania are available to researchers. We may also wonder why Lithuanian dietines did not raise the issue in question. Nonetheless, we are in possession of over one hundred fifty instructions of Lithuanian dietines from the period under discussion, and a similar claim is mentioned in only one instruction, which is an apparent evidence that the problem was not given priority at dietines.

By way of contrast, we may point to the series of examples of unanimous dietines’ actions when the concerning issue was (due to various reasons) of a great importance to the Lithuanian szlachta. The first case in point is the aforementioned conflict concerning the appointment of the bishop of Vilnius at the end of the 16th century. Almost all Lithuanian dietines, which instructions are available, opposed to the appointment of Bernard Maciejowski for the office hitherto held

»круглага стала« «Ідэя беларускасці і ідэя польскасці на мяжы тысячагоддзяў: да вызначэння паняццяў» (Мінск, 6–7 верасня 2000 г.), рэдкал.: Аляксандр Баршчэўскі [і інш.], Мінск 2001, р. 39.

³⁴ Idem, *Да пытання аб прызначэннях палякаў на дзяржаўныя пасады ў Вялікім Княстве Літоўскім у канцы XVI ст.*, [in:] *На шляхах да ўзаемаразумення. Навуковы зборнік*, рэд. Адам Мальдзіс, Мінск 2000, pp. 52–54.

³⁵ Иван И. Лаппо, *Великое княжество Литовское за время от заключения Люблинской Унии до смерти Стефана Батория (1569–1586)*, Санкт-Петербург 1901, р. 148; А.В. ЗАКРЗЕВСКИ, *Szlachta Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego*, р. 262.

³⁶ AGAD, AR II, book 196, fol. 5.

³⁷ Ibid., book 1086, fol. 4.

by the bishop Jerzy Radziwiłł. In 1596 objections were raised by the dietines of Oszmiana³⁸ and Minsk³⁹. The exception was the instruction of the dietine of Orsha which did not take a stand on the problem⁴⁰. In 1598 the protest was articulated in all instructions we know: the instructions of Vilnius⁴¹, Brest⁴², Trakai⁴³, Wiłkomierz (Ukmergė)⁴⁴, Vawkavysk⁴⁵, Minsk⁴⁶, Oszmiana⁴⁷, Lida⁴⁸, Bratslav⁴⁹ and Samogitia⁵⁰.

The conflict over the appointment of the bishop of Vilnius was very serious; obvious evidence for this is not only the unanimity of all Lithuanian dietines (apart from the dietine of Orsha of 1596) which protested against the appointment of B. Maciejowski, but also the rhetorics, the length of the demands as well as their position in the list of claims. Although this may not seem so noticeable in case of instructions of 1596 (in the instruction of Minsk they first addressed issues connected with foreign policy, taxes and the confirmation of the Warsaw Confederation; in the instruction of Oszmiana first they discussed the problem of the Turkish threat, Tatar gifts, peace with Muscovy, food provisions to castles situated near the border and the confirmation of the Warsaw Confederation), in 1598 in most instructions the issue of the Vilnius bishopric occupied one of the leading positions (in the instruction of Wiłkomierz it is mentioned in first place, in the instructions of Bratslav, Brest and Vawkavysk – in the second, and in the instruction of Lida – in the third). The only exception is the instruction of Minsk which first addressed a few other issues such as various aspects of the king's departure to Sweden. Unanimity of opinions of the dietines provokes to inquire about its reasons, among others to what an extent it was the result of the organised action of Krzysztof Radziwiłł "Piorun" ["Thunderbolt"] in cooperation with Lev Sapieha⁵¹.

Another example are the protests of the Lithuanians connected with the territorial belonging of the voivodeship of Smolensk – conquered during the war with Muscovy; its incorporation into the Crown⁵² by Sigismund III gave rise to a great deal of dissatisfaction. The demand to incorporate Smolensk into the Grand

³⁸ Ibid., book 352, fol. 2.

³⁹ Ibid., book 378, fol. 3.

⁴⁰ Ibid., book 346.

⁴¹ Ibid., book 370, fol. 2.

⁴² Ibid., supplement 142, fol. 1.

⁴³ Ibid., book 380, fol. 2.

⁴⁴ Ibid., book 402, fol. 1.

⁴⁵ Ibid., book 401, fol. 1.

⁴⁶ Ibid., book 368, fol. 4.

⁴⁷ Ibid., book 371, fol. 1.

⁴⁸ Ibid., book 354, fol. 2.

⁴⁹ Ibid., book 400, fol. 1.

⁵⁰ Ibid., book 243, fol. 2–3.

⁵¹ Arkadiusz CZWOŁEK, *Piórem i buławą. Działalność polityczna Lwa Sapiehy, kanclerza litewskiego, wojewody wileńskiego*, Toruń 2012, p. 118.

⁵² Wojciech POLAK, *O Kreml i Smoleńszczyznę. Polityka Rzeczypospolitej wobec Moskwy w latach 1607–1612*, Gdańsk 2008, p. 370.

Duchy of Lithuania was included in 1611 in the instructions of Vilnius⁵³, Samogitia⁵⁴ and Oszmiana⁵⁵. It needs to be mentioned, though, that such demands cannot be found in all the instructions of that year. They were not mentioned in the instruction of Minsk, in which the dietine limited itself to expressing their thanks to the king for conquering the Smolensk land and Severia and requesting the return of the lost estates to “our brothers, the citizens of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania” [transl. A.Ch]⁵⁶. The dietine of Poltsk did not express its protest either; the *szlachta* demanded that the people guilty of starting the war be punished and requested returning the lost estates in the voivodeship of Smolensk or granting them to the meritorious⁵⁷. However, dietines prior to the seym of 28 February 1613 expressed their opinion unanimously. The *szlachta* protested against the incorporation of Smolensk into the Crown in the instructions of Vilnius⁵⁸, Minsk⁵⁹, Trakai⁶⁰, Oszmiana⁶¹ and Wilkomierz (Ukmergė)⁶².

Joint protests of Lithuanian dietines were also induced by the decision of Władysław IV that part of the district of Starodub with Trubchevsk should remain within the boundaries of the state of Muscovy during the division of lands in the 1640s. The Lithuanians expressed their unanimous outrage in the instructions of Bratslav⁶³, Hrodna⁶⁴, Minsk⁶⁵, Slonim⁶⁶ and Navahrudak⁶⁷ to the seym of 1645; in the following year their strong dissatisfaction was expressed in the instructions of Slonim⁶⁸, Vilnius⁶⁹, Samogitia⁷⁰, Bratslav⁷¹, Navahrudak⁷², Minsk⁷³, Smolensk⁷⁴, Trakai⁷⁵, Vawkavysk⁷⁶, Brest⁷⁷ and Wilkomierz (Ukmergė)⁷⁸.

⁵³ AGAD, AR II, book 561, fol. 4.

⁵⁴ BPAU-PAN, manuscript 360, fol. 219.

⁵⁵ AGAD, AR II, book 560, fol. 1.

⁵⁶ BPAU-PAN, manuscript 365, fol. 41.

⁵⁷ Ibid., fol. 49, 52.

⁵⁸ AGAD, AR II, book 584, fol. 2.

⁵⁹ Ibid., book 583, fol. 2, 3.

⁶⁰ Ibid., book 589, fol. 2.

⁶¹ Ibid., book 585, fol. 2.

⁶² Ibid., book 588, fol. 1.

⁶³ BPAU-PAN, manuscript 365, fol. 116.

⁶⁴ Ibid., fol. 122v.

⁶⁵ Ibid., manuscript 360, fol. 479.

⁶⁶ Ibid., manuscript 365, fol. 120.

⁶⁷ BCzart., manuscript 375, fol. 849.

⁶⁸ BPAU-PAN, manuscript 365, fol. 160.

⁶⁹ BCzart., TN 140, no. 61, fol. 227.

⁷⁰ Ibid., manuscript 378, no. 82, fol. 443–444.

⁷¹ Ibid., TN 140, no. 59, fol. 203.

⁷² Ibid., no. 60, fol. 211.

⁷³ BPAU-PAN, manuscript 365, fol. 132–133.

⁷⁴ BCzart., TN 126, fol. 1.

⁷⁵ Ibid., TN 140, no. 55, fol. 175.

⁷⁶ Ibid., TN 126, no. 7, fol. 33.

⁷⁷ BPAU-PAN, manuscript 365, fol. 127.

⁷⁸ Ibid., fol. 114.

However, it must be noted that despite the fact that Lithuanian dietines expressed their indignation, they demonstrated hardly any common consolidated viewpoint, considering that they put forward different demands and applied various rhetorics. The harshest language was used by the dietine of Minsk in 1646 where Trubchevsk was mentioned four times. Various demands of dietines included the return of the territories passed over to Muscovy, compensation from the Polish Crown or only (in general words) receiving appropriate explanations. Curiously enough, at least in the case of some dietines the tone and demands put forward underwent significant changes⁷⁹. With all the reservations, it can be concluded that the examples provided here clearly show that there was a group of problems which were particularly significant to the *szlachta*, who took the same standpoint towards such problems unanimously at dietines. Thus, it is worth considering importance of the various demands to the dietines and generally to the Lithuanian *szlachta* – or at least its politically involved members who took part in dietines.

Apart from this, the previously mentioned “catalogue” of signs of Lithuanian particularism should supposedly be broadened. Returning to what we referred to as the objective aspect of the phenomenon of particularism, we must pay attention to the existence of two very important legal institutions which determined the separate identity of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania – the Lithuanian Statute and Tribunal. Although the existence of both institutions itself has been already given due consideration⁸⁰, it seems that the subjective aspect of the problem (despite being mentioned in science⁸¹), has not been examined thoroughly yet. What we mean is to analyze demands of the dietines referring to the given matter.

The question of the organisation and functioning of the judiciary system of the *szlachta* is one of the most frequently addressed issues in the instructions of Lithuanian dietines. The *szlachta* at dietines were interested in a wide spectrum of problems connected with the organisation and functioning of courts and the Lithuanian Tribunal such as the order of process acts, the appointment of deputies, the execution of sentences, the division of competence between the *szlachta* courts and royal court, etc. An issue of greatest importance to Lithuanians was the questioning of the competence of the Tribunal by the *zadworny* [in curia] general court. This question was raised in the instructions about fifty times. Dietines complained about bringing cases falling under the jurisdiction of the Tribunal to the *zadworny* [in curia] court. Another objection concerned the passing of judgment by the *zadworny* [in curia] court in cases where court verdicts had already been announced i.e. by the Tribunal⁸². Sometimes people attempting to undermine the

⁷⁹ More compare: Томаш АМБРОЗЯК, *Отношение литовских сеймиков к передаче Трубчевска Московскому государству в 1645-46 гг.*, [in:] *Военные триумфы эпохи Вялікага княства Літоўскага: зборнік навуковых прац* (in print).

⁸⁰ Compare for example: Juliusz BARDACH, *Statuty litewskie w ich kręgu prawno-kulturowym*, [in:] idem, *O dawnej i niedawnej Litwie*, Poznań 1988, p. 67.

⁸¹ H. WISNER, *Naprawa państwa*, pp. 43–44.

⁸² More compare: Tomasz КЕМПА, *Trybunał litewski w obronie wolności wyznaniowej w końcu XVI i w pierwszej połowie XVII wieku*, *Zapiski Historyczne*, vol. 76: 2011, no. 2, pp. 29–50.

competence of the Tribunal and bringing their cases to royal courts were threatened with punishments.

In this perspective the question of the conflict of competence between the Tribunal or other Lithuanian courts and their Polish counterparts seems to be of secondary importance⁸³. Moreover, whereas the demands concerning questioning competences of the Tribunal by royal courts appear throughout all the period discussed in the article, the conflicts with the Polish counterparts are marked by certain dynamics – the most intensive periods are the second and the fifth decade of the 17th century. In other periods of time, demands of this kind appear rather rarely.

The functioning of the Statute itself was given relatively less attention in the dietines instructions and was usually referred to in the context of its “improvement”, which is an interesting proof of the vitality of this legal institution. Thus, it seems that a detailed and in-depth analysis of the dietines’ demands concerning both the Statute and the Lithuanian Tribunal would be a precious complementation of the research hitherto conducted.

Other issues worth looking at are the questions of foreign policy. Arkadiusz Czwołek underlined the disproportions in the extent of the Lithuanian interest in individual directions of foreign policy⁸⁴. Similar disproportions are also reflected in the content of the instructions of the dietines. While demands referring to various aspects of the relations with Muscovy appear in the instructions about two hundred fifty times and relations with Sweden over two hundred, contacts with Turkey and the Crimean Khanate drew attention of the dietines just about one hundred fifty times. The remaining directions of foreign policy appear in the Lithuanian instructions even less frequently. The relations with Prussia were referred to seventy times (much of which concerns local issues, e.g questions of trade), relations with Courland thirty times, and France was mentioned in the instructions only thrice.

Not only is the significant character of the Muscovite direction of foreign policy indicated by the quantitative analysis of the content of instructions, but also by the rhetorics used towards various neighbours of the Rzeczpospolita. Herein, contrast in the Lithuanian attitude can be clearly noticed – two states strikingly differ from others. One of them is Turkey, often referred to as the “enemy of the holy religion”, the “enemy of the Cross” or simply “pagans”, the other – the Muscovite State, frequently defined as an “enemy” and labeled as “faithless”. Interestingly, such sharp rhetoric was not so eagerly used in referring to relations with Sweden despite even the long and exhaustive war. However, whereas demands concerning Sweden or Muscovy were quite extensive, the question of the Turkish military threat was nor-

⁸³ A.B. ZAKRZEWSKI, *Szlachta Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego*, pp. 265–266.

⁸⁴ Arkadiusz CZWOŁEK, *Spory w rodzinie. Polsko-litewskie dyskusje i polemiki wokół interpretacji zapisów Unii Lubelskiej w czasach Zygmunta III*, [in:] *Проблеми інтеграції і інкарнарації*, p. 302.

mally expressed in general terms and reaching “mutual agreement” with the Polish Crown was recommended. Naturally, there were exceptions to the rule⁸⁵.

As far as foreign policy is concerned, we come across another curious phenomenon. In the light of the relations with Muscovite and Sweden we may differentiate two types of factors: the ones which favoured further integration and the ones which disintegrated the union or, less firmly speaking, led to Polish-Lithuanian conflicts. Paradoxically, in case of both policy directions the factors coexisted and can be traced in the content of the dietines’ instructions. On the one hand, we can easily notice a specific evolution of attitudes of dietines during the war with Muscovy (1609–1618), since they gradually started to require concrete and joint actions with the Polish Crown against the common enemy⁸⁶. On the other hand, as mentioned above, the problem of the belonging of Smolensk and Trubchevsk gave rise to serious tensions in the relations between the Grand Duchy of Lithuanian and the Crown. As far as the policy towards Sweden was concerned, the territorial situation of Livonia forced the Poles and Lithuanians to cooperate to protect the province, but on the other hand it was also a source of conflicts connected with the distribution of the burdens.

Besides, it seems to be an interesting idea to conduct a comparative analysis of the Crown dietines and the Lithuanian dietines concerning their involvement in various directions of foreign policy. In other words, the question to examine would be whether the Crown was more concentrated on foreign policy with territories adjacent to Poland while neglecting more distant areas.

Another question possible to include into the catalogue of signs of Lithuanian particularism which requires thorough analysis are the financial claims presented in the instructions⁸⁷. In this case it would also be useful to carry out a compar-

⁸⁵ For example, most Lithuanian dietines in 1646 objected to the plans of Władysław IV – the instruction of Brasław [“instrukcja brasławska”]: BCzart., TN 140, no. 59, fol. 204; the instruction of Brest [“instrukcja brzeska”]: BPAU-PAN, manuscript 365, fol. 127; the instruction of Hrodna [“instrukcja grodzieńska”]: BCzart., TN 140, no. 60, fol. 209–210; the instruction of Lida [“instrukcja lidzka”]: BPAU-PAN, manuscript 365, fol. 155; the instruction of Minsk [“instrukcja mińska”]: *ibid.*, fol. 132; the instruction of Navahrudak [“instrukcja nowogródzka”]: BCzart., TN 140, no. 113, fol. 429; the instruction of Slonim [“instrukcja słonimska”]: BPAU-PAN, manuscript 365, fol. 160; the instruction of Wilkomierz [“instrukcja wilkomierska”]: BCzart., TN 140, no. 58, fol. 193–194; the instruction of Trakai [“instrukcja trocka”]: *ibid.*, TN 143, no 162, fol. 687–688.

⁸⁶ More compare: Томаш Амброзяк, *Внешняя угроза как катализатор интеграционных процессов: на примере отношений литовской шляхты к Польской Короне во время войны Речи Посполитой с Россией 1609–1618 гг.*, [in:] *Фундаментальные науки и пути становления и развития новой экономики России. Труды международной научно-практической конференции с элементами научных школ*, ч. 1, ред. Вячеслав М. Герасимов, Москва 2013, pp. 6–9; *idem*, *Отношение литовских сеймиков к Смуте и интервенции Речи Посполитой в Москве (1604–1618)*, [in:] *Смута как исторический и социокультурный феномен. Материалы Всероссийской научной конференции 22–23 апреля 2013 г.*, Москва 2013, pp. 179–185.

⁸⁷ Such an analysis was only partly made; comp. A. CZWOŁEK, *Spory w rodzinie*, pp. 306–311; the author underlined numerous claims put forward by Lithuanians (including financial claims), concerning the insufficient involvement in the common military venture.

tive analysis of the Crown and Lithuanian dietines. It would be interesting to find the answer to the question to what an extent dietines were eager (at least verbally) to share the financial burden to cover the expenses connected with the common needs of the state.

Apart from the research suggestions provided above, it would be useful to address other questions which would allow us to look at Lithuanian particularism from a different perspective. The question that arises from our reflections above is to what extent the phenomenon discussed here was of a negative character. By this category we certainly do not mean forming any value judgments (such as indicating its positive or negative consequences). It should be rather defined as rejecting any actions treated as real or even potential attempts to limit the rights of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania or the Lithuanian *szlachta*. As can be seen, the most insistent and unanimous demands of Lithuanian dietines (e.g. in case of the conflict over the appointment of the bishop of Vilnius or conflicts of competence between the Lithuanian and Crown Tribunals) were usually caused by non-Lithuanian factors (decisions of the king or the Crown Tribunal).

However, even if it may be difficult to determine a single and direct cause of the individual Lithuanian demands, it seems that to a large extent they constituted an attempt to eliminate divergences between the factual state and the ideal (as it was assumed by the authors of sources). For example, a great part of dietines' demands that the king reside in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania every third year appear to be of this kind⁸⁸.

Naturally, there are also examples of the "positive programme" – demands which were not merely a reaction against actions undertaken by other actors, but could have been formulated by the Lithuanians themselves. An interesting example may be the instruction of Minsk of 1615 in which it was acknowledged that the previous seym headed by a Lithuanian Aleksander Korwin Gosiewski had been only a convention, not fulfilling the features of seym. As a result, the Lithuanians demanded that the representative of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania for the position of marshall be elected again and called to all Lithuanian envoys for a unanimous position on the issue⁸⁹. The justification for such an interpretation was the fact that the former seym, held in December 1613, had been called as extraordinary.

⁸⁸ For example, the instruction of Wilkomierz ["instrukcja wilkomierska"] of 1600 (RNB, Ф. 971, Оп. 2, the collection of autographs 133, no. 41, fol. 125), where it said: "constitutią seymową warowano iest, że Je[g]o Kr[ó]lewska M[ó]ść dwie lecie w Polsce, a trzeci rok w W[ielkim] X[ięstwie] Lit[ewskim] mieszkać ma, czemu ysz się dosyć nam od Je[g]o Kr[ó]lewskiej M[ó]ści nie dzieie gdyż od kilku lat w tym państwie naszym bywać Je[g]o Kr[ó]lewska M[ó]ść nie raczy" ["yet the seym constitution stipulateth that His King's Majesty shall dwell two years in Poland and the third year in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, His Majesty, alas, neglecteth this duty as for several years Him deigneth not to abide in this state of ours" – transl. T.A.] or the instruction of Navahrudak ["instrukcja nowogródzka"] of 1618 (AGAD, AR II, book 701, fol. 5), in which the king was asked "aby prawom dosyć czyniąc w Wielkim X[ięs]twie Litewskim przemieszkiwać raczył" ["to deign to abide in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, thus obeying laws" – transl. T.A.].

⁸⁹ AGAD, AR II, book 619, fol. 6.

Another issue worth examining is the question to what an extent Lithuanian particularism was directed against the Polish Crown, or was it rather an attempt to protect Lithuanian interests and construct (or at least maintain) their own identity, not inevitably directing itself against anyone. In other words, it would be interesting to examine whether particularism was only a “defence” or rather a way of “realisation” of Lithuanian own interests.

Moreover, it needs to be underlined that Lithuanian particularism might not have been directed exclusively against the Polish Crown. Previous researches have accentuated the multilevel character of *szlachta*’s identity⁹⁰. Apart from the notion of unity of the *szlachta* of Rzeczpospolita as a whole and a feeling of belonging to one big community of the *szlachta* of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, members of that estate may also had a local identity, namely a kind of bond with their territory, voivodeship or district; at the same time, all those identities not necessarily contradicted each other.

As for the activity of dietines, it is obvious that they also played a significant role in the functioning of local self-government resolving a lot of various local issues. Besides, they were also the places where local interests and needs were formulated, articulated and put into action. The evidence for this are various demands included in instructions which concerned the problems of a given district. However, apart from the issues, which we may call as self-governmental (such as the election of officials, organisation of fairs, requests to confirm grants for monasteries, etc.) there are also demands directed against other districts. For example, the dietine of Trakai in 1628 accused “Ich M[ó]sci Panów Braci obywatelów W[ielkie]o X[ięstw]a Litt[ewskiego] w powiatach niektórych” [„Gentlemen Brothers, citizens of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania from certain districts” – transl. T.A.], that “żyjąc w pokoju immisceribus patriae porównać się z nami w podatkach nie chcą” [„yet in one motherland living in peace, they desire not to equate with us as far as taxes are concerned” – transl. T.A.], ordering their envoys that they “się do żadnych (ieśliby iakie dalsze następowały kontribucyje) pociągać nie dali, ażby się nam w tey mierze satisfactia stała” [„shall object to any taxes be them administered, as long as we are settled in that matter” – transl. T.A.]⁹¹.

It seems that here we encounter some terminological difficulty. How should the phenomenon presented above be named? Should we refer to it as “particularism” either? If so, should we define it as “regional/district particularism”, in parallel to the term “Lithuanian particularism”? Or should we rather use the term “regionalism”? Moreover, what criteria should we use to differentiate both phenomena

⁹⁰ Juliusz BARDACH, *Wieloszczeblowa świadomość narodowa na ziemiach litewsko-ruskich Rzeczypospolitej w XVII–XX wieku*, [in:] *Krajowość – tradycje zgody narodów w dobie nacjonalizmu. Materiały z międzynarodowej konferencji naukowej w Instytucie Historii UAM w Poznaniu, (11–12 maja 1998)*, ed. Jan JURKIEWICZ, Poznań 1999, pp. 11–34.

⁹¹ AGAD, AR II, book 996, fol. 1.

– Lithuanian particularism and regional/district particularism or regionalism (depending on how we decide to call it)?

Another issue worth considering is the explanation (as far as it is possible) of reasons for the individual demands put forward by dietines. It would be interesting to analyse to what extent the Lithuanian claims, even those directed against the Crown or “brothers from the Crown”, were in fact determined by other factors, not necessarily connected directly with the problem discussed. Various “Lithuanian” claims could result from the competition between the pro-king party and the opposition, tensions among various factions of magnates or conflicts on the line magnates – the *szlachta*. That phenomena can also be observed in other periods beyond the scope of interest of this paper (which concentrates on the reigns of Sigismund III and Władysław IV). For instance, Tomasz Kempa underlined that in the 1560s differences of opinions concerning the conclusion of the union with the Crown were “a result of other differences dividing Lithuanian society” [transl. A.Ch.], particularly in terms of the rivalry between the Radziwiłłs and the Chodkiewicz family⁹². Besides, sometimes the motives of Lithuanian demands were even more prosaic. Despite the obvious fact of formulating by some Lithuanian dietines the demands that the king reside every third year in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania⁹³ (though neither ferociously nor particularly often), a purpose of similar claim expressed after the death of Stephen Bathory (who had a well-known predilection for residing in Hrodna) could be rather to reduce the time the king spent in Lithuania, since at the same time complaints about the financial problems were made⁹⁴.

What is more, the phenomena discussed here need to be approached dynamically. We cannot forget that the time under analysis embraces 60 years, therefore the exact time perspective should be maintained. During the sixty-year period some problems formerly expressed disappear or cease to be relevant, whilst other issues arise. For example, the question of the territories incorporated into the Polish Crown at the seym of Lublin, which was prioritised by the Lithuanian elite during the first three *interregna*⁹⁵ and included for example in the list of demands expressed in the instruction of Samogitia for the coronation seym of Sigismund III⁹⁶, disappeared from the list of claims put forward by Lithuanian dietines at the beginning of Sigismund III's reign. From that time onwards the Lithuanians would

⁹² Tomasz KEMPA, *Konflikty w elicie politycznej Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego w XVI wieku (do 1569 roku) a kwestia unii polsko-litewskiej*, [in:] *Проблеми інтеграції і інкарнарації*, pp. 42–58.

⁹³ H. WISNER, *Szlachta Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego*, p. 265.

⁹⁴ „Bo tesz skarb nasz dobrze mniejszy za odeszcziem Wołynia i Podlaszia” [“as our treasury dwindled due to the loss of Volhynia and Podlachia” – transl. T.A.]; cited after: A.B. ZAKRZEWSKI, *Szlachta Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego*, p. 261.

⁹⁵ Henryk LULEWICZ, *Gniewów o unię ciąg dalszy. Stosunki polsko-litewskie w latach 1569–1588*, Warszawa 2002, p. 52.

⁹⁶ AGAD, AR II, book 196, fol. 2.

refer to the issue of the territories lost in 1569 only as a reason to reject a financial contribution to Tatar gifts.

If we were to narrow down the topic only to Lithuanian-Polish conflicts, it would be useful to attempt to create a kind of “diagram” of mutual relations taking into account separate problems in a chronological aspect, examining whether it is possible to observe any regularities in that area. It would be particularly interesting to ponder whether we deal with the development of integration or rather the increase in conflicts between Lithuania and the Crown. Furthermore, the role and significance of integrative factors should be underlined. Let us mention the previously indicated external threat or the functioning of the parliamentary mechanism itself, where on the one hand issues important for the whole Rzeczpospolita were debated at dietines (i.e. through royal instruction); still, various local problems were discussed at the seym (at the central level). We should also note the role of Polish Crown as a model for the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and claims made by Lithuanian dietines (even if not particularly often) aimed at employing various solutions from the Crown⁹⁷.

The demand for the dynamic examination of the phenomenon of particularism has been presented earlier on the basis of the analysis of the use of the term “rzeczpospolita” in Lithuanian dietines’ instructions. While at the end of the 16th century within the terminology of the sources still the own Lithuanian perspective prevailed, in the 17th century we can clearly notice the phenomena of favouring the term “rzeczpospolita” and articulating the common character of Polish-Lithuanian state. The analysis has also demonstrated the increase of the frequency of the term “rzeczpospolita” as well as serious alterations in the relation between the number of uses of the term “rzeczpospolita” and names referring to the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. Additionally, an increase of quantity of terms such as “Rzeczpospolita nasza” [“our Rzeczpospolita” – transl. A.Ch.] and “Rzeczpospolita ojczyzna nasza” [“Rzeczpospolita – our motherland” – transl. A.Ch.] together with some critical moments in relations with the Crown have been noticed⁹⁸. It would be interesting to examine how the phenomena noticed in the terminology corresponds with the content of the instructions.

Another problem worth considering is to what an extent the phenomenon of Lithuanian particularism was exceptional in the whole Rzeczpospolita. Certainly, the complexity of that multi-ethnic state should not be ignored, which precludes treating it only in terms of Polish-Lithuanian dualism. It seems that few elements attributed by researches as symptoms of “Lithuanian particularism” were typical exclusively of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania.

⁹⁷ For example, establishing the institution modelled on the Radom Committee, appointed to control the expenses of the treasury, introducing the institution of a quarter or increasing the head tax for Jews.

⁹⁸ More comp. Tomasz AMBROZIAK, *Rzeczpospolita w litewskich instrukcjach sejmikowych w latach 1587–1648. Próba analizy terminologicznej*, *Czasopismo Prawno-Historyczne*, vol. 65: 2013, no. 2, pp. 191–214.

Moreover, we also need to return to the previously mentioned objective meaning of the analysed term and consider the conception of particularism of feudal law. Thus, it seems clear that we are able to indicate within Rzeczpospolita a number of territories diversified from a legal point of view. Obvious examples of such diversity are both Royal Prussia and Ruthenian lands, incorporated into Polish Crown in 1569. Finally, Livonia and the Piltene region were also a specific part of the Rzeczpospolita.

However, not only is our suggestion a result of analysis of the objective meaning of the term “particularism”, but it also stems from its subjective aspect, since in this case we happen to notice some interesting parallels. Taking into consideration the attitude of the *szlachta* to the common Polish-Lithuanian state, it needs to be underlined that in all of the aforementioned territories we may notice (to a greater or lesser degree) some form of awareness of distinction from other parts of the Polish Crown or Rzeczpospolita as a whole. What is more, every dietine to some extent debated its own problems and articulated its own (sometimes selfish) interests, willing to defend them if necessary.

It seems that comparative research should be employed here, for both differences and similarities of political attitudes among *szlachta* members, manifested in their political activity, could be revealed. It would be crucial to present both the phenomena which were common for different parts of the Rzeczpospolita and those which were specific only for the Lithuanian identity. The attitude of Lithuanian and Crown dietines to various problems could be compared, some elements of which have been discussed in this paper – such as the readiness to finance the needs of the Rzeczpospolita and to bear various burdens for the sake of the state. In connection with limited Lithuanian interest in foreign policy issues (aforementioned concentration on relations with Sweden and Muscovy), we might compare the degree of interest and attitude of individual dietines to its various directions, considering any possible parallels in this matter. Another issue worth considering would be the comparison of the degree of involvement of individual dietines in solving problems concerning the whole Rzeczpospolita on the one hand, and articulating their own local interests and resolving local issues on the other.

To recapitulate, it seems that despite the fact that the term “Lithuanian particularism” belongs to the most fundamental terms in the research on the history of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and the Polish-Lithuanian relations during the times of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, it still needs in-depth research. There exist many valuable detailed studies, but appropriate methods allowing us to carry out an objective analysis and describe the phenomenon of the Lithuanian particularism, its scale and characteristic features as well as the similarities and differences in Polish and Lithuanian political culture have not been developed yet. Another problem is that researchers sometimes tend to concentrate excessively on negative aspects of the Polish-Lithuanian relations.

Finally, frameworks for Lithuanian particularism should be created in order to evaluate the phenomenon objectively, neither undervaluing nor overestimating it. Further detailed research should allow us to look at the problem of Lithuanian particularism and Lithuanian identity as a whole in a new light. Let us hope it would help us conduct the complete and objective evaluation of the Polish-Lithuanian relations in the early modern period.

Translated from Polish by Agnieszka Chabros and Tomasz Ambroziak

O POTRZEBIE NOWEGO SPOJRZENIA NA KWESTIĘ
PARTYKULARYZMU LITEWSKIEGO
W OKRESIE PANOWANIA ZYGMUNTA III I WŁADYSŁAWA IV

Streszczenie

Słowa kluczowe: Rzeczpospolita Obojga Narodów, Wielkie Księstwo Litewskie, stosunki polsko-litewskie, kultura polityczna, regionalizm, tożsamość polityczna, instrukcje sejmikowe

W niniejszym artykule dokonano krytycznej oceny osiągnięć badań nad kwestią partykularyzmu litewskiego i przedstawiono szereg postulatów dotyczących możliwości nowego spojrzenia na omawiane zagadnienie w okresie panowania dwóch pierwszych Wazów. Wydaje się, że wciąż istnieje potrzeba prowadzenia szczegółowych studiów nad wskazaną problematyką, obejmujących wypracowanie dokładnej definicji, ocenę jego skali i analizę cech charakterystycznych zjawiska partykularyzmu litewskiego. Ważnym aspektem poruszonej problematyki są również badania komparatystyczne mogące wskazać podobieństwa i różnice w postawach szlachty koronnej i litewskiej oraz ich stosunku do wspólnego państwa. Należy także zwrócić uwagę na częstotliwość i dynamikę konfliktów polsko-litewskich, a także dokonać analizy ilościowej wysuwanych przez sejmiki litewskie postulatów.

ÜBER DIE NOTWENDIGKEIT EINES NEUEN BLICKS AUF DIE FRAGE
DES LITAUISCHEN PARTIKULARISMUS WÄHREND DER REGIERUNGSZEIT
SIGISMUNDS III. UND WŁADYSŁAWS IV.

Zusammenfassung

Schlüsselbegriffe: Republik beider Nationen, Großfürstentum Litauen, polnisch-litauische Beziehungen, politische Kultur, politische Identität, Regionalismus, Landtagsinstruktionen

Der vorliegende Artikel liefert eine kritische Analyse der Forschungsergebnisse zur Frage des litauischen Partikularismus und stellt eine Reihe von Postulaten für einen neuen Blick auf das besprochene Problem während der Regierungszeit der beiden ersten Wasa-Herrscher auf. Anscheinend besteht nach wie vor Bedarf an detaillierten Studien zu dieser Problematik, einschließlich der Erarbeitung einer genauen Definition, der Einschätzung des Umfangs und der Analyse der charakteristischen Eigenschaften des litauischen Partikularismus. Bedeutsam für die angesprochene Problematik sind zudem vergleichende Untersuchungen, welche auf Ähnlichkeiten und Unterschiede in den Einstellungen des polnischen und litauischen Adels sowie auf ihre Haltung zum gemeinsamen Staatswesen hinweisen könnten. Darüber hinaus ist auf die Häufigkeit und Dynamik polnisch-litauischer Konflikte hinzuweisen, und eine quantitative Analyse der von den litauischen Landtagen erhobenen Postulate durchzuführen.

