

# The commons in late medieval and early modern Poland

## An unattended historical phenomenon

### Introduction

The problem of rural commons, although occasionally discussed in Polish historiography, has not been separately and comprehensively studied yet. Scholars studying rural, settlement or economic history or the history of village self-government are aware of the existence of lands used as communal property, but they tend to attach no proper significance to their role. Only two articles have been published thus far on the issue of *nawsie* (common land in the centre of the village), but both are more than fifty years old.<sup>1</sup> The other type of commons, consisting of forests and pastures, has been frequently mentioned by historians, but it has usually been pushed to the margin of other discussions. The aim of this article is to summarise and present the achievements of Polish historiography in the study of the commons, understood as natural resources exploited by social collectives for agrarian purposes in late medieval and early modern Poland. The structure of rural commons, their organisation and importance for the rural community and agrarian economy are the focal points of this study.

### Origins and types of common land

Information about the earliest usage of common-pool resources in Polish villages comes from the thirteenth century, the time of German colonisation and intensive settlement. It was also the time when the so called *ujazdy* were organised. They were delimitation operations aimed at drawing the boundaries of landlords' property. Landlords had exclusive rights to the lands within the boundaries of *ujazd*.<sup>2</sup> The processes of delimitation were not always smooth and sometimes the rights of village communities were violated. Their complaints were dealt with by ducal courts of justice. The oldest surviving document containing the court's verdict was written between 1253 and 1258 when Duke Bolesław the Chaste overruled the plan by a Benedictine abbot in Tyniec to establish a boundary between the villages of Radziszowo and Kurozwęki. As a result of this delimitation, the inhabitants of Kurozwęki were to lose the right to use a vast forest area which had been shared by both villages as hunting and fishing grounds.<sup>3</sup> More or less at the same time, in 1265, inhabitants of several villages were in conflict with a Cistercian abbey in Łąd. They demanded the right of free access to one of the banks of the Warta river and a forest there. This time, however, the ducal court of Bolesław the Pious decided to take the monks' side.<sup>4</sup>

These two cases prove the existence of forests and waters used jointly by several villages prior to the German colonisation. According to Henryk Łowmiański, the existence of the commons was tightly connected with the functioning of neighbourhoods known in Latin as *vicinia* or *vicinitas* and in Polish as *opole*.<sup>5</sup> Their origins and significance were hotly disputed in twentieth-century Polish historiography. On the one hand, Karol Modzelewski and Karol Buczek claim that *opole* was a formal, state-created institution, performing specific legal (prosecution of criminals) and economic (delimitations, tax collection) functions.<sup>6</sup> On the other hand, Jacek Matuszewski believes that *opole* could be defined as a number of dwellings forming a neighbourhood whose creation was facilitated by the state, but which was not a formalised institution.<sup>7</sup> Most scholars agree that *opole* consisted of a few to more than ten villages who shared the right to use common lands. The custom of common usage of land by all the inhabitants of *opole* survived at least until the end of the middle ages, in spite of the process of establishing firm boundaries between individual villages. All decisions concerning boundaries had to be consulted on and accepted by the inhabitants of the *opole*. Joint decisions were also made about the way common lands were to be used. Forest areas were used as pastures for pigs and cattle; all peasants were also allowed to cut wood, to fish and to hollow tree trunks for beehives. Zofia Podwińska claims that the importance of the commons derived from the fact that within the boundaries of one village there was not enough land

‘to meet all the needs and to correspond with the technological level of rural economy at that time, especially in husbandry and forest bee-keeping. For these reasons, both landlords and peasants were interested in keeping the ancient rights of rural communities to use communal pastures, forests and waters.’<sup>8</sup>

During the colonisation process between the thirteenth and fifteenth century, new regulations were introduced concerning the commons in newly created villages and in the old ones which decided to adopt the German law. Increasing settlement density led to the replacement of *opole*-based territorial communities by village communities. The change was a result of the landlords’ deliberate policy of spatial planning and of their wish to control the land use.<sup>9</sup> Privileges issued for individual villages established peasant self-government bodies such as *soltys* (village leader) and counsellors whose role was also to perform legal functions in their villages. Privilege documents also contain information about how much land was allocated for *soltys* and other peasants, and how much rent they were supposed to pay to their lord. Some of these documents mention the commons. Historians distinguish between two types of commons: *skotnice/wągrody* and *nawsie*.

*Skotnice* was a name used in Little Poland, while in other regions the name *wągrody* was preferred to refer to a fenced pasture used by the whole village community. According to Stefan Chmielewski, *skotnice/wągrody* ‘were used to graze cattle, horses and pigs, tended and guarded by shepherds whose wages were paid by all villagers.’<sup>10</sup> Scholars have paid greater attention to the other category of the commons, i. e. *nawsie*, but some researchers suggest that *skotnice/wągrody* could also be treated as *nawsie* in the broad sense of the term. Thus, broadly described, *nawsie* included all the lands used jointly by the village community. In a narrow sense, *nawsie* was just a central square in a village.<sup>11</sup>

In Polish historiography, *nawsie* has been studied from the point of view of its geographical location in a village and of its legal and economic status. Jan Gerlach notes that there must

have been a close correlation between the existing commons and the layout of fields and buildings in villages as well as natural features of the area. In his studies he shows that access to water (pond, river, stream) was a decisive factor in determining the location of *nawsie*.<sup>12</sup>

The study of *nawsie* was further developed by Józef Burszta. He claims that the oldest villages, whose origins date back to the times prior to German colonisation, took the form of settlements arranged along a street with a central square. 'The square was usually a place where a church, a cemetery, sometimes a pond, or even houses of landless peasants were located, depending on how big the square was.'<sup>13</sup> Burszta thinks that the square was a part of *nawsie*. *Nawsie* often determined the layout of the village. The layout could take a circular form (*okolnica*) if the village was fortified. It could also take an oval shape (*owalnica*). Such villages consisted of two parallel densely built-up streets (from 0.5 to 2 kilometres long) with an open area, a pond or a church with a cemetery in between, which can be treated as *nawsie*.<sup>14</sup>

The third type of villages with *nawsie* was typical of the German colonisation period when so called *łańcuchówki* (chain villages) were established. The name derived from a characteristic arrangement of farms located on both banks of a river or stream, or even by some standing waters, like beads on a chain. Each peasant was given a plot of land where he built a house and other farm buildings, and the strip of land behind them, down to the village border, was allotted for cultivation. 'The most important thing was that the plots of land did not begin right on the bank of the river or stream, but at some distance from it, which was caused by the natural features of the land or because of the threat of flooding.'<sup>15</sup> Consequently, on both sides of a river, stream or pond there was an area which was not meant to be divided among the villagers and formed *nawsie* or commons.

In short, *nawsie* is a term that refers to the main square in a village as well as to a long strip of land along a village. *Nawsie* was a piece of undivided land serving a variety of purposes. Part of it was wasteland known as *agri inutiles*,<sup>16</sup> but most of it played a significant economic role in the life of a village. Primary sources use the following terms to refer to *nawsie*: *campita* (*compita*), *exitium*, *exitorium commune*, *exitus*, *medietas villae*, *planicies communis*, *planicies villae*, *superficies*, *vicus*, *willa*, *villa communis*, *villagium*, *villamentum* (*villimentum*).<sup>17</sup>

## Legal status and conflicts

It is believed that in villages under the German law *nawsie*, meaning a central square and *nawsie* in the form of pastures and forests, were quite common.<sup>18</sup> Gerlach and Burszta note that German law location privileges put *nawsie* (narrow definition) at the village's head or bailiff's (*sołtys*) disposal.<sup>19</sup> In villages under the Vlach law, characteristic of the Subcarpathia, where farms specialised in husbandry, a number of fifteenth- and sixteenth-century location privileges also mentioned a village *kniaź* (the counterpart of *sołtys* elsewhere) as a person to whom *nawsie* belonged. Both historians claim that *sołtys* and *kniaź* had some formal control over *nawsie*, but the right to make use of this common land belonged to the whole village community.<sup>20</sup> The significance of this right can be compared to the importance of the right of individual peasants to use and inherit their plots of land in spite of the existence of personal subjection and the development of demesne economy.<sup>21</sup>

The oldest surviving information about the legal status of *nawsie* is contained in fourteenth-century documents recording litigations over *nawsie* when property divisions were

made after a village changed hands as a result of sale or inheritance. New divisions in the village occasioned new divisions of *nawsie* as well. In the fifteenth century, when the office of *sołtys* and the accompanying right to hereditary land were often taken over by village owners, information about *nawsie* can also be found in documents that record legal proceedings involving peasants as users of the commons and the landlords as their new owners. According to Burszta, 'landlords took over the *sołtys*' right to control *nawsie*, allowing the village community to use it only as *ius in re aliena*.<sup>22</sup>

Communist historiography in Poland tended to emphasise the gradual appropriation of the commons by landlords, which was seen as evidence for the oppressive policies of Polish nobility towards peasantry. According to Burszta, 'landlords' attempts were aimed not so much at formal, but at actual seizure of *nawsie* or its fragments, and they treated it as a part of their manorial farm, denying the right of the village community to use this land.<sup>23</sup> Historians admit, however, that available sources do not allow one to draw unambiguous conclusions from this matter. The surviving documents yield information about conflicts between village owners and members of the village self-government representing the interests of the whole community. These documents show that villagers were not defenceless and were not always fighting a losing battle. In the case of villages belonging to the crown, peasants had the right to appeal to *Referendaria Koronna*, a royal court of appeal (although the role of the king himself was only symbolic) whose responsibility since the 1580s was to investigate peasants' complaints against royal officials and noblemen leasing the land from the king.<sup>24</sup> The very fact that the complaints were filed by peasants proves that lords did violate the village communities' rights to *nawsie*. What is more, the verdicts of *Referendaria* were not always favourable to villagers. Nevertheless, historians emphasise the relatively strong position of peasants in these conflicts and their determination to defend their rights in institutions they could turn to for assistance.<sup>25</sup>

It appears that the position of peasants in villages belonging to the church and in those owned by the gentry was less strong because they were devoid of the king's legal protection there. Information about conflicts over *nawsie* in these villages can be found in village courts' records,<sup>26</sup> in documents known as 'economic instructions'<sup>27</sup> and in 'village acts'<sup>28</sup> issued by village owners to regulate the relations between the landlord and his subjects as well as social relations within the village community. In the case of villages with split property rights (different fragments of one village belonging to different lords) information about conflicts over *nawsie* is contained in the records of land and town gentry courts (*sądy ziemskie* and *sądy grodzkie*) which worked in Poland until the partitions of the late eighteenth century. The same courts also dealt with complaints filed by peasants from villages belonging to the church.

## Economic significance of *nawsie*

It is indisputable that the commons with their meadows, pastures, forests and a central square played a significant role in the peasants' economy, especially in husbandry. The fact that the commons were exempt from taxes paid by peasants to the landlord and the state was the reason why they were not mentioned in inventories and tax records – a factor that seriously hinders research. Another problem is the lack of data from land surveys. General land surveying had not been made in Poland until the sixteenth century and even then the

surveyors focused on establishing the boundaries of individual peasant farms, the boundaries between peasants' land and the manorial farm, and the boundaries between villages. As a result, historians writing about manorial and peasant economy concentrated on the amount of arable land at the disposal of peasants and the lord of the manor, ignoring the problem of the commons or limiting themselves to descriptions of common pastures and meadows based on the common-sense speculation that peasants must have used and controlled these lands collectively.

According to Alicja Falniowska-Gradowska, the very existence and the size of *nawsie* were determined primarily by the layout and arrangement of peasants' fields. She outlines that in chain villages 'each individual farm consisted not only of arable land but also of meadows, pastures, thickets and forests',<sup>29</sup> resulting in a lesser need for a big *nawsie*. In villages characterised by the open field system, peasants had their strips of arable land for which they had to pay rent to the lord of the manor. All other grounds within the boundaries of the village were common property of the village community.

Detailed information about the property structure of land in southern Poland, Little Poland in particular (western Galicia), is provided by a land cadastre made by the Austrian administration in 1785–1788 (after the First Partition of Poland). For the purposes of the cadastre, the village land was classified as: arable, meadows, pastures, ponds and woodland.<sup>30</sup> Unfortunately, historians working on this document compiled data only for two categories: 1) lands belonging to the lord of the manor and 2) lands belonging to peasants, without differentiating between individual and communal property. Alicja Falniowska-Gradowska gathered data for 124 villages belonging formerly to the Polish king in the Cracow voivodship. She showed that 33.62 per cent of the land belonged to manorial farms, 65.52 per cent to peasants (as individuals and as a community), 0.36 per cent belonged to *sottys*, and 0.5 per cent to the parish.<sup>31</sup> She also showed that meadows, pastures and arable land were used primarily by peasants, but she did not determine the extent to which they were used jointly by the whole community.

Table 1: Division of land between the manorial farm and the village community in Cracow voivodship, 1785–1788 (%)

Type of land	Manorial	Village community
Forests	91.84	7.94
Ponds	82.63	15.02
Arable land	7.31	91.43
Meadows and pastures	12.48	86.67

Source: Falniowska-Gradowska, *Świadczenia*, see note 29, 60.

In another study, Alicja Falniowska-Gradowska extends the range of her research to include all villages from the former Cracow voivodship in the late eighteenth century. She confirms the discrepancy in the proportion of land used by manorial farms and peasants. She also notes that these differences were similar in all types of estates – royal, ecclesiastical and gentry. The proportion of arable land (cultivated and fallow) belonging to peasants was the smallest in gentry estates (about 75 per cent), much bigger in ecclesiastical estates (82.7 per

cent of cultivated and 95.2 per cent of fallow land) and the biggest in royal estates (89.7 per cent of cultivated and 94 per cent of fallow land). 83.2 per cent of meadows and 91.1 per cent of pastures belonged to peasants in royal estates, while in ecclesiastical and gentry estates the proportion of meadows and pastures in the hands of peasants was smaller (meadows: 73.8 and 73.7 per cent, pastures: 87.8 and 78.2 per cent). Most ponds and forests were controlled by the manor.

Table 2: Division of land between manorial farms and peasants in estates according to their ownership in Cracow voivodship, 1785–1788 (%)

Ownership	Users	General division of land	Arable land	Gardens	Meadows	Ponds	Fallow land	Pastures, thickets	Forests
The crown	manorial farm	33.6	10.3	8.5	16.8	81.6	6.0	8.9	90.0
	peasants	66.4	89.7	91.5	83.2	18.4	94.0	91.1	10.0
The church	manorial farm	31.5	17.3	6.6	26.2	91.7	4.8	12.2	92.8
	peasants	68.5	82.7	90.4	73.8	8.3	95.2	87.8	7.2
The gentry	manorial farm	42.4	24.6	16.0	26.7	92.0	25.4	21.8	95.2
	peasants	57.6	75.4	84.0	73.7	8.0	74.6	78.2	4.8
Total	manorial farm	37.7	18.8	12.5	23.3	90.2	9.8	15.5	92.9
	peasants	62.3	81.2	87.5	76.7	9.8	90.2	84.5	7.1

Source: Alicja Falniowska-Gradowska, *Studia nad społeczeństwem województwa krakowskiego w XVIII wieku*, Warszawa 1982, 33, table 11.

The structural analysis of lands in the hands of peasants in Cracow voivodship at the end of the eighteenth century shows that most of the land at their disposal was arable (more than 60 per cent), while pastures and meadows formed a lesser part (over 20 per cent and about 8 per cent). A similar pattern was in effect in the east of Little Poland where arable land made 71.7 per cent of lands used by peasants, with pastures (13.4 per cent) and meadows (9.1 per cent) making the lesser part of the total.<sup>32</sup>

Table 3: Uses of land held by peasants in Cracow voivodship, 1785–1788 (%)

Ownership	Arable land	Gardens	Meadows	Ponds	Fallow land	Pastures	Forests	Total
The crown	60.2	2.4	7.9	0.1	0.7	24.1	4.3	100
The church	62.3	3.6	8.8	0.0	0.9	22.4	2.0	100
The gentry	65.4	3.0	8.1	0.2	0.2	21.0	2.1	100
Total	63.0	2.9	8.1	0.1	0.5	22.5	2.9	100

Source: Alicja Falniowska-Gradowska, *Studia nad społeczeństwem województwa krakowskiego w XVIII wieku*, Warszawa 1982, 36, table 14.

Bohdan Baranowski claims that the role of the commons was the most significant in husbandry. Here the community of peasants shared common pastures and meadows as well as acres of fallow land belonging to individual peasants. Baranowski notes that ‘most frequently, cattle from the whole village were tended by a hired shepherd’<sup>33</sup> although sometimes the task was also performed by cattle owners themselves, who would take turns guarding the animals. The commons were used not only for communal cattle but also for pig and horse grazing.<sup>34</sup> In the Subcarpathian region, the commons were used as pastures for sheep. Individual sheep owners put their animals together into one big herd and arranged for their guarding.<sup>35</sup>

Much less information is available about the uses of forests at the disposal of the whole village community. The proportion of forests in the commons was smaller than in the lands belonging to the manor or to individual peasants and their economic significance for the community was probably also smaller. Instead, from the late middle ages, location privileges included regulations guaranteeing the right of peasants to exploit manorial forests. They were allowed to cut trees there or to hunt birds, but they were expected to pay a special rent in return called *gajowe*.<sup>36</sup>

The main village square played an important role whose significance can be compared to that of the central market square in a town.<sup>37</sup> The area was used as a location for some joint village investments, such as a church, communal beehives or granary.<sup>38</sup> Historians have paid most of their attention to the role of the main village square (*nawsie* in the narrow sense) in the process of settlement of some specific social groups in villages. Some late medieval location privileges clearly stated that *nawsie* was assigned for the settlement of blacksmiths, weavers, butchers, shoemakers and bakers.<sup>39</sup> Later, the square became also the place where the poorest peasants, *zagrodnicy* and *chalupnicy*, had their houses. In the beginning, these two groups were invited to settle on *nawsie* by *soltys*, but in the early modern period, the initiative was taken over by the village community.<sup>40</sup> Some of these settlers were engaged to perform certain social and economic functions, such as road building, looking after the church, working as night watchmen, or simply ‘providing the community service should the need arise’.<sup>41</sup>

Soon, *nawsie* became simply the settling place of hired labourers working on manorial farms or on the farms of wealthy peasants. In communist historiography they were referred to as rural proletariat.<sup>42</sup> When decisions concerning the settlement on the territory of *nawsie* were taken by the whole community, the settlement process was often disorderly and, in the

eighteenth century, tended to result in overpopulation. When new dwellers were settled in *nawsie* by the lord, the whole process was usually better planned and more methodical, and its aim was usually to supply labour force for a certain section of the manorial economy, e. g. weaving in Silesia.<sup>43</sup>

A characteristic feature of settlement on the territory of *nawsie* was the so called *wspólnictwo* (co-operation). Originally, *wspólnictwo* was connected with inheritance patterns, e. g. when two brothers lived and worked together on one farm.<sup>44</sup> Later, the term was also used with reference to situations when, as Jan Rutkowski explains, 'co-operators' received pieces of land from peasants and in return they were supposed to participate in paying duties imposed by the landlord and the state. Participation took the form of rents paid by 'co-operators' to peasants who held the land. Moreover, 'co-operators' provided labour services to peasants or worked in their stead on the manorial farm.<sup>45</sup> In eighteenth-century Little Poland village communities often extended the acreage of arable land by turning communal fallow lands into gardens or small allotments for their 'co-operators'.<sup>46</sup>

Some parts of the Subcarpathia (eastern Little Poland, Pokucie and some parts of Podolia) were characterised by the existence of rural communities (*wspólnota gminna*). According to Roman Rozdolski at the end of the eighteenth century as many as 469 villages functioned as rural communities, which means that all the lands in a village, except the grounds where houses, farm buildings and gardens were situated, were the communal property of all villagers.<sup>47</sup> In *wspólnota gminna*, separate farmlands, meadows or pastures belonging to individual peasants did not exist. Instead, 'all the lands in a village were used for a number of years to grow cereal crops and then for a few years they served as pastures or hay meadows'.<sup>48</sup> The communal land was divided into smaller pieces and peasants were assigned to farm them for a given period of time. Certain categories of villagers were excluded from this division. They were *zagrodnicy* (crofters who possessed only a house and a garden), *chałupnicy* (cottagers without land who possessed only a house), and *komornicy* (lodgers without a house who worked for other peasants).

## Conclusion

Polish historians writing about the premodern rural economy in the first half of the twentieth century and then in the communist period tended to bring the political emancipation of Polish peasants to the foreground of their studies and sought the traces of class struggle in historical sources from the pre-industrial era. Consequently, all those historians paid considerable attention to the problem of mutual relations between landlords, representing the privileged, and their subjects, representing the oppressed. They primarily based their research on court records that documented legal disputes over land resources. Beyond that, available primary sources would also allow historians to conduct comprehensive studies of the commons in Poland, but, unfortunately, no attempt has been made so far. The more or less successful efforts of rural communities to preserve the commons have been mentioned by many historians on the margins of other discussions, but this is not enough to present the problem synthetically. The question of the commons in Poland remains largely neglected by historians and requires studies with the use of modern research tools and techniques to allow more detailed conclusions. Our knowledge of the commons in late medieval and early



modern Poland is, at this stage, best summarised by Burszta writing that ‘neither *sołtys*, nor landlords were able to destroy the institution of *nawsie*. It survived, although substantially reduced in size, and so did the custom of the communal use of the land and its resources.’<sup>49</sup>

## References

- 1 Jan Gerlach, *Nawsie-wspólna własność gromadzka wsi staropolskiej*, in: *Czasopismo Prawno-Historyczne* 4 (1952), 260–273; Józef Burszta, *Zagadnienie ‘nawsia’ w osadnictwie wiejskim*, in: *Lud* 41 (1954), 439–498.
- 2 Zofia Podwińska, *Zmiany forma osadnictwa wiejskiego na ziemiach polskich we wcześniejszym średniowieczu: Żreb, wieś, opole*, Wrocław 1973, 351.
- 3 Wojciech Kętrzyński/Stanisław Smolka (eds.), *Codex Diplomaticus Monasterii Tynecensis, Lwów 1875*, no. 19, 43 f.; Franciszek Bujak, *Studia nad osadnictwem Małopolski*, Poznań 2001, 327; Podwińska, *Zmiany*, see note 2, 352.
- 4 *Kodeks Dyplomatyczny Wielkopolski*, vol. 1, Poznań 1877, document no. 415; Stanisław Trawkowski, *Gospodarka wielkiej własności cysterskiej na Dolnym Śląsku w XIII wieku*, Warszawa 1959, 136.
- 5 Henryk Łowmiański, *Początki Polski*, vol. 3, Warszawa 1967, 407.
- 6 Karol Modzelewski, *Chłopi w monarchii wczesnopiastowskiej*, Wrocław 1987, 161–207; Karol Buczek, *Organizacja opolna w Polsce wczesnośredniowiecznej*, in: *Studia Historyczne* 13 (1970), 205–248.
- 7 Jacek Matuszewski, *Vicinia id est... Poszukiwania alternatywnej koncepcji staropolskiego opola*, Łódź 1991, 225–229.
- 8 Podwińska, *Zmiana*, see note 2, 356.
- 9 Łowmiański, *Początki*, see note 5, 406.
- 10 Stefan Chmielewski, *Gospodarka rolna i hodowlana w Polsce w XIV i XV w (Technika i rozmiary produkcji)*, Warszawa 1962, 122.
- 11 Burszta, *Nawsie*, see note 1, 461.
- 12 Gerlach, *Nawsie*, see note 1, 269.
- 13 Burszta, *Nawsie*, see note 1, 449 f.
- 14 *Ibid.*, 453.
- 15 *Ibid.*, 456.
- 16 *Ibid.*, 442.
- 17 *Ibid.*, 461.
- 18 Juliusz Bardach, *Historia państwa i prawa Polski*, vol. 1: *Do połowy XV wieku*, 4<sup>th</sup> ed., Warszawa 1973, 501.
- 19 For more information about peasant self-government see: Józef Rafacz, *Ustrój wsi samorządnej małopolskiej w XVIII wieku*, Lublin 1922; Jerzy Wyrozumski, *Gromada w życiu samorządowym średniowiecznej wsi polskiej*, in: *Spółczesność Polski Średniowiecznej* 5 (1985), 219–251; Barbara Kubiak, *Gromada wiejska i jej funkcjonowanie w Małopolsce w XVI i XVII wieku*, in: *Spółczesność staropolska* 3 (1983), 139–158; Piotr Guzowski, *Organizacja samorządowa wsi na prawie niemieckim w XV i XVI wieku na Rusi Czerwonej (na przykładzie ziemi sanockiej)*, in: Henryk Gmiterek/Janusz Łosowski (eds.), *Urzędy państwowe, organy samorządowe i kościelne oraz ich kancelarie na polsko-ruskim pograniczu kulturowym i etnicznym w okresie od XV do XIX wieku*, Kraków 2010, 37–54.
- 20 Burszta, *Nawsie*, see note 1, 468. For more information about village types see: Maria Kielczewska-Zalewska, *O typach sieci osiedli wiejskich w Polsce i planie ich przebudowy*, in: *Przegląd Geograficzny* 37 (1965), 457–480; Halina Szulc, *Morfogeneza osiedli wiejskich w Polsce*, Wrocław 1995, 25–82.
- 21 Markus Cerman, *Villagers and Lords in Eastern Europe, 1300–1800*, Basingstoke 2012, 22–31.
- 22 Burszta, *Nawsie*, see note 1, 469.
- 23 *Ibid.*, 472.
- 24 Zbigniew Ćwiek, *Z dziejów wsi koronnej XVII wieku*, Warszawa 1966, 61–73, 182–212.
- 25 Burszta, *Nawsie*, see note 1, 473. For more information about the stronger position of peasants in the crown lands see: Edward Trzyna, *Położenie ludności chłopskiej w królewskich województwach krakowskiego w XVII wieku*, Wrocław 1963, 282–288.
- 26 The list of surviving Polish village court records is contained in Tomasz Wiślicz, *Katalog małopolskich ksiąg sądowych wiejskich XV–XVIII w.*, Warszawa 2007.

- 27 The list of economic instructions is contained in Bohdan Baranowski et al. (eds.), *Instrukcje gospodarcze dla dób magnackich i szlacheckich XVII–XIX wieku*, vol. 1–2, Wrocław 1958–1963; Stefan Inglot/Leszek Wiatrowski (eds.), *Instrukcje gospodarcze dla dóbr pszczyńskich od połowy XVII do początków XIX w.*, Wrocław 1963.
- 28 Stanisław Kutrzeba/Alfons Mańkowski (eds.), *Polskie ustawy wiejskie XV–XVIII*, Kraków 1938.
- 29 Alicja Falniowska-Gradowska, Świadczenia poddanych na rzecz dworu w królewskich województwach krakowskiego w drugiej Polowie XVIII wieku, Wrocław/Warszawa/Kraków 1964, 78.
- 30 Wincenty Styś, Metryki gruntowe józefińskie i franciszkańskie jako źródła do historii gospodarczej Galicji, in: *Roczniki Dziejów Społecznych i Gospodarczych* 2–3 (1932–34), 57–92, here 64f.; Janina Stoksikówna, Galicyjski kataster gruntowy. Jego geneza, dzieje i spuścizna aktowa, in: *Archeion* 63 (1975), 165–187, here 169.
- 31 Falniowska-Gradowska, Świadczenia, see note 29, 59.
- 32 Alicja Falniowska-Gradowska/Franciszek Leśniak, Struktura własności ziemskiej i użytkowania gruntów w Galicji w cyrkulach rzeszowskim, sanockim i tarnowskim w świetle katastru józefińskiego (1785–1787), Toruń 2009, Table 9, 33–24.
- 33 Bohdan Baranowski, Ślady współdziałania na wsi z XVII i XVIII wieku, in: *Prace i Materiały Etnograficzne* 8–9 (1950–51), 681–718, here 691.
- 34 *Ibid.*, 692–693.
- 35 Kazimierz Dobrowolski, Najstarsze osadnictwo Podhala, Lwów 1935, 61.
- 36 *Ibid.*, 58.
- 37 Burszta, Nawsie, see note 1, 465.
- 38 Baranowski, Ślady, see note 33, 700 f.
- 39 Burszta, Nawsie, see note 1, 478.
- 40 *Ibid.*, 478 f.
- 41 *Ibid.*, 481.
- 42 *Ibid.*
- 43 *Ibid.*, 480.
- 44 Jan Rutkowski, Klucz brzozowski biskupstwa przemyskiego w XVIII w., Kraków 1910, 92–93, 98.
- 45 Celina Bobińska, Pewne kwestie chłopskiego użytkowania gruntu i walka o ziemię, in: Celina Bobińska (ed.), *Studia z dziejów wsi małopolskiej w drugiej połowie XVIII wieku*, Warszawa 1957, 319.
- 46 Bobińska, Pewne, see note 45, 320 f.
- 47 Roman Rozdolski, Wspólnota gminna w byłej Galicji Wschodniej i jej zanik, Lwów 1936, 8.
- 48 *Ibid.*, 12–14.
- 49 Burszta, Nawsie, see note 1, 476.