

Anna Penkała-Jastrzębska

(Pedagogical University of Kraków)

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6386-8139>

Marianna Sanguszko née Lubomirska (1693–1729) – Introduction to the Biography of the Overlooked Heiress to the Entail of Ostrog*

Marianna z Lubomirskich Sanguszkowa (1693–1729) – przyczynek do biografii
niedocenianej dziedziczki ordynacji ostrogskiej

ABSTRACT

The life of Marianna Sanguszko née Lubomirska has not been the subject of academic interest. Owner of a huge manor, sister of the owner of Ostrogski's entail, sister of the Duchess of Neuburg, and finally the wife of Paweł Karol Sanguszko, a Court Marshal of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, she never played a significant political role nonetheless. Little is known about her private life, activity and participation in the fight for the inheritance of the Entail of Ostrog. This paper is to determine the most important events which led directly to Marianna and her husband Paweł Karol Sanguszko acquiring the rights to selected properties. An in-depth analysis of the historical source material reveals the complexity of the fight for the right to the Entail of Ostrog. From the moment he married Marianna in 1710, Sanguszko was an important political player, consistently accomplishing his objectives. Thanks to his spouse and the support she showed him, firstly in a conflict with her brother Aleksander Dominik Lubomirski, and then with his opponents who tried to prove his wrongful activities, Sanguszko became the administrator of a huge estate in the 1720s. Marianna herself was not politically involved, with her lively and industrious spouse taking care of the prolonged court trials. The paper focuses on three important moments in her life, i.e. marriage, dowry conflict and political crisis after the death of her brother, Aleksander Dominik Lubomirski.

Key words: biography, Sanguszko Family, Ostrogski's entail

* This paper has been prepared in the course of a study conducted under the National Science Centre grant 'Dobrodziejki i klienci. Specyfika patronatu kobiecego i relacji klientalnych w czasach saskich' [Favors and clients. The specificity of women's patronage and customer relations in the Saxon era], grant number 2015/19/B/HS3/01797.

Owner of a huge manor, sister of the owner of Ostrogski's entail, sister of the Duchess of Neuburg¹, and finally the wife of Paweł Karol Sanguszko, the Court Marshal of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, Marianna Sanguszkowa née Lubomirska has not been the subject of academic interest². Little is known about her private life, activity and participation in the fight for the inheritance of the Entail of Ostrog³. The authors of several introductory papers who analysed the artistic commissions and the will left by her spouse mentioned very little about Marianna herself. Her biography, family relationships or social contacts were not discussed in the analyses of the eulogy delivered at her funeral in 1729⁴. The daughter of Teofila née Zasławski-Ostrogski, primo voto Wiśniowiecka, secundo voto Lubomirska (d. 1709)⁵ and Józef Karol Lubomirski (d. 1702)⁶, the wife of

¹ The sister of Marianna Sanguszko née Lubomirska was Teresa née Lubomirska (d. 1712), spouse of Count Palatine Charles Philip of Neuburg (d. 1742).

² Marianna Sanguszko née Lubomirska (1693–1729) – daughter of Teofila née Zasławski-Ostrogski and Józef Karol Lubomirski, second spouse of Paweł Karol Sanguszko, whom she married in 1710. Mother of the last heir of the Entail of Ostrog, Janusz Aleksander Sanguszko (d. 1775). Marianna had three siblings: a sister, Teresa, and two brothers, Jan and Aleksander (heir of the entail, deceased in 1720). Particular records regarding her biography can be found in the following sources: K. Niesiecki, *Herbarz Polski*, vol. 7, Lipsk 1842, p. 293; W. Rudziński *Właściciele Mińska w świetle dokumentów*, 'Rocznik Mińsko-Mazowiecki' 1992–1993, 1, p. 8; A.J. Baranowski, *Między Księstwem Litewskim a Koroną Polską. Wzrost roli rodu Sanguszków w Rzeczypospolitej na początku XVIII wieku*, in: *Wokół Sanguszków. Dzieje – sztuka – kultura. Materiały I ogólnopolskiej konferencji naukowej*, eds. J. Skrabski, B. Bułdys, Tarnów 2007, pp. 47–63; I. Czamańska, *Wiśniowieccy. Monografia rodu*, Poznań 2007, p. 346.

³ See. M. Pakoca, *Zapisy i zalecenia wobec żon w testamentach Pawła Karola Sanguszki (1680–1750) i jego syna Hieronima Janusza (1743–1812)*, 'Saeculum Christianum' 2014, 21, pp. 179–192; J. Marszałska, *Religious Foundations of Princes Lubartowicz – Sanguszko of Kowelski Lineage in the Turn of the 17th and 18th Century in Wołyń*, 'The Person and the Challenges' 2013, 3, 1, pp. 267–280.

⁴ I. Rolska-Boruch, *Panegiryk pogrzebowy Marianny z Lubomirskich Sanguszkowej jako źródło do dziejów fundacji artystycznych w XVIII wieku*, 'Roczniki Humanistyczne' 2010, 58, 4, pp. 161–169.

⁵ Teofila née Zasławski-Ostrogski, primo voto Wiśniowiecka, secundo voto Lubomirska (d. 1709) – daughter of Dominik Władysław Zasławski-Ostrogski and Katarzyna née Sobieska. Her first spouse was Dymitr Wiśniowiecki, the second was Józef Karol Lubomirski (separated from 1696); see J. Pietrzak, *Sprawa rozwodowa Teofili z Ostrogskich-Zasławskiej z Józefem Karolem Lubomirskim w latach 1695–1702*, 'Klio. Czasopismo poświęcone dziejom Polski i powszechnym' 2016, 39, 4, pp. 97–117; J. Horwat, *Działalność polityczna i wojskowa księcia Jerzego Dymitra Wiśniowieckiego: hetmana polnego (koronnego) wojewody bełskiego w latach 1669–1672*, 'Rocznik Przemyski' 1990, 27, pp. 157–182.

⁶ Józef Karol Lubomirski (d. 1702), son of Aleksander Michał Lubomirski and Helena Tekla née Ossolińska; I. Czamańska, *op. cit.*, p. 244; A. Przyboś, *Lubomirski Józef Karol*, in: *Polski Słownik Biograficzny* [hereinafter: PSB], vol. 18, Wrocław–Warszawa–Kraków 1973, p. 27.

the Lithuanian Court Marshal Paweł Karol Sanguszko (d. 1750)⁷ from 1710 to her death in 1729, Marianna is worthy of detailed research not only due to her social position and property, but most importantly because of her role in seizing the rights to the Entail of Ostrog after 1720⁸. An intriguing question in this respect is why there is so little biographical information, studies and sources regarding Marianna. It cannot be the scarcity of sources, given the number of economic documents and court files preserved in the Sanguszko Archive of the National Archive in Kraków. These present the activity of the duchess and provide substantial information on the major events in the dispute regarding the Entail of Ostrog. The duchess' correspondence is of key importance to this study. It contains abundant information as to the wars for the rights to the entail fought behind the scenes, valuable accounts of Paweł Karol Sanguszko himself, as well as a number of letters sent to the duchess from her family and relatives, presenting entirely new findings. At this point, however, it should be emphasized that an overwhelming majority of the source material are the letters addressed to Marianna, not these written by herself. This might have been one of the reasons for the low interest of researchers in the duchess. Her absence from the scientific discourse may also result from the fact that her role as the heiress to the entail has been largely underestimated. There are visible tendencies among researchers to analyze the attitudes and actions of persons regarded as more crucial, such as Aleksander Dominik

⁷ Paweł Karol Sanguszko (1680–1750), Court Treasurer of Lithuania (from 1711), Lithuanian Court Marshal (from 1713), Grand Marshal of Lithuania (od 1734). Married three times, firstly to Bronisława née Pieniążek (d. 1707), secondly to Marianna née Lubomirska (d. 1729), thirdly to Barbara née Dunin (d. 1791). After Marianna's brother Aleksander Dominik Lubomirski died without leaving an heir to the Entail of Ostrog Paweł Karol became the custodian of the estates. Following his wife's death in 1729, he maintained this role and kept it with his son Janusz Aleksander in mind. In 1738, they entered an agreement whereby Paweł Karol passed the administration of the entire entail onto Janusz Aleksander; see R. Marcinek, *Paweł Karol Sanguszko, książę (1680–1750)*, in: PSB, vol. 34, Wrocław–Warszawa–Kraków 1993, pp. 497–500.

⁸ Before 1720, the entail was the property of Aleksander Dominik Lubomirski (d. 1720) – the starost of Zator, Ryki and Sandomierz. Aleksander was a twin brother of Marianna, his mother was Teofila née Zasławska-Ostrogska, primo voto Wiśniowiecka, secundo voto Lubomirska (d. 1709), his father was Józef Karol Lubomirski. Aleksander Dominik inherited the rights to the Entail of Ostrog from his mother. This was not the first case the rules of entail inheritance were infringed upon. As early as in 1673, upon the death of Aleksander Janusz Zasławski, the Order of Malta was supposed to obtain the rights to the entail. After Aleksander Dominik Lubomirski died without an heir, these rights passed to his only sister, Marianna Sanguszkowa née Lubomirska, wife of Paweł Karol Sanguszko. Sanguszko managed the property until his son, Janusz Aleksander (born in 1712), came of age. The other children of the Sanguszkos died early.

Lubomirski, Paweł Karol Sanguszko⁹, or his son Janusz Aleksander Sanguszko¹⁰. The considerations presented in this paper are to fill the existing research gap at least partially. They constitute a preliminary presentation of the most important events in the duchess' biography, which are relevant to the fight for inheritance from the Lubomirski family and the Entail of Ostrog. The paper addresses the fundamental reasons behind the position the House of Sanguszko gained in the 1820s. The pivotal moments include the marriage between Marianna and Paweł Karol Sanguszko, the conflict with Aleksander Dominik Lubomirski over dowry, as well as the years 1720–1724, which were a period of political struggle for obtaining and maintaining the rights to the entail. The paper does not address the private life of the duchess, her unsuccessful attempts at pregnancy, relations with her son Janusz Aleksander, or social life. In view of the extensive source material available, these issues call for a much more comprehensive biographical study which would present Marianna Sanguszko née Lubomirska in a thorough and exhaustive manner.

An analysis of the vital events in Lubomirska's life suggests that it was primarily her happy and successful marriage that shaped her position. The daughter of Teofila née Zasławska Ostrogska (d. 1709) and Józef Karol Lubomirski (d. 1702) got married after the death of her parents, although the negotiations regarding the arranged relationship had begun while her mother was still alive¹¹. On April 9, 1710, she married Paweł Karol Sanguszko, who had been prematurely widowed by his previous wife¹². This was preceded by a conflict with the Lubomirski family,

⁹ A.J. Baranowski, *Między Księstwem Litewskim*, pp. 47–63; G. Czapska, *Pałac Sanguszków w Lubartowie*, 'Roczniki Humanistyczne' 1967, 15, 4, pp. 63–94; J. Rogulski, *Podróże i mobilność magnata epoki saskiej w świetle księgi skarbowej Pawła Karola Sanguszki z 1726 roku*, in: *Via viatores quaerit. Mobilność społeczna w dziejach krajów Grupy Wyszehradzkiej*, eds. A. Teterycz-Puzio, L. Kościelak, E. Łączyńska, Słupsk 2016, pp. 177–196; J. Skrabski, *Organizacja prac budowlanych i artystycznych na dworze Pawła Karola i Barbary Sanguszków*, in: *ibidem*, pp. 153–161; W. Komorowski, *Krakowskie pałace Sanguszków*, in: *ibidem*, pp. 129–140; J. Sito, *Warszawski pałac Sanguszków w rękach Heinricha Brühla* in: *ibidem*, pp. 147–151; I. Rolska-Boruch, *Fundacje Sanguszków w Lubelskiem w 2 połowie XVIII wieku*, in: *ibidem*, pp. 179–186.

¹⁰ Zob. T. Zielińska, *Ordynacje w dawnej Polsce*, 'Przegląd Historyczny' 1977, 68, 1, pp. 24–25.

¹¹ Letter from Paweł Karol [hereinafter: P.K.] Sanguszko to Teofila Lubomirska née Zasławska-Ostrogska, 3 September 1708, Archiwum Narodowe w Krakowie, Oddział I [hereinafter: ANKr I], Archiwum Sanguszków [hereinafter: ASang], file no. 292/2, p. 1.

¹² Marianna was the second spouse of Paweł Karol. His first spouse was his sister-in-law, Bronisława née Pieniążek, who had been married to his brother, Kazimierz Antoni Sanguszko (d. 1706). This marriage lasted only a year, with Bronisława dying childless in 1707. Upon her marriage to Sanguszko, Bronisława received the properties of Ostromęczyn, Witulin and Nosów as her dowry. The prenuptial agreement was signed on 15 February 1706; see ANKr I, ASang, rkps 937.

who did not approve of Sanguszko. They preferred Michał Lubomirski, the Crown Great Deputy Master of the Pantry (d. 1714)¹³. Ultimately, Aleksander Dominik Lubomirski did not consent to his sister's marriage to Sanguszko, yet she escaped to seek the help of the Radziwiłłs who supported Sanguszko. Thus the marriage ceremony was held in spite of the objections raised by the Lubomirski family¹⁴. It was Marianna's wealthy and influential sister, Anna Katarzyna Radziwiłłowa née Sanguszko (d. 1746)¹⁵, that brought the contested marriage to a conclusion. Due to the extraordinary circumstances, it was not preceded by a classical pre-wedding marriage settlement. Sanguszko, however, did not accede to enter into marriage without a satisfactory dowry proposal from the bride's relatives¹⁶. The Lithuanian Treasurer, therefore, made an appeal to Marianna's brother for at least the traditional amount of dowry under the principle of *czwarcizna* (referring to a quarter)¹⁷.

Due to the special circumstances of the marriage, the case of Marianna's dowry was promptly heard by the court. Her brother, Aleksander Dominik Lubomirski, was responsible for resolving the problem. Correspondence from that period shows that both parties made prompt efforts to reach

¹³ Michał Lubomirski (d. 1714) – Crown Great Deputy Master of the Pantry, son of Aleksander Michał Lubomirski and Katarzyna née Sapieha; see *Urzednicy centralni i nadworni Polski XIV–XVIII wieku. Spisy*, eds. A. Gašiorowski, Kórnik 1992 p. 134.

¹⁴ For more information on the marriage planned between Marianna Lubomirska and Michał Lubomirski as well as the circumstances in which this plan was changed, see: B. Popiołek, *Kobiety świat w czasach Augusta II. Studia nad mentalnością kobiet w kręgach szlacheckich*. 2nd ed., extended, Kraków 2018, pp. 229–230.

¹⁵ Anna Katarzyna Radziwiłł née Sanguszko (d. 1746) – wife of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania chancellor Karol Stanisław Radziwiłł (d. 1719), one of the most powerful magnates of the period under the rule of Augustus II the Strong. Upon the death of her husband, she was very active in politics and economy. For more information on her life and work, see: W. Karkucińska, *Anna z Sanguszków Radziwiłłowa (1676–1746). Działalność gospodarcza i mecenat*, Warszawa 2000; J. Dygdała, *Codziennie kłopoty, wielkie interesy i podwójna elekcja. Korespondencja radziwiłłowskich urzędników z księżną Anną z Sanguszków Radziwiłłową i jej synem Michałem Kazimierzem z 1733/1734*, Warszawa 2013.

¹⁶ ANKr I, ASang rkps 937, Fascykuł 6 [b.p]; the law stipulated that a bride lost the right to a dowry by entering into a marriage relationship secretly or against the will of her parents or legal guardians, the bride lost. There were several exceptions to that rule, such as the case in which the guardians prolonged the time the bride remained unmarried in order to profit from the possession of her property; see P. Dąbkowski, *Prawo prywatne polskie*, vol. 1, Lwów 1910, pp. 356–358.

¹⁷ For more information on the rule of *czwarcizna* and the dowry principles resulting therefrom, see: A. Penkała, *'Panieńskie ochędóstwo'. Kwestie posagowe i wienne w małżeństwach szlachty województwa krakowskiego w czasach saskich*, Kraków 2016, p. 66. Cf. W. Zielecka, *Sprawy spadkowe między najbliższymi krewnymi w sądach i księgach sądowych Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego w XVI–XVIII wieku*, in: *Praktyka życia publicznego w Rzeczypospolitej Obojga Narodów w XVI–XVIII wieku*, eds. U. Augustyniak, A.B. Zakrzewski, Warszawa 2010, p. 137.

an agreement. The first negotiations with Sanguszko began soon after the wedding. In September 1710, Lubomirski sent a letter in which he assured: 'I declared to give Jakubowice and Kijany with adjoining lands, three villages from the region of Lewartów: Tarło along with the farm, Baranówka and another one (not specified since no one here knows those lands) to my sister'¹⁸. Letters exchanged within the first months after the marriage indicate a very interesting aspect of the arrangements. Lubomirski wanted to help his sister to take over the property in an efficient manner. He warned one of his subordinates: '[...] due to the long distance, Duke Sanguszko cannot sign the indemnification soon enough. My sister is already on her way and she will need comfort so yield Jakubowice and Niciany to her *cum attentibus in possessionem*'¹⁹. Aleksander Dominik transferred the promised properties without waiting for the confirmation of the full settlement of formal issues by the Sanguszkos, i.e. that they had signed the official receipt documents. The source material confirms that he was not mistaken in trusting the honesty of his sister. In fact, according to the Sanguszkos' declaration, the relevant documents had been signed several days earlier. On September 19, 1710, Marianna and Paweł Karol signed an indemnification contract in which they agreed to temporarily settle for several landed estates being pledged in favour of them²⁰. As a result of the agreement, Marianna received a number of pledged assets, including a cluster of properties along with the palace in Jakubowice, Murowane in the Lublin powiat, Kijany, as well as Poddybie, Rudnik, Lewartów, and the clusters in Ostrowiec and Ćmielów²¹. The full payment of the dowry was postponed until, as was indicated in the documents, 'the friends of the Duchess would compose themselves in respect of her dowry'²². Aleksander Dominik tried to cool down his sister's emotions and resolve the matter amicably. Although Sanguszko attempted to obtain a sum higher than the one proposed by Lubomirski, he calmly explained: 'I did not demand any donations from you at that time, I was just asking for a record so that I could talk with the gentlemen from the tribunal, who urge me to be

¹⁸ Letter from Aleksander Dominik [hereinafter: AD] Lubomirski to NN from Kolbuszowa, 20 September 1710, ANKr I, ASang, file no. 426/5, p. 7.

¹⁹ A.D. Lubomirski to NN Kosza from Kolbuszowa, 3 October 1710, *ibidem*, p. 15.

²⁰ There are several errors in the work of I. Rolska-Borcuch. Marianna Sanguszko née Lubomirska was not given bride price at the wedding (but there was a dowry). She was not entitled to the Entail of Ostrog at that time. Cf. I. Rolska-Borcuch, *Panegiryk pogrzebowy Marianny z Lubomirskich Sanguszkowej jako źródło do dziejów fundacji artystycznych w XVIII wieku*, 'Roczniki Humanistyczne' 2010, 58, 4, p. 164.

²¹ See R. Marcinek, *op. cit.*, pp. 496–497; list of land properties indicated in the agreement: ANKr I, ASang, rkps 937, Fascykuł 6 [b.p].

²² ANKr I, ASang, rkps 937, Fascykuł 6 [b.p].

very cautious about this and warn about the consequences not only for me but also for your successors'²³. Aleksander further assured his sister of his constant support and even apologised for prolonging his deliberations on the division of property. The final agreement on the endowment of Paweł Karol Sanguszko's wife was signed in 1711. It stipulated that Marianna's dowry was to be paid from both maternal and parental property. A huge amount of 1,250,000 Polish zloty has been allocated for this purpose. The whole sum was divided according to the assumption that 700,000 Polish zloty was the value of the Lewartów property, whereas the Wałowice cluster was worth 120,000 Polish zloty, the Cmielów cluster – another 100,000, and the Ostrowiec cluster – 120,000. All these land estates were to be transferred to Marianna as hereditary property²⁴. The dowry passed on her in the form of land property was supplemented with 120,000 zloty in cash²⁵. In addition, Marianna received two residences from her brother – a palace in Lublin (located behind the convent for the Carmelite Sisters in Lublin) and a palace in Warsaw. Sanguszko was supposed to add a sum of 130,000 zloty for his wife to the dowry indicated in the contract. Given the further fate of Lubomirska's property, it was significant that Marianna and Paweł Karol entered into a life estate agreement whereby either spouse was guaranteed to use the other's property in the case of their death²⁶.

Despite all these agreements, there were still difficult property matters that had to be settled between the siblings. Both parties would be engaged in a long-term conflict over lands which Sanguszko considered to be the property of his wife. In June 1711, one of the correspondents alerted Aleksander Dominik: 'Mr Popiel will tell you what is going on here and how Duke Sanguszko has been talking the attorneys round'²⁷. Other representatives of the Lubomirski house joined in the mediation between the siblings. In 1711, Elżbieta Sieniawska née Lubomirska, the wife of the Kraków castellan, assured Marianna about her support. In one of her

²³ Letter from A. D. Lubomirski to Marianna [M.] Sanguszko née Lubomirska [b.m], [b.d], ANKr I, ASang, file no. 231/5, p. 61.

²⁴ These properties were finally settled when Aleksander Dominik Lubomirski transferred the right to the cluster in Cmielów and Ostrów Marianna 'for eternity' in 1711; ANKr I, ASang file no. 210/5, pp. 1–11; he also transferred the right to the Łokacze property in Volhynia in a separate document (the same year 1711); ANKr I, ASang, file no. 469/20, pp. 1–2.

²⁵ *Ibidem*.

²⁶ *Ibidem*. For more information on the principles of life estate, see U. Kicińska, *Umowa dożywocia jako przykład regulacji majątkowej małżonków w dawnej Polsce*, 'Rocznik Lubelskiego Towarzystwa Genealogicznego' 2014, 5, pp. 266–283.

²⁷ Letter from Adam Dorengowski to A.D. Lubomirski, Lublin, 14 June 1711, ANKr I, ASang, file no. 282/14, p. 39.

letters, she promised to promptly 'apply all the services and all the means [...] to facilitate the transaction with His Majesty the starost'²⁸. Yet the squabble over Marianna's dowry and the settlement between Sanguszko and Lubomirski went on for another few years. In 1716, Aleksander Dominik Lubomirski was forced to issue a document on the basis of which he settled some unregulated issues related to the dowry for Marianna²⁹. At that time, the amount to be paid was 67,000 zloty³⁰. In exchange for the underpaid dowry, Marianna and her husband were to keep the pledged part of the property which belonged to Aleksander Dominik, including the villages of Kijany and Jakubowice³¹. The starost then allowed the Sanguszkos to make some investments in those assets, as they had 'had no profit from these properties thus far'³². In 1719, the ordinate issued the last document undertaking to buy back the abovementioned lands³³. However, it should be emphasized that during his last years, Lubomirski was strengthening the family ties with the Sanguszkos, and they did not refuse to help him in difficult financial matters³⁴.

The Sanguszkos began to expand their existing powers and try to acquire the rights to the Entail of Ostrog in 1720. When Aleksander Dominik Lubomirski died without leaving a clear successor, the Sanguszkos aspired to take over both the property rights after Marianna's brother and the rights to the Entail. The first part began soon after Lubomirski's death. As early as 1720, Marianna was legally allowed to enter the Tarnów estate³⁵. The 'new benefactor' brought hope for those who had been hitherto somewhat dependent on the generosity of Aleksander Dominik Lubomirski. At the end of November 1720, Marianna received first correspondence from the monastery in Wiśnicz. The prior of the Barefoot Carmelites assured her that it was with 'heavy regret' that he learned of the death of the convent's previous benefactor. He did not, however, waste any time and fervently

²⁸ Letter from Elżbieta Sieniawska to Marianna Sanguszko née Lubomirska, Jaworów, 2 May 1711, ANKr I, ASang, file no. 282/34, p. 5.

²⁹ ANKr I, ASang, file no. 426/5, p. 27.

³⁰ In the document, Marianna was already referred to as the 'Lady of Ostrog and Zaslów, Duchess Sanguszko', *ibidem*, p. 27.

³¹ The previous agreement, entered into in 1713, provided that these properties would be pledged for the amount of the dowry to be paid. However, Aleksander Dominik Lubomirski was not able to buy it out, so he signed a document pledging the properties for another three years.

³² ANKr I, ASang, file no. 426/5, p. 28.

³³ For that purpose, Aleksander Dominik took out a loan from the wife of the Volhynia castellan, Jadwiga Zahorowska, and pledged a part of his heirlooms; see *ibidem*, p. 43.

³⁴ ANKr I, ASang, file no. 423b/11, p. 1.

³⁵ ANKr I, ASang, file no. 210/14, pp. 1–4.

pleaded with Marianna to secure the further existence of the order³⁶. He wrote to his new protector: 'We were orphaned and left in our tribulation without a protector. We ask your protection, Your Majesty, as our Sponsor and Benefactor'³⁷. For the Sanguszkos, to guarantee their legal succession required profound political and legal action. Marianna was being informed on an ongoing basis about the priorities that the environment supporting her was trying to advance during parliamentary sessions. She was repeatedly told by her confidants that the confirmation of her rights to the inherited property should be an undisputed fact, but to obtain the rights to the entail will require long-term efforts as well as the favour of the parliamentarians. One of the correspondents even warned her that her case 'would not be concluded until her right to succession is confirmed by the *constitutia*'³⁸. This was considered the key issue at the time, therefore all possible efforts were undertaken to ensure that this problem would not be discussed at every parliamentary session. For the Sanguszkos, this meant further fruitless disputes and rising costs.

The second stage, which was the takeover of the rights to the Entail of Ostrog, proved to be much more troublesome and time-consuming than expected. The Sanguszkos were immediately faced with the counterattack of August Czartoryski, the only member of the Order of Malta in the entire Commonwealth³⁹. Referring to the laws establishing the entail, Czartoryski tried to prove that earlier arrangements provide that it is the Order that should come into possession of the properties. Sanguszko's ambition was to prevent that from happening and he succeeded. Initially, King August II created the position of the entail administrator, appointing Jan Tarło (d. 1750)⁴⁰ and

³⁶ The Lubomirskis contributed to the Wiśnicz monastery very generously; see P.S. Szlezzynger, *Mauzoleum rodowe Lubomirskich w Nowym Wiśniczu*, 'Ochrona Zabytków' 1996, 49, 2, pp. 149–158; idem, *Fundacje architektoniczne S. Lubomirskiego, wojewody i starosty generalnego krakowskiego*, Kraków 1994, B.J. Wanat, *Architektura i wyposażenie kościoła i klasztoru Karmelitów bosych w Wiśniczu*, 'Folia Historica Cracoviensia' (journal review) 2013, 19, pp. 119–132; Z. Gogola, *Dzieje klasztoru Karmelitów bosych w Nowym Wiśniczu w latach 1630–2009*, 'Folia Historica Cracoviensia' 2013, 19, pp. 177–194.

³⁷ Letter from Fr. Julian, prior of the Barefoot Carmelites, to Marianna Sanguszko née Lubomirska, Wiśnicz 29 November 1720, ANKr I, ASang, file no. 231/5, p. 49.

³⁸ Letter from Fr. Karp to Marianna Sanguszko née Lubomirska, Warszawa 22 October 1722, *ibidem*, p. 108.

³⁹ August Aleksander Czartoryski (d. 1778) – son of Izabela née Morsztyn (d. 1758) and Kazimierz Czartoryski (d. 1741). Following his travel to Western Europe in 1713 together with his brother Michał, he decided to stay on Malta and join the Order of Malta. Upon his return to the Commonwealth, he represented the Order in cases regarding the entail; see K. Kuras, *Współpracownicy i klienci Augusta A. Czartoryskiego w czasach saskich*, Kraków 2010.

⁴⁰ Jan Tarło (d. 1750) – voivode of Sandomierz and Lublin, son of Stanisław Tarło, voivode of Lublin. Married four times, firstly to Marianna née Lubowiecka (annulled),

Stanisław Poniatowski (d. 1762)⁴¹. In 1721, Paweł Karol Sanguszko was also assigned to that role. The voivode of Kraków, Janusz Antoni Wiśniowiecki (d. 1741)⁴², was designated as the *super-arbitrator* for that case. Roman Marcinek, the author of the record of Paweł Karol Sanguszko in the Polish Biographical Dictionary, pointed out that, Sanguszko disrupted the work of the Sejm in 1722, although the subsequent decisions regarding the property should be made during its sessions. One of the tribunal judgments officially referred to Paweł Karol as the possessor of the entail and thus paved the way for his rights to the entail being confirmed⁴³.

An analysis of Marianna's correspondence sheds new light upon the events of 1720–1724, revealing previously unknown aspects of the programme pursued by her husband, the Lithuanian Court Marshal. Marianna's personal attitude remained completely unknown and unexplored, while she became the subject of a political storm. Although it was her husband that assumed the burden of fighting for their case in courts, Marianna was in great distress. Her relatives kept assuring her of their constant support. Even in May 1721, Krystyna Sapieżyna née Sanguszko (d. 1756)⁴⁴ reassured Marianna in these words: 'my dear sister, do not fuss [...] everyone believes that this business will be over soon, for God's sake'⁴⁵. Many friends assured Marianna about the magnates' support for Sanguszkos. The Grand Marshal of the Crown, Józef Wandalin Mniszech (d. 1747)⁴⁶, was to be particularly favourable to the case.

secondly (in 1722) to Elżbieta Łaszczowa née Modrzewska, thirdly to Elżbieta née Branicka, *primo voto* Potocka. His fourth wife was the young Zofia née Krasińska, whom he married four years prior to his death, in an unsuccessful attempt to produce at least one heir; see B. Popiołek, *Magdalena z Tarłów Lubomirska (d. 1728), wojewodzina krakowska: próba biografii*, 'Krakowskie Studia Małopolskie' 2013, 18, pp. 435–439.

⁴¹ Stanisław Poniatowski (d. 1762), Grand Treasurer of Lithuania, voivode of Mazowsze, castellan of Kraków, father of Stanisław August Poniatowski.

⁴² Archiwum Główne Akt Dawnych [hereinafter: AGAD], Archiwum Czołowskiego, no. 528, p. 120; Janusz Antoni Wiśniowiecki (d. 1741), castellan of Kraków from 1726, married to Teofila née Leszczyńska; see I. Czamańska, *op. cit.*, p. 364.

⁴³ See R. Marcinek, *op. cit.*, pp. 496–497.

⁴⁴ Krystyna Sapieha née Sanguszko, daughter of Hieronim Sanguszko and Konstancja Sanguszko née Sapieha, sister of Paweł Karol Sanguszko, spouse of Władysław Józefat Sapieha; see *Testamenty książąt Lubartowiczów-Sanguszków. wybór tekstów źródłowych z lat 1750–1876*, eds. J. M. Marszałska, W. Graczyk, Kraków 2011, p. 30.

⁴⁵ Letter from K. Sapieżyna to Marianna Sanguszko née Lubomirska, [b.m.] 16 May 1721, ANKr I, ASang, file no. 231/5, p. 1.

⁴⁶ Józef Wandalin Mniszech (d. 1747) – Grand Marshal of the Crown, son of Anna née Chodkiewicz and Jerzy Wandalin Mniszech. Married twice, firstly to Eleonora Ogińska, secondly to Konstancja née Tarło; see B. Popiołek, *Kostusieńka i Józieniek. Listy miłosne Konstancji z Tarłów i Józefa Wandalina Mniszcha, marszałkostwa wielkiego koronnego, jako przykład relacji małżeńskich w epoce saskiej*, in: *Epistolografia dawnej Rzeczypospolitej*, vol. 3:

The correspondents mentioned several times that ‘the marshal and his spouse declare their great affection and friendship towards the Duke and the Duchess’⁴⁷. Another correspondent confirmed that ‘the Duke’ himself approached the wife of the Marshal herself [Konstancja Mniszech née Tarło] in order to maintain the friendship with such high-ranking people and induce her to quicken the end [of the case]⁴⁸.

Marianna received regular messages about the situation in the Sejm and the resolutions made in their case. Among her best sources of information was Fr. Szwykowski. He notified his benefactor of the most important political events in an extremely compelling manner. When the authorities were deciding on the appointment of entail administrators, Marianna was informed that ‘The voivode of Lublin [Jan Tarło] and Poniatowski succumbed to the administration and so the case of the entail was forwarded to the Sejm’⁴⁹. Correspondence sent to her reveals some interesting and at the same time crucial aspects of the policy pursued by her husband, which cannot be elicited from other types of source. In one of the letters, Marianna was assured that the administrators of the entail, as well as the super-arbitrator, should be in favour of the her interests. Sanguszko was supposed to arrange everything beforehand. For the sake of objectivity, ‘The Voivode signs all legal matters pertaining to your case. Only in several instances has he called for a compromise for a more varied general picture’, whereas the super-arbitrator ‘signed all the documents, even if sometimes it was not absolutely necessary’⁵⁰. The support of the decision makers was, of course, not just a matter of courtesy. Each of the nobles involved in the case had previously received an appropriate compensation from the Marshal. In exchange for passing judgments in favour of the Sanguszkos, Wiśniowiecki received the pledged property in Wołowice with Sulejów and Kijany, as well as 40,000 zloty in cash on top of that. Poniatowski was to receive 30,000 zloty, whereas Gałęzowski, whose status was the least significant, 10,000 zloty⁵¹. In his letters to Marianna, Fr. Szwykowski commented on her husband’s policy in a characteristic way. He comforted her that ‘there were no other gifts,

Perspektywa historyczno-literacka (XV–XIX wiek), eds. P. Borek, M. Olma, Kraków 2013, pp. 157–196.

⁴⁷ Letter from Fr. Karp to Marianna Sanguszko née, Warszawa 1 October 1722, ANKr I, ASang, file no. 231/5, p. 93.

⁴⁸ Letter from Fr. Szwykowski to Marianna Sanguszko née Lubomirska, Opatów 6 June 1721, ANKr I, ASang, file no. 260/16, p. 7.

⁴⁹ Letter from Fr. Szwykowski to Marianna Sanguszko née Lubomirska, Opatów 7 June 1721, ANKr I, ASang, file no. 231/5, p. 33.

⁵⁰ *Ibidem*, p. 34.

⁵¹ *Ibidem*.

so your own property has been left unharmed'⁵². As it soon turned out, neither Poniatowski nor the Lublin voivode Jan Tarło helped the interests of the Sanguszkos in any way. In one of the letters from 1722, Marianna was informed that it was 'the Lublin voivode and others actually promoted the interest of the opposite party. Interestingly enough, the Lublin voivode remarked that the state would have never been able to reclaim the Entail of Ostrog from its current possessors, if the mandates had been cancelled and the case had not been forwarded to the Sejm court'⁵³. In another letter, Marianna received an even worse picture of the voivode's corruption. Although he had been previously paid 'one hundred thousand, he dared to support the interest of the opposite party only yesterday. Allegedly, he had declared to be in doubt whether he would continue to uphold his position'⁵⁴. Jan Tarło clearly tried to reduce the chances of resolving the case in favour of the interests of Sanguszkos, striving to implement the scenario proposed by Czartoryski.

The duchess's correspondents tried to depict the situation as realistically as possible, without avoiding some more uncomfortable topics and neither did they ignore the unofficial activities of the Marshal. The pivotal decisions regarding the entail were to be made ca. two years after the death of Aleksander Dominik Lubomirski. In her correspondence from 1722, Marianna seems to be well versed in the political matters regarding the disputed heritage. Particularly interesting fragments describe the Sanguszkos' efforts to bring the case to an end with a positive result. One of the concepts which had the greatest chance of a prompt success was to prevent the Sejm courts from handling the case. This, of course, required concentrated efforts outside the official political path. Unfortunately, Sanguszko probably failed to take advantage of several opportunities for advancing this course of action. Marianna received such information from one of her correspondents who was helping Paweł Karol with his business. He wrote to her, 'then we heard the cry [...] that the Duke did not present himself before the royal court upon his arrival, and if he had done it, then the king would not have issued the mandate'⁵⁵. It was thus necessary to work intensively along with the magnates who

⁵² Letter from Fr. Szwykowski to Marianna Sanguszko née Lubomirska, Opatów 7 June 1721, ANKr I, ASang, file no. 231/5, p. 34.

⁵³ Letter from Fr. Karp to Marianna Sanguszko née Lubomirska, Warszawa 4 November 1722, *ibidem*, p. 117.

⁵⁴ Letter from Fr. Karp to Marianna Sanguszko née Lubomirska, Warszawa 5 November 1722, *ibidem*, p. 127.

⁵⁵ Letter from Fr. Karp to Marianna Sanguszko née Lubomirska, Warszawa 1 October 1722, *ibidem*, p. 97.

favoured Sanguszko on the possibilities of forwarding their case to the entire Sejm. Marianna was repeatedly encouraged to follow this path, with her correspondents meticulously explaining that such action could prove only positive. Only then, they wrote, would the decision on the Entail of Ostrog be 'up to the whole Commonwealth and not just the Sejm courts'⁵⁶. The letters also reveal that the affiliates of the Sanguszkos believed to be strong enough to enforce the provisions favourable to the Marshal. The support for Paweł Karol was accentuated in the letters to his wife to the extent that one of her correspondents claimed that 'the entire chamber, except for Poniatowski and the Master of the Pantry, supports the Duke's interest'⁵⁷. In fact, Sanguszko could not count on such extensive support. Prematurely celebrating the imminent conclusion of the case, the correspondents sometimes took an extremely subjective stand on any adverse information. In 1724, Marianna received an emotional letter, in which Fr. Karp, her long-time correspondent and confidant, fervently recounted the situation in the Sejm. Embittered by the public accusation whereby 'it is the case of the entail that is stalling the Sejm operations [...] but I think I expressed myself sufficiently clearly when arguing that it is merely a plot designed by the Czartoryskis and the Lithuanian Treasurer to publicly discredit us'. Subsequently, he added that 'it is as false as it can be that we could have persuaded anyone to disrupt the Sejm. It would be unreasonable in every manner to go after late hearings at the Sejm courts'⁵⁸. Apparently, he took offence and did not want to acknowledge that the community of Sanguszko supporters effectively blocked parliamentary matters until a positive result of the entail dispute would be achieved.

A series of letters from Paweł Karol to his wife reveals additional interesting aspects of their activities over the years 1720–1724. He kept Marianna informed about the emerging factions so that she was perfectly familiar with the part of the nobility that favoured their interests. For instance, her husband assured her: 'They participated in today's session [...]. The primate [...] seems to favour us, but I am going to find out more tomorrow as I have invited him over for dinner'⁵⁹. The Marshal informed his wife about the steps he was going to take in order to guarantee their rights to the entail. He explained the principles governing the Sejm

⁵⁶ Letter from Fr. Karp to Marianna Sanguszko née Lubomirska, Warszawa 22 October 1722, *ibidem*, p. 107.

⁵⁷ *Ibidem*.

⁵⁸ Letter from Fr. Karp to Marianna Sanguszko née Lubomirska, Warszawa 9 November 1724, *ibidem*, p. 79.

⁵⁹ Letter from P.K. Sanguszko to Marianna Sanguszko née Lubomirska, Warszawa 23 January 1724, ANKr I, ASang, file no. 256/2, p. 41.

in detail. The duchess received regular updates on the next steps to be taken for the purpose of promptly finishing the proceedings. Thanks to her husband's instructions, she was aware which solutions could be the most beneficial for them. The Marshal reported his current progress the costs involved in the parliamentary struggle and paying for more clients. On the premise that the entail concerned both of them equally, Paweł Karol assured her that 'our business has been steadily going forward from the very beginning, we have more and more friends, although not without a price, because we have to pay them all the time, but we'll manage with God's help'⁶⁰. He tried to present Marianna's absence during parliamentary sessions as a weighty argument in the fight against his political opponents. Although Sanguszko did miss his wife, he also admitted that everybody respects her instructions and must capitulate faced with the argument that 'I cannot do this without my wife'⁶¹. All the communication she received could give her the impression that the whole struggle would be eventually successful thanks to their determination and the funds invested in the struggle. In October 1722, the Marshal reported to his wife from Warsaw: 'I haven't seen the king yet and they are making me a lot of fuss. Yet we managed to send the Marshal today as an envoy on behalf of me and the Dukes [...]. We must maintain and secure the Entail of Ostrog. There is no way we may allow any court judgments'⁶². Sanguszko's fears turned out to be justified. In 1722, Marianna Sanguszkowa née Lubomirska was refused the rights to the entail of Aleksander Dominik Lubomirski⁶³. It was only in subsequent years that Paweł Karol Sanguszko achieved his goal thanks to his clever political efforts and a favourable court ruling.

When the entail case needed no further involvement, Marianna gradually lost her interest in ongoing parliamentary affairs. It was Sanguszko who managed the properties and appointed administrators, thus becoming not only a guardian but also the chief custodian of the estates⁶⁴. Until the death of his wife, he was responsible for the entail, progressively arranging the management of their huge assets according to

⁶⁰ Letter from P.K. Sanguszko to Marianna Sanguszko née Lubomirska, Warszawa 2 June 1722, ANKr I, ASang, file no. 283/2, p. 19.

⁶¹ Letter from P.K. Sanguszko to Marianna Sanguszko née Lubomirska, Warszawa 29 October 1722, *ibidem*, p. 91.

⁶² Letter from P.K. Sanguszko to Marianna Sanguszko née Lubomirska, Warszawa 4 October 1722, ANKr I, ASang, file no. 2/9, p. 13.

⁶³ ANKr I, ASang, file no. 210/20, p. 1.

⁶⁴ For more information, see A. Penkała, *Sprawy ordynacji ostrogskiej w rękach Pawła Karola Sanguszki (1680–1750). Korelacja centrum-pogranicze w świetle korespondencji*, in: *Hranice a pohraničia. Ambivalentný charakter pohraničných území*, eds. P. Švorc, L. Harbulová, A. Chłosta-Sikorska, Preszów 2019, pp. 107–120.

his taste. The correspondence between the spouses allows us to conclude that their relationship was very happy until the very end. It was based on mutual understanding, support and undisguised fondness. Marianna Sanguszkowa née Lubomirski died on January 12, 1729⁶⁵. Shortly after her death, Sanguszko instructed his most trusted correspondents to ensure that his wife was honoured appropriately. On 13 January 1729, Paweł Karol sent out sorrowful messages confirming that his wife 'left this world yesterday at nine o'clock at night'⁶⁶. His plenipotentiaries were entrusted with all major steps. Sanguszko ordered 'funeral rites to be performed in Wiśnicz, in the Carmelite monastery, as well as at the parish church'. Moreover, he paid for the death knell in Krakow churches three times a day for two weeks to properly commemorate his beloved wife⁶⁷. The correspondence indicates that Sanguszko could not accept the loss of Marianna for months to come. In one of his letters, he wrote: 'despite the much regretted [...] loss of my wife, I cannot discard the *vivam et immortalam* friendship and affection I have in my heart for her'⁶⁸. Sanguszko waited until 1735 to marry his next wife, a seventeen-year-old Barbara née Dunin (who died 1791).

The compilation of the most important events which directly led to the acquisition of rights to certain assets by Marianna Sanguszko née Lubomirska and her husband Paweł Karol reveals the complexity of the dispute over the Entail of Ostrog. From the beginning of his marriage in 1710, Sanguszko entered the political arena as an important player and consistently strived to achieve his goals. Thanks to his spouse and the support she showed him, first in a conflict with her brother Aleksander Dominik Lubomirski, and then with his opponents who tried to prove his wrongful activities, Sanguszko became the administrator of a huge estate in the 1720s. Marianna herself was not politically involved, probably not only because of her health issues and frequent pregnancies. With her lively and industrious spouse taking care of prolonged court trials, she assumed the role of an intermediary and a beholder, watching attentively the events connected with her heritage. Upon the analysis of the extensive base of source materials concerning both Marianna Sanguszkowa née Lubomirska, her mother, Teofila Lubomirska née Zasławska-Ostrogska, her brother, Aleksander Dominik, and finally

⁶⁵ The funeral, catering for workers and the candles for Marianna's funeral cost nearly 3600 zloty; ANKr I, ASang, file no. 231/4, p. 26.

⁶⁶ Letter from P.K. Sanguszko to Kochowski, Kolbuszowa 13 January 1729, ANKr I, ASang, file no. 255/4, p. 41.

⁶⁷ *Ibidem*, p. 41.

⁶⁸ The funeral was held on 12 December 1729 in Wiśnicz; Letter from P.K. Sanguszko to Józef Sapieha, Lewartów, 16 December 1729, AGAD, Archiwum Roskie, no. LV/16, p. 5.

also the substantial legacy of Paweł Karol Sanguszko, it will be possible to conduct an comprehensive and in-depth study aimed at thorough investigation of the circumstances which allowed for the Entail of Ostrog to be taken over by the House of Sanguszko and more detailed biography of Marianna Sanguszkowa née Lubomirska herself.

REFERENCES

Archival sources

Archiwum Narodowe w Krakowie, Oddział I:
 Archiwum Sanguszków: file no. 2/9, 210/5, 210/14, 210/20, 231/5, 231/4, 255/4, 256/2, 260/16, 282/14, 282/34, 283/2, 292/2, 423b/11, 426/5, 469/20, rkps 937.
 Archiwum Główne Akt Dawnych:
 Archiwum Roskie: no. LV/16
 Archiwum Czołowskiego, no. 528.

Studies

- Baranowski A.J., *Między Księstwem Litewskim a Koroną Polską. Wzrost roli rodu Sanguszków w Rzeczypospolitej na początku XVIII wieku*, in: *Wokół Sanguszków. Dzieje – sztuka – kultura. Materiały I ogólnopolskiej konferencji naukowej*, eds. J. Skrabski, B. Bułdys, Tarnów 2007.
- Czamańska I., *Wiśniowieccy. Monografia rodu*, Poznań 2007.
- Czapska G., *Pałac Sanguszków w Lubartowie*, 'Roczniki Humanistyczne' 1967, 15, 4.
- Dąbkowski P., *Prawo prywatne polskie*, vol. 1, Lwów 1910.
- Dydała J., *Codzienne kłopoty, wielkie interesy i podwójna elekcja. Korespondencja radziwiłłowskich urzędników z księżną Anną z Sanguszków Radziwiłłową i jej synem Michałem Kazimierzem z 1733/1734*, Warszawa 2013.
- Gogola Z., *Dzieje klasztoru Karmelitów bosych w Nowym Wiśniczu w latach 1630–2009*, 'Folia Historica Cracoviensia' 2013, 19.
- Horwat J., *Działalność polityczna i wojskowa księcia Jerzego Dymitra Wiśniowieckiego: hetmana polnego (koronnego) wojewody bełskiego w latach 1669–1672*, 'Rocznik Przemyski' 1990, 27.
- Karkucińska W., *Anna z Sanguszków Radziwiłłowa (1676–1746). Działalność gospodarcza i mecenat*, Warszawa 2000.
- Kicińska U., *Umowa dożywocia jako przykład regulacji majątkowej małżonków w dawnej Polsce*, 'Rocznik Lubelskiego Towarzystwa Genealogicznego' 2014, 5.
- Komorowski W., *Krakowskie pałace Sanguszków*, in: *Wokół Sanguszków. Dzieje – sztuka – kultura. Materiały I ogólnopolskiej konferencji naukowej*, eds. J. Skrabski, B. Bułdys, Tarnów 2007.
- Kuras K., *Współpracownicy i klienci Augusta A. Czartoryskiego w czasach saskich*, Kraków 2010.
- Marcinek R., *Paweł Karol Sanguszko, książę (1680–1750)*, in: *Polski Słownik Biograficzny*, vol. 34, Wrocław–Warszawa–Kraków 1993.
- Marszalska J., *Religious Foundations of Princes Lubartowicz – Sanguszko of Kowelski Lineage. In the Turn of the 17th and 18th Century in Wołyń*, 'The Person and the Challenges' 2013, 3, 1.
- Pakoca M., *Zapisy i zalecenia wobec żon w testamentach Pawła Karola Sanguszki (1680–1750) i jego syna Hieronima Janusza (1743–1812)*, 'Saeculum Christianum' 2014, 21.
- Penkała A., *'Panięńskie ochędstwo'. Kwestie posagowe i wienne w małżeństwach szlachty województwa krakowskiego w czasach saskich*, Kraków 2016.

- Penkała A., *Sprawy ordynacji ostrogskiej w rękach Pawła Karola Sanguszki (1680–1750). Korelacja centrum-pogranicze w świetle korespondencji*, in: *Hranice a pohraničia. Ambivalentný charakter pohraničných území*, eds. P. Švorc, L. Harbuľová, A. Chłosta-Sikorska, Preszów 2019
- Pietrzak J., *Sprawa rozwodowa Teofili z Ostrogskich-Zasławskiej z Józefem Karolem Lubomirskim w latach 1695–1702*, 'Klio-czasopismo poświęcone dziejom Polski i powszechnym' 2016, 39, 4.
- Popiołek B., *Kobiety świat w czasach Augusta II. Studia nad mentalnością kobiet z kręgów szlacheckich*, wydanie II poszerzone, Kraków 2018.
- Popiołek B., *Kostusienka i Józieniek. Listy miłosne Konstancji z Tarłów i Józefa Wandalina Mniszcha, marszałkostwa wielkiego koronnego, jako przykład relacji małżeńskich w epoce saskiej*, in: *Epistolografia dawnej Rzeczypospolitej*, vol. 3: *Perspektywa historyczno-literacka (XV–XIX wiek)*, eds. P. Borek, M. Olma, Kraków 2013.
- Popiołek B., *Magdalena z Tarłów Lubomirska (zm. 1728), wojewodzina krakowska: próba biografii*, 'Krakowskie Studia Małopolskie' 2013, 18.
- Przyboś A., *Lubomirski Józef Karol*, in: *Polski Słownik Biograficzny*, vol. 18, Wrocław–Warszawa–Kraków 1973.
- Rogulski J., *Podróże i mobilność magnata epoki saskiej w świetle księgi skarbowej Pawła Karola Sanguszki z 1726 roku*, in: *Via viatores quaerit. Mobilność społeczna w dziejach krajów Grupy Wyszehradzkiej*, eds. A. Teterycz-Puzio, L. Kościelak, E. Łączyńska, Słupsk 2016.
- Rolska-Boruch I., *Fundacje Sanguszków w Lubelskiem w 2 połowie XVIII wieku*, in: *Wokół Sanguszków. Dzieje – sztuka – kultura. Materiały I ogólnopolskiej konferencji naukowej*, eds. J. Skrabski, B. Bułdys, Tarnów 2007.
- Rolska-Boruch I., *Panegiryk pogrzebowy Marianny z Lubomirskich Sanguszkowej jako źródło do dziejów fundacji artystycznych w XVIII wieku*, 'Roczniki Humanistyczne' 2010, 58, 1.
- Rudziński W., *Właściciele Mińska w świetle dokumentów*, 'Rocznik Mińsko-Mazowiecki' 1992–1993, 1.
- Sito J., *Warszawski pałac Sanguszków w rękach Heinricha Brühla*, in: *Wokół Sanguszków. Dzieje – sztuka – kultura. Materiały I ogólnopolskiej konferencji naukowej*, eds. J. Skrabski, B. Bułdys, Tarnów 2007.
- Skrabski J., *Organizacja prac budowlanych i artystycznych na dworze Pawła Karola i Barbary Sanguszków*, in: *Wokół Sanguszków. Dzieje – sztuka – kultura. Materiały I ogólnopolskiej konferencji naukowej*, eds. J. Skrabski, B. Bułdys, Tarnów 2007.
- Szlezzynger P.S., *Fundacje architektoniczne S. Lubomirskiego, wojewody i starosty generalnego krakowskiego*, Kraków 1994.
- Szlezzynger P.S., *Mauzoleum rodowe Lubomirskich w Nowym Wiśniczu*, 'Ochrona Zabytków' 1996, 49, 2.
- Testamenty książąt Lubartowiczów-Sanguszków. wybór tekstów źródłowych z lat 1750–1876*, eds. J. M. Marszałska, W. Graczyk, Kraków 2011.
- Urzednicy centralni i nadworni Polski XIV–XVIII wieku. Spisy*, ed. A. Gąsiorowski, Kórnik 1992.
- Wanat B.J., *Architektura i wyposażenie kościoła i klasztoru Karmelitów bosych w Wiśniczu*, 'Folia Historica Cracoviensia' 2013, 19.
- Zielińska T., *Ordynacje w dawnej Polsce*, 'Przegląd Historyczny' 1977, 68, 1.

STRESZCZENIE

Postać Marianny z Lubomirskich Sanguszkowej nie była dotychczas przedmiotem zainteresowania badaczy. Choć Lubomirska była posiadaczką olbrzymiego majątku, siostrą ordynata ostrogskiego i księżnej neuburskiej, a wreszcie żoną marszałka nadwornego litewskiego, nie odegrała znaczącej roli politycznej. O jej życiu, działalności i udziale

w walce o spadek po ordynacji ostrogskiej wiadomo niewiele. W artykule podjęto próbę przybliżenia najistotniejszych momentów, które bezpośrednio wpłynęły na pozyskanie praw do określonych majątków przez Mariannę z Lubomirskich Sanguszkową i jej męża Pawła Karola. Gruntowna analiza zachowanego materiału źródłowego ujawnia bowiem złożoność spornego problemu walki o ordynację ostrogską. Od momentu małżeństwa, zawartego w 1710 r., Sanguszko wkroczył na arenę polityczną jako ważny gracz, konsekwentnie zdobywający założone cele. Dzięki osobie swej małżonki, a także jej ewidentnemu poparciu – udzielonemu najpierw w konflikcie z bratem Aleksandrem Dominikiem Lubomirskim, a następnie z przeciwnikami, usiłującymi wykazać bezprawność działań – Sanguszko od lat dwudziestych XVIII w. stał się zarządcą ogromnego majątku. Marianna sama prawie nie angażowała się politycznie, zostawiwszy sprawy przeciągających się batalii sejmowych rzutkiemu i operatywnemu małżonkowi. Artykuł oparto na trzech kluczowych wydarzeniach z życia księżnej – małżeństwu, walce o wyznaczenie posagu i wydarzeniach po śmierci brata Aleksandra Dominika Lubomirskiego.

Słowa kluczowe: biografia, Sanguszkowie, ordynacja

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Anna Penkała-Jastrzębska, PhD – assistant professor in the Institute of History and Archival Studies at the Pedagogical University of Cracow. She completed a doctoral course in the years 2012–2016 at the Faculty of Humanities at the Pedagogical University of Cracow. The paper was devoted to the financial aspects of marriages between noble families, in particular in the area of former Kraków voivodship, and was published in the form of a monograph: *'Panieńskie ochędóstwo'. Kwestie posagowe i wienne w małżeństwach szlachty województwa krakowskiego w czasach saskich* (publishing house LIBRON, Kraków 2016). E-mail: penkala.anna@gmail.com.