

Director Emeritus

Gaetano Platania (Università degli Studi della Tuscia)

Director

Alessandro Boccolini (Università degli Studi della Tuscia)

Scientific Board

Irena Vaišvilaitė (Ambassador of the Republic of Lithuania to UNESCO)

Matteo Sanfilippo (Università degli Studi della Tuscia)

Massimo Carlo Giannini (Università degli Studi di Teramo)

Rimvydas Petrauskas (Vilnius University)

Giordano Altarozzi (Petru Maior University of Târgu Mures)

Giovanni Pizzorusso (Università degli Studi “G. d’Annunzio”, Chieti-Pescara)

Michaela Valente (Università degli Studi di Roma “La Sapienza”)

Cesare La Mantia (Università di Trieste)

Prokhorov Andrei (Belarusian State University of Minsk)

Olexiy Sokyrrko (Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv)

Rafał Quirini-Popławski (Jagiellonian University of Kraków)

Jarosław Pietrzak (Pedagogical University of Kraków)

Marta Gołabek (Museum of King John III’s Palace at Wilanów – Warsaw)

Dorota Gregorowicz (University of Silesia in Katowice)

Michał Salamonik (Södertörn University)

Language Expert

Sonia Maria Melchiorre (Università degli Studi della Tuscia)

Editorial Board

Bogdana Nosova (Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv)

Francesco Vitali (Università degli Studi di Roma “La Sapienza”)

Małgorzata Trzeciak Cygan (University of Warsaw)

Giulio Merlani (University of Caen Normandy)



Centro Studi sull'Età dei Sobieski e della Polonia Moderna
(Study Center on the Sobieski Age and of Modern Poland)
www.cespom.eu

Proprietà letteraria riservata. La riproduzione in qualsiasi forma, memorizzazione o trascrizione con qualunque mezzo (elettronico, meccanico, in fotocopia, in disco o in altro modo, compresi cinema, radio, televisione, internet) sono vietate senza l'autorizzazione scritta dell'Editore.

Eastern European History Review è una rivista on-line peer-reviewed con lettori anonimi

Chiuso il 31-12-2024

Impaginazione a cura di: *Emanuele Paris*

ISBN: 979-12-5524-146-1
ISBN ebook: 979-12-5524-147-8
ISSN: 2612-0402 008

Permalink: <http://hdl.handle.net/2067/53009>

EASTERN EUROPEAN HISTORY REVIEW
Via Santa Maria in Gradi 4 – 01100 Viterbo
www.easterneuropeanhistory.eu
eehr@unitus.it

Edizioni **SETTE CITTÀ**
Via Mazzini 87 – 01100 Viterbo
t. +39 0761 303020 – info@settecitta.eu

EASTERN EUROPEAN HISTORY REVIEW

Annually Historical Journal

~
n. 7/2024
Special Issue

ROYAL FREE ELECTIONS IN THE
POLISH-LITHUANIAN COMMONWEALTH.
POLITICAL GAMES, SOCIAL COMMUNICATION,
DIPLOMACY

Edited by
Aleksandra Ziober and Alessandro Boccolini



EASTERN EUROPEAN HISTORY REVIEW: LA RIVISTA

Il Comitato redazionale e scientifico è lieto di presentare al pubblico la rivista scientifica *Eastern European History Review*.

Con un carattere internazionale e interdisciplinare, una cadenza annuale e una fruibilità *open access* la rivista focalizza i propri interessi sulle dinamiche occorse nell'Europa Orientale durante tutta l'età moderna (XIV-XIX). *Eastern European History Review* è espressione del Centro Studi dell'Università della Tuscia CESPoM (Centro Studi sull'età dei Sobieski e della Polonia Moderna) nato nel 1997 per intuizione del Prof. Gaetano Platania, Direttore Emerito della Rivista.

L'iniziativa editoriale che presentiamo nasce dall'evidente mancanza in Italia di una rivista scientifica relativa alla storia dell'Europa centro-orientale in Età Moderna, nonostante la penisola abbia giocato un ruolo fondamentale per la Storia e la Cultura di una parte integrante del continente, a torto considerata come lontana e periferica.

Consapevoli di questo, il Comitato ha posto quale obiettivo primario della *Eastern European History Review* quello di offrire uno spazio di riflessione e di discussione su temi che appartengono alla storia dell'Europa centro-orientale, e insieme alle relazioni - politiche e culturali - che questa vasta area del Vecchio Continente ha avuto con l'occidente d'Europa, e l'Italia in particolare, incoraggiando il dialogo tra studiosi e esperti di settore, e tra differenti approcci della ricerca scientifica.

Il Comitato Redazionale e Scientifico

EASTERN EUROPEAN HISTORY REVIEW: THE JOURNAL

The Editorial and Scientific Board are proud delighted to present the *Eastern European History Review* under the aegis of Sette Città Editore.

The *Eastern European History Review* is an international and interdisciplinary annually online and open access peer-reviewed journal about studies on Central and Eastern Europe in the Modern Age (XIV-XIX). The Journal is also the expression of the Study Center CESPoM (Centro Studi sull'età dei Sobieski e della Polonia Moderna – Center Study on the Age of Sobieski and Modern Poland) of the University of Tuscia, born in 1997, from an idea of Prof. Gaetano Platania, today Director Emeritus of this journal.

It publishes articles with significant approaches and original interpretations in all research fields concerning Central and Eastern Europe, with specific attention to the History sciences.

The editorial initiative we present comes from the obvious lack of a journal, in Italy, concerning the history of Central and Eastern Europe during the Modern Age, this despite its fundamental role in the history and culture of that part of the continent, wrongly considered distant and peripheral.

Quite the contrary is true, in fact. Main objective of the journal is to create a space for reflection and discussion on topics pertaining to Central and Eastern Europe, but also relations with Continental Europe, encouraging dialogue between scholars and experts in the field, and between different approaches of scientific research.

The Editorial and Scientific Board

SUMMARY

Aleksandra Ziober <i>Introduction</i>	9
Miguel Conde Pazos <i>The Spanish Monarchy in the free royal elections in Poland: aspirations and diplomatic strategies (16th and 17th centuries)</i>	15
Kateřina Prařákova <i>The Secret Candidature of William of Rosenberg to the Polish Throne in 1574 and 1575</i>	37
Justyna Gałuszka <i>The role of Stanisław Stadnicki (c. 1551–1610) during the third free election</i>	51
Urszula Augustyniak <i>Magnate projects of electoral reform during the reign of Sigismund III and the potential effects of their implementation</i>	61
Bartosz Staręgowski <i>Security of the Greater Poland during the elections of the Polish Vasa dynasty. Mechanisms, organization and legal state</i>	85
Dorota Gregorowicz <i>The Holy See Towards the Contention for the Polish-Lithuanian Throne Between the Representatives of the Vasa Dynasty: John Casimir and Charles Ferdinand (1648–1649)</i>	103
Julia Paduch <i>Election 1648 from the perspective of Charles Ferdinand Vasa</i>	125
Alessandro Boccolini <i>The political and diplomatic activity of Virginio Orsini, Cardinal Protector of the Poland Kingdom in the time of John Casimir Vasa, last king of the Vasa Dynasty</i>	145

Aleksandra Ziober <i>The Art of Persuasion and Power: Profiles of Candidates for the Polish Throne after the Abdication of John II Casimir in the Light of Pamphlets</i>	171
Jarosław Pietrzak <i>Livio Odescalchi and his candidacy for Polish throne between 1696 and 1697</i>	193
Gaetano Platania <i>Fabrizio Paolucci: an extraordinary nuncio in the post-interregnum Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth (1697–1698)</i>	225
Grzegorz Glabisz <i>Political activities of the nobility of the voivodships of Poznań and Kalisz during the interregnum following the death of August III</i>	247
 VARIA SECTION	
Matteo Sanfilippo <i>Bald Island: A Review</i>	273
Michaela Valente <i>Amor libertatis e tolleranza nell'Europa centrale dell'età moderna: questioni politiche e religiose.</i>	283
Bibliocard Susanna Piselli <i>I Nunzi di Papa Urbano VIII nella Rzeczpospolita dei Waza</i> , Series: <i>Acta Barberiniana</i> , vol. 7, edited by Alessandro Boccolini, and Gaetano Platania. Viterbo: Sette Città, 2024.	303



POLITICAL ACTIVITIES OF THE NOBILITY OF THE VOIVODSHIPS OF POZNAŃ AND KALISZ DURING THE INTERREGNUM FOLLOWING THE DEATH OF AUGUST III¹

ABSTRACT

Research on the course of the last interregnum in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth has generally dealt with it from a top-down perspective. The political struggle between the Czartoryski “Familia” supported by the Russian army and the republican camp in individual provinces was usually presented rather superficially. This article will attempt to do so on the example of the political activity of the nobility of the Poznań and Kalisz voivodeships. This was a rather interesting area, as it was dominated by middle-income nobility. None of the magnate families was able to gain the upper hand in this territory. The political struggle that took place in these provinces between 1763 and 1764 led to a major mobilisation of the local gentry and a split session of the sejmik in Środa, which was common to both regions. Both sides passed instructions in support of regime reform. Ultimately, despite a large majority, the supporters of the republican camp lost. The assembly of supporters of the Czartoryski “Familia” in the region was recognised as legitimate.

KEYWORDS: Parliamentarism; Stanisław August; Political elites; Poznań-Kalisz voivodeships; Interregnum.

INTRODUCTION

The death of August III, like that of the previous rulers of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, was a turning point in the political history of the period. Old arrangements ceased to function, and all participants in public life had to redefine themselves in the face of rapidly succeeding events. This time, noble society was entering a period of interregnum after more than thirty years of the collapse of the political culture, system and institutions of the state². The impotence that had prevailed during this time and the influence of the neighboring powers had built

1 The following article is a partially abridged and revised version of one of the chapters of my book (dissertation) Grzegorz Glabisz, *Sejmiki Wielkopolski w latach 1764–1793* (Poznań: Wydawnictwo UAM, 2022).

2 Józef Gierowski, “Rozkład państwowości szlacheckiej w czasach saskich”, in *Między Wschodem a Zachodem. Rzeczpospolita XVI–XVIII w. Studia ofiarowane Zbigniewowi Wójcikowi w siedemdziesiątą rocznicę urodzin*, ed. Teresa Chynczewska-Hennel (Warszawa: Historia pro Futuro, 1993), 191–93; Wojciech Kriegseisen, “Zmierzch staropolskiej polityki, czyli o niektórych celach szczególnych polskiej kultury politycznej przełomu XVII i XVIII wieku”, in *Zmierzch kultury staropolskiej. Ciągłość i kryzysy (Wiek XVII–XIX)*, eds. Urszula Augustyniak, and Andrzej Karpiński (Warszawa: Semper, 1997), 15–39.

up the conviction among a significant part of the political elite that only with foreign support could any political project be carried out. Admittedly, it may still have seemed to the masses of the nobility at the time that it was up to them to decide on the choice of king and any reforms. However, this was to some extent a misconception, although this does not mean that nobility could be completely ignored.

The aim of this article is to show the entire course of the 1764 interregnum from a grass-roots perspective, understood here as a description of the attitudes of the nobility and local elites of the Poznań and Kalisz provinces towards the political struggle taking place at that time. So far, this topic has not been presented more extensively³. A well-preserved source base allows this process to be captured quite precisely in the case of Greater Poland (Wielkopolska or the voivodeships of Poznań and Kalisz). This was a region which was not only highly populated and economically developed, but also characterized by a strong domination of the middle gentry within the noble estate. The representation of both provinces in the Senate numbered as many as 16. This group was quite hermetic; noblemen from outside the provinces rarely had any chance of holding office⁴. In both voivodeships, the starosta general of Greater Poland also played an important role, with a number of judicial and administrative powers not found in other regions of the country. These included the right to convene an assembly to defend the province, or the authority over 7 of the 10 town offices in both voivodeships, which gave the starost power over a large group of town officials, and thus the power to decide the careers of a large group of local nobility. It is also worth mentioning here that the Greater Poland voivodeships were represented in the Sejm (polish parliament) by 12 deputies. Thanks to such an extensive hierarchy of offices, administrative system, and socio-economic situation, the importance and political potential of the joint Sejm of the voivodeships of Poznań and Kalisz was extremely significant on a national scale⁵.

On the political scene of the time, only the Czartoryski Familia, gathering around it a considerable number of more organized supporters, was prepared to attempt to seize the throne and introduce its own program of reforms⁶. However, it could not be made fully public, as the noble nation was not ready for such a radical reform of the system. Having remained in opposition to the royal court for years, the Familia was

3 So far, only an article has been devoted to this topic by Tomasz Szwaciński, "Sejmiki poselskie przed konwokacją 1764 r.", *Kwartalnik Historyczny*, 113/1 (2006): 19-56.

4 Teresa Zielińska, *Magnateria polska epoki saskiej. Funkcje urzędów i królewszczyzn w procesie przeobrażeń warstwy społecznej* (Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy imienia Ossolińskich, 1977), 72.

5 Michał Zwierzykowski, "Odrębności ustrojowe Wielkopolski w dobie nowożytnej" in *Między barokiem a oświeceniem. Staropolski regionalizm*, ed. Stanisław Achremczyk (Olsztyn: OBN, 2008), 54-62.

6 Jerzy Michalski, "Plan Czartoryskich naprawy Rzeczypospolitej", in *Studia historyczne z XVIII i XIX w.*, t. 1, eds. Wojciech. Kriegseisen, and Zofia Zielińska (Warszawa: Stentor, 2007), 11-27.

closely allied with the Russian⁷. It should be stressed that the objectives of Russian policy overlapped only minimally with the plan of the Czartoryskis, who in their naivety believed that they were similar. It was in the Russian interest to maintain the vassal character of the Polish-Lithuanian state. However, in order to achieve this objective, a political party was needed⁸.

The other factions, referred to as the Saxon-Republican, Patriotic-Republican or Saxon-hetmanic, had no common program or political center. Rather, they were not very compact political camps, which in earlier periods often competed. They only formed into one common party in the face of the Czartoryskis' attempts to seize power and thus lose their previous influence. Its main leaders included Jan Klemens Branicki, Grand Hetman of the Crown, who grouped his clientele around the army, Jerzy August Mniszech, Court Marshal of the Crown, who had long been at the head of the so-called "kamaryla", or court party, and who was also joined by numerous representatives of the Potocki family⁹. Despite some polarization, not all families took a strong side, with some playing two sides for safety through various family ramifications¹⁰. Also, a significant part of the nobility had no concretized views in the face of this situation¹¹.

The chronology of the struggle for their support in the early stages of the interregnum was set at the Senate Council on 7 and 8 November 1763. During the deliberations, all the Families holding the most important positions in the country symbolically reconciled and advised on the good of the state, but it was a political spectacle - each side pursued a separate scenario¹². During the council, much was said about the need for state reform. In the end, the conclusion of the senate council was not very clear on the issue of state reform. Influenced by earlier discussions with the Russian ambassador Herman Karl von Keyserling, the Primate Władysław Łubieński yielded and formulated it rather generally. Also in the universals, instructions and letters from the pre-Convocation Sejm expedition to the provinces, he made only a vague request that the nobility should devise and indicate to the deputies to the Sejm in their instructions ways of upholding all the laws of the Republic. Not a word was written about preventing the breaking of the Sejm, the reform of the army, or other

7 Zofia Zielińska, "Rosja wobec planów reform ustrojowych", in *Studia z dziejów stosunków polsko-rosyjskich w XVIII wieku*, ed. Ead. (Warszawa: Semper, 2001), 60-90.

8 Emanuel Rostworowski, "Łubieński Władysław", in *PSB*, vol. 18 (1973), 508-11.

9 A broader characterization of the main leaders of the parties see: Henryk Schmitt, *Dzieje panowania Stanisława Augusta*, t. 1 (Lwów: Drukarnia Narodowa im. W. Manieckiego, 1868), 97-114.

10 Zofia Zielińska, *Polska w okowach "systemu północnego" 1763-1766* (Kraków: Arcana 2012), 21-80.

11 Often, descriptions of political events have so far been formulated that one could get the impression that there were only warring parties and factions. In fact, however, as in the case of democratic regimes, there have always been whole crowds of undecided or passive participants, who only under the influence of sometimes completely different events became involved in public life.

12 Schmitt, *Dzieje*, t. 1, 97-114.

fundamental issues, in accordance with the wishes of the Russian ambassador.

It was not until late November/early December that Familia realized that a full program of reform would not be able to be carried out¹³. Nevertheless, the decisions of the senate council in the absence of opposition were in its favour. The pre-convocation royal assemblies were convened for 6 February, while the Convocation Sejm was not convened until 7 May. This gave the necessary time for preparations, the introduction of Russian troops into the country and the gathering of a sufficient number of supporters for the various assemblies. The Saxon-Republican camp also counted on the support of neighboring kingdoms, but received nothing but vague assurances of support. The death of Augustus III's son, Frederick Christian, in December 1763 caused confusion, as the party lost a candidate for the throne. With time, the party began to favour the candidature of Jan Klemens Branicki, then already 75 years old, Grand Hetman of the Crown.

250

The Saxon-Republican camp was already spreading rumors that Prussia and Russia were planning the partition of the country. At the end of December, however, these were debunked by an official declaration from both powers. It also stated that both countries supported the candidacy of "Piaśt"¹⁴. Before the royal assemblies convened, the tone of the debate was initially set by political magazines circulating around the country, published by the two warring parties. The Czartoryskis' opponents accused them that the election of "Piaśt" would result in the withdrawal of all allies in Europe and dependence on Russia. They therefore advocated that no one should be excluded from the monarchy election. At the same time, they demanded that Sejm support the passing of a law according to which anyone who drew foreign troops into the country and colluded with neighboring powers was to be considered as a traitor to the homeland. All deputies were also to take an oath not to accept money from anyone. The election was to be held by right of participation for any nobleman who turned up, and not through the deputies, as the Czartoryskis wanted¹⁵. Interestingly, some of the republicans in private correspondence also considered this a better idea and even recommended that the money the nobility would use for an expedition to the region of the electoral field should be used to fund the replenishment of some of the troops of the crown army¹⁶.

The other side pointed to the decline in previous years, stressing that only a person familiar with the laws and privileges of the Commonwealth could understand it and maintain proper governance. In turn, the election of deputies instead of *viritim* participation would bring about a quicker election of the king and preserve peace. There were also reformist proposals in the journalism: the introduction of majority voting in all royal assemblies and secret ballots if there was no unanimity. Some wanted to retain the *liberum veto* but limit its scope. These types of demands were closer to the Saxon-Republican camp. Its leaders also proposed that the future king

13 Zielińska, *Polska*, 196-256.

14 Zofia Zielińska, "Pogłoski o rozbiórce Polski oraz ich reperkusje w Rzeczypospolitej w okresie bezkrólewia 1763-1764 r.", *Przegląd Historyczny*, 96/4 (2004): 557.

15 Schmitt, *Dzieje*, t. 1, 205-07.

16 BUW, ms. 116, J. Starzeński to W. Łubieńskiego, [propably 17 XI 1763], ff.114-15.

should be deprived of the power to distribute offices and provincial governorships (an administrative unit in the Polish-Lithuanian Com. managed by a starosta) Hetman and treasurers, whose abuses they wanted to curb, came under criticism from authors with a reformist streak. All agreed on the need to raise the subject of the reform of the Tribunal and courts at future royal assemblies and Sejm sessions¹⁷. The fight between the parties for the noble votes also took place in the Poznań and Kalisz voivodeships¹⁸. The area had suffered severely in recent years as a result of the Russian occupation from the Seven Years' War, so it was difficult to find supporters of cooperation with Russia there. One of the dominant political camps in Greater Poland was the partisanship of George Augustus Mniszech, Court Marshal of the Crown, who was also general starost of Greater Poland from 1757. His main collaborator was Ignacy Twardowski Voivode of Kalisz, who owed virtually his entire career to him¹⁹. Supporting him in the upcoming political battle during the interregnum was Antoni Barnaba Jabłonowski, Voivode of Poznań, who was regarded as an independent politician with considerable influence²⁰. At the time, the Familia camp was led in the area by Teodor Czartoryski Bishop of Poznań, the younger brother of the main leaders of Princes August and Michael, who until then had rather rarely made public statements²¹. Russian diplomacy sought supporters among those supporting each side, though far more strongly among Familia supporters, thus creating a base for further action²².

In the case of the senatorial and clerical elite of Greater Poland (the voivodships of Poznań and Kalisz) the first attempts to probe the scale of support for particular parties began to become more apparent during the January meetings of senators and officials in Poznań. Teodor Czartoryski, Bishop of Poznań, was probably the first to convene such a meeting on January 23²³. He wanted to prevent him from

17 H. Schmitt, *Dzieje*, t. 1, 205-07.

18 The problem of pre-convocation local councils was dealt with by T. Szwaciński. The very wide scope of this article caused him to devote one page to the royal assemblies of the Poznań and Kalisz provinces, relying only on correspondence and copies of instructions and lauds. In this regard, the author did not review the "księgi grodzkie" (specific to Poland-Lithuania, something similar to municipal record book) and many other collections. The following findings show this issue in a much more complete way, so I do not refer to the article Szwaciński, "Sejmiki", 19-56.

19 Maria Czeppe, *Kamaryla pana z Dukli. Kształtowanie się obozu politycznego Jerzego Augusta Mniszcha 1750-1763* (Warszawa: Neriton, 1998), 52, 55, 72-3.

20 Halina Wereszycka, "Jabłonowski Antoni Barnaba", in PSB, vol. 10 (1962-1964), 216-18; Dariusz Rolnik, "Kasztelan krakowski Antoni Jabłonowski i inni 'możnowładcy'. O roli politycznej magnaterii w czasach panowania Stanisława Augusta", in *Wobec króla i Rzeczypospolitej. Magnateria w XV-XVIII wieku.*, eds. Ewa Dubas-Urwanowicz, and Jerzy Urwanowicz (Kraków: Avalon 2012), 207-31.

21 Władysław Konopczyński, "Czartoryski Teodor", in PSB, vol 2 (1936), 297-99.

22 The scale of the bribes granted in the era of the interregnum showed Zielińska, *Polska*, 175-78.

23 Some of the materials indicate that the meeting took place on January 22, 1764,

doing so, Ignacy Twardowski Voivode of Kalisz, who also sent out letters inviting potential participants on January 20²⁴. His initiative, however, turned out to be misguided, with few representatives of the Greater Poland elite coming to his invitation. Eventually, they all met at a meeting called by the Bishop of Poznań²⁵. This was the solution preferred by most officials, as for practical reasons at the time, the point of two meetings in such a short interval was not seen.

Senators and almost all officials from both voivodeships came to Poznań in large numbers on January 23. Rarely has such a turnout among the local elite been recorded at the royal assemblies²⁶. The discussion during the session centered around three issues, proposed by Theodor Czartoryski. They concerned: 1. the issue of the exclusion of the foreigner and the election of the “Piaś”, 2. the form of participation in the election - through deputies or *viritim*, and 3. the organization of the so-called confederate court local extraordinary courts²⁷.

Among those gathered, only a few supported the bishop’s proposal to exclude the foreigner from the throne. This group included Józef Mielżyński, Castellan of Poznań, Piotr Drwęski, Land Writer of the Voivodeship of Poznań, Wojciech Rydzyński, Carpenter of the Voivodeship of Poznań, Antoni Krzycki, Podstoli of the Voivodeship of Poznań and Jan Korytowski, Podstoli the Voivodship of Kalisz. This type of unequivocal declaration allows us to believe that they belonged to the circle of strongly declared supporters of Familia, which was also confirmed by later events. Ignacy Twardowski, Voivode of Kalisz, who was also supported at the time by Piotr Paweł Sapieha, Voivode of Smolensk, who was associated with the Czartoryski camp, went in a slightly different direction. Well, according to the former, in fact the homeland was in decline during the reign of August III and the “Piaś” should

BUW, ms. 116, A. Miaskowski to W. Łubieńskiego, Poznań, b.d. [propably 26 I 1764], ff. 326-27.

24 BUW, ms. 116, A. Miaskowski to W. Łubieńskiego, Poznań, [after 26 I 1764], f. 326-27. It is difficult to ascertain who was the first to come up with such an initiative and who copied it, as in accounts and correspondence both parties attributed priority to each other on this issue, see: BCzart., ms. 3858, I. Twardowski to J.A. Mniszcha, Poznań 24 I 1764, f. 1-3.

25 BUW, ms. 116, A. Miaskowski to W. Łubieńskiego, Poznań, [propably 26 I 1764], f. 326-27.

26 BUW, ms. 116, Senators present at the conference: Teodor Czartoryski Bishop of Poznań, Ignacy Twardowski Voivode of Kalisz, Piotr Paweł Sapieha Voivode of Smoleńsk, Józef Mielżyński Castellan of Poznań, Roch Zbijewski Castellan of Kalisz, Józef Starzeński Castellan of Gniezno, Stanisław Chłapowski Castellan of Międzyrzec, Rafał Gajewski Castellan Rogoziński, Michał Miaskowski Castellan of Łędz, Jan Tworzyński Castellan of Przemyśl, Antoni Gajewski Castellan of Nakielsk, Antoni Wyssogota Zakrzewski Castellan of Biechów, Józef Potocki Castellan of Kamień. Was not present Antoni Barnaba Jabłonowski Voivode of Poznań, Rafał Bniński Castellan of Śrem, Antoni Krzycki Castellan of Krzywín. Among officials, only Ksawery Sokolnicki Chamberlain of Kalisz, and Antoni Gorzeński Ensign of Kalisz, (Manuscript newspaper from Poznań sent to W. Łubieńskiemu after 24 I 1764, f. 339-340.

27 AGAD, AR, II, 2874, “Punkta Teodora Czartoryskiego”, Poznań 23 I 1764, f. 1-3.

be elected, but there is no point in enacting an exclusion, as all such attempts in the past failed. In turn, such a decision should be made by the Convocation Sejm. The majority of those gathered supported it²⁸. Twardowski no longer had to specifically defend the issue at the time, as the candidate of his camp was Hetman Branicki.

The assembled nobility also decided that an election by parliamentarians could be held, but only if the convocation passed such a resolution unanimously. If this does not happen, it should be held *viritem*. During the discussion, some participants supported only the latter possibility. Generally, supporters of voting by deputies were Familia followers, although the idea also found supporters among its opponents, e.g. Józef Starzeński, Castellan of Gniezno, supported this initiative as early as November 1763. The issue of confederate court (local extraordinary courts) was not discussed much, as it was unanimously agreed that they should be elected according to the current formula. In the later part of the session, a proposal for the nomination of a marshal of the future pre-convocation royal assembly was discussed. Teodor Czartoryski's supporters preferred the young Kazimierz Raczyński, then twenty-five years old, the Starost of Czerwogrodzki. He reportedly had many supporters among the local nobility. The republican camp, on the other hand, proposed Kasper Rogaliński, Starost of Nakiel, who had been active in Sejm self-government and state affairs for years²⁹.

Toward the end of the meeting, when Teodor Czartoryski was already heading to the conclusion and bidding farewell to those gathered, August Sulkowski took the floor with a request, however, that it be determined whether at the upcoming royal assembly it would be recommended to the deputies that the "Piaśt" candidate and the foreigner be excluded, or some other solution. This request was supported by his brother-in-law Piotr Paweł Sapieha Voivode of Smoleńsk. Eventually, the meeting ended, and some of the supporters of both parties went to the seat of the Bishop of Poznań in Dolsk to further advise on the thread that had been raised, as well as the creation of instructions and the course of the royal assembly. Antoni Barnaba Jabłonowski, Voivode of Poznań, who was absent from the meeting in Poznań, also arrived there. Pleasantly received, however, he failed to convince the bishop and his supporters of his vision. He therefore returned to Poznań, where he, together with Ignacy Twardowski and Kasper Rogaliński Starost of Nakiel³⁰, decided to prevent the Bishop of Poznań from opening the royal assembly session as customary. They also began to jointly organize a party of their supporters with "money, hope and threats"³¹.

28 BUW, ms. 116, A. Miaskowski to W. Łubieńskiego, Poznań [26 I 1764], f. 326-27.

29 BUW, ms. 116, J. Starzeński to W. Łubieńskiego, [19 XI 1763], 114-15; BCzart., ms. 3858, I. Twardowski to J.A. Mnischka, Poznań 24 I 1764, f. 1-3; BCzart., ms. 3858, J. Starzeński to J.A. Mnischka, Poznań 26 I 1764, ff. 5-7; AGAD, APP, 83, J. Starzeński to W. Łubieńskiego, Iłowiec 26 I 1764, ff. 264-265; BUW, ms. 116, Manuscript newspaper from Poznania to W. Łubieńskiego [after 26 I 1764], f. 339-340; BUW, ms. 116, A. Miaskowski to W. Łubieńskiego, Poznań, [ok. 26 I 1764], f. 326-327. Jerzy Dygdała, "Rogaliński Kasper", in PSB, vol. 31 (1988-1989), 404-08.

30 Ignacy Twardowski Voivode of Kalisz was brother-in-law of Kasper Rogaliński Starost of Nakiel

31 BCzart., ms. 3858, I. Twardowski to J.A. Mnischka, Poznań 24 I 1764, f. 1-3.

On 6 February 1764, in accordance with the Primate's universal, a pre-convocation royal assembly took place in Środa. Both sides were preparing for a confrontation, having already arrived in the town the day before and intending to use all possible means to push through their vision of instructions and the composition of the parliamentary representation³². The bishop's supporters were said to wear green caps, while the other side wore orange caps³³. Some attempt at mediation was still made between the parties by Piotr Paweł Sapieha, Voivode of Smoleńsk. The only agreement reached was that everyone would arrive at the cemetery at 6.00 in the morning, before the church was even opened³⁴. This did not happen, however, as some of Jabłonowski's supporters overslept. The Poznań Bishop's party entered the church to listen to the morning votive as was customary. At this time, the supporters of Voivode Jabłonowski, who sat in the chair provided for the Bishop of Poznań, were gathering in the cemetery. At about the same time, information came to those gathered in the church that he already wanted to start the royal assembly. Several dozen nobles ran out to stop him. A brawl ensued in which the Voivode was thrown off his chair. From the above description, it appears that it was the bishop's supporters who attacked the Poznań voivode's group, but it is hardly surprising, as Jabłonowski took the seat provided for the speaker, and, as he recalled, intended to do so himself³⁵. Eventually, the two sides split up and the royal assembly split into two separate royal assemblies.

The Bishop of Poznań convened the royal assembly in the cemetery, the usual place. A marshal of this assembly was Kazimierz Raczyński, Starost of Czerwonogród. In the Jabłonowski voivode's circle, tied up behind the church on the other side, the marshal of this assembly was Adam Poniński, the Crown Master of the Kitchen. Each party then dispersed, having declared a break in the proceedings until the following day.

When they resumed, the assembly, chaired by Raczyński, set to work electing deputies and drawing up instructions. The second assembly of Poniński debated the cause of the split and took steps towards unity. Delegates to the second assembly were elected. Their task was to convince those maintaining neutrality in the dispute: Józef Chłapowski, Castellan of Międzyrzec, Michał Skórzewski, *Podkomorzy* of Poznań, and Ksawery Sokolnicki, *Podkomorzy* of Kalisz, to mediate between the two sides.

32 Antoni Barnaba Jabłonowski, *Pamiętniki ks. Antoniego Jabłonowskiego kasztelana krakowskiego*, ed. August Bielowski (Lwów: Zakład Narodowy Ossolińskich, 1875), 82.

33 Katarzyna Kuras made an interesting suggestion for the interpretation of wearing different colored caps. In her opinion, the members of the two camps were not only aware of the differences between them, but also felt the need to manifest them externally. Katarzyna Kuras, "‘Człowiek manekin’ w politycznym teatrze XVIII wieku", in *Miscellanea res Polonorum, Brittanorum ac Judaeorum illustrantia*, eds. Jakub Basista, Adam Kaźmierczyk, Mariusz Markiewicz, and Dominika Oliwa (Kraków: Era, 2015), 219-34, Szwaciński, "Sejmiki", 24-5.

34 Jabłonowski, *Pamiętnik*, 82

35 LMAVB, F17-181, A.B. Jabłonowski to W. Łubieńskiego, Poznań 12 II 1764, f. 67-8v; Jabłonowski, *Pamiętniki*, 83-4; BOssol., ms. 3829, "Diariusz rozdwojonego sejmiku", Środa 6-12 II 1764, f. 58-9.

Ultimately, despite the attempt, no compromise was reached. Chłapowski, together with his comrades, saw only hope in Primate Łubieński, who should have convened a reconvene the royal assembly without recognising the assemblies chaired by Raczyński and Poniński³⁶.

On the third day, deputies to the Convocation Sejm had already been elected in a circle chaired by Raczyński. These were noblemen, led by Raczyński, who had already cooperated with the Familia for some time or had associated themselves with it before the interregnum. It took two more days to pass the entire instructions and the composition of the confederate court. The assembly chaired by Poniński also elected twelve deputies, deciding that the Convocation Sejm would judge who had deliberated legally. Both royal assemblies finished their work on 12 February³⁷. According to tradition, presumably in both circles before the instructions were written down, letters from key officials and dignitaries were also read. In his letter, Primate Łubieński appealed to the nobility to avoid splits, determine issues related to the security of the electoral field, recapitulate treaties with neighbors, maintain security throughout the country and on the borders, do not change the existing legal status of dissenters, and include in the instructions demands for: settlement of accounts by the heirs of previous treasurers and those currently holding the office, taking care of taxes, and strengthening Cracow. The Primate, although cooperating with the Familia, suggested in his letter that the exclusion of foreign candidates for the throne should be avoided. Similar demands had previously gone to senators³⁸. Jan Klemens Branicki, Castellan of Cracow and Grand Hetman of the Crown, proposed far more specific demands in his letter and accompanying instruction. He considered the issue of breaking Sejms, the influx of bad coin over the years, poorly functioning Tribunals, the decline of cities and the powerlessness to protect borders to be the most important problems. In his opinion, the Convocation Sejm, under the knot of confederation, should remedy these problems, especially with regard to the smooth operation of the Sejm and the reform of the army, as well as the abolition of the poll tax on the estates of the nobility in exchange for the introduction of other equitable burdens. This was a constant demand of the nobility, made for many years. In general, despite the attention paid to more specific problems, it was also in vain to find in these correspondence proposals on how to make these changes.

Two anonymous political periodicals associated with the Sasko-Hetmanski camp also spoke in a similar vein. It was in them, although not explicitly, that the choice of a monarch was promoted without excluding anyone, and there was a strong emphasis on a critical attitude towards political actors who bring foreign troops into the country or enlist their own. This remark was probably directed toward the

36 BOssol., ms. 3829, "Diariusz", f. 58-9; BUW, ms. 116, J. Chłapowski, M. Skórzewski, K. Sokolnicki to W. Łubieńskiego, b. m., 10 II 1764, f. 414-15.

37 BOssol., ms. 3829, "Diariusz", f. 58-9; LMAVB, F17-181, A.B. Jabłonowski to W. Łubieńskiego, Poznań 12 II 1764, f. 67-8v; A.B. Jabłonowski, *Pamiętnik*, s. 83-84; BCzart., ms. 3858, I. Twardowski to J.A. Mniszcha, Poznań 10 and 15 II 1764, ff. 103-06, 123-24.

38 Szwaciński, "Sejmiki", 49-50; BUW, ms. 116, W. Łubieński do województw, ziem i powiatów, Warszawa 22 XII 1763, f. 98-9; LMAVB, F17-181, Kopia listu W. Łubieńskiego do senatorów, Warszawa 22 XII 1763, f. 29-30v.

Familia, which was trying, then still secretly, to introduce Russian troops³⁹.

The instructions passed at the bifurcated royal assemblies in Środa handed over to the elected deputies did not differ all that much, which leads one to conclude that this political battle was more about choosing the right deputies for a particular party. The content of the documents handed over to them coincided in many places, and sometimes were even identical. The issue of the exclusion of foreigners from candidacy also turned out to be irrelevant in this case, as both instructions supported the election of a “Piaśt” born in the Republic, familiar with its laws, customs and wearing Polish clothes⁴⁰.

Only the instruction written under the leadership of Poniński recommended preserving the rights of Royal Prussia in the matter of electing parliamentarians, since there the opposition planned to gain their most parliamentarians. On the other issues, there were already more rhetorical differences or particularization of a given issue. The consensus prevailed in both royal assemblies in Środa on the election between Warsaw and Wola, conducted only by the Primate. Parliamentarians were ordered to strive to ensure that no bishop had the right to usurp these powers, as had been the case in the past. Also, foreign diplomats were to be out of Warsaw at this time. And the election of the king itself, according also to both royal assemblies in Środa, was to take place *viritim* (with the right of participation of every nobleman), and as soon as possible. As for the election of the Speaker of the Electoral Sejm, the instruction from under Poniński’s cane proposed election by the parliamentarians. In diplomatic matters, supporters of the Familia raised the issue of recognizing Catherine II’s imperial title. It was pointed out, however, that by virtue of this title she could not lay claim to any lands of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, Courland and Ruthenia. Both instructions called for the renewal of treaties with neighbors, as well as talks with the Prussian resident and the Imperial deputy on the delimitation of estates in the borderlands with those countries. They also proposed appointing commissioners to deal with the damage done by the armies of both countries during the past war. Also, the problem of reforming the army, which had been burning for years, was raised by the nobility of Greater Poland, but these were not proposals on the scale of the situation at the time. Again, as in 1744 and at later assemblies, there were demands for the establishment of voivodeship land militaries, supplementing the ranks with privates in existing formations, hiring only Polish officers, taking away officers’ ranks from senators and officials, establishing a school of knighthood, and replacing the poll tax with other taxes that would be fairer to the nobility. Quite interestingly, the instruction written under Poniński’s leadership included a postulate to give tenant of royal lands to current possessors in hereditary possession in exchange for high taxation. This instruction also included a demand that hetmans should not be allowed to sit in the senate and that they should be elected at the Sejm by majority vote.

The issue of breaking the Sejm was raised rather perfunctorily, with the nobility only signaling that they should be held in accordance with the law, that the election of the Speaker of the Sejm (presiding over proceedings) should take place on the

39 Szwaciński, “Sejmiki”, 48-9.

40 Of the 45 instructions known to historiography, only three ordered the actual exclusion of foreigners. These came out of sejmiks dominated by the Czartoryskis.

first day, and that if there was a rupture, then, according to instructions from the royal assembly where Raczyński presided, the envoy was to take an oath that he was guided by the public interest, and at the assembly he was to give an account of why he did so. The second sejmiks recommended that deputies not interfere with the work of the chamber. When it came to the functioning of the royal assemblies, the demands of Greater Poland were similar: the election of provincial governors, castellans, deputies, land judges, land undersheriffs, land writers and chamberlain were to be carried out by a majority. The royal assembly instruction, chaired by Poniński, further expanded this catalog to include the election of all senators and other land officials up to and including the treasurer by appointing 4 candidates to the king, as was the case with the election of land judges. According to Jabłonowski's supporters, all ministers, senators, crown officials and deputies should receive salaries.

The supporters of the Familia proposed a narrower catalog of individuals in their instructions, and rather suggested attaching the income from royal leasehold land to these offices on a permanent basis. Representatives of this camp also postulated that in the absence of judges, their replacements should be elected, while the universals for royal assembly should be entered in the town registers 2 weeks before the royal assembly and itself should begin at 9 a.m. after mass, while the other side proposed 3 weeks and 10 a.m., also after mass. The nobility probably wanted to avoid in this way the problems that occurred at the pre-convocation royal assemblies in Środa. All deliberations, according to both sides, were to be held only with the participation of nobles who owned any landed property in the region, and only they were to be elected to all functions and offices.

The issues of state finances were also limited to the proposals, which had been repeated for years, to restore the mint, to mine bullion in the Olkusz mountains, to strengthen the monarch's table estates with starships, to change the rate of coinage with the help of the Sejm. In the case of the treasurers (finance ministers), it was also sought that they finally account to the Sejm for their activities. This demand also applied to the families of already deceased officials who failed to do so due to the breaking of the Sejm. If there was not enough time, the deputies were to appoint a commission that would complete the matter by the time the monarch was elected.

Quite a lot of space in the instructions was devoted to judicial and legal issues. Here, too, the discrepancies were at the level of detail. Both instructions proposed reforming the Tribunals (the highest court of the nobility) and abolishing the Tribunal of Radom (the highest court of account for settling taxes transferred to the army). They also suggested setting fixed salaries for deputies working in the tribunals; the instruction from the Raczyński-led assembly proposed that the new reformed Tribunal sit in Poznań and Piotrków⁴¹.

In the case of the dissidents (not Catholics), there was a lack of any proposal from Greater Poland to improve their political or any other rights. The instruction

41 The issue of justice reform was discussed more extensively by the Jerzy Michalski, "Reforma sądownictwa na sejmie konwokacyjnym 1764 roku", in *Między wielką polityką a szlacheckim partykularyzmem. Studia z dziejów nowożytnej Polski i Europy ku czci profesora Jacka Staszewskiego*, ed. Kazimierz Wajda (Toruń: Wydawnictwo UMK, 1993), 295-313.

of the assemble chaired by Raczyński even proposed the demolition of illegal congregations. This postulate may come as a surprise, since already at that time the Russian ambassador had asked the Czartoryskis to improve the rights of dissidents. However, the Familia did not take up this thread, as they knew the real, very negative attitude of the nobility⁴². The instructions also touched on several issues related to the Church and land ownership, including the vetting of royal leases and estates, property matters, the promotion of distinguished nobility and disputes over tithes. The plan for repairing the state by the Czartoryskis did not feature prominently in them. The instructions of the supporters of the Sasso-Hellenic camp also proposed positive changes, sometimes even more profound than those formulated by the supporters of the Familia. A good example is that it was the assemble chaired by Poniński that proposed the introduction of a permanent institution to manage the state or the improvement of the post office.

258

To sum up, one should agree with Tomasz Szwaciński, who compared more than 45 instructions from across the Commonwealth, that the content provided by both parties did not differ significantly⁴³. The plan for repairing the state by the Czartoryskis did not feature prominently in them. The instructions of the supporters of the opposition camp also proposed positive changes, sometimes even more profound than those formulated by the supporters of the Familia. A good example is that it was the assembly chaired by Poniński that proposed the introduction of a permanent institution to manage the state or the improvement of the post office⁴⁴. It was in this instruction that there was also a demand to rectify all violations of the law, and even to convene an extraordinary parliament on the matter even before the election, if they could not be rectified at the convocation.

Despite the programmatic convergence of the instructions themselves, the two voivodeships found themselves in a situation of political disunity and legal and constitutional confusion. The two assemblies confederated according to tradition and elected two separate formations of confederate court. This threatened chaos, as it was unclear which was legitimate. An assemblies of Familia supporters decided to depose J.A. Mniszech the Crown Court Marshal, who at the time was also acting as General Starost of Greater Poland, of the powers related to the right to convene a local hasty march, and if there was any threat to both voivodeships, handed them over to Marshal Raczyński. In contrast, supporters of Jabłonowski, Voivode of Poznań, recognized only Mniszech's powers in this regard. There were more such discrepancies, but it is difficult to determine how the issue was handled⁴⁵.

42 Zielińska, *Polska*, 154.

43 More about the other instructions, including the Wielkopolska, zob. Szwaciński, "Sejmiki", 46-56.

44 APPozn., Gr. Poznań 1221, "Instrukcja sejmiku przedkonwokacyjnego pod laską marszałka Kazimierza Raczyńskiego starosty czerwonogrodzkiego", Środa 6 II 1764, ff. 137-47v; APPozn., Gr. Poznań 1221, "Instrukcja sejmiku przedkonwokacyjnego pod laską marszałka Adama Ponińskiego", Środa 6 II 1764, ff. 120-24.

45 APPozn., Gr. Poznań 1221, "Laudum sejmiku przedkonwokacyjnego [...]", f. 99-119; APPozn., Gr. Poznań 1221, "Laudum sejmiku przedkonwokacyjnego [...]",

It was not known at the time how the other assemblies had ended and whether Familia had gained an adequate advantage. The legality of any of the assembly was to be decided only by the Convocation Sejm, since Primate Władysław Łubieński did not agree to convene a second assembly, as supporters of reconciliation had converged on him for⁴⁶. However, from the very beginning of this dispute (information about the split reached him as early as February 8), he supported the supporters of Theodore Czartoryski, Bishop of Poznań⁴⁷, despite the fact that the *laudum* (resolution document) of his assembly was signed by about 794 nobles, while that of the opposing side was signed by about 1,700. In both cases, however, there were forgeries, so it was not actually known how many citizens were present in Środa⁴⁸.

Both sides, in the days following the end of the deliberations, convinced public opinion throughout the country, and especially Primate Łubieński, that they were right on their side⁴⁹. Locally, there was the publication of voluminous manifestos accusing each other of violating laws and traditions⁵⁰. Political writings were also circulated⁵¹. However, Primate Łubieński remained to the very end in his position that Jabłonowski and his party were to blame for the whole situation⁵². Still hoping that it would change, Jabłonowski Voivode of Poznań continued to contest the actions of the other side. He opened, together with Twardowski, Voivode of Poznań, the confederate court in Poznań on March 5, 1764. On the orders of Branicki, Great

f. 77-98. Among other things, the army was ordered to support the opponents of the Familia: AGAD, APP, 313, t. 1, J.K. Branicki to K.J. Laurene de Bosquet, Białystok 17 II 1764, f. 182

46 AGAD, APP, 83, W. Łubieński to J. Chłapowskiego, and J. Skórzewskiego to K. Sokolnickiego, Warszawa, 16 II 1764, f. 285-286.

47 BUW, ms. 116, "Informacja sejmiku w Środzie", 8 II 1764, f. 371; BUW, ms. 116, W. Łubieński to A.B. Jabłonowskiego, Warszawa 9 II 1764, f. 372-373.

48 APPozn., Gr. Kalisz 404, "Protestacja Piotra Korytowskiego oraz Zygmunta Kurczewskiego przeciw podpisom pod laudum sejmiku zagajonego przez A.B. Jabłonowskiego wojewodę poznańskiego", Kalisz 20 III 1764, f. 101-02, 108.

49 Glabisz, *Sejmiki*, 300-02.

50 APPozn., Gr. Wałcz 92, "Manifest spisany podczas sądów kapturowych wałeckich", Wałcz 19 III 1764, f. 294-95v; APPozn., Gr. Kalisz 404, "Manifest spisany podczas otwarcia sądów kapturowych kaliskich przez zwolenników sejmiku zagajonego przez A.B. Jabłonowskiego wojewodę poznańskiego", 19 III 1764, f. 146-51; APPozn., Gr. Kalisz 404, APPozn., Gr. Poznań 1106, "Manifest spisany w grodzie kaliskim", 19 III 1764, f. 100, 102-07; APPozn., Gr. Poznań 1106, "Manifest spisany w grodzie poznańskim", Poznań 12 III 1764, f. 646-51.

51 Biblioteka Narodowa w Warszawie, Biblioteka Ordynacji Zamoyskich, ms. 964, "Pismo dowodzące pierwszeństwa biskupa przed senatorem na sejmikach", f. 110-14; BOssol., ms. 1612, "Racje pro parte jm. wojewody poznańskiego względem precedencji przed biskupem poznańskim", f. 116-19

52 BUW, ms. 116, W. Łubieński to T. Czartoryskiego, Warszawa 13 II 1764, f. 416; BUW, ms. 116, W. Łubieński to A.B. Jabłonowskiego, Warszawa 16 II 1764, f. 417-18; AGAD, APP, 83, W. Łubieński to I. Twardowskiego, 16 II 1764, f. 284-85.

Hetman of the Crown, the troops of the Poznań garrison were to cover their course and support all the activities of the voivode⁵³. The session lasted until Saturday after which it was sealed so as not to cause more confusion with its verdicts⁵⁴. The Courts of Familia supporters were opened in Poznań on March 12, 1764. The day before, Teodor Czartoryski Bishop of Poznań arrived in the city, along with Raczyński Marshal of the Confederation and Mielżyński Castellan of Poznań. A total of 228 participants came to the assembly in Środa⁵⁵. After the meeting and the mass in the parish church, a “deliberately made” vision of the castle, which was in a deplorable state, was read⁵⁶. This was undoubtedly an attempt to publicly discredit the opposition-minded George Augustus Mniszch, Crown Court Marshal and General Starost of Greater Poland, whose duties included taking care of the castle. During the proceedings of the confederate court of the Familia supporters the following day, a rather interesting situation took place. Well, a nobleman unknown by name, Radecki, sued the Jews of Poznań, so that, according to the law, “they all wear yellow caps or berets, and this is to mortify another party whose caps are of a similar color”⁵⁷. This was undoubtedly an interesting manifestation of the political struggle at the level of symbols, as well as an unsympathetic attitude towards Jews. The remaining confederate court conventions in both voivodeships were held in a similar atmosphere⁵⁸.

In the end, the power of the Convocation Sejm was taken over by the Familia, and all the bifurcated squads of supporters of the opposition camp were declared illegally elected. In Greater Poland, the power of the confederation under the leadership

-
- 53 Wojciech Stanek, “‘Opisanie’ urzędu hetmańskiego z 1717 roku i jego polityczne następstwa”, *Studia i materiały do historii wojskowości*, 37 (1995): 36; AGAD, APP, 313, t. 1, J.K. Branicki to K.J. Laurene de Bosquet, Białystok 17 II 1764, f. 182; BCzart., rkp 3858, I. Twardowski to J.A. Mniszcha, Poznań 4 III 1764, f. 193-94.
- 54 BCzart., ms. 3858, J. Starzeński to J.A. Mniszcha, b.m. i d [11 III 1764], ff. 163-65.
- 55 APPozn., Gr. Poznań 1106, “Manifest senatorów, urzędników i szlachty, zwolenników Familii, zgromadzonych na sądy kapturowe w Poznaniu”, Poznań 12 III 1764, ff. 646-51.
- 56 It is probably about the visions issued by Zbigniew Chodyła, “Wizje Zamku Królewskiego, jego wieży i sklepu z archiwum grodzkim”, *Kronika Miasta Poznania*, 4 (2004): 321.
- 57 BUW, ms. 116, A. Miaskowski do W. Łubieńskiego, b.m, [przed 21 III 1764], f. 294r-v; APPozn., Gr. Poznań 1106, “Manifest spisany w grodzie poznańskim przez zwolenników sejmiku zagajonego przez T. Czartoryskiego biskupa poznańskiego”, Poznań 12 III 1764, ff. 646-51.
- 58 APPozn., Gr. Kalisz 404, “Manifest senatorów, urzędników i szlachty, przeciwników Familii, zgromadzonych na sądy kapturowe w Kaliszu”, Kalisz 20 III 1764, ff. 140-51; BK PAN, 2110, W. Wyganowski do J.K. Potockiego, Kalisz 17 III 1764, ff. 86-7v; APPozn., Gr. Kalisz 404, “Manifest senatorów, urzędników i szlachty, zwolenników Familii, zgromadzonych na sądy kapturowe w Kaliszu”, Kalisz 20 III 1764, ff. 102v-04; APPozn., Gr. Wałcz 92, “Manifest spisany podczas sądów kapturowych wałeckich przez zwolenników sejmiku zagajonego przez T. Czartoryskiego biskupa poznańskiego”, Wałcz 19 III 1764, ff. 294-95v.

of Kazimierz Raczyński was sanctioned. The opposition, after behind-the-scenes arrangements, resigned from the Convocation Sejm so that there would be no bloodshed. Before long, most of its leaders emigrated or surrendered⁵⁹. In addition to fulfilling a number of Russian policy goals, the assembly determined that the delegates would decide for themselves whether the nobility should go to the election *viritim* or by parliamentarians. Foreigners were excluded from the candidacy, and the king, in accordance with the wishes expressed earlier by Russian and Prussian diplomats, was to become “Piaś”.

During the deliberations, the central government, taxation and economic affairs were partially reformed. The rationalization of the system also affected the assembly and the Tribunal. It was possible to agree to such changes because the neighboring powers considered that majority voting for deputies and candidates for land and chamber judges, or questions of procedural conduct, were a need of domestic order, and therefore did not constitute a politically important matter, like voting at parliamentary sejmiks, to which such agreement was no longer given⁶⁰. However, it should be noted that the new law gave the local nobility very wide latitude in deciding the order of sejmik and granting active and passive voting rights⁶¹. After the end of the Convocation Sejm on June 23, 1764, the confederation binding it was dissolved, and a new crown general confederation was established in its place, under the leadership as marshal of August Czartoryski, Voivode of Russia, who then also became Commander-in-Chief (temporary commander of the entire army). Behind the highfalutin justifications for its existence, was the maintenance of Familia’s control over the country, under the auspices of its Russian ally, which had already announced at the time (August 7 officially) that Stanisław Antoni Poniatowski Court Pantler of Lithuania was to be the new king⁶². According to the will of the Convocation, the start of the Electoral Sejm was set for August 27, 1764, while the assemblies after the Convocation Sejm was to meet on July 23⁶³. Poznań and Kalisz voivodeships were still divided in the face of the upcoming election, although no longer as strongly as in February 1764. Some officials and nobles, such as Kasper Rogaliński starosta of Nakiel, realized that the situation had already been decided and it was necessary to adapt to the new conditions, so he reconciled with his

59 Grzegorz Szymborski, “Wykorzystanie i kontrola wojska jako przedmiot gry politycznej i obrad sejmiku konwokacyjnego w dobie bezkrólewia 1764 roku”, *AUL, Folia Historica*, 98 (2017): 5-68.

60 After the Convocation Sejm, the opposition sought this provision because it was aware that with the help of republican and freedom slogans it would be able to gain a majority in the regional assemblies. Zofia Zielińska, “Zabiegi Rosji o zachowanie liberum veto i o gwarancję w okresie bezkrólewia 1763–1764 r.”, *Kwartalnik Historyczny Rocznik*, CXI/3 (2004): 78-80, 84-5.

61 Schmitt, *Dzieje*, t. 1, 270.

62 Publicly, this message was given by Russian diplomacy at a meeting at the Primate’s 7 VIII 1764; Zielińska, *Polska*, 154, 179-180.

63 APPozn., Gr. Kalisz 404, “Uniwersał prymasa Władysława Łubieńskiego zwołujący sejmik relacyjno-elekcyjny”, Warszawa 26 VI 1764, f. 305.

previous opponents⁶⁴. At this time, too, on the ruins of the former opposition and among the supporters of the Czartoryskis, the Russian embassy was slowly building its hidden party, generously rewarding both its allies and recent enemies⁶⁵.

Some attempts to make a name for themselves in the new political situation among the Greater Poland were made by the Sułkowski brothers, of whom Prince August sympathized with the Familia camp from the beginning of the interregnum, according to a previously established Family plan⁶⁶. At the beginning of June, he asked Stanisław Poniatowski for patronage from Teodor Czartoryski, bishop of Poznań, himself somewhat exaggeratedly creating himself as having considerable influence in the region⁶⁷. He asked for direct orders regarding the upcoming assemblies, probably hoping to play an important role in the future royal party. From the information he provided on June 21, 1764, it appeared that Antoni Barnaba Jabłonowski Voivode of Poznań was absent from Greater Poland and hesitated to come to the assembly. He reportedly made this contingent on providing protection⁶⁸. Among the nobility, the idea of going to the viritim election still prevailed. Some dissatisfaction among Greater Poland was caused by information from Primate Łubiński's universal that the nobility would not be able to advise on the constitutions passed at the Convocation, as they would not be able to be printed in time. Sułkowski rightly conceded at the time, asking: "What instruction can we give to the next Diet, if we don't know what was passed at the previous one?"⁶⁹. The recent decisions related to the creation of a general confederation were also a major problem. It was headed, as I have already mentioned, by August Czartoryski, Voivode of Ruthenia, who, by virtue of the Convocation Sejm's constitutions, was also regent-general and headed the general confederate court. In this way, he actually wielded supreme military, judicial and partly legislative power, which, in the opinion of his opponents, resembled a dictatorship from the times of ancient Rome. At the end of June, Sułkowski asked Poniatowski what points he would be pushing for in his instructions to the Sejm for the election. It is difficult to say whether he finally received such instructions.

Proceedings of the relational-electoral assembly in Środa on 23-25 July. Information preceding the assembly shows that Jabłonowski, Voivode of Poznań, together with

64 Dygdała, *Rogaliński*, 404-08.

65 Zielińska, *Polska*, 175-78.

66 Dorota Dukwicz, and Michał Zwierzykowski, "Sułkowski August", in PSB, vol. 45 (2007-2008), 544.

67 August Sułkowski must have known by then that Stanislaus Antoni Poniatowski, the Lithuanian stolen monarch, would be a Russian candidate for the crown. They knew each other from their time in Vienna. Doubtless Sułkowski hoped to use this acquaintance in his career and political plans; Stanisław August, *Pamiętniki króla*, 85; BCzart., ms. 712, A. Sułkowski to Stanisława Augusta, Rydzyna 1 VI 1764, f. 41

68 BCzart., ms. 712, A. Sułkowski to Stanisława Augusta, Rydzyna 7 VI 1764, f. 45.

69 BCzart., ms. 712, A. Sułkowski to Stanisława Augusta, Rydzyna 22 VI 1764, f. 47.

his supporters, probably made some kind of compromise with the Familia camp⁷⁰. Some 507 noblemen were present at the assembly itself. Among the senators, only the Czartoryski's supporters appeared: Michał Miaskowski, Castellan of Łąd, and Antoni Gajewski, Castellan of Nakło. Unfortunately, little is known about the proceedings themselves. What is important, however, is that the assembled nobility confirmed that, despite the dissolution and establishment of a new confederation, the functions of marshal were to continue to be performed by Kazimierz Raczyński, Starost of Czerwonogród, who, together with Władysław Gurowski, the Great Crown Writer, was responsible for conducting the assembly in accordance with the party's assumptions⁷¹. The gathered nobility agreed to merge with the general confederation. Accordingly, consuls were elected to assist the marshal, and an act of particularistic confederation was passed⁷². Instructions for deputies to the electoral assembly were also formed. However, it did not fully meet the objectives of the Familia and the Russian embassy, because apart from the issue of electing the "Piaśt" king and improving his financial situation, it demanded respect for the free vote in the election of the monarch and an equal number of senators and deputies in the composition of the Treasury Commission appointed at the Convocation Sejm⁷³. The choice of how to go to the election was also compromised. In the debate so far, the supporters of the Familia proposed that the king should be elected by the deputies, while the opposition proposed *viritim*⁷⁴. In the end, the assembly decided to elect 36 deputies, considering the *viritim* election to be too costly for the nobility. At the same time, however, it was resolved that any citizen from the Poznań and Kalisz voivodeships who wished to do so could go to the election and vote. This was quite a breakneck solution, and it is apparent that there was probably no way to tip the scales in favour of either side. The parliamentary representation, which was obligatory to go to the Sejm, consisted in sixteen cases of deputies elected in both circles at a split pre-convocation⁷⁵. The majority of the others were also active participants in political life⁷⁶.

Under the cover of 25,000 Russian troops stationed away from the electoral field, the Electoral Sejm began on 27 August 1764. On 4-5 September, the Russian ambassador Keyserling and the Prussian deputy Gedeon de Benoît recommended to the states, during official audiences, the candidature of Stanisław Antoni Poniatowski Stolnik

70 BCzart., ms. 712, A. Sułkowski to Stanisława Augusta, Rydzyna 22 VI 1764, f. 47.

71 Zielińska, *Polska*, 174-75.

72 APPozn., Gr. Poznań 1221, Konfederacja spisana na sejmiku relacyjnym i przedelekcyjnym w Środzie, 23-5 VII 1764, f. 146-52v.

73 APPozn., Gr. Poznań 1221, "Instrukcja sejmiku relacyjno-elekcyjnego na sejm elekcyjny", Środa 25 VII 1764, ff. 153-54v.

74 BCzart., ms. 712; A. Sułkowski to Stanisława Augusta, Rydzyna 22 VI 1764, f. 47.

75 Glabisz, *Sejmiki*, 686-587.

76 Marcin Skakawski also applied for parliamentary function; he did not receive it at that time, so the sejmik promised to elect him to function at the next assembly; APPozn., Gr. Poznań 1221, "Laudum sejmiku relacyjno-elekcyjnego", Środa 23-25 VII 1764, f. 155-56.

of Lithuania for the crown. They also set the date of the coronation in Warsaw for 25 November, while the Coronation Sejm was to meet on 3 December. As the dates of the assembly to elect judges to the Crown Tribunal coincided with the coronation and the Sejm sessions, they were postponed to the day after the pre-Sejm assembly, recommending the election of judges already elected to the would-be tribunal in 1763⁷⁷. The deputies of Greater Poland were also very active in these days, striving strenuously, in line with the aims of the Familia and the Russian embassy, to enact a constitution increasing the royal revenues. Among those striving for this provision was Adam Poniński, the Crown Cook (who was already collaborating with the Familia at the time)⁷⁸. Józef Łącki, *Podkomorzy* of Brzeg and Kujawy, and August Sułkowski, Starost of Nowy Dwór. The proposal was not accepted, the king only received the right to income from the operation of the post office⁷⁹.

264

The election itself took place on 7 September 1764. Among its participants were some 256 representatives of the Poznań and Kalisz voivodeships, including 36 parliamentarians elected at the assembly⁸⁰. Among them was Ignacy Twardowski, Voivode of Kalisz, who also recognized at the time that reconciliation with the victors should be sought. Antoni Barnaba Jabłonowski, Voivode of Poznań, and other opposition-minded noblemen of Greater Poland soon did the same⁸¹. The dominance of the Familia camp, however, was unacceptable to most of them, and many hoped that the situation would soon change, however⁸².

Meanwhile, another problem, unrelated to current political events, had been growing for a long time in Greater Poland. From the very beginning of the interregnum, the activities of so-called groups of deserters from the army, mainly Prussian, who were crossing the border, looting the surrounding villages in the process, intensified⁸³. Kazimierz Raczyński, as marshal of the local confederation, ordered all types of

77 See, "Konstytucja", part "O Trybunale Lwowskim", and "Czas Sejmików Ante-Coronationis Króla przyszłego y Seymu Koronacyi", in *Volumina Legum: Przedruk zbioru praw staraniem XX. Pijarów w Warszawie, od roku 1732 do roku 1782*, t. 7, edited by Józefat Ohryzko (Petersburg: Józefat Ohryzko, 1860), 33, 95; APPozn., Gr. Wschowa 219, "Uniwersał prymasa Władysława Łubieńskiego zwołującego sejmiki przedkoronacyjne", Warszawa 10 IX 1764, ff. 77v-8.

78 Zielińska, *Polska*, 173-75

79 Rafał Zgorzelski, "Kształtowanie się struktury organizacyjnej dyrekcji oraz pocztamtu nadwornego poczty stanisławowskiej", in *W podróży przez wiek osiemnasty. Studia i szkice z epoki nowożytnej. Dedykowane Profesorowi Jerzemu Dygdałowi*, eds. Adam Perłakowski, Monika Wyszomirska, and Michał Zwierzykowski (Kraków: Księgarnia Akademicka, 2015), 251-73.

80 The number is approximate, because the source material contains printing errors and repetitions. Ohryzko, *Volumina Legum*, t. 7, 107-08, 113-14.

81 Wereszycka, *Jabłonowski*, 216-18

82 Jerzy Głowacki, *Gastronomia polityczna kuchmistrza litewskiego. Michał Wielhorski (ok. 1731–1814) – życie i myśl ustrojowa* (Warszawa: DIG, 2014), 97-9.

83 BUW, ms. 116, P.P. Sapieha to W. Łubieńskiego, [XI 1763], f. 41-42; BUW, ms. 116, P.P. Sapieha to W. Łubieńskiego, b.m. i d. [I 1764], f. 282.

estates to field troops to guard security⁸⁴. Primate Łubieński was also kept informed of the whole situation, assuring the people of Greater Poland that, following talks with the Prussian diplomatic representative, he had received an assurance from Frederick II that order would be maintained on the border⁸⁵. Fundamentally, however, these as well as other talks did not achieve much⁸⁶. Raczyński issued another universal on 1 October calling for expeditions⁸⁷. By the end of October, the situation already seemed to be more normalized, the borders secured, so the nobility was increasingly resistant to keeping the expeditions going.

The day before the pre-Sejm assembly on 28 October, there was a meeting between Teodor Czartoryski, Bishop of Poznań, and the vast majority of senators from both voivodeships on matters to be discussed. Unfortunately, it is not known who exactly attended this meeting and what its conclusions were⁸⁸. The parliamentary representation elected at that time consisted of those who had participated in the two previous assemblies, with an emphasis on supporters of the Familia camp in Greater Poland⁸⁹. The interests of the Russian embassy were certainly unofficially represented at the Sejm sessions by Władysław Gurowski, the Great Crown Writer at the time. It was supposedly due to his efforts that the nobility did not introduce demands close to the king for the reform of the army and the introduction of majority voting at all assemblies⁹⁰. However, the latter issue was smuggled out of the instruction under a clause demanding the reinstatement of the 1685 rules. As for the other issues, the instruction recommended that the deputies agree with others on the extension or dissolution of the General Confederation, on the functioning of the Treasury Commission (the Ministry of Finance) it was recommended to clarify the selection of its commissioners, and in Lithuania a Military Commission (the Ministry for the Lithuanian army) was to be established, analogous to the Crown section. It was also recommended that the matter of the mint be included in the pacts of convention (the king's personal obligations). In financial matters, the demand for an increase in the royal income appeared once again - income from stamp paper was cited as a proposal for improvement, as well as the enlargement of the table estate by four royal leases. The deputies were also to see to the permanent financing of the Knights' School. In connection with the subordination of the post office to the king, the nobility of Greater Poland wanted it to be organized in such a way that fees and private post offices were abolished.

84 APPozn., Gr. Gniezno 201, "Uniwersał Kazimierza Raczyńskiego marszałka konfederacji", Poznań 18 IX 1764, f. 304.

85 BUW, ms. 116, J. Mielżyński to W. Łubieńskiego, [2. poł. IX 1764], f. 1113; BUW, ms. 116, W. Łubieński to J. Mielżyńskiego, Warszawa 27 IX 1764, f. 1115.

86 Zielińska, *Polska*, 204-05.

87 APPozn., Gr. Gniezno 201, "Uniwersał Kazimierza Raczyńskiego marszałka konfederacji", Poznań 1 X 1764, f. 313.

88 BCzart., ms. 712, A. Sułkowski to Stanisława Augusta, Rydzyna 28 X 1764, f. 79-80.

89 Glabisz, *Sejmiki*, 586-87.

90 Zielińska, *Polska*, 215.

For the security of both voivodeships, the deputies were ordered to seek the return of four companies of General Goltz's regiment to Poznań from Kamieniec Podolski, where they were currently stationed. Other issues concerned church matters, the improvement of the flow of the Warta river and other local matters. Finally, it was traditional to recommend to the monarch's favour priest Andrzej Młodziejowski for the office of the Vice Chancellor of the Crown, and to the post of Grand Chancellor of the Crown Antoni Barnaba Jabłonowski, Voivode of Poznań, or Andrzej Zamoyski, Voivode of Inowrocław. Envoys were also not to forget Józef Mielżyński, Castellan of Poznań, and Kazimierz Raczyński, Starost of Czerwonogród and Marshal of the Confederation⁹¹. Thus, it can be seen that, on the ground of local politics, Jabłonowski cooperated, but further analysis of his behavior will show that this was an ad hoc alliance, in the face of the weakness of all the other opposition⁹². Although the pre-Sejm assemblies was over, the nobility remained to hold, in accordance with the new law on the Crown Tribunal, assemblies for the election of judges to the tribunal and separate assemblies for economic affairs. At the first of these, in accordance with the new law, the introduction was made by Antoni Barnaba Jabłonowski, who then put forward Kazimierz Raczyński as a candidate for the post of assembly marshal. Such a move was necessary in the light of the new law, which the nobility interpreted very literally. In principle, these provisions applied only to deputy and electoral assembly; in other cases, e.g. pre-Sejm ones, when there was a confederation, its marshal automatically held the post of director already without recitation or election. Raczyński was legally assisted by ten assessors, two from each county, who were then sworn in in accordance with the constitution⁹³. In the end, four deputies were elected by means of a majority vote. All of them were associated with the Familia camp from the very beginning of the interregnum⁹⁴. They were headed by Józef Mielżyński, Castellan of Poznań, who, according to the party's plans, became Marshal (chairman) of the Tribunal for the Greater Poland Province⁹⁵. All those elected, in accordance with the new law, took an oath before Jabłonowski, Voivode of Poznań, which was recorded in the *laudum*⁹⁶. At the Coronation Sejm, despite the communication to the Familia and Stanislaus Augustus by the Russian ambassador, Repnin, of Catherine II's disapproval of profound changes to the state's political system; in the end, some real changes were introduced. Majority voting at all pre-Sejm assemble was not one of them.

91 APPozn., Gr. Poznań 1221, "Instrukcja na sejm koronacyjny posłom", Środa 29 X 1764, ff. 163-67v.

92 Wereszycka, "Jabłonowski", 216-18

93 APPozn., Gr. Poznań 1221, "Laudum sejmiku deputackiego", Środa 5 XI 1764, f. 161-62v.

94 Glabisz, Sejmiki, 611.

95 He was also part of a group receiving financial gifts from the Russian embassy from 1764; Włodzimierz Dworzaczek, "Mielżyński Józef", in PSB, vol. 20 (1975), 782-84; Zielińska, *Polska*, 173-75.

96 APPozn., Gr. Poznań 1221, "Laudum sejmiku deputackiego", Środa 5 XI 1764, ff. 161-62v.

However, by the back door, with the help of constitutions for individual lands and voivodeships referring to old customs, many sejmiks 'restored' this right to themselves, including the Poznań and Kalisz voivodeships. In summing up the Sejm to Catherine II, Stanislaus Augustus pointed out that he had submitted to the will of the Emperor, and had not introduced the planned reforms, but had tried to carry out all the postulates, except for the equality of dissidents. Everyone was aware that the noble people would not agree to this. However, it did not matter. Catherine II absolutely demanded this change, for the sake of her prestige. However, it only became the axis of political debate in 1766.

In the case of the Poznań and Kalisz voivodeships, the rivalry for power after the death of August III was quite turbulent. Ultimately, the fight was won by representatives of the Familia camp; nevertheless, the opposition supporters had the actual advantage among the noble masses. Mainly associated with Jerzy August Mniszech, his supporters pretended to come to terms with the situation after the King's election, waiting for a convenient moment to raise their heads. In fact, and this was a mistake, the Familia camp made no attempt at reconciliation and compromise after the election of 1764 but continued to maintain power through general and particular confederations across the country until 1766. Despite the apparent division in both voivodeships in matters of state, the nobility of Greater Poland was united in its reforms. The essence of the feuds and disputes was the question of who took power and who was spurned. Already after the Convocation Sejm, it can be seen that the reforms introduced at the Sejms found recognition and rationalised the functioning of, among other things, the assemblies. The reforms to the functioning of local institutions were not reversed in the following years, when the opposition began to gain the upper hand in Greater Poland as well, thanks to Russian patronage.

ABBREVIATION

AGAD: Archiwum Główne Akt Dawnych w Warszawie.

APP: Archiwum Publiczne Potockich.

AR: Archiwum Radziwiłłów.

APPozn.: Archiwum Państwowe w Poznaniu.

Gr.: Księgi Grodzkie.

BCzart.: Biblioteka Książąt Czartoryskich w Krakowie.

BK PAN: Biblioteka Kórnicka Polskiej Akademii Nauk.

BOssol.: Biblioteka Zakładu Narodowego im. Ossolińskich PAN we Wrocławiu.

BUW: Biblioteka Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego.

PSB: Polski Słownik Biograficzny.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- 268 Chodyła, Zbigniew. "Wizje Zamku Królewskiego, jego wieży i sklepu z archiwum grodzkie". *Kronika Miasta Poznania*, 4 (2004): 313-25.
- Czeppe, Maria. *Kamaryla pana z Dukli. Kształtowanie się obozu politycznego Jerzego Augusta Mniszcha 1750–1763*. Warszawa: Neriton, 1998.
- Dukwicz Dorota, Zwierzykowski Michał. "Sułkowski August". In PSB, vol. 45 (2007–2008), 542-52.
- Dworzaczek, Włodzimierz. "Mielżyński Józef". In PSB, vol. 20 (1975), 782-84.
- Dygdała, Jerzy. "Rogaliński Kasper". In PSB, vol. 31 (1988–1989), 404-08.
- Gierowski, Józef. "Rozkład państwowości szlacheckiej w czasach saskich". In *Między Wschodem a Zachodem. Rzeczpospolita XVI–XVIII w. Studia ofiarowane Zbigniewowi Wójcikowi w siedemdziesiątą rocznicę urodzin*, edited by Teresa Chynczewska-Hennel, 187-96. Warszawa: Historia pro Futuro, 1993.
- Glabisz, Grzegorz. *Sejmiki Wielkopolski w latach 1764–1793*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo UAM, 2022.
- Głowacki, Jerzy. *Gastronomia polityczna kuchmistrza litewskiego. Michał Wielhorski (ok. 1731–1814) – życie i myśl ustrojowa*. Warszawa: DIG, 2014.
- Konopczyński, Władysław. "Czartoryski Teodor". In PSB, vol. 2 (1936), 297-99.
- Kriegseisen, Wojciech. "Zmierzch staropolskiej polityki, czyli o niektórych celach szczególnych polskiej kultury politycznej przełomu XVII i XVIII wieku". In *Zmierzch kultury staropolskiej. Ciągłość i kryzysy (Wiek XVII–XIX)*, edited by Urszula Augustyniak, and Andrzej Karpiński, 15-39. Warszawa: Semper, 1997.
- Kuras, Katarzyna. "'Człowiek manekin' w politycznym teatrze XVIII wieku". In *Miscellanea res Polonorum, Brittanorum ac Judaeorum illustrantia*, edited by Jakub Basista, Adam Kaźmierczyk, Mariusz Markiewicz, and Dominika Oliwa, 219-34. Kraków: Era, 2015.
- Michalski, Jerzy. "Plan Czartoryskich naprawy Rzeczypospolitej". In *Studia historyczne z XVIII i XIX w.*, t. 1, edited by Wojciech Kriegseisen, and Zofia Zielińska, 11-27. Warszawa: Stentor, 2007.
- Michalski, Jerzy. "Reforma sądownictwa na sejmie konwokacyjnym 1764 roku". In *Między wielką polityką a szlacheckim partykularyzmem. Studia z dziejów nowożytnej Polski i Europy ku czci profesora Jacka Staszewskiego*, edited by Kazimierz Wajda, 295-313. Toruń: Wydawnictwo UMK, 1993.
- Rolnik, Dariusz. "Kasztelan krakowski Antoni Jabłonowski i inni "możnowładcy". O roli politycznej magnaterii w czasach panowania Stanisława Augusta". In

- Wobec króla i Rzeczypospolitej. *Magnateria w XV-XVIII wieku*. edited by Ewa Dubas-Urwanowicz, and Jerzy Urwanowicz, 207-31. Kraków: Avalon 2012.
- Rostworowski, Emanuel. "Łubieński Władysław". In PSB, vol. 18 (1973), 508-11.
- Schmitt, Henryk. *Dzieje panowania Stanisława Augusta*, t. 1. Lwów: Drukarnia Narodowa im. W. Manieckiego, 1868.
- Stanek, Wojciech. "'Opisanie' urzędu hetmańskiego z 1717 roku i jego polityczne następstwa". *Studia i materiały do historii wojskowości*, 37 (1995): 31-41.
- Szwaciński, Tomasz. "Sejmiki poselskie przed konwokacją 1764 r.". *Kwartalnik Historyczny*, 113/1 (2006): 19-56.
- Szymborski, Grzegorz. "Wykorzystanie i kontrola wojska jako przedmiot gry politycznej i obrad sejmu konwokacyjnego w dobie bezkrólewia 1764 roku". *AUL, Folia Historica*, 98 (2017): 5-68.
- Wereszycka, Halina. "Jabłonowski Antoni Barnaba". In PSB, vol. 10 (1962–1964), 216-18.
- Zgorzelski, Rafał "Kształtowanie się struktury organizacyjnej dyrekcji oraz pocztamtu nadwornego poczty stanisławowskiej". In *W podróży przez wiek osiemnasty. Studia i szkice z epoki nowożytnej. Dedykowane Profesorowi Jerzemu Dygdale*, edited by Adam Perłakowski, Monika Wyszomirska, and Michał Zwierzykowski, 251-73. Kraków: Księgarnia Akademicka, 2015
- Zielińska, Teresa. *Magnateria polska epoki saskiej. Funkcje urzędów i królewszczyn w procesie przeobrażeń warstwy społecznej*. Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy imienia Ossolińskich, 1977.
- Zielińska, Zofia. *Polska w okowach "systemu północnego" 1763–1766*. Kraków: Arcana 2012.
- Zielińska, Zofia. "Pogłoski o rozbiórze Polski oraz ich reperkusje w Rzeczypospolitej w okresie bezkrólewia 1763–1764 r.". *Przegląd Historyczny*, 96/4 (2004): 543-71.
- Zielińska, Zofia. "Zabiegi Rosji o zachowanie liberum veto i o gwarancję w okresie bezkrólewia 1763-1764 r.". *Kwartalnik Historyczny Rocznik*, CXI/3 (2004): 63-88.
- Zielińska, Zofia. "Rosja wobec planów reform ustrojowych". In *Studia z dziejów stosunków polsko-rosyjskich w XVIII wieku*, edited by Ead., 60-90. Warszawa: Semper, 2001.
- Zwierzykowski, Michał. "Odrębności ustrojowe Wielkopolski w dobie nowożytnej". In *Między barokiem a oświeceniem. Staropolski regionalizm*, edited by Stanisław Achremczyk, 54-62. Olsztyn: OBN, 2008.

PRIMARY SOURCES

AGAD:

APP, sign. 83, 313.

AR, II, sign. 2874.

APPozn.

Gr. Gniezno, 201.

Gr. Kalisz, 404.

Gr. Poznań, 1106, 1221.

Gr. Wałcz, 92.

Gr. Wschowa 219

BCzart.: ms. 712, 3858.

BK PAN, ms. 2119.

Biblioteka Narodowa w Warszawie . Biblioteka Ordynacji Zamoyskich, ms. 964.

BUW, ms. 116.

Biblioteka Wróblewskich, F17-181.

BOssol.: mss. 1612, 3829.

PRINTED SOURCES

Jabłonowski, Antoni Barnaba. *Pamiętniki ks. Antoniego Jabłonowskiego kasztelana krakowskiego*, edited by August. Bielowski. Lwów: Zakład Narodowy Ossolińskich, 1875.