

ULADZIMIR PADALINSKI (*Minsk*)

THE REPRESENTATION OF THE GRAND DUCHY OF LITHUANIA
IN THE FINAL STAGE OF THE SEYM OF LUBLIN (JUNE–AUGUST 1569)

Key words: the *szlachta*, district envoys, the general seym, the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, political elites, the social status, the ethnic origin

The conclusion of the union between the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and the Polish Crown has been a matter of interest to historiographers from many countries. Historians have analysed various aspects of the union: reasons, preparations and results. They have also dealt with the seym of Lublin taking place from 10 January to 12 August 1569 during which a historical decision was taken to establish a new union between Poland and Lithuania¹. Nevertheless, the subject of this research is the main events at the seym and around it until 1 July. The course of the seym, which was in fact the first general seym (*sejm walny*) of the whole Polish-Lithuanian Rzeczpospolita, specially its final key stages (from 2 June² to 12 August 1569) has been examined quite cursorily³. The composition of the representation of landowners (envoys from voivodeships and counties) of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania at this key stage has not been discussed yet, nor has the activity of the seym during its sessions.

The aim of this article is to complete the research in this aspect. We shall focus on the analysis of the social and material status of envoys from the Grand Duchy

¹ Acts for the seym: *Volumina Constitutionum*, T. 2: 1550–1609, vol. 1: 1550–1585, ed. Stanisław GRODZISKI, Irena DWORNICKA, Waław URUSZCZAK, Warszawa 2005, pp. 213–268. Detailed diary of the seym printed in: *Дневник Люблинского сейма 1569 года. Соединение Великого Княжества Литовского с Королевством Польским*, изд. Михаил Коялович, Санкт-Петербург 1869. The terms “Lithuanian”, “Polish”, “Ruthenian” are used in their historical meaning.

² Матвей Любавский, *Литовско-русский сейм. Опыт по истории учреждения в связи с внутренним строем и внешнею жизнью государства*, Москва 1900, pp. 838–846; Уладзімір Падалінскі, Любоў Собалева *Люблінская унія 1569 г.*, [in:] *Гісторыя Беларусі*, т. 2: *Беларусь у перыяд Вялікага Княства Літоўскага*, Мінск 2008, pp. 471–473; Oskar HALECKI, *Dzieje unii jagiellońskiej*, vol. 2, Kraków 1920, pp. 345–349; Henryk LULEWICZ, *Gniewów o unię ciąg dalszy. Stosunki polsko-litewskie w latach 1569–1588*, Warszawa 2002, pp. 41–47, 51–53.

³ The first delegation of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania left the session of the seym in the night of 1 March 1569. However, under the pressure of various circumstances, the delegation returned to Lublin at the beginning of June 1569 and worked there until the seym finished (the composition of the delegation had changed).

of Lithuania, their ethnic origin, social position in terms of offices held by them, their political activities and careers both prior to and after the seym of Lublin. It should be remembered that envoys from counties and voivodeships went to Lublin as representatives of the sovereign Grand Duchy, and ended their work in the seym as representatives of the common Rzeczpospolita. This is why it is important to present the composition of the representation of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania at the seym of 1569, for it is useful for the research on the functioning of the seym of Lithuania prior to the union of Lublin and for the research on the parliamentary system of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania while part of the Rzeczpospolita.

The analysis of the personal composition of the representatives at the seym has quite a long tradition in Polish historiography. The methodology of such an analysis was suggested and prepared as early as the 1970s and at the beginning of the 1980s by Jan Seredyka, Irena Kaniewska, Anna Filipczak-Kocur⁴. The most recent works by Henryk Litwin and Jolanta Choińska-Mika developed the scope of the criteria according to which it is possible to make research on the representation of landowners in the seyms of the Rzeczpospolita⁵.

At the end of April 1569 the Polish king and the grand duke of Lithuania Zygmunt August convened dietines (*sejmiki*) for 10 May in the counties and voivodeships of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. Representatives of the *szlachta* and senators elected there were instructed by the king to arrive at the seym in Lublin on 30 May 1569 to finalise the union along with the senators and envoys from the Crown⁶.

A special situation occurred with dietines in Vilnius voivodeship. Sigismund Augustus suggested that the voivode of Vilnius, chancellor Mikołaj Radziwiłł “Rudy” [“the Red”] and the land treasurer Mikołaj Naruszewicz should decide

⁴ Anna FILIPCZAK-KOCUR, *Senatorowie i posłowie na sejmie „pacyfikacyjnym” w 1589 r.*, *Czasopismo Prawno-Historyczne*, vol. 34: 1982, no. 2, pp. 197–212; Irena KANIEWSKA, *Małopolska reprezentacja sejmowa za czasów Zygmunta Augusta (1548–1572)*, Kraków 1974; Jan SEREDYKA, *Posłowie Rzeczypospolitej na sejm „ratyfikacyjny” w 1629 r.*, *Sprawozdania Opolskiego Towarzystwa Przyjaciół Nauk*. Wydział Nauk Historyczno-Społecznych, no. 15: 1977/1978, Opole 1979, pp. 23–33. See also: *Dzieje Sejmu Polskiego*, ed. Juliusz BARDACH, Stanisław GRODZISKI, Andrzej GWIŹDŹ [and others], Warszawa 1993, pp. 53–57; Anna FILIPCZAK-KOCUR, Jan SEREDYKA, *Stan badań nad dziejami parlamentarizmu polskiego w latach 1573–1647 i postulaty*, [in:] *Parlamentaryzm w Polsce we współczesnej historiografii*, ed. Juliusz BARDACH, cooperation Wanda SUDNIK, Warszawa 1995, pp. 77–78; Jan SEREDYKA, *O ujednoczenie badań nad parlamentarzystami epoki staropolskiej*, [in:] *Parlamentaryzm i prawodawstwo przez wieki. Prace dedykowane prof. Stanisławowi Plazie w siedemdziesiątą rocznicę urodzin*, ed. Jerzy MALEC, Waclaw URUSZCZAK, Kraków 1999, pp. 23–29.

⁵ Jolanta CHOIŃSKA-MIKA, *Sejmiki koronne XVI–XVII wieku. Problemy badawcze*, [in:] *Praktyka życia publicznego w Rzeczypospolitej Obojga Narodów w XVI–XVIII wieku. Materiały XVIII konferencji Komisji Lituanistycznej przy Komitecie Nauk Historycznych PAN w dniach 22–23 września 2009 r.*, ed. Urszula AUGUSTYŃIAK, Andrzej B. ZAKRZEWSKI, Warszawa 2010, p. 20; Henryk LITWIN, *Równi do równych: kijowska reprezentacja sejmowa 1569–1648*, Warszawa 2009.

⁶ Letters convoking dietines were written and sent to their recipients on 26–29 April 1569, see: M. Любавский, op.cit., приложения, pp. 215–225; *Lietuvos Metrika. Knyga Nr. 532. (1569–1571). Viešuju reikalu knyga 10*, parengė Lina ANUŽYTĖ, Algirdas BALULIS, Vilnius 2001 (further: *Lietuvos Metrika*, kn. 532), pp. 30–37.

whether to conduct one common dietine for the voivodeship in Vilnius or separate dietines in each county (Vilnius, Oszmiana (Ashmyany), Lida, Wiłkomierz (Ukmergė), Braslau)⁷. It should be noted that before the beginning of the seym of Lublin in Vilnius there took place a dietine common for all counties of the voivodeship⁸. This time, however, separate dietines were organised, for the Lithuanian incisor (*krajczy litewski*) Krzysztof Radziwiłł wrote to Mikołaj Krzysztof Radziwiłł “Sierotka” [“the Orphan”] about “powiatowym sejmiku [w] Wilnie” [“county dietine [in] Vilnius” – transl. A. Chabros]⁹; besides, various envoys represented individual counties of the Vilnius voivodeship at the seym of Lublin.

It should be noted that the seym letters were also sent to the county of Kiev and the voivode and castellan of Kiev¹⁰. On 5 May 1569, the Kiev voivodeship was incorporated into the Polish Crown, which resulted in its representatives not being included in the group of envoys sent to represent the Grand Duchy of Lithuania at the seym of Lublin¹¹.

Dietines (at least some of them) took place because envoys from almost all regions of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania had arrived. Presumably, at most dietines heated debates took place about how to react to what had happened in Lublin – the incorporation of Podlachia and Volhynia into the Polish Crown. For instance, there were rumours that the son of M. Radziwiłł “Rudy” – the leader of the anti-union opposition – Krzysztof Radziwiłł “Piorun” [“the Thunderbolt”] – incited the *szlachta* at the dietine of Vilnius to boycott the seym and not to go to Lublin. Nevertheless, K. Radziwiłł “Piorun” himself denied this by explaining that he had encouraged all the envoys present at the dietine to participate in the common seym on the day imposed by Sigismund Augustus¹². Probably the majority of dietines in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania agreed with the king and supported his demand to elect envoys for the seym of Lublin giving them unlimited authorisation to conclude the union and look for the resources to defend the state¹³. It is known that the *szlachta* of Brest explicitly “niekazała [...] wracać się do domu bezi

⁷ М. Любавский, op.cit., приложения, pp. 220–221.

⁸ Andrzej RACHUBA, *Wielkie Księstwo Litewskie w systemie parlamentarnym Rzeczypospolitej w latach 1569–1763*, Warszawa 2002, pp. 62–64.

⁹ Tomasz КЕМРА, *Listy Radziwiłłów z okresu Unii Lubelskiej (1568–1569)*, Zapiski Historyczne, vol. 69: 2004, no. 4, p. 99. In the edition the letter by Krzysztof Radziwiłł was dated 11 April 1569. The content of the letter shows that it was written after the dietine – i.e. after 10 May – exactly on 1 June. In the same letter there was marked “Datt z Wilna w poniedziałek święteczny roku 1569” [“Dated in Vilnius on Easter Monday after the Resurrection”]. It must have referred to Easter (which fell on 10 April), but after the White Sunday (30 May).

¹⁰ М. Любавский, op.cit., приложения, p. 223; *Lietuvos Metrika*, kn. 532, pp. 31–32.

¹¹ *Volumina Constitutionum*, T. 2, vol. 1, pp. 226–232. Kievian envoys were elected at the dietine of 10 May. Iva Olizar and Ivan Sołtan took an oath as representatives of the Crown, see: H. LITWIN, op.cit., pp. 14–18, 42–45.

¹² T. КЕМРА, op.cit., pp. 99, 102.

¹³ М. Любавский, op.cit., приложения, pp. 219–220, 224–225; *Lietuvos Metrika*, kn. 532, pp. 34, 37.

akieikolwiek uniey” [“told them not to come back home without a union” – transl. A.Ch.]¹⁴.

From among the representatives of Lithuanian lands, only the envoys of the counties of Upita (Upytė) and Braslau, along with the voivodeship of Polotsk did not attend the seym of Lublin. It is hard to say why this happened. What we know is that all the documents necessary to call dietines in those counties had been sent¹⁵. It is not very likely that the reason was a possible threat from Muscovy. From the beginning of 1569 the relations between the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and Muscovy had stabilised¹⁶. What is more, nothing is known about the negative attitude of the *szlachta* from those areas to the union. It is possible that the reason for the absence of the envoys was connected with the lack of guarantee to pay money for “на сътраву и выправу” for the envoys. Even before the seym of Lublin, the *szlachta* from some counties of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania (for example, of Vilnius and Mazyr) refused to return the travel costs to their envoys for the seym of Lublin. Sigismund Augustus was forced to support the envoys financially from the ducal treasury. The monarch, wanting to avoid incurring the costs of the travel of the Lithuanian representatives for the seym again, demanded that the *szlachta* introduce a special tax to finance their envoys¹⁷. It is likely that in May 1569, the dietines from the counties of Polotsk, Braslau, and did not approve of the introduction of the tax, which is why their envoys did not take part in the seym of Lublin¹⁸. The *szlachta* was particularly sensitive about having to bear any additional costs connected with the functioning of the state.

¹⁴ Археографический сборник документов, относящихся к истории Северо-Западной России, издаваемый при управлении Виленского учебного округа (further: АСД), т. 7, Вильна 1870, р. 40. The *szlachta* of Brest declared that “nie chcą rozrywać [się] z bracią swoją pany wołyńskimi” [“they refuse to break away with the noblemen of Volhynia” – transl. A.Ch.]. Mikołaj Naruszewicz, a Lithuanian who was staying in Lublin at that time interpreted this as an attempt to break away from the Grand Duchy of Lithuania: “od tey nieszczęśliwei oiczyzny swei” [“from his unhappy motherland” – transl. A.Ch.].

¹⁵ М. Любавский, op.cit., приложения, pp. 220–222; *Lietuvos Metrika*, kn. 532, pp. 31–32. Previously, dietines took places even in the voivodeship of Polotsk, the major part of which was dominated by the Muscovites: М. Любавский, op.cit., приложения, р. 207; *Русская историческая библиотека* (further: РИБ), т. 30: *Литовская Метрика*, отдел первый–второй, ч. 3: *Книги личных дел*, ред. Иван Лаппо, Юрьев 1914, pp. 848–849.

¹⁶ Андрэй Янушкевіч, *Вялікае Княства Літоўскае і Інфлянцкая вайна 1558–1570 гг.*, Мінск 2007, pp. 110–111.

¹⁷ М. Любавский, op.cit., приложения, pp. 213–215; *Lietuvos Metrika. knyga Nr. 531. (1567–1569). Viešuju reikalu knyga 9*, parengė Lina ANUŽYTĖ, Algirdas BALIULIS, Vilnius 2001 (further: *Lietuvos Metrika*, kn. 531), pp. 142, 173–174. It is known that the *szlachta* of Navahrudak approved of the tax for the maintenance of their envoys at the dietine before the seym of Lublin: Andrzej RADAMAN, *Uchwała sejmikowa powiatu nowogródzkiego z 1568 r. a system finansowania posłów sejmowych Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego*, [in:] *Litwa w epoce Wazów. Prace ofiarowane Henrykowi Wisnerowi w siedemdziesiątą rocznicę urodzin*, ed. Wojciech KRIEGEISEN, Andrzej RACHUBA, Warszawa 2006, pp. 145–156.

¹⁸ The problem of the money was discussed in the final stage of the seym of Lublin: *Документы Московского архива Министерства юстиции*, т. 1, Москва 1897, p. 499.

On the other hand, the representation of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania in Lublin included the envoys from the Smolensk land. It is not clear whether a dietine was held there (as the Smolensk land at the beginning of the 16th century belonged to the Muscovite state) or the “representatives” of the province were elected arbitrarily by the hospodar himself. The answer seems to lie in the priorities of foreign policy conducted by Sigismund Augustus, the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and the Crown. The confirmation of the union by the representatives of the Smolensk land made it possible for the unified state to claim the return of Smolensk¹⁹. That is why the two envoys (Fedor Kopeć and Jan Skirmont) were appointed by the monarch himself – both of them were connected with the royal court in the 1560s. F. Kopeć was certainly associated with the Smolensk land as he came from a family who had settled there a long time ago²⁰.

We are familiar with the composition of the envoys of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania for the last stage of the seym of Lublin thanks to the privilege of the union of 1 July 1569 which confirmed that “prełaci i panowie rada, tak duchowna jako świecka, książęta, stany wszystkie Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego, ktemu posłowie ziemscy” [“prelates and members of the council including the clergy and laymen, dukes, all the estates of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania were represented by envoys” – transl. A.Ch.]²¹. The act of the union was signed and authorised by the stamps of 42 representatives of the voivodeships and counties of Lithuania. The total number of the Lithuanian representatives in Lublin might have reached 46 envoys, including the envoys from Smolensk (as mentioned above, envoys from Braslau, Upita and Polotsk did not arrive at the seym). As a result, we know 91,3% of the representatives of the *szlachta* in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania at the seym of Lublin. It should be noted that the dietines of the Trakai county and the starosty of Samogitia sent not two (as it was stipulated by the Statute of 1566) but three envoys to the last stage of the seym (June–August 1569)²².

It is interesting to examine how the composition of the envoys of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania changed between the initial stage (before the envoys set off in the night of 1 March) and the final stage of the seym of Lublin. For example, at the dietine of Vilnius voivodeships in November 1568 the following people were elected envoys for the seym of Lublin: the pantler (*stolnik*) of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and the *ciwun* (Latin: *tivunus*) *gondyński* [the administrator of the

¹⁹ Let us notice that among the delegates of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania for the crown seym of 1563–1564, where the negotiations concerning the new union were held, was also the “representative” of Smolensk land – Wasyl Kopeć, see: *Volumina Constitutionum*, T. 2, vol. 1, p. 129.

²⁰ *Poczet rodów w Wielkim Księstwie Litewskim w XV i XVI wieku*, ed. Adam BONIECKI, Warszawa 1887, pp. 138–140; Tadeusz WASILEWSKI, *Kopeć Sidor Wasilewicz h. Kroje (zm. 1531)*, [in:] *Polski słownik biograficzny* (further: PSB), vol. 13, Wrocław–Warszawa–Kraków 1967–1968, p. 633.

²¹ *Akta unii Polski z Litwą 1385–1791*, ed. Stanisław KUTRZEBA, Władysław SEMKOWICZ, Kraków 1932, pp. 348–356. It is worth noting that envoys Jan Świrski, Malcher Snowski and Paweł Ostrowicki vowed for the act of the union as the hospodar’s marshal.

²² *Статут Вялікага княства Літоўскага 1566 года*, рэдкал. Таісія І. Доўнар [and others], Мінск 2003, p. 80; *Akta unii Polski z Litwą 1385–1791*, p. 356.

royal estates – A.Ch.] Mikołaj Dorohostajski, the *ciwun* of Vilnius Stanisław Naruszewicz, sub-chamberlain (*podkomorzy*) of Vilnius and the starost of Daugavpils Jan Lewoń, the knyaz Łukasz Świrski and the royal secretary Wenclaw Agryppa²³. However, none of them was elected envoy at the dietines (or one dietine in Vilnius) in May 1569²⁴. The composition of the representation of the starosty of Samogitia changed completely. During the first stage of the seym of Lublin, Samogitia was represented by four envoys: the wojski of Samogitia and the *ciwun* [administrator of estates] of Berżenai Sebastian Mikołajewicz, the *ciwun* of Rietavas Marek Wnuczko, the courtier of the hospodar Kazimierz Bartkowicz and Piotr Gradowski. On the other hand, in the last stage of the seym there were three other envoys: the sub-chamberlain of Samogitia and the *ciwun* of Ariogala Mikołaj Stankiewicz-Billewicz, the *ciwun* of Viešvilė Ivan Iłgowski and the *ciwun* of Dyrwiany Jan Gradowski²⁵. The county of Navahrudak was twice represented by the same envoys: the hospodar marshall and the judge of Navahrudak Malcher Snowski and the secretary of His Majesty and the sub-chamberlain of Navahrudak Andrzej Charytonowicz-Obryński²⁶. It is possible that the hospodar marshall Jan Świrski and the sub-judge (*podśędek*) of Pinsk Ivan Domanowicz, who were present in Lublin in February 1569, had the function of envoys²⁷. This fragmentary information does not allow us to establish what the reasons for such changes were. Were they connected with the political conflict between the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and the Crown about the union with the Crown, or maybe they resulted from other more down-to-earth reasons – for example they may be explained by the high expenses connected with the envoys' participation in the seym of Lublin?

According to the social hierarchy of the 16th century, the *szlachta* in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania could be divided into three groups (*strata*)²⁸. The first group includes dukes (knyazes) – descendants of Rurik and Gediminas. The second social strata consisted of families of lords – very prestigious and influential in the social and political life. The third group was the regular *szlachta* (nobility).

Among the envoys of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania elected to represent it in the last stage of the seym of Lublin four (9,5%) had the title of duke. The brother-

²³ М. Любавский, op.cit., приложения, pp. 212–213; *Lietuvos Metrika*, kn. 531, p. 142.

²⁴ But M. Dorohostajski, P. Naruszewicz and Ł. Świrski approved of the union as representatives of the Council (*Pany Rada*) of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, see: *Akta unii Polski z Litwą 1385–1791*, p. 355.

²⁵ Нацыянальны гістарычны архіў Беларусі ў Мінску (further: НГАБ), КМФ-18, воп. 1, спр. 265, fol. 196v–197; *Akta unii Polski z Litwą 1385–1791*, p. 356.

²⁶ *Akta unii Polski z Litwą 1385–1791*, pp. 355–356; A. RADAMAN, *Uchwała sejmikowa powiatu nowogródzkiego z 1568 r.*, pp. 147, 154. See also: НГАБ, КМФ-18, воп. 1, спр. 265, fol. 199, 201v.

²⁷ НГАБ, КМФ-18, воп. 1, спр. 265, fol. 201v, 206v.

²⁸ About the social and material division of the nobility of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania in the mid-16th century see e.g. Павел Лойка, *Шляхта беларускіх зямель у грамадска-палітычным жыцці Рэчы Паспалітай другой паловы XVI–першай трэці XVII ст.*, Мінск 2002, pp. 11–14; Jerzy OCHMAŃSKI, *Historia Litwy*, Wrocław 1990 (3rd edition), pp. 100–101, 107–108.

knyazes Malcher and Kasper Giedroyć²⁹ represented correspondingly the county of Vilnius and the county of Kaunas. The knyaz J. Świrski was elected envoy at the dietine of Vilnius, while the knyaz Ivan Massalski represented the county of Hrodna. Interestingly enough, members of the ducal families were elected envoys from the central voivodeships of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania – of Vilnius and Trakai. What is more, the county of Vilnius was represented by two knyazes.

Among the representatives of the landowners of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania there were three (7,1%) noblemen from lordly families. Hence, the envoy of the county of Lida was elected “lord” Szadzibor Dowgird, while “lord” M. Snowski represented the county of Navahrudak. The county of Brest elected “lord” Dominik Pac. The geography of the election of the “lords” to become envoys for the seym of Lublin was extended. It included the voivodeships of Vilnius, Navahrudak and Brest. Eastern regions of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and the starosty of Samogitia were represented by the regular *szlachta* members who did not belong to the category of knyazes and magnates. It constituted as much as 83,4% of all the elected envoys, which proves the increase in the importance of regular noblemen in the political life of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. The *szlachta* from the families of knyazes and magnates entered the political elites in a different way. For example, some offices at the court (cup-bearer, carver, pantler) and offices of marshals hospodars made it possible for them to become members of the council of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. We should not forget that before the union of Lublin representatives of many knyaz families were invited for “Lithuanian” seyms³⁰. Thus, the function of an envoy was particularly important for representatives of the local elite which bore no titles. After the union of Lublin was concluded, the tradition of inviting dukes and lords of The Grand Duchy for a common assembly was given up. At the same time, court officials and marshals hospodars were beyond the Polish-Lithuanian senate³¹. As a result, in the subsequent years some titled noblemen started to make a career as representatives of landowners of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania in order to preserve their social status and political influence. For this reason, at general seyms of the Rzeczpospolita in the years 1569–1600, representatives of knyaz and lordly families constituted over 30% of the envoys in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania³².

²⁹ Władysław Konopczyński considered Malcher Matuszewicz Giedroyć to be his brother. However, at the same time there lived also Kasper Mikołajewicz Giedroyć: РИБ, т. 33: *Литовская Метрика*, отдел третий, ч. 3: *Книги публичных дел. Переписи Литовского войска*, ред. Станислав Л. Пташицкий, Петроград 1915, col. 485; Władysław KONOPCZYŃSKI, *Giedroyć Mateusz*, [in:] PSB, t. 7, Kraków 1948–1958, p. 430.

³⁰ А. РАСНУВА, *op.cit.*, pp. 49–52.

³¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 167–169.

³² Уладзімір Падалінскі, *Прадстаўніцтва ВКЛ на вальных соймах Рэчы Паспалітай (1569–1600 гг.). Да пытання рэгіянальных асаблівасцяў*, [in:] *Канструкцыя і дэканструкцыя Вялікага княства Літоўскага: матэрыялы міжнар. навук. канф, рэд. Наталья У. Сліж, Мінск 2007*, pp. 59–61.

The social status of envoys of the Grand Duchy who were also landowners should be examined together with their material status, which could be defined on the basis of the data included in the registration lists of the army of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania from the years 1565 and 1567³³. According to the seym's regulation of 1567 a landowner was to provide one armed horseman out of 10 village "servants"³⁴ within the *pospolite ruszenie* [the mass mobilization of armed forces]. Knowing the number of armed horsemen it is possible to estimate the size of the estate of each representative of the *szlachta* class. I would like to stress that the data should not be overestimated, for the information allow us to learn about the magnitude of the lands owned, but it does not reflect the actual revenue from them. Moreover, we are not acquainted with other sources of income (from wholesale trade, *jurgielt* (German: *Jahrgeld*), etc.). That is why it is important to take into consideration the number of extra armed horsemen provided by a nobleman additionally.

In present historiography there are different approaches to defining the degree of wealth of noblemen³⁵. The criteria suggested by us, as it seems, reflect the division of the *szlachta* into material categories. Thus, the lower *szlachta* included noblemen who had fewer than 50 village "servants", which meant they had to provide from 1 to four horsemen; the middle *szlachta* had from 50 to 249 "servants" (providing from five to 24 horsemen); the wealthy *szlachta* consisted of owners of at least 250 "servants" (25–99 horsemen); finally, the magnates owned over 1000 "servants" and had to provide over 100 horsemen.

It has been estimated that most Lithuanian envoys to the final stage of the seym of Lublin belonged to the lower *szlachta* (i.e. at least 19 envoys – 45,2%). For example, in 1567 only one armed horseman was provided by: Michajło Worona (in 1569 the envoy of the Trakai county), Krzysztof Razmusowicz (the county of Wilkomierz (Ukmerge)), K. Giedroyć (from the county of Kaunas), I. Domanowicz (from the county of Pinsk)³⁶. Two horsemen were provided by: Szczęśny Huba (the county of Lida), Jan Klukowski (the county of Hrodna), Piotr Skrobot (the county of Waukawysk), Andrzej Stankiewicz (the county of Minsk)³⁷. Three horsemen were sent to the parade of the army in 1567: M. Giedroyć (the county of Vilnius), Kacper Rajecki (the county of Trakai), Hieronim Puksza (the county

³³ РИБ, т. 33, pp. 237–430, 431–1378.

³⁴ М. Любавский, op.cit., pp. 759–762; РИБ, т. 30, pp. 409–415.

³⁵ See for example: Анатолий Грицкевич, *Распределение магнатских и шляхетских владений в Белоруссии по их величине и этнической принадлежности владельцев (XVI в.)*, Вопросы истории, вып. 5, Минск 1978, pp. 96–97; Михайл Спірьдонаў, *Пань і прыгонныя*, [in:] *Памяць: Гістор.-дакум. хроніка Навагруд. р-на, Мінск 1996*, p. 95; *Dzieje Sejmu Polskiego*, p. 56; H. Litwin, op.cit., p. 30; Andrej RADAMAN, *Samorząd sejmikowy w powiatach województwa nowogrodzkiego Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego w latach 1565–1632*, [in:] *Praktyka życia publicznego*, p. 59.

³⁶ РИБ, т. 33, pp. 478, 603, 604–605, 648, 1206. In 1565 I. Domanowicz provided one horseman, K. Razmusowicz two horsemen, see: *ibid.*, pp. 293, 297, 310.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 692, 757, 861, 1226.

of Waukawysk), Andrzej Chalecki (the county of Rzeczyca (Rečyca))³⁸. Moreover, K. Rajecki and A. Chalecki provided one infantry soldier (*drab*)³⁹. Three envoys provided four horsemen: Stanisław Sakowicz (the county of Ashmyany), F. Kopeć (the voivodeship of Smolensk) and Wasyl Rahoza (the county of Minsk)⁴⁰. S. Sakowicz and W. Rahoza also sent two infantry men, while F. Kopeć – one. According to the sources from the parades of 1565 and 1567, the S. Dowgird family in the county of Lida and the Szyrma family also belonged to the lower *szlachta*⁴¹. A. Charytonowicz-Obryński (the county of Navahrudak) was also a member of the lower *szlachta*. In 1565 during the *pospolite ruszenie* [the mass mobilization of armed forces] his brother Iwan sent four horsemen, whilst his father Iwan Charytonowicz, the standard-bearer of Navahrudak, in 1567 provided three horsemen⁴². The data concerning the land property of Piotr Kisiel (the county of Vitebsk in the voivodeship of Vitebsk and in Volhynia allow us to qualify him as a member of the lower *szlachta*⁴³.

The majority of the envoys from the Grand Duchy of Lithuania (eleven – 26,2%) who had arrived to participate in the second stage of the seym of 1569 belonged to the middle *szlachta*. For example, five horsemen and two infantry men were provided by Michajło Sokołowski (the county of Słonim) and Zmajło Zienkowicz (the county of Rzeczyca [Rečyca])⁴⁴. Seven horsemen and four infantry men were sent by the representative of the county of Kaunas Andrzej Iłgowski⁴⁵. The would-be envoy of the county of Trakai Andrzej Dzierżko (Dzierżak) sent eight horsemen and four infantry men for the military parade in 1567⁴⁶. In the same year I. Iłgowski (representing Samogitia in 1569) provided ten horsemen and four

³⁸ Ibid., pp. 478, 646–647, 856, 1233. In 1565 H. Puksza provided four horsemen, two of whom were „на ласку”, see: *ibid.*, p. 319.

³⁹ Ibid., pp. 646–647, 1233.

⁴⁰ F. Kopeć and W. Rahoza provided two of the four horsemen „на ласку”, see: *ibid.*, pp. 514, 525, 572. In 1565 P. Sakowicz provided also four horsemen, while W. Rahoza 2 horsemen, one of them „на ласку”, and one infantry soldier (*drab*), see: *ibid.*, pp. 252, 274.

⁴¹ Ibid., pp. 256, 312, 508–509, 770, 1205, 1212. All of them provided one-two horsemen. One horseman was provided also by Krzysztof Marcinowicz Szyrma, probably the brother of Stanisław.

⁴² Ibid., pp. 413, 811. See also: Андрэй Радаман, *Род Харытановічаў-Вобрынскіх (Абрынскіх) уласнага герба „Харытон” у Навагародскім павеце ў другой палове XVI ст.*, [in:] *Карэліччына: людзі, падзеі, час: зборнік навуковых артыкулаў*, уклад. Анастасія А. Скеп’ян [and others], рэдкал. Аляксандр А. Каваленя [and others], Мінск 2012, p. 50; A. RADAMAN, *Uchwala sejmikowa powiatu nowogrodzkiego z 1568 r.*, p. 148.

⁴³ *Архив Юго-Западной России, издаваемый временной комиссией для разбора древних актов* (further: АЮЗР), ч. 8, т. 6: *Акты о землевладении в Юго-Западной России XV–XVIII вв.*, Киев 1911, pp. 257–262, 283–285, 295–298; *Историко-юридические материалы, извлеченные из актовых книг губерний Витебской и Могилевской* (further: ИЮМ), вып. 21, ред. Михаил Веревкин, Витебск 1891, pp. 258–261. Additionally, in 1565 Peter’s brother, Andrzej Kisiel, provided two horsemen to the Volhynian standard, see: РИБ, т. 33, p. 423.

⁴⁴ РИБ, т. 33, pp. 838–839, 1233. In 1565 M. Sokołowski provided four horsemen (one of them „на ласку”) and two infantry soldiers, whilst Zienkowicz three horsemen and two infantry soldiers.

⁴⁵ Ibid., p. 1258.

⁴⁶ Ibid., p. 523.

infantry men, J. Świrski (the county of Vilnius) – twelve horsemen and six infantry men, half of whom he sent extra “на ласку”⁴⁷. The middle *szlachta* included also Paweł Ostrowicki (the county of Oszmiana (Ashmyany)) and I. Massalski (the county of Hrodna), who in 1567 sent 15 horsemen each. In this case, P. Ostrowicki provided six horsemen more than he was obliged to. Moreover, I. Massalski sent eight infantry men, while P. Ostrowski seven (three of them extra “на ласку”)⁴⁸. Among the middle *szlachta* we can distinguish two noblemen J. Gradowski (the starosty of Samogitia) and D. Pac (the county of Brest), who during the *pospolite ruszenie* [the mass mobilization of armed forces] in 1567 sent 24 horsemen each; Gradowski additionally provided ten armed soldiers “на ласку его королевское милости”⁴⁹. Their financial status was close to the wealthy *szlachta*. The sources from the parade allow us to include in the middle *szlachta* also Marcin Jacynicz (the county of Słonim). His brothers Iwan and Lew provided in 1567 five horsemen each, and correspondingly two and one infantry men⁵⁰.

What is interesting, a minor number of the envoys arriving at the final stage of the seym of Lublin came from the wealthy *szlachta*. Only two noblemen can be included in the category (4,8%). In 1567 M. Stankiewicz-Billewicz (the starosty of Samogitia) provided 27 horsemen and 13 infantry soldiers⁵¹. The most affluent representative of the landowners in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania at the seym of Lublin was the envoy of the county of Navahrudak M. Snowski. During the parade in 1567 he demonstrated 48 horsemen and 28 infantry soldiers, including 16 horsemen and 12 infantry soldiers more than he was obliged to provide⁵².

We do not have any concrete information about the material condition of the remaining envoys (23,8%)⁵³. Nevertheless, it is quite unlikely that any of them belonged to the wealthiest *szlachta*. They probably belonged to the lower or the middle *szlachta*. Thus, we can increase the participation of the lower *szlachta* as the representatives of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania at the seym of Lublin even to 70%.

Undoubtedly, the lower *szlachta* dominated in almost all the regions of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, particularly in the east. Presumably, all envoys from the voivodeship of Vitebsk and Mstislavl belonged to the lower *szlachta*. The percentage of the middle *szlachta* was somewhat higher in the central voivodeship

⁴⁷ Ibid., pp. 462, 1258.

⁴⁸ Ibid., pp. 456, 472. For the military parade of 1565. P. Ostrowicki provided 12 horsemen, four of whom were „на ласку”, and six infantry soldiers: *ibid.*, p. 260.

⁴⁹ Ibid., pp. 505, 1257. D. Pac provided 20 infantry soldiers, J. Gradowski – seven.

⁵⁰ M. Jacynicz himself commanded his own *rota*: *ibid.*, p. 844. Marcin's father – Ostafi Jacynicz – in 1528 provided 17 horsemen for the parade of the *pospolite ruszenie*: *ibid.*, pp. 11–12.

⁵¹ Ibid., p. 1258.

⁵² Ibid., p. 463.

⁵³ Mikołaj Koncza (the country of Wiłkomierz), J. Skirmont (the voivodeship of Smolensk), Tymofiej Hurko (the country of Vitebsk), Bogusz Skolko and Fedor Woropaj (both from the country of Orsza), Isaj Szczołkanowicz and Hrehory Makarowski (both from the voivodeship of Mstislavl), Adam Pocij (the country of Brest), Fedor Lenkiewicz-Ipohorski and Jan Kłopot (both from the country of Mazyr).

– Vilnius, Trakai and Navahrudak. The exception was the starosty of Samogitia, the envoys of which belonged either to the wealthy or to the middle *szlachta*.

It must be noted that representatives of titled families of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania who were elected envoys for the seym of Lublin belonged to all the three-classes. Thus, “Lord” M. Snowski had the status of a wealthy nobleman, the knyaz I. Masalski and “Lord” D. Pac – were middle noblemen, while M. and K. Giedroyć and “Lord” S. Dowgird were lower *szlachta*. It should be also underlined that among the envoys of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania there were no magnates.

The Grand Duchy of Lithuania at the beginning of its existence was a multi-ethnic country, which was reflected in the composition of the “political nation”⁵⁴. What was the ethnic origin of envoys representing the Grand Duchy of Lithuania at the seym of Lublin? We would like to stress that we shall consider the origin of selected noble families. However, representatives of one ethnic community could have assimilated with another ethnic community owing to the change of the language, denomination, or adopting a foreign culture⁵⁵.

To define precisely the ethnic belonging of every single envoy, we must first define his ethnic (self) identity. Yet, it is not possible to do in the case of all the representatives due to a lack of sources. That is why, to identify envoys for the seym of 1569 we tried to establish where they came from, searching for the information in genealogical and anthroponymic data concerning individual families.

The *szlachta* from Ukrainian territories and Belarusian counties tended to be of Ruthenian origin. So, the envoy from the county of Navahrudak A. Charytonowicz-Obryński came from a local noble family of Belarusian origin⁵⁶. M. Jacynicz⁵⁷ belonged to the local Belarusian nobles from the county of Słonim. The old Belarusian family of Hurek⁵⁸ came from the Vitebsk land. Supposedly, the envoy of the county of Orsha Bogusz Skołko⁵⁹ belonged to an old local noble family. The Pocij family originated from the area of Kamenets (Kamieniec), which is confirmed for

⁵⁴ See for example: А. Грицкевич, *op.cit.*, pp. 94–105; П. Лойка, *op.cit.*, pp. 22–24; А. РАСНУВА, *op.cit.*, p. 26; Jerzy SUCHOŃSKI, *Formowanie się i skład narodu politycznego w Wielkim Księstwie Litewskim późnego średniowiecza*, *Zapiski Historyczne*, vol. 48: 1983, no. 1–2, pp. 31–78.

⁵⁵ *Беларусы*, т. 4: *Вытокі і этнічнае развіццё*, рэдкал. Васіль К. Бандарчык, Мінск 2001, pp. 63–67, 97–99.

⁵⁶ Kasper NIESIECKI, *Herbarz Polski*, wyd. Jan BOBROWICZ, vol. 3, Lipsk 1839, p. 20; vol. 7, Lipsk 1841, p. 16. See also: А. Радаман, *Род Харытановічаў-Вобрынскіх (Абрынскіх)*, p. 50.

⁵⁷ К. NIESIECKI, *op.cit.*, vol. 4, Lipsk 1839, p. 425; *Poczet rodów*, p. 101.

⁵⁸ ИЮМ, вып. 28, ред. Дмитрий И. Довгялло, ч. 2: *Оршанский гербовник*, Витебск 1900, p. 56; Андрей Нарбут, *Гурко-Ромейки. Родословные росписи*, вып. 10, Москва 1998, pp. 3–5; К. NIESIECKI, *op.cit.*, vol. 4, pp. 396–397; *Poczet rodów*, pp. 95, 283. The envoy from the country of Vitebsk T. Hurko also had estates in Polotsk land occupied by the Muscovite army in 1563: *Метрыка Вялікага княства Літоўскага. Кніга 44. Кніга запісаў 44 (1559–1566)*, падрыхт. Александр И. Груша, Мінск 2001, p. 98.

⁵⁹ Иван. И. Лаппо, *Литовский Статут 1588 года*, т. 1: *Исследование*, ч. 1, Каунас 1934, pp. 200–201.

the period of the reign of Casimir Jagiellon⁶⁰. I. Domanowicz⁶¹ came from the land of Pinsk. Both envoys from the county of Minsk: W. Rahoza and A. Stankiewicz belonged to the local *szlachta* of Ruthenian origin⁶². The Zienkowicz family residing in the county of Rzeczyca (Rečyca)⁶³ may also be considered to belong to the Belarusian *szlachta*. Jan Kłopot probably came from the Mazury land⁶⁴.

Some families also came from contemporary Ukrainian and Ruthenian lands. For example, the family of Kisiel moved to the east of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania from Volhynia⁶⁵. The Woron family and Woropaj family⁶⁶ were probably from Volhynia. The Chalecki family who settled in the county of Rzeczyca (Rečyca) moved there from the Chernihiv land, which at that time belonged to Muscovy⁶⁷. The Kopeć family and the Massalskis had their roots in the Smolensk land and Severia⁶⁸. It is hard to define the origin of the envoy of Mstislav H. Makarowski (Makarowicz?), but the patronym of “Makarowski” indicates the Ruthenian roots of the noble family. In total, there were 17 envoys of Ruthenian origin (40,5%) at the seym of Lublin.

The *szlachta* from the ethnically Lithuanian counties of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania (along with Samogitia) was Lithuanian in origin. J. Świrski⁶⁹, the representative of the county of Vilnius, came from a family of Lithuanian dukes. The other envoy from Vilnius M. Giedroyć (like his brother K. Giedroyć, the envoy of Kaunas) belonged to a ducal family who originated in the north of Lithuania⁷⁰.

⁶⁰ K. NIESIECKI, op.cit., vol. 7, pp. 335–339; *Poczet rodów*, pp. 248–250; *Złota księga szlachty polskiej*, ed. Teodor ŻYCHLIŃSKI, vol. 10, Poznań 1888, pp. 245–252. See also: Jan DZIĘGIELEWSKI, *Pociej (Potij) Adam, później Hipacy, h. Waga (1541–1613)*, [in:] PSB, vol. 27, Wrocław 1982, p. 28; Marzena LIEDKE, *Od prawosławia do katolicyzmu. Ruscy możni i szlachta Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego wobec wyznań reformacyjnych*, Białystok 2004, pp. 84, 95.

⁶¹ *Poczet rodów*, pp. 45–46. See also: Аляксандр Груша, *Мяноўная грамата князя Васіля Нарымонтавіча і фарміраванне пісьмовай культуры ў прававой сферы Вялікага княства Літоўскага ў апошнія трыці XIV–першай трыці XV ст.*, Мінск 2010, pp. 13–15.

⁶² Bolesław KUMOR, *Rahoza Michał (ok. 1540–1599)*, [in:] PSB, vol. 30, Wrocław 1987, p. 453; K. NIESIECKI, op.cit., vol. 8, Lipsk 1841, pp. 85, 493–494; *Poczet rodów*, p. 281.

⁶³ K. NIESIECKI, op.cit., vol. 10, Lipsk 1843, pp. 169–170; *Poczet rodów*, pp. 416–417.

⁶⁴ K. NIESIECKI, op.cit., vol. 5, Lipsk 1840, pp. 95–98; *Poczet rodów*, pp. 124–125; *Złota księga szlachty polskiej*, vol. 3, Poznań 1881, pp. 109–114. See also: *Адам Григорьевич Кисель: сборник материалов*, сост. Владимир Н. Киселев, Владимир О. Свистун, Минск 2012, pp. 11–16.

⁶⁵ K. NIESIECKI, op.cit., vol. 9, Lipsk 1842, pp. 431–432; *Poczet rodów*, p. 385.

⁶⁶ K. NIESIECKI, op.cit., vol. 3, pp. 12–14; *Poczet rodów*, pp. 19–20.

⁶⁷ K. NIESIECKI, op.cit., vol. 5, pp. 217–218; vol. 6, Lipsk 1841, pp. 349–353, 481; *Poczet rodów*, pp. 138–141, 174–177; *Złota księga szlachty polskiej*, vol. 4, Poznań 1882, pp. 173–182.

⁶⁸ K. NIESIECKI, op.cit., vol. 8, pp. 579–580; *Poczet rodów*, pp. 339–342. See also: Jan TĘGOWSKI, *Rodowód kniazów Świrskich do końca XVI wieku*, Wrocław 2011, pp. 17–24, 86–90.

⁶⁹ K. Niesiecki, op.cit., vol. 4, pp. 85–95; *Poczet rodów*, pp. 61–62. See also: Stanisław HERBST, *Giedroyć Melchior*, [in:] PSB, vol. 7, pp. 430–431.

⁷⁰ Henryk LULEWICZ, *Snowski Malcher (Melchior) h. Dolgga (zm. 1587)*, [in:] PSB, vol. 39, Warszawa–Kraków 1999, p. 408; K. NIESIECKI, op.cit., vol. 7, pp. 219–231; *Poczet rodów*, pp. 241–243; A. RADAMAN, *Samorząd sejmikowy*, p. 97; *Złota księga szlachty polskiej*, vol. 5, Poznań 1883, pp. 201–214; vol. 8, Poznań 1886, pp. 166–172; Jerzy WIŚNIEWSKI, *Pac Dominik h. Gozdawa (zm. 1579)*, [in:] PSB, vol. 24, Wrocław [etc.] 1979, p. 695.

The lordly families of Snowski and Pac⁷¹ were also of Lithuanian origin. The envoy M. Stankiewicz-Billewicz⁷² came from the old and respectable Samogitian family. The envoy of Lida S. Dowgird⁷³ belonged to a very extended family of probably Samogitian origin. The families of Sakowicz and Puksza⁷⁴ had Lithuanian roots. The Skirmont⁷⁵ family probably came from the old Lithuanian boyar family settled in the area of Navahrudak and Pinsk. Mikołaj Koncza was a representative of a family with Lithuanian roots, who had been associated with the county of Wiłkomierz (Ukmergė)⁷⁶ since the end of the 15th century. The brothers Andrzej and Iwan Iłgowsy, correspondingly the envoy of Kaunas and the starosty of Samogitia, were associated with the land of Kaunas⁷⁷. According to the patronym “Razmusowicz” we can conclude that the family of the envoy of Wiłkomierz (Ukmergė) – Krzysztof – was of Lithuanian origin. We can define the ethnic origin of such families as the Hubas and Skroboty – they seem to originate from the Lithuanian language (from “guba” – stack; “skroblas” – hornbeams). Hence, it can be concluded that 16 (38,1%) representatives of Lithuanian voivodeships and counties at the seym of Lublin in 1569 belonged to Lithuanian (or Samogitian) families.

The representation of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania included also the *szlachta* of Polish origin. For instance, Jan Rajecki, the father of the envoy of Trakai K. Rajecki moved to the county of Trakai from the county of Radom in the Polish Crown during the reign of Sigismund the Old – in the first half of the 16th century⁷⁸. Another envoy from the county of Trakai – A. Dzierżek⁷⁹ also came from the Polish *szlachta*. The envoy of the county Oszmiana (Ashmyany) P. Ostrowicki⁸⁰ from the Ostrowicki family also had Polish roots. The representatives of Samogitia J. Gradowski came from a noble family from Lesser Poland⁸¹. The Sokołowski, from

⁷¹ K. NIESIECKI, op.cit., vol. 2, Lipsk 1839, pp. 159–160; vol. 8, pp. 491–493; Eugenijus SAVIŠČEVAS, *Bilevičių kilmė ir genealogija (XV–XVI a.)*, Lituania, 2001, Nr. 4, pp. 3–22. See also: Henryk LULEWICZ, *Stankiewicz (Billewicz, Bielewicz, Stankiewicz z Billewiczów) Mikołaj h. Mogiła (zm. ok. 1581/2)*, [in:] PSB, vol. 42, Warszawa–Kraków 2003, p. 202.

⁷² K. NIESIECKI, op.cit., vol. 3, pp. 393–394; *Poczet rodów*, p. 47.

⁷³ K. NIESIECKI, op.cit., vol. 7, p. 577; vol. 8, pp. 229–230; *Poczet rodów*, pp. 290–291. About the Sawkowicz family see also: Ewa KELMA, *Ród Sakowiczów i jego majątności w XV i pierwszej połowie XVI wieku*, Lituano-Slavica Posnaniensia. Studia Historica, vol. 3: 1989, pp. 155–177.

⁷⁴ K. NIESIECKI, op.cit., vol. 8, pp. 380–381; *Złota księga szlachty polskiej*, vol. 1, Poznań 1879, p. 284.

⁷⁵ K. NIESIECKI, op.cit., vol. 5, p. 190; *Złota księga szlachty polskiej*, vol. 22, Poznań 1900, pp. 66–68.

⁷⁶ Raimonda RAGAUSKIENĖ, *Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės kancleris Mikalojus Radvila Rudasis (apie 1515–1584 m.)*, Vilnius 2002, p. 368.

⁷⁷ K. NIESIECKI, op.cit., vol. 4, p. 402.

⁷⁸ Ibid., vol. 8, pp. 85–88.

⁷⁹ Ibid., vol. 3, pp. 469–471; *Złota księga szlachty polskiej*, vol. 21, Poznań 1899, pp. 28–35. See also: Bohdan BARANOWSKI, *Dzierżek Krzysztof*, [in:] PSB, vol. 6, Kraków 1948, p. 160.

⁸⁰ K. NIESIECKI, op.cit., vol. 7, pp. 201–202.

⁸¹ Ibid., vol. 4, p. 272; *Poczet rodów*, p. 68. See also: Валерый Пазднякоў, *Градоўскі Францішак (каля 1545–1595)*, [in:] *Вялікае Княства Літоўскае. Энцыклапедыя. У 2 т., т. 1*, Мінск 2005, p. 551.

whom M. Sokołowski was elected the envoy of Słonim for the seym in Lublin⁸² came from the Sandomierz Land. Mikołaj Szyrma – the great-grandfather of the envoy of Pinsk Stanisław Szyrma⁸³ – moved to Polesie from the Sandomierz Land in the 1430s. The Klukowski family, whose estates were situated in Podlachia in the county of Drohiczyn⁸⁴, also seem to have had Polish roots. As a result, it may be concluded that seven (16,7%) envoys from the Grand Duchy of Lithuania to the seym in Lublin were of Polish origin.

Two envoys (4,8%) from the Grand Duchy of Lithuania had a distinct ethnic origin. The representative of the county of Mazyr Fedor Lenkiewicz-Ipohorski came from an Armenian family who, in the 16th century, had settled in the county of Mazyr⁸⁵. The envoy from the voivodeship of Mstislavl I. Szczołkanowicz was supposedly of Tatar origin⁸⁶.

As can be seen above, according to the ethnic origin, the representatives of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania at the seym of Lublin in 1569 was divided into two main groups: noblemen of Ruthenian (Belarusian and Ukrainina) and Lithuanian origin. Moreover, the major part of the representatives were noblemen with Polish roots. The Ruthenian noblemen prevailed among envoys from Vitebsk Voivodeship and Minsk Voivodeship. In turn, envoys from the counties of Vilnius Voivodeship and the starosty of Samogitia were by and large of Lithuanian origin (and Samogitian). The representatives of Trakai, Navahrudak and Brest voivodeships were of various origins such Lithuanian, Ruthenian and Polish. Thus, taking into consideration the family roots, the Ruthenians were elected from the counties of Trakai, Hrodna, Navahrudak, Słonim, Brest and Pinsk, whilst the Lithuanians were from the counties of Kaunas, Navahrudak, Vawkavysk and Brest. The *szlachta* of Polish origin was represented mainly by envoys from Trakai voivodeship (A. Dzierżek and K. Rajewski from the county of Trakai, J. Klukowski from the county of Hrodna). It must be noticed that most envoys from the counties of Oszmiana (Ashmyany), Lida, Navahrudak, Vawkavysk came from Lithuanian noble families. It proves the thesis that in the 16th century the eastern border of the Lithuanian ethnic group crossed north-western areas of Belarus (in relation to the present boundaries)⁸⁷. The mixed ethnic composition of the *szlachta* in the region is confirmed by the

⁸² K. NIESIECKI, op.cit., vol. 8, pp. 446–452.

⁸³ Ibid., dodatek [appendix], Lipsk 1844, pp. 433–435; *Poczet rodów*, p. 347.

⁸⁴ РИБ, т. 33, p. 883. See also: R. RAGAUSKIENĖ, op.cit., pp. 337–339.

⁸⁵ АЮЗР, ч. 7, т. 1: *Акты о заселении Юго-Западной России*, Киев 1886, pp. 624–625; K. NIESIECKI, op.cit., vol. 6, p. 43; vol. 7, p. 335; Wojciech SZCZYGIELSKI, *Lenkiewicz Adam h. Kotwicz (ok. 1710–1782)*, [in:] PSB, vol. 17, Wrocław 1972, p. 54.

⁸⁶ *Poczet rodów*, p. 343. I would like to express my heartfelt thanks for the information about the Szczołkanowicz family to A. Szałanda.

⁸⁷ Jerzy OCHMAŃSKI, *Litewska granica etniczna na wschodzie od epoki plemennej do XVI wieku*, Poznań 1981, pp. 39–80; idem, *Historia Litwy*, pp. 93–94, 98–99. Nevertheless, in the 16th century in the north-eastern part of present Belarus and adjacent territories of Lithuania there continued processes of assimilation of the Lithuanian population: *Беларусы*, т. 4, pp. 63–71, 95; Мойсей Гринблат, *Белорусы. Очерки происхождения и этнической истории*, Минск 1968, pp. 144–167.

data from military parades in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania⁸⁸. Generally speaking, the data acquired in a quite objective manner reflect the ethnic composition of the *szlachta* in various regions of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. It should also be added that the majority of the envoys from the titled *szlachta* of the Grand Duchy, who were elected for the seym of Lublin in 1569, belonged to Lithuanian families. Only the knyaz Massalski was of Ruthenian origin. Curiously enough, the material condition of envoys of Ruthenian and Lithuanian origin for the seym of Lublin in 1569 was very similar (if we were to consider both groups as a whole); however, both representatives of the wealthiest *szlachta* (M. Stankiewicz-Billewicz and M. Snowski) belonged to families of Lithuanian (Samogitian) origin. At the same time, among envoys of Polish origin, the middle *szlachta* prevailed.

In historiography, there is an opinion that in the 16th century noblemen of Lithuanian origin consisted of about 60% of noble society in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, while noblemen of Ruthenian origin – only about 20%⁸⁹. Even if we accept such calculations, the data concerning the ethnic origin of envoys of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania to the seym of Lublin in 1569 show that the parliamentary system made it possible for the *szlachta* of Ruthenian origin counterbalance the more numerous of noblemen with Lithuanian roots. Nevertheless, it should be remembered that it was in the 16th century in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania that the so called “political nation” was created; it included the whole noble community irrespective of their ethnic origin and nationality⁹⁰. It must also be stressed that the majority of envoys of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania came from local noble families settled in their region at least for two generations. In our opinion, this was a key factor which affected the position of the *szlachta* in a given county and determined who would become an envoy.

It should also be considered what offices were taken by envoys of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania elected for the last stage of the seym of Lublin. From this point of view, three groups of envoys can be distinguished: court dignitaries, county officials and people who did not hold any offices⁹¹.

⁸⁸ M. Грицкевич, op.cit., pp. 102–104. An exception was the country of Hrodna inhabited mainly by Ruthenians: Henryk ŁOWMIAŃSKI, *Studia nad dziejami Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego*, Poznań 1983, p. 392; J. ОСИМАŃSKI, *Historia Litwy*, p. 124.

⁸⁹ The rest was the nobility of Polish origin, i.e. from Podlachia: H. ŁOWMIAŃSKI, *Studia nad dziejami Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego*, pp. 390–393. See also: Mečislovas JUČAS, *Unia polsko-litewska*, transl. Andrzej FIREWICZ, Toruń 2004, p. 61; M. ЛІЕДКЕ, op.cit., pp. 32–33. More: Henryk ŁOWMIAŃSKI, *Zaludnienie państwa litewskiego w wieku XVI. Zaludnienie w roku 1528*, prepared by Artur KIJAS, Krzysztof PIETKIEWICZ, Poznań 1998.

⁹⁰ Юліуш Бардах, *Штатаузоўная нацыянальная свядомасць на літоўска-рускіх землях Рэчы Паспалітай у XVII–XX ст.*, [in:] *Штудыі з гісторыі Вялікага Княства Літоўскага*, пер. Мікола Раманоўскі, Аляксандр Істомін, праф. Генадзь Сагановіч, Мінск 2002, pp. 296–315; П. Лойка, op.cit., p. 23.

⁹¹ It should be underlined that some envoys held offices at a time, e.g. M. Snowski was the hospodar's marshall and the judge of Navahrudak. Thus, in the analysis each such person was considered twice. See, e.g. J. SEREDYKA, *O ujednolicenie badań*, p. 28.

The most representative group of envoys of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania constituted county officials. It was a group of 22 envoys (52,4%) holding different positions in their regions. The group included four chamberlains (of Trakai A. Dzierżak, of Samogitia M. Stankiewicz-Billewicz, of Navahrudak A. Charytonowicz-Obryński and of Brest D. Pac)⁹². Three envoys were county standard-bearers (of Trakai K. Rajecki, of Vawkavysk H. Puksza and of Orsha B. Skołko)⁹³. There were quite a few *ciwuns* – heads of administrative units with military-economic rights in the starosty of Samogitia. There were four *ciwuns* elected for the seym of Lublin: of Tver A. Iłgowski (the envoy from the county of Kaunas), of Ariogala M. Stankiewicz-Bilewicz, of Dyrwiany J. Gradowski and of Viešvenai (Wiszwiany) I. Iłgowski (all the three were Samogitian envoys)⁹⁴. There were many officials from county courts among representatives of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania such as four district judges (of Ashmyany S. Sakowicz, of Hrodna I. Massalski, of Navahrudak M. Snowski and of Slonim M. Sokołowski), three lands subjudges (*podśędek ziemski*) (of Vitebsk T. Hurko, of Pinsk I. Domanowicz and of Mazyr F. Lenkiewicz-Ipohorski) and two landdistrict clerks (of Brest A. Pocij and of Rzeszyca (Rečyca) A. Chalecki)⁹⁵. Moreover the following were elected envoys: the *wojski* of Pinsk S. Szyrma and the steward (*horodniczy*) of Vitebsk P. Kisiel. Let us notice that among representatives of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania at the seym of 1569 there were no castle officials.

The second most numerous group among representatives of voivodeships and counties of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania were envoys who held no offices. There were 18 such envoys (42,9%): M. Giedroyć (the county of Vilnius), S. Huba and S. Dowgird (both from the county of Lida), M. Koncza and K. Razmusowicz (both from the county of Wiłkomierz (Ukmergė)), M. Worona (the county of Trakai), J. Klukowski (the county of Hrodna), K. Giedroyć (the county of Kaunas), M. Jacynicz (the county of Slonim), P. Skrobot (the county of Vawkawysk), F. Kopec and J. Skirmont (both from Smolensk voivodeship), F. Woropaj (the county of Orsha), I. Szczołkanowicz and H. Makarowski (both from the voivodeship of Mstislavl), A. Stankiewicz (the county of Minsk), Z. Zienkowicz (the county of Rzeszyca (Rečyca)) and J. Kłopot (the county of Mazyr).

The third group of representatives of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania in the final stage of the seym of Lublin in 1569 constituted court officials. There were five of

⁹² *Akta unii Polski z Litwą 1385–1791*, p. 356. See also: *Urządnicy Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego. Spisy*, vol. 2: *Województwo trockie XIV–XVIII wiek*, ed. Andrzej RACHUBA, Warszawa 2009, p. 173.

⁹³ *Akta unii Polski z Litwą 1385–1791*, p. 356. See also: *Urządnicy Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego*, vol. 2, p. 102.

⁹⁴ *Akta unii Polski z Litwą 1385–1791*, p. 356.

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 355–356. See also: Дарюс Вилимас, *Врядники земских судов Великого княжества Литовского – участники сеймов Речи Посполитой и Главных съездов ВКЛ (1569–1588 гг.)*, [in:] *Парламенція структуры ўлады ў сістэме дзяржаўнага кіравання Вялікага княства Літоўскага і Рэчы Паспалітай у XV–XVIII стагоддзях. Матэрыялы міжнар. навук. канферэнцыі*, рэд. Сцяпан Ф. Сокал, Андрэй М. Янушкевіч, Мінск 2008, pp. 91–95.

them elected (11,9%). Among the envoys there were three marshalls hospodars (J. Świrski, P. Ostrowicki and M. Snowski) and the Lithuanian court standard-bearer W. Rahoza, the envoy of the county of Minsk⁹⁶. In this case, we also include in the group of court officials the secretary of His Majesty – A. Charytonowicz-Obryński, who was the envoy of the county of Navahrudak⁹⁷. Moreover, among the envoys there were also the hospodar courtiers A. Dzierżek and K. Rajecki (both envoys of the county of Trakai)⁹⁸. It must be added that many county officials, including nobles not holding any offices – as we can see below – were actively engaged in the realisation of various tasks commissioned by the hospodar, which was the evidence for their connections with the court of Sigismund Augustus.

It must be underlined that many representatives of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania at the seym of Lublin were connected with the judicial system of the Grand Duchy. Nine officials from lands courts were elected envoys, which accounts for 21,4% of all the envoys from the Grand Duchy of Lithuania we know about. At the same time, it constitutes 40,9% of the whole group of county officials participating in the seym in Lublin. Obviously, the people had to have adequate legal knowledge, which could be useful during debates. Some envoys had some experience working for the state judicial system such as P. Ostrowicki, I. Massalski, M. Sokołowski. For example, from the end of the 1550s the first of them was a member of the committee working on the amendment of the Statute of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania⁹⁹. If we take into consideration eight envoys who held the offices of sub-chamberlain or *ciwun* [administrator of estates] and had judicial functions, the number of representatives of the *szlachta* who were acquainted with law will increase even more. All the data indicates that the level of legal culture of envoys of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania at the seym of Lublin of 1569 was very high. It cannot be forgotten that offices in lands courts were elected. So, people who held them must have enjoyed the esteem of the *szlachta*.

Over half (27; 64,3%) of envoys elected for the seym of Lublin in the 1560s took part in the social and political life both on a regional and state level. Some of them held county offices even before 1569. The standard-bearers were: P. Ostrowicki (of Oszmiana), K. Rajecki (of Żyżmory (Żieźmariai)), M. Sokołowski (of Słonim) and Z. Zienkowicz (of Rzeczyca (Rečyca))¹⁰⁰. The *ciwun* of Tver was M. Stankiewicz-Billewicz, of Szawda I. Iłgowski, while J. Gradowski in 1563 worked as the *ci-*

⁹⁶ *Akta unii Polski z Litwą 1385–1791*, p. 355; *Urządnicy centralni i dygnitarze Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego XIV–XVIII wieku. Spisy*, ed. Henryk LULEWICZ, Andrzej RACHUBA (*Urządnicy dawnej Rzeczypospolitej XII–XVIII wieku*, vol. 11), Kórnik 1994, p. 30.

⁹⁷ *Akta unii Polski z Litwą 1385–1791*, p. 356. The hospodar's secretary directly dealt with the documentation of the king and the grand duke.

⁹⁸ *Urządnicy Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego*, vol. 2, pp. 102, 173.

⁹⁹ И. Лаппо, *Лумовский Статут 1588 года*, pp. 44–46; М. Любавский, *op.cit.*, приложения, p. 95.

¹⁰⁰ РИБ, т. 33, pp. 314, 838–839, 1231; *Poczet rodów*, p. 239; *Urządnicy Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego. Spisy*, vol. 1: *Województwo wileńskie XIV–XVIII wiek*, ed. Andrzej RACHUBA, Warszawa 2004, p. 238; vol. 2, p. 102.

wun of Tver¹⁰¹. Before land courts were introduced in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, P. Ostrowicki was the judge of Vilnius, while M. Sokołowski was a riter in the court of the county of Słonim¹⁰². I. Massalski in the mid-1560s held the office of deputy starost of Hrodna¹⁰³. J. Świrski in the years 1561–1565 was the hospodar bridge supervisor of Polotsk¹⁰⁴. What is more, A. Charytonowicz-Obryński was a *diak* [a district clerk] in the chancery of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania at the end of the 1550s and at the beginning of the 1560s¹⁰⁵.

Before the seym of Lublin, the envoys of 1569 were tax collectors in various parts of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. In the years 1565–1568, the following tax collectors were appointed: M. Koncza (the county of Vilnius), I. Iłgowski (the county of Kaunas), H. Puksza (the county of Vawkavysk), B. Skołko (the county of Orsha), Z. Zienkowicz (the county of Rzeczyca (Rečyca))¹⁰⁶. J. Gradowski at the seym of 1563 was elected a tax *diak*, and at the seym of 1565–1566 he was appointed one of the main tax collectors in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania¹⁰⁷. A. Charytonowicz-Obryński and P. Ostrowicki (1558), T. Hurko and J. Gradowski (1561), J. Skirmont and P. Skrobot (1566)¹⁰⁸ provided lists concerning the collection of taxes and tolls. During the Livonian war would-be envoys (W. Rahoza, A. Charytonowicz-Obryński, J. Skirmont, M. Stankiewicz-Bilewicz and an Iłgowski) were involved in the execution of the hospodar's orders connected with the distribution of the army, providing the army with food, revising damage caused by soldiers¹⁰⁹.

¹⁰¹ НГАБ, КМФ-18, воп. 1, спр. 269, fol. 38; М. Любавский, *op.cit.*, приложения, pp. 123–124; РИБ, т. 30, pp. 668–671; т. 33, p. 1258; *Lietuvos Metrika. Kn. Nr. 261. (1562–1566). Teismų bylą knyga 47 (XVI a. pabaigos kopija)*, pp. 1562–1566, parengė Irena VALIKONYTĖ, Neringa ŠMILIENĖ, Vilnius 2011, p. 139; H. LULEWICZ, *Stankiewicz (Billewicz, Bielewicz, Stankiewicz z Billewiczów) Mikołaj*, p. 202.

¹⁰² *Акты, издаваемые Виленской археографической комиссией* (further АВАК), т. 11: *Акты Главного Литовского Трибунала*, Вильна 1880, p. 19; т. 22: *Акты Слонимского земского суда*, Вильна 1895, p. 2; *Lietuvos Metrika*, kn. 261, p. 81; *Poczet rodów*, p. 239; *Urzednicy Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego*, vol. 1, p. 166. I would like to thank A. Radaman for the information about M. Sokołowski.

¹⁰³ *Urzednicy Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego*, vol. 2, pp. 305–306. See also: Аляксей Шаланда, *Гродскі суд Гарадзенскага павеата ВКЛ у другой палове XVI–XVII ст. Частка I: Перадумовы, ход і вынікі рэформы гарадзенскага замкавага суда (1562–1572 гг.)*, [in:] *Гарадзенскі палімпсест. 2010. Дзяржаўныя і сацыяльныя структуры. XVI–XX ст.*, рэд. Аляксандр Ф. Смалянчук, Наталля У. Сліж, Мінск 2011, p. 27.

¹⁰⁴ *Lietuvos Metrika*, kn. 261, pp. 45, 81, 131; J. Tęgowski, *op.cit.*, p. 87.

¹⁰⁵ АЮЗР, ч. 7, т. 2: *Акты о заселении Юго-Западной России*, Киев 1890, pp. 35–42; М. Любавский, *op.cit.*, приложения, pp. 87, 90; *Метрыка Вялікага княства Літоўскага. Кніга 44*, pp. 39–40; *Lietuvos Metrika*, kn. 261, pp. 85–87.

¹⁰⁶ М. Любавский, *op.cit.*, приложения, pp. 691–694; РИБ, т. 30, pp. 417, 451, 866–867.

¹⁰⁷ АЮЗР, ч. 7, т. 2, pp. 377–380; РИБ, т. 30, pp. 696, 829, 846.

¹⁰⁸ М. Любавский, *op.cit.*, приложения, pp. 87, 89–90, 103–104, 170, 172–173; РИБ, т. 30, pp. 869–870, 875–876; *Lietuvos Metrika. Knyga Nr. 564. (1553–1567). Viešuju reikalų knyga 7*, parengė Algirdas BALIULIS, Vilnius 1996, pp. 83–84.

¹⁰⁹ М. Любавский, *op.cit.*, приложения, pp. 150, 195; РИБ, т. 30, pp. 758, 802–803, 816.

Other tasks given by the hospodar concerned economic matters. For example, A. Iłgowski, J. Gradowski and A. Charytonowicz-Obryński were involved in estate dealing correspondingly with the manor of Slonim, the starosty of Pinsk and in Volhynia¹¹⁰. The hospodar's commissaries and inspectors in the 1560s were A. Charytonowicz-Obryński, J. Gradowski, M. Snowski, J. Świrski, A. Dzierżek¹¹¹. It must be noted that in the 1540–1550s the hospodar's courtiers were: P. Ostrowicki, M. Worona, A. Dzierżek, Z. Zienkowicz, A. Iłgowski, F. Kopeć, K. Rajewski, W. Rahoza, M. Snowski¹¹². In 1567 J. Klukowski¹¹³ was at “службе господарьской”. It should be added that the offices of bridge supervisor (*mostowniczy*) and the steward (*horodniczy*) were considered to be the hospodar's service¹¹⁴.

Some people took part in the execution of the hospodar's orders connected with the parliamentary system of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. The hospodar's envoys for pre-seym dietines in the counties of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania in the years 1566–1569 were appointed M. Koncza (the county of Oszmiana), J. Świrski (the county of Lida), A. Dzierżka (the county of Trakai), I. Iłgowski (the starosty of Samogitia), H. Puksza (the county of Wawkavysk), T. Hurka (the county of Vitebsk), A. Pocieja (the county of Brest)¹¹⁵. The seym lists before the seym of 1566–1567 in Hrodna were provided by W. Rahoza, and before county dietines in May 1569 – P. Skrobot¹¹⁶.

The data above show that at least 23 representatives of the voivodeships and counties of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania (54,8%) who took part in the final stage of the seym of Lublin in 1569 were connected with the royal court. That is why we can assume that the crown had a considerable influence on the composition of “Lithuanian” envoys and their activities in the seym. We believe that Sigismund Augustus was in a position of providing a large number of envoys-royalists at

¹¹⁰ АВАК, т. 7: *Акты гродненского гродского суда*, Вильна 1874, pp. 80–81; АЮЗР, ч. 7, т. 2, pp. 35–42; *Метрыка Вялікага княства Літоўскага. Кніга 44*, p. 30; А. Радаман, *Род Харытановічаў-Вобрынскіх (Абрынскіх)*, p. 55; *Lietuvos Metrika*, kn. 532, pp. 59, 74.

¹¹¹ АЮЗР, ч. 8, т. 5: *Акты об украинской администрации XVI–XVIII вв.*, Киев 1907, pp. 173–175; ИЮМ, вып. 8, ред. Александр М. Созонов, Витебск 1877, p. 216; М. Любавский, op.cit., приложения, p. 124; *Метрыка Вялікага княства Літоўскага. Кніга 44*, pp. 39–40, 65–66; РИБ, т. 30, pp. 668–671; *Lietuvos Metrika*, kn. 261, pp. 47, 151; kn. 531, p. 168; kn. 532, pp. 29–30, 60.

¹¹² АВАК, т. 11, p. 24; *Метрыка Вялікага княства Літоўскага. Кніга 44*, pp. 11, 28, 30, 54; РИБ, т. 33, pp. 257, 514; *Lietuvos Metrika*, kn. 261, pp. 47, 132–133, 165, 173, 177; kn. 532, p. 59; *Poczet rodów*, pp. 239, 281; А. РАДАМАН, *Samorząd sejmikowy*, p. 79; *Urządnicy Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego*, vol. 2, pp. 102, 173. Later, in 1571 P. Skrobot acted as the royal courtier, see: НГАБ, КМФ-18, воп. 1, спр. 54, fol. 57v.

¹¹³ РИБ, т. 33, p. 692.

¹¹⁴ See the footnote 104. In 1570 P. Kisiel went to Vitebsk „для службы господарьское”, see: АЮЗР, ч. 8, т. 6, p. 297.

¹¹⁵ М. Любавский, op.cit., приложения, pp. 180, 207, 220–222; РИБ, т. 30, p. 849. Moreover, prior to the seym of 1566–1567 J. Świrski might have been the hospodar's envoy for the Vilnius dietine, while A. Dzierżek for the Trakai dietine, see: М. Любавский, op.cit., приложения, p. 180.

¹¹⁶ М. Любавский, op.cit., приложения, pp. 176–177, 222.

county dietines in May 1569 and was able to control the work of the representatives of the Grand Duchy in Lublin.

It should also be noted that a few persons before the seym of Lublin had acquired direct experience in working in the seym. Namely, M. Snowski and P. Ostrowicki¹¹⁷ were sent from the Lithuanian seym to the Crown seym in Warsaw in 1563–1564 as delegates from the Grand Duchy. M. Stankiewicz-Billewicz¹¹⁸ became an envoy of the starosty of Samogitia to the seym of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania in 1566. Probably at the seym of Vilnius of 1565–1566 the function of envoys was fulfilled by M. Koncza and H. Puksza¹¹⁹. Those examples are the evidence for the influence and authority of the persons among the local *szlachta*.

Let us note that during the Livonian war some envoys acquired military experience. In the 1560s the following were cavalry captains: S. Huba, J. Klukowski, M. Snowski, M. Jacynicz, F. Woropaj¹²⁰. Moreover, A. Charytonowicz-Obryński had some experience in diplomacy as in 1559 and 1563 he went to Muscovy as a messenger of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania¹²¹.

It is interesting to examine the further political career of the representatives of the Grand Duchy at the seym of Lublin. Half of them after 1569 participated actively in the public life of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and the whole Rzeczpospolita. Some continued their parliamentary work. Thus, the delegation of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania for the first convocation seym of the Rzeczpospolita, called at the beginning of 1573, included: J. Klukowski, F. Woropaj and A. Pocij¹²². M. Snowski (1575), J. Świrski (1575) and A. Charytonowicz-Obryński (1587)¹²³ participated in election seyms. M. Stankiewicz-Billewicz became a Samogitian envoy for the Coronation seym in 1574, and later A. Pocij¹²⁴ became an envoy of Brest for the coronation of Sigismund III in 1587–1588. In June 1576 the del-

¹¹⁷ *Volumina Constitutionum*, T. 2, vol. 1, p. 129.

¹¹⁸ H. LULEWICZ, *Stankiewicz (Billewicz, Bielewicz, Stankiewicz z Billewiczów) Mikołaj*, pp. 202–203.

¹¹⁹ РИБ, т. 30, pp. 866–867.

¹²⁰ АСД, т. 4, Вильна 1867, p. 217; М. Любавский, ор.цит., приложения, pp. 190–191; Андрэй Радаман, *Патранальна-кlientальныя адносіны ў Навагародскім павеце і іх уплыў на палітыку і дзейнасць органаў шляхецкага самакіравання ў другой палове XVI–пачатку XVII ст.*, [in:] *Магнацкі двор і сацыяльнае ўзаемадзеянне (XV–XVIII стст.)*. Зборнік навуковых прац, рэд. Андрэй М. Янушкевіч, Мінск 2014, p. 277; РИБ, т. 30, pp. 644, 648; А. Янушкевіч, ор.цит., pp. 163, 165, 171, 174, 176, 183, 189; *Lietuvos Metrika*, kn. 261, pp. 85–87; kn. 531, pp. 43, 46, 55; kn. 564, pp. 38, 40, 72, 120, 130.

¹²¹ А. Радаман, *Род Харытановічаў-Вобрынскіх (Абрынскіх)*, p. 56; А. Янушкевіч, ор.цит., pp. 38–39.

¹²² *Akta zjazdów stanów Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego*, vol. 1: *Okresy bezkrólewia*, ed. Henryk LULEWICZ, Warszawa 2006, p. 64; H. LULEWICZ, *Gniewów o unię ciąg dalszy*, p. 122.

¹²³ H. LULEWICZ, *Gniewów o unię ciąg dalszy*, pp. 228, 380. See also: Андрэй Радаман, *Інструкцыя Навагародскага сойма паслам на elekцыйны сойм 1587 г.*, Беларускі Гістарычны Агляд, т. 10: 2003, сш. 1–2 (18–19), pp. 163–174.

¹²⁴ АСД, т. 4, p. 12; Diana KONIECZNA, *Ustrój i funkcjonowanie sejmiku brzeskolitewskiego w latach 1565–1763*, Warszawa 2013, p. 161.

egation of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania who acknowledged officially that Stefan Bathory was king and the grand duke of Lithuania included: J. Świrski, J. Klukowski, H. Puksza, M. Sokołowski¹²⁵. Envoys for the subsequent ordinary seyms of the Rzeczpospolita were: A. Pocij (1579/1580), S. Szyrma (1589) and A. Stankiewicz (1598)¹²⁶. Moreover, the following persons contributed to the work of dietines and conventions of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania in the last three decades of the 16th century: K. Giedroyć, J. Klukowski, A. Pocij, M. Sokołowski, S. Sakowicz, J. Świrski, M. Snowski, A. Stankiewicz, M. Stankiewicz-Billewicz, A. Chalecki¹²⁷. Royal envoys to county dietines in the years 1567–1577 were: M. Koncza (the county of Wiłkomierz (Ukmergė)), A. Pocij (the county of Brest), H. Puksza (the county of Vawkavysk), A. Chalecki (the county of Rzeczyca (Rečyca))¹²⁸.

Additionally, at the seym of Lublin in 1569 the following were appointed tax collectors: S. Huba, K. Giedroyć, F. Woropaj, W. Rahoza, A. Stankiewicz. Besides, J. Świrski and A. Dzierżek were appointed stewards for the treasurer of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania¹²⁹. In 1577 at the main dietine of the Grand Duchy in Vawkavysk M. Snowski and M. Stankiewicz-Billewicz were allotted the responsibility for collecting and issuing approved taxes¹³⁰. Later A. Pocij, A. Chalecki, J. Klukowski¹³¹ held the function of county tax collectors.

Among the deputies of the Tribunal of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania which started operating in 1582 there were former envoys for the seym of Lublin. The first marshall of the tribunal in the years 1582 and 1583 was M. Snowski¹³². J. Świrski (1589, 1591) and S. Szyrma (1595)¹³³ were also deputies of the Tribunal. As far as the participation in the work of the Tribunal at the end of the 16th century and at the beginning of the 17th century is concerned, the real record-holder was A. Stankiewicz. He was the judge of the tribunal at least five times in the years 1585, 1588,

¹²⁵ *Akta zjazdów*, vol. 1, pp. 181–182, 184; H. LULEWICZ, *Gniewów o unię ciąg dalszy*, p. 276.

¹²⁶ Archiwum Główne Aktów Dawnych w Warszawie, Archiwum Radziwiłłów, dział [section] II, nr [no.] 368, p. 1; *Codex diplomaticus Regni Poloniae et Magni Ducatus Lituaniae*, vol. 1, ed. Mathias DOGIEL, Vilnae 1758, p. 239; D. KONIECZNA, op.cit., p. 160; H. LULEWICZ, *Gniewów o unię ciąg dalszy*, p. 328.

¹²⁷ *Akta zjazdów*, vol. 1, pp. 86–87, 169, 173, 278–280; vol. 2: *Okresy panowań królów elekcyjnych XVI–XVII wiek*, ed. Henryk LULEWICZ, Warszawa 2009, pp. 117–118.

¹²⁸ Иван Лаппо, *Великое княжество Литовское во второй половине XVI столетия. Литовско-русский повет и его сеймик*, Юрьев 1911, приложения, pp. 54, 72.

¹²⁹ НГАБ, КМФ-18, воп. 1, спр. 272, fol. 24; *Помнікі старажытнай беларускай пісьменнасці*, рэд. Юліян С. Пшыркоў, Мінск 1975, p. 83; *Lietuvos Metrika*, kn. 532, pp. 78–79; *Volumina Constitutionum*, T. 2, vol. 1, p. 263.

¹³⁰ *Akta zjazdów*, vol. 2, pp. 43–44.

¹³¹ НГАБ, КМФ-18, воп. 1, спр. 285, fol. 276v–277, 287v, 617–617v; *Volumina Constitutionum*, T. 2, vol. 1, pp. 429, 439, 461.

¹³² *Deputaci Trybunału Głównego Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego (1582–1696). Spis*, ed. Andrzej RACHUBA, Warszawa 2007, pp. 61, 63.

¹³³ *Ibid.*, pp. 76, 82, 96. J. Świrski was a representative of the country of Vilnius and Oszmiana, while P. Szyma – of the country of Pinsk.

1595, 1603 and 1605¹³⁴, simultaneously holding the office of the marshall of the Tribunal during the Navahrudak (1588) and Minsk (1595) terms of office¹³⁵.

Other envoys of 1569 took part in various diplomatic missions. For example, A. Chalecki was sent as a messenger from the seym of 1569 to Muscovy and in November 1569 secured safe conduct from Ivan IV for the diplomatic mission of the Rzeczpospolita. The secretary of the mission was appointed A. Charytonowicz-Obryński¹³⁶. M. Giedroyć was one of the envoys sent by the convention of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania in October 1574 to Henry Valoise to persuade him to return to the Rzeczpospolita¹³⁷. In the years 1572 and 1573, F. Woropaj¹³⁸ acted as a messenger to Muscovy. In October 1587 J. Świrski was elected one of the envoys of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania to two pretenders to the throne of the Rzeczpospolita: the Swedish prince Sigismund III Vasa and the archduke Maximilian¹³⁹.

Quite a few envoys (8,19%) made a political career on a county level. J. Świrski and A. Iłgowski held municipal offices. The former was the vice-palatinus of Vilnius (1586–1593), while the latter was the castle judge of Kaunas (1578)¹⁴⁰. High offices were also held by: K. Giedroyć (the sub-chamberlain of Kaunas in the years 1581–1599), M. Sokołowski (the standard-bearer of Słonim from 1579) and A. Pocij (the district judge of Brest in the years 1576/1577–1588)¹⁴¹. J. Klukowski, A. Stankiewicz and A. Chalecki held a few county offices. J. Klukowski was a steward (*horodniczy*) (1573–1582) and starost (1582–1601) of Hrodna¹⁴². A. Stankiewicz was the Chamberlain of Minsk from 1583 and the Starost from 1592¹⁴³. A. Chalecki was a judge of Rzczyca (Rečyca) from 1579, and from 1589 – the

¹³⁴ Ibid., pp. 69, 76, 96, 121, 127. He represented the voivodeship of Mstislaw and the country of Minsk.

¹³⁵ Ibid., pp. 73, 94.

¹³⁶ АСД, т. 7, р. 48; *Книга посольская Метрики Великого княжества Литовского*, т. 1: 1545–1572 гг., ред. Михаил А. Оболенский, Игнатий Н. Данилович, Москва 1843, pp. 284–285, 290–293. See also: A. Radaman, *Pod Charytonowicza-Wobrynских (Abrynskich)*, pp. 57–58; Uladzimir PADALINSKI, *Szlachta Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego w misjach dyplomatycznych Rzeczypospolitej (ostatnie trzydziestolecie XVI w.)*, [in:] *Polska wobec wielkich konfliktów w Europie nowożytnej. Z dziejów dyplomacji i stosunków międzynarodowych w XV–XVIII wieku*, ed. Ryszard SKOWRON, Kraków 2009, pp. 246, 256.

¹³⁷ H. LULEWICZ, *Gniewów o unię ciąg dalszy*, pp. 188–190.

¹³⁸ U. PADALINSKI, *Szlachta Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego*, p. 257.

¹³⁹ H. LULEWICZ, *Gniewów o unię ciąg dalszy*, pp. 395–397.

¹⁴⁰ J. TĘGOWSKI, op.cit., p. 384; *Urzednicy Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego*, vol. 1, p. 160; vol. 2, p. 414.

¹⁴¹ J. DZIĘGIELEWSKI, op.cit., p. 29; A. RADAMAN, *Samorząd sejmikowy*, p. 85; *Urzednicy Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego*, vol. 2, p. 399.

¹⁴² *Urzednicy Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego*, vol. 2, pp. 252, 337.

¹⁴³ *Метрыка Вялікага княства Літоўскага. Кніга 70. (1582–1585)*, падрыхт. Андрэй А. Мяцельскі, Мінск 2008, p. 101; Андрэй Радаман, Віталь Галубовіч, Даріус Вілімас, *Земскія ўраднікі Менскага павеата ў другой палове XVI–першай палове XVII стст.*, Полацкія гістарычныя запіскі, т. 3: 2006, p. 65. Moreover, at least in 1575 A. Stankiewicz held a position of the podstarost of Mińsk, see: АСД, т. 4, pp. 16–18.

marshall of Rzeczyca (Rečyca)¹⁴⁴. In September 1569 M. Koncza was appointed for the office of the district clerk of Wilkomierz (Ukmergė). However, he did not take the office, for the law had been breached in the appointment procedure¹⁴⁵. The careers of both envoys (4,8%) were connected with the chancery and the treasury of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania: A. Charytonowicz-Obryński in 1574 became the clerk of the Grand Duchy, while A. Iłgowski from 1586 was the treasury clerk¹⁴⁶.

Finally, four envoys (9,5%) became senators of the Rzeczpospolita. D. Pac was the first to hold the office – in 1572 he was appointed the castellan of Smolensk¹⁴⁷. M. Giedroyc¹⁴⁸ was the bishop of Samogitia from 1576 until his death in 1608. One of the leaders of envoys of the Grand Duchy to the seym of Lublin, M. Snowski, in 1578 became the castellan of Vitebsk¹⁴⁹. A. Pocij made both a secular and clerical career. At first in 1588 he became the member of the senate of the Rzeczpospolita as the castellan of Brest. Nevertheless, in 1593 he became a clergyman and under the name of Hipacy (Hypatius) he became the orthodox bishop of Wilkomierz (Ukmergė), and as such he played a crucial role in the Union of Brest (1596) concluded between the Roman-Catholic Church and the Orthodox Church. In 1599 Hipacy Pocij became the metropolitan bishop of Kiev and was the head of Uniates in the Rzeczpospolita until his death in 1613¹⁵⁰. We would like to stress that all these senators played an active role in the social and political life of the Rzeczpospolita at the end of the 16th and the beginning of the 17th centuries. It may be concluded that 12 envoys of the Grand Duchy (28,6%) participating in the last stage of the seym of Lublin continued their political career, mostly at a county level.

To recapitulate, most envoys of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania participating in the last stage of the seym of Lublin in 1569 belonged to the lower and middle *szlachta*. Envoys belonging to the titled or wealthy *szlachta* constituted a minority. Voivodships and counties in Lublin were normally represented by nobles connected with the land they represented, mostly of Ruthenian and Lithuanian origin. The percentage of envoys with Polish roots was relatively high – they had lived in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania for some time. Most envoys of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania were officials at the county level or nobles holding no offices. Many envoys were connected with the judicial system of the Grand Duchy. Let us underline

¹⁴⁴ Oskar HAŁECKI, *Chalecki Andrzej*, [in:] PSB, vol. 3, Kraków 1937, p. 247.

¹⁴⁵ *Urządnicy Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego*, vol. 1, p. 446.

¹⁴⁶ НГАБ, КМФ-18, воп. 1, спр. 72, fol. 37; А. Радаман, *Род Харытановічаў-Вобрынскіх (Абрынскіх)*, p. 58.

¹⁴⁷ He held the office until his death in 1578, see: *Urządnicy Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego. Spisy*, vol. 4: *Ziemia smoleńska i województwo smoleńskie XIV–XVIII wiek*, ed. Andrzej RACHUBA, Warszawa 2003, p. 87; J. WIŚNIEWSKI, op.cit., p. 695.

¹⁴⁸ S. HERBST, op.cit., pp. 430–431.

¹⁴⁹ He held the office until his death in 1578, see: H. LULEWICZ, *Snowski Malcher (Melchior) h. Dolęga*, pp. 408–410.

¹⁵⁰ J. DZIĘGIELEWSKI, op.cit., pp. 29–31. Let us notice that in the years 1589–1599 the metropolitan bishop of Kiev was Michał Rahoza – the son of the envoy for the seym of Lublin of 1569 Wasyl Rahoza, the court standard-bearer, see: B. KUMOR, op.cit., pp. 453–457.

that over half of the envoys had been associated with the hospodar's court earlier. We think that it is an important evidence for the influence of Sigismund Augustus on the election and activity of representatives of the Grand Duchy in Lublin in the summer of 1569. At the same time, the data acquired show that almost two-thirds of envoys participated actively in the public life of the state. Many envoys enjoyed esteem and authority among the local *szlachta* – they tended to evince a high level of political culture and legal knowledge. About one-third of the envoys of the Grand Duchy for the seym of Lublin after 1569 achieved higher levels of the political career. Nevertheless, only four of them managed to enter the senate of the Rzeczpospolita. Generally, it may be stated that many of the envoys representing the Grand Duchy in the final stage of the seym of Lublin in 1569 affected the social-political life of the state of the second half of the 16th century and the beginning of the 17th century. The group included: Andrzej Chalecki, Andrzej Charytonowicz-Obryński, Malcher Giedroyć, Jan Gradowski, Jan Klukowski, Paweł Ostrowicki, Dominik Pac, Adam Pocij, Malcher Snowski, Andrzej Stankiewicz, Mikołaj Stankiewicz-Billewicz, and Jan Świrski.

Translated from Polish by Agnieszka Chabros

REPREZENTACJA ZIEMSKA WIELKIEGO KSIĘSTWA LITEWSKIEGO
NA KOŃCOWYM ETAPIE SEJMU LUBELSKIEGO
(CZERWIEC–SIERPIEŃ 1569 ROKU)

Streszczenie

Słowa kluczowe: szlachta, posłowie ziemscy, sejm walny, Wielkie Księstwo Litewskie, elity polityczne, status społeczny, pochodzenie etniczne

Celem artykułu jest analiza składu reprezentacji ziemskiej Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego na końcowym etapie sejmu lubelskiego w czerwcu–sierpniu 1569 r. Większość posłów Wielkiego Księstwa należała do drobnej i średniej szlachty. Posłowie należący do grona szlachty utytułowanej lub zamożnej stanowili wyraźną mniejszość. Przedstawicielami województw i powiatów w Lublinie była z reguły szlachta od dłuższego czasu związana z ziemią, którą reprezentowali, w większości ruskiego (białoruskiego i ukraińskiego) oraz litewskiego pochodzenia. Jednocześnie stosunkowo wysoki był odsetek posłów mających korzenie polskie, choć zwykle już dłużej mieszkających w Wielkim Księstwie. Większość posłów ziemskich Wielkiego Księstwa była urzędnikami powiatowymi lub szlachcicami bez urzędu. Znaczący udział w reprezentacji mieli posłowie związani z systemem sądowym Wielkiego Księstwa. Podkreślny też, że ponad połowa posłów była już wcześniej związana z dworem hospodarskim. Moim zdaniem jest to istotny dowód na wpływ Zygmunta Augusta na wybór i działalność przedstawicieli ziemskich Wielkiego Księstwa na

sejmie w Lublinie latem 1569 r. Jednocześnie uzyskane dane pokazują, że prawie dwie trzecie posłów aktywnie uczestniczyło w życiu publicznym państwa. Spora grupa cieszyła się wpływami i dużym autorytetem w środowisku lokalnej szlachty, często mając jednocześnie wysoki poziom wiedzy prawnej. Około jedna trzecia posłów Wielkiego Księstwa na sejm lubelski już po 1569 r. osiągnęła wyższe szczeble politycznej kariery. Jednak tylko czworgu z nich udało się wejść do senatu Rzeczypospolitej.

DIE REPRÄSENTANZ DER LANDBOTEN DES GROSSFÜRSTENTUMS LITAUEN
IN DER SCHLUSSPHASE DES LUBLINER REICHSTAGES
(JUNI–AUGUST 1569)

Zusammenfassung

Schlüsselbegriffe: Szlachta, Landboten, Versammlungsreichstag, Großfürstentum Litauen, politische Eliten, Sozialstatus, ethnische Herkunft

Der Artikel analysiert die Zusammensetzung der Landbotenrepräsentanz des Großfürstentums Litauen in der Schlussphase des Lubliner Reichstages im Juni bis August 1569. Die Abgeordneten des Großfürstentums gehörten überwiegend der kleinen und mittleren Szlachta an. Abgeordnete aus den Reihen des titulierten oder vermögenden Adels waren deutlich in der Minderzahl. Als Vertreter der Wojewodschaften und Kreise agierten in der Regel Adelige, die seit langem mit der von ihnen repräsentierten Gegend verbunden waren; sie waren überwiegend ruthenischer (weißrussischer und ukrainischer) sowie litauischer Herkunft. Zugleich war der Anteil von Abgeordneten mit polnischen Wurzeln relativ hoch, wobei diese üblicherweise bereits seit längerem im Großfürstentum lebten. Die Mehrzahl der Landboten des Großfürstentums waren Kreisbeamte oder Adelige ohne Amt. Bedeutenden Anteil an der Repräsentanz hatten Abgeordnete, die mit dem Gerichtssystem des Großfürstentums verbunden waren. Es sei zudem unterstrichen, dass mehr als die Hälfte der Abgeordneten bereits vorher mit dem großfürstlichen Hof verbunden gewesen war. Meiner Ansicht nach ist dies ein wichtiger Hinweis auf den Einfluss Sigismund Augusts auf die Auswahl und die Tätigkeit der Landboten des Großfürstentums auf dem Lubliner Reichstag im Sommer 1569. Zugleich zeigen die erhobenen Daten, dass fast zwei Drittel der Abgeordneten aktiv am öffentlichen Leben des Staates beteiligt waren. Eine beachtliche Gruppe genoss Einfluss und große Autorität im Milieu des lokalen Adels, wobei sie häufig gleichzeitig über ein großes juristisches Wissen verfügten. Ungefähr ein Drittel der Abgeordneten des Großfürstentums zum Lubliner Reichstag erklimmte kurz nach 1569 eine höher Stufe der politischen Karriere. Allerdings gelang es nur vier von ihnen, in den Senat der Rzeczpospolita aufzusteigen.