

Teresa Zielińska

NOBLEWOMEN'S PROPERTY RIGHTS IN 16TH–18TH C. POLISH–LITHUANIAN COMMONWEALTH

In early modern times noblewomen's property rights in Poland underwent certain changes both in the light of the law in force and its practical application.

The most ample exposition of private law concerning the nobility in this era can be found in the *Lithuanian Statutes*, the first from 1529, the second from 1566 and the third from 1588¹. Some of the relevant resolutions were also included in the votes of the Commonwealth Sejm, published in *Volumina Legum*². Many legal compendia that appeared in print from the 16th c. onwards provide more information about the principles of the written and common private law³. Testimony of the practice applied in cases relating above all to property can be found in the extant noblemen's archives, for the most part belonging to the magnate upper strata. Different laws concerned the burghers, which question requires a separate discussion⁴.

¹The *First Lithuanian Statute* was published by S. Lazutka and E. Gudavičius, ent. *Primas Lietuvos Statutus*, vol. I, part 2, Vilnius 1985; I cite the *2nd Statute* after its Polish edition by F. Plekosiński, *Archiwum Komisji Prawniczej (Archives of the Legal Commission)*, vol. VII, Kraków 1900; the *3rd Statute* was published in Minsk in 1989, ent. *Statut Wielikaha Kniaswa Litoyskaha 1588. Teksty. Dawiednik. Kamentary.*

²*Volumina Legum*, vol. I–X, Petersburg 1859–1889, Warszawa 1952.

³Most information useful for discussing this issue can be found in the following publications: T. Ostrowski, *Prawo cywilne albo szczególne narodu polskiego (The Civil or Special Law of the Polish Nation)*, vol. I, Warszawa 1784, and A. Trębicki, *Prawo polityczne i cywilne Korony Polskiej i Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego (The Political and Civil Law of the Polish Crown and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania)*, Warszawa 1789.

⁴The law concerning the burghers gave a woman equal inheritance rights with man, resulting among other things from conjugal community. We find more extensive information about it in M. Sędek, *Czy uprawnienia majątkowe kobiet w Starej Warszawie odpowiadały zasadom prawa chełmińskiego (Whether Property Rights of Women in Old Warsaw Corresponded with the Principles of Chełmno Law)*, in: *Warszawa średniowieczna*, fasc. 1, Warszawa 1972, p. 142 and foll.

A woman, in accordance with the letter and spirit of the whole of the era's legislation, was subject to her father's control, although in fact the mother had frequently greater influence on her fate. Father missing, this control was in the hands of guardians, as a rule males. Their principal duty was to ensure the woman suitable maintenance and give her away in marriage or place her in a nunnery when she reached a suitable age. This age was defined by the *2nd Lithuanian Statute* as 13 years, and the *3rd Lithuanian Statute* shifted it to 15 years. The latter *Statute* even introduced a clause that allowed a woman who was over this age to choose her husband on her own (provided he was a nobleman), if her guardians neglected this duty⁵.

Anyway, one should remark here that in the era under discussion there were practically no unmarried women in the milieu of rich gentry, as well as very few unmarried men, with the exception of those who took the habit or became clergymen⁶. A woman who was getting married or taking the veil was bound to get a dowry, a custom universally accepted. In medieval times its height depended on her father's (or guardians') decision. However, as early as in the 16th c. this principle was acknowledged to deserve a correction. Thus the *Lithuanian Statutes* modified it by introducing the so-called "quarter" (*czwarcizna*), i.e. by designating one fourth of the father's property for the dowry of his daughters, regardless of their number. According to the *Statutes* the dowry consisted of sums of money, "treasures" and movables. This meant that the old custom was in force, to reserve immovables, i.e. real estate, for the sons, and these missing, to hand it over to more distant male relatives. However, these principles

⁵Respective records in: *The 2nd Lithuanian Statute* (cont. as *Lith. St.*) chap. III art. 8 and the *3rd Lith. St.*, chap. V, art. 9, p. 2.

⁶The lack of unmarried men and women clearly distinguishes the milieu of nobility in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth from some societies of Western Europe. J. P. Cooper, *Patterns of Inheritance and Settlement by Great Landowners from the Fifteenth to the Eighteenth Centuries*, in: *Family and Inheritance. Rural Society in Western Europe, 1200-1800*, Cambridge 1976, esp. pp. 287-291 has shown e.g. that in the same era there were drastic limitations to the marriages of the offspring in Italian urban patrician families, due to the tendency to keep the property whole. The author also associates this phenomenon with the tradition of celibacy in the Roman Catholic Church (p. 304).

ceased to be observed in early modern times, and daughters had priority over other related heirs⁷.

In rich families usually (although not always) a marriage contract (Lat. *interctiso nuptialis*) was prepared, which was confirmed by inscription in court books. These documents, initially procured in Latin, then in Polish, were marked by a certain vacillation of terms. Thus dowry (Lat. *dos*, Pol. *posag*) was not always distinguished from trousseau (Lat. *expeditio muliebris, paraphernalia*, Pol. *wyprawa*), or from the husband's landed property on which the wife's dowry was secured. This property was more precisely called morning gift, or counter dowry (Lat. *dotallitium*, Pol. *wiano*), and security itself was called jointure (Lat. *reformatio*, Pol. *oprawa*). This ambiguity of terms continues to appear in historical, not only Polish, literature, for also in English discussions devoted to property relations in the family till the end of the 18th c., the divergent use of terms by particular authors made the editors provide the whole volume with a suitable glossary⁸.

In Poland the basic component of a rich noblewoman's endowment was her dowry in money. It was complemented by various movables and "treasures" (so called in the *Lithuanian Statutes*). "Treasures" consisted of gold and silver objects, pearls and precious stones. The few dowry lists extant in archives are marked, until the end of the 18th c., by a certain one-sidedness, i.e. a prevalence of luxurious objects over articles of everyday use, such as e.g. underwear, bed clothes, kitchen and table utensils. Perhaps some of them were omitted in the lists as not deserving a mention. At any rate, they are all found in the dowry lists in the 19th c. In the 16th and 17th c., movables belonging to the dowry also included coaches and horses, and sometimes even drivers, who naturally were serfs⁹. We very seldom encounter money

⁷A more extensive discussion in: T. Zielińska, *Rozważania nad kwestią wyposażenia szlachcianek w Wielkim Księstwie Litewskim w XVIII stuleciu (Deliberations on the Question of Noblewomen's Endowment in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania in the 18th c.)*, in: "Kwartalnik Historyczny", № XCVI, 1989, fasc. 1/2, pp. 93-108.

⁸*Family and Inheritance, Glossary*, pp. 399-404.

⁹Rich noblewomen's trousseaus are described in T. Zielińska, *Kosztowność jako składnik wyposażenia kobiet w XVII i XVIII w. (Valuables as an Element of Women's Endowment in the 17th and 18th c.)*, in: *Masto-region-społeczeństwo*, Białystok 1992, pp. 295-303. On 19th c. trousseaus cf. E. Kowicka, *W salonie i w kuchni (In Salon and Kitchen)*, Warszawa 1984, esp. pp. 237-240.

estimates of the parts of dowry, which at any rate happen to surprise us by the proportion of their values. Thus, e.g., Anna Zamoyska's dowry list of 1675 includes a charriot, coaches and six horses estimated together at 8,000 Polish zlotys and 20 groschen, while a few dresses constituted a much more valuable entry, estimated at 21,881 Polish zlotys¹⁰.

The "quarter" system for establishing the height of a noblewoman's dowry did not become popular and it was replaced by a certain rate based on unwritten principles formed by the practice of life in noble families. The analysis of a great number of marriage contracts enables me to observe certain regularities, i.e. the dependence of this height not so much on the current financial situation of the family that designated the dowry, as on this family's pretensions to a certain social position. Thus, probably the most abundant data entitle us to say that in the 18th c., in the milieu of moderately wealthy gentry, dowries amounted to from a dozen thousand to several score thousand Polish zlotys, while in magnate families the rates of dowries were between several score thousand to several hundred thousand Polish zlotys. The most frequent rate was from two to three hundred thousand Polish zlotys, and higher rates were considered extremely rich dowries. In the period from the middle of the 17th to the end of the 18th c., one can notice a certain upward tendency in the height of dowry sums, which can only partly be attributed to inflation, since there was no rapid fall in the value of money at that time¹¹.

A woman and her husband were due to receive a dowry shortly after their marriage, in return for which they made a written receipt (*quietatto*), together with a declaration that they waive their claim to the inheritance from her parents (*abrenunttatio*)¹². Both these documents acquired strength after being

¹⁰The list has been preserved in the Central Archives of Historical Records in Warsaw (further on CAHR). Zamoyski Family Archives N° 59, pp. 1–14.

¹¹T. Zie li ń s k a, *Rozważania*, p. 98. On the value of money in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth see: R. Ry b a r s k i, *Skarb i pieniądz za Jana Kazimierza, Michała Korybuta i Jana III (Treasure and Money in the Reign of John Casimir, Michael Korybut and John III)*, Warszawa 1939, pp. 6–9.

¹²The problem of the exclusion of the earlier endowed children from the inheritance from their parents was dealt with by J. Y v e r, *Egalité entre héritiers et exclusion des enfants dotés*, Paris 1966. Also J. P. C o o p e r in his *Patterns*, p. 256, while dealing with relationships at the close of the Middle Ages, writes about the renouncement of the further share in inheritance by the endowed daughters: "The daughters were married with portions and renounced all claims on their father's inheritance". The subject has also been taken up by J. G o o d y, *Inheritance, Property and Women: Some Comparative Considerations*, in: *Family and Inheritance*, pp. 10–36.

attested in court books. Similar declarations were made by nuns, whose dowries were generally lower than those of their sisters given away in marriage. I can find no explanation for this situation¹³. At any rate, the dowry was considered to be an equivalent of the prospective inheritance. Such an apparent settling of a woman's accounts with her family did not always correspond to the real state of affairs. Family archives contain confidential declarations that only a part of the dowry was received, and sometimes we encounter pledges to supply the missing part. It also happened that the newly-married couple under the pressure of the family wrote a receipt without actually receiving the dowry. This can be put down to the notorious lack of cash, suffered even by the most powerful and richest magnate families. Frequently the payment of the dowry was delayed by twenty, thirty and more years, and those interested, having exhausted the possibility of settling the dispute out of court, prosecuted an action. This was often done not by them personally, but by their offspring. The principle of equality in the height of dowry of all daughters made some of them claim a supplementary sum, years after receiving their dowry, since younger sisters were better endowed because in the meantime the parents' property increased. Sometimes the parents themselves offered such supplement to the dowry (Lat. *melioratio*). It was a widespread practice, if the dowry sum could not be paid, to give a woman and her husband an estate as security or to secure an annual interest on it for them. Frequently such secured land became later the property of the couple, if the family could not collect cash for buying it back.

Marriage as a financial transaction between two families encumbered above all the family of the wife because of the mentioned obligation to pay the dowry and prepare the trousseau. The husband's family, or he himself, if he was financially independent, were also forced to make some contribution, the more serious in proportion to the social standing of both families entering a relationship. The courtship itself entailed large expen-

¹³M. Borkowska in *Żyćie codzienne polskich klasztorów żeńskich w XVII-XVIII w.* (*Everyday Life in Polish 17th-18th c. Female Convents*), Warszawa 1996, pp. 39-43 estimates similarly the height of the nuns' dowries, although she quotes a different opinion by J. Ch. Pasek, *Pamiętnik (Memoirs)*, Warszawa 1971, p. 329, who says that the dowry of a nun was more costly than that of a daughter given away in marriage. J. Bielecka in *Kontrakty lwowskie w latach 1762-1775 (Contracts in Lwów in the Years 1762-1775)*, Poznań 1948, p. 87, supports the opinion that the dowries of women who got married were more costly than those of nuns.

ditures. Quite an exceptional occasion to know how large is provided by a list of expenditures preserved in the Radziwiłł archives, prepared by Michał Kazimierz Radziwiłł's (1702–1762) mother, when it turned out that his matrimonial endeavours failed (in 1724). The long list of presents given by Michał Kazimierz not only to the girl, Maria Zofia Sieniawska (1698–1771), who was courted by him, but also to her parents and courtiers, included a charriot, a golden watch, a golden casket set with diamonds, with small enamelled bottles inside, a ring with a large diamond, a tea-jug set with diamonds, rubies and emeralds and various sums of money. The whole of it was estimated by the Radziwiłłs at 187,778 Polish zlotys and 20 groschen. The Sieniawskis, although they admitted the claim was just, nevertheless undermined the estimate as too high. However, soon after, they died, and this probably broke all the dispute¹⁴.

The dowry brought by a woman had to be secured by her husband who bequeathed to her a property of double its value. We extremely seldom encounter obligations undertaken by the fiancé on account of receiving certain sums before marriage as part of the future dowry. I know only two such documents. One of 1657 presented by Krzysztof Kamiński to the parents of his fiancée, Zofia Sawrynowiczówna for 1,000 golden Lithuanian groschen, and another of 1772, containing a similar obligation of Jan Frackiewicz to his future father-in-law, Franciszek Piłsudski, who paid [Jan] 80,000 Polish zlotys¹⁵.

Mutual bequests of survivorship from the property one owned, contracted between husband and wife, were known in the Polish law as early as in the 16th c., however, they became more frequent in the 17th c., to gain widespread popularity in the 18th c., when they replaced the securing of the wife's dowry on the husband's property. For both spouses this form of using their property was more convenient, especially because of eliminating from the bequest of survivorship any reservations relating to remarriage. The act of the 1523 Sejm defining the conditions under which a widow owned her deceased husband's landed

¹⁴Bargaining over the return of courtship costs was strictly confidential. Information about it comes from a family archive, CAHR, Radziwiłł Family Warsaw Archives (further on *Radz. Arch.*), Dz. XI 135, pp. 81–86.

¹⁵Kamiński's record can be found in CAHR, Zabiello Family Archives, N^o 684, pp. 1–4, and Frackiewicz's (Radziwiłł's) record in CAHR, Piłsudski Family Archives N^o II. A. 14.

property on which he secured her dowry, enjoined that in case she remarried she would have to return this property (jointure, Lat. *sedes vidualis*, Pol. *dobra oprawne*) to her former husband's family, on condition that the dowry sum would be repaid to her. On the other hand the bequest of mutual survivorship made possible to transfer this survivorship to the next spouse if a widower or a widow remarried (sometimes more than once). This sometimes took years and aroused bitterness among the offspring or other heirs, who could not come into the possession of their due inheritance. It seems, however, that the old clause concerning the loss of rights to the husband's property by a widow who remarried continued to be of some significance, perhaps customary, since a jointress happened to conceal this fact. I know an example of such a situation: the last King of Poland's, Stanislaus Augustus' sister, Izabela Poniatowska (1730–1808), was a jointress to the enormous property of her first husband Jan Klemens Branicki (1689–1771), and she did not reveal her second marriage to Andrzej Mokronowski. She retained till the end of her life part of the property of the childless Branicki, which only after her death went to his sister's grandchildren¹⁷.

Not only in the case of the death of a childless woman were her relatives entitled to the recovery of her dowry. It came back to the family together with a woman if her marriage was annulled by an ecclesiastical court, which happened as early as in the 16th c. and was called a divorce (Lat. *divorcium*). Such cases were initially very rare, a bit more frequent among the Orthodox

¹⁶The act of 1523 can be found in *Volumina Legum*, vol. I, pp. 409–410. A widow's rights to enjoying her deceased husband's property occupy a lot of space in the rules of codified and common law in most European countries. There were no unanimous solutions, since some laws confirmed the woman's right to her husband's property on the basis of her dowry, others, like the cited Polish act, enjoined a return of property to her deceased husband's relatives in case the widow remarried, and also if her immoral conduct was proved. Cf. E. Chénon, *Histoire générale du droit français public et privé des origines à 1815*, vol. II Paris 1929, esp. pp. 102–103, 129; W. R. Cornish, R. de N. Clark, *Law and Society in England, 1750–1950*, London 1989, esp. pp. 365–366; J. Goody, *Inheritance*, p. 17; E. P. Thompson, *The Grid of Inheritance: a Comment*, in: *Family and Inheritance*, pp. 351–352.

¹⁷*Volumina Legum*, vol. I, pp. 419–420, year 1523 contains a model contract of mutual survivorship on the property between husband and wife without taking into account a remarriage of the spouse enjoying survivorship. Izabela Branicka's biography penned by W. Konopczyński is included in *Polski Słownik Biograficzny (Polish Biographical Dictionary — further on PSB)*, vol. II, 1937, pp. 396–397. Andrzej Mokronowski's, her alleged second husband's biography by E. Rostworski is in *PSB*, vol. XXI, 1976, pp. 385–394.

magnates, but gradually there were more of them, although they were not very frequent until the end of the 18th c. The *1st Lithuanian Statute* (1529) does not mention divorce at all. However, both the 1566 and the 1588 *Statutes* discuss them. According to them the party guilty of the divorce should lose its contribution to property, i.e. the dowry or the security of the dowry on the landed property, for the sake of the victim. However, the *Statutes* allowed for a possibility of dissolving a marriage when no party was guilty, and then each party was entitled to retain their share of property. The last solution was a common practice in divorces among the nobility, regardless of the actual causes of divorce. The invoked arguments usually concerned mistaken procedure in contracting a marriage (e.g. no bans were put up or the couple were not married by a suitable parish priest), or it was argued that one of the parties (generally the woman) married under pressure. This enabled one to avoid scandal as well as financial complications. The actual circumstances of the divorce were hardly ever made public, although they were known, which frequently finds its expression in memoirs and correspondence.

Sometimes the spouses, at odds with one another, did not try to get a divorce, but remained in separation “from bed and board”, which, however, after a time, ended up rather in divorce than reconciliation. A rare example of the latter solution can be found in the archival materials concerning Great Lithuanian Chancellor Jan Fryderyk Sapieha (1680–1751) and his wife Konstancja née Radziwiłł (1697–1756). Their conflicts began soon after marriage; in 1717 Sapieha blamed for them his mother-in-law. Eventually Konstancja — despite her husband’s resistance — left him and returned to her mother. For a long time the spouses remained in separation, although they both declared they wished to become reconciled, which came about after 16 years of living apart. Konstancja, at 48 years of age, was then expecting a baby, however, it can be supposed that the child died prematurely, since there is no mention of it. The whole problem of separation had its financial aspect, revealed in respective documents. Sapieha waived the overdue interest on the dowry sum, which was remitted on account of the cost of Konstancja’s maintenance at her mother’s house, while Konstancja herself waived the security of her dowry on her husband’s estates¹⁸.

Despite all the delay and curtailment in the payment of dowries, daughters were in a better position than sons. The votes of the Seym and *Lithuanian Statutes* emphasized that parents had an absolutely free disposal of their property and although during their lifetime they could give part of it to their children, an adult son or a daughter who was getting married, yet this was not obligatory and depended on their free will. However, the custom required to endow married daughters and nuns with trousseaus and dowries, which was exacted (although with varying success) by the interested husbands and convents. Common law also enjoined the suitable endowment of a son in connection with his marriage, which was, so to say, the moment of his emancipation and obliged him to present some estate as security of his wife's dowry. Her family attached a lot of weight to such security¹⁹.

A proof of that can be found in the correspondence between Great Lithuanian Chancellor Karol Stanisław Radziwiłł's widow Anna and Great Lithuanian Marshal Aleksander Sapieha. In the years 1726–1727 they negotiated the marriage of Kazimierz Leon Sapieha (1697–1738) to Karolina Radziwiłł (1707–1765). Let us add that the interested parties did not participate in those negotiations, although it was long since Kazimierz Leon had come of age. However, he was still totally dependent on his father as regards property. The energetic Anna Radziwiłł demanded that Aleksander Sapieha should allot to his son a property that would yield an income amounting to the height of her daughter's dowry, and which would not be encumbered with debts and would be so legally insured that in the future (which here means, in case of an earlier death of Kazimierz Leon!) the relatives of her daughter's

¹⁸The matter of divorces is dealt with in the *2nd Lith. St.*, chap. V, art. 18 and the *3rd Lith. St.*, chap. V, art. 20. I took information about J. F. Sapieha's separation from K. Radziwiłł from family archives, CAHR, *Radz. Arch.*, Dz. XI, № 124–127, years 1717–1733. Information about Konstancja's late motherhood is taken from her brother's, M. K. Radziwiłł's memoirs in CAHR, *Radz. Arch.*, Dz. VI, № II, 80a, p. 1387.

¹⁹A more extensive discussion of this matter in T. Zielińska, *Przyczynek do kwestii konfliktu pokoleń na tle majątkowym w osiemnastowiecznym środowisku magnackim (A Contribution to the Question of Conflict Between Generations Over Property in the 18th c. Magnate Milieu)*, in: *Trudne stulecia. Studia z dziejów XVII i XVIII w.*, Warszawa 1994, pp. 132–139. This problem undoubtedly existed in all the contemporary societies. J. Goody mentions it in *Inheritance*, p. 28, however it seems to have been overshadowed by the question of unequal rights of the offspring to inheritance from their parents in the system of unigeniture widespread in Western Europe.

husband would not be able to deprive her of this property. And this was not the end of her claims, since she proposed that Chancellor Sapieha should immediately designate the estates which in the future would be Kazimierz Leon's inheritance. Aleksander Sapieha answered by indicating Druja estates as the property to secure his daughter-in-law's dowry, however, he made a reservation that he could not free these estates of all their debts as yet. And he positively rejected her suggestion to allot during his lifetime the inheritance portion to his son, since this was impossible because of the complicated state of his affairs, and at any rate "this is not done". Karolina's family apparently accepted this statement, for her marriage was contracted²⁰.

It happened that the son in connection with his marriage received a separate estate on the strength of an official resignation for his sake signed by his parents. The document of resignation recorded in court books did not always constitute a proof that the son actually took the property over. The above-mentioned Michał Kazimierz Radziwiłł, e.g., already as an adult received from his mother the property for which she had received survivorship from her husband, then already deceased. However, when a year later Michał Kazimierz decided to get married, his mother did not want to give her consent or blessing, without which, according to the ideas of the time, a marriage could not be contracted. After much bargaining she finally consented to her son's marriage, however, at the cost of the property which he had to return to her. A few years later she returned it to him but on this occasion she demanded from him a declaration that the estate would be his property only in title, for his mother would retain it in her possession and collect all the income. This declaration, signed for the sake of more security also by her daughter-in-law and her father, has been preserved to this day in the family archives as a strictly confidential document, nowhere attested²¹. The above-quoted episode of family life, just as those quoted before, show the relations between a woman and her family mainly in a

²⁰Information about negotiations between Anna Radziwiłł and Aleksander Sapieha has been preserved in CAHR, *Radz. Arch.*, Dz. XI, № 132, pp. 4–7, 63–65.

²¹The conflict between Anna Radziwiłł and her son has been described on the basis of the latter's diary by A. Sajakowski in *Od Sterotki do Rybeńki (From Sterotka [Mikołaj Krzysztof Radziwiłł's nickname] to Rybeńko [the nickname of Michał Kazimierz Radziwiłł])*, Poznań 1965, pp. 143–148. The certificate given to Anna Radziwiłł in 1732 can be found in CAHR, *Radz. Arch.*, Dz. XI, № 135, pp. 117–120.

negative light. The one-sidedness of this picture is due above all to the otherwise well-known regularity in the observations of social life. The phenomena resulting from a positive, normal course of events are accepted as obvious and pass unnoticed, while any encroachment or irregularity arouse interest and focus attention, which finds its expression both in the extant historical sources and historians' observations. Thus I found it rather difficult to detect documents testifying to good, disinterested relations between a woman and her husband. One such example is the reminiscence of Marcybella Ogińska, who wrote about 1681, after twenty years of her marriage, that her husband, Marcjan Ogiński, although he did not receive from her family the property promised as dowry, because it was seized by the Muscovites, he secured her dowry on his estates without making matters difficult²². Also Jan Aleksander Koniecpolski in his will of 1719 thanks his "beloved wife" Elżbieta for her patience during difficult years that they lived together, although he did not fulfil his promise made when getting married, of granting her the Roźniatów estate, and even was not able to ensure her a suitable income from this estate for her everyday needs²³.

To sum up my deliberations on the financial situation of women, I can say that in the period under observation it changed to their advantage. This was the result of a rise in dowry rates, the transference of some estates that secured the unpaid dowry into the hands of women, and above all of the spread of mutual survivorship contracts between husband and wife, which gave the latter more freedom to deal with her property. However, I must add that it is very difficult to establish the actual situation of women on the basis of the contemporary legislation, or documents signed on its grounds. Sometimes only a knowledge of confidential records hidden in family archives enables one to see the real situation.

(Translated by Agnieszka Kreczmar)

²² Marcybella Ogińska's recollection can be found in CAHR, Archives of the Roś Estate, N^o CXXVI/42.

²³ Koniecpolski's will was published in *Pamiętniki o Koniecpolskich. Przyczynek do dziejów polskich XVII w. (Memoirs About the Koniecpolski Family. A Contribution to 17th c. Polish History)*, pub. by S. Przyłęcki, Lwów 1842, p. 413.