On the biography of Leonard Marcin Świeykowski


It might be surprising that the latest book by Dariusz Rolnik¹, a well-known researcher of the time of Stanisław August Poniatowski’s reign, is so large in volume and constitutes such an extensive collection of facts about Leonard Marcin Świeykowski who previously was not considered to be a particularly active or outstanding person, though he held the office of the voivode of Podole. Thus far, he might have been identified as a representative of the middle nobility, competing with the magnates only by the king’s initiative. He could have been seen as a typical careerist who climbed the ladder by supporting the royal court. Although his name appeared in the studies on the political skirmishes in the Crown voivodships of Kresy, no individual or significant role was ascribed to him. Consequently, as emphasized by the author, he was perceived to be “a figurant of his times” whose political views are not worth learning (pp. 8–9). Especially that he was virtually not known to his contemporaries, at least until he was appointed as the Marshal of the Crown Tribunal (1782–1783) and Castellan

¹ D. Rolnik, Leonarda Marcina Świeykowskiego (1721–1793) ostatniego wojewody podolskiego życie codzienne i polityczne oraz myśli o Rzeczypospolitej, Katowice 2016, pp. 756.
of Kamieniec\textsuperscript{2}. His previous political activity was barely spoken of, except for the mentions that he acted as a deputy of Bratslav to the Convocation Sejm in 1764 and that he made efforts to become a deputy in 1778. Later, he was mostly involved in the grain trade with Russia. Thus, it seems natural that the historians could have confused the spelling of his name or even associate him with completely different families such as the family of Szwykowscy (pp. 11–17).

The author was challenged by the lack of details on the life and achievements of the last voivode of Podole. The aim of his research, however, was not to write the biography of L.M. Świeykowski, but rather to show career paths of King Stanisław August Poniatowski’s supporters. Basing on the example of Świeykowski, Dariusz Rolnik sought to present an image of an ordinary nobleman and his advancement to the circle of truly influential politicians of the period (p. 23, 25). Most importantly, he aimed to illustrate a complex nature of Świeykowski’s worldviews in which the republican spirit was combined with the readiness to support the king’s aspirations to strengthen the executive power (p. 30). In order to implement such a structured idea, the author made use of the hitherto fairly unknown, scattered Archive of Świeykowski family (preserved mainly in the Kórnik Library of the Polish Academy of Sciences) and critically examined the literature on the subject which includes hardly any information on Świeykowski and his family, but rather numerous mistakes, partially resulting from the marginalization of his significance. It should be emphasized that the author’s evaluation of the former studies is highly critical and he engages into polemics with the opinions and statements of numerous researchers, including Bogusław Leśnodorski, Jerzy Łojek, Władysław Smoleński, Andrzej Stroynowski, Zofia Zielińska. In this criticism, he does not omit himself, asserting that: “The biographical sketch by Dariusz Rolnik fills the gap only to a lesser extent and is not free of flaws either” (p. 24)\textsuperscript{3}.

\textsuperscript{2} This is indicated by the fact that his name was not even mentioned in the diaries studied by Dariusz Rolnik, \textit{Portret szlachty czasów stanisławowskich, epoki kryzysu, odrodzenia i upadku Rzeczypospolitej w pamiętnikach polskich}, 2\textsuperscript{nd} ed., Katowice 2011.

The book consists of two parts. The former, entitled *L.M. Święykowski, his life, household, political activity and views* addresses the main subject matter, while the latter constitutes a thorough appendix: *The documents and “political” letters of L.M. Święykowski*, comprising 14 letters from the sons and four longer texts from 1792, out of which the most important are: *Citizens’ thoughts on establishing a republican form of government* and *Cato’s view on the freedom of the Commonwealth and on political virtues*. The main body is preceded by a large, 30-page-long introduction and enriched with a bibliography and an index of people. The focus of this article is the first part of the book, divided into nine chapters, with the titles that accurately reflect undertaken themes and the author’s concept. The book is closed with a brief, four-page-long conclusion.

The first chapter *The family and affinities – from “Święykowo” under the “Tulczyn roof” of Stanisław Szczęsny Potocki* (pp. 37–100) perfectly illustrates the problems encountered while conducting a genealogical study of less known noble families. It turned out that even L.M. Święykowski himself was getting lost in the genealogy and financial status of his own (p. 53)⁴. The author, nonetheless, managed to determine the most relevant facts about the affinities of the Święykowski family in the 18th century, pointing to how meaningful the marriages of the voivode’s daughters were as Balbina and Ludwika became wives of the Moszczeński brothers, Adam and Ignacy. The remaining children married already after their father’s death and the most prestigious union was between Jan Nepomucen and Octavia, the daughter of Stanisław Szczęsny Potocki. It was a major leap in the standard of these marriages in comparison with the beginnings of Święykowski’s career who managed to enter into his first marriage to Joanna Justyna Orłowska (sister of Jan Onufry Orłowski who later became a chamberlain).

in 1750 only thanks to the backing of Józef Lubomirski (p. 65). He remarried in 1773 with Izabela of the well-known Dunin-Karwicki family. It was also essential to prove the growing financial capabilities to provide each daughter with 100 thousand zlotys of dowry which was later supplemented (in total, the dowries amounted to 900 thousand zlotys, p. 148).

The second chapter *The properties and economic status – from the owner of Nowosielica to the voivode of Bratslav* (pp. 101–148) shows the improvement in Świeykowski’s financial situation. At the beginning, he owned no estates but the village Nowosielice by virtue of a lien, which generated 3,133 zlotys of annual profit and which he did not buy until 1757. At the end of his days, his estate was worth approx. five million zlotys and it was burdened with only 0.4 million zlotys of debt. Thus, his position in the voivodship was comparable to those of the Sanguszki, Radziwiłł, Lubomirski and Potocki families (pp. 147–148).

The third chapter *Court proceedings – between the politics and the interests of own household* (pp. 149–236) is meant to demonstrate that despite Konstanty Podwysocki’s previous opinion, Świeykowski did his best to follow the letter of the law and repeatedly succeeded, due to his adequate preparation for the confrontations, in court. He was usually the accused party and yet was able to successfully protect his properties, also against border usurpations. Świeykowski adhered to the principles of law and safeguarded them even in less significant arguments (p. 149). He happened to defend his position against the king who supported Marianna Wykowska (Wyhowska) in her dispute with the voivode and influenced the choice of judges that was favorable to her (p. 202).

The fourth chapter *The landlord and protector of peasants – the economy on the borderlands of big politics* (pp. 237–354) is devoted to the voivode’s sources of economic success (s. 237), most of all consisting in diligence, skills and devotion rather than in politics. He could let his remote estates on lease, while taking out a lease on other properties himself. He also exercised discipline over his plenipotentiaries and overseers, frequently with the help of detailed instructions (p. 250). Taking care of his peasants, he prevented from rebellions or escapes. For safety reasons, he also kept at least 40 Cossacks and own unit of hayduks. Until 1792, he was selling grain and liquor to the Russian army at a profit. He also managed (up to 1792/93) to secure his goods against assaults of the Russian
troops (p. 297). It led to the growth of his estates which in the late years of his life were inhabited by tens of thousands of subjects (out of whom ten thousand were men, p. 354).

The fifth chapter Political career – a road to honours (pp. 355–422) reveals how skilled Świeykowski was at public activities which was meant to help him climb the ladder of status. For this reason, he always kept close to the crown (of August III and of Stanislaw August Poniatowski) and knew how to gain the patronage of different figures: since 1743, Stanislaw Lubomirski (later, the voivode of Bratslav), the Sanguszko family, Józef Stempkowski, Maciej Lanckoroński and finally, Stanisław Szczęsny Potocki. It is worth emphasizing that he was able to enjoy their favour for many years by avoiding conflicts and helping with their estates (he managed part of the Ostróg entail after the Kolbuszowa Transaction) and legal matters (as the judge of Bratslav, pp. 355–379)). In addition, he displayed a great deal of political intuition in the most crucial moments. For instance, during the Bar Confederation he minimized his contact with the king but at the same time renounced his plenipotentiary power over Stanisław Lubomirski’s properties, turning away from politics and devoting himself solely to his own estate. At that time, he became involved with Józef Stempkowski, seeking his help with the threat of the haidamakas and the disputes over properties with Grocholski and Czetwertyński. He became a truly significant figure when in 1772, thanks to M. Lanckoroński, August Czartoryski and the royal support, he was appointed as the judge of Bratslav. Soon, he was said to be one of the candidates for position of the voivode of Livonia. Świeykowski’s position of an influential royalist was strengthened by his close association with Szczęsny Potocki, which in 1781 brought him the Order of Saint Stanislaus and in 1782 he became the Marshal of the Crown Tribunal and the Castellan of Kamieniec – as the first senator in his family. It was a token of appreciation for his competence and talent, manifested in his previous economic and judicial activity (p. 422).

The sixth chapter The Senator of the Commonwealth – between Stanisław August and the magnates of Kresy (pp. 423–460) opens with a statement that since L.M. Świeykowski was appointed as senator, he was not particularly active in politics and ceased to attend the sessions of the Diet. His participation was limited to reading reports from his correspondents. Likewise, he did not enter great political disputes and avoided expressing his opinion on the
matter of Maria Dogrumova. His views could only be represented by both Moszczeński brothers, and later by his sons, Michał and Jan Nepomucen. Świeykowski also stayed away from engaging into the campaigns of sejmiks. Even though in 1786 he supported efforts of his brother-in-law, Jan Onufry Orłowski, to become the chamberlain of Letychiv, he probably did not join him at the memorable session of the Podole sejmik when the royalists clashed with Adam Kazimierz Czartoryski. His absence at the sittings of the Diet was attributed to his poor health. As a declared royalist, he maintained good relationship with everyone. And so, he extended his influence on the provinces by offering noblemen his support in their contacts with the king, Szczęsny Potocki and Adam Czartoryski (p. 453).

The seventh chapter VII The time of the Great Diet – the observer, executor and critic of the will of “Diet’s participants” (pp. 461–534) confirms that Świeykowski was unwilling to get involved in political conflicts as he did not take part in the sittings of the Great Diet. For the sake of neutrality, he even limited his thus far close contacts with Szczęsny Potocki. The author considers it to be a manifestation of the pro-state attitude of his protagonist. After all, it brought him further benefits – in 1790, he took the seat of the Voivode of Podole (pp. 461–468). At the same time, however, he expressed an interest in the ongoing sessions of the Great Diet and in 1790, supported his son Michał in his efforts to become a deputy. While remaining at home, he privately criticized certain reforms, in particular the abolition of the Permanent Council and the lack of a new executive power. He also disapproved of garrulousness and ineffectiveness of Diet’s decisions and the ineptitude of the civil and military commissions. He opposed to teasing Russia, partly concerned about keeping his trade profitable; yet, he did not believe in developing close relationship with Prussia. At the same time, however, he zealously fulfilled his civic duties, like in the case of taxes and providing recruits. The Constitution of May 3, and especially the manner in which it was passed, proved to be a turning point that agitated the voivode. Only then did he realise that the king was the main initiator of this attack on traditional liberties of the nobility. Still, he avoided making unambiguous declarations and although his reluctant attitude was widely known, he did not join the battle

for the result of the so-called constitutional referendum of February 14, 1792 (pp. 510–531).

The eight chapter *In the Targowica Confederation – advising the marshal of the crown general confederation?* (pp. 535–578) depicts a dramatic period after the establishment of the Targowica Confederation in St. Petersburg (Jan Nepomucen Świeykowski, son of the voivode, was already there in March 1792). At that time, Świeykowski already abandoned the pretense of neutrality and on May 14, 1792, joined the Targowica Confederation. Yet, it was not until July 31, that he took part in the congress of the nobility in Dubno and did not fulfil his obligations as an advisor of the marshal of the General Council which as usual he attributed to his ill health (pp. 541, 555). He still supported military operations of the Polish army, which was also due to the attitudes of Russian troops who were destroying his properties regardless of liberation that the confederation established. All the same, he naïvely believed in Catherine II’s good will and that she was unaware of mass robberies. Also, he still trusted Szczęsny Potocki and, in response to the appeal (of September 29, 1792) of the frequently criticized General Council, he sent him his project of reforming the country (pp. 570–576).

The ninth chapter *Political views – a republican by the king’s side or a monarchist among republicans?* (pp. 579–610) constitutes a closing of the deliberations and an analysis of Świeykowski’s writings which are published in the second part of the book. His ideas are believed to have been used by Szczęsny Potocki in the anti-monarchical project meant to reform the political system (sent on October 6, 1792) which was rejected by Catherine II (p. 583). In the absence of evidence for his hypothesis that Świeykowski was an unofficial adviser of Szczęsny Potocki, the author points to the low mental efficiency of the Marshal and high positions held by the sons and son-in-law of the voivode (pp. 584–586). Świeykowski’s political concepts were founded on the conviction that the basis of a good system “is the nation made up of virtuous citizens” (p. 586). The said nation was to be characterized by: the love of freedom, law and the motherland. He feared that the king would reach an agreement with Russia bypassing the General Council. Hence, he wanted to limit the monarch’s power by, for example, finishing with the only seemingly functioning three-estate system, narrowing it down to two chambers: of senators and nobles (p. 590). Glorifying freedom
and disapproving of the May coup, he wished to introduce a new political system skipping the lengthy Diet debates, suggesting the solution from 1717. For this reason, the author maintains that his protagonist became politically torn after 1791 (p. 610).

As stated in a brief ending of the discussion, L.M. Świeykowski was in fact underestimated by his contemporaries since he stayed in the side-lines and participated in politics through his relatives. Consequently, in 1794, his sons were denounced in absentia as traitors (pp. 611–612); yet, it happened after the voivode’s death. Świeykowski himself took pride in obeying the law and adhering to the republican principles until the end of his days. Being a nouveau riche person, he could also boast that due to his diligence, abilities, good knowledge of economics and positive thinking, he was successful with his estate, held office and politics. Even though it was common to make use of the king’s and magnates’ backing, Świeykowski’s career was based mostly on his own work and such patronage was only a contributing factor (pp. 613–614).

While the book provides a very broad coverage of the subject matter and is printed in a neat edition, certain shortcomings of the editorial nature cannot be ignored. For example, a nearly identical sentence appears twice on the same page (30): “S.Sz. Potocki was accompanied by the sons of L.M. Świeykowski – Michał and Jan Nepomucen, and his sons-in-law – Adam and Ignacy Moszczeński, virtually at all times”. Next, writing of 1792, the young Świeykowski brothers are referred to as “sons of a castellan” and “sons of a voivode” on the two neighboring pages (pp. 562–563). This category of oversights includes the sentence: “This author no conclusion is drawn from this” (p. 381). The statement that Świeykowski “in a sense, remained a royalist, as he entrusted the absolute power to a narrow group of the wealthiest nobility, and he did so on behalf of the noble nation” (p. 610) is to be considered incomprehensible – what do oligarchic tendencies have in common with royalism? Lacking consistency or being overly influenced by a source text translated into the use of the term “house” while referring to “family” of Świeykowski (p. 50)\(^6\). What is more, the author includes in the bibliography publications which are not referenced in any

---

\(^6\) It should be noted that the use of the notion “house” in respect of the 17\(^{th}\) and 18\(^{th}\) centuries should be avoided, as decided at the conference “Honestas et turpitudo. Magnates in the Commonwealth in the 16\(^{th}\)–18\(^{th}\) centuries”, held in Augustów on September 10–12, 2015, in which Dariusz Rolnik also participated.
A more serious issue lies in the lack of references to the contemporary Ukrainian literature devoted to the political situation and properties in the south-eastern Kresy in the 18th century, while it seems essential to mention the works of Tatiana Czubina and Mykoła Krykun. Neither did Rolnik include numerous Polish works that would offer a broader context of Świeykowski’s political, and especially economic, activity.

One may have certain reservations concerning some of the author’s detailed claims. For instance, he insists that during the 1786 Diet’s session, Adam Moszczeński maintained a moderate political stance rather than that of the opposition, and that his comments on the Russian violence stemmed simply from widespread indignation (p. 444). He forgot, however, that during the same ses-

footnote7. A more serious issue lies in the lack of references to the contemporary Ukrainian literature devoted to the political situation and properties in the south-eastern Kresy in the 18th century, while it seems essential to mention the works of Tatiana Czubina and Mykoła Krykun. Neither did Rolnik include numerous Polish works that would offer a broader context of Świeykowski’s political, and especially economic, activity9.

One may have certain reservations concerning some of the author’s detailed claims. For instance, he insists that during the 1786 Diet’s session, Adam Moszczeński maintained a moderate political stance rather than that of the opposition, and that his comments on the Russian violence stemmed simply from widespread indignation (p. 444). He forgot, however, that during the same ses-

---


sion his closest “friend” Szczęsny Potocki was one of the leading oppositionists, and Moszczyński himself signed the famous manifesto of Kazimierz Rzewuski. Likewise, it is difficult to agree with the statement that the postulates to establish three academies, one for each province of the Commonwealth, revealed a decentralization trend, while in reality it solely reflected efforts at educational development, also manifested in repeated demands of the Greater Poland nobility to set up an academy in Poznań.

Nevertheless, all of these are just details that do not influence the evaluation of Rolnik’s work, which encourages deeper reflection and questions. To some extent, they are associated with a fairly understandable tendency to emphasize the merits of the protagonist, to stress the integrity of his character and disinterestedness of his actions, even if, in accordance with the spirit of the era, Świerkowski believed that merits should be rewarded. This view is also expressed in the description of how the nature of his relationships with other magnates was changing. Initially, he was only a client of Józef and Stanisław Lubomirski; later, he was able to collaborate with Józef Stempkowski, Michał Walewski or even with Szczęsny Potocki – and benefited most from this relation, though he was not Potocki’s “creature” as the author advocates. He grew closer to Tulczyn thanks to his sons-in-law, Adam and Ignacy Moszczyński, who were members of Szczęsny Potocki’s household. It proves Świerkowski’s talent for arranging suitable marriages and true mastery of making friends, including Gen. Jan Komarzewski (considered him a relative) and Michał Jerzy Wandalin Mniszech, or even with some reservations: Bishops Antoni Okęcki and Antoni Ostrowski, and the castellan of Kraków, Antoni Barnaba Jabłonowski. Also, he enjoyed the support of Primate Michał Poniatowski. Świerkowski gained his position despite being just the judge of Bratslav. Before he was elected for the office, he skillfully outplayed Grocholski in the competition.

---


11 A. Stroynowski, Opozycja sejmowa..., p. 409.
to become the chamberlain of Bratslav, much as he did not care about it (pp. 373–375).

What can raise questions is the lack of comparisons between the course of life and achievements of Świeykowski and of other representatives of the senate from Stanisław August Poniatowski’s period, especially those who, like him, just entered the senate elite. The prominent figures of bishops should be regrettably omitted as their way of social advancement differed from that of secular senators. And when it comes to the latter, more detailed studies were rarely conducted (apart from the short entries in *The Polish Biographical Dictionary*), at least in the case of those who joined the senate during the time of S.A. Poniatowski’s reign. And hence, the author could not have used either the biographies of: Fryderyk Moszyński, the natural grandson of Augustus II; Antoni Tyzenhauz, coming from a senatorial family; Joachim Litawor Chreptowicz, related to the great Lithuanian houses. Tadeusz Lipski, the castellan of Łęczyca, came from a similar background, yet no monograph was fully devoted to his person. Therefore, there are not too many options for comparing Świeykowski with other senators who, during Stanisław August Poniatowski’s reign, took up the office without falling back on their influential relatives. In fact, the choice is limited to Jacek Jezierski. While he was an incompa-

---

12 The most positive assessment of this group of senators was done by Ewa M. Ziółek, *Biskupi senatorowie wobec reform Sejmu Czteroletniego*, Lublin 2002, p. 67. An inability to draw a comparison is all the more unfortunate that the biggest number of extensive biographies were written about this group.


rably more notable figure, constantly participating in the sessions of the Diet and undertaking comprehensive business activities, the memoirists seem to have given him a comparable amount of attention as to L.M. Świeykowski\textsuperscript{19}. It should be noted, however, that the castellan of Łuków was mentioned more frequently\textsuperscript{20} and his name was not being twisted as it happened in the case of the voivode of Podole\textsuperscript{21}. Making such a comparison would make it possible to achieve one of the main aims of the book, i.e. the portrayal of royalists’ attitudes and their promotion from ordinary nobles to the circle of influential senators. And since it was not done, Świeykowski emerges as a unique phenomenon of the Stanisław August Poniatowski period, which is clearly a misunderstanding as it was the era of fast promotions, gained mainly thanks to royal patronage\textsuperscript{22}.

It would be also necessary to present his political attitude and concepts against a broader background in order to learn his methods of political activity in the center of action – Warsaw, as well as in the provinces, where he was one of the main leaders of the nobility. Given that he was unwilling to come to Warsaw, especially after he became a senator, it is not clear to what he owed his successes. He did not attend any of the Diet sessions, and so he remained anonymous, at least to those who were less involved in politics. The analysis of Dariusz Rolnik reveals that Świeykowski was not too active in the life of sejmiks either. After all, he did not have to attend the gatherings in person but simply prepare for them and delegate his trusted people to face direct confrontations. Hence, his withdrawal is surprising and hard to understand, especially when compared with the attitudes of other magnates, including those

\textsuperscript{19} They were completely overlooked by Kajetan Koźmian (Pamiętniki, vol. I, Wrocław 1972), Antoni Chrząszczewski writes only one time that Świeykowski transferred the dowry (Pamiętnik oficjalisty Potockich z Tulcyn, Warszawa 1976, p. 48) M. Matuszewicz mentions each of men once (op. cit., vol. II, p. 454, 550).


\textsuperscript{22} Stanisław Kosmowski writes with a great enthusiasm on how the nobility was used to fight the magnate elite, Rys panowania Stanisława Augusta Króla Polskiego, [n.p.] 1807, pp. 8–9; Pamiętniki Stanisława Kosmowskiego z końca XVIII wieku, Poznań 1860, p. 14.
related to the royal court. It is also hard to grasp on what the author bases his claim that Świeykowski was not “a figurant of his times”. One can only agree with the fact that he could influence the course of events in the Bratslav voivodship as he remained there, but not in the voivodship of Podole, which he represented despite holding none of its properties (until 1791). Moreover, Rolnik’s study lacks further references to the literature while discussing the political concepts of the voivode and thus, it is difficult to assess to what extent they are credible. In particular, the author could have indicated, in particular, common views of nobility which Świeykowski repeated or argued with in his projects and deliberations. The analysis of his views also lacks a reference to the reforms of the Great Diet as they must have been influencing his thoughts, which is evident in, for example, the repetitions of the concept to introduce the equal number of Diet representatives for each province or make a new administrative division (p. 600).

However, certain errors or problems with the analysis do not affect the final, highly positive evaluation of the book. It is important to emphasize that at the time, the king did not expect the regional leaders to understand his plans, but to simply implement his directives. For this reason, during the Great Diet, he could have been greatly surprised at emerging independent attitudes of those who were thus far his supporters. It turned out that the king “either did not foresee the actions of the Castellan of Kamieniec or was not concerned about his political views... Until this turning point, the cooperation between Stanisław August and L.M. Świeykowski was going quite harmoniously. It was certainly motivated by economic

---

interest but also by issues of other nature, such as the prospect of restoration of the Commonwealth, even though to Świeykowski such an undertaking was limited to the reorganization of the country, or at least there are no indications that he thought otherwise. It was not until 1788 that certain cracks in their relationship started to show” (p. 421).

On the other hand, the most important advantage of Dariusz Rolnik’s extensive work is pointing to the new possibilities and problems of research in the field of biography writing, like in the provocative wording of the title of the last chapter: *a republican by the king’s side or a monarchist among republicans?* But even more importantly, the author undertakes a methodically engaging research on the management of Świeykowski’s properties, to which he devotes two chapters (the second and the fourth one). The methods and results of the study on the size and profitability of his properties are particularly appealing. As it appears, there are materials that allow for a fairly precise estimation of their value, as well as a detailed presentation of various economic activities of the nobility and magnates in Kresy. It gives a possibility of a more comprehensive approach to the issue of economic development in the south-eastern Kresy, which can also be referred to as a “right-bank Ukraine”24, especially after 1783 as it was when a sharp increase in the profitability of these estates occurred, affecting the position and views of the nobility and the magnates, and most of all, their attitude to Russia. This process was reflected in that, after the partitions, the Polish nobility, along with Świeykowski’s sons, was engaging in the political system of the Russian Empire. It also applies to the possibility of a new approach to the peasant issue understood in both economic and social terms. Nonetheless, it posed an equally acute political problem since the living tradition of the haidamak movements must have influenced the attitudes and actions of the nobility and magnates from Kresy, making them markedly different than those of Greater Poland. Moreover, the author’s extensive considerations about the lawsuits over properties are also engaging,

---

though legal historians could assess them better (chapter third). What is most relevant are not the results of the legal proceedings that Świeykowski was engaged in, but the procedures and methods allowing him to win. We are given a rare example of presenting bare court records as a passionate game for increasing one’s estate, which also involves the struggle for respecting the law. To a political historian, the question remains of how the voivode of Podole managed to achieve such spectacular career advancement without active participation in politics on the state level, limiting himself to being a deputy in 1764 and an attempt to become one in 1778 or holding the office of the Marshal of the Crown Tribunal. He continued to neglect his duties as a senator, always making excuse about his poor health. Consequently, he might prove useful to the court solely on the regional level, the author does not provide too many examples of Świeykowski’s engagement in this sphere either. All in all, the political career of the last voivode of Podole remains a mystery and an incentive for further research and a search of analogies which would allow to answer the probing questions. And that is what it is all about, the whole point of historians’ work.
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