

*Tomasz Wiślicz, The Political Life of Peasants in the Commonwealth
from the Sixteenth to the Eighteenth Century — an Outline*

The article intends to bring peasants of the early modern era back to political history by outlining fundamental problems of the social organisation of public space in the village, and to propose methods of their analysis. Although isolated from the political life of the country, the peasants lived and acted within their own social structures (the *gromada* — commune). At least part of the village residents was involved in decision-making, chose (and dismissed) the leaders, influenced the principles of group activity, and created, transformed and sustained rural political institutions.

The point of departure for an analysis of the mechanisms of political life in a peasant *gromada* is the case of Tomasz Kobiecz, the *wojt* of Golcowa near Brzozowo. In November 1621 the *gromada* recalled Kobiecz from his post and accused him of abusing power. His dismissal illustrates the peasant vision of normative rural authority and ways of its application. The whole procedure was carried out in an atmosphere of legality and with the assistance of *gromada* political institutions and the manor, engaged in the case by the opponents of the corrupt official.

An excellent example of the political activity of a *gromada* in circumstances created by an absence of external supervision is the so-called uprising in the *starostwo* of Libusza in the region of Biecz (1755–1758). An analysis of the peasants' undertakings during the disturbances suggests that they sustained the political system of a corvee village even when manorial administration had ceased to exist. Nonetheless, deprived of control wielded by the manor this system tended to become deformed. The politically most active leaders of the rebellion took over the functions of the manor house, assumed its role as an arbiter, enforced their will by resorting to force and ignoring the principles of rule of law, and profited from their new position.

All forms of the peasants' political life evolved on a local level (village or estate) without any possibilities of affecting state policy. The part performed by the attitude of the village towards manorial supervision and intervention in its political life from the viewpoint of the emergence of peasant political culture as such constitutes a different research problem.

Translated by
Aleksandra Rodzińska-Chojnowska

*Andrzej Karpiński, Deputies from Cracow in the Parliament of the
Commonwealth in the Sixteenth–Eighteenth Century*

The intention of this article was to solve the question of the representation of the Cracow townspeople in the Polish Parliament (Sejm) from the sixteenth to the eighteenth century. The author also discussed, i. a. the struggle conducted by Cracow for the sake of maintaining the town's prerogatives associated with the right to dispatch its representatives to ordinary and extraordinary parliamentary sessions, the circumstances of electing the burgher deputies and the contents of their instructions, the character of the activity pursued by the Cracovians at the time of the debates, and their reports about the expenses of journeying to Warsaw and Grodno.

The author determined the significance of the so-called fees (in cash or in kind), which, due to the waning activity of the Cracow deputies, played an increasingly important part in settling the town's concrete issues by its gentry and magnate protectors. Other examined topics include the lively extra-parliamentary undertakings of the Cracow deputies, who in the course of numerous private meetings with assorted dignitaries or influential gentry representatives tried to persuade them to speak in the Chamber of Deputies and the Senate in the name of Cracow.

Finally, the article draws attention to the participation of the Cracow burghers in debates held by the dietines of Little Poland, comparing them with the representatives of Wilno, Poznan, Lwow and Lublin, who while in Warsaw tried to settle various postulates of importance for the local townspeople.

Translated by
Aleksandra Rodzińska-Chojnowska

***Jerzy Dygala, The Participation of the Gentry of Royal Prussia
in the Political Life of the Province and the Commonwealth in 1733–1772 (Statistical
Interpretation)***

The political activity of the gentry in Royal Prussia in 1758–1764 can be best captured for the period when province's political life was at its liveliest. Pertinent research has established the names of about 1 230 representatives of the politically active local gentry, i. e. more or less one-third of the potentially active nobility (males) living at the time in Royal Prussia. The pre dominating component was the petty gentry, comprising 72,4% of all politically active noblemen. The supporters of the Czartoryski familia totalled 624 (50,7%). It is highly characteristic that among the adherents of the familia an overwhelming majority, i. e. as many as 75,1%, belonged to the petty gentry. The medium gentry (owners of 1–2 villages) constituted only 4,7% of familia's supporters. The structure of the so-called Prussian patriot party, linked with the court of Augustus III, was quite different. Out of a total of 428 (34,8%), the percentage of the petty gentry was 65,9%, the medium gentry — 17,7%, and the more prosperous gentry — 15,1%. The third distinguished group are noblemen who in the years 1758–1764 changed their political stand and party affiliation. Here, we are dealing with only 178 persons (14,5%), with a conspicuous pre dominance of the petty gentry (78,6%).

The author presented the presence of senators from Royal Prussia in parliamentary sittings and Senate councils during the reign of Augustus III (1734–1763), with an additional characteri sation of deputies from this province attending Sejm sessions in 1764, 1766 and 1767/1768. The article attempts to determine the degree of literacy among the gentry from Prussia: as many as 55,7% of the petty gentry could not sign their names, but noblemen possessing at least one village did not include any illiterates.

Translated by
Aleksandra Rodzińska-Chojnowska

Almut Bues, The Gentry and the Duke in the Duchy of Courland

During the early modern era gentry ideology in the Commonwealth contained assorted specific values and elements associated with Eastern Europe, and comprised a powerful integrative force affecting the consciousness of all the members of the gentry estate regardless of the region. True, the Duchy of Courland did not possess a functioning expanded cliental system, which, as in the Commonwealth, could have acted as an administrative structure, but bonds between patrons and clients created an essential tie connecting the gentry of Courland with gentry families in Poland and Lithuania. At the same time, the local gentry, whose members frequently opposed the Kettler family, supported the dukes whenever the interests and existence of the duchy were at stake. The Kettler court in Mitawa was perceived by the gentry elite as an instrument for enforcing and stabilising the predominance of the estates. At the same time, the ducal court acted as a guarantor of independent policy in the region, and prevented closer integration between the Duchy and the Commonwealth.

Translated by
Aleksandra Rodzińska-Chojnowska

***Bogusław Dybaś, On the Privileges of Piltyń. a Contribution to the Position
of the Livonian Gentry in the Polish–Lithuanian
Commonwealth***

Livonia, which in about 1560 found itself within the range of the impact of the Jagiellonian monarchy, remained one of the least examined parts of the Polish–Lithuanian Commonwealth, especially within the context of its connections with Poland and Lithuania state. A prominent element was the emergence of the Livonian gentry, whose members originated from the mediaeval vassals of the bishops of Livonia and the Livonian branch of the Teutonic Order; this process was based on *Privilegium Sigismundi Augusti* issued in Wilno by King Zygmunt Augustus of Poland (November 1561). The privilege granted the Livonian gentry a position and status similar to those enjoyed by the Polish gentry, and gradually shared by the gentry in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania (i.a. complete land ownership, rule over the peasants, religious freedom).

The turbulent history of Livonia in the second half of the sixteenth century and at the beginning of the seventeenth century was the reason why the rank of the gentry (especially political rights) underwent a far-reaching differentiation in particular Livonian territories connected with the Polish–Lithuanian Commonwealth (Dzwina Livonia, Courland, the county of Piltyń).

This article deals with a certain aspect of the position held by the gentry in the county of Piltyń, which formerly belonged to the demesne of the bishop of Courland; in 1585 it became part of the Commonwealth upon the basis of a treaty signed by the Polish and Danish monarchs. The treaty guaranteed existing laws and the distinction of the demesne, while the local gentry was to be granted a separate royal privilege confirming its rank. Ultimately, the status of the county within the Commonwealth and of the local gentry was regulated by the Statutes of Piltyń (1611), a parliamentary constitution from the same year, and *Formula regiminis* from 1617. Before this took place, the gentry endeavoured to obtain the privilege promised by King Stefan Batory. A noteworthy proposal formulated by the gentry of Piltyń in 1604, published in an appendix to this article, outlines a variant of incorporating the county and its population into the systemic framework of the Commonwealth, while preserving the existing privileges and certain distinctive features. The proposal casts additional light on the complicated evolution of the position represented by the gentry in former Livonia, and illustrates the capacity of the systemic structure of the Polish–Lithuanian state (as it was perceived by the inhabitants of the county of Piltyń).

Translated by
Aleksandra Rodzińska–Chojnowska

*Marzena Lidke, Rus' Families among the Elite of the Grand Duchy of
Lithuania from the Sixteenth to the Eighteenth Century*

Already in the Middle Ages the Grand Duchy of Lithuania functioned as a multi-ethnic and multi-creed state organism. This diversity pertained to all the estates, and thus also to the political elite, envisaged as a group of the highest state officials: senators and ministers. The basic ethnic components were the Lithuanians and the Ruthenians. The former, due to their Catholicism, for long played a primary role in the state. On the other hand, the Ruthenians, who up to the appearance in the Duchy of Reformation creeds were identified primarily with the "Greek" Church, had limited political rights as regards supreme state offices such as the voivode and castellan of Wilno and Troki, guaranteed by the privileges of Horodlo exclusively to the Catholics. Exceptions were made for particular deserving persons such as Hetman Konstanty Ostrogski. Furthermore, all these posts were accessible to converts to Catholicism. The limitations were abolished in 1563–1568. In the so called Rus' annexes the Ruthenians, both princes and lords, could hold the highest land offices with no restrictions, although this privilege did not denote membership in the hospodar council. Up to 1569 the political elite was composed of the following princes: the Ostrogski, the Zasławski of Volhynia, the Sanguszko, the Wiśniowiecki, the Zbarazski, the Połubiński, the Czartoryski, the Korecki, the Proński, the Słucki, the Holszański, the Sołomerecki and the Kapusta. The lords included members of the Bohowitynowicz, Chodkiewicz, Hlebowicz and Wiaśewicz, Hornostaj, Kmita, Pociiej, Sapieha, Siemaszko, Tyszkiewicz,

Wojna, Wołłowicz, Hajko, Tryzna, Kierdej and eventually the Zenowicz families. After the establishment of the Commonwealth of Two Nations, up to the mid seventeenth century its senators included princes: Hołowczyński, Drucki Sokoliński, Łukomski, Massalski, Ogiński, Dolski, Drucki-Horski, Czetwertyński and lords: Korsak, Chalecki, Haraburda, Siemaszko, Zahorowski, Czaplic-Szpanowski, Kopeć Mielezsko, Słuszko, Stetkiewicz and eventually Obryński, Lacki, Łowejko, Jesman and Chreptowicz. Members of the Proński, Wiśniowiecki, Zbaraski, Korecki, Ostrogski, Kapusta, Zahorowski, Czaplic-Szpanowski, Hornostaj, Kmita Czarnobyłski, Hajko, Pociiej and Wiaśewicz families did not attain senatorial rank.

The second half of the seventeenth century witnessed the promotion of the Puzyna, Wojna-Jasienicki, Chrapowicki, Zienkowicz, Kurczowie, Jewłaszewski and Obuchowicz families. The Wiśniowieckis, Wiaśewiczowie and Pocijejs returned to the political elite, which was no longer composed of representatives of the Sanguszko, Zasławski, Hołowczyński, Massalski, Sołomerecki, Czetwertyński, Wojna, Siemaszko and Tryzna families. In the eighteenth century senatorial posts were granted to members of such families as the Drucki-Lubecki, Wyhowski, śaba, Bułharyn and eventually the Oskierko. The Sołtan returned to the senatorial "estate", which now did not include the Połubiński, Drucki-Horski, Dolski, Słuszka, Wiaśewicz, Zenowicz, Chalecki, Hlebowicz, Jewłaszewski, Korsak, Wojna Jasienicki, Kopeć, Zienkowicz, Stetkiewicz, Kurcz, Puzyna, Wiśniowiecki, Drucki-Sokoliński, and Pociiej.

The abolition of religious restrictions in the second half of the sixteenth century was accompanied by the gradual progress of the Counter-Reformation, discernible in mass-scale conversion to Catholicism by some of the Lithuanian families, which previously turned to Protestant creeds or belonged to the Eastern Rite Church. In this way, the local bishops, who should be regarded as members of the political elite of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, included representatives of the Holszański, Wojna, Wołłowicz, Tyszkiewicz, Sapieha, Kotowicz, Zieńkowicz, Massalski, Chodkiewicz, Puzyna, Czartoryski and Ogiński families.

It is worth noting that up to the grant of equal rights in 1563 the office of the voivode and castellan of Wilno and Troki was sporadically held by Ruthenian families, while in the following period, to the end of the eighteenth century, they comprised more than half of all the officials. This fact should be associated with conversion to Catholicism and unification (customs, language

and creed) with the remaining magnates and gentry in the Grand Duchy.

From the second half of the sixteenth century to the eighteenth century political leaders of Ruthenian origin included members of the Ogiński, Massalski, Sapieha, Tyszkiewicz, Wołłowicz, Chodkiewicz, and eventually the Hlebowicz and Korsak families.

The prime factors influencing the ethnic composition of the political elite of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania were the binding law, also as regards religious restrictions, and the religious preferences of the given monarch and his domestic policy. Equal importance should be ascribed to the activity of particular persons interested in social promotion or the retention of their achieved positions, and the vitality of assorted families and their tendency to expand or die out.

Translated by
Aleksandra Rodzińska–Chojnowska

Mariusz Robert Drozdowski przy współudziale Teresy Chynczewskiej-Hennel, The Cossacks in the Commonwealth from the Sixteenth to the Seventeenth Century. Another Estate in Old Polish Society

The article depicts the evolution of the Zaporozhe Cossacks into a social estate conscious of its rights, privileges and national distinctness, together with all the consequences for the Commonwealth and the Ukraine.

The essential presentation concerns the origin of the Zaporozhe Cossacks, with particular emphasis on their social and national composition and the creation of the first Cossack register. The author also emphasizes the impact of the reign of Stefan Batory on the further development of the estate character of the Cossack population, and describes the attitude of the Cossacks at the time of the religious conflict between the Orthodox, Uniate and Roman Catholic communities, initiated by the council of Brzesc. While considering the efforts made by the Cossacks to restore the rights of the Orthodox Church, the author drew attention to the part played by them in the reactivation of the Orthodox hierarchy in 1620 as well as the demands made by Cossack delegations at the Sejm of the Commonwealth in the first half of the seventeenth century, when they called for the “mitigation of the Greek creed”.

The article focuses on the armed risings of the Zaporozhe Cossacks at the end of the sixteenth century and during the first half of the seventeenth century as well as their influence upon the fate of the Polish and Ukrainian nations. The article is supplemented with reflections about the breakthrough stages of the uprising led by Bohdan Chmielnicki, which crowned the transformation of the Zaporozhe Cossacks into a social estate conscious of its distinctness. The discussed issues include the compact of Perejasław (1654), the Union of Hadziacz and the Treaty of Andruszow.

Translated by
Aleksandra Rodzińska-Chojnowska

Ryszard Skowron, Poland and the Poles in Spanish Diplomatic Correspondence during the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Century

This study is based on Spanish diplomatic correspondence pertaining to the Commonwealth and originating from the sixteenth and seventeenth century. The most important sets of sources are to be found at the Archivo General in Simancas, and part has been published in the *Elementa ad fontium editiones* series. Obviously, all the sources are of a strictly diplomatic nature. In the 1572–1698 period assorted missions in Poland were carried out by the following diplomats: Pedro Fajardo y Cordoba Marquis de los Velez (1573), Pedro Cornejo (1583), Guillen de San Clemente (1587), Francisco de Mendoza (1597), Lamoral Count de Ligne and Francisco Damant (1601), Abraham de Dohna (1612), Johann Hermant (1615), Count de Solre and Baron de Auchy (1626), Baron de Auchy (1627-1630), Gabriel de Roy (1627), Count de Solre and Alfonso de Vazquez (1635–1636), Algretto di Alegretti (1640), Pedro Roca de Villagutierre (1640), Vincezo Tuttavilla (1641), Maximilian Dietrichstein (1645), Henrique Teller (1646), Baron de Auchy (1646–1647), Juan de Borja (1651), Ferdinand Harrach (1669), Fernan Nuñez (1670), and Pedro Ronquillo (1674).

With the exception of accounts by Mendoza and Nuneza, the correspondence conducted by the Spanish diplomats lacks descriptions or characterisations of Polish society, mores, culture and geography. Various opinions and perceptions of Poland and the Poles are closely connected with the political tasks entrusted to the diplomats during their stay abroad. This is the reason why they first and foremost aimed at defining the political system and the structure of the authorities in the Commonwealth. The former was described as a mixed monarchy, with considerably restricted royal authority and extremely expanded liberties and privileges of the gentry. The correspondents distinguished only the fundamental elements of the system, without delving into state structures. On the other hand, the examined correspondence does not contain critical views about the legal and political foundations of the Polish–Lithuanian state, and the diplomats tried to adapt their activity to the prevailing reality. Stronger critical tones concern predominantly the interregnum. According to the Spanish diplomats the liberties and privileges of the local gentry exerted an essential impact on the domestic and foreign policy of the state.

Translated by
Aleksandra Rodzińska–Chojnowska

*Wojciech Kriegseisen, The Society of the Commonwealth of the Gentry
and the Modern “European Norm” — Select Problems
of Religious Relations*

The question of relations between the pro-Reformation Christian Churches and the state of the gentry is one of the most fascinating domains of research concerning the social history of the modern-era Commonwealth. The extent to which the specificity of religious relations in the modern Polish-Lithuanian state deviated from the “European norm” of the period remains particularly interesting.

Our reflections should resign predominantly from the imprecise term “religious tolerance”, much abused in political discourse, and concentrate on studies focused on assorted conceptions of relations between modern states and pro-Reformation Churches. We should also abandon attempts at creating periodisation systems, whose purpose is the introduction of chronological and comparative order into the pro-Reformation secularisation of European societies. Owing to local differences, the chronological dissimilarities encompass decades, and discussions involving the authors of chronologies and the adherents of various caesurae could be useful only for authors of synthetic outlines and textbooks.

An analysis of views concerning the state appears to be much more constructive; the same holds true for the conceptions of inter-religious relations devised by the reformers, on the one hand, and by the opponents of resorting to violence, who remained under the influence of Erasmus of Rotterdam, on the other hand. Poland became the scene of a sui generis synthesis of both trends of thought about connections between religion and politics; its outcome assumed the form of religious equal rights for the gentry estate in 1573, and as a consequence — a blockade against confessionalisation. In late sixteenth-century Western Europe universal recognition was won by the Justus Lipsius principle rendering confessionalisation possible and assuming state control over dissenters. It was precisely this conception, envisaged as the “European norm”, which survived until the eighteenth century when the tide of laicisation and the popularisation of Locke’s notion of a division of the Church and the state inaugurated a re-evaluation of views concerning the relation between the “sacrum” and the “profanum” in the already modern European state, which, however, affected Polish society to a very slight degree.

Translated by
Aleksandra Rodzińska-Chojnowska

*Szymon Brzeziński, The Tyrant and Tyranny in Polish Language of Politics
(16th –17th century)*

This study deals with the functioning of the concepts of “tyrant” and “tyranny” in the political language of the Commonwealth in the sixteenth and seventeenth century. The language of politics is treated as a source for becoming familiar with the values shared by the community using it, and thus with its culture, which in this case is tantamount to political culture. In the Commonwealth the two concepts — distinctive and fundamental for understanding authority in the language of politics as such — gained new contexts of their application. Both played a special role at the time of political conflicts or crises, such as those which drew the author’s attention: the interregnum of 1572–1573 together with accompanying dilemmas, the conflict between assorted parties during the reign of Stefan Batory together with its culmination caused by the case of Samuel Zborowski (1584–1585), the political tension at the time of Zygmunt III, expressed strongest of all during the Zebrzydowski rebellion (1606–1609), and, finally, the reign of Jan Kazimierz (1648–1668) together with the Jerzy Lubomirski rebellion (1665–1666). The overwhelming majority of the presented research is based on popular writings (journalism) from the discussed periods. The titular terms were studied in all their possible applications, taking into account also their context, connotations, opposites, synonyms, associated features (attributes) and evaluation. The author cites and partly employs the assumptions of the most important trends of examining the history of concepts within the range of linguistic studies and historiography: the field theory of meaning, quantitative methods, cognitive linguistic studies, the German “history of concepts” school (Begriffsgeschichte), as well as Anglo–Saxon (Q. Skinner, J. G. A. Pocock) and French studies (lexicometrie). He also discusses the history of the concepts in Polish research. A suitable context is provided by an analysis of the most important dictionaries of historical vocabulary from the sixteenth and seventeenth century: in the sixteenth century the “despot” appears chiefly in a “geographical” meaning, connected rather with a certain territory (especially the Balkans). Various associations accompany the term “tyrant”, a word which occurs as an entry much more often than “despot”.

In the writings of the first interregnum “tyrant” and “tyranny” belonged to the resources of words most often used in the language of politics. They played a dominating part in the principal current of polemics, i.e. the description of the candidates’ faults and virtues. Applied by all the sides concerned, they held a special place in discussions about candidates from Muscovy. The authors borrowed from associations found in classical definitions of tyranny, adjusting them to their own argumentation, as in disputes on the tyranny of Władysław Jagiełło. In this case, the positive argument used by the supporters of the “Muscovite” contender was the expression “light tyranny” illustrating a “battle of words” (an attempted endowment of tyranny with desired meaning and context). The same sources demonstrate that the described concepts were not isolated but remained an inseparable fragment of comprehending the political sphere, also in its close association with religion and morality.

Numerous examples of the usage of “tyranny” in the political struggle of the time are provided by declarations aimed against chancellor Jan Zamoyski, recorded at the time of disputes accompanying the so-called Zborowskis case (anti-chancellor literature, pamphlets, and writings). The “tyrant” and “tyranny” became the chief accusation formulated in the propaganda campaign conducted by the Zborowskis. Another noteworthy phenomenon was the charge of tyranny launched not only against the ruler but predominantly his official; despite certain precedents in public debates, this was a novum on such a scale. On the other hand, the same terms were applied extremely rarely in the language of correspondence. The image of Zamoyski is a combination of the traditional portrait of the “evil adviser” of the king–tyrant with a characterisation concurrent with the universal vision of tyranny (a new accusation of “Machiavellism”). Zamoyski did not remain indifferent to the rhetoric of the camp of Zborowskis’ supporters and readily resorted to the term “tyranny” as a counter-argument. In this controversy, tyranny, together with its context and associations (violence, egoism, armed force, acting outside the boundaries of law and

institutions, the sowing of discord and benefiting from ensuing divisions) played a primary part.

The high frequency of the examined concepts is a characteristic feature of writings from the time of the Zebrzydowski rebellion. Both sides — the rebels and the royal supporters — launched the charge of tyranny. Tyranny played a crucial part in justifying the right to declare disobedience towards the monarch. An analysis of the context of the application of the terms in question shows that in rebels' publicistic they acted as live ideas, functioning in the very centre of political debates (including the linguistic dispute). The authors turned to well-established and more topical examples of tyranny. On the other hand, accusations levelled at the rebels used the concept of the "tyranny of many". A set of accusations was also employed against the Jesuits. A new example was the slogan of the "tyranny of law", and the stereotype of "Muscovite tyranny" was still in use.

A corpus of texts from the reign of Jan Kazimierz makes it possible to observe assorted changes in the functioning of the titular concepts, especially if we compare them with discussions dating back to the Zebrzydowski rebellion. The disproportion in resorting to the argument of tyranny by the two most important sides in conflicts from the 1650s and 1660s was much less conspicuous — the royal side levelled this charge against Jerzy Lubomirski. Adherents of the royal camp employed a whole set of references and associations traditionally linked with "tyranny". This was a symptom of the propaganda strategy of the royal camp, which obliterated the different styles of declarations made by both sides. The meaning of *dominatio* evolved from a predominantly neutral term to a negative one. Generalisations are rare and, as a rule, tyranny was referred to a concrete opponent or phenomenon (Lubomirski, the court, Swedes, "schismatics", soldiers). References to typical examples of Turkish and Muscovite tyranny were rarer. In the latter case, "tyranny" was accompanied by a wider use of, e. g. *potentia* or *dominatus*, while "despotism" was almost totally lacking. As a rule, "tyranny" was replaced by *absolutum dominium*, generally identified with tyranny or regarded as its lower level.

"Tyrant" and "tyranny" are one of the foremost concepts in the political debate of the sixteenth and seventeenth century, particularly at the time of intensified confrontation. The debate involving them was conducted also with their help. Apart from the role performed in the political theory of the epoch, the terms in question proved to be of importance for political praxis. Originating in the political philosophy, the categories used in the context of current disputes were each time rendered topical for a concrete purpose (e. g. "private" tyranny in relations between neighbours, „spiritual tyranny" in instances involving consciousness, military tyranny). Despite political and ideological divisions, „tyranny" was applied by all sides involved in the controversies; hence the conclusion about the essential unity of the language of politics. The semantic field of tyranny includes the tyrant's egoism (the pursuit exclusively of own welfare and not public good), violence, cruelty and aggressive methods, secrecy, and contacts with foreigners as regards state issues (the latter on a large scale at the time of the Zebrzydowski rebellion). In order to understand tyranny during the examined period essential importance is attributed to its connection with violence, especially its armed counterpart. In the case of J. Zamoyski and J. Lubomirski we are dealing with a connection between "tyranny" and offices, especially that of the hetman. The function of the hetman conceived as the wielding of power became an additional source of a threat of tyranny. The charge of tyranny launched against Jan Zamoyski, together a wide gamut of references, is the first instance when a concrete official was accused on such a large scale.

Translated by
Aleksandra Rodzińska-Chojnowska