

Mariusz Sawicki, *Dom sapieżyński 1666–1685. Droga do hegemonii w Wielkim Księstwie Litewskim*, Opole: Wydawnictwo uniwersytetu opolskiego, 2016, 275 s. (Uniwersytet opolski, Studia i monografie, nr 535) ISSN 1233-6408, ISBN 978-83-7395-721-3

An important monograph by the Polish historian Mariusz Sawicki was published recently about one of the most influential magnate families in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, specifically, the genesis of the hegemony of the Sapieha family in Lithuania. This is his second monograph in which the magnate and the noble political factions of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania are the object of his research.¹ As we know, at the beginning of the 1670s, in terms of influence, the Ruzhany (in Belarusian Ружаны, in Polish Różana) line of the Sapiehas surpassed other magnates in that period in Lithuania. The extent of their influence soon reached such heights that the period is quite reasonably described in historiography using the concept of the Sapiehas' hegemony in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. Two members of this family, Kazimierz Jan Sapieha, the Palatine of Vilnius (from 1682) and Grand Hetman of Lithuania (from 1683), and his younger brother Benedykt Paweł, the Grand Treasurer of Lithuania (from 1676), became the most powerful Lithuanian magnates in their day, leaders of the magnate and nobility political factions that formed around the Sapieha family. The domination of the Sapiehas and their frequent abuses of power aroused dissatisfaction among other magnates and nobles, which was further encouraged by the ruler of the Polish-Lithuanian state John III Sobieski (in Polish Jan III Sobieski, reigned 1674–1696), who was also in conflict with the Sapiehas. The conflict, which grew more and more intense, developed into a civil war in Lithuania during the reign of the next king, Augustus II the Strong of the House of Wettin, culminating in the Battle of Valkininkai (18 November 1700). During this battle, the forces of the anti-Sapieha

¹ In his first monograph, Mariusz Sawicki thoroughly analysed the composition and activities of the royalist faction in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania (the supporters of King John II Casimir Vasa [in Polish Jan II Kazimierz Waza]) in the middle of the 17th century. See: M. Sawicki, *Stronnictwo dworskie w Wielkim Księstwie Litewskim w latach 1648–1655* (Opole, 2010).

movement, who came to be known as republicans, defeated the army of the Sapiehas. The defeat brought an end to the family's hegemony in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania.

In his work, Sawicki has concentrated less on the period of the Sapiehas' hegemony, and more on its actual genesis. He formulated the aim of his research as follows: to discuss all the critically important elements that brought about the unprecedented rise of one family in 1666–1685. The author decided to analyse the issue firstly in the political context, also using, when required, a discussion of military and property aspects (p. 12). He supports his choice by reasoning that even though the fact of the Sapiehas' hegemony is frequently mentioned in historiography, the phenomenon itself is rarely an object of research by historians, and there are no papers devoted especially to research into the phenomenon that discuss the whole period of the Sapiehas' hegemony, while the genesis of their hegemony has received even less attention (pp. 11–12). We can basically agree with this summary of the issue. But it is a shame that the author did not also strive to discuss the phenomenon of the hegemony of another magnate family in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, which unfolded at the end of the 1660s, when the Pac family rose to prominence.² The years of the Pac family's hegemony almost coincide with the chronological research framework of the book under review. After all, the Sapiehas' hegemony was a continuation of the same phenomenon. Nor does Sawicki try to compare the periods of hegemony of the Pac and the Sapieha families, or to reveal the special characteristics that distinguish them. But we do notice that the author views the hegemony of the Sapiehas as more prominent than that of their predecessors, the Pac family ('the unprecedented rise of one family'). Incidentally, as the book under review does not focus on

²The magnate family's hegemony in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania is discussed in a special section in Vol. VI of the academic 'History of Lithuania' devoted to this phenomenon and specifically to the hegemony of the Pac family 'Vienos didikų giminės hegemonijos sistema. Pacų hegemonija (1669–1682 m.)' (The system of one magnate family's hegemony. The Pac hegemony [1699–1682]), see: *Lietuvos istorija*, t. 6: G. Sliesoriūnas, *Lietuvos Didžioji Kunigaikštystė XVI a. pabaigoje – XVIII a. pradžioje (1588–1733 metais)* (Vilnius, 2015), pp. 485–489. It also presents a discussion of the special characteristics of the period of the Sapiehas' hegemony. See, *ibid.*, pp. 512–517. For more details on the period of the Sapiehas' hegemony, see also: G. Sliesoriūnas, 'Sapiegų hegemonija Lietuvos Didžiojoje Kunigaikštystėje XVII amžiaus pabaigoje', in: *Sapiegos, Kryžiai yra dorybės ženklas, o strėlė – pergalės... Sapiegos – valstybininkai, meno mecenatai ir kolekcininkai: tarptautinės parodos katalogas*, sud. V. Dolinskas, B. Verbiejūtė (Vilnius, 2012), pp. 65–79.

the actual period of the Sapieha family's hegemony, but rather on an analysis of its genesis, a comparison of the periods of the hegemony of the Pac and Sapieha families was not necessary.

The strong point of Sawicki's work is his good use of archival sources. The author has used material collected from 30 archives and libraries across nine countries: Poland (11 archives and libraries), Lithuania (four), Ukraine (three), Belarus, France, Great Britain, Russia, Germany (two each), and Austria and Latvia (one each). Numerous published sources and historiography from the period discussed were also used.

The structure of the monograph consists of an introduction and three chapters: 1) Political Youth. The Sapiehas in 1666–1673; 2) Towards Political Independence 1674–1682; 3) Towards Hegemony 1682–1685. It ends with a summary (The End, pp. 247–255), a bibliography, an index of names, and a summary in English. The first chapter is divided into two sub-chapters, and the second into three. This structure is justifiable, and allows the author to reveal thoroughly the Sapiehas' ascent to the height of their powers. The first chapter analyses how, following the death on 30 December 1665 of Paweł Jan Sapieha, the Grand Hetman of Lithuania and Voivode of Vilnius (he held both these positions in 1656–1665), his four sons, Kazimierz Jan, Benedykt Paweł, Franciszek Stefan and Leon Bazyli, were left without the guardianship of their influential father. Only the two oldest had come of age and had started their political careers, i.e., they already held office in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, had gathered around them the most loyal clients and supporters of the Sapieha family, and had preserved the relatively fragile and weakened faction of Sapieha supporters. It has been shown that, feeling pressurised by the Pac family, who had acquired the position as the most influential magnates in Lithuania, the Sapiehas looked for support in a union with the Radziwiłłs, both the Birżai and the Nesvyzh branches, and had become particularly close at the time to Bogusław Radziwiłł, the Lithuanian Master of the Horse (equerry, in Polish *koniuszny*) and the Governor of the Hohenzollern-ruled Duchy of Prussia. Meanwhile, King John Casimir Vasa, who fell out with the Pac family towards the end of his reign, saw the Sapieha faction as a constituent part of the emerging faction of the king's supporters in Lithuania, whose main core was to consist of members of both branches of the Radziwiłłs (the Birżai and Nesvyzh lines). Sawicki is able to reveal rather convincingly how, even during this difficult period, the Sapieha faction managed to maintain relative independence. Their efforts to gather their supporters and strengthen the independence of their faction continued under the

reign of Michael I (in Polish, Michał Korybut Wiśniowiecki, 1669–1673). Even though their position was closer to the opposition (in Lithuania, it included the Radziwiłłs, and in Poland Jan Sobieski, who had entered into a family union with the Radziwiłłs) than to the king's supporters (in Lithuania, the king's most important backing came from the Pac family, who had difficult relations with the Sapiehas), the Sapiehas avoided open confrontation with the king, which helped them rise up the hierarchy of official positions in Lithuania.

In the second chapter, Sawicki reveals in detail how the Sapieha faction, which had become one of the strongest supporters of Jan III Sobieski in Lithuania, who was elected to the throne in 1674, gradually moved away from the influence of the Radziwiłł faction, which had initially become the main supporters of the new king in Lithuania. The author highlights, with reason, the significance of the delegation headed by Mikołaj Władysław Przeździecki, the Castellan of Navahrudak (in Belarusian *Наварудак*, in Polish *Nowogródek*), who represented the Sapiehas and the Grand Marshal of Lithuania Aleksander Hilary Połubiński, to meet the king in 1678 (followed soon afterwards by the visit to the monarch by Benedykt Paweł Sapieha, who was then already grand treasurer). These meetings were an important chance to convince Sobieski to choose the strengthened Sapieha faction as his main support in Lithuania in the struggle against the Pac family, who were openly opposed to the king's policies (pp. 153–158). The author states that some of the Radziwiłłs' clients and supporters started to change their political patrons, and changed over to the Sapieha faction, which was a redistribution of influence within the camp of John III Sobieski's supporters in Lithuania: the influence of the Radziwiłł faction decreased, whereas the Sapiehas' increased. The fateful shift happened in 1679–1680, when at first, in 1679, the influential Grand Marshal of Lithuania, Aleksander Hilary Połubiński, died, followed by the passing of the king's brother-in-law Michał Kazimierz Radziwiłł, the Grand Chancellor of Lithuania, in 1680. No other serious opponents to the Sapiehas remained in the camp of the king's supporters, and most of the clients of the deceased marshal and chancellor joined the Sapiehas' faction. In 1681, Kazimierz Jan Sapieha became Field Hetman of Lithuania. The fateful turning point that changed the balance of power in Lithuania and ended the hegemony of the Pac family was the death of the Palatine of Vilnius and Grand Hetman Michał Kazimierz Pac on 4 April 1682, which is what Sawicki points out (p. 253).

In the third chapter, the author discusses the process of the consolidation and entrenchment of the Sapiehas' influence in the Grand

Duchy of Lithuania, from the appointment of Kazimierz Jan Sapieha as grand hetman in 1682 until the appointment of Marcjjan Aleksander Ogiński, the Palatine of Trakai (in Polish, Troki), as the Grand Chancellor of Lithuania in 1685. In Sawicki's view, the latter's nomination was a very significant event in the genesis of the hegemony of the Sapiehas in Lithuania. Even though the initial goal of the Sapieha faction was to secure the post of chancellor for Benedykt Paweł Sapieha, and in the event of success, to try to win the king's appointment of the third brother, Franciszek Stefan Sapieha, to the vacant post of Grand Treasurer of Lithuania, the eventual appointment of Marcjjan Aleksander Ogiński ended up by serving the Sapiehas' interests, as the new chancellor was very well disposed towards them, and did not let the king involve him in a conflict with the Sapiehas. According to Sawicki, once Marcjjan Aleksander Ogiński had become chancellor, the Sapiehas acquired an obvious advantage in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, and from this point onwards, they took control of the Lithuanian political stage, capable of opposing the king's policies and any other detrimental outcomes for themselves (p. 255). This chapter also discusses how the Sapieha faction shifted to become the king's opposition, and John III Sobieski's own unsuccessful initial efforts, when he still hoped to keep the Sapiehas in his supporters' camp, to limit their influence in the creation of a counterbalance within the royalists' faction (the beginning of this policy can be seen up to 1682, evident from the nominations of the Radziwiłłs), and later, when it became obvious that the paths of the king and the Sapiehas had ultimately taken different directions, in the gathering of a new royalist faction in Lithuania, in which radical opponents of the Sapiehas tried to be involved, and which they encouraged through official appointments.

We can summarise that Sawicki has achieved his aim. The genesis of the hegemony of the Sapiehas in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania is thoroughly and convincingly explained.

Nonetheless, the monograph does contain a number of inaccuracies, some of the author's theses remain unexplained or are not explained convincingly enough, and other statements that could be a basis for future academic discussion have been left without sufficient argumentation, in the opinion of this reviewer. During the period of the Sapiehas' hegemony in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania described in the introduction, the author cites a mandate (a summons to the Sejm court) issued to Kazimierz Jan Sapieha, where the most influential Lithuanian magnate of the time is accused of forcing the whole Grand Duchy of

Lithuania to obey his commands (p. 12). Sawicki attributes these words to King John III Sobieski, while the mandate itself is identified in a footnote (no 26) as 'Mandate issued by John III Sobieski to Kazimierz Jan Sapieha, place and date unknown, in the year 1693'. The attribution of these words to the king gives them particular weight. But in fact they were spoken by the Bishop of Vilnius Konstanty Kazimierz Brzostowski, who became involved in a serious conflict with the grand hetman in 1693 over the army's dislocation in the bishop's estates, which led him to call Kazimierz Jan Sapieha before the Sejm court. The summons was issued in the king's name. But this was just a formality. The same happened with summonses to the Supreme Tribunal. Incidentally, this summons by the Bishop of Vilnius to the Sejm court was invalid. It had to be stamped with Lithuania's majestic or minor seal in order to be legally valid, while neither the grand chancellor Dominik Mikołaj Radziwiłł, nor the vice-chancellor Karol Stanisław Radziwiłł (both incidentally were supporters of John III Sobieski, while the vice-chancellor was also the king's nephew) agreed to stamp the summons. People in the circle of the vice-chancellor believed that the Bishop of Vilnius had procured the form from the Lithuanian Minor Chancellery with the seal by deceit, and thereby forged his summons (mandate), leading to the conflict between Karol Stanisław Radziwiłł and the Bishop of Vilnius at the end of 1693. Meanwhile, based on the three copies, each with different dates, the document itself could be dated to 12 or 30 October, or 12 November 1693.³ Another inaccuracy is related to the location of Kadino (Kadzino, in Russian Кадино, in Polish Kadzin), an important town in 17th-century diplomacy. In the monograph, it is claimed that Kadino was in the Smolensk Voivodeship (Province, p. 133). As we know, after the Truce of Andrusovo of 1667, the Smolensk Voivodeship ended up becoming part of Muscovite Rus'. Kadino was the last town in the territory of the GDL where the Commonwealth's diplomats could stay on their way to Moscow or to border negotiations with representatives of Russia. The town was in the Mstislaw Voivodeship, and was thus part of the territory of the GDL until 1772. Like other Polish historians,⁴ Sawicki claims that the Grand Hetman of Lithuania ruled over

³ For more on the Vilnius bishop's mandate (summons to the Sejm court) to Kazimierz Jan Sapieha at the end of 1693 and the circumstances behind its deceitful procurement, see: G. Sliesoriūnas, *Lietuvos Didžioji Kunigaikštystė vidaus karo išvakarėse: didikų grupuočių kova 1690–1697 metais* (Vilnius, 2000), pp. 135–137.

⁴ A. Rachuba, 'Hegemonia Sapiechów na Litwie jako przejaw skrajnej dominacji magnaterii w życiu kraju', in: *Władza i prestiż. Magnateria Rzeczypospolitej w XVI–*

18,000 households (in Polish *dymy*, literally hearths) in 1690, and was the wealthiest landowner in the GDL (p. 199). Yet this statement is not quite true. Following the proper order of things, officially ruled household declarations can only be compared to other official declarations of this nature, while information prepared for private use should only be compared to other similar documents also prepared for private use. If we compare the same types of official documents (official declarations about the area of domains) rather than private information (given to K.J. Sapieha), and the official declaration by Liudwika Karolina Radziwiłł, the owner of the Biržai Radziwiłł domains, concerning the households under her control, we can see clearly that the biggest landowner in the GDL at this time was Liudwika Karolina Radziwiłł, who declared 12,855 households, whereas Kazimierz Jan Sapieha had only 7,970.⁵

Another example of arguments worthy of more discussion and thorough argumentation could be Sawicki's thesis that when King John III Sobieski redeemed the Šiauliai *ekonomia* (Crown Estate) from the Sapiehas for 300,000 zloty in 1680, the transaction was essentially in the Sapiehas' favour (pp. 133–134). However, knowing that Kazimierz Jan Sapieha in particular expected to receive a greater sum for the Šiauliai *ekonomia*, a completely different assumption can be made, whereby the transaction was in fact an outcome of the king's pressure on the Sapiehas, who were not yet then (1678–1680) prepared for a confrontation with the king, and that the transaction can be viewed as one of the factors that led to the end of the political union of the king and the Sapiehas in 1680–1682, which became completely obvious by 1683.

Even more thorough argumentation is required regarding the author's attitude towards the actions and motivations of representatives of the GDL who were part of the Commonwealth's delegation that conducted negotiations in 1678 in Moscow. As we know, during these

XVIII wieku, ed. J. Urwanowicz (Białystok, 2003), p. 223. Elsewhere, Andrzej Rachuba has said that K.J. Sapieha ruled around 17,000 households in 1690, not including elderships. See: A. Rachuba, 'Kazimierz Jan Sapieha', in: *Polski słownik biograficzny*, t. 35 / 1 (144) (Warszawa-Kraków, 1994), p. 46. The historian based these conclusions on private documents, where it was indicated that K.J. Sapieha's domains had 17,093.5 households. Information to K.J. Sapieha about the household tax amounts collected in his domains in the GDL (names or dates not given), Vilnius University Library Manuscript Division, col. 4, file A-1744, pp. 63v–67v. However, this document also mentions K.J. Sapieha's elderships as part of his domains (e.g., Rokantiškės, Lavoriškės, Volpa, Anykščiai, and others).

⁵ For more details, see: G. Sliesoriūnas, *Lietuvos Didžioji Kunigaikštystė vidaus karo išvakarėse*, pp. 35–49, 66–68.

negotiations the Commonwealth's truce with Russia was extended for another 13.5 years. An enormous hurdle in extending the truce was the ardent provision among the Polish crown elite to associate the extension with the demand to return Kiev to Poland. Moscow had agreed to return the city to Poland within three years in 1667 as part of the Truce of Andrusovo. Its expiry (the treaty was signed on 30 January 1667 for a 13.5-year term) was approaching, at which point the elite of the GDL categorically demanded that the truce be extended, so as to avoid renewing the Commonwealth's war with Russia. Besides Kazimierz Jan Sapieha, the delegation's grand ambassador, who was then the Palatine of Polotsk (in Belarusian Полацк, in Polish Połock), and hence a senator of the Commonwealth, Lithuania was also represented by the more junior but very experienced diplomat (secretary of the Embassy), the Orsha (in Belarusian Орша, in Polish Orsza) district judge Hieronim Komar. At the very start of his visit to Moscow, the latter confidentially informed Russia's representatives that the Lithuanian representatives had the mandate of the 'Lithuanian senate' to present a separate offer to Moscow (one that bypassed the leader of the Commonwealth's delegation Michał Jerzy Czartoryski, the Palatyn [Palatine] of Volhynia, who represented the Kingdom of Poland). Based on this information, sourced from documents of the Russian diplomatic service, as well as the overall course of negotiations in Moscow during which the misalignment between Sapieha and Czartoryski rose to the surface, historians (Zbigniew Wójcik and others) have claimed that the representatives of the GDL at these negotiations had 'separate instructions' (or a more reserved interpretation, a verbal obligation) to essentially, judging by the course of the negotiations, ensure that an extension to the truce was signed, even if Moscow would not agree to return Kiev to Poland, and that the Polish representatives on the delegation would categorically refuse to give up Kiev (in the end, it was the Lithuanians who had to help Moscow avoid the obligation to return Kiev to Poland in the new treaty). But Sawicki states categorically that under no circumstances could Komar have had any separate instructions, and that his conversation with the Russian representatives should be interpreted as his personal opinion, which could have impeded the official negotiations. The actions of Komar, who is likely to have been a supporter of the Pac faction which was dominant in Lithuania at the time, could have reflected the interests of Michał Kazimierz Pac, the Grand Hetman of Lithuania, who might even have aimed to derail the delegation's efforts. All the while, Kazimierz Jan Sapieha probably knew nothing about Komar's intentions and his

suggestions to the Russians. This situation, according to Sawicki, shows that the Lithuanian political stage was very divided, even on foreign policy (pp. 133–134). Further, when commenting on the course of the negotiations in Moscow, and the different positions held by Czartoryski and Sapieha that emerged, and also on the results of this delegation, the author states that Sapieha did after all represent Lithuania's state interests, while his position matched that of most Lithuanian senators (p. 135). We have to agree with this claim, but what does seem odd is that the statement does not really coincide with the author's earlier idea about the cardinal differences between the Sapiehas and the Pac faction that was dominant at the time in Lithuania, even in the field of foreign affairs, and Michał Kazimierz Pac's alleged desire to derail the delegation. We should also note that by saying that Komar could not have had separate instructions, and that Sapieha probably had no idea of these secret conversations by the delegation's secretary, Sawicki has not conveyed accurately the information found in Moscow's diplomatic documents. They do not mention the 'instructions to Komar', but the 'obligation to Sapieha [...] and to him, Komar'.⁶ The claim that Sapieha could not have known anything about this demands more justification, especially in the light of the negotiations, during which Sapieha's actions, at least partially, echoed Komar's hints to the Russians. It would also have been worth paying attention to the terminology used in the source. A separate 'instruction from the GDL senate' (this term is also used by Wójcik) is truly a contradictory and doubtful term, as the existence of this kind of document would obviously have contradicted the documents that entrenched the union between Lithuania and Poland and its spirit.⁷ However, the term 'instruction' is not used in the source itself. It is written that Sapieha and Komar had the mandate of the GDL senate to make different proposals to Moscow to those made by Czartoryski, Poland's delegate: '*predložyt' na Moskve ot senatu kniazhestva litovskago osoboje delo mimo korunnago kniazia Chartoryjskogo*'⁸ ('to propose a special offer

⁶ Z. Wójcik, *Rzeczpospolita wobec Turcji i Rosji 1674–1679. Studium z dziejów polskiej polityki zagranicznej* (Wrocław etc., 1979), p. 153 (footnote 45).

⁷ Not doubting the existence of this instruction, Wójcik used it to substantiate his thesis about the particularism and separatist tendencies of the GDL in the second half of the 17th century. See: Z. Wójcik, 'The separatist tendencies in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania in the 17th century', *Acta poloniae historica*, vol. 69 (1994), pp. 55–62; Z. Wójcik, 'Wielkie Księstwo Litewskie wobec Szwecji, Rosji i powstań kozackich w XVII wieku', *Przegląd wschodni*, t. 1, z. 3, (1991), p. 557–593.

⁸ Z. Wójcik, *Rzeczpospolita wobec Turcji i Rosji 1674–1679. Studium z dziejów polskiej polityki zagranicznej* (Wrocław etc., 1979), p. 153 (footnote 45).

in Moscow from the Senate of the Duchy of Lithuania bypassing the Crown [Polish] Prince, Czartoryski'). This can also be understood as a verbal rather than a written mandate or order, made to Sapieha and Komar by a group of the more influential senators of the GDL. Depending on the chosen interpretation of this story from 1678, we can make two completely different conclusions: the GDL elite was deeply divided, even on fundamental matters of foreign policy (as Sawicki asserts); or that in 1678, regardless of the contradictions in internal political conflicts and the resulting competition between political factions, when it came to a fundamental matter in Lithuanian foreign policy, extending the truce with Russia, the elite of the GDL did manage to come to a common agreement and realise their goal, overcoming the doubts of the king and Poland's political elite. It is a shame that in presenting his own new interpretation of the circumstances behind the activities of the delegations in 1678, Sawicki does not try to offer more justification for his thesis, or to discuss the existing interpretations, or to polemicise more comprehensively, especially since the events of 1678 mentioned here could also be viewed as a prelude to the disagreements in foreign policy between the Sapiehas, especially Kazimierz Jan Sapieha, and John III Sobieski.

Another statement by Sawicki that could do with more justification is the thesis about the final peak in the hegemony of the Sapiehas in 1685. Understandably, the indication of a specific year, when we are speaking about a process, and not a concrete event, is rather relative. The author associates the final peak of the hegemony of the Sapiehas, as was mentioned at the beginning of the review, with the appointment of Marcjjan Ogiński as Grand Chancellor of Lithuania. However, it would have been worth assessing the significance of this appointment in the context of changes in the military leadership in the GDL, i.e., the appointment to the position of Field Hetman of Lithuania in 1683–1685. In 1683–1684, the field hetman, the second-highest military official in the GDL, was Jan Jacek Ogiński, who was loyal or at least neutral towards Kazimierz Jan Sapieha. But in April 1685, at around the time when the post of chancellor was taken by Marcjjan Ogiński, Józef Bogusław Szuska, a member of the opposition to the Sapiehas, became field hetman, and almost immediately started to gather other like-minded opponents of the Sapiehas from the Lithuanian army. Did the appointment of the loyal yet still relatively independent Marcjjan Ogiński as chancellor open the door to unfavourable changes for the Sapieha faction among the ranks of the leaders in the Lithuanian army? Did the influence of the Sapieha

faction in Lithuania become greater in 1685 than it was in 1684? These are questions that still demand deeper historiographical discussion, even after the publication of Sawicki's monograph.

Despite the minor inaccuracies mentioned here, which in no way question the monograph's conclusions and fundamental statements, and the handful of theses and interpretations made by the author that, in the opinion of this reviewer, are not thoroughly enough argued, it should be noted that Sawicki's work is indeed a significant contribution to historical research on political factions in the GDL. This book has definitely expanded our knowledge of the genesis of the hegemony of the Sapieha faction in Lithuania. This is why the author should be congratulated on completing this work, and I wish him fruitful historical research on the GDL in the future.

Gintautas Sliesoriūnas
Lithuanian Institute of History