

Grzegorz Wrona

(Maria Curie-Skłodowska University in Lublin, Poland)

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6851-2799>

E-mail: grzegorz.wrona@poczta.umcs.lublin.pl; grzes_wrona@o2.pl

Treasury Contracts for Sambor Crown Estate in the Second Half of 17th and 18th Centuries

*Kontrakty skarbowe na dobra ekonomii samborskiej
z drugiej połowy XVII i XVIII wieku*

ABSTRACT

The purpose of the article is to analyse the treasury contracts for Sambor crown estate from the 17th and 18th centuries. The focus is on the conditions under which the monarchs decided to lease or give into administration to the faithful hands („ad fideles manus”) the lands of „Samborszczyzna”. The historical sources have allowed to describe the role of the contrahents in the scope of organization and functioning of crown estate, the appointment of the members in the control and management apparatus as well as in the judicial system. Their duties to the property and the people living in it, activities aimed at guaranteeing the integrity of the crown lands and its profitability, as well as the consequences resulting from non-compliance with the conditions of the contracts were presented as well. The considerations are based mainly on the manuscripts stored in the Central Archives of Historical Records in Warsaw, supported by the documents from the

PUBLICATION INFO			
			
		e-ISSN: 2449-8467 ISSN: 2082-6060	
THE AUTHOR'S ADDRESS: Grzegorz Wrona, the Institute of History of the Maria Curie-Skłodowska University in Lublin, Pl. M. Curie-Skłodowskiej 4A, 20-031 Lublin, Poland			
SOURCE OF FUNDING: The research was finalised thanks to the funding from the National Science Centre, allocated as part of the financing of an internship after obtaining the PhD degree, on the basis of the decision no. UMO-2016/20/S/HS3/00560			
SUBMITTED: 2019.07.03	ACCEPTED: 2021.04.12	PUBLISHED ONLINE: 2021.06.30	
WEBSITE OF THE JOURNAL: https://journals.umcs.pl/rh		EDITORIAL COMMITTEE E-mail: reshistorica@umcs.pl	

Scientific Library of the Ivan Franko National University in Lviv and Central National Historical Archives in Lviv.

Key words: Sambor crown estate, crown lands, royal demesne, treasury contracts, leasehold, leaseholders, saltworks

STRESZCZENIE

Ekonomia samborska należała do największych pod względem powierzchni i najbardziej dochodowych spośród wszystkich koronnych i litewskich dóbr stołowych. Wydzielona została mocą konstytucji sejmowych pod koniec XVI w. jako uposażenie królów Rzeczypospolitej. Monarchowie nie zarządzali tymi dobrami bezpośrednio, lecz decydowali się na ich wydzierżawianie lub oddawanie w administrację w ramach tzw. zarządu do wiernych. Efektem tego było powstanie kontraktów skarbowych, w których określano warunki i zasady zarządzania dobrami samborskimi przez dzierżawców i administratorów. Analiza konstrukcji zachowanych umów i treści zawartych w nich zapisów pozwoliła zaprezentować zbiorowość zarządców ekonomii oraz sprawowane przez nich urzędy i pełnione stanowiska. Scharakteryzowano ich uprawnienia w zakresie organizacji i funkcjonowania dóbr, powoływania członków aparatu kontrolno-zarządzającego i sprawowania wymiaru sprawiedliwości. Przedmiotem analizy uczyniono obowiązki administratorów i dzierżawców względem królewskiej majetności, ich prawa wobec zamieszkujących ją poddanych, działania, jakie podejmować mieli w celu zagwarantowania integralności ekonomii i jej dochodowości, oraz konsekwencje wynikające z nieprzestrzegania zapisów umów. Rozważania przeprowadzono na podstawie materiałów rękopiśmiennych przechowywanych w zasobach Archiwum Głównego Akt Dawnych w Warszawie, Biblioteki Naukowej Lwowskiego Uniwersytetu Narodowego im. Iwana Franki oraz Centralnego Państwowego Archiwum Historycznego Ukrainy we Lwowie.

Słowa kluczowe: ekonomia samborska, dobra stołowe, kontrakty skarbowe, umowy dzierżawne, zarząd do wiernych rąk, administratorzy, dzierżawcy, żupy solne

Royal properties, *bona mensae regiae*, also referred to as „table estates” and „economies” were territorial and administrative units separated from the royal lands, the revenues of which were used to finance the king and his court. They were delineated by the constitution of the Sejm adopted in 1589–1590, first in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and then in the Kingdom of Poland¹. The largest crown economy in terms of its total area was the Sambor crown estate, which comprised three cities (Sambor, also known as Nowy Sambor, Stary Sambor, also referred to as Stare Miasto and Stara Sól), along with about 130 villages and saltworks. It was located in the area of Przemyśl and Sanok in the Ruthenian province². The table estates constituted the property of each ruler and were

¹ *Volumina Legum, Przedruk zbioru praw staraniem xx Pijarów w Warszawie, od roku 1732 do roku 1782, [dalej: VL], t. 2, Petersburg, 1859, s. 282, 289, 312.*

² Selected aspects concerning the functioning and organisation of the Sambor estate in modern times were addressed by Ukrainian scholars. Cf. В.Ф. Інкін, *Розвиток феодалної*

supervised by the court treasurers (Royal Treasurer in the Kingdom of Poland and the Lithuanian Treasurer in Lithuania). The only exception to that rule was the period of interregnum, when they were under the administration of the superior treasurers, who controlled the state treasury. The monarch did not manage the royal lands and economies directly, instead, he would usually provide them to his loyal supporters by means of short-term leases or mandates. The contracts, resulting from this process, enable us to discover the detailed terms and conditions of contracts concluded between the king and administrators of table estates³.

ренти в Самбірській економії у другій половині XVI на початку XVII століття, „Вісник Львівського університету. Серія історична” 1967, 4, s. 79–91; *idem*, *Сільське суспільство Галицького Прикарпаття у XVI–XVIII століттях: історичні нариси*, red. М. Крикун, Львів 2004; М.Є. Гарасимчук, *Діяльність королівської комісії в Самбірській економії та комісарська книга 1696 року*, „Вісник Львівського університету. Серія Книгознавство, бібліотекознавство та інформаційні технології” 2014, 9, s. 154–165; *idem*, *Функціонування замкової та старосольської жупної канцелярії на території Самбірської економії в XVII столітті*, „Вісник Львівського університету. Серія історична” 2015, 51, s. 243–264; *idem*, *Замкові книги Самбірської економії першої половини XVII століття як джерело до шляхетської й селянської генеалогії*, „Генеалогічні записки Українського геральдичного товариства” 2014, 12, s. 17–26; І. Смуток, *Адміністратори Самбірської економії (кінець XVI–XVIII ст.)*, в: *Дрогобицький краєзнавчий збірник*, Вип. 4, Дрогобич 2000, s. 351–382; *idem*, *Архів Самбірської економії як джерело до історії міст і сіл Прикарпаття*, „Студії з історії архівної справи та документознавства” 2003, 10, s. 137–139; *idem*, *Організація управління Самбірської економії в XVI–XVIII ст. (характеристика документальних матеріалів)*, в: *Дрогобицький краєзнавчий збірник*, Вип. 3, Дрогобич 1998, s. 276–286.

³ Treasure contracts for the Sambor table estate are held in the Archiwum Główne Akt Dawnych w Warszawie [dalej: AGAD] in Metryka Koronna fonds [dalej: MK], sygn. Lustracje dz. XVIII 78, k. 102–106, *Kontrakt o arendę ekonomii samborskiej z urodzonym Stanisławem Skarszewskim do lat 4 (1656–1660)*; k. 131–134, *Kontrakt o arendę ekonomii samborskiej z urodzonym Stanisławem Skarszewskim do lat 3 (1660–1663)*; k. 312–314, *Kontrakt o ekonomię samborską z urodzonym Adamem Biskupskim starostą wieluńskim na lat 4 zawarty*; sygn. Lustracje dz. XVIII 79, k. 48–50, *Kontrakt o ekonomię samborską z urodzonym Janem Leonardem Ebertzem na lata 3 (1695–1698)*; k. 101–106, *Kontrakt na ekonomię samborską z Panem Konstantym Wapowskim, stolnikiem koronnym i podkomorzym ziemi przemyskiej i z Panem Arturem Forbesem, generalnym postmaistrem koronnym i z Panem Robertem Lowem, administratorem ceł małopolskich na lat 5 (1701–1706)*; sygn. Lustracje dz. XVIII 80, k. 119–122, *Kontrakt trzyletni o ekonomię samborską z urodzonym baronem [Gasparem Ernestem] Blumenthalem na lata 1715–1718*; sygn. Lustracje dz. XVIII 81, k. 119–131, *Kontrakt o sześćoletnią arendę ekonomii samborskiej z urodzonym Gasparem Ernestem Blumenthalem na lata 1724–1730*, and in the Archiwum Kameralne fonds [dalej: AK]: sygn. I/3, k. 161–175, *Kontrakt na sześćoletnią arendę o żupy krakowskie bocheńskie i wielickie oraz o ekonomię samborską z urodzonym Gasparem Ernestem Blumenthalem*; sygn. II/61, k. 181–191, *Kontrakt na sześćoletnią arendę ekonomii samborskiej z urodzonym Antonim Werenką, stolnikiem żytomirskim i Janem Wężykiem, majorem wojsk koronnych (1743–1749)*; sygn. II/123, k. 72–86, *Prorogacyja kontraktu sześćoletniego ad 1 Juli 1755 ad ultemam Juni 1761*

Treasury contracts for Sambor table estate start with records informing about the identity of their new supervisor. In the source materials, that person was usually referred to as a „contractor”, „administrator” or a „tenant”, depending on the form of management over the property⁴. The first part was followed by the list of official posts and functions held by the administrator. They allow us to establish their backgrounds, social standings and political experience, measured by the importance of their posts and functions in the Commonwealth. Unfortunately, the content of preserved source materials often makes it impossible to find out the motives, which determined the appointment of an administrator. It can be however assumed that the activity in gathering estates, as well as having numerous and important public service functions were factors taken into consideration by the king in the case of people, who wanted to manage royal estates. The candidates’ proficiency in growing their own estates seemed to be a guarantee of due care for the property entrusted to them by the ruler. Franciszek Leśniak also mentioned individual characteristics and strengths of the candidates, including organisational skills, experience, reliability and diligence in the performance of their duties, among many factors, which allowed the king to determine who would manage their table estates. In the case of managing estates by trusted supporters, it seemed only rational and reasonable to entrust the estate to a candidate, who guaranteed the highest possible income to the royal treasury⁵.

In the second half of the 17th century, the ranks of the administrators of the Sambor estate included mainly people connected with the ruler’s closest supporters, including courtiers (Stanisław Skarszewski, Jan Leonard Ebertz), royal secretaries (Adam Kotowski, Jan Wodnicki) and central officials responsible for state finances (royal treasurers). The biographies and profiles of some of the tenants bear mentions of them holding local official posts – town starost (Stanisław Skarszewski, Adam Biskupski) and chamberlain (Konstanty Wapowski). In the 18th century, the managers of Sambor table estate still included the representatives of court (stewards and high stewards), local (Gaspar Ernest Blumenthal)

o ekonomią samborską z urodzonym Ludwikiem Graffem de Nostitz Drzewieckim, woysk naszych generał majorem (a copy of this contract can also be found in the AGAD, AK, sygn. II/173, k. 135–144).

⁴ The surviving source documentation proves that the terms „administrator” and „tenant” were used interchangeably in the case of administrators of the Sambor table estate appointed on the basis of treasury contracts, regardless of the actual form of management. Cf. G. Wrona, *Rewizja komisji skarbowej w ekonomii samborskiej w 1698 roku*, „Roczniki Dziejów Społecznych i Gospodarczych” 2018, 79, s. 15, przyp. 22.

⁵ F. Leśniak, *Wielkorządcy krakowscy w XVI–XVIII wieku. Gospodarze zamku wawelskiego i majątku wielkorządowego*, Kraków 1996, s. 240.

and central (Teodor Wessel) officials. In mid-18th century, just like in the governments of Krakow⁶, people connected with the army (Jan Baptysta Renard, Marcin Wieniawski, Jan Bukowski), even majors and generals (Artur Forbes, Jan Wężyk and Ludwik de Nostitz Drzewiecki) became tenants of the royal estates⁷.

The duration of the contracts was mentioned in the next section, including the day, month and year of their conclusion, as well as the exact dates of their expiry. In the analysed period, these contracts were concluded for the period ranging from 1 to 8 years. In the second half of the 17th century, short-term leases, usually 3-year-long, were prevalent, which is evidenced by the contracts concluded with Stanisław Skarszewski, Adam Biskupski, Adam Kotowski, Andrzej Rzeczycki and Jan Leonard Ebertz. In the 18th century, longer contracts lasting for from 5 to 8 years were also recorded. Among the longest were six-year contracts concluded with Gaspar Ernest Blumenthal, Antoni Werenka and Jan Wężyk, Ludwik de Nostitz Drzewiecki and Piotr de Gartenberg Sadogórski. The latter two tenants were appointed as administrators for a seven-year period⁸. The longest recorded contract was an eight-year one concluded with Jan Renard, although it is known that the cupbearer of Nur finished managing the estate before the contract expired. One of the most interesting contracts is the one with Count Teodor Wessel, concluded in 1762, according to which in line with the royal decision, the crown treasurer was given the Sambor estate for a lifetime lease.

Some leases had to end before the contractually agreed date due to the death of the manager. The lease of Adam Biskupski, starost of Wieluń was particularly short-lived, as it was interrupted by his death only two years after his nomination in 1665. Franciszek Borzęcki and Ludwik de Nostitz Drzewiecki died while holding that office as well, and the latter was replaced by his wife Eleonora de Zeidlitz de Nostitz Drzewiecka. She leased the table estate since 1758, in accordance with a contract signed three years earlier by her husband, which guaranteed Drzewiecki's heirs that in the event of his death, they would have the right to continue managing the estate and fulfil the conditions of the contract concluded for 1755–1761⁹.

In several cases, the ruler decided to continue a successful cooperation with the current manager by concluding further contracts with them.

⁶ *Ibidem*, s. 236.

⁷ See the table contained in this paper.

⁸ AGAD, AK, sygn. II/123, k. 72–86; sygn. II/232, k. 57.

⁹ AGAD, AK, sygn. II/137, k. 58–59; sygn. II/173, k. 143. See the table contained in this paper.

Stanisław Skarszewski managed the Sambor estate on such terms. After the expiration of the first contract in 1660, another three-year contract was concluded, later extended until 1665. A similar situation took place in the case of Konstanty Wapowski and Gaspar Ernest Blumenthal. The first lease agreement with the royal chamberlain was signed for the years 1713–1716, after which it was renewed in the next decade for the years 1724–1730. The source materials also mention one-year contracts preceding the conclusion of another contract. This was the case with Ludwik de Nostitz Drzewiecki. After the expiry of the one-year lease, he was given another lease agreement for 1748–1755¹⁰. The extension of the contract for the years 1755–1761 made Drzewiecki one of the administrators with the most extensive experience in managing table estates, alongside Gaspar Blumenthal and Stanisław Skarszewski.

The subsequent part of the treasury contracts described the manner in which the royal lands were to be managed. The management took the form of a lease, however, in some cases it could also be management by loyal hands („ad fideles manus”). In the period in question, the main form of administration of the Sambor estate used was a short-term lease (with the exception of Teodor Wessel’s lifelong lease). Tenants were obliged to pay their rent on time in fixed annual instalments. The central treasury authorities had the right to terminate the existing contract in the event of a failure to comply with this provision, and take over the estate, along with the entire salt stock. This kind of information was recorded in a number of surviving contracts¹¹. In a document concluded in 1695 with Jan Leonard Ebertz, a period of two weeks after the agreed payment date was envisaged, allowing the tenant to settle the arrears with the royal treasury¹². Including provisions concerning the timely payment of financial obligations proves their particular importance from the point of view of the treasury authorities. It seems that timely payments could have been used as the basis for a possible extension of the contract for the following years. On the other hand, delays in payments of rent instalments probably had a negative impact on the possibility of lease renewal, and in the worst case scenario it could have resulted in early termination of the contract. It is possible that Jan Ebertz’s financial negligence led to him losing the chance at extending the lease agreement for a longer period of

¹⁰ AGAD, AK, sygn. III/232, k. 108.

¹¹ AGAD, MK, sygn. Lustracje dz. XVIII 79, k. 101v; sygn. Lustracje dz. XVIII 80, k. 119v; AGAD, AK, sygn. II/61, k. 182; sygn. II/137, k. 182.

¹² AGAD, MK, sygn. Lustracje dz. XVIII 78, k. 48–48v.

time. We learn about this from the accounts of the royal commissioners controlling the Sambor estate between July and September 1698¹³.

The second form of economic governance of the estate included the so-called management by loyal hands, or *ad manus fideles in tenutam*. Such a model involved overseeing the estate in return for a certain remuneration, as well as an obligation to settle the revenues and expenditures with the royal treasury¹⁴. The list of Sambor tenants, who were managing the estate as its administrators, includes Andrzej Rzeczycki and Jan Bukowski¹⁵.

The vast majority of administrators and lessees of Sambor held the estate on their own. In several cases, the ruler decided to entrust the estate to a group of administrators. In 1667, after Adam Biskupski's death, in accordance with King John Casimir's decision, the royal secretaries Adam Kotowski and Jan Wodnicki became the administrators of the estate. They were to manage the estate in line with the conditions set out in the contract signed with their predecessor¹⁶. Similarly, in 1743–1749, Antoni Werenka and Jan Wężyk¹⁷ were tenants of the Sambor estate. After the expiry of the contract with Konstanty Wapowski, the crown steward and chamberlain of Przemyśl, a contract for the next five years was concluded with him in 1702. This time he was to manage the royal estate together with Artur Forbes, the general postmeister, as well as Robert Low, the administrator of customs in Lesser Poland. The decision was dictated by the fact that they had the relevant skills and knowledge in economic matters, and the royal treasury was well-aware of that fact¹⁸.

An important element of each of the contracts was the form and amount of rent, in exchange for which the ruler gave the estate to the tenants. In the second half of the 17th century and at the beginning of the 18th century they were defined in monetary amounts. Starting in the 1740s, the administrators could pay their rent either in cash, or by supplying a certain number of salt barrels. Both forms of rent were paid in instalments, with annual instalments being the most common variant. In contracts concluded with Adam Biskupski, Jan Ebertz, Teodor Wessel and Gaspar Blumenthal, the amount of all instalments was the same. The latter was given the opportunity to pay his rent in thalers or tynfs. He was

¹³ Наукова бібліотека Львівського національного університету імені Івана Франка [dalej: НБЛНУ], Відділ Рукописів [dalej: BP], sygn. 516/III, k. 9; G. Wrona, *Rewizja*, s. 14–15.

¹⁴ F. Leśniak, *Wielkorządcy*, s. 43.

¹⁵ See the table contained in this paper.

¹⁶ AGAD, MK, sygn. Lustracje dz. XVIII 78, k. 312–314.

¹⁷ AGAD, AK, sygn. II/61, k. 182.

¹⁸ AGAD, MK, sygn. Lustracje dz. XVIII 79, k. 101.

obliged to ensure timely delivery of 130,000 thalers or their equivalent of 650,000 tynfs in four annual instalments. He was supposed to pay the sum of 162.500 tynfs in a timely manner in the first days of July, October, January and April¹⁹. Some contracts contain information about varying amounts paid back in instalments. This is confirmed by contracts concluded, for example, with Stanisław Skarszewski. As a tenant, he was obliged to annually deliver the following amounts to the royal treasury, throughout the period from 1656–1660: 80,000 Polish zlotys, 90,000 Polish zlotys and 100,000 Polish zlotys in the final two years of the lease. He had to pay each of the annual instalments on three dates²⁰. A similar situation can be seen in the second contract concluded with him. Throughout the duration of the contract, which ran from June 1660 to June 1663, he was obliged to timely pay in advance the amounts increasing every year: 110,000, 120,000 and 130,000 Polish zlotys²¹.

In the case of payments in salt, the lessees were to deliver 50,000 to 52,000 barrels of evaporated salt to warehouses in Torki and Sośnica. In the case of such a provision in the contract, the delivery was made in two instalments. Antoni Werenka and Jan Wężyk were obliged to send 50,000 barrels of salt a year. The first instalment in the amount of 32,000 barrels was to be paid at the beginning of April, the remaining 20,000 barrels were to be sent in mid-June of the same year²². The content of the contract concluded in 1755 with Ludwik de Nostitz Drzewiecki shows that the tenant undertook to deliver 52,000 barrels of salt per year. By the end of March at the latest, he was to hand over 30,000 barrels to the treasury, and deliver the remaining 22,000 by the end of June²³. Failure to comply with this provision of the contract was threatened with the same punishment as in the case of the non-payment of instalments, namely, termination of the contract and handing the estate over to a new tenant. The tenant was also supposed to pay 7 tynfs for every barrel of salt that was not delivered. Moreover, the contracts contained general guidelines concerning producing evaporated salts and its packaging²⁴.

Further sections of contracts presented the scope of powers and competencies bestowed upon the new tenants. Their broadly understood „administrative jurisdiction” included powers over „all cities, estates, lands, manors, villages, saltworks, breweries and inns, mills, rivers and lakes,

¹⁹ AGAD, AK, sygn. I/3, k. 161–162.

²⁰ AGAD, MK, sygn. Lustracje dz. XVIII 78, k. 102–103.

²¹ *Ibidem*, k. 131–132. See the table contained in this paper.

²² AGAD, AK, sygn. II/61, k. 182.

²³ AGAD, AK, sygn. II/173, k. 135.

²⁴ *Ibidem*, k. 135–136.

ponds and buildings”²⁵ as well as „the subjects and their duties, labour and all other belongings and benefits”²⁶. The administrators and lessees were entrusted with table estates and management of their income, as well as oversight and judicial powers over the population living in their territory. They were also reminded that after the end of the contract they were supposed to return the estate in the same condition and with the same equipment as at the moment of them taking it over. This provision concerned buildings, farm buildings, saltworks buildings, farming equipment, livestock, as well as crops growing in the fields. During the handover of the estate, the commissioners compared its condition with the inventory records made before the goods were handed over to the manager²⁷.

The numerous rights of the royal tenants were also accompanied by certain duties and obligations. They were obliged to pay their kwarta tax in a timely manner to the royal treasury in Rawa Mazowiecka and to pay the so-called life-long salaries²⁸. These were salt stocks and cash reserves based on the revenues of the saltworks, which – in accordance with royal privileges – were given annually to distinguished people, church institutions, local officials, saltworks workers and members of the administrative apparatus. The amount of these salaries was determined in the so-called pension register²⁹. The beneficiaries of the saltworks revenue were mentioned in the treasury contracts. The group of beneficiaries included – at least since mid-17th century – male monastic orders (the Bernardine monks in Sambor were given 12,000 Polish zlotys) and female congregations (the Bridgettines of Lviv were promised 200 barrels of salt, while the Convention of Bridgettines in Sambor was given 50 barrels)³⁰. In turn, a group of lay people who were endowed with these salaries included the crown treasurer. The basis for the allocation of the saltworks salaries, in addition to the pension register, were also contracts concluded with individuals. Antoni Werenka and Jan Węzyk were obliged to donate a certain amount of salt to the Sandomierz and

²⁵ „wszystkimi miastami, kluczami, krainami, folwarkami, wsiami, żupami, arendami browarnymi i karczemnymi, młynami, rzekami i jeziorami, stawami i sadzawkami, budynkami”.

²⁶ „poddanymi i ich powinnościami, robociznami i innymi wszelkimi przynależnościami i pożytkami”. AGAD, AK, sygn. II/173, k. 135; sygn. II/123, k. 72.

²⁷ AGAD, MK, sygn. Lustracje dz. XVIII 81, k. 128.

²⁸ AGAD, MK, sygn. Lustracje dz. XVIII 78, k. 104, 132, 312; sygn. Lustracje dz. XVIII 79, k. 49v, 101v; sygn. Lustracje dz. XVIII 80, k. 120; sygn. Lustracje dz. XVIII 81, k. 121; AGAD, AK, sygn. I/3, k. 163; sygn. II/61, k. 183; sygn. II/123, k. 73; sygn. II/173, k. 136.

²⁹ W. Osuchowski, *Gospodarka solna na Rusi halickiej od XVI do XVIII wieku*, Lwów 1930, s. 12–13, 33.

³⁰ AGAD, MK, sygn. Lustracje dz. XVIII 79, k. 48v–49.

Tab. 1. Summary of basic information contained in treasury contracts concerning the Sambor table estate concluded in the second half of the 17th century and the 18th century (incomplete list)

Administrator/ Tenant name	Post/ function*	Years of lease / administration of the estate**	Lease amount	Source
Stanisław Skarszewski	Courtier	1656–1660	370 000 Polish zlotys (4 instalments)	AGAD, MK, sygn. Lustracje dz. XVIII 81, k. 102–106.
Stanisław Skarszewski	starost of Sambor, castellan of Matogoszcz, starost of Drohobych	1660–1663 (in 1662, the contract was extended until 1665)	360 000 Polish zlotys (3 instalments of 120 000 Polish zlotys each), from 1662 to 1665 420 000 Polish zlotys (3 instalments of 130 000 Polish zlotys each)	<i>Ibidem</i> , k. 131–134, 239–241.
Adam Biskupski	starost of Wieleń	1665–1669	592 000 Polish zlotys (4 instalments of 148 000 Polish zlotys each)	<i>Ibidem</i> , k. 312–331, 332–333.
Adam Kotowski; Jan Wodnicki	royal secretaries	1667–1669	592 000 Polish zlotys (4 instalments of 148 000 Polish zlotys each)	<i>Ibidem</i> , k. 332–333.
Andrzej Rzeczycki	ensign of Grabowiec	1692–1695	management by loyal hands (ad manus fideles in tenutam)	AGAD, MK, sygn. Lustracje dz. XVIII 79, k. 13–14v.
Jan Leonard Ebertz	Bohemian courtier	1695–1698	200 000 Polish zlotys (4 instalments of 50 000 Polish zlotys)	<i>Ibidem</i> , k. 48–50.
Konstanty Wapowski; Artur Forbes; Robert Low	crown pantier, chamberlain of Przemysł; general postmeister of the crown; customs administrator in Lesser Poland	1701–1706	160 000 Polish zlotys (4 instalments of 40 000 Polish zlotys)	<i>Ibidem</i> , k. 101–106.
Gaspar Blumenthal	royal chamberlain	1715–1718	85,000 tynfis (4 instalments of 21,250 tynfis)	AGAD, MK, sygn. Lustracje dz. XVIII 80, k. 119–122.
Gaspar Blumenthal	royal chamberlain	1724–1730	130,000 thalers or 650,000 red zlotys	AGAD, MK, sygn. Lustracje dz. XVIII 81, k. 119–133; AK, sygn. I/3, k. 161–175.
Jan Baptysta Renard	cupbearer of Nur, lieutenant colonel	1730–1738	–	AGAD, AK, sygn. III/232, k. 108.

Marcin Wieniawski	ensign of Przemysł	1735–1736	–	<i>Ibidem</i> , k. 108.
Jan Bukowski	ensign of Owruicz	1736–1739	management by loyal hands (ad manus fideles in tenutam)	<i>Ibidem</i> .
Franciszek Borzęcki	Lithuanian steward	1739–1742	–	<i>Ibidem</i> .
Antoni Werenka; Jan Wężyk	Zhytomir pantier, army major	1743–1749	50,000 barrels of salt or 350,000 tynfs	AGAD, AK, sygn. II/61, k. 181–194.
Ludwik de Nostitz Drzewiecki	cavalry regiment colonel	1749–1755	–	AGAD, AK, sygn. III/232, k. 108.
Ludwik de Nostitz Drzewiecki	major general	1755–1761	52,000 barrels of salt or 364,000 tynfs	AGAD, AK, sygn. II/173, k. 135; sygn. II/123, k. 72–86.
Eleonora de Zedlitz de Nostitz Drzewiecka	spouse of Ludwig de Nostitz Drzewiecki	1758–1761	52,000 barrels of salt or 364,000 tynfs	AGAD, AK, sygn. II/137, k. 58–59; sygn. II/173, k. 143; sygn. III/232, k. 108.
Teodor Wessel	treasurer of the crown	lifelong lease from 1762.	100,000 tynfs annually	AGAD, AK, sygn. II/154, k. 290–291; sygn. II/174, k. 71v–75.
Piotr Mikołaj de Gartenberg Sadogórski	councillor and mint director	1768–1774	–	AGAD, AK, sygn. III/4, k. 68–69.

* The column includes the offices and posts listed in the treasury contracts.

** The column shows the period of administration specified in the treasury contracts.

The table was compiled on the basis of the provisions of treasury contracts for Sambor table goods (cf. annotation 3) and a list of the inventory records, commissions, revisions and list of contract titles for the Sambor estate from the 18th century from the Sambor castle archives. The source materials obtained did not provide enough information to enable compilation of a comprehensive table including all the tenants, along with the terms and conditions for the entire analysed period, cf. AGAD, AK, sygn. III/232, k. 56–57, 107–108.

Smoleńsk voivodes³¹. In case of the death of a beneficiary included in the register, the salt and money reserves intended for said person remained at the disposal of the king. The ruler rarely kept them for himself, and usually appointed new beneficiaries, which was the case, for example, after the death of the voivode of Malbork³². The lessee's obligation was to deliver the settlements of the saltworks salaries paid out to the treasury clerk³³. In the case of paying the kwarta tax, it should be mentioned that the amount of tax paid for the upkeep of the kwarta army was rarely recorded in contracts. At the beginning of the 18th century, 2,435 zlotys were paid by the Sambor estate for this purpose³⁴.

The treasury contracts also make mention of the obligation of the subjects of the estate, concerning paying the poll tax and hiberna tax for the upkeep of the royal army. However, it was strictly forbidden to burden them with costs related to the soldier stations. For this purpose, the appropriate proclamations were to be issued, and the „Crown Hetmans were to be [...] made aware of the fact that these estates should remain free of the soldierly burdens”³⁵. The source materials confirm that the residents of the Sambor region at the end of the 17th century suffered severe losses caused by the Crown troops. In 1696, the mutinous army established a military confederation in Szczerzec (Shchyrets') with Marshal Gustaw Baranowski due to outstanding pay. During the wintertime, the soldiers carried out many robberies and seizures, abusing their power against the residents of Sambor and the surrounding villages³⁶. The inhabitants of the estate have repeatedly complained in letters to the king about the material losses suffered in connection with the soldier stations³⁷. For example, in their 1757 letter, peasants from Litynia (Litynya) and Hruszowa (Grushevo) listed the ways they were wronged by soldiers stationed in the area for eleven years³⁸.

³¹ AGAD, AK, sygn. II/61, k. 183.

³² AGAD, MK, sygn. Lustracje dz. XVIII 81, k. 121. This most probably concerns Piotr Ernest Kczewski, governor of Malbork in 1703–1722, who died on 22 September 1722 in Warsaw. Cf. J. Gierowski, *Kczewski Piotr Ernest*, w: *Polski Słownik Biograficzny*, t. 12, Wrocław–Warszawa–Kraków 1966–1967, s. 319–321.

³³ AGAD, MK, sygn. Lustracje dz. XVIII 81, k. 121.

³⁴ AGAD, MK, sygn. Lustracje dz. XVIII 79, k. 101v.

³⁵ „hetmanów koronnych [...], żeby te dobra ekonomiczne nasze całe od impertyi żołnierskich [...] wolne zostawały”. *Ibidem*, k. 49.

³⁶ A. Kuczera, *Samborszczyzna. Ilustrowana monografia miasta Sambora i ekonomji samborskiej*, t. 2, Sambor 1937, s. 49; *Słownik geograficzny Królestwa Polskiego i innych krajów słowiańskich*, t. 10, red. B. Chlebowski, Warszawa 1889, s. 240.

³⁷ AGAD, AK, sygn. II/118, k. 1–4; sygn. II/121, k. 99; sygn. II/150, k. 188–189; sygn. II/151, k. 164–166.

³⁸ AGAD, AK, sygn. II/133, k. 157.

The tenants of the Sambor estate were guaranteed the right to collect taxes and duties owed by their residents to the state, in exchange for paying contractual fees. They enforced this with the help of auxiliary personnel, holders of lands and officials. The summary of revenues from the estate in the years 1765–1766 shows that the lease of inns was the main source of revenue in table estates. They yielded 62,210 Polish zlotys, or approximately 29,7% of total dues. Rents were close second, with the total amounting to 57,181.16 zlotys, or approximately 27,3%. This was followed by the profits from the hiberna tax for the upkeep of the army (34,872.24 zlotys, or 16,7%, lease of lands 32,700 zlotys – 15,6%) and leases of voytships (6897.20 zlotys, or approximately 3,2%)³⁹.

The collection of rents and taxes was to be accompanied by keeping appropriate records for each village in the form of the so-called accounting registers. This was justified by the desire to ensure „clarity of the accounting and preventing [...] problems”⁴⁰. The obligation to keep the records, as well as to write down all revenues and expenses in the books was to be fulfilled by the communes. For this purpose, they were to use the services of the Sambor bookbinder, who was commissioned to make an appropriate number of books and hand them over to the commune authorities⁴¹. It needs to be pointed out that the tenants were forbidden to make up for the insufficient income from the estate with treasury instalments⁴².

The income of the Sambor estate also encompassed other duties collected from its residents. The contracts mentioned corvée payment, which was to be used to pay the salary of a deputy administrator, castle officials (Cossacks, servants, couriers), patrons, plenipotentiaries and other legal expenses⁴³. In addition, contracts had a provision instructing the tenants to collect said payments in the amounts set out in the registers. In the 1730s, the subjects of Sambor had to pay the maximum amount of 8000 zlotys⁴⁴. The contract of 1762 sets its annual amount to 10,549.10 zlotys, although in some justified cases the tenants were allowed to raise that payment⁴⁵.

The task of the tenants of the table estates, based on the provisions of the contracts was to make efforts to preserve the integrity of the royal

³⁹ НБЛНУ, BP, sygn. 538/III, k. 18, *Summaryusz prowentów w ekonomii JKMcI samborskiej pro annos 1754–1766*.

⁴⁰ „dobrego porządku w rachunkach i zapobieżenia [...] mankamentom”. AGAD, AK, sygn. II/154, k. 298.

⁴¹ НБЛНУ, BP, sygn. 555/III, k. 276.

⁴² AGAD, AK, sygn. II/61, k. 183–184.

⁴³ AGAD, AK, sygn. II/154, k. 297.

⁴⁴ AGAD, AK, sygn. II/61, k. 190.

⁴⁵ AGAD, AK, sygn. II/154, k. 297–298.

property. The division was forbidden, and after the deaths of lifetime lessees, voytships and lands were to be attached to the estates until they were granted again by way of royal privileges⁴⁶. Illegally used or detached land would be recovered with the help of the estate and crown instigator⁴⁷. Specific recommendations for the revindication of the Sambor region were brought up against Jan Ebertz. A review carried out by the commissioners in 1698 showed that four lands (Babińsk, Medenice, Ulucz and Dnister) were used without proper treasury contracts. The former was taken by Mikołaj Giedziński, the cupbearer of Lviv. Despite receiving a rescript concerning a single village, he raided the estate and seized the entire income from the area, including the annual harvest and grain left aside for sowing⁴⁸. From the content of the contract concluded in 1724 with Ernest Blumenthal, we know that at the time of its signing the lands of Kupnowice and Liszna remained in private hands⁴⁹. The contracts instructed the administrators and lessees that they were to take action to recover the lands detached from the estates on the basis of mandates received from the royal chancellery. Only documents bearing the peace seal and signed by the Grand Treasurer of the Crown were to be considered valid⁵⁰. In this way, they were supposed to find out „those who use our estate's goods illegally”⁵¹ using falsified documents⁵².

In order to guarantee the integrity of the table estate and the revenues collected by the treasury, the tenants were required to audit their assets on a regular basis⁵³. The main purpose of the audit was to take stock of any unused land. According to the contracts, the auditors were to be honest, trustworthy and experienced people. Before starting the work, they had to take the appropriate oath. The peasants from a given area or land were charged with the payment of rent due in connection with the increase of unused fields⁵⁴. In order to reduce the costs associated with the work of the auditing teams, the obligation to inspect part of the

⁴⁶ AGAD, AK, sygn. I/3, k. 173; sygn. II/61, k. 191; sygn. II/123, k. 141–142.

⁴⁷ AGAD, MK, sygn. Lustracje dz. XVIII 79, k. 49, 103.

⁴⁸ НБЛHV, BP, sygn. 516/III, k. 6, 13; E. Stańczak, *Kamera saska za czasów Augusta III*, Warszawa 1973, s. 60; *Urzednicy województwa ruskiego XIV–XVIII wieku: (ziemie halicka, lwowska, przemyska, sanocka)*. Spisy, oprac. K. Przyboś, Wrocław–Warszawa–Kraków–Gdańsk–Łódź 1987, nr 809.

⁴⁹ AGAD, MK, sygn. Lustracje dz. XVIII 81, k. 121.

⁵⁰ AGAD, MK, sygn. Lustracje dz. XVIII 79, k. 103; AK, sygn. II/173, k. 142.

⁵¹ „tych, którzy dóbr ekonomii naszej niesłusznie zażywają”.

⁵² AGAD, MK, sygn. Lustracje dz. XVIII 78, k. 105.

⁵³ AGAD, AK, sygn. I/3, k. 173; sygn. II/61, k. 186; sygn. II/123, k. 140; sygn. II/154, k. 297.

⁵⁴ AGAD, AK, sygn. II/154, k. 297.

land of the estate was sometimes imposed on the communes themselves. Any treasury arrears determined found out during the audit were to be spread proportionally over all the villages of a given area or land and paid annually in accordance with the inventory provided to tenants at the time of signing contracts⁵⁵.

The general audit of the estate was carried out by specialised royal committees. The court treasury, which was responsible for direct oversight over table estates, in certain situations could make the decision to carry out an audit the assets of the estate. Each period of interregnum resulted in the termination of the contract between the treasury authorities and tenants, which until the appointment of a new tenant was administered by the grand treasurer of the crown⁵⁶. Other reasons for initiating an audit of the estate, in addition to the expiry of treasury contracts, could include repeated requests of the royal subjects and administrators' requests to grant them a defalcation, or abatement of a part of the instalments paid to the treasury⁵⁷. During the period of administration of the Sambor estate by Andrzej Rzeczycki, Jakub Becal was appointed to the position of general auditor of the estate. He supervised the income of the estate and, he was also responsible for overseeing its proper functioning, and also took care of the transport of the salt dues to the storage facilities on the San River and depots in Greater Poland⁵⁸.

The members of the auditing teams took over the powers of estate tenants during their inspections. They carried out their tasks in accordance with the instructions given to them, which defined the scope of their competencies. These usually concerned the assessment of the state of the estate, based on inventories, registers of income, rents, and other records of duties. They did this in cooperation with the officials responsible for depots, income and saltworks. Their task was also to exercise judicial

⁵⁵ AGAD, AK, sygn. II/173, k. 136v–137.

⁵⁶ G. Wrona, *Rewizja*, s. 8–9; A. Sucheni-Grabowska, *Monarchia dwu ostatnich Jagiellonów a ruch egzekucyjny*, cz. 1, *Geneza egzekucji dóbr*, Wrocław 1974, s. 74–85; F. Leśniak, *Zarys problematyki dóbr stołu królewskiego w Koronie i na Litwie (koniec XVI–XVIII wiek)*, „Rocznik Naukowo-Dydaktyczny WSP w Krakowie. Prace Historyczne” 1999, 20 (203), s. 39; idem, *Wielkorządcy*, s. 44.

⁵⁷ AGAD, AK, sygn. II/61, k. 188; E. Stańczak, *op. cit.*, s. 107; F. Leśniak, *Królewskie komisje inwentarzowe w wielkorządach krakowskich (druga połowa XVI–XVIII w.)*, „Studia Waweliana” 1996, 5, s. 91–92; AGAD, AK, sygn. II/56, k. 370–371. The reasons for establishing treasury committees can be deduced from the titles of the books they created. Cf. AGAD, AK, sygn. III/232, k. 107–108.

⁵⁸ AGAD, MK, sygn. Lustracje dz. XVIII 79, k. 13; A. Kaźmierczyk, *Sprawa Jakuba Becala, żydowskiego faktora Jana III Sobieskiego w końcu XVII wieku*, „Studia Historyczne” 1992, 35, s. 155–172.

jurisdiction in the area of the royal table estates, where they presided over the so-called commissary court⁵⁹.

One of the key powers of the administrator of the estate, brought up in the contracts was jurisdiction over the area. The tenant could perform this task either personally or through a representative, who was referred to in contracts with the state treasury as a *substitute*⁶⁰. The administrators and tenants relied on the help of a team of castle officials, among whom their deputies, known as the deputy administrator, held the greatest power. Cases resolved with the participation of the estate administrator, who was referred to as the judge, were rare. The analysis of the castle court's documents confirmed the dominance of the deputy administrator in the sphere of the judiciary. This was particularly true in the 17th and 18th centuries, where one can find an abundance of court records starting with the following: „in front of royal Sambor estate court of the deputy administrator”⁶¹. Given that they were responsible for the courts on behalf of the administrator of the estate, they were often referred to as *podsedek*, or the court man⁶².

The royal tenants exercised their judicial powers in the Sambor castle, hence the courts held by them or their deputies (deputy administrator) were called the court or castle office. The preserved court records show that it was an appellate court for the residents of towns and villages of the estate in civil and criminal matters. It recognised appeals against the verdicts of the local council and voytship courts, based on customary laws, as well as royal and commissioner's decrees⁶³. In the case of fines, half of them would go to the administrator or tenant, while the remaining fines were to be used to pay the debts of the subjects⁶⁴. Appeals against castle court judgements were sent to the royal referendary or assessor courts. The former dealt with disputes between the peasant population and tenants, while the burghers appealed to the assessors⁶⁵.

⁵⁹ AGAD, AK, sygn. II/173, k. 137; G. Wrona, *Rewizja*, s. 14–20.

⁶⁰ AGAD, AK, sygn. I/3, k. 172; sygn. II/173, k. 138.

⁶¹ НБЛНУ, ВР, sygn. 508/III, *Manualia dekretów sądów viceadministratorskich ekonomii JMci samborskiej 1730–1748*; sygn. 568/III, *Reskrypta od Prześwietnej Komisyyi J.K.M. Skarbowej do administracyi ekonomii Samborskiej a die 24 aprilis 1739 ad diem 24 octobris 1757*. A similar division and scope of judicial competence was noted in the Krakow's governments. Cf. F. Leśniak, *Wielkorządcy*, s. 47.

⁶² AGAD, AK, sygn. II/81, k. 57.

⁶³ „przed sądem wiceadministratorskim J.K.M. ekonomii samborskiej”. AGAD, AK, sygn. II/173, k. 136v.

⁶⁴ AGAD, AK, sygn. II/61, k. 185; sygn. II/173, k. 136v.

⁶⁵ Центральний Державний Історичний Архів України, м. Львів [dalej: ЦДІАУЛ], fond 856, opis 1, sprawa 44, k. 20–23; sprawa 233, k. 18; sprawa 326, k. 1–2; A. Moniuszko,

The castle office's jurisdiction was also extended to residents of towns and villages governed by Magdeburg law. Every year, the representatives of the communes in the lands of the estate, which were governed by the Vlach law were also obliged to appear at the castle court for the so-called commune courts. In the Sambor estate, in the second half of the 18th century, the commune courts were held before the feast of St. John the Baptist (24 June). They were carried out annually in accordance with the established order, which is reported in the royal proclamation of 1765, describing the order of appearance of the representatives of Vlach communes before the castle court: „Following not only the old customs that the commune courts before the feast of St. John the Baptist from the seven lands of the Sambor estate should arrive to the Sambor castle, orders the communes of the Bug land to come on the 18th day, the Wołoszań, Ilnicz and Libuchorz communes to arrive on the 19th day, Rozłuck and Lipa on the 21st, and Gwoździec on the 22nd day of the month. The landowner should on this occasion produce a report of the dues to be signed by the castle jurisdiction, along with list of debts with interest, all other expenses of the commune, lists of peasants' dues, number of residents, legal regulations concerning the selection of members of the local government, along with other revenues due to the treasury”⁶⁶. The castle court's activity resulted in the commune court reports, included in the books entitled *Winy wsi ekonomii samborskiej 1659–1670*⁶⁷.

Few copies of contracts for the lease of estate lands have survived to this day. On the basis of these contracts, one may infer the terms and

Prawo sądowe Rzeczypospolitej szlacheckiej (XVI–XVIII wiek): zarys wykładu z wyborem źródeł, Warszawa 2017, s. 16–17.

⁶⁶ „Stosując się nie tylko do dawnych zwyczajów, że tedy sądy zborowe przed festum św. Jana Chrzciciela z krain siedmiu w ekonomii samborskiej będących w zamku samborskim agitować się powinni [nakazuje się jurysdykcji ekonomicznej], aby gromadom całej krainy podbuskiej dzień 18, tenże i wołosiańskiej, ilnickiej i libuchorskiej 19, rozłuckiej i lipeckiej 21, gwoździeckiej 22 tego miesiąca. Krajnik mający w swojej dyspozycji krainę winien wówczas przedstawić protokół z grzywnami, które miał przedstawić jurysdykcji zamkowej do podpisu, wykazy długów gromadzkich z prowizjami, wszelkie inne wydatki gromady, wykazy powinności chłopskich, liczby mieszkańców wsi, regulacji prawnych dotyczących wyboru członków samorządu gminnego przedstawić ma do podpisu oraz inne prowenty należne skarbowi ekonomicznego”. НБЛНУ, ВР, sygn. 555/III, k. 275–278.

⁶⁷ НБЛНУ, ВР, sygn. 514/III, *Winy wsi ekonomii samborskiej*; sygn. 515/III, *Winy wsi ekonomii samborskiej*. The minutes of the courts can also be found in НБЛНУ, ВР, sygn. 538/III, k. 21–242. Sambor court records held in НБЛНУ were characterised by: В. Інкін, *Архів Самбірської економії*, w: *Записки товариства імені Шевченка*, т. 231, *Праці Комісії спеціальних (допоміжних) історичних дисциплін*, red. Я. Дашкевич, О. Купчинський, Львів 1996, s. 125–146.

conditions of contracts applicable to the lease of lands, their duration, the duties of tenants and income earned from them by administrators⁶⁸. The losses of revenue, resulting from the activity of sub-lessees or farm managers appointed by the administrator were to be covered from their personal funds⁶⁹. The officials and staff of the administrative and audit apparatus were paid by the administrator⁷⁰. An exception was made for those designated by the treasury authorities, who were paid by the treasury. These included the cashier, the superintendent and the officer responsible for transporting treasury salt dues⁷¹.

Sambor administrators and lessees, who managed royal lands, took care of the proper use of their forests, which was particularly important from the point of view of salt economy. The main duty of the peasant population living on and around the saltworks was to provide a certain amount of wood for salt production⁷². The oversight over forest exploitation guaranteed the proper functioning of saltworks enterprises. The most frequent complaints concerned ravaging forests by royal subjects⁷³. This led to particularly strong responses, in particular when it concerned the forests in the vicinity of the saltworks. Antoni Werenka and Jan Węzyk were allowed to use all the forests for the purposes of the estate, except for the forests near Sprynia and Ulucz⁷⁴. When concluding the contract for the lease of the estate with Teodor Wessel, he was instructed about the possibility of freely managing the estate forests, with the exception of the „forests near Stara Sól, Nahujowice, Łużek, Wola Jakubowa and Bronica”⁷⁵. Similar recommendations concerning the use of forests were presented in the contracts concluded with other administrators and tenants of the estate⁷⁶.

Forests were also used as a source of wood for heating and construction purposes. Correspondence between the castle administration and the

⁶⁸ The Central State Historical Archives of Ukraine in Lviv collection includes copies of the 1757 contracts concerning the lease of the Ulucz estate, as well as the 1762 and 1771 contracts concerning the lease of the Kupnowice (Kupnovychi) estate. ІІДІАУЛ, фонд 856, opis 1, sprawa 312, k. 1–4; sprawa 227, k. 1–4; sprawa 227, k. 23–26. A copy of the Medenice (Medenychi) estate lease contract covering the years 1695–1698 can also be found in AGAD, MK, sygn. Lustracje dz. XVIII 79, k. 125–126v.

⁶⁹ AGAD, AK, sygn. II/154, k. 294.

⁷⁰ AGAD, MK, sygn. Lustracje dz. XVIII 78, k. 104.

⁷¹ AGAD, AK, sygn. II/173, k. 136.

⁷² A. Kuczera, *op. cit.*, s. 17–19.

⁷³ НБЛНУ, BP, sygn. 525/III, k. 468–468v.

⁷⁴ AGAD, AK, sygn. II/61, k. 191.

⁷⁵ „lasu buczowskiego przy Starej Soli, zapustów przy Nahujowicach, także przy Łużku, Woli Jakubowej i Bronicy”. AGAD, AK, sygn. II/154, k. 299.

⁷⁶ AGAD, AK, sygn. II/173, k. 141.

Treasury Commission in the 18th century abounds in numerous requests from subjects and church institutions for the possibility of harvesting timber from royal estate forests⁷⁷. They were most often motivated by the lack of adequate capital and natural disasters (mainly fires), which often completely ruined the farms of the subjects. In order to protect the forest resources, tenants are guaranteed the right to appoint foresters and rangers⁷⁸.

The treasury contracts ordered the tenants of the Sambor estate to take due care of the entire estate and to grow its revenues. They were encouraged to obtain the highest possible crop yields from cereal cultivation and to enlarge the animal stock. The contracts concluded in the second half of the 17th century mention a royal herd of 40 livestock, which the manager „should rear where it is going to bring the best results”⁷⁹. The proper performance of this duty guaranteed significant benefits, as half of the cattle would belong to the tenant, and the remainder to the treasury⁸⁰. Negligence that resulted in the death of the herd or part thereof were to be compensated by the administrator with their own money. In a situation where the death of the herd was not their fault, they had to prove that „it happened by chance”⁸¹, i.e. because of a plague⁸².

The tenants of the Sambor estate held the power over the subjects of the table estate on behalf of the monarch. The contracts stipulated that peasants should not be subject to greater duties than those set out in the inventories and commissioners’ audits⁸³. The same was required of tenants appointed by administrators to manage individual lands. Short lease periods have resulted in tenants often illegally forcing the subjects to pay higher dues. Therefore, the treasury authorities started to add a stipulation in the contracts that all services and works carried out by subjects above the established duties should be compensated⁸⁴.

The contracts, especially those concluded in the 18th century, dealt with the issue of credit obligations of the inhabitants of the estate. They were the reason for their frequent exploitation by creditors, especially because of the high interest rates on loans. According to Roman Rybarski, the most common reason for the royal subjects’ debt was the

⁷⁷ НБЛНУ, BP, sygn. 565/III, k. 1–6, 38, 45–45v.

⁷⁸ AGAD, MK, sygn. Lustracje dz. XVIII 78, k. 104, 132, 313.

⁷⁹ „там gdzie najlepiej będzie się нам здаło човаць повинien”. *Ibidem*, k. 10.

⁸⁰ AGAD, MK, sygn. Lustracje dz. XVIII 81, k. 128.

⁸¹ „z przypadkowego to się stało”.

⁸² AGAD, MK, sygn. Lustracje dz. XVIII 78, k. 106.

⁸³ AGAD, AK, sygn. II/61, k. 186, 188.

⁸⁴ AGAD, AK, sygn. II/154, k. 296.

inability to settle their feudal obligations in a timely manner⁸⁵. According to the provisions of the analysed contracts, an important reason for peasants to borrow money from other villagers, townsfolk, representatives of the nobility and clergy, as well as church institutions was also a shortage of grain⁸⁶. The need to obtain it for bread baking and for sowing was often associated with usury⁸⁷. The administrators and lessees of the estate were ordered to support the subjects with difficulties in obtaining grain for sowing. It was also stipulated that they should not ask for compensation from the treasury authorities for the aid provided. At the same time, they were warned against seeking redress by discretely collecting their dues and labour in excess of the actual due amount⁸⁸.

The indebtedness of communes was particularly cumbersome for the treasury authorities, when loans were taken against royal land. In some cases, the lenders among the nobility reacted to their debtors defaulting on their debts by invading the table estates and forcibly taking what was due. In order to counteract this, the commissioners auditing the estate in 1698 prohibited communes from taking out loans against the land without the consent of the castle administration. They also determined the maximum commission rate, which was not to exceed 10% of the loans granted⁸⁹.

A significant part of treasury contracts contained instructions and recommendations concerning the activities of saltworks. The Sambor estate had seven saltworks in: Drohobych, Stara Sól, Modrycz, Kołpiec, Nahujowice, Sprynia and Bania Kotowska⁹⁰. These included not only salt springs, from which the precious resource was extracted through the so-called windows (shafts, wells) to the surface and poured into large evaporation dishes placed over the fire, where the evaporation process took place. The saltworks companies also included various buildings and their furnishings, salt stores, buildings used by saltworks workers and royal subjects, as well as towns and villages with windows and forests located in their area⁹¹.

⁸⁵ R. Rybarski, *Kredyt i lichwa w ekonomii samborskiej w XVIII wieku*, Lwów 1936, s. 1–2.

⁸⁶ Creditors of the residents of the table estate and the amounts of loans they took out were included in the minutes from the courts. Cf. НБЛНУ, BP, sygn. 514/III; sygn. 515/III; sygn. 538/III, k. 21–190.

⁸⁷ AGAD, AK, sygn. II/61, k. 185–186.

⁸⁸ *Ibidem*, k. 186.

⁸⁹ G. Wrona, *Rewizja*, s. 27–28.

⁹⁰ A. Kuczera, *op. cit.*, s. 17–21; K. Czernyński, *O dobrach koronnych byłej Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej*, Lwów 1870, s. 20.

⁹¹ W. Osuchowski, *op. cit.*, s. 8–9. J. Rutkowski, *Podział dochodów w żupach ruskich za Zygmunta Augusta*, Poznań 1927, s. 19–20; idem, *Z dziejów żup ruskich za Zygmunta Augusta*, Lwów 1925, s. 18.

The administrators and lessees of table estates were given extensive powers in appointing saltworks workers at every level. They were also obliged to keep the saltworks facilities in working order and carry out the necessary renovation works. The contracts also stipulated their obligation to deliver a certain amount of evaporated salt to the salt stores in Torki and Sośnica. Their task was also to transport the so-called noble salt to the stores of the Greater Poland, Kuiavia and Dobrzyn regions. To this end, the tenants of the Sambor estate cooperated with saltworks workers, warehouse tenants and crown treasurers, who issued proclamations in order to find freighters⁹².

Each administrator and lessees of the Sambor estate undertook to fulfil the provisions of the contracts under the pain of a treasury trial, which was adopted in 1607⁹³. This stipulation referred to the provisions of the Sejm constitution established during the turbulent civil war in the Commonwealth, known as the Zebrzydowski rebellion. According to this provision, all the dues resulting from the administration or lease of table estates were to be provided to the crown treasurer in the case of the Polish estates, or Lithuanian court treasurer (in the case of Lithuanian estates), who were to stay with the King. In the absence of the crown treasurer, the money had to be delivered to a place designated by them, and the parties to the contract were to be notified of that fact via letter⁹⁴. Rents from the Lithuanian estates were always to be delivered to the treasury in Vilnius, regardless of the presence or absence of the local treasurer. The 1607 Constitution also includes penalties resulting from non-compliance with the terms and provisions of the contracts. If the contractor is in arrears with his payments, a lawsuit was sent to him calling for payment within two weeks and for the fulfilment of the remaining contract terms. Failure to do so resulted in the estate being taken away and a ruling on debt collection with the help of a starost. All the cases of financial arrears were to be recognised in the royal court of law. The parties were also reminded of the possibility to complain about impediments making them unable to attend the proceedings (*legalis impedimenti*) as well as other unforeseen events (*casus fortuitus*)⁹⁵.

⁹² A detailed analysis of the issues concerning saltworks, which were included in the treasury contracts concerning the Sambor table estate in the 17th–18th centuries was outlined by G. Wrona, *Problematyka żup solnych w kontraktach skarbowych na dobra ekonomii samborskiej z drugiej połowy XVII i XVIII wieku*, „Wschodni Rocznik Humanistyczny” 2019, 16, 2, s. 219–237.

⁹³ AGAD, MK, sygn. Lustracje dz. XVIII 78, k. 106, 134.

⁹⁴ VL, t. 2, s. 439–440.

⁹⁵ *Ibidem*, s. 440.

Treasury contracts concerning Sambor estate constitute an important source of information on the organisation and functioning of the royal estates, as well as the duties and powers of their administrators. Copies of surviving contracts vary in the form of their provisions. In the second half of the 17th century, they were generally written in a continuous manner, without distinguishing the numbered paragraphs that appear in the contracts characteristic of the next century. The volume of the contracts seems to follow a similar pattern, as the contracts from the 18th century are more extensive in terms of content (the most extensive is the lease agreement concluded with Gaspar Ernest Blumenthal for the years 1724–1730). The analysis of the content of the manuscripts proves that in the analysed period, the monarch rarely decided to offer the Sambor estate *ad manus fideles in tenutam*. Most of the contracts envisaged short-term leases. The group of estate administrators usually included people associated with the royal court, high-ranking military personnel as well as central, court and land officials. In most cases, they managed the estate alone, although there were also cases of offering the estate to a collective of managers. The exact duration of the contract as well as the form, amount and term of lease payments were recorded in the contracts. In the second half of the 17th and 18th centuries there were two possible ways to pay these dues. Most often, this concerned cash payments. Starting in the 1740s, this obligation could be fulfilled by supplying a certain number of salt barrels. The contracts also mentioned the consequences resulting from failure to meet the conditions contained therein, including their termination by the treasury and the possibility of concluding a contract with a new tenant. In the case of rent arrears, the treasury trial procedure adopted by the Sejm in 1607 was in force.

A significant part of the contracts was made up of the provisions concerning the powers and obligations of the tenants. The management of extensive estate required an efficient clerical team. The tenants were therefore given the right to freely appoint deputies, landowners, supervisors, saltworks workers and other auxiliary staff who were also paid by them. The exceptions included the cashier, the superintendent and the salt officer, appointed and paid by the treasury. Administrators and tenants also had judicial powers over the residents of their territory, they also participated in the work of the castle office and the commune courts.

Due to the rent paid to the royal treasury, contractors were entitled to collect treasury dues from their subjects, which required keeping appropriate documentation and records. It was the duty of the tenant of the Sambor estate to make every effort to improve its profitability. For this reason, they were responsible for ensuring the integrity of the estate. They were obliged to cooperate with the crown instigator in order to

recover the illegally detached or used land. They were also tasked with overseeing peasants' loans and commitments, which were sometimes taken out without the consent of the communes and the castle office. Non-payment of loans resulted in the raids on the estate by creditors and forced enforcement of debts. In the contracts, the tenants undertook to exercise due control over the estate forests. They also supervised their harvesting, which was to ensure the proper functioning of Sambor's saltworks.

REFERENCES (BIBLIOGRAFIA)

Archival sources (Źródła archiwalne)

Archiwum Główne Akt Dawnych:

Archiwum Kameralne, sygn. I/1, I/3, II/56, II/61, II/81, II/118, II/121, II/123, II/133, II/137, II/150, II/151, II/154, II/173, III/232.

Метрыка Коронна, sygn. Lustracje dz. XVIII 78, Lustracje dz. XVIII 79, Lustracje dz. XVIII 80, Lustracje dz. XVIII 81.

Naukowa Biblioteka L'vivskoho Natsional'noho Universytetu imeni Ivana Franka, Viddil Rukopysiv [Наукова Бібліотека Львівського Національного Університету імені Івана Франка, Відділ Рукописів]:

sygn. 508/III, 510/III, 514/III, 515/III, 516/III, 525/III, 538/III, 555/III, 565/III, 568/III.

Tsentral'nyy Derzhavnyy Istorychnyy Arkhiv Ukrayiny, m. L'viv [Центральний Державний Історичний Архів України, м. Львів]:

f. 856, opis 1, sprawa 44, 103–105, 194, 227, 233, 312, 326, 431.

Printed sources (Źródła drukowane)

Urzednicy wojewodztwa ruskiego XIV–XVIII wieku: (ziemie halicka, lwowska, przemyska, sanocka). Spisy, oprac. K. Przyboś, Wrocław–Warszawa–Kraków–Gdańsk–Łódź 1987.

Volumina Legum, Przedruk zbioru praw staraniem xx Pijarów w Warszawie, od roku 1732 do roku 1782, t. 2, Petersburg 1859.

Studies (Opracowania)

Czemeryński K., *O dobach koronnych bylej Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej*, Lwów 1870.

Gierowski J., *Kczewski Piotr Ernest*, w: *Polski Słownik Biograficzny*, t. 12, Wrocław–Warszawa–Kraków 1966–1967.

Harasymchuk M.Ye., *Diyal'nist'korolivs'koyi komisiji v Sambirskiy ekonomiyi ta komisars'ka knyha 1696 roku*, „Visnyk L'vivskoho universytetu. Seriya Knyhoznavstvo, bibliotekoznavstvo ta informatsiyni tekhnolohiyi” 2014, 9. [Гарасимчук М.Є., *Діяльність королівської комісії в Самбірській економії та комісарська книга 1696 року*, „Вісник Львівського університету. Серія Книгознавство, бібліотекознавство та інформаційні технології” 2014, 9.]

Harasymchuk M.Ye., *Funktsionuvannya zamkovoyi ta starosol's'koyi zhupnoyi kantselyariy na terytoriyi Sambirsk'koyi ekonomiyi XVII stolitti*, „Visnyk L'vivskohouniversytetu. Seriya istorychna” 2015, 51. [Гарасимчук М.Є., *Функціонування замкової та старосольської жупної канцелярії на території Самбірської економії в XVII столітті*, „Вісник Львівського університету. Серія історична” 2015, 51.]

Harasymchuk M.Ye., *Zamkoviknyhy Sambirsk'koyi ekonomiyi pershoiy polovyny XVII stolittya yak dzhereloshlyakh do shlyakhets'koyi y selyans'koyihenealohiyi*, „Henealohichni zapysky Ukrayins'koho heraldychnoho tovarystva” 2014, 12. [Гарасимчук М.Є.,

- Замкові книги Самбірської економії першої половини XVII століття як джерело до шляхетської й селянської генеалогії, „Генеалогічні записки Українського геральдичного товариства” 2014, 12.]
- Inkin V.F., *Arkhiv Sambirs'koyi ekonomiyi*, w: *Zapysky tovarystva imeni Shevchenka*, t. 231, *Pratsi Komisiyi spetsial'nykh (dopomizhnykh) istorychnykh dystsyplin*, red. Ya. Dashkevych, O. Kupchyn's'kyu, L'viv 1996. [Інкін В.Ф., *Архів Самбірської економії*, w: *Записки товариства імені Шевченка*, t. 231, *Праці Комісії спеціальних (допоміжних) історичних дисциплін*, red. Я. Дашкевич, О. Купчинський, Львів 1996.]
- Inkin V.F., *Rozvytok feodal'noyi renty v Sambirs'kiy ekonomiyi u druhiy polovyni XVI na pochatku XVII stolittya*, „*Nisnyk L'viv's'koho universytetu. Seriya istorychna*” 1967, 4. [Інкін В.Ф., *Розвиток феодалної ренти в Самбірській економії у другій половині XVI на початку XVII століття*, „*Вісник Львівського університету. Серія історична*” 1967, 4.]
- Inkin V.F., *Sil's'kesuspil'stvo Halys'koho Prykarpattya u XVI–XVIII stolittiyakh: istorychni narysy*, red. M. Krykun, L'viv 2004. [Інкін В.Ф., *Сільське суспільство Галицького Прикарпаття у XVI–XVIII століттях: історичні нариси*, red. М. Крикун, Львів 2004.]
- Kaźmierczyk A., *Sprawa Jakuba Becala, żydowskiego faktora Jana III Sobieskiego w końcu XVII wieku*, „*Studia Historyczne*” 1992, 35.
- Kuczera A., *Samborszczyzna. Ilustrowana monografia miasta Sambora i ekonomji samborskiej*, t. 2, Sambor 1937.
- Leśniak F., *Królewskie komisje inwentarzowe w wielkorządach krakowskich (druga połowa XVI–XVIII w.)*, „*Studia Waweliana*” 1996, 5.
- Leśniak F., *Wielkorządcy krakowscy w XVI–XVIII wieku. Gospodarze zamku wawelskiego i majątku wielkorządowego*, Kraków 1996.
- Leśniak F., *Zarys problematyki dóbr stołu królewskiego w Koronie i na Litwie (koniec XVI–XVIII wiek)*, „*Rocznik Naukowo-Dydaktyczny WSP w Krakowie. Prace Historyczne*” 1999, 20 (203).
- Moniuszko A., *Prawo sądowe Rzeczypospolitej szlacheckiej (XVI–XVIII wiek): zarys wykładu z wyborem źródeł*, Warszawa 2017.
- Osuchowski W., *Gospodarka solna na Rusi halickiej od XVI do XVIII wieku*, Lwów 1930.
- Słownik geograficzny Królestwa Polskiego i innych krajów słowiańskich*, t. 10, red. B. Chlebowski, Warszawa 1889.
- Smutok I., *Administratory Sambirs'koyi ekonomiyi (kinets' XVI–XVIII st.)*, w: *Drohobys'kyu krayeznavchyyu zbirnyk*, Vyp. 4, Drohobych 2000. [Смуток І., *Адміністратори Самбірської економії (кінець XVI–XVIII ст.)*, w: *Дрогобицький краєзнавчий збірник*, Вип. 4, Дрогобич 2000.]
- Smutok I., *Arkhiv Sambirs'koyi ekonomiyi yak dzherelo do istoriyi mist i sil Prykarpattya*, „*Studiyi z istoriyi arkhivnoyi spravy ta dokumentoznavstva*” 2003, 10. [Смуток І., *Архів Самбірської економії як джерело до історії міст і сіл Прикарпаття*, „*Студії з історії архівної справи та документознавства*” 2003, 10.]
- Smutok I., *Orhanizatsiya upravlinnya Sambirs'koyi ekonomiyi v XVI–XVIII st. (kharakterystyka dokumental'nykh materialiv)*, w: *Drohobys'kyu krayeznavchyyu zbirnyk*, Vyp. 3, Drohobych 1998. [Смуток І., *Організація управління Самбірської економії в XVI–XVIII ст. (характеристика документальних матеріалів)*, w: *Дрогобицький краєзнавчий збірник*, Вип. 3, Дрогобич 1998.]
- Stańczak E., *Kamera saska za czasów Augusta III*, Warszawa 1973.
- Sucheni-Grabowska A., *Monarchia dwu ostatnich Jagiellonów a ruch egzekucyjny*, cz. 1, *Geneza egzekucji dóbr*, Wrocław 1974.
- Rutkowski J., *Podział dochodów w żupach ruskich za Zygmunta Augusta*, Poznań 1927.

- Rutkowski J., *Z dziejów żup ruskich za Zygmunta Augusta*, Lwów 1925.
- Rybarski R., *Kredyt i lichwa w ekonomii samborskiej w XVIII wieku*, Lwów 1936.
- Wrona G., *Problematyka żup solnych w kontraktach skarbowych na dobra ekonomii samborskiej z drugiej połowy XVII i XVIII wieku*, „*Wschodni Rocznik Humanistyczny*” 2019, 16, 2.
- Wrona G., *Rewizja komisji skarbowej w ekonomii samborskiej w 1698 roku*, „*Roczniki Dziejów Społecznych i Gospodarczych*” 2018, 79.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Grzegorz Wrona – PhD, historian with a doctorate in humanities, employee of the Institute of History of Maria Curie-Skłodowska University in Lublin. His research interests revolve around social and economic history of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in the 16th–18th centuries, the issue of royal table estates (especially the history of the Sambor estate) and regional history. Author of the book *Dzieje Miejsca Piastowego do 1914 roku* (Krosno 2018) and several papers on social and economic relations of the Polish-Ruthenian borderland in modern times.

