

Robert Kołodziej

(University of Wrocław, Poland)

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3900-6667>







E-mail: robert.kolodziej@uwr.edu.pl; kolodziej69@op.pl

## Attitudes of the Kiev, Bratslav and Chernihiv Dietines in Exile Towards the Policy of John III Sobieski in the Period of 1687–1691<sup>1</sup>

*Egzulanci kijowscy, bractawscy i czernihowsky wobec polityki Jana III Sobieskiego  
w latach 1687–1691*

### ABSTRACT

The article discusses the political positions of Ukrainian nobles from three dietines in exile, from the county (voivodship) of Kiev, Bratslav and Chernihiv between 1687 and 1691, who met together in Volodymyr-Volynskyy. Based on documents of assemblies from the pre-diet and after-diet one can analyze political views of nobles from three dietines and their attitudes towards the king and his politics during three consecutive diets (1688, 1688–1689, 1690). Research proves that

PUBLICATION INFO			
			e-ISSN: 2449-8467 ISSN: 2082-6060
			
THE AUTHOR'S ADDRESS: Robert Kołodziej, the Historical Institute of the University of Wrocław, 49 Szewska Street, Wrocław 50-139, Poland			
SOURCE OF FUNDING: Statutory Research of the Historical Institute of the University of Wrocław			
SUBMITTED: 2019.06.05	ACCEPTED: 2020.05.25	PUBLISHED ONLINE: 2020.12.21	
WEBSITE OF THE JOURNAL: <a href="https://journals.umcs.pl/rh">https://journals.umcs.pl/rh</a>		EDITORIAL COMMITTEE E-mail: reshistorica@umcs.pl	

<sup>1</sup> The author's intention is to analyze the attitude of the three dietines in Ukraine between 1687 and 1696. However, because of the amount of source material, the task was split into two papers.

in these times the opposition had an advantage in the Kiev's dietine, but the other two dietines were dominated by the Court's supporters. Additionally, a fierce political struggle was waged at all three assemblies as evidenced by the interruption of some dietines. An analysis of the preserved documents shows that Court's supporters actively pursued politics in Volodymyr-Volynskiy. His actions proved remarkably effective. The opposing dietine of the Kiev county was interrupted before the 1690s diet, and the remaining two assemblies elected the King's sympathetic parliamentarians and produced articles of instructions that had advantages for the King. After the diet people trusted by the king dominated the deliberation of the Kiev's dietine.

**Key words:** John III Sobieski, dietine, diet, Kiev count, Bratslav count, Chernihiv count, exile, Ukraine

The internal situation in the Commonwealth during the final period of the reign of John III Sobieski (1687–1696) has not been met with sufficient interest among historians<sup>2</sup>, in spite of the fact that trailblazing works in the field were carried out by Ernest Łuniński, Stanisław Tarnowski, and Kazimierz Piwarski<sup>3</sup>. Several comprehensive monographs of diets from the period have remained in typescript form, but only a few articles have been released in print, and these certainly do not exhaust the subject matter<sup>4</sup>. However, owing to the research by Andrzej Rachuba and Gintautas Silesoriusas, our knowledge on the internal affairs in the Great

<sup>2</sup> An apparent effect of such a situation is reflected in the fact that the authors of the two major biographies of the reign of John III Sobieski are very well informed in the intricacies of foreign policy and of the international circumstances of the Commonwealth, but analyze to a much lesser extent the internal situation in the country, see: O. Fort de Battaglia, *Jan Sobieski król Polski*, Warszawa 1983; Z. Wójcik, *Jan Sobieski*, Warszawa 1983.

<sup>3</sup> E. Deiches (E. Łuniński), *Na stos. Karta historyczna z czasów Jana III*, Petersburg 1901; S. Tarnowski, *Tajemnica roku 1688*, 'Roczniki Zarządu Akademii Umiejętności' 1883; K. Piwarski, *Między Francją a Austrią. Z dziejów polityki Jana III Sobieskiego w latach 1687–1690*, Kraków 1933.

<sup>4</sup> The following works have been published: A. Kaźmierczyk, *Sejm grodzieński, 31 grudnia 1692 – 11 lutego 1693 r.*, 'Studia Historyczne' 1990, 33, 1, pp. 21–36; idem, *Pomiędzy dwoma sejmami w 1693 r.*, 'Śląski Kwartalnik Historyczny Sobótka' [hereinafter: 'Sobótka'] 1992, 47, p. 221; M. Mróz, *Ostatnie zwycięstwo parlamentarne króla. Sejm 1690 roku*, in: *Z dziejów i tradycji Srebrnego Wieku*, ed. J. Pietrzak, 'Acta Universitatis Wratislaviensis' [hereinafter: 'AUWr'] 1990, 1108, Historia 75, pp. 101–113; J. Kaniewski, *Problem wojny polsko-tureckiej na sejmie 1690 r.*, in: *Wojny polsko-tureckie w XVII w.*, Przemyśl 2000, pp. 29–48; R. Kołodziej, *Sejm z 22 grudnia 1693 r.*, 'Wieki Stare i Nowe' 2016, 10, pp. 47–76; there are two major studies that remain in typescript form: J. Maroń, *Sejmy z lat 1688–1689*, Wrocław 1987, typescript of the doctoral dissertation in Library of the Institute of History at the University of Wrocław; J. Kaniewski, *Sejm z 1690 roku*, Katowice 1997, typescript of the doctoral dissertation in Library of the Institute of History at the University of Silesia in Katowice; to a minor extent political problems are also touched upon in the monograph discussing the operation of the Sejm during the reign of John III Sobieski, see: R. Kołodziej, *Ostatni wolności naszej klejnot. Sejm Rzeczypospolitej za panowania Jana III Sobieskiego*, Poznań 2014.

Duchy of Lithuania has been substantially improved<sup>5</sup>. The phenomenon of the Sapieha family's hegemony has also been investigated by other authors<sup>6</sup>. The existing state of research on the internal affairs within the Polish Crown appears to be far inferior. Many valuable pieces of information have been provided in a study by Stefan Ciara<sup>7</sup>, whereas Marek Wagner presented in some detail the political attitudes of major senators, such as Jan Stanisław Jabłonowski and Jędrzej Potocki<sup>8</sup>. Michał Komaczyński and Aleksandra Skrzypietz in a series of works investigated the relations within the Royal family<sup>9</sup>. Meanwhile, the propaganda struggle in the country was analyzed by Jerzy Maroń and Anna Czarniecka<sup>10</sup>. Lastly, several monographs on the Crown and Lithuanian diets of the discussed period enables us to characterize the attitudes of

<sup>5</sup> A. Rachuba, *Litwa wobec projektu zwołania sejmu konnego w 1695 r. i walki Sapiehów z biskupem Brzostowskim*, 'Zapiski Historyczne' 1986, 51, 1, pp. 63–82; idem, *Hegemonia Sapiehów na Litwie jako przejaw skrajnej dominacji magnaterii w życiu kraju*, in: *Władza i prestiż. Magnateria Rzeczypospolitej w XVI–XVIII w.*, eds. J. Urwanowicz, E. Dubas-Urwanowicz, P. Guzowski, Białystok 2003, pp. 217–229; A. Rachuba also authored a series of biographical entries in *Polski Słownik Biograficzny* [hereinafter: PSB]; G. Sliesoriūnas, *Lietuvos Didžioji Kunigaikštystė vidaus karo išvakarėse: didikų grupuočių kova 1690–1697 m.*, Vilnius 2000; idem, *Problem separatyzmu Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego w XVII w.*, in: *Rzeczpospolita wielu narodów i jej tradycje*, eds. A. Link-Lenczowski, M. Markiewicz, Kraków 1999, pp. 85–94.

<sup>6</sup> M. Sawicki, *Konflikt biskupa wileńskiego Konstantego Kazimierza Brzostowskiego z Kazimierzem Janem Sapiehą w latach 1693–1696*, in: *Studia z dziejów Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego (XVI–XVIII wieku)*, eds. S. Górczyński, M. Nagielski, Warszawa 2014, pp. 383–401; P.P. Romaniuk, *Instytucjonalne podstawy hegemonii Sapiehów w Wielkim Księstwie Litewskim w drugiej połowie XVII wieku*, in: *W cieniu wojen i rozbiorów. Studia z dziejów Rzeczypospolitej XVIII i początków XIX wieku*, eds. U. Kosińska, D. Dukwicz, A. Danilczyk, Warszawa 2014, pp. 29–37; R. Kołodziej, *Stronnictwo Sapiehów a funkcjonowanie sejmu w drugiej części panowania Jana III Sobieskiego (1685–1696)*, in: *Wielkie rody dawnej Rzeczypospolitej*, vol. 1, *Sapiehowie*, eds. T. Ciesielski, M. Sawicki, Opole 2018, pp. 105–119; Z. Hundert, *Działalność Sapiehów w 'powiedeńskim' okresie panowania Jana III Sobieskiego (1683–1696) w świetle akt sejmikowych województwa mazowieckiego*, in: *Wielkie rody dawnej Rzeczypospolitej*, vol. 1, *Sapiehowie*, eds. T. Ciesielski, M. Sawicki, Opole 2018, pp. 87–104.

<sup>7</sup> S. Ciara, *Senatorowie i dygnitarze koronni w drugiej połowie XVII wieku*, Wrocław–Warszawa–Kraków 1990.

<sup>8</sup> M. Wagner, *Stanisław Jabłonowski (1634–1702)*, Siedlce 1997; idem, *Andrzej Potocki hetman polny koronny*, in: *W cieniu szukamy jasności chwały. Studia z dziejów panowania Jana III Sobieskiego (1684–1696)*, ed. M. Wagner, Siedlce 2002, pp. 49–60.

<sup>9</sup> M. Komaczyński, *Teresa Kunegunda Sobieska*, Warszawa 1982; idem, *Maria Kazimiera d'Arquien Sobieska królowa Polski 1641–1716*, Kraków–Wrocław 1984; A. Skrzypietz, *Królewscy synowie – Jakub, Aleksander i Konstanty Sobiescy*, Katowice 2011.

<sup>10</sup> J. Maroń, 'Sejmu grodzieńskiego exorbitancja' – opinia publiczna wobec zerwania sejmu 1688 roku, 'Sobótka' 1993, 48, pp. 247–250; idem, *Pisma ulotne po sejmie grodzieńskim 1688 r.*, in: *Studia z dziejów Rzeczypospolitej szlacheckiej*, eds. K. Matwijowski, Z. Wójcik, 'AUWr' 1988, 945, *Historia* 66, pp. 203–209. A. Czarniecka, *Nikt nie słucha mnie za życia... Jan III w walce z opozycyjną propagandą (1684–1696)*, Warszawa 2009.

the nobility hailing from various territories towards the internal situation in the country and towards the King's policy<sup>11</sup>. Among the latter body of works, the research on Ukrainian dietines in exile certainly appears to be particularly scarce. Until quite recently, the matter had been entirely overlooked<sup>12</sup>, with a significant obstacle in the form of limited access to the municipal court records stored in the archive in Kiev<sup>13</sup>. Two historians pioneered the research into the field. Jarosław Stolicki investigated the operation of the dietine of Podolia *in hostico*, concurrently publishing the extremely valuable records thereof<sup>14</sup>. The area of interest of the Krakow-based historian covers also matter related to the three dietines held in Volodymyr. These pertained to the religious postulates of the Ukrainian dietines, the role of magnates in their operation and the political attitudes of the nobility of the region in the period between 1673 and 1683<sup>15</sup>. These

<sup>11</sup> Z. Trawicka, *Sejmik województwa sandomierskiego w latach 1572–1696*, Kielce 1985; S. Achremczyk, *Życie sejmikowe Prus Królewskich w latach 1647–1772*, Olsztyn 1999; M. Ujma, *Sejmik lubelski 1572–1696*, Warszawa 2003; R. Kozyński, *Sejmik szlachecki ziemi chełmskiej 1648–1717*, Lublin 2006; W. Sadowski, *Państwo i władza w oczach szlachty. Postawy polityczne obywateli województwa lubelskiego za panowania Michała Korybuta Wiśniowieckiego i Jana III Sobieskiego*, Lublin–Radzyń Podlaski 2008; A. Burkietowicz, *Sejmik sieradzki w latach 1669–1717*, Sieradz 2009; M. Wagner, *Sejmik ziemi litwskiej w dobie Jana III Sobieskiego (1674–1696). Zarys problematyki*, in: *Po unii – sejmiki szlacheckie w Rzeczypospolitej XVI–XVIII wieku*, eds. H. Lulewicz, M. Wagner, Siedlce 2013, pp. 253–262. For more information on Lithuanian dietines, see: A. Zakrzewski, *Sejmiki Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego XVI–XVIII w., Ustrój i funkcjonowanie: sejmik trocki*, Warszawa 2000; D. Konieczna, *Ustrój i funkcjonowanie sejmiku brzesko-litewskiego w latach 1565–1763*, Warszawa 2013.

<sup>12</sup> Only very recently have historians turned their attention to the gaps in researches on Ukrainian dietines, and commenced to gradually fill in those, see: N. Jakowenko, *Posłowie województw wołyńskiego, kijowskiego i braclawskiego na sejmach Rzeczypospolitej w końcu XVI i pierwszej połowie XVII w. (Próba portretu zbiorowego)*, in: *Spółczesność obywatelskie i jego reprezentacja (1493–1993)*, ed. J. Bardach, Warszawa 1995, pp. 88–93; K. Mazur, *W stronę integracji z Koroną. Sejmiki Wołynia i Ukrainy w latach 1569–1648*, Warszawa: 2006; H. Litwin, *Równi do równych. Kijowska reprezentacja sejmowa 1569–1648*, Warszawa 2009; Г. Літвін, *З народу руського. Шляхта Київщини, Волині та Брацлавщини (1569–1648)*, transl. Л. Лисенко, Київ 2016.

<sup>13</sup> These difficulties were identified by J. Stolicki, see: J. Stolicki, *Sejmiki ukraińskie w latach 1648–1702. Problemy badawcze*, in: *Patrimonium. Studii z rannjomodernj istorii Centralno-Schidnoji Evropy*, vol. 1, *Rannjomoderna ludina. Prostir–włada–prawo XVI–XVIII st.*, eds. В. Михайловський, Я. Столицький, Краків 2015, p. 226.

<sup>14</sup> J. Stolicki, *Egzulanci podolscy (1672–1699). Znaczenie uchodźców z Podola w życiu politycznym Rzeczypospolitej*, 'Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego' 1994, 1152, *Prace Historyczne* 114; *Akta sejmiku podolskiego in hostico 1672–1696*, ed. J. Stolicki, Kraków 2002; additionally, their value stems from the fact that the records of the Diet of Podolia from other periods have not been preserved.

<sup>15</sup> With regard to the final years of the reign of John III, the analysis only covers the years 1692–1696, see: J. Stolicki, *Sejmiki ukraińskie wobec spraw religijnych 1669–1696*, in: *Rzeczpospolita wielu wyznań*, eds. A. Kaźmierczyk et al., Kraków 2004, pp. 132–134; on the role of magnates,

pieces of research are complimented by the reflection on the specificity of operation of the three Ukrainian dietines in exile<sup>16</sup>. Michał Kulecki, in turn, studied the nobility in exile during the final years of the reign of John II Casimir and during the reign of Michał Korybut Wiśniowiecki<sup>17</sup>. The political attitudes of exiles in Ukraine (in the voivodeships of Kiev, Bratslav, and Chernihiv) in the final years of the reign of John III have not been to date the subject of detailed treatment<sup>18</sup>. The study of the manner in which the nobility from the three dietines reacted to the developments in both the interior and international situation, as well as to the policy of the King, seems particularly interesting, as these three nobles assemblies shared sessions, held in Volodymyr<sup>19</sup>. It not only allowed the members to remain in constant contact, but also enabled some groups of the nobility (those possessing estates in several voivodeships) to freely move between two – and at times even three – dietines, thus giving them much freedom to agitate and launch propaganda campaigns. It may have had significant impact during the meetings on the enactment of laws, the principal subject matter of this analysis, aimed, as it is, to answer the question of whether the Ukrainian nobility was in the Court's sphere of influence and whether the King could depend on the deputies elected in the dietines of the region. That, in turn, will constitute yet another element of building up the knowledge about the Court faction in the Commonwealth during the final years of the reign of John III Sobieski.

In order to make an attempt at analysing the attitudes towards the country, and particularly towards the King, assumed by the elites of the nobility in the exiled dietines in Volodymyr, one has to select the crucial issues for the country's situation at the time. During the final years of John III Sobieski's reign, it was shaped by a series of factors, various in nature.

---

see: J. Stolicki, *Magnateria na sejmikach ukraińnych we Włodzimierzu za panowania królów rodaków 1669–1696*, in: *Patron i dwór. Magnateria Rzeczypospolitej w XVI–XVIII wieku*, eds. E. Dubas-Urwanowicz, J. Urwanowicz, Warszawa 2006, pp. 359–374; lastly, for an exhaustive monograph on the political attitudes, see: J. Stolicki, *Wobec wolności i króla. Działalność polityczna szlachty ruskiej, ukraińskiej i wołyńskiej w latach 1673–1683*, Kraków 2007.

<sup>16</sup> J. Stolicki, *O modelu monografii sejmiku w drugiej połowie XVII wieku*, in: *Po unii – sejmiki szlacheckie w Rzeczypospolitej XVI–XVIII wieku*, eds. H. Lulewicz, M. Wagner, Siedlce 2013, pp. 177–198; idem, *Sejmiki ukraińne*, pp. 225–239.

<sup>17</sup> M. Kulecki, *Wygnańcy ze Wschodu. Egzulanci w Rzeczypospolitej w ostatnich latach panowania Jana Kazimierza i za panowania Michała Korybuta Wiśniowieckiego*, Warszawa 1997.

<sup>18</sup> The aforementioned monographs of the dietines from the period of 1688–1693 were written at the time when the access to the archive records held in Kiev was very limited.

<sup>19</sup> The dietines of Kiev and Bratslav had their sessions in the very same building – i.e. the church of the Dominican Friars. The dietine of Chernihiv gathered in the Dormition Uniate Cathedral, see: *Słownik geograficzny Królestwa Polskiego i innych krajów słowiańskich*, vol. 14, ed. B. Chlebowski, Warszawa 1895, p. 173.

First of all, one has to bear in mind the war being fought and the complex international situation of the Commonwealth. The absence of military successes resulted in the growing dissatisfaction of the populace, who had to carry the burden of heavy taxation. Even the King, and for some time also his spouse, envisaged various conflicting political plans, that either assumed continued warfare, or a separatist peace treaty with the Porte. King's worsening health condition was not without its importance. His ever more frequent illnesses emboldened the opposition, that was at the time growing in power<sup>20</sup>; however, the threat of interregnum would equally prompt the Court to develop plots involving the promotion to the throne of one of the Princes<sup>21</sup>.

Regarding foreign politics, the King desired an approval for the war against Turkey. It indirectly entailed the approval of the 1686 Peace Treaty with Moscow, rather difficult to concede for the exiles of Kiev and Chernihiv, as it would put an end of their dreams of recuperating their lost estates. The international circumstances changed after the final large-scale campaign, launched in 1691, the result of which proved below the King's expectations<sup>22</sup>. Partly as a result thereof, the monarch started to more frequently consider signing a peace treaty with Turkey, not ruling out a separatist treaty, without regard for the other allies<sup>23</sup>. For the above reason, he demanded that dietines authorize his sitting for peace talks independently of the remaining members of the Holy League. The mandate granted by the nobility would put the King in a strong position and enable

---

<sup>20</sup> In the latter half of the 1680s, the Lithuanian house of Sapieha had turned to opposition, leading the way for many more families in Lithuania. In the Polish Kingdom, the opposition — comprising Grand Marshal of the Crown Stanisław Herakliusz Lubomirski and Voivode of Sieradz Jan Chryzostom Pieniążek — was joined by Primate Michał Radziejowski, Grand Treasurer of the Crown Tomasz Zamoyski and Chancellor of the Crown Jan Wielopolski. There were also rather frigid relations between the Court and the Bishops: of Kuyavia – Bonawentura Madaliński, of Chełmno – Kazimierz Jan Opaliński, and of Kiev – Andrzej Chryzostom Załuski.

<sup>21</sup> Initially, these plans involved the oldest of them, Jakub; however, according to the French diplomat Melchior de Polignac, at a later time, Marie Casimire started to favour the younger, Aleksander. In the opinion of A. Skrzypietz, *Królewscy*, p. 191, the information provided by the diplomat has to be treated with much caution.

<sup>22</sup> For a negative evaluation of John III's final campaign, see: P. Smolarek, *Kampania mołdawska Jana III roku 1691*, eds. Z. Hundert, M. Wagner, Oświęcim 2015, pp. 70–72; however, one cannot speak here of an utter failure, as the Moldovan strongholds taken by the King became a bargaining chip in the negotiations with the Porte about the recovery of Kamieniec Podolski.

<sup>23</sup> There was a promising outlook for peace substantiated by the suggestions expressed by the diplomatic envoys of Khan of Crimea, see: K. Piwarski, *Sprawa pośrednictwa tatarskiego w wojnie polsko-tureckiej (1692–1693)*, in: *Studia Historica w 35-lecie pracy naukowej Henryka Łowmiańskiego*, eds. A. Gieysztor et al., Warszawa 1958, pp. 351–372.

him to operate regardless of the attitude of a fraction of senators affiliated with the Imperial Court<sup>24</sup>. In matters related to domestic policy, of greatest importance would obviously be the attitude of the nobility gathered in dietines towards the current affairs in the country and their reactions to the emergence of the opposition, i.e. the 'dethronement plot' exposed in 1689, as well as the stand taken publicly against the King by some senators<sup>25</sup>. At the time, an indicator of the leanings of the nobility was also their relation to the leaders of the opposition, particularly to the House of Sapieha, whereas in the mid-1690s, the manner they approached the conflict between Lithuanian Hetman, the Voivode of Vilnius Kazimierz Jan Sapieha and Konstanty Brzostowski, the Bishop of Vilnius, supported by the Royal Court. Not without significance was also the issue of accepting either the discourse of the court faction or that of the opposition, mutually accusing one another of breaking the subsequent sessions of Sejm<sup>26</sup>. Lastly, an extremely important aspect for the Court was the attitude assumed by the nobility towards the royal family, including the sons of Sobieski. The importance of that was regarded in terms of prestige as well as practical consequences. For there can be no doubt that Sobieski took steps aimed at facilitating the election of one of his sons after his own demise. Therefore, the opinions spreading among the nobles, shaping the image of a potential candidate to the crown, were of utmost importance. In the matters related to the issue, one of the most essential contextual clues appears to have been the stance towards the 'Berlin affront', when the oldest of the Princes, Jakub, as a result of the activity of imperial diplomats, was deprived of his fiancée, Ludwika Karolina, the daughter and heiress of Bogusław Radziwiłł, secretly and hastily betrothed to Charles III Philip, Count of Palatinate-Neuburg<sup>27</sup>. Also worth noting is the manner how the Princes were presented in the dietine records; whether opinions that appeared in

---

<sup>24</sup> Many leading senators both in the Crown and in Lithuania received regular salaries from the Emperor, see: R. Kołodziej, *Ostatni*, p. 323. There were additional elements associating the magnates with imperial diplomacy. In the case of Kazimierz Jan Sapieha, it was his son, Michał Franciszek Sapieha, who served in the Imperial Army, see: K. Piwarski, *Między*, p. 80. In the case of Stanisław Herakliusz Lubomirski, the Emperor exerted pressure sending his troops to the Spiš estate owned by the latter, see: A. Kamiński, *Polska a Brandenburgia-Prusy w drugiej połowie XVIII wieku. Dzieje polityczne*, Poznań 2002, pp. 349, 358–362.

<sup>25</sup> Among the highest-profile cases, one has to rank the oration by Jan Chryzostom Pieniążek, Voivode of Sieradz, after the Grodno dietine of 1688, or the address by Kazimierz Opaliński, Bishop of Chełmno, delivered during the Sejm of 1688–1689, considered to be derogatory to the King, see: Z. Wójcik, *op. cit.*, pp. 436–437, 450.

<sup>26</sup> J. Maroń, *Pisma*, pp. 203–209.

<sup>27</sup> A. Skrzypietz, *Królewscy*, pp. 155–160.

their context were of negative tenor, as for instance the harshly criticized by the opposition fact that Prince Jakub was seated under the King's baldachin<sup>28</sup>, or more positive, as the praises of the Princes' participation in the military campaigns<sup>29</sup>. Finally, the catalogue of analyzed issues will include several minor questions, which were nevertheless important for the King, such as the *ius patronatus* that he wanted to remain the prerogative of the monarch, despite it being questioned by some members of the clergy.

Of course, both the Court and the opposition took various measures aimed at swaying the public opinion in their favor. To that end, a range of propaganda initiatives was employed; among those, ephemeral political writings served an important role<sup>30</sup>, as well as the correspondence dispatched to dietines<sup>31</sup>. Furthermore, the Court had at its disposal official forms of propaganda. Due to the fact that the most important and most intense moments for the propaganda activity came during the Sejm, as well as the pre-Sejm and relational dietines, a major role must have been played by royal universals and legations sent thereto<sup>32</sup>. The political struggle focused most of all in the local gatherings of nobility, and oftentimes it was their attitude that proved decisive for the success achieved by a diet or the decisions on taxations reached during relational dietines. The information on the stances taken by the respective dietines can be found in the enacted *lauda* (decrees), i.e. the instructions for the members sent to the Sejm, to the King, but not infrequently also to Hetmans. The supporters of the Crown present in the dietines not only wanted certain postulates to be included in the instruction, but also some uncomfortable issues to be omitted. Substantial role was also played by the very election, and the King paid much attention to the selection as deputies, particularly for the Sejm, of persons directly affiliated with the Court or with the senators

---

<sup>28</sup> Such situation occurred twice. For the first time, during an audience with the Muscovite envoys, for the second – during a session of the Council of the Senate, see: K. Piwarski, *Między*, pp. 22–23.

<sup>29</sup> Prince Jakub participated in the 1686 campaign, while a year later he was present in the camp at Kamieniec, see: A. Skrzypietz, *Jakub Sobieski*, Poznań 2015, pp. 122–126.

<sup>30</sup> The political writings of the analysed period received the most exhaustive treatment in A. Czarniecka, *op. cit.*, pp. 146–274.

<sup>31</sup> For instance, Kazimierz Opaliński, Bishop of Chełmno, wished to present his own version of the events that occurred in the Sejm of 1688–1689 to the nobility, see: *List Kazimierza Jana Opalińskiego biskupa chełmińskiego na sejmiki relacyjne – Chościska, 28 IV 1689 r.*, in: *Akta sejmikowe województw poznańskiego i kaliskiego. Lata 1676–1695*, eds. M. Zwierzykowski, R. Kołodziej, A. Kamiński, Poznań 2018, pp. 455–456.

<sup>32</sup> R. Kołodziej, *Przedsejmowe legacje królewskie w propagandzie wojennej Jana III Sobieskiego*, in: *Między obowiązkami, przywilejami a prawem Rzeczypospolitej XVI–XVIII wieku. Społeczeństwo w obronie państwa polsko-litewskiego*, eds. A. Kalinowska et al., Warszawa 2018, pp. 231–241.



associated with its faction. The content of the created documents could also serve as a certain reflection of the sentiments prevailing among the nobility gathered at the dietine. That concerns all sorts of expressions of gratitude towards the King, his family, Hetmans, and other senators<sup>33</sup>. The analysis of all these elements may help us identify the attitude assumed towards the Court by the three Ukrainian dietines between 1687 and 1696.

In 1687, following a long hiatus, during which the two-year term of the office had been breached<sup>34</sup>, the King decided to convene another Sejm. The King's universal intended the three dietines in exile to be held in Volodymyr on 16 December 1687<sup>35</sup>. In his pre-Sejm legation<sup>36</sup>, the King extensively discussed the military activity and proposed that the war against the Porte should be continued both alongside the existing as well as with newly-established allies. He explained the necessity of signing a peace treaty with Moscow, a move that would persuade the Eastern neighbor to join the anti-Turkish coalition. He did not fail to mention the war merits of Prince Jakub and expressed his dissatisfaction at the collection of taxes, requesting that the arrears of taxes for 1685 be paid during the pre-Sejm dietines. The King suggested that the nobility deliberate on the steps to be taken in order that 'the dietines for the Sejm laws, i.e. in ordine of taxation and its enactment, could not obstruct and postpone their proceedings'<sup>37</sup>. He also suggested that a new, more efficient manner of financing the artillery should be established. He drew the nobles' attention to the conflict between the Tribunal in Radom and the Treasury of Prussia. Lastly, he appealed for their support in keeping the monarch's privilege of *ius patronatus* intact.

The dietine of Bratslav convened within the time prescribed by the law. In their instruction<sup>38</sup>, the nobility saw the continuation of military activity

---

<sup>33</sup> This element was very important for the Court, and its adherents strove to include in the dietine records not merely the customary acknowledgements to the King, but also to his family. Giving thanks to the Queen, and even addressing to her a special envoy was pursued by the supporters of the Court in the dietines during the reign of John II Casimir, see: *Diariusz sejmiku przedsejmowego w Warszawie 3 II 1666*, ed. S. Ochmann-Staniszevska, in: *Studia i materiały z dziejów nowożytnych*, eds. K. Matwijowski, S. Ochmann-Staniszevska, Wrocław 1995, p. 219.

<sup>34</sup> The previous Sejm convened in 1685, see: R. Kołodziej, *Ostatni*, pp. 62, 75–77.

<sup>35</sup> Tsentral'nyy Derzhavnyy Istorychnyy Arkhiv Ukrayiny, Kyiv [hereinafter: TDIAUK], f. 28, ref. no. 132, sheets 1359v–1360, Uniwersał przedsejmowy Jana III, Żółkiew 18 XI 1687; for the content of the universal, see: *Akta sejmikowe*, pp. 383–384.

<sup>36</sup> *Akta sejmikowe*, pp. 385–389, Instrukcja Jana III na sejmiki przedsejmowe, [no day date] XI 1687.

<sup>37</sup> 'sejmiki ustaw sejmowych, mianowicie in ordine podatkovania i jego uchwały trudnić i zwłaczać nie mogły'.

<sup>38</sup> TDIAUK, f. 28, ref. no. 132, sheets 1370v–1378, Instrukcja sejmiku województwa braclawskiego posłom na sejm, Włodzimierz, 16 XII 1687; the instruction was published

as to such a degree an obvious matter that they failed to even mention it. Neither did they voice any reservations as to the previously imposed taxes, merely demanding that the collected money be allocated solely to the military<sup>39</sup>. Admittedly, the dietine did not make any reference to the delicately phrased proposal to reform the taxation system; however, the instruction included regulations that must have been welcomed by the King. In all certainty, those included the postulate that the Senate ought to punish its members involved in correspondence with foreigners that was detrimental for the country<sup>40</sup>. The King was likely to be further satisfied with the thanks expressed to Prince Jakub for his service for the country. On the other hand, however, the instruction featured a demand that the exorbitant Sejm be convened 'so that anything fallen *ex orbitu legum* could again be covered thereby'<sup>41</sup>. This point may have constituted a veiled criticism of the Court, as the opposition in their pre-Sejm propaganda campaign accused the monarch of having transgressed the law by seating Prince Jakub under the royal baldachin<sup>42</sup>. Regarding current affairs, much space was given to the complaints about the looting committed by the army, including the Lithuanian forces<sup>43</sup>. Furthermore, the nobles requested that the King alleviate the conflict between the Treasury of the Crown and the Prussian Treasury, which was in fact equivalent to achieving a reconciliation between the Grand Treasurer of the Crown Marcin Zamoyski and the Grand Treasurer of the Prussian Territories Władysław Łoś, a dispute that resulted in the former becoming conflicted with the Court<sup>44</sup>. A request in that matter addressed to the King during

---

in print in: *Архив Юго-Западной России*, part 2, vol. 2, Киев 1888, pp. 467–479; Andrzej Żabokrzycki, Cupbearer of Bratslav served in the office of marshal of the dietine.

<sup>39</sup> TDIAUK, f. 28, ref. no. 132, sheet 1372, Instrukcja braclawska 16 XII 1687.

<sup>40</sup> *Ibidem*, sheet 1373v; the postulate, decidedly pro-royal, was also introduced in the – most favorable for the Court – instructions of the dietines of Mazovia, Sandomierz, and Lublin, see: A. Piwarski, *Między*, pp. 34–35.

<sup>41</sup> TDIAUK, f. 28, ref. no. 132, sheet 1372v, Instrukcja braclawska 16 XII 1687; the demand to convene the exorbitant Sejm was already put forth in John III's *pacta conventa* and the call to summon it was occasionally returned to, see: R. Kołodziej, *Ostatni*, pp. 65–67.

<sup>42</sup> See: f.n. 28.

<sup>43</sup> TDIAUK, f. 28, ref. no. 132, sheets 1372, 1373, 1375v–1376, 1377, Instrukcja braclawska 16 XII 1687; the demand to seek damages from the Lithuanians was to become one of the crucial postulates during the sessions of the Sejm. Jerzy Maroń even believed it to have been an element of the Court's strategy, see: J. Maroń, *Sejmy*, p. 95.

<sup>44</sup> Attempts at placating Marcin Zamoyski in his resentment against the Court were made by Queen Marie Casimire, see: R. Kołodziej, *Listy od Jej Mości Królowej. O próbach wpływu Marii Kazimierzy na sytuację wewnętrzną w Rzeczypospolitej*, in: *Maria Kazimiera Sobieska (1641–1716). W kręgu rodziny, polityki i kultury, Zamek Królewski w Warszawie. Studia i materiały*, eds. A. Kalinowska, P. Tyszk, Warszawa 2017, pp. 101–111.

a Sejm could bear the fruit in the form of a commission established to make peace between the magnates, thus putting an end the contention<sup>45</sup>.

The dietine of the Chernihiv Voivodeship also took place at the date stipulated in the universal. In the recorded instruction article<sup>46</sup>, the nobility expressed their support for the continuation of the war; they did not, however, rule out the possibility of signing a peace treaty if an opportunity presented itself. They voiced their decisive approval for the development of taxation to support the army<sup>47</sup>. The inclusion of thanks to Prince Jakub could have been read by the monarch as a positive cue<sup>48</sup>. Sobieski may also have been pleased with the postulate that the cases of those attacking the King's majesty and honor should be tried before the Sejm court. The same was to apply to foreign contacts of the senators which deemed detrimental for the country<sup>49</sup>. Among the items that received an extensive treatment, there was the looting carried out by the military and their unauthorized stationing in hereditary estates, with demands addressed to Hetmans of both nations to forego the practice of allocating their troops in private estates of the nobility. An ultimatum was given that, should such

---

<sup>45</sup> It was quite frequent for the dietines to establish commissions aimed at reconciling magnates, see: R. Kołodziej, *Ostatni*, pp. 250–251.

<sup>46</sup> TDIAUK, f. 28, ref. no. 132, sheets 1384–1393v, Instrukcja sejmiku czernihowskiego, Włodzimierz 16 XII 1687; Jerzy Kisiel of Brusyliw, Starosta of Sinica, served in the office of the marshal of the dietine.

<sup>47</sup> *Ibidem*, sheet 1385v, Instrukcja czernihowska 16 XII 1687; it has to be added, however, that the majority of the citizens of Chernihiv, having lost their estates, did not pay any taxes. It was for that reason the Voivodeship of Chernihiv had not submitted tax declaration during the 1685 Sejm, limiting itself to set the date of the relational dietine, see: *Volumina Legum*, vol. 5, ed. J. Ohryzko, Petersburg 1860, p. 362.

<sup>48</sup> TDIAUK, f. 28, ref. no. 132, sheet 1385, Instrukcja czernihowska 16 XII 1687.

<sup>49</sup> *Ibidem*, sheet 1387v; the postulate pertained most of all to the senators hailing from the clergy; however, the identification of the person whose activity may actually have caused it proves rather difficult. K. Piwarski put forth a working hypothesis that the clause may have been directed against Michał Radziejowski, Bishop of Warmia, see: K. Piwarski, *Między*, p. 35, f.n. 1; the view seems plausible insofar as Radziejowski indeed had recently procured for himself a cardinal's hat in Rome, causing a grave dissatisfaction of the Court, see: R. Kawecki, *Kardynał Michał Stefan Radziejowski (1645–1705)*, Opole 2005, pp. 50–54. Nevertheless, we cannot rule out that the article applied to Jędrzej Chryzostom Załuski, who was reported to have gone on a mission to Berlin and – according to Krzysztof Zierowski, Emperor's Resident – solicited a marriage between Jerzy Radziwiłł and Duchess Ludwika Karolina, the widowed heiress of the immense estate of Bogusław Radziwiłł, see: K. Piwarski, *Między*, p. 18, f.n. 2. Such an errand could not have been regarded as a favourable development by the Court, as they had already entertained the hope of matching Ludwika Karolina with Prince Jakub. However, some doubt as to the matrimonial intentions of Karol Radziwiłł was expressed by A. Rachuba, see: A. Rachuba, *Radziwiłł Jerzy Józef h. Trąba (1668–1689)*, in: PSB, vol. 30, Wrocław–Warszawa–Kraków–Gdańsk–Łódź 1987, p. 236.

unlawful activity be continued, members of the dietine would demand to be granted by the Office of the Chancellor of the Crown the mandates to the Sejm court<sup>50</sup>. Much attention was also paid to the movement of Lithuanian troops and the damages caused thereby<sup>51</sup>. The citizens of Chernihiv, not unlike the nobles of Bratslav, wanted the dispute between Marcin Zamoyski and Władysław Łoś to be settled, without prejudging the guilt of either party<sup>52</sup>. Lastly, the instruction included the demand for the Muscovite monies to be paid out. The reckoning was to take place *ante omnia*, whereas the deputies of the case were to supervise it *'etiam cum pericularum* of the dietine'<sup>53</sup>. This demand, as extremely important for the exiles and reiterated in the subsequent years, would provide the King with an instrument of exerting influence over the dietines of Kiev and Chernihiv.

The dissolution of the first dietine of Kiev can be regarded as a testament to the political struggle waged in the assemblies in Volodymyr. The nobility managed to receive from the King a new universal that reconvened the session to 9 January 1688<sup>54</sup>. The second session was successfully completed, and the deputies elected during its proceedings were provided with the adopted instruction article<sup>55</sup>. In a short summary, the nobility gathered at the dietine accepted all proposals presented by the King in the legation; however, they admonished the monarch that his having signed a peace treaty with Moscow without the participation of a Commissary from their voivodeships was unlawful. Solely on account of the war being fought, the citizens of Kiev approached with understanding the fact that treaties aimed at securing support against the Porte had been affirmed. However, the ratification of the peace treaty by the dietine – and even its very conclusion – was made dependent on the payment of the compensations to the citizens of Kiev and Chernihiv from the monies obtained from Moscow, and on the Commonwealth transferring the District of Krosno by hereditary law to the two voivodeships in question<sup>56</sup>. It must be acknowledged that these

<sup>50</sup> TDIAUK, f. 28, ref. no. 132, sheets 1386–1386v, Instrukcja czernihowska 16 XII 1687.

<sup>51</sup> *Ibidem*, sheet 1390.

<sup>52</sup> *Ibidem*, sheet 1386.

<sup>53</sup> *Ibidem*, sheets 1387v–1388.

<sup>54</sup> *Ibidem*, sheets 1409–1409v, Powtórny uniwersał króla na sejmik kijowski, Warszawa, 19 XII 1687.

<sup>55</sup> TDIAUK, f. 28, ref. no. 133, sheets 795v–803, Instrukcja sejmiku województwa kijowskiego, Włodzimierz, 9 I 1688; District Judge of Kiev and Borough Substarosta of Volodymyr, Jan Wojnarowski, served in the office of the marshal of the dietine.

<sup>56</sup> *Ibidem*, sheet 797; the District of Krosno had been promised to the exiles in 1667 by a royal privilege; however, during the subsequent years they were unable to take it over due to the pretensions of the families of Tarło and Branicki, see: M. Kulecki, *Wygnañcy*,

clauses were rather firm and resolved, certainly much more assertive in tone than those of the Chernihiv dietine. In a similar vein one should read the requirement that deputies concur with the entire Commonwealth in the case of a Sejm discussion on maintaining the right of free election<sup>57</sup>. The demand, which the analyzed instruction expressed in a rather veiled manner, resulted from the criticism levelled at the Court by the opposition, who accused the royal family of a 'coup' against the free election<sup>58</sup>. However, the instruction featured additional requests directed against the King. In the dispute between the Radom Tribunal and the dietine of Prussia, the citizens of Kiev decisively sided with the former, calling for the *laudum* of the Prussian dietine to be annulled, as contrary to the laws of the Commonwealth. Thus, in the personal conflict between Marcin Zamoyski and Władysław Łoś, they took the part of the Grand Treasurer of the Crown – as opposed to the King – and insisted on the Voivode of Pomerania being punished for infringing upon the honor of the Radom Tribunal and the office of Grand Treasurer of the Crown<sup>59</sup>. The monarch may have received one more request as a slap in the face, as the citizens of Kiev stood up for Jan Odrowąż Pieniążek, the Voivode of Sieradz and Marshal of the Crown Tribunal, asking for him to be satisfied<sup>60</sup>. As regards the liberation of the nobility's estates from the troops illegally stationing therein, the deputies from Kiev were to cooperate with those from Volhynia<sup>61</sup>. The representatives of Kiev were to express their gratitude to the Hetmans of both nations, but at the same time to implore them to issue universals for their troops warning them against looting when being stationed. Ultimately, what's interesting, they opted for the maintenance of a high *hiberna*. That stemmed from the simple fact that many citizens of the voivodeship served in the military<sup>62</sup>.

Evaluating the three instructions adopted in Volodymyr, it has to be noted that the dietines of Bratslav and Chernihiv took a royalist stance, although one could discover certain clauses indicating a moderate influence of the opposition in the former. However, the royalists frequently agreed to include certain points detrimental to the King, striving to for-

---

pp. 89–90, 96–97, 134, 160, 187. The exiles never stopped striving to receive the District as the so-called *reclinatorium*.

<sup>57</sup> TDIAUK, f. 28, ref. no. 133, sheet 797, Instrukcja kijowska, 9 I 1688.

<sup>58</sup> Much more astute in their disapproval of the monarch were the dietines in Lithuania, influenced as they were by the faction of the Sapieha family, see: K. Piwarski, *Między*, p. 35.

<sup>59</sup> TDIAUK, f. 28, ref. no. 133, sheets 797–797v, Instrukcja kijowska, 9 I 1688.

<sup>60</sup> *Ibidem*, sheet 799.

<sup>61</sup> *Ibidem*, sheet 796.

<sup>62</sup> *Ibidem*, sheet 796v.

mulate those in such a way so as not to offend the monarch. In return, the opposition would acquiesce in positions favorable for the Court, and – equally importantly – would elect the deputies endorsed by the Court faction. Now, regarding the dietine of Kiev, there can be no doubt that the opposition came out victorious in this instance. Even though some anti-royal clauses were presented in a disguised form, these left no doubt as to their true meaning for any observers well versed in politics. The Court faction must have been aware that the issuing of another universal had been a tactical error, for the dietine became dominated by their political adversaries. Perhaps the royalists took it as an admonition for them not to spare any effort before the next session in order to preclude such a situation.

After the dietine of Grodno in 1688 broke down, the King, following the conclusions of the Council of the Senate, issued universals convening pre-Sejm dietines<sup>63</sup>. In Volodymyr, these took place on 29 May 1688.

The dietine of the Chernihiv Voivodeship produced a *laudum*<sup>64</sup>, in which the nobility expressed their gratitude to the deputies for their work; however, in no way did they attempt to identify the causes of disbanding the session. Nevertheless, a decision was made to dispatch an envoy to the King<sup>65</sup>. Even though the instruction for the deputies could not be found, on the basis of the clauses featured in the *laudum* we can infer that its main objective was the rapid payment of the Muscovite monies. Concurrently, the dietine decided to send legates to the Grand Hetmans, of the Crown – Jan Stanisław Jabłonowski, and of Lithuania – Kazimierz Jan Sapieha<sup>66</sup>. They also received a special instruction, ordering them to make a formal complaint about the looting by the Crown troops and Cossacks. Meanwhile, the Lithuanian Hetman received a request not to station his troops in the already ruined Kiev Polesia, and to establish the promised commission to deal with the damages caused by the troops he was in charge of. Awaiting

---

<sup>63</sup> Archiwum Główne Akt Dawnych [hereinafter: AGAD], Archiwum Publiczne Potockich [hereinafter: APP], ref. no. 48, pp. 25–28, Posejmowa rada senatu w Grodnie 15 III 1688; The universals calling the dietines of Bratslav and Chernihiv were issued in Grodno on 28 Mar 1688, see: TDIAUK, f. 28, ref. no. 133, sheets 1167–1169v. The text of the universal, see: *Akta sejmikowe*, pp. 404–405.

<sup>64</sup> TDIAUK, f. 28, ref. no. 133, sheets 1246–1247v, Instrukcja posłom z sejmiku czernihowskiego, Włodzimierz, 29 V 1688; Waclaw Konstanty Zubczewski, the Cupbearer of Nowogródek, served as its marshal.

<sup>65</sup> The legates were: Mikołaj Piaseczyński, Starosta of Nowogródek; Waclaw Krzysztof Zubczewski, Cupbearer of Nowogródek and City Judge; Łukasz Werkiej Oleszkowski, Pantler of Chernihiv.

<sup>66</sup> TDIAUK, f. 28, ref. no. 133, sheets 1248–1249v, Instrukcja posłom z sejmiku czernihowskiego, Włodzimierz, 29 V 1688; Remian Suryń, the Pantler of Zhytomyr; Jan Horain, the Cupbearer of Pärnu; Stefan Skuratowski, the City Clerk of Zhytomyr; and Piotr Iliński were selected as legates.

the return of their legates, the noblemen of Chernihiv decided to postpone the session to 28 June 1688.

Likewise, the dietine of Kiev convened on the prescribed date. The nobles widely discussed the proceedings of the disbanded session, expressing their warm gratitude to the legates, who had brought the King's assurance of the payment of the Muscovite monies during the following dietine<sup>67</sup>. It is apparent from the *laudum* that Kiev deputies were able to obtain not only special universals from Kazimierz Sapieha addressed to the Lithuanian army, regarding a more restraint behavior while stationed, but also the promise of establishing a commission in order to examine the abuse perpetrated by the troops of the Grand Duchy<sup>68</sup>. In spite of the fact that in his universal for the relational dietine the King appealed to noblemen that they pay their arrears of the taxes imposed already in 1685<sup>69</sup>, the nobility of Kiev tried to free themselves from some of the burden of taxation. According to the nobility, the collection of money and *retenta* (debt) execution was not possible both because of Tatar raids and due to Cossack activity<sup>70</sup>. Under the provisions adopted by the dietine, citizens of Kiev decided to send an envoy to the King<sup>71</sup>, whereas the looting by the military prompted them to send envoys to Grand Hetmans of both nations<sup>72</sup>. Crown Grand Hetman Stanisław Jan Jabłonowski was requested not to station Cossacks in Polesia, whereas Lithuanian Grand Hetman Kazimierz Jan Sapieha to put through as soon as possible the promised commission to deal with the damages caused by the Lithuanian army. The dietine, like that of Chernihiv, was postponed, with the date set as late as to 14 September 1688<sup>73</sup>.

<sup>67</sup> The decision resulted from a session of the Senate Council convened after the dietine, by virtue of which the exiles were to receive a sort of an advanced payment in the amount of thirty thousand zlotys, see: J. Maroń, *Sejmy*, p. 140.

<sup>68</sup> TDIAUK, f. 28, ref. no. 133, sheets 1250–1252, *Laudum sejmiku kijowskiego*, Włodzimierz, 29 V 1688; the person to serve in the office of marshal of the dietine was Teodor Niemiryecz of Chernihiv, the squire of Khoroshki, the ward of Chamberlain of Kiev.

<sup>69</sup> *Akta sejmikowe*, pp. 404–405, Uniwersał Jana III, zwołujący sejmik relacyjny województw poznańskiego i kaliskiego, Grodno, 28 III 1688.

<sup>70</sup> TDIAUK, f. 28, ref. no. 133, sheet 1251v, *Laudum sejmiku kijowskiego*, Włodzimierz, 29 V 1688.

<sup>71</sup> The instruction could not be found. Jerzy Maniecki, Standard-bearer of Kiev; Adam Olizar, Cupbearer of Ovruch; Teodor Niemiryecz of Chernihiv, the squire of Khoroshki, ward of Chamberlain of Kiev and marshal of the dietine; and Marek Askak were sent as envoys, see: *Ibidem*, sheet 1250.

<sup>72</sup> *Ibidem*, sheets 1248–1248v, Instrukcja posłom województwa kijowskiego do hetmanów, litewskich i koronnych, Włodzimierz, 29 V 1688, published in: *Архив Юго-Западной России*, part 2, vol. 2, pp. 479–482; Remigian Suryn, Pantler of Zhytomyr; Jan Horain, Cupbearer of Pärnu; Stefan Skuratowski, City Clerk of Zhytomyr; and Piotr Iliński were selected as legates.

<sup>73</sup> TDIAUK, f. 28, ref. no. 133, sheet 1252, *Laudum sejmiku kijowskiego*, Włodzimierz, 29 V 1688.

The *laudum* of the dietine of Bratslav was not included in the city records of Volodymyr. It may be with high probability concluded that it was disbanded. In all likelihood, similar was the fate of the postponed dietine of Kiev. The lack of *laudum*, as well as the entry in the city records of the King's response to the envoy of the citizens of Kiev can be regarded as an indirect confirmation of that fact – presumably the deputies, unable to present the King's response during the dietine, decided to publish it in the city records<sup>74</sup>. From it, we can learn about the objectives of the legation. Above all, the nobility demanded that the Muscovite monies be distributed among them. They also complained of military stations being placed in their estates and of Cossack's raids; they requested the City and Land Records of Kiev, appropriated by Moscow, to be returned. In his answer, the King took a rather favorable attitude, promising the payment of the damages. Admittedly, as regards the stations of the military, he referred the legates to Hetmans; yet he did bind himself to issue a universal addressed to the Cossack Polkovnyk Semen Paliy, who was stationed in Polesia, 'strictly forbidding him to cause any injuries and damages'<sup>75</sup>. The monarch's negative stance towards the section of the instruction, in which the nobility attempted to have some of the taxes imposed on their voivodeship waived, is perfectly understandable. Sobieski responded firmly that taxation is the prerogative of the Sejm and no dietine could be allowed to abolish it<sup>76</sup>. The remains of the three dietines, the postponed session of the Chernihiv nobility, proceeded without obstructions; however, it was only able to once again postpone the assembly. The subsequent *lauda* do not provide us with any pivotal information regarding its attitude towards the King and his policies<sup>77</sup>.

When assessing the outcome of the relational dietines held in Volodymyr, it is difficult to resist the impression that the King could not have been very satisfied with their proceedings. Firmly royalist statements

<sup>74</sup> TDIAUK, f. 28, ref. no. 133, sheets 1454–1456v, Respons JKM ichm. panom posłom województwa kijowskiego na instrukcję tegoż województwa dany, ręką w. jm. pana Stanisława Szczuki regenta koronnego, starosty lubelskiego przy pieczęci pokojowej in absetnia koronnej, podpisany, 12 VIII 1688; for a copy of the Response, see: Biblioteka Książąt Czartoryskich, ref. no. 422, pp. 288–291.

<sup>75</sup> 'aby się tam krzywd i szkód żadnych nie ważył czynić'. TDIAUK, f. 28, ref. no. 133, sheet 1455.

<sup>76</sup> *Ibidem*, sheet 1455v; the passage most likely pertains to the taxes imposed already by the 1685 Sejm, for the disbanding of the Sejm of Grodno of 1688 made it impossible to enact any further financial burdens.

<sup>77</sup> TDIAUK, f. 28, ref. no. 133, sheets 1325v–1326v, Laudum sejmiku czernihowskiego, Włodzimierz, 28 VI 1688; sheets 1453v–1454, Laudum sejmiku czernihowskiego, Włodzimierz, 14 IX 1688.



were sorely lacking and, to make matters worse, the nobility of Kiev tried to avoid paying taxes. It cannot be ruled out that, consequently, ideas of more determined course of action emerged among the local royalists, particularly for the dietine of the Kiev Voivodeship.

Already in the autumn of 1688, John III made the decision to convene another Sejm. Universals addressed to the Ukrainian voivodeships convoked the three dietines to Volodymyr on 5 November 1688<sup>78</sup>. In this rather laconic summon to diets<sup>79</sup>, the King reinstated the terms of his previous instruction. He lamented the fact that the taxation laws of 1685 in many regions of the country had still not been executed. Because of the opposition's intensified campaign, attacking the dynastic policy of the Court and Prince Jakub personally<sup>80</sup>, Sobieski decided to enter into polemics against the spreading slanders, claiming 'that he does not think about enthroning in advance his most beloved son, His Highness Prince Jakub, and was not striving towards that'<sup>81</sup>. In his final words, he mentioned the 'Berlin affront' that had shaken not only the Court, but also the entire opinion of the Commonwealth's nobility<sup>82</sup>. The rather brief mention of the matter, furnished with a comment explaining that the monarch does not wish to involve the dietine in his personal affairs, is certainly misleading, as the King's intentions were exactly the opposite, with the damages for the broken engagement (perhaps involving the confiscation of the Radziwiłł estates) being an absolutely crucial issue<sup>83</sup>. It can hardly come as a surprise, therefore, that the King did not wish to direct the attention of the nobility to other questions, and failed to include in the instruction any items pertaining to other current developments, such as the religious unrests resulting from the conflict between the Bishop of Chełmno, Kazimierz Jan Opaliński, and the burghers of Toruń<sup>84</sup>.

<sup>78</sup> For the universals, see: TDIAUK, f. 28, ref. no. 133, sheets 1487–1492; for the content, see: *Akta sejmikowe*, pp. 420–422.

<sup>79</sup> *Akta sejmikowe*, pp. 424–425, Instrukcja Jana III na sejmiki przedsejmowe, 1 X 1688.

<sup>80</sup> For an extensive treatment of the matter, see: J. Maroń, *Pisma*, pp. 203–209.

<sup>81</sup> 'że jako in antecessum osiedzeniu najjaśniejszego królewicza Jakuba syna swego najmilszego nie myśli i nie był sollicitus'. *Akta sejmikowe*, p. 425, Instrukcja Jana III na sejmiki przedsejmowe, 1 X 1688.

<sup>82</sup> Meaning, of course, the secret marriage between Duchess Ludwika Karolina and Charles III Philip, Count of Palatinate-Neuburg, and the break-up of the engagement with Jakub Sobieski; for more on the subject, see: A.Z. Helcel, *O dwukrotnym zamęściu księżniczki Ludwiki Karoliny Radziwiłłowej i wynikłych stąd zamieszkach. Przyczynek do dziejów panowania Jana III Sobieskiego*, Kraków 1857.

<sup>83</sup> Jakub possessed a warranty issued by Ludwika Karolina, according to which, in case of a break-up of the engagement, he would seize the Lithuanian estates owned by the Duchess; for a discussion of the issue, see: J. Maroń, *Sejm*, pp. 172–176.

<sup>84</sup> For an exhaustive treatment of the matter, see: S. Salmonowicz, *Dzieje wyznań i życia religijnego*, in: *Historia Torunia*, vol. 2, part 3, *Między barokiem a oświeceniem (1669–1793)*,

On that occasion, all three dietines assembled in Volodymyr were successfully completed at first sitting, even though once again an attempt had been made at disbanding the Kiev session, one most likely undertaken by the representatives of the court faction<sup>85</sup>. The nobility of Kiev, a group in all likelihood once more dominated by the opposition, in its instruction for the deputies referred to the vital matter for the King, i.e. to the 'Berlin affront', with utmost moderation. Admittedly, condolences were expressed to the King; however, the misconduct of Duchess Ludwika Karolina and the activity of the imperial diplomacy in Berlin were laconically put down to feminine inconstancy, and more elaborately represented with a statement that 'such was the fortune that at times tends to trouble the greatest of earthly monarchs, be they best behaved in the world, which now afflicted His Royal Majesty, in the person of His Highness Prince Jakub'<sup>86</sup>. Additionally, the King was offered a rather vague promise that the entire voivodeship would exert efforts that 'the honor of HRM be consoled in another manner'<sup>87</sup>. Compared to the positions on the matter expressed by other dietines<sup>88</sup>, that assumed by the Kiev nobility proved more than restrained. With regard to the ratification of the treaty with Moscow, the deputies received – as the King had wished it – *plenariam potestatem*; however, they were to have the best interest of their voivodeship at heart. Concurrently, the nobles demanded that their deputies, even before the nomination of the Sejm Marshal, obtain a straightforward response from the estates, that the Muscovite monies would be distributed

---

ed. M. Biskup, Toruń 1996, pp. 127–131; the turmoil provoked a backlash that swept the country and had a major influence on the General Dietine of Royal Prussia being disbanded, see: J. Maroń, *Sejmy*, p. 177.

<sup>85</sup> The attempt at disbanding the dietine was made by Dymitr Żabokrzycki, Cupbearer of Ukmergė, who submitted a protestation in a caucus. It was countered by a *reprotestation* submitted in the city by the other burghers, see: TDIAUK, f. 28, ref. no. 133, sheets 693–695v, *Reprotestacja przeciw wydarzeniom na sejmiku województwa kijowskiego*, Włodzimierz, 6 XI 1688; A protestation directed against the deputies from Kiev was also submitted to the City of Ovruch, see: TDIAUK, f. 28, ref. no. 134, sheets 1079–1081v, *Laudum sejmiku kijowskiego*, Włodzimierz, 11 VI 1689; The nobility of Kiev, aware of the fact that their protestations may result in their deputies being expelled, instructed them, nevertheless, to stay in Warsaw, be that in the capacity of private persons, and appeal to the King with official supplications, promoting the Voivodeship's demands, see: TDIAUK, f. 28, ref. no. 133, sheet 1511, *Instrukcja kijowska*; Ultimately, however, no attempt was undertaken to expel the representatives of Kiev; at least, there is no mention of such an incident in any of the Sejm records.

<sup>86</sup> TDIAUK, f. 28, ref. no. 133, sheet 1506, *Instrukcja kijowska*, Włodzimierz, 5 XI 1688; Jan Woronicz, Lord of Shuysk served as the marshal of the dietine.

<sup>87</sup> *Ibidem*, sheet 1506v.

<sup>88</sup> The position of decisive support for the King was assumed, among others, by the dietines of Chełm, Różan, Halych, Upytė, and even Sroda, see: J. Maroń, *Sejmy*, pp. 188–189.

among their citizens<sup>89</sup>. Perhaps bearing in mind the King's firm answer to their preceding legation, they agreed to taxation proportional to other voivodeship<sup>90</sup>. In the case of disbandment of the Sejm, they authorized the monarch 'that with HRM's honor, a confederation be constituted, most rightfully abiding by the law, for the *publicam salutem* of the Homeland'<sup>91</sup>.

In its instruction, the dietine of Chernihiv made a brief but strongly phrased reference to the Berlin affair, calling the deed of Prince Charles an 'unprecedented' development. The decision as to the specific course of action to be adopted was left to the suggestions of all the deputies<sup>92</sup>. Much space was devoted to the Muscovite monies, enjoining the deputies to escort the money directly to Volodymyr, 'without the aid of any commissaries'<sup>93</sup>. As a matter of course, the nobility of Chernihiv, having been deprived of their estates, had no say in matters related to taxation. However, they demanded the *reclinatoria* (damages) for the Voivodeship of Chernihiv envisaged in the constitutions to compensate for the lost estates. Chernihiv nobles must have considered the tractates to be signed with Moscow a decided matter; hence, they did not refer to the ratification thereof<sup>94</sup>.

The nobility of Bratslav as the only one of the groups convened in Volodymyr, in their instruction included thanks not only to John III, but also to the Queen, and the 'the Most Magnificent House of HRM'<sup>95</sup>. In the case of the 'Berlin affront', however, they only expressed their regret at the misdeed of Duchess Ludwika Karolina, fairly enigmatically commanding their delegates 'to act with regard to that matter *cum integra Reipublicae*'<sup>96</sup>. Nevertheless, they voiced their support for the *ius patronatus* of the King of Poland<sup>97</sup>. Furthermore, the instruction included the demand to remove Cossacks from the territory of their voivodeship, thus enabling them to return to their estates, a requirement 'they will *ullatenus* [in any respect whatsoever] forego'<sup>98</sup>. The approval of the peace treaty with Russia

<sup>89</sup> TDIAUK, f. 28, ref. no. 133, sheets 1506v–1507, Instrukcja kijowska, 5 XI 1688.

<sup>90</sup> *Ibidem*, sheet 1507.

<sup>91</sup> *Ibidem*.

<sup>92</sup> TDIAUK, f. 28, ref. no. 133, sheet 1516, Instrukcja czernihowska, Włodzimierz, 5 XI 1688; Stanisław Woyna Orański served as the marshal of the dietine.

<sup>93</sup> *Ibidem*, sheet 1515v.

<sup>94</sup> *Ibidem*, sheet 1516v.

<sup>95</sup> TDIAUK, f. 28, ref. no. 133, sheet 1519, Instrukcja braclawska, Włodzimierz, 5 XI 1688; for a printed version, see: *Архив Юго-Западной России*, part 2, vol. 2, pp. 482–485; Michał Woliński served as the marshal of the dietine.

<sup>96</sup> TDIAUK, f. 28, ref. no. 133, sheet 1520v, Instrukcja braclawska, 5 XI 1688.

<sup>97</sup> *Ibidem*, sheet 1519.

<sup>98</sup> *Ibidem*, sheet 1520v.

featured in the instruction was tied to the rapid disbursement of the Muscovite monies for the citizens of Kiev and Chernihiv. The nobility of Bratslav, while instructing their delegates to insist on the demand even ‘*cum discrimine* [at the risk (of disbandment)] of the Sejm’, pointed out that many of their peers also had been deprived of their estates on the other bank of the Dnieper<sup>99</sup>.

Evaluating the demands enacted by the dietines in Volodymyr, one has to consider them as rather moderate. Those adopted by the nobility of Kiev appear to have been again the least favorable for the Court. Therefore, it cannot come as a surprise that the adherents of the Court attempted to disband its session. Now, the provisions passed by the other dietines, though partly congruent with the monarch’s intentions, indeed only matched those where it was simultaneously in the interest of the nobility. No firm stances requiring the scores to be settled regarding ‘the Berlin affront’ may have come as a sore disappointment. On the other hand, however, the selection of deputies sympathetic towards the Court was an all-important development for the monarch. It not only guaranteed the support for the proposals put forth by the King in the Chamber of Deputies, but it additionally helped to ensure that deputies would not block the proceedings, allegedly on account of the allocation of the money transferred from Moscow. As the King was preparing for a confrontation against the opposition spearheaded by the House of Sapieha, every deputy favoring the Court mattered. Meanwhile, the dietine of Chernihiv selected Aleksander Felicjan Cieszkowski, the Chamberlain of Chernihiv<sup>100</sup>, whereas the Bratslav dietine – Józef Karol Lubomirski, the Crown Equerry, who was related to the King through his wife<sup>101</sup>.

The disbandment of another Sejm, at that instance no doubt inspired by the Sapieha faction<sup>102</sup>, resulted in a backlash from a major part of the Crown’s nobility. On the basis of the decision made by the post-Sejm Council of the Senate<sup>103</sup>, the King convened relational dietines, imploring the nobility to deliberate over the ways to continue the war in the face of

<sup>99</sup> *Ibidem*, sheets 1520v–1521.

<sup>100</sup> An experienced soldier, wounded in the Battle of Chocim, frequent parliamentary deputy and political activist, who may have been in the number of the Court’s sympathizers, see: M. Wagner, *Słownik biograficzny oficerów polskich drugiej połowy XVII wieku*, vol. 2, Oświęcim 2014, pp. 54–55.

<sup>101</sup> A. Przyboś, *Lubomirski Józef Karol h. Szreniawa (1638–1702)*, in: PSB, vol. 18, Wrocław–Warszawa–Kraków 1973, p. 27.

<sup>102</sup> R. Kołodziej, *Stronnictwo*, p. 113.

<sup>103</sup> AGAD, APP, ref. no. 47, vol. 2, pp. 45–57, *Senatus consultum postkomicjalne*, Warszawa, 5–15 IV 1689.

subsequent Sejms being disbanded and the resultant void in the Treasury<sup>104</sup>. Still, these dietines did not proceed smoothly, with the most spectacular incidents occurring during the relational dietine of Sandomierz, where the nobility formed a confederation against the King's enemies<sup>105</sup>. That was to have certain bearing on the attitude of the exiles.

All three relational dietines were held in Volodymyr on 11 June 1689. The Kiev dietine continued to be dominated by the opposition. In the *laudum*<sup>106</sup> adopted, the local nobility in no way referred to fact of the Sejm having been disbanded by the Sapieha faction. Admittedly, the King received courtesy thanks, with a rather large legation of as many as four envoys provided with a special instruction<sup>107</sup>. However, the citizens of Kiev stood firmly behind their deputies to the Sejm – whose selection was contested after the pre-Sejm dietine by the adherents of the Court – and reacted sharply to the protestation against them submitted to the City of Ovruch. In a *laudum*, the marshal was required to write a letter to the municipal officials of Ovruch requesting that the protestation, as a breach of the Nobles' Liberty, be removed from the records<sup>108</sup>. The nobility of Kiev, in case of the King's call, declared its readiness to gather for a *pospolite ruszenie (levée en masse)* 'not only against the enemy of the Holy Cross, but also ad sananda vulnera Reipublicae and if other voivodeships would viritim stand, we also oblige ourselves to do so'<sup>109</sup>. It must have been an echo of the calls to convene a 'Horseback' Sejm. The citizens of Kiev, however, decided against making any taxation decisions, requested by the King in his instruction to relational dietines. As an excuse, they put forth the problems with the inspection of their estates, enacted already

<sup>104</sup> *Akta sejmikowe*, pp. 450–451, Uniwersał Jana III zwołujący sejmik relacyjny województw poznańskiego i kaliskiego, Warszawa, 18 IV 1688.

<sup>105</sup> Z. Trawicka, *op. cit.*, p. 60.

<sup>106</sup> TDIAUK, f. 28, ref. no. 134, sheets 1079–1081v, *Laudum sejmiku kijowskiego, Włodzimierz*, 11 VI 1689; as marshal the deputies appointed Andrzej of Wojnarów Wojnarowski, the son of the District Judge of Kiev, Companion (*Towarzysz*) in the Squadron of Hussars under Karol Stanisław Radziwiłł, Lithuanian Equerry.

<sup>107</sup> Among the legates dispatched to the King, there were Franciszek Potocki, Starosta of Ovruch; Jan Wojnarowski, District Judge of Kiev, Deputy Starosta of Volodymyr; Michał Stawecki, Standard-bearer of Zhytomyr, Borough Substarost of Ovruch; and Jerzy of Szpanowo Czaplic, Pantler of Ovruch, Standard-bearer at the Squadron of Hussars under Józef Bogusław Słuszko, Lithuanian Field Hetman; see: *Ibidem*, sheets 1079–1079v; the actual content of the instruction remains unknown.

<sup>108</sup> *Ibidem*, sheet 1079.

<sup>109</sup> 'nie tylko przeciwko nieprzyjacielowi Krzyża Świętego, ale też ad sananda vulnera Reipublicae i jeżeli inne województwa viritim będą stawały, i my także obligujemy się', see: TDIAUK, f. 28, ref. no. 134, sheet 1080; to serve as the Head of the *Levée en masse* they asked Marcyan Czaplic, Chamberlain of Kiev.

in 1683<sup>110</sup>. For this reason, the discussion on the matters of taxation was postponed to the day after the deputational dietine<sup>111</sup>. Besides that, the dietine focused solely on local issues<sup>112</sup>, and the promises to disburse in the future all the outstanding money to the deputies send both to sessions of the Sejm and to the King.

The dietine of Bratslav convened on the same day as that of Kiev, and enacted its *laudum* in the form of an instruction to the King<sup>113</sup>. As opposed to the citizens of Kiev, they did refer in their document to the fact of the Sejm having been broken, and requested that the King remove all the obstacles that ‘had confounded the Sejm’. They agreed for the *levée en masse* to be enacted; however, only for the purposes of defending the country. The instruction was complemented by the usual complaints of Cossacks pillaging the estates of the Bratslav Voivodeship, with an entreaty to the King to have them removed.

The relational dietine of Chernihiv also had a positive outcome, during which only two legates were debriefed (Aleksander Felicjan Cieszkowski, Chamberlain of Chernihiv, Starosta of Kleszczele, and Kazimierz Szlubicz Zaleski, Standard-bearer of Nowogródek, City Judge of Lutsk)<sup>114</sup>. With no references to any current affairs, another session of the dietine was

<sup>110</sup> The deputies selected to perform the inspection were: Michał Stanecki, Standard-bearer of Zhytomyr, Borough Substarost of Ovruch; Marcin Suryń; and Marek Szkuratowski, see: *Ibidem*, sheet 1081.

<sup>111</sup> *Ibidem*, sheets 1080v–1081; however, it was decided that a permission should be issued to the collectors of the hearth tax, Jan Trypolski, Sword-bearer of Lida, and Jerzy Rodkiewicz, Borough Substarost of Zhytomyr, liberating them from the uncollected arrears. Only a vague promise was made to pay out the remaining remuneration to the infantry ‘rota’ (Freikompanie of dragoons) under Marcin Kątski, Voivode of Kiev, and to the company of armoured cavalry (*pancerni*) under Stanisław Druszkiewicz, Castellan of Chełmno.

<sup>112</sup> Apart from private affairs, these included a revision of the records of Zhytomyr, a task entrusted to Michał Stawecki, Standard-bearer of Zhytomyr, Borough Substarost of Ovruch, and Stefan Krynicki; whereas the delivery of the records to Volodymyr was entrusted to Jerzy Rodkiewicz, Borough Substarost of Zhytomyr, Companion (*Towarzysz*) in the Squadron of Cavalry under Prokop Granowski, Starosta of Zhytomyr, and Maciej Stefan Szkuratowski, Castellan of Kiev, Borough Scriptor of Zhytomyr. Additionally, the dietine allocated a sum of one thousand zlotys for the erection in Ovruch of a building to accommodate the City and Circuit Courts of Kiev.

<sup>113</sup> TDIAUK, f. 28, ref. no. 134, sheets 1075–1076, Instrukcja dla posła do króla z sejmiku braclawskiego [11 VI 1689]; Michał Woliński served as the marshal of the dietine. Michał Kordysza, Cupbearer of Bratslav, was selected as the legate to the King.

<sup>114</sup> TDIAUK, f. 28, ref. no. 134, sheets 1076–1077v, *Laudum sejmiku czernihowskiego* 11 VI 1689; Stanisław Iwanicki, Lord of Ivanychi, Master of the Hunt of Nowogródek, served as the marshal of the dietine. The two legates informed their peers that in Warsaw they had received two thousand zlotys each from the Muscovite monies for their service.

postponed to the week after the deputational session. Furthermore, the dietine selected the legates to the King and developed the instruction article for them, the crucial point of it being the disbursement of damages for the citizens of Chernihiv<sup>115</sup>.

The temporary agreement between the Court and the opposition, reached towards the end of 1689, helped to appease the moods throughout the country. The attempted peace talks with Turkey did not achieve much<sup>116</sup>; hence, the only sensible option remained to continue the war, an enterprise impossible without funds. Therefore, the King decided to call the Sejm for the third successive time. In the universals to the nobility, he summoned the dietines to Volodymyr on 5 December 1689<sup>117</sup>. The most important, and indeed the only point of the King's legation<sup>118</sup> was of course the issue of funding the military, in other matters the King referred his addressees to the two preceding instructions.

Of the sessions convened in Volodymyr, only the dietine of Bratslav was able to reach a satisfactory ending at first sitting, i.e. on 5 December 1689. The deputies were obliged to concur with all the items specified in the King's embassy<sup>119</sup>. Much attention was paid to the wages of the troops, calling for tax collection, imposition of greater *hiberna* on ecclesiastical estates, as well as inspections to investigate whether officers, deputies, and commissaries did transfer the salaries to simple soldiers<sup>120</sup>. The instruction also included an entry pertaining to the reimbursement to Dymitr Żabokrzycki, Cupbearer of Ukmergė, Royal Commanded of Regiment, whose Company of Armed Cavalry had been disbanded without being paid in full<sup>121</sup>. As a testament to the influence over the dietine exerted by the House of Zamoyski one may see the fact that the deputies were ordered to plead the case of the successors to the late Treasurer Marcin Zamoyski, in order for them to be granted

---

<sup>115</sup> AGAD, APP, ref. no. 133, p. 326, Instrukcja posłom do króla Stanisławowi Korytkowi podczasem czernihowskiemu i Jaroszowi Wolskiemu z sejmiku czernihowskiego, 11 VI 1689.

<sup>116</sup> K. Piwarski, *Między*, pp. 113–122.

<sup>117</sup> TDIAUK, f. 28, ref. no. 134, sheets 1276–1276v, Uniwersał króla do województwa czernihowskiego, Żółkiew, 31 X 1689; TDIAUK, f. 28, ref. no. 134, sheets 1276v–1277v, Uniwersał króla do województwa braclawskiego, Żółkiew, 31 X 1689; For the content of the universals, see: *Akta sejmikowe*, pp. 466–467.

<sup>118</sup> *Akta sejmikowe*, pp. 468–470, Instrukcja Jana III na sejmiki przedsejmowe, 29 X 1689.

<sup>119</sup> TDIAUK, f. 28, ref. no. 134, sheet 1282, Instrukcja braclawska, Włodzimierz, 5 XII 1689; as marshal of the dietine, they selected Aleksander Żabokrzycki, Cupbearer of Bratslav.

<sup>120</sup> *Ibidem*, sheets 1283–1283v.

<sup>121</sup> *Ibidem*, sheet 1285.

the certificate of completion by the Crown Treasury<sup>122</sup>. Concurrently, it should be pointed out that the Bratslav nobility was growing ever more impatient with the Cossacks stationing within their voivodeship. They sent a demand of their removal to the King, threatening that otherwise their deputies would make it impossible to open the session of the Sejm<sup>123</sup>. This section may have been regarded as too radical, for in the *laudum* enacted during the dietine, a more mitigated tone was opted for. Lest the Sejm's time be employed, as the nobility claimed, they selected separate legates to be dispatched to the King before the opening of the session, to implore him to issue universals enabling the evacuation of Cossacks and the return of the nobles to their estates<sup>124</sup>. The envoys who approached the King in Żółkiew, before his departure to the Sejm, were soon able to receive an audience<sup>125</sup>. Although Sobieski did respond to the demands with much understanding, his answer to the legates was highly restrained, whereas further actions were to depend on the developments in the international situation.

The first dietine of Chernihiv was disbanded; however, upon the King's repeated summons, it reconvened on 17 December 1689<sup>126</sup>. As the document bore the date of 13 December, one can hardly suppose that all the interested members of the nobility got to be informed. Even though the distance between Żółkiew (the place where the universal was issued) and Volodymyr was not great, there was not enough time. It is possible that the dietine was 'seized' by the Court faction, that is, organized hastily and partly in secret. The unequivocally pro-royal tenor of the enacted instruction could be seen as another indication thereof. The nobility, while thanking the monarch, ordered their deputies 'if such malevolentia was to be encountered, that would ingratinem sapere [express], our honourable deputies omni conatu et studio ought to oppose it, in support of the honor

<sup>122</sup> *Ibidem*, sheet 1286v; due to the fact that two subsequent sessions of Sejm had been broken, Marcin Zamoyski was unable to obtain from the Sejm the certificate of completion, attested with a constitution.

<sup>123</sup> *Ibidem*, sheets 1282–1282v.

<sup>124</sup> TDIAUK, f. 28, ref. no. 134, sheets 1280–1280v, *Laudum braclawskie*, 5 XII 1689; Dymitr Żabokrzycki, Cupbearer of Ukmergė and Franciszek Duchanicz were the legates. It cannot be ruled out that such a decision had resulted from the suasion of the Court's 'partisan' – Dymitr Żabokrzycki.

<sup>125</sup> Archiwum Polskiej Akademii Nauk w Warszawie, Teki Janusza Wolińskiego, ref. no. 70, sheets 361–361v, *Respons na instrukcje z kancelarii królewskiej posłom do króla z sejmiku braclawskiego Dymitrowi Żabokrzyckiemu podczaszemu wiłkomierskiemu i Andrzejowi Franciszkowi Duchomiczowi*, Żółkiew 22 XII 1689.

<sup>126</sup> TDIAUK, f. 28, ref. no. 134, sheets 1313–1314, *Uniwersał powtórny na sejmik czernihowski*, Żółkiew, 13 XII 1689.



of His Royal Highness and His House'<sup>127</sup>. It included the point concerning 'factions' inspired by 'foreign lords' and the call, much required by the Court, to expel from the country foreign delegations<sup>128</sup>. When the Sejm had already convened, the Court benefitted from such demands when – after a failed attempt to disband the parliament undertaken by a deputy from Belz, Samuel Głogowski, paid off by the French – the decision was in fact made to remove French diplomats from the country<sup>129</sup>.

Similar to the fate of the first dietine of Chernihiv was that of the dietine of Kiev. The city records of Volodymyr not only do not include its *laudum* or instruction article, but neither is the entry of the King's universal to be found anywhere therein. It proves difficult to determine whether the fact was actually associated with the Sejm not taking place<sup>130</sup>. There are also indications that the citizens of Kiev did not obtain a re-issued universal from the monarch, and consequently were unable to select their deputies for the Sejm<sup>131</sup>. Perhaps the Court was unwilling to repeat the mistake committed in 1687, when the reconvened dietine of Kiev came to be dominated by the supporters of the opposition. It may be supposed that the dietine of Kiev had been nullified by the Court partisans, who did not want to allow for the unfavorable entries to be enacted. Indeed, on the basis of the analyzed instructions, one may argue that it was the Court faction that reported a decisive victory during the dietines of Volodymyr on that occasion. It is further corroborated by the names of the selected deputies, among whom we discover parliamentarians tried and sympathetic to the Court.

The Sejm of 1690, was completed with the enactment of a constitution and taxes, as the last to do so during the reign of John III, enabling the King to organize his final major military campaign<sup>132</sup>. Afterwards, pursuant to the

<sup>127</sup> 'jeśliby jaka malevolentia miała się kimkolwiek znaleźć, któraby ingratitude sapere miała, ichm. panowie posłowie omni conatu et studio jej się opponent zabierając na dalszą pańską i domu jego łaskę przy honorze jego stawać będą powinni'. TDIAUK, f. 28, ref. no. 134, f. 1315v, Instrukcja czernihowska, 17 XII 1689; for a printed version of the instruction, see: *Архив Юго-Западной России*, part 2, vol. 2, pp. 485–487; Stanisław Korytko, Cupbearer of Chernihiv served as the marshal of the dietine.

<sup>128</sup> TDIAUK, f. 28, ref. no. 134, sheet 1316, Instrukcja czernihowska, 17 XII 1689.

<sup>129</sup> K. Piwarski, *Między*, pp. 136–137.

<sup>130</sup> The records include the universals summoning to the two subsequent dietines. As most commonly all universals were brought together and entered into the records one after another, one may suspect here deliberate moves undertaken by the followers of the King.

<sup>131</sup> In the city records there is no entry of any such universal, whereas in the *laudum* of the relational dietine of Kiev after the 1690 Sejm it was reported that the voivodeship had not had any deputies on it 'because of the pre-Sejm dietine having been disbanded out of spite', see: TDIAUK, f. 28, ref. no. 135, sheet 1298v, *Laudum sejmiku kijowskiego*, Włodzimierz, 26 VI 1690. Thus, a mention of a reconvened dietine is missing here as well.

<sup>132</sup> See: f.n. 22.

constitutions of the Sejm, relational dietines convened<sup>133</sup>. An indubitably positive influence on the proceedings of the session of the exiled dietines had been effected by the issuing of the King's certificate of establishing the commission to disburse the Muscovite monies, a body that was to have its meetings held in Warsaw<sup>134</sup>. The earliest to meet in session in Volodymyr was the nobility of the Chernihiv Voivodeship. In an extensive *laudum*, enacted on 15 June 1690, they thanked the King for his hard 'work and exertion without regard for his own health', that allowed for the sitting to be successfully completed<sup>135</sup>. Verbal and monetary expressions of gratitude were also granted to the deputies, who 'complied with the instruction they have been entrusted with'<sup>136</sup>.

In the *laudum* of 26 June 1690, the nobility of Kiev also managed to include the thanks directed to the King<sup>137</sup>. However, no resolutions had been enacted, a fact that was accounted for with the late summons to the dietine and the low attendance of the nobles. For that reason, the session was postponed as late as to 12 September 1690<sup>138</sup>. It was only during the rescheduled dietine, most likely attended by a large group of the Court supporters, that a series of personal and financial decisions was made. The nobility thanked Marcin Kącki, Voivode of Kiev, and Dymitr Żabokrzycki,

<sup>133</sup> 'Wojewodztwo Braclawskie, Seymik bierze na mieyscu zwyczajnym w Włodzimierzu pro die 26 Iunij anno currenti. Woiewodztwo Czerniechowskie, ponieważ dotąd Rzeczyp. nie iest wroczone, dla tego podatkować nie może. Seymik Relationis in loco solito w Włodzimierzu, na dzień 15 Czerwca bierze' ['The Voivodeship of Bratslav holds its dietine at the usual location in Volodymyr on 26 June of the current year. The Voivodeship of Chernihiv, as it has not as yet been returned to the Commonwealth, cannot be taxed. The relational dietine is held at the usual location in Volodymyr on 15 June'], see: *Volumina Legum*, vol. 5, p. 391; 'Woiewodztwo Kiiowskie. Ponieważ Posłów swoich nie miało przeto w podatkowaniu do konstytucyey roku 1685 stosować się powinno; Seymik Relationis na dzień 26 Iunij in loco solito w Włodzimierzu naznaczamy' ['The Voivodeship of Kiev. As it did not have its Deputies, it ought to abide by the taxation imposed in the constitution of 1685; the Relational Dietine is summoned to 26 June at the usual location in Volodymyr'], see: *Volumina Legum*, vol. 5, p. 386.

<sup>134</sup> During the 1690 Sejm, the Royal Certificate, signed by the King, the highest Senator and Sejm Marshal, Działyński, was confirmed with a constitution, see: 'Approbatio diplomatis na ukontentowanie exulum', in: *Volumina Legum*, vol. 5, p. 380. The opening of the commission's operation was planned to 2 May 1691, see: TDIAUK, f. 28, ref. no. 135, sheets 1488v–1489, *Laudum kijowskie*, Włodzimierz, 12 IX 1690.

<sup>135</sup> TDIAUK, f. 28, ref. no. 135, sheet 1264, *Laudum czernihowskie*, Włodzimierz, 15 VI 1690; as marshal of their dietine, they selected Marcin Zahorowski, Starosta of Volodymyr.

<sup>136</sup> 'uczynili dość instrukcyi sobie powierzonej'. TDIAUK, f. 28, ref. no. 135, sheet 1264v.

<sup>137</sup> TDIAUK, f. 28, ref. no. 135, sheet 1298v, *Laudum kijowskie*, Włodzimierz, 26 VI 1690; as the marshal of the dietine served Dymitr Żabokrzycki, Lord of Żabokrzyki, Cupbearer of Ukmergė.

<sup>138</sup> *Ibidem*, sheets 1298v–1299v.

Cupbearer of Ukmergė – who was present at the session – for their aid in the efforts to obtain the Muscovite monies<sup>139</sup>. They decided to dispatch an envoy to the King as a token of their gratitude<sup>140</sup>. In accordance with the resolution of the Sejm, the dietine further enacted a new excise tax (*podatek szelężny*) and ordered tax collectors to execute the tax delations already from 1683<sup>141</sup>. Moreover, it was determined that the recompense from the Lithuanian Treasure to the citizens of Volhynia, resultant from the damages caused by the marching Lithuanian troops, ought to be disbursed in their voivodeship, too. Therefore, the nobility selected legates to Kazimierz Sapieha, Voivode of Vilnius and Grand Hetman of Lithuania, and to Benedykt Sapieha, Grand Treasurer of Lithuania, in order to obtain the reparations<sup>142</sup>. It can probably be said that this time the dietine of Kiev managed to subdue the opposition and proceed in the interest of the Royal faction<sup>143</sup>.

The third of the sessions held in Volodymyr, the relational dietine of Bratslav, convened on the same day that the Kiev one (26 June 1690). Although deputies willing to submit their report appeared there, due to low attendance it was rescheduled to a day after the deputation dietine<sup>144</sup>. It turned out to be the first of an entire chain of postponements. On a session reconvened on 12 September 1690, the relation from the Sejm was heard. It must have proceeded in a rather tumultuous atmosphere. The nobles decided to dispatch envoys both to the King and to the Hetmans<sup>145</sup>. Such

---

<sup>139</sup> TDIAUK, f. 28, ref. no. 135, sheets 1486v–1487, Laudum kijowskie, Włodzimierz, 12 IX 1690; Voivode of Kiev was reported to have received a special letter of gratitude from the nobility for his service in the capacity of the representative of the Kiev Voivodeship during the Sejm.

<sup>140</sup> As legates, they selected Dymitr Żabokrzycki, Cupbearer of Ukmergė; Wawrzyniec Peplowski, Lord of Peplowo, Wojski and Borough Clerk of Lutsk; Stanisław Liniewski, Swordbearer of Kiev; Stanisław Zahorowski, Lord of Zahorów, son of District Judge of Volodymyr, see: *Ibidem*, sheets 1486–1486v.

<sup>141</sup> *Ibidem*, sheets 1491v–1493. As the collector of the excise tax, they appointed Dymitr Żabokrzycki, Cupbearer of Ukmergė.

<sup>142</sup> Adam Olszar Wołczkiewicz was appointed to be the legate and was granted '*plenariam facultatem*' in seeking the damages, see: *Ibidem*, sheets 1494v–1495v. At the same time, all the aggravated citizens were obliged to make claims in the cities. *Konstytucja sejmu 1690: Immunitas dóbr ziemskich*, in: *Volumina Legum*, vol. 5, p. 372.

<sup>143</sup> It is indicated both by the role played by Dymitr Żabokrzycki, the thanks directed to other adherents of the King, incl. Prokop Granowski, Starosta of Zhytomyr and Royal Colonel, see: TDIAUK, f. 28, ref. no. 135, sheet 1487, Laudum kijowskie, Włodzimierz, 12 IX 1690.

<sup>144</sup> TDIAUK, f. 28, ref. no. 135, sheets 1299v–1300v, Laudum braclawskie, Włodzimierz, 26 VI 1690; as marshal of the dietine served Mikołaj Antonii of Łyczków Dogieł Cyryna.

<sup>145</sup> As legates to the King, they appointed: Jerzy Piaseczyński, Starosta of Nowogródek and Ulanów; Dymitr Żabokrzycki, Lord of Żabokrzyki, Cupbearer of Ukmergė, Deputy

a decision was made as a result of a disappointment with the failure to meet the demands put forth by the voivodeship, pertaining to the evacuation of Cossacks from the Bratslav territories. In order for the relations from both legations to be heard, the dietine was once again rescheduled, this time to 12 December 1690. However, though on that date a session was held, its results were rather unsatisfactory. The nobility caucus did receive the legates sent to Hetmans, who wanted to inform their peers of their mission; however, the legates sent to the King 'due to their great obligations in the Tribunale and other difficult matters in desiderio of the voivodeship could not come and perform their function'<sup>146</sup>. Moreover, the attendance at the dietine turned out to be rather modest, as a result of terrible weather conditions. Eventually, the nobility decided to appoint new legates to be sent to the King, and to reschedule the session to 5 April 1691<sup>147</sup>. The newly-elected legates received another instruction article, reiterating the complaints against the Cossacks<sup>148</sup>. In the end, until the postponed date of the session, the legates to the King had not been able to obtain an audience, a fact in part explained by the preparations to the wedding of Prince Jakub<sup>149</sup>. Once more, the dietine was postponed, this time to 25 June 1691. This is where the series of deferrals ends, nor is it known whether the legates were ultimately granted their audience.

Evaluating the political situation in the three dietines in exile operating in Volodymyr between 1687 and 1691, one must underscore that no decisive domination of the Court faction can be noted. The fact was most strikingly observable in the case of the Kiev dietine. However, the other two assemblies also happened to include in their instructions some entries that might not have been to the King's liking. Even though there are almost no narrative sources that would describe the backstage proceedings of the dietines, from the *lauda* and instruction articles one is able to draw

---

Voivode of the General Dietine of Kiev Voivodeship; Antoni Potocki, Lord of Potok, Master of the Hunt of Bratslav. As legates to the Hetmans, they appointed Jerzy Żyżyński, Wojski of Winnica; Mikołaj Dowgieł Cyryna, marshal of the dietine, see: TDIAUK, f. 28, ref. no. 135, sheet 1394, *Laudum braclawskie*, Włodzimierz, 12 IX 1690.

<sup>146</sup> 'dla wielkich swoich spraw w Trybunale i inszych trudnych zabaw in desiderio województwa nie zjechali i funkcyjej swojej nie odprawili'. TDIAUK, f. 28, ref. no. 135, sheet 1498, *Laudum braclawskie*, Włodzimierz, 12 XII 1690.

<sup>147</sup> *Ibidem*, sheet 1498v. As legates to the King, the dietine selected Jan Antoni Potocki, Master of the Hunt of Bratslav and Jerzy of Łyczków Dowgieł Cyryna.

<sup>148</sup> Biblioteka Zakładu im. Ossolińskich, ref. no. 408, pp. 99–102, *Instrukcja posłom do króla z sejmiku kijowskiego*, 13 XII 1690.

<sup>149</sup> *Laudum sejmiku braclawskiego z limity*, Włodzimierz, 5 IV 1691 printed in: *Архив Юго-Западной России*, part 2, vol. 2, p. 495; Mikołaj Antoni of Łyczków Dowgieł Cyryna was appointed as the marshal of the dietine.

conclusions of tense political struggle waged during the sessions. The dietines would be disbanded, and in all likelihood also appropriated. The followers of the Court seem to have played the key role in such interventions. To some extent, their policies proved efficient. The least effect of their influence – though only for some time – could be observed in the Kiev dietine. When they proved unable to dominate its two subsequent sittings, before the third Sejm of the discussed period, the dietine of Kiev was disbanded, and the nobility proved unable to be granted another universal. Furthermore, the King must have made attempts to sway in his favor some of the politicians opposing him in the Kiev dietine. Having been the deputy at both session of the Sejm in the years 1688–1689, Andrzej Drohojowski, Standard-bearer of Lublin was nominated to the office of Starost of Łuków in 1689, and in 1690 he was appointed the deputy by the royalist dietine of Chernihiv. Efforts by the royal faction resulted in the Court's declared supporter, Dymitr Żabokrzycki, being placed as the marshal of the relational dietine after 1690. In the case of Chernihiv dietine, the domination of the royal faction was overwhelming, with opposition unable to counteract it. The attempt to disband the 1688 pre-Sejm dietine ended up in only a partial success, for following the universal reissued by the King, another session convened, this time entirely controlled by the royalists. Similarly, great influence of the Court may be discovered in the Bratslav dietine, that elected as its deputies Dymitr and Aleksander Zabokrzycki, as well as Józef Lubomirski. Admittedly, their instruction articles did feature demands not entirely congruent with the monarch's expectations, but such practice was often resorted to also in other royalist dietines – they constituted the art of working out a compromise, appeasing the legalist-minded masses of nobility and reaching a satisfactory end of the session in the form of election of deputies that would be convenient for the Court. Observing the three dietines in Volodymyr in the discussed period, one discovers a rough political struggle waged therein, with the Court faction starting to emerge victorious towards the end of that era<sup>150</sup>.

---

<sup>150</sup> Final conclusions and more details analyses of the attitudes adopted by the nobility from the Ukraine dietines will be presented in the subsequent paper, dealing with the period 1692–1696.

## APPENDIX

An index of the Sejm Deputies from the dietines of Kiev, Bratslav and Chernihiv in the period of 1687–1690<sup>151</sup>

### THE SEJM OF 1688

#### Deputies of the Bratslav dietine of 16 Dec 1687

Michał Kordysz, Cupbearer of Bratslav [podczaszy braclawski]  
 Dymitr Żabokrzycki, Lord of Żabokrzyki, Cupbearer of Ukmergė, Deputy Voivode of the General Dietine of the Kiev Voivodeship [podczaszy wilkomirski, podwojewodzi generalny województwa kijowskiego]  
 Teodor Krosnowski, Steward of Bratslav [podstoli braclawski]  
 Aleksander Żabokrzycki, Lord of Smyków, Cupbearer of Bratslav [czesnik braclawski]

#### Deputies of the Chernihiv dietine of 6 Dec 1687

Aleksander of Cieszkowice Cieszkowski, Chamberlain of Chernihiv [podkomorzy czernihowski]  
 Kazimierz of Szłubice Załęski, Standard-bearer of Nowogródek [chorąży nowogródzki]  
 Jerzy Piaseczyński, Starosta of Ulanów [starosta ulanowski]  
 Waclaw Zubczewski, Cupbearer of Nowogródek, City Judge of Kiev [podczaszy nowogródzki, sędzia grodzki kijowski]

#### Deputies of the Kiev dietine of 9 Jan 1688 (reconvened dietine)

Marcjan of Szpanowo Czaplic, Chamberlain of Kiev [podkomorzy kijowski]  
 Andrzej Drohojowski, Deputy Standard-bearer of Lublin [chorąży lubelski]  
 Jan Wołczkiewicz Olizar, Deputy District Judge of Kiev [podsędek kijowski]  
 Stanisław Kazimierz Kowalewski, Master of the Hunt of Kiev [łowczy kijowski]

### THE SEJM OF 1688–1689

#### Deputies of the Kiev dietine of 5 Nov 1688

Marcjan of Szpanowo Czaplic, Chamberlain of Kiev [podkomorzy kijowski]  
 Stanisław Kazimierz Kowalewski, Master of the Hunt of Kiev [łowczy kijowski]  
 Adam Wołczkiewicz Olizar, Cupbearer of Ovruch [podczaszy owrucki]  
 Teodor Niemirycz, Deputy Chamberlain of Kiev [podkomorzyc kijowski]

<sup>151</sup> A number of the deputies was mentioned in the study R. Kołodziej, *Ostatni*.

**Deputies of the Chernihiv dietine of 5 Nov 1688**

Aleksander Felicjan Cieszkowski, Chamberlain of Chernihiv [podkomorzy czernihowski]

Mikołaj Piaseczyński, Starosta of Nowogródek [starosta nowogródzki]

Andrzej Drohojowski, Standard-bearer of Lublin [chorąży lubelski]

Kazimierz of Szlubice Załęski, Standard-bearer of Nowogródek, City Judge of Lutsk [chorąży nowogródzki, sędzia grodzki łucki]

**Deputies of the Bratslav dietine of 5 Nov 1688**

Józef Count of Wiśnicz and Jarosław Lubomirski, Crown Equerry [koniuszy koronny]

Teodor Krasnosielski, Steward of Bratslav [podstoli braclawski]

Jerzy Piaseczyński, Starosta of Ulanów [starosta ulanowski]

Michał Woliński

## THE SEJM OF 1690

**Deputies of the Bratslav dietine of 5 Dec 1689**

Marcin Czarnecki, Steward of Bratslav [stolnik braclawski]

Michał Hieronim Kordysz, Cupbearer of Bratslav [podczaszy braclawski]

Tomasz Romanowski, Standard-bearer of Chełm [chorąży chełmski]

Michał Woliński

**Deputies of the Chernihiv dietine of 17 Dec 1689 (reconvened dietine)**

Aleksander Felicjan of Cieszków Cieszkowski, Deputy Chamberlain of Chernihiv, Starosta of Kleszczele [podkomorzy czernihowski, starosta kleszczelowski]

Andrzej Drohojowski, Starosta of Łuków [starosta łukowski]

Konstanty of Szlubicze Załęski, Steward of Chernihiv [podstoli czernihowski]

Stanisław Woyna Orański

**The dietine of Kiev disbanded**

(translated by LINGUA LAB)

## REFERENCES

**Archival sources**

- Archiwum Główne Akt Dawnych:  
 Archiwum Publiczne Potockich, ref. no. 47, vol. 2; 48; 133.  
 Archiwum Polskiej Akademii Nauk w Warszawie:  
 Teki Janusza Wolińskiego, ref. no. 70.  
 Biblioteka Książąt Czartoryskich w Krakowie:  
 ref. no. 422.  
 Biblioteka Zakładu im. Ossolińskich:  
 ref. no. 408.  
 Tsentral'nyy Derzhavnyy Istorychnyy Arkhiv Ukrayiny, Kyiv:  
 f. 28, ref. no. 132–135.

**Printed sources**

- Akta sejmikowe województw poznańskiego i kaliskiego. Lata 1676–1695*, eds. M. Zwierzykowski, R. Kołodziej, A. Kamieński, Poznań 2018.  
*Akta sejmiku podolskiego in hostico 1672–1696*, eds. J. Stoliczka, Kraków 2002.  
 Arkhiv Yugo-Zapadnoy Rossii, part 2, vol. 2, Kiyev 1888.  
 [Diariusz sejmiku przedsejmowego w Warszawie 3 II 1666], ed. S. Ochmann-Staniszevska, in: *Studia i materiały z dziejów nowożytnych*, eds. K. Matwijowski, S. Ochmann-Staniszevska, Wrocław 1995.  
*Volumina Legum*, vol. 5, ed. J. Ohryzko, Petersburg 1860.

**Studies**

- Achremczyk S., *Życie sejmikowe Prus Królewskich w latach 1647–1772*, Olsztyn 1999.  
 Battaglia O.F. de, *Jan Sobieski król Polski*, Warszawa 1983.  
 Burkietowicz A., *Sejmik sieradzki w latach 1669–1717*, Sieradz 2009.  
 Ciara S., *Senatorowie i dygnitarze koronni w drugiej połowie XVII wieku*, Wrocław–Warszawa–Kraków 1990.  
 Czarniecka A., *Nikt nie słucha mnie za życia... Jan III w walce z opozycyjną propagandą (1684–1696)*, Warszawa 2009.  
 Deiches E. (Łuniński E.), *Na stos. Karta historyczna z czasów Jana III*, Petersburg 1901.  
 Helcel A.Z., *O dwukrotnym zamęściu księżniczki Ludwiki Karoliny Radziwiłłowej i wynikłych stąd zamieszkach. Przyczynek do dziejów panowania Jana III Sobieskiego*, Kraków 1857.  
 Hundert Z., *Działalność Sapiehów w 'powiedeńskim' okresie panowania Jana III Sobieskiego (1683–1696) w świetle akt sejmikowych województwa mazowieckiego*, in: *Wielkie rody dawnej Rzeczypospolitej*, vol. 1, *Sapiehowie*, eds. T. Ciesielski, M. Sawicki, Opole 2018.  
 Jakowenko N., *Posłowie województw wołyńskiego, kijowskiego i braclawskiego na sejmach Rzeczypospolitej w końcu XVI i pierwszej połowie XVII w. (Próba portretu zbiorowego)*, in: *Spółczesność obywatelska i jego reprezentacja (1493–1993)*, ed. J. Bardach, Warszawa 1995.  
 Kaźmierczyk A., *Pomiędzy dwoma sejmami w 1693 r.*, 'Śląski Kwartalnik Historyczny Sobótka' 1992, 47.  
 Kaźmierczyk A., *Sejm grodzieński, 31 grudnia 1692 – 11 lutego 1693 r.*, 'Studia Historyczne' 1990, 33, 1.  
 Kaniewski J., *Problem wojny polsko-tureckiej na sejmie 1690 r.*, in: *Wojny polsko-tureckie w XVII w.*, Przemyśl 2000.  
 Kaniewski J., *Sejm z 1690 roku*, Katowice 1997, typescript of the doctoral dissertation in Library of the Institute of History at the University of Silesia in Katowice.



- Kamiński A., *Polska a Brandenburgia-Prusy w drugiej połowie XVII wieku. Dzieje polityczne*, Poznań 2002.
- Kawecki R., *Kardynał Michał Stefan Radziejowski (1645–1705)*, Opole 2005.
- Kołodziej R., *Listy od Jej Mości Królowej. O próbach wpływania Marii Kazimierzy na sytuację wewnętrzną w Rzeczypospolitej*, in: *Maria Kazimiera Sobieska (1641–1716). W kręgu rodziny, polityki i kultury, Zamek Królewski w Warszawie. Studia i materiały*, eds. A. Kalinowska, P. Tyszką, vol. 6, Warszawa 2017.
- Kołodziej R., *Ostatni wolności naszej klejnot. Sejm Rzeczypospolitej za panowania Jana III Sobieskiego*, Poznań 2014.
- Kołodziej R., *Przedsejmowe legacje królewskie w propagandzie wojennej Jana III Sobieskiego*, in: *Między obowiązkami, przywilejami a prawem Rzeczypospolitej XVI–XVIII wieku. Społeczeństwo w obronie państwa polsko-litewskiego*, eds. A. Kalinowska et al., Warszawa 2018.
- Kołodziej R., *Sejm z 22 grudnia 1693 r.*, 'Wieki Stare i Nowe' 2016, 10.
- Kołodziej R., *Stronnictwo Sapiechów a funkcjonowanie sejmu w drugiej części panowania Jana III Sobieskiego (1685–1696)*, in: *Wielkie rody dawnej Rzeczypospolitej*, vol. 1, Sapiehowie, eds. T. Ciesielski, M. Sawicki, Opole 2018.
- Komaszyński M., *Maria Kazimiera d'Arquien Sobieska królowa Polski 1641–1716*, Kraków–Wrocław 1984.
- Komaszyński M., *Teresa Kunegunda Sobieska*, Warszawa 1982.
- Konieczna D., *Ustrój i funkcjonowanie sejmiku brzesko-litewskiego w latach 1565–1763*, Warszawa 2013.
- Kozyński R., *Sejmik szlachecki ziemi chełmskiej 1648–1717*, Lublin 2006.
- Kulecki M., *Wygnańcy ze Wschodu. Egzulanicy w Rzeczypospolitej w ostatnich latach panowania Jana Kazimierza i za panowania Michała Korybuta Wiśniowieckiego*, Warszawa 1997.
- Litwin H., *Równi do równych. Kijowska reprezentacja sejmowa 1569–1648*, Warszawa 2009.
- Litvin H., *Z narodu rus'koho. Shlyakhta Kyivshchyny, Volyni ta Bratslavshchyny (1569–1648)*, transl. L. Lysenko, Kyiv 2016.
- Maroń J., *Pisma ulotne po sejmie grodzieńskim 1688 r.*, in: *Studia z dziejów Rzeczypospolitej szlacheckiej*, eds. K. Matwijowski, Z. Wójcik, 'Acta Universitatis Wratislaviensis' 1988, 945, Historia 66.
- Maroń J., *'Sejmu grodzieńskiego exorbitancja' – opinia publiczna wobec zerwania sejmu 1688 roku*, 'Śląski Kwartalnik Historyczny Sobótka' 1993, 48.
- Maroń J., *Sejmy z lat 1688–1689*, Wrocław 1987, typescript of the doctoral dissertation in Library of the Institute of History at the University of Wrocław.
- Mazur K., *W stronę integracji z Koroną. Sejmiki Wołynia i Ukrainy w latach 1569–1648*, Warszawa 2006.
- Mróz M., *Ostatnie zwycięstwo parlamentarne króla. Sejm 1690 roku*, in: *Z dziejów i tradycji Srebrnego Wieku*, ed. Jerzy Pietrzak, 'Acta Universitatis Wratislaviensis' 1990, 1108, Historia 75.
- Piwiński K., *Między Francją a Austrią. Z dziejów polityki Jana III Sobieskiego w latach 1687–1690*, Kraków 1933.
- Piwiński K., *Sprawa pośrednictwa tatarskiego w wojnie polsko-tureckiej (1692–1693)*, in: *Studia Historica w 35-lecie pracy naukowej Henryka Łowmiańskiego*, eds. A. Gieysztor et al., Warszawa 1958.
- Przyboś A., *Lubomirski Józef Karol h. Szreniawa (1638–1702)*, in: *Polski Słownik Biograficzny*, vol. 18, Wrocław–Warszawa–Kraków 1973.
- Rachuba A., *Hegemonia Sapiechów na Litwie jako przejaw skrajnej dominacji magnaterii w życiu kraju*, in: *Władza i prestiż. Magnateria Rzeczypospolitej w XVI–XVIII w.*, eds. J. Urwanowicz, E. Dubas-Urwanowicz, P. Guzowski, Białystok 2003.

- Rachuba A., *Litwa wobec projektu zwołania sejmu konnego w 1695 r. i walki Sapiechów z biskupem Brzostowskim*, 'Zapiski Historyczne' 1986, 51, 1.
- Rachuba A., *Radziwiłł Jerzy Józef h. Trąba (1668–1689)*, in: *Polski Słownik Biograficzny*, vol. 30, Wrocław–Warszawa–Kraków–Gdańsk–Łódź 1987.
- Romaniuk P.P., *Instytucjonalne podstawy hegemonii Sapiechów w Wielkim Księstwie Litewskim w drugiej połowie XVII wieku*, in: *W cieniu wojen i rozbiorów. Studia z dziejów Rzeczypospolitej XVIII i początków XIX wieku*, eds. U. Kosińska, D. Dukwicz, A. Danilczyk, Warszawa 2014.
- Sadowski W., *Państwo i władza w oczach szlachty. Postawy polityczne obywateli województwa lubelskiego za panowania Michała Korybuta Wiśniowieckiego i Jana III Sobieskiego*, Lublin–Radzyń Podlaski 2008.
- Salmonowicz S., *Dzieje wyznań i życia religijnego*, in: *Historia Torunia*, vol. 2, part 3: *Między barokiem a oświeceniem (1669–1793)*, ed. M. Biskup, Toruń 1996.
- Sawicki M., *Konflikt biskupa wileńskiego Konstantego Kazimierza Brzostowskiego Kazimierzem Janem Sapiehą w latach 1693–1696*, in: *Studia z dziejów Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego (XVI–XVIII wieku)*, eds. S. Górzynski, M. Nagielski, Warszawa 2014.
- Skrzypietz A., *Jakub Sobieski*, Poznań 2015.
- Skrzypietz A., *Królewscy synowie – Jakub, Aleksander i Konstanty Sobiescy*, Katowice 2011.
- Sliesoriūnas G., *Lietuvos Didžioji Kunigaikštystė vidaus karo išvakarėse: didikų grupuočių kova 1690–1697 m.*, Vilnius 2000.
- Sliesoriūnas G., *Problem separatyzmu Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego w XVII w.*, in: *Rzeczpospolita wielu narodów i jej tradycje*, eds. A. Link-Lenczowski, M. Markiewicz, Kraków 1999.
- Słownik geograficzny Królestwa Polskiego i innych krajów słowiańskich*, vol. 14, ed. B. Chlebowski, Warszawa 1895.
- Smolarek P., *Kampania mołdawska Jana III roku 1691*, eds. Z. Hundert, M. Wagner, Oświęcim 2015.
- Stolicki J., *Egzulanci podolscy (1672–1699). Znaczenie uchodźców z Podola w życiu politycznym Rzeczypospolitej*, 'Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego' 1994, 1152, *Prace Historyczne* 114.
- Stolicki J., *Magnateria na sejmikach ukraińskich we Włodzimierzu za panowania królów rodaków 1669–1696*, in: *Patron i dwór. Magnateria Rzeczypospolitej w XVI–XVIII wieku*, eds. Ewa Dubas-Urwanowicz, Jerzy Urwanowicz, Warszawa 2006.
- Stolicki J., *O modelu monografii sejmiku w drugiej połowie XVII wieku*, in: *Po unii – sejmiki szlacheckie w Rzeczypospolitej XVI–XVIII wieku*, eds. H. Lulewicz, M. Wagner, Siedlce 2013.
- Stolicki J., *Sejmiki ukraińskie w latach 1648–1702. Problemy badawcze*, in: *Patrimonium. Studiji z rann'omodernoyi istoriyi Tsentral'no-Skhidnoyi Yevropy*, vol. 1, *Rann'omoderna lyudyna. Prostir-vlada-pravo XVI–XVIII st.*, eds. V. Mykhaylovs'kyi, Ya. Stolits'kyi, Krakiv 2015.
- Stolicki J., *Sejmiki ukraińskie wobec spraw religijnych 1669–1696*, in: *Rzeczpospolita wielu wyznań*, eds. A. Kaźmierczyk et al., Kraków 2004.
- Stolicki J., *Wobec wolności i króla. Działalność polityczna szlachty ruskiej, ukraińskiej i wołyńskiej w latach 1673–1683*, Kraków 2007.
- Tarnowski S., *Tajemnica roku 1688*, 'Roczniki Zarządu Akademii Umiejętności' 1883.
- Trawicka Z., *Sejmik województwa sandomierskiego w latach 1572–1696*, Kielce 1985.
- Ujma M., *Sejmik lubelski 1572–1696*, Warszawa 2003.
- Wagner M., *Andrzej Potocki hetman polny koronny*, in: *W cieniu szukamy jasności chwały. Studia z dziejów panowania Jana III Sobieskiego (1684–1696)*, ed. M. Wagner, Siedlce 2002.
- Wagner M., *Sejmik ziemi liwskiej w dobie Jana III Sobieskiego (1674–1696). Zarys problematyki*, in: *Po unii – sejmiki szlacheckie w Rzeczypospolitej XVI–XVIII wieku*, eds. H. Lulewicz, M. Wagner, Siedlce 2013.

- Wagner M., *Słownik biograficzny oficerów polskich drugiej połowy XVII wieku*, vol. 2, Oświęcim 2014.
- Wagner M., *Stanisław Jabłonowski (1634–1702)*, Siedlce 1997.
- Wójcik Z., *Jan Sobieski*, Warszawa 1983.
- Zakrzewski A., *Sejmiki Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego XVI–XVIII w., Ustrój i funkcjonowanie: sejmik trocki*, Warszawa 2000.

#### STRESZCZENIE

Artykuł przedstawia stanowisko polityczne szlachty ukraińskiej z sejmików egzulacyjnych województw kijowskiego, braclawskiego i czernihowskiego w latach 1687–1691, obradujących wspólnie we Włodzimierzu. Na podstawie akt sejmikowych ze zjazdów przedsejmowych i relacyjnych można zanalizować postawę polityczną szlachty z trzech województw i ich stosunek do króla i jego polityki podczas trzech kolejnych sejmów (1688, 1688–1689, 1690). Badania dowodzą, że w omawianym czasie na sejmiku kijowskim przewagę miała opozycja, na pozostałych dwóch zjazdach dominowali zwolennicy dworu. Jednocześnie na wszystkich zjazdach toczyła się ostra walka polityczna, o czym świadczy zerwanie kilku sejmików. Z analizy zachowanych akt wynika, że bardzo aktywną politykę prowadziło we Włodzimierzu stronnictwo dworskie. Jego działania okazały się bardzo skuteczne. Opozycyjny sejmik kijowski przed sejmem 1690 r. został zerwany, a pozostałe dwa zgromadzenia wybrały na posłów stronników dworu i spisały korzystne dla króla punkty instrukcji. Po sejmie stronnictwu regalistycznemu udało się również zdominować relacyjny sejmik kijowski.

**Słowa kluczowe:** Jan III Sobieski, sejmik, sejm, województwo kijowskie, województwo braclawskie, województwo czernihowskie, egzulanci, Ukraina

#### ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Robert Kołodziej – PhD with ‘habilitation’, Assistant Professor at the Institute of History at the University of Wrocław. In his research, he focuses mainly on the history of parliamentarism and political system of the Polish and Lithuanian Commonwealth. In his publications, he also covered matters related to the Old Polish diplomacy and political culture. Furthermore, the study of the history of culture and mentality constitutes a distinct field of his research. An important area of his academic activity is also the editing of historical sources.

