

Robert Kołodziej

(University of Wrocław, Poland)

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







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

## The Kiev, Bratslav, Chernihiv Exiles and the Policy of John III Sobieski in the Years 1692–1695

*Egzulanci kijowscy, braclawscy i czernihowscy wobec polityki Jana III Sobieskiego w latach 1692–1695*

### ABSTRACT

The article discusses the political positions of Ukrainian's nobles from three dietines in exile, of counties (voivodships) of Kiev, Bratslav and Chernihiv between 1692 and 1695. These assemblies met together in Volodymyr-Volynskiy. Based on documents of the assemblies from pre-diet and after-diet one can analyze political views of nobles from three dietines and their attitude towards the king and his politics during three consecutive diets (1692–1693, 1693, 1695). In these times all three dietines were dominated by the royal party. In the instructions to deputies appear demands in line with the king's expectations, and among deputies one can find many supporters of the court. Only before the 1695's diet the opposition came to the force. He was able to dominate the Chernihiv's dietine, the Bratslav's dietine was interrupted, and disputes within court's party led to a duality (division) of Kiev's dietine. The crisis of royal party was temporary, because

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: 2019.10.16	ACCEPTED: 2020.01.14	PUBLISHED ONLINE: 2020.12.28	
WEBSITE OF THE JOURNAL: <a href="https://journals.umcs.pl/rh">https://journals.umcs.pl/rh</a>		EDITORIAL COMMITTEE E-mail: reshistorica@umcs.pl	

they dominated all tree dietines in 1695, and their decisions were in line with the court's expectations.

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

The last four years of the rule of John III Sobieski<sup>1</sup> were the time of deteriorating international situation and growing internal crisis of the Commonwealth. The problems of the state were noticeable in many areas. One of them was the increasing incapability of the armies of the Commonwealth to carry out effective military actions during the war with the Ottoman Empire. The last large-scale campaign was organized in 1691, e.g. thanks to the taxes imposed a year earlier by Sejm. The king himself took part in the attack on Moldavia, together with not only prince Jakub, but also the younger one, Aleksander. Although armies managed to capture a few Moldavian fortresses and leave Polish crews in them during the campaign, it surely was not enough, taking into consideration the ambitious plans of the monarch, who wanted to separate Crimea from Turkey completely<sup>2</sup>. During the subsequent years, Sobieski watched military actions closely and tried to coordinate them, but he did not fight himself and left the direct command to hetmans – Stanisław Jan Jabłonowski and Feliks Kazimierz Potocki. However, they were not as talented commanders as the king<sup>3</sup>. Their limited activity, consisting mostly in the attempts to block Kamianets and keeping the previously occupied land, resulted not only from their commanding skills. First of all, there was not enough money for the war. Moreover, the increasingly more decentralized system of tax collection and the disbursement of the collected money to the particular units of cavalry directly by the collectors at the particular lands had very negative influence on the size of the army<sup>4</sup>. Many soldiers travelled to poviats and lands, to which their units of cavalry were assigned, where they waited for months for the disbursement of the amounts due. Such

---

<sup>1</sup> The article constitutes the continuation of the text discussing the same issues in respect of the period: 1687–1691.

<sup>2</sup> One of the more important causes of the campaign being unsuccessful was the lack of the expected support of the imperial armies, see: P. Smolarek, *Kampania mołdawska Jana III roku 1691*, prepared for printing by Z. Hundert, M. Wagner, Oświęcim 2015, pp. 59–60.

<sup>3</sup> For the critical evaluation of the commanding skills of Jabłonowski, see: M. Wagner, *Stanisław Jabłonowski (1634–1702). Polityk i dowódca*, vol. 2, Siedlce 1997, p. 281.

<sup>4</sup> Domination of the particularistic tendencies in the fiscal system, see: M. Nycz, *Geneza reform skarbowych sejmu niemego. Studium z dziejów skarbowo-wojskowych z lat 1697–1717*, Oświęcim 2016, p. 102; R. Rybarski, *Pieniądz i skarż za Jana Kazimierza, Michała Korybuta i Jana III*, Oświęcim 2015, pp. 389–390.

a situation caused considerable decrease in the size of the army, the king himself estimated that the number of soldiers decreased by as many as one thousand<sup>5</sup>. There were also other causes of decreasing number of soldiers in units – diseases, desertions, or self-willed abandoning of cavalry units and regiments by soldiers seeking additional livelihood due to the lack of regular disbursements of soldier's pay. All of this resulted in the number of soldiers under control of the commanders being completely different compared to the computes fixed during Sejm; sometimes in the camp there were cavalry units with only a few horses<sup>6</sup>. In connection with such a difficult situation, we should not be surprised that the rare military successes<sup>7</sup> during the last years of the rule of Sobieski were overshadowed by the defeats and failures.

The unfavorable situation at the front had influence on the foreign policy. Decreasing probability of a military victory<sup>8</sup> motivated the court to seek other solutions, including separate peace, to which the representatives of Versailles were persistently trying to convince the court. Although in 1690, the Commonwealth for the second time distanced itself from France with respect to diplomacy, removing the French residents – Gravel and du Teil – from Warsaw, the operation was not so drastic as the one of the year 1683. Marquis de Bethune stayed in the country and, as brother-in-law of

<sup>5</sup> R. Kołodziej, *Funkcjonowanie systemu podatkowego Rzeczypospolitej i jego wpływ na wojnę z Turcją w czasach Jana III Sobieskiego*, in: *Pecunia nervus belli. Z dziejów dyplomacji i stosunków międzynarodowych w XV–XVIII wieku*, eds. M. Markiewicz, R. Skowron, F. Wolański, Katowice 2016, p. 251; one more problem, related to the fact that sometimes one unit had to send delegates to many voivodeships and lands, was pointed out by Z. Hundert, *Reparycja jednostek wojska koronnego według komisji lwowskiej w 1679 r.*, 'Przegląd Historyczno-Wojskowy' 2016, 18, 2–3, p. 23.

<sup>6</sup> Information about the condition of the army e.g. *Komput wojska JKM i RP w Brzeżanach spisany die 20 II 1693 r.*; some of the cavalry units consisted of between eleven and nineteen horses, while the armoured cavalry unit of the Crown chamberlain consisted of only 9 horses, Natsyyanal'ny Histarychny Arkhiv Byelarusi Minsk [hereinafter: NHABM], f. 695, inv. 1, ref. no. 55, sheets 111–111v.

<sup>7</sup> The most famous was intercepting in 1694, by hetman Jabłonowski, of zachara transported to Kamianets, see: M. Wagner, *Stanisław*, vol. 2, pp. 97–101; D. Kołodziejczyk, *Podole pod panowaniem tureckim. Ejalet kamieniecki 1672–1699*, Warszawa 1994, p. 125; *Diariusz opisujący bitwę pod Uściczkiem 6 X 1694 r.*, in: M. Wagner, *Źródła do dziejów wojny polsko-tureckiej w latach 1683–1699*, Oświęcim 2016, pp. 154–156; to celebrate the victory, there was even a commemorative medal minted, see: A. Czarniecka, *Nikt nie słucha mnie za życia... Jan III w walce z opozycyjną propagandą (1684–1696)*, Warszawa 2009, p. 61.

<sup>8</sup> In 1690, the Turks gained many military victories (e.g. they occupied Belgrad once again) that made it impossible for the Dutch and English mediation, which was planned back than, to be effective, see: K. Piwarski, *Sprawa pośrednictwa tatarskiego w wojnie polsko-tureckiej*, in: *Studia historica. W 35-lecie pracy naukowej Henryka Łowmiańskiego*, Warszawa 1958, p. 356.

Sobieski, he was treated as a representative of the royal family, while he de facto performed the function of a French resident in the Commonwealth. After he left to Stockholm in Spring 1692<sup>9</sup>, Vidame d'Esneval, envoy, came to the country. Vidame, after his death (15 February 1693), was replaced by another representative of Versailles, Melchior de Polignac, who later proved his high effectiveness and who persistently tried to change the foreign policy of Sobieski. Emperor Leopold I tried to counteract the French influences. In 1690, he agreed to the marriage of prince Jakub with Hedwig Elisabeth of Neuburg, the sister of the empress, which took place in March 1691. This operation, which ended the perennial search for a suitable candidate for wife of the prince, was to mitigate the outrage in Commonwealth caused by the 'Berlin affront'<sup>10</sup>. The marriage impeded the communication of the Polish court with Paris for a certain period, however, the relation with Vienna was not free from conflicts and frictions<sup>11</sup>. The court of Sobieski family, after the campaign of the year 1691, was aware of the huge difficulties the continuation of the war would pose due to the lack of money and this situation encouraged to consider prospective propositions of separate peace<sup>12</sup>. Such propositions were presented in mid-1692 in the Commonwealth by the Crimea diplomat, Derwish Gazi murza, a delegate of khan Safa Girej<sup>13</sup>. His propositions, in combination with the constant efforts of France, began to bring certain results. Especially queen Ludwika Maria supported the idea of change in diplomacy. The queen, in connection with the deteriorating health condition of her husband, decided to take active political steps, called by

---

<sup>9</sup> That mission was related to the matrimonial plans of Sobieski family and another project of alliance between the Commonwealth and Sweden and Denmark. During that mission, de Bethune died on 2 October 1692, see: O. Forst de Battaglia, *Jan Sobieski król Polski*, transl. K. Szyszkowska, introduction Z. Wójcik, Warszawa 1983, p. 348.

<sup>10</sup> Various matrimonial plans related to prince Jakub are discussed in detail by A. Skrzypietz, *Królewscy synowie – Jakub, Aleksander i Konstanty Sobiescy*, Katowice 2011, pp. 113–119, 143–147, 155–182.

<sup>11</sup> Vienna did not want accept the right of Poland to incorporate Moldavia for a long time and it did not accept them at all in respect of Valachia; moreover, Sobieski held a grudge due to not sufficient support during the campaign of 1691, as well as in connection with the stationing of imperial soldiers in Spisz domain.

<sup>12</sup> The peace between the emperor and Turkey was included also in plans of the countries actively operating at seas that is England and the Netherlands, proposing to mediate conflict, which would make it possible for the Habsburgs to quickly become involved in the war against France, see: K. Piwarski, *Sprawa*, pp. 356–357.

<sup>13</sup> His mission has been discussed in detail by K. Piwarski, *Sprawa*, p. 358; the propositions were quite promising, as they assumed that Poland regains control over the Ukraine, Podolia and Kamianets with intact fortifications.

historiographers the 'diplomacy of Marysieńka'<sup>14</sup>. These plans, in general, included closer cooperation with France and, at the same time, an attempt to sign a separate peace treaty under the conditions that would be as favorable as possible to Sobiescy family. According to Zbigniew Wójcik, the king accepted the operations of the queen and Kazimierz Piwarski suggested that he could have even inspired them and that he did not cease to control the foreign policy during his rule<sup>15</sup>. If that was actually the case, then it is worth underlining that he showed great reserve as regards the plans of his wife, probably because he was aware of the difficulties related to their implementation<sup>16</sup>. However, it does not mean that he did not hope for some positive result of the ongoing peace talks. In order to increase the chance of achieving it, as well as to make negotiations effective, the nobility should be convinced that peace treaty needs to be signed and rather wide support of the nobility should be ensured. The acceptance of the project by a broad group of citizens made it possible for the court to be flexible and to choose the most favorable political options.

In the internal policy in the years 1690–1692, a certain stabilisation was noticeable, due to the leaders of the opposition, the Lithuanian Sapieha family, being relatively loyal to the king<sup>17</sup>. However, it did not mean that they were not strengthening their position in Grand Duchy by expanding the group of their clients, taking control of subsequent dietines and the Lithuanian Tribunal<sup>18</sup>. According to the French diplomats, Sapiehowie

<sup>14</sup> For the detailed discussion of these operations, see: O. Forst de Bataglia, *op. cit.*, pp. 348–358; Z. Wójcik, *Jan Sobieski*, Warszawa 1983, pp. 472–476; M. Komarzyński, *Maria Kazimiera d'Arquien Sobieska królowa Polski 1641–1716*, Kraków 1983, pp. 134–142.

<sup>15</sup> Z. Wójcik, *op. cit.*, p. 472; K. Piwarski, *Sprawa*, p. 362; according to K. Piwarski, the king did not want to become openly involved in the projects the nobility considered suspicious and preferred delegating them to the queen.

<sup>16</sup> The caution of Sobieski resulted from the suspicion that the Tatar mediation constitutes only a sham operation. He could hold such a belief for instance because when in autumn 1692 Derwish Gazi was still in Poland, a Tatar attack and two-week siege of Soroki, the Moldavian fortress controlled by the armies of the Commonwealth, took place, see: K. Piwarski, *Sprawa*, p. 359.

<sup>17</sup> G. Sliesoriūnas, *Lietuvos Didžioji Kunigaikštystė vidaus karo išvakarėse: didikų grupuočių kova 1690–1697m.*, Vilnius 2000 pp. 111–114; it does not seem likely that the thesis of Kazimierz Piwarski that Sapieha family members caused the premature termination of Sejm in the years 1692–1693 was well-founded, see: K. Piwarski, *Sprawa*, p. 370.

<sup>18</sup> For the characteristics of Sapieha domination, see: A. Rachuba, *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; 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.

were becoming almost sovereign princes of Lithuania<sup>19</sup>. The political base developed at that time was used by them in the years 1693–1696, in the course of another serious conflict with the king. During the last four years of the rule of Sobieski, taking the initiative in the country by the opposition is noticeable. The opponents of the monarch were becoming more and more bold year by year and due to the determined actions they were winning subsequent allies, including, according to Kazimierz Sarnecki, companion of the king, even the king's courtiers<sup>20</sup>. In some sense, such a situation was a result of the worsening health condition of the king, but also of the reluctance to spend money to win followers, increasing proportionally to the age of the monarch. This tendency was widely noticed and the rumors circulating in the country openly accused Sobieski of avarice<sup>21</sup>. At the central level, an increasing passivity of the court supporters, sometimes even their helplessness, was noticeable. It was especially evident at the moments of crisis, such as the second Sejm of 1693. None of the senators present in Warsaw tried to control the situation related to the disease of the king, who did not attend the commencement of the first session<sup>22</sup>. The increasing weakness of the court supporters was possibly influenced by the promotion of the persons of doubtful intellectual prowess and low authority among the nobility. For sure, the then sealers, both the Crown sealers (Jerzy Denhoff and Karol Tarło) and the Lithuanian sealers (Dominik and Karol Radziwiłł) could not be described as politicians of exceptional abilities, skills and activeness. None of them was eminent and at the crisis moments they could not assume responsibility for the state.

It is worth examining how the increasing passivity of the court supporters influenced the local structures and whether the persons the members of the court trusted wanted and were able to carry out effective activity at the sessions. For the purposes of analysis, three exile dietines were selected, which took place in Włodzimierz (the dietines of the Kiev Voivodeship, Bratslav Voivodeship and Chernihiv Voivodeship). The court intensely and, what is more important, effectively interfered with

<sup>19</sup> Z. Wójcik, *op. cit.*, p. 477.

<sup>20</sup> K. Sarnecki, *Pamiętniki z czasów Jana III Sobieskiego. Dziennik i relacje z lat 1691–1696*, ed. J. Woliński, Wrocław 1958, p. 277.

<sup>21</sup> M. de Mongrillon, *Pamiętnik sekretarza ambasady francuskiej w Polsce pod koniec panowania Jana III oraz w okresie bezkrólestwa i wolnej elekcji po jego zgonie (1694–1698)*, transl. and ed. Ł. Częścik, Wrocław–Warszawa–Kraków–Gdańsk–Łódź 1982, pp. 26–27.

<sup>22</sup> The senators counted on primate Radziejowski coming to Warsaw, they were sending him letters in an almost desperate tone with requests for his arrival, see: R. Kołodziej, *Sejm z 22 grudnia 1693 r.*, 'Wieki Stare i Nowe' 2016, 10, pp. 63–64.



the sessions of those dietines in the years 1687–1691<sup>23</sup>. The basic research question is to what extent was the noticeable weakening of the supporters of the court evident at the local level, in a place, where the influence of the court, before the year 1692, seemed to be genuinely significant. As in the previous deliberations, concerning the years 1687–1691, the source material is, first of all, the dietine instructions and lauda, this time from the years: The comparison of their content with the expectations of the king and the attitude towards the slogans of the opposition during subsequent Sejm campaigns should provide the answer to the question about the influence of the supporters of the king at Włodzimierz sessions.

After the successfully completed Sejm session of 1690, due to the participation in the war, the king again put off the organisation of a subsequent Sejm. Finally, probably in order to make the impression on citizens that the law on the 2-year term had not been broken again, Sobieski decided that the first session of the new Sejm will commence on 31 December 1692<sup>24</sup>. The universals sent to Włodzimierz included information that the dietines will take place on 19 November 1692<sup>25</sup>.

Before the Sejm session, fierce political disputes took place mainly at the area of the Crown. This time the conflicts were related to two issues. First of them was the attack of Stanisław Świącicki, the bishop of Chełm, on Stanisław Jabłonowski, Great Crown Hetman. The bishop directly accused the hetman of plunder by the Crown armies in his domain, and distributed letters attacking the hetman. The attitude of Świącicki resulted in a fierce reaction of primate Michał Radziejowski, who sent a letter to reprimand the bishop<sup>26</sup>. It is not known, what role did the king play in

<sup>23</sup> R. Kołodziej, *Attitudes of the Kiev, Bratslav and Chernihiv Dietines in Exile Towards the Policy of John III Sobieski in the Period of 1687–1691*, 'Res Historica' 2020, 49, pp. 229–263.

<sup>24</sup> Bishop of Cracow, Jan Małachowski, advised the king to convene Sejm session already in 1692, see: R. Kołodziej, *Ostatni wolności naszej klejnot. Sejm Rzeczypospolitej za panowania Jana III Sobieskiego*, Poznań 2014, p. 73.

<sup>25</sup> The universals for the sessions of the dietines of the Wołyń Voivodeship, Bratslav Voivodeship, Chernihiv Voivodeship and Kiev Voivodeship, issued in Pomorzany, 3 October 1692, see: Tsentral'nyy Derzhavnyy Istorychnyy Arkhiv Ukrayiny Kyyv [hereinafter: TDIAUK], f. 28, inv. 1, ref. no. 137, sheets 1136v–1140, 1141–1143. For the content of the universal, see: *Akta sejmikowe województw poznańskiego i kaliskiego. Lata 1676–1695*, eds. M. Zwierzykowski, R. Kołodziej, A. Kamiński, Poznań 2018, pp. 523–524.

<sup>26</sup> Biblioteka Książąt Czartoryskich w Krakowie [hereinafter: BCz], ref. no. 183, pp. 481–485; R. Kołodziej, *Między sacrum i profanum. O politycznej roli biskupów w czasach Jana III Sobieskiego*, in: *Staropolski ogląd świata. Kultura staropolska – poszukiwanie sacrum odnajdywanie profanum*, eds. B. Rok, F. Wolański, Toruń 2013, p. 293; the dispute of Świącicki with Jabłonowski commenced already in 1691, when during the April Senate council session an argument between them took place, see: A. Kamiński, *Polska a Brandenburgia-Prusy w drugiej połowie XVII wieku. Dzieje polityczne*, Poznań 2002, p. 338.

that incident, but he probably did not know about it at the moment of its occurrence. For sure, bishop Świącicki was a supporter of the monarch. However, during the discussed period, unusually good relations with the court were maintained by both the primate Michał Radziejowski and the hetman Jabłonowski, both of whom the king and the queen tried to prevent from joining the opposition<sup>27</sup>. For this reason, we could assume that the actions of Świącicki were not agreed upon with the court and the king could not have been pleased with them. Probably, the most convenient thing to do would be to hush up the conflict, which however (due to both, resentful sides: the hetman and the Chełm bishop) became widely known and was discussed at the sessions of dietines<sup>28</sup>. The second issue, intensely debated on during the sessions of dietines, was directly related to the attack of the Crown opposition on the king. Jan Chryzostom Pieniążek presented himself as its leader by distributing a long letter at the dietines that preceded the Sejm<sup>29</sup>. It included a series of accusations against the court, which the Sieradz voivode, with the imaginativeness characteristic to him, presented as the abuses of power of the king. Firstly, he included in the list the case of breaking the law on the 2-year term of the Sejm. He attacked also the confidant of the king, Stanisław Antoni Szczuka, asking why the documents issued by the Crown Chancellery are signed not by the regent of the chancellery, but by the Crown referendary<sup>30</sup>. He tried to stir up the public opinion with the accusations against the factor of the king, Jew, Jakub Becal, lessee of Crown customs and against the Jews employed by him that supposedly were offending nobility at customs houses. Finally, Pieniążek bluntly reviewed the dietines' instruction of the king, arguing that peace treaty may only be signed 'bez naruszenia koligacyi'<sup>31</sup>. He criticized the foreign policy of the monarch, requesting, like a populist, that the entire public opinion is informed about the content of the signed international treaties<sup>32</sup>. Kazimierz Opaliński, the Chełmno bishop who

<sup>27</sup> Before the 1692–1693 Sejm, Radziejowski was informing the monarch about the works he performed for him during Łęczyca dietine, see: *Akta*, pp. 534–535; the political attitude of the great hetman, see: M. Wagner, *Stanisław*, pp. 79–81.

<sup>28</sup> 'Z łęczyckiego, z rawskiego, z dobrzyńskiego stanęły artykuły ciężkie na biskupa' ['Łęczyckie, rawskie and dobrzyńskie made serious accusations against the bishop']. See: *Akta*, p. 534.

<sup>29</sup> *Akta Sejmikowe Województwa Krakowskiego*, vol. 5, ed. A. Przyboś, Wrocław–Warszawa–Kraków–Gdańsk–Łódź 1984, pp. 117–120; *Akta*, pp. 528–533.

<sup>30</sup> Stanisław Antonii Szczuka, actually, held three offices, being Crown Chancellery regent, king chancellery regent and Crown referendary.

<sup>31</sup> 'without adversely affecting the alliances'.

<sup>32</sup> According to Otton Forst de Battaglia, the case of Becal was introduced by Sapieha family, whose Jewish factor was supposedly badly treated by the banker of the king.



was resentful towards the king, joined the attack of Pieniążek, by accusing the monarch, in a letter addressed to him, of defending Becal. The extent of discontent of Sobieski caused by the letter is illustrated by his decision not to even answer it himself, but to delegate his confidant, Stanisław Szczuka, Crown referendary, to do it instead of him<sup>33</sup>. The activities carried out by both senators prove fierce dispute of the Crown opposition with the court and the attempt to discredit its policy in the eyes of nobility.

Legation for dietines<sup>34</sup> concerned almost in its entirety the financial situation the state was in. The king complained that despite the previous Sejm, after almost half of year, was successfully completed, the taxes imposed during it had still not been paid by the lands and the army had not been supported with the money. He complained about terminating of dietines prematurely and the common practice of limiting them, which led to postponing the decisions concerning taxes and had very negative influence on undertaking of military actions. Although the king did not propose specific solutions in respect of tax issues, according to Adam Kaźmierczyk, he tried, in an informal way, include in the agenda of the dietines of nobility the issues of fiscal reforms<sup>35</sup>. On one hand, Sobieski spoke of the 'desired peace', on the other, in a rather indirect way, he implied that general pacification, taking into consideration all members of the coalition, will not be easy. In addition to the issues related to the war, the instruction included also monetary issues and the issues important from the point of view of *ius patronatus* monarch prerogatives, that is, preservation of the right to appointment of some Church posts<sup>36</sup>.

The Kiev session took place uninterrupted, within the time limit provided for by the law. At the beginning of the instruction for the deputies, nobility included a long text expressing acknowledgement of the king, not only in connection with the successful Moldavian campaign, but also due to spending of large sums on the army by the king, who paid with his own money. Princes Jakub and Aleksander, were also acknowledged for the

---

Unfortunately, the author did not provide the source of that information, therefore it is hard to verify, see: O. Forst de Battaglia, *op. cit.*, p. 352; for more information on that topic, see: A. Kaźmierczyk, *Sprawa Jakuba Becala, królewskiego faktora Jana III Sobieskiego w końcu XVII wieku*, 'Studia Historyczne' 1992, 35, pp. 155–171.

<sup>33</sup> Biblioteka Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego [hereinafter: BUW], ref. no. 113, sheets 83v–84.

<sup>34</sup> *Akta*, pp. 525–528.

<sup>35</sup> A. Kaźmierczyk, *Dworski projekt reform na sejmie grodzieńskim 1692–1693*, in: *Studia i materiały z czasów Jana III Sobieskiego*, ed. K. Matwijowski, 'Acta Universitatis Wratislaviensis' 1992, Historia 102, pp. 63–73.

<sup>36</sup> In connection with this issue, a trusted diplomat of the king, Father Vota, was sent to Rome, see: BUW, ref. no. 113, sheets 68–73.

personal participation in the last campaign<sup>37</sup>. The inclusion of an item, in accordance with which foreign diplomats should stay only at the king's court, constituted unquestionable success of the court. It was supposed to make carrying out of activities against the king, at the area of the country, impossible<sup>38</sup>. Similarly, the court must have been very pleased with the item, in which the nobility requested senators to refrain from private rallies and sending delegates and correspondence abroad *ad externos principes*<sup>39</sup>. Finally, the king has been granted a permission for the separate peace with Porta and nobility required that '*quibuscunque conditionibus, zwłaszcza kiedy i od nieprzyjaciela tollerabiles* proponowany, pokój zawarty i skończony był'<sup>40</sup>. A long fragment was dedicated by the nobility to the robberies by the army, it contained the order for the deputies to exert pressure on both the Crown hetmans and the Lithuanian hetmans<sup>41</sup>. The instruction included also a provision against the practice of delegating the obligation of collecting Crown duties to the administration. The attack on the factor of the king, Jakub Becal, was, however, very veiled, as his surname was not mentioned<sup>42</sup>. It seems that the supporters of the king, active during the session, could not completely ignore the outrage of nobility caused by a very emotional letter of Jan Pieniążek, widely distributed in the country. Probably for that reason, they agreed on inclusion of adequate provision, trying, however, to significantly reduce its influence. Analysing the entire instruction, we can notice that the Kiev dietine definitely supported the ideas of the king.

Bratslav dietine took place on the date set in the universal (19 November 1692) as well. In respect of the issue that was the most important to the king, the nobility supported signing the peace treaty with Porta<sup>43</sup>. The citizens of Bratslav, similarly to the nobility of Kiev Voivodeship, included in the instruction the provisions concerning two issues important to the king – residing of foreign diplomats only at the king's court and prohibiting senators not only to have private contacts abroad, but also to have informal relations in the country<sup>44</sup>. The postulate of the monarch related

<sup>37</sup> TDIAUK, f. 28, inv. 1, ref. no. 137, sheets 1156v–1157v.

<sup>38</sup> *Ibidem*, sheet 1164; thanks to the endeavours of the court, a large number of Crown dietines adopted similar item, which worried the Brandenburg resident, Johann Dietrich von Hoverbeck, see: A. Kamieński, *op. cit.*, p. 349.

<sup>39</sup> TDIAUK, f. 28, inv. 1, ref. no. 137, sheets 1164–1164v.

<sup>40</sup> '*quibuscunque conditionibus, especially when also the enemy proposes tollerabiles, the peace treaty is signed and implemented*'. *Ibidem*, sheet 1165.

<sup>41</sup> *Ibidem*, sheets 1160–1161v.

<sup>42</sup> *Ibidem*, sheet 1163.

<sup>43</sup> *Ibidem*, sheet 1171.

<sup>44</sup> *Ibidem*, sheet 1172v.

to the appointment of Church posts was accepted as well<sup>45</sup>. In respect of other items of the king's instruction, the deputies were free to make their own choices and they were ordered to vote in a way that ensures public agreement<sup>46</sup>. Dietine referred to the dispute between Stanisław Święcicki and Stanisław Jan Jabłonowski. The nobility categorically took the side of hetman, accusing the bishop of blocking of *bonum publicum*<sup>47</sup>. The instruction included also a provision constituting the reflection of the attack of opposition on the customs administration before the Sejm. Like in the case of Kiev dietine, the item had rather moderate wording and the surname of Becal was not mentioned. The deputies were only to remind that Crown customs leases should not be offered to 'Jews, Greeks, Armenians, but *plus offerentia*'<sup>48</sup>. So, also in the case of Bratslav Voivodeship, we can say that the supporters of the king definitely won.

The third dietine, holding its session in Włodzimierz, a Chernihiv Voivodeship dietine, was terminated prematurely. However, the local nobility, like before the Sejm of 1690<sup>49</sup>, easily procured a new universal, on the basis of which a repeated session took place on 1 December 1692<sup>50</sup>. According to the content of the instruction, the dietine was one more time dominated by the supporters of the king, who imposed the narration of the court on the participants. The deputy instruction begins with a long text expressing the acknowledgement of the king, as well as of the queen. Prince Jakub, whose military achievements 'makes the name of Poland scare the pagans' and prince Aleksander, 'Polish Achilles', were acknowledge as well<sup>51</sup>. The nobility decidedly supported the idea of signing a peace treaty with Porta<sup>52</sup>. The nobility was clearly against the attempts of Rome and some clergymen, questioning *ius patronatus* of the Polish king. As regards nuncios, the nobility categorically postulated that they 'in accordance with the law on the foreign delegates, came back promptly to Rome after Sejm' and that those who try to question the rights of the Polish king during Sejm are deprived of *voce activa* and punished

<sup>45</sup> *Ibidem*.

<sup>46</sup> *Ibidem*, sheet 1171v.

<sup>47</sup> *Ibidem*, sheet 1173v.

<sup>48</sup> *Ibidem*, sheets 1172, 1173.

<sup>49</sup> After the premature termination of dietine of 5 December 1689 that preceded Sejm, the repeated session took place already on 17 December 1689, see: R. Kołodziej, *Attitudes*.

<sup>50</sup> TDIAUK, f. 28, inv. 1, ref. no. 137, sheets 1178v–1179v.

<sup>51</sup> *Ibidem*, sheets 1190v–1192.

<sup>52</sup> *Ibidem*, sheet 1192v; however, the instruction contained the information that the idea of signing of peace treaty is unequivocally supported by all members of the coalition, which was not true.

with infamy<sup>53</sup>. The postulates concerning residing of the foreign envoys at the court and the prohibition to send private delegations abroad by senators were repeated<sup>54</sup>. Like in the case of the nobility of the Kiev and Bratslav Voivodeships, the Chernihiv instruction included also an item concerning lease of Crown customs by Jews<sup>55</sup>, it did not, however, change the document message, which communicated express support of the king. Therefore, we should notice that all three Włodzimierz dietines, preceding the Sejm commencing on 31 December 1692, had adopted postulates in accordance with the king's intentions. The instructions did not cover the issues related to tax reforms, but it should not be surprising, because exiled nobility from the Bratslav Voivodeship and Chernihiv Voivodeship was completely exempted from taxes and Kiev Voivodeship nobility was exempt from many taxes<sup>56</sup>. Although in each instruction, we can find complains related to the lease of customs by Jews, a personal attack on Jakub Becal is included in the instruction as well. The inclusion of the provisions itself is easy to explain by a great outrage of the nobility, which could not have been ignored. On the other hand, the supporters of the king managed to introduce in the instruction provisions that had been worded in a moderate manner, in order not to make the king resentful.

The Sejm that took place in the years 1692–1693 was not completed successfully, it was prematurely terminated after six weeks by Łęczyca deputies<sup>57</sup>. On the basis of the decision<sup>58</sup> of senate council that followed Sejm, the king convened dietine, which was to consider the way to financially support the army and continue war in connection with Sejm not having been completed successfully. Unfortunately, there are no known traces of universals or decisions of the relational dietines held in Włodzimierz<sup>59</sup>.

The international situation of the Commonwealth was changing during the year 1693<sup>60</sup>. The ongoing diplomatic talks concerning the peace

<sup>53</sup> *Ibidem*, sheets 1193–1193v.

<sup>54</sup> *Ibidem*, sheets 1194v, 1195v.

<sup>55</sup> *Ibidem*, sheet 1195; also in this instruction Jakub Becal was not mentioned by name.

<sup>56</sup> Here, it is also worth noticing, that the tax issues were deemed important only by Lublin nobility, which was led during the sessions by the local starost, one of the closest confidants of the king, Stanisław Antonii Szczuka, see: A. Kaźmierczyk, *Dworski*, p. 68.

<sup>57</sup> For the discussion of the Sejm, see: A. Kaźmierczyk, *Sejm grodzieński 31 grudnia 1692–11 lutego 1693 r.*, 'Studia Historyczne' 1990, 33, pp. 21–36.

<sup>58</sup> A. Kaźmierczyk, *Pomiędzy dwoma sejmami w 1693 r.*, 'Śląski Kwartalnik Historyczny Sobótka' 1992, 47, pp. 217–219.

<sup>59</sup> The universal of the king, convening the dietines, was issued in Grodno, on 26 February 1693, the dietines were convened on 25 May 1693, see: *Akta*, pp. 536–537.

<sup>60</sup> Detailed analysis of international situation, see: A. Kaźmierczyk, *Pomiędzy*, pp. 217–222.

with Porta, were, in general, unsuccessful, despite their continuation and sending Stanisław Rzewuski, Chełm starost, to Crimea. The new French envoy, Melchior de Polignac, was exerting pressure on the queen, still trying to make Commonwealth discontinue the war, however, it seems that the king was increasingly sceptical as regards such a possibility. The discord between the spouses was noticeable, for instance, in respect of the decision to quickly convene another Sejm. Despite the fact that Polignac and Maria Kazimiera believed that it may constitute an obstacle in the process of signing of separate peace treaty<sup>61</sup>, the King decided to commence a Sejm expedition, most probably counting on imposing of taxes necessary for the payment to the army to which the state owed money to. Before the Sejm, however, there took place the events that were to influence the internal situation of the country for the next several years. Konstanty Brzostowski, the Vilnius bishop, accused Kazimierz Sapieha of situating the Lithuanian armies in the Church domain and wanted to bring him before the Sejm court for this<sup>62</sup>. Pasquinades in a form of subpoena for Sapieha were distributed in the country<sup>63</sup>. Without a doubt, the actions of the bishop were inspired by the court, trying to counteract the growing domination of Sapieha family in the Grand Duchy<sup>64</sup>. I will not assess whether the accusations were reasonable, however, I should mention that the row was widely discussed in the entire country, deeply dividing the nobility. Moreover, Kazimierz Sapieha was defended by hetmans that could not be accused of having positive attitude towards the voivode of Vilnius<sup>65</sup>.

In such a tense internal situation, the king, urgently needing the money from taxes to finance the army, decided to convene another Sejm, the first session of which was to commence on 22 December 1693. Traditionally, dietines preceding Sejm were to take place before the session, they were

<sup>61</sup> It was the opinion of Brandenburg resident, Johann Dietrich von Hoverbeck, see: A. Kaźmierczyk, *Pomiędzy*, p. 221.

<sup>62</sup> The internal situation of the Commonwealth has been characterised in the following works: A. Kaźmierczyk, *Pomiędzy*, pp. 217–222; G. Sliesoriūnas, *Lietuvos*, pp. 129–138; M. Sawicki, *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. Górczyński, M. Nagielski, Warszawa 2014; R. Kołodziej, *Sejm*, pp. 49–58.

<sup>63</sup> R. Kołodziej, *Sejm*, pp. 54–55.

<sup>64</sup> As regards the intentions of the court in this case, already K. Piwarski, *Brzostowski Konstanty Kazimierz*, in: *Polski Słownik Biograficzny*, vol. 3, no. 1, Kraków 1937, p. 51. did not have any doubts.

<sup>65</sup> The Crown hetmans, Stanisław Jabłonowski and Feliks Potocki and Lithuanian field hetman, Józef Słuszka, have even sent a letter to the pope, defending Sapieha, see: K. Sarnecki, *op. cit.*, p. 276, annotation 102.

planned, in accordance with the universals, for 10 November 1693<sup>66</sup>. In a legation preceding Sejm<sup>67</sup>, Sobieski once again underlined the issue of the need for financing of the current pay for the soldiers, but also the question of payment of the debts the state owed the army that accrued over many years. He postulated that the infantry units consisting of royal peasants are restored to the normal condition. The instruction contained more extensive, compared to the previous one, fragment concerning the international situation and reminding about the ongoing talks with the delegates of khan<sup>68</sup> and about sending to Crimea, with a diplomatic mission, of Stanisław Mateusz Rzewuski, Chełm starost. He also assured that both the emperor and Venice are informed about the peace talks on ongoing basis and that all negotiations are discussed during senate council sessions. These explanations were probably included in order to prevent prospective criticism of the foreign policy of the court by the opposition and were to convince the nobility of the legality of all actions of the king. The last item of the instruction included the repetition of information on the issue of preservation of the right of patronage as king's prerogative.

Again, two dietines, which took place in Włodzimierz, Kiev dietine and Bratslav dietine, were completed successfully within the time limit provided for in the universal. The first one supported the idea of signing a peace treaty, regardless of the stance of the members of the coalition, however, the deputies required the participation of its representative in the negotiations. However, the nobility did not consent for the peace treaty providing for the territorial losses of the Commonwealth<sup>69</sup>. Although the instruction did not contain a mention of the conflict of Sapieha and Brzostowski, but the nobility included in it an provision that constituted a fierce criticism of the Lithuanian army and directly of hetman Sapieha for 'harms, oppressions, violence and crimes'<sup>70</sup>, which was beneficial to the court. The Kiev deputies were recommended to, before the speaker is selected, force the hetman to guarantee that all officers of the Lithuanian armies cover the costs borne due to the damage caused<sup>71</sup>. The instruction

---

<sup>66</sup> The universals of the king, related to three dietines holding sessions in Włodzimierz were issued in Żółkiew, on 1 October 1693, see: TDIAUK, f. 28, inv. 1, ref. no. 138, sheets 1043–1046v; for the content of the universal, see: *Akta*, pp. 548–549.

<sup>67</sup> *Akta*, pp. 550–552.

<sup>68</sup> In autumn 1693, one more emissary of Crimea came to the court of Sobieski; for the entire negotiations, see: K. Piwarski, *Sprawa*, pp. 351–372.

<sup>69</sup> CDIAUK, f. 28, ref. no. 138, sheets 1069, 1071v; for print see: *Архив Юго-Западной России*, part 2, vol. 2, Киев 1888, p. 512.

<sup>70</sup> 'krzywdy, opresyje, wiolencyje i kryminały'.

<sup>71</sup> CDIAUK, f. 28, ref. no. 138, sheets 1070v–1071v; the Kiev Voivodship nobility even called specific officers by name and listed the examples of the offences they have committed.



included also tax postulates, resulting from the discussion that took place during the Grodno Sejm of the years 1692–1693<sup>72</sup>. In accordance with the intent of the court, the nobility of the Kiev Voivodeship criticized the current system of taxes collection, arguing against the progressing decentralisation in respect of fiscal issues and postulating the transfer of the obligation of making the tax decisions and the obligation of appointing of tax collectors to the Crown treasury<sup>73</sup>. The nobility decided also that it will independently impose a two-year tenth shilling tax, in order to acquire financial resources for the financing of dietine deputations and other forms of activity of citizens, requiring financial expenses<sup>74</sup>.

The Bratslav nobility passed an exceptionally laconic instruction. Analogically to the Kiev Voivodeship nobility, it gave consent for the peace treaties, requiring presence of its representative during the prospective talks<sup>75</sup>. As regards other issues related to the functioning of the state, it ordered the deputies to comply with the instruction issued for the previous Sejm. Most of the items concerned local or private issues or issues related to the functioning of the Crown Tribunal. On the other hand, no item concerned in any way the conflict taking place in Lithuania.

The first Chernihiv dietine, like in the previous years, was terminated prematurely, however, the subsequent one was successfully completed. It is interesting, that the repeated dietine took place on 22 December 1693, that is, on the day of Sejm inauguration, which turned out to be also the only day on which a session was held<sup>76</sup>. The nobility, like its neighbors from Włodzimierz, demanded signing of peace treaty and wanted its representative to be present during the negotiations<sup>77</sup>. Like the nobility of the Kiev Voivodeship, they demanded covering the damage caused by the Lithuanian army. For this reason, the deputies were to require from Benedykt Sapieha, Lithuanian treasurer, the adequate compensation the amount of which was to be specified during a session of the Vilnius commission<sup>78</sup>. In the instruction of the dietine, like in the case of the instructions issued by the two previous dietines, there was no mention of the conflict taking place in Lithuania.

<sup>72</sup> A. Kaźmierczyk, *Dworski*, pp. 63–73.

<sup>73</sup> CDIAUK, f. 28, ref. no. 138, sheet 1072; due to this postulate we can assume that the court intended, during the Warsaw Sejm of 1693, to once again include in the agenda the reform of the tax system of the Commonwealth.

<sup>74</sup> *Ibidem*, sheets 1074–1078.

<sup>75</sup> *Ibidem*, sheet 1058.

<sup>76</sup> *Ibidem*, sheets 1112v–1113v.

<sup>77</sup> *Ibidem*, sheet 1114; for print see: *Apxus*, part 2, vol. 2, p. 523.

<sup>78</sup> The nobility of the Chernihiv Voivodeship mentioned the amount of 110 thousand zlotys, see: TDIAUK, f. 28, inv. 1, ref. no. 138, sheet 1116v.

The king could have been pleased with the instructions passed in Włodzimierz. The nobility authorized him to continue the peace negotiations. At the same time, in respect of internal issues, despite the fact that there was not direct mention of the dispute in the Grand Duchy, an indirect support has been provided to Bishop Brzostowski. I believe we should interpret that way the list of demands to the Lithuanian hetman and his brother, the treasurer. The items of the instruction constituted an important argument in the Sejm debate and made it possible for the deputies to include in the agenda adequate issues, at the same time being a perfect alibi, defending against the prospective accusations of partiality.

The Warsaw Sejm of 22 December 1693 were terminated after only one day. Due to disease, the king did not manage to arrive from Żółkiew to Warsaw and a group of Lithuanian opposition senators and deputies did not allow to postpone the Sejm. Moreover, the Lithuanian parliamentarians organized the next a session, during which they created a universal, in which they objected to the plans of limiting Sejm, demanded disregarding the archive script of Sejm 1690 that gave the king the right to negotiate peace treaty and defended the hetman against unlawful – according to them – attacks of the bishop Brzostowski<sup>79</sup>. The king eventually talked to the members of the delegation, however, his response was very cold. He also did not decide to convene relational dietines and only explained in the universal, sent to the particular administration units, the reasons for the Sejm sessions not taking place<sup>80</sup>. That way, Sejm of 1693 turned out to be the only Sejm during the rule of Sobieski that was not followed by relational dietines.

The attempts to mitigate the internal conflict in the Commonwealth lasted the entire year 1694, however, they were not successful. In the Grand Duchy, the dispute became even more severe, after bishop Brzostowski had anathematized hetman Sapieha<sup>81</sup>. It did not impress the hetman much, all the more so since his Crown ally, the primate Michał Radziejowski, suspended the anathema against the opinion of nuncio Santa Croce<sup>82</sup>. The international situation of the country did not change, except for the probability of signing of separate peace treaty, which in reality has never

---

<sup>79</sup> For the discussion of the Sejm, see: R. Kołodziej, *Sejm*, pp. 47–76; for the analysis of the Lithuanian Sejm postulates, see: G. Sliesoriūnas, *Problem separatyzmu Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego w końcu XVII wieku*, in: *Rzeczpospolita wielu narodów i jej tradycje*, eds. A. K. Link-Lenczowski, M. Markiewicz, Kraków 1999, pp. 85–94.

<sup>80</sup> CDIAUK, f. 28, ref. no. 139, sheets 605v–608; the content of the universal has been published in: *Akta*, pp. 582–583.

<sup>81</sup> G. Sliesoriūnas, *Lietuvas*, pp. 147–156.

<sup>82</sup> Z. Wójcik, *op. cit.*, pp. 486–487.

been high, decreasing even more. The marriage of the only daughter of Sobieski family, Teresa Kunegunda, with Bavarian elector, Maksymilian Emanuel Wittelsbach<sup>83</sup>, did not change the situation of the Commonwealth and did not end its relation with the Habsburgs. Therefore, the only option was to continue the war operations, which in 1694 resulted even in a success – winning a battle with a large group of Tatar soldiers in Pokuttya and taking control over a transport of zachara heading to Kamianets<sup>84</sup>. However, the financial situation of the army was dire and required prompt imposition and collection of taxes and only Sejm could carry out these activities. Eventually, the king planned the Sejm session for 12 January 1695. The universals preceding the Sejm provided for that the dietines in Włodzimierz will take place on 1 December 1694<sup>85</sup>. At that time, everyone was writing texts attacking their political opponents and, at many dietine sessions<sup>86</sup>, sabers replaced pens<sup>87</sup>. The Lithuanian dietines have been, in the vast majority, taken over by the partisans of Sapieha family and the supporters of the court suffered a total defeat. The king could only count on winning support of Crown dietines, however, in Crown as well Sapieha family was carrying out propaganda activities, and the great Lithuanian hetman was sending letters to the recipients across the entire country<sup>88</sup>. In the legation preceding the Sejm<sup>89</sup>, the king referred to the previous Sejm, which ended after one day of proceedings. He was explaining his intents once again and openly accusing the opposition that it showed ‘who did not need the Sejm’. He discussed the international situation, underlining the small probability of signing the peace treaty quickly, he also indicated the ineffectiveness of the negotiations with the khan delegates to date.

<sup>83</sup> The efforts related to the marriage has been described in detail by M. Komaszyński, *Teresa Kunegunda Sobieska*, Warszawa 1982, pp. 19–32.

<sup>84</sup> O. Forst de Battaglia, *op. cit.*, p. 359, see annotation 7.

<sup>85</sup> See: TDIAUK, f. 28, inv. 1, ref. no. 139, sheets 892–897; for the content of the universal, see: *Akta*, pp. 588–589.

<sup>86</sup> Both Konstanty Brzostowski and Kazimierz Sapieha sent their letters to the Lithuanian dietines, see: BCz, ref. no. 184, pp. 543–544, 605–607; Hetman Sapieha used also his friends and clients, ordering them to, during Lithuanian dietines, promote his items, see: *ibidem*, pp. 573–575; the campaign preceding the Sejm in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania was discussed by: G. Sliesoriūnas, *Lietuvos*, pp. 156–160.

<sup>87</sup> For the presentation of events of Samogitia dietine, see: Archiwum Główne Akt Dawnych, Archiwum Radziwiłłów dział II, ref. no. 1801, pp. 1–3; during dietine in Rosienie, riots took place already before the Sejm of 1693, see: G. Sliesoriūnas, *Iš Žemaitijos seimelių istorijos: 1693 m. lapkričio 10 d. Žemaitijos seimelis*, in: *Žemaičių praeitis*, vol. 8, Vilnius, 1998, pp. 29–33.

<sup>88</sup> The scale of involvement of hetman Sapieha is confirmed by sending of his letters even to the individual Mazovian dietines, see: NHABM, f. 695, inv. 1, ref. no. 223, sheets 1–2.

<sup>89</sup> *Akta*, pp. 592–596.

Large part of the legation was dedicated to the fiscal and tax problems and the difficulties of carrying out war operations without money. He also drew attention to the severity of the problem of premature terminations of dietines, which made it impossible to efficiently collect taxes and spend money from taxes. In most of the items the monarch referred to the previous instructions, as he did not know 'what new elements was he supposed to add'. As we can see, the legation did not include any references to the situation in Lithuania. However, it is beyond any doubt that it was very important to the king. Therefore, possibly, the information on this issue was to be added to the agenda of dietines' sessions by the 'partisans' of the king, in order to adequately change the attitude of the nobility to the dispute between the bishop, supported by the king, and the Sapieha family. In the entire country, the issue stirred intense discussions and the climate of aggressive, political debate influenced the course of dietines in Włodzimierz. Probably due to the great mobilisation of the opposition, this time it was very hard for the supporters of the king to effectively control the sessions, the atmosphere of which must have been very tense.

Bratslav dietine was terminated prematurely and the register books do not include information on neither another king's universal, nor any traces of repeated dietine. The first Chernihiv dietine was prematurely terminated as well, but the citizens of that voivodeship procured a second universal. Probably, the king issued it, hoping that, like in the previous years, repeated dietine will be dominated by its supporters. However, the hopes of the monarch proved to be vain. The repeated Chernihiv dietine, which took place on 18 December 1694<sup>90</sup>, in a laconic instruction referred to, first of all, the complaint of Kazimierz Sapieha, sent to the association, decidedly taking the side of the hetman. The nobility believed that he should be provided with adequate compensation, suffering no dishonor. It also expressed the hope that the conflict in Lithuania would not impede the sessions of Sejm<sup>91</sup>. The rest of the documents included only local issues and private postulates. It seems interesting that dietine, which has been controlled by the supporters of the king so far, was so effectively dominated by the opposition. We cannot rule out that the attitude of the local nobility was affected by the opinion and activities of the Crown hetmans that perceived the attack on Sapieha as potential threat to themselves and defended their Lithuanian colleague.

During Kiev dietine, a bizarre situation happened. The dietine took place in accordance with the universal of 1 December 1694. Dietine

---

<sup>90</sup> TDIAUK, f. 28, inv. 1, ref. no. 139, sheets 927–927v.

<sup>91</sup> *Ibidem*, sheet 929.

selected deputies and the instruction for them was created. However, some members of the nobility did not accept the legality of the dietine and asked the king for another universal, which they eventually received<sup>92</sup>. In accordance with the universal, the Kiev dietine took place on 11 January 1695, chose new deputies and created a new instruction for them. Both instructions have been entered into the register books of Włodzimierz. However, we do not know if both groups of deputies came for Sejm to Warsaw.

The first instruction ordered the deputies to thank the king and the entire 'family of His Majesty'. They were also to express regret in connection with the previous Sejm not being completed successfully<sup>93</sup>. The instruction included many complaints on the army robberies, including those of the Lithuanian army. However, the nobility referred to the letter sent to dietines by Kazimierz Sapieha. It was careful and did not support any side of the conflict, recommending the deputies to, together with others, mitigate the situation<sup>94</sup>. As regards other issues related to the functioning of the state, the deputies were to refer to the previous instructions. Dietine decided also to send delegates to hetman Jabłonowski in order to discuss the Crown armies robberies<sup>95</sup>. The second instruction, passed a few weeks later, was exceptionally short, concerned only private issues and ordered the deputies to apply the past instructions in respect of the issues related to the functioning of the state<sup>96</sup>. There were no references to the letter of Kazimierz Sapieha. The content of both instructions indicates that the supporters of the king were still dominating the Kiev dietine. The reasons for the quite original 'division' of the dietine were probably the conflicts in the king's supporters group. The issuance of another universal by the king should not surprise us, if we look at the list of the deputies selected during the repeated dietine. It included king's confidants – Dymitr Żabokrzycki, Wilkomierz deputy cup-bearer and Stanisław Rzewuski, Chełm starost.

The course and effects of three exile dietines show that the supporters of the king managed to maintain its influences only at the dietine of Kiev Voivodeship. Compared to few previous campaigns, it was a step back and the attitude of the Chernihiv dietine constituted for sure a significant failure of the court, as that dietine was usually supporting the king in the past. If we add to it the quarrels of the supporters of the king during Kiev

<sup>92</sup> TDIAUK, f. 28, inv. 1, ref. no. 140, sheets 404v–405.

<sup>93</sup> TDIAUK, f. 28, inv. 1, ref. no. 139, sheet 905v.

<sup>94</sup> *Ibidem*, sheets 907–907v.

<sup>95</sup> *Ibidem*, sheet 911v. The selected deputies were: Jan from Szumsk, Woronicz – son of Kiev chamberlain, and Jędrzej Wojnarowski – son of Kiev judge of nobility court.

<sup>96</sup> TDIAUK, f. 28, inv. 1, ref. no. 140, sheet 414.

dietine, we can say that the results of dietines of Włodzimierz were surely disappointing for the court.

The Sejm of 1695 was not completed successfully. During the Sejm, disgraceful quarrels of deputies took place, concerning who is to commence the first session. Of course, the main cause of the disputes was the conflict in the Great Duchy of Lithuania<sup>97</sup>. The attempts to reconcile the Lithuanian hetman and the Vilnius bishop ended in a fiasco, which made successful completion of the Sejm impossible. During the senate council<sup>98</sup> following the Sejm, a decision on convening of the relational dietines was made. The king asked nobility in the universals about the steps he should take in connection with the premature termination of the third, subsequent Sejm and a growing crisis of state's political system. The citizens gathered at dietines were to communicate with the monarch by sending to him a delegation answering to the question, whether he should convene another Sejm or 'horse Sejm' or organise mass mobilisation. Thanks to the research of Andrzej Rachuba, we know the attitudes of Lithuanian dietines, the large majority of which took a stance of supporters of Sapieha family<sup>99</sup>. The analysis of attitudes of all Crown dietines has still not been carried out. The below remarks, concerning three exile dietines, may be helpful while carrying out future research on this topic.

Three relational dietines were planned to take place in Włodzimierz on 26 May 1695<sup>100</sup>. All took place at the planned date. This time Bratslav dietine was completed successfully. The nobility of that voivodeship assured in laudum that it will fight with any enemy to defend the king's majesty. It included detailed recommendations were included in the instruction for the delegates sent to the king, which, unfortunately, is not available<sup>101</sup>. Chernihiv nobility promised in its laudum the loyalty

---

<sup>97</sup> R. Kołodziej, *Stronnictwo Sapiehów a funkcjonowanie sejmu w drugiej części panowania Jana III Sobieskiego (1685–1696)*, in: *Wielkie rody dawnej Rzeczypospolitej XVI–XVIII w.*, vol. 1, *Sapiehowie*, eds. T. Ciesielski, M. Sawicki, Opole 2018, p. 115.

<sup>98</sup> The senate council session was held between 25 February and 2 March of 1695, see: BCz, ref. no. 1674, pp. 9–26; the council activities were discussed by K. Matwijowski, *Próba charakterystyki stanowiska szlachty litewskiej po niedoszłym sejmie 1695 r.*, 'Śląski Kwartalnik Historyczny Sobótka' 1993, 48, pp. 252–254.

<sup>99</sup> Thanks to the research by Andrzej Rachuba, we know the attitude of most of the Lithuanian dietines, which decidedly took the stance of supporters of Sapieha family, see: A. Rachuba, *Litwa wobec projektu zwołania sejmu konnego w 1695 r. i walki Sapiehów z biskupem Brzostowskim*, 'Zapiski Historyczne' 1986, 51, pp. 63–82.

<sup>100</sup> See: TDIAUK, f. 28, inv. 1, ref. no. 140, sheets 539–568; for the content of the universal, see: *Akta*, pp. 625–626.

<sup>101</sup> TDIAUK, f. 28, inv. 1, ref. no. 140, sheets 576v–577. The delegates sent to the king were Michał Hieronim on Kordyszów Kordysz, Bratslav deputy cup-bearer, Benedykt Żabokrzycki, Bratslav cup-bearer, Mikołaj of Łyczki Dogieł Cyryna, Wojciech on Potok Potocki.



to the king, 'declaring readiness *et iurata pectoris* in oppositionem the enemies of the Commonwealth and peculiarly Sejm insults of public councils'<sup>102</sup>. Chernihiv nobility appealed also to the nobility from all over the country to collect taxes for the purposes of payment of army's debts. They wanted the king to make the decision in respect of the organisation of mass mobilisation<sup>103</sup>. However, laudum does not include information on whether a delegation was sent to the king, but we can assume that it was. Kiev dietine was completed successfully thanks to the agreement of conflicted groups, which organized two separate dietines before the Sejm<sup>104</sup>. The nobility of the largest Ukraine voivodeship also assured that it will stand 'by the king's majesty' and the sent delegates were to reassure the monarch about that support. A decision was made for a separate delegation to be sent to Stanisław Jabłonowski, Cracow castellan, the great Crown hetman<sup>105</sup>.

The provisions of lauda of Włodzimierz dietines of May 1695 indicate that the supporters of the courts regained control over the dietine. They presented positive attitude towards the monarch and the reassurances about the defence of the king's majesty indicated that the supporters of the court won the propaganda struggle<sup>106</sup> following the Sejm. We could assume that the actions taken by the Lithuanians during the Sejm, aimed at making the inauguration of the first session impossible, deeply outraged the nobility. For these reasons, the dietines widely accepted the postulate to transfer the right to organise the mass mobilisation to the monarch.

<sup>102</sup> 'deklarując gotowość et iurata pectoris in oppositionem zawziętych na RP i rad publicznych osobliwie sejmowych insultów'.

<sup>103</sup> *Ibidem*, sheets 580–581.

<sup>104</sup> 'Nad to mutuo między nami certując affectu dyferencyje wszystkie sejmików podwójnych przedsejmowych szczerą umarzając niepamięcią praesenti laudo cavemus, aby takie novitates województwo nasze mieszające in futurum nie bywały, o czym fusius na sejmiku przedsejmowym conferemus' ['Moreover, mutuo between us resigning from the differences in views of all double dietines preceding Sejm, sincerely letting them sink into oblivion praesenti laudo cavemus, so that such novitates causing problems in our voivodeship would not happen in futurum, we fusius conferemus about it during dietine preceding Sejm']. See: *Ibidem*, sheet 582v.

<sup>105</sup> *Ibidem*, sheets 581–582v; the delegates to the king were Aleksander Kazimierz Wilczopolski, Parnawa Voivodeship cup-bearer, municipal judge of general dietine of Kiev Voivodeship, Jan Woronicz, son of Kiev chamberlain, Andrzej Wojnarowski, son of Kiev judge of nobility court, Jerzy of Łyczki Cyryna; the delegates to the great Crown hetman were Jerzy of Szpanów Czaplac, Ovruch master of the pantry, standard-bearer of hussar cavalry unit of Józef Słuszka, Vilnius castellan, Lithuanian field hetman, Piotr Wojnarowski, Ovruch master of the chase.

<sup>106</sup> After the Sejm, a few letters that reminded of a Sejm session relation were issued. They were aimed at convincing the nobility to the arguments of one of the side; for a detailed discussion, see: A. Czarniecka, *op. cit.*, pp. 339–381.

Although Sobieski did not want to use that right, it could constitute a convenient tool enabling exerting pressure on the opposition. The reluctance of the king to take decisive actions against his opponents resulted probably from the belief that such actions could cause civil war. The memory of similar events that took place in the country in 1672 and ended up with Gołąb confederation did not encourage such steps. The king decided to postpone all political activities until the situation in the Grand Duchy normalises. He planned to convene another Sejm no sooner than after bishop Brzostowski reconciles with hetman Sapieha<sup>107</sup>. It was planned for the year 1696, but the death of the monarch made convening it impossible.

Assessing the attitudes of the three Włodzimierz dietines in the years 1692–1695, we can see that for most of the time, they were in the sphere of influence of the court. This thesis is confirmed by both the postulates included in lauda and instructions and by the selection of the persons to perform the functions of deputies. They include king's confidants, the deputies of also the previous Sejms: Dymitr Żabokrzycki, Wilkomierz deputy cup-bearer, Atanazy Międzyński, Crown Court Treasurer and colonel<sup>108</sup>, Aleksander Cieszkowski, Chernihiv chamberlain or Kazimierz Załęski, Nowogród chamberlain<sup>109</sup>. Stanisław Rzewuski, sent by Kiev dietine, the Chełm starost, king's envoy sent to Crimea khan, also was the deputy for the last Sejm during the rule of Sobieski. Although the parliamentarians sent by the Włodzimierz dietines were not very active during sessions of the last three Sejms that took place during the rule of Sobieski, we should take into consideration that only the last one of them was a Sejm that operated in accordance with the standard procedures. At the end of the discussed period, the supporters of king in Włodzimierz for a short period of time did not hold a dominant position. In 1694, the opposition dominated the Chernihiv dietine, Bratslav dietine has been terminated prematurely and the Kiev dietine was divided by the supporters of the king. These events could have been related to the fact that in the exile dietines there took part a very large number of representatives of the army<sup>110</sup>, while the main accusation

<sup>107</sup> The reconciliation of the two conflicted groups took place not earlier than in autumn 1695, see: G. Sliesoriūnas, *Lietuvos*, pp. 182–189.

<sup>108</sup> M. Wagner, *Korpus oficerski wojska polskiego w drugiej połowie XVII wieku*, Oświęcim 2015, pp. 444–445.

<sup>109</sup> The authors of *Spisy* did not include Kazimierz Załęski, Nowogród chamberlain. They made a mistake and instead of registering two brothers, Kazimierz and Konstanty, registered one person, Kazimierz Konstanty Szlubicz Załęski, see: *Urzednicy województwa kijowskiego i czernihowskiego XV–XVIII wieku. Spisy*, eds. E. Janas, W. Kłaczewski, Kórnik 2002, pp. 205, 228.

<sup>110</sup> J. Stolicki, *Wobec wolności i króla. Działalność polityczna szlachty ruskiej, ukraińskiej i wołyńskiej w latach 1673–1683*, Kraków 2007, pp. 267–312; M. Wagner, *Korpus*, p. 442.

against the hetman Sapieha concerned situating soldiers in Church domain. The events of 1694 may suggest exerting of significant influence by Crown hetmans and officers on the exiles. However, there was no long-lasting crisis among the supporters of the king in Włodzimierz, as all three relational dietines in 1695 supported the king.

In accordance with the research of Jarosław Stolicki, the nobility of the eastern voivodeships in the years: 1674–1683 had positive attitude towards Sobieski<sup>111</sup>. During the second part of the period of rule of Sobieski that tendency did not change, there were only small exceptions. In the years 1688–1691, the Kiev dietine opposed the monarch stance the most, however, the supporters of the court managed eventually to take control of it. The other two dietines had more or less positive attitude towards the king<sup>112</sup>. In the period: 1692–1695, all three dietines convened in Włodzimierz remained in the sphere of influence of the court. However, it did not mean that there were no internal conflicts. The best evidence of their existence were premature terminations of dietines and repeated universals. The repeated dietines were, probably on purpose, organized in haste, we could assume that only confidants were informed about them and those that were known as supporters of opposition were skipped. It outraged some of the citizens<sup>113</sup>, but the results of such practices were not questioned. Such behavior shows also the great influence of the supporters of the king that de facto dominated the Włodzimierz dietines, ensuring passing an instruction favorable to the monarch and the selection of Sejm deputies with positive attitude towards the king.

<sup>111</sup> J. Stolicki, *op. cit.*, pp. 259–266.

<sup>112</sup> R. Kołodziej, *Attitudes*.

<sup>113</sup> The Chernihiv instruction of 1693 includes the following fragment: 'Niemależ stąd pochodzi cum praeiudicio województwa całego, że uniwersały z łaski JKM PNM powtórne i trzecie z kancelarii wydane przedsejmowe non solito tempore promulgowane, ale ipso die sejmików przypadających do grodów podawane bywają. Za czym occurendo huic consuetudini zlecamy to ichm. panom posłom naszym, aby to in posterum nie bywało, konstytucją obwarowaną było, żeby przynamniej tygodniem takowe uniwersały do grodów należytych podawane byli' ['Significant conveniens is caused cum praeiudicio of the entire voivodeship because of the repeated and third universals, preceding the Sejm, of His Majesty PNM, issued by the chancellery, are non solito tempore promulgated, but are sometimes ipso die of adequate dietines send to boroughs. Therefore occurendo huic consuetudini we order you, our deputies, to prevent it from happening in posterum, to regulate it with a provision so that such universals are send to adequate boroughs at least a week earlier']. See: TDIAUK, f. 28, inv. 1, ref. no. 138, sheet 1116.

## APPENDIX

AN INDEX OF THE SEJM DEPUTIES FROM THE DIETINES OF KIEV, BRATSLAV  
AND CHERNIHIV IN THE PERIOD OF 1692–1695

## The Sejm of 1692–1693

**Deputies of the Kiev dietine of 19 Nov 1692**

Marcjan of Szpanów on Nowy Dwór Czaplic, Kiev chamberlain [podkomorzy kijowski]

Franciszek on Potok Potocki, Ovruch starost [starosta owrucki]

Dymitr on Żabokrzyki Żabokrzycki, Wiłkomierz deputy cup-bearer, court Kiev deputy voivode, Kremenets municipal starost deputy [podczaszy wiłkomierski, podwojewództwi sądowy kijowski, podstarości grodzki krzemieniecki]

Adam Olizar Wołczkiewicz, Ovruch deputy cup-bearer [podczaszy owrucki]

**Deputies of the Bratslav dietine of 19 Nov 1692**

Jerzy Piaseczyński, starost of Nowogród, Ułanowice and Sinice [starosta nowogródzki, ulanowski, sinicki]

Michał Hieronim on Kordyszów Kordysz, Bratslav deputy cup-bearer [podczaszy braclawski]

Michał on Krynice Woliński, Radzyń starost [starosta radziński]

Jerzy Żytyński, Vinnytsia tribune [wojski winnicki]

**Deputies of the Chernihiv dietine of 1 Dec 1692 (repeated dietine)**

Atanazy Miączyński, Crown Court Treasurer, starost of Łuck, Krzepice, Łosice, colonel of His Majesty [podskarbi nadworny koronny, starosta łucki, krzepicki, łosicki, pułkownikowi JKM]

Kazimierz Szlubicz Załęski, Nowogród chamberlain [podkomorzy nowogródzki]

Jerzy on Markowicze Hulewicz, Łuck municipal judge [sędzia grodzki łucki]

Jan on Shumsk Woronicz, son of Kiev chamberlain [podkomorzyc kijowski]

## THE SEJM OF 1693

**Deputies of the Kiev dietine of 10 Nov 1693**

Jan of Wojnarów Wojnarowski, Kiev judge of nobility court, Włodzimierz municipal starost deputy [sędzia ziemski kijowski, podstarości grodzki włodzimierski]

Jerzy from Szpanów Czaplic, Ovruch master of the pantry [stolnik owrucki]  
 Adam Olizar Wołczkiewicz, Ovruch deputy cup-bearer [podczaszy owrucki]  
 Samuel on Krzywicze Hołowiński, Ovruch sword-bearer [miecznik owrucki]

### **Deputies of the Bratslav dietine of 10 Nov 1693**

Franciszek on Potok Potocki, Ovruch starost [starosta owrucki]  
 Jerzy Kazimierz Piaseczyński, starost of Nowogród and Ułanowice  
 [starosta nowogródzki, ulanowski]  
 Michał Kordysz, Bratslav deputy cup-bearer [podczaszy braclawski]  
 Dymitr on Żabokrzyki Żabokrzycki, Łuck nobility court writer, court Kiev  
 deputy voivode, Kremenets municipal starost deputy [pisarz ziemski łucki,  
 podwojewodzi sądowy kijowski, podstarości grodzki krzemieniecki]

### **Deputies of the Chernihiv dietine of 22 Dec 1693 (repeated dietine)**

Atanazy on Miączyna Miączyński, crown court treasurer, starost of Łuck,  
 Krzepice, Łosice, colonel of His Majesty [podskarbi nadworny koronny,  
 starosta łucki, krzepicki, łosicki, pułkownik JKM]  
 Franciszek on Pereniatin Ledóchowski, Kremenets chamberlain [podko-  
 morzy krzemieniecki]  
 Aleksander from Cieszków Cieszkowski, Chernihiv chamberlain, Klesz-  
 czele starost [podkomorzy czernihowski, starosta kleszczelowski]  
 Kazimierz Szlubicz Załęski, Nowogród chamberlain [podkomorzy now-  
 ogródzki]

## THE SEJM OF 1695

### **Deputies of the Kiev dietine of 1 Dec 1694**

Jan of Wojnarów Wojnarowski, Kiev judge of nobility court [sędzia  
 ziemski kijowski]  
 Jerzy from Szczepanów Czaplic, Ovruch master of the pantry, hussar  
 standard-bearer of Józef Słuszką Vilnius castellan, field hetman of the  
 Grand Duchy of Lithuania [stolnik owrucki, chorąży husarski Józefa  
 Słuszki kasztelana wileńskiego, hetmana polnego W. Ks. Lit.]  
 Wacław Zubczewski, Nowogród deputy cup-bearer [podczaszy now-  
 ogródzki]  
 Samuel on Krzywicze Hołowiński, Ovruch sword-bearer [miecznik owrucki]

### **Deputies of the Kiev dietine of 11 Jan 1695 (repeated dietine)**

Stanisław Rzewuski, Chełm starost [starosta chełmski]  
 Wojciech Stanisław Czacki, Włodzimierz starost [starosta włodzimierski]

Jan Wojnarowski, Kiev judge of nobility court, Włodzimierz municipal starost deputy [sędzia ziemski kijowski, podstarości grodzki włodzimierski]  
 Dymitr Żabokrzycki, Łuck nobility court writer, deputy voivode of general dietine of Kiev Voivodeship [pisarz ziemski łucki, podwojewodzi generału województwa kijowskiego]

#### PREMATURELY TERMINATED BRATSLAV DIETINE

##### **Deputies of the Chernihiv dietine of 19 Dec 1694 (repeated dietine)**

Franciszek Ledóchowski, Kremenets chamberlain [podkomorzy krzemieniecki]

[Józef Felicjan Potocki], Ropczyce starost [starosta ropczycki]

NN N of Nowogród<sup>114</sup>

NN

(translated by LINGUA LAB)

#### REFERENCES

##### **Archival sources**

Archiwum Główne Akt Dawnych:

Archiwum Radziwiłłów dział II, ref. no. 1801.

Biblioteka Książąt Czartoryskich w Krakowie:  
 ref. no. 183, 184, 1674.

Biblioteka Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego:  
 ref. no. 113.

Tsentrал'nyy Derzhavnyy Istorychnyy Arkhiv Ukrainy Kyiv:  
 f. 28, inv. 1, ref. no. 137–140.

Natsyyanal'ny Histarychnyy Arkhiw Byelarusi Minsk:  
 f. 695, inv. 1, ref. no. 55, 223.

##### **Printed sources**

*Arkhiv Yugo-Zapadnoy Rossii*, part 2, vol. 2, Kiyev 1888.

*Akta Sejmikowe Województwa Krakowskiego*, vol. 5, ed. A Przyboś, Wrocław–Warszawa–Kraków–Gdańsk–Łódź 1984.

*Akta sejmikowe województw poznańskiego i kaliskiego. Lata 1676–1695*, eds. M. Zwierzykowski, R. Kołodziej, A. Kamieński, Poznań 2018.

Mongrillon de M., *Pamiętnik sekretarza ambasady francuskiej w Polsce pod koniec panowania Jana III oraz w okresie bezkrólewia i wolnej elekcji po jego zgonie (1694–1698)*, transl. and ed. Ł. Częścik, Wrocław–Warszawa–Kraków–Gdańsk–Łódź 1982.

Sarnecki K., *Pamiętniki z czasów Jana III Sobieskiego. Diariusz i relacje z lat 1691–1696*, ed. J. Woliński, Wrocław 1958.

<sup>114</sup> The text is damaged, part of the card is torn off.



- Sliesoriūnas G., *Iš Žemaitijos seimelių istorijos: 1693 m. lapkričio 10 d. Žemaitijos seimelis*, in: *Žemaičių praeitis*, vol. 8, Vilnius, 1998.
- Wagner M., *Źródła do dziejów wojny polsko-tureckiej w latach 1683–1699*, Oświęcim 2016.

### Studies

- Czarniecka A., *Nikt nie słucha mnie za życia... Jan III w walce z opozycyjną propagandą (1684–1696)*, Warszawa 2009.
- Forst de Battaglia O., *Jan Sobieski król Polski*, transl. K. Szyszkowska, introduction Z. Wójcik, Warszawa 1983.
- Hundert Z., *Repartycja jednostek wojska koronnego według komisji lwowskiej w 1679 r.*, 'Przegląd Historyczno-Wojskowy' 2016, 18, 2–3.
- Kamiński A., *Polska a Brandenburgia-Prusy w drugiej połowie XVII wieku. Dzieje polityczne*, Poznań 2002.
- Kaźmierczyk A., *Dworski projekt reform na sejmie grodzieńskim 1692–1693*, in: *Studia i materiały z czasów Jana III Sobieskiego*, ed. K. Matwijowski, 'Acta Universitatis Wratislaviensis' 1992, Historia 102.
- 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.
- Kaźmierczyk A., *Sprawa Jakuba Becala, królewskiego faktora Jana III Sobieskiego w końcu XVII wieku*, 'Studia Historyczne' 1992, 35.
- Kołodziej R., *Attitudes of the Kiev, Bratslav and Chernihiv Dietines in Exile Towards the Policy of John III Sobieski in the Period of 1687–1691*, 'Res Historica' 2020, 49.
- Kołodziej R., *Funkcjonowanie systemu podatkowego Rzeczypospolitej i jego wpływ na wojnę z Turcją w czasach Jana III Sobieskiego*, in: *Pecunia nervus belli. Z dziejów dyplomacji i stosunków międzynarodowych w XV–XVIII wieku*, eds. M. Markiewicz, R. Skowron, F. Wolański, Katowice 2016.
- Kołodziej R., *Między sacrum i profanum. O politycznej roli biskupów w czasach Jana III Sobieskiego*, in: *Staropolski ogląd świata. Kultura staropolska – poszukiwanie sacrum odnajdywanie profanum*, eds. B. Rok, F. Wolański, Toruń 2013.
- Kołodziej R., *Ostatni wolności naszej klejnot. Sejm Rzeczypospolitej za panowania Jana III Sobieskiego*, Poznań 2014.
- 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 XVI–XVIII w.*, vol. 1, *Sapiehowie*, eds. T. Ciesielski, M. Sawicki, Opole 2018.
- Kołodziejczyk D., *Podole pod panowaniem tureckim. Ejalet kamieniecki 1672–1699*, Warszawa 1994.
- Komaszyński M., *Maria Kazimiera d'Arquien Sobieska królowa Polski 1641–1716*, Kraków 1983.
- Komaszyński M., *Teresa Kunegunda Sobieska*, Warszawa 1982.
- Matwijowski K., *Próba charakterystyki stanowiska szlachty litewskiej po niedoszłym sejmie 1695 r.*, 'Śląski Kwartalnik Historyczny Sobótka' 1993, 48.
- Nycz M., *Geneza reform skarbowych sejmu niemego. Studium z dziejów skarbowo-wojskowych z lat 1697–1717*, Oświęcim 2016.
- Piawski K., *Brzostowski Konstanty Kazimierz*, in: *Polski Słownik Biograficzny*, vol. 3, no. 1, Kraków 1937.
- Piawski K., *Sprawa pośrednictwa tatarskiego w wojnie polsko-tureckiej*, in: *Studia historica. W 35-lecie pracy naukowej Henryka Łowmiańskiego*, Warszawa 1958.

- 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. Guzowskiego, Białystok 2003.
- Rachuba A., *Litwa wobec projektu zwołania sejmu konnego w 1695 r. i walki Sapiechów z biskupem Brzostowskim*, 'Zapiski Historyczne' 1986, 51.
- 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.
- Rybarski R., *Pieniądz i skarb za Jana Kazimierza, Michała Korybuta i Jana III*, Oświęcim 2015.
- Sawicki M., *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.
- Skrzypietz A., *Królewscy synowie – Jakub, Aleksander i Konstanty Sobiescy*, Katowice 2011.
- Sliesoriūnas G., *Lietuvos Didžioji Kunigaikštystė vidaus karo išvakarėse: didikų grupuočių kova 1690–1697m.*, Vilnius 2000.
- Sliesoriūnas G., *Problem separatyizmu Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego w końcu XVII wieku*, in: *Rzeczpospolita wielu narodów i jej tradycje*, eds. A. K. Link-Lenczowski, M. Markiewicz, Kraków 1999.
- Smolarek P., *Kampania mołdawska Jana III roku 1691*, eds. Z. Hundert, M. Wagner, Oświęcim 2015.
- Stolicki J., *Wobec wolności i króla. Działalność polityczna szlachty ruskiej, ukraińskiej i wołyńskiej w latach 1673–1683*, Kraków 2007.
- Urzednicy województw kijowskiego i czernihowskiego XV–XVIII wieku. Spisy*, eds. E. Janas, W. Kłaczewski, Kórnik 2002.
- Wagner M., *Korpus oficerski wojska polskiego w drugiej połowie XVII wieku*, Oświęcim 2015.
- Wagner M., *Stanisław Jan Jabłonowski (1634–1702). Polityk i dowódca*, vol. 2, Siedlce 1997.
- Wójcik Z., *Jan Sobieski*, Warszawa 1983.

#### STRESZCZENIE

Artykuł omawia stanowisko polityczne szlachty ukraińskiej z sejmików egzulanckich województw kijowskiego, braclawskiego i czernihowskiego w latach 1692–1695. Zgromadzenia te obradowały wspólnie we Włodzimierzu. Na podstawie akt sejmikowych z sejmików przedsejmowych i relacyjnych można zanalizować postawę polityczną szlachty z trzech województw i ich stosunek do króla i jego polityki podczas trzech kolejnych sejmów (1692–1693, 1693, 1695). W omawianym okresie sejmiki te zdominowane były przez stronnictwo prokrólewskie. W instrukcjach dla posłów pojawiają się postulaty zgodne z oczekiwaniami dworu, a wśród posłów można znaleźć wielu królewskich zaufanych. Dopiero przed sejmem 1695 r. opozycja doszła do głosu. Udało jej się zdominować sejmik czernihowski, sejmik braclawski został zerwany, a spory wewnątrz stronnictwa dworskiego doprowadził do rozdwojenia sejmiku kijowskiego. Kryzys regalistów we Włodzimierzu był jednak przejściowy, gdyż już na sejmikach relacyjnych w 1695 r. zdominowali ponownie wszystkie trzy zjazdy, a podjęte wówczas uchwały były zgodne z oczekiwaniami dworu.

**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. The main topic of his research is the history of parliamentarism and political system of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. In his publications, he also covered the issues 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.

