

## DISAPPEARING SIGNS. CAN THE CHANGES IN THE POLISH CHIVALRIC COATS-OF-ARMS BE TRACED IN MEDIEVAL SOURCES?

MATEUSZ GIGOŃ  
kliper@gazeta.pl  
University of Wrocław  
Poland



### ABSTRACT

The paper presents an overview of current papers (but it reminds us also of findings of prewar researchers) about coats-of-arms of small chivalric clans, rarely present in sources. It also contains some findings made by the author himself, mainly about Prus, Chmara and Zgraja coats-of-arms. The intent of the author was also a limited sources study reflection on the coats-of-arms, about which there is lack of information concerning their shape and probable genetical relationship with other coats-of-arms. The following coats-of-arms or their callings were mentioned: Kliza, Wiza, Moszczenica, Calina, Wazanki, Piękostki, Ulina, Owada, Czawuja, Kołmasz, Prus I (Turzyna), Prus II (Wilczekosy), Glezyna, Larysza, Ogniwo, Zarosie, Chmara, Zgraja, Goljan. Most of them turned out to equate with other, better known coats-of-arms, or strove for that kind of equation. All this makes the structure of polish medieval society and the rules of that society more clear.

**Key words:** heraldry, petty knightly clans, coat-of-arms varieties, diminishing of coat-of-arms, medieval society.

One of the goals of modern heraldry is to reconstruct the structure of medieval society – together with genealogy it tries to answer the question about the role of knightly clans. The visible sign of unity of a clan is the coat-of-arms – the hereditary, established sign placed on a shield and called by a given name. In Polish medieval heraldry there was an additional important element of a coat-of-arms: *proclamatio* (the battle call) (Szymański 2004, p. 653). The coat-of-arms distinguishes a group (here – a clan) from the bigger society (local, regional, state) and gives the clan its limits; therefore comes the issue of equation or distinction of coats-of-arms (and consistently – the clan)<sup>51</sup>. Janusz Bieniak wrote about knightly clans as real, cohesive (relatively) and supportive political parties (Bieniak 2002b, p. 123-130; Bieniak 2002d, p. 71-79). The following paper focuses on the heraldic aspect of medieval knightly clans, specifically on the obstacles which are met by a researcher in this area of studies.

Creation of a coat-of-arms as a sign is a process different for each clan – depending on the social position of a particular *gens* it could take two to three generations or even more to reach its final *de facto* form in the 16<sup>th</sup> century (Bieniak 2002a, p. 109; Bieniak 2002d, p. 64; Wroniszewski 1982, p. 121). The coat-of-arms has its

<sup>51</sup> The points about social role of coat-of-arms refer to 14<sup>th</sup>–15<sup>th</sup> century.

roots in individual property marks from the seals of 13<sup>th</sup> century chivalry. Referring in the beginning to particular people, they then became (in 13<sup>th</sup>/14<sup>th</sup> century) hereditary signs<sup>52</sup>, placed on shields – and from this moment we can call them coats-of-arms. During 14<sup>th</sup> century final shapes for coats-of-arms forms appeared (Wroniszewski 1982, p. 122), whereas in the 15<sup>th</sup> century – by a reduction of less popular paroles – appeared names of the clans and coats-of-arms, as well as battle calls (Bieniak 2002a, p. 85-109, esp. 93, 109-107). It has to be stressed here that this chronology refers mostly to the aristocracy. Petty knightly clans often used many variations of their coat-of-arms, name of the clan and battle call (Wroniszewski 1982, p. 129). Such variations are often rarely present in sources and this causes a problem to the researcher – is a particular clan a separate clan or a branch of a bigger one? If a branch – of which big clan?

I would like now to return to 13<sup>th</sup> century seals. They presented combinations of lines, crosses, rings and half-rings, which could have been a basis on which a form of a particular coat-of-arms known in later centuries was created. At the same time several different signs were used by relatives within one clan. Only gaining political power with a particular member or branch of a clan forced accepting one sign by other members of this clan (Bieniak 2002c p. 32-33; Bieniak 2002a, p. 109-113). It could be the old combination of lines, transformed into a more geometrical simple heraldic *mobililia*<sup>53</sup> (a horseshoe, a cross, a sword etc.) – as in the case of the Pobóg clan, whose oldest seals resemble a 14<sup>th</sup>-15<sup>th</sup> century horseshoe with a cross (Bieniak 2002a, p. 113; see also: Sikora 1983 and Zawitkowska 2005); or a completely new sign<sup>54</sup>, introduced by one of the members of Wierzbna clan, who started to seal with a belt and lilies (Jurek 2006, p. 94-97)<sup>55</sup>. Other seal signs are – referring to the title of the article – the first which “disappeared”, even though when mentioning them we should remember that not all of them were coats-of-arms. The “rivalry” of emblems was in the 14<sup>th</sup> century still in progress, in powerful clans as well as in poorer ones (Wroniszewski 1982, p. 122).

These rivalries of signs is a cause of misunderstandings in present researches when two variations of one coat-of-arms appear<sup>56</sup>. Moreover, we should also be aware of

<sup>52</sup> As “mark” I mean combination of dashes or images used by knights to sign seals or individual items before the coat-of-arms were created; “sign” – it’s image represented in coat-of-arms.

<sup>53</sup> Term “*mobililia*” means sign or image placed on the shield of a coat-of-arms. See Szymański 1993, p. 5-15.

<sup>54</sup> Polish heraldry uses term “*godło*”, even though J. Wroniszewski proved a completely different meaning in the medieval era – “*godło*” were mentioned in sources as “battle call” (Wroniszewski 1990).

<sup>55</sup> T. Jurek sees the origin of this change in the supposition, that Jan of Wierzbna studied in Paris and Capetian iconography became familiar to him.

<sup>56</sup> I write about “variations” in Polish heraldry with some sort of anxiety, because this problem still waits for a complete study. There is no definition of coat-of-arms variations. In all papers and books there is a “silent assumption” that the variations are in some way contemporary and are a process of unifying a particular coat-of-arms – compare with this quote from J. Bieniak’s work: “colour variations were not different coats-of-arms” (even though he writes about different colours in Grzymała and Pogorzela coats-of-arms). Variation is considered a more permanent phenomenon probably by M. Zawitkowska; “It is therefore probable that in ca. 1430-1440 there were two different variations of the Pobóg coat-of-arms”. An attempt at definition was given by A. Małcki in *Studia heraldyczne*: “Variations of some emblems were created by giving some additions to the

the problem of accuracy (or to be more precise – inaccuracy) of descriptions of coats-of-arms in court notes, which are often the only source of information about a specific *clenodium*<sup>57</sup>. Alicja Szymczakowa points out that “terminological instability, typical in 15<sup>th</sup> heraldry, results often in multiplication of coats-of-arms” (Szymczakowa 2001, p. 125). All these difficulties have their roots in the process of creating heraldic clans – if the genealogical clan had many branches, the process of unifying emblems was longer as less powerful was the clan. On the other hand – if we study an artificially created knightly clan (or a knightly clan which contained many genealogically extraneous elements), all of the many used signs are a reminiscence of former distinctiveness (Wroniszewski 1982, p. 129)<sup>58</sup>. Another issue is the number and condition of surviving medieval sources – both written and iconographical. Often one coat-of-arms is mentioned only once or only one picture of it can be found. The researcher gets confused, but we have to remember that constantly developed studies sometimes result in bringing back to attention forgotten ideas, formulated much earlier. Even conclusions which seemed to be definitive can therefore be revised (Szymczakowa 2001, p. 125-131; Karczewska 2005; Fronczak 2007).

Several corrections were made by A. and Jan Szymczak after a query in documents of the court in Sieradz and epigraphic studies (Szymczak 1990; Szymczakowa 2001, p. 129-131). Those studies enabled identification of people appearing in court documents in relation to only once mentioned coats-of-arms – Kliza<sup>59</sup> and Wiza. A. and J. Szymczak came to a conclusion that Jarosław of Remiszewice, who

---

ordinary form – and those additions made the emblems distinct from their primary form”. Later papers considered this problem marginal – F. Piekosiński sees variations as a natural consequence of growth of a clan in which the oldest son inherited the coat-of-arms from his father, whereas younger sons created variations. W. Semkowicz had a more realistic opinion – for him variations were a consequence of decay of the clan spirit. Views of F. Piekosiński and W. Wityg were strongly criticized by H. Polackówna. M. Cetwiński states an opinion that in medieval Poland variations were accepted as something natural because one clan is related to another and one coats-of-arms come from another one. J. Bieniak’s view was presented at the beginning of this footnote. See: Małecki 1890, p. 285; Piekosiński 1899, p. 6; Semkowicz 1908, p. 7; Polackówna 1909, p. 77-79; Cetwiński 1987, p. 129-131; Bieniak 2002a, p. 117, 121; Zawitkowska 2005, p. 27.

<sup>57</sup> There is a note from Przemyśl from 1478, in which Piotr and Iwan of Chłopczyce described their coat-of-arms as „*Vilczkossy et duabus crucibus et luna*”. In 1414 in Cracow witnessed Andrzej of Druszkowo and Mikołaj of Osie „*de clenodio Ignilis (...) medij nigri griffonis*” as well as Jan Franczuch of Nosaczowice and Wyszko of Druszkowo „*de clenodio curvatura et altere medie crucis*”. In 1412 also in Cracow Waclaw and Wawrzyniec of Cudzinowice described their coat-of-arms as „*duorum babatorum et crucis*”. It is not known how all those mobilia were placed on the shield. Giving the colour of the griffin in the second note seems important – colours rarely appear in supreme court documents. AGZ XVIII, p. 165 nr 1084; SPPP II nr 1330; SPPP VII nr 219.

<sup>58</sup> There are two theories about origins of heraldic clans: 1) the genealogical theory – a clan arose by natural process of multiplying; 2) the client theory – several smaller clans united into a bigger one. Nowadays most of the experts consider the first theory more accurate, but it is said that exceptions were also possible – bigger clans could accept smaller familiae. Also completely artificial clans were created (like Prus clan or Sas-Drag clan). Except mentioned Wroniszewski 1982, see also: Cetwiński 1985, p. 40-85 and Bieniak 2002c, p. 37-39. About Prus clan and Sas-Drag clan: Chwalibińska 1948, Wyrostek 1931.

<sup>59</sup> The names of coats-of-arms I take from Szymański 1993. However, J. Szymański is not consistent when describing Owad coat-of-arms. Sometimes it (in Polish) it is a male gender (“Owad” – page 216), sometimes – female gender (“Owada” – f. e. footnote 4 in the section “Owad”). Wroniszewski 1982, p. 125 uses the female gender version and I’ve also chosen to use this one.

used the Kliza coat-of-arms in 1399, had a grandson with the same name, who used the Jelita coat-of-arms. Furthermore, the names often used by members of Kliza clan and Jelita clan are similar, and leads to a conclusion that those two coats-of-arms were identical, even if some particular signs are different (Jan Wroniszewski accepted such possibility) (Wroniszewski 1982). Wiza coat-of-arms was used in 1398 by Bartłomiej of Rdultowice during a trial of his relative. This knight was later twice – in 1405 and 1410 – called Ostoja. In his paper A. Szymczak reminds us that the name Moszczenica is not a separate coat-of-arms but a proclamation of Wilczekosy (through research of Jadwiga Chwalibińska) (Chwalibińska 1948, p. 80, 121). To a petty knightly clan with a cognomen Koysz, which used this call, A. Szymczakowa adds the clan Wspinkowie of Będkowo (Piekosiński 1898 nr 22; Szymczakowa 2001, p. 129-130). Their progenitor stood as a witness on a trial in 1405 using the Moszczenica coat-of-arms, and his descendants appear in documents as Wilczekosy (Fronczak 2005, p. 9 and footnotes 15, 17). A. and J. Szymczak did further research on Sulima coat-of-arms, which was mistakenly read as Calina – it is simply a paleographical mistake (Szymczakowa 2001, p. 131). The battle call Wazanki was also mistakenly connected to Wilczekosy (Prus II) (Dziadulewicz 1921, p. 135-136). In 1404 Mszczuj of Będkowo called his coat-of-arms Wazanki, but he came from different Będkowo, located in the county of Sieradz, while Wilczekosy lived in Będkowo in the county of Brzeziny. Mszczuj had a brother, Stanisław, who used cognomens Wężyk<sup>60</sup> and Małdrzyk. He is the ancestor of Wężyk clan of Sieradz, so Wazanki is a name of clan which has a Snake in its coat-of-arms (their battle call is Zachorz). A similar mistake was made (according to Fronczak 2007, p. 88-89) by connecting written and iconographical sources in which Piękostki coat-of-arms was mentioned. Jan Długosz in *Księga uposażeń biskupstwa krakowskiego* lists the inheritors of Mikułowice and Wielkanoc, who used "Pyakostky" coat-of-arms (Jan Długosz *Liber beneficiorum* vol. II, p. 39; vol. III, p. 433)<sup>61</sup>. This information was connected with a plaque erected in a church in Wojciechowice (formerly called Mikułowice) (Fronczak 2007, p. 84), which presents a certain coat-of-arms as a sign similar to number "8" with small crosses coming out from the sides (Szymański 1993, p. 218; Fronczak 2007, p. 84). But Wojciechowice-Mikułowice are near Opatów, while Długosz clearly states that he is writing about Mikułowice near Busko. In this situation Stanisław Dziadulewicz's hypothesis can be recalled, who put together Piękostki and Mądrostki coats-of-arms, based on Mądrostki coat-of-arms, used by the inheritors of Wielkanoc in the second half of 16<sup>th</sup> century (Dziadulewicz 1912c, p. 12; Szymański 1993, p. 86, 88).

J. Wroniszewski (whose paper about heraldic criteria was quoted in this paper several times) juxtaposed several pairs of coats-of-arms, which – like Kliza and Jelita or Piękostki and Mądrostki – can be considered identical based on the identity of people using first and second *clenodium*. Jan of Jaszowice uses Ulina coat-of-arms, Mikołaj of Jaszowice – Owada coat-of-arms (Wroniszewski 1982, p. 125). Both coats-of-arms present the "M" maiuscule, but in Ulina there is also a charged cross, while

<sup>60</sup> Wężyk = "little snake".

<sup>61</sup> As the matter of fact, in villages around Wielkanoc lived only members of Mądrostka clan and the parish priest in Baczkowice was called „Mikulowsky nobilis de domo Mądrostklyf”.

in Owada – a crown. J. Szymański in his armorial admits that those coats-of-arms became identical – „a note from 1445 calls by the name Ulina coat-of-arms, which is in fact Owada, and a note from 1453 omits the cross” (Szymański 1993, p. 282, footnote 4 to the “Ulina”). The case of Czawuja i Kolmasz coats-of-arms is similar – „in 1409 Andrzej of Deszno used Kolmasz coat-of-arms, while in 1455 his son Wojciech declared himself as a member of Czewoja clan. In 1428 and 1429 in chivalry-proving trials witnessed Florian of Wiazlin, using the coat-of-arms Kolmasz with a similar battle call. His brother Mikołaj, accused of being a peasant descendent in 1430, came with two knights from the clan of his father »*de clenodio duorum babatorum et crucis in medio ac proclamacione Czawgia*«” (Wroniszewski 1982, p. 125-126).

In this place the Prus coat-of-arms should be mentioned. This clan was created in a process of consolidation of Prussian settlers and prisoners-of-war around clan privileges from the mid 14<sup>th</sup> century. Those privileges gave some of them chivalry rights. The rest of the Prussians tried therefore to prove that they were relatives to those of them who gained chivalry. Therefore it is in fact a completely artificial „knightly clan”, containing many small knightly clans living in a long belt of Wielkopolska, Mazowsze, lands of Sieradz and Dobrzyń. In the 15<sup>th</sup> century the Prus clan devoured the Turzyna clan, an old knightly clan from Małopolska (probably ethnically Slavonic) – and already in the beginning of the 15<sup>th</sup> century „*de clenodio Prussi*” became owners of three different signs: 1) two-and-a-half-barred-cross (Prus I), 2) Wilczekosy (a wolf-trap; Prus II) and 3) horseshoe (later – demi-horseshoe with demi-wolf-trap) with two-and-a-half-barred-cross (Prus III). Judging from the common clan name (which was one of the necessary conditions of a heraldic clan) (Bieniak 2002d; Bieniak 2002a)<sup>62</sup>, they were a united community, functioning in the political and legal spheres of state and in the social structure. But there is also a court note from 1434 which states that to prove his nobility Piotr of Pańszczyca called as witnesses knights from his own coat-of-arms (Brożyna) and also from Wilczekosy and Prus coats-of-arms (Potkański 1886, nr 77). This can mean that Prus I and Prus II are two different *clenodia*, having nothing in common. There are two explanations of this mystery. First one assumes that to prove nobility in the land of Sieradz a member of the own clan, of the mother`s clan and from the father`s mother clan were necessary. Analysis of court notes of the Sieradz land shows however that this hypothesis is not true. To find another explanation, a research through the sources is needful. In a note from 1434 two members of Wilczekosy clan – Jan Koysz of Wodzyń and Jakub Zacharski – appear even later, but they do not even once use the proclaim „Prus” (Potkański 1886, nr 83; *Poktosie heraldyczne* nr 13). We can assume that it was a really „defiant” clan, defending their distinction. In this case we meet Wilczekosy, not Prus II. Only the Będkowski clan wanted to be members of Prus clan – in the beginning of the 15<sup>th</sup> century they use the Moszczenica proclamation, but later – the Prus proclamation (SPPP II nr 2344). It is proven that the Koysz and the Zacharski families were rather poorer clans and they rarely appeared in sources – till the beginning of the 15<sup>th</sup> century.

<sup>62</sup> The Wilczekosy clan was a politically powerful group – at least locally. The proof for it is that members of this clan were present when declaration of loyalty for king Władysław Jagiełło were prepared – see KDP II, nr 576, 578.



Then the career of Wspinek (later – Spinek) family started – some of members of this family even became senators (Chwalibińska 1948, p. 76-79; Szymczak 1991)<sup>63</sup>. The Wspinek family wanted to bond ties with the Prus clan because it enabled the family to become more and more powerful. This interesting process gives us a picture of different tendencies and different levels of political sense of different branches of one clan.

Closing the issue of Prus clan I want now to return now to Turzyna clan. The complete individuality of genealogy of this knightly clan was shown by J. Chwalibińska (Chwalibińska 1948, p. 100-101, 110-112). Worth mentioning are two inheritors of Ciechanowice, who until 1472 used a two-and-a-half-barred-cross coat-of-arms with Turzyna battle call, and after that year – Prus coat-of-arms (SPPP II nr 1197; SPPP VII nr 293, 302, 338, 843, 1114). Chwalibińska assumes this is an influence of Długosz, who in his *Księga uposażeń* mistakenly collated a two-and-a-half-barred-cross of Turzyna clan with a two-and-a-half-barred-cross of Prus clan of Wielkopolska. And then in *Klejnoty*, first Polish armorial, only continued this tradition (Chwalibińska 1948, p. 112). We therefore have an interesting example of changing of proclamation and *de facto* the whole coat-of-arms (but keeping the sign unchanged) and of incorporating a small group of relatives into the artificially created clan.

We therefore see that identifying one coat-of-arms with another (as in the case of Prus and Turzyna clans or – mentioned by J. Wroniszewski – Kołmasz and Czawuja clans) led to making the clan bonds tighter (or it was only a signal of tightening of such bonds). J. Wroniszewski gives also an example of a counter process in Bogoria clan – when a clan falls into decay, its coat-of-arms appears in different variations (Wroniszewski 1982, p. 128-129).

The cases of Kołmasz, Czawuja, Kliza, Jelita, Wiza and Ostoja clans encourage us to search for other “parted” clans. In 1909 already W. Semkowicz (and lately J. Wroniszewski) wrote about the identity of people who used calls Larysz and Glezyna (Semkowicz 1909, p. 39-41; Wroniszewski 1990, p. 169-170). J. Szymański parted these two coats-of-arms (Szymański 1993, p. 122-123, 168-170), but without doubt “it was one clan” (Wroniszewski 1990, p. 170), because “the same person, Piotr of Chechło, appears in one place with Glezyna battle call and in another with Larysz battle call” (Semkowicz 1909, p. 40). Between 1420 and 1453 Piotr of Chechło three times used Glezyn battle call and twice Larysz battle call (Wroniszewski 1990, p. 170).

When analyzing mixing of coats-of-arms, a paper by M. Wolski about Ogniwo coat-of-arms should be mentioned (Wolski 1997). Quoting J. Wroniszewski I

<sup>63</sup> About the principle patronizing within a clan – see Bieniak 2002d, p. 76-77. Members of the Spinka clan were one of the first who added a cross and a half to the wolf-trap. This emblem became an element that united all the three branches of the family (the plaque erected in the church in Będkowo – Mrozowski 1990, p. 100). In the document from January 25th 1434 (see footnote 12) in which knights of Dobrzyń agree that the son of Władysław Jagiełło will become a new king a seal presenting wolf-trap with a two-and-a-half-barred-cross was put by Jan of Grodzienie, with whom Piotr of Będkowo witnessed in the trial of Jan Kraszko. The trial was held in Cracow on November 24th 1431 and the higher clergy and secular officials were present. It is therefore clear what society the Będkowsky clan was familiar with. See SPPP II nr 2344 and Piekosiński 1907a, nr 455.

recalled the most controversial note about this clan (footnote 7). In other notes as a clan sign appears to be not a half-griffon, but a chain link ("ogniwo") with a cross: „*proclamatio Lubowla, clenodium ignile et crux*” (SPPP VII nr 54). No graphic representation of this coat-of-arms survived till recent times<sup>64</sup> – only a drawing of a seal of Waclaw Swoszowski, published by F. Piekosiński in his *Heraldyka polska wieków średnich* (Piekosiński 1899, p. 267 fig. 444). This small knightly clan, like some another knightly clans mentioned before, started to identify itself with richer knightly clans which surrounded it. A certain member of the Lubowla clan, Mikołaj, in 1387 issued a document using his battle call ("Lubowla"), but in 1415 identified himself as member of Strzemię clan. Piotr Kawalec, son on Michał Kawalec (coat-of-arms – Ogniwo) was listed in *Księga uposażeń biskupstwa krakowskiego* with Strzemię coat-of-arms (his cousin was listed there with Nowina coat-of-arms). During the 15<sup>th</sup> century decomposition of this clan continues – and not because of similarities between Ogniwo and Strzemię signs. We cannot genetically connect both coats-of-arms because “they contain completely different sets of elements” – a stirrup and a ring, “a closed shape with something like moustache coming out” and a cross formée (Wolski 1997, p. 398). The Lubowla clan is mentioned for the last time in 1524 – members of the clan who did not join other genealogies probably died out.

In the same volume M. Wolski’s paper comes after a paper by B. Paszkiewicz and M. Florek *Pieczeń Gedki i herb Bienia z Łososiny* (Paszkiewicz, Florek 1997). Using the same source material, they come to completely different conclusions – Bień’s coat-of-arms M. Wolski identified as Ogniwo, while B. Paszkiewicz and M. Florek – as Zarosie. Furthermore, they connected it (as a far-going hypothesis) with Gedka, who was the castellan of Sącz in the first half of the 13<sup>th</sup> century. M. Wolski states also that in results of archeological research of the Polish medieval age remains a bow stirrup was never found (Wolski 1997, p. 398) – and such a type of stirrup would appear in Bień’s coat-of-arms if we accept B. Paszkiewicz and M. Florek’s argument. Nevertheless, authors of the paper present interesting facts about people using Zarosie coat-of-arms – those facts are useful for this dissertation. We again find knights using names we know as names of other coats-of-arms and clans (Paszkiewicz, Florek 1997, p. 367-368). Zarosie coat-of-arms presents a stirrup with a star (Piekosiński 1907b, nr 19), but twice it is described only with a latin word “*strepā*” – stirrup. Does it enable us to consider those two coats-of-arms (“Zarosie” and “Strzemię”, Stirrup) identical? I mentioned already that these coats-of arms were described inaccurately – maybe this problem appears also in this case (it is even more probable here, because this was a small and disappearing knightly clan).

All the examples above showed that accurate enquiry can broaden knowledge about less known coats-of-arms and about the social structure of 15<sup>th</sup> century Poland. But does it always have this effect? In 1439 in Sambor Iwan Czyżowski (coat-of-arms – Chmara) proved his chivalry when he was accused of being a peasant’s descendent (AGZ XIII nr 1116). He brought two witnesses – two from his father’s clan, two from his mother’s clan and two from another clan. Only the two

<sup>64</sup> Three seals presented by J. Szymański belong to other people – Szymański 1993, p. 182; Wolski 1997, p. 392.

members of his mother's clan we can qualify as an existing coat-of-arms – Powąła, despite their different battle call – Sudkowicz (see: Szymański 1993, p. 204, 205 and footnote 1). Chmara and the other clan's coats-of-arms are described in detail, but even then we are unable to identify them. Moreover, no other descriptions appear in documents, despite the fact that Iwan had a brother Stanisław and a son Ilnatko (AGZ XIII nr 3258, 3259, 3988). In documents we can find information only about his financial situation (and partially also his social situation). We can fragmentarily reconstruct his social environment, but we are unable to identify him with a particular knightly clan<sup>65</sup>. Documents tell us what they want us to tell and not a word more than that.

There is a similar case of Zgraja coat-of-arms, mentioned in *Księga uposażeń biskupstwa krakowskiego* (Jan Długosz *Liber beneficiorum* vol. II, s. 485, 515, 527, 528, 548, 558; vol. III, s. 252). This source contains many single notes about knights and their coats-of-arms, so it can be very useful for prosopographical research – even if sometimes the research can only simply conclude that such a coat-of-arms existed. Knights using Zgraja coat-of-arms lived in few villages in a rather compact area – similar to the Lubowla clan. S. Dziadulewicz identified their coat-of-arms with Awdaniec, but in this particular point his argument is not convincing, because it is based only on speculations of authors of armorials from the modern era (Dziadulewicz 1912b, p. 9-10, 169-170)<sup>66</sup>. Much more probable is identification of the Goljan coat-of-arms with the Chorąbala coat-of-arms, on account of where the coat-of-arms is mentioned (Dziadulewicz 1912a, p. 5-6, 95-97) – in *Księga uposażeń* appears Żegota „*de Zaborowye de domo Golyan*” and in court notes Stefan from the same village. Two other knights, who used Chorąbala coat-of-arms, have both a cognomen “Golyan” (Potkański 1886, nr 48, 79). But even in this case we are unable to state anything else – because of the small number of sources.

Until the present day seven coats-of-arms were identified. Kliza, Wiza, Kołmasz, Glezyna, Goljan, Moszczenica i Wazanki turned out to be variations or proclamations of other coats-of-arms – well-known and often mentioned in documents. This result would be impossible without detailed genealogical research of petty knightly clans, which often started with repeated enquiry through handwritten sources. This course of research was suggested in many papers and will probably be developed (Chwalibińska 1948, p. 118)<sup>67</sup>.

In two cases we met an obvious mistake – identifying two separate villages with a similar name (Będków, Mikułowice). It proves how careful we should be in genealogical research.

There was also one paleographical mistake. It can result in a return to yet unpublished sources, with careful reading and working them out.

<sup>65</sup> Among Iwan's creditors appear the Mzurowski family from Amadej clan and Mikołaj Zawiasa. He was also in some dealings with the orthodox priest from Wielinice and Iwan „Iamvrowicz” – AGZ XIII nr 890, 1531, 1973, 3258, 3259.

<sup>66</sup> In Cracow notes appears only one hypothetical ancestor of knights listed in *Liber beneficiorum*, Sędziwoj Kanimir – in 1402 „Canimirus de Zircouice” pawned his part of village to his neighbor, Jakusz. SPPP II 850.

<sup>67</sup> Especially researches before the World War II were deeply interested in “heraldic crumbs” and tried to connect each of them with a particular coat-of-arms.



It is impossible to continue the survey on the history of coats-of-arms like Chmara and Zgraja because of lack of sources or absence of these coats-of-arms in sources we have (even though we can track knights using Chmara coat-of-arms up to the end of 15<sup>th</sup> century) (AGZ XVII nr MXXX).

Histories of Ogniwo and Zarosie coats-of-arms (and in some ways – also Turzyna coat-of-arms) were examples of decomposition of petty knightly clans and how members of those knightly clans joined other, bigger clans. It is an obvious example of how in that époque people cared about being connected with some strong social group, which could be a way of protection to a particular man – even though we have also counter-examples of the Wilczakosa clan and Zacharski family, who did not want to form a compact and strong social group. Those two cases, especially can prove the theory about limited penetration of alien elements into fully genealogical clans.

## SOURCES

- Akta grodzkie i ziemskie z czasów Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej z archiwum tak zwanego bernardyńskiego we Lwowie*, (AGZ) vol. XIII, Lwów 1888.
- Akta grodzkie i ziemskie z czasów Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej z archiwum tak zwanego bernardyńskiego we Lwowie*, (AGZ) vol. XVII, Lwów 1901.
- Akta grodzkie i ziemskie z czasów Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej z archiwum tak zwanego bernardyńskiego we Lwowie*, (AGZ) vol. XVIII, Lwów 1903.
- Helcel A. Z. (ed.) (SPPP), *Starodawne prawa polskiego pomniki. Z ksiąg rękopiśmiennych dotąd nieużytych głównie zaś z ksiąg dawnych sądowych ziemskich i grodzkich*, vol. II, Kraków 1870.
- Joannis Długosz (Jan Długosz *Liber beneficiorum*), *Opera omnia*, ed. A. Przezdziecki, vol. VIII, *Liber beneficiorum dioecesis cracoviensis*, vol. II, Cracov 1864.
- Joannis Długosz (Jan Długosz *Liber beneficiorum*), *Opera omnia*, ed. A. Przezdziecki, vol. IX, *Liber beneficiorum dioecesis cracoviensis*, vol. III, Cracov 1864.
- Mrozowski P. (1990), *Polskie tablice erekcyjne z wieków XIV i XV*, „*Studia Źródłoznawcze*” XXXII-XXXIII, Piekosiński F. (1907a), *Jana Zamoyckiego notaty heraldyczno-sfragistyczne* [in:] Piekosiński F., *Studia, rozprawy i materjały z dziedziny historii polskiej i prawa polskiego*, vol. VII, Kraków.
- Piekosiński F. (1898), *Nieznane zapiski heraldyczne średniowieczne polskie, głównie sieradzkie*, *Archiwum Komisji Historycznej Akademii Umiejętności*, vol. VIII.
- Piekosiński F. (1907b), *Nieznane zapiski heraldyczne z ksiąg wiślickich* [in:] Piekosiński F., *Studia, rozprawy i materjały z dziedziny historii polskiej i prawa polskiego*, vol. VII, Kraków.
- Pokłosie heraldyczne (1921-1923)*, „*Rocznik Towarzystwa Heraldycznego*” VI.
- Potkański K. (1886), *Zapiski herbowe z dawnych ksiąg ziemskich, przechowywane w archiwum radomskim i warszawskim*, *Archiwum Komisji Historycznej*, vol. III.
- Rzyszczewski L., Muczkowski A. (ed.) (KDP), *Kodeks Dyplomatyczny Polski*, vol. II, Warszawa 1852.
- Ulanowski B. (ed.) (SPPP), *Starodawne prawa polskiego pomniki. Inscriptiones clenodiales ex libris iudicialibus palatinus cracoviensis*, vol. VII, Kraków 1885.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bieniak J. (2002a), *Heraldyka polska przed Długoszem. Uwagi problemowe* [in:] Bieniak J., *Polskie rycerstwo średniowieczne*, Kraków.
- Bieniak J. (2002b), *Jeszcze w sprawie genezy rodów rycerskich w Polsce* [in:] Bieniak J., *Polskie rycerstwo średniowieczne*, Kraków.
- Bieniak J. (2002c), *Problemy metodyczne średniowiecznej genealogii w Polsce* [in:] Bieniak J., *Polskie rycerstwo średniowieczne*, Kraków.
- Bieniak J. (2002d), *Rody rycerskie jako czynnik struktury społecznej w Polsce XIII-XV wieku (uwagi problemowe)* [in:] Bieniak J., *Polskie rycerstwo średniowieczne*, Kraków.
- Cetwiński M. (1987), *Wokół „Klejnotów”*, [in:] J. Hertel (ed.), *Genealogia. Studia nad wspólnotami krewnia-czmi i terytorialnymi w Polsce średniowiecznej na tle porównawczym*, Toruń 1987.

- Chwalibińska J. (1948), *Ród Prusów w wiekach średnich*, Toruń.
- Dziadulewicz S. (1921), *Drobiazgi heraldyczne*. 5. Herb Wążanki, „Rocznik Towarzystwa Heraldycznego” VI.
- Dziadulewicz S. (1912a), *Ze studiów heraldycznych*. 2. Herb Golián, „Miesięcznik Heraldyczny” V, 5-6.
- Dziadulewicz S. (1912b), *Ze studiów heraldycznych*. 5. Herb Zgraja, „Miesięcznik Heraldyczny” V, 9-10.
- Dziadulewicz S. (1912c), *Ze studiów nad heraldyką*. Herb Piękostki, „Miesięcznik Heraldyczny” V, 3-4.
- Fronczak W. (2007), *O herbie Piękostki*, „Gens”.
- Fronczak W. (2005), *Programy heraldyczne w będkowskim kościele – próba wyjaśnienia*, „Gens”.
- Jurek T. (2006), *Panowie z Wierzbnej*, Kraków.
- Małecki A. (1890), *Studia heraldyczne*, vol. II, Lwów.
- Paszkiwicz B., Florek M. (1997), *Pieczczę Gedki i herb Bienia z Łososiny* [in:] Radziwiński A., Supruniuk A., Wroniszewski J. (ed.), *Venerabiles, nobiles et honesti. Studia z dziejów Polski średniowiecznej. Prace ofiarowane Proesorowi Januszowi Bieniakowi w siedemdziesiątą rocznicę urodzin i czterdziestopięćlecie pracy naukowej*, Toruń.
- Piekosiński F. (1899), *Heraldyka polska wieków średnich*, Kraków.
- Polackówna H. (1909), *Recenzja W. Wittyg, Nieznana szlachta polska i jej herby*, „Miesięcznik Heraldyczny” II, 5.
- Semkowicz W. (1908), *Długosz jako heraldyk*, „Miesięcznik Heraldyczny” I, 1.
- Semkowicz W. (1909), *O początkach rodu Laryszów-Glezynów*, „Miesięcznik Heraldyczny” II, 1.
- Szymański J. (1993), *Herbarz średniowiecznego rycerstwa polskiego*, Warszawa.
- Szymański J. (2004), *Nauki pomocnicze historii*, Warszawa.
- Szymczak J. (1990), *Epigrafika w służbie genealogii. O początkach Wspinków z Będkowa*, „Annales Universitatis Mariae Curie-Skłodowska”, Historia XLV.
- Szymczakowa A. (2001), *Drobiazgi heraldyczne z Sieradzkiego*, „Rocznik Towarzystwa Heraldycznego nowej serii” V.
- Wolski M. (1997), *Kilka uwag o herbie Ognitwo i rodzie „Lubowlitów”* [in:] Radziwiński A., Supruniuk A., Wroniszewski J. (ed.), *Venerabiles, nobiles et honesti. Studia z dziejów Polski średniowiecznej. Prace ofiarowane Proesorowi Januszowi Bieniakowi w siedemdziesiątą rocznicę urodzin i czterdziestopięćlecie pracy naukowej*, Toruń.
- Wroniszewski J. (1982), *Kryteria herbowe w badaniach genealogicznych* [in:] Hertel J. (ed.) *Genealogia. Problemy metodyczne w badaniach nad polskim społeczeństwem średniowiecznym na tle porównawczym*, Toruń.
- Wroniszewski J. (1990), *Proclamatio alias godlo. Uwagi nad genezą i funkcją zawotań rycerskich w średniowiecznej Polsce* [w:] *Spółczesność Polski średniowiecznej*, vol. 4, Warszawa.
- Zawitkowska W. (2005), *O herbie Pobóg w XV wieku. Na marginesie badań nad dziejami Konięcpolskich w późnym średniowieczu*, „Rocznik Towarzystwa Heraldycznego nowej serii” VII.