

Model of the Formal and Functional Evolution of a Private Feudal Residence in Late Medieval Poland: Case of the Residences of the Pałuka Family in Northeastern Greater Poland

Author: Tomasz Olszacki, Artur Różański

PL ISSN 0860-0007; e-ISSN: 2719-7069

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.23858/FAH38.2025.001>

<https://rcin.org.pl/dlibra/publication/285687>

Jak cytować:

Olszacki, T., & Różański, A. (2025). Model of the Formal and Functional Evolution of a Private Feudal Residence in Late Medieval Poland: Case of the Residences of the Pałuka Family in Northeastern Greater Poland. Fasciculi Archaeologiae Historicae, 38, 7–38. <https://doi.org/10.23858/FAH38/2025.001>

TOMASZ OLSZACKI*, ARTUR RÓŻAŃSKI**

MODEL OF THE FORMAL AND FUNCTIONAL EVOLUTION OF A PRIVATE FEUDAL RESIDENCE IN LATE MEDIEVAL POLAND: CASE OF THE RESIDENCES OF THE PAŁUKA FAMILY IN NORTHEASTERN GREATER POLAND

Abstract

This article analyses the evolution of private feudal seats in late medieval Poland on the example of the Pałuka family from northeastern Greater Poland. The authors present the history of research on the feudal residences and underscore the significance of an interdisciplinary approach that combines archaeology and an analysis of written sources. This paper discusses the spatial and functional development of the castle in Gołańcz and the residences in Danabórz and Łekno, noting the variability of the forms and uses of these structures. The present investigation has revealed the existence of four alternative variants of the residences' evolution: from a simple house connected with manor (mainly farm) outbuildings in manor complexes (1), a residential-farm manor with a defensive *fortalicium* (2), a residential and defensive *fortalicium* with a manorial farmstead (3), and a castle (4). We highlight the role of the regalian right to fortification in the formation of knightly manorial complexes. Our study points to the necessity of further interdisciplinary research and a wider identification of field and written sources. We consider the evolution model proposed here as credible for the Pałuki microregion, but open for comparison to other areas of Poland.

Received: 09.12.2025 Revised: 24.12.2025 Accepted: 27.12.2025


Citation: Olszacki T., Różański A. 2025. *Model of the Formal and Functional Evolution of a Private Feudal Residence in Late Medieval Poland: Case of the Residences of the Pałuka Family in Northeastern Greater Poland*. "Fasciculi Archaeologiae Historicae" 38, 7-38, DOI 10.23858/FAH38/2025.001


INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF FEUDAL RESIDENCES IN POLAND

Brief History of Research

From the present-day perspective, the study of late medieval feudal residences (including monarchical, ecclesial, magnate, knightly, and groups outside the noble estate) has quite an extensive and rich tradition in Poland. The vast disparity between the multitude of families who must have owned residences in the past, complete with economic

infrastructure, and the modest number of masonry castles and defensive mansions has long led researchers to conclude that the standard consisted of layouts constructed from short-lived materials, meaning none have survived to the present day. However, we can still observe the remains of these residences in the form of terrain features, primarily mounds surrounded by moats known as *godzisko stożkowate* (literally 'conical stronghold') by Polish archaeologists. These belong to the European tradition of motte-type residences. Professional research into these residences began in the 1960s with Janina Kamińska, and an opportunity for broader studies emerged with research on two sites with particularly well-preserved stratigraphy and multiple artefacts: Siedlątków in the historical Sieradz

* Corresponding author; Institute of Archaeology and Ethnology, Polish Academy of Sciences, Łódź;  <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2667-3222>; t.olszacki@iaepan.edu.pl

** Faculty of Archaeology, Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań;  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5994-1735>; artur.rozanski@amu.edu.pl

KEYWORDS

- Greater Poland
- Pałuki
- Middle Ages
- medieval castles
- knight's manor house
- motte
- residential tower



land and Plemięta in the Chełmno land.¹ Despite surveying numerous sites since that time, their findings have rarely been as spectacular. Rather, they have been an accumulation of repetitive observations, which is why the aforementioned strongholds have remained model structures. However, two areas of research stand out as the most significant discoveries of the late 20th and early 21st centuries. The first is the desk research of Leszek Kajzer, who combined the perspectives of an archaeologist and a scholar of written sources, subjectively structuring the narrative around facts relating to the field, history, and the history of architecture. This makes Polish knightly seats a phenomenon that can be widely understood within the context of medieval studies.² The second is the pioneering 1996 monograph by archaeologist Ryszard Grygiel and historian and source expert Tomasz Jurek on the Doliwa family's residences along the Warta River. This was the first work to explore the essence of the evolution of specific residences by successfully combining two research perspectives, without any other historians producing more numerous or equal continuations.³ The 2010s saw the publication of two significant, albeit very different, works. In 2011, Anna Marciniak-Kajzer published an archaeological monograph on Polish knightly manor houses, offering an interesting reflection on the varying quality of the research collected in the catalogue.⁴ In 2017, Dominik Nowakowski published a monumental work on motte fortifications in Silesia, subtitled "Studium archeologiczno-historyczne" ("Archaeological and historical study"), which is a comprehensive study of the subject containing rich illustrative material.⁵

It is likely that the merits of this publication will grow over time, providing new impetus for research into this type of layout. Both monographs provide an extensive overview of European and Polish research on medieval manors and also present discussions of their formal and functional reconstruction (especially in the work of A. Marciniak-Kajzer). The timeliness of the information presented there means that we do not need to reference it here. The last two post-conference volumes of the *Qolloquia Castrensis* series, published by the Royal Castle in Warsaw, provide more extensive reports on private Polish

castles in the 14th and 15th centuries, in terms of their origins, the analysis of the circle of their founders, and formal matters.⁶

Methodological and Source Problems

With the exception of one dated example of interdisciplinary research showing the evolution and transformation of a private feudal residence, studies of this kind in the area of the former Kingdom of Poland have not developed. The absence of basic research has led to a deadlock in which discussions primarily involve the reinterpretation of incomplete, territorially distant studies, interspersed with random and often biased quotes from written sources or debatable parallels from cultural anthropology or art history.

The Pałuki Region as a Field of Interdisciplinary Research

An attempt to build on the work of R. Grygiel and T. Jurek was a grant implemented between 2017 and 2021 entitled "Castrum et curia. Studies on the development of private defensive residences and their outbuildings, from the Middle Ages to the early modern period, on the example of the estates of the Pałuka family and their descendants". The project aimed to create a model of the evolution of a residence from a manor house, for which questions remained about its forms and functions, to a castle. The research area is a part of northeastern Greater Poland, the historical region of Pałuki,⁷ and more precisely its part: the historical Kcynia district (which existed from about 1361 to 1768).⁸ The research sites included Gołańcz (already known to the authors from their own earlier research), Danabórz, Łekno and Szubin, i.e., selected residences of the branching Pałuka family (Fig. 1). The research was intended to include an in-depth archival enquiry, a reinterpretation of past field research (namely the excellent archaeological project conducted by Eugeniusz Cnotliwy⁹ to verify the defensive residences), a geomorphological analysis, extensive remote sensing and, finally, archaeological excavation.¹⁰ Ultimately, a comprehensive research programme could be carried out in Gołańcz and Danabórz, despite property issues and the questionable revitalisation of the castle in Szubin beginning at the same time. First, we will present a broader overview of the research in

¹ Kamińska 1968.

² The programmatic text here was Kajzer 1975, while an initial summary was the script: Kajzer 1988, while the monograph: Kajzer 2010, served as the finalization of the research (it contains a full set of the author's works on the subject).

³ Grygiel and Jurek 1996.

⁴ Marciniak-Kajzer 2011. Abbreviated English version: Marciniak-Kajzer 2016.

⁵ Nowakowski 2017.

⁶ Problems essential to this research are, among others, discussed in the studies published there: Lasek 2019; Bania 2023; Mrozowski 2023.

⁷ Wyrwa 1989.

⁸ A detailed account of its establishment, borders, operation and property structure is presented in Piber-Zbieranowska 2015.

⁹ Cnotliwy 1995.

¹⁰ Różański 2018.



Fig. 1. The Pałuki region on the map of Poland with the current administrative division and the location of the places discussed in the article.

Graphic design:
M. Krzepakowski.

Gołańcz, Danabórz and Łekno. Following this, and in reference to it, we will present the titular model of the evolution of a private feudal residence,¹¹ with all caveats expressed in the final section.

THE GOŁAŃCZ RESIDENCE – EVOLUTION AND ARCHITECTURE

Genealogy of Owners

The progenitor of the Gołańcz and Danabórz lines of the Pałuka family was Sławnik of Gołańcz, Castellan of Nakło from 1296 to 1299. He was the son of Światosław II and died before 1302. His wife was Małgorzata of the Leszczyc family.¹² He had three sons: the Voivode of Tczew, who later became the Stolnik of Pomerania; the Castellan of Nakło, who later became the Castellan of Gniezno; and Maciej of Gołańcz. The Gołańcz estate was given to the youngest son, but as he had chosen a career in the church, it was passed on to Zbylut's younger son (Maciej's nephew): Tomisław, whose brother bore the name Zbylut after their father and remained in Danabórz. Maciej, lord of Gołańcz and previously a scholastic of Włocławek, was consecrated bishop of Włocławek in 1324. He headed the episcopal capital until 1364, when he relinquished this title in favour of his nephew Zbylut of Wąsosz (son of Światosław, who is still often erroneously called

Zbylut of Gołańcz). Maciej died four years later. He and his two aforementioned brothers were loyal supporters of Prince Władysław Łokietek, who later became King of Poland. The bishop was involved in the Kuyavian Piast's diplomacy, while Zbylut and his brother Świątosław stood beside him in battles against the Teutonic Order and were witnesses in the trial against the Order. Their service earned them important offices and endowments, and they lived to see knightly belts from King Casimir the Great, Łokietek's son, in 1339. Tomisław Zbylutowic (also known as "Tomisław, son of Zbylut"), nicknamed "Domabórz", was probably given the Gołańcz estate while his uncle was still alive, as he wrote from there as early as 1364. Initially a Poznań deputy cupbearer (Polish: *podczaszy*), he later became a judge in Poznań and finally, after exchanging offices with another notable, a judge in Kalisz. He remained in this position until his death around 1377/1381. The founding of the town is most likely connected with the period when Gołańcz was under his rule.¹³ It should be noted that, with his father and both uncles among Władysław Łokietek's war veterans, he could rely on Casimir the Great's favour. However, this was probably damaged by his signing the confederation act opposing the king's policy in 1352. He appeared alongside some of the other Greater Poland magnates who were united around Voivode Maciej Borkowic.¹⁴ Although none of Judge Tomisław's nine sons managed to develop a significant career, they were a force to be reckoned with in the civil

¹¹ Similar studies, which were more closely related to non-invasive methods, were carried out in the service areas of motte-type knight residences in Central Poland (Sikora and Kittel 2017). It is worth considering a correlation between the results of these studies and those of this publication in future.

¹² Genealogy and basic information about the Pałuka family of the Wąsosz-Gołańcz line quoted from: Bieniak 1985; Białowąs 2018.

¹³ Wędzki 2001, 31 et seq.

¹⁴ Łojko 1977, 32, 46.

Fig. 2. Gołańcz, an orthophotomap: A – Castle; B – Outer bailey, C – ‘Old zone’ (manor); D – Garden zone; E – The site of the old parish church; F – City square. Source: CODGiK, created by A. Róžański.



war that erupted in Greater Poland after the death of King Louis of Hungary. This war, known as the Grzymała-Nałęcz War (1382-1385), was fought between the Grzymała and Nałęcz factions. The brothers had an undivided estate, the economic support of a town and a mighty masonry residence and fortress. Contrary to the false information presented in literature, written sources do not attest to the existence of a fortified residence in Gołańcz in 1383, as we have demonstrated.¹⁵

Of the numerous siblings, Jakub, known as “Kusz”, eventually gained the highest position. In the 1st quarter of the 15th century, he was already the sole owner of Gołańcz. In addition to this, he owned several villages in whole or in part, half the town of Krajenka, and, together with his brothers, the town of Łęczyca near Poznań and the neighbouring large parish village of Wiry.¹⁶ This provided a sufficient basis for the accumulation of capital to allow the family residence to be developed (Fig. 2).

The Spatial and Functional Development of the Residence in Light of the Written Sources

The last male Gołańcz Pałuka family members were Jakub’s heirs: Andrzej, who inherited

the nickname ‘Kusz’ (he died without issue before 1471), and his brother Michał (who probably lived until 1461 and had three daughters). They only divided their paternal estate in 1450, and the document written on this occasion is the most important source of information on the topography and chronology of the spatial transitions of the Gołańcz castle property (it is also the first written mention of the castle itself) and is one of the most interesting accounts associated with late medieval Greater Poland. Here, we publish a fragment about the castle and its surroundings, in which Michał of Gołańcz is mentioned: (...) *Totam ipsius medietatem castri Golyancza qua medietas iacet proprius silvam, medietatem domus qua iacet in medio castri ita ex fundamento ut /est e/ muro munita in qua medietate domus debet facere portam in eodem castro in sua parte et hostium facere debet in domo eodem, et medietatem valli alias przekopw que medietas iacet ad silvam et ryppam lacus que servire debent ambabus partibus pro ad aquacionem equorum, et medietatem valve que nunc sunt uel post modum omnium ambabus partibus servire debent, medietatem lacus que iacet proprius antemurium alias przegrothka, antiquam domum que est penes antemurium alias przegrodka et braseum, et medietatem curie que est ante castrum /antiquam area/ et medietate antique aree alias Gwinina que iacet ad magnum pomerium et medietate ortus que iacet penes magnum pomerium et medietatem lacus*

¹⁵ *Dopelnienie Szamotulskie...* 1872, 861; *Joannis de Czarnkow...* 1872, 730-731, 747-748, 753; Olszacki and Róžański 2015, 17-21.

¹⁶ Karczewska 2010, 208-209; Olszacki and Róžański 2015, 21-24.

*proprius castris, spacium alias Placz inter lacum et antiquam domum et wallem alias przekopem ambabus partibus servire debent. Et nullus super eodem spacio aliquid eo servire debent. Via, qua vadit ad castrum ambabus partibus servire debet. In advocatus debet servire uno anno domino Michaeli et alio anno domino Andree, at iam isto anno (...) servire debet primo domino Michaeli. Et medietatem oppidi Golyanicza, qua medietas iacet ad Thomczyce (...) medietatem ville Golyanicza que iacet ad silvam (...) medietatem allodi (...).*¹⁷ From that moment on, the brothers were to manage the castle together, each overseeing their own dedicated zones. We will return to the numerous problems associated with this document later in the paper. From now on, we will forego a closer account of the castle's history, which is no longer tied to the Pałuka family, and merely report the most essential information taken from numerous written sources. Until the mid-16th century, court sources consistently refer to the fortified residence in Gołańcz as a castle (e.g., in 1541 there was mention of *oppidum et castrum Golancza*¹⁸), while later naming becomes more fluid. Thus, undoubtedly, at the same table in the parade chamber (*mensa in stuba*) of the brick tower house in 1568, the Kcynia town usher read a lawsuit "in the castle",¹⁹ while already in 1607 it was to be done in the "room with a stove" "in a manor" (*curia*),²⁰ similarly, in 1628 and 1634, when the same interior on a similar occasion was called a "dining room".²¹ In 1584, there was mention of "an ancient ditch. Whose water from the lake and from a trench from the castle" was led to an artificial body of water, certainly north of the castle, deep in a garden.²² Finally, in 1606, a court case mentioned *Arcum seu fortalitium oppidi vel Villa Gołańcza*.²³ The complex under consideration is referred to as *arx* in Latin texts that documented its capture and destruction by Swedish troops on May 3, 1656, while in peasant testimonies written in Polish relating to the same event, the place is referred to as a "castle".²⁴ In 1723, when Joachim Frederick, Count Fleming, sold the Gołańcz estate, a detailed inventory of the estate was taken. Having fully published and extensively discussed it (in addition to the succinct 1712 inventory), we need not analyse it here.²⁵

Results of the Archaeological and Architectural Investigation

The castle in Gołańcz was the site of an archaeological and architectural investigation conducted in 2009-2010, i.e., prior to the research associated with the grant. The investigation's findings, particularly those pertaining to the architectural analysis and stratigraphy of the archaeological horizons, have already been disseminated to the public.²⁶ Here, we present them briefly. The castle was built on the site of a former promontory, which was located between the main basin of Lake Smolary and its now-dried-up northern bay (Fig. 3). The scale of the site's transformation relating to its construction and extensions did not permit more in-depth archaeological observations of how the area functioned before the castle was built. However, on the northern side of the tower house, we were able to record a trench that was more than 4 m wide and more than 1.2 m deep relative to the original sterile soil level. The trench was filled with clay with sand, pug with imprints of wooden structures and burnt wood. It also yielded fragments of traditional pottery vessels with pottery marks on the bottom, which can be dated to the early 14th century. The aforementioned trench can either be seen as a moat cutting off the tip of the promontory, together with a structure located there, most likely of a fortified nature (more on this later in a broader context), or with a ditch that drained the construction site of a brick residential tower (which, due to its location, seems more likely and also does not contradict the existence of a fortified structure, but protected by the waters of the lake and possibly cut off by some kind of a trench – but from the west, where a wide moat, that destroyed older evidence, was later formed). In any case, it contained construction deconstructs and admittedly few movable materials related to an earlier building than the brick tower house that existed at the same location. Bishop Maciej of Gołańcz began construction of a brick residential tower in the 1360s, which – after a long hiatus (most likely caused by fire) – was completed by his nephew Judge Tomisław in the late 1370s/early 1380s. All architectural observations indicate a consistent continuation of the same ambitious project (Fig. 4). The tower house was built on a rectangular plan measuring 10.9×16.7 metres. Its substantial foundation, which is 1.95 metres thick, was constructed from large stones stacked in layers on a bed of lime mortar. An offset topped the structure, above which there was a brick wall fully bound

¹⁷ APP, PKG 4, 132-134; Olszacki and Róžański 2015, 21-24.

¹⁸ APP, KKG 10, 176v.-177r.

¹⁹ APP, KKG 19, 1207.

²⁰ APP, KKG 78, 572-573.

²¹ APP, KKG 83, 715; APP, KKG 84, 476-477.

²² APP, KKG 27, 1165.

²³ APP, KKG 91, 13.

²⁴ Cf. Olszacki and Róžański 2015, 36-38.

²⁵ Olszacki and Róžański 2015, 42-55.


²⁶ Kittel 2011, 373-377; Olszacki and Róžański 2011, 143-371; Olszacki and Róžański 2015; Łukasik et al. 2019; Olszacki et al. 2019.

Fig. 3. Golańcz:

1 – A visualisation of the digital terrain model of the area around the castle.

Source: CODGiK, elaborated by A. Róžański;
2 – Terrain profiles based on ALS data.

Created by A. Róžański.



across its width with a Gothic pattern, displaying high-quality craftsmanship. In the first stage, the walls were built up to the ceiling of the third storey. In the second stage, a further two storeys were added and the whole structure was covered with a roof, perhaps inserted between masonry gables. Solid buttresses braced the building at the southern corners: diagonal ones and short perpendicular ones at the northern corners, which widened the front façade illusively. The entrance was on the northern side. It was placed in a panel and framed by a monumental Gothic portal with a profiled guide for a portcullis. The entire structure was topped by a wimperg. Originally, a causeway starting on the west side of the moat led to the tower. At the end of the causeway was a wooden bridge running at right angles to both the causeway and the portal it connected to. This meant that the tower was surrounded by only a small patch of land. The interiors up to and including the third storey were originally divided into two main rooms, in addition to an internal passageway in the north-west corner that was partitioned off by a masonry wall. After the tower was divided between the brothers in 1450, a second staircase was added to the north-east corner. The first and second floors had storage and fortified functions, while the third floor housed two public halls (in the early modern era, the western hall was reduced in size and designated as a vestibule in front of an interior heated by a stove

and fireplace, in sources from the 16th and the early 17th centuries referred to it as a chamber with a stove and a dining room). The fourth floor was residential. It had access to a staircase (doubled in the mid-15th century), and a transverse division similar to the lower stories, but with a frame wall. From this level there was an entrance to an impressive garderobe near the south facade (measuring 2.05×2.10 m in plan), while the luxury use program of the interior also featured two lavabos and a urinal made from artificial stone. The fourth story was surrounded by an exterior wooden gallery. Storage and defence uses, and perhaps partially residential (heating) were introduced to the fifth story, which featured numerous windows. Significant modifications were performed in the 15th century, when Golańcz was in the hands of Jakub “Kusz” (Fig. 5). The residential tower was surrounded by a perimeter wall with a quadrilateral outline, measuring about 25.5×34 m and walls 1.2–1.7 m thick, with a cylindrical tower in the north-west corner about 5 m in diameter. This created a courtyard and required the garderobe to be moved out of the area. This was achieved by transferring the arcade to a new gallery overhanging the southern defensive wall. The bailey was built between this and the lake shore, in a previously marshy and partially flooded location. To construct it, large quantities of clayey sand had to be piled there, probably primarily obtained by widening and deepening the western moat. Under the embankment, a beam from an older dismantled structure (perhaps an old bridge) was found, and dendrochronological analysis determined that it was felled in 1371. The bailey occupied a strip approximately 11 m wide and 30 m long (see Fig. 2:B). Leading to it from the west was a brick gate building measuring 5.9×6.6 m in plan (built with a deviation towards the south in relation to the other masonry elements), supported by buttresses in the western corners, to which a new bridge was led. Apart from the gate to which the western side of the perimeter wall was attached, this zone was probably protected in the Middle Ages only by light wooden fortifications. As we might guess, the new space included part of the ancillary facilities, such as the stables. According to a 1450 agreement, the wharf located along the bailey was to be used to water the Golańcz brothers' mounts. The total area of the castle and bailey was about 1,200 m²; the later transformations of the castle complex between the 16th and 18th centuries are omitted here. An archaeological reconnaissance of the site located on the north-west side of the castle moat was carried out between 2017 and 2019. At the time of the reconnaissance, the area was



Fig. 4. A variant of the reconstruction of the first phase of the brick residential tower in Gołańcz. View from the north-east. According to T. Olszacki and A. Róžański, drawing by Śląskie Studio Architektury Paweł Rajski.




Fig. 5. A variant of the reconstruction of the second phase of the brick residential tower in Gołańcz with a defensive wall. View from the north-east. According to T. Olszacki and A. Róžański, drawing by Śląskie Studio Architektury Paweł Rajski.

a cultivated field located on a gentle slope that descended towards the lake, while from the west it was steeply cut by an artificial trench – a moat; no forms that could be seen as the remains of historical settlement were visible on its surface, and its loose destructs such as brick or pug fragments were absent. In light of the 1450 deed of division of the estate and an analysis of eighteenth-century inventories and the 1823 plan, it was assumed that, looking from the side of the lake, the remains of the castle’s service infrastructure – the outer bailey (*lacus*

que iacet proprius antemurium alias przegrothka) – should be located at the site (Fig. 2:B). To the north of them we expected a residential and ancillary zone, which, in the opinion of those living in the mid-15th century, was older than the castle itself (*antiqua area*), and which we will conventionally call the “old zone” (Fig. 2:C). Between it, Lake Smolary and the western moat stretched an undeveloped space (*spacium alias Placz inter lacum et antiquam domum et wallem alias przekopem*). In the “old zone” itself, the search was for an “old

Fig. 6. A visualisation of the digital terrain model of the area around Gołańcz Castle, showing the locations of the archaeological trenches from 2017 to 2019, as well as the outlines of the discovered building relics. Source: CODGiK, elaborated by T. Olszacki and A. Różański.



house” located closer to the bailey (*antiquam domum que est penes antemurium alias przegrodka*), with perhaps a younger brewery (*braseum*), and a manor house (*curia*) located a little further away, understood as a residential and ancillary complex once associated with the house in question, and the manor-*curia* was to be located in front of the castle (*ante castrum*), or most generally, more “outside”. The belief in the correct reading of the “source” topography was strengthened by the mention of an area named “Gwinina” situated next to a large orchard (*antique aree alias Gwinina que iacet ad magnum pomerium*) in the vicinity of the manor and house belonging to the “old zone”. The orchard is shown on the 1823 plan to the northwest of the castle moat, in front of an “Italian garden” divided into beds (also known from the inventory taken in 1723), and it can be presumed that this land use generally continued the medieval tradition (*magnum pomerium et (...) ortus que iacet penes magnum pomerium*), especially since the 1450 description further mentions the *lacus proprius castri*, that is, the northern section of the castle moat, which was in fact a natural body of water (Fig. 2:D). The purpose of the archaeological fieldwork was to identify and elementarily explore the “old zone”. It began with a detailed non-invasive survey of an area of about 5,000 m² by Piotr Wroniecki (Fig. 7). This survey found the existence of a significant number of anthropogenic anomalies all across the area, with their clear concentrations initially confirming the accuracy of the presented source reading. Based on them, five trenches covering

a total of 197 m² were delineated. Trenches no. 1/2017 and no. 5/2018 were located on the eastern side (the alleged “old house” and its surroundings), trenches no. 3/2018 and no. 4/2019 were located on the northern side (the alleged “manor”), while one (trench no. 2/2018) was delineated on the west side, in the only place where the character of the anomalies could suggest the existence of an obstacle of akin to a shallow moat or the base of a levelled embankment (Figs. 6 and 7).

The anomalies located in the central and eastern parts of trench No. 1/2017 were found to be the remains of an intensively used settlement from the end of the Early Middle Ages. It is most likely that this was an ancillary zone, as there were numerous pits, hearths and accumulations of stones, but no obvious remains of residential buildings. Analysis of associated historical materials indicates that the settlement was active in the 13th century. The remains of a building were identified in the north-west corner of trench no. 1/2017 and in trench no. 5/2018. These discoveries are discussed further below. These observations were expanded to include an analysis of the results of geophysical surveys, as the anomalies identified during excavations continued beyond the limits of the digs.

This made it possible to delineate the contours of the structure, which we identify as the *domus antiquam* mentioned in 1450 and will refer to as the lord’s house from here on. It was a building with its longer axis oriented northwest–southeast, consisting of a main body measuring 5.80×ca. 10.30 m (Fig. 7:A), and an ‘L-shaped’ corridor perpendicular




Fig. 7. Gołańcz, the 'old zone'. Time-slice visualisation of georadar data (elaborated by P. Wroniecki), with the location of building relics discovered in archaeological excavations and the supposed interpretation of other archaeological objects. A – Lord's house (*domus antiquam*), the older part; B – Corridor, the younger part of the house; C – Alleged granary building; D – Alleged remains of massive poles of the manor fences; E – Castle. Graphic design: T. Olszacki and A. Różański.

to it on the east (Fig. 7:B). The building featured a basement in the southern part at least, which was cut into the bedrock by about 1.75 m. Unfortunately, the interior contained only temporary clay-sand fill associated with the planned liquidation (rather than destruction) of the basement and probably the entire building. This fill, consisting of a sequence of occupation layers with charcoal inclusions, was deposited at the bottom of the building and was about 0.4 m thick. Therefore, its exploration yielded no information about the structural features of the upper parts of the building or the objects associated with it. However, the construction of the basement can be documented: a pit was dug wider by about 0.4–0.6 m than the planned indoor space, and wooden walls were introduced, probably supported by a plate. As work progressed, the space behind the formwork was filled with clay. The southwest corner of the higher part of the building featured an 'overlap' joint as there was no sign of a construction pile (or it was set on a base plate). The southeast corner was different: it featured a pole with a four-sided cross-section (probably a post), about 0.2 m wide, with a flat-cut base hammered deep into the sterile soil and stones above it (Fig. 8). This information allow us to suppose the application of a frame or post-and-plank structural system. Turning to the description of the corridor, it consisted of a section adjacent to the body, 5.3 m long, further breaking off at right angles to the north and still about 3.5 m long. The width of both sections in the outer contour reached about 2.2 m. It was offset to the south with respect

to the transverse axis of the main body of the building. We interpret the corridor as a cellar entrance suitable for transporting barrels. Analysis of its cross-section made it possible to observe the presence of longitudinal steps cut into the undisturbed soil and ending obliquely, the difference in height between which was about 0.4 m. The side walls of this corridor were of varied construction. It was noted that they were sided with beams, and at the intersection with the main body, that is, at the doorway to the basement, the corridor was faced with retaining walls at the bottom (Fig. 9). Their faces were built with 'finger' bricks behind which were medium-sized stones, the binder being clay. Given the format of the bricks, identical to the one used in the lower part of the masonry tower house, it can be assumed that the corridor was a later element, added to the body in the 3rd quarter of the 14th century. We consider the hypothesis that its appearance was related to the cellar's use as a beer barrel storage to be legitimate, and this occurred when the residential uses were transferred to the brick residential tower, and a brewery (*braseum*, mentioned in the 1450 text and not as old) was erected next to the lord's house. Although this is only hypothesis territory, it is a natural implication to see the basement in its original form as a space accessible from inside the lord's house.

Another building was discovered in trench no. 3/2018 and no. 4/2019, about 17 metres north-west of the house's corner, with the same orientation (Fig. 7:C). It had a square-like plan and was situated in the same way as the house, i.e. along

Fig. 8. Gołańcz, the 'old zone'. Trench 1/2017, western profile, southern part. The southeast corner of the lord's house with the relic of the construction pile. Photo: T. Olszacki.



Fig. 9. Gołańcz, the 'old zone'. Trench 1/2017 (northwestern part explored in 2018). Relic of the corridor. Photo: T. Olszacki.



the north-west–south-east direction. Its outer contour measured 6×6.5 m, and as with the lord's house, its lower part was dug into undisturbed clay soil. However, this zone was shallower, reaching approximately 1.1 m below ground level. During construction, a trench wider than the planned room was dug. Then, a log or frame structure of beams, with a width of about 0.2 m (without piles driven into the ground), was introduced into the interior. This filled the free space behind the wall with clay that had been previously dug out (Fig. 10). This

structure was built to the level of the undisturbed soil, forming a compact base for the building and a plinth for the floor. Higher up, the walls were moved outwards to the edge of the previously created trench that had been filled with clay. Along the eastern side of this clay, circular log beams with a diameter of about 0.15–0.17 m were driven in at a spacing of 1.2–1.5 m. It can be presumed that the walls, which extended from the lower floor, gained a kind of external formwork above ground level, which would have strengthened and insulated



Fig. 10. Gołańcz, the 'old zone'. Trenches 3/2018 and 4/2019. View from the east of the remains of the alleged granary building. Photo: T. Olszacki.



Fig. 11. Gołańcz, the 'old zone'. Trench 4/2019, southern part. View of the remains of the north-eastern corner of the alleged granary building with a layer of daub. Photo: M. Cichocki.

the entire structure. The building was destroyed by fire, which is why analysing the fill complements the structural observations. A south-descending layer of lumps of clay floor daub deposited on charred wood with a total thickness of up to 0.3 m was recorded (Fig. 11). It was possible to detect the relics of larger beams in a north-south stratum, spaced around 1.4 m apart. With full certainty, this layer is what remains of the ripped-off floor above the lower, depressed zone, which could have been a low basement, but could most importantly have

been a chamber that insulated the main level from damp. Numerous destructs of daub from the walls indicate that the frame structure was filled with clay at least in the part of the outer siding. At the same time, observation of the backfill above the floor allows us to presume that under the roof truss (which was completely charred, or had been dropped outside the building's perimeter at the time of the fire²⁷) the structure was no longer divided in any

²⁷ Cf. Pokropek 2019, 297.

way. The solid structure of the walls and floor (perhaps supported by transverse beams), and the lack of objects typical of residential or defensive use, alongside the presence of farming equipment, allows us to hypothesize that the building may have been a granary. The time of its construction can be determined as the late thirteenth, based on fragments of ceramic vessels found in a stratum located under the floor, probably dating from the time of its construction.

Unlike previously discussed, the exploration of trench no. 2/2018 yielded a negative result, namely it did not uncover the expected defensive perimeter of the site on the western side, i.e., (next to the northern side) the side from which it was not naturally protected. In view of this, it is reasonable to assume, and the scope of the geophysical survey seems authoritative here, that the area was not protected by a significant earthen obstacle. Instead, one can guess the functioning of the residential part of the complex in a perimeter consisting of a reinforced fence. The row of anomalies visible to the east of the granary and to the east and south of the lord's house can signify the remains of massive poles set in ditches clad with stones (similarly to the aforementioned construction pile from the lord's house, which appeared similarly in a GPR survey) (Fig. 7:D). This fence would have formed an oval-shaped perimeter measuring about 900 m². The lord's house would have been located roughly in the middle of the courtyard, while the granary would have been positioned along the northeastern edge, connecting the residential area to the service areas of the manor that probably extended beyond the fence.²⁸ To the east of the complex, in the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries, the terrain formed into the aforementioned lake promontory. A wooden building was erected on this promontory, probably in the early 14th century, using daub. It is theorised that this building was defensive in nature, perhaps a tower, and thus expanded the functional programme of the manor. In the 3rd quarter of the 14th century, the causeway leading to the bridge connected to the new residence began at this location. Further moat formation work associated with the formation of the castle in the 1st quarter of the 15th century eventually led to the disappearance

of the route leading through the manor in an easterly direction in favour of a new crossing shifted to the south, with a new bridge, preceded by a new outer bailey and a brick gate to the inner bailey.

THE DANABÓRZ RESIDENCE – DEVELOPMENT PHASES AND USES

The Owners and the Residence in the Light of Written Sources

Information about the Danabórz estate, which belonged to the Pałuka family,²⁹ dates back to the 14th century. Previously, the village was part of the Cistercian estate complex in Łekno (Fig. 12).³⁰

The first person to consistently style themselves as being from Danabórz (Domaborz in the Middle Ages) was Władysław (Włodko), the son of Zbylut Zbylutowic of Danabórz (who died in 1361, and was the elder brother of Judge Tomisław) and the grandson of Castellan Zbylut of Gołańcz and Danabórz. Active in the late 14th century, Władysław was an ally of Duke Vladislaus of Opole and was nominated by him as Voivode of Gniewkowo.³¹ After him, Danabórz passed to his son Andrzej, who began styling himself 'of Danabórz' in 1417 and died in 1436.

His early career was probably hindered by his father's political choices,³² but by 1425 he had become Castellan of Kamieńsk. From the 1430s onwards, he was listed as Governor of Kalisz and Starost of Nakło, indicating that he belonged to the highest ranks of the Greater Polish official elite. He had already established a position in Władysław Jagiełło's circle by this time, attesting to royal documents and accepting bequests and land grants in 1426 and 1430 in return for his services to the king.³³ The next lord of Danabórz and his son was the famous Władysław (Włodko) – Junior of Danabórz. First the Starost (from 1432), then the Castellan of Nakło (from 1453) and, after Poland conquered the Komtur Castle in Człuchów, its Tenutiary (from 1456 to 1463).³⁴ The second wife of the younger Władysław (married around 1457) was Duchess Catherine, daughter Wenceslaus II, Duke of Opava-Ratibor of the Přemyslid dynasty (who had died the year before) and Małgorzata Szamotulska of the coat of arms of Nałęcz.³⁵ Władysław Junior made active attempts to elevate Danabórz to the rank

²⁸ During surface trenching ahead of the excavations in this area, a seal matrix bearing the Topór coat of arms on a Gothic shield with an inscription on the rim was found. Similarities to known Pałuka family seals dated to the 14th century suggest that this seal most likely belonged to Tomisław of Gołańcz. The presence of this artefact further supports the theory that the lord's house was used for residential purposes before the residence was moved to a new location.

²⁹ Bieniak 1985; Karczewska 2017, 17-18 (older literature cited here); Białowas 2018.

³⁰ *Kodeks...* 1877, 590; *Kodeks...* 1879, 1969, 1950; *Kodeks...* 1881, 348.

³¹ *Lites...* 1892, 267-268; Lekszycki... 1889, 314.

³² Szybkowski 2000, 158.

³³ *Kodeks...* 1908, 449; *Codex...* 1847, 305-306.

³⁴ AGAD, ZDP, 472.

³⁵ *Annales...* 2005, 294.




Fig. 12. Danabórz, an orthophotomap. A – Motte; B – ‘Southern ward’; C – ‘Eastern ward’; D – Ruins of an unfinished Gothic church; E – New manor; F – Church in the village of Grylewo. Source: CODGiK, elaborated by A. Róžański.

of town. In 1444, *civitas Damaborz* was mentioned, while in 1452 there was an attempt to erect a parish church in Danabórz, which, due to the negative opinion of the canons delegated to do so, ended in failure.³⁶ Władysław Junior was an ambitious and deceitful magnate who engaged in his own brand of politics during the Thirteen Years’ War between Poland and the Teutonic Order (1454-1466). He resorted to criminal acts that were incompatible with the interests of the state.³⁷ According to Jan Długosz’s narrative, in 1465, Władysław instigated a rebellion of 500 knights against King Casimir IV, who had gathered in Nakło and Danabórz; the latter intended to send troops against them and besiege these places until he either conquered them or the rebels surrendered.³⁸ Władysław Junior humbled himself before the king’s majesty on 28 August of the same year in Inowrocław, and the conflict was seemingly averted. Fortunately, we know the original text of his vow, which was the source used by Długosz.³⁹ It features the first explicit

mention of the existence of a fortified structure in Danabórz, then called a *fortalicium*, clearly semantically distinguished from the twice-noted castle in Nakło (*ad oppidum et castrum Nakel, ad castrum et oppidum Nakyel et ad fortalitiu Domaborz*).⁴⁰ As can be presumed, the Castellan of Nakło wanted only to gain time to, among other things, properly fortify the long-held (Nakło and Danabórz) and newly captured (Wągrowiec and Pakość) Pałuka sites, as reported by Długosz, who is probably not familiar with these sites in detail: *ut ex Nakel et Domaborz, veteribus sue possessionis castris, ex Vangrowyecz quoque et Pakoscz de novo incastellandis bellum secum (...) regno inferrent*.⁴¹ Finally captured and handed over to the Starost of Poznań, Piotr of Szamotuły, Władysław Junior was beheaded in the market square of Kalisz in May 1467.⁴² After his death, it was Duchess Catherine and her two sons, both named Jan, who would reside in Danabórz. The two brothers would later become associated mostly with the castle in

³⁶ This is discussed in Korytkowski 1888, 237.

³⁷ For more on Włodko’s participation in the Thirteen Years’ War, see Biskup 1967, 412, 458, 540, 548, 571, 615. Also of interest are the remarks in Lasek 2017, 254-256.

³⁸ *Annales...* 2005, 111-112. It should be noted that, contrary to the Polish translation by Julia Mrukówna (*Roczniki...* 2009, 123), the Latin text only mentions the localities and there is no mention of strongholds.


³⁹ *Codex epistolaris...* 1876, no. 200.

⁴⁰ *Codex epistolaris...* 1876, no. 200.

⁴¹ *Annales...* 2005, 184. Translated into Polish: “(...) from Nakło and Domaborz, old castles that were in his possession, and Wągrowiec and Pakość, which had to be fortified anew, together with him they instigated a war with the Kingdom (...)”, *Roczniki...* 2009, 184. It appears that the chronicler’s intention was to display the various rights to the castellan’s estates, while also informing of the fortification of them all for the expected war.

⁴² *Annales...* 2005, 184.

Fig. 13. Danabórz.
A visualisation of the digital terrain model of the area around the motte, along with terrain profiles based on ALS data.
Source: CODGiK, elaborated by A. Róžański.



Nakło, which they held as a starosty-tenure. The last generation of the Pałuka-Danaborski family were their sons: Andrzej (died around 1530) and Krzysztof, who also still held the Nakło starosty,⁴³ and after them their estates went to other families via their daughters. In 1570, Gertruda Kościelecka, daughter of Andrzej, most likely sold Danabórz to Walenty Wargowski, who was introduced to the new property in the “common room alias dining room of the Danabórz manor house”.⁴⁴ In 1601, Anna Baranowska, the widow of Maciej Wyrzyski, inherited, among other things, Danabórz together with the *curia domus*, or manor house.⁴⁵ In 1607, the burgrave of Kcynia announced in the manor

(*curia*) in Danabórz the sentence of the municipal court in Poznań to strip the renegade Jan Wyrzyski of his possessions.⁴⁶ The *curia domus* was mentioned once again in the deed of division of the Danabórz estate, written in 1617.⁴⁷ At that time, in the Late Middle Ages, Danabórz, which aspired to be a town and parish seat, was only a small village.⁴⁸ Over time, probably in the late 17th century, the noble residence was moved to a new location that was more convenient and separated from a fortified context – a lakeside terrace, where there is currently a masonry, single-story manor house, probably from the early 19th century (Fig. 12:E).⁴⁹

⁴³ AGAD, MK 42, 29-31.

⁴⁴ APP, KKG 20, 310, 748

⁴⁵ APP, KKG 82, 163 (oblata from 1612 of an act concluded in Poznań).

⁴⁶ APP, KKG 78, 323-324.

⁴⁷ APP, KKG 80, 634-636, 668-670.

⁴⁸ Klint 2012, 112, 116.

⁴⁹ Paszkowska 1983.




Fig. 14. Danabórz. A hypsometric LIDAR map of the area around the motte. A – Motte with a remains of the *fortalicium* discovered in archaeological trench in 2021; B – ‘Southern ward’; C – ‘Abutment’; D – ‘Rampart’; E – Upland. Source: CODGIK, elaborated by A. Różański.

Three Phases of the Fortified Residence of the Lords of Danabórz

The fortified residence was located on a natural elevation (a kame), located on the eastern shore of Grylewskie Lake, to the southwest from a promontory that juts into the lake (Figs. 12:A and 13 and 14:A). This steep hill has a circular plan, slightly more stretched along the southwest–northeast axis, with its extreme dimensions being about 55×65 m, with the base at about 82.0 m a.s.l. and the top elevated at about 10 m. A deep basin can be observed from the inside. No masonry relics protruded above ground when the survey began. Four areas significant to this study could be identified near the hill. Looking from the southwest, there is an elevated area with outer dimensions of about 25×50 m, which we will call the “southern ward” (Fig. 14:B). Farther and higher up, a small form is legible, created by digging up the ground around the edge of the lakeside terrace, which formed an outcrop cut into the northeastern side with extreme dimensions of about 10×18 m, with a dry moat about 8 m wide – we will call this the “abutment” (Fig. 14:C). To the east of the terrain feature there

is a surviving embankment offset about 15 m from the hill, and corresponding in curvature, with a length of about 50 m – hereinafter referred to as “the rampart” (Fig. 14:D). The entirety is terminated by the “eastern ward”, which is a lakeside meadow of about 1,800 m² located at the very base of the lake promontory (Fig. 12:C). As a part of excavations associated with the *Castrum et curia...* project, seven trenches were set up at the site of the fortified residence on the hill, with one divided by sections in the “eastern ward” on the “rampart”; in total, an area of around 100 m² was explored via excavations. This field research allows us to adopt an entirely new perspective of the Danabórz fortified residence, and in its light identify three phases of its operation.

Phase one – late 14th century

Phase one is linked with the late 14th century and Władysław Senior of Danabórz, voivode of Gniewkowo (Fig. 15). A sandy, circular embankment elevate above the original humus was created on the postglacial kame, reaching an elevation of around 89.0 m a.s.l. This ring-shaped rampart,

Fig. 15. A variant of the reconstruction phase one of the fortified residence in Danabórz (a manor with a *fortalicium* – type). View from the east. According to T. Olszacki and A. Róžański, drawing by A. Olszacka.



oval in plan, was approximately 22×26 m in its outer outline. Judging by the layout of the layers recorded in the annexes of trench no. 2/2021 (the rampart slope's descent towards the centre of the trench), this area featured the original entrance into the fortified structure and the tradition of its functioning continued into later periods as well. The structure's interior, in place of a masonry building constructed into the perimeter, was formed as a hardened clay platform with a thickness of ca. 0.8 m. The remains of the building (probably a tower), situated in the courtyard, but shifted towards the gate there were post-demolition stones (with numerous traces of lime mortar), which were found in every excavation inside the walls of the fifteenth-century buildings. The floor of the stratum of these stones was found to be the lowest at 88.65 m a.s.l. (trench 2/2021), while the crown reached up to 90.15 m a.s.l. (trench 6/2021). Trench no. 2/2021 revealed the presence of the strip footing of the building (its southern wall), more than 1.0 m wide, with the footing at 88.35 m a.s.l. It thus ran more or less in the line of the later southern wall of the stone building, being, however, slightly offset towards its interior. Exploration of the crown of the oldest embankment yielded few fourteenth-century relics, which confirms the suggestion expressed above about linking the original seats with Władysław Senior, but their small number is notable, which is important in the context of interpreting the function of this part of the layout. It should be highlighted that we treat phase one as the first visible transformation of the natural terrain form for a defensive

purpose, but this was probably not the first phase of this area's use as a feudal residence, with the caveat that it probably began operating in the 'southern ward' in the early 14th century (and the period of Castellan Zbylut, son of Sławnik, or his son – also Zbylut), and for which the hill could have been a potential refugium.

Phase two – before 1436

Phase two involved a significant redesign of the site by Kalisz Voivode Andrzej of Danabórz (Fig. 16). The exact start date of construction is unknown, but the latest possible date is the lord's date of death, 1436. Construction probably did not begin before the 'rehabilitation' of the lords of Danabórz in the eyes of Władysław Jagiełło, which occurred around 1420. The building located in Władysław Senior's stronghold was completely demolished at this time. A house measuring approximately 9.1×16 metres was built on the lakeside hill. This was divided into three spaces, with a centrally located entrance hall measuring 4.05×6.95 m and two rooms on either side. The eastern room was the same size as the hall, while the western room was slightly smaller at 3.85×6.95 m. There was an additional entrance to the hall from the south. The building's main walls had a thickness of ca. 1.17 m, which was not considerable, and we cannot expect a building with the proportions of a tower (this is also contradicted by the presence of the central entrance hall), but rather a stone house with a horizontal interior disposition. The relatively low wall thickness can be considered alongside the original



Fig. 16. A variant of the reconstruction phase two of the fortified residence in Danabórz (a *fortalicium* with a manor – type). View from the east. According to T. Olszacki and A. Róžański, drawing by Śląskie Studio Architektury Paweł Rajski.

absence of buttresses in the building's corners. The footing level of the building's walls was found at heights ranging from 88.70-89.10 m a.s.l. The lowest zone of the foundation was constituted by a layer of stones and sand. At a higher level, a wall composed of unlayered stones with crushed brick was observed, bound with lime mortar and topped with a brick levelling stratum. From the outside, the walls were erected in a formwork, as a result of their being dug into an older earthen mound on that side, while from the inside the house was built from in an open space from the bottom up. Stones from the demolition of the phase-one building were laid between the interior walls, thus filling the empty space under the floor of the lower floor, which is not a basement but a first floor. The absence of any plinths or beam sockets in the inner faces of the building and the height of the walls preceding the entrance to the building built in the next phase is evidence that the floor of the lowest level was higher than the highest preserved masonry structures in the castle. The outer earthen embankment was raised to an elevation greater than 91.50 m a.s.l. during this construction project. Unfortunately, there are no intact cultural stratifications contemporaneous with the use of the stone house of Andrzej of Danabórz, but only numerous dated materials present in the mixed stratifications.

Phase three – after 1460

Phase three is the impressive extension of the stone house by Nakło Castellan Władysław Junior, completed probably around 1460, when he was at

the height of his power (Fig. 17). His project consisted of a functional extension, but also of giving the paternal seat new and grander architectural forms. An alcove turret was placed in the northeast corner. It has a hexagonal plan, with a diameter of ca. 2.2 m. It was, similarly to the other elements from this extension project, fully dug into the embankment that surrounds the stone house's walls, with the use of a tall 'flexible' foundation in the form of a block of stone wall made of stone mixed with crushed brick and sand in a wide trench. All the funded elements at the time were founded shallower than the phase two house and were attached to it. The foundation level of the turret was found at 90.55 m a.s.l., and its foundation was 0.55 m high. Higher up, its walls were made of bricks and were no more than about 0.3 m thick. The interior was probably masonry-filled in the lower floor or housed a small chamber. Above it was one more floor made of rather perishable materials. At the western corners, diagonal buttresses were added to the building, the southwestern one of which was 1.3×2-2.4 m. The presence of strong buttresses suggests the verticalization of the mass by one masonry floor and, most likely, the finalization of the use program by the top floor, made of perishable materials, with a pyramid roof covered with shingles (no fragments of tiles were found). In the middle of the length of the south side, the entrance to the building was placed in a risalit whose extreme external dimensions were ca. 1.9×2.5 m. It was founded at a level of about 89.85 m a.s.l., with the bottom on the 'flexible' foundation, and from

Fig. 17. A variant of the reconstruction phase three of the fortified residence in Danabórz (a *fortalicium* with a manor – type). View from the east. According to T. Olszacki and A. Róžański, drawing by Śląskie Studio Architektury Paweł Rajski.



a level of about 90.60 m a.s.l. it shifted into a wall of stones bound with lime mortar. The level of its crest (91.25 m a.s.l.) also determines the lowest possible level of the entrance threshold (also from an earlier phase). In the southeast corner of the risalit, a clear protrusion of stones in front of the line of the south face was found, allowing one to guess the type of console, e.g., for the support of a bridge.

In the area named “eastern ward”, trench 3/2021 uncovered relics of a brickmaking kiln measuring approximately 2.1×4.5 m, located along the north–south axis. Its walls were built of burnt clay and were about 0.4–0.5 m thick, inside was a chamber measuring about 1.2×3.5 m, with access from the longer eastern side with a clear width of about 0.8 m. Perhaps the kiln was located under a roof, as relics of massive pile in close proximity to its walls seem to attest. The chronology of the kiln can be traced to the 15th century, and although it has not been possible to determine it more precisely, there is no doubt that it produced bricks for the construction of the stone house by Andrzej of Danabórz, or its tower extension carried out by Władysław Junior. In addition, the presence of numerous unverified excavation anomalies scattered in the area testify to the intensive anthropogenic use of the area for service rather than residential purposes. Investigations into the “rampart” helped determine that the original width of the embankment’s base was around 4.5 m, the width of its crown was probably close to ca. 2.5 m, and it rose ca. 2 m above the adjacent terrain from the internal (eastern) side, also having a significantly steeper

slope from that side. It was built in the 15th century with a pit of mixed loose sands, while higher up the sands were stabilized by frail wooden structures. The apparent cheapness of the means used suggests a quick, yet unfinished project. We think it is the remnant of a defensive rampart shielding the hill from the southeast, intended as a perimeter stretched between the “southern ward” (potentially with its own ramparts) and the lake shore. Let us recall Długosz’s account that Władysław Junior’s planned resistance sites were to be *de novo incastellandis* after the accord of August 1466, and clearly these works were not finished before the lord’s inglorious death in May of the following year. Unfortunately, the land use prevented us from investigation both in the “southern ward” and the “abutment”. Concerning the former, we should reference the previous observations by E. Cnotliwy, who established a reconnaissance dig there and cut this area along with its adjacent terrain depressions with a transverse sequence of sixteen drilling surveys. He found the existence of a naturally elevated landform here. At its top part, despite erosion processes and early modern levelling (probably associated with the removal of local settlement), the site still presented with ca. 0.40 of a cultural stratum saturated with pug, charcoal, and a significant amount of char, out of which ceramic vessel fragments were extracted, and whose dated can be placed between the early 14th (late 13th?) to the 15th (16th?) century, as well as numerous vessel tiles (and higher – plate tiles). However, no traces of a moat were found. Cnotliwy noted that “this part of the

site was used during the summit defensive structure's operation as a sort of working yard".⁵⁰ We agree with this view, although we believe that in the light of the long-term existence of this space and the identified change in the function of the 'summit' layout (as well as the working uses of the 'eastern ward') it had, apart from working purposes, also residential ones. We identify the second landform, "the abutment", with a fortified bridge abutment, which is suggested by its transverse axis, delineated from the plateau through half the length of the concave northwest side, is aimed almost directly at the main entrance to the stone house.

THE ŁEKNO RESIDENCE – FROM AN EARLY MEDIEVAL STRONGHOLD TO A MANOR

The Beginning of Settlement and Family History

Łekno with its early medieval stronghold located on a peninsula near the western shore of Lake Łekno could be the original nest of the Pałuki (Fig. 18:C).⁵¹ In the early 12th century, the stronghold belonged, by inheritance, to comes Zbylut of Panigródz of this family and a "citizen of Poland" (*Poloniae civis*), who donated it, along with its landed estates, to the Cistercians (who came from Altenberg near Cologne), which was finalized by the issue of a foundation document in 1153, in which a monastery dedicated to the Blessed Virgin Mary and St. Peter was authorized by Jan, bishop of Gniezno.⁵² A new private settlement complex later developed on the opposite, eastern shore of the lake, to the south of the village of Łekno that had been donated to the monks, and it was the seat of a separate (Łekno-based) line of the Pałuka family, who were not as influential in the Late Middle Ages as their relatives from Gołańcz. Before 1370, the town of Łekno was founded there (Fig. 19:D-E), while south of it was the seat of its owners (Fig. 19:A-B); after the end of the 14th century this settlement complex became locally dominant, due to the relocation of the Cistercian monastery to nearby Wągrowiec.⁵³ Recently, the genealogy of the Pałuka-Łekiński family, who lived in the 15th century, became the subject of a detailed study by Witold Brzeziński.⁵⁴ Brzeziński recalled the Kcynia municipal court records published almost 90 years ago in Kcynia, written in the light of a testimony delivered in December 1460 concerning the circumstances

and consequences of a raid of the Łekno manor.⁵⁵ This source, combined with an archaeological analysis of the feudal residence in Łekno, is (similarly to the already referenced and decade older act of Gołańcz's division) a fundamental contribution to research on the broadly understood topic of the residence of Polish feudal lords, with potential far exceeding the framework of this text. The origins of the residence can be linked to Trojan I, who was active in the late 13th and early 14th century, and who was Castellan of Nakło in the years 1302-1306 (he died between 1306 and 1313). Zbylut I of Łekno, Castellan of Ujście, who died after 1349, can also be placed on the horizon of Greater Poland nobility.⁵⁶ Zbylut's issue is not known even by name, although they must have possessed sufficient inherited capital to effect the granting of Łekno's town rights (if it had not been done by Zbylut I himself). Zbylut I's grandsons were the mutually related (brothers or cousins) Zbylut II and Mikołaj, who we can see as knights rather than lords.⁵⁷ The latter died probably in 1397, in deep debt, and had two daughters, whose inherited property later went to the sons of Zbylut II (who died between 1388 and 1391). Thus, in the early 15th century, Zbylut II's sons: Trojan II (died ca. 1455) and Wojciech (died in 1432 at the latest) became lords of Łekno. They married the sisters Małgorzata and Dorota of the Leszczyc family, heiresses to a sizeable estate, and also relatives of Piotr Wysz (bishop of Kraków in the years 1391-1412, and of Poznań in 1413-1414) and Gniewkowo voivode Maciej, which once again gave the Pałukas of Łekno an opportunity to rise to the ranks of Greater Poland's elite. It was taken by the longer-living Trojan II, who at the turn of 1432 became judge of Kalisz and held this post until his death.⁵⁸ He held the town of Chodzież and took care of the arguably hitherto underdeveloped Łekno, as evidenced by a document he issued in 1444 that redefined the rights and duties of the Łekno burghers; he also bought from his late brother's daughters the estates they had inherited in Kcynia county, including in Łekno itself.⁵⁹ At the latest then, he also began construction of a brick parish (on the site of a former wooden church) dedicated to Saints Peter and Paul.⁶⁰ We can link to him the construction of a polygonal presbytery at this church and perhaps (at a later stage) of a monumental nave body that had a striking multitude of Cistercian

⁵⁰ Cnotliwy 1995, 342-346.

⁵¹ This is how the case was referred to almost a 120 years ago by Semkowicz 1907, 21 et seq. and to this day this verdict seems justified.

⁵² Wyrwa 2007.

⁵³ Wyrwa 2010.

⁵⁴ Brzeziński 2011.

⁵⁵ Tymieniecki 1938.

⁵⁶ Brzeziński 2011, 20-21.

⁵⁷ Brzeziński 2011, 22-24.

⁵⁸ Brzeziński 2011, 24-28.

⁵⁹ Brzeziński 2011, 28.

⁶⁰ Kowalski 2010, 267.

Fig. 18. Łekno, an orthophotomap. A – Motte; B – ‘Ward’; C – Early medieval stronghold; D – Parish church; E – City square. Source: CODGiK, elaborated by A. Róžański.



references, but which must have been completed after his death.⁶¹ Trojan II had sons: Maciej and Jan, who both died before their father, leaving the underage son of the latter: Trojan III, who by a decision from 1454 – due to the age of his grandfather – was to be taken into the care of more distant relatives from the Pałuka family, including Michał of Gołańcz with whom we are already familiar.⁶² When Trojan III reached his able years, Łekno suffered from the already mentioned raid, which was instigated by his stepmother, Dorota, with her second husband Mikołaj Milan (vel Milaj) of Miłosław, intending to reclaim her dowry and bride price, a substantial sum of 1800 florins.⁶³ The couple came to Łekno with an impressive force of 180 men, including 80 noble born and 100 of lesser status (*octoginta sibi similibus et centum inferioribus*), who were well-armed and some bore firearms (*cum pixidibus et aliis armis*). During peacetime, they seized the house of Trojan, lord of Łekno, and expelled him from it (*in curiam et in domum ipsius Troyani heredis in Lekna in terra pacifica (...) repercussit*). They also chased away his burgrave with his court servants from his house (*et repercusiens burgabium ipsius cum tota familia*), and looted the house and manor with great violence (*domo et curia sua violenter et potenter expulit*), destroying them (*curie*

et domus destructionem). Afterwards, they occupied his manor and house for seventeen weeks and would not leave, despite being called to do so by order of the Starost of Kcynia (*Et cum idem generosus Troyanus, heres Leknensis, de mandato domini capitanei alias z urzadu per dominicellos et ministerialem ipsam auisauit, alias obszylal, ut de ipsus curia et de domo exiret, quam violenter cum viro tuo Nicolao Milan et suis coadiutoribus violenter bellicose et hostiliter obsidens per sedecim septimanas mansit*). During this time, with the aid of their supporters, Dorota and Mikołaj ordered, defying law and noble custom, to erect, following wartime custom, a *fortalicium* at the site of the house and “with violence and forcefulness, dig a moat around a part of this house, during peacetime but to wartime custom” (*Et more bellico fortalicium de eadem domo ipsius contra ius et consuetudinem terrestrem fecit et fossam circumquaque parte domus eiusdem in terra pacifica bellicose, violenter et potenter fodit*).⁶⁴ Another testimony stated that “this house was fortified in wartime fashion and a *fortalicium* was made of it” (*circumfodiens eandem domum more bellico et fortalicium de eadem domo faciens*).⁶⁵ The altered residential zone thus became not only a fortified site of resistance against Trojan III (and the royal administration), but also a prison and place

⁶¹ Kowalski 2010, 264-271.

⁶² Brzeziński 2011, 29-30.

⁶³ Brzeziński 2011, 30-32.

⁶⁴ Tymieniecki 1938, 322-323.

⁶⁵ Tymieniecki, 325.




Fig. 19. Łekno, a visualization of the Digital Terrain Model of the vicinity of the motte and terrain profiles based on ALS data, with the approximate location of E. Cnotliwy's excavations. Source: CODGIK, elaborated by A. Różański.

of torture for Łekno's burghers, who were forced to swear fealty to the new lords and had excessive tax rates imposed on them (*et potenter repercussit et repercusiens more hostili capitauit, capituum ligavit et in eundem fortalicium adduxit; ibique eundem in eodem fortalicio incarceravit et diversis cruciatibus ferociter puniuit et pensauit eundem alias szaczowal*).⁶⁶ It should be added that the case ended without legal effect, as the injured party failed to appear for an unknown (though imaginable) reason. Trojan III himself died in the early 1460s, being the last male representative of the Pałuka family in Łekno.⁶⁷

Spatial and Functional Transitions

This motte is located on the eastern shore of a lake, and its centre is currently around 90 m from the lake's water surface and around 70 m away from a reed bed (Fig. 18:A). It is an embankment with an almost circular plan and dimensions of about 33×34 m, with an uneven, partly destroyed plateau reaching up to 90.0-88.0 m a.s.l., i.e. an average of about 4.5 m above the level of the bottom of the moats and about 3.50-4.0 m above the adjacent area outside the trench; its concavity and higher elevated banks are noticeable, while on the southeastern side the form has suffered far-reaching destruction. The diameter of the plateau is about 14×17 m (with its extension along the northwest-southeast axis) (Fig. 19). The hill is

⁶⁶ Tymieniecki, 326.

⁶⁷ Brzeziński 2011, 31.

surrounded by a moat about 5.5–8.3 m wide and with a preserved depth of 0.80–1.20 m; it is absent from the southeast (backfilled with material from the destruction of the mound), but its course is visible on LIDAR images. On the northeast, north, northwest and west sides, there is an area adjacent to the outer arch of the moat, elevated at about 86.0–85.50 m a.s.l., about 30–40 m wide, which can be called a “ward”. Its plateau is located about 0.8–1.3 m above the surrounding meadows.

E. Cnotliwy’s previous research in Łekno included two reconnaissance trenches: on top of the mound and within the northern zone of the “ward” (Fig. 19) and a sequence of 31 drilling surveys crossing the site along a north–south axis, from the outer side of the aforementioned part of the “ward” to the outer side of the southern arm of the moat.⁶⁸ As a result of these explorations, it was found that at a depth of about 4.50 m below the highest preserved earthen relics on the plateau of the motte (i.e., at about 85.50 m), there was a layer of intense char with a thickness of less than 0.10 m (Fig. 20:4), and on top of it is a gray humus with charcoal and clods of daub with a thickness of about 0.20 m (Fig. 20:3). Strata of the same sequence were identified in both the central area of the mound (during excavations) and its periphery (in drilling surveys). Beneath the charring there was highly compacted marl with humus – probably a levelling layer, with a thickness of ca. 0.25 m (Fig. 20:5) and resting on sterile clay (Fig. 20:6,10). Of particular significance was the presence of a uniform hardened mound, measuring approximately 3 metres in thickness, constructed from a mixture of clay, marl, and humus, indicative of a naturally occurring terrain with a levelling layer. This mound was situated at an elevation of approximately 88.50 metres above sea level (Fig. 20:2). Both from the embankment, which is the main component of the mound, and from the overlying strata beneath it, similar materials were excavated: traditional, turned ceramics fired in an oxidizing atmosphere and unglazed pitchers (including forms with rounded spouts that are characteristic of later medieval varieties). Altogether, this material can be considered (in reference to forms we know from our own investigations) in the wide chronological framework of the end of the 13th century to around the early 15th century. Char appeared directly on the embankment and only from the south. Also, only on this side there was a layer of brown humus that rested on it and flowed down the slope. On the latter and in places where

these layers did not occur, gray sandy humus up to 1 m thick was recorded and, together with humus, constituted the main component of the embankment crown. In the archaeological trench located in the northern part of the settlement, behind the moat, the base of an older cultural layer was identified (black humus with char and clods of daub) (Fig. 20:9) deposited on a clayey bedrock (Fig. 20:10) at an approximate depth of 83.80 m. The top of the layer was found at an elevation of approximately 84.0 m above sea level. The material from this layer can be dated using the same method as described above. The younger stratigraphic level (brown sandy humus), with a floor at about 84.25 m a.s.l., contained ceramic materials made using the tape-slip technique, which can be dated to the late 15th and the early 16th centuries (Fig. 20:8).

The 1460 Raid as a Source for Reinterpreting Archaeological Research

Well-planned and documented research referenced to the text from 1460 cited above allow us to clearly propose conclusions that had not been possible while not knowing this source previously. In phase one, whose origins date back perhaps to the late thirteenth and certainly to the early 14th century, there was a poorly defined natural terrain form here, and there was no moat. The entire complex consisted of an area located on a slightly artificially elevated area (the lower stratum with marl) that largely overlapped with the later mound, which was originally elevated less than 2 m over the adjacent terrain. The plateau featured buildings made of perishable materials (wooden frame?), which we identify as the “lord’s house”, and which were probably surrounded by some form of delimitation (palisade, fence) to which an intensely used area of the manor abutted, which multiplied the extent of the ward. The entire complex did not occupy more than about 7,000 m². This is how the *curia et domus* of Trojan III, inherited from his ancestors, in the late 1450s, and which were destroyed at that time by Dorota and her husband’s raid (*curie et domus destructionem*), which is attested by the widespread detection of char and charcoal. The site of the lord’s residence was then surrounded by a moat (*circumfodiens eandem domum*), and the excavated earth acquired by this (natural strata intermixed with anthropogenic strata) form a mound with a plateau level above the use level of the earlier house by at least 3 m. We can presume that a building from perishable materials was then built there, and that it had at least a partial basement, as this is how we can interpret the visible shift in the strata from

⁶⁸ The information below is based on Cnotliwy 1995, 324–329. We present our own levelling calculations, which may be subject to a small error.




Fig. 20. Łekno. Stratigraphic profiles of the E. Cnotliwy's archaeological excavations. According Cnotliwy 1995, drawn by: T. Olszacki and A. Róžański.

the south side, which was filled with humus that was previously adjacent to the walls of the upper story after the house was put to disuse (or burned down?). This is undoubtedly a *fortalicium* built by the aforementioned aggressors on the site of the former house (*fortalicium de eadem domo faciens*), that is, in full accordance with the account of 1460. The court facilities are also rebuilt, henceforth located outside the moat and clearly, about 5 m lower than the top level of the mound. In light of the artifacts presented by E. Cnotliwy, the new layout did not operate longer than up to the mid-16th century, and had probably been abandoned even earlier (as evidenced by the absence of tiles and glazed ceramics).

MODEL OF THE FORMAL AND FUNCTIONAL EVOLUTION OF A PRIVATE FEUDAL RESIDENCE

Source Specificity and Interpretation Methods

Before presenting the titular model of the formal and functional evolution of a private feudal residence, derived from our research, we would first like to highlight the specificity of the sources available to us. Metaphorically speaking, these resources can be likened to three jigsaw puzzles, each with missing pieces, which we aim to combine – by adding missing elements from other puzzles – to create a composite image. This collage is

composed of two different categories of sources: material sources, which are typical of archaeological and architectural investigations, and written sources, which are the domain of historical interpretation. Does the resulting image reliably reconstruct past reality, and can it be considered a model of the research process? The credibility of the model is certainly strengthened by the fact that the research was performed in a small historic-geographic region of Pałuki. The distance between the sites in Łekno and Danabórz is almost 7 km in a straight line, while the distance between Łekno and Gołańcz Castle is around 11.5 km. Not only were the surveyed sites territorially close to each other, but they were also all associated with the same family, the Pałukas, until the end of the Middle Ages. The bond of the family relationship here was not only the coat of arms and legendary images⁶⁹ that gave a sense of community, whose actual exemplification was the mustering of the

⁶⁹ Here we should mention the matter raised by W. Semkowicz of a purported genealogical origin from a member of a Czech ducal dynasty – the Slavnikids (Slavnikovci) – who had been saved from murder, and thus of blood relation with the patron of Poland – Adalbert of Prague (Saint Wojciech) – which can be the reason, in his opinion, for the popularity of the names Slawnik and Wojciech in the family and the exceptional position of the Pałuka family among the early medieval Greater Polish nobility, see Semkowicz 1907, 16 et seq.

Pałuka family banner, which was blessed by bishop Maciej of Gołańcz before the clash at Płowce. These were also actual family relations, very close in the Gołańcz-Danabórz branch, but that also mattered belong distant relatives, as evidenced by Michał of Gołańcz becoming the guardian of the future Łekno heir in the mid-15th century. In all likelihood, all the founders and owners of the sites under study knew each other personally to some extent and saw their residences, while also being linked by administrative affiliation as they were all subject to the municipal jurisdiction in Kcynia and on the territory of the Łekno decanate.⁷⁰ In the period under study, they formed a group of people brought up in the same culture and subject to the same influences, including especially – as their means allowed – mimicking their most powerful fellows. All of this supports the claim of similarity. This feature can also be treated as a counterargument that supports the identification of an exceptional situation, and which also concerned the borderland of the Crown (in a period that preceded the reclaiming of Pomerania from the Teutonic Order); we leave this for further discussion. Below we present an attempt to outline the evolution of the Pałuka family feudal residences, which we try to place within a wider comparative background; to structure the facts, we highlighted the formal and functional schemes found during analysis in the form of four alternative variants of these residences, which is also a form of their classification.

Variant 1: House in the Manor

We consider the first spatially distinct variant of a feudal residence to be a complex that included a house within a manor (*curia et domus*), in which the two components (i.e., the residence and its outbuildings) were in a close spatial relationship and lacked anthropogenic fortified elements other than simple delimitations such a palisade, a fence, or a shallow ditch and/or a low rampart, and primarily used its convenient location to this end. This is certainly what the first phase of the residence in Łekno looked like, and most probably also in Gołańcz, where we also know the form of the lord's house – a house with a basement, erected using perishable materials on a rectangular plan measuring 5.8×10.3 m, as well as the area of the site surrounded by a fence (about 900 m²). In Danabórz, it is likely that the same scheme operated within the “southern ward”. We can only hypothetically – and optionally – imagine the possibility of there being a natural refugium in their proximity, and in

Gołańcz this may have been the outer part of the promontory jutting into the lake (a similar scheme may have worked in Łekno), while in Danabórz it may have been the top of the lakeside kame. The period of the emergence of this type of residences is most probably the 13th (and primarily its 2nd half) and the early 14th century. This is how, based on our research, we date the construction of the *domus in curia* complex of Castellan Sławnik Świętosławowic in Gołańcz, and perhaps we should associate with it the construction of the analogous complex in Łekno, in this situation founded Trojan I, who held the same office, and in Danabórz the founder was one of the two Zbyluts (either the father-castellan or the son). However, this model persisted in its primacy up to the end of the Middle Ages, and could be enjoyed by both town owners who held offices (Trojan II of Łekno), and the multitude of knights who owned wither one or several villages in every place where sources mention the presence of landowners and no motte or similar type of layout was present (and there was no mention of their existence in the past, or traces of their demolition that would be visible via remote sensing). The diversification of the residence layouts meant primarily, supposedly, their furnishing standards, the number of animals and the capacity of the granary. In terms of archaeological research by others, we can reference the case of the “lost town” of Dzwonowo located a short distance to the south of Pałuki, where the manor was probably erected on the initiative of Poznań voivode Dobrogost of the coat of arms of Nałęcz, at the turn of the 14th century. It was built to the southwest of the town, on the edge of a slightly elevated promontory. Non-invasive research and excavations did not find any remains of fortifications around the lord's house, either from the earlier or later phases. However, remains of residential buildings and complexes of artefacts that document the owners' high social status were identified. The site is associated with the Skocki family and the Nowina coat of arms, dating to the late 15th century.⁷¹ Further examples we can cite include Orłów on the Bzura River, where in its first phase, dated from the late 13th to the mid-14th century, amid a parch of land slightly elevated above a march there was a manor surrounded by a fence or palisade, within a circle with a diameter of around 20 m.⁷² In written sources, we should not situations in which, in the context of the narrative, the house appears as the layout's most significant

⁷¹ Krzepakowski 2017, 245-263. This author is currently more prone to questioning his previous conditional supposition of the presence of a moat.

⁷² Kajzer 1990.

⁷⁰ Piber-Zbieranowska 2015, 90-91, 95.

part, without additional information about fortified structures located in the residence's area. In order to maintain consistency with the same group of characters, it is possible to draw upon the example of the raid of the Pałuka–Gołaniecki brothers on the residence of Przemysław Jakuszowicz Gultowo of the coat of arms of Grzymała. This raid occurred when he and his family were captured in his estate in the village of Wełna near Rogoźno, after his lord's house was set aflame and the family managed to evacuate it, trying to flee from the fire: (...) *et ipsos in domo expugnare non volentes, domum succenderunt, sicque Przemysław cum suis de igne salientem captivarunt*⁷³). The prevalence of this model was not conditioned by the knights' and lords' aversion to having a residence with a strongly accentuated defensibility and feudal symbolism, or the financial inability to finance such a project, but a rather difficult to scrutinize – due to a lack of Polish written source – nonadherence to the royal right to fortification, not only in the 13th but also deeper into the 15th century. This matter was already discussed by Marcin R. Pauk, who noted the mistakes in the narratives of medievalist archaeologists.⁷⁴ In the Silesian archaeological context, the essence of restrictions on the construction of motte-type layouts was discussed more extensively by D. Nowakowski, referring to the source-confirmed regional reception of paragraphs of the early-thirteenth-century *Sachsenspiegel*, which prohibited, for example, the arbitrary construction of towers in villages.⁷⁵ The case of Łekno analysed above aligns with the remarks of these researchers. Subsequent testimonies that incriminated the conduct of the militant Dorota and her husband refer each time to the construction of a fortalice (which the testifiers understood as a residence on a mound encircled by a moat) built to wartime standards during peacetime, which infringed on the law of the land and was against custom. Could these words be explained by an implementation of principles similar to those of the *Sachsenspiegel* in the law of the land that applied in this area of historical Kalisz until the mid-15th century, which were also known to the municipal court in Kcynia?

Looking from this perspective at previous proposals for reconstructing a 'typical' knightly lowlands manor in the *curia cum fortalitium* scheme, whether one sees the manor understood as a feudal household in a horizontal building within development dubbed a *curia*, or wants to see it in a tower on a mound with presumed tower house

(donjon)-like functions, one should negate the typicality of this scheme per se. Residences consisting of a manorial complex with a tower, which we presume was originally clearly fortified (more on this below), and which used elaborate artificial terrain obstacles such as ramparts and moats, were probably not a natural stage in the evolution of Polish knightly residences. Rather, they were established in cases of favourable political circumstances or war threats, and concerned only some of them. As Western European examples demonstrate, sufficient manpower could build mottes very quickly, which was their greatest advantage, enabling the efficient establishment of a territorial foundation for new authority.⁷⁶ If fortifications could be built from scratch in Łekno over four months, after which all of the events reported in the testimonies took place, then the construction did not take longer than two months. Although we view this situation as somewhat exceptional and the project as rather unimpressive (although larger in scale than a small fortified tower built out of perishable materials), we do not believe that it deviated significantly from the standard. These favourable circumstances probably included two political contexts: the extreme weakening of the supreme power, which resulted in a lack of control and a substantial increase in the threat level (especially in the Kingdom of Poland during the interregnum after the death of Louis the Hungarian); and the monarch's encouragement of trusted lords to enhance the defensibility of a given region, as well as a desire to elevate them above others who wished to influence policy (elite formation). The latter occurred, for instance, in Greater Poland under the Dukes of Głogów. The house-and-manor scheme was then enhanced with a mound-based tower surrounded by a moat, forming a defensible *fortalicium*. The destructions of these points of resistance and symbols of independence was probably the focus of Władysław Łokietek's campaign, who used Prince Casimir to mercilessly destroy these forts, as mentioned by the Traska Annals (*in Poloniam maiorem remeavit, ubi fugitivos duce Polonie regno incumbantes aggrediens, quinquaginta et eo amplius ipsorum fortalicia cremans*). However, he probably did not leave fifty knightly properties with their owners without roofs over their heads.⁷⁷ Demolishing a tower was easier than removing a mound, which is why motte-type layouts, created in these or other circumstances, typically persisted, regardless of the events surrounding their construction.

⁷³ Joannis de Czarnkow... 1872, 753.

⁷⁴ Pauk 2003.

⁷⁵ Nowakowski 2017, 248-250, 253.

⁷⁶ Nowakowski 2017, 15 et seq.

⁷⁷ Rocznik Traski... 1872, 857.

We can consider the continued existence of the motte in Łekno, despite legal objections voiced in the mid-fifteenth century, as evidence of this. Simultaneously, combining the conclusions of the current and last paragraphs rejects the widely accepted suggestions of L. Kajzer. Kajzer clearly linked the original lordly residence with a tower on a mound (operating as a tower house/donjon), and saw the fifteenth-century transition to horizontal houses on mounds or behind ramparts as a shift from defensibility to everyday comfort and, socially, from knighthood to landed gentry.⁷⁸ Indeed, this social process obviously took place, but illustrating it with the unchanging function of the buildings on the mound throughout the late medieval period was an obvious mistake.

Variant 2: Manor with a Fortalicium

The second variant of the feudal residence that we see in the research on the structures in Pałuki under discussion is a manor house with a fortalice (*curia cum fortalicium*), which we consider to be a potential second stage in their evolution, although we have attempted to prove that this is not necessary. However, to truly understand this phenomenon, we believe that we would have to abandon the ahistorical perception of facts in this field, which leads to a ‘flattening’ of the reality under study. Instead, we should correlate it with written sources and the findings of archaeological observations, giving much greater value to the former than was previously given. Numerous studies on fortified residences almost always feature a paragraph in which the multitude of terms used in texts that mention a given site are used to argue for the ambiguity, variability or even randomness of old terminology.⁷⁹ We believe that this is an incorrect approach to understanding the problem. Collecting references produced over hundreds of years, including those made in various contexts by authors with varying degrees of knowledge about a given layout, often produces a chaotic image that does not contribute much to the study of the form and function of historical residences; in fact, it hinders it. However, analysing the selected site against layouts similar to it, from the perspective of a single narrative source (e.g. the Chronicles of Jan of Czarnków) or the texts of a given chancellery (e.g. the municipal office mentioned numerous

times here) reveals a consistent and logical use of precise nomenclature, often signifying a unified understanding of spaces and their uses. Even in the case of a single chancellery that was active for centuries, these terms obviously changed over time, but they can always be understood and translated into a coherent image of the facts they report. With regard to residential and defensive complexes with surviving motte remains, we believe that their progressive functional differentiation over time is the most important matter, for which we can tentatively establish a boundary around 1410. This retains Bohdan Guerquin’s periodisation of Polish castle development for reasons similar to his own, which were analysed in greater depth by Leszek Kajzer.⁸⁰ In general terms, the layouts built earlier displayed the presence of manors (*curia*) and their accompanying residences, which were sometimes equated with the term itself by default (often more in-depth narratives reveal them as a *domus*) and a fortified element added to them (*fortalicium*), which for functional reasons was often located on a mound that was sectioned off by a ditch and formed from the soil thus procured, or on a natural feature that was further reinforced by compacted soil (via its elevation or the formation of ramparts). On the elevation’s plateau a non-residential building was built, typically a tower, which also served as the final defensive position – a *Bergfried* (German). The manor complexes of the Greater Polish allies of Henryk of Głogów known from the Traska Annals. This is how the oldest residence of the Włocław bishops in Wolbórz presented itself, where, according to the account of Janek of Czarnków, during the Grzymała–Nałęcz war, the men of a Jakusz of Kuczów, during his feasting with the canon Henryk (probably in a lord’s house at the manor, as it is difficult to assume that this would take place in an outbuilding), they occupied the “fortress of his manor” with the priest’s consent, and did not want to leave it afterwards (*familiares Jacussi praedicti fortalitium curiae ibidem, praefato canonico consentiente et permittente, intrarunt et ingressi exire nolabant*). Unaware of the conspiracy, the burghers of Wolbórz wanted to expel the intruder with his companions by force *de praedicta curia et fortalio*, with the structures once again listed separately.⁸¹ Fourteenth-century accounts from Silesia speak of such layouts. Here, for example, in Magnice in 1336, there was a *curia cum propugnaculo, quod wlgo Berffrit nominatur*, and in Gulów in 1365 there stood a *curia habitationis*

⁷⁸ Kajzer 1988, 31-36.

⁷⁹ E.g., Kajzer 1993, 12-13; Pietrzak 2003, 19-22. The works of historians were also not without influence on the overly casual treatment of nomenclature, especially the one repeatedly cited in this context: Nowak and Szymczak 1993, especially pp. 81-82.

⁸⁰ Guerquin 1974, 52-60; Kajzer 2001, 54-58.

⁸¹ Olszacki 2023, 58-59.

cum propugnaculo, while in Great Poland's Mosa, on a river island, a fortified state foundation with a clearly mentioned traditional form was to be built on the orders of Władysław Jagiełło: *domus lignea cum propugnaculis*.⁸² This issue was raised by T. Jurek, and in the context of his own archaeological observations it was popularized by R. Grygiel;⁸³ one should generally agree with their arguments except for the comments and additions made in this text. Beginning with the same paradigm as L. Kajzer, they made the same mistake as him: they generalised and flattened the dimension of time, ignoring the functional evolution of manorial complexes. They saw the mound-sited forts from the late 13th to the 15th century as strictly fortified structures that appeared alongside residential buildings in their vicinity, a view we challenge further on. Examples of this type include structures made of both perishable and masonry materials. Due to the complexity and cost of construction, these could never have been created as spontaneous projects under the conditions of the Kingdom of Poland, but should be seen as royal policy supporting selected lords in consolidating their regional position, thus indirectly strengthening the monarch's own potential. The fortified residence of the Janina family in Tudorów near Opatów, which existed in 1371 (and was probably built during the reign of Casimir the Great), is an excellent example of this. A surviving masonry tower with solely defensive functions was located on a plateau protected by a rampart. This refugium stood next to the manor house and work complex.⁸⁴ This issue leads us back to the research on the Pałuki region, where in Danabórz in the late 14th century, Gniewkowo voivode Władysław Senior Pałuka, being an ally of Duke Vladislaus II of Opole, constructed a building on a hill surrounded by a rampart, which was probably a tower and its lower parts, if not more, were masonry (Fig. 15). This *fortalicium*, which archaeological research has shown to be non-residential, formed part of a complex alongside a manor house that stood at its foot, known as the "southern ward". The complex probably also featured a manor house belonging to the voivode. In all likelihood, Gołańcz also became the site of a "mid-lake" *fortalicium*, although research was unable to tell us anything of its form (a tower?), although it was most certainly a structure with a perishable construction, with walls filled with daub. The construction of a defensive structure on the promontory

behind the manorial complex (which included a lord's house) during the time of the anti-Teutonic bishop Maciej and his warlike brother Zbylut, and probably still during the reign of Władysław Łokietek, would be seen as a project that protected not only the Pałuka family's private estate, but also aligned with the king's policies. A similar explanation may be found for the mid-fourteenth-century fortified manor in Nowe Miasto nad Wartą, the seat of the Doliwa family. They faithfully supported Casimir the Great during his conflict with the elites of Greater Poland, having previously supported his father. The layout included a fortified wooden tower measuring about 6×6 m, erected on a mound and burned down in the 1383–1384 civil war. A lord's wooden house was probably located in the eastern part of the nearby ward.⁸⁵

Variant 3 – *Fortalicium with a Manor*

According to the conventional chronology adopted above, the third variant comprises younger fortified residences that operated with a similar scheme to the one discussed earlier. They consisted of a manor (*curia*) and a structure designated in Latin as *fortalicium*. Nevertheless, they had a fundamentally different distribution of accents, which makes it possible to refer to them as *fortalicium et curia*, reversing the earlier designation. These residences could represent an evolution of the first and second variants. While the defensive element was clearly treated separately in the first two, the notion of a *curia* implied the residential and farm functions of the manor. In the third variant, however, it is the residency and defence that co-create the semantic content of the term *fortalicium* – a fortified lord's house – while the *curia* becomes a service area in the background. Understood in this way, a *fortalicium* is a building (perhaps a horizontal stone house or a tower with a vertical interior layout) made of various materials with various interior layouts, combining the functions of a residence and a fortified building with passive defensive features and attributes of a feudal lord's seat (manifested in a wide range of possibilities, including significant reduction), located in a defensive position with an external obstacle such as a moat or rampart. Although the brick tower in Gołańcz was first mentioned in 1450 already as part of a castle, its first phase built from the 1360s to the 1370s, being a kind of *Wasserburg* connected by a bridge and causeway with the manor area, should be identified precisely as a *fortalice*, and the whole complex as

⁸² Quoted in Nowakowski 2017, 82; Pietrzak 2003, 132.

⁸³ Grygiel and Jurek 1996; Grygiel 2001.

⁸⁴ See Lasek 2013, 258-259.

⁸⁵ Grygiel and Jurek 1996, 27 et seq., 148-149, 235, 295 et seq.; Łojko 1977, 29 et seq.

fortalicium et curia (Fig. 4). This was a very early example of this kind of scheme, and in its fullest possible form, but it explains the figure of the founder-bishop, who was also a long-time implementer of the state policy of the last crowned Piasts. At the same time, the temporary halt of the tower project at the stage of a single-story stone house is equally symptomatic. In addition to the probable fire, the death of Maciej and the takeover of the site by judge Tomisław, a former confederate, were significant factors here. Although this conjecture is a far-reaching hypothesis, it cannot be ruled out that royal will and the impact of the regalian right to fortification may have left their mark here. Perhaps it was the death of Casimir the Great and Tomisław's ascension to the Greater Polish elite that supported the throne of the House of Anjou (present on the tour of the province by the regent, Queen Elizabeth),⁸⁶ which was led by his cousin Sędziwój of Szubin, that allowed the judge to complete the bishop's monumental project? The other Pałuka fortalices were built in the period typical for such projects. In Danabórz, probably in the 1420s, a fortalice was erected in the form of a rampart-shaped stone house directly accessible by a bridge spanning over a depression in the terrain (Fig. 16), and about thirty years later it was expanded into a magnificent edifice serving ideologically as a tower house (Fig. 17). The mansion was located at the southern foot of the hill at this time, and unlike the previous phases, it was already the economic base of the fortified residence. Perhaps the verticalization of the masonry building, and certainly the attempt to cut it off with a defensive rampart, should be seen in the context of – known from the sources – the waywardness of Władysław Junior, the second of the actions took place not only without royal consent, but openly against the king. The fortalice in Łekno was built roughly contemporaneous with the earliest phase of Danabórz's expansion, but it was much more modest, and we also know – as mentioned – that it was erected in violation of the law of the land and custom, and therefore most likely in defiance of the regalian right to fortification. It was of unknown form, but not very impressive, a building made of perishable materials, which was erected on a dedicated mound surrounded by a moat at the time. We are certain that it was not the second variant, since witnesses unanimously testified that it replaced a lord's house in the same location. Archaeological evidence suggests that this house had most likely burned down. The hotheaded Miłosławski couple inhabited

the house for seventeen weeks, after which it was probably the residence of Trojan III for a short time. After him, it became the home of the next owners of Łekno. It is in such a manor on a mound – a fortalice (only in the context of the variant discussed here the first term is valid by becoming a synonym of the second) – that Albert Krowicki died *in alba stuba* in Smardzew in the Sieradz land in 1417, while in 1466, in Łęczeszycy in Mazovia, the lustful archdeacon Jan Pieniążek murdered the husband of his lover in his own bed.⁸⁷ Masonry fifteenth-century fortalices in the Crown, like castles, are testimony to the founding activity of a narrow circle of the noble elite supported by the monarch. Among the most magnificent was undoubtedly the rampart-encircled seat of the Bąk family of Zadora coat of arms in Bąkowa Góra, named in 1489 *fortalitium seu turris*, which replaced an older layout, perhaps of the second variant.⁸⁸ This fortified tower house (German: *Festes Haus*) is, in a formal and ideological sense, a close analogy to phase two of the Danabórz fortalice, both of which can also be considered within the circle of late Gothic influences of the model that was the tower house (donjon) of Cardinal Zbigniew Oleśnicki in Pińczów.⁸⁹ We know less about the form of the residence of the Pobóg-Konieczpolski family in Konieczpol, the most powerful family of the Sieradz land, not far from Bąkowa Góra, while naming it in 1463 *Fortalitium et curia Conyeczpole* perfectly inscribes this layout as being of the variant described.⁹⁰ If, in addition to the fortalice, the adjacent manor complex was properly fortified, the entire layout was sometimes called a castle in some sources. This is how, for instance, Sarnowo was seen, about which an oft-cited description from 1480 stated that there was (...) *fortalicium, in quo domum dicta slupp* [which was to express the same as the description of the Latin description of the tower house in Bąkowa Góra – T.O., A.R.] *cum celario, quod vocatur thesaurus et anterior pons castelli alias przigrodek, quod iacet in aqua, preterea pons et schanyborza. Una piscina est ante castrum posita (...)*⁹¹ Although the example of Sarnowo does not apply to the Kingdom of Poland at the time in question, but to the still independent Mazovian ducal domain, it is a good commentary on the issue of the long duration of the regalian right to fortification as a way to strengthen the defence of the state but also as

⁸⁷ Both cases from Kajzer 1988, 28.

⁸⁸ Kajzer 2003. As an aside, in the context of the issues raised here, we believe that the titular Zbigniew did not live in the "real" castle.

⁸⁹ Lasek 2013, 168-171.

⁹⁰ Bania 2023, 82.

⁹¹ Quoted from L. Kajzer 2010, 52.

⁸⁶ Marzec 2021, 106, 111, 119.

a tool for the creation of elites. Indeed, as indicated by the accounts of Duke Janusz II, preceding the description referenced by two years, the monarch gave the noble Jakub (?) Sarnowski four *kopy of groschen pro reformatione et reparacione castrum in Sarnow*, which was the private residence of this lord.⁹² Despite the recently indicated circumstance, we propose to consider all of the mentioned sites of the second and third variants/types, in the context of architectural history, both because of their historical nomenclature and perhaps more importantly the factor of scale that conditions coexistence with the external outbuildings and the lack of their own masonry perimeter, as fortified manors in the future.⁹³

Final Stage – Castle (Castrum)

This brings us to the fourth variant of private residence: the castle (*castrum*), which is not covered in much detail in this study. Of the Pałuka family sites discussed in more detail, only Gołańcz became a castle. This occurred in the 1st quarter of the 15th century, evolving from the *fortalicium et curia* scheme. It is also the only example of a feudal residence among those discussed to have gone through all of the previously mentioned formal and functional variants. In the late medieval sense, the term ‘castrum’ refers to a feudal residence enclosed within a defensive perimeter (identified as masonry fortifications by the end of the 14th century at the latest), which is large enough to accommodate an undeveloped area – a courtyard – and is multifunctional, typically with development around the courtyard. The author of the mid-seventeenth-century work “Krótka nauka budownicza...” thought similarly, classifying fortified residences as castles, palaces or manors and writing: “I use the term castle for a building with a courtyard, enclosed on four sides”.⁹⁴ The Gołańcz fortalice became a castle in the 1st quarter of the 15th century, when it was independently ruled by Jakub “Kusz” without a style, but an industrious and wealthy host, who had at his disposal structures inherited from his ancestors in the form of a masonry residential tower surrounded by a moat and a manor at its western edge. “Kusz” surrounded the tower with a solid defensive wall and did a tremendous amount of work of hauling masses of earth between the tower and the lake, which made it possible to establish an outer bailey with its own masonry gate and a mixed: masonry and, above all, wooden fortified perimeter (Fig. 5). Into

these spaces he introduced development that serviced the main residence, which was tower house, and once an independent fortalice, and later a house located in the castle’s centre, which, in the understanding of the municipal scribe from 1450, an area delineated by a quadrangle of walls (*domus qua iacet in medio castrum*). Further outbuildings were located on the west side of the moat, and its northwestern part became the nucleus of the entire layout, which was then more than 100 years old – a manor with a lord’s house (Fig. 7). Already in the early 17th century, those who wrote about the castle saw primarily its residential qualities, with moderate (in relation to their contemporaneous projects) defensive qualities, which resulted in calling it primarily by the terms *arx* and *curia*, sometimes, however, with a clear hesitation in balancing the relationship of the said qualities, with the semantically insignificant scale of defence (when referring to “small castle” or *Arcum seu fortalicium*) nevertheless highlighted, the semantic difference in early modern nomenclature between Gołańcz and Danabórz still remained noticeable. As we suppose in this comparative context, the phenomenon of the private masonry castle in late medieval Poland becomes a fact that is even more exceptional than before.

CONCLUSIONS AND PROSPECTS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

In conclusion, we would like to emphasise that we consider the presented classification, as well as the entire evolution model, to be highly probable within the micro-region we studied. We believe that it will be essential in comparative studies of the widely and tentatively understood ‘knightly manor’, particularly in the lowland areas of the late medieval Kingdom of Poland, and will contribute to intensifying research and providing new perspectives. However, we are still very far from understanding the paths that this evolution took in the different provinces and the degree to which they displayed similarities and uniqueness. The research discussed in this text indicates that, in terms of field operations, the widest possible reconnaissance and exploration of the surroundings and the ‘subsoil’ of what is now manifested as a material relic of a feudal seat (*motte*, mansion or castle) is necessary, while excavations should complement non-invasive prospecting but be limited to the most promising sites. The ‘designation’ must depend strictly on an in-depth analysis of written sources, aided by a willingness to understand them (rather than a priori marginalisation). We are aware that one cannot usually expect to have access to such an abundance of archival material as we had when implementing

⁹² *Rachunki Janusza II...* 2024, no. 97.

⁹³ In the sense perhaps most fully expressed by Pietrzak 2003, 22.

⁹⁴ *Krótka nauka budownicza...* 1957, 16, 78-79.

the grant-funded project discussed here. The field situation also often does not allow for the same freedom of movement in undeveloped areas. The studies presented also enabled us to reach one of our key conclusions: that it is possible to provide a more tangible account of the long duration of the regalian right to fortification in the Kingdom of Poland. This is essential for understanding the subject matter discussed and shows what a typical knightly manor complex looked like when affected by it. All of this leads us to conclude that future research must be interdisciplinary, as any partial perspective in a situation where we analyse such an unimaginable and interpretatively complicated reality will only further blur its contours.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work was written as a part of carrying out a grant of the National Science Centre no. 2016/23/B/HS3/00689 entitled “Castrum et curia. Studies on the development of private fortified residences and their outbuildings, from the Middle Ages to the early modern period, on the example of the estates of the Pałuka family and their descendants.” The authors would like to thank all the individuals and institutions that supported the research and the preparation of this study.

DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

SOURCES

- AGAD, MK – Archiwum Główne Akt Dawnych w Warszawie (Archives of Historical Records in Warsaw): *Metryka Koronna*, no. 42.
- AGAD, ZDP – Archiwum Główne Akt Dawnych w Warszawie (Archives of Historical Records in Warsaw). Zbiór dokumentów pergaminowych, no. 472.
- Annales...* 2005 – *Joannis Długossi Annales seu cronicae incliti Regni Poloniae, Liber Duodecimus (1462–1480)*. Cracoviae 2005.
- APP, KKG – Archiwum Państwowe w Poznaniu (State Archive in Poznań): Kcynia – księgi grodzkie, nos. 10, 19, 20, 27, 78, 80, 82, 83, 91.
- APP, PKG – Archiwum Państwowe w Poznaniu: Poznań – księgi grodzkie, no. 4.
- Codex...* 1847 – *Codex Diplomaticus Poloniae* 1, S. Strąbski (ed.), Varsaviae 1847.
- Codex epistolaris...* 1876 – *Codex epistolaris saeculi decimi quinti* 1. A. Sokołowski, J. Szujski (eds.), Kraków 1876.
- Dopelnienie Szamotulskie...* 1872 – *Dopelnienie Szamotulskie*. Monumenta Poloniae Historica 2. A. Bielowski (ed.), Lwów 1872, 861-871.
- Krótką nauka budownicza...* 1957 – *Krótką nauka budownicza dworów, pałaców, zamków podług nieba i zwyczaju polskiego*. A. Miłobędzki (ed.), Wrocław 1957.
- Joannis de Czarnkow...* 1872 – *Joannis de Czarnkow Chronicon Polonorum*. Monumenta Poloniae Historica 2. J. Szlachetkowski (ed.), Lwów 1872, 599-756.
- Kodeks...* 1877 – *Kodeks Dyplomatyczny Wielkopolski* 1. I. Zakrzewski (ed.), Poznań 1877.
- Kodeks...* 1879 – *Kodeks Dyplomatyczny Wielkopolski* 3. I. Zakrzewski (ed.), Poznań 1879.
- Kodeks...* 1881 – *Kodeks Dyplomatyczny Wielkopolski* 4. I. Zakrzewski (ed.), Poznań 1881.
- Kodeks...* 1908 – *Kodeks Dyplomatyczny Wielkopolski* 5. F. Piekosiński (ed.), Poznań 1908.
- Lekszycki... 1889 – *Die ältesten grosspolnischen Grodbücher* 2. J. Lekszycki (ed.), Lepizig 1889.
- Lites...* 1892 – *Lites ac res gestae inter Polonos ordinemque Cruciferorum* 2. I. Zakrzewski (ed.), Posnaniae 1892.
- Rachunki Janusza II...* 2024 – *Rachunki Janusza II księcia mazowieckiego z lat 1477–1485, 1487–1490*. J. Grabowski (ed.), *Folia Jagellonica Fontes* 28. Kraków 2024.
- Rocznik Traski...* 1872 – *Rocznik Traski*. Monumenta Historica 2. A. Bielowski (ed.), Lwów 1872, 826-861.
- Roczniki...* 2009 – *Jana Długosza Roczniki czyli kroniki sławnego Królestwa Polskiego (...)* *Księga Dwunasta (1462–1480)*. Warszawa 2009.

REFERENCES

- Bania Z. 2023. *Dlaczego Konięcpolscy nie zbudowali sobie zamku w 2. połowie XV w.?* In: A. Bocheńska, P. Mrozowski (eds.), *Zamki w Polsce u progu nowych czasów. Transformacje i fundacje w XV w.* *Colloquia Castrensia* 3. Warszawa, 77-90.

- Białowas J. E. 2018. *Pochodzenie i najbliższa rodzina biskupa włocławskiego Macieja Pałuki (ok. 1285–1368)*. “Nasza Przeszłość” 130, 33-51.
- Bieniak J. 1985. *Krąg rodzinny biskupa kujawskiego Macieja Pałuki (korekta do Rodu Pałuków Władysława Semkowicza)*. “Zapiski Historyczne” 50, 85-117.
- Biskup M. 1967. *Trzynastoletnia wojna z Zakonem Krzyżackim 1454–1466*. Warszawa.
- Brzeziński W. 2011. *Rodzina Łekieńskich z rodu Pałuków w XV wieku. Z genealogii i życia rodziny szlacheckiej w późnośredniowiecznej Polsce*. In: B. Możejko, M. Smoliński, S. Szybowski (eds.), *Dzierżawcy – literaci – posłowie*. Malbork, 19-35.
- Cnotliwy E. 1995. *Badania weryfikacyjne późnośredniowiecznych siedzib obronnych zachodniej części Pałuk*. In: A. M. Wyrwa (ed.), *Studia i Materiały do Dziejów Pałuk 2: Osadnictwo i architektura w rejonie Łekna we wczesnym średniowieczu*. Poznań, 321-373.
- Grygiel R., Jurek T. 1996. *Doliwowie z Nowego Miasta nad Wartą, Dębna i Biechowa. Dzieje rezydencji i ich właścicieli*. Łódź.
- Grygiel R. 2001. *Curia cum fortalicio (dwór i wieża obronna) podstawą układu rezydencjonalnego późnośredniowiecznej siedziby rycerskiej w Wielkopolsce*. In: E. Opaliński, T. Wiślicz (eds.), *Rezydencje w średniowieczu i czasach nowożytnych*. Warszawa, 204-218.
- Guerquin B. 1974. *Zamki w Polsce*. Warszawa.
- Horbacz T. J., Lechowicz Z. 1984. *Jeszcze o siedzibie rycersko-szlacheckiej w Polsce*. “Acta Universitatis Lodzianensis. Folia Archaeologica” 5, 69-106.
- Kajzer L. 1975. *Uwagi o ewolucji wiejskich siedzib rycerskich w ziemi łączyckiej i sieradzkiej w XIII-XVII wieku*. “Kwartalnik Historii Kultury Materialnej” 23(4), 589-603.
- Kajzer L. 1988. *Archeologiczny rodowód dworu. Przemiany siedzib obronno-rezydencjonalnych Polski centralnej w późnym średniowieczu i czasach nowożytnych*. Łódź.
- Kajzer L. 1990. *Średniowieczny drewniany dwór obronny w Orłowie nad Bzurą*. “Slavia Antiqua” 32, 241-290.
- Kajzer L. 1993. *Zamki i społeczeństwo. Przemiany architektury i budownictwa obronnego w Polsce w X-XVIII wieku*. Łódź.
- Kajzer L. 2001. *Dzieje zamków w Polsce*. In: L. Kajzer, S. Kołodziejski, J. Salm, *Leksykon zamków w Polsce*. Warszawa, 13-75.
- Kajzer L. 2003. *Czy Zbigniew Bąk mieszkał w prawdziwym zamku?*. “Kwartalnik Historii Kultury Materialnej” 51(3-4), 337-354.
- Kajzer L. 2010. *Dwory w Polsce. Od średniowiecza do współczesności*. Warszawa.
- Kamińska J. 1968. *Siedlętków, obronna siedziba rycerska z XIV wieku*. “Prace i Materiały Muzeum Archeologicznego i Etnograficznego w Łodzi. Seria Archeologiczna” 15, 15-88.
- Karczewska J. 2010. *Własność szlachecka na pograniczu wielkopolsko-kujawskim w pierwszej połowie XV wieku*. Kraków.
- Karczewska J. 2017. *Majątki szlacheckie w okolicy Kcyni na przełomie XIV i XV wieku*, “Studia Zachodnie” 19, 17-26.
- Kittel P. 2011. *Wstępna informacja o wynikach sondowań geologicznych w rejonie zamku w Golańczy, gm. Wągrowiec, wykonanych w 2010*. “Wielkopolskie Sprawozdania Archeologiczne” 12, 373-377.
- Klint P. 2012. *Szlachecki obrót ziem w powiecie kcyńskim w latach 1626-1655*. Badania z Dziejów Społecznych i Gospodarczych 66. Wrocław.
- Korytkowski J. 1888. *Arcybiskupi gnieźnieńscy: prymasowie i metropolici polscy od roku 1000 aż do roku 1821 czyli do połączenia arcybiskupstwa gnieźnieńskiego z biskupstwem poznańskim 2*. Poznań.
- Kowalski J. 2010. *Gotyki wielkopolski. Architektura sakralna XIII-XVI wieku*. Poznań.
- Krzepkowski M. 2017. *Wyniki badań ratowniczych średniowiecznej siedziby rycerskiej i dworu staropolskiego (Niedźwiedziny stan. 5). Sezon 2015*. In: M. Krzepkowski, M. Moeglich, P. Wroniecki (eds.), *Dzwonowo. Średniowieczne zaginione miasto 1: Środowisko naturalne, zarys dziejów, badania nieinwazyjne*. Wągrowiec, 245-263.
- Lasek P. 2013. *Turris fortissima nomen Domini. Murowane wieże mieszkalne w Królestwie Polskim od 1300 r. do połowy XVI w*. Warszawa.
- Lasek P. 2017. *Prywatne zamki polskich dowódców z czasów wojny trzynastoletniej*. “Komunikaty Mazursko-Warmińskie” 2, 233-262.
- Lasek P. 2019. *Obronne siedziby rycerskie i możnowładcze w czasach Kazimierza Wielkiego*. In: A. Bocheńska, P. Mrozowski (eds.), *Wielkie murowanie. Zamki w Polsce za Kazimierza Wielkiego*. Colloquia Castrensia 2. Warszawa, 67-86.

- Łojko J. 1977. *Konfederacja Macieja Borkowica*. "Roczniki Historyczne" 43, 29-58.
- Łukasik S., Krenz-Niedbała M., Zdanowicz M., Różański A., Olszacki T. 2019. *Victims of a 17th Century Massacre in Central Europe: Perimortem Trauma of Castle Defenders*. "International Journal of Osteoarchaeology" 29(2), 281-293.
- Marciniak-Kajzer A. 2011. *Średniowieczny dwór rycerski w Polsce. Wizerunek archeologiczny*. Łódź.
- Marciniak-Kajzer A. 2016. *Archaeology on Medieval Knights' Manor Houses in Poland*. Łódź, Kraków.
- Marzec A. 2021. *Pod rządami nieobecnego monarchy. Królestwo Polskie 1370–1382*. Kraków.
- Mrozowski P. 2023. *Zamki murowane w dobrach prywatnych u progu nowych czasów w Królestwie Polskim – wyraz jednostkowych ambicji czy norma społecznych oczekiwań?*. In: A. Bocheńska, P. Mrozowski (eds.), *Zamki w Polsce u progu nowych czasów. Transformacje i fundacje w XV w.* Colloquia Castrensia 3, 91-110.
- Nowak T., Szymczak J. 1993. *Obiekty obronne w Sieradzkim i Wieluńskim w świetle źródeł pisanych (do końca XVI w.)*. In: T. J. Horbacz and L. Kajzer (eds.), *Między północą a południem. Sieradzkie i Wieluńskie w późnym średniowieczu i czasach nowożytnych*. Sieradz, 81-95.
- Nowakowski D. 2017. *Śląskie obiekty typu motte. Studium archeologiczno-historyczne*. Wrocław.
- Olszacki T. 2023. *Zamek „górnny” w Wolborzu w świetle najnowszych badań terenowych i ich interpretacji (zagadnienia wstępne)*. In: M. Gajda (ed.), *750-lecie nadania Wolborzowi praw miejskich. Księga pamiątkowa*. Łódź, 43-67.
- Olszacki T., Różański A. 2011. *Zamek w Gołańczy na Pałukach w świetle nowych badań (sezony 2009 i 2010)*. "Wielkopolskie Sprawozdania Archeologiczne" 12, 143-371.
- Olszacki T., Różański A. 2015. *Zamek w Gołańczy. Dzieje i architektura od połowy XIV po schyłek XVIII stulecia*. Gołańcz.
- Olszacki T., Różański A., Łukasik S., Krenz-Niedbała M. 2019. *Szwedzkie oblężenie zamku w Gołańczy 3 maja 1656 roku w świetle źródeł pisanych oraz badań archeologicznych i antropologicznych*. In: P. Lasek, P. Sypczuk (eds.), *Residentiae tempore belli et pacis. Materiały do badań i ochrony założeń rezydencjonalnych i obronnych*. Warszawa, 198-225.
- Paszkwoka M. 1983. *Karta Ewidencyjna Zabytków Architektury i Budownictwa: Danabórz (Bukowiec) – Dwór*; sheet ref. no. 17332. Typescript in the archives of WUOZ in Poznań. Poznań.
- Pauk M. R. 2003. *Funkcjonowanie regale fortyfikacyjnego w Europie Środkowej w średniowieczu*. "Kwartalnik Historii Kultury Materialnej" 51(1), 3-16.
- Piber-Zbieranowska M. 2015. *Powiat kcyński w drugiej połowie XVI w.* "Studia Geohistorica" 3, 89-109.
- Pietrzak J. 2003. *Zamki i dwory obronne w dobrach państwowych prowincji wielkopolskiej. Studium z dziejów państwowych siedzib obronnych na przełomie średniowiecza i nowożytności*. Monografie Instytutu Archeologii Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego 1. Łódź.
- Poklewski-Kozieł (ed.). 2013. *Centrum włości szlacheckiej w Pomorzanach i Pomorzankach pod Kutnem od 1375 do 1810 roku. (Autostrada A1)*. Archeologiczne Zeszyty Autostradowe Instytutu Archeologii i Etnologii PAN 14. Łódź.
- Pokropek M. 2019. *Etnografia. Materialna kultura ludowa Polski na tle porównawczym*. Warszawa.
- Różański A. 2018. *Castrum et curia. Studia nad rozwojem prywatnych siedzib obronnych oraz ich zapleczy od średniowiecza do nowożytności na przykładzie włości rodu Pałuków i ich następców*. "Archeologia Historica Polona" 26, 183-199.
- Semkowicz W. 1907. *Ród Pałuków*. Kraków.
- Sikora J., Kittel P. 2017. *Problem nieco zapomniany? Zaplecza rezydencji rycerskich typu motte*. In: A. Różański (ed.), *Gemma Gemmarum. Studia dedykowane Profesor Hannie Kóćce-Krenz* 1. Poznań, 561-589.
- Szybkowski S. 2000. *Związki rodzinne Danaborskich z elitą urzędniczą Kujaw i ziemi dobrzyńskiej*. "Roczniki Historyczne" 66, 157-169.
- Tymieniecki K. 1938. *Akt hołdu w stosunkach dominialnych XV wieku*. "Roczniki Historyczne" 14, 322-331.
- Wędzki A. 2001. *Okres staropolski*. In: A. Wędzki (ed.) *Gołańcz w 600-leciu (1399–1999)*. Gołańcz z dziejów miasta i regionu. Gołańcz, 10-65.
- Wyrwa A. M. 1989. *Pałuki – nazwa i terytorium w świetle źródeł i literatury. Stan badań*. In: A. M. Wyrwa (ed.), *Osadnictwo i architektura w rejonie Łekna we wczesnym średniowieczu*. Studia i Materiały do Dziejów Pałuk 1. Poznań, 11-22.
- Wyrwa A. M. 2007. *A Fortified and Sacred Site in Łekno until the Middle of the 12th Century. A Note*. "Questiones Medii Aevi Novae" 12, 341-362.
- Wyrwa A. M. 2010. *Klasztory cysterskie w Łeknie i Wągrowcu. Szlak Cysterski w Polsce. Klasztory cysterskie pętli wielkopolsko-lubuskiej* 1. Bydgoszcz.