# Europe's Wealth of Civic Traditions:

## The Case of Polish-Lithuanian Republicanism[1]

*Richard Butterwick-Pawlikowski (College of Europe, Natolin)*

Within most member states of the European Union, European citizenship is not a popular cause. Widespread cynicism towards pan-European institutions and pan-European slogans is all too obvious in many member states, especially in the oldest and/or richest ones. Indeed, the EU now seems to be held in highest esteem just beyond its eastern border. The Ukrainian philosopher Volodymyr Yermolenko has claimed that 'the Europe founded upon faith in the European idea' is now in the east (starting at the Polish-German frontier), while 'the Europe of rules and regulation' is in the west.[2] This disenchantment, this sense that the EU is remote, unresponsive, unrepresentative, corrupt, and in decline, 'elderly and haggard', 'a "grandmother", no longer fertile and vibrant', as Pope Francis rather ungallantly put it,[3] is, I believe, fed by the perception that the EU does not care to seek the consent of its constituent peoples. The EU has repeatedly ignored the popular will in member states in order to pursue the orthodoxy of 'ever closer union' – monetary, fiscal and political. Decentralization has become a heresy, rather than a legitimate political argument.[4] When the people get the answer wrong, they are told to vote again, until they get it right. When they are allowed to vote at all. I doubt that this was what Bronisław Geremek had in mind when told his fellow guests at Pope John Paul II's symposium at Castel Gandolfo in 1994 that 'democracy can only be cured with democracy'.[5]

Talk of the 'democratic deficit' is an inadequate response to this crisis of confidence. Yes, in today's rapidly globalizing world, no medium-sized nation state can exercise untrammelled sovereignty. It makes sense for countries to come together in matters which cannot be dealt with satisfactorily at national level. But as Václav Havel put it, speaking to the European Parliament five years ago, 'agreement to the principle of multi-layered sovereignty is only possible thanks to civic and political identification with it'.[6]

Inhabitants of the member states of the EU cannot be expected to feel, still less to act on a sense of European citizenship, unless they feel that the content of 'European citizenship' has drawn in on the civic heritage of their own national or local communities. In every corner of Europe we can find civic traditions, reaching back centuries or even millennia. Europeans have practised and developed ideas of liberty, government by consent, individual and shared rights, and duties, all founded on the values of the *res publica* – the common good. But most of this

heritage is lamentably little-known. Wider appreciation of these riches requires EU institutions (and budget holders) to promote the heritage of *all* parts of the European continent in the face of widespread ignorance and prejudice. This is not solely a matter of national bias in school textbooks – it is understandable that the French children are taught about the Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen, that Italians learn of the glories of the Italian Renaissance, the Dutch and Spanish of their Golden Ages, that Greek schools celebrate ancient Athenian democracy, that Scots know of the Declaration of Arbroath, and that at one time the English were taught about Magna Carta.

Far more corrosive of European solidarity is the conviction that 'Eastern Europeans' knew little or nothing of civic values until they were accepted 'into Europe'. How many outside Hungary have heard of the Golden Bull? It was issued in 1222, just seven years after Magna Carta, and well before Magna Carta was accepted into English law. The Golden Bull provided Hungarian noblemen with safeguards against arbitrary arrest, taxation, and military service, as well as what would later be interpreted as a right of resistance. Within decades the Golden Bull had become part of the Hungarian national narrative of liberty, and it widened its scope from the sixteenth century, a process that culminated in its talismanic significance during the 1848-49 war of independence[7]. Without doubt, still fewer Europeans have heard of Pylyp Orlyk's constitution of 1710. It was drawn up in Bendery by exiled Ukrainian Cossacks, and has a claim to be the first such constitutional document in European history[8].

The problem is not new, although in a long-term historical perspective, it is comparatively recent. For the last two or three centuries much of Central and Eastern Europe was usually ruled by powers which, for the most part, sought to suppress most manifestations and even memories of the civic spirit. Fortunately, they failed. The EU should actively confront the prejudice that liberty, democracy, and civil society are 'Western' European exports to the 'backward' 'Eastern' reaches of the continent following the fall of Communism.

The civic tradition I would like to enlarge upon here is the republicanism of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. It remains unfamiliar to most Europeans. This remarkable civic culture took shape in the late middle ages and the Renaissance, flourished for almost a hundred years, experienced a profound crisis, and was renewed before the Commonwealth was finally destroyed by its neighbours in 1795. The transformations that took place in the late eighteenth century made it possible for stateless Poles to export a universal idea of liberty to nineteenth-century revolutionaries of Europe and the Americas, encapsulated by the slogan 'For our freedom and yours'. Achievements such as the Constitution of 3 May 1791 made it much harder for the propagandists of the three absolute monarchies that dismembered the Commonwealth to

persuade European opinion that 'Polish liberty' had been nothing more than the ruinous privileges of an anarchic, oppressive and parasitical nobility, which had reduced its elective kings to impotence. And it would have been far more difficult to convince others that 'la tranquillité régnait à Varsovie', as a French Minister of Foreign Affairs announced after General Ivan Pashkevich's suppression of the Polish-Lithuanian rising of 1830-31 – provoking a fierce satirical reaction on the theme of 'l'ordre règne à Varsovie'.[9]

Even so, these stereotypes retain much currency. This is partly because of the Polish taste for self-flagellation, alternating with bouts of megalomania. These traits tend to convince even the most sympathetic Western Europeans of their own civilizational superiority over people with unpronounceable names ending in –ski. They retain currency too, because national narratives in Lithuania, Belarus and Ukraine were constructed according to the formula of 'Polish' lords exploiting 'Lithuanian', 'Belarusian' and 'Ukrainian' peasants, and ultimately losing the long struggle with Muscovite Russia[10]. Polish-speaking lords also exploited Jewish middlemen and Polish-speaking peasants. They undermined the trade of townspeople, while excluding them from the body politic. Most of those towns, even at their sixteenth-century zenith, were poor shadows of those of the Low Countries and Northern Italy. The political system, the preserve of the nobility, did indeed fall into a chronic state of crisis. The country was in the end partitioned. And yet…

And yet the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth should not be written off as a failure. On the contrary, the civic republican values which shaped, sustained and revived the Commonwealth could provide excellent examples for the European Union. As well as a warning of how things can go wrong.[11]

The sheer size of the Commonwealth – at its height in the early seventeenth century it encompassed all of modern Belarus, Lithuania and Latvia, most of Poland and Ukraine, half of Estonia and parts of Russia – was the principal source of its diversity. The confessional continental divide, between Eastern and Western Christendom, bisected the Commonwealth. Catholic and Orthodox Christians simply had to find a *modus vivendi*, well before the Protestant Reformation complicated things further. Peaceful co-existence was a necessity. Religious toleration was a condition for the settlement of many migrants, including Ashkenazi Jews, Tatars, Karaites, Dutch and German Mennonites, Scots, Bohemian Brethren, Armenians, Old-Believers, and until the mid-seventeenth century, anti-Trinitarians. Toleration did not usually mean equality in rights or esteem. But disputes were usually settled peacefully and according to civil law. In 1555, a papal nuncio disapprovingly called Vilnius (Vilna, Vilne, Wilno) a 'Babylon, because [...] there are Armenians, Muscovites, Ruthenians, Tatars, Lithuanians, Germans and

Italians, but few good Christians'. Similar observations would be made over the next century and more.[12]

Among the nobility, for a few decades at least, equality between Christian confessions did prevail. In 1573, during the era of religious wars, the year after the infamous St Bartholomew's Day massacre in France, the noble citizens of the Commonwealth, joining together in a league known as the Confederation of Warsaw, but finding themselves divided in religion, solemnly resolved and promised not to persecute each other, shed blood or confiscate property on that account.[13] Only from the mid-seventeenth century would non-Catholic citizens become a reluctantly tolerated minority, and gradually be deprived of their political (but not civil) rights. But the law of 1573 was never abolished and each new king had to swear to maintain religious peace. During that first interregnum of 1572-73, citizens were faced with the challenge of completing the construction of the joint Polish-Lithuanian polity – sometimes called the Commonwealth of the Two Nations (*Rzeczpospolita Obojga Narodów*) – created by the Union of Lublin in 1569, while also electing a new king, avoiding a civil war and guarding the frontiers. They succeeded, and for three generations the Commonwealth flourished.

The political system which crystallized in the third quarter of the sixteenth century was founded on a political culture which recognized that necessary action for the sake of the common good – the *res publica* – had to be achieved by persuasion, discussion, negotiation and a willingness to compromise particular, private and provincial interests. Given the diversity of interests and the paucity of coercive power in the huge new state, implementation of centrally reached decisions required the consent and participation of local citizens. Had simple majority voting been practised in parliament, it might have fissured the Commonwealth beyond repair. The union between the Kingdom of Poland and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania would have been imperilled had the interests of Lithuania been overridden too frequently. The interests of the eastern territories, whose nobles were still predominantly Orthodox and Ruthenian-speaking, could not be ignored – although too often they weighed too lightly. 'Votes should be weighed, not counted', ran the proverb in many places. So it was in the Commonwealth. Both the strength of the argument itself and the personal authority of the speaker were taken into account. Minorities were persuaded to yield to the will of the majority, but the majority would make concessions to the interests of the minority – *pro bono publico*. Only from the mid-seventeenth century did the deepening crisis of political culture turn the imperative of consensus into the *liberum veto* – the right of any individual member (with a sufficiently powerful protector in the shadows) to bring parliamentary proceedings to an end and thereby prevent any laws at all from being passed. The defenders of the *veto* – and there were many – argued that a single virtuous

man could thereby prevent the destruction of liberty by a corrupted majority. But by the mid-eighteenth century, the Commonwealth's legislature was paralysed. I trust that the analogies with the dilemmas facing the European Union – between weighted majorities, simple majorities and unanimity in its various fora – are so obvious, that they do not require further emphasis here.

The *liberum veto* was also an outgrowth of the *libera vox* – the free voice, whose purpose was to secure freedom. Freedom of speech in political matters at public assemblies, long respected in practice, but enshrined as a constitutional law in 1609, was not merely a liberty, but a civic duty: the duty of a free citizen to give counsel regarding the public good. The principle comprehended freedom of the press; in the entire history of the Commonwealth, no attempt to impose royal or ecclesiastical censorship ever succeeded for long. The *libera vox* exemplifies both the individual and collective dimensions of freedom.

The rights, privileges and liberties which came to be regarded collectively as 'liberty' derived, on the one hand, from a mixture of immemorial customs, founding charters and concessions extracted from princes. The rule of a Hungarian king, Louis the Great, led to the effective exemption of the nobility and Catholic clergy from taxation without their consent in the late fourteenth century. In the 1420s, the noble privilege of *Neminem captivabimus nisi iure victum* – essentially the principle of no incarceration without trial, equivalent to the much later English Habeas Corpus Act – was won from a king anxious to secure the succession of his eldest son. The law of *Nihil novi*, agreed in 1505, laid down that the monarch could make no new laws without the consent of the lower house of parliament, comprising the delegates or envoys of the various lands and provinces that comprised the Kingdom of Poland. All these liberties came to be shared by Lithuanian and Ruthenian nobles of all Christian denominations in the course of the sixteenth century.

Broadly similar processes were taking place across most of the European continent. Elective monarchies were common; majority voting in parliamentary estates was rare. However, in the course of the sixteenth, seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, this process was reversed in many places, whose monarchs claimed and even exercised a much greater degree of arbitrary power than hitherto. Republicans regarded the growth of royal power in successive states with horror, but the so-called rise of the absolute state was for long seen by historians as a necessary vehicle of modernization, especially in its eighteenth-century variant of 'enlightened absolutism'. In the French case, Bourbon absolutism supposedly prepared the way for the rational, centralizing and progressive revolutionary and Napoleonic state. Nowadays historians tend to emphasize that princes ignored local opposition at their peril.[14] The Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation, long derided as an anachronistic obstacle to a 'modern' German nation-state, is

5

now at least partly rehabilitated as a framework of law and collective security for diverse communities in the middle of Europe. The liberties and privileges of early modern *Ständestaaten* are sometimes included in the history of human and civil rights.[15]

By the time that the drift towards royal 'absolutism' had begun, an alternative, republican ideology had been recovered by scholars from the surviving writings of classical antiquity and applied to the diverse liberties and practices of self-government enjoyed by communities and individuals across most of the continent. To 'Western' historians, the best known cases were made in the Italian city states during the Renaissance, during the 'English Revolution' of the mid-seventeenth century, and in the United Provinces of the Netherlands during their long war of independence from Spain. But – thanks to the universal language of Latin – an important contribution to this international republican conversation was made by writers from Poland-Lithuania, such as Andrzej Frycz Modrzewski, the author of *De Republica emendanda* (published for the first time in full in Basle in 1554). The volumes arising from the project financed by the European Union, *Republicanism: A Shared European Heritage*, edited by Quentin Skinner and Martin van Gelderen, contain two excellent essays on Polish-Lithuanian republicanism.[16] Indeed, the understanding of republican liberty advanced by Skinner can be applied at least as well to the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth as anywhere else in Europe[17].

Skinner has questioned the long-established liberal tendency, to contrast collective and individual freedom: the tendency to call the former 'ancient', 'positive' or 'republican', and the latter 'modern', 'negative' or 'liberal'. This tendency, while it originated in an older distinction between civil and political freedom, took firm root in response to the French Revolutionary terror. It was most persuasively articulated in the 1958 by Sir Isaiah Berlin.[18] The former idea of liberty is often associated with the 'tyranny of the majority'[19] and the latter is often invoked to justify ever greater restrictions placed on popular democracy. Skinner has 'excavated' (his favourite metaphor) the conviction of earlier, 'neo-Roman' republican writers, most of them Italian and English, a few French, German or Dutch, that all individual freedoms from the actions of an arbitrary ruler are secured by the free participation of citizens in the making and execution of laws. So the 'negative' freedom from government is not an alternative to the 'positive' freedom to participate in government; instead, the first depends upon the second.[20]

Such was the conviction of Polish-Lithuanian republicans, who from the early sixteenth century were as steeped in the Latin classics as any elite in Europe. Such was the ideological foundation for a mixed form of government, an Aristotelian blend of monarchy, aristocracy, and *politeia* (impolitely called democracy). Still more ambitiously, this *forma mixta* was not only preached, but practised, and not in a small city-state, as the ancient and modern theorists of the

Mediterranean world conceived, but in a vast polity which at its zenith encompassed more than a million square kilometres. We return to the great extent of the Commonwealth, which necessitated not only compromise between diverse interests in order to agree laws binding on all, but the leaving of the implementation of those laws to local communities. When, in the late eighteenth century, Jean-Jacques Rousseau tried to square the circle of the ancient belief that republics could only flourish in small city states with the reality of a still extensive Commonwealth, his answer was more decentralization, not less.[21] Could the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth not teach us a lesson in applied subsidiarity?

For such a system to work well, much was demanded of its citizens. It was sustained by deep reservoirs of civic virtue – which is essentially the willingness, in consequence of the *amor patriae* inculcated by upbringing and education, to sacrifice one's private interest to serve the common good. It also rested on a high degree of trust, between monarch and citizens, between wealthier and poorer citizens, and between citizens of different faiths. In retrospect, it is perhaps surprising that the Commonwealth's political culture supported a fairly successful political system for as long as three generations.

Nowadays, we may well ask, when there seems to be precious little sacrificial virtue and trust in some of the most stable and coherent communities (national and local) within Europe, with identities that have been nurtured over many centuries, what hope could there possibly be for such qualities among European citizens? And the idea of inculcating patriotic virtues through education has been tainted by the fear of indoctrination in national hatred. Surely it would be easier to rule Europeans technocratically, while guaranteeing their individual human rights, as adjudicated by a competent and learned judiciary? No, no indeed, and not only because peoples whose clear wish is repeatedly ignored by their governors will in the end revolt against the entire system. The genie of popular sovereignty has long since left the bottle. There is also an old republican axiom: the freedom of each and all cannot be safe without the participation of each and all.

There is no possibility here of rehearsing the endless arguments, dating back two and a half millennia, among philosophers, poets and historians about how and why republics decline and fall. Suffice it to say that the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth declined precipitously between the mid-seventeenth and mid-eighteenth centuries. Not least in the quality of the education received by its citizens. Revival, when it came, rested on three foundations – all of them associated with a Piarist pedagogue, Stanisław Konarski.[22] The first of these foundations was a renewed emphasis on the civic virtues of reasoned and respectful persuasion, and a willingness to make concessions and sacrifices for the sake of the *res publica*. The second was that

robust institutions must be fashioned for sinful but redeemable men, and not for angels. And the third was a willingness to study and learn from the experience of more successful free countries abroad – including the Protestant examples of the Netherlands and Great Britain – and to apply those lessons discriminately, without abandoning the Commonwealth's own traditions and values.

By the later eighteenth century, the opportunities to apply these salutary lessons were constricted by the Commonwealth's dependence on the Russian Empire, and also by the eagerness of its other neighbours, especially Prussia, to keep the Commonwealth weak. The Hohenzollern monarchs looked for chances to annex Polish-Lithuanian territories. And yet in these difficult circumstances, great intellectual transformations associated with the Enlightenment took place – even as the likes of Voltaire and d'Alembert mocked the Poles for their supposed fanaticism and anarchy.

When Russia was at war with the Ottoman Empire (1787-91), the time was right to turn ideas into action. The Constitution of 3 May 1791 was passed two years after the American constitution and four months before the French. The outcome of a compromise between the king and his former opponents, it blended a republican sovereignty of the nation with a Montesquieuvian division of powers into legislative, executive and judicial, all of which were strengthened. It struck a judicious balance between the individual rights of citizens and their collective need to defend the Commonwealth's independence. For just over a year, 'orderly freedom' triumphed at home, and the Polish Constitution was toasted by opinion-formers in America, France, and Great Britain.[23]

Then Russia invaded and destroyed the Commonwealth. Before Empress Catherine II was able to complete this dismemberment, however, the scope of the 'Polish nation' was widened, in theory, to include all inhabitants of the Commonwealth. Although the nation of noble citizens was very numerous, reaching perhaps 7.5 per cent of the population, which compares favourably with many nineteenth-century Western European electoral franchises, it remains the case that until 1791 burghers were marginalized, while the majority of the population was composed of unfree peasants. First, the civic and self-governing rights of urban citizens were strengthened, according to the emerging principle that property and education, rather than the accident of birth, made an active citizen. Then, the Constitution of 3 May 1791 declared the peasantry the most numerous and useful part of the nation.[24] The Constitution's shortcomings regarding their actual legal and socio-economic position were redressed during the last, desperate insurrection against Russian dominance in 1794. Its leader, Tadeusz Kościuszko, hero of the American Revolution, abolished serfdom, symbolically ennobled a peasant soldier and donned a

peasant cloak. On top of all this, the Constitution guaranteed adherents of all religious faiths freedom and protection, and restored most of the political equality of non-Catholic citizens. Freedom, at least in theory, was for all.[25]

Jean-Jacques Rousseau had in 1771 famously advised the Poles to make a citadel of liberty in their hearts, so that even if they were swallowed by their neighbours, they could not be digested.[26] As a universal idea, rather than a set of privileges and liberties claimed by particular communities, liberty could be exported by exiled Polish-Lithuanian revolutionaries and romantics of the nineteenth century. Empire-builders could become empire-breakers, as Andrzej Nowak has argued.[27] The banner of 'For our freedom and yours' was carried by Polish insurrectionaries and soldiers, at home and abroad, in causes ranging from the 'Spring of Nations' of 1848 to the Second World War. Theirs was not a freedom that was restricted to individual rights. Its essence was a willingness to make sacrifices for the common good of all nations in the cause of universal liberty. It conveyed a sense of solidarity. In October 1956 Hungarian students demonstrated their solidarity with Poles, menaced by the Soviet Union. They marched to the statue of Józef Bem, the Pole who commanded the Hungarian army in the 1848-49 war of independence against the combined forces of Austria and Russia. In 1956, they briefly won their freedom, only to lose it again as the Red Army rolled back in. Unfortunately, as Bronisław Geremek observed in 2008, 'this history of struggle for liberty, symbolized by the Hungarian Revolution of 1956, the Prague Spring and *Solidarność*, is not part of European collective memory.'[28] Still less well known is the eloquent protest of Lithuanians, Latvians and Estonians, forming a human chain in a triumph for civil society on 23 August 1989, the fiftieth anniversary of the infamous Hitler-Stalin pact which partitioned East-Central Europe.

The Iron Curtain has, thankfully, gone from Europe. But the threat to freedom from an arbitrary and illiberal neo-imperial regime in Moscow has not. The problem posed by the conference held in the European Parliament on 9 December 2014 – 'Ukraine as a test for European solidarity' – has no easy answers. But the history of the region can teach us some lessons. The Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth ultimately failed the Cossacks of Ukraine. It failed them because, despite their services in wars against Muscovy and the Ottoman Empire, it denied their wish to participate as fellow-citizens in its republican political system – until (in 1658) it was too late. The Cossacks were driven to revolt, and driven into the arms of Muscovite Russia.[29] For three and a half centuries.

When the Commonwealth succeeded, it did so by tolerating convictions which many found heretical or idolatrous; it did so by reaching decisions by reasoned argument, consensus and compromise; it did so by decentralizing most functions of government to the localities; and

it did so by involving its citizens in the making and executing of laws. The Commonwealth's key principle was and is expressed in the words '*nic o nas bez nas*' – 'nothing concerning us without us'. These are just some of the many underexplored treasures of the shared European heritage of liberty. The cause of European citizenship needs them all.

Notes

1 This is a fuller version of a paper delivered to the conference: *Citizen Matters: Views and Perspectives on European Citizenship*, organized by Mr Fernando Maura Barandiarán, Vice-President of the ALDE group of MEPs, at the European Parliament in Brussels on 10 December 2014.

2 V. Yermolenko, 'Dreams of Europe', *Eurozine*, http://www.eurozine.com/articles/2014-02-06-yermolenko-en.html (accessed 10 December 2014).

3 The full text of the speech, delivered to the European Parliament on 25 November 2014, is available at http://en.radiovaticana.va/news/2014/11/25/pope_francis_address_to_european_parliament/1112318 (accessed 10 December 2014).

4 J. C. Espada, 'The Missing Debate', *Journal of Democracy*, 25, 2014, 4, pp. 88-95.

5 B. Geremek, 'Demokracja', in *Profesor to nie obelga. Alfabet Bronisława Geremka*, ed. J. Głażewski, Kraków, 2012, pp. 14-15. My translation from the Polish translation.

6 V. Havel, 'Jako Czech jestem też Europejczykiem', in id., *Zmieniać świat. Eseje polityczne*, Warsaw, 2012, p. 375. My translation from the Polish translation.

7 For a nuanced assessment, see M. Rady, 'The Right of Resistance in Hungary', available at http://www.academia.edu/3683922/The_Right_of_Resistance_in_Hungary._A_Lecture (accessed 16 December 2014); idem, 'Hungary and the Golden Bull of 1222', *Banatica*, 24, 2014, 2, pp. 87-108, available at https://www.academia.edu/9987735/Hungary_and_the_Golden_Bull_of_1222 (accessed 3 January 2015).

8
http://www.encyclopediaofukraine.com/display.asp?AddButton=pages\B\E\BenderyConstitutionof.htm (accessed 19 December 2014); K. Losson, *Komu miła całość Ojczyzny. Świadomość i aspiracje polityczne kancelistów kozackich (1760-1720)*, Warsaw, 2013, pp. 99-110.

9 The minister was Horace Sebastiani, speaking to the National Assembly on 16 September 1831. The most famous cartoon, showing a Cossack surrounded by corpses and gallows, was produced by Jean Ignace Isidore Gérard. The incident might be compared to the reaction of Helmut Schmidt to General Wojciech Jaruzelski's imposition of Martial Law in Poland on 13 December 1981.

10 See T. Snyder, *The Reconstruction of Nations: Poland, Ukraine, Lithuania, Belarus, 1569-1999*, New Haven, CT, 2003; R. Frost, 'Ordering the Kaleidoscope: The Construction of Identities in the Lands of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth since 1569', in *Power and the Nation in European History*, ed. L. Scales and O. Zimmer, Cambridge, 2005, pp. 212-32.

[11] In a piece of this kind, rather than attempt to provide references for the following paragraphs, I confine myself to a few suggestions for further reading in English: D. Stone, *The Polish-Lithuanian State, 1386-1795*, Seattle, WA, 2001; *The Polish-Lithuanian Monarchy in European Context, c. 1500-1795*, ed. R. Butterwick, Basingstoke, 2001; *Citizenship and Identity in a Multi-National Commonwealth: Poland-Lithuania in Context, 1550-1772*, Leiden and Boston, MA, 2009, ed. K. Friedrich and B. Pendzich; K. Friedrich, 'Polish-Lithuanian Political Thought, 1450-1700', in *History of European Political Thought, 1450-1700*, ed. H. Lloyd, G. Burgess and S. Hodson, New Haven, CT, 2007, pp. 208-42; R. I. Frost, 'The Nobility of Poland-Lithuania, 1569-1795', in *The European Nobilities in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries*, vol. 2, *Northern, Central and Eastern Europe*, ed. H. M. Scott, Harlow, 1995, pp. 183-222; A. S. Kamiński, 'The Szlachta of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and Their Government', in *The Nobility in Russia and Eastern Europe*, ed. I. Banac and P. Bushkovitch, New Haven, CT, 1983, pp. 17-45; A. Grześkowiak-Krawicz, 'Noble Republicanism in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth (an Attempt at Description)', *Acta Poloniae Historica*, 103, 2011, pp. 31-65; A. Grześkowiak-Krawicz, *Queen Liberty: The Concept of Freedom in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth*, Leiden and Boston, MA: 2012; J. Lukowski, *Disorderly Liberty: The Political Culture of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in the Eighteenth Century*, London, 2010.

[12] Aloisius Lippomano, quoted in W. Pawlikowska-Butterwick, 'A "Foreign" Elite? The Territorial Origins of the Cathedral Chapter of Vilna in the Second Half of the Sixteenth Century', *Slavonic and East European Review*, 92, 2014, 1, pp. 44-80, at 79. See also D. Frick, *Kith, Kin and Neighbors: Communities and Confessions in Seventeenth-Century Wilno*, Ithaca, NY, 2013.

[13] The text, translated into English by M. B. B. Biskupski, is available in *Polish Democratic Thought from the Renaissance to the Great Emigration*, Boulder, CO, 1990, ed. M. B. B. Biskupski and J. S. Pula, and at http://www.reformation.org/confederation-of-warsaw.html (accessed 19 December 2014).

[14] See N. Henshall, *The Myth of Absolutism: Change and Continuity in Early Modern European Monarchy*, London, 1992.

[15] See K. O. von Aretin, *Das Alte Reich, 1648-1806*, 2 vols., Stuttgart, 1993-97; J. Whaley, *Germany and the Holy Roman Empire*, 2 vols., Oxford, 2011; For an accessible introduction, see Peter H. Wilson, *The Holy Roman Empire 1495-1806*, Basingstoke, 1999.

[16] A. Grześkowiak-Krawicz, 'Anti-Monarchism in Polish Republicanism in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries', in *Republicanism: A Shared European Heritage*, ed. M. van Gelderen and Q. Skinner, 2 vols, Cambridge, 2002, vol. 1, pp. 43-59. E. Opaliński, 'Civic Humanism and Republican Citizenship in the Polish Renaissance', in *Republicanism: A Shared European Heritage*, vol. 1, pp. 147-67.

[17] A. Grześkowiak-Krawicz, *Regina libertas. Wolność w polskiej myśli politycznej XVIII wieku*, Gdańsk, 2006 (shorter English edn: *Queen Liberty*); R. Butterwick-Pawlikowski, 'A Dialogue of Republicanism and Liberalism: Regarding Anna Grześkowiak-Krawicz's Book on the Idea of Liberty', *Kwartalnik Historyczny*, 121, 2014, special issue, pp. 169-88, available online at http://ihpan.edu.pl/publikacje/czasopisma/573-kwartalnik-historyczny.

[18] I. Berlin, 'Two Concepts of Liberty' [1958], in id., *Four Essays on Liberty*, Oxford, 1969, pp. 118-72.

[19] J. S. Mill, *On Liberty and Other Writings*, ed. S. Collini, Cambridge, 1989, p. 8.

[20] Q. Skinner, *Liberty before Liberalism*, Cambridge, 1998. Id., 'A Third Concept of Liberty', *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 117, 2002, pp. 237-68.

[21] J.-J. Rousseau, *Considérations sur le gouvernement de Pologne et sur sa reformation projetée* [1771], ed. J. Fabre, in J.-J. Rousseau, *Oeuvres completes*, ed. B. Gagnebin and M. Raymond, Paris, 1959-95, vol. 3, pp. 970-71.

[22] See Lukowski, *Disorderly Liberty*, pp. 68-97.

[23] See *Constitution and Reform in Eighteenth-Century Poland: The Constitution of May 3, 1791*, ed. S. Fiszman, Bloomington, IN, 1997; R. Butterwick, *Poland's Last King and English Culture: Stanisław August Poniatowski, 1732-1798*, pp. 285-309; id., 'Political Discourses of the Polish Revolution, 1788-1792', *English Historical Review*, 120, 2005, 481, pp. 695-731.

[24] See Lukowski, *Disorderly Liberty*, pp. 173-253.

[25] See A. Walicki, *The Enlightenment and the Birth of Modern Nationhood: Polish Political Thought from Noble Republicanism to Tadeusz Kościuszko*, Notre Dame, IN, 1989.

[26] Rousseau, *Considérations*, pp. 959-60.

[27] A. Nowak, 'From Empire Builder to Empire Breaker, or There and Back Again: History and Memory of Poland's Role in Eastern European Politics', in id., *Od imperium do imperium. Spojrzenia na historię Europy Wschodniej*, Kraków, 2004.

[28] B. Geremek, 'Europa wielu ojczyzn', in id., *Nasza Europa*, Kraków, 2012, p. 108. My translation from the Polish translation by E. Stolarczyk-Makowska.

[29] See A. S. Kamiński, 'The Cossack Experiment in Szlachta Democracy: The Hadiach (Hadziacz) Union', *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, 1, 1977, 1-2, pp. 178-97; F. Sysyn, 'The Khmel′nyts′kyi Uprising: A Characterization of the Ukrainian Revolt', *Jewish History*, 17, 2003, 2, pp. 115-39.