Transnational Representations of Revolt and New Modes of Communication in the mid-seventeenth century Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth: Jerzy Lubomirski's Rebellion against King Jan Kazimierz

ANGELA RUSTEMEYER

During the last decades, religion on the one hand, and the slow but steady move towards modern nationalism on the other hand have been considered as the most important factors in early-modern conflicts. The use conflicting parties made of transnational motives in their propaganda, mostly allusions to foreign powers taking sides with their domestic rival, should corroborate this accentuation. So should also a closer look at the seventeenth-century Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, a place of armed conflict and counter-reformation. However, an analysis of transnational motives in the contemporary representation of a seventeenth-century major rebellion in this country, led by the magnate Jerzy Lubomirski, demonstrates the importance of factors other than religion and an emerging national consciousness, namely the structuring of the public sphere through the perception of the actors and the pressure of a political order providing legitimacy for protest: That order demanded radical figures of argumentation to combat the growing protest, for which allusions to the actors' relations to foreign powers provided. Still, transnational positions in the network of communication dealing with the revolt also provided for moderate assessments, which broke with traditional conventions of discourse.

Scepticism about the exclusive role of religion and emerging nationalism in early modern conflicts in Eastern Europe has been provoked by historian Natal'ia Yakovenko. She has convincingly demonstrated that revolts in the seventeenth century were also shaped by the development of subcultures in a society prone to make these categories look less significant than nineteenth and twentieth-century

ideologists wanted them to be. Iakovenko discusses the mid-seventeenth century Khmelnytsky uprising with its numerous victims from all nations and confessions in the concerned areas of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. What undermined central categories such as confession and nation, was a subculture that could be found in all conflicting parties, i.e. the professional identity of soldiers who, independently of their allegiance, shared mutual respect, the desire to make booty, and the contempt for the lives of civilians.[1] The question asked in this book is whether the (self)-positioning of the agents in a transnational context can also be considered as an orientating factor which fashioned modes of action and discourse in early-modern revolts. In this manner, we are studying transnationality as a resource that guided behaviour in a similar way than the subculture analysed by Iakovenko did.

How did transnational motives influence the basic contemporary categories of conflict? The interaction (and maybe alteration) of concepts interpreting conflicts "vertically", that is, as individuals' attacks against authorities perceived as revolt by the attacked, on the one hand and of concepts describing a conflict as ubiquitous and horizontal, that is, as "civil war", on the other is of particular interest here. Both "revolt" and "civil war" partially transformed medieval concepts, notably the right to resistance and the definitions of peace and of the violation of peace. But the concept of "civil war" was more subtle and more hegemonic as to the still unregulated spaces in which social and political action had taken place before the beginning of the modern era. The term "civil war", designating violent conflict not only between subjects and authorities, but also among subjects, came close to contemporaries' experience as depicted above. Yet the topic of civil war is also well-known to have been elaborated by a contemporary of the events described here, Thomas Hobbes, into an apocalyptic vision of universal warfare to be tamed only by a strong state.[2]

The interlinked construction of revolt and civil war which I am interested in can be considered as a part of a large-scale process in the history of communication. Broadly speaking, face-to-face communication as norm and practice, which provoked the interpretation of conflict as a matter of honour between agents identified and represented as persons, was being transformed. More mediated and less personalised communication encouraged the idea of a plurality of opinions

1 N. Iakovenko, Paralel'nyi svit. Doslidzhennia z istorii uiavlen' ta idei v Ukraïni XVI-XVII st. Kyiv 2002, 189-228.

2 Cf. Bernhard Kroener, "Krieg", in *Enzyklopädie der Neuzeit* (7), ed. Friedrich Jaeger (Stuttgart, 2008), col. 137-162.

being natural.[3] The result could theoretically have been the decrease of discursive pressure towards solutions by battle – unless no new means were used to provoke a conflict.

This view of the development of communication may be elaborated to envisage the front lines in early modern conflict. Persons and parties in conflict on all levels of the social hierarchy were profiled by complex processes of construction and distribution of honour titles. In this sense "revolt" was perceived as an asymmetric interpersonal conflict about honour, with a ruler's honour being attacked by subjects' disobedience. As to the transnational aspect of conflict discussed here, it is clear that there were modes of attributing honour which transcended the increasingly fixed borders between early modern states and also the borders sometimes arising within these states. These modes could be, for example, ideals of military honour both in its traditional knightly and its new soldier's version mentioned above. However, titles equal by name did not equally provide their owners with honour, authority and power. The best example of this is the position of kings. Protected by legal acts that were at least similar in criminalising attacks on the person bearing the title of king, the positions of monarchs nevertheless strongly differed. The king's extent of power and the degree to which his position was rooted in an enduring dynasty influenced the variety of means to represent him as a person – and, thus, also the degree to which both royal and anti-royal propaganda sought these means in a transnational context.

The early modern period was characterized by a rapidly increasing exchange of people, goods and information. Transnational motives, which were not always confined to what had actually happened, but to the needs to provide or confirm legitimacy in the very moment when it was being contested, were thus within the reach of the European political elites. Borrowing was facilitated by basic processes marking the period, even if the final result of these processes was a stronger demarcation between countries and cultures. These processes, namely the profiling of confessions, nation building and military reform, were charged with ideology. Insofar, they stood in sharp contrast to the lived experience, which often strikingly contradicted ideologically based promises and expectations. Given these contradictions, it could be useful for agents to extrapolate the conflict by alluding to "foreign" influence or to their adversaries in the conflict, said to be seeking help from abroad. Such motives were conceived and diffused in expectation of their political use or even their juridical dimension, as they could make the adversaries' actions look like conspiracy and treason in the sense of penal law.

3 R. Schlögl, "Kommunikation und Vergesellschaftung unter Anwesenden. Formen des Sozialen und ihre Transformation in der frühen Neuzeit", *Geschichte und Gesellschaft* 24 (2008): 155-224, especially 176, 209, 216-217.

Allusions to foreign influence in propaganda diffused by the different parties in a conflict classified as a revolt are one of two aspects of transnationality in protest movements which I would like to discuss. The other aspect is the structure of the public sphere. A comprehensive discussion of the involvement of European political orders with a transnational space of exchange of information and discourse is out of the scope of this article. But I am going to cite a few examples of how transnationality and extraterritoriality in the seventeenth century provided for an enlargement of the public sphere and for a new perspective on king and rebel, offering an interpretation that transcends the traditional view of revolts as conflicts about honour depicted above.

My topic is a high-ranking noble's mid-seventeenth century rebellion against Jan Kazimierz, king of Poland and grand prince of Lithuania. Due to the lack of a comprehensive study of the public sphere in early-modern Poland-Lithuania, I can only make some preliminary remarks on representation in that rebellion.[4] But I can rely on a number of studies of the factual history of the rebellion, its social background and its political implications. As mentioned above, I also rely on works about conflicts in the Commonwealth which revise the topoi of national historiographies.

The case discussed on the following pages might in still another respect be helpful to continue the revision of stereotypes disseminated by national historiographies. Periods of upheaval in early modern Eastern Europe have been used to establish topoi of vitality or decay. As to the seventeenth century, a somewhat optimistic approach has been applied to Russia, the historical "winner" of that century: Even before the more and more "absolute autocracy" coped with a number of uprisings, the social forces at the very beginning of the century already managed to interpret and present what was in fact mainly a civil war as a conflict with foreign powers, and thus to establish the basis of national statehood.[5] In the case of Poland-Lithuania, historians have stated exactly the opposite: Revolts of the seventeenth century made visible patterns of behaviour that finally led to the fall of the Republic of nobles. Reluctance to reform a political order, which could easily be used for intervention from abroad, was accompanied by the loss of tolerance and the rise of xenophobia, all of which contributed to destabilising and discrediting the

4 Such a study, which would include the transnational dimension of the public sphere in early-modern Poland-Lithuania, could recur to the classical works by Janusz Tazbir, notably Janusz Tazbir, *Rzeczpospolita i świat. Studia z dziejów kultury XVII wieku* (Wrocław, 1971). Tazbir, however, does not explicitly deal with the public sphere.

5 V. Kljuchevskii's interpretation of the growth of national consciousness at the end of the Time of troubles can be understood that way (V. Kljuchevskii, *Sochineniia v deviati tomakh*, 9 vols. (Moskow, 1988), 3: 64.

Commonwealth's political order.[6] But does a political order indeed suffer from xenophobic attitudes of its actors? If this had been the case, there would have been a lot more failed states in history. To be sure, when dealing with the last two centuries preceding the divisions of Poland, one cannot help but pay attention to the making of the fatal stigma of Polish anarchy. Still, in order to properly locate the Polish-Lithuanian case in the current discussion about early-modern communication and the public sphere, the focus of interest should be replaced: The way revolts, the climax of disorder, and their transnational dimension were dealt with might have been less due to a direct orientation on (proto-)national values than to the set of references defining what was "public".

What exactly was this particular revolt about? The Commonwealth of Poland-Lithuania had a political order based on far-reaching rights of the nobility, with the assembly of nobles electing the king. In the period under consideration, candidates usually came not from within the Commonwealth, but from abroad. King Jan Kazimierz, himself from the Swedish dynasty of the Vasa, intended to change the political order of the Commonwealth by having his successor elected while he himself was still alive (vivente rege). It was clear that this would be a successor according to the king's choice. Jerzy Lubomirski, a powerful magnate, Great Marshall of the Commonwealth and himself a possible candidate for the throne, acted against these plans, referring to the rights and the freedom of the nobility.

During the mid-seventeenth century, the Commonwealth was permanently at war with its neighbouring countries. Discontent was not only nourished by the king's plans concerning his successor, but also by the crown's incapacity to pay the troops. The king tried to cope with Lubomirski as the head of resistance by political, military and judicial means. But it was not easy to use criminal law against a noble in a Republic of nobles. Having Lubomirski finally condemned for lèse-majesty, the king drove him into outright military resistance. Lubomirski and his adherents called their military actions a "rokosz", that is, military resistance against a king violating the rights of the nobility. The nobles of the Commonwealth considered this form of resistance against the king not only as legitimate, but also as legal. For them, the *rokosz* was based on their right to organize in confederations not only during an interregnum, but also during a reign when it came to fulfil tasks the monarch would not or could not manage, such as the defence of the Commonwealth's endangered borders or the defence of nobility rights.[7]

6 M. Nagielski, *Rokosz Jerzego Lubomirskiego w 1665 roku* (Warszawa 1994), 242, referring to Tazbir, Rzeczpospolita.

7 J. Bardach, *Historia państwa i prawa Polski*, 5 vols. (Warszawa, 1957), 2 [Od połowy XV wieku do r. 1795]: 244.

Although lead by a magnate, the Lubomirski rebellion was less far away from mass revolt than it might initially appear. A matter of elite politics, it was also linked to a military revolt, and it was a reason for the top players to turn to the most humble subjects for support. Some aspects of the rebellion thus touch the problem of mass revolt both as it has been associated by historians with what used to be called "antifeudal protest" and as it has been identified as the "language of the crowd" ever since the eighteenth century. Still, the revolt first and foremost has to be considered in the scope of the public space in the Republic of nobles. The way this public space and its legal foundations were perceived within the Commonwealth and beyond the borders influenced the status of the country in international relations.

1. PUBLIC PROCEDURE AND INFORMAL POLITICS: THE REPUBLIC'S OPEN FLANK

The notion of *rokosz*, an armed uprising against the king considered legal, concretized the Commonwealth's nobles right to resistance. It is significant that a seventeenth-century French observer of Lubomirski's rebellion found it impossible to translate "rokosz" into French and therefore simply left it as it was.[8]

The French observer's failure to translate the term is significant. Authors like him, writing for external readers, developed a political ethnography of the Republic of nobles, taking an alienated position as referring to what they knew about that political formation. To indicate the uniqueness of certain traits in the Polish political landscape – like the *rokosz* – was a means to make it exotic. Another means to express the author's distance to the subject was the description of the Commonwealth's political procedures in terms of parody.[9] To parody procedure

8 Nagielski, Rokosz, 91.

9 An example is the French historian de Bizardière's description of what can be called the epilogue of the Lubomirski rebellion. In 1668, two years after the rebel's death, his main enemy, King Jan Kazimierz, finally abdicated the throne. The nobility was to elect a new king. Having shown how the most insolent tricks used by foreign candidates failed with the assembled nobles, Bizardière is also highly ironic about the final election procedure and its result: the election of a new king from within the nobility of the Commonwealth after a great number of monarchs from foreign dynasties: see Michel de Bizardière, *Neuligst eröffnetes Polnisches Staats-Cabinet Oder Eigentliche Beschreibung der Merckwürdigkeiten/so sich von langen Zeiten her in diesem Königreich zugetragen* (Cölln, 1698) (original text in French, Paris, 1697). I here refer to the text as printed in

was to parody a crucial element in Poland-Lithuania's political order. Procedure in the sense of a formalized process claiming openness concerning its results was certainly not always observed in practice. Nevertheless, it symbolized and guaranteed the public status of the nobility and, thus, its political legitimacy. Notably the formal observation of the rules for convoking and carrying out the assembly of nobles was all the more important because, particularly in times of crisis, political and juridical functions of the assembly of nobles overlapped, with the Sejm also being the Republic's highest court.[10] The qualifications of "public" and "private" mattered concretely as to what was considered as debatable at the assembly of nobles in an open and mediated discussion about matters of common interest.[11]

Of course the reach of the distinction of public and private as well as the reach of the claim to politics being public could not but be limited in real life. There were large areas of informal power dominated by forms of communication far from the procedures of public political communication. For example, the Lithuanian aristocracy participated in the institutions of the Commonwealth, but its influence was mainly organized as informal power based on sociability. Lithuania was dominated by a few aristocratic clans. Surveying the postal traffic, one of them even organized a specific means of controlling communication.[12] The Lubomirski rebellion shows clearly how much informal politics mattered in this context. In order to gain the Lithuanian aristocrats' support, both the royal party and the rebel extensively made use of personal persuasion outside of formal political representation, which meant that the king, the queen as well as a monk charged by Lubomirski travelled to see the Lithuanian magnates and convince them of their cause, with the king promising important offices in order to get military support.[13]

The highly-developed and extensively used vocabulary denoting public institutions and hinting at their assumed commitment to public interest made the contrast between an ideal order and a much less ideal practice visible. Moreover, the understanding of *rokosz* as legal resistance implied that the rebel institutions were ascribed the same public quality as the original ones. As we shall see,

---

Die gelehrte Welt des 17. Jahrhunderts über Polen. Zeitgenössische Texte, ed. E. Szarota (Wien, 1972), 342-348.

10 About the Republic's highest court: Bardach, Historia państwa i prawa, 2: 153-155.

11 Comp. Nagielski, Rokosz, 149.

12 A.Rachuba, "Litwa wobec sądu nad Jerzym Lubomirskim", *Kwartalnik historyczny* 93 (1987): 679-707; A. Rachuba, "Zabiegi dworu i Jerzego Lubomirskiego o pozyskanie Litwy w 1664 roku", *Przegląd historyczny* 78 (1987): 1-17. About the control of the mail traffic: Nagielski, Rokosz, 149.

13 Rachuba, Zabiegi dworu i Jerzego Lubomirskiego, 1-17.

formations belonging to the constitutional order – notably the army – could organize within the frame of legality to articulate their needs as a social group. In case of the army, this concerned the crucial matter of pay. But the more profiled such formations were as public organs, the more could the articulation of limited interests discredit the Republic's political order to the (willingly) unaccustomed eye. It was easy for a French diplomat to declare, for example, in an alarming tone that the unpaid royal army of the Commonwealth "is for sale"[14] – a situation not extraordinary in that period, but of greater public visibility in Poland-Lithuania than elsewhere. The high degree of structured public institutions, that is, modern, not archaic elements, made the Republic of nobles as a political order rather vulnerable. In this sense, the role of crises such as the Lubomirski rebellion in a transnational interplay discrediting the Republic of nobles on the long run has to be investigated further. Given the delicacy of the wide-spread and highly elaborate public quality of institutions in the Commonwealth, my thesis is that the modernisation of the modes of communication about internal conflicts rather accelerated than slowed down this process.

As to the long-term development of the Commonwealth's inner situation as well as its international position, I suppose that these modes of communication certainly played a more important role than xenophobic attitudes or the agents' relations to foreign powers in the Lubomirski movement.

2. LUBOMIRSKI IN HISTORICAL CONTEXT: TRANSNATIONAL ELEMENTS IN RELATED REVOLTS

Historians consider resistance against foreigners in the royal army as one of several factors that made up the reasons for the uprisings in 1606-1609. King and rebel alike built up their respective international network in close rivalry to each other, with Lubomirski being supported, for instance, by the Elector of Brandenburg-Prussia, while his rival, the king, was in close relation with the noble opposition in this neighbour monarchy.[15] But neither xenophobia nor appeals to foreign support were specific characteristics of Lubomirski's rebellion, as a look at comparable seventeenth-century revolts inside and outside of the Commonwealth demonstrates.

Lubomirski's rebellion may be compared to another major rebellion in seventeenth-century Poland-Lithuania, and also to the French Fronde.

A major conflict between the crown and a noble rebel in the Commonwealth had already marked the years from 1606 to 1609. That confrontation between the

14 Nagielski, Rokosz, 83.

15 Ibid., 43.

crown and part of the nobility was in many respects similar to the conflict between the king and Lubomirski more than half a century later. Both conflicts were centred around the nobles' and the king's prerogatives in their mutual relationship. In both conflicts the issue of confessional freedom as well as noble resistance against the secular power of the church played a role.[16] Contemporaries themselves compared the two rebellions. King Jan Kazimierz's astronomer believed that the Lubomirski rebellion was worse than the older one because of the simultaneous uprisings in the Ukraine and the Muscovite danger.[17] Resistance against the presence of foreigners in the royal army is mentioned as one of several factors that made up the reasons for the uprising in 1606-1609.[18] As to the Lubomirski rebellion, it may have resulted in growing resistance against a king from a foreign dynasty: In fact, the nobles elected their next king from among the Commonwealth's domestic elite. But it would be difficult to prove that the mid-seventeenth century revolt itself was more marked by xenophobia than the one in the first decade of the 17th century.

Compared to the Fronde in France, the Lubomirski rebellion shows important differences, but also reveals parallels. One difference lay in the medial representation of the monarchy, which was, of course, closely linked to the hereditary position of the king in France on the one hand and the position of an elected king in the Commonwealth on the other hand. Relations of the agents to foreign powers played a role in both revolts. This was in part because one of the main motives for these movements was the disappointment of high-ranking office holders with the crown.[19] Needless to say, high-level office holders were also transnational agents. Another similarity is the disastrous financial situation of the crown, that is, its difficulties to pay for its military forces – with the difference that the French monarchy recurred to what has been called an inner "système fisco-financier", while the Polish king had to rely on subsidies paid for by or intermediated by the French court.[20] Yet in general, the use of foreign support by the opponents was by no means unique to the Lubomirski movement and Poland-

16 On the conflict about the representatives of the church and their secular power in the Lubomirski rebellion: W. Kłaczewski, *Jerzy Sebastian Lubomirski* (Wrocław, Warszawa, Kraków, 2002), 240. About the early 17th-century Zebrzydowski rebellion: H. Wisner, *Rokosz Zebrzydowskiego* (Kraków, 1989), especially 1-9.

17 Kłaczewski, Jerzy Sebastian Lubomirski, 229.

18 Wisner, Rokosz Zebrzydowskiego, 16, 18.

19 As mentioned above, Lubomirski himself held high offices in the Commonwealth. For the French case: A. James, *The Origins of French Absolutism 1598-1661* (Harlow et al., 2006), 56.

20 Quotation: James, Origins of French Absolutism, 53; Nagielski, Rokosz, 27.

Lithuania: One of the principal actors of the age of the Fronde, the Prince de Condé, tried to achieve military invasion from abroad for his cause.[21]

A transnational context of agency in revolts was thus not exceptional – at least if the revolt was a rebellion of nobles. Dealing with the representation of the Lubomirski revolt on the following pages, we have to consider that its transnational motives reflected a real and quite common state of things. However, propaganda presented the facts in an original way.

3. LUBOMIRSKI'S REBELLION IN DOMESTIC JURISDICTION

At first sight, one of the most prominent representations of the revolt – its staging as a juridical drama - was a purely internal one. Both the king and Lubomirski made abundant use of formalized legal procedures and their written representations to win their case. In practice, legal procedure was, of course, by no means independent of the power of sociability. It was easier to judge those who socially and culturally did not belong to the core of the Republic than those who did.

The king's jurists had a large choice of accusations against Lubomirski to present to the assembly of nobles – and yet a restricted one. These restrictions concerned precisely the magnate's relations to foreign powers in the conflict about the future of the Polish throne. It is significant that there were cases of accusation of political crime in 17th-century Poland in which foreign relations of the defendant played an important role. In the mid-seventeenth century, a former Cossack hetman, Ivan Vyhovs'kyi, was judged mainly for his relations with the Ottoman Empire. At the same period the leader of a peasant uprising, Aleksander Leon Kostka-Napierski, was condemned for talking about his alleged relations with external enemies of the Commonwealth.[22] But in our case, the accused belonged to the inner circle of the formally and informally powerful; he was both in the centre and on the top of the noble stratum, sociable both to the nobles, many of whom felt he shared their cause, and to the king himself. This cut short the field of possible accusations. Lubomirski's acts might easily be compared to the very similar modes of action of the monarch himself. Therefore, the magnate's secret correspondence with the emperor and the elector was no explicit matter of accusation.

So what was left to the king to accuse the rebel of? Fortunately for the royal party, the accusers found it possible to charge him with breaking a law which, in order to promote formal equality among the nobles, forbade the use of particular

21 James, Origins of French Absolutism, 70-71.

22 A. Lityński, *Przestępstwa polityczne w polskim prawie karnym XVI-XVII wieku* (Katowice, 1976), 62.

titles hinting at the superior position of the concerned nobles within their estate.[23] This point in the accusation was a tribute to the szlachta as a social formation. The main crimes Lubomirski was charged with and then judged for at a dramatic assembly of the nobles in 1665 were, however, actions against the king. As I will discuss later, Lubomirski was, for instance, accused of having tried to establish himself as a counterweight to royal power by establishing a "protectorate" over the Republic and to have stirred up public opinion against the ruler.[24] In the sense of what has been said above about the early-modern understanding of revolts, lèse-majesty, the legal formula used by the king in the conflict with Lubomirski, was a representation of the sovereign's honour. In the 16th century, Polish nobles had fought against the use of lèse-majesty by their monarchs. In 1539, they had achieved that lèse-majesty referred only to crimes directly against the person of the king. At least as far as Polish (but not Lithuanian) law was concerned, they thus had successfully banned the large understanding of that crime in Roman law, which they considered as "law for unfree peoples".[25] In this tradition a law of 1588 made sure that accusations of lèse-majesty should not hinder a noble in his legal political activity.[26] The concept of *rokosz*, a legalized, far-going form of resistance against the crown, demonstrates that this was a notion wide-open to interpretation. Insofar the 1588 law on lèse-majesty was clearly pro-noble. On the other hand, that law was a relatively fresh basis of reference for accusations of political crime for mid-seventeenth century actors, a legal source which possessed the legitimacy of law made by the Republic of nobles itself. This was important, as the noblemen of the Commonwealth considered foreign law as an instrument for installing the much-feared *dominium absolutum* of a king assuming more and more power.

King Jan Kazimierz and his jurists finally managed to persuade the Assembly of nobles to condemn Lubomirski for lèse-majesty. Some years later, another assembly of nobles – ironically the Sejm following the abdication of Lubomirski's royal adversary – rehabilitated the then late magnate. Thus, so far, the case looks like a series of events within the frame of the domestic noble public sphere. In fact, it transcended this frame. The transnational elements in the discourses about Lubomirski provided for this enlarged scope.

23 Kłaczewski, Jerzy Sebastian Lubomirski, 225-226.

24 See below and annotation 28.

25 Lityński, Przestępstwa polityczne, 21, 171.

26 St. Salmonowicz, "La noblesse polonaise contre l'arbitraire du pouvoir royal: les privilèges judiciaires de la noblesse", *Revue du droit français et étranger* 72 (1994): 21-29, 27.

4. ENLARGING THE SCOPE: TRANSNATIONAL MOTIVES IN THE PROPAGANDISTIC REPRESENTATION OF THE REBELLION

The problem with the accusation of lèse-majesty in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth was its very nature: a king-centred crime in a non-king-centred, mixed political order. It is therefore logical that in the eyes of the king and his advisors, the mere declaration of Lubomirski's condemnation, which was sent to all towns of the Commonwealth, did not suffice. To convince the many discontented people, more efforts were needed. Printers worked night and day to immediately produce a large documentation of the Lubomirski case from the king's point of view.[27] This work, "Processus iudiciarius",[28] suggests through its documentary character that there was a well-informed reading public to discuss and judge the case. The text did not do without allusions to foreign princes' influence on Lubomirski's actions, but its polemic elements concentrated on the negative effect of Lubomirski's activity for Poland's position in the conflict with the Tatars and the Cossacks. Yet, most remarkable in our context is a reference to the English regicide of 1649 and the following period of Oliver Cromwell's rule as "protector". According to the "Processus", Lubomirski's adherents had even made an axe for him as symbol of his new function as a "protector". One of these adherents explicitly announced that it was time to cut off the heads first of the king and then of high court officials. The "Processus" underlines that the expression for "cut off the heads" was pronounced in Tatar language! The text further tells us that several other supporters of the rebels agreed to this, referring to the English example and stating that they themselves, the nobles of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, had more reason to cut off their king's head than the English had had. Some high-ranking nobles were shocked about what they heard and immediately made an effort to install a trial against those who pronounced such "blasphemy". Not so Lubomirski, who did everything to downplay the crime and thus, the text suggests, showed his approbation.[29] Of course, Lubomirski rejected these reproaches in his printed answer to the "Processus", denying any ambitions to become a "Protector" of the Commonwealth.[30]

27 St. Szczotka, "Zabiegi o pozyskanie chłopów w okresie rokoszu Lubomirskiego", *Przegląd historyczny* 43 (1952): 319-337.

28 Georgius Lubomierski, *Processus iudiciarius in causa illustri et magnifico Georgio comiti in Wisnicz et Iaroslaw Lubomierski* (Varsaviæ, 1664), E.

29 Ibid.

30 Jerzy Lubomirski, Publicæ Innocentiæ Manifestum Deo Mundo Patriæ (s.l., 1666), 84.

So, the English regicide took a prominent place in the royal propaganda for the reading public. It is remarkable that it reoccurs in the risky propaganda efforts to gain the support of a group traditionally outside of the system of political representation: the peasants. To agitate peasants to rise against nobles was to play with fire and, thus, it was done only when the struggling parties felt that their cause was at stake. The arguments used in the addresses to the peasants are therefore worthy of attention.

Trying to agitate peasants against Lubomirski and his noble followers, the royal side acted according to patterns established during the Swedish invention into the Commonwealth a decade before the events (in 1655): The Swedish king had then tried to rise the peasants against their noble lords, and King Jan Kazimierz, for his part, had tried to make the mountaineers of the Podhale region, the most rebellious element among catholic peasants in Poland, rise against the Swedish invaders. Taking this into account, the king's analogous action in 1665, the appeal to the peasants' support in the struggle against Lubomirski,[31] can be considered as a kind of declaration of war against this domestic enemy. Yet the royal address to the peasants also explicitly raised the topic of civil war,[32] and thus transcended the scope of arguments that had so far been tied to the interpretation of the conflict as a revolt. To be sure, during Lubomirski's rebellion, the idea of civil war had already emerged, but only privately, for instance, in the correspondence of Jan Sobieski's, the future king and the victor of Vienna in 1683, who mentioned robberies by Lithuanian troops on Polish territory.[33] Yet in the king's *uniwersały* (manifestos) to the Podhale peasants the civil war motif was developed *in public*.

The king was the first to address to the Podhale peasants. Lubomirski, for his part, also wrote to them, recommending himself not only as the defender of a just cause, but also as a victorious warrior. The king did not hesitate to contradict this version, stating that Lubomirski's victories had been bought by the blood of the peasants.[34] This is in fact to say that the magnate had not made war against the Swedish troops, but that his war had been a domestic one!

In their manifestos to the Podhale peasants, both the king and Lubomirski accused each other of having exposed the people to Tatar raids.[35] Yet the most remarkable element in the propaganda for peasants is once more the mentioning of the English regicide. Supporting the king's cause, an anonymous adherent of the king's side stated in his appeal to the peasants that Lubomirski had even sent a

31 Szczotka, Zabiegi o pozyskanie chłopów, 321-322.

32 Ibid., 319-337.

33 Nagielski, Rokosz, 97.

34 Szczotka, Zabiegi o pozyskanie chłopów, 321, 328-329, 333.

35 Ibid., 332.

person to England to get to know how to proceed. The "Processus" was cited as a proof that these accusations against Lubomirski were true, that is, the authority of the printed text was referred to. The king's supporter justified the fact that this Latin text was incomprehensible for peasants by the need to inform other countries about Lubomirski's evil-doing.[36] The reference to the English regicide, for its part, shows that the author assumed events that mattered for the European public to matter also for peasants in a Polish mountain region. The domestic public (i.e., the whole Commonwealth, including at least a part of its peasant population) was thus consequently thought of as complementary to an international public and vice versa. Yet the regicide motif also fulfils the same function as the other conspicuous transnational motives in the pro- and anti-Lubomirski propaganda, the allusion to the Tatar or Tatar-Cossack danger. Poland-Lithuania's electoral monarchy was a political order rationalised in the sense of not leaving much room for the sacralisation of the king. There was no room for anything analogous to the famous French leaflets of the period – the Mazarinades – with their conspicuous images of the king between heaven and hell.[37] Transnational motifs – the Tatars and, most notably, the English regicide – took the place of apocalyptic motifs which developed along the long-term presence of hereditary kingdom in other political orders. In other words: when it came to constructing radicalism under the given circumstances, transnationality was an indispensable source to recur to. A closer study of the background of the regicide motive and the protector motive shows how this worked.

5. THE ENGLISH REGICIDE AND OLIVER CROMWELL AGAINST A POLISH BACKGROUND

There were good conditions in the Commonwealth for receiving information about developments in England, but the allusions to the English regicide and the Protectorate cannot be considered as a mere reflex of fresh news: In 1664 Cromwell, "Lord Protector of the Realm of England" from 1653 to 1659, had been dead for five years, and the Stuart monarchy had been restored. These new circumstances might have enhanced the Polish king's hope to successfully discredit his adversary in the eyes of an international public by alluding to his alleged

36 Ibid.

37 A. Pietsch, "Zwischen Gottesähnlichkeit und Höllensturz. Das Bild des französischen Königs in Zeiten der Fronde", in *Die Bibel als politisches Argument,* ed. A. Pečar and K. Trampedach, Beihefte der Historischen Zeitschrift, ed. Lothar Gall, vol. 43 (München, 2007), 333-348.

ambitions to become Protector himself, as monarchy now seemed to be victorious at the very spot where it recently had been most dangerously been attacked.

The argument also corresponded to internal demands. Restricted by the Commonwealth's minimalist law on lèse-majesty, Lubomirski's accusers were to find both arguments for the Marshall's evil intention concerning the king in person and for his treacherous intentions, for his being prepared to collaborate with anyone and to borrow from anyone in order to achieve his aims. England, Oliver Cromwell and the Protectorate offered such opportunities. Yet apart from alleged sympathy with the king-murderers fitting very well into the conditions an accusation of political crime had to fulfil, there were also other reasons why the English case as cited in royal propaganda was suitable.

The strong English presence in several sectors of the Commonwealth's society makes it probable that recent English events were known and that therefore allusions to them would be understood. England's quickly modernising economy, which was heading towards the beginnings of industrialisation, was an important complementary partner for the Commonwealth, which provided England with grain and with raw material for the English textile production.[38] Moreover, due to the fact that in an age of confessional conflict, the Commonwealth had long been receiving persons from many confessions, including those persecuted at home, the British catholics in Poland-Lithuania were quite numerous.[39] They were particularly strong in the army. Jan Kazimierz even had special Irish units.[40] It is significant that not only Polish propaganda presented England (or, better, England in a certain, recent period) as a hotbed of subversion, but in a way also vice-versa: In England, Poland was perceived as a potential *place d'armes* for Irish insurgents who could be recruited from the Irish units in the Polish military.[41]

During the Protectorate, England had become more deeply involved with politics in Poland-Lithuania's sphere of interest than before. Cromwell had ambitious aims as to common strategies of protestant countries, but the interests of English merchants also had to be taken into account. This was especially the case when the Protector, whose original basis of power had been the army, at a later stage tried to gain larger support. He could then count on the London merchants'

38 Edward Alfred Mierzwa, *Anglia a Polska w pierwszej połowie XVII w.* (Warszawa, 1986), passim.

39 Antoni Krawczyk, "The British in Poland in the Seventeenth Century", *The Seventeenth Century* 37 (2002)**:** 254-271, especially 254.

40 Krawczyk, The British in Poland, 260.

41 Ibid.

and money lenders' interest in a stable government,[42] but this even more bound him to a balanced strategy in the Baltic region. As a result, the government restricted the number of English soldiers to be recruited for the Swedish wars against the Commonwealth.[43]

The Protector himself was a highly conspicuous figure in England. He had been shaped in this way by adversary English royalist propaganda even at a stage when his actual power did not yet justify such a strong image.[44] Two contradictory symbols, the axe symbolizing his responsibility for the regicide of 1649 and the knightly sword, were attributed to him on printed pictures.[45] The martial qualities he was accorded mirrored his military identity and the military basis of his rule. This martial image was ambiguous in the context of mid-seventeenth century debates about legitimate power. Cromwell's strong connection to the military made him vulnerable to sharp criticism not only in England. "Both Florentine and Venetian ambassadors saw Cromwell as a tyrant because he ruled with the support of the army".[46] In England, a similar argument arose when the question of the Protector's follower and thus the options to extend the Protectorate or to restore monarchy became acute. Cromwell, though probably waiting to be offered the crown himself, had declared hereditary monarchy (but democracy as well!) a negative extreme in 1655.[47] However, it soon became evident that Cromwell's contemporaries stuck to hereditary monarchy, which they considered as a natural order in spite of the 1649 execution of the Stuart king then considered a tyrant. The arguments of the 1649 anti-royalists were now turned upside down: It was no longer the hereditary monarch, but the potentially elected king who was supposed to become a tyrant, and the military men surrounding Cromwell were considered as a danger.[48]

As object to a fierce debate about hereditary monarchy and the influence of the military on politics, Cromwell and the Protectorate were a valuable point of reference in the Polish context. Hereditary monarchy was the central matter of

42 Eric Porter, "A Cloak for Knavery: Kingship, the Army and Parliament, 1654-1655", *The Seventeenth Century* 17 (2002): 187-205, especially 192.

43 Barry Coward, *The Cromwellian Protectorate* (Manchester and New York, 2002), 130.

44 Laura Knoppers, *Constructing Cromwell: Ceremony, Portrait, and Print, 1645-1661* (Cambridge et al., 2000), 30.

45 Knoppers, Constructing Cromwell, 50.

46 Marco Barducci, "Oliver Cromwell, European Historical Myth? The Case of the Italian States in Seventeenth-Century Representations of Cromwell", *The Seventeenth Century* 23, 1 (2008): 57.

47 Porter, A Cloak for Knavery, 188.

48 Ibid., 197-198.

conflict between Lubomirski and his supporters on the one hand and the royal party on the other. The military question was a crucial one, too, in the mid-seventeenth century Commonwealth. Citing the historian Iakovenko, I have hinted at the significance of professional soldiers' mentality for the experience of internal violence that large parts of the Commonwealth's population underwent in that period. Military men had not yet been profiled as a social group in the first half of the century, but wars and invasions of the mid-century pushed forward a professional conscience of both the officers and the soldiers. In permanent military conflict both with external and internal adversaries, the rulers of the Commonwealth felt pressure from many sides to make the army more efficient. Trying to do so, they copied what was considered as useful from Habsburg, Swedish, Turkish, Persian, and Tatar troops.[49] The core of the Commonwealth's military forces had been a royal army of mercenaries, which was transformed into a standing formation in the course of the 17th century. This army had differed from the beginning from other European mercenary armies in so far as it was not the product of "private" military entrepreneurship: It was recruited in the name of the king, its leaders were installed by the monarch, and it was to be paid by state means.[50]

Funding is well-known to have been the vulnerable point of army modernisation, especially in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth with its high degree of political participation by all layers of the nobility, since this participation included questions of state finance. A part of the Commonwealth's army, the light cavalry, was "seldom paid except out of booty".[51] Yet the core of the army expected the king to pay the soldiers. If he did not, the army formed one more institution of self-defence legitimated by custom, which could not easily be declared illegal because it was a variation of the noble confederation described above: the *Związek.* This formation was supposed to exert pressure on the king to fulfil his financial obligations. In contrast to the confederation, the *Związek* was no exclusively noble institution: it included non-noble soldiers.[52] Thus it was a sworn association of military men, a *Männerbund*, and in a way a public institution of what Iakovenko calls the military subculture of the Commonwealth.

49 Henryk Wisner, "Polska sztuka wojenna pierwszej połowy XVII wieku. Wątpliwości i hipotezy", *Kwartalnyk historyczny* 84 (1977): 405-415; Alfred P. Brainard, "Polish-Lithuanian Cavalry in the Late Seventeenth Century", *The Polish Review* 36 (1991): 69-82, especially 74.

50 Bardach, Historia państwa i prawa, 2: 250, 137.

51 Brainard, Polish-Lithuanian Cavalry, 76.

52 Bardach, Historia państwa i prawa, 2: 244.

To be sure, it was not before the end of the seventeenth century that such a *Związek* tried to pursue political aims beyond pressing for payment.[53] But the formation of two of these formations within a few years – in 1659 and 1661 – was an important political fact even if both restricted themselves to the issue of payment. This is all the more true as it was Jan Kazimierz's major adversary to come, Lubomirski, who took the lead of the 1661 *Związek*. It was this dimension of Lubomirski's military leadership which the mentioning of Cromwell and the Protectorate in royal propaganda alluded to.

Considering transnational representation in Lubomirski's rebellion, we thus have to conclude that this rebellion was not just an act of resistance by nobles fearing a royal *dominium absolutum*. It rather reflected the float of information and the differentiated concepts of legitimate rule in contemporary Europe. Cromwell and the Protectorate as points of reference in royal propaganda against Lubomirski bear witness to the strong presence of people from abroad (the British in this case) in the Commonwealth, but also of the power of military men, whose self-organization made them agents of their own. Thus, the rebellion stood for the manifold subcultures that made up the Commonwealth and which the attribute "Republic of nobles" describes only partially.

6. AN ALTERNATIVE VOICE FROM EXILE

When Lubomirski died in 1667 in Silesia, his legal status was that of a political criminal in exile. He was not alone. The legal categories treating revolt as a crime, which were accepted in all European monarchies under consideration in this article, created not only the option to use European revolts for propaganda purposes, they also created a truly transnational group of people with a common fate: that of persons condemned for major political crimes living in exile. A voice from abroad commenting on the Lubomirski revolt in a way which significantly differed from the king's and the rebel's propaganda was that of the Anti-Trinitarian Stanisław Lubieniecki, whom Janusz Tazbir drew historians' attention to.[54] Lubieniecki was among the Polish nobility living in Prussian exile. He offered a thorough reflection of the transnational character of the conflict, including the topic of money and the relation between want of money, inflation and the dependence of the Republic's political forces on foreign courts. He distinguished Tatars and Cossacks, who for other authors were but one, pleading for the Cossack's reintegration into the

53 Ibid.

54 Janusz Tazbir, "Głos ariański w polemice rokoszu Lubomirskiego", *Przegląd historyczny* 60 (1959): 62-80, especially 72.

Commonwealth through religious tolerance. Even the French-born queen's manoeuvres were described with an appeal to human understanding: the Queen's position was explained to be dependent on family loyalty and insofar (considering female nature in its contemporary construction, one may add) natural.[55] Compared to the king's and Lubomirski's propaganda, this author's arguments shifted from describing a conflict of honour to the more "modern" analysis of positions and opinions as described in ideal typology by historians of communication.

For our story, it is important to remark that the cited author did not deem it possible to confront his presumed readers in the Commonwealth with his real identity as an exiled Anti-Trinitarian. The confessional conflict, but, possibly, also a presumed effect of the official dishonouring of the condemned as infamous may have incited Lubieniecki to hide his identity behind a fictional catholic author.[56] He thus assumed an authorship qualifying for legitimate claims to authority in the Commonwealth as it was in the mid-seventeenth century: that of the average catholic nobleman. Voices of the exiled were certainly not supposed to successfully claim such authority. The rules of noble public status and of public discursive authority largely overlapped: This made the way out of the mid-seventeenth century crisis more difficult.

Many elements in Lubieniecki's position were not new. They mirrored traditional views and coalitions of the confessional age. The author's peace vision might have been enrooted in the Anti-Trinitarians' irenical views. The understanding for the cause of the Cossacks might have recurred to the good relations between Protestants and Orthodox in the Commonwealth before the Khmel'nyc'kyj uprising of 1648.

Nevertheless, the alternativeness of that voice might also hint at the specific character of the communicative context it emerged from. The juridical procedure to which their cases had been subjected gave the banished a public status and established a durable, though negatively defined, relation to the political formation they came from. This was also the case with the banished rebel Lubomirski himself, who wrote and printed his propaganda in Silesia, while the Polish crown claimed in vain that the Holy Roman Empire should cease giving him exile. This public status distinguished them ,from those whom the mass exoduses caused by religious persecution drove abroad. When studying the transnational representation of revolts, the transnational spaces of communication inhabited by the exiled of European monarchies in defence against unruly subjects should be considered.

Lubieniecki's more modern, pluralistic vision of things broke with the view of the conflict as a legitimate or non-legitimate revolt. This vision tended towards the

55 Tazbir, Głos ariański, 72.

56 On Lubieniecki hiding his authorship: Ibid., 74.

civil war interpretation, but without the call for a strong monarch most prominently deduced from a vision of civil war by Thomas Hobbes. Ironically, such a broad view on foreign dependence and multiply motivated dissent gave more material to discredit Poland-Lithuania's political order as a façade or even a mere back-drop to "anarchy" than the representation of resistance as revolt could ever provide. The modernisation of communication was not to the Commonwealth's advantage.