

Henryk Litwin

THE POLISH MAGNATES, 1454—1648.
THE SHAPING OF AN ESTATE

The Polish state during the modern era was something, if not exceptional, then at any rate unusual for Europe as it then was. The great numerical strength of the nobility, its exceptionally wide political rights, the relative weakness of the executive powers — these are only some of the features distinguishing the “Polish Commonwealth of Nobles” from other countries. Not least amongst these was the official and legal equality of members of the nobility. There was no formal aristocracy. The titles of prince and count were not recognized. Irrespective of this, the privileged classes were not homogeneous, of course. Property differentiations, unavoidable in the history of any social group, had led to the emergence of differences in political standing. The social layer thus created gained the name of the magnate class. However, it is not easy to define its composition, and what follows on from this, its internal structure, since we do not possess any formal discriminants.¹

In a debate of many years' standing among Polish historians, many attempts have been made to pinpoint the so-called “magnate criteria”, but the problem remains unsolved. It was decid-

¹ Cf. W. Dworzaczek, *La mobilité sociale de la noblesse polonaise aux XVI^e et XVII^e siècles*, “Acta Poloniae Historica”, vol. XXXVI, 1977; *ibidem*, A. Kersten, *Les magnats: élite de la société nobilière*; *ibidem*, A. Wyczański, *La structure de la noblesse polonaise aux XVI^e—XVIII^e siècles; Magnateria polska jako warstwa* [The Polish Magnates as a Social Group], Toruń 1974; A. Kersten, *Problem władzy w Rzeczypospolitej czasu Wazów* [The Question of Power under the Vasas], in: *O naprawę Rzeczypospolitej XVII—XVIII wieku*, Warszawa 1965.

ed that for the attainment of "magnate" status prerequisites were the possession of considerable property (hereditary property and leaseholds of Crown lands), of the office of Senator (i.e. entitlement to sit in the upper chamber of the Polish Sejm), and of suitable family connections, as well as the leading of a given life-style (the maintenance of independent armed forces and a court).² Vital, too, was continuity in the maintenance of such status. It was only in the second or third generation that a family possessing the above-described attributes was accepted as being a magnate family. Membership of the social layer discussed was largely determined by a person's or a whole family's social prestige. Today we take great pains in piecing together the factors which influenced this question. For contemporary Poles it was just as clear who should be regarded as a magnate, as it was clear in England who should be considered a gentleman.

The difficulties associated with the precise determination of the composition of the magnate class have led to a want of works dealing with the structure and growth of this social group.³ The current work represents a proposal to adopt a new approach in such research. Utilizing a certain theoretical (sociological) schema, we shall attempt to determine the phases of

² W. Czapliński, J. Długosz, *Zycie codzienne magnaterii polskiej XVII wieku* [*The Everyday Life of Polish Magnates in the 17th Century*], Warszawa 1976, pp. 7—11; W. Dworzaczek, *Perméabilité des barrières sociales dans la Pologne du XVI^e siècle*, "Acta Poloniae Historica", vol. XXXVI, 1977, p. 26; *Dzieje Wielkopolski* [*A History of Great Poland*], vol. I, ed. J. Topolski, Poznań 1969, p. 223; I. Ihnatowicz, A. Mączak, B. Zientara, *Spoleczeństwo polskie od X do XX wieku* [*Polish Society from the 10th to the 20th Century*], Warszawa 1979, p. 286; A. Kersten, *Les magnats...*, pp. 129—132; J. Maciszewski, *Szlachta polska i jej państwo* [*The Polish Nobility and Its State*], Warszawa 1969, p. 21; A. Wyczański, *Le structure...*, p. 111; *idem*, *Spoleczeństwo polskie* [*Polish Society*], in: *Polska w epoce Odrodzenia*, Warszawa 1970, pp. 137—138.

³ The only monograph which analyses the magnate group from the perspective of its internal structure is that of T. Zielińska, *Magnateria polska epoki saskiej* [*The Polish Magnates during the Saxon Era*]. Wrocław 1977.

development of the magnate group on the basis of the results of quantitative research.

Since the basis for isolating the magnate from the rest of the nobility was social prestige, it is legitimate to employ Max Weber's "universal-reverential" definition of estate (*Stand*) as the point of departure for our further deliberations. Let us recall that Weber calls an "estate" a group of people characterized by the same "estate position" (*ständische Lage*). Whilst the latter is defined as follows: "*Im Gegensatz zur rein ökonomisch bestimmten 'Klassenlage' wollen wir als "ständische Lage" bezeichnen jede typische Komponente des Lebensschicksals von Menschen, welche durch eine spezifische positive oder negative, soziale Einschätzung der 'Ehre' bedingt ist, die sich an irgendeine gemeinsame Eigenschaft vieler knüpft.*"⁴ Since "*praktisch betrachtet geht die ständische Gliederung überall mit einer Monopolisierung ideeller und materieller Güter oder Chancen [...]*",⁵ one should focus on the study of social access to these "goods and opportunities" (*Güter und Chancen*). Weber regards the most important of them as being access to a given circle of potential spouses and to certain positions.⁶ In our case these will be respectively — access to the magnate marriage market and to the office of Grand Senator. In accordance with the definition, when we pinpoint the moment of monopolization of access to these "goods" (*Güter*), we shall have chronologically fixed the formation of an estate — the magnate group.

The development of social groups is a long-term process. For this reason the chronological framework of this work embraces a fairly long period — 1454—1648. The first of these dates is pretty generally recognized today as the beginning of the era of the Commonwealth of Nobles. The second concludes a period

⁴ Max Weber, *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft*, Pt. III, ch. 4, p. 635, J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), Tübingen 1956.

⁵ *Ibidem*, p. 637.

⁶ *Ibidem*, pp. 663 and 668; a similar position is taken by the German researcher of Polish history, G. Rhode, *Stände und Königtum in Polen, Litauen und Böhmen (Mähren)* in: *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas* N. F. vol. 12, 1964, pp. 221 ff., reprinted in: *Die geschichtlichen Grundlagen der modernen Volksvertretung...*, ed. H. Rauch, vol. 1, Darmstadt 1980, pp. 486 ff., *Wege der Forschung*, vol. 196.

of long-term though relative stabilization. Before 1648 military conflicts took place on the borders of the state without disturbing the natural formation and development of social structures. However, from this point on there commences a period of wars waged throughout the country's territory. These brought about increased mobility of the population and its physical devastation. These kind of changes, produced violently, one might say artificially, go beyond the author's field of interest, concerned as he is with organic development processes.

Because of the acceptance of such a wide chronological compass, it seemed necessary to restrict the territorial range. The selection of the two principal Polish provinces — Great Poland (Wielkopolska) and Little Poland (Małopolska) — ensured that the leading magnate families would fall within the study.

The term Great Poland will be used in the sense of Wielkopolska proper, i.e. as the name of the territory embracing the Poznań and Kalisz voivodeships,⁷ whereas Little Poland is what we shall call the area which consisted of the Cracow, Sandomierz and Lublin voivodeships.⁸

*

* *

One can most simply analyse access to the "goods" mentioned in the introduction by studying the composition of the group who shared in the enjoyment of these "goods". In this connection we have created two statistical groups. The first comprises all Grand Senator appointments in Great Poland and Little Poland during the years 1454—1648; the second is intended to reflect the condition of the magnate marriage market in each of the provinces of interest to us.

In practice the task of drawing up a list containing all the Grand Senator appointments made in the period and territory of interest to us fell to the author, since there are only two publications in existence which are suitable for direct utilization

⁷ *Dzieje Wielkopolski*, p. 30; W. Konopczyński, *Wielkopolska w dobie Rzeczypospolitej szlacheckiej* [Great Poland during the Age of the Nobles' Republic], "Roczniki Historyczne", vol. 1, 1925, p. 75; G. Lengnich, *Prawo pospolite Królestwa Polskiego* [Common Law in the Polish Kingdom], Kraków 1836, pp. 9—15.

⁸ G. Lengnich, *op. cit.*, pp. 9—15.

here: A. Gąsiorowski's list of Great Poland officials during the years 1385—1500,⁹ and K. Fedorowicz' list of dignitaries from the Cracow voivodeship during the years 1385—1506.¹⁰ Other publications of this kind, few in number as they are, were utilized only sporadically.¹¹ The list which serves as the basis for the deliberations below was too large to be included in the text intended for publication.¹² It was chiefly compiled on the basis of a summary of the Crown Register¹³ (the years 1454—1572), and the index of appointments contained in the Crown Register belonging to the Institute of History of the Polish Academy of Sciences, and located in the Central Archives of Historical Rec-

⁹ A. Gąsiorowski, *Urzednicy wielkopolscy 1385—1500* [Great Poland Officials, 1385—1500], "Prace Komisji Historycznej Poznańskiego Towarzystwa Naukowego", vol. XXIV, No. 2, Poznań 1968.

¹⁰ K. Fedorowicz, *Dostojnicy i urzednicy wojewodztwa krakowskiego 1385—1506* [Dignitaries and Officials of the Cracow Voivodeship, 1385—1506], "Archiwum Komisji Historycznej AU", vol. VIII, Kraków 1898.

¹¹ L. Białkowski, *Urzednicy ziemscy podolscy w XVI i początkach XVII wieku* [Podolian District Officials in the 16th and the Beginning of the 17th Centuries], vol. VIII, 1928; P. Czaplowski, *Senatorowie swieczcy, podskarbiowie i starostowie Prus Królewskich 1454—1772* [Lay Senators, Treasurers and Starostas in Royal Prussia, 1454—1772] Toruń 1921; A. Gąsiorowski, *Starostowie wielkopolskich miast królewskich w dobie jagiellońskiej* [Starostas in the Royal Cities of Great Poland during the Jagiellonian Era], Poznań 1981; J. Kobierzycki, *Spis dygnitarzy* [List of Dignitaries], in: idem, *Przyczynki do dziejów ziemi sieradzkiej*, vol. II, Warszawa 1915; K. Maleczyński, *Urzednicy grodzcy i ziemscy Lwowsy 1352—1783* [Lvov Castle and District Officials, 1352—1783], "Zabytki dziejowe", vol. VI, Lwów 1938; K. Sochaniewicz, A. Wolff, *Urzednicy wojewodztwa betzkiego do połowy XVI-go wieku* [Officials of the Betz Voivodeship up to the mid 16th Century], "Miesięcznik Heraldyczny" 1931, No. 10.

¹² The list on which the statistical analysis contained in the present work is based, is appended as Annexe No. 1 to the author's degree dissertation entitled *Struktura terytorialna magnaterii polskiej 1454—1648. Próba sondażu* [The Territorial Structure of the Polish Magnates, 1454—1648. A Trial Sounding], typescript in the Library of the Historical Institute of the University of Warsaw. All information concerning appointment policy not referred to in the footnotes, comes from this list.

¹³ *Matricularium Regni Poloniae Summaria*, vols. I—V, ed. T. Wierzbowski, Warszawa 1905—1919.

ords in Warsaw (the years 1572—1648). The skeleton thus created was supplemented by information from the *Polish Biographical Dictionary*, W. Dworzaczek's *Genealogia*, and armorials.¹⁴ Of the latter, only Boniecki's armorial was frequently consulted. The works by Żychliński and Uruski, and Niesiecki's old records were used on rare occasions, and always with a great deal of caution. Some of the information was collected in a rather random fashion from various sources and treatments.¹⁵

The statistical group intended to re-create the magnate marriage market in Great Poland and Little Poland, comprises all marriages contracted in the period under study by representatives of families regarded as magnate families and as belonging to the local community of one of the provinces of interest to us. Families qualifying as magnate families are those possessing a representative in the Senate for three successive generations, or three such persons in one generation.¹⁶ A two-generation break in the holding of offices such as that of Grand Senator

¹⁴ W. Dworzaczek, *Genealogia* [*Genealogy*], pt. 2: Tabele [Tables], Warszawa 1959; A. Boniecki, *Herbarz polski* [*A Polish Asmorial*], Warszawa 1890—1914 (A. Makowski); S. Kozierowski, *Obce rycerstwo w Wielkopolsce* [*Alien Knights in Greater Poland*], Poznań 1982; K. Niesiecki, *Herbarz polski* [*A Polish Armorial*], vols. I—X, ed J. N. Bobrowicz, *Lipsk 1839—1846*; S. Uruski, *Rodzina, herbarz szlachty polskiej* [*The Houses and Arms of the Polish Nobility*], Warszawa 1904—1931 [A — Rzyszkol]; T. Żychliński, *Złota księga szlachty polskiej* [*The Golden Book of the Polish Nobility*], vols. I—XXXI, Poznań 1879—1908.

¹⁵ I refer here to works concerned with particular families and scattered amongst various publications: K. Hartleb, *Z Ocieszyna Ociescy* [*The Ocieskis of Ocieszyn*], "Miesięcznik Heraldyczny", 1913, No. 6; S. Kot, *Stupeccy w ruchu reformacyjnym* [*The Stupecki Family in the Reformation Movement*], "Reformacja w Polsce", vol. IV. 1926; W. Sauter, *Krzysztof Zegocki pierwszy partyzant Rzeczypospolitej* [*Krzysztof Zegocki, the Republic's First Partisan*], Poznań 1981.

¹⁶ J. Maciszewski, *op. cit.*, p. 21; E. Opaliński, *Elita władzy w województwach poznańskim i kaliskim za Zygmunta III* [*The Power Élite in the Poznań and Kalisz Voivodeships during the Reign of Sigismund III*], Poznań 1981, pp. 164—165; W. Pałucki, *Studia nad uposażeniem urzędników ziemskich w Koronie do schyłku XVI wieku* [*Research on the Endowments of District Officials in the Kingdom of Poland up to the Close of the 16th Century*], Warszawa 1962, p. 288; A. Wyczański, *La structure...*, pp. 115—116; T. Zielińska, *Rody urzędami zaszczycone* [*Families Honoured with Official Appointments*], in: *Spoleczeństwo staropolskie*, vol. II, Warszawa 1979, p. 217.

by members of the family signifies the loss of magnate status.¹⁷ Marriages of individuals from families selected in this way have been included in the statistics. Senatorial generations and first non-Senatorial generations have been taken into account. The following families fulfilled the above-mentioned conditions at different periods — in Great Poland: the Czarnkowski, Górka, Grudziński, Latałski, Leszczyński, Opaliński, Ostroróg, Szamotulski, Potulicki, Rozrażewski, Tomicki, Zaremba, and Zebrzydowski (Great Poland line) families; in Little Poland: the Firlej, Kmita, Kurozwęcki, Ligęza, Maciejowski, Mielecki, Myszkowski, Oleśnicki, Ossoliński, Pilecki, Szydłowiecki, Szafraniec, Tarło, Tarnowski, Tęczyński, Zborowski, and Zebrzydowski (Little Poland line) families. Altogether the group comprises 380 Great Poland marriages and 480 Little Poland marriages.

The list described above was compiled mainly on the basis of data contained in Dworzaczek's *Genealogia*,¹⁸ and Boniecki's armorial.¹⁹ Other armorials²⁰ were used more rarely and with greater caution. In about one-fifth of cases we possess exact dates of marriage. In two-fifths of the cases we only know the *terminus post quem*. For the remaining two-fifths it proved necessary to introduce approximations. The dates of marriage are contained in time divisions ranging from 5 to 15 years' duration. The approximations were made on the basis of the information provided by the literature concerning the average age of newly-wed couples, life expectancy and so on.²¹

¹⁷ E. Opaliński, *op. cit.*, p. 164.

¹⁸ W. Dworzaczek, *op. cit.*

¹⁹ A. Boniecki, *op. cit.*

²⁰ Cf. Note 14, and W. Dworzaczek, *Materiały historyczno-genealogiczne do dziejów wielkiej własności w Wielkopolsce* [*Historico-genealogical Material on the History of Landed Property in Great Poland*] (typescript).

²¹ J. Bystron, *Dzieje obyczajów w dawnej Polsce* [*A History of Customs in Old Poland*], Warszawa 1960, pp. 121—123; T. Furtak, *Kilka zagadnień z demografii szlachty polskiej* [*Some Problems Relating to the Demography of the Polish Nobility*]. RDSG, vol. IV, 1937, pp. 42—48; I. Gieysztorowa, *Rodzina staropolska w badaniach demograficznych* [*The Old Poland Family in Demographic Research*], in: *Spółczesność staropolska*, vol. II, Warszawa 1979, pp. 166—172; *idem*, *Wstęp do demografii staropolskiej* [*An Introduction to Old Poland Demography*], Warszawa 1977, p. 251; M. Koczerska, *Rodzina szlachecka w Polsce póź-*

We thus possess given statistical groups: Grand Senator posts and access to the magnate marriage market. We shall use these to study the course of the process of the arisal of the magnate estate in accordance with Weber's definition cited above. Let us recall that this says that an estate arises "along with monopolization of a chosen sphere of goods and opportunities".²² In other words, at that point when membership of a given social group becomes the most important of the features predetermining a share in the enjoyment of the "goods".

In our case this means that the magnate estate arose at the point when membership of a magnate circle 1) became the most important of the features predetermining access to the office of Grand Senator, and to the magnate marriage market and other "goods", with which we are not concerned in the present work. In the hierarchy of predetermining features, we shall also be interested in 2) membership of the non-magnate type nobility, and 3) membership of the local community connected with the provincial marriage market and the provincial official hierarchy.²³ Changes occurring within the hierarchy of importance of the first and second features and the first and third features will provide us with information on the course of the processes of the closing-up and integration of magnate groupings — constituent elements of the process of the arisal of the estate.

nego średniowiecza [The Noble Family in Poland during the Late Middle Ages], Warszawa 1976, pp. 30—32.

²² Cf. Note 5 above.

²³ The primary link between marriage policy and the influence of the local community is confirmed in M. Koczerska, *op. cit.*, p. 1; see also A. Wyczański, *Polityka polska w XVI wieku [Polish Politics in the 16th Century]*, "Człowiek i światopogląd", No. 115, 1975. On the condition of residency relating to the receiving of appointments to district Senatorial seats, cf. W. Dworzaczek, *Oblicze wyznaniowe senatu Rzeczypospolitej w dobie kontrreformacji [Religious Aspects of the Senate of the Polish Republic during the Counter-Reformation Era]*, in: *Munera Litteraria*, Poznań 1962, p. 43; *Dzieje Wielkopolski...* pp. 113—115, 324; A. Gąsiorowski, *Urzednicy zarządu lokalnego późnośredniowiecznej Wielkopolski [Local Government Officials in Late-Medieval Great Poland]*, Poznań 1970, pp. 99—100; J. Matuszewski, *Sprzedawalność urzędów w Polsce [The Venality of Official Appointments in Poland]*, "Czasopismo Prawno-Historyczne", vol. XVI, No. 2, 1964, p. 106; W. Pałucki, *op. cit.*, pp. 21, 26; T. Zielińska, *Rody urzędami zaszczycone*, pp. 199—200.

We shall learn of these changes by studying their consequences on the basis of the statistic material we possess, which is to say by comparing the numbers of persons appearing in the statistics in given periods possessing each of the features of interest to us. In the case of the group relating to appointments to the office of Grand Senator, we shall do this descriptively. But in the case of the compilation of marriages, we shall use a tabular approach. This is made possible by the application of two fixed determinants. The first of these — determinant No. 1 — will be called the affinity quotient of the development of integration processes. Each time, the numerator of this quotient will contain the number of marriages contracted in a given period by magnates belonging to one of the local communities of interest to us (Little Poland, Great Poland) with representatives of “outside” magnate families, and the denominator will contain the number of unions contracted by the former with the local middle nobility.

Determinant No. 2 is the affinity quotient of the development of the closing-up process among magnate circles. Its numerator will consist of inter-magnate marriages contracted in a given period in the territory under study, and its denominator — the number of mixed noble-magnate unions.

To conclude the introduction, a few more technical comments. It is assumed that persons characterized by the feature of belonging to magnate circles are those possessing a forebear (on the male side) in the previous generation, holding the office of Grand Castellan, and whose family holds a Senatorial position in the given generation.²⁴

Membership of the local community is recognized by the traditional holding of office in a given family in a given territory — dating back at least two generations.²⁵

²⁴ E. Opaliński, *op. cit.*, pp. 164 f. Different qualifying criteria are applied here for defining a magnate (the holding of office by two generations successively) and defining a magnate family (three generations). This was determined by a desire to arrive at a group of families of powerful, fixed status.

²⁵ Z. Zielińska, *Mechanizm sejmikowy i klientela radziwiłłowska za Sasów [The Local Diet Mechanism and the Radziwiłł Clientele under the Saxons]*, “Przegląd Historyczny”, vol. LXII, 1971, No. 3, pp. 398 ff.

The feature of membership of the non-magnate type nobility does not present any qualification difficulties.

The division into sub-periods sprang, in the case of marriage policy, from the only logical time-boundary — that of 1569, i.e. when Poland and Lithuania were joined by ties of territorial, and not merely personal union. It was then that very considerable changes took place in the composition of the Chamber of Deputies and the Senate — owing to the lack of fully-developed court life, the only places of personal contact for magnates from the different parts of the Polish-Lithuanian State.

The date of 1569 divides the period of interest to us into two unequal parts. Further divisions led to the creation of fairly small, but comparable time intervals. Because of the limits of the marriage-date approximations, these intervals could not be of less than twenty years' duration.

In the case of research on appointments policy, the only logical time-boundaries are the dates of the reigns of particular rulers. Of fundamental significance here is the boundary of 1572, a year associated with an important change in political structure — the extinction of the Jagiellon dynasty and the beginning of an electoral monarchy. Since this divides the period of interest to us into unequal parts, a further division of the Jagiellonian epoch, into the periods 1454—1506 and 1506—1572, was introduced. With the aim of obtaining tolerably multi-elemental groups, further divisions were not introduced.

*

* *

We shall commence our survey of the data with the course of the process of integration of magnate circles.

Following is a table showing changes in the affinity quotient of the development of integration processes in Great Poland during the Jagiellonian epoch:

1454—1477	5 : 12	(0.42)
1478—1500	7 : 7	(1.0)
1501—1523	6 : 12	(0.5)
1524—1546	12 : 18	(0.67)
1547—1569	8 : 13	(0.62)

As we can see, the value of the determinant is fairly low, with the exception of a considerable swing during the period 1478—1500. However, this is a chance difference, no doubt arising from the lack of accuracy of marriage-date approximations. This is confirmed by the table below, where longer time-intervals are utilized:

1454—1492	9 : 18	(0.5)
1493—1530	11 : 22	(0.5)
1531—1569	18 : 22	(0.82)

Comparing the data from these two tables, we can state that throughout the Jagiellonian period local ties in Great Poland were stronger than the sense of unity of social standing. But we can see that group consciousness works its way into the mentality of the magnates: the value of the determinant of interest to us increases slowly, but fairly systematically. We observe a considerable rise (an absolute rise, too, it's worth noting) in the number of unions with outside magnates, in the second half of Sigismund I's reign especially. We shall return to this point again.

Now let us compare the situation in Great Poland with the changes occurring in Little Poland. These are the corresponding tables:

1454—1477	5 : 10	(0.5)
1478—1500	7 : 14	(0.5)
1501—1523	11 : 9	(1.22)
1524—1546	17 : 17	(1.0)
1547—1569	14 : 15	(0.93)

And for the longer time-intervals:

1454—1492	10 : 16	(0.63)
1493—1530	21 : 21	(1.0)
1531—1569	23 : 28	(0.82)

The Little Poland magnates during the Jagiellonian epoch, as we can see, were more strongly integrated with magnate groups from other parts of the Kingdom of Poland than their Great Poland counterparts were. The "Cracow lords" start from a higher level (0.5 as opposed to 0.42), which is not surprising, since in spite of a conflict with Casimir the Jagiellon the Little

Poland magnates still held a high position within the state during the first years of his reign.²⁶ This position assured the families belonging to the local élite a good deal of "matrimonial eligibility". In this way, without any attempts at expansion on their part, the magnates in this area crossed the territorial barriers in family policy with relative ease.

This state of affairs is shown even more clearly under Sigismund I. During his reign there is an increase in the proportion of "outside magnates" in the marriage markets both of Great Poland and Little Poland. Such situation is brought about by the policy conducted by the youngest of Casimir the Jagiellon's sons. The King, called in fact the "Senators' King", based his rule on the support of the magnates, and maintained a numerous and, for Polish conditions, rich court.²⁷ This facilitated personal contacts between magnates from various parts of the Kingdom, owing to which there was a drift towards the establishing of magnate marriage traffic on a nation-wide scale in place of the local traffic.

Sigismund I's manner of ruling was especially beneficial for the growth of the magnates of Little Poland — as being closest to the court and enjoying its benefits to the full. During the years 1506—1548 the value of determinant No. 1 in respect of this province is constantly in excess of 1.0. But during this period the magnates of Great Poland also enjoyed more and more numerous contacts with the other parts of the Kingdom.

The situation changes substantially under Sigismund II. A long period of non-resident rule, with the King far away from Cracow, cancels out the supremacy of the Little Poland magnates as described above. Towards the end of the Jagiellonian epoch we observe a similar situation in the two provinces of the King-

²⁶ F. Kiryk, *Jeszcze o możnowładztwie małopolskim XIV i XV wieku* [*More on the Little Poland Magnates of the 14th and 15th Centuries*], "Studia Historyczne", vol. XII, 1969, No. 1, p. 112; W. Knoppek, *Zmiany w układzie sił politycznych w II połowie XV wieku* [*Changes in the Disposition of Political Forces in the Second Half of the 15th Century*], "Czasopismo Prawno-Historyczne", vol. VII, 1955, No. 2, pp. 62—63.

²⁷ Z. Wojciechowski, *Zygmunt Stary* [Sigismund the Old], Warszawa 1979, pp. 403—416.

dom under study. Local ties still have a decisive influence on the condition of the provincial marriage market, but a sense of group ties among the magnates is constantly on the increase.

Let us take a look at further developments during the era of elective kings. These are the data for Great Poland — determinant No. 1 (for the sake of comparison let us also give the data for the last time-interval of the Jagiellonian period):

1547—1569	8 : 13	(0.62)
1569—1596	12 : 18	(0.67)
1597—1622	21 : 17	(1.24)
1623—1648	27 : 20	(1.35)

Over the longer time-intervals:

1531—1569	18 : 22	(0.82)
1569—1609	21 : 28	(0.75)
1610—1648	39 : 27	(1.44)

The changes in Little Poland appear as follows:

1547—1569	14 : 15	(0.93)
1569—1596	23 : 25	(0.92)
1597—1622	20 : 30	(0.67)
1623—1648	29 : 22	(1.32)

Over the longer time-intervals:

1531—1569	23 : 28	(0.82)
1569—1609	33 : 41	(0.80)
1610—1648	39 : 37	(1.05)

During the years following the Union and during the first interregnum, we observe a fall in the value of determinant No. 1. This is fairly surprising when we consider the fact that during these years the Polish magnates, in the struggle concerning the form of the elections and the formulation of the organizational principles contained in the Henrician Articles, geared themselves up to conscious and deliberate group action. The appearance in the Senate and in political life generally of the new, and initially clearly separate, group represented by the Lithuanian magnates following the Union of Lublin, ought also to have had the effect of closing the ranks of the Polish magnates.

There are several reasons lying behind the state of affairs described above. Firstly, and this applies to both provinces under discussion, considerable changes must have taken place in the consciousness of the Polish magnate in response to the events of the first interregnum, but a further period of time had to elapse before such changes could become consolidated. Only the course of the entire turbulent thirty-five-year period between 1572 and 1607, ending in the violent and undoubtedly anti-magnate movement of the Zebrzydowski rebellion, would bring about a sufficient closing of the ties joining magnates from various parts of the Polish State for this to be visible in their family policy. In fact this becomes apparent, as emerges from the tables presented above, only during the period of relative stability following the rebellion, and preceding a series of wars in the second half of the 17th century.

Secondly, in the case of Little Poland a crisis materializes for the magnates, and this both in a demographic and a political sense. Three free elections in quick succession shift the centre of gravity of political life to Mazovia, so that a valuable trump card slips from the hands of the Little Poland magnates. After 1569 the distribution of economic power among the Polish magnates also undergoes change. The Little Poland magnates, whose economic resources are not very impressive,²⁸ are not in a position to compete with Volhynian and Kievan princes. The latter simply force their way into the province's chief Senatorial posts,²⁹ access to which has hitherto been monopolized by the Little Poland magnates. Leading positions among the magnates previously occupied by the Little Poland Tęczyński and Tarnowski families, are now occupied by the Zbaraski and Ostrogski families, and

²⁸ I. Kaniewska, *Małopolska reprezentacja sejmowa za czasów Zygmunta Augusta* [Little Poland Representation in the Sejm under Sigismund II], "Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego", No. 351, Kraków 1974, p. 87.

²⁹ During the years 1593—1648 the office of Cracow Castellan was held by magnates from Volhynian princely families, or from families connected with the Ukraine economically: Prince Janusz Ostrogski, 1593—1620; Prince Janusz Zbaraski, 1620—1631; Stanisław Koniecpolski, 1633—1646; Jakub Sobieski, 1646; and Mikołaj Potocki, 1646—1651.

then the Koniecpolski, Wiśniowiecki and Potocki families, all connected economically with the areas of Volhynia and the Ukraine.

The demographic crisis was another reason for the decline in the status of the Little Poland magnate group and its expansion potential. At the turn of the 17th century the Tarnowski, Ligeża and Zborowski³⁰ families were on the decline — they were faced with the imminent dispersal of their fortunes. During the same period the Tęczyński, Mielecki, Pilecki and Boner families were already “dying out”.³¹ Such a state of affairs is nothing new, renewal in the family composition of the magnate strata is a process which recurs periodically in modern Poland, but previously (e.g. at the beginning of the 16th century) such changes took place within the framework of one territorial group. The extinct Szydłowiecki, Jarosławski, Kurozwęcki, Rytwiński or Kmita families were replaced by other Little Poland magnates — the Myszkowski, Maciejowski, Zborowski and Mielecki families.³² Now, at the turn of the 17th century, the places vacated by Little Poland families were taken over by the magnates from Volhynia and the Ukraine. The last family power connected strictly with Little Poland was the Lubomirski family.

The crisis among the Little Poland magnates brought about a situation where the Great Poland magnates played a larger part in creating a nation-wide magnate marriage market. Such a market took shape before the close of the period under study. Its arisal should be dated to the end of the first half of the 17th century.

The changes in the value of determinant No. 1 show that in relation to the question of family policy, territorial borders ceased to hinder the development of integration processes. This sec-

³⁰ W. Dworzaczek, *Genealogia*, Figs. 95, 96, 133; A. Boniecki, *op. cit.* — the Ligeża family.

³¹ W. Dworzaczek, *Genealogia*, Figs. 94, 103, 124, 128.

³² *Ibidem*, Figs. 98, 99, 100, 122, 128, 130, 133; S. Uruski, *op. cit.* — the Rytwiński family. Cf. also A. Gąsiorowski, *Rotacja elity władzy w średniowiecznej Polsce [The Rotation of the Power Élite in Medieval Poland]*, in: *Spoleczeństwo Polski średniowiecznej*, vol. I, ed. S. K. Kuczyński, Warszawa 1981, pp. 264—290.

tion of the building of the magnate estate was completed before 1648.

Relying on the same statistical group, let us now trace the course of the closing-up process among the magnates. For this purpose we shall require tables providing information on the changes which determinant No. 2³³ underwent during the period under study, which is to say changes concerning the relationship between the number of marriages among magnate families themselves to the number of mixed noble-magnate unions.

Great Poland during the Jagiellonian period:

1454—1477	5 : 14	(0.35)
1478—1500	8 : 12	(0.67)
1501—1523	6 : 17	(0.35)
1524—1546	16 : 27	(0.58)
1547—1569	12 : 20	(0.60)

Over the longer time-intervals:

1454—1492	9 : 23	(0.39)
1492—1530	13 : 34	(0.38)
1531—1569	26 : 33	(0.79)

Little Poland during the Jagiellonian period:

1454—1477	10 : 14	(0.71)
1478—1500	8 : 21	(0.38)
1501—1523	22 : 22	(1.00)
1524—1546	23 : 36	(0.64)
1547—1569	22 : 30	(0.73)

Over the longer time-intervals:

1454—1492	15 : 24	(0.63)
1492—1530	37 : 43	(0.86)
1531—1569	34 : 46	(0.74)

As we can see, in the case of both provinces the value of the determinant fluctuates greatly. But above all a considerable disproportion stands out in the determinants relating to the two magnate groups under discussion. Initially the Little Poland magnates represent a more firmly closed community in respect of family contacts with the middle nobility, and this state of af-

³³ Included with inter-magnate marriages are marriages with foreign nobility.

fairs is maintained right up until the end of Sigismund I's reign. Under Sigismund II the differences disappear. The reason is, we believe, that Little Poland practically lost its character as a central province for a time, in consequence of the long period of non-residential rule in the reign of the last Jagiellon.

A. Kersten and W. Dworzaczek maintain that the first stage in the closing-up process among the Polish magnates was concluded in the first half of the 16th century. The point at which this occurred is meant to be marked by the dates of acceptance by certain magnate families of the nobility titles of the Holy Roman Empire.³⁴ The tables given above argue against this way of looking at the question. The data contained in the tables relating to the period in question (the first half of the 16th century), are indicative rather of the fact that the boundaries separating the magnates from the rest of the nobility were still fluid and perfectly crossable, whilst the process of their consolidation and sealing-off suffered set-backs in Great Poland in the first quarter, and in Little Poland in the second quarter of the 16th century. It is therefore difficult to talk about the conclusion of any developmental stage, whilst the acceptance by certain Polish families of foreign titles represented rather the satisfaction of individual aspirations and had nothing to do with conscious group action.

Let us recall the facts more exactly. Roman countships were accepted by the Leszczyński family in 1473, the Tęczyński family in 1527, the Górka family in 1534, the Latałski family in 1543, and the Tarnowski family in 1547. The Boner family received baronetcies of the Holy Roman Empire in 1540.³⁵ At the point of acceptance of these titles, half of the above-mentioned families — the Latałski, Leszczyński and Boner families — were merely taking the initial steps towards magnate status. In the case of the Boner family, even their nobility was of very recent vintage.³⁶ Receipt of a title was meant to keep up one's prestige,

³⁴ W. Dworzaczek, *Perméabilité...*, p. 24; *Magnateria polska jako warstwa społeczna*, p. 6.

³⁵ W. Dworzaczek, *Genealogia*, Figs. 94, 95, 111, 119, 124; A. Boniecki, *op. cit.* — the Latałski family.

³⁶ A. Boniecki, *op. cit.* — the Boner family.

and to convince contemporaries of the magnate status of the family. In the same way the Tęczyński, Tarnowski and Górka families now received mere confirmation of the generally recognized and proclaimed greatness and antiquity of their families.

It therefore appears that the acceptance of foreign titles was the result of various trends, and putting them all in the same bag amounts to a dangerous confusion of the sum of individual actions with action on the part of the group. Such procedure can only be justified in research of a statistical nature, whilst in the case in question (a group composed of 6 elements!) this is inconceivable. Foreign titles were a trump card in the rivalry which went on among the magnates. The purpose of accepting them was to stand out in magnate circles or to rise from the ranks of the common nobility, and not to formally separate a group isolated from the rest of the citizens.³⁷

The post-election period produces the following changes in the development of the process in question — Great Poland:

1547—1569	12 : 20	(0.60)
1569—1596	21 : 23	(0.91)
1596—1622	34 : 31	(1.10)
1623—1648	43 : 32	(1.34)

Over the longer time-intervals:

1531—1569	26 : 33	(0.78)
1569—1609	36 : 41	(0.88)
1610—1648	62 : 45	(1.38)

Little Poland:

1547—1569	22 : 30	(0.73)
1569—1596	31 : 36	(0.86)
1596—1622	29 : 35	(0.83)
1623—1648	37 : 32	(1.16)

Over the longer time-intervals:

1531—1569	34 : 46	(0.74)
1569—1609	42 : 56	(0.75)
1610—1648	54 : 49	(1.10)

³⁷ Foreign nobility titles were not officially recognized in the Republic.

We notice that the value of determinant No. 2, as before, rises sharply only after about the year 1610, which is to say, after the Zebrzydowski rebellion. During the 40 years following the Union there is merely a slow and insignificant increase. Sigismund II's home policy lies behind this state of affairs, as well as the factors mentioned previously.

The last of the Jagiellon kings endeavoured to build up a power élite based on ministerial posts. Such activity had short-term effects.³⁸ But the favouring of "new" people tended to blur what even then was a distinct boundary separating the Tarnowski, Tęczyński, Firlej or Górka families from the nobility brotherhood. Renewal in the composition of the Polish magnate groups restored the missing middle rungs on the nobility's social ladder. For obvious reasons, the results of these changes could only be seen some time later, and this is apparent in our statistics. They became particularly noticeable when most of the "old" magnate representatives had faded from the scene. The new magnate families had to wait for several generations before the barrier separating them from the rest of nobility society was as distinct as it had been in the case of the Tęczyński family for instance. Only in the 17th century, when the "new" families had become more firmly established, and when (something very important) the family composition of the magnate strata had stabilized, could the tempo increase in the erection of this social barrier — the boundary between the magnates and the nobility.

However, the magnitude attained by determinant No. 2 for both provinces in the last time-interval prior to 1648, signifies that the magnates still do not represent a closed group, an estate, at this point. Access to the magnate marriage market has still not been sufficiently sealed off from the middle and greater nobility. This is revealed more clearly by the new form of determinant No. 2.

In the 1626—1648 interval, inter-magnate marriages represent the following proportions of the magnate matrimonial

³⁸ A. Sucheni-Grabowska, *Badania nad elitą władzy w latach 1551—1562* [Research on the Power Élite during the Years 1551—1562], in: *Spółeczeństwo staropolskie*, vol. I, Warszawa 1976, pp. 64—65.

market: Little Poland — 54⁰/₀, and Great Poland — 57⁰/₀. And in the 1610—1648 interval: Little Poland — 52⁰/₀, and Great Poland — 58⁰/₀.

All the time something more than 40⁰/₀ of marriages³⁹ contracted by magnates are of the kind where one of the parties is a representative of the greater or middle nobility. The closed circle of mutually related families which Z. Kuchowicz writes about⁴⁰ did not yet exist in the first half of the 17th century.

We shall now analyse access to the next of the “goods” monopolized by the magnates, to the office of Grand Senator.

In Great Poland during the years 1454—1506, 29 appointments fell to 16 people from 11 families in respect of the five highest Senatorial seats in the province. Most of the appointments (20) were secured by representatives of the province's five leading families — the Ostroróg, Czarnkowski, Szamotulski, Bniński and Zaremba families. Two Gniezno Castellans, Rafał Leszczyński and Janusz Latański, were the founders of magnate family fortunes, but they themselves should be numbered among the middle nobility. These are the only Great Poland representatives of this group to be found among the major Senators of the period in question. Of the “outside” individuals, who secured a total of 6 appointments, only Mikołaj Lubrański and Jan Jarand Brudzewski can be qualified as magnates, and this with serious reservations.

In the pre-Sigismund era, representatives of old local magnate families had the greatest access to Grand Senator posts in Great Poland. Their monopoly was broken rarely and in equal measure by “outside” magnates and the local nobility. It is worth noting that in as many as 11 cases the two highest, prestige Senatorial posts in the province (12 appointments in all) fell to members of the five old families mentioned above. Only Mikołaj Lubrański as late as 1501 managed to break this tradition.

³⁹ *Magnateria polska...*, p. 7.

⁴⁰ Z. Kuchowicz, *Spoleczne konsekwencje postępującej degeneracji możnowładztwa polskiego XVII—XVIII wieku* [Social Consequences of the Progressive Degeneration of the Polish Magnates during the 17th to the 18th Centuries], “Kwartalnik Historyczny”, vol. LXXVI, 1969, No. 1, p. 25.

In 23 out of 29 cases the major Senatorial posts in Great Poland during the years 1454—1506 were conferred on magnates. They were the true domain of the magnates. But this monopoly was maintained by the latter only in the context of their own province.

These observations are confirmed in the case of Little Poland. Here the magnates also dominate during the years 1454—1506. They received more than 88% of the appointments to Grand Senator posts in the province (37 posts for 17 people). More than a third of all appointments of this type (16) fell to three families only — the Tęczyński, Tarnowski and Kmita families. The list is completed by representatives of the Rytwiński, Jarosławski, Kurozwecki and Pilecki families and by the lords of Dębno and Ostrów. Only one of the major Senators — Jakub Sieklucki — can be numbered among the body of the middle nobility. Of the “outsiders” — Hincza of Rogów, Paweł Jasiński and Mikołaj Kamieniecki — none can easily be classed as a magnate. Even Kamieniecki, subsequently hetman, is really *homo novus*.⁴¹

The local middle nobility and the “outside” middle nobility received a mere 7% of appointments to the posts of interest to us in the time-interval in question.

Comparing the data concerning appointments with the information about the matrimonial market, we can say that during the pre-Sigismund period the magnate class was divided into very separate provincial groups tied to their own territory. They were sufficiently powerful and integrated to defend the monopoly they held in their own provinces on Grand Senator appointments, but too few in number to be able to shut themselves off in their own family circle. Family connections with the middle nobility must have blurred the sharpness of the social barrier separating the magnates.

We can observe the consequences of such state of affairs in the very next period, 1506—1569. During this time 41 appoint-

⁴¹ Mikołaj Kamieniecki was the first Senator in the family, but he held a very high position within the state. Cf. the biogram in the *Polish Biographical Dictionary*. and A. Boniecki, *op. cit.* — the Kamieniecki family.

ments were made in Great Poland. These fell to the lot of 27 people from 19 families, with the local magnates securing 17 appointments (over 41%). However, the magnate ranks were expanding with new families. Apart from those known to us already, from whose numbers the Bniński family departed, we have the Górką, Kościelecki, Latański⁴² and Tomicki⁴³ families. However, the first representatives of the Tomicki family are qualified as coming from the middle nobility. The latter's share in Grand Senator appointments is completed by the successes of Piotr Opaliński, Mikołaj Trzebuchowski, Jan and Jerzy Konarski, and Kacper Zebrzydowski. Altogether here 10 appointments for 7 people are concerned.

In the same period "outside" magnates received 11 appointments. These fell to 7 people from the Kościelecki,⁴⁴ Kretkowski, Służowski, Lubrański and Zborowski families. Jan Sierakowski, Kalisz Castellan, is the only representative of "outside" middle nobility to be found among the major Senators of Great Poland in these years.

In the period 1506—1572 access to the major Senatorial posts of Great Poland was no longer so thoroughly monopolized by the magnates. 76% of the appointments fell to their lot, as compared with 87% in the preceding period. The compact and already strongly developed group of Great Poland magnates, which was created in the 15th century by a few families who clearly surpassed the other local families in tradition, wealth and honours, dissolved into a broad front of old and new, local and "outside" families, in competition with each other. On the other hand the permeability of territorial barriers increased. Lying behind this state of affairs was the weakening of the position of many old Great Poland families — the Czarnkowski,⁴⁵ Bniński,⁴⁶ and Za-

⁴² E. Opaliński, *op. cit.*, p. 165.

⁴³ S. Brzeziński, *Panowie z Tomice* [*The Lords of Tomice*], "Miesięcznik Heraldyczny", 1933, No. 12, *passim*.

⁴⁴ The first representatives of the Kościelecki family were qualified as "outsiders", but the domiciling of the family in Great Poland allows the representatives of the third and fourth generations to be included within the ranks of the houses of Great Poland.

⁴⁵ W. Dworzaczek, *Genealogia*, Fig. 106.

⁴⁶ *Idem*, *Materiały historyczno-genealogiczne* — the Bniński family.

remba⁴⁷ families, the extinction of others — the Szamotulski⁴⁸ family, or the ephemeral nature of the Senatorial successes of the Latałski and Tomicki families.⁴⁹

During the years 1506—1572 in Little Poland we note the granting of 73 appointments to 44 people from 23 families. The majority of them, though not so overwhelming a majority as before, fell to the lot of the local magnates — 72⁰/₁₀₀. They comprised 53 appointments for 30 people from 11 families. Of the 15th-century powers, the Tarnowski, Tęczyński and Kmita families were still prominent. However, the last-named were now at the swan-song stage. The impressive but short-lived successes of the Szydłowiecki and Maciejowski families arose. A period of greatness in the history of the Firlej, Myszkowski, Mielecki and Zborowski families commenced. The list of magnates holding Grand Senator seats is completed by the Lanckoroński and Oleśnicki families. The appearance of a number of new magnate families was made possible through the “leaving of the stage” by the old powers represented by the Jarosławski, Kurozwecki, Rytwiański and Kmita families.⁵⁰ The 15th-century successes of the lords of Dębno and Ostrów were also short-lived. The result is the same as in Great Poland: the closing-up process among the magnates suffers a setback. We have already written about this above. However, the situation described arises only in the second half of the period under discussion.

During the years 1506—1548, Grand Senator appointments for the upper nobility already represented 18⁰/₁₀₀ of the total (previously 7⁰/₁₀₀). The magnates were no longer in a position to maintain the same kind of grip on the voivodeships and major Castellan posts as had been possible in the second half of the 14th century.

There was a large inflow of outside magnates into Little Poland during the period under discussion. Kościelecki, Wolski,

⁴⁷ T. Zychliński, *op. cit.*, vol. VII — the Zaremba family.

⁴⁸ W. Dworzaczek, *Genealogia*, Fig. 48.

⁴⁹ Cf. Notes 42, 43 above.

⁵⁰ Cf. Note 32 above.

Chodecki, Herbert and Barzi⁵¹ received a total of 7 Grand Senator appointments. Their influence was equal to the influence of the local middle nobility. Members of the Jordan, Sobek, and Słupecki families, and the first Senators from the Ossoliński, Zebrzydowski and Maciejowski families were appointed ten times. So that the permeability of territorial barriers increased, as was also shown by the marriage statistics, but the inflow of "outsiders" was probably connected not so much with the forming of strong social ties on a national scale (between the magnates, of course), as with a weakening in the position of the local élite. This fact is revealed most clearly by an analysis of appointments to the three highest Senatorial seats in the province — the Cracow Castellan office and voivodeship, and the Sandomierz voivodeship.⁵² During the years 1454—1506 these posts were received exclusively by the local magnates; in the period 1506—1572, only 72% fell to the magnates. So that their hegemony was broken.

The Polish magnates, therefore, entered the epoch of elective kings as a diverse and still open group. This at any rate is what emerges from our appointments analysis, and the results of this are confirmed by the analysis of the matrimonial market presented previously.

The years 1572—1648 brought 33 appointments for 26 people from 16 families in Great Poland. The local magnates received 23 of these, or more than two-thirds. So that their share of access to the posts in question was on the increase again. But the family composition of this group had significantly changed. Of the families with Senatorial traditions going back to the 15th century, the Ostroróg and, for a time, Czarnkowski families experienced a revival of power. The Górka family was still represented, although they were already dying out before the first

⁵¹ As in the case of Mikołaj Kamieniecki, none of Stanisław Barzi's forebears had been Grand Senator. So that doubts might arise as to his qualifying as a magnate.

⁵² During the years 1506—1572 appointments to the three highest official posts in Little Poland were assigned to 16 local inhabitants and 6 "outsiders".

half of the time-interval under discussion was over (1592).⁵³ The leading families in the province were the Opaliński, Leszczyński and Przyjemski families. The group in question is completed by the Krotoski and Zebrzydowski families. Four appointments, for Jan and Hieronim Gostomski, Adam Stadnicki and Jan Zborowski — this was the total extent of the presence of “outside” magnates in Great Poland. Whereas the local middle nobility had six representatives amongst the higher Senatorial posts. In the case of Jan Rozrażewski and Piotr Potulicki, their appointment represented the crowning achievement of long-standing successes on the part of their families — Senatorial successes, but at the lower level, so that certain doubts might arise as to their qualification as non-magnates. The two Mielżyńskis, Gniezno Castellans were the founders of what was to become a magnate family power only in the 18th century. The ephemeral rise of the Tuczyński and Roszkowski families to the Grand Senator level erases all doubts as to what is essentially the middle-nobility background of these families.

In the electoral epoch we observe the development of a new group of magnate families in Great Poland. These managed to greatly monopolize access to the chosen positions, for their representatives received 82% of the appointments (1454—1506 — 87%; 1506—1515 — 76%). The gaining of a firm foothold in magnate society by these new families was conducive to progress being made in the closing-up process among the magnates. However, at the same time this strong family élite blocked the access of “outsiders” to the Great Poland hierarchy. We remember that in the time-interval in question there were four appointments of “outside” magnates and six (four if we discount the controversial cases of Rozrażewski and Potulicki) in respect of the local upper nobility.

We observe a different situation in Little Poland. During the years 1572—1648, representatives of the local magnate families received only 68% of the Grand Senator appointments. Out of 55 appointments distributed among 48 people from 33 families, 29 magnates from 14 families received 34. The successes of the

⁵³ W. Dworzaczek, *Genealogia*, Fig. 111.

Tarnowski and Tęczyński families, who appeared on the lists of officials as early as the first time-interval under study, were now over. The Firlej, Myszkowski, Oleśnicki, and Zborowski families remained among the "leaders". The Szafraniec and Boner families reached the height of their Senatorial achievements. New faces among the magnates are those of the Ossoliński, Tarło, Zebrzydowski, Kazanowski, Lubomirski and Sobieski families. The Szydłowiecki, Mielecki, and Maciejowski families⁵⁴ were dying out. The Little Poland line of the Lanckoroński family⁵⁵ suffered a temporary decline. In 1637 the last of the Tęczyńskis died.⁵⁶ The Tarnowski fortune was dispersed.⁵⁷ The Boner and Szafraniec families "fade from the arena".⁵⁸

In the face of such demographic conditions among the ranks of the old magnates, the upper nobility's offensive on the Grand Senator posts became stronger and stronger. During the years 1572—1648, 24% of all appointments fell to local and "outside" representatives of this social group (1454—1506 — 7%; 1506—1572 — 18%). Analysis of appointments policy in Little Poland therefore indicates a slowing-down in the rate of development of the closing-up process among the magnates.

However, the chief candidates for occupying the place left by the old Little Poland families were the latifundia holders connected with the eastern lands of the Republic. Stanisław Konicpolski, Janusz Ostrogski, Janusz Zbaraski, Władysław Dominik Zasławski, and Mikołaj Potocki all figured within the Little Poland hierarchy before 1648. The list of "outsiders" is completed by Stanisław Witowski of the Sieradz district and the Prussian *terrigena*, Jan Kostka. Still prevailing numerically, however, are the upper nobility (the Słupecki, Czerny, Sienieński, Koryciński, Dembiński, and Mniszech families), among whom should

⁵⁴ *Ibidem*, Figs. 122, 128; A. Boniecki, *op. cit.* — the Maciejowski family.

⁵⁵ *Ibidem*, Figs. 101—102.

⁵⁶ *Ibidem*, Fig. 94.

⁵⁷ W. Dworzaczek, *Leliwici Tarnowscy. Z dziejów możnowładztwa małopolskiego wiek XIV—XV* [The Tarnów Leliwa Family. From the History of the Little Poland Magnates during the 14th to the 15th Centuries], Warszawa 1971, pp. 295 f.

⁵⁸ *Idem*, *Genealogia*, Figs. 108, 124.

also be numbered the first Senators from the Sobieski, Lubomirski and Tarło families. All these received a total of 10 appointments (9 people). Following is a corresponding diagrammatic comparison.⁵⁹ The vertical line represents a time axis; the column on the left contains a note of appointments of "outside" magnates, and that on the right — appointments of local non-magnates.

Jan Kostka, Sandomierz Voivode 1574	1576 Jan Tarło, Lublin Voivode
	1577 Walenty Dembiński, Cracow Castellan
	1585 Piotr Andrzej Czerny, Lublin Castellan
	1589 Jerzy Mniszech, Sandomierz Voivode
	1591 Marek Sobieski, Lublin Cas- tellan
Janusz Ostrogski, Cracow Castellan 1593	1597 Marek Sobieski, Lublin Voi- vode
	1603 Sebastian Lubomirski, Wojnicz Castellan
	1613 Feliks Słupecki, Lublin Cas- tellan
Janusz Zbaraski, Cracow Castellan 1620	
Stanisław Koniecpolski, Sandomierz Voivode 1625	1630 Zbigniew Sienieński, Lublin Castellan
Stanisław Koniecpolski, Cracow Castellan 1633	1633 Krzysztof Koryciński, Wojnicz Castellan
Stanisław Witowski, Sandomierz Castellan 1642	
Dominik Zasławski, Sandomierz Voivode 1645	
Mikołaj Potocki, Cracow Castellan 1646	

⁵⁹ The table is compiled on the basis of my own list — cf. Note 12 above.

As we can see, although the appointments for each group almost balance each other out numerically (with a slight advantage on the side of the local upper nobility), it is obvious that the practice of granting Grand Senator posts to the nobility is on the decline. Whereas, with the passing of time, these posts in Little Poland are more and more frequently occupied by “outside” magnates.

In the last of the time-intervals under study (1572—1648), the staffing of Senatorial posts in the two provinces of interest to us is marked by considerable differences in respect of internal structure. In Great Poland a closed élite of magnate families is formed, which effectively monopolizes access to local Grand Senator posts. This monopoly effectively isolates the local land-owner hierarchy from expansion on the part of “outsiders”.

In Little Poland on the other hand, the group of local magnates declines to such an extent that the influence of “outside” magnates systematically increases. The situation is complicated by the fact that there was a simultaneous escalation in the upper nobility’s expansion into the “higher” positions in the province.

*

* * *

It is time for a summing-up of the findings emerging from the analyses of the two groups we are interested in (marriages and appointments).

In the mid 17th century a magnate estate had not yet taken shape. Whilst it is true that integration processes had reached a very advanced stage — the magnate marriage market operated on a nation-wide scale — there still existed provincial hierarchies (especially in Great Poland), access to which was extremely limited for “outside” magnates. In the consciousness of the average magnate, ties with another magnate, even if he came from a distant part of the Polish State, were stronger than any sense of neighbour/territorial unity, testimony of which is provided by the matrimonial policy of the social group under discussion.⁶⁰

⁶⁰ However, one should not forget about the economic motives of family policy on the contracting of marriages.

However, this was a field of activity for the magnate characterized by the fact that generally it was only the will of the second party (whose state of consciousness was identical) that stood between the intention and its execution. Appointments policy, on the other hand, was the resultant of several forces: the will of the King, the opinion of the nobles, pressure on the part of the magnates, and tradition.⁶¹ Voivodeship and Castellan posts remain district appointments, connected with a certain territory. Whilst it is true that they only retained vestigial powers,⁶² they nevertheless tied the official, if only formally, to a given voivodeship or district. Only *terrigenae* had access to local posts, and the King had to take account of these claims. Therefore appointments policy less accurately reflects the changes occurring in the consciousness of the magnates. Lying behind it is noble traditionalism, resisting these changes and not wishing to acknowledge that the magnate was no longer a Great Poland, Mazovian or Little Poland magnate but simply a magnate. The interests of local elite groups were also at stake.

However, nothing from the above argument alters the fact that the numerical data are not compatible with the suggestion that a magnate estate existed as early as the first half of the 17th century. We have attempted to explain the reasons for differences in the results of the analyses of the two groups under study. There is no inconsistency in this difference, we feel. Even in the first half of the 17th century, marriage policy among the magnates ignores the existence of inter-territorial barriers, whereas political activity is still effectively forced into the traditional spatial structure by the King and the nobility. But in the results of the analysis of the statistical tables presented, even in this area one can see signs of change in the not too distant future.

The affinity and appointments data respecting the process of the closing-up of the magnate class should be compared to each other with due regard being paid to the reservations previously discussed. The influence of nobility opinion on appointments

⁶¹ Cf. Note 23 above.

⁶² W. Pałucki, *op. cit.*, *passim*.

policy has somewhat different consequences in this case. The appointment of magnates to Senatorial posts did not meet with opposition. Rather the supporting of "new" people encountered resistance. Therefore monopolization of access to Grand Senator posts was considerably simplified for the magnates. Whereas the creation of a closed circle of families related to each other by marriage was hindered by virtue of the small size of the magnate population in the mid 17th century. Canon-law and genetic obstacles prevented the arisal this early of a closed magnate marriage market. This could only arise at a point when the circle of magnate families had considerably expanded. Therefore there can be no question of the closing-up of Polish magnate circles in the first half of the 17th century. This is contradicted by the marriage statistics. And on the basis of the appointments statistics, in Little Poland we should even note a certain regression in the course of this process. Access to the magnate marriage market was not closed to non-magnates. Advances in the monopolization of access to Grand Senator posts were still subject to interference in the 17th century. Conditions did not yet exist for the birth of a magnate estate.

(Translated by Phillip G. Smith)