

**HISTORY, CULTURAL STUDIES, TOURISM, SPORTS**

UDC 94

**THE UNION OF LUBLIN AND THE ACT OF UNION OF SCOTLAND AND ENGLAND  
IN THE HISTORICAL MEMORY OF THE BELARUSIANS AND THE SCOTS:  
A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS****L. BADUNOVA, A. TSIMBAL****Minsk State Linguistic University, Belarus**

*In my research I examined the history of two political unions – England and Scotland, The Grand Duchy of Lithuania and Poland. Analyzing some historical sources (The Act of Union of Scotland and England and the Union of Lublin), textbooks, dissertations, as well as independent opinions from carriers of historical memory, I came to the conclusion that the historical path of the Scots and the Belarusians is very similar.*

What happens when you get married without love? For both the modern world and the past, such alliances are not new. In this case, the couple has two possible ways: either they accept it and continue to live together, conflicting from time to time, or a third person appears in their life, who decides the fate of their relationship. In my research, I want to study the history of two "couples": Scotland and England, The Grand Duchy of Lithuania and Poland. The political histories of these two unions are very similar, but the "marriage of the Rose and the Thistle", as history has shown, was more durable than the Union of Poland and the Grand Duchy. Who knows what would have happened if Russia had not intervened in their relations?

In 1454, at a meeting of the lords of the Rada, the adherents of Jan Gashtold declared: "We were happy until we were united with the Poles, who took kings from the principalities of our tribe. It would be better if their eyes were clouded, their ears were closed, when the hand connected us with the Poles." [1] "Why am I so sad on my wedding day?" - a tune that was rung by the bells of St. Giles' Cathedral in Edinburgh on May 1, 1707 [2].

The history of Scotland, "poor old matron in rags", "a beggar woman" as this country was called, is closely intertwined with the history of England [3]. These states were formed at the same time. Scotland had always been heavily influenced by England and dependent on it. They could not get along peacefully for ages. England had tried many times to finally subdue Scotland. However, England managed to do it only at the beginning of the 18<sup>th</sup> century. In general, I must say that any scientist or historian who researches the relations between two nations faces a lot of difficulties, it is really hard to remain objective when it comes to the history of your country. But it is much easier to make someone guilty.

What was the life like in Scotland at the beginning of the 18<sup>th</sup> century? At the beginning of the 18<sup>th</sup> century, the population of Scotland, especially of the Highlands, was poor, much poorer than the population of England. At the end of the 17<sup>th</sup> century Scotland was experiencing a real famine. Mountaineers lived by hunting, cattle breeding and plunder. They lived dirty, they didn't wash enough. In 1745, during their last raid on England, they frightened the English not only with guns, but also with skin diseases that they brought with them. But, to be honest, not all the country lived such a primitive life. The Lowlands were different from the Highlands. Both valley Scots and highlanders were often employed in Europe for military service, especially in France. So they "cut a window into continental Europe" and brought home European culture and new military equipment [4].

Poland and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania also did not become a unified state immediately. The history of their union began after the Union of Krewo in 1385, and was consolidated by the Unions of Vilna-Radom and Horodlo. And they were finally joined together after the Union of Lublin. The nature of The Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth as a state is difficult to determine. Some historians say that it is difficult to call it a state at all. Both England and Scotland, as well as the Grand Duchy and Poland, began to have the closest contact after the personal union. When the childless Queen Elizabeth died in England, the Scottish king James VI (James I as the king of England) succeeded the throne – "the most educated fool on the throne", as his contemporaries called him. James I grew up in Scotland. He felt the Scots, understood their problems. But once in the English environment, he quickly got used to it, and the connection with the homeland was completely lost [4]. When leaving his homeland, James promised to visit it several times a year. But in fact he went there only once during 22 years of his reign. Thus,

these two states were united under the rule of one monarch, but they had different parliaments. The situation in Poland was the same as in England. The younger brother of the Polish king Vladislav III, Casimir Andrey, was never particularly eager to move to Lithuania. However, a deep passion for hunting and dense forests aroused in him a desire to go to the Homeland of his parents. At the same time, the king and the Royal Rada taught him how to behave correctly: "To cherish justice and the unity between the Kingdom of Poland and the Grand Duchy and keep mutual love and do not make destructive wars without the permission of Vladislav and always remember the benefits from the Kingdom of Poland, think about its good, increase and glory". A retinue of two thousand Polish lords and gentry came with Casimir to make sure that he was obedient and did not succumb to the influence of the Litvins. However, he was only his brother's deputy, not the Grand Duke. That was a good chance for the absorption of the Grand Duchy by Poland, which could not but please the Poles. Nevertheless, by deception, the Litvin nobles crowned Casimir. With the death of Vladislav, the possibility of a unified state of the Litvins and the Poles began to recede. The Poles did the utmost to put the Litvin Duke on the Polish throne. They managed to do this. Thus, the personal union of these two states was restored. However, the "parliaments" were separate [1].

Of course, just as James wanted to unite England with Scotland, Casimir saw the Grand Duchy and Poland as a unified state. The only question was how to do it so that everyone was happy. Both England and Scotland, the Grand Duchy and Poland did not particularly seek to unite. They were divided by religious issues and national identity. Casimir was between two fires during the entire period of his reign. A. E. Presnyakov in his lectures says that he sometimes acted more as an umpire than a ruler [5]. He could please neither the Litvins nor the Poles. And how could he be good for everyone, if the Poles demanded him to expand the territory of Poland, annexing certain lands belonging to the Grand Duchy ("It's why he was chosen the king not only to keep the rights of the Kingdom, but also to expand them"), in turn the Litvin gentry also craved new lands. The Poles found a way out of the situation by offering the Grand Duchy to become a part of the Polish Kingdom. But it is clear that the Litvins were not satisfied with this outcome. So, Casimir ran from one to the other during the whole period of his reign. The Poles and the Litvins threatened him with the dethronement. But there was a problem, he was beneficial for both. He would give rich gifts, and they would calm down [1].

Let's go back to England and Scotland. One of James's most important tasks was to unite Scotland itself first, to subdue the recalcitrant Northern clans, to erase these obvious borders between the north and the south, and then to create a favorable ground for unification with England. And I must say that he partly succeeded [6]. During the reign of James, the foundation was laid for the future unification of England and Scotland. The children of the Northern leaders were sent to study in the south, where they learned English and were brought up in the protestant spirit. Scottish poets started writing in English. James, who loved poetry and art, actively supported them. But for the English, the Scots still remained barbarians. The English peers wanted to isolate themselves from them and did not support James in his desire to unite the two countries. The English did not want to equate the Scots with themselves, they were afraid of merging. A commoner declared that *to unite both countries is like putting a judge and a criminal on the same bench: the Scots have always been beggars, rebels, traitors, and all their kings have not died of natural causes*. And another commoner compares England to *a fat pasture that is threatened by a hungry foreign herd* [4].

By the beginning of the 18th century, relations between Scotland and England were strained. Scotland even passed laws on independent foreign policy and the possibility of breaking the Union after the death of Queen Anne. England was not satisfied with that course of events. Drastic measures had to be taken. England was at war with France over the Spanish succession, and a reliable Scottish rear would have been desirable. On the one hand, the Scots had a desire to defend their own cultural past, on the other hand, they were haunted by the tempting prospects that the Union with England promised. The Scots were torn between "the heart that draws them to the romantic past and the mind that calls them to the future", which only England could provide [3]. The Scottish Parliament split into two factions. One supported the Union and thus hoped to strengthen its position, achieve high public offices and improve its economic situation by getting access to the English colonies, as the plan to create their own one failed. The other group, representatives of the old feudal nobility, part of the commercial and industrial bourgeoisie, and members of the Presbyterian Church, were afraid of losing their privileges and were not interested in the Union. Through political and financial pressure, England still managed to achieve its goal, and the Union was concluded – The Great Britain was formed. "The adoption of the Union was truly a trauma for Scottish people. People had no idea what had happened to them or who they were. In that atmosphere, many Scots turned to the Scottish cultural past, feeling more comfortable there and feeling belonging to the Scottish nation, " - David Dyches [3]. However, the paradox is that on the one hand, the Union deprived the Scots of independence, and on the other hand, it became a catalyst for the national idea of the Scots. They began to pay special attention to their history, starting from the depth of centuries, and felt proud of their great past. It is important

---

**History, cultural studies, tourism, sports**

to note that from 1746-1747, as a result of a number of acts, Highland Scotland, which represented Scottish culture as a whole, was subjected to violent "britanization" - a process called "Highland clearance", when the local population was prohibited from carrying weapons, using traditional clothing and bagpipes under threat of being sent to galleys, in other words, everything that formed the basis of Scottish culture was destroyed. But on the other hand there was the process of integrating the Highlands into the market economy of Britain, and an increasing number of highlanders left for military service in the colonies [3]. Thus, we can say that the Union had a positive impact on the Scottish economy. It was after the conclusion of the Union that the boundaries between Highland and Lowland Scotland began to blur. The Union served as a unifying factor for Scotland. As a result, we now see that there is no fundamental difference between northern and southern Scotland.

Similar processes occurred in the Great Duchy of Lithuania. In the middle of the 16th century closer unification of Poland and the Great Duchy became an issue again. The largest landowners who were actually in power were not very keen to unite with Poland. But the middle and small gentry wanted to get the privileges of the Polish gentry and supported the union. The war for Livonian lands which was not very successfully waged by the Duchy, hinted to the Litvin gentry that then more than ever the Great Duchy needed an ally. The Grand Duke himself (at that time it was Sigismund II Augustus) was all the time in Poland and pressed the recalcitrant Litvin delegation in Lublin, passing a significant part of the lands of the Great Duchy to Poland. In addition, the Poles were afraid that after the death of Sigismund II, the Litvins might want to elect their monarch, thereby they would end the personal union (as noted above, the English were also afraid of breaking the personal union, and thus we can say, adding to this economic difficulties, that the same environment was formed for the unification of these two "couples"). Thus, after weighing all the "pros and cons", the Litvin delegation went to the conclusion of the Lublin Union [5]. Later the Litvins happened to get acquainted with the phenomenon of "Polonization" (as the Scots with "Britanization").

If we look at the documents that legally confirmed the formation of the two new states – The Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and the Great Britain (the Union of Lublin in 1569 and the Act of Union in 1707), we will find a lot in common. The clauses that relate to the name of a new unified state, the preservation of existing rights, privileges and positions, issues of duties and, of course, the formation of a single Parliament. It was clear that in those Parliaments there was to be a majority of the English and Poles respectively. And this was quite noticeable. If Scotland sent 61 MPs, England sent 513. The same situation developed in The Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. Many powerful landowners who actively expressed the interests of their country simply did not get to the Senate. And the reasons are obvious. It should be noted that according to the Act, the traditional system of legal proceedings was maintained in Scotland. As for the Grand Duchy, it has achieved independence in this matter by creating the Tribunal of the Grand Duchy and adopting the third Statute, where not a word was related to the Union.

Nowadays it is especially important for us to research, how people (in this case, Belarusians and Scots) evaluate the events of the past. For some clarity, I will present the opinions of Daniel Frampton, a London historian who studies the history of his country at a professional level, and Duncan Cushnie, a native of a small town in the Highlands.

**Daniel Frampton:**

- I think it was a union of political expediency. Scotland was bankrupt. I think Scotland benefited from it. Before the union it had been a small nation, but with England its influence increased, its intellectual center in Edinburgh became very important. Scottish politicians at Westminster played an important part and soldiers too, in the building of the British Empire. However, it still retains its sense of being a nation in itself, so questions of independence, especially after the fall of the British Empire, are still there. Obviously, there is a significant number of people in Scotland who want to be independent. But really it's not about freedom, because if they leave they will simply join the European Union. They'll be switching their allegiance from London to Brussels. They won't be independent either way.

**Duncan Cushnie:**

- This is an interesting period in the history of my country. The Union had both positive and negative consequences. At that time, Scotland was bankrupt because of the failure of the Darien expedition. After the Union Scotland began to flourish., it played a significant role in the UK. Now the situation has changed and the interests of the English outweigh the interests of the Scots and their desires and aspirations are not taken into account. Questions about independence are being raised. Of course, Scots are interested in their history. They are proud of it and want to study it. However, there is one thing that people do not want to admit: during the Empire, we participated in the Imperial expansion, the slave trade, and other things that are inherent in colonialism. Of course, many Scots were involved and profited from it. But most Scots don't realize or recognize this, or don't want to.

Today, there is no explanation, no justification for the terrible things, the evil that we have done to people throughout Imperial history. In England, people are more willing to take responsibility for terrible acts committed in the colonial past.

## REFERENCES

1. Чаропко, В. Великие князья Великого Княжества Литовского / В.К. Чаропко. – 2-е изд., испр. – Минск : Беларусь, 2013. – 264 с.
2. Ставиская, Н. Великобритании исполнилось 300 лет / Н. Ставиская // Русская служба BBC [Электронный ресурс]. – 2007. – Режим доступа: [http://news.bbc.co.uk/hi/russian/international/newsid\\_6612000/6612913.stm](http://news.bbc.co.uk/hi/russian/international/newsid_6612000/6612913.stm). – Дата доступа: 17.02.2020.
3. Апрыщенко, В. Ю. Травма Унии и опыт ее историзации в XVIII – первой половине XIX века / В.Ю. Апрыщенко // Кризисы переломных эпох в исторической памяти. - 2012. С. 181-214.
4. Савин, А. Н. Лекции по истории Английской революции / А.Н. Савин - М.: 2000. - 522 с.
5. Пресняков, А.Е. Литовско-Русское государство в XIII – XVI вв. / А.Е. Пресняков. – Минск : Харвест, 2013. – 296 с.
6. Зверева, Г. И. История Шотландии / Г.И. Зверева. — М.: Высшая школа, 1987. — 208 с.