



ŚLĄSKI KWARTALNIK HISTORYCZNY SOBÓTKA

SILESIA AS A MEETING PLACE OF CULTURES

W numerze / In the issue:

Teresa Kulak, *Historical conditions and manifestations of the culture-forming role of Wrocław in the perspective of the past millennium*

Wojciech Mrozowicz, *Silesia – the meeting land of Eastern and Western civilisations. Testimony of the Book of Henryków and other medieval Silesian sources*

Jan Zdichynec, *Upper Lusatia and Silesia at the turn of the Middle Ages and the Early Modern Era in comparative perspective. Selected aspects of social, cultural and church development in the given period*

Gabriela Wąs, *“A culture bridge?” Early modern Silesia as a region of several historiographies*

Wojciech Kunicki, *Literature in 17th- and 18th-century Silesia – the region at the crossroads of cultures*

Tomasz Przerwa, *Transfer of tourist and sporting practices in the 19th and 20th centuries from the Silesian perspective: regional models in an age of mass and national culture*

Jędrzej Chumiński, *Social conditions of the development of culture in post-war Wrocław*

WROCŁAWSKIE TOWARZYSTWO MIŁOŚNIKÓW HISTORII
ODDZIAŁ POLSKIEGO TOWARZYSTWA HISTORYCZNEGO



ŚLĄSKI KWARTALNIK HISTORYCZNY SOBÓTKA

SILESIA AS A MEETING PLACE OF CULTURES

ROCZNIK LXXI (2016)
NR 4

REDAKCJA / Editorial Board

Teresa Kulak (Wrocław, Redaktor naczelny / Editor-in-chief)
Martin Čapský (Opava), Lucyna Harc (Wrocław, Sekretarz / Secretary),
Paweł Jaworski (Wrocław),
Wojciech Mrozowicz (Wrocław, Zastępca redaktora naczelnego / Deputy Editor)

KOMITET NAUKOWY / Scientific Committee

Krystyn Jakub Matwijowski (Wrocław, Przewodniczący / President)
Christoph Augustynowicz (Vienna), Lenka Bobková (Prague),
Marek Derwich (Wrocław), Helmut Flachenecker (Würzburg),
Piotr S. Górecki (Riverside, USA), Winfried Irgang (Marburg),
Tomasz Jurek (Poznań, Zastępca przewodniczącego / Deputy President),
Edward Włodarczyk (Szczecin), Rościśław Żerelik (Wrocław)

ADRES REDAKCJI / Editorial Office

ul. Szewska 49, 50-139 Wrocław, Polska / Poland

<http://sobotka.uni.wroc.pl/>

skh.sobotka@uwr.edu.pl

Konto / Bank Account: 66 1050 1575 1000 0023 6929 9314

Publikacja finansowana w ramach programu Ministra Nauki i Szkolnictwa Wyższego pod nazwą
„Narodowy Program Rozwoju Humanistyki” w latach 2016-2020
w ramach umowy 0119/NPRH4/H3b/83/2016



NATIONAL PROGRAMME
FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF HUMANITIES

This volume is published in the framework of the programme of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education under the title National Programme for the Development of Humanities in the years 2016-2020, agreement no. 0119/NPRH4/H3b/83/2016

© Copyright by Wrocławskie Towarzystwo Miłośników Historii

ISSN 0037-7511

Prace publikowane w „Sobótce” są recenzowane / ŠKH „Sobótka” is a peer reviewed journal

Printed in Poland

Opracowanie redakcyjne / Editorial development: Redakcja / Editorial Board
Opracowanie tekstów anglojęzycznych / English language editors: Matthew La Fontaine
Korekta / Proof-reading: Jolanta Kardela
Skład / Setting: iKontekst.pl Tomasz Kalota

EDITORIAL

Wrocław's selection as "European Capital of Culture" in 2016 coincided with the 1050th anniversary of the Baptism of Poland and the entry into European history of the Piast state, in which Silesia became part around 990. In the 12th century the capital of Silesia, Wrocław was listed, along with Kraków and Sandomierz, among the "principal seats of the Kingdom". After the death of the last ruler of the Wrocław Piast dynasty in 1335, it became a part of the Crown of Bohemia until 1526, and then was incorporated into the Habsburgs' rule for two centuries, until 1741. For the next 200 years, until 1945, Wrocław and Silesia remained under Prussian-German rule, after which, due to border changes after World War II, it again became part of the Polish state.

Although over the centuries Wrocław changed its political affiliation and ethnic character, it retained its importance as an administrative center, a center of production and economic exchange within Silesia, as well as playing the role of an intermediary in the cultural development between Eastern and Western Europe. It took advantage of its location at the crossroads of trade routes between the resource-rich countries of Eastern Europe and the economically more developed Western European countries. As a result, the historic capital of Silesia, a region of communication and bridging character and the farthest western part of Poland, became a centre of international trade and craft production, fulfilling over the centuries an important role in the transmission of goods, ideas, and cultural patterns within the European continent. At that time, in the course of urban socialization, the inhabitants of Wrocław participated in a multi-stage process of transformation, passing from an agrarian and artisan community to an industrial one.

Reflection on the phenomenon of Silesian history prompted the editorial board of the "Śląski Kwartalnik Historyczny Sobótka" ("Silesian Historical Quarterly Sobótka") to present in 2015, within the Internationalization (3.b.) competition announced by the Ministry of Science and Higher Education and financed by the National Programme for the Development of Humanities, a five-year research and popularization task under the title "The History of Silesia in the European Perspective. Electronic Edition of five English Language Issues of *Silesian Historical Quarterly Sobótka*". The quarterly is an official publication of the Wrocław branch of the Polish Historical Society, under a separate, statutory name of the Wrocław

Society of History Enthusiasts. Currently it is the oldest regional historical journal in Poland, being published continuously since 1946. It is well known in the historical circles within Poland and among historians of many countries, especially in the area of Central Europe.

The project involves the preparation of five issues of the journal in English in the years 2016–2020, thematically narrowed down to five key issues from the past of Silesia, presented monographically in the millennial perspective. Their conception is consistent with the scientific profile of “Sobótka”, and the substantive proposal of the cycle refers to the historical anniversaries coming up in the following years and concerns the significant events taking place in Silesia or in its vicinity. Specialists representing various areas of historical sciences – besides classical history, also archaeology, history of art and literature, intellectual life, education and military history – were invited to contribute to the realization of this concept. The aim of the undertaken task is to popularize knowledge about Silesia’s past, as a region mediating in multifaceted contacts between the West and the East of Europe. Also as an area of centuries-long and diverse influences of Poland, Germany, Austria and Bohemia, which reflects Silesia’s multi-national and multi-confessional cultural heritage. The dissemination in English of knowledge about these issues, sometimes little known or poorly realized, may be of significant value in popularizing knowledge about Silesia beyond the circle of directly interested countries. The selected topics are as follows:

Issue One (2016) has the title “Silesia as a Meeting Place of Cultures”, which refers to the choice of Wrocław as the European Capital of Culture. It was treated as an opportunity to highlight interdisciplinary themes related to the place and importance of Silesia and its capital Wrocław in the European context over the millennium. Presentation of its geopolitical location, giving it the status of a bridging region, proves that over the centuries it has played an important, intermediary role in the transmission of cultural patterns on a European scale. Therefore, the author’s studies will include references to the geographical location of Silesia, and its resulting mediation in the development of intellectual and political culture, noticeable in the historical process from the Middle Ages to the present day.

The preparation of Issue Two (2017), called “Not Only the Reformation. Churches and Religious Movements in Silesia Through the Centuries”, will be linked to the 500th anniversary of Martin Luther’s Theses. Addressing this topic also creates an opportunity to present the whole confessional relations in Silesia,

in connection with the religious-social and national demands of its inhabitants from the 10th to the 21st century. In this context, we will consider religious movements from the pre-Reformation period, treated then as departures from the teachings of the Catholic Church, but constituting both the Silesian contribution to the work of the Reformation and the reaction to it at that time. The issues of religious life and religious organizations in Silesia after the end of the Second World War will relate to contemporary times. The Issue will conclude with a description of the scientific and cultural events in Wrocław and in Silesia accompanying the celebrations of the 500th anniversary of the Reformation.

The content planned for Issue Three (2018) under the title “Wars and Their Consequences in the History of Silesia (10th–20th century)” will refer to anniversaries of warfare fought in Silesia. There were many of them, starting from medieval Polish-German wars, which ended with the Peace of Bautzen in 1018, to later attacks by Hussite armies in the 15th century, and to the events of the Thirty Years’ War in the 18th century. The latter preceded the three Silesian Wars fought by Friedrich II Hohenzollern, King of Prussia, against Austria and, in the 20th century, the First and Second World Wars. In the context of military consequences, the presence of Napoleon’s Grand Army from 1806 to 1814 in Silesia will be discussed. In the 20th century, in the territorial and political situation of Silesia, two world wars must be examined, considering them in the context of World War I, which ended in 1918, and new threats in the Central European perspective, on the eve of World War II. It caused great destruction in Silesia, but it also brought significant political changes and a shift in citizenship for the local population.

In Issue Four (2019), called “Times of Prosperity and Stagnation in the Economy of Silesia in Past Centuries”, the authors’ analyses focus on the economic foundations of the region’s development over the centuries. It emphasizes particularly questions of internal and external opportunities and limitations of Silesia’s participation in the continental economic exchange, in the context of its changing state affiliations since the Middle Ages. Therefore, special attention will be paid to both the modernizing changes and crises in Silesia in the years 1815–1945, associated with the end of many years of warfare. Phenomena with long-term repercussions on a European and sometimes world scale, as well as the process of its reconstruction and development after World War II.

The final Issue Five (2020) under the title “Science, Education and Intellectual Culture in Silesia over the Centuries” will be linked to the 75th anniversary of

the Polish University and Polytechnic in Wrocław. The anniversary provides an opportunity for a retrospective study of the early days of education in Silesia, the attempts to found a university in Wrocław in 1505, as well as the circumstances surrounding the establishment of the Catholic Leopoldine Academy in the Protestant city in 1702. It preceded the foundation of the Prussian-German state University of Wrocław, founded in 1811, and determined its culture-forming role until 1945. This last topic will be complemented by the analysis of different positions and evaluations of the Polish and German literature in the last 75 years, relating to the acquisition, in 1945, and the use of the material resources of the Friedrich Wilhelm University of Silesia and the problem of the continuation of its scientific traditions by the Polish University of Wrocław.

The five mono-thematic volumes of “Sobótka” will result in a new compendium of knowledge about Silesia and its history, taking into account the past 1000 years, including over a quarter of a century of peaceful Polish-German dialogue about them due to the international recognition of the Polish-German border on the Oder and Lusatian Neisse in 1992. The main themes of Silesia’s past will be presented in a problematized narrative, which – without losing its regional value – will present them in a European dimension.

The English-language issues of “Sobótka” in 2016–2020 will retain the thematic sections currently existing in the printed issues of the journal, i.e. dissertations and studies, source miscellanea, review articles and reviews, as well as scientific chronicle, with the subject matter of all sections relating to the title theme of each issue. Each issue will be preceded by an editorial preface providing detailed information on the subject matter covered.

In Issue One of the series, under the title “Silesia as a Meeting Place of Cultures”, in the ARTICLES AND STUDIES section, seven essays have been prepared by a group of specialists in Silesian history from Poland and abroad. In these studies, the history of broadly understood culture, including its innovativeness and adoption of solutions developed outside of Silesia, has been brought to the fore.

Teresa Kulak, who for many years has been conducting research on the history of the region and its capital particularly in the 19th and 20th centuries, in her study, which in fact constitutes an introduction to the subject matter of the volume, focuses on the political and cultural history of Wrocław, the capital of Silesia. The

study is presented against the background of the changing stages of the city's state-political affiliation, beginning with the Piast period and the dynastic-state bond with Poland, when the city's location, officially finalized in 1261, led to the establishment of the City Council, which actively influenced the city's economy, education, and culture until 1741. It also contributed to the transition of Wrocław to the rule of the Bohemian kings in 1335, which led to its economic prosperity and enabled, among other things, the creation of monumental sacral architecture known as Silesian Gothic. In 15th century, Wrocław became a European trading emporium and a major center of craft production, and even undertook efforts to establish a university in 1506. The transition of the Kingdom of Bohemia, and with it Wrocław, to Habsburg rule in 1526 occurred after Martin Luther's teachings were adopted in the city. This meant the onset of conflict, as the Habsburgs reacted to confessional and cultural changes by limiting municipal privileges. For these reasons, the city supported the actions of Protestant forces against the Habsburgs on two occasions during the Thirty Years' War (1618–1648). The defeats of these forces had political and economic as well as cultural and religious consequences, after the introduction of the Counter-Reformation. A new turning point in the history of Wrocław was its seizing in 1741 by the army of Prussian King Frederick II Hohenzollern. Contrary to the expectations of the citizens, as the author proves, the municipal government was liquidated, and three wars with Austria over Silesia fought until 1763 stopped the development of the city, which had been turned into a fortress. It was not until 1807 when Napoleon ordered the dismantling of its walls that the city accelerated its development, in which an important scientific and cultural role was played by the University of Wrocław, established in 1811. The intensification of the city's development began in the 1840s with the establishment of industry and the construction of railroads resulting in rapid population growth and suburban expansion in the following decades. At the dawn of the 20th century, Wrocław was a metropolis of 543,000 inhabitants, an economic and political center, a city of universities, museums and theatres. This process was interrupted by World War I, which ended in 1918 with the defeat of the Second Reich and the fall of the Hohenzollern dynasty. The post-war economic depression lasted in the city until the mid-1920s and, as throughout the Weimar Republic, fostered political activism by the Communists and Nazis. Hitler's assumption of chancellorship in 1933 and the rise of the Third Reich meant a future war. It was not expected that the outbreak of the war in September 1939 would lead in August 1944 to the declaration of

Breslau as a fortress and its siege (from 22nd January to 6th May 1945) by the Red Army, during which 70 to 90% of its pre-war buildings were destroyed. On 9th May, a day after the end of World War II, representatives of the Polish government came to the still burning Wrocław to begin its new era in accordance with the decisions of the Big Three and to transform the destroyed German Breslau into the Polish Wrocław.

The author of the second article, Wrocław medievalist Wojciech Mrozowicz, referred to the 2015 entry of the *Book of Henryków*, one of the most important written testimonies of the Silesian Middle Ages, on the UNESCO Memory of the World Register. The *Book of Henryków*, which was written at the Cistercian monastery in Henryków over a period of 40 years – from around 1270 to 1310 – is a testimony to a peaceful encounter of settlers from Western Europe, mainly from Germany, with the local Slavic population. They brought to Silesia new cultural patterns and farming methods. This encounter took place starting at the turn of the 12th and 13th centuries, with a noticeable intensification after the Mongol invasion in 1241. It resulted in civilizational changes, which entailed intensive economic and cultural development of the entire region, including the introduction of new legal customs and writing skills, among the previously oral society. The *Book of Henryków*, one of the oldest monuments of Latin historical literature, also contains interesting inclusions in Polish and German, including the oldest recorded Polish sentence. Other written monuments include the *Versus Lubenses*, from one century later, in which the same civilizational changes were depicted with already propagandistic emphasis on the cultural superiority of the newcomers from the West.

The Czech historian Jan Zdichynec aimed to compare Upper Lusatia and Silesia around the turn of the Middle Ages and Early Modern Times. He contrasted the social, cultural, and religious levels. Both regions, of which Silesia was clearly the stronger in terms of territorial and demographic potential, did not play an important political role in Central Europe. Nonetheless, a comparative look at both regions led the author to some interesting findings. Upper Lusatia and Silesia belonged to the Crown of Bohemia, which determined their administrative structure (although in Silesia numerous duchies were retained) and created the conditions for the participation of the estates in governance. The stronger ties to the Crown are evident in Upper Lusatia, which was not impeded, as was the case in Silesia, by a strong ducal authority and town councils. From the turn of the 12th and 13th centuries, both areas became bilingual – the local population spoke Slavic

languages (Sorbian, Polish), and the settlers coming from the West – German, with the latter dominating in the towns. Under their influence, German legal customs quickly spread in both regions. J. Zdichynec emphasizes that in the 15th century, although in both regions Catholicism proved stronger than the influence of Husitism, the Reformation soon took hold. The author has also studied a selection of historiographical works from the period, which has made it possible to demonstrate numerous further similarities, including in the sphere of artistic and literary output.

The article by J. Zdichynec is to some extent linked to the study by Gabriela Waś. Her reflections, under the title “*A culture bridge? Early modern Silesia as a region of several historiographies*”, concern current historiography and express her consternation at the acceptance of the concept of Silesia as a culture bridge to serve in the function of an interpretive model for its modern history. The already existing concept of Silesia as a bridge in historiography has a tradition of being understood in a strong dependence on political and state connotations. This beautiful slogan, symbolizing the connection and peace of a centuries-old, complicated neighbouring, was created ad hoc to express the cancellation in contemporary political language of the existence of two worlds in Europe.

The Baroque and Enlightenment literature created in Silesia in the 17th and 18th centuries has become Wojciech Kunicki’s subject of interest. He noticed that the most eminent German poets of the Baroque period came from Silesia and determined the direction of development of the whole German literature. Wondering about the sources of their success, the author enumerated several factors, of which he considered the religious spirituality emanating from them under the influence of Catholicism and Protestantism (Evangelical and Reformed) as essential. He also considered important the rivalry between educated German intellectual circles and Polish refugees from the Silesian-Greater Poland (Wielkopolska) borderland. They were inspired by the mixed Polish-German background, as a result of the horror and cruelty of the Thirty Years’ War, which induced conformist attitudes. At the other extreme were irenic factors, stemming from the search for tranquillity in the confrontations of artists coming from the burghers with the traditions of the noble society. The aforementioned contacts of confessions, languages and social conventions positively influenced the quality of cultural communication, its uniqueness, providing conditions for the creation of works that decided the rank of the Silesian Baroque by artists such as: Christian Hoffmann von Hoffmannswaldau, Martin Opitz, Jacob Boehme, Andreas Gryphius, Daniel

Czepko von Reigersfeld, Johannes Scheffler (Angelus Silesius). A separate section is dedicated to German Enlightenment literature, discussed by W. Kunicki, which for a long time has been treated rather marginally in research due to its local importance. However, the civilization advancement of Silesia, which was influenced by the establishment of universities and other educational institutions, as well as the stabilization of the political situation after its incorporation into the Prussian state, brought about a revival of intellectual life, including literature. It was represented by, among others, Carl Friedrich Flögel, Johannes Timotheus Hermes, Johann Gottlieb Schummel and Balthasar Ludewig Tralles. An important place was also occupied by utilitarian writing – historiography, geographical and travel descriptions, etc., which could count on mass social reception.

Tomasz Przerwa pays attention to tourism and sport, or other phenomena in the field of mass culture in Silesia. While tracing their beginnings and development before 1945, this Wrocław-based researcher points to certain phenomena formed in the region which are innovative on a European scale. He mentions the official mountain guide service (documented since 1813), the establishment of the oldest guide organization (in 1817), as well as so-called horned sleigh rides for the elite. Since the mid-19th century, the models developed in the Alps started to reach the Silesian mountains, so pastoral farms combined with tourist services and associations involved in management and promotion of the mountains were established (since 1880). First of all, they started to organize winter mountain tourism and introduced winter sports, mainly skiing and modern sledding. From the southern part of Krkonoše Mountains the ideas of building a network of cheap mountain shelters for youth and establishing social-democratic tourist societies were adopted. T. Przerwa also describes the beginnings of sports competition in Silesia, inspired by models from other German cities, mainly Berlin. This competition resulted in the establishment of sports clubs, with the oldest rowing club in Wrocław (1876). Football also arrived in Silesia (the first club was established in Wrocław in 1898). In conclusion, the author notes that Silesia, as a border region, easily adopted solutions in the field of tourism and sports developed outside of it and mediated in their dissemination, while ideas in the field of tourism born in Silesia did not meet with interest in other regions.

Due to the chronology, the last article in this issue of “Sobótka” is a study by Jędrzej Chumiński, a historian from Wrocław, on the social conditions for the development of culture in Wrocław after World War II. The author emphasizes

that the special situation of Wrocław is a consequence of a complete population exchange, as the German inhabitants were replaced by Poles, who had not previously constituted a close-knit community in the city. As a result, in the first post-war years the city's residents were an atomized mass of people with very poor education, almost half of them coming from the countryside, which significantly limited the potential for cultural development. However, within a quarter of a century, this mass transformed into a consolidated, young and creative community and brought forth numerous and significant figures of Polish (and European) literary, theatrical, musical and fine arts life. It was also able to initiate great cultural projects, which enjoy a reputation far beyond Silesia. In search of the sources of this phenomenon, the author has shown the structure and dynamics of changes in the inhabitants of Wrocław, referring to statistical data and comparing to the situation in Kraków. He emphasized that the residents of Wrocław were characterized by great diversity in terms of territorial origin, mobility and relatively young age. These factors, combined with the goodwill of the local authorities, were conducive to undertaking cultural activities.

As in every issue of *Sobótka*, there is also room for other sections of our journal. As a SOURCE MISCELLANEUM a paper by Adrien Quéret-Podesta, a French researcher active in various Central European scientific institutions, was selected. The content of the Miscellaneum focuses on the circulation of motifs from Silesian historiographical works, exemplified by the adoption of the motif of famine which affected the inhabitants of Spiš after the Mongol invasion from Martin the Pole's *Chronicle of Popes and Emperors* by a late medieval chronicle from Spišská Sobota. The review section discusses selected recent publications on the history of Silesia and Lusatia, including biographical studies on Duke Henry I the Elder of Ziębice (d. 1498), on Upper Silesian historian and archivist Ezechiel Zivier (d. 1925), and on Duchess Daisy Hochberg von Pless (d. 1943).

The volume closes with the section CHRONICLE, which contains a presentation of historical projects, including exhibitions, carried out in 2016 by the city of Wrocław as European Capital of Culture.

Editorial Board

TERESA KULAK
(Polish Historical Society)

HISTORICAL CONDITIONS AND MANIFESTATIONS OF THE CULTURE-FORMING ROLE OF WROCLAW IN THE PERSPECTIVE OF THE PAST MILLENNIUM

“The civilisation and culture of the whole of Silesia [...] and all its prosperity originate in Wrocław, where trade between the surrounding peoples has intensified the most; after that all the rest of the [Silesian] towns have developed”¹. This statement from 1512 by Barthel Stein (1476–1522), a Johanniter, derived from his work *Descriptio totius Silesiae et Civitatis regiae Wratislaviensis*, reflects the then conviction of the significant economic and cultural role of the capital of Silesia, a borderland area neighbouring Poland, Bohemia, Lusatia and Saxony, as well as a bridge to the lands of Central and Eastern Europe. It is assumed that early medieval Wrocław had favourable development conditions² due to its location in the central part of the Silesian Lowlands, at the mouth of the Oława River, the only left-bank tributary of the Oder River, with a group of safe to settle islands concentrated on its right bank. The largest of them were the islands later called Ostrów Tumski and Ołbin, while the small Sand Island (Wyspa Piasek), in the crossing of the Oder River, played a communication role. From neighbouring Bohemia, it was crossed by the Adriatic-Baltic route, known since ancient times, which, after Ołbin, intersected with the transcontinental East-West route, going from the Black Sea,

¹ Bartłomieja Steina renesansowe opisanie Wrocławia. *Die Beschreibung der Stadt Breslau der Renaissancezeit durch Bartholomäus Stein*, ed. Rościśław Żerelik, Wrocław 1995, p. 19.

² See more Marta Młynarska-Kaletynowa, *Wrocław w XII–XIII wieku. Przemiany społeczne i osadnicze*, Wrocław 1986, pp. 16–33.

Ruthenia and Hungary to German countries and Flanders, enabling the inhabitants of Wrocław to trade and cultural exchange on a European scale³.

From settlements of Oder's islands to a town municipality (10th to 13th centuries)

The origins of the town, whose name derives from the Bohemian ruler Vratislav I (d. 921) from the Přemyslid dynasty, however, are connected with Mieszko I (d. 997), the founder of the Piast monarchy and the stronghold on Ostrów Tumski, which he conquered around 990⁴. During the reign of his son Bolesław I (997–1025), a metropolis in Gniezno was founded in 1000, to which a bishop's power centre with a stone cathedral dedicated to St John the Baptist, patron of the diocese and the city, was subordinated⁵. One hundred years later, under the rule of Bolesław III (1097–1138), Wrocław was counted among the three main royal seats ("sedes regni principales"). It was the centre of state political-administrative and military power in the province stretching from Krosno Odrzańskie to Racibórz and Cieszyn⁶. Duke Bolesław III, who, in his will of 1138, separated hereditary districts on the territory of Poland for his four sons, caused a crisis of supreme state power. Bishop Walter of Malonne (1149–1169) maintained Wrocław's position as the diocesan capital, reforming the liturgy and religious life of the clergy and initiating the erection of a new Romanesque cathedral. The college (with a quadrivium programme), together with the library⁷, was established by this cathedral and became the leaven of local intellectual culture and clergy education⁸. At the same time, the palatine of Bolesław III, a magnate Piotr

³ Grzegorz Myśliwski, *Wrocław w przestrzeni gospodarczej Europy (XIII–XV wiek). Centrum czy peryferie?*, Wrocław 2009 (Monografie FNP. Seria humanistyczna), pp. 65–66.

⁴ Paweł Rzeźnik, *Gród wrocławski około roku 1000*, [in:] *Śląsk około roku 1000*, Wrocław 2000, pp. 139–148.

⁵ Bogusław Długoborski, Józef Gierowski, Karol Maleczyński, *Dzieje Wrocławia do 1807 r.*, Wrocław 1957, p. 41 [hereafter: *Dzieje Wrocławia do 1807 r.*].

⁶ Stanisław Rosik, *Kształtowanie się Śląska (do 1163 r.). Czynniki integracji regionalnej*, „Śląski Kwartalnik Historyczny Sobótka”, 67, 2012, 4, p. 41.

⁷ Ewa Maleczyńska, *Tradycje szkoły polskiej na Śląsku na tle walki o narodowość*, [in:] *Dolny Śląsk*, vol. 2: *Dzieje, kultura*, edd. Ewa Maleczyńska, Bolesław Olszewicz, Zygmunt Rysiewicz, Wrocław–Warszawa 1948 (*Oblicze Ziemi Odzyskanych*), p. 397; Mieczysław Pater, *Historia Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego do 1918 roku*, Wrocław 1997, pp. 13–14.

⁸ Wojciech Mrozowicz, *Kultura umysłowa i artystyczna Dolnego Śląska*, [in:] *Dolny Śląsk. Monografia historyczna*, ed. Wojciech Wrzesiński, Wrocław 2006, p. 135.

Włostowic⁹ was engaged in church matters, having funded in Ołbin the church of St. Michael the Archangel and the Benedictine abbey of St. Vincent (since 1145), granting it an inn and a year-round market. On the Sand, its foundation in 1138 was the church of the Blessed Virgin Mary and a monastery of the Canons Regular of St. Augustine¹⁰. He also offered them an area at the ford on the left bank of the Oder, where they built an inn and a colony of settlers, later called the Old Market (Stary Targ)¹¹.

Since 1138, the city of Wrocław was the capital of the Silesian Duchy and the seat of the Silesian Piasts¹². However, a new stage of economic and settlement development was only reached under the rule of Henry I the Bearded (1202–1238) following his decision to build on the left bank of the Oder River a princely curia, hospital and house for foreign merchants¹³. Near the Oder ford the New Market (Nowy Targ, *Novum Forum Vratislaviense*)¹⁴, was established, where – after the transfer of the market privilege from Ołbin – local and transit trade was concentrated. The New Market was adjacent to a Jewish community¹⁵, on the eastern side, while on the south-eastern side, along the route leading on the south from Bohemia, “*civitas ad sanctum Adalbertum*” developed. It was the first left-bank parish of the St. Adalbert Church founded by the Włostowic family and handed over to the monastery of the Canons Regular in 1148. Nearby “*civitas*”, at the threshold of the 13th century, a colony of Walloon weavers was established, with a parish church of St. Maurice¹⁶. In this multi-unit and ethnically diverse colonisation, which was dominated by the Polish population, there were also German “*hospites*”. The settlement centres were connected by a market relation, and the development of the New Market caused the colonisation to shift to the west. Since 1226 the function of the parish church was served by a church of St. Mary Magdalene, built near the Market Square (Rynek),

⁹ Stanisław Rosik, *Peter Wlast (+ ok. 1151)*, [in:] *Schlesische Lebensbilder*, vol. 11, ed. Joachim Balcke, Inzingen 2012, pp. 11–24; Eduard Mühle, *Historia Wrocławia*, Warszawa 2016, p. 25.

¹⁰ Anna Pobóg-Lenartowicz, *A czyny ich były liczne i godne pamięci. Konwent klasztoru kanoników regularnych NMP na Piasku we Wrocławiu do początku XVI wieku*, Opole 2007, pp. 22–23.

¹¹ *Dzieje Wrocławia do 1807 r.*, p. 66.

¹² In 1190, the Silesian district was divided into two Piast lines: the Silesian one and the Opole-Racibórz one, which resulted in the later Lower and Upper Silesia.

¹³ Marek Słoń, *Szpitalie średniowiecznego Wrocławia*, Warszawa 2000, pp. 80 *passim*.

¹⁴ Janusz Pudełko, *Aglomeracja wczesnośredniowieczna*, [in:] *Wrocław, jego dzieje i kultura*, ed. Zygmunt Świechowski, Warszawa 1976, p. 16.

¹⁵ Leszek Ziątkowski, *Dzieje Żydów we Wrocławiu*, Wrocław 2000, pp. 8–10.

¹⁶ Marek Słoń, *Średniowieczna osada Walońów we Wrocławiu w świetle badań archeologicznych*, [in:] *Dzieje parafii św. Maurycego na Przedmieściu Oławskim we Wrocławiu. Od początków osady walońskiej – poprzez czas Festung Breslau – do współczesności*, ed. Rościsław Żerelik, Wrocław 2007, pp. 14–20.

where from 1232 the entire Wrocław trade was concentrated¹⁷. In 1248, the Silesian Duchy was divided into the Wrocław and Legnica Duchies.

Henry I's investments in the New Market area are considered to be the first location of Wrocław¹⁸, with the participation of foreigners, mainly from German countries. It is assumed that the next location of the town was carried out after the invasion of the Mongols in 1241 and their destruction of the left bank developments¹⁹. The so-called final location according to Magdeburg law, was carried out in 1261. Henry III the White then also incorporated the Sand Island (Wyspa Piaszkowa) and St. Maurice Suburb (Przedmieście św. Maurycego) into the city's area. Wrocław, divided into two parishes, St. Mary Magdalene and St. Elizabeth, then reached an area of about 120 km². In 1263, the Duke, in a separate act, located New Town (Nowe Miasto) whose parish church became the temple of the Holy Spirit. With its location under Magdeburg law, Wrocław experienced a kind of "spatial and legal revolution"²⁰. It received a modern political system and on was included under equal rights among the trading cities of medieval Europe.

The locational town under the authority of the Silesian Piasts (1261–1335)

After 1261, the town authorities were formed, which consisted of: the *wójt*, Judge's Bench and Council (19 people in total)²¹. The inhabitants of located towns were granted personal freedom and were freed from patrimonial laws. They formed the burghers, a new social group, whose wealth diversity was reflected in the socio-topography of the town²², as only the owners of the town's location plots were

¹⁷ Maciej Krzywka, *Podsumowanie badań średniowiecznych kramów bogatych we Wrocławiu*, [in:] *Centrum staromiejskie we Wrocławiu*, edd. Tomasz Głowiński, Halina Okólska, Wrocław 2016, pp. 37–45.

¹⁸ Maria Bogucka, Henryk Samsonowicz, *Dzieje miast i mieszczaństwa w Polsce przedrozbiorowej*, Wrocław 1986, p. 85.

¹⁹ Mateusz Goliński, *Czas wielkich zmian*, [in:] Mateusz Goliński, Michał Kaczmarek, Teresa Kulak, Włodzimierz Suleja, *Wrocław. Dziedzictwo wieków*, Wrocław 1997, pp. 38–39. [hereinafter: *Wrocław. Dziedzictwo*].

²⁰ *Kultura średniowiecznego Śląska i Czech. "Rewolucja XIII wieku"*, ed. Krzysztof Wachowski, Wrocław 1998.

²¹ Mateusz Goliński, *Powstanie i funkcjonowanie wrocławskiej Rady Miejskiej w średniowieczu*, [in:] *Rada Miejska przez wieki*, Wrocław 2008, pp. 7–12.

²² *Idem*, *Socjotopografia późnośredniowiecznego Wrocławia (przestrzeń – podatnicy – rzemieślnicy)*, Wrocław 1997; *idem*, *Przy wrocławskim Rynku. Rekonstrukcja dziejów własności posesji*, Część 1: 1345–1420, Wrocław 2011.

members of the municipality. Not belonging were the common people (merchants and craftsmen), the poor, referred to as the plebs, as well as the hereditary *wójt*, who represented the economic interests of the prince and the judge's bench. Location started the process of formation of a new type of towns and a new social awareness of the burghers²³. Its first evidence in Wrocław was that the Town Council questioned the cathedral's monopoly in education, as it obtained the Chapter's consent in 1267 to establish a town school at the parish of St. Mary Magdalene, while maintaining its formal authority. In 1293, the second town school was established at the parish of St. Elizabeth. As a result of legal changes, the need for secular education for the sons of the townsmen emerged due to chancery and trade reasons, in which the German language has become an important factor²⁴. The Polish population Germanised themselves, the German language was spoken by Walloon weavers and Jews²⁵.

Left-bank Wrocław gained a new significance during the reign of Duke Henry IV Probus (1270–1290), who moved from Ostrów Tumski to the castle built on the Oder River. Also Jews moved to its vicinity, having settled at the intersection of today's Kuźnicza and Uniwersytecka Streets. They played an important role in the commercial transactions of the Piast dukes²⁶ and benefited from their protection. Also Henry IV, who freed the Jews from municipal jurisdiction in 1270, confirmed his protection. He granted the city numerous privileges²⁷, including the so-called the mile right (1272) and the storage right (1274), allowing it to trade on a regional and European scale. The former eliminated the competition of suburban settlements within a mile of the city walls and created a monopoly for city's craft production and trade. The "storage right", in turn, opened up the prospect of participating in lucrative transcontinental trade, as it forced foreign merchants to stop in the city and exhibit their goods for several days, allowing them to be purchased for further processing or trade²⁸. In 1273, after the privilege of creating

²³ Henryk Samsonowicz, *Ideologia mieszczańska w Polsce w XIII w.*, [in:] *Sztuka i ideologia*, Wrocław 1974, p. 153.

²⁴ Małczyńska, *Tradycje*, p. 400. See Jacques Le Goff, *Kultura średniowiecznej Europy*, Warszawa 1970, p. 92.

²⁵ Lenka Bobková, Radek Fukala, *Śląsk częścią ziem w Koronie Czeskiej*, [in:] *Śląsk – perła w Koronie Czeskiej. Historia, kultura i sztuka*, eds. Mateusz Kapustka et al., Praha 2007, p. 52.

²⁶ Goliński, *Czas*, p. 49.

²⁷ Wrocław received 17 privileges in Total. See Benedykt Zientara, *Henryk IV Probus*, [in:] *Poczet królów i książąt polskich*, Warszawa 1978, p. 203.

²⁸ Mateusz Goliński, *Koncesje Henryka IV*, [in:] *Historia Wrocławia. Od pradziejów do końca czasów habsburskich*, vol.1, Wrocław 2001, p. 110.

guilds (then representing 23 crafts), the city received a share of fees for admission to these craft corporations. The benefits of the privileges transformed Wrocław into an important transit point for European trade and influenced the development of crafts and income of craftsmen. They also changed the attitude of the people of Wrocław towards the ruling dukes, as they had to pay for dukes' regalia and share their income. As Benedykt Zientara noted, in located towns there was a tendency to seek "to remove the interference of a duke, the lord of the town, in its internal affairs" and to obtain "autonomous power" in it²⁹. Such a goal was achieved by the Town Council after the death of Henry VI (1311–1335), the last of the Wrocław Piasts, who – wanting to free himself from family disputes concerning power in the duchy – under the influence of the Council, concluded an agreement in 1327 with John I of Luxembourg, King of Bohemia, on the fiefdom relationship of the duchy until his death and its subsequent succession the Luxemburg dynasty³⁰. In the meantime, the Council took over power in New Town, after having bought its right of inherited office of the *wójt*, and eliminated his competition, especially in the cloth industry. It also made an effort to buy the office of the *wójt* of Wrocław, but it was not until after the death of the Duke in 1335 that the Council gained rule, when the Luxembourg's sovereignty was recognised and the state-political affiliation of the duchy changed.

At that time, Wrocław reached an area of 133 km² and about 20,000 inhabitants, and became one of the largest cities in Central Europe. In Bohemia it was the second city (after Prague) in terms of size and wealth. The process of the political emancipation of the Council ended with the complete assumption of the powers of the *wójt* by the Senior Councilor, to whom the Judge's Bench was henceforth subordinate, creating together with the Council the city authorities³¹. In the sphere of symbolic policy, the Council has marked its new legal position by the commencement of the construction of the Town Hall and the second ring of city walls, which have determined anew the border between the town and its rural surroundings.

²⁹ Benedykt Zientara, *Przemiany społeczno-gospodarcze i przestrzenne miasta w dobie lokacji*, [in:] *Miasta doby feudalnej w Europie środkowo-wschodniej. Przemiany społeczne a układy przestrzenne*, eds. Aleksander Gieysztor, Tadeusz Rosłanowski, Warszawa 1976, p. 91.

³⁰ *Ibidem*, p. 59.

³¹ Goliński, *Powstanie*, p. 12.

A “royal city” in Bohemian Crown 1335–1526

Wrocław becoming part of Bohemia, almost at the same time when John I of Luxembourg gained power in the Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation, ensured its economic boom. By granting the city a monopoly on the salt trade and exemption from duties and taxes in the transit and river trade of the Oder and in regional trade, he secured the city high revenues. The successor, Charles IV Luxembourg, King of Bohemia (1346–1378) and the King of Rome (from 1355), directly subordinated the Duchy of Wrocław to the Bohemian Crown as his hereditary authority and gave this city a reason to call itself a “royal city”. From then on, Wrocław functioned as a self-governing republic of patricians and was subordinated only to the Kings of Bohemia, to whom a separate homage was paid in Wrocław³². In 1359, the Council was granted the authority of the Starost (starosta) of the Duchy of Wrocław, highly valued because this office of territorial authority meant the Council’s position as equal to that of dukes and co-chairing the sessions in the Ducal Hall of the Town Hall³³. High income was also obtained from duty-free transport of goods to Hanseatic cities (1349), to Venice, Carinthia (1358), to Prague (1359), from issuing a gold coin (1360) and 3 annual fairs.

The economic boom of Wrocław in the 14th century was marked by the opening of St. Matthew’s city water supply system (1387) and the change of residential buildings – from wooden to brick³⁴. It also fostered the development of the sacred architecture, reflected in the image of “Gothic”³⁵ Wrocław. 13 monumental temples³⁶, were built at that time, of which only 3 (on the other side of the Oder River) were the result of patronage of the Catholic Church. The Church of St. Wenceslas, St. Stanislaus and St. Dorothy³⁷, was the foundation of Emperor Charles IV for the

³² Gabriela Wąs, *Wrocław pod panowaniem czeskim 1335–1742*, [in:] *Oblicza Wrocławia: historia, kultura, rozwój*, ed. Tadeusz Woźniakowski, Wrocław 2009, pp. 43–47.

³³ Arno Herzig, Krzysztof Ruchniewicz, Małgorzata Ruchniewicz, *Śląsk i jego dzieje*, Wrocław 2012, p. 45.

³⁴ Marian Kutzner, *Spoleczne uwarunkowania rozwoju śląskiej architektury w latach 1200–1330*, [in:] *Sztuka i ideologia XIII wieku*, ed. Piotr Skubiszewski, Wrocław 1974, pp. 205–279.

³⁵ See the panorama of Wrocław in Hartmann Schedl’s *Chronicle of the world (Kronika świata)* from 1493. See more Jerzy Wyrozumski, *Hartmann Schedel i jego Kronika świata*, Kraków 2000.

³⁶ Agnieszka Zabłocka-Kos, *Między czeskim gotykiem, austriackim barokiem i pruskim klasycyzmem – architektura Wrocławia w latach 1335–1850*, [in:] *Oblicza Wrocławia*, p. 49.

³⁷ Zygmunt Świechowski, *Architektura sakralna XIII–XV wiek*, [in:] *Wrocław, jego dzieje*, pp. 104, 107.

Franciscan hermits, while the other temples were investments of the Town Council. Of these, the most important were the two parish churches: St. Elizabeth and St. Mary Magdalene, which were impressive in terms of the height of their towers and walls and the extent of their inner space enclosed by three-support (star-shaped and so-called Piast) vaults. They are considered, apart from wooden sculptures of “beautiful Madonnas”, to be the highest artistic achievement of the Silesian school of architecture, known as the Wrocław Gothic, radiating to other Silesian cities as well as to the Lesser Poland (Małopolska) and Bohemia³⁸. The extension of the town hall was also undertaken, enlarging the space for municipal authorities and trade and legal activities³⁹. The city needed educated people, so the sons of the burghers studied at European universities, initially Italian ones, from 1347 mainly in Prague and after 1364 at the Cracow Academy. They were involved in the development of the city’s historiography, as evidenced, among others, by the creation of the *Old Wrocław Annals* [*Rocznik wrocławski dawny*] (1308) and the *Annals of Wrocław Magistrate* [*Rocznik magistratu wrocławskiego*] (1514). A unique work is the *Historia Wratislaviensis* written down in two editions (Latin and German) by the city scribe Peter Eschenloer (died 1481). He has innovatively combined in it a chronicle record of knowledge about Wrocław’s past, obtained from city documents, with his own comments about the observed events⁴⁰. The merchant patricians treated the New Town hostilely, whose poor inhabitants, mainly weavers, considered being harmed by privileges granted to the inhabitants of Wrocław. After being incorporated into Wrocław in 1327, New Town’s craftsmen unsuccessfully demanded the presence of their representative in the Council⁴¹. There were unrests since 1333 in this context, and they organised the biggest rebellion in 1418. As it was connected in time with the Hussite uprisings in Bohemia, so to intimidate the plebs in Wrocław and indirectly in Prague, Sigismund of Luxembourg (the

³⁸ Jakub Adamski, *Czy istniała śląska szkoła architektoniczna w XIV w.? Przyczynek do rozważań nad śląską tożsamością regionalną w zakresie architektury sakralnej*, „Śląski Kwartalnik Historyczny Sobótka”, 71, 2016, 1, pp. 12–13.

³⁹ Roman Stelmach, *Najstarsze wrocławskie dokumenty miejskie (do końca XIV w.)*, [in:] *Mieszczanstwo wrocławskie. Materiały sesji naukowej zorganizowanej przez Muzeum Miejskie Wrocławia w dn. 7–9 grudnia 2000 r.*, Wrocław 2003, pp. 273–290.

⁴⁰ Wojciech Mrozowicz, *Dziejopisarstwo średniowieczne we Wrocławiu*, „Śląski Kwartalnik Historyczny Sobótka”, 61, 2006, 1, pp. 16–18.

⁴¹ The weavers of New Town (Nowe Miasto) were only given a seat in 1454. See Goliński, *Powstanie*, p. 9.

King of Bohemia in 1419–1437) sentenced 23 participants to beheading⁴². In the interest of the Wrocław patricians, he issued new, restrictive guild statutes, so the Council – in return – supported the King by participating in an anti-Hussite coalition with its mercenary troops⁴³.

In the atmosphere of the fight against Hussitism, a great pogrom against the Jews took place in 1453, who had already been persecuted one hundred years earlier under John I and Charles IV. At the request of the council, in 1454, King Ladislaus the Posthumous has banned them from living in the city with the privilege of “de judeos non tolerandis”⁴⁴. In 1458, the Council, risking losses and the outbreak of civil war, refused to recognize George of Poděbrady, a Utraquist, as King of Bohemia, and opted for the King Matthias Corvinus of Hungary, a Catholic (1471–1490). Yet it was disappointed later, because Matthew, in the face of financial disputes with the Council, deprived it of its right to hold the office of Starost of the Duchy of Wrocław. The office was returned to the city by the new King of Bohemia, Ladislaus II Jagiellonian (1490–1516), at the price of obtaining the throne for his underage son. He also supported the intellectual ambitions of the burghers, who came forward with a plan to establish a university in 1505⁴⁵. This plan was not implemented due to the lack of the Pope’s consent, as Wrocław’s efforts, as an initiative of the secular authorities, violated the Church’s right to establish universities and did not gain financial support in the city. However, they were in line with the new trends in European mental culture of the Renaissance, in parallel with the increase in the wealth of the burghers and their intellectual progress⁴⁶.

The ideological currents of Renaissance humanism influenced the educated clergy of the Bishop’s Curia and the cathedral chapter, especially under the rule of Jan V Turzo (1506–1520)⁴⁷, a Cracow (Kraków) patrician and the former rector of the Cracow Academy. Humanism, however, along with intellectual revival, has

⁴² Goliński, *Czas*, p. 64.

⁴³ Mateusz Goliński, *Najemnicy w służbie miasta Wrocławia XV w.*, „Śląski Kwartalnik Historyczny Sobótka”, 71, 2016, 1, pp. 17–46.

⁴⁴ Mühle, *Historia Wrocławia*, p. 95.

⁴⁵ Norbert Conrads, *Książęta i stany. Historia Śląska (1469–1740)*, Wrocław 2005, p. 34; Theodor Goerlitz, *Verfassung, Verwaltung und Recht der Stadt Breslau*, part 1: *Mittelalter*, Würzburg 1962, p. 78.

⁴⁶ Ewa Maleczyńska, *Życie codzienne Śląska w dobie Odrodzenia*, Warszawa 1972, pp. 105–106.

⁴⁷ Aleksandra Szewczyk, *Mecenat artystyczny biskupa wrocławskiego Jana V Thurzona (1506–1520)*, Wrocław 2009.

caused an increase in anti-clerical sentiment. They manifested themselves in Wrocław, in connection with the accumulation, in the city of 20,000 people, of 37 churches and chapels, 12 monasteries and about 1,000 people of Catholic clergy with sometimes reprehensible lifestyles. Aware of these problems, the Bishop discussed the need for internal church reform⁴⁸ with young clergy, among them Ambrosius Moiban, known to him from Cracow, and Dr Johannes Hess, bishop notary. Both were in contact with Martin Luther, whose writings they distributed. However, the mission to introduce the Lutheran Reformation was taken over by the Council (known as the “Ratsreformation”⁴⁹), which sought to have patronage over city churches and education⁵⁰. It made a historic decision for the city by allowing Pastor Hess to hold a Lutheran service in the Church of St. Mary Magdalene on 21st October 1523. In 1525, a similar confessional change was done by Moiban in the church of St. Elizabeth, and in the parish of St. Spirit in the New Town the conversion did not take place until 1541⁵¹. The parishes came under the authority of the Council with the property of the city and outside its walls, which was important because there the clergy developed a non-guild craft competing with that of the city. Some orders, especially the Franciscans, supported the new confession, after which their conventual property became the property of the city.

The Reformation in Wrocław was a major social and political phenomenon, initiating a great religious and cultural breakthrough, which changed the previous religious uniformity of its inhabitants and their spiritual heritage until the end of World War II. The division of the inhabitants into opposing confessional movements has been reflected in their intellectual and artistic culture. However, the Protestants did not achieve confessional exclusivity, although the Catholic Church lost the whole of the city parishes and in 1529 the parish of St. Vincent on Ołbin⁵², where – allegedly due to the Turkish threat – a Romanesque Premonstratensian abbey was destroyed. Within the city walls, the ducal and monastic “jurydyki” and the inhabitants of Ostrów Tumski, the Sand and Ołbin remained Catholic. Some of the

⁴⁸ Friedrich G.A. Weiss, *Chronik der Stadt Breslau*, Breslau 1888, pp. 798, 814; *Dzieje Wrocławia do 1807 r.*, p. 296.

⁴⁹ Conrads, *Książęta*, p. 49.

⁵⁰ Katarzyna Sulej, *Fundacje artystyczne wrocławskiego patrycjusza Heinricha Rybischa (1485–1544)*, Wrocław 2011, p. 32.

⁵¹ Jan Harasimowicz, *Kościół św. Elżbiety we Wrocławiu – “ewangelicka katedra” habsburskiego Śląska*, [in:] *Z dziejów wielkomięskiej fary. Wrocławski kościół św. Elżbiety w świetle historii i zabytków sztuki*, red. Mieczysław Zlat, Wrocław 1996, p. 293.

⁵² Sulej, *Fundacje artystyczne*, p. 34.

Polish population adopted Lutheranism due to the possibility of choosing the language of services and for them the so-called Polish deacons were introduced in parishes⁵³. The rapid development of the new confession was fostered by the spread of printing, and both sides, i.e. the Council and the Bishop's Curia, avoided conflicts, so that their coexistence at the time was to be an exceptional state⁵⁴. However, the Curia could not resist, for lack of believers within the walls, and for the Council, the Reformation was an important material factor⁵⁵, so it did not allow any disturbances or destruction of Catholic property. It took them over to perform its new tasks, carried out on the model of the Catholic Church, i.e. to care for the development of religious worship and parish education as well as for hospitals and the poor.

With the Bohemian Crown under the rule of the Habsburgs (1526–1740)

The change in the religious character of Wrocław coincided with the transition of Bohemia and Silesia to the rule of Ferdinand I of Habsburg (1526–1564), after the death of King Louis II Jagiellonian in the battle with the Turks at Mohács. The new ruler, while receiving homage, demanded that the council “exterminate the Lutheran heresy, return the seized church property and expel Protestant priests”⁵⁶. He did not undertake any repression of the city because he needed its money and help in connection with the war with Turkey that is threatening him. This threat caused the political advancement of Wrocław, which from 1529 was incorporated into the defensive structures of the province, with the task of expanding its fortifications⁵⁷. It also received the right to maintain its own army, which was combined with the privilege of “*ius praesidia*” – that is, without the obligation to accept foreign troops within the city walls. Another political elevation of Wrocław was to give it a place in the knightly curia of the Silesian Estates Parliament, instead of in the curia of cities.

⁵³ Maleczyńska, *Życie codzienne*, p. 72.

⁵⁴ Gabriela Waś, *Dzieje Śląska od 1526 do 1806 roku*, [in:] *Historia Śląska*, ed. Marek Czaplinski, Wrocław 2002, pp. 145–146.

⁵⁵ Conrads, *Książęta*, p. 49.

⁵⁶ *Dzieje Wrocławia do 1808 r.*, p. 200.

⁵⁷ Leszek Ziátkowski, *Wrocław w czasach habsburskich*, [in:] *Historia Wrocławia*, vol. 1, pp. 239–242.

After the Reformation, the city was marked by confessional and political dualism, i.e. the Catholicism of the state-provincial Habsburg authorities and the bishopric, and the Protestantism of the city authorities. The policy of the Habsburgs caused disappointment in Wrocław, due to the loss of its political significance and independence gained in the Middle Ages. The old privileges have been preserved, e.g. respecting its title of the Starost of the Duchy of Wrocław, but it has been transformed into a merely titular dignity, as a separate office of the General Starost has been created. The new coat of arms granted in 1530 by Emperor Charles V (1500–1556) was accepted with approval as it signified recognition among the cities of the Reich and also symbolised the Piast genealogy of the city and its subjection to the Bohemian Crown⁵⁸. However, the simultaneous imperial approval of the former city trade and property privileges, and legal sovereignty over the duchy's nobility turned out to be only a gracious gesture, as King Ferdinand I was against them. He aimed at the complete unification of the state, and the initial step was the introduction of the thaler as the national coin in 1546, despite the protests of Wrocław, as it threatened its mint privilege. In 1552, the Silesian Estates Assembly protested in connection with the deprivation of the right to collect taxes, but has definitively lost it in 1558 to the Royal Chamber, i.e. the office of the state tax administration.

The reform has weakened the local Catholic environment, which has lost its material and intellectual strength. The success of the Protestants, especially after the Augsburg Peace in 1555, provided an impulse for the development of their own culture, combining religious ideas with Renaissance humanism, known as Silesian Evangelical humanism⁵⁹. This process occurred during a period of economic prosperity in the city, marked by the creation of a representative office for Fugger's banking house, famous in Europe. The richest of Wrocław's patricians, following the example of rulers and church dignitaries, only then did they become interested in collecting works of art, manuscripts and books. Among them stood out Thomas Rehdiger (1540–1576), who donated his rich collection to the city, initiating the creation of the city library and Silesian museums⁶⁰. The lack of new Protestant churches can be explained by the takeover of magnificent Catholic buildings, which

⁵⁸ Bogusław Czechowicz, *Między katedrą a ratuszem. Polityczne uwarunkowania sztuki Wrocławia u schyłku średniowiecza*, Warszawa 2008, p. 181.

⁵⁹ See Jan Harasimowicz, *Treści i funkcje ideowe sztuki śląskiej reformacji*, Wrocław 1986.

⁶⁰ Mühle, *Historia Wrocławia*, pp. 111–112.

were adapted to the Lutheran liturgy⁶¹ and the influence of the North German and Netherlandish Renaissance. Following the example of the works of Cranach the Elder and Albrecht Dürer, painting and sculpture have adopted an epitaphic character. The burghers obtained the opportunity to artistically present evidence of their wealth, as well as their families and persons' merits in the service of the city. This trend is symbolised by the merchant Heinrich Rybisch (1485–1544), the imperial councillor and city administrator, who became famous by donating twice (1534, 1539) his tombstone in the church of St. Elisabeth⁶².

The city did not change its architecture during the Renaissance, but its artistic influence – apart from the decoration of private tenement houses on the Market Square (Rynek) – manifested itself (ca. 1510) in the sculptural decoration of the southern facade of the Town Hall, now considered to be “the highest achievement of Wrocław’s visual arts”⁶³. The stylistic changes in it took place until 1559, when the Town Hall tower was covered with a helmet, creating a representative building with associations with the “castle of burghers”⁶⁴. It is believed that by its size and high artistry, the ideological and political principle, officially defended by the council, of “the sovereignty of the city authorities and the unique position of Wrocław as a royal city”⁶⁵, was strengthened against Vienna. During the Thirty Years’ War (1618–1648), the Council revealed its dissatisfaction with the Habsburg rule twice: between 1618–1621 it supported the Bohemian uprising, and in 1633 it entered into a Protestant coalition with Saxony, Sweden and Brandenburg. Both coalitions ended in a political and military defeat, so in 1621, the victorious Ferdinand II enforced a huge contribution from the city, and his successor Ferdinand III punished Wrocław similarly in 1633. An additional blow to the city was the definitive loss of the office of Starost of the Duchy of Wrocław in 1639 to the “Oberamt”, i.e. the all-Silesian state administration office. After these experiences, Wrocław remained neutral towards both the Habsburgs and Protestant Swedish troops until

⁶¹ Jerzy Rozpędowski, *Ogólne warunki rozwoju sztuki w latach 1524–1650*, [in:] *Wrocław, jego dzieje*, p. 140.

⁶² Sulej, *Fundacje artystyczne*, pp. 84–87.

⁶³ Jerzy Rozpędowski, *Architektura świecka od połowy XIII do początku XVI wieku*, [in:] *Wrocław, jego dzieje*, p. 140.

⁶⁴ Mieczysław Zlat, *Ratusz – zamek mieszczan, symbolika typu architektonicznego i jego form*, [in:] *Ratusz w miastach północnej Europy. Materiały z sesji “Ratusz w miastach nadbałtyckich”*, Gdańsk 1997, pp. 70–91.

⁶⁵ Piotr Oszczanowski, *Reprezentacyjność władzy, czyli sztuka na usługach Rady Miejskiej we Wrocławiu*, [in:] *Rada Miejska przez wieki*, p. 26.

1648. As a trading city, however, it suffered significant material losses due to restrictions on trade activities, and in the final stage of the war – as a result of a cholera epidemic – it lost around 18,000 inhabitants.

The Peace of Westphalia, which ended the longest religious war in modern Europe in 1648, proclaimed freedom of the Augsburg faith, but did not protect against re-Catholicisation. The city was deprived of 4 churches in suburban villages and had to accept the presence of the Jesuits and their college for noble youth (1646). A huge blow to the Council was the handover of the imperial castle to the Jesuits in 1659 by Leopold I (1640–1705), who replaced it with Baroque buildings: the Church of the Holy Name of Jesus (1698) and an edifice of Leopoldine Academy funded in 1702⁶⁶. The Baroque, based on the art and architecture of Vienna, Prague and Munich, did not find approval in Protestant Wrocław because it was seen as a style supporting the offensive of re-Catholicisation. However, it dominated in the foundations of new churches and buildings of monastic congregations, and it manifested itself in residential buildings of Habsburg officials⁶⁷. The increasing confessionalization of the city had an impact on social attitudes, and the choice of the language of services meant that the Reformation required linguistic self-identification from its supporters and initiated a long-term process of shaping their national awareness on a linguistic basis. A pioneer of creativity in German was Martin Opitz (1579–1639), who stayed in the city, and his main work *Das Buch von der deutschen Poeterey* (1624) was a harbinger of a literary and cultural breakthrough⁶⁸. The counter-reformation was symbolised by Johann Scheffler (1624–1677) from the Order of the Cross with a Red Star, who, under the monastic name of Angelus Silesius⁶⁹, created in Latin theological-philosophical poetry with a deep religious commitment.

After the agreement in Altrandstädt in 1707 between Emperor Joseph I of Habsburg and King Charles XII of Sweden, the city benefited from the alleviation of a religious conflict that lasted almost two centuries. It was ruled by the Augsburg

⁶⁶ Teresa Kulak, Mieczysław Pater, Wojciech Wrzesiński, *Historia Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego 1702–2002*, Wrocław 2002, pp. 35–36.

⁶⁷ Małgorzata Wyrzykowska, *Modne palace i siedziby lojalistycznej arystokracji habsburskiej i cesarskich urzędników we Wrocławiu doby baroku*, [in:] *Centrum staromiejskie we Wrocławiu*, pp. 93–101.

⁶⁸ Norbert Conrads, *Schlesien frühe Zeit (1469–1740)*, [in:] *Deutsche Geschichte im Osten Europas. Schlesien*, ed. Norbert Conrads, Berlin 1994, pp. 310–311.

⁶⁹ Józef Kosian, *Mistyka śląska. Mistrzowie duchowości śląskiej Jakub Boehme, Anioł Ślązak i Daniel Czepko*, Wrocław 2001.

confession, which fought against Calvinism and factions calling for a “second reformation”, for fear of the social consequences of grass-roots movements of a mystical or puritan nature. Merchants, recreating the traditional model of conducting business, have rebuilt their former trade contacts, especially with Poland. Hoping for ennoblement, they invested their income in the land and Wrocław also owned 22 suburban villages. Due to the lack of free capital, no new merchant companies or trading houses were established, while participation in transit trade resulted in large-scale bill of exchange and credit operations⁷⁰. Proto-industrialisation in a city of about 48,000 inhabitants was in fact minimal and boiled down to the creation of cloth and silk weaving manufactories (which employed about 500 people) and the production of tin, needle and tobacco products⁷¹. At the beginning of the 18th century, the feeling of regional-provincial isolation and political – economic exhaustion of the governing Council’s potential was growing in Wrocław. Regarding Vienna, the Council tried hard to maintain the formal and real city autonomy, but it was no longer possible to broaden its scope.

In the Kingdom of Prussia and the German Reich (1741–1945)

The entering of the army of King Frederick II Hohenzollern of Prussia (1711–1786) into Silesia took place in December 1740, but only after several victories over the army of the Austrian monarchess Maria Theresa and the insidious occupation of Wrocław on 10th August 1741, it was paid, in the Town Hall, a loyal tribute by its authorities, together with the Silesian Estates⁷². The King was supported by the Protestant burghers, but the authority was taken over by a Prussian General-Feldkriegskommissariat, which meant militarisation of the city⁷³. In response to complaints from the inhabitants about a violation of the “*ius praesidia*”, the ruler gave Wrocław on 30th January 1742 the status of a fortress, subordinate to the garrison commander. Due to the lack of military barracks, the burghers have been burdened with a so-called service, i.e. compulsory housing of the army in their private homes.

⁷⁰ *Dzieje Wrocławia do 1807 r.*, pp. 450–451.

⁷¹ *Ibidem*, pp. 432–437.

⁷² Paul Baumgart, *Schlesien als eingenständige Provinz im altpreussischen Staat (1740–1806)*, [in:] *Deutsche Geschichte im Osten Europas*, pp. 346–353.

⁷³ Paweł Jaworski, *State and local administration in Silesia in 1740–1918 as factor in regional (dis)integration*, [in:] *Silesia under the Authority of the Hohenzollerns (1741–1918)*, eds. Lucyna Harc, Teresa Kulak, Wrocław 2015 (*Cuius regio? Ideological and Territorial Cohesion of the Historical Region of Silesia (c. 1000–2000)*, 3), pp. 27–28.

After the end of the First Silesian War in 1742, the King raised the rank of Wrocław to the third – after Königsberg and Berlin – residential capital of the Kingdom of Prussia. In 1748, i.e. after the Second Silesian War, “The Rules and Regulations for the City of Wrocław” were issued, announcing the creation of the Royal Prussian Magistrate, subordinate to the Wrocław War and Domain Chamber and a minister responsible to the King. The Magistrate consisted of 20 people, 16 of whom represented the army and 4 people were appointed from among the New Town guild masters. It is not known for what purpose, as they were forbidden by law to “convene any assembly, formulate collectively any proposals, petitions or complaints”⁷⁴.

Sudden changes in the city administration and the disruption of trade exchange, as well as the introduction of excise tax, protective tariffs and a restrictive tax system⁷⁵, have shaken the economy of Wrocław. While turning the city into a fortress, the king did not undertake any other investments apart from the expansion of the fortifications and annexed the land of suburbs and villages around the city for this purpose. The inhabitants demonstrated their opposition to this policy in 1757, during the Third Silesian War, forcing the Prussian command of the Wrocław fortress to surrender it to the Austrians. After their defeat, they were sued for treason and punished with a contribution of half a million⁷⁶.

A change took place in confessional politics, because the evangelicals who had been fought against so far in 1750 established a community of the evangelical-reformed denomination and under the protectorate of the ruler they undertook the construction of a church of the Divine Providence. In 1765 an Evangelical-Reformed gymnasium was founded, named Friedrichsschule in honour of the king. The king also reintroduced the presence of Jews in the city, because thanks to them 2/3 of the then imports from Eastern Europe and Poland were coming to Wrocław. The King also reintroduced the presence of Jews in the city, because thanks to them 2/3 of the then imports to Wrocław from Eastern Europe and Poland were coming. The most difficult situation was that of the Catholic clergy, due to their previous political affiliation with Austria⁷⁷. The Baroque Leopoldine Academy, built in 1740, was converted into military

⁷⁴ Teresa Kulak, *Historia Wrocławia. Od twierdzy fryderycjańskiej do twierdzy hitlerowskiej*, vol. 2, Wrocław 2001, pp. 13–18.

⁷⁵ Kazimierz Orzechowski, *Historia ustroju Śląska 1202–1740*, Wrocław 2005, pp. 227–229.

⁷⁶ See *Akten des Kriegsgerichts von 1758 wegen der Kapitulation von Breslau am 24. November 1757*, ed. Colmar Grünhagen, Franz Wachter, Breslau 1895, p. 14.

⁷⁷ Teresa Kulak, *Kościół św. Wojciecha i klasztor dominikanów we Wrocławiu pod władzą Prus i Niemiec (1741–1945)*, [in:] *Błogosławiony Czesław, Patron Wrocławia*, vol. 1, ed. Marek Derwich, Wrocław–Warszawa 2006, pp. 128–130.

barracks and stables, but despite the dissolution of the Jesuit order in 1773, the King preserved its college as an educational institution for Catholic priests. However, he deprived them of their property and imposed a curator and civil status as members of the Corporation of Priests of the Royal School Institute⁷⁸.

The reign of Frederick II's enlightened absolutism was symbolised by the 1763 and 1765 regulations on the compulsory schooling of children aged 6–13 years. In 1766, the King ordered a reform of curricula in the three oldest gymnasiums in Wrocław (St. Mary Magdalene, St. Elizabeth and St. Spirit), following the example of the real Berlin gymnasiums⁷⁹. By doing so, the King won the sympathy of outstanding Wrocław pedagogues and publicists, among them Christian Gavre and Johann C.F. Manso, Johannes Caspar Arlet, Johann Gottlieb Schummel and authors of historical works: Jerzy Samuel Bandtkie and Samuel Benjamin Klose⁸⁰. However, the burghers, restricted in the public sphere and in its economic activity, decided that the reign of Frederick II had impeded the development of the city, so that from its successor, Frederick William II (1786–1797), it obtained a reduction in the fiscal burden and freedom of industrial production⁸¹. Since 1790, he also became engaged in the Enlightenment school policy creating 2 teachers' seminars, the Royal School of Arts and Crafts, the Royal Institute of Midwives and the Royal Building School. In 1791 the Wilhelmschule was established, as the first public Jewish school, and the compulsory schooling was introduced by Universal National Law in 1794⁸².

Modern phase of Wrocław's development (since 1807)

The symbol of the political and social changes of that time was the destruction of the Frederick II's fortress in 1807, undertaken at the order of the French occupying the city⁸³, who arrived in Silesia at the end of 1806, after Frederick William III

⁷⁸ Pater, *Historia Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego*, pp. 35–36.

⁷⁹ Teresa Kulak, *Das Breslauer Schulwesen im 19. und in der ersten Hälfte des 20. Jahrhunderts unter Berücksichtigung der Privat-, Berufs- und Sonderschulen*, [in:] *Breslauer Schulen. Geschichte und Architektur*, ed. Maria Zwierz, Wrocław 2005, pp. 68–69.

⁸⁰ Lucyna Harc, *Samuel Benjamin Klose (1739–1798). Studium historiograficzno-źródłoznawcze*, Wrocław 2002, pp. 69–81.

⁸¹ *Dzieje Wrocławia do 1807 r.*, pp. 839–840.

⁸² Kulak, *Historia Wrocławia*, pp. 80–81.

⁸³ Agnieszka Zabłocka-Kos, *Zrozumieć miasto. Centrum Wrocławia na drodze ku nowoczesnemu city 1807–1858*, Wrocław 2006, pp. 19–29.

lost the war with Napoleon. Thanks to the removal of walls and earth fortifications, the area of the city, after the formal incorporation of 5 suburbs in 1816, increased to 2046 km². As a result of top-down reforms (between 1808 and 1811) implemented in Prussia by royal ministers H.F.K. Stein and K.A. Hardenberg, the city regained self-government and the medieval guild restrictions on crafts and trade were removed⁸⁴. They were accepted by the educated burghers, who saw in them an opportunity for economic development and social opening, as was manifested by giving the Jews the *preussische Staatsbürgerrecht* in 1812⁸⁵. The burghers contributed significantly to the victory of Prussia during the *Befreiungskrieg* in 1813, and an important justification for its patriotic commitment was the creation in Wrocław in 1811 the Royal University, thanks to which it obtained the ennobling status of a university city⁸⁶.

The economic crisis after the Napoleonic Wars caused difficulties with the sale of Silesian flax products, which did not keep up with the needs and technological progress. A new source of income for rich merchants since the 1820s was the twice-yearly wool fair. They gained financial momentum with the expansion of the railway network (since 1842), which also stimulated the development of Silesian mining and metallurgical industry⁸⁷. In 1848, the revolutionary events of the Spring of Nations forced Frederick William IV (1840–1861) to make political changes, in 1850 he octroyed the constitution and signed the Prussian *Landtag Act on Municipal Self-Government* in 1853⁸⁸. During the rapid industrialisation in Wrocław, the metallurgical industry (with important production of railway rolling stock), weaving, clothing and food industries were expanded. Suburban development was also intensified, which was necessary in view of the overpopulation of the city centre and its transformation into a business district.

⁸⁴ Reinhart Koselleck, *Preussen zwischen Reform und Revolution. Allgemeines Landrecht, Verwaltung und soziale Bewegung vom 1791 bis 1848*, Stuttgart 1967, pp. 163–164.

⁸⁵ Leszek Ziątkowski, *Między niemożliwym a koniecznym. Reformy państwa pruskiego w końcu XVIII i na początku XIX wieku a proces równouprawnienia Żydów, ze szczególnym uwzględnieniem sytuacji na Śląsku*, Wrocław 2007, pp. 161–198.

⁸⁶ Teresa Kulak, *From Silesian Wars to the Great War: Region Silesia in the Prussian Kingdom and the German Reich (1741–1918)*, [in:] *Silesia under the Authority*, pp. 17–18.

⁸⁷ Marian Jerczyński, Stanisław Koziański, *150 lat kolei na Śląsku*, Opole 1992, pp. 49–53, 93–94.

⁸⁸ Teresa Kulak, *Zgromadzenie Deputowanych Miejskich w latach 1918-1933*, [in:] *Rada Miejska przez wieki*, pp. 63–64. The act was in force for 80 years, i.e. until the liquidation of the municipal government in March 1933.

Further acceleration of civilizational development manifested itself after German reunification and the creation of the Imperial Reich (1871). New city arteries were marked out, museums and representative buildings for state, provincial and financial institutions were created. Initially, new waterworks (1871), then electrification of the city (1891), and installation of a telephone and tramway network (1893) were the symbols of the municipal modernisation. At the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries, investments were made for public institutions, especially for university clinics and common schools. The concentration of municipal, provincial and state authorities, as well as trade and financial institutions, cultural and scientific life in Wrocław has given it the status of a metropolis. At the beginning of the 20th century. Wrocław was a great city, with an area of 4962 km² and a population of 544,369 people in 1914, among whom there were about 20,000 Polish people. In this part of Europe, the city was an important administrative, economic and political centre, a transport junction of macadam roads, the iron railway, inland waterways on the Oder River and since 1911 also of air transport⁸⁹.

At the forefront of scientific activity was the University, which, on the occasion of its centenary, was given the name of the Silesian Frederick William University in 1911. Since 1910 the Technische Hochschule existed, while in 1912, The School of Fine Arts and Crafts was transformed into an Academy. An important role in the municipal and intellectual elite was played by the academic circles, including the Jewish community. Together with artists from the Silesian Art Society, journalistic and literary milieu, headed by Gerhart Hauptmann (1862–1946), Nobel Prize winner from 1912, it co-created the cultural life of the city. A summary of the achievements of Prussia and the Second Reich was the Centennial Exhibition of the Liberation Wars against Napoleon, opened on 20th May 1913. It turned out to be a great success of its creators, and the Jahrhunderthalle, a modernist work of the city architect Max Berg⁹⁰, aroused widespread interest. It was placed on the UNESCO World Cultural and Natural Heritage List in 2006.

The First World War (1914–1918) seriously weakened the position of Wrocław, which was assigned the status of a fortress in 1911. Although the warfare did not reach the city, the costs of its organisation and of maintaining a garrison of 31,000 troops

⁸⁹ *Idem*, *Metropolia czy tylko stolica prusko-niemieckiej prowincji? Spojrzenie na Wrocław na przełomie XIX i XX wieku*, „Śląski Kwartalnik Historyczny Sobótka”, 54, 1999, 3, p. 297.

⁹⁰ Jerzy Ilkosz, *Hala Stulecia i Tereny Wystawowe we Wrocławiu – dzieło Maxa Berga*, Wrocław 2005.

have had a dramatic impact on the lives of the inhabitants. The city spent 12 million marks on equipping the fortress and went into debt of 120 million⁹¹, which was not compensated for after the defeat of the Imperial Reich in 1918 and the establishment of the Weimar Republic. The scale of economic exhaustion of the city economy can be evidenced by the card system, which in Wrocław lasted until 1924. Only later did the economic revival appear, allowing for the creation of suburban housing estates, new department stores and the creation of a sports stadium (for 50,000 spectators) in 1926, named the Olympic Stadium, as its design was awarded in 1937 during the Los Angeles Olympics.

Since 1930, the global economic crisis, in a city of 620,000 inhabitants, has caused the collapse of industry and catastrophic unemployment, politically activating the Communists and the Nazis⁹². After the victory of the NSDAP in the 1932 Reichstag elections and Adolf Hitler's assumption of the post of Chancellor on 30th January 1933, attacks on the Jewish community, which numbered around 20,000, intensified. Their drama revealed during the so-called Kristallnacht (9/10 November 1938) and continued until their annihilation in 1943⁹³. In August 1939, members of the Wrocław Polish community were arrested and sent to concentration camps. Only a few of them survived⁹⁴.

During the Second World War, Wrocław was once again proclaimed a fortress, where about one million people lived. In connection with the offensive of the Red Army, on 21st January 1945 the Nazi authorities issued an order to evacuate the civilian population. Due to a lack of transport, approximately 700,000 people were forced to leave on foot, of whom approximately 90,000 died on the way. On the night of 15/16 February, the Festung encirclement was closed. Its capitulation took place on 6th May 1945, after which the Red Army's military command took over the control of the city⁹⁵. It remained the supreme authority there until 2nd August, i.e. until the Big Three signed an agreement in Potsdam establishing the Polish western border on the Oder and the Lusatian Neisse.

⁹¹ Romuald Gelles, *Gospodarka Wrocławia w latach I wojny światowej*, „Studia Śląskie. Seria nowa”, 28, 1975, pp. 80–86.

⁹² Franciszek Biały, *Ruch narodowosocjalistyczny w prowincjach śląskich. Początki – postępy – przejęcie władzy*, Wrocław 1987, p. 16.

⁹³ Karol Jonca, *Deportation of German Jews from Breslau 1941–1943 as Described in Eye-witness Testimonies*, „Yad Vashem Studies”, 225, 1996, pp. 275–316.

⁹⁴ *Niewolnicy w Breslau – wolni we Wrocławiu. Wspomnienia Polaków z wojennego Wrocławia*, ed. Anna Kosmulska, Wrocław 1995.

⁹⁵ Mühle, *Historia Wrocławia*, pp. 232–234.

Polish city with German past (Wrocław after 9th May 1945)

With the consent of the Soviet troops, on 9th May, the day after the end of World War II, representatives of the Polish authorities arrived in the still burning city of Wrocław. The organisation of the Polish presence started on 10th May, after Dr. Bolesław Drobner, a member of the Polish Socialist Party (PPS) and Government Plenipotentiary for the City of Wrocław arrived from Cracow. On 24th March 1945 he was appointed the president of the city by the Provisional Government of National Unity⁹⁶. He was accompanied by a staff of future employees of the City Board and the Scientific and Cultural Group with Professor Stanisław Kulczyński, who was the Rector of the Jan Kazimierz University in Lviv from 1937 to 1938. They were delegated by the Ministry of Education to organise cultural institutions and education of various degrees⁹⁷. The war losses, depending on a borough, were estimated at 30–90% and were increased by looting, devastation and arson attacks⁹⁸.

In the city they remained about 165,000 Germans and about 3,000 Poles, from the pre-war Polish community of Wrocław, as well as about 30,000 multinational forced labourers and prisoners brought to Wrocław by the Nazis for slave labour from concentration camps existing in Silesia⁹⁹. In June, there were 17,000 Poles in the city, but the number of Germans rose to 189,000, as many did not manage to escape before the Red Army closed the roads to the west¹⁰⁰. There was a shortage of food and housing for the population being removed at that time from the USSR, from the eastern voivodeships of Poland before 1939, whose transports had been coming to Wrocław since June¹⁰¹. From the USSR over 16,000 Jews, Polish citizens, who survived the war there, also arrived¹⁰². Under these circumstances, the authorities organised the “voluntary emigration” of the Germans, about 30,000 of whom

⁹⁶ Bolesław Drobner, *Zdobyliśmy polskie złote runo*, [in:] *Trudne dni (Wrocław 1945 r. we wspomnieniach pionierów)*, vol. 1, Wrocław 1960, p. 89.

⁹⁷ Wojciech Wrzesiński, *Uniwersytet Wrocławski 1945–1995*, Wrocław 1995, pp. 204–205.

⁹⁸ Elżbieta Kaszuba, *Codziennosc powojennego Wrocławia – zjawisko szabru 1945–1947*, [in:] *Studia z dziejów XX w.*, ed. Teresa Kulak, Wrocław 1997, p. 145; Marek Ordyłowski, *Życie codzienne we Wrocławiu 1945–1948*, Wrocław 1991, p. 123.

⁹⁹ Kulak, *Historia Wrocławia*, p. 335.

¹⁰⁰ See Iwan Koniew, *Walki o Wrocław*, [in:] *Wrocławska epopeja. Wspomnienia z walk o wyzwolenie Wrocławia w 1945 r.*, ed. Ryszard Majewski, Wrocław 1975, p. 17.

¹⁰¹ Józef Wołoch, *Wrocław był symbolem nowych czasów*, [in:] *Związani z miastem. Opracowanie i fragmenty wypowiedzi nadesłanych na konkurs “Czym jest dla Ciebie miasto Wrocław”*, ed. Bohdan Jałowicki, Wrocław–Warszawa–Kraków 1970, p. 225.

¹⁰² Bożena Szaynok, *Ludność żydowska na Dolnym Śląsku 1945–1950*, Wrocław 2000, p. 51.

left Wrocław by the end of 1945¹⁰³. Since February 1946, resettlement of the German population has been taken over by the signatory states to the Potsdam Agreement: 140,000 Germans left Wrocław in 1946 and 63,000 in 1947.

The situation in post-war Wrocław was determined by the fact that it was the largest city in Poland, where there was a total population exchange, which means that, apart from a small group of pre-war Polish people, all its inhabitants came from outside. This phenomenon of immigration has shaped a community of democratically-minded people, because everyone felt that they were all equally entitled newcomers in it¹⁰⁴. Statistical and demographic research from 1950 showed that in a city of 315,000 inhabitants, only 16.1% of people came from voivodeships taken by the USSR, and 73% came from internal migration, which meant that they arrived from their own choice¹⁰⁵. The pre-war Poles of Wrocław constituted 7.9% of the population and 2% of it – re-emigrants from Western and Southern European countries (mainly from Germany, France and Yugoslavia)¹⁰⁶. The domination in the city of the ‘new Wrocławers’, who arrived spontaneously, indicates that, although many were scared away by their ruins, there was social approval for taking over the ‘recovered territories’ and developing them. Undoubtedly, Wrocław was a ‘strange city’ for them¹⁰⁷ and they did not identify themselves with its cultural heritage, which they associated with the tragic experience of the recently ended war. They have therefore undertaken work to ‘domesticate the place’, by removing German office and street names as well as monuments and state symbols. This process, which was necessary for the new residents, is currently the subject of accusations that “Polonisation has brought another wave of destruction”¹⁰⁸.

The post-war political situation was not stable, and as early as in 1946, “Cold War” slogans appeared, which raised fears of territorial changes in the western territories due to an unfinished peace conference, i.e. lack of international recognition and treaty-based securing of the Polish border on the Oder and

¹⁰³ Bronisław Pasierb, *Początki przesiedlania Niemców z Dolnego Śląska (czerwiec–grudzień 1945)*, „Śląski Kwartalnik Historyczny Sobótka”, 21, 1964, 1–2, p. 253.

¹⁰⁴ See more *My, Wrocławianie. Społeczna przestrzeń miasta*, eds. Piotr Żuk, Jacek Pluta, Wrocław 2006.

¹⁰⁵ Irena Turnau, *Studia nad strukturą ludnościową polskiego Wrocławia*, Poznań 1960, p. 31.

¹⁰⁶ *Ibidem*, p. 250.

¹⁰⁷ See more Gregor Thum, *Obce miasto. Wrocław w 1945 i potem*, Wrocław 2005.

¹⁰⁸ See Philipp Ther, *Eine Stadt erfindet sich neu*, [in:] *Das polnische Breslau als europäische Metropole. Erinnerung und Geschichtspolitik aus Blickwinkel der Oral History*, eds. Philipp Ther, Tomasz Królik, Lutz Henke, Wrocław 2005, p. 11.

Lusatian Neisse. The first three years were crucial for the inhabitants of Wrocław, culminating in the organisation of the Exhibition of the Regained Territories (22 July – 1 October 1948), whose preparation was a great mobilisation of the city authorities and inhabitants. In the course of the undertaken works, the heterogeneous community of newcomers has become integrated (the fastest among the young generation) and psychological identification with the new place of residence has taken place¹⁰⁹. These sentiments of approval were broken after the end of the exhibition, due to the Stalinisation of the country and the new policy of the central authorities. The inhabitants of Wrocław were outraged by the fact that between 1949 and 1955, as a result of their decision, millions of bricks were transported to Warsaw (Warszawa), museum objects were taken away and factory equipment was dismantled and carried even to the New Steel Mill (Nowa Huta) in Cracow. Meanwhile, the city, due to a lack of investment and reconstruction, was struggling with serious housing problems and labour shortages, significant barriers to its economic and urban development¹¹⁰. The planned reconstruction did not start until October 1956, when, in the conditions of the initial political “Thaw”, the development of cultural life was taking place, which transformed the inhabitants coming from villages and small towns into a “cohesive metropolitan society” with its own collective identity¹¹¹. Various social groups, including young people from universities, became active, and theatres experienced a special era of development. In 1957, the Student Theatre “Kalambur” commenced its activity, in 1958 Henryk Tomaszewski’s Pantomime appeared, and in 1965, Jerzy Grotowski’s the Laboratory Theatre was established as well as Wratislavia Cantans, an international oratorio-cantata festival was inaugurated¹¹². The events of March 1968, which were an attack by the Communist authorities on the Jewish community, triggered an internal political crisis and protests against the policy of the PZPR (The Polish United Workers’ Party). In August, the international threat increased due to the Warsaw Pact troops entering Czechoslovakia¹¹³. Anxiety was growing in the western territories and the concerns known since 1946, reinforced in 1953 by the Berlin crisis,

¹⁰⁹ Edmund Piasecki, *Integracja ludności m. Wrocławia w świetle statystyki małżeństw i rozwodów*, Wrocław 1963, p. 5.

¹¹⁰ Stanisław Ciesielski, *Wrocław 1956*, Wrocław 1999, pp. 26–57.

¹¹¹ Irena Turnau, *Pochodzenie ludności polskiego Wrocławia*, [in:] *Ziemie zachodnie w polskiej literaturze socjologicznej. Wybór tekstów*, ed. Andrzej Kwilecki, Poznań 1970, p. 351.

¹¹² See more *Panorama kultury współczesnego Wrocławia*, ed. Bogdan Zakrzewski, Wrocław 1970.

¹¹³ *Wokół Praskiej Wiosny*, ed. Łukasz Kamiński, Warszawa 2004.

about the permanence of the border on the Oder and Lusatian Neisse rivers have returned. This should explain the importance attributed to the visit of Chancellor Willy Brandt to Poland in 1970 and the agreement of 8th December¹¹⁴.

However, a real change in relations with our western neighbour has been awaited for another 20 years, preceded by the democratic transformation in 1989 in Poland and the reunification of Germany. The Poland-Germany bilateral agreement, ratified by the Reichstag on 14th November 1991, enabled Poland to become a member of the NATO in 1999, and the European Union in 2004. For all Poles it was an international security of the border and the certainty that the provisions of the treaty finally “cancelled out all hopes for the reintegration of the eastern territories into the German state” felt in German society¹¹⁵. In order to achieve this certainty, traces of Polishness in the thousand-year-old history of the city and Silesia, confirming our “rootedness” in them, have been intensely explored over the long post-war decades. Historical policies and related propaganda were created, and marked by the “Piaśt” stigma, they played a great political role¹¹⁶. They formed in the collective memory of Poles premises integrating society around Western lands and the post-war “shift” of state territory to the Oder and Lusatian Neisse. In the atmosphere of political change since 1989, a highly affective attitude of society towards urban space and its history has manifested itself. The City Council of Wrocław identified itself with it, deciding in 1990 to restore the Imperial Coat of Arms from 1530, and during the Great Flood of July 1997, the citizens of Wrocław demonstrated a strong emotional bond with the cultural heritage of the city. They joined with great dedication in saving all its material testimonies, from the past of both the Piaśt dynasty and the Czech, Habsburg and Prussian-German rule, treating them as an integral part of the thousand-year history of Wrocław.

¹¹⁴ Thum, *Obce miasto*, pp. 420–421. Cf. Niklas Hille, *Willy Brandts Kniefall. Die politische Bedeutung, emotionale Wirkung und mediale Rezeption einer symbolischen Geste*, [in:] *Erinnerungsorte, Mythen und Stereotypen in Europa*, ed. Heidi Hein-Kircher, Jarosław Suchoples, Hans Henning Hahn, Wrocław 2008, pp. 163–179.

¹¹⁵ Andreas Kossert, *Tradycje stron rodzinnych w RFN*, [in:] *Wspólne dziedzictwo? Ze studiów nad stosunkiem do niemieckiej spuścizny kulturowej na Ziemiach Zachodnich i Północnych*, ed. Zbigniew Mazur, Poznań 2000, p. 784.

¹¹⁶ Marcin Zaremba, *Komunizm, legitymizacja, nacjonalizm. Nacjonalistyczna legitymizacja władzy komunistycznej w Polsce*, Warszawa 2001, pp. 37–38.

TERESA KULAK

POLITYCZNO-KULTUROWE DZIEJE WROCŁAWIA W PERSPEKTYWIE MINIONEGO TYSIĄCLECIA

Tematyka kulturalnej roli Wrocławia została przedstawiona na tle kilku przełomowych zmian w jego przynależności politycznej i państwowej. Do około 990 r. Wrocław należał do Czech, następnie pozostawał pod panowaniem dynastii Piastów do 1335 r. Odziedziczyli go Luksemburgowie włączając do Korony Czeskiej, którą Habsburgowie przejęli w 1526 r. Przeciwko nim Fryderyk II Hohenzollern stoczył trzy wojny o Wrocław i Śląsk, po czym wcielił je do Prus, które od 1871 r. weszły w skład Rzeszy Niemieckiej. W maju 1945 r., kiedy to zakończyła się niemiecko-sowiecka walka o Festung Breslau i klęska III Rzeszy, Wrocław odzyskał przynależność do państwa polskiego. Wcześniej jednak stracił większość mieszkańców i – w zależności od dzielnicy – od 70 do 90% swojej historycznej zabudowy.

WOJCIECH MROZOWICZ
(Institute of History, University of Wrocław)

SILESIA – THE MEETING LAND OF EASTERN AND WESTERN CIVILISATIONS. TESTIMONY OF THE *BOOK OF HENRYKÓW* AND OTHER MEDIEVAL SILESIAN SOURCES

An occasion to undertake work on the title problem was the entry of the *Book of Henryków* to the “Memory of the World Register” announced by UNESCO in the autumn of 2015. It is the only monument of Silesian writing and one of the few from the Polish collection to be included in this world register¹. As we read in the documentation accompanying the entry, the *Book of Henryków* shows “a peaceful encounter of various ethnicities, as a result of which their original form of coexistence was shaped. Counting among the oldest monuments of local writing in Central-Eastern Europe, it portrays in an exceptional way the meeting of the oral and written cultures”². It constitutes a unique testimony reflecting the process of encounter of the native Slavic civilisation with civilisation patterns brought to Silesia by settlers from the West. The result of this process was the adaptation to the Slavic lands of new models of management – legal solutions and the culture of writing developed in the West. At this point, I will try to answer the question, what is the phenomenon of the *Book of Henryków*, as a unique source depicting the meeting of the European world of East and West, which resulted not only in the aforementioned civilisational transformations, but also social and political changes. These, however, for chronological reasons, could not be presented by the *Book*

¹ See <http://www.unesco.org/new/en/communication-and-information/memory-of-the-world/register/access-by-region-and-country/pl/> (access: 15 December 2016).

² This documentation was compiled by the author of this article.

of *Henryków*. They did, however, find expression in several other historiographical works produced in Silesia in the late Middle Ages.

The *Book of Henryków* is a monastic foundation chronicle in Latin³, written at the small Cistercian monastery in Henryków, located about 60 km south of Wrocław, the capital of Silesia. The monastery was founded in the years 1222–1228 “de jure” by the Silesian prince Henry II the Pious, but the actual founder was – as the *Book of Henryków* informs in detail – the ducal notary Nicolas, who came from Lesser Poland (Małopolska)⁴. The new settlement was populated by German monks, coming from the oldest Silesian Cistercian monastery in Lubiąż. It was formed in the period of intensive transformations in Silesia, aimed at raising the civilisation condition of the region, including the development of the previously sparsely settled, forested border areas⁵. These processes were brutally interrupted in 1241 by the Mongol invasion, which caused great devastation. Prince Henry the Pious, the official founder of the monastery, died fighting them⁶. Overcoming the effects of the invasion was facilitated by an intensified location campaign, accompanied by documentation of the actions taken⁷.

³ In this work I refer to the edition of: *Liber fundationis claustris sanctae Mariae Virginis in Heinrichow czyli Księga Henrykowska*, ed. and transl. Roman Grodecki, Wrocław 1991 (hereinafter: *Księga Henrykowska*). English excerpts are given in Piotr Górecki’s translation, available in: Piotr Górecki, *A local society in transition. The Henryków Book and related documents*, Toronto 2007 (Studies and Texts, 155), pp. 91–193. The research literature on the *Book of Henryków* is very extensive, the most important studies include: Józef Matuszewski, *Najstarsze polskie zdanie prozaiczne. Zdanie henrykowskie i jego tło historyczne*, Wrocław 1981; recently Piotr Górecki, *The text and the world. The Henryków Book, its authors and their region, 1160–1310*, Oxford 2015; Aleksandra Filipek-Misiak, *W ogrodzie cnót, wad i grzechów. Problematyka cnót w wybranych średniowiecznych kronikach klasztornych na Śląsku i w Czechach*, Kraków 2016, pp. 31–38 and *passim*.

⁴ Most significant studies devoted to the Henryków Monastery: Heinrich Grüger, *Heinrichau. Geschichte eines schlesischen Zisterzienserklosters 1227–1977*, Köln–Wien 1978 (Forschungen und Quellen zur Kirchen- und Kulturgeschichte Ostdeutschlands, 16); Stanisław Kozak, Agata Tarnas-Tomczyk, Marek Wójcik, *Henryków*, [in:] *Monasticon Cisterciense Poloniae*, vol. 2: *Katalog męskich klasztorów cysterskich na ziemiach polskich i dawnej Rzeczypospolitej*, Poznań 1999, pp. 64–78.

⁵ These transformations are in particular interestingly characterised by Benedykt Zientara, *Henryk Brodaty i jego czasy*, Warszawa²1997 (German edition: *Heinrich der Bärtige und seine Zeit. Politik und Gesellschaft im mittelalterlichen Schlesien*, München 2002).

⁶ See for example Przemysław Wiszewski, *Henryk II Pobożny. Biografia polityczna*, Legnica 2011, pp. 186–205; Jerzy Maroń, *Koczownicy i rycerze. Najazd Mongołów na Polskę w 1241 roku na tle sztuki wojennej Europy XII i XIII wieku*, Wodzisław Śląski 2011.

⁷ See for example Sławomir Gawlas, *Znaczenie kolonizacji niemieckiej dla rozwoju gospodarczego Śląska*, [in:] *Korzenie środkowoeuropejskiej i górnośląskiej kultury gospodarczej*, ed. Antoni Barciak, Katowice 2003, pp. 2–46; Josef Joachim Menzel, *Die schlesischen Lokationsurkunden*

The *Book of Henryków*, which was compiled in two stages – around the turn of 1260s and 1270s and around 1310 – tells in vivid language the story of the monastery's foundation and the expansion of its property, scattered over a relatively small territory of southern Silesia. Moreover, it presents the history of particular villages and areas, enriched with copies of official documents, provided that they were of interest to the monastery, as actual or potential parts of the monastic property. Because of these documents, the *Book of Henryków* is sometimes treated as a cartulary chronicle⁸. The micro-histories presented therein, are full of interesting details, which take on an attractive anecdotal character, although, after all, it was not the attractiveness of the account that prompted the authors to cite them⁹. The narration of the *Book of Henryków* is competent, as it was the work of the former highest officials of the monastery, perfectly familiar with the details of its functioning. The author of Part I was Peter I (abbot in the years 1259–1269) and the alleged author of Part II was Peter II (abbot in the years 1303–1309)¹⁰. They emphasised the importance of the achievements of the monks of Henryków, and the author of Part II wrote that their “first and foremost fathers, brought forth into this place of holy observance, cast all of their power and knowledge, and so – having placed the spring of this monastery in a lofty poverty upon the poor [body of]

des 13. Jahrhunderts. Studien zum Urkundenwesen, zur Siedlungs-, Rechts- und Wirtschafts-geschichte einer ostdeutschen Landschaft im Mittelalter, Würzburg 1977 (Darstellungen und Quellen, 19); Richard C. Hoffmann, *Liberties, and lordship in a Late Medieval Poland. Agrarian structures and change in the Duchy of Wrocław*, Philadelphia 1989, particularly the part: *Organizing agricultural resources*). It is also worth pointing out a recently published critical review of research: Sébastien Rossignol, *Doit-on encore parler de colonisation allemande au Moyen Âge? Réflexions sur l'historiographie récente concernant l'Europe du Centre-Est aux XII^e et XIII^e siècles*, “Revue Historique”, 2016, fasc. 680, pp. 905–940.

⁸ Jörg Kastner, *Historiae fundationum monasteriorum. Frühformen monastischer Institutionsgeschichtsschreibung im Mittelalter*, München 1974 (Münchener Beiträge zur Mediävistik und Renaissance-Forschung, 18), pp. 31–36, where it also mentioned the exceptionally careful combination of chronicle and cartulary; Volker Honemann, *Klostergründungsgeschichten*, [in:] *Die deutsche Literatur des Mittelalters. Verfasserlexikon*, vol. 4, Berlin–New York 2010, pp. 1239–1247.

⁹ For more on the purpose of writing the *Book of Henryków* see, inter alia, Matuszewski, *Najstarsze polskie zdanie*, pp. 66–80; Górecki, *A local society*, pp. 13–14.

¹⁰ On the abbots see for example Grüger, *Heinrichau*, p. 284. On the authorship of the *Book of Henryków* see especially: Matuszewski, *Najstarsze polskie zdanie*, pp. 21–29; Górecki, *The text*, pp. 3–28; Górecki has pointed out (pp. 25–26) the weaknesses of the hypothesis formulated by Rościśław Żerelik, who attributes the authorship of the second part to Piotr II (Rościśław Żerelik, “... Ego minimus fratrum...”. *W kwestii autorstwa drugiej części “Księgi Henrykowskiej”*, [in:] *Dzieje, kultura artystyczna i umysłowa polskich cystersów od średniowiecza do końca XVIII wieku. Materiały trzeciego ogólnopolskiego sympozjum naukowego zorganizowanego przez Instytut Historii Uniwersytetu im. Adama Mickiewicza, Poznań 27–30 września 1993 r.*, ed. Jerzy Strzelczyk („Nasza Przeszłość”, 83, 1994), pp. 63–75.

Christ – shining with faith, firm in hope, and aflame with love, they courageously erected the workshop of Christ”. He added also that this occurred in the place they had occupied, which had previously been “quite savage and covered with many forests”. Thanks to them “the flower of the Cistercian Order” could flourish there, as “did they furrow the earth here by hoe and plowshare, and sustain themselves by eating bread [they had baked] by the sweat of their brow”¹¹.

Already years ago it was noted that the Cistercians in works written by them – which undoubtedly also applies to the *Book of Henryków* – and in their visual art, especially in miniatures in codices, produced in their scriptoriums, created their image as colonisers of undeveloped areas, distant from the centres of civilisation, where they brought new tools and technologies. However, researchers underline the discrepancy of this created ideal image of the Cistercians with the reality¹². Nevertheless, the fame that accompanied them had the effect that they met with support from local dukes interested in the intensive development of their own lands.

The *Book of Henryków* presents various aspects related to the adaptation of the Cistercians of Henryków to the new Polish social environment. It emphasises above all the importance of the obligation to care of the foundation (“cura fundationis”) over the monastery, resulting from its effective participation in the foundation process. The monks cared that the patrons of the monastery should be local dukes, and not one of the knights, as Peter I stressed several times in his argumentation. He expressed this especially in the description of the foundation of the monastery, which, although made on the initiative and with the funds of the notary of Duke Henry the Bearded, Nicholas, was attributed to the ducal family at the pious request of Nicholas. When granting his consent for the foundation, the Duke is supposed to have said that “if a cloister is built in this place, Henryków, then the

¹¹ Translation by Górecki, *A local society*, p. 147. Original text – *Book of Henryków* p. 155: “nostri patres primi et principales in hoc loco sancte religionis editui et sic huius cenobii laticem in alta paupertate super Christum pauperem iacentes, fide precludi, spe robusti, ac ignei caritate Christi fabricam [...] viriliter erexerunt. [...] Ad hunc locum, tunc satis horridum et multis nemoribus obsitum, non solum hic terram rastro sulcantes et vomere panem in sudore vultus pro nature sustentaculo comederunt”.

¹² See, for example Josef Roth, *Die Wirtschaftsgeschichte der Cistercienser*, [in:] *Die Cistercienser. Geschichte – Geist – Kunst*, Köln 1977, s. 556–557; Siegfried Epperlein, *Gründungsmythos deutscher Zisterzienserklöster westlich und östlich der Elbe im hohen Mittelalter und der Bericht des Leubuser Mönches im 14. Jahrhundert*, “Jahrbuch für Wirtschaftsgeschichte”, 8, 1967, 3, pp. 303–335; *idem*, *Zur Wirtschaftspolitik von Zisterzienserklöstern östlich und westlich der Elbe im 12. und 13. Jahrhundert*, [in:] *Historia i kultura cystersów w dawnej Polsce i ich europejskie związki*, ed. Jerzy Strzelczyk, (UAM w Poznaniu. Seria Historia, 135), Poznań 1987, pp. 25–31; Robert Bartlett, *The making of Europe. Conquest, colonization and cultural change 950–1350*, London 1993, p. 155.

authority of this cloister's foundation shall be ascribed not to Nicholas, but to me and my successors"¹³. Eventually, however, as we already know, Henry the Pious was recognised as the founder of the monastery.

The ducal patronage guaranteed the Cistercians the security of owning their properties, even if it was connected with the necessity of bearing certain costs in favour of the dukes. Their protection, for monks organising their life in a world that was new to them, was of paramount importance. Peter I warned his fellow monks never to accept the patronage of anyone outside the Piast family, even if they claimed kinship with the actual founder Nicholas: "we again and again persuade our successors that they shall not place any man over themselves by reason of any kinship, except only those who issue or may issue from the stock of the glorious duke of revered memory, Henry the Bearded"¹⁴. In the *Book of Henryków* there are several references to Nicholas and calls to pray for him as a benefactor of the monastery. Peter I admonished "that he should be prayed for. In this matter, we urge ourselves and our successors that the memory of this pious man, Nicholas, be forever solemnly celebrated on the anniversaries [of his death] and in other obsequies"¹⁵. He also called to pray for Dukes Henry the Bearded and Henry the

¹³ Translation by Górecki, [in:] *idem*, *A local society*, p. 96. Original text – *Book of Henryków*, p. 113: "si in isto loco Heinrichow claustrum constructum fuerit, eiusdem claustris foundationis auctoritas non Nycolao, sed mihi meisque posteris describatur". On the foundation itself see, inter alia, Jerzy Mularczyk, *Jeszcze o fundacji klasztoru cystersów w Henrykowie*, "Acta Universitatis Wratislaviensis", 499, (Historia, 33), 1980, pp. 181–198; Marek Cetwiński, *Bóg, szatan i człowiek w Księżce Henrykowskiej*, [in:] *Dzieje, kultura artystyczna*, pp. 77–91; Piotr Górecki, *An interpreter of law and power in a region of medieval Poland. Abbot Peter of Henryków and his Book*, [in:] *Building legitimacy. Political discourses and form of legitimacy*, eds. Isabel Alonso, Hugh Kennedy, Julio Escalona, Leiden–Boston 2004 (The Medieval Mediterranean Peoples, Economics and Cultures, 400–1500, 53), pp. 263–289; Anna Adamska, *Founding a monastery over dinner. The case of Henryków in Silesia (c. 1222–1228)*, [in:] *Medieval legal process. Physical, spoken and written performance in the Middle Ages*, eds. Marco Mostert, Paul S. Barnwell, Turnhout 2011, pp. 212–230; Przemysław Wiszewski, *Zakonnicy i dworzanie – tradycje fundacji klasztorów w średniowiecznym dziejopisarstwie śląskim (XIII–XV w.)*, [in:] *Origines mundi, gentium et civitatum*, eds. Stanisław Rosik, Przemysław Wiszewski, Wrocław 2001 (Acta Universitatis Wratislaviensis, 2339, Historia 153), pp. 179–198.

¹⁴ Translation by Górecki, *A local society*, p. 110. Original text – *Book of Henryków*, p. 123: "iterum atque iterum suademus, ut nullum hominem ratione alicuius cognationis super se trahant, nisi solos illos, qui de stirpe gloriosi ducis venerande recordationis Heinrici Barbatii processerunt vel processerint". On the care of the foundation over the monastery see especially Matuszewski, *Najstarsze polskie zdanie*, pp. 71–77; Jerzy Mularczyk, *Ze studiów nad prawem patronatu na Śląsku w wiekach średnich*, "Śląski Kwartalnik Historyczny Sobótka", 32, 1977, 2, pp. 133–148.

¹⁵ *Księga Henrykowska*, p. 115: "Ut pro eo oretur. Qua in re nobismet ipsis ac nostris posteris suademus, quatenus huius piissimi viri Nycolai in anniversariis et aliis exequiis memoria sollempniter perpetuo celebretur".

Pious, the official founders of the monastery, because “nevertheless whatever this cloister holds in its circuit, it possesses everything by the alms and the generosity of those dukes”¹⁶. It should be noted, however, that the names of the two founding dukes were entered into the monastery obituary, which was kept from the last decades of the 13th century, only in the 16th century, and the names of their successors – Bolesław II the Horned, Henry III the White, and Henryk IV Probus – were not entered at all, although they were personally known to the authors of the *Book of Henryków*¹⁷. Maybe because the book contains opinions about rather illusory character of ducal protection of the monastery, as they needed to pay “a lot” for it¹⁸.

Piast dukes, although the most important representatives of Silesian society, with whom the Cistercians had contact, were not the only ones mentioned on the pages of the *Book of Henryków*. Others, especially representatives of the local knighthood, are often mentioned as donors giving their property to the monastery. Altogether 13 such cases can be identified¹⁹. According to the local law, these properties could be claimed later by the natural heirs of the donors, which was not known in the West. Peter I meticulously compiled arguments which could be used by the Cistercians in possible disputes arising in this context. Józef Matuszewski aptly wrote that the *Book of Henryków* became for the monks an arm with which they could defend the monastery’s property against any claims by laypeople²⁰. This was one aspect of the case of the encounter between representatives of Western civilisation and local legal customs, signalled in the title of this contribution. In this case, unknown to them was a legal provision, called the right of retract (“*ius propinquitatis*”, right of repurchase), which could expose the Cistercians to the loss of properties received from the mighty for the benefit of their descendants. To

¹⁶ Translation by Górecki, *A local society*, p. 105. Original text – *Book of Henryków*, p. 121: “quicquid tamen hoc claustrum in circuitu suo continet, totum elemosina et largitate ipsorum ducum possidet”.

¹⁷ Heinrich Grüger, *Der Nekrolog des Klosters Heinrichau (ca. 1280–1550)*, III: *Die Beziehungen des Klosters zu Landesherrschaft, Adels und Hierarchie*, “Archiv für schlesische Kirchengeschichte”, 32, 1974, p. 46; see also Mularczyk, *Jeszcze o fundacji*, p. 183.

¹⁸ Marek Cetwiński, *Klasztor w oczach sąsiadów. Ze studiów nad Księgą henrykowską*, [in:] *Cystersi w społeczeństwie Europy Środkowej. Materiały z konferencji naukowej odbytej w klasztorze oo. Cystersów w Krakowie Mogile z okazji 900 rocznicy powstania Zakonu Ojców Cystersów. Poznań–Kraków–Mogila, 5–10 października 1998*, ed. Andrzej Marek Wyrwa, Józef Dobosz, Poznań 2000, pp. 696–704, here p. 700.

¹⁹ Piotr Górecki, *Ad Controversiam Reprimendam. Family groups and dispute prevention in Medieval Poland, c. 1200*, “Law and History Review”, 14, 1996, 2, pp. 213–243, where (p. 220) there is a list of all these references.

²⁰ Matuszewski, *Najstarsze polskie zdanie*, p. 77.

instruct his confrères, Peter I, who treated this law as a part of “ius” or “mos Polonicum”²¹, quoted the words of the founder of the Cistercian monastery in Kamieniec Żąbkowicki and the local provost Wincenty of Pogorzela, who undertook to explain the essence of the right of retract: “If I possess anything which my grandfather and my father have left me in possession, this is my true patrimony. If I sell this to anyone, my heirs have the power to demand it according to our law. But whatever possession the lord duke may have given to me for my service or by grace, that I [may] sell to whomever I wish, even against the will of my friends, because my heirs do not have the right to demand such a possession”²². Hence the recommendations, formulated especially by the author of the first part of the *Book of Henryków*, which arguments should be used to avoid the negative consequences of the right of retract²³. Sometimes the Cistercians had to compromise in order to guarantee the monastery a peaceful future (“for future security of the cloister”), as in the case of the agreement with the brothers Bogusza and Paweł from Brukalice, who blackmailed the monks with ceding their property “to some knight who

²¹ *Księga Henrykowska*, pp. 124, 128, 136, 150. See also Przemysław Wiszewski, *The multi-ethnic character of medieval Silesian society and its influence on the region's cohesion (12th–15th centuries)*, [in:] *The long formation of the Region Silesia (c. 1000–1526)*, ed. Przemysław Wiszewski, Wrocław 2013 (Cuius regio? Ideological and Territorial Cohesion of the Historical Region of Silesia (c. 1000–2000), 1), pp. 167–192, here 183–184.

²² Translation by: Górecki, *A local society*, pp. 125–126. Original text – *Book of Henryków*, p. 136: “[...] scire debetis, domine abbas, quod apud avos nostros et patres ex antiquo statutum est, ut si quisquam de genere Polonorum venderit quodlibet patrimonium suum, eius heredes postmodum poterunt redimere. Sed forte vos, Teuthonici, non plene intelligitis, quid sit patrimonium. Ut ergo plenarie intelligatis, vobis exponam. Si quicumque possideo, quod avus meus et pater michi in possessionem reliquerunt, hoc est meum verum patrimonium. Hoc si cuiquam vendero, heredes mei habent potestatem iure nostro requirendi. Sed quacumque possessionem mihi dominus dux pro meo servicio vel gratia donaverit, illum vendo, etiam invitis amicis meis, quicumque voluero, quia in tali possessione non habent heredes mei ius requirendi”. On the right of retract, see Zygfryd Rymaszewski, *Prawo bliźszości krewnych w polskim prawie ziemskim do końca XV w.*, Wrocław–Warszawa 1970; Juliusz Bardach, *Historia państwa i prawa Polski*, vol. 1: *Do połowy XV wieku*, Warszawa 1964, pp. 296–297; Matuszewski, *Najstarsze polskie zdanie*, pp. 66–71; Górecki, *Ad Controversiam Reprimendam*. See also *idem*, *A Historian as a Source of Law: Abbot Peter of Henryków and the Invocation of Norms in Medieval Poland, c. 1200–1270*, “Law and History Review”, 18, 2000, 3, pp. 479–523, here pp. 481–483; also Marek Cetwiński, “Śląska wieża Babel”? *Ludy, języki i kultury w Księdze henrykowskiej*, [in:] *Korzenie wielokulturowości Śląska ze szczególnym uwzględnieniem Śląska Górnego*, ed. Antoni Barciak, Katowice–Zabrze 2009, p. 20.

²³ See, for example, the arguments concerning the monaster's property in Brukalice – *Book of Henryków*, p. 153: “Hec, domini et fratres, propterea scripsimus, ut sciatis predicti Myrozłai filios, quia non sunt de stirpe Bogwali Boemi, primi possessoris de Brucaliz, nati, ad hereditatem ibi nichil habere iusticie”.

will be very onerous to your cloister”²⁴. These arguments made the *Book of Henryków* a kind of manual or legal handbook for the monks²⁵. Taken together with its other important information collected on the monastery properties, benefactors and neighbours of the monastery, as well as the rulers of the diocese of Wrocław where the monastery was located, the *Book of Henryków* became more and more valuable. Even a few centuries later, the Cistercians treated it as priceless, as evidenced by the annotation on the first page of its original manuscript: “The foundation book of the monastery of the Blessed Virgin Mary, written by the first fathers of this monastery, may it be protected with care, more than gold and topaz”²⁶.

The meetings between monks and people from the monastery surroundings recorded in the *Book of Henryków* took place when the monastery hosted local knights and offered them food. However, as Marek Cetwiński pointed out, they were not treated in the same way as, for example, high-ranking clergymen. The second author of the *Book*, described hosting Gniewko Woda of Raczyce in the monastery. Representatives of his family “were Poles, and held office in the prince’s court – that is, they were *camerarii* – and they frequently distressed the poor by their evil deeds”. The Cistercians intended to acquire from them the property in Raczyce, so the question was raised in the old kitchen of the monastery. He was invited to the table, where – as the *Book of Henryków* describes it with some contempt – he devoured the food served to him. There he was taken by a sudden death: “one day he came here to the cloister, and, as he was sitting at the table in the old kitchen and eating, was seized by a sudden death”²⁷. Analysing this thread, M. Cetwiński wondered

²⁴ Translation by Górecki, *A local society*, p. 141. Original text – *Book of Henryków*, p. 148: “vel vos ematis nostram sortem, vel nos dabimus alicui militi, qui claustrum vestro erit valde onerosus, [...] tandem dominus abbas pro securitate claustrum futura prebuit eis commutationem”.

²⁵ Among others Górecki, *The text*, p. 29–54 (particularly the chapter titled *The past as a legal resource*). See also note 22.

²⁶ Manuscript of the Archdiocesan Archive in Wrocław, ref. V 7, note from the 16th century: “Liber fundationis monasterii Beatae Mariae Virginis in Henrichau, conscriptus a primis Patribus eiusdem monasterii [...] super aurum et topazion [Ps 118, 127] diligenter asservandus”. See also Wojciech Mrozowicz, *Księga Henrykowska. “Cenniejsza niż złoto, niż złoto najczystsze”, [in:] Historia magistra vitae. Dolnośląskie dziedzictwo religii i kultury. Wykłady z lat 2014/2014 i 2014/2015*, ed. Michał Piela, Wrocław 2015 (Silesia Sacra, 3), pp. 126–140.

²⁷ Translation of source citations: Górecki, *A local society*, p. 173; original excerpts – *Księga Henrykowska*, p. 176: “Erant autem Poloni et habebant officium in curia principis, quod erant camerarii et suis calumpniis pauperes crebrius molestabant”; “postea quadam die veniens huc ad claustrum, cum in antiqua coquina sederet ad mensam et comederet, subita morte preventus est”. On this issue, see Marek Cetwiński, *Śmierć w starej kuchni. Parabola Księgi Henrykowskiej o pożytkach z gościnności*, “Nasza Przeszłość”, 96, 2001, pp. 209–216; *idem*, *Klasztor w oczach sąsiadów*, p. 702.

why this death, similarly to sudden deaths of other proprietors of Raczyce, did not arouse any suspicion in the author of the *Book of Henryków*, but this one preferred to perceive them as consequences of God's anger²⁸.

Another interesting episode from the history of contacts of the monastic world with the environment outside the monastery, described in the *Book of Henryków*, is related to the peasant Kwiecik, called Kika (Limp) because of his disability. The Cistercians fed him for many years before and after the Mongol invasion, "because he was extremely poor in body and in things, and was, as was said, very old". This passage is generally interpreted as information about the monastery's charitable work for the local population. However, in this case there is also a pragmatic aspect. For, thanks to his advanced age, Kwiecik remembered and recounted news of interest to the Cistercians: "because this peasant quite often ate bread here after the cloister's foundation, before and after the pagans, he narrated to us all the antiquities of the inheritances [situated] around the territory of the cloister". The Cistercians used them to acquire the wood called Bukowina and the Głębowice "źreb"²⁹ for their monastic possessions. Kwiecik died around 1245, and Peter I, appreciating the importance of the information he had passed on, called for prayers in his intention³⁰. In this context, however, it should be immediately pointed out that the Cistercians also had disputes concerning German colonists living in the immediate vicinity of the monastery. Such a dispute arose, for example, between the monks and the knight Michał Daleborowic, who allegedly maliciously settled Germans ("Theutonici") on his property bordering the monastery. The cause of the controversy was the dancing of women and girls in the monastery garden, where they ventured on festive days. Concerned about this, the abbot of the time, Bodo, who made no secret of his

²⁸ Cetwiński, *Śmierć*, pp. 214–215.

²⁹ In the early Middle Ages, buildings and land forming part of a single farm (translator's note).

³⁰ Translation of source citations: Górecki, *A local society*, p. 124; original excerpts – *Book of Henryków*, p. 134: "quia corpore et rebus erat nimis miserimus et valde, ut dictum est, antiquus [...]. Hic idem rusticus, quia post foundationem claustrum ante paganos et post paganos quasi frequenter hic panem comedebat, narravit nobis omnes antiquitates hereditatum circa huius claustrum territorium". On Kwiecik and his importance to the monastery of Henryków see, for example: Matuszewski, *Najstarsze polskie zdanie*, pp. 113–117; *idem*, "Per eum" czy "ab eo"? *Relacja "Księgi henrykowskiej" o Głębowicach źródłem do XIII-wiecznych stosunków społecznych*, "Śląski Kwartalnik Historyczny Sobótka", 44, 1989, 2, pp. 185–210; Benedykt Zientara, *Konflikty narodowościowe na pograniczu niemiecko-słowiańskim w XIII–XIV w. i ich zasięg społeczny*, "Przegląd Historyczny", 59, 1968, 2, p. 210; Cetwiński, *Klasztor*, p. 702; Grzegorz Myśliwski, "Pamiętnicy". *Ludzie sędziwi jako źródła wiedzy o przeszłości na ziemiach polskich (do końca XVI w.)*, [in:] *Europa barbarica, Europa christiana. Studia mediaevalia Carolo Modzelewski dedicata*, ed. Roman Michałowski *et al.*, Warszawa 2008, pp. 113–126, here p. 119; Górecki, *The text*, pp. 154–156.

worries about the disturbance of the monastery's peace, is said to have said: "If over a long passage of time this dancing ripens into a habit here, that will lead to a most dangerous loss of many souls in this cloister". The problem was solved in 1254 by an equivalent exchange of property, as a result of which the monastery acquired Michael's neighbouring property. He was satisfied with getting the Cistercian property in Nikłowice, while the mentioned colonists were redeemed by the monastery and probably moved to a new place³¹.

The narrative of the *Book of Henryków* allows us to observe some of the settlement transformations taking place in the monastery's surroundings, where German colonists appeared thanks to the monks. They established settlements according to the principles of German law, an example of which can be Budzów (after the location called "Sconenwalde", i.e. "Schönwalde") or Czerńczyce (after the location called "Vrowini Villa", "Frömsdorf")³². Under the influence of settlers the old customs and way of life in and around the monastery property were transformed, such as the replacement of the old measurements of land area ("pług" – ploughs) with those brought by German colonists ("łany" – hides)³³ and the introduction of "rent" ("census")³⁴. The result of these transformations was the dichotomous picture of the monastic domain presented by the *Book of Henryków*, excellently characterised by Piotr Górecki: "Peter and his continuator conceptualized arable land principally in terms of the 'hide', and where they noted recent an ongoing clearing of forest, and immigration – under the monks' 'authority' – of 'assarters', 'peasants', or 'people', most conspicuously Germans, or others 'settling according to German law'. Thus, overall, the property consisted of two economic zones. The paradigmatic component of its oldest portion was the 'farmstead', or

³¹ Translation: Górecki, *A local society*, p. 121; original text – *Book of Henryków*, p. 132: "Si iste coree longa posteritatis successione in consuetudinem hic senescunt, multarum erit hoc in clastro periculosissima perditio animarum". See also Adam Krawiec, *Seksualność w Polsce średnio-wiecznej*, Poznań 2000, p. 59; Marek Cetwiński, *Corizabant mulieres et puelle in pomerio nostro. "Księga henrykowska" o słabościach natury ludzkiej*, [in:] *Mundus hominis – cywilizacja, kultura, natura. Wokół interdyscyplinarności badań historycznych*, eds. Stanisław Rosik, Przemysław Wiszewski, Wrocław 2006 (Acta Universitatis Wratislaviensis, 2966, Historia, 175), pp. 221–229.

³² *Book of Henryków* p. 138–139, 162. On the issue, see, for example Piotr Górecki, *Economy, society, and lordship in medieval Poland, 1100–1250*, New York–London 1992, Chapter *The German law of rural Settlement* (on Budzów pp. 212–215).

³³ On ploughs, see *Book of Henryków*, pp. 121, 126, 127, 147; on hides, see *ibidem*, pp. 117, 122, 128, 129. On the issue, see, for example: Górecki, *The text*, pp. 133–134.

³⁴ On "census", see; *The Book of Henryków* mentions them several times, especially in the second book, see e.g. pp. 123, 165, 167–168. On them see, among others, Górecki, *Economy, passim*; *idem*, *The text*, pp. 186–189, 209–212; Matuszewski, *Najstarsze polskie zdanie*, p. 77.

‘grange’, and of the newer zone (or zones) was the tenure: a rural landholding associated with rent and tithe”³⁵.

But the *Book of Henryków* is not only a historiographical monument with significant legal themes. It is also a remarkable literary source. Its authors were well educated – they wrote good Latin and had a sound knowledge of rhetorical conventions³⁶. Under the influence of the Polish social environment of the Henryków monastery, it was unavoidable for the authors of the book to quote local or personal names. There even appeared a full Polish sentence, put into the mouth of... Boguchwał, a Bohemian. It is commonly regarded as the oldest written sentence in Polish³⁷. It is cited in almost every textbook on Polish language and literature, as well as in history textbooks. Because of this sentence, the *Book of Henryków*, although it was written on the periphery of the Polish state functioning under feudal fragmentation, becomes one of the most important monuments, standing at the beginning of the process of literalization of the Polish language. This is undoubtedly a positive result of the encounter between the world of written culture (Latin) and the Slavic world of oral culture.

There is no other Silesian work of monastic historiography which would address the issue of the meeting of the autochthonous inhabitants of Silesia with the newcomers of the period of colonisation in such a way as the *Book of Henryków*. Of course, one could wonder whether other Silesian Cistercian monasteries did not produce chronicles similar to it. The meagre source traces allow at most to formulate a hypothesis on the existence of a foundation chronicle of the monastery in Lubiąż, from which the Henryków monks originated. It was probably a lost 13th-century parchment manuscript, which was entitled *De fundatione domus Lubensis eiusque decimis, praediis, villis, privilegiis etc.* in the early 19th-century catalogue of the University Library. Unfortunately, trace of this manuscript disappeared

³⁵ Górecki, *The text*, p. 136. On the ethnic aspects of colonisation under German law (from different points of view) see, among others: Louis J. Leka i, *Germans and the medieval Cistercian abbeys in Poland*, “Cîteaux. Commentarii Cistercienses”, 28, 1977, pp. 121–132; Heinrich Grüger, *Das Volkstum der Bevölkerung in den Dörfern des Zisterzienserkloster Heinrichau im mittelschlesischen Vorgebirgslande vom 13. –15. Jahrhundert*, “Zeitschrift für Ostforschung”, 27, 1978, pp. 241–261; Józef Matuszewski, *Rzekoma germanizacja Śląska w wieku XIII*, [in:] *idem*, *Pisma wybrane*, vol. 5, Łódź 2002, pp. 311–327; Cetwiński, “*Śląska wieża Babel*”?, pp. 13–22.

³⁶ See, for example Matuszewski, *Najstarsze polskie zdanie*, p. 30.

³⁷ See, for example Stanisław Rospond, *Dzieje polszczyzny śląskiej*, Katowice 1959, pp. 79–87; Teresa Michałowska, *Średniowiecze*, Warszawa 1995 (Wielka Historia Literatury Polskiej), pp. 266–268; *eadem*, *Literatura polskiego średniowiecza. Leksykon*, Warszawa 2011, pp. 890–891 (entry *Zdanie henrykowskie*, there further literature), also p. 465 (entry *Księga henrykowska*).

after it was transferred to the Provincial Archive in Wrocław in 1826³⁸. However, other historiographical works of Lubiąż origin have survived, including the renowned *Versus Lubenses*³⁹.

This anonymous, small-sized Latin work, consisting of only 49 (47) verses and probably written in the 1370s, significantly contributed to the creation of a stereotype of the backwardness of the inhabitants of Silesian (and Polish) lands in the period before the arrival of the Cistercians (and German colonists)⁴⁰. This stereotype affected the historiography of the 19th and 20th century. In a reader-friendly form of a hexameter poem *Versus Lubenses* relates the beginnings of the Cistercian monastery in Lubiąż. This subject matter allows us to treat it, as in the case of the *Book of Henryków*, as a *historia foundationis monasterii*⁴¹. A characteristic feature of this genre of monastic historiography is its limited source value, as it is dominated by legendary thread⁴². If in the analysis of *Versus Lubenses* one takes

³⁸ The manuscript bore the reference number IV Q 184a. The only mention of it can be found in the catalogue of Johann Christoph Friedrich, see manuscript of the University Library in Wrocław, Ref. Akc. 1967/1, vol. 2, fol. 140r: “Code quite old, written by one hand on parchment sheets” (“Codex satis antiquus ab una manu in membranis scriptus”). See Konstanty K. Jażdżewski, *Lubiąż. Losy i kultura umysłowa śląskiego opactwa cystersów (1163–1642)*, Wrocław 1992 (Acta Universitatis Wratislaviensis, 1081), p. 95; Wojciech Mrozowicz, *Średniowieczne śląskie dziejopisarstwo klasztorne*, [in:] *Tysiącletnie dziedzictwo kulturowe diecezji wrocławskiej*, ed. Antoni Barciał, Katowice 2000, pp. 145–146.

³⁹ [*Versus*], [in:] *Monumenta Lubensia*, ed. Wilhelm Wattenbach, Breslau 1861, pp. 6, 14–15; here I use the edition: *Versus Lubenses*, [in:] Kazimierz Liman, *Antologia poezji łacińskiej w Polsce. Średniowiecze*, Poznań 2004, pp. 330–333 (text with Polish translation), 393–394 (commentary).

⁴⁰ On this work see, among others, Jażdżewski, *Lubiąż*, pp. 25, 111–115, 160; Epperlein, *Gründungsmythos*, pp. 303–335; Elżbieta Wilamowska, *Kronika polsko-śląska. Zabytek pochodzenia lubiąskiego*, “Studia Źródłoznawcze”, 25, 1980, p. 81; Bartlett, *The making of Europe*, pp. 154–155; Mrozowicz, *Średniowieczne śląskie dziejopisarstwo*, pp. 146–147; *idem*, *Versus Lubenses*, [in:] *The Encyclopedia of the Medieval Chronicle*, ed. Graeme Dunphy, Leiden–Boston 2010, pp. 1476–1477; Wiszewski, *Zakonnicy i dworzenie*, p. 186–187, 192–193; Marek Cetwiński, *Juliusz Cezar w Lubiążu: wokół pewnej wizji dziejopisarstwa śląskiego*, [in:] *idem*, *Metamorfozy śląskie. Studia źródłoznawcze i historiograficzne*, Częstochowa 2002, pp. 187–194; Waldemar P. Königshaus, *Die Zisterzienserabtei Leubus in Schlesien von ihrer Gründung bis zum Ende des 15. Jahrhunderts*, (Deutsches Historisches Institut Warschau. Quellen und Studien, 15), Wiesbaden 2004, inter alia pp. 11, 15–16, 27–28; Andrzej Pleszczyński, Joanna Sobiesiak, Karol Szegiec, Michał Tomaszek, Przemysław Tyszka, *Historia communitatem facit. Struktura narracji tworzących tożsamości grupowe w średniowieczu*, Wrocław 2016, pp. 41–64 (here other works are mentioned).

⁴¹ Cf. Kastner, *Historiae foundationum*, pp. 90–94; Honemann, *Klostergründungsgeschichten*, col. 1239: “Der Wert der ‚K[lostergründungsgeschichte]‘ als historische Quelle ist meist gering, legendäre Züge herrschen besonders bei der Darstellung des Gründungsvorgangs und der Genealogie des Stiftergeschlechtes vor”.

⁴² Honemann, *Klostergründungsgeschichten*, pp. 1239–1247.

into account this situation, it will not be surprising that factual errors, sometimes even literary fiction (such as, for example, including in the prehistory of Lubiąż the figure of Julius Caesar, the invented abbot Ticelin, the unbelievable dating of the monastery foundation in 1031 instead of 1075, illogical attribution of the fact of destruction of pagan idols to the Cistercians and not to the Benedictines), with information difficult to verify (e.g. foundation of the first abbey in Lubiąż by the Benedictines, foundation of St. Jacob's chapel, primitivism of Silesian society and economy before the arrival of the Cistercians), but also with reliable historical information. Moreover, again as in the *Book of Henryków*, one should take into account the propaganda aspect of the work⁴³, for the sake of which the principle of polarity was used, i.e. contrasting the primitive state of Silesia before the arrival of the Cistercians and the order and prosperity achieved by them⁴⁴. Therefore, it is not surprising, that the phrase concluding *Versus Lubenses* emphasizes the Cistercians' own achievements: it was their first representatives who transformed the entire (Silesian) land, and everything they have now or wanted before was gained thanks to their toil and sweat⁴⁵.

However, regardless of the clearly signalled in *Versus Lubenses* superiority towards the Polish people ("gens Poloniae"), who were supposed to be poor, lazy, using primitive farming techniques, unfamiliar with the achievements of civilisation, etc., we will not find in the work any traces of confrontation between the newcomers and the native population of Silesia, which at the time of the work's creation was more and more saturated with German elements. An open German-Polish confrontation on national grounds, limited only to the world of monks, was to occur in the Lubiąż monastery nearly a century later, in 1462, as the entry in the *Lubiąż Annals II* was most often interpreted: "In the year of our Lord 1462, on the day of St. Apollonia the Virgin, a great dispute took place in the monastery of Lubiąż between Polish and German monks"⁴⁶. A detailed analysis of the internal

⁴³ See above, p. 3, and the literature cited in note 9.

⁴⁴ Bartlett, *The making of Europe*, p. 154; Pleszczyński, Sobiesiak, Szejgiec, Tomaszek, Tyszka, *Historia communitatem facit*, p. 64.

⁴⁵ *Versus Lubenses*, p. 332: "Est tamen haec terra per eos his tota referta, [...] / Nunquam credamus haec quod per nos habeamus, / Vel sint optata per eos sic elaborata".

⁴⁶ *Annales Lubenses*, [in:] *Monumenta Lubensia*, p. 23: "Anno Domini 1462, in die Apollonie virginis [9 II 1462], facta est contencio magna in monasterio Lubensi inter Polonos monachos et Almanos". This controversy was seen as a national conflict by, for example, Waclaw Korta, *Średniowieczna annalistyka śląska*, Wrocław 1966, p. 279; Jażdżewski, *Lubiąż*, p. 72; Kazimierz Bobowski, *Dolnośląskie konwenty cysterskie filiacji lubiąskiej w okresie średniowiecza*, „Śląski

relations in the monastery, carried out by Waldemar Könighaus, leads, however, to a different view of this conflict. Using the information on the visitation and comparative material he demonstrated that the term “monachi Poloni” was used to describe monks coming from Silesia, who were to enter into a dispute with “monachi Almani”, i.e. Saxon and Thuringian monks coming to Lubiąż in order to restore the original Cistercian ideals of monastic life, i.e. to carry out a reform of internal life in the monastery⁴⁷. In this situation, it seems that the entry of the *Lubiąż Annals II* is not evidence of a conflict with national connotations.

And a few more concluding remarks. As a result of colonisation processes in Silesia, which started around the turn of the 12th and 13th centuries, a multicultural Silesian society was gradually created. This phenomenon is, to some extent, illustrated by Cistercian historical sources with the *Book of Henryków* at the forefront. Its testimony is sometimes biased, because it was shaped from the perspective of the Cistercians of German origin, who, however, just like other newcomers from the West, did not lack a sense of loyalty to their new homeland⁴⁸. The book allows us to observe, in a small territory, the process of getting to know each other and the formation of mutual relations between the local population and the newcomers, which took place in the 13th and early 14th centuries. It notes a number of disputes between them, but never mentions that these took the form of open confrontation. They ended in amicable settlements. Conflicts arose mainly from the unfamiliarity of the Henryków Cistercians with the local legal customs. However, one can also speak about a certain abuse of the Cistercians’ willingness to compromise by the Silesian mighty, as the monks wanted to create at all costs the best possible organised centre, in which God’s service would be inculcated to last forever, as it is repeatedly mentioned in the *Book of Henryków*. They also strove, as servants of God and therefore the privileged ones, to occupy the highest possible place among the inhabitants of Henryków and its surroundings⁴⁹.

However, there is a lack of further source information which would make it possible to trace the mutual relations of the Cistercians with the Polish surroundings

Kwartalnik Historyczny Sobótka”, 53, 1998, 3–4, p. 471; Józef Mandziuk, *Historia Kościoła katolickiego na Śląsku. Średniowiecze*, vol. 2, part 2: *Od 1417 do 1520 roku*, Warszawa 2010, p. 440.

⁴⁷ Könighaus, *Die Zisterzienserabtei Leubus*, pp. 83–84, 110. Przemysław Wiszewski did not agree with Könighaus’ position, considering that as the causes of the conflict were not indicated, it is difficult to understand the meaning of this entry, but he sees that “[t]he ethnic nature of the conflict was emphasized” in it, cf., see Wiszewski, *The multi-ethnic character*, pp. 188–189.

⁴⁸ Zientara, *Konflikty narodowościowe*, p. 210.

⁴⁹ This aspect is pointed out by Cetwiński, *Klasztor*, pp. 702–703.

in this area in later times. However, the *Versus Lubenses* of the 1370s allow us to discern a certain evolution in the attitude of the Cistercians from Lubiąż (could we say that also of those from Henryków?), who begin to look upon the local Polish population with clear superiority.

Finally, it is worth adding that the Henryków historiographical work, represented by the *Book of Henryków*, which is unique not only in Silesia and Poland, enables us to trace the transformations of local economic and social relations on a micro-scale. They proceeded under the influence of a two-way cultural exchange between the newcomers and the local population. It resulted in particular in the mutual reception of legal customs, the introduction of the culture of writing into everyday life in Silesia and the first attempts to record information in Polish by means of writing. Undoubtedly, this is an excellent testimony to the region's entry into, "mutatis mutandis", modernity.

WOJCIECH MROZOWICZ

ŚLĄSK KRAINĄ SPOTKANIA CYWILIZACJI WSCHODU I ZACHODU. ŚWIADECTWO *KSIĘGI HENRYKOWSKIEJ* I INNYCH ŚREDNIOWIECZNYCH ŹRÓDEŁ ŚLĄSKICH

Autor nawiązał do wpisu *Księgi Henrykowskiej*, jednego z najważniejszych świadectw pisanych śląskiego średniowiecza, na listę UNESCO *Pamięć świata*, dokonanego w 2015 r. W tym kontekście *Księga Henrykowska*, powstała około 1270 i 1310 r. w klasztorze cystersów w Henrykowie, jawi się jako świadectwo pokojowego spotkania osadników z zachodniej Europy, głównie z Niemiec, niosących ze sobą nowe wzorce kulturowe i metody gospodarowania, z miejscową ludnością słowiańską. Spotkanie to dokonywało się na Śląsku począwszy od przełomu XII i XIII w., z wyraźną intensyfikacją po najeździe mongolskim w 1241 r. Wynikiem spotkania były przemiany cywilizacyjne, które pociągnęły za sobą intensywny rozwój gospodarczy i kulturalny całego regionu, w tym zaprowadzenie nowych zwyczajów prawnych i upiśmiennienie oralnego wcześniej społeczeństwa. *Księga Henrykowska*, należąca do najstarszych rodzimych zabytków łacińskiej literatury historycznej, zawiera też interesujące wtrącenia w językach polskim i niemieckim, m.in. najstarsze zapisane zdanie polskie. Z innych zabytków piśmienniczych zostały wykorzystane o wiek późniejsze tzw. *Versus Lubenses*, w których te same przemiany cywilizacyjne zostały ukazane z propagandowym podkreśleniem przewagi kulturowej przybyszów z Zachodu.

JAN ZDICHYNEC
(Faculty of Arts, Charles University, Prague)

**UPPER LUSATIA AND SILESIA AT THE TURN OF
THE MIDDLE AGES AND THE EARLY MODERN ERA
IN COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVE.
SELECTED ASPECTS OF SOCIAL, CULTURAL AND
CHURCH DEVELOPMENT IN THE GIVEN PERIOD**

These two historic lands of the Crown of Bohemia, Upper Lusatia and Silesia, differed both in terms of territory and importance. Upper Lusatia was the smallest of all the Lands of the Crown. It had the size of an “average” Silesian duchy. Silesia, on the other hand, was the second-largest land of the conglomerate state, right after Bohemia. Silesia receives much attention from Polish, Czech and German historians, while Upper Lusatia remains a marginalized, lesser-known theme of the broader discourse – this corresponds with the “macro-historic” importance of these two regions. Already the humanist *Cosmography* (*Cosmographiae universalis libri VI*) by Sebastian Münster dedicates – in several, a little bit modified language versions – to Silesia and its capital, Wrocław, several pages, while it contains no mention of Upper and Lower Lusatia¹. Besides, even in the current research outside of the Central European region, some Upper Lusatian towns are mistaken for Silesian towns² – rather than caused by location, proximity or other similarities, this is due to their administrative development in 19th and 20th century, leading to the creation

¹ Compare to Jaroslav Pánek, *Morava a Slezsko v kosmografických spisech z poloviny 16. století* (*Moravia and Silesia in the cosmographies from mid-16th century*), [in:] *Ve znamení zemi Koruny české: sborník k šedesátým narozeninám prof. PhDr. Lenky Bobkové, CSc.*, eds. Luděk Březina, Jana Konvičná, Jan Zdichynec, Praha 2006, pp. 585–598.

² One example: Armin Schlechter, *Das “böhmische Abenteuer” Kurfürst Friedrichs V. von der Pfalz in der zeitgenössischen schlesischen Publizistik*, [in:] *Schlesien und der deutsche Südwesten um 1600. Späthumanismus – reformierte Konfessionalisierung – politische Formierung*, Heidelberg–Ubstadt–Weiher–Basel 2012 (Pforzheimer Gespräche zur Sozial-, Wirtschafts- und Stadtgeschichte, 5),

of oddly-named entity, the “Niederschlesischer Oberlausitzkreis” (Lower-Silesian-Upper-Lusatian district with centre in Weisswasser that existed between 1994 and 2008)³. Besides, the attention dedicated to Upper Lusatia is tinted by focus on Sorbian issues, while understanding of Silesia is burdened with the issues of so-called “Ślązacs” (Ślązacy). In second half of 20th century, research of the two areas was marked by political tendencies and tensions. Thankfully, the current generation of historians was able to give up this biased point of view⁴.

Despite significant differences, the two historic lands are often mentioned side by side. Either within the context of the extensive Czech research dedicated to the history of the Lands of the Crown of Bohemia⁵, or within the debate of historic regions and their parallels⁶ – here, I can rely partially on the ideas of Matthias Weber which I will examine later⁷ – or, finally, in the context of the research of cultural transfer. Sometimes, the discourse works with the notion of integral Silesian-Lusatian space⁸. Researchers try to grasp and evaluate the mediating role of the two regions in the transient, ethnically and religiously diverse area of contact between the Eastern regions of the Holy Roman Empire, Poland and the Crown of Bohemia. This role was indeed present in the Middle Ages, yet it gained importance

eds. Joachim Bahlcke, Albrecht Ernst, pp. 261–296, listing Görlitz among Silesian towns with printers.

³ Cf. https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Niederschlesischer_Oberlausitzkreis (access: 10 December 2016).

⁴ For a brief assessment of Silesian and Lusatian historiography, Lenka Bobková, Jan Zdichynec, *Korunní země (Slezsko a Lužice) v raném novověku*, [in:] Marie Šedivá Koldinská, Ivo Cerman et alii, *Základní problémy studia raného novověku*, Praha 2013 (České dějiny, 6), pp. 413–452, above all pp. 417–419.

⁵ See the volumes from the series *Korunní země v dějinách českého státu* (I–VII), with chief editor Lenka Bobková.

⁶ First signs already in Martin Reuther, *Die Oberlausitz als Geschichtsraum, Wesen und Eigenart*, „Blätter für deutsche Landesgeschichte“, 93, 1957, pp. 102–127.

⁷ Compare to Matthias Weber, *Strukturähnlichkeit und historische Parallelentwicklung. Aspekte der oberlausitzischen und der schlesischen Geschichte des Spätmittelalters und der Frühen Neuzeit im Vergleich*, [in:] *Die Oberlausitz im frühneuzeitlichen Mitteleuropa, Beziehungen – Strukturen – Prozesse*, ed. Joachim Bahlcke, Leipzig–Stuttgart 2007 (Quellen und Forschungen zur sächsischen Geschichte, 30), pp. 92–108.

⁸ Compare esp. Klaus Garber, *Aspekte gelehrter Kommunikation im schlesisch-lausitzischen Raum in der Frühen Neuzeit. Ein Beitrag zur Morphologie und Restitution mitteleuropäischer Überlieferungen*, [in:] *Die Oberlausitz im frühneuzeitlichen Mitteleuropa*, pp. 243–255. In relation to the history of education, see numerous essays by Martin Holý, to name just one, see *Vliv luterské reformace na rozvoj partikulárního školství ve vedlejších zemích České koruny v 16. století*, [in:] *Korunní země v dějinách českého státu IV, Náboženský život a církevní poměry v zemích Koruny české ve 14.–17. století*, eds. Lenka Bobková, Jana Konvičková, Praha 2009, pp. 535–550.

in the early Modern Era and carried on to the modern day⁹. In the very beginning, I need to stress that already Early Modern Era scholars saw the parallels and the proximity of the two regions, be it August Adolph of Haugwitz¹⁰ or Samuel Grosser¹¹, law historian Melchior Goldast¹², or topographers Martin Zeiller and Matthäus Merian¹³, although it needs to be said that their commentary was often inaccurate and full of contradictions.

In the current essay, I shall focus on the similarities and differences between the historic regions of Upper Lusatia and Lower Silesia, especially in terms of social, cultural and ecclesiastical situation. They sprung from the political and territorial situation in place, namely from the fact that they were parts of the Crown of Bohemia. Further, I shall offer possibilities for comparison and research of church history and the history of historiography. In case of Upper Lusatia, I am referring to my own primary research, while my notes on Silesia are mostly based on secondary literature; it is necessary to stress that I deal more with Lower Silesia, which was already geographically closer to the Upper Lusatia – Upper Silesia, with its

⁹ Abundant Polish and German research dedicated to Silesia aims in this direction; for the most current research topics for Early Modern Era Silesia as a historic region on the crossroads, see *The Strengthening of Silesian Regionalism (1526–1740)*, eds. Lucyna Harc, Gabriela Waś, Wrocław 2014 (Cuius regio. Ideological and Territorial Cohesion of the Historical Region of Silesia (c. 1000–2000), 2).

¹⁰ This aristocrat of the second half of 17th century takes a stand against the fact that some of his predecessors mistook Lusatias with Silesia (this was typical for the perception of Lusatia already in the Early Modern Era, see also the note nr. 2), on the other hand, he admits that both regions had much in common, be it laws, customs or language. See August Adolph Haugwitz, *Tractatus integer de Lusatia*, Biblioteka Uniwersytecka we Wrocławiu (University Library in Wrocław, from now on BUWr.), Msc. sign. Akc. 1948/617, pp. 94–95.

¹¹ Samuel Grosser, *Lausitzische Merckwürdigkeiten [...] I–V*, Leipzig und Budissin, Immanuel Tietzen, 1714.

¹² Melchioris Goldasti Heiminsfeldii, *De Bohemiae Regni, Incorporatarvmqve provinciarvm, ivribvs ac priuilegijs; necnon de hereditaria Regiae Bohemorum familiae succeßione, Commentarii, in libros VI. diuisi, & inde a prima vsqve origine ad praesentem aetatem quam diligentissime & accuratissime deducti [...]*, Francofordiae, Apud Ioannem Iacobum Porsium, 1627.

¹³ Popular topographies dedicated to the various regions of “Germania” point to linguistic and cultural similarities between Silesia and Upper and Lower Lusatia, as well as to their ethnic and denominational complexity. They mention the complicated territorial issues and shifts on their borders, the liquid character of the border and the changes in the government with transfers from the Crown of Bohemia to the Holy Roman Empire and vice versa. See Martin Zeiller, *Topographia Superioris Saxoniae, Thuringiae, Misniae, Lusatiae etc. Das ist Beschreibung der Vornemsten und Bekantesten Stätt und Plätz in Churfürstum Sachsen, Thuringen, Meissen, Ober und Nider Lausnitz und einverleibten Landen [...]*, Franckfurt, Matthäus Merian, 1650, p. 16; *idem*, *Topographia Bohemiae, Moraviae et Silesiae, das ist Beschreibung und eigentliche abbildung der vornehmsten und bekandisten Stätte und Plätze in dem Königreich Boheim und einverlebten Ländern, Mährern und Schlesien*, Franckfurt, Matthäus Merian, 1650, for Lusatia, see p. 8, for Silesia, pp. 117–123.

links to Moravia and Czech milieu is yet more specific. It is my conscious decision to view the theme from the perspective of the centre of the Crown of Bohemia, while taking into account the perspective of the Holy Roman Empire (i.e. the German nation). Thus, I try to complete or rather widen the comparison of M. Weber, which is based clearly in the German, “Reichs” perspective and omits some important points. Weber – basing more on older research than on sources – stresses above all the common political evolutions of Middle Ages, the parallels of legal structure of both regions, their “Städtelandschaft”, it means, the huge web of towns, organisation of the countryside, weaker position of peasants etc.¹⁴ He disregards – obviously under the impact of the administrative situation of the 19th century – the bindings of both regions to the Crown of Bohemia and to the Kingdom of Poland, too.

First, I shall define the status of the two lands within the conglomerate of the Crown at the turn of the Middle Ages and the Early Modern Era, focusing on the influence coming from Bohemia rather than from the Holy Roman Empire or Poland. Then, I will suggest the possibilities of research of their parallels in terms of the culture of law, the church culture, and finally, of literature, namely historiography. I would like to stress that this essay is more of a reflective draft of the various possibilities and a number of aspects will need to be further explored and evolved in detail.

Lower Silesia and Upper Lusatia within the Crown of Bohemia

The Crown of Bohemia was a complicated conglomerate of the “core of the empire”, the Kingdom of Bohemia, and the so-called secondary lands of the Bohemian Crown, a product of territorial expansion under the late Přemyslids and Luxembourgs. The empire was cemented in mid-14th century¹⁵ by Charles IV. through various decrees and laws and despite the turbulent era of the Hussite wars and the following interregnum, the conglomerate state survived, although reduced, up until the Early Modern Era¹⁶. In the 16th century, kings of Bohemia remained

¹⁴ Weber, *Strukturähnlichkeit und historische Parallelentwicklung*.

¹⁵ See Lenka Bobková, 7. 4. 1348. *Ustavení Koruny království českého. Český stát Karla IV*, Prague 2006 (Dny, které tvořily české dějiny, 12).

¹⁶ Bobková, Zdichynec, *Korunní země*; Lenka Bobková a kol., *Česká koruna na rozcestí: k dějinám Horní a Dolní Lužice a Dolního Slezska na přelomu středověku a raného novověku (1437–1526)*, Prague 2010 (Tempora et memoria, 1), here, especially Lenka Bobková, *Česká Koruna na sklonku středověku*, pp. 25–86.

the overlords of Silesian duchies, they ruled Moravia as Moravian margraves and they governed Upper and Lower Lusatia directly. Besides, they held a number of fragmented pieces of land, so-called German fiefs (“feuda extra curtem”), mostly in Vogtland, Pleissnerland, Upper Palatinate and some pawned territories, such as Egerland. These various territories were bound to the King of Bohemia by various legal ties; Silesia, Lusatia and Moravia were incorporated “permanently” into the conglomerate in the Middle Ages, embodied by the King of the Crown. However, the Early Modern Era (especially the 17th and 18th century) saw a gradual reduction of the Crown – namely loss of Lusatia in favour of Saxony in 1635 and Silesia in favour of Prussia in 1742, but also weakening of the integration tools devised by Charles IV. and other cementing tendencies.

Silesia and Lusatia share one distinct characteristics – the long and arduous process of political and territorial crystallization, with the key period being the time they belonged to the Crown of Bohemia. The region of Upper Lusatia was the most compact (it covers about 5870 sq. km), but we must bear in mind that it is much smaller than Silesia – its territory covers approx. an area of one Silesian duchy. The integrity of Lower Lusatia (approx. 9000 sq. km) suffered already in the 15th century¹⁷. Silesia was the most fragmented territory, ever since the High Middle Ages, with all of its duchies. The Silesian duchies joined the Crown one by one, based on a variety of legal claims, and that complicated the character of Silesia as a united territory. Nevertheless, the local political élite viewed the whole area as a certain “metaregion” with common identity, and the aspect of belonging to the Crown of Bohemia did play an important role in its self-perception – especially when joined with the need to demarcate the boundaries with the Polish Kingdom¹⁸.

Politically, in the Middle Ages and the Early Modern Era, Lusatia and Silesia played a marginal role within the Central Europe¹⁹. For a long time, they oscillated

¹⁷ See Lenka Bobková, Luděk Březina, Jan Zdichynec, *Horní a Dolní Lužice*, Praha 2008 (Stručná historie států).

¹⁸ See esp. texts in the thematic issue of the magazine „Śląski Kwartalnik Historyczny Sobótka”, 66, 2011, 3, as one of them, see Lenka Bobková, *Integrace Slezska do České koruny podle představ Karla IV. Úvod k diskusi o identifikaci Slezska jako regionu a jeho postavení v České koruně*, pp. 3–9; Przemysław Wiszewski, *Region wrocławski – region śląski. Podziały terytorialne a kształtowanie wspólnoty regionalnej w XI – pierwszej połowie XIII w. Esej źródłowy*, pp. 11–26; Mlada Holá, *Institucionální ukotvení moci českých králů ve slezském prostoru. K problematice prosazení úřadu vrchního slezského hejtmana ve druhé polovině 15. století*, pp. 65–72.

¹⁹ Weber, *Strukturähnlichkeit und historische Parallelentwicklung*.

between the Holy Roman Empire, the Kingdom of Bohemia and Poland. While Silesia never belonged to the Holy Roman Empire directly, this only happened through the incorporation of the Crown of Bohemia into it and even this is often a subject of doubts (despite the fact that many Silesians strove for the prestigious status culturally²⁰), Lower Lusatia became one of the Empire's marches as early as in the 10th century. Upper Lusatia, too, was considered to be a part of the Holy Empire, although there is no definite proof of its status of Holy Roman margraviate ("marca") throughout the Middle Ages. In the first third of 17th century, Swiss law historian Melchior Goldast attempted to write in support of the theory that the two territories were part of the Empire, but his work was biased, as it was ordered by the Habsburgs. On the other hand, Czech non-Catholic historian Pavel Stránský stressed the unique, independent character of the Crown of Bohemia, including the ties between its various territories²¹. In case of Silesia and Lusatia, we often hear of their unique position on the map – the territories were a crossroads of a variety of regions, namely between Central Germany and Eastern Europe²².

Ever since the German colonization of the 12th and 13th century, both territories were more or less bilingual (leaving the Jewish minority aside): while in Lower Silesia, Germans were a majority, in Upper Silesia, it was the Poles²³. In Lower Lusatia, Lusatian Sorbs had a majority up until the beginning of the 20th century, while in Upper Lusatia, the ratio of Lusatian Sorbs and Germans was pretty much balanced throughout the Early Modern Era. In all of these regions, towns were mostly inhabited by Germans, while the rural areas had a Slav majority. In Silesia and Lusatia alike, speaking German was the necessary condition of cultural growth.

²⁰ See in detail: Matthias Weber, *Das Verhältnis Schlesiens zum Alten Reich in der Frühen Neuzeit*, Köln–Weimar–Wien 1992 (Neue Forschungen zur schlesischen Geschichte, 1).

²¹ Goldast, *De Bohemiae Regni [...] Commentarii*; M. Paulus Stransky, *Respublica Bojema*, Lugdunii Batavorum, Ex officina Elzeviriana, 1634 (2nd issue, 1643). See my essay: Jan Zdichynec, *Die Böhmisches Krone als staatsrechtliches Ganzes in ausgewählten historischen Werken des 17. Jahrhunderts. Die Auffassungen von Pavel Stransky, Melchior Goldast, Bohuslav Balbin und August Adolph Haugwitz*, [in:] *Terra – Ducatus – Marchionatus – Regio. Die Bildung und Entwicklung der Regionen im Rahmen der Krone des Königreichs Böhmen. Die Kronländer in der Geschichte des böhmischen Staates VI*, eds. Lenka Bobková, Jana Fantysová-Matějková, Prag 2013, pp. 375–395.

²² See Reuther, *Oberlausitz*; for Silesia, see *The Long Formation of the Region (c. 1000-1526)*, ed. Przemysław Wiszewski, Wrocław 2013 (Cuius regio. Ideological and Territorial Cohesion of the Historical Region of Silesia (c. 1000–2000), 1); Marie Bláhová, Stanislav Rosík, Thomas Wunsch, *Radices Silesiae – Silesiacae Radices. Śląsk: kraj, ludzie, memoria a kształtowanie się społecznych więzi i tożsamości (do końca XVIII wieku) I*, Wrocław 2011.

²³ The point which is omitted by Weber, *Strukturähnlichkeit und historische Parallelentwicklung*.

It needs to be stressed, however, that most communication in the Early Modern Era was in German (Czech and Latin was used in specific circumstances), and the Slavs took little part in the “grand history” of the secondary lands of the Crown. The only exception were some duchies of Upper Silesia, namely the duchy of Teschen and Ratibor. Here, Czech was the official language of both secular and church authorities up until the end of the 18th century, despite the fact that the inhabitants of the two duchies were by no means Czechs – they formed a specific, locally typical *mélange* of Polish, German and Silesian elements.

It is interesting to note the findings from the unfinished history written by Upper Lusatian Baroque nobleman, August Adolf Haugwitz († 1706)²⁴, or the findings of the legal and historic anthology by Jacob of Salza († 1589)²⁵. Both authors mention the relations between the Lusatian and Silesian people, each supporting their claims by different reasoning. Haugwitz reacts to the fact that European authors of the time often mistook Lusatia and Silesia for one another; he labels the original inhabitants of both regions as German tribes and he stresses the fact that both regions are a part of Germania, i.e. the Holy Roman Empire, and it is necessary to perceive them differently from Poland. In direct opposition to Jacob Schickfus²⁶, he refuses the claim that Lusatians and Silesians are of a single tribe; at the same time, he points out their similarities in terms of language, dialect, customs and culture. Salza reasons that the two territories had “common laws”, as both followed Saxon law. Both authors are careful to clearly define the boundaries between Lower Silesia and Upper Lusatia. This could mean that these two were easily confused from the outside during the Early Modern Era (this confusion could be due to the administrative reforms started already by Matthias Corvinus, King of the Crown of Bohemia in late 15th century). Certain proximity of both regions in terms of language, culture, and, after all, even religion, or, better to say, the confusion and mixing of the two, was easy to track in a number of contemporaneous history books dealing with Central Europe.

Ever since the High Middle Ages, the economy of Lusatia and Silesia relied heavily on the craftsmen in towns (weavers, brewers, cloth makers) as well as on merchants. Nobles did focus on some economic activities, in Upper Lusatia

²⁴ See note 10.

²⁵ Jacob von Salza, *Bericht von des Marggrafthums Oberlausitz [...]*, manuscript from the 16th century, today in the collection of BUWr., sign. Akc. 1948/316 (originally Bibliothek der Oberlausitzischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften, sign. L I/71).

²⁶ Jakob Schickfus, *New vermehrete schlesische Chronica*, Jena 1625.

mostly on fish farming. In Upper Lusatia, the network of towns was quite developed – economically, royal towns assumed the leading role, namely the towns of the Lusatian League (“Hexapolis”, “Sechsstädte”), i.e. Görlitz, Zittau, Bautzen, Lauban (now Lubań), Kamenz and Löbau. Later, small towns and large villages active in the textile proto-industry took part in the economic boom of the area²⁷.

Until today, the most important centre of Lower Silesia is Wrocław, one of the largest and richest towns in the Central-Eastern Europe in the Early Modern Era. Wrocław was an important trade centre, occupying a prominent spot on the “Via Regia” (“Hohe Strasse”), running from Erfurt and Leipzig to Kraków and further East²⁸. In Upper Silesia, on the other hand, towns begun developing much later, during the industrialization of the 19th century.

Both Upper Lusatia and Silesia had numerous nobility, but their economic and political powers were limited, with the exception of the estate demesnes in both regions – Hoyerswerda and Muskau in Upper Lusatia and Groß Wartenberg (Syców) and Trachenberg (Żmigród) in Silesia²⁹. In both lands, the Early Modern Era saw greater participation of the estates in government. This was due to the distance from the ruler and despite centralizing and absolutist efforts of the Habsburgs. Silesia maintained a certain legal autonomy and administration up until the beginning of the Prussian rule in mid-18th century (a bit longer in case of Austrian Silesia)³⁰, and in case of Lusatia, this survived up until the 19th century³¹.

²⁷ Cf. Erhard Hartstock, *Wirtschaftsgeschichte der Oberlausitz, 1547–1945*, Bautzen 2007.

²⁸ Cf. Grzegorz Myśliwski, *Wrocław w przestrzeni gospodarczej Europy (XIII–XV wiek). Centrum czy peryferie?*, Wrocław 2009 (Monografie FNP. Seria humanistyczna). For most recent notes on the so-called “Via Regia”, see the catalogue Roland Enke, Bettina Probst, *Via regia – 800 Jahre Bewegung und Begegnung. Katalog zur 3. sächsischen Landesausstellung, Görlitz–Dresden 2011* and the collection of essays by Winfried Müller, Swen Steinberg, *Menschen unterwegs. Die via regia und ihre Akteure. Essays zur 3. sächsischen Landesausstellung, Görlitz–Dresden 2011*.

²⁹ For nobility in Silesia in the comparative perspective, see Jan Harasimowicz, Matthias Weber, *Adel in Schlesien I: Herrschaft – Kultur – Selbstdarstellung*, München 2010 (Schriften des Bundesinstituts für Kultur und Geschichte der Deutschen im östlichen Europa, 36); for Upper Lusatia, see most recent notes (focused on later Early Modern Era period) by Lars Arne Dannenberg, Kai Wenzel, *Zwischen mächtigen Fürsten – Der Adel der Oberlausitz in vergleichender Perspektive (16.–19. Jahrhundert)*, Neues Lausitzisches Magazin, Beiheft 15, Görlitz–Zittau 2016. The works of Hermann Knothe, *Geschichte des Oberlausitzer Adels und seiner Güter vom XIII. bis gegen Ende des XVI. Jahrhunderts*, Leipzig 1879; *idem, Fortsetzung der Geschichte des Oberlausitzer Adels und seiner Güter von Mitte des 16. Jahrhunderts bis 1620*, Görlitz 1888, still have core value for us.

³⁰ See Harc, Wąs, *The Strengthening of Silesian Regionalism*.

³¹ Karlheinz Blaschke, *Beiträge zur Geschichte Oberlausitz. Gesammelte Aufsätze*, Görlitz–Zittau 2000, Neues Lausitzisches Magazin, Beiheft 1, especially *Das Markgraftum Oberlausitz – Eine Ständerepublik im sächsischen Staatsverband*, pp. 108–113.

We need to point out that even though both areas survived the Hussite wars loyal to the Catholic church and the King Sigismund of Luxembourg, and this was one of the causes of the weakening of links to the Kingdom of Bohemia, on the other hand, they were quick to accept protestant reformation, namely in the Martin Luther's, Wittenbergian approach to it. Both lands maintained strong, economically and legally well-established Catholic institutions, mostly monasteries (often Cistercian, such as St. Marienstern, St. Marienthal in Upper Lusatia, Trzebnica, Lubiąż, Henryków in Lower Silesia, but also collegiate chapters (Bautzen, Wrocław), and, of course, the Wrocław episcopate. Roman Catholics enjoyed direct support from the King of Bohemia and this permitted the long-term coexistence of various denominations. Up until 1609, when Rudolf's Letter of Majesty was issued for Silesia granting religious freedom to non-Catholic denominations, and until 1611, when Upper Lusatia received its religious "assecuracion" ("assurance"), this state of affairs wasn't supported by law. Despite the protestant majority, catholic administration was, in many aspects (such as the ordaining of clergy, issues of theology, marital affairs, patronage rights etc.) superior to the protestant one. At the same time, the distance from the Habsburg central power and the strong authority of estates in the area resulted in the intermingling of the reformative processes both from the top and from the bottom. This way, we can see the effects of "Prince" reformation ("Fürstenreformation") especially in Silesian duchies, alongside the "council" reformation ("Ratsreformation") in Wrocław. To an extent, in Upper Lusatia, council reformation joined forces with reformation "from the bottom up", mostly spread by lower burgher strata and by parish clergy, who were active in Silesia, too.

The principles of Peace of Augsburg ("cuius regio, eius religio") didn't have much effect, neither in Silesia nor in Upper and Lower Lusatia. This was indeed due to the complicated administrative and social situation of the local estates as well as it was a result of the state of affairs in the Kingdom of Bohemia, where non-Catholic organisations and structures had little chance to develop (too weak and too late). Both Lusatian and Silesian reformation is often perceived as "late" and "slow" reformation, as well as rather traditional – this is best illustrated in the momentum of catholic elements in liturgy, but also in the adoption of medieval Catholic art³². Again, this

³² See Kai Wenzel, Marius Winzeler, *Kunst und Architektur in der Oberlausitz 1526 bis 1635*, [in:] *Welt – Macht – Geist. Das Haus Habsburg und die Oberlausitz 1526–1635*, eds. Joachim Bahleke, Volker Dudeck, Görlitz–Zittau 2002, pp. 129–152; in comparison with Silesia Jan Harasimowicz, *Schwärmergeist und Freiheitsdenken. Beiträge zur Kunst- und Kulturgeschichte Schlesiens in der Frühen Neuzeit*, Köln–Weimar–Wien 2010 (Neue Forschungen zur Schlesienschen

may have been the influence of the King of Bohemia, but just as likely, it may be the effect of practical, rather than theological interests of local reformers. On the other hand, the complicated structure of both regions meant that this was the space for rather free expression of various non-conformists³³. Apart from the traditional members of Roman Catholic and Luther churches, Anabaptists, Schwenckfeldians and Arians lived in Silesia³⁴, while Reformists, Melancthonians or later Moravian Brothers lived in Upper Lusatia in numbers unthinkable, for example, in the neighbouring Saxony or Brandenburg, and from 1627 onwards, even in Bohemia and Moravia.

Micro-historic comparative probes – themes for research

We could explore the ties of the two regions to the Crown of Bohemia in the Early Modern Era with a variety of tools. Obvious approach explores the administrative level, or, more precisely, the legal provisions and laws: in this area, a lot of material was not explored yet. While the Silesian funds of Habsburg central offices did not keep well (I am referring to the loss of the Silesian fund during the Second World War)³⁵, they can be replaced by the Lusatian papers or the royal registries (“Königliche Registra”, i.e. books of copies of documents, containing the correspondence sent by the Habsburgs), or by the Court Chamber of Bohemia (it mostly deals with economic and fiscal affairs, but also with town and monastery matters). Together with the Court Office of Bohemia (administration of the secondary lands of the Crown)³⁶, they provide us with a good look into the systematic political

Geschichte, 21). In details for the example of town of Zittau Petr Hrachovec, *Die Zittauer Fastentücher im Licht der Rechnungen der Zittauer Pfarrkirche und Frauenkirche (um 1470–1570)*, [in:] *Die Zittauer Fastentücher*, Görlitz 2009, pp. 24–26; *idem*, *Maria honoranda, non adoranda: studie k poznání role obrazů a umělecké výzdoby v luteránském kostele éry konfesionalizace*, [in:] Kateřina Horníčková, Martin Šroněk, *In puncto religionis: konfesní dimenze předbělohorské kultury Čech a Moravy*, Praha 2013, pp. 233–251.

³³ See Gabriela Wąs, *Kaspar von Schwenckfeld, mysl i działalność do 1534 roku*, Wrocław 2005 (*Acta Universitatis Wratislaviensis*, 169); Radek Fukała, *Reformace ve Slezsku a na Opavsku*, Opava 2010 (*Acta historica Universitatis Silesianae Opaviensis. Supplementa*, 6).

³⁴ Good synopsis by Wąs, *Kaspar von Schwenckfeld*.

³⁵ Originally deposited in Prague and later in Vienna.

³⁶ All these funds (Královská registra, RG; Lužické spisy, LŽ; České oddělení dvorské komory, ČDKM) are kept in the National Archive in Prague (Národní archiv v Praze) and they have more-or-less detailed inventories. For now, however, they were always seen from partial points of view, such as this author’s perspective of monasterial politics of the Habsburgs. At the same time, research within the grant project *Royal Upper Lusatia* is going on, focusing on the royal authority in this land of the Crown at the turn of the Middle Ages and the Early Modern Era in a broader, more consistent way.

strategy the Habsburgs employed in the Early Modern Era from Vienna, obviously through a mid-point in Prague. Even Habsburgs perceived Prague as the centre of the Crown of Bohemia.

It would be beneficial to track the parallels of legal provisions in each of the lands of the Crown, especially the parallels in the “Landrecht”, as we did with L. Bobková, using the example of the “Landrecht” (“*Ordinatio provincialis*”, “*Landesordnung*”) for Upper Lusatia³⁷. We can indeed expect links between the “Landrecht” within the Crown of Bohemia³⁸; unfortunately, research here is complicated by the fact that the books of law vary greatly and it is rare to find laws of comparable character and content – we are dealing with a typical pre-Modern law system, focused on ad-hoc issues³⁹. In the next stage of research, we could compare the royal privileges, letters with instructions for the King’s representatives – land governors⁴⁰. Furthermore, we could look into the land assembly structures of the two regions⁴¹. Here, we would run into trouble owing to the two-layer structure of Silesia with the conglomerate of its duchies. In the Early Modern Era, Silesia was further from direct royal influence than Upper Lusatia, governed directly by the King. It appears that while the Silesian Early Modern Era legal ways are complicated and little explored yet, Habsburgs and Czech influence in general should not be underestimated. This is documented in analyses by Matthias Weber and lately also by Waclaw Gojniczek. They focus on civil servants and on the assembly culture in Upper Silesia⁴². Other points of interest are the integrating role of the Prague Appeal Court established in 1548⁴³, as well as the economic ties and the comparison of taxes in

³⁷ Lenka Bobková, Jan Zdichynec, *Kodifikace zemského práva pro Horní Lužici v 16. až 18. století*, [in:] *Vývoj české ústavnosti v letech 1618 až 1918*, eds. Karel Malý, Ladislav Soukup, Praha 2006, pp. 112–134.

³⁸ *Vladislavské zřízení zemské a počátky ústavního zřízení v českých zemích (1500–1619)*, eds. Karel Malý, Jaroslav Pánek, Prague 2001.

³⁹ For Silesia, see Matthias Weber, *Die schlesischen Polizei- und Landesordnungen der Frühen Neuzeit*, Köln–Weimar–Wien 1996 (Neue Forschungen zur Schlesischen Geschichte, 5).

⁴⁰ Mostly for comparison with the medieval era, see Lenka Bobková, Martin Čapský, Irena Korbelářová et alii, *Hejtmanská správa ve vedlejších zemích Koruny české*, Opava 2009 (Acta historica Universitatis Silesianae Opaviensis. Supplementa, 7).

⁴¹ Cf. Józef Leszczyński, *Stany Górnych Łużyc w latach 1635–1697*, Wrocław 1963 (Prace Wrocławskiego Towarzystwa Naukowego, Seria A, 95).

⁴² Waclaw Gojniczek, *Urzędy książęce i ziemskie w ustroju księstwa cieszyńskiego (1477–1653)*, Katowice 2014.

⁴³ Václav Zdeněk, *Dějiny královského appellačního soudu na hradě Pražském, nyní Vrchního soudu v Praze, od roku 1548–1933*, Prague 1933. More recently Klára Woitschová, *Personální obsazení pražského apelačního soudu v letech 1548–1783*. “...což slušného a spravedlivého jest fedrovati...”, Pelhřimov 2010.

each of the lands of the Crown of Bohemia. At least for the period of the beginning of Ferdinand I. rule, these were explored by Josef Janáček⁴⁴.

We may focus on the ties between the aristocracy and the towns; I must mention the current research of my doctorate student Jan Bouček, who focuses on Christoph Wenzel von Nostitz (1643–1712). Nostitz served at the Habsburg court in Bohemia, but, most importantly, he was the land governor of Silesian duchies (he served longest in the Świdnica-Jawor duchy). Bouček explores family and personal strategies, as well as the iconography in Nostitz residences, namely in Lobris and Rokytnice nad Jizerou. They speak clearly of this particular aristocrat's connections with Silesia as well as about the Czech and Habsburg context.

Similarly, we can look at the links between church institutions. For example, Cistercian residences in Silesia weren't part of the Bohemia-Lusatian-Moravian vicarage, yet they were very close and at least Grüssau (Krzeszów) displays strong influence of Czech Baroque⁴⁵. I can point out my numerous essays dedicated to the female Cistercian monasteries in Upper Lusatia, that were, especially in the Baroque era, the key link between Bohemia, Upper Lusatia and Lower Silesia – in terms of social and geographic roots of the nuns and their spiritual superiors, provosts and chaplains as well as in terms of their social and cultural contacts⁴⁶. Jesuits and Capuchins of all the Lands of the Crown maintained strong bonds, too, mentioning just the most important Catholic orders of the post-Trident era. From the older religious orders, we must mention the Knights of the Cross with the Red Star (the House of St. Matthew in Wrocław) and the Premonstratensians. The female Benedictines from Liebenthal in Silesia maintained links with the female Cistercians in Upper Lusatian St. Marienthal, and the Magdalenite sisters from Upper Lusatian

⁴⁴ Josef Janáček, *České dějiny*, I, 1–2: *Doba předbělohorská 1526–1547*, Praha 1968, 1971, 1984.

⁴⁵ Henryk Dziurla, Kazimierz Bobowski, *Krzeszów. Uświęcony laską*, Wrocław 1997.

⁴⁶ *Sie hat ein üble stimm, und keine rechte luft. Zur Personengeschichte der Frauenklöster im böhmisch-mährischen-lausitzischen Zisterzienservikariat in der frühen Neuzeit*, [in:] *Leben und Alltag in böhmisch-mährischen und niederösterreichischen Klöstern in Spätmittelalter und Neuzeit. Referate der gleichnamigen Tagung in Brno vom 28. bis 29. Oktober 2008*, eds. Heidemarie Specht, Tomáš Černušák, St. Pölten–Brno 2011 (*Monastica Historia*, 1), pp. 298–321; *Kláster na trojmezí ve druhé polovině 18. století: Abatyše Anastasia Rösler; její korespondence a další prameny k jejímu působení v čele kláštera Marienthal (1764–1784) = Ein Kloster im Dreiländereck in der zweiten Hälfte des 18. Jahrhunderts: Die Äbtissin Anastasia Rösler; ihre Korrespondenz und weitere Quellen zu ihrem Wirken an der Spitze der Abtei St. Marienthal (1764–1784)*, [in:] *Philipp Leubner (1733–1803). Pozdní baroko na Lužické Nise = Philipp Leubner (1733–1803), Spätbarock an der Lausitzer Neisse*, eds. Zuzana Štěpanovičová, Marius Winzeler, Liberec–Zittau 2015, pp. 162–195.

Lauban, Silesian Naumburg and Šprotawa were close bound together (origins of sisters, legal boundings).

For older period, Bogusław Czechowicz⁴⁷ has repeatedly pointed to many interesting parallels and ties between royal, noble, church and burgher mercenary activities. Jan Harasimowicz pointed to the links between Lusatian and Silesian Lutheran art. It would be worth it to delve deeper into the parallels of the solutions to the clashes between the Catholic and Protestant reformation, as we hinted in the possible solutions in terms of administration and church organization, or, in particular, shown by some Wrocław bishops and Bautzen deans – Catholic church administrators. Here, one would like to see a comparison between Jan Leisentrit († 1586) and Martin Gerstman († 1585). On one hand, these clergymen introduced their parishioners to the postulates of the Trident council, on the other, however, they had to adapt to the presence of followers of different denominations – in Silesia and Upper Lusatia, this was nothing new. Their approach needs to be confronted with the influence of Prague Archbishopry, namely of Antonín Brus of Mohelnice, as the Lusatian and Silesian Catholic clergymen were in close contact with him. At the same time, they maintained contacts with the Bishopry of Olomouc (Stanislav Pavlovský, František of Ditrichštejn) which was very important for the later re-Catholicisation of Silesia.

It would be useful to look into the parallels of selected works of Upper Lusatian and Silesian historiography. We may focus on the works of Silesian historian Joachim Curaeus and of Upper Lusatian historian Christophorus Manlius. Both of these humanists worked at approximately the same time, in the second half of the 16th century, they were rooted in German and Lutheran discourse, yet they were influenced by the fact that their lands belonged to the Crown of Bohemia. We should analyse the important works of the 17th century, first of all the patriotic works by Pavel Stránský of Zápská Stránka, the legal-historic analyses by Melchior Goldast, or the historic works of Bohuslav Balbín. Their works function as counter-points, trying to describe the Crown of Bohemia and its parts from macro-perspective.

⁴⁷ Cf. Bogusław Czechowicz, *Dvě centra v Koruně. Čechy a Slezsko na cestách integrace a rozkolu v kontextu ideologie, politiky a umění (1348–1458)*, České Budějovice 2011; *idem*, *Książęcy mecenat artystyczny na Śląsku u schyłku średniowiecza*, Warszawa 2005; *idem*, *Między katedrą a ratuszem. Polityczne uwarunkowania sztuki Wrocławia u schyłku średniowiecza*, Warszawa 2008.

Humanist and Baroque era historiography reveals clear parallels and ties between Lusatia and Silesia, perceived as early as in the Early Modern Era. A corrective for this viewpoint of internationally renowned scholars can be seen in the work of the above-mentioned August Adolph Haugwitz and Abraham Frenzel⁴⁸, an erudite polymath, and in the select town chronicles of Lauban. Briefly, I will present the results of my research to date: while the broad-scope works (for example those by Stránský, Goldast and Balbín) attempt to present more or less precise picture of the Crown of Bohemia as a whole, including its internal ties, and they focus quite a bit of attention on Silesia and Lusatia, the regional historians (such as Curaeus, Manlius, Haugwitz and numerous Silesian 17th century historians, i.e. Hennel and Sinapius) tend to focus on their lands only. They do not deny the connection to the Crown of Bohemia and their subordination to the King of Bohemia, they read Czech authors and quote them aplenty, but still – local events are more important for them and they do not deny the ties to the Holy Roman Empire, either.

Great historiographical topic of the recent decades is the history of communication. Here as well, the secondary lands of the Crown of Bohemia offer us plenty of material for research from a broad variety of viewpoints. It could be prosopographical studies, research of academic journeys, or career paths of teachers and ministers⁴⁹. This applies to the Middle Ages, to the Early Modern Era (for the later period, of course, the resources for study are much more plentiful), for Catholics and non-Catholics alike – either Lutherans or more nonconformist denominations⁵⁰. As I see in my research, the communication can be traced well, based on certain portions of town chronicles – for example, my research of the town of Lauban⁵¹ has clearly shown the contacts of the local burgers in Upper Lusatia and Lower Silesia. We can see how they took a stand against Silesia, as they perceived it as inferior and less civilized; they tended to see themselves as

⁴⁸ See Jan Petr, *Abraham Frenzel*, Bautzen 1989.

⁴⁹ Joachim Bahlcke, *Bildungswege, Wissenstransfer und Kommunikation. Schlesische Studenten an europäischen Universitäten der Frühen Neuzeit*, „Berichte und Forschungen. Jahrbuch des Bundesinstituts für Kultur und Geschichte der Deutschen im östlichen Europa“, 18, 2010, pp. 37–55.

⁵⁰ Various articles of Martin Holý and his book *Vzdělanostní mecenát v zemích České koruny (1500–1700)*, Praha 2016.

⁵¹ Jan Zdichynec, *Lauban/Lubań mit den Augen der humanistischen Geschichtsschreiber gesehen. Die Bildung der mittelalterlichen Geschichte der Stadt*, [in:] *Die Nieder- und Oberlausitz – Konturen einer Integrationslandschaft I: Mittelalter*, eds. Heinz-Dieter Heimann, Klaus Neitmann, Uwe Tresp, Berlin 2013 (Studien zur brandenburgischen und vergleichenden Landesgeschichte, 11), pp. 359–389.

part of the “German” space, they stressed the early Christianisation of their town and the early adoption of the Lutheran faith. Again, they do not deny the deference of their region to the Crown of Bohemia and the authority of the King of Bohemia. Yet, they felt similarly close to Saxony and Brandenburg. When Upper and Lower Lusatia was handed over to Saxony, they did not seem to regret the loss of their “Bohemian” history. More than that, they were troubled by the everyday struggles of the 30-years-war and they blamed the Estates of the Kingdom of Bohemia for starting the uprising in 1618–1620, as it was the direct cause of the war that followed. I must highlight two important figures of Lauban burgraves and chroniclers, Martin Zeidler and Christoph Wiesner. They were pretty much contemporaries, they lived in the first third of the 17th century, they kept a close eye on the events of the unraveling 30-years war, they participated in the assembly negotiations in Bautzen, but most likely in Prague as well, at the general assemblies of the Crown of Bohemia. They had strong personal and social links to Silesia – for this, see the unique *Hausbuch* by Martin Zeidler, describing the history of his family and himself, and containing his journal entries as well⁵².

Although Upper Lusatia and Silesia differ in size and importance, at the turn of the Middle Ages and the Early Modern Era, they shared a number of similarities and parallels – in structure and development. These parallels were partly the result of them being a part of the Crown of Bohemia, but partly due to their German, Lutheran élites. Denomination-wise, socially, culturally and economically, they leaned towards the Holy Roman Empire. Upper Lusatia had a more “direct” link to the King of Bohemia – he employed his authority there without having to take into account the powerful dukes of Silesia, its towns and estates. In both areas, Slavic and German inhabitants lived side by side. The variety of languages was very much supported by the spreading reformation – we see a number of Bible translations into Sorbian and Polish. We can see parallels in legal systems, too – historically, the two regions employed the laws of Saxony, Magdeburg as well as being influenced by the legal tradition of the Kingdom of Bohemia and of the Czech customary law. Both maintained significant autonomy up until the beginning of the Modern Era. We can trace a number of similarities in art, literature and customs,

⁵² “Hausbuch“ of Martin Zeidler, BUWr, manuscript sign. Akc. 1948/I/566 [old signature of the Library of Upper Lusatian Science Society L. I. 308a].

and these were things well-known to the people of the given period. It is documented through research of contemporaneous historiography and in the communication it reveals – it is seen in the links between texts and in the personal contacts of important intellectuals.

JAN ZDICHYNEC

**GÓRNE ŁUŻYCE I ŚLĄSK NA PRZEŁOMIE ŚREDNIOWIECZA
I CZASÓW NOWOŻYTNYCH W PERSPEKTYWIE PORÓWNAWCZEJ.
WYBRANE ASPEKTY ROZWOJU SPOŁECZNEGO,
KULTURALNEGO I KOŚCIELNEGO**

Autor dowodzi, że choć Górne Łużyce i Śląsk różnią się wielkością i znaczeniem, to na przełomie średniowiecza i wczesnego okresu nowożytnego łączyło je wiele podobieństw w strukturze i rozwoju. Były one częściowo wynikiem przynależności do Korony Czeskiej, a częściowo wynikały z ich niemieckich, luterańskich elit. Wyznaniowo, społecznie, kulturowo i ekonomicznie, skłaniały się one ku Świętemu Cesarstwu Rzymskiemu. Górne Łużyce miały bardziej ‘bezpośredni’ związek z królem Czech, który korzystał ze swojej władzy bez konieczności brania pod uwagę opinii potężnych książąt śląskich, miast i majątków. Na obu obszarach słowiańscy i niemieccy mieszkańcy żyli obok siebie. Różnorodności językowej sprzyjała szerząca się reformacja, co widać w szeregu przykładów Biblii na język serbołużycki i polski. Podobieństwa dostrzegamy również w systemach prawnych, ponieważ historycznie oba regiony stosowały prawa Saksonii, Magdeburga oraz pozostawały pod wpływem tradycji prawnej Królestwa Czech i czeskiego prawa zwyczajowego. Oba terytoria zachowały znaczną autonomię aż do początku ery nowożytnej. Szereg podobieństw można zauważyć w sztuce, literaturze i obyczajach tamtego okresu. Widać też oczywiste korelacje między tekstami tamtejszych intelektualistów, co dowodzi ich osobistych kontaktów.

GABRIELA WĄS
(Institute of History, University of Wrocław)

“A CULTURE BRIDGE”? EARLY MODERN SILESIA AS A REGION OF SEVERAL HISTORIOGRAPHIES¹

The image of history of a given territory functioning in the general perception is conditioned not so much by the phenomena taking place there that are described in – non-existent – objective categories, but it depends on their evaluations made by historians in the name of assumed needs, usually state – national or civilizational-ideological ones. The historiographic description is determined by the context of values given to the phenomena of the past in the current political and social reference, or by the tasks which the ideas about them have to fulfil in these scopes. The more general and comprehensive picture of the history of a given territory is attempted by historiography, the more it fulfils servile functions in relation to non-research ideas. In this context the paradigm of Silesia as a culture-bridge region has become popular today. It was created in German historiography and has been remodelled many times, sometimes in extreme ways, evolving from a beautiful symbol of the fusion of Western and Eastern cultures to a “Bollwerk of Germanness” based on three pillars: Prussia, German Silesia and Austria². Under the influence of the meeting of the German Chancellor and the Polish Prime Minister in Krzyżowa in 1989 in the spirit of reconciliation and the declarations made there about political cooperation between the two states, it was adopted as a research method and paradigm by Polish historiography. In its current version, Silesia was supposed to be the area where the most intensive ideological and civilisational, yet

¹ The presented text refers to the subject matter of the article by Gabriela Wąs, *Nowożytność*, [in:] *Śląskoznawcze deficyty badawcze nauk historycznych*, ed. Marek Czaplinski, Wrocław 2007, pp. 34–48.

² Norbert Conrads, *Deutsche Geschichte im Osten Europas. Schlesien*, Berlin 1994, pp. 27–28.

peaceful exchange between Poland and Germany, or “East and West”, took place. It was to include various phenomena from the Silesian past, including mutual influences and the mixing of the culture and history of both countries. While it is doubtful whether Silesian history can be described solely in Polish and German terms, one can accept this opinion when looking at the last decades of the 20th century. The question also arises about the place of other state structures in Silesian history, especially Czech and Austrian. Restricting ourselves, however, to the period referred to in the title, we may wonder whether the history of the German-speaking population in early modern Silesia constitutes “German history”, while the Polish-speaking Silesians are actors in “Polish history”. Specifically: are a German-speaking burghers of Świdnica in the 17th century, settled in that town more than three centuries ago, still to be treated as an exponent mediating “German” cultural values? And an Upper Silesian nobleman living in the same century, e.g. Andreas Kochitzky, who spoke Polish and had in his parantel the noble families of Lesser Poland (Małopolska) and Greater Poland (Wielkopolska), is to be perceived as a carrier of “Polish” culture? Beautiful symbols sometimes play a good role as quintessential signifiers of change in political relations, but their usefulness as research methods has yet to be examined.

In the 1990s, when constructing the history of Silesia, it was often omitted Czech historiography, which after 1945 represented, due to the imposed political correctness, the attitude of not disclosing claims to almost the whole Silesian lands. For Silesia since 1328/1335 was a part of the Crown of the Bohemian Kingdom as a fief, and in the early modern period Silesian and Bohemian political elites in close alliance, at least twice, in 1609 and 1619, expressed their desire to remain within one state. In the name of mutual benefits, they made attempts to rebuild its political and religious system. After 1989, Czech historiography on its own initiative joined the Polish-German historical dialogue on Silesia, when Lenka Bobková, a Prague-based researcher, activated Czech, Polish and German researchers to take part in a series of meetings on the history of the Bohemian Crown lands, including Silesia in the Middle Ages and early modern period³. They showed that not much could be said about the history of Silesia at that time without its close connection

³ Some of them took place under the common title *Korunní země v dějinách českého státu*, summed up in collections of articles published e.g. in 2003, 2005 and 2007; others had their own names e.g. *Náboženský život a církevní poměry v zemích Koruny české ve 14.–17. století*, Praha 2009 or *Geschichte Erinnerung, Selbstidentifikation: die schriftliche Kultur in den Böhmisches Ländern im 14–18. Jahrhundert*, Praha 2011.

with and dependence on the Kingdom of Bohemia. The experiences gained on the basis of these meetings – it is difficult to say whether they were predetermined – seem to be binding for professional historians. A politically updated history of Silesia, confronted with historiographical analyses, makes it possible to understand the role it has played in the history of neighbouring states.

Treating the history of Silesia as a part of state history, understood in the categories of national history, resulted in historiography not only in the development of moral and political justifications for its possession by a particular state, but also for writing about this region. The interpretative motifs and research paradigms created – skilfully – within one historiography sometimes strongly influenced the others. An important role in this respect was played by Austrian historiography, whose language of historical description concerned large areas of the history of early modern Silesia. Under its influence, different interpretations of Silesian history took root in German and Polish historiography, while other aspects were overlooked. In this context, it is worth noting the nomenclature of the time, since historiography speaks of “Habsburg Silesia”, and even of “Austrian Silesia”. However, in the 16th–18th centuries, these names had only dynastic justifications, but not state ones, because the state, as the Austrian Empire, was not established until 1804, and Silesia at that time belonged in state terms to the Crown of the Kingdom of Bohemia. Also, the policy of strengthening the political dependence of Silesia on the Kingdom of Bohemia is attributed to the Habsburg rulers after 1526, disregarding the deliberate and effective policy of uniting and subordinating the Bohemian and Silesian elites to the central power pursued by the Bohemian Kings from the Jagiellonian dynasty at the turn of the 15th and 16th centuries. In such a perspective, the policy of unification of the social elites of Bohemia and Silesia could be treated as a permanent directive of internal policy, initiated not only by the current kings, but also by Bohemian Estates politicians. These activities were continued by the above-mentioned Silesian and Bohemian state initiatives, undertaken in the 17th century to modernise their functioning in one state. However, they are most often classified as a war between the Estates opposition and the Habsburg royal power. It is a historiographical custom, especially in Polish historiography, to refer to all Habsburg rulers of that time as “emperors” in relation to their rule over Silesia, irrespective of the time of their rule. This is also how the first of them, Ferdinand, is referred to. However, leaving aside the diplomatic customs and the political courtesies prevailing at that time, from the legal and state point of view,

they exercised power in Silesia as Bohemian kings. Often it is forgotten, with reference to the 19th and 20th centuries, that Silesia was a region of the Prussian state, remaining in a federation of states within the German Empire, the Weimar Republic and legally – although the political existence of the Prussian state was then firmly erased – also in the Third Reich until 1945. The interweaving in the last two centuries of what is “Silesian” with what is “German” and “Prussian”, in both state and culture terms, is blurring as these terms are used synonymously.

Historians, however, seek to go beyond such state historiography. One of the directions became regional historiography, understood not as 19th century “Landskunde”, i.e. knowledge about the region in strict reference to the state, but as the study of the history of the region perceived as a special case in European history. Yet in modern Europe the region is understood in an eminently political way and means part of a larger territorial-political-state whole, only perhaps with its own distinctive culture or language. Nor does it fit into today’s understanding of political-territorial relationships to accept that most regions in the early modern period did not have to have a clearly defined “linear” structural-state assignment. In that period various power structures existed side by side even in one state and did not end at the “top” of the political-state power. As far as early modern Silesia is concerned, a thesis present in the literature would need to be clarified, that it could be called, in order to designate such state power, the “Duchy of Silesia” (“Herzogthum Schlesien”) subordinated to the sovereign Kingdom of Bohemia, with which since 1526 it was part of the Habsburg Monarchy⁴, ruled by the Emperor⁵. The Silesian country consisted of a dozen or so Silesian principalities, individually paying fief homage to the King of Bohemia. The king for the fiefs was the suzerain, not the “Duke of Silesia”. Moreover, the archdukes of the Habsburg dynasty until 1627, if they were not elected kings of Bohemia or (after 1627) if they did not hereditarily assume the Bohemian throne or were not elected emperors – were not monarchs and did not rule a sovereign state. They had territorial authority over their hereditary territory, the Austrian principalities, within the Empire, which had the characteristics of a federated state. The territories under the direct rule of the Habsburgs were not even a whole, as they were divided into three territories until 1619, then into two territories until 1668, and remained under the rule of separate Habsburg

⁴ Joachim Bahlecke, *Das Herzogtum Schlesien im politischen System der Böhmisches Krone*, „Zeitschrift für Ostmitteleuropa-Forschung“, 44, 1995, 1, pp. 27–55, here: p. 43.

⁵ Common in use especially in Polish research literature.

dynasties. When referred to that period, the name “Habsburg Monarchy” has the character of a political metaphor rather than a state. Were it not for historiographical custom, this name could be used for the early modern period, provided it was identified with the Bohemian monarchy. The attempt to define the state affiliation of Silesia is a reminder that the derivation of political power in the early modern period did not have to designate the links of state structures. Questioning the rule of the state as a superior political structure over the regions – a phenomenon existing universally in the past and present of almost all European countries, in the dominant part built from a combination of regions under one political-territorial authority – is also manifested in relation to Silesia.

Contemporary Silesian regional-political nonconformism has caused a part of the Silesian community to deepen the phenomenon, wishing not only for regional distinctiveness, but also recognition as a separate Silesian nationality. This new identification also brought about attempts to write a national history of Silesia⁶, treated by its authors in terms of the well-known classic “state” historiography. However, it is not about the specific attempts of regionalist-independentists to create a state, but about the goals of such historiography. Such a view is prompted by the absolutisation of moral and political values, represented in the opinion of these historians by – regardless of the era – the people, i.e. the nation of the region. There is also a conviction of the superiority of the presented reasons, which are in line with the Silesian *raison d'état* and are characterised by the sense of the Silesian “*bonis communio*”, as well as a messianic belief that the singularity of historical reality is so exceptional that, according to the law of nature and the law of nations, the necessity of Silesian political-social-territorial sovereignty must result from it. However, in the case of Silesia, those claiming this status for the region (or for the population of the region) face a fundamental difficulty: they are operating in Polish historical categories, manifested most strongly in the synonymous use of the names “Silesian” and “Upper Silesian”. It is also unclear whether the latter term should also refer to the sub-region of Silesia, the historical Opole region, or whether it should be understood as a territory similar to the Silesian Voivodship within the borders of the Second Polish Republic. There is also no place in this concept for the “Silesianness” of today’s Lower Silesians, and the Silesian identity of half of today’s Lubuskie Voivodeship is not conceptualised at all.

⁶ Dariusz Jerczyński, *Historia narodu śląskiego: prawdziwe dzieje ziem śląskich od średniowiecza do progu trzeciego tysiąclecia*, Zabrze 2003.

The change of borders after 1945 placed Silesia within the borders of only Poland and Czechoslovakia, but in all the countries with which Silesia had been associated in the past, competing elaborations of its history emerged having the character of state historiographies with the content of descriptions determined by their national sentiments or political ideologies. After 1989 and at the beginning of the 21st century, there was again a sudden increase in publications synthesizing Silesian history. It seems that the causative factor was both the need to recall, especially in German-language syntheses, the “German” part of Silesian history, and the desire to summarize the findings to date, with the clear premise of preparing perspectives for new research. In 1994, as part of the *Deutsche Geschichte im Osten Europas* series, the volume *Schlesien*⁷ was published, in 1996 *Schlesien und die Schlesier*⁸, and in 2002 *Historia Śląska*⁹ and in 2006 *Dolny Śląsk. Monografia historyczna*¹⁰. These syntheses were still constructed rather schematically, taking into account the classical historical epochs (the Middle Ages, the modern period, the 19th and 20th centuries) or traditional thematic sections (politics, economy, literature, art). However, they clearly show that the circle of researchers dealing with the history of this land has widened, and with them the range of research issues and methods. Especially in the last synthesis mentioned above, the group of authors included more than a dozen researchers, although from a single scientific centre, and it signalled the need to pay attention to the different history of Silesian sub-regions: the synthesis was devoted to the history of Lower Silesia, a Silesian area of dominant importance in political, cultural and economic history, whose inhabitants, also after 1945, experienced a different and specific history.

A new concept for a synthesis of Silesian history is presented in the 2005 edition of *Kulturgeschichte Schlesiens in der Frühen Neuzeit*, edited by Klaus Garber¹¹, a distinguished scholar of Silesian culture, especially literary culture in the early modern period. It was profiled in such a way that it became possible to observe Silesian history through the prism of culture. A number of researchers were invited to formulate contributions on particular problems, who – regardless of the native language of their research – were interested in various aspects of the history of Silesian culture in the early modern period. An extremely positive effect

⁷ Conrads, *Deutsche Geschichte*.

⁸ Joachim Bahlcke, *Schlesien und die Schlesier*, München 42005.

⁹ *Historia Śląska*, ed. Marek Czapliński, Wrocław 2007.

¹⁰ *Dolny Śląsk. Monografia historyczna*, ed. Wojciech Wrzesiński, Wrocław 2006.

¹¹ *Kulturgeschichte Schlesiens in der Frühen Neuzeit*, ed. Klaus Garber, Tübingen 2005.

was that their articles, which analysed issues chosen by the authors themselves, were often not of a concluding nature but of a research character.

The above brief review of publications in the form of syntheses of Silesian history does not – and cannot – constitute a systematic discussion on all similar initiatives. The aim of this text is not to review them, but to try to identify the general research directions of early modern Silesian history on their basis. In this context, two more characteristic examples of synthesis could be mentioned. One of them is the multiple-author monograph *Historia Górnego Śląska*¹². It may have been a response to a separate study of the history of Lower Silesia. However, in distinction to the methodological assumptions of the authors of the early modern sections in the monographs *Historia Śląska* and *Dolny Śląsk. Monografia historyczna*, who took the route of writing history from the “inside of the region”, the authors of *Historia Górnego Śląska*, decided, for this period, to attempt to write the history of a European region. It was assumed that the basic tool in this intention would be a team composed of researchers from the three countries most interested in Silesia. The second most recent synthesis on the history of Silesia in the early modern period was written as part of the international research programme “Cuius regio”¹³. The innovativeness of the research according to this programme consisted in starting from the analysis of factors that were supposed to form the region (administration, economy, social groups, ethnicity and cultural identity), and not from the analysis of events/phenomena taking place in the region. A critical reflection on the adopted method can be aroused by the arbitrary designation of 5 factors which are to steer the description and embody the existence of the region, and the lack of space among them to discuss, for example, meta-narratives, sometimes autonomous-regional, with an ideological-religious-political background. It seems that the following three encounters and related publications may be even more symptomatic of the described turn in Silesian research. In 1998, the book *Silesiographia. Stand und Perspektiven schlesischen Forschung* edited by Matthias Weber, was published¹⁴. In 2005 another meeting of researchers took place, resulting in the publication of *Historische*

¹² *Historia Górnego Śląska. Polityka, gospodarka i kultura europejskiego regionu*, eds. Joachim Bahlcke, Dan Gawrecki, Ryszard Kaczmarek, Gliwice 2011.

¹³ *The strengthening of Silesian Regionalism (1526–1740)*, eds. Lucyna Harc, Gabriela Wąs, Wrocław 2014 (Cuius regio. Ideological and Territorial Cohesion of the Historical Region of Silesia (c. 1000–2000), 2).

¹⁴ *Silesiographia. Stand und Perspektiven der historischen Schlesiensforschung. Festschrift für Norbert Conrads zum 60. Geburtstag*, eds. Matthias Weber, Carsten Rabe, Würzburg 1998.

*Schlesienforschung*¹⁵, edited by Joachim Bahlcke and Carsten Rabe, which attempted to revisit methods, topics and outline perspectives for Silesian research. And in 2007 a publication appeared as an effect of the third historians' meeting in the series devoted to thematic and methodical perspectives of Silesian studies, titled *Śląskoznawcze deficyty badawcze nauk historycznych*¹⁶. These three conferences of researchers, so close in chronological terms, devoted to considerations on the direction of development of research on Silesia, probably indicate that the study of Silesian history is on the verge of a historiographical breakthrough.

Despite the obvious analogy, the three meetings mentioned above started from different methodological premises. In the publication edited by Weber, the main postulates can be read as an appeal to deepen the awareness of today's researchers towards the Silesian historiographical legacy. In the past, "historical interpretations" – according to him – "were stimulated by wishful imaginings" and history was too often a tool for the construction of a "selective Geschichtsbeußtsein"¹⁷. Weber primarily directed these remarks towards German historiography, reflecting on the problem in the context of the contemporary, still ongoing, influence of research from the so-called "Ostforschung" current. The problem, however, seems to be much broader than just an attentiveness to the role of the nationalist factor in historical research. A researcher who values authoritarian forms of power positively will also in principle interpret positively past phenomena related to the shaping of power, such as Prussian absolutism in Silesia. A different basis is found in Bahlcke's project, which, in its subtitle, situates today's Silesian historiography in the space between traditional local history, limited to describing and interpreting events in strictly Silesian perspectives, the so-called "Landesgeschichte", and "modern science of culture". Individual articles, which can be treated in fact as reports from research on a given problem, systematically, within the framework of rather classical thematic divisions (history of cities, of education, of law and political system, social economic one, religious one), summing up the achievements, are probably to make it easier for the readers to state, whether the research on a given topic is still in the orbit of the once dominant in

¹⁵ *Historische Schlesienforschung. Methoden, Themen und Perspektiven zwischen traditioneller Landesgeschichtsschreibung und moderner Kulturwissenschaft*, ed. Joachim Bahlcke, Köln–Weimar–Wien 2005.

¹⁶ *Historia Śląska*, ed. Marek Czapliński, Wrocław 2002.

¹⁷ Matthias Weber, Über die Notwendigkeit einer Standortbestimmung der historischen Schlesienforschung in Deutschland, [in:] *Silesiographia*, pp. 13–25.

Silesian research methods of the 19th century “Landeskunde”, or whether it is already done with the use of contemporary methods. The aforementioned third publication of the same type from 2007, under the heading “research deficits”, in its most desiderative form demands a critical evaluation of Silesian research and scepticism about its achievements, including the identification of specific blank spots in Silesian research.

The body of work in Silesian historiography is considerable. Especially in the last decade many good and interesting scientific dissertations have been written and new thematic areas have been covered. The aim of this text is not to list them, but rather to reflect on the evaluation of Silesian research in terms of its subject matter and research methods. Hence a few remarks about what has “not been done” in Silesian research, despite the abundance of studies on Silesia. What has been lacking, especially on the Polish side, is deeper methodological and methodical reflection, because Polish Silesian historiography for the early modern period has not independently developed coherent theories and interpretative models. It also makes little use of solutions used in the world humanities. Thematic innovations are created when a new methodological approach is born and accompanied by methodological awareness. Therefore, in apparent inconsistency with the previous statement about the multiplicity of publications on Silesian history, one can say that the types and methods of research absent in the historiography of modern Silesia, but used in historiographies of other European areas, are numerous. More precisely, if some of them are used, it is in an intuitive and fragmentary way. This problem can be shown in several areas of Silesian history.

For the 16th and 17th centuries in the history of Silesia, as in Europe, one of the most important phenomena was the confessional division. In order to reveal the implications of this phenomenon for political, social and cultural processes (and not only, as is commonly understood, strictly religious), two important interpretative models were constructed in German historiography. The first, termed “Konfessionsbildung”, i.e. the formation of confessional societies, was developed by Ernst Walter Zeeden¹⁸ in the late 1950s. He assumed that the confessional division not only caused a cultural division of European societies, within which new ethical hierarchies and specific spiritual cultures emerged, but that it was also an

¹⁸ Ernst Walter Zeeden, *Die Entstehung der Konfessionen. Grundlagen und Formen der Konfessionsbildung im Zeitalter der Glaubenskämpfe*, München–Wien 1965; *idem*, *Konfessionsbildung. Studien zur Reformation, Gegenreformation und katholischen Reform*, Stuttgart 1985.

expression of the emergence of new social bonds and behaviours and helped them to reveal themselves and become codified. Following research on the formation of the modern state, in which Gerhard Oestreich's theory¹⁹ on "social disciplining"²⁰, played a major role as an important element of this process, two researchers, Heinz Schilling²¹ and Wolfgang Reinhard²² simultaneously in the late 1970s and early 1980s, built an interpretative model referred to as confessionalization. Their theory absorbed Zeeden's concept, combined it with Oestreich's theory and constituted it into the claim that confessional divisions became an important factor supporting the emergence of the territorial state²³.

The concept of confessionalization has a strong orientation to political and social history. It is based on the assumption that the seizure of church sovereignty by secular authorities in Protestant states and the institutionalisation of religion in Catholic ones gave secular authorities a tool for social influence, in the direction of creating an awareness of identity between religion, church and a particular secular superior authority. These processes brought about an increase in the control of secular power over the governed communities by developing patterns of behaviour of duty and loyalty rooted in the sphere of metaphysical values, as religion was used as a vehicle for political goals²⁴.

¹⁹ Gerhard Oestreich, *Geist und Gestalt des frühmodernen Staates*, Berlin 1969; Winfried Schulze, *Gerhard Oestreichs Begriff "Sozialdisziplinierung in der Frühen Neuzeit"*, „Zeitschrift für Historische Forschung”, 14, 1978, pp. 265–302.

²⁰ Oestreich's concept assumed that the essence of social disciplining was the "Christianisation of social behaviour". He also proceeded from metaphysical assumptions. In the last decades of the 20th century, this theory was reformulated and interpreted in the literature in social terms and 'social disciplining' was treated as a technical and ideological tool for the expansion of state power.

²¹ Heinz Schilling, *Die Konfessionalisierung im Reich. Religiöser und gesellschaftlicher Wandel in Deutschland zwischen 1555 und 1620*, „Historische Zeitschrift”, 246, 1988, pp. 1–45; *idem*, *Reformation und Konfessionalisierung in Deutschland und die neuere deutsche Geschichte*, „Gegenwartskunde. Zeitschrift für Gesellschaft, Wirtschaft und Bildung”, Sonderheft, 5, 1988.

²² Weinhard Reinhard, *Zwang zur Konfessionalisierung? Prolegomena zu einer Theorie des konfessionellen Zeitalters*, „Zeitschrift für Historische Forschung”, 10, 1983, pp. 257–277.

²³ *Die reformierte Konfessionalisierung in Deutschland – Das Problem der "Zweiten Reformation"*, ed. Heinz Schelling, Gütersloh 1986; *Die lutherische Konfessionalisierung*, ed. Hans-Christoph Rublack, Gütersloh 1992; *Die katholische Konfessionalisierung*, eds. Weinhard Reinhard, Heinz Schelling, Gütersloh–Münster 1995; Heinrich Richard Schmidt, *Konfessionalisierung im 16. Jahrhundert*, München 1992.

²⁴ The issue of confessionalization of Silesia was discussed marginally only Cf. *Konfessionalisierung in Ostmitteleuropa*, eds. Joachim Bahlcke, Arno Strohmeyer, Stuttgart 1999. Only the area of her County of Kladsko was described in this context: Arno Herzig, *Reformatrische Bewegungen und Konfessionalisierung. Die habsburgische Rekatolisierungspolitik in der Grafschaft Glatz*, Hamburg 1996.

The reference to these explanatory models for the history of Silesia can be justified by the fact that in the modern period it became an area where, on the one hand, two large confessional cultures developed, a Catholic and an Evangelical one, and, on the other hand, a specific relationship existed here between royal power and territorial, ducal and estates power. This political-religious complexity made it possible for confessionalization processes to appear in Silesia in various variants. The structure of political power in Silesia was built on the principle of two tiers or two levels. The Bohemian king was the senior, fief lord over the dukes and political estates of Silesia. However, Silesia functioned as the sum of several principalities and free estates, and within the principalities the Silesian dukes had autonomy of power and enjoyed almost full ducal rights and where there were no more ducal dynasties, a large part of their functions were taken over by the estates, although formally the territorial lord was the Bohemian king. From such a range of authority came their relation to church institutions. In the period of the Reformation, their function of defender and protector of the Church (“*advocatus ecclesiae*”) was transformed into the right to decide on the form of religion and began to be understood as a political prerogative closely related to the exercise of secular power. A similar balance of power, as existed e.g. in the Empire, the Netherlands, the Swiss cantons, Ducal Prussia or Catholic France and Spain, led to the inclusion of the religious factor in the formation of the territorial state. Applying this fundamentally political interpretative model to Silesian studies would perhaps also provide a more precise answer to the question, which has probably been treated too marginally in previous research: how and to what extent the Silesian principalities were transformed from medieval organisms based on fief relationships, and therefore personal dependencies, into modern principalities of a territorial type, functioning on the basis of offices and institutions. Therefore, as a research postulate, it can be formulated the necessity to study the process of formation of the Silesian principality of the modern type.

The model of confessionalization is not unknown in the circles of Polish historians, but the general awareness that this interpretative proposal was subjected to extensive criticism in the country of its origin is what works the most here. It was, however, a creative critique, which did not overthrow the paradigm of confessionalization, but, on the one hand, showed its limits and restrictions, specifying for which areas it is adequate, and, on the other hand, initiated many new, innovative research ideas.

Conclusion

The concept of confessionalization is only one of the interpretative models possible to analyse Silesian history of the early modern period. If we are to apply the above-mentioned metaphor of a bridge in historiography, then perhaps in a utilitarian form, postulating its understanding as a means of transmission serving to link the diverse and multidimensional history of Silesia with implementation to describe its past according to current research methods and interpretative models. At the same time, it seems that both those applied to other European regions and those innovatively constructed for Silesian specific history would be applicable.

GABRIELA WĄS

„MOST KULTUROWY”? ŚLĄSK W EPOCE WCZESNONOWOŻYTNEJ JAKO OBSZAR KILKU HISTORIOGRAFII

Refleksje dotyczące historiografii przedstawione w artykule są wyrazem konsternacji związanej z akceptacją koncepcji Śląska jako pomostu kulturowego w funkcji modelu interpretacyjnego dla jego nowożytnej historii. To piękne hasło, symbolizujące połączenie i pokój, powstało, aby wyrazić anulowanie we współczesnym języku politycznym istnienia dwóch światów w Europie. Ponadto istniejące już w historiografii pojęcie Śląska jako mostu ma tradycję rozumienia w silnej zależności od konotacji politycznych i państwowych. Poza tym, próbując interpretować przeszłość za pomocą tego pojęcia, współczesny historyk czuje się nieswojo, stosując je do złożoności historii Śląska.

Autorka przyjęła koncepcję konfesjonalizacji jako jeden z możliwych modeli interpretacyjnych do analizy śląskiej historii okresu nowożytnego. Postuluje zastosowanie wspomnianej metafory mostu w formie utylitarnej, jako środka przekazu służącego powiązaniu różnorodnej i wielowymiarowej historii Śląska przy opisie jego przeszłości według aktualnych metod badawczych i modeli interpretacyjnych.

WOJCIECH KUNICKI
(Institute of German Philology, University of Wrocław)

LITERATURE IN 17TH- AND 18TH-CENTURY SILESIA – THE REGION AT THE CROSSROADS OF CULTURES

The Baroque period in German literature, spanning the 17th century, was not an epoch of Silesia's sole dominance in German spirituality, a case in point being Simon Dach (1605–1659) from Königsberg, the Hamburger Paul Fleming (1609–1640) who came originally from the Lusatian town of Hartenstein, the Nurnberg Pegnitz-Schaefer (Pegnitz Shepherds) group whose works brought the city wide acclaim, and lastly, Friedrich Spee (1591–1635), residing in Rheinland, a great opponent of witch-hunting, Jesuit and author of the song *Trutznachtigall*. The greatest Baroque prose-writer was Hans Jacob von Christophel (1622–1676) from Hessen, the author of the novel *Simplicius Simplicissimus* and a great literary role model for Günter Grass. The Baroque period, so named only in the 20th century, was therefore not a particularly Silesian domain.

And yet, there is no other province which gave birth to the most distinguished poets within that movement, becoming for the first time in its history a source of cultural impulses, and it did so for a number of reasons. The first was religious spirituality oscillating between Catholicism and Evangelical and Reformed Christianity. Links to the Catholic south (Vienna, Prague) were vying with ties maintained by intellectuals with the Protestant North (Leiden and the Netherlands in general) where many Silesians studied. This synthesis of multiple denominations contributed to a free circulation of ideas, but also to fierce controversies. Creative spirit emerged out of a rift between the German culture of the educated classes and the Polish culture of refugees from Leszczno, Rawicz and Toruń. Creative activities found fertile ground in those of mixed Polish-German ancestry, as was the case with Johannes Scheffler (Angelus Silesius), whose father was probably Polish and

mother German. The threat to human existence posed by the Thirty Years' War contributed to widespread conformist attitudes and Irenism, i.e. a search for peace and calm amidst the horrors of warfare. There were also tensions between bourgeois poets who, like Opitz, gained their knighthood through merit, and the principle of estate representation professed by the old nobility. For art was a vehicle not only for erudition but also religious and social norms, acting as a cultural code for communities in the age of absolutism. Yet another trait left its mark on Silesian spirituality, namely, the fact that it had developed at the point of contact of languages, creeds, and social conventions: between the reformed courts of Piast princes and the Catholic imperial court at Vienna, between aristocrats, such the Schaffgotsch family in the Giant Mountains (Karkonosze) area, and the bourgeois audiences from Wrocław, Świdnica and Jelenia Góra. The “in-between” position led to the rise of a unique channel of cultural communication, the convecticle, as exemplified by the works of Silesian mystics, from the natural philosophers such as Caspar von Schwenckenfeld and Jacob Boehme († 1624), through Daniel Czepko von Reigersfeld (the Protestant, Evangelical variant) and Johannes Scheffler (the Catholic variant) to Abraham von Franckenberger and Johannes Springer, both of whom wrote irenic convecticles. All of these testified to the quality of cultural communication, its uniqueness, while also exemplifying the type of works which determined the rank of Silesian Baroque.

Language: norms and executions

Typically of all centres of Baroque thought and literary activity, poetry developed in the company of philosophical and linguistic reflections. There was a predominating belief, as formulated by Georg Cruciger in his *Harmonia Linguarum*, in a connection between theology and philology, and that a poet was none other than a theologian¹ speaking in a high-flown manner and thereby an interpreter of divine affairs; a poet – says Harsdörffer – uses language in the same way as he does metals. “Extracted from obscure depths with enormous toil and effort, to be purified and enriched through the labour of nimble hands over a fire, they [words] are rendered serviceable”. Purity is then the prime need. On the other hand, it is necessary to consider “travel, commerce and the community of nations which

¹ In the first sentence of *Das Buch von der deutschen Poeterey*, Opitz says, “Poetics is first and foremost a hidden theology”. See Marian Szyrocki, *Martin Opitz*, Berlin 1959 (ed. 2: 1974).

bring us foreign goods and with them alien words so that we may use them”. A merchant from Nurnberg was probably more open-minded about foreign languages than Martin Opitz, a native of inner Silesia (born in Bolesławiec at the border of Saxon Lusatia), who demanded in his *Aristarchus*, and even more forcefully in the treatise on poetics entitled *Buch von der deutschen Poeterey* (*Book of German Poetics*), printed in Brzeg by the Wrocław publisher David Müller in 1624, an absolute purity for the German language, as expounded in a chapter devoted to rhetorical elocution, i.e. a linguistic implementation of a work of art / rhetoric: “Finery requires that the words are pure and clear. But in order that we may speak purely, let us commit ourselves, to the best of our ability, to what we call High German and disregard those places where bad language is spoken”. However, he revolutionized poetry with the following sentences, laying down the canon for poetic expression in Germany for the next 150 years: “After all, each verse is either an iamb or a trochee; it is not so that we should follow the Greeks and Romans in paying attention to the length of certain syllables, but that we know from the accents and tones which syllable should be high and which should be low”. Thus, in the first verse, the first syllable is low (unstressed), the second high, third low, fourth high and so forth; in the second verse, the first syllable is high. In this way, stress patterns across a German verse line were distributed as in the alexandrine, i.e. six iambic feet separated by a caesura after the third word phrase.

Erudite poetry

The division of literary genres into lyric (recording experiences), epic (narrative) and drama (representative) is a brainchild of the 18th century, during which the modern (including present-day) understanding of literature (“belles lettres”) emerged. In its own time, Baroque was not considered a uniform or distinct movement; furthermore, literature was defined using traditional models derived from rhetoric (in particular, from what formed its first part, i.e. “invention”). Consequently, there was no lyric but instead secular and religious songs, eclogues (idylls), epigrams, satires and silva; there was no epic, just histories and epopees, no drama but “head and state actions” (“Haupt- und Staatsaktionen”), with the strict principle of propriety (“aptum”) dictating a division into three styles and assigning each protagonist one out of three social backgrounds – elevated style, aristocratic

characters, comedy – low style, lower-class characters, and the intermediate style – middle-class scholars or writers dressed up as shepherds.

Following Opitz's reforms, literature joined ranks with the national literatures of the rest of Europe, including its central part, to focus on practical themes: religious song (Protestant and Catholic²), praise of the ruler, numerous panegyrics, including the ones by Opitz in honour of the Polish king Ladislaus IV, communications between scholars and artists (Opitz's panegyric in honour of Bartholomeus Strobel), praise of land combined with extolling a virtuous life in harmony with the ideals of Christian neo-Stoicism³ (Opitz's *Vielgüt* or *Zlatna*). The development of memory techniques used in all kinds of devotional literature, from the gnomes of Daniel Czepko to the mystic epigrams of Johannes Scheffler, was furthered by epigrammatic poetry, whose secular counterpart was found in the work of Friedrich Logau.

While Opitz's work embodied Silesian literary innovation in form and content, Andreas Gryphius, the second most distinguished Silesian poet after Johannes Scheffler⁴, followed modern poetic models, acting in a double role as a sonnet writer and a playwright. From as early as the 1670s, Gryphius's sonnets have been considered to implement supra-individual rhetorical models in service of religious tasks (*Sonn- und Feiertagssonette*) through visualisations of the Passion of Christ (*Thraenen über das Leben Jesu Christi*) and social tasks, by conveying in an allegorical form the images of "the order" (ordo)⁵. The "I" speaking in the text is not a personal projection of the poet's self-reflecting ego in pursuit of an autobiographic programme, but an "I" which is representative and sinful⁶. This is the methodical pathway which bears out the aesthetic, and therefore interpretatively boundless, value of these works, found in the relation between oftentimes contradictory, mutually exclusive, dialogic and ambiguous meanings. In that sense, Gryphius's sonnets are not only a visualisation

² For more information on Silesian hymnals, see the work of Marian Szyrocki's student, Anna Mańko-Matysiak, *Schlesische Gesangbücher 1525–1741. Eine hymnologische Untersuchung*, Wrocław 2005.

³ For neo-Stoic inspirations, see the monograph of the scholar on the Netherlands, Stefan Kiedroń, *Andreas Gryphius und die Niederlande. Niederländische Einflüsse auf sein Leben und Schaffen*, Wrocław 1993.

⁴ For the literature on Johannes Scheffler, see Angelus Silesius (Johannes Scheffler), *Cherubinischer Wandersmann*, kritische Ausgabe, ed. Louise Gnädinger, Stuttgart 1995.

⁵ See Nicola Kaminski, *Andreas Gryphius*, Stuttgart 1998, p. 44.

⁶ See the fundamental work on Gryphius's sonnets: Wolfram Mauser, *Dichtung, Religion und Gesellschaft. Die "Sonete" des Andreas Gryphius*, München 1976, p. 42.

(allegory) and interpretation (alegoresis) of orthodox Lutheran elements, but also “a space of theatricalization, an interplay of various discursive elements allowing the reader’s dialogic activity”⁷. The case is similar with Johannes Scheffler’s *The Cherubic Wanderer* (*Cherubinischer Wandersmann*, 1675): as early as in the 19th century, a philosopher and literary scholar, August Kahlert, discerned in these verses elements transcending the orthodox Catholic piety, namely, pantheistic traits observed also by Gottfried Wilhelm Leibnitz⁸. Whether we expand the aesthetic dimensions of the Baroque stage, upon which rhetorical and allegorical games take place, in order that we may see positioned upon it an aesthetic that bursts the mould of clear-cut religious truths, or whether we remain within that circle of pre-conceived meanings, these two masters of poetry are still a joy to read, either for the accumulation of pathos in Gryphius or for the concentration of expressive power as well as notional and emotional charge, as seen in Reverend Scheffler.

Territorialisation

While the work of Gryphius is a product of its Silesian environment, the same author’s sonnet entitled *An sich Selbst* (*To My Own Self*) draws on the self-reflective models cultivated by Ronsard and then continued by Opitz in *Trostgedicht*, a poem addressed to his publisher David Müller: “I am the skin and bones in death’s fearful claws”; his war imagery, such as in *Traürklage des verwüsteten Deutschlands* (in *Lissaiür Sonette*, 1673)⁹, magnifies Opitz’s vision from a youthful poem *Trostgedichte in Widerwertigkeit deß Krieges* (1633)¹⁰. Scheffler’s Silesian connections were with Jacob Böhme, a great natural philosopher, an unorthodox Protestant mystic, who inspired Daniel Czepko’s distiches (*Sexcenta Monodisticha Sapientium*)¹¹, which in turn provided the impulse for Angelus Silesius to write his famous short two-line pieces (*Cherubinischer Wandersmann*). We know God through His work, the joy of creation is the joy of God’s glory: Scheffler met Böhme through Abraham von Franckenburg, an Irenist, during his stay with Prince

⁷ See Kaminski, *Andreas Gryphius*, p. 50.

⁸ August Kahlert, *Angelus Silesius. Eine literarhistorische Untersuchung*, Breslau 1853, p. 51.

⁹ That sonnet and its interpretation in *Gryphius. Werke in einem Band*, ed. Marian Szyrocki. Berlin–Weimar 1969, p. XI, especially *Interpretation*, p. 3.

¹⁰ See Volker Meid, *Literatur im Zeitalter des Barock. Vom Späthumanismus zur Frühaufklärung*, München 2009, p. 171.

¹¹ See the critical edition Daniel Czepko, *Sämtliche Werke*, eds. Ulrich Seelbach, Hans-Gert Roloff, Marian Szyrocki, vol. 1, part 2: *Lyrik in Zyklen*, Berlin–New York 1989.

Sylvius Nimrod von Württemberg in the town of Oleśnica, where Scheffler held a position as a court doctor and suffered intolerance at the hands of a Protestant preacher named Freytag. Von Franckenburg did not only author Böhme's biography, but also published his works in the Netherlands (Amsterdam) in order to bring them later to Silesia.

Silesian territorialisation pertains mainly to the first eclogue in prose in German literature, namely Martin Opitz's *The Idyll of the Nymph Hercinie*. The poet conjures up an Arcadian image of "homeland" about which he reminisces on his constant wanderings. The homeland is structured around two rivers. The rivers spring forth from a source where the nymph Hercinie has her grotto, at the foot of what is known as the Snowy Mountain (Śnieżka)¹², "on yonder side of the Sudeten crest that doth part Silesia and Bohemia asunder, at the Giant Mountains' gracious foot"¹³. This is where the eclogue is set: in the manor of the Lord of Cieplice, i.e. Hans Ulrich Schaffgotsch, to whom Opitz dedicated his Hercinie poem in 1630, hoping to obtain employment. The piece is the first German idyll (bucolic, eclogue or shepherd's poem, for that is how the word "Schaefferey" should be translated), which was inspired by ancient models established by Theocritus, Vergil as well as modern ones laid down mainly by Jacob Sannazar and Sidney, whose *Argenis* Opitz rendered into German¹⁴. Regional territorialisation also had a sociological dimension in the Baroque literature of Silesia. This aspect was heavily emphasized in the works of German scholars from Poland from the 1950s, especially in the context of German-Polish relations, for example, in the analyses of the Piast-related mythology in the works of Opitz and Gryphius¹⁵. New areas of Baroque literary expression have been discovered for some years now, including literary works

¹² Martin Opitz, *Schaefferey von der Nimfen Hercinie*, ed. Peter Rusterholz, Stuttgart 1969. The first edition was published by David Müller of Wrocław in Brzeg in 1630.

¹³ Opitz, *Schaefferey*, p. 9.

¹⁴ It is not altogether impossible that the form of a bucolic interspersed with numerous lyrical fragments (such as odes, epigrams and sonnets), also known as the Menippean satire, was chosen in gallant homage to the future employer Gotthard Schoff, whose full name can be translated literally into English as Gotthard the Sheep. The place in which Opitz names his predecessors. See Opitz, *Schaefferey*, p. 7.

¹⁵ See especially the anthology: Marian Szyrocki, Zdzisław Żygulski, *Silesiaca. Wybór z dzieł pisarzy śląsko-niemieckich XVII wieku w tekstach oryginalnych i polskich przekładach*, Warszawa 1957.

authored by woman¹⁶, which are important sociological documents, or leaflets, i.e. obituaries¹⁷ and wedding notes¹⁸.

Lyric in its late phase of development

There was a shift in poetic models in the second half of the 18th century: late-Renaissance inspirations faded away into the shade to be replaced by the (once more delayed) onset of Marinism, conceptualism, with Spanish inspirations gaining in strength. These influences would have a decisive impact on the poetry of Christian Hoffmann von Hoffmannswaldau (1616–1679), an alderman from Wrocław (from 1647), who was on friendly terms with another distinguished representative of a later, Marinist phase of Silesian Baroque – Daniel Caspar von Lohenstein (1635–1683). Hoffmannswaldau saw his poetic work as a gentleman's pursuit, his first extensive selection of poetry entitled *Deutsche Ürbersetzen und Gedichte*, 1679 came out only after the illegal *Grabschriften* prints (*Centuria epitaphiorum*, ca. 1662) and his translation of Giovanni Battista Guarini's *Il pastor fido* (1678). The most refined erotic verse was not published until 1695 in Benjamin Neukirch's anthology entitled *Herrn von Hoffmannswaldau und anderer Deutschen auserlesene und bißher ungedruckte Gedichte* (1695 and following)¹⁹.

The spectrum of erotic language found in Marinist and Mannerist poetry enraged puritanical German readers for centuries, contributing to its reputation for being immoral, flamboyant or even degenerate, while in reality, its main focus was to test the subtle potentialities of erotic language, largely unexplored by 18th-century German literature. The last great poet of the Silesian Baroque movement was Johann Christian Günther (1695–1723) from the town of Striegau (Strzegom). His appeal lay in his life as a cursed poet, suffering from illness and embroiled in a long-standing

¹⁶ See Mirosława Czarnecka, *Die "verse=schwangere" Elyse: Zum Anteil der Fraün an der literarischen Kultur Schlesiens im 17. Jahrhundert*, Wrocław 1997 (Acta Universitatis Wratislaviensis); Kalina Mróz-Jabłocka, *Die weiblichen Lebenswelten in den barocken Funeraldrucken – Gedächtnisformen der urbanen Kultur am Beispiel der Stadt Breslau von Mitte des 17. bis Mitte des 18. Jahrhunderts*, Berlin 2011.

¹⁷ *Kultura smutku. Paradygmaty postaw wobec śmierci w literaturze niemieckiego baroku*, eds. Mirosława Czarnecka, Jolanta Szafarz, Wrocław 2004.

¹⁸ *Hochzeit als ritus und casus. Zu interkulturellen und multimedialen Präsentationsformen im Barock*, eds. Mirosława Czarnecka, Jolanta Szafarz, Wrocław 2001.

¹⁹ On Neukirch and his anthology, see Tomasz Jabłocki, *Benjamin Neukirch (1665–1729) – śląski poeta przelomu wieków XVII i XVIII*, Wrocław 2006, pp. 42–45.

quarrel with his own father, which represented rebellion against God. The cry of despair which springs from the dramatic and heavily censored poem *Alß er durch innerlichen Trost bey der Ungeduld gestercket wurde* brings to mind Biblical visions (*Book of Job*) and Ovid's laments. The crisis of faith, the crisis of belief in the perfection of the world converges with a drastically formulated disbelief in Stoic virtues. Despite personal allusions, Günther's poem, just as the rest of his masterful output, is a lasting example of rhetorical traditions making use of firmly established language models, hence its misclassification as the so-called "survival lyric" because of its personal overtones and images of a father-and-son conflict. Although Günther had been published in Silesia, his reputation as a "poete maudit" was not fully appreciated by German scholarship until the 20th century²⁰.

Baroque drama

Epic was, besides drama, the principal field of poetic creation. Wishing to stay true to the principles of social status and style (only high-ranking aristocrats or deities as protagonists, elevated style), Opitz follows the example of Scaliger by contenting himself only with "core elements of tragedy": there are mentions of "royal will, murder, despair, infanticide, patricide, conflagration, incest, war, rebellion, lament, weeping, sighing, and the like"²¹. Of great theoretical value is Opitz's introduction to Seneca's tragedy *Trojans* (1625). The poet sees points of similarity between tragedy and the current war and re-interprets the Aristotelean principle of Katharsis as that which "may render harmless the enemies of a peaceful life, the turmoil of the spirit", "for tragedy is nothing but \ (...) a mirror for those who wager only on happiness in all their doings and omissions.\ (...) On the other hand, constancy...". Moreover, Opitz demonstrates that as we look at the changing fortunes of great people, we learn "to fear less and better to bear" our own fate.

The golden age of Silesian drama was initiated by Andreas Gryphius. He is the author of three dramatic genres: tragedies (*Leo Armenius oder der Fürsten-Mord; Catharina von Georgien. Oder Bewehrte Beständigkeit*); historical tragedy (*Cardenio und Celinde*), which holds a special place in the history of the genre,

²⁰ Wilhelm Krämer, *Das Leben des schlesischen Dichters Johann Christian Günther 1695–1723. Mit Quellen und Anmerkungen zum Leben und Schaffen des Dichters und seiner Zeitgenossen*, Godesberg 1949.

²¹ Thus in: Meid, *Literatur*, p. 398.

comedies (*Absurda Comica oder Herr Peter Sqünz*); solemn dramas (*Piastus*) as well as translations such as *Die sieben Brüder oder die Gebeoniter*.

Gryphius's historical dramas contain references to political and religious conflict on-going at the time, as evident from *Leo Armenius oder Fürsten-Mord*. In terms of politics, Fortune and *Vanitas*, which takes hold of even the most powerful, are the operative motifs. The poet calls for the powerful to stop and reflect awhile. Drama has a theological dimension in that it allows for the tragedy of grace in a Lutheran spirit against the background of the tragedy of punishment. Martyred by a contender, Leo dies at the altar (he has redeemed his sins by refusing to kill the imprisoned Balbus): in that sense, the lion appearing in Balbus's dream at the outset of the drama is symbolic of Leo Armenius's tyranny and a reference to the emblematic lion in the treatise *Physiologus* where this animal represents Christ. The blood-stained imperial garb with a cross becomes a martyr's cloak.

Cardenio and Celinde is an exceptional play: its high expressiveness is striking, as it transcends the constraints of the Baroque "aptum" (propriety) principle which figured in martyrdom dramas (*Cardenio and Celinda* are almost too lowly for a tragedy and their language is full of colloquialisms), the convention is also broken by the conciliatory ending of this plaintive mirror ("Traür-Spiegel"), as Gryphius named the play in reference to a designation of tragedy in German as a plaintive drama ("Trauerspiel"). As rightly noted by Volker Meid, however, this is not the first bourgeois drama, but a drama of conversion ("Bekehrungsdrama")²². The conversion can be observed in how Olympia and Lysander grow to accept mature and faithful marital love, and at the same time also in *Celinda and Cardenio*, who faced with death and ghastly visions of corpses realize the vanity of earthly life and decide to relinquish not only erotic pleasure but also the entire world. At the core of the play lies the belief that Providence can deliver anybody from the snares of sin. While Cardenio's personality is somewhat melancholy and Celinda is arguably ill-behaved, in both cases, there is a lack of restraint with respect to erotic passions, leading to vanity and pride but also acting as a warning not to cross the limits set by God.

A Baroque scene should reflect the discrepancy between the cruelty of death and worldly pleasures, as a result of which the stage is first and foremost a space in which transformation takes place ("Verwandlungsbühne"), as postulated by

²² *Ibidem*, p. 418. Friedrich Gundolf described *Cardenio and Celinda* as a soul drama ("Seelendrama"), drawing attention to the psychological implications which were far ahead of its epoch.

Willi Flemming. Such a rapid transformation is depicted by the spirit of Olympia who turns into a terrible skeleton holding a bow in hand aimed at Cardenio. The false Cupid kills the body, false love leads from delusions of delight to the reality of sin. Gryphius executes the graveyard and church scene with elaborate effects in the background and foreground separated by a curtain²³. While plays were probably staged in the city hall of Wrocław (Ballhaus), the theatre itself relied for its driving power on Wrocław and Silesian schools, as long observed and thoroughly investigated by the German scholar Konrad Gajek from Wrocław²⁴.

Silesian Baroque prose

The most important prose piece of Silesian Baroque is Lohenstein's novel entitled *Großmüthiger Feldherr Arminius oder Herrmann* (1689). Finished by Christian Wagner following the original author's death in 1683, the work is a sizeable text in two parts, with nine books each. In it, Lohenstein depicts the story, set at the time of Germanic tribes and the Roman Empire, of a prince of the Cherusci, who fought a victorious battle against Varrus's legions in the Teutoburg Forest. Far from ending the story, the Roman defeat starts the novel with an extensive use of flashbacks (Hermann and Thusnelda, who fell in love while in Roman captivity) with the Empire itself portrayed as a thinly veiled contemporary Habsburg monarchy, in whose apotheosis the piece was written in the first place. The author exploits the conventions of a courtly novel and adventure novel (separation, encounter). The text uses modern notions by presenting the Germanic tribes and aggressive French policies in the 17th century (paralleling the religious wars of the 16th and 17th centuries)²⁵.

An outline of German literature in 18th-century Silesia

Scholars have for many years paid scant regard to German literature in 18th-century Silesia²⁶. This is no wonder, because it had only a local status in its beginnings.

²³ Willi Flemming, *Andreas Gryphius und die Bühne*, Halle 1921, pp. 136–152.

²⁴ Konrad Gajek, *Das Breslauer Schultheater im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert. Einladungsschriften zu den Aufführungen "förmlicher Comödien" an Gymnasien*, Tübingen 1994.

²⁵ On Arminius, see the study by German literary scholar from Warsaw Elida Maria Szarota, *Lohensteins Arminius als Zeitroman. Sichtweisen des Spätbarock*, Bern–München 1970.

²⁶ Noteworthy Polish research on the subject includes: Mieczysław Urbanowicz, *Oświecenie w literaturze niemieckiej na Śląsku*, Wrocław 1965. The body of German research features an especially noteworthy monograph by Anna-Margarete Brenker, *Aufklärung als Sachzwang*.

The early 18th century saw the establishment of “Collegium poeticum” in Hirschberg (Jelenia Góra), whose members oscillated in their literary leanings between Baroque and early-Enlightenment descriptive nature poetry (August Heinrich Brockes), paving the way for a new Enlightenment vision embedded within Leibniz’s idea of theodicy. The “Collegium’s” members included Daniel Stoppe (1697–1747) associated with literary rationalism of the type originated by Gottsched (*Neü Fabeln oder Moralische Gedichte*, vol. 2, 1738–1740), Caspar Gottlieb Lindner (1705–1769), a biographer of Martin Opitz and publisher of the so-called *Koppenbücher* which contained accounts of travels through the Giant Mountains (*Vergnügte und unvergnügte Reisen auf das weltberufene schlesische Riesengebirge*, 1736). As much as the literature of the time was reduced to utilitarian writings, Silesia in the age of Enlightenment entered into a phase of civilizational advancement, as foreshadowed by a number of institutions, e.g. the Jesuit University in Wrocław (1702) and the Knight Academy in Legnica (1708). Scientific advancement became evident in Silesia at the end of Habsburg rule under the influence of these institutions which were Catholic in spirit but operated in a Protestant cultural context²⁷.

From a Prussia-centred perspective, Silesia was regarded as a land that was slowly making civilizational advancement, also in the field of literature. “It was ascertained above that Melancton²⁸ credited Silesians with the gift or talent for the poetic art. Opitz, Scultetus²⁹, Wolff, Tralles³⁰, Flögel³¹ stand as proof and example that the local climate is as little an obstacle to the rise of philosophical genius as it is to the works of the imagination³². [...] This difficulty means that even Silesia now

Realpolitik in Breslau im ausgehenden 18. Jahrhundert, Hamburg–München 2000 (Hamburger Veröffentlichungen zur Geschichte Mittel- und Osteuropas, 8). See Arno Lubos, *Geschichte der Literatur Schlesiens*, vol. 1: *Von den Anfängen bis ca. 1800*, Würzburg 1996.

²⁷ For a discussion of religious and philosophical views in Silesia in the early-modern period, see: Arno Herzig, *Konfession und Heilsgewissheit. Schlesien und die Grafschaft Glatz in der Frühen Neuzeit*, Bielefeld 2002.

²⁸ Philipp Melancton (1497–1560) one of the main promoters of the Reformation, a reformer of schools, including also in Silesia, in a Protestant spirit.

²⁹ Klöber probably means Andreas Scultetus (1622–1647), a Baroque poet.

³⁰ Balthasar Ludewig Tralles (1708–1797), a doctor and writer, author of a descriptive poem *Versuch eines Gedichts über das Schlesische Riesen-Gebürge* Breßlau, Leipzig: im Verlag Michael Huberts 1750.

³¹ *Commentatio de machina et anima humana, a se invicem distinctis* Wratislav 1749. *De animae immaterialitate & immortalitate* 1774.

³² If this paper mentions but a few Silesian writers, it does not mean that there was any shortage of authors of learned dissertations, whose number – according to a 1776 census – ran up to over a hundred, could not be listed as examples of a literary or philosophical Enlightenment. The names listed in this, somewhat limited, work should be sufficient.

produces fewer poems, or rather that fewer verses than in the past are considered poetic these days, e.g. Schönaich *Hermann*, Stoppe *Fabeln*³³, Stöckel *Gedichte*³⁴. For Tralles's *Poetische Beschreibung des schlesischen Gebirges*, the *Alpen* by Haller are a counterweight. Mrs. Karschin³⁵, a Silesian, could be regarded as a natural born poet, although her poetry would be as insignificant as the doggerel churned out by the dozen by most amateurs if she had not acquainted herself with the principles, critiques and rules of the poetic art³⁶.

The above-mentioned Ludwig Kloeber und Hellscheborn, Hoym's administrative official, pronounces judgments in the belief that the civilizational development of Silesia is in progress, and evaluates literary phenomena in terms of popularity and nationwide relevance, while his treatise is actually an internal description of this development, also in the sphere of culture. Such a perception, full of reverence for Berlin and Brandenburg, irked the natives of Silesia, especially Christian Garve, who in his lecture for Schlesische Oekonomische Gesellschaft provided the following description of the Brandenburg victors' attitude to and relationship with Silesians: "The demeanour of the Silesian, somewhat sluggish, modest and shy at times, had made the new guests, who soon became his compatriots, grow suspicious that he was less proficient than themselves in his powers of reasoning and thinking. There was also the fact that the latter ones initially considered themselves as victors and us as vanquished, taking somewhat ostentatious pride in their advantages, in as much as we still felt a certain distrust which a new government inspires as a matter of course"³⁷.

Here was yet another issue, namely that of the national character, i.e. the Silesian identity, which was often debated in the 19th century. And again, Prussia-centred historiography, even in Silesia itself, claimed that no Silesian identity could arise under Habsburg rule in the first half of the 18th century. The historian Karl

³³ Daniel Stoppe (1697–1747), a follower of Gottsched in Silesia, a poet from Hirschberg (Jelenia Góra), the author had in mind his *Neü Fabeln oder Moralische Gedichte*, vol. 1–2, Breslau 1738–40).

³⁴ Christian Gottlob Stöckel (1722–1774).

³⁵ Anna Louisa Karsch (1722–1791), an Enlightenment poetess.

³⁶ Anonim [Karl Ludwig von Klöber und Hellscheborn], *Von Schlesien vor und seit dem Jahr MDCCXXXV*, vol. 2, Freiburg 1785, pp. 412–450.

³⁷ Christian Garve, *Über die Lage Schlesiens in verschiedenen Zeitpunten, und über die Vorzüge einer Hauptstadt vor Provinzialstädten. Eine Vorlesung in der Schlesischen Oekonom. Gesellschaft in Breslau gehalten, [in:] idem, Vermischte Aufsätze welche einzeln oder in Zeitschriften erschienen sind*, vol. 1, Breslau 1801, pp. 203–230.

Adolf Manzel (1784–1855) wrote in *Geschichte Schlesiens* (1809): “Under the pressure of the circumstances no distinct national character was able to grow. A lack of interest in Silesia on the part of historians may serve to excuse that nation for its lack of grasp of general history, which was evident in paying high regard to accidental and unimportant advantages of one’s birth and station in life”³⁸. This was related to the alleged cultural dominance of Catholic sensibilities³⁹, but also to a negative judgment of the literature of Baroque, including its late phase, or the actually derivative character of Gottsched’s Silesian epigones. Then again, in a time of war of Silesia, which came to an end with the Peace of Hubertusburg (1763), there was no chance of an “independent” literature within the meaning of 19th century axiology, for which originality was a basic literary criterion. Another powerful influence was the shift in the new province’s governance which eliminated a great number of old estate or municipal privileges and introduced militaristic methods of administration. However, the 1760s did not put an end to topical literature, as attested by eye witnesses: Christian Gottlob Stöckel’s (1722–1774) panegyrics in honour of Frederick II, poems by Anna Louise Karschini⁴⁰ or Gottlob Wilhelm Burmann (1737–1805). The peak of poetic achievement in Silesia was marked by the popular anthology of Carl Friedrich Lentner (1746–1776) entitled *Schlesische Anthologie* (in two parts 1773–1774). The lyric is today of greater interest as a political and social document and a record of mental attitudes prevailing in Prussian Silesia and has been partially discussed before, but mainly as testimony to the shift in the Silesian educated classes’ cultural paradigms that was gravitating ever more heavily towards Berlin⁴¹. Thorough investigation would also be in order regarding ephemeral periodicals such as “Breslauer Manufactur” (1772), “Das Kraenzel”

³⁸ Quotations from: August Kahlert, *Schlesiens Anteil an deutscher Poesie. Ein Beitrag zur Literaturgeschichte*, Breslau 1835, p. 90. See *Literaturgeschichtliche Schlüsseltexte zur Formung schlesischer Identität. Kommentierte Studienausgabe*, eds. Maria Katarzyna Lasatowicz, Andrea Rudolph, Berlin 2003.

³⁹ These negative judgments of Catholic Leopoldina have by now changed to a large extent. See: Carsten Rabe, *Alma Mater Leopoldina. Kolegium i uniwersytet jezuitów we Wrocławiu 1638–1811*, Wrocław 1999.

⁴⁰ Ernst Josef Krzywon, *Unterwegs zur Mündigkeit. Elemente der Aufklärung im Leben und Werk der Karschin in schlesisch-polnischer Zeit*, [in:] *Aufklärung in Schlesien im europäischen Spannungsfeld. Traditionen, Diskurse, Wirkungen*, ed. Wojciech Kunicki, Wrocław 1996 (Acta Universitatis Wratislaviensis, 1757. Germanica Wratislaviensis, 114), pp. 45–67.

⁴¹ Wolfgang Baumgart, *Der Neubeginn der schlesischen Dichtung im 18. Jahrhundert*, typescript, part 1 in the Manuscripts Division of the University Library in Wrocław, reference number 1949/1574, part 2 in the Silesia and Lusatia Section, reference number 15294 III.

(1772–73) and “Breslauer Nachrichten von Schriften und Schriftstellern” (1758–71) by Samuel Benjamin Klose (1730–1798)⁴². Research on that period should pay more attention to utilitarian literature, especially homilies⁴³ and Protestant school drama⁴⁴.

The 1770s saw large-scale transformations in literature. There followed a political stabilization, restoration of war losses, formation of public opinion related mainly to the public service sphere centred around minister Georg von Hoym but also to the literary movement of teachers from prominent Silesian schools and chiefly Protestant clergy. At that time, the best-known two Silesian novels are written. *Sophiens Reise von Memel nach Sachsen* (1770–1775) by Johannes Timotheus Hermes (1738–1821)⁴⁵ was largely successful despite its length (the heroine reaches not Saxony, but only Gdańsk) thanks to the protagonist who describes her emotional states in her letters, while also displaying a sensitivity to natural landscapes. This novel of sensibility based on the English models appealed mostly to a female readership. The situation was different with the second success of Silesian literature, a satirical novel *Spitzbart* by Johann Gottlieb Schummel – *Eine komi-tragische Geschichte für unser pädagogisches Jahrhundert* (1779). This was an anonymously published satire on the unrealistic, excessive plans for philanthropic activities represented by child educator and writer from Dessau Johann Bernhard Basedow (1724–1790). The hero, a pedagogy theorist *Spitzbart*, publishes his work on the reform of education, while being unable himself to raise his unbearable son Isreal. Admittedly, Schummel did not score any major literary successes besides *Spitzbart*, but he continues to hold a distinguished place in regional literature as a school reformer and an author of magnificent travelogues from Silesia. It might be added that as a teacher in the Liegnitz Knight Academy he included fragments of *Lord Sub-Steward (Pan Podstoli)* by Ignacy Krasicki in the anthology designed to aid in the solid bourgeois upbringing of his students⁴⁶.

⁴² Lucyna Harc, *Samuel Benjamin Klose (1730–1798). Studium historiograficzno-źródłoznawcze*, Wrocław 2002.

⁴³ See Rainer Bendel, *Prediger im Bistum Breslau zwischen Jansenismus und Aufklärung*, [in:] *Aufklärung in Schlesien*, p. 197 and following.

⁴⁴ Gottfried Heinrich Burghart, *Der Anno 965 am 5ten Merz Getaufte Pohnisch- und Schlesische Herzog MIESLAUS. I. Oder Das zum Christenthum Öffentlich bekehrte Schlesien ein Schauspiel Welches Nach Ablauf des Achten Jahr-Hunderts Auf dem Briegischen Schul-Theater Aufgeführt...*, Brieg 1765.

⁴⁵ Another novel of the same author, *Miss Fanny Wilkes* (vol. 1–2, 1766) was mentioned in Goether's *The Sorrows of Young Werther*.

⁴⁶ See article by Mieczysław Klimowicz, *Krasicki im Kreis der Breslauer Aufklärer*, [in:] *Aufklärung in Schlesien*, p. 233 and following.

While Hermes was indebted to the sentimental novel (Pamela, Grandison), Schummel looked for models in humorous English writings by Fielding and Swift. On the one hand, the 1780s brought much delayed imitators of Klopstock and *The Grove League of Göttingen* (*Göttinger Hainbund*) group, especially Johann Joseph Kausch (1751–1825) and his *Ästhetische Gespräche* (1786) and *Schlesisches Bardenopfer* (vol. 1–3, 1786–1788), on the other, enlightened aphoristic works by the emancipated Jewish author Ephraim Moses Kuh (1731–1790)⁴⁷, who published his 256 poems, mostly epigrams, in the nationwide journal “Deutsches Museum” in 1784–1786⁴⁸, becoming one of the most important literary members of the Haskalah in Wrocław⁴⁹.

The 1780s, however, were a decisive factor in the formation of public opinion which matured amid heated debates, both open and clandestine, carried on by the public officials centred around minister Hoym in the periodical “Schlesische Provinzial-Blätter” (1785). The opening of the journalistic platform stimulated growth in contemporary studies on Silesia in the works of Samuel Benjamin Klose (*Von Breslau* 1781–1783), Friedrich Wilhelm Pachale (*Über Schlesiens Geschichte und Bewohner*, Breslau 1783), Sigismund Justus Ehrhardt (*Presbyterologie des evangelischen Schlesiens*, vol. 1–4, Breslau 1780–1790) as well as the geographical and historical work of Friedrich Albert Zimmermann (1745–1815) *Beiträge zur Beschreibung von Schlesien* (vol. 1–13, Breslau 1783–1796). The crucial information on the local Silesian flora was contained in the botanical section of *Flora Silesiaca* (vol. 1–2, 1776–1777) by Heinrich Gottfried Graf von Matuschka (1734–1779). It was precisely Zimmermann and Karl Konrad Streit, author of the lexicon *Alphabetisches Verzeichnis aller im Jahre 1774 in Schlesien lebender Schriftsteller* (Breslau 1776), founder of a library and reading room, head of the police in Wrocław, who established the periodical enlisting the services of the most distinguished German sensualist philosopher Christian Garve⁵⁰. The latter in his dissertations

⁴⁷ For more information, see Wojciech Kunicki, *Schicksale der jüdischen Literaten im aufgeklärten Schlesien*, [in:] *Aufklärung in Schlesien*, pp. 93–110.

⁴⁸ *Deutsches Museum*, Januar 1784, pp. 33–52, September, pp. 193–213, Maerz 1785, pp. 262–279, April, pp. 327–345, September 1786, pp. 193–213. His *Hinterlassene Gedichte* appeared in Zurich in 1792 (vol. 1) and Berlin in 1793 (vol. 2).

⁴⁹ For more on the Haskalah, i.e. the Jewish Enlightenment, see Joanna Obruśnik-Jagła, *Przyczynę do wrocławskiej haskali*, [in:] *Wrocław literacki*, eds. Marta Kopij, Wojciech Kunicki, Wrocław 2007, pp. 115–137. See also, in the same volume, Jörg Ulrich Fechner’s article on the Powder Tower Explosion in Wrocław in 1749 and its tragic aftermath as explored in Lessing’s *Die Juden* (*ibidem*, pp. 77–89).

⁵⁰ An extensive bibliography “Schlesische Provinzial-Blätter” was compiled by Michael Rüdiger Garber, *Die Schlesischen Provinzial-Blätter 1785–1849*, Sigmaringen 1995.

presented clear philosophical reflection allowing educated individuals to become involved in the intellectual life of the epoch; he created a model of genuine tolerance by engaging in debates with the Berlin writer Friedrich Nicolai to question his theses on the ubiquitous Jesuit conspiracies. As a native of Wrocław⁵¹ and a Silesian patriot, he strove to attain a model of metapolitical reflection on the difficult problems of the province forming part of the new European superpower⁵².

The philosopher who contributed signally to the development of the aesthetics of comism was Carl Friedrich Flögel (1729–1788). Working as a teacher at the city school in Jawor (1762–1773) and later in the Liegnitz Knight Academy (from 1774), he brought out a four-volume treatise *Geschichte der komischen Litteratur* (1784–1787), in which he not only presented a sensualist theory of laughter and comism but also expressed his appreciation of the literary output of such half-forgotten authors as Johann Christian Günther, Martin Opitz and Andreas Gryphius⁵³. The 1790s mark the most prolific period in Silesian literature, when debates broke out following the death of Frederick II on the advantages and disadvantages of Silesia's allegiance to the Prussian state. The intellectuals centred around Hoym questioned the foreign perceptions of Silesia (Upper Silesia, in particular) represented by foreign observers⁵⁴. The apologies for Silesia published in the 1790 reflect a new perspective on history which takes into consideration eye witness accounts. Johann Gottlieb Schummel's amazing *Reise durch Schlesien im Julius und August 1791* was written by an intellectual who described himself as a "professional historian" and came in response to the charges of Upper Silesia's civilizational backwardness. "As I rode through Upper Silesia, I had to read numerous articles on the half of our homeland, published in 'Provinzial-Blätter' and other periodicals. My

⁵¹ For more information on the subject, see Tomasz Małyszczek, *Christian Garve i jego rola w kulturze literackiej Wrocławia*, [in:] *Wrocław literacki*, pp. 105–115.

⁵² Christian Garve, *Rozprawy popularnofilozoficzne*, eds. Radosław Kuliniak, Tomasz Małyszczek, Wrocław 2002. The term *Popularphilosophie* should be understood as a moral philosophy in a wide sense rather than as pop philosophy addressed to a mass folk audience.

⁵³ More on Flögela in: Wojciech Kunicki, *Aufgeklärte Theorie des Komischen und ihre praktischen Auswirkungen. Zum Verhältnis von J.G. Schummel und C. F. Flögel*, [in:] *Aufklärung in Schlesien*, vol. 2: *Aufgeklärter Sensualismus*, ed. Wojciech Kunicki, Wrocław 1998 (Acta Universitatis Wratislaviensis, 2122), pp. 55–65.

⁵⁴ For a discussion of Upper Silesia in the late 18th century, see. Łukasz Bieniasz, *Über Barbaren, Jesuiten und Schulmänner. Zeugnisse des Kulturtransfers zwischen Schlesien und Brandenburg-Preußen in den publizistischen Aufklärungsdiskussionen 1785–1806*, Hannover 2015.

travel proves that they did not discourage me from Upper Silesia despite somewhat too gaudy pictures painted in the descriptions”⁵⁵.

The judgment of civilizational backwardness first of Silesia and then of Upper Silesia is transformed but only to the extent that it relates to the economy (appreciative words about the Upper Silesian industry), while in a social and cultural sense, the land as a whole remained in German consciousness as an epitome of backwardness⁵⁶.

WOJCIECH KUNICKI

LITERATURA WIEKÓW XVII I XVIII NA ŚLĄSKU – KRAINA NA STYKU KULTURALNYM

Przedmiotem analizy Autora stała się literatura barokowa i oświeceniowa powstająca na Śląsku w XVII i XVIII w. Ze Śląska wywodzą się najwybitniejsi niemieccy poeci barokowi, wpływający na kierunek rozwoju całej literatury niemieckiej. Zastanawiając się nad źródłami ich sukcesu Autor wskazuje kilka czynników, z których najważniejsze to: duchowość religijna pozostająca pod wpływem katolicyzmu i protestantyzmu (ewangelickiego i reformowanego); rywalizacja wykształconych niemieckich kręgów intelektualnych i polskich refugium z pogranicza śląsko-wielkopolskiego; inspiracje będące wynikiem mieszanego pochodzenia polsko-niemieckiego; groza wojny trzydziestoletniej, która wywoływała postawy konformistyczne, a na drugim biegunie irenistyczne, wynikające z poszukiwania spokoju; konfrontacja twórców wywodzących się ze stanu mieszczańskiego z tradycjami społeczeństwa szlacheckiego. Te styki wyznań, języków i konwencji społecznych wpływały pozytywnie na jakość komunikacji kulturalnej, jej wyjątkowość, stwarzając warunki do powstawania dzieł, które zdecydowały o randze baroku śląskiego twórców takich, jak: Christian Hoffmann von Hoffmannswaldau, Martin Opitz, Jacob Boehme, Andreas Gryphius, Daniel Czepko von Reigersfeld, Johannes Scheffler (Angelus Silesius) i inni. W dalszym ciągu została omówiona niemiecka literatura oświeceniowa, którą w badaniach traktowano przez długi czas dość marginalnie, ze względu jej lokalną rangę. Jednak awans cywilizacyjny Śląska, na który miało wpływ powstanie wyższej uczelni i innych instytucji oświatowych, a także ustabilizowanie sytuacji politycznej po przyłączeniu do państwa pruskiego, przyniosło ożywienie życia intelektualnego, w tym literackiego. Reprezentowali je m.in. Carl Friedrich Flögel, Johannes Timotheus Hermes, Johann Gottlieb Schummel czy Balthasar Ludewig Tralles. Ważne miejsce zajmowało też piśmiennictwo użytkowe – historiografia, opisy geograficzne, podróznicze itd., mogące liczyć na masowy odbiór społeczny.

⁵⁵ Johann Gottlieb Schummel, *Reise durch Schlesien im Julius und August 1791*, Breslau 1792, p. 313.

⁵⁶ See: *Three accounts of travels in Silesia in the 18th and 19th centuries*, ed. Jarosław Szymański, transl. Leszek Szybkowski, Chudów 2006.

TOMASZ PRZERWA
(Institute of History, University of Wrocław)

TRANSFER OF TOURIST AND SPORTING PRACTICES IN 19TH AND 20TH CENTURIES FROM THE SILESIAN PERSPECTIVE: REGIONAL MODELS IN AN AGE OF MASS AND NATIONAL CULTURE

Sport and tourism presently occupy an important position in mass culture, the way we think about leisure time, health and politics; this is the result of transformations that have taken place in the last few centuries. While it is the case that for ages people have moved, played, competed, and practiced all to satisfy the needs of their soul, it was not until the latter half of the 19th century, a time of mental and even civilizational crisis, that mass participation in sport became a phenomenon. In a mechanized, industrialized, and urbanized world, in the face of new possibilities and circumstances, individuals were forced to again define their obligations, real needs, and internal desires. An increasingly large portion of society was devoting their free time (holiday and weekend) as well as financial resources to new objectives that overshadowed their old day-to-day reality. Growing demand for activity was a response to the modern lifestyle, in which the joy of cognizance and victory took centre stage. Generally, we can consider this a quickly-spreading fashion, furthered by strong globalizing tendencies themselves reinforced by the development of modern media. These accelerated the transfer of ideas and behaviours, at the same time erasing past dissimilarities. In this context, research on tourism and sporting activity can prove an attractive subject of discussion on the exchange of experiences, the tempo and the direction of the flow of new models. Interesting observations can be drawn from the example of Silesia, whose rich

history and borderland location facilitates similar analyses¹. Within the adopted chronological framework, its central portion was first a part of Prussia/Germany, while from the end of World War II it was a part of Poland. The year 1945 – understood symbolically – is of particular significance here, as the change in political borders brought with it an exchange of population inhabiting the region and the initiation of communist rule, essentially causing a caesura in cultural continuity. The differences in development which arose are doubtlessly an attractive object of study for historians, yet for the purposes of this study I shall focus on the first period, as it allows us to examine the issue of cultural crisis without needing to consider additional deformations². The question remains of whether earlier tourism traditions and the later sporting experiences of Silesia impacted other regions or countries, and to what extent it functioned as a seedbed, intermediary, or recipient of new social behaviours.

Silesia lies within the upper and middle Odra river basin. Of equal importance to the region's perception and development is the Sudetes mountain chain, which form its southern border and separate it from Czechia and Moravia. For centuries, Sudeten mining and weaving were the cornerstones of the region's economy; today a similar role is played by tourist services. That said, some mountain regions began attracting attention far earlier. The first documented journeys to Śnieżka (Schneekoppe), the highest peak of the Karkonosze Mountains at 1603 m a.s.l., took place in the 16th century. It also became an object of interest for visitors, solidifying its position in successive centuries. Analysis of entries in the Śnieżka *Books* (*Schneekoppen-Bücher*) from visitors reaching the summit allows us to state that several hundred people made it to the top each year, an unusual situation in the Europe of the time. At the same time, there is no evidence that this trend caught on with people from outside communities near the Karkonosze Mountains, those visiting the neighbouring health resort in Cieplice (Warmbrunn) or traveling in the area nearby. The mistaken conviction as to the incredible height of Śnieżka, as well as its concurrent accessibility, and ultimately the tradition of admiring the sunrise from peak all encouraged people to make the effort and accept the risk of climbing. The courageous ones could count on hospitality from the pastoral cabin located below the

¹ For more: *Historia Śląska*, ed. Marek Czapliński, Wrocław 2002.

² Compare i.a. Piotr Sroka, *Turystyka w polskich Sudetach w latach 1945–1956*, Wrocław 2013; Mateusz J. Hartwich, *Das schlesische Riesengebirge: Die Polonisierung einer Landschaft nach 1945*, Wien–Köln–Weimar 2012; Marek Ordyłowski, Zbigniew Szwarzer, Leonard Szymański, *50 lat wrocławskiego sportu 1945–1995*, Wrocław 2007.

summit, while their curiosity was piqued by the St. Lawrence Chapel erected in the period 1665–1681 by the powerful Schaffgotsch family as reinforcement of the mountains' Christianity as well as setting out the borders of their estate. Holy Masses celebrated several times a year in the chapel gathered the region's inhabitants, which increased the volume of "tourism". Modern excursions to Śnieżka – similarly to Ślęża (Zobtenberg – 717 m a.s.l.), which is close to the regional capital of Wrocław (Breslau) – were certainly not a common practice at the time, but when compared to many other mountain areas they did become somewhat regular³.

In 1677, Śnieżka was scaled by Fr. Michał Kazimierz Radziwiłł, which has since turned into the symbolic beginnings of Polish mountain tourism⁴. Because Polish elites readily travelled to Sudeten resorts, or simply passed through the Habsburgian Silesia on their way to the West, the Śnieżka *Books* contain many Polish traces⁵. Attempts are made to infer on this basis that Poles learned mountain tourism in the Sudetes. Their proven presence does not, however, prove that there was a direct transfer of Karkonosze models to the lands of the then-Polish republic, where we may find only trace references to journeys in mountainous regions. Polish mountain tourism began to take shape in the 19th century, and was focused on the Tatra Mountains⁶, which to this day remain the point of reference for Polish tourism practices. For many years, the distinctness of the German model was stressed, whose flaws were harshly criticized by the famous Polish tourism activist Mieczysław Orłowicz in his report from a trip to the Karkonosze taken at the beginning of the 20th century⁷. Accustomed to the particular elitism of Polish journeys around the more poorly developed Carpathians, he criticized the mass presence of Germans on mountain trails, their philistine behaviour, and the commercialization of the mountain space. We hasten to add that not all Poles at the time complained about the significant extent of the tourist transformation of the Karkonosze. One Polish guest of Szczawno-Zdrój (Bad Salzbrunn) emphasized in

³ Krzysztof R. Mazurski, *Historia turystyki sudeckiej*, Kraków 2012, pp. 23–66.

⁴ Jacek Kolbuszewski, *Krajobraz i kultura. Sudety w literaturze i kulturze polskiej*, Katowice 1985, pp. 21–22.

⁵ For more Ryszard Kincel, *Sarmaci na Śnieżce*, Wrocław 1973.

⁶ For example Jolanta Kamińska-Kwak, "Górami oczarowani". *Rozwój turystyki górskiej w Galicji (XIX w. i początek XX stulecia)*, [in:] *Galicyjskie drogi i bezdroża. Studium infrastruktury, organizacji i kultury podróżowania*, eds. Zdzisław Budzyński, Jolanta Kamińska-Kwak, Przemysław-Rzeszów 2016, pp. 131–161.

⁷ Mieczysław Orłowicz, *Moje wspomnienia turystyczne*, Wrocław–Warszawa–Kraków 1970, pp. 217–231, 519–521.

1857 that rambling around the mountains was a habit for “the German tribe [...] more inclined to daydreaming”⁸, while Polish visitors preferred short strolls and recreation in the safe zone of the resorts. The adopted perspective and stereotypes doubtlessly impacted the judgements made, which themselves underwent evolution. The well-documented presence of Polish patients in Sudetes health spas served to confirm their attractiveness among Poles, at least until the final decades of the 19th century⁹, when centres offering a similar level of services were established in Polish lands; this plus other factors served to limit the frequency of medicinal and leisure trips to Silesia by inhabitants of lands located to its east and north. Aside from Germans, people from other nations did not come in larger numbers to Silesia. In turn, the presence of Polish clientele was conditioned – for a time – by the absence of similar centres, affordable prices, and the western orientation of Polish voyages. It is thus difficult to speak of the Sudetes’ broader popularity and their impact on European tourism practices.

In the Sudetes we may find a range of innovations which were seemingly advanced in comparison to similar solutions introduced in other mountain ranges. Let us turn our attention to the formation of an official mountain guide service whose roots extend to the early 19th century. Franz Pabel of Kraków, who began guiding tourists around Szczeliniec Wielki (Heuscheuer) in 1813, is considered by Poles to be the first licensed mountain guide in Europe. The Guide and Porter Corps, founded in 1817 in the Karkonosze Mountains, considers itself the first organized tour organization in Europe¹⁰. That said, these claims require further verification, as there are serious deficits in research on the history of tourism, and many claims of fact are of a distinctly local character. There are also difficulties in defining phenomena. The aforementioned Pabel led people around one (sic!) mountain, and his “license” was related more to his position in the forest service than to any guide license understood in the contemporary sense. The Guide and Porter Corps grew out of the tour guide oversight system, which local authorities decided to get under control in the face of complaints by tourists and the rapidly-growing numbers of guests. It

⁸ *Listy ze śląskich wód*, ed. Andrzej Zieliński, Wrocław–Warszawa–Kraków–Gdańsk–Łódź 1983, p. 7.

⁹ See Ryszard Kincel, *U śląskich wód. Z dziejów śląskich uzdrowisk i ich tradycji polskich*, Racibórz–Katowice 1994.

¹⁰ Ryszard Kincel, *Przewodnictwo turystyczne w śląskich Sudetach w XIX wieku*, [in:] *Zarys dziejów turystyki i przewodnictwa w Sudetach*, ed. Piotr Gryszel, Jelenia Góra 2013, pp. 155–321; *idem*, *Początki przewodnictwa turystycznego w Karkonoszach*, Jelenia Góra 1972.

would seem that both solutions were derivatives of the highly-bureaucratized Prussian Silesia, as well as the exception – within Prussia – extent of the development of tourism in the Karkonosze and Szczeliniec¹¹. In any case, these regulations were not applicable apart from those specific cases. As it was, the scope of work done by mountain guides (and porters) evolved rapidly, which in turn impacted the gradually-emerging mass character of tourism and the spread of hikes with a printed guide (later a map) in hand. Orientation was made easier by a network of tourist roads and paths established from the end of the 19th century, while comfortable mountain huts made it unnecessary to carry extensive baggage. Simple “highlanders” were replaced by specialized guides. The egalitarian attitude of tourists conflicted with the late-19th century practice known in the Karkonosze of carrying rich tourists on special litters. Solutions familiar to the Sudetes were not transplanted beyond them, as they were the product of local conditions and unsuitable for new trends in tourism. This flourished towards the Alps, Europe’s highest mountains.

It is precisely Switzerland, Austria and southern Germany where inspiration was drawn for the creation of a modern mountain tourism product. The Alpine trend began in Silesia as early as the mid-19th century, when the Sudetes saw the emergence of “Switzies” – mountain huts combined with tourist service. Apart from architectural and functional models, other details of the Alpine world were transplanted. The most curious example came in the form of attempts to plant Alpine edelweiss in the Middle Sudetes, which was supposed to make it similar to the Alps¹². Active in this were mountain societies, which, beginning in the 1880s, took up the cause of tourism development and the promotion of mountain regions. The first of these was founded in Silesia in 1880, the Karkonosze Society (Riesengebirgsverein – RGV), followed in subsequent years by more associations of a local or sub-regional scope¹³. The wave of social engagement in tourist activities came to the Sudetes from the west, but was delayed. The venerable (and Polish)

¹¹ Tomasz Przerwa, *Rocznicowe refleksje nad formułą organizacji przewodnictwa górskiego w Sudetach w początkach XIX wieku*, [in:] *Zarys dziejów turystyki*, pp. 95–106.

¹² Józef Tarnowski, *Styl alpejski w środkowej Europie i polska kontrakcja wobec niego – styl zakopiański*, „Estetyka i Krytyka”, 2, 2012, 25, pp. 231–242; Tomasz Przerwa, *Odkryli dla nas piękno gór. Trzy śląskie organizacje górskie (1882–1945): Verband der Gebirgsvereine an der Eule, Waldenburger Gebirgsverband, Zobtengebirgsverein*, Toruń 2003, pp. 106–107.

¹³ See Edmund Szczepański, *Towarzystwo Karkonoskie (1880–1945)*, „Śląski Labirynt Krajoznawczy”, 1, 1989, pp. 75–86; Marcin Dziedzic, *Kłodzkie Towarzystwo Górskie 1881–1945*, Wrocław 2013; *idem*, *Morawsko-Śląskie Sudeckie Towarzystwo Górskie 1881–1945*, Wrocław 2006.

Tatra Society was formed seven years prior to the RGV¹⁴, even though numbers of tourists visiting the Sudetes at the time were significantly higher than in the Tatras, or in the Polish Carpathians in general. It should also be mentioned that mountain societies were modelled on Alpine associations, the oldest of which was the Alpine Club, formed in London in 1857. In writing about the decisive influence of Alpine models, emphasis should be put on the particular contribution made by the British, who left a lasting mark on Swiss tourist centres. Their rapid blossoming was conditioned by the arrival of well-heeled and active English guests whose preferences determined the development of the tourism and sporting offers available. Proof of this can be found in winter sports. Their attractiveness was “tested” in the Alps (St. Moritz and Davos), which was the source of the notion of the winter season that came to Silesia, along with sleigh rides, ski-jöring, and, with time, Alpine skiing. The Scandinavian roots of skiing need not be questioned, and Norwegian instructors, professionals, and even skis themselves were an important element of the “winter” revolution in Silesia. Nevertheless, as for the fabrication of the tourist product, the Alps served as inspiration, which was frequently emphasized in the hope of attracting guests from urban centres who would quickly immerse themselves in Alpine novelties¹⁵.

Winter tourism appeared in the Karkonosze Mountains several decades before the discovery of the winter charms of the Alps, in the form of rides on horned sleighs (“Hornschlitten”). The first such trips were recorded near the Karkonosze town of Kowary (Schmiedeberg) in 1817, but for almost a century they remained a local anomaly available to the area’s elites. This situation did not change until the end of the 19th century, when a total of almost 4,000 downhill runs were recorded during the 1899/1900 season along pistes in the northern Karkonosze. The vision of winter adventure was attracting increasingly numerous groups of well-heeled guests, and special trains from Berlin and Wrocław were set up. It comes as no surprise that similar offers were introduced in other areas. In particular, this included the Sudetes, while the expert Berthold Lessenthin wrote in 1901 of the Harz Mountains in central Germany¹⁶. However, the Karkonosze did not become a destination for commercial trips during which tourists went as passive observers.

¹⁴ More Władysław Krygowski, *Dzieje Polskiego Towarzystwa Tatrzańskiego*, Warszawa–Kraków 1988.

¹⁵ Tomasz Przerwa, *Między łąkiem i zachwytem. Sporty zimowe w śląskich Sudetach i ich znaczenie dla regionu (do 1945 r.)*, Wrocław 2012, pp. 34–35, 52–56, 106–109, 189, 220, 240, 307, 357.

¹⁶ Berthold Lessenthin, *Das Riesengebirge im Winter*, Breslau 1901, pp. 58–76, 216.

Inhabitants of the Alpine region displayed greater resourcefulness in this respect, where a sport was made of the horned sleigh. This equipment – initially serving to transport wood and hay – was brought from the Alps to the Karkonosze in the 16th century. While there is no evidence that the earlier tourist career of the Karkonosze horned sleighs influenced similar initiatives within Alpine circles, this cannot be definitively excluded, at least as a potential source of inspiration. The explosion in popularity of skiing ultimately overshadowed the horned sleigh, rendering it a niche product. The widespread 20th-century fascination with skiing also impacted the development of modern sleighing, which was successfully transplanted to the Karkonosze region at the end of the 19th century. European successes of lugers from Karpacz (Krummhübel and Brückenberg), Szklarska Poręba (Schreiberhau) and Świeradów-Zdrój (Bad Flinsberg) as well as the constructions of sleighs from the region demonstrate only a successful adaptation of a fashion taken from the Alps. The same was true in the case of the outstanding bobsleigh track built in Szklarska Poręba in 1925, which later served as the model for the Olympic track in Lake Placid, New York¹⁷. Silesians frequently drew inspiration from other regions, where innovation was adopted more rapidly and greater funds were designated for investment. It was not until after 1945 that the cableways and lifts so important for skiing began to appear in the region, while in many other places in Europe they had been present before the outbreak of World War II¹⁸.

Underinvestment in Silesian tourism during the interwar period was a serious problem affecting the region, but local and regional resources were insufficient to overcome it. The prosperous times of the 19th century, when the highest mountains of Prussia, i.e. the Karkonosze, hosted residences of the Prussian monarchs and other elites, had come and gone. While many inhabitants of Berlin, Brandenburg, and Saxony eagerly travelled to the nearby Karkonosze (Sudetes), it was the Bavarian Alps which were to become the mountain calling card of a Germany united in 1971, as those mountains attracted greater investment and the attention of all of German society. This was boosted by the transportation revolution, but also the standard tourism fare of seeking the most extreme experiences possible. Zugspitze (2962 m a.s.l.), the highest summit in Bavaria and Germany, was not conquered

¹⁷ Przerwa, *Między łąkiem*, pp. 217–256.

¹⁸ Tomasz Przerwa, *Koleje turystyczne i wyciągi sportowe w Sudetach do 1945 roku – próba bilansu*, [w:] *“Mkną po szynach...”*. *Z dziejów transportu i komunikacji na ziemiach polskich na przestrzeni wieków*, eds. Tomasz Głowiński, Robert Klementowski, Wrocław 2014, pp. 241–250.

until 1820, and just over one century later it was possible to ascend it via cable car¹⁹. The well-known tourist centre of Garmisch-Partenkirchen developed later, playing host to the 1936 Winter Olympics. The distance between the “German” Alps from the “east-German” Sudetes in tourism terms quickly grew, which did not, however, lead to a reduction in tourist numbers for the latter. Tourism and winter sports became a relatively mass phenomenon, which also had a positive impact on Silesia. It was only the tempo of that growth which was different. However, let us return to the issue of cultural transfer. The Silesian advantage from the pre-modern era of tourism development began to decline from the mid-19th century, and the Karkonosze quickly lost their position. Ultimately, it is difficult to identify a plane of the Karkonosze tradition that would be identifiable within tourist practices even in Germany alone. On the other hand, we can point to the continually growing absorption of Alpine models in the Sudetes. The interwar period saw the adoption of solutions in the spheres of infrastructure (scenic mountain trails), organization (mountain rescue service), and successive sports disciplines (curling). At the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries, it was possible to observe tourists along trails in the Sudetes dressed in Bavarian traditional folk wear (breeches, knee-high socks and caps with feathers), which was associated at the time with hiking.

Silesians sought models primarily in the south-west (Switzerland and Bavaria), the south (Austria and Czechia), more rarely in the north (Scandinavia), and almost entirely ignored the east (Russian and Poland); this was certainly a product of the late start and distinctness of tourism solutions developed there, as well as Polish-German antagonisms growing from the end of the 19th century. If we overlook the numerically small group of patients and tourists coming to Silesia from Polish lands (including people of Jewish origin), as well as the few Silesian fans of travels to the Carpathians, it becomes difficult to identify closer links between the two sides. In 1918, Galicia was a part of the Habsburg empire, which made it easier for Poles active in tourism and sport to adopt Austrian models. As we have already demonstrated, from the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries, when fascination with tourism and sport began to grow rapidly, Silesia was no longer a particularly attractive point of reference for Carpathian centres playing catch-up. While it could have acted as a sort of bridge, Poles preferred to draw on other experiences, particularly those of culturally closer Czechs. While the territory of Silesia did see

¹⁹ For example Toni Hiebeler, *Zugspitze: von der Erstbesteigung bis heute*, Munich 1979.

a mixing of German and Polish populations, this took place primarily in the peripheral and essentially agricultural counties in the north, the lowlands in the outer areas of the region, and what were then the equally unattractive eastern areas characterized by a high concentration of industry. The Polish population there was comprised primarily of workers and peasants, who could not afford unnecessary journeys and thus did not participate in the tourist movement, which in turn limited cultural transfer. Such transfer was present to a greater degree in the Habsburgian region of Cieszyn Silesia, where the German Beskid Society (Beskidenverein), the “Beskid” Polish Tourism Society, and the Czech Tourist Club (Klub českých turistů) were all active²⁰. Consideration should be given here to the greater national awareness of the residents of that region, the higher economic status of the Polish and Czech populations, and the nearness of the mountains (Beskid), which, from the perspective of the Upper Silesian city of Katowice (Kattowitz) were on the other side of the frontier until 1922.

The Sudetes separate Silesia from Czechia, but from the tourist perspective they should link these lands, as the border massifs have been penetrated from both sides. A special place in this respect is occupied by the Karkonosze, which constitute Czechia’s highest mountain range, making them a particularly prominent element of Czech culture. However, until 1945, in the mountain region the Sudeten German community²¹ was larger than the Czech population. The former group enjoyed privileges under Habsburg rule, making the collapse of the Austro-Hungarian Empire and the 1918 founding of Czechoslovakia all the more painful for it. This apposition is of importance when considering how strong national antagonisms were brought into the mountain space, where each side wished to document its advantage over the other²². Strong national motivation was not, however, the only factor leading to tourism and sport growing more rapidly on the Czech side of the border. The economic dimension of tourism was understood more quickly in Vienna than in Berlin, which is why the Austrian authorities began to support it before the German ones did. A pro-tourist policy was also continued by

²⁰ Edward Wieczorek, *Szkice z dziejów turystyki i krajoznawstwa na Górnym Śląsku*, Katowice 2007, pp. 15–28.

²¹ For more Piotr M. Majewski, “*Niemcy sudeccy*” 1848–1948: historia pewnego nacjonalizmu, Warszawa 2007.

²² Tomasz Przerwa, *Narciarstwo w przedwojennych Sudetach z perspektywy narodowej*, [in:] *Historia polskiego i niemieckiego sportu w XIX i XX wieku: idee, ludzie, polityka i kultura*, eds. Dariusz Wojtaszyn, Włodzimierz Stępiński, Jerzy Eider, Poznań 2016, pp. 77–88.

Czechoslovakian authorities, seeking a means of reinforcing the Czech presence in the Sudetes. Let us return, however, to the issue of cultural transfers. The German-Czech conflict in Czech lands did not directly impact the Silesian region (insofar as we overlook the fragment of Silesia under Habsburg control and later taken over by Czechoslovakia). Nevertheless, national sentiment led Germans from Silesia to sympathize with the Sudeten Germans. Czechs from Germany and Germans from Czechia were unenthusiastic partners. They were more inclined to compete and lift ideas from one another, proof of which can be found in such examples as the similarity of the Czech “Sokół” to the German Gymnastic Society (Turnverein). That said, the ideas of Friedrich Ludwig Jahn did not reach Prague via Wrocław. German gymnastics, popular in Silesia following the Napoleonic Wars, and again (after the ban was lifted) from the mid-1860s, did not have a direct impact on the activities of Poles. Even the Polish “Sokół” in Upper Silesia was subject to Czech and Galician intermediary influences²³. Indeed, this split would seem typical of activities with a strong national subtext, which was heavily emphasized in the gymnastics of the time²⁴.

National issues increasingly impacted the possibility of and desire to cooperate. Within the Slavic (Poles and Czechs) environment, German residents of Silesia were essentially left with the choice to reinforce their ties with Sudeten Germans, who were more active in tourism. A range of solutions was thus imported from the south to the German side of the Sudetes in the age of accelerated development in tourism. A modern conception for a network of inexpensive tourist lodgings for youngsters (“Studenten- und Schülerherberge”) was developed in the Czech portion of the Karkonosze in 1884, which was then copied in Silesia. The Habsburg Empire also provided inspiration in the north for the ideas of the social democratic “Naturfreunde” Tourist Societies (Touristenverein). The Sudeten Germans surpassed their Silesian counterparts in establishing mountain and sporting associations. Some of them engaged in activity on the Silesian side of the border as well, such as the Moravian-Silesian Sudeten Mountain Society (Mährisch-Schlesischer Sudetengebirgsverein) and the

²³ Karl-Heinz Schodrok, *Turnen und Sport während des 19. und am Anfang des 20. Jahrhunderts*, [in:] *Geschichte des Turnens und Sports in Schlesien 1812–1989*, eds. Tomasz Jurek, Karl-Heinz Schodrok, Weimar 2012, s. 60–77; *idem*, *Turnvereine für Erwachsene*, [in:] *Geschichte des Turnens*, s. 105–118; Diethelm Blecking, *Die polnische Sokolbewegung 1894–1921*, [in:] *Geschichte des Turnens*, s. 119–123.

²⁴ See Pieter M. Judson, *Guardians on the Nation: Activists on the Language Frontiers of Imperial Austria*, London 2000, s. 141–176; Češi a Němci ve světě tělovýchový a sportu = *Die Deutschen und Tschechen in der Welt des Turnens und des Sports*, ed. Marek Waic, Praha 2004.

“Riesengebirge” Skiers’ Association (Schneeschuhläuferverband). The south also provided inspiration for the signage used along tourist trails. Examples of the opposite direction for transfer of models were less frequent, but not unheard of. Oscar Vorwerg, one of the pioneers of German skiing and linked closely with the Jelenia Góra region at the end of the 19th century, also promoted the sport in the Czech region of the Karkonosze. His ski textbook, one of the first in Central Europe, was also known to Polish enthusiasts of the sport. Nevertheless, the development of Silesian skiing was slow, which explains why Sudeten German and Czech skiers outpaced their Silesian counterparts up to the 1930s. It was only during the interwar period that Silesia saw the development of world-class sporting facilities; Norwegian and Austrian trainers were brought in, and professionals were sent to camps and courses both domestically and abroad. All this contributed to the success of the skiers Günther Meergans and Herbert Leupold. That said, Silesia’s contribution to the development of German skiing was modest at best. The descriptions in some works of the pioneering (in the German context) use of skis in the Karkonosze as early as the 1840s remains up for discussion, and – more importantly – did not impact the later popularity of the equipment. Insofar as it was used at all in Szklarska Poręba, it did not catch on even among the town’s residents²⁵.

The preceding analysis – focused on a discussion of tourism and winter sports in the Sudetes – has demonstrated the insignificant influence of Silesian experiences on the development of those segments of contemporary mass culture, in spite of chronologically preceding the achievements of many other mountain regions of (Central) Europe. It can be assumed that the transfer of Silesian models was not furthered by the absence of broader interest and distinctness of conditions present during the modern era and in the first half of the 19th century. However, later on these practices were out of line with the modern spirit of tourism and sport. The fashion for admiring sunrise from mountaintops, carrying litters with well-to-do tourists, and descents on horned sleighs quickly passed. While the latter lasted until the mid-20th century, it was in the form of a local curiosity from a past era. Newer and newer attractions and were sought in the mountains. The old elitism was replaced with the presence of the masses, while self-reliance and performance became the focus, which nevertheless did not exclude considerations of comfort. Once inaccessible mountains attracted tourists with an expansive network of

²⁵ Przerwa, *Między łąkiem*, pp. 51–216.

lodgings and transport infrastructure, which themselves required brave decisions and significant financial investment. Key investments were concentrated in the most attractive areas, essentially flagships. The Silesian mountains did remain popular among Germans inhabiting the eastern provinces of the Reich, but their fame rapidly declined in comparison to the soaring Alps. It was there that the usefulness of familiar solutions was confirmed while new ones were created. The Sudetes were simply too low, too gentle, and too unremarkable to play a similar role. The spatial distance of Silesia to the economic, political, and cultural core of Europe also cannot be ignored, which impacted i.a. the important absence of enterprising Brits. Modern media, including outstanding film productions, served to solidify and extend the predominance of the Alps. It was those mountains rather than the Sudetes which ultimately influenced the development of modern mountain tourism. Significantly, Silesia did not even impact regions located further east, including the Carpathians. Elites there took their cues from Austrian solutions which they had become accustomed to under Habsburg rule. They also began to directly employ the “Sèvres model”, which accelerated the transfer of ideas and eliminated the German intermediary; this was not insignificant in the face of growing national tensions at the end of the 19th century. The past custom of Polish elites to visit Silesian health resorts was replaced by the need to create indigenous tourist centres. The later (from the Sudeten perspective) discovery of the qualities of the Tatra Mountains had been rendered meaningless by the interwar period. The dynamic growth of Zakopane erased the lead once enjoyed by Silesian tourist spots, which, in contrast to the capital of the Polish Tatras, did not enter the general national consciousness nor receive state support. The cable car at Kasprowy Wierch, opened in 1936, and the skiing world championships held in Zakopane in 1939 – contrasted with the lack of similar achievements in Silesia – demonstrate how rapidly the reality of tourism in this part of the continent evolved.

Sporting and tourism activity in Silesia was naturally not restricted to the Sudetes. Nevertheless, it remains difficult to indicate other aspects in this respect that would distinguish Silesia from Germany or Europe, which in turn makes it more difficult to determine the direction, mode, and scale of transfer of certain models during an age of increasing openness. It is sufficient to recall the power of the press at the time (including tourism and sporting press), the growing mobility enjoyed by society, and the political conditions already mentioned, all of which made it possible to overlook Silesia in the transfer of new cultural models.

Similarly, the region's residents did not have to take notice of the experiences of neighbouring regions. The notion of sporting competition came to Germany from England, considered the home of modern sport, in the 19th century. Initially this trend did not awaken significant enthusiasm among Germans, as a result of the previous development in German lands of a gymnastics directed at physical and patriotic education simultaneously, not accommodating of foreign models. Following the lead of other German cities – particularly the capital, Berlin – sporting activity also penetrated Silesia's leading urban centres. This process is reflected in the chronology of Wrocław. In 1876, the first rowing club was founded there, while a cycling club formed in 1880, in 1885 – a swimming club, in 1891 – an athletic club, in 1897 – track and field, in 1898 – football, in 1903 – tennis, and in 1907 – skating²⁶. In successive decades, particularly during the interwar period, Silesia saw the emergence of hundreds of similar organizations; sport also penetrated gymnastics societies, youth groups, etc. It became an element of mass culture, chasing out the old elitism. The greatest popularity was achieved by football, which took root in almost every part of Silesia. However, the distance from England and negligible presents of Brits in the region meant that the fascination with sport there developed more slowly and later than in comparison to regions located further west. Another observation would seem to be crucial, namely that the residents of Silesia adopted finished models without developing them further. Individual successes of particular athletes also do not attest to the special position of Silesian sport²⁷. All of these factors influenced Silesia's weak impact on sport.

A particular situation in Upper Silesia developed at the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries, where a national conflict erupted. Fierce political conflict extended to the sporting sphere, which was then subjected to national segmentation. It also affected later historiography, something pointed out by several authors, including Henryk Rechowicz²⁸. This segmentation of activity was not, however, a total separation, as the national fluidity of a significant portion of the population and an initial discrimination against Polish initiatives forced those Polish youth with sporting ambitions to don the colours of German associations. During the Upper

²⁶ See also Gerhard Schindler, *Entwicklung und Organisation des neuzeitlichen Sports in Breslau von den Anfängen bis 1905*, Breslau 1938.

²⁷ Karl-Heinz Schodrok, *Turnen und Sport in Schlesien in der Zwischenkriegszeit und während des Zweiten Weltkriegs*, [in:] *Geschichte des Turnens*, pp. 130–131, 227–232. See also Sławomir Szymański, *Sport w Breslau*, Wrocław 2011.

²⁸ Henryk Rechowicz, *Sport na Górnym Śląsku do 1939 roku*, Katowice 1997, pp. 5–6.

Silesian Uprisings (1919–1921) and following the incorporation of the eastern portion of Upper Silesia into Poland, this situation naturally changed. Investigations into the history of Upper Silesian sport continue to devote insufficient focus to the issue of penetration of cultural models. In turn, the similar (in terms of direction) evolution of Polish and German sport in that area during the first half of the 20th century must have at least partially arose out of the adoption of attractive solutions which the Germans – richer, better educated and supported by the state – were generally first to take notice of. The socio-economic distinctness of the region also certainly affected this parallelism in development, as did access to the sporting infrastructure being developed. These factors help explain the successes of Upper Silesian swimmers, skaters, and hockey players²⁹. Proximity encouraged competition³⁰, while also making it easier to adopt models and athletes themselves. The legendary striker Ernst Wilimowski began his career in 1927 playing for the German side 1. FC Kattowitz, and from 1934 played for the Polish club Ruch Hajduki Wielkie (Chorzów). He first represented Poland, but after 1939 played for the Third Reich, leading some to attempt to erase him from the annals of Upper Silesian sport. There are quite a number of similar cases from the nationally diverse history of Upper Silesia³¹.

Invoking the slogan of the present project – Silesia, a region of cultural encounters – it can be said that the encounters which took place within Silesian tourism and sport prior to 1945 were of a rather limited nature, resulting in part due to national animosities and animosities, as well as cultural and social differences. This does not exclude cultural transfer from Silesia to Polish lands, but it also was not of decisive influence on the development of the Polish tourist and sporting movement. A result of the clear distinctness of the Polish-speaking and essentially plebeian population inhabiting Upper Silesia from Polish society in the remaining Polish regions was the absence – not necessarily intentional – of cultural penetration in any broader scope. Potentially greater possibilities for transfer could be found in the experiences of Poles in Sudeten health spas. Polish elites

²⁹ For more *ibidem*; Antoni Steuer, *Ruch sportowy w województwie śląskim 1922–1939*, Opole 2008; *Z dziejów kultury fizycznej na Śląsku. Rozwój kultury fizycznej na Śląsku w latach 1919–1989*, eds. Mirosław Ponczek, Karl-Heinz Schodrok, Katowice 2009.

³⁰ Henryk Rechowicz, *Wpływ konfliktu polsko-niemieckiego i rywalizacji polsko-niemieckiej na rozwój polskiego sportu w województwie śląskim*, [in:] *Z najnowszej historii kultury fizycznej w Polsce*, vol. 6, ed. Leonard Nowak, Gorzów Wielkopolski 2004, pp. 149–154.

³¹ *Górnoślązacy w polskiej i niemieckiej reprezentacji narodowej w piłce nożnej – wczoraj i dziś. Sport i polityka na Górnym Śląsku*, Gliwice–Opole 2012, pp. 23–38.

eagerly visited them and felt relatively free there, but these locations began to lose their cosmopolitan character at the end of the 19th century. The German population of Silesia, Brandenburg, and Saxony became predominant³². In an era of mass tourism, the once prominent but nevertheless small groups of Polish guests simply became less important. Manifestations of Polish patriotism allowed as late as the 1870s could not count on the acceptance of the German majority in a period of rising nationalist tendencies³³. National antagonisms began to penetrate with increasing strength what seemed to be the neutral sphere of sport and recreation. Demonstrating superiority over a rival in sporting competitions in particular contributed to feelings of national pride. However, such international competitions were sporadic in Silesia, within whose borders there were also few sporting events of greater than local reach. The 1933 bobsleigh world championships and 1928 European sledding championships, both held in Szklarska Poręba, were the greatest achievements in this area. Considerations of infrastructure and politics decided about the awarding of such events.

Tourism – as mentioned – was not free of competition, and in Silesia this was manifested in the border areas of the Sudetes, where summits were adorned with monuments, towers, and huts dedicated to rulers and national heroes. While those devoted to the Hohenzollerns and to Bismarck were considered at the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries to be expressions of German patriotism (as the Polish writer Stanisław Bełza felt), during the interwar period a strong German-Czech conflict led to a controlled confrontation. This is reflected in the erection at the border of “political” huts in close proximity to one another, such as the Czech “Masarykowej boudy” and German “Hindenburgbaude” in the Orlickie Mountains (Adlergebirge). A similar phenomenon could be observed in Cieszyn Silesia, where Germans and Poles tried to exert influence over the Beskid ranges in the area. Visitors chose with increasing frequency “native” venues where “foreigners” were not as welcome. The harmony which once existed was disrupted, reaching its end with the beginning of World War I. The report of Stanisław Bełza from “Labska bouda” (“Elbfallbaude”)

³² In 1935, foreign guests in the Karkonosze and Izerskie mountains constituted 1.28% of all tourists, while 81.26% of domestic tourists came from the eastern part of Germany. See Hans Poser, *Geographische Studien über den Fremdenverkehr im Riesengebirge: Ein Beitrag zur geographischen Betrachtung des Fremdenverkehrs*, Göttingen 1939, p. 83, 89.

³³ Tomasz Przerwa, *Problemy narodowe z perspektywy sudeckiej na Śląsku (do 1945 roku)*, [in:] *Wiekie stare i nowe. Ludzie i elity pogranicza*, eds. Maciej Fic, Ryszard Kaczmarek, Katowice 2012, pp. 184–200.

in the Karkonosze must have sounded during the interwar period like an idyllic tale from a far-off land, as he had written at the close of the 19th century “When the sign was given [...] the notes of a wistful song rang out. It was the Czech melody ‘Where is my home?’ [orig. ‘Kde domov můj’], so popular in Czechia, and so lovely. Germans and Czech rose from their benches, formed a circle around the singing girl, and at the end rewarded her with a storm of heartfelt applause”³⁴. As it later turned out, two decades later this tune, applauded so warmly, became the hymn of Czechoslovakia, and in 1993 of The Czech Republic. The nationalism raised in the “valleys” quickly penetrated the visitor-filled mountains, which themselves became a new space for conflict. Interestingly, the mountain of Śnieżka, significant for both Czechs and Prussians (Germans), was also the site of demonstrations by patriotic Poles during the time of subjugation, and when the Tatras did not yet dominate the national literature. In 1847, the Polish poet Kornel Ujejski built a pyramid of stones on it. When asked by a curious German what he was trying to achieve, he replied “Für die polnische Unsterblichkeit!”³⁵. As some had once sought God in the mountains, now others sought the spirit of their nation. This is reflected in *Kordian* by the Polish national bard Juliusz Słowacki, in which the hero experiences a spiritual transformation on the peak of Mont Blanc. Romantics were fixated on the mythical space of the mountains, while their successors were more inclined to engage in a battle for symbols and land. In this respect, Poles before 1945 had little to say in the Sudetes, for even those aware of the Polish nature of Silesia during the Middle Ages understood the German transformation that took place. In 1848, the young poet Roman Zmorski penned these prophetic words about Ślęża, writing that “She shall return to her old nest – Old law, old speech – And the inspired life of the Slavs.”³⁶ These words – to the extent they were known in the broader world – could not count on a greater response among the Polish visitors to the then-German Silesia.

The tourism and sport movement as we understand it today does not have a long historical record. Its earlier forms and similar practices (pilgrimage, *grand tour*, tourneys, etc.) are worthy of attention, but seem to have very little in common with the later explosion of interest in sport and tourism. Fundamental transformations in the 19th century replaced the previous model of social behaviours, and gave

³⁴ Stanisław Bełza, *W Górach Olbrzymich*, Warszawa 1893, p. 102.

³⁵ Kincel, *Sarmaci*, p. 141.

³⁶ Zbigniew Szkolnicki, *Roman Zmorski na Ślęży*, Wrocław 1980, p. 14.

rise to the need to escape the monotony and accelerating pace of everyday existence. This was encouraged by the material and intellectual improvements in the lives of people in urban and industrial regions, which at the time formed the seedbeds of obligatory cultural models. The contribution of the urban elites was to introduce sport and tourist activity to the canon of social behaviours, which simultaneously accelerated their standardization and nationalization. The regional perspective of the history of sport and tourism must thus be presented in a broader context. Social mobility and the rapid circulation of information contributed to the erasure of traditionally understood borders, and sped up the transfer of new ideas, which is why it is more comfortable to speak of the influence of exceptional individuals, centres, or particular events rather than regional impact within this scope. Mass culture accelerated the transfer of adopted models within regions, states, continents, and the world as a whole, along with particular attitudes. The hope that sport and tourism can bring nations closer turned out to be only partially justified. It did create a platform for encounters and meetings, but of various natures and colour. The borderland character of Silesia theoretically seemed to facilitate the transfer of new cultural phenomena, but in practice it is difficult to find confirmation of this taking place on a larger scale. It rather adopted fashions created elsewhere instead of an originator or mediator. Particularly significant in this dimension is the impossibility of transplanting tourist practices developed in Silesia in the early 19th century, a time when it was far ahead of many other European regions.

TOMASZ PRZERWA

TRANSFER PRAKTYK TURYSTYCZNYCH I SPORTOWYCH W XIX I XX WIEKU Z PERSPEKTYWY ŚLĄSKA: WZORCE REGIONALNE W DOBIE KULTURY MASOWEJ I NARODOWEJ

Autor dowodzi, że choć w Sudetach ma swoje źródło szereg innowacji turystycznych i sportowych, które wyprzedzały podobne rozwiązania wprowadzane w innych masywach górskich, to jednak nie wykroczyły one poza środowiska lokalne. Inspirację do kształtowania nowoczesnego ruchu turystycznego czerpano w Alpach. Moda na alpejskość rozpoczęła się na Śląsku już w połowie XIX w., kiedy w przestrzeni Sudetów pojawiły się „szwajcarki” – pasterskie gospodarstwa połączone z obsługą turystyczną. Prócz wzorców architektoniczno-funkcjonalnych przeniesiono model funkcjonowania towarzystw górskich, ideę sezonu zimowego, zjazdów saneczkowych, bobslejowych, ski-jöringu, modę na narciarstwo alpejskie, a nawet przyrodnicze detale alpejskiego świata (kuriozalny przykład to podjęcie próby nasadzeń szarotek alpejskich w Sudetach Środkowych). Z Alp

przejęto m.in. rozwiązania infrastrukturalne (widokowe szosy górskie), organizacyjne (ratownictwo górskie) i kolejne dyscypliny sportowe. Tak istotne dla narciarstwa alpejskiego koleje linowe i wyciągi narciarskie pojawiły się na tym terenie dopiero po 1945 r.

Szereg rozwiązań importowano również z austriackiej/czeskiej na niemiecką stronę Sudetów w dobie przyspieszonego rozwoju turystycznego. Nowatorska koncepcja sieci tanich kwater turystycznych przeznaczonych dla młodzieży (Studenten- und Schülerherberge) zrodziła się w czeskich Karkonoszach w 1884 r. i znalazła propagatorów na Śląsku. Z monarchii Habsburgów przeniknęła również na północ idea socjaldemokratycznych Towarzystw Turystycznych (Touristenverein) „Naturfreunde”. Niemcy Sudeccy wyprzedzili śląskich Niemców w powoływaniu zrzeszeń górskich i sportowych. Z południa przyjmowano nadto sposoby oznaczenia szlaków turystycznych. Przykładów odwrotnego kierunku transferu kulturowego było znacznie mniej. Turystyka nie była wolna od rywalizacji politycznej, a ta na Śląsku przejawiała się w przestrzeni granicznych Sudetów, gdzie stawiano na szczytach pomniki, wieże widokowe i schroniska turystyczne dedykowane władcom i bohaterom narodowym. Pograniczny charakter Śląska teoretycznie zdawał się sprzyjać wymianie różnorodnych zjawisk kulturowych, ale w praktyce stawał się odbiorcą wytworzonych gdzie indziej mód niż ich kreatorem czy pośrednikiem.

JĘDRZEJ CHUMIŃSKI
(Wrocław University of Economics and Business)

SOCIAL CONDITIONS OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF CULTURE IN POST-WAR WROCLAW

Padraic Kenney, an American scholar researching the post-war history of Wrocław, observed that in the 1980s the capital of Lower Silesia was a special city, not only when considered against the backdrop of other Polish cities, but was also a phenomenon among other metropolias of Central and Eastern Europe. Wrocław became an important centre of opposition against the authoritarian governments of the communist party, a significant place of intellectual ferment, where original concepts for the development of self-governance and systemic economic reforms were born; but it also became a place where cultural life blossomed, both within official structures and as an effect of social activity occurring outside the control of authorities¹.

Wrocław's exceptionality is all the more significant when considering it was only from the second half of 1945 that the Polish community of the city began to form essentially from scratch. Thus, a mere 40 years was enough for a city composed primarily of immigrants, whom the dramatic events of war forced to settle in Wrocław, to evolve into a welcoming city and community comprised of people considered both past and present as friendly, open, and tolerant. They are characterized by "attributes, attitudes, values, habits, and predispositions" which allow us to speak of them in terms of a modern community². Colloquial assessments were confirmed in scientific studies conducted after 1981. In the opinion of Wrocław's residents themselves, they are characterized by a large number of pro-social traits

¹ Padraic Kenney, *Wrocławskie zadymy*, Wrocław 2007, p. 5–12.

² Piotr Sztompka, *Socjologia zmian społecznych*, Kraków 2005, p. 85.

like openness, gregariousness, solidarity, and tolerance³. In some of its aspects the Wrocław population's reserves of social capital (such as social trust and tendency to engage in altruistic behaviour to the benefit of other members of the community) is presently on par with that of leading European cities⁴.

One of the key features of the city's community has been and continues to be its openness to the values of culture. This was central in the city achieving the status of one of Poland's most important centres of culture and art. As Bogdan Zakrzewski said when summarizing in 1970 the achievements of Wrocław in the field, "its achievements in the last quarter-century make it second only to the cultural milieu of Warsaw (Warszawa), and equal to that of Kraków"⁵. Aleksander Wallis, a scholar researching the issue of the spatial arrangement of culture during the times of the People's Republic (PRL), classified Wrocław as one of the cities in possession of "multifaceted and durable functions at the national level in primary fields of the arts and sciences, as well as independent ties – at least in selected areas of the arts and sciences – with centres in other countries"⁶. It should be emphasized that the capital of Lower Silesia was initially placed in the same group alongside Jelenie Góra, only to rapidly – already in the 1950s – advance to the category of Grade II cultural centres, which at the time included *inter alia* Kraków, Poznań, and Łódź.

This, of course, was primarily the achievement of many outstanding artists, whose professional careers after the war were linked with Wrocław. The founders of theatre live in the city were such outstanding "pre-war" directors and producers like Edmund Wierciński, whose name today graces the Contemporary Theatre, and Wilam Horzyca, legendary producer of works by Stanisław Wyspiański and William Shakespeare. At the turn of the 1950s and 60s, a global career was undertaken by Henryk Tomaszewski, who, alongside Jean-Louis Barrault, is one of the most outstanding artists in the pantomime theatre tradition, as well as Jerzy Grotowski, who, in spite of only three premiers in Wrocław, is considered a great reformer of

³ Jacek Pluta, *Studium wrocławskiego autostereotypu*, [in:] *My Wrocławianie. Społeczna przestrzeń miasta*, eds. Piotr Żuk, Jacek Pluta, Wrocław 2006, p. 245; *Rozmowa z Piotrem Żukiem o tym jacy jesteśmy – kto ma kompleks Wrocławia*, „Wieża Ciśnień”, no. 79 of 10 June 2005, p. 5 (supplemental to „Gazeta Wyborcza”).

⁴ Wojciech Skiba, *Kapitał społeczny mieszkańców Wrocławia*, [in:] *My Wrocławianie*, p. 97.

⁵ Bogdan Zakrzewski, *Przedmowa*, [in:] *Panorama kultury współczesnego Wrocławia*, ed. Bogdan Zakrzewski, Wrocław 1970, p. 11.

⁶ Wallis classified only Warsaw as a Grade I city. The majority of cities were classified as Grade III. Aleksander Wallis, *Atlas kultury Polski 1946-1980*, Warszawa 1994, p. 18.

theatre in the same vein as Konstantin Stanisławski, Wsiewołod Meyerhold, Bertold Brecht, and Peter Brook. Wrocław was also a place for important theatre festivals – the Festival of Polish Contemporary Art was initiated in 1960, while the All-Poland Review of One-Person Shows was started in 1966, and a year later, in 1967, the Festival of Festivals of Student Theatres kicked off. Life was breathed into the musical scene in Wrocław by outstanding instrumentalists, directors, and composers: Stanisław Skrowaczewski, Kazimierz Wiłkomirski, Tadeusz Natanson, and Edmund Kajdasz. Of particular distinction, however, was Andrzej Markowski, who not only turned the Wrocław Philharmonia into one of the country's best orchestras, but also founded one of Poland's leading music festivals, the Wratislavia Cantans. This was not, however, the only important musical event in Wrocław. Beginning in 1962, the Festival of Polish Contemporary Music was organized, while 1964 saw the beginning of the Organ Music Days and the Jazz on the Odra Festival, while the Music of the Old Masters festival was initiated in 1967. As for the plastic arts, worthy of distinction is Eugeniusz Geppert, founder of the Wrocław School of Structuralism, and Xawery Dunikowski, the most outstanding Polish sculptor of the last century, whose work has been continued by his numerous students in Wrocław. The quality of the Wrocław literary milieu is attested to by the fact that it was inhabited for various periods of time by such luminaries as Maria Dąbrowska, Anna Kowalska, Jan Kott, and Wojciech Żukrowski. Tadeusz Różewicz, one of the most exquisite Polish poets and playwrights of the 20th century, also hitched his literary star to Wrocław. It was Czesław Miłosz, another Pole and winner of the Nobel Prize, in a work dedicated to him and titled "To Tadeusz Różewicz, the Poet", wrote the well-known line "Happy is the nation that has its poet, and does not labour in silence".

The rank of Wrocław's cultural milieu was therefore determined first and foremost by the great artists that, somewhat prophetically in anticipation of the communist era, Folrian Znaniecki called "leaders of culture"⁷. Scholars examining various aspects of the functioning of the "cultural universum" point out, however, that in spite of its autonomy, it is also a subsystem of the broader system that is society. This means that the shape of the world of culture is determined not only by internal factors of development, but external ones as well, the most important of which are educational and demographic processes, wealth levels, class and

⁷ Anna Karwińska, *Kultura*, [in:] *Kultura a rozwój*, eds. Jerzy Hausner, Anna Karwińska, Jacek Purchla, Warszawa 2013, p. 62.

professional structure, generational divides, political events, processes of migration and urbanization etc.⁸ This means that culture always has a social character, and its own distinctness in every society. A community, with its particular and individual experiences, is the co-creator of a culture which must be adapted to the specific needs and aspirations of the members of that group. Thus, there exist “cultural responses” whose form is influenced primarily by the addresses of culture⁹. As Anna Karwińska put it, “Every act associated with participation in culture, with receipt of its products, is at the same time an act of creating symbolic meaning. [...] The process of creating culture is not necessarily something exceptional, require a particular inspiration or or exceptional talent”¹⁰. This means that an important element in the creationl of the cultural values of every community are so-called prosumers, i.e. consumers who are at once its co-creators¹¹.

Scholars of culture emphasize the problems associated with identifying an unambiguous definition of “cultural practices”, which are composed not only of engagement with “high art” (such as going to the cinema, theatre, museum, or concerts), but also lifestyle, participation in amateur art endeavours, custom, tradition, education, knowledge¹². There is consensus as to one thing: it concerns the sociodemographic characteristics of societies which have an influence on the concentration and quality of the “cultural prasctices” being performed. It is almost a linear relationship: the higher the level of education, wealth, resicence in larger urban centres, privileged position the social structure etc., the greater the participation in “cultural practices”¹³. In this context, the issue of post-war conditions for the development of culture in Wrocław is essentially a question of the changing shape of the community that makes up the city. Indeed, it is its residents, being not only consumers of cultural values, but also their co-creaotrs in a certain sense, that establish the tempo and direction of changes in the city’s culture.

It should also be emphasized that the starting point in 1945 was exceptionally disadvantageous. During the first years after the war it is hard to speak of

⁸ Wallis, *Atlas*, p. 36.

⁹ Karwińska, *Kultura*, p. 58–63.

¹⁰ *Ibidem*, p. 68.

¹¹ Ewa Gulik, *Konsument, prosument, produser transformacja podmiotu wymiany rynkowej w społeczeństwie sieci*, „Kultura i Historia”, 24, 2013, [in:] www.kulturahistoria.umcs.lublin.pl/kultura-i-historia-nr-242013 (access: 5 December 2016).

¹² Andrzej Tyszką, *Interesy i ideały kultury*, Warszawa 1987, pp. 89–96; *Uczestnictwo ludności w kulturze w 2009 r.*, Warszawa 2012, pp. 53–57.

¹³ *Uczestnictwo ludności w kulturze w 2014 r.*, Warszawa 2016.

a community in the city; rather, it was an amorphous, atomized, and alienated mass, with a very poor level of education, and to a significant degree hailing from rural areas. This resulted in the city assuming a sort of rustic quality (in 1947 it was estimated that the percentage of the population coming directly from the countryside was 40.8%, while those born there was 48.5%)¹⁴. Gregor Thum pointed out that the village roots of a significant portion of “new” Vratislavians (taken from the Latin name of the city Vratislavia) was more important for the animosities then present among various groups of city residents than the differences resulting from regional ties or historical experiences¹⁵. This also impacted the possibilities at the time for the development of culture. The creators of culture settling in Wrocław at the time understood this. The outstaying poet Anna Kowalska wrote that “For now, that ever-growing human mass remains alien, anonymous. [...] there remains no organizational life. There are dead hives with wiled bees. There is no society”¹⁶. The peak of cultural needs for a large portion of the city’s residents at the time was to visit the fun fair and to adorn their flats with reproductions of “the strutting deer”¹⁷. The press continually featured articles condemning the behaviour of spectators at the theatre or during concerts, which people considered to be “the most appropriate place for eating and conversing, for off-colour humour, or even simply offensive jokes”, and the audience emitted sounds of “slurping, smacking, crunching, and other inarticulate noises, as practically everyone considered it a manner of honour to down cookies and sweetmeats at the theatre”¹⁸.

In such circumstances it should come as no surprise that, as noted by researchers on cultural phenomena in Wrocław, during the initial years the offer of the city’s cultural institutions had to take into account the specific traits of the city’s society. As Józef Kelera put it, this was “the primitive in its mass and civilizationally heterogeneous mix of people that the community of Wrocław’s residents constituted in the 1940s – particularly during the pioneer years – should be enlightened from its foundations up, and continually dragged by the arm into a showcase of art selected in accordance with elementary needs”¹⁹. However, this “primitive mixture of people” very quickly turned into a society, which then became

¹⁴ Irena Turnau, *Studia nad strukturą ludnościową polskiego Wrocławia*, Poznań 1960, p. 59.

¹⁵ Gregor Thum, *Obce miasto. Wrocław 1945 i potem*, Wrocław 2005, pp. 139–146.

¹⁶ Anna Kowalska, *Opowieści Wrocławskie*, Warszawa 1955, p. 225.

¹⁷ Thum, *Obce miasto*, p. 144.

¹⁸ Marek Ordyłowski, *Życie codzienne we Wrocławiu 1945–1948*, Wrocław 1991, p. 132.

¹⁹ Józef Kelera, *Teatry wrocławskie*, [in:] *Panorama kultury współczesnego Wrocławia*, p. 312.

“a fertile and grateful social soil” and whose impact on the development of culture after less than a quarter-century was characterised by Bogdan Zakrzewski thus: “This is the contribution of a young, creative, consolidating community, full of the verve so characteristic of youth unburdened by the heritage of a traditionalist understanding of culture, a risk-taking youth that scorns ‘cold rationality’. This is the contribution of many ambitious, spontaneous, and frequently improvised social and individual initiatives which – at times – took the authorities responsible for culture by surprise by acting out of turn”²⁰.

Examination of the sources of this exceptional transformation in the Wrocław community requires, first and foremost, familiarizing oneself with the social and demographic characteristics of the city’s initial residents. It is also vital to compare their characteristics and traits with those of residents of Poland’s other large cities – only then would it be possible to understand the specificities of Vratislavians, which could have impacted the later development of culture. Of course, we are not in possession of statistical data that would allow us to examine such issues at a scale covering the city’s entire community. However, we do have information about a statistically significant sample of Wrocław’s industrial workers who took up work in the period 1945-1956²¹. In total, we are in possession of data for 11,038 workers, which includes 10,021 blue collar and 1,017 white collar employees. This means that we have information on roughly 18% of all those employed in the city’s industry in 1956 (357 workplaces employed 61,412 people)²². It should also be emphasized that workers in industry comprised the largest group within the social structure of the city (over 1/3), and they can thus be treated as the archetypical “man/woman on the street”, reflecting typical characteristics of Wrocław residents²³. We compare this information with data on the industrial workers of Kraków, an important centre of culture and learning, which was destroyed during the war, and whose community was not subjected to diffusion and disintegration (we have information about 6,762 people, including 6,103 blue collar workers and 659 white

²⁰ *Ibidem*, p. 331; Zakrzewski, *Przedmowa*, p. 11.

²¹ Information on industrial employees was taken from the personnel files located in the following archives: Przedsiębiorstwo Aparatury Spawalniczej “ASPA”, Zakład Przemysłu Odzieżowego “Intermoda”, Zakład Przemysłu Odzieżowego “Otis” in Wrocław, Fabryka Maszyn Odlewniczych and Vistula Group S.A. in Kraków.

²² *Rozmieszczenie przemysłu według województw i powiatów w latach 1946 i 1956*, Warszawa 1960, p. 27.

²³ *Przekroje terenowe 1945–1965*, Warszawa 1967, p. 304.

collar workers), which constituted roughly 8.6% of the total number of employed (78,527 people).

Statistical analysis confirms the sociological “weakness” of the first generation of Vratislavians. In the first years immediately after the war, the city’s community was *in statu nascendi*, not only because practically all of its inhabitants were migrants, but also and primarily because they came from all of the pre-war regions of Poland. As we can learn from studies by Irena Turnau conducted in 1947, and confirmed in the data on industrial workers we gathered, Wrocław constituted a sort of “meeting point” for Poles seeking a new “little homeland” for themselves after the war²⁴. It is sufficient to point out that, in respect of Wrocław factories, never did more than 20% of the workforce come from a single province; the largest contingent, 80%, came from the so-called Old Lands, primarily from the Kielce Province (15.9%), Warsaw Province (15.6%), Łódź Province (11.8%), and Poznań Province (9.9%). However, contrary to the widely-held stereotype, the percentage of people from the Eastern Borderlands (which was comprised of 7 provinces) was relatively small – under 20%, out of which the largest portion came from Lwów Province (6.6%). However, a relatively large group consisted of workers who as of August 1939 lives beyond the borders of the Polish state (4.5%).

Diverse regional origins led to conflict, as Elżbieta Kaszuba observed “hostile reactions and contempt were generated by visible differences in culture, custom, speech (dialect), dress, behaviour, etc.” These were reflected in the offensive terms applied to various regional groups. The indigenous population were referred to as “krauts”, “Lutherans”, or “Fritzes”, while those resettled from the East were called “ruskies”, “little ukrainians”, and many other names, while migrants from central Poland were called “thieves” or “congressionalists” (from the term “Congress Poland”, given to the Russian-controlled portion of the country during the period of partition)²⁵.

Social atomization and disintegration resulting from regional differences were additionally deepened by differences of mentality resulting from the fact that a very large portion of Wrocław’s new residents were of rural origin. It is enough to indicate that among both white and blue collar industrial workers taking up employment in 1945–1956, as of August 1939, more than one of every two (50.2%) was

²⁴ Turnau, *Studia*, p. 31, 53.

²⁵ Marek Czaplinski, Elżbieta Kaszuba, Gabriela Wąs, Rościślaw Żerelik, *Historia Śląska*, Wrocław 2002, p. 464; Paweł Lewandowski, *Wschód i Zachód przemieszczone oraz odtworzone. Powstanie postmigracyjnego społeczeństwa polskich ziem zachodnich*, „Społeczeństwo i Kultura”, 3, 2013, p. 207.

living in a village. An even higher percentage is recorded when we take into consideration the birthplaces of the research individuals, as almost 2/3 was born in rural areas (62.6%). In this context, the frequent observations of the time concerning a sort of rustic tendency in the habits of Vratislavians come as no surprise. Another significant negative trait of that community was its quite low level of education. Over 70% had at best a primary education, of which over half (38.9%) of those did not complete even primary school²⁶. If we employ the education level indicator, on average among blue collar workers it was below the primary level (6.36, where full primary education is equivalent to 7), while among white collar workers it was below the level of secondary education (10.72 out of 11)²⁷.

The scale of disadvantageous phenomena is clearly visible when we compare these basic socio-demographic indicators on the people of Wrocław with residents of Kraków. In the case of Kraków, the milieu of industrial workers was far more homogenous in terms of culture. Almost 4/5 (79.3%) of workers taking up employment in the period 1945–1956 were living in Kraków Province in August 1939, and 47% of them in Kraków itself. The cultural identity of that group, its patterns of behaviour and of thought must have been passed on from generation to generation²⁸. We may also observe from information on background that the phenomenon of rusticalization of Kraków must have taken much smaller dimensions than in Wrocław; that said, the disproportions are not as great as one might suspect (indeed, those living in rural areas in August 1939 constituted 42%, while those born in the city: 54.8%). However, significant disproportions are visible if we take into account the level of education enjoyed by residents of the two cities. Indeed, in this respect the percentage of people with less than primary and with primary education was lower in Kraków than in Wrocław by over 16%²⁹. If we examine the education level indicator, for blue collar workers in Kraków it was above the primary level (7.21), while for white collar workers it exceeded the secondary level (11.05).

²⁶ Out of 11,042 employees, 31.7% (3,497 people) completed primary school, while 39.9% (4,292 people) did not reach this level of education.

²⁷ Calculations were made according to the model proposed by Zbigniew Strzelecki, *Zmiany w poziomie kwalifikacji załogi*, [in:] *Kształtowanie się załóg w regionach uprzemysłowionych*, ed. Władysław Szulc, Warszawa 1974, pp. 207–208.

²⁸ Ludwik Mrocza, *Krakowianie. Szkic do portretu zbiorowego w dobie industrialnej transformacji 1890–1939*, Kraków 1999, pp. 146, 152.

²⁹ Among 6,762 industrial employees, 33.2% (2,246 people) had a primary education, while those with less than a primary education were 20.9% (1,410).

The paradox consists in the fact that, over time, what had been the source of serious problems in the initial years following the war went on to become a source of positive transformations in the city. As E. Kaszuba pointed out, “the process of regionalisms blending together potentially comprised a source of a new and uniquely local identity for Wrocław”³⁰. Undoubtedly, there is quite a bit of exaggeration in the words of one settler, who predicted in 1945 that “the cleverness of the Varsovian, the sincerity of those from Lwów and Wilno, and the sturdiness of the Poznanians could be combined to create a new type of valuable society”³¹, it cannot, however, be denied that the clashes of different value systems, social awareness, and cultural identity made the city’s residents acutely aware of issues of otherness, and formed attitudes of openness and tolerance³². It is worth citing the opinion of Irena Turnau, who pointed out that as early as the end of the 1940s “the mixing of migrant groups of diverse social backgrounds was beneficial in practice. After less than four years of its existence, the Polish Wrocław is beginning to attain its own socio-cultural countenance. Bratislavians belonging to many sorts of regional groups are gradually forming a homogenous urban community”³³.

Alongside diverse territorial origin, a second factor that could have impacted the formation of a sort of collective identity for Bratislavians was their earlier mobility. Indeed, studies by social psychologists and sociologists demonstrate that territorial mobility is a characteristic of people who are active, resourceful, and capable of taking risks. Such people adapt more easily to new conditions, and are open to contacts with new people and cultures. Daniel Lerner pointed out the link that exists between physical and social mobility on the one hand, and what he termed “the mobile personality” on the other. Its significant characteristics are the capacity to adapt to rapid changes, and empathy, understood as “a general capacity to imagine oneself in another person’s shoes”³⁴. Travels and contacts with other people, the necessity of cohabitation with people exhibiting different patterns of behaviour and value systems, these are factors that contribute to tolerance and acceptance of otherness.

³⁰ Elżbieta Kaszuba, *Wrocław 1945–2008. Definiowanie tożsamości*, „Śląski Kwartalnik Historyczny Sobótka”, 65, 2010, 3, p. 404.

³¹ Lewandowski, *Wschód*, p. 208.

³² Jędrzej Chumiński, *Procesy ludnościowe we Wrocławiu w latach 1945-1950*, „Śląski Kwartalnik Historyczny Sobótka” 65, 2010, 3, pp. 365–382.

³³ Irena Turnau, *Pochodzenie ludności polskiego Wrocławia*, [in:] *Ziemie zachodnie w polskiej literaturze socjologicznej. Wybór tekstów*, ed. Andrzej Kwilecki, Poznań 1970, p. 351.

³⁴ Seymour M. Lipset, *Homo politicus. Społeczne podstawy polityki*, Warszawa 1995, p. 63.

In this context, of particular significance is the previous (pre-war and during the war) mobility of Wrocław residents. We can illustrate this phenomenon by referring to data concerning workers employed in industry during the period 1945–1956. From this data we can see that their pre-war mobility levels were far higher than that of the residents of Kraków. A telling fact is that, from among the future residents of Wrocław, who lived in cities of various categories in August 1939, at least 42.1% were migrants, while in Kraków it was 33.3%. Significantly, among the residents of cities, 30.5% of those in Wrocław had migrated from rural areas, while it was 24.4% in the case of Kraków. Future residents of Wrocław thus before the war had demonstrated an active approach to improving their own situation.

A radical increase in mobility took place during the occupation period. However, what primarily determined this was the removal of Poles to perform forced labour in Germany³⁵. It is no exaggeration to say that during the first years after the war, the milieu of industrial workers in Wrocław was comprised of a significant number of individuals who had experienced forced deportation to Germany. It is enough to point out that in the years 1945–1947, over 40% of these workers had such an experience in their history, while for the entire period under examination here this proportion was 25.8%. If we add to this people who changed their place of residence for other reasons, migrating to at least another province, the percentage of mobile individuals rises to over 35%. In the case of residents of Kraków, these values are far lower – 7.7% were deported to work, while around 13% migrated during the occupation period. It should, however, be emphasized that the “work”, in spite of its coercive character, did give young people the chance to encounter more urbanized areas displaying a higher level of civilization. Natural fears associated with changing one’s place of residence were also overcome, and the inclination to actively seek better life conditions was enhanced³⁶.

A third factor that should be taken into account when analyzing sources of the transformation of Vratislavians into a community open to cultural values is their age. Indeed, this was a “young” community when compared to the inhabitants of other cities. In the category of 15 to 39 years, and thus of the greatest life activity, only in Wrocław do we note a proportion exceeding 50% of the total population

³⁵ Jędrzej Chumiński, *Die Rolle ehemaliger Zwangsarbeiter bei der Besiedlung und Bewirtschaftung der sogenannten Wiedergewonnenen Gebiete in Polen in den Jahren 1945–1956*, [in:] *Interesse und Konflikt. Zur politischen Ökonomie der deutsch-polnischen Beziehungen 1900–2007*, eds. Dieter Bingen, Peter Oliver Loew, Nikolaus Wolf, Wiesbaden 2008, pp.161–181.

³⁶ Kazimierz Dobrowolski, *Teoria procesów żywiołowych w zarzysie*, Wrocław 1973, pp. 95–97.

(54.1%). This number is around 10% lower in the remaining large cities (Warsaw 42%, Kraków 45%, Łódź 43%, Poznań 41%). This percentage was, naturally, far lower in the 40+ age category, which in Wrocław was slightly over 20%, whilst in the other cities it oscillated between 32% and 36%. In this context, it is difficult to disagree with Władysław Markiewicz, who observed in respect of the characteristics of people settling in the western and northern regions after the war, that those places “became a land for the expansion of youthful, talented, energetic and ambitious people”³⁷.

It would seem that those three factors: diversity of life experiences associated with the different cultural baggage carried by new residents of Wrocław, the previously demonstrated active attitude expressed in migrations and the search for better living conditions, and the statistical “youthfulness”, allowed for an original community to form and take root in the city in the 1950s and 60s. This community easily adapted to new situations, actively confronted difficulties, eagerly absorbed new experiences, and was oriented towards getting ahead. Scholars examining social transformations in the Western and Northern Lands identify the sources of this in i.a. the fact that desirable social and cultural norms which all members of that new community must measure up to were recognized as the values of the Western world, like resourcefulness, attaching high importance to education, industriousness, thriftiness, durability; as once researcher captured it, these models were “saturated” with the ethos of a “Poznań positivism”³⁸.

A particular characteristic of Vratislavians was making up educational deficits. This is consistent with the observations of sociologists and demographers, who note that an important characteristic of migrants is their attaching great importance to education. Vratislavians who were in the first generation not only mostly of labourer and peasant background, but also had poor educations, transformed essentially into a studying society³⁹. In 1965, over 174,000 Vratislavians, i.e. 36.9% of the city’s residents, were taking education from primary to tertiary levels (in Warsaw it was 31%, Kraków 33%, Łódź 26.7%, and Poznań 33.4%). It should be emphasized that a significant portion of those enrolled were individuals pursuing complementary education (29,979 people – not including extramural

³⁷ Władysław Markiewicz, *Rola czynnika politycznego w przemianach społecznych*, [in:] *Ziemie zachodnie*, p. 413.

³⁸ Lewandowski, *Wschód*, p. 206, 211.

³⁹ Edmund Piasecki, *Mieszkańcy Wrocławia z r. 1959 w świetle statystyki ich miejsc urodzenia i pochodzenia społecznego*, „Czasopismo Geograficzne”, 33, 1962, 2, p. 231.

studies). We should also note that already in 1960 the percentage of those with a higher education either complete or in progress (students) in Wrocław (9.9%) was higher than in Poznań (9.3%) and Łódź (5.5%), and not much lower than in Kraków (13%) and Warsaw (13.3%). Then, a large portion of the community already consisted of people with a secondary education or pursuing education at the post-primary level (in Wrocław: 30%, while in Poznań 30.2%, Łódź 24%, Kraków 35.4%, Warsaw 35.2%)⁴⁰.

In this context it comes as no surprise that as early as in the 1960s, Wrocław did not stand out in terms of the proportion of inhabitants engaged in culture when compared to other major Polish cities, while in many aspects it was surpassed only by Warsaw and Kraków. In 1965, Wrocław was home to 9 cultural institutions (6 theatres, an opera, a musical theatre, and a philharmonic) and 8 institutions of higher education where a total of 25,801 people were studying. It should be emphasized that Poznań had 7 cultural institutions and 8 universities, Łódź had 11 and 7, respectively, while Kraków had 10 and 11, and Warsaw had 21 and 14. The stages of Wrocław's theatres and music halls enjoyed great popularity; indeed, in 1965 a total of 809,000 people visited them, which means that, on average, each resident of the city participated in almost two shows (1.71). In Poznań this number was smaller (1.67), while in Łódź only a bit higher (1.79); as for Kraków (2.04) and Warsaw (2.16) it should be kept in mind that many tourists visited these cities, and eagerly took advantage of the cultural offerings available in them. However, Vratislavians' favourite pastime was attending the cinema. Every resident participated in an average of over 10 screenings annually, and only Varsovians (residents of Warsaw) attended more frequently (in Wrocław, there were 10.1 people at the cinema per 1,000 residents; in Poznań it was 9.2, while in Łódź 7.2, Kraków 9.8, and Warsaw 11.4).

It is worth emphasizing that in the mid 1960s, Vratislavians were far ahead of the residents of all other large cities in terms of books read. Out of every 1,000 inhabitants, 171 Vratislavians made use of a library, whereas in Warsaw it was 149, in Kraków 150, Łódź 136, and Poznań 127. The same holds for the number of books borrowed, a category dominated by Vratislavians (25.2), followed by Poznań (24.6), Warsaw and Kraków (24.5), and Łódź (21.7). They were also equally eager to read

⁴⁰ All statistical data cited in this publication come from publications by *Statistic Poland: Rocznik statystyczny kultury 1945–1967*, Warszawa 1969; *Statystyka miast i osiedli 1945–1965*, Warszawa 1967; *Rocznik statystyczny powiatów 1971*, Warszawa 1971; *Przekroje terenowe 1945–1965*, Warszawa 1967; *Rocznik demograficzny 1945–1966*, Warszawa 1968.

the daily press, particularly periodicals. In the case of this last category, there were 33 copies sold per resident of the city, while in Poznań it was 32, Łódź 26, Kraków 42, and Warsaw 30. Also interesting is that, in 1965, Vratislavians possessed the largest number of television sets compared the residents of other large cities (save Warsaw). There were 1,386 per 10,000 residents, while in Poznań 1,383, Łódź 1,335, Kraków 1,192, and Warsaw 1,527.

While the generation of the first settlers provided an impulse for the development of culture in Wrocław, it was the next, born in the city during the two decades following the war, that made it a symbol of freedom, avant-garde artistic endeavours, and counterculture. Wiesław Wątroba, a scholar of the Wrocław “baby boomers” generation, stated that: “It is they who created the atmosphere of a city that was, at the time, the most intellectually and structurally open one in the country, unburdened by the ballast of cliques and social prejudices, where everyone had an equal chance to ‘discover’ their city. During the years of the ‘Boomers’, Wrocław was a city of settlers, where everyone came from somewhere, an open and tolerant city where covenants can be easily broken, where one may ‘wrestle’ with conservatism, where one came for pluralism, for anarchy, generally: for freedom”⁴¹.

It should be emphasized that by the end of the 1960s this was a very large group within the social structure of the city; indeed, as we can see from the census conducted in 1970, almost every third Vratislavian (167,400 out of 525,600) was born in the city after the war⁴². Eight years later, in 1978, the proportion of native-born Vratislavians reached nearly 40% (235,000 of 600,100), the largest group of which was the over 135,000 who were born before 1965. Raised in an atmosphere of freedom and tolerance shaped by their parents, they were oriented towards self-fulfillment and advancement. Their particular trait was the drive to acquire a thorough education, and openness to new ideas and trends in culture. In 1978, more than one in five Vratislavians with a higher education (either completed or in progress) had been born in Wrocław (15,500 of 75,100), while the number was even higher in respect of those with a secondary education (comprehensive and vocational), reaching 27% (39,700 of 144,700)⁴³. Indeed, it should also be emphasized that at

⁴¹ Wiesław Wątroba, *Wrocławscy baby boomers*, [in:] *Spoleczeństwo i zmiana*, eds. Olga Kowalczyk, Adam Kubów, Wiesław Wątroba, Wrocław 2016, p. 24.

⁴² *Migracje ludności m. Wrocław. Narodowy Spis Powszechny 8 grudnia 1970 r.*, Warszawa 1973, pp. 6–23.

⁴³ *Migracje ludności m. Wrocław. Narodowy Spis Powszechny 7 grudnia 1978 r.*, Warszawa 1981, pp. 122–123.

the end of the so-called “Gierek decade”, over 65% of Vratislavians aged 15 and above had greater than a primary education (318,900 of 484,900). In consequence, at the end of the PRL era, Vratislavians were among the best-educated urban communities in Poland, as in 1988 almost one-half of its residents (47.8%) had completed at least secondary school, and 12.8% had completed tertiary education (in Poznań these numbers were 43.8% and 11.6%, Łódź 41.1% and 9.4%, Kraków 51% and 15%, Warsaw 57.2% and 16.9%)⁴⁴.

It was precisely and mainly representatives of the “baby boomers” that filled the seats of the theatres directed by Grotowski and Tomaszewski; they were active participants in numerous music and theatre festivals; they filled the seats of fashionable jazz clubs; they also engaged in the rapidly-developing student culture movement, which grew with particularly strong dynamics in Wrocław. Its origins go all the way back to 1946, when the “Wrocław Academic Theatre” was founded. The “Gest” pantomime theatre founded in 1960 by students of the Wrocław University of Science and Technology enjoyed national fame, while from 1957 the “Kalumbur” theatre operated at the University of Wrocław, surpassing in quality and innovation many professional theatres. A high level of artistry was achieved by academic musical groups such as the University of Wrocław Chamber Orchestra, and the vocal and instrumental group “Collegium Musicum”. The student musical movement “Pro Musica” was a phenomenon, organizing lectures and discussions about music, and supporting the organization of concerts and musical gatherings for youth⁴⁵. The crowning of the countercultural aspirations of Vratislavians’ youth was the anti-communist “Orange Alternative” movement, which, as Norman Davies put it, was in the 1980s “the most original contribution by Wrocław to the national cause”⁴⁶.

Among the factors fuelling the development of culture in Wrocław it is also worth mentioning both national and local authorities. In spite of the centralized nature of the state, which did not afford much freedom of action to local authorities, along with the authoritarian character of the so-called “real socialism” system, they

⁴⁴ We are in possession of data concerning residents of provincial cities after the 1975 reform, which means that data concerning the Wrocław Province is essentially identical to data concerning Wrocław. *Rocznik statystyczny województw 1991*, Warszawa 1991, p. 30.

⁴⁵ Joanna Popińska, *Fenomen kultury studenckiej w czasach PRL na przykładzie Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego (wprowadzenie do tematyki lat 50., 60. i 70. XX w.)*, [in:] *Dzieci, młodzież i studenci na Ziemiach Zachodnich po II wojnie światowej*, eds. Wojciech Kucharski, Grzegorz Strauchold, Wrocław–Warszawa 2012, pp. 165–172.

⁴⁶ Norman Davies, Roger Moorhouse, *Mikrokosmos. Portret miasta środkowoeuropejskiego*, Kraków 2002, p. 517.

did attempt insofar as was possible to support the development of various cultural undertakings, even when they were inconsistent with the official cultural programme of the ruling party. With many of their activities they earned the lasting gratitude of creators of culture. For example, fantastic workign conditions were given to Grotowski, who arrived to Wrocław in 1965 at the behest of the National Council, while it was the act of the director of the Culture Department, Jerzy Nowak, to bring A. Markowski to the city, to whom it was promised “in advance” that all his conditions would be met, even though “meeting them did not at all seem easy”⁴⁷.

Statistics attesting indirectly to the attitude of the authorities to matters of culture, education, and science can be found in investment spending in those sectors, the percentage of people employed in them, and their earnings. It should thus be emphasized that Wrocław was typically far ahead of other cities, excepting Warsaw. In the years 1961–1970, spending on these three areas totalled 9.4% of general investment spending, while in Poznań it was 8.2%, Łódź 7.3%, Kraków 6.4%, and only in Warsaw was it higher, at 10.9%. Employment in these areas was also relatively high in Wrocław. This is confirmed in statistocs for both 1960 and 1970. In the latter of those years, out of the total working population, the proportion of those employed in the area of culture, education, and science was 12.6%, while in Poznań 11.1%, Łódź 8.5%, Kraków 12.1%, and Warsaw 17.6%⁴⁸. Significantly, full-time employees in institutions of culture and art in Wrocław earned relatively better than the majority of employees in that sector in other cities: in 1967, they earned PLN 2,235, while in Łódź PLN 2,189, Kraków PLN 2,162, Warsaw PLN 2,144; only in Poznań were earnings higher (PLN 2,247)⁴⁹.

Full analysis of the social conditions of the development of culture in Wrocław would, of course, require a broader spectrum of issues to be taken into account. However, the phenomena we have cited here allow us to posit the hypothesis that one of its primary sources came in the form of the processes taking place within the Wrocław community itself. The characteristics of the first generation of Vra-tislavians, such as activeness, inclination to take risks, the search for better living

⁴⁷ Although there were other cases, such as that of mayor Aleksander Wachniewski, who, despite protests by members of the theatre community, handed over the relatively undamaged building of the Polish Theatre to a private enterprise for use as a garage and workshop. Ewa Kofin, *Życie muzyczne Wrocławia*, [in:] *Panorama kultury współczesnego Wrocławia*, p. 179; Kelera, *Teatry*, p. 264.

⁴⁸ *Rocznik statystyczny powiatów 1971*, Warszawa 1971, pp. 106–107, 134–135.

⁴⁹ *Rocznik statystyczny kultury 1945–1967*, Warszawa 1969, p. 475.

conditions for themselves and their children, plus ease in adapting to new conditions and situations, were “inherited” by successive generations of Bratislavians, their children and grandchildren. This, it may be felt, decided that as quickly as at the end of the 1950s the city of Wrocław became the capital of Polish counterculture and avant-garde, while residents of the city began to be perceived – of course, in the proper scale and appropriately to the conditions of a communist state – as an “open society”. It is the nature of things that social mobility weakens stereotypes, reigns in superstition, and eliminates discriminatory practices. A type of personality formed in which advancement “is not only broadly possible, but also subject strongly expected and demanded culturally”⁵⁰. One of the important characteristics of such communities is an interest in matters of culture.

JĘDRZEJ CHUMIŃSKI

SPÓŁECZNE UWARUNKOWANIA ROZWOJU KULTURY POWOJENNEGO WROCŁAWIA

Autor podkreśla wyjątkowość powojennego Wrocławia jako skupiska polskiej społeczności kształtującej się praktycznie od zera od połowy 1945 r. Jednym z jej ważnych rysów była i jest otwartość na wartości kultury. Bardzo szybko „mieszanka ludności” zmieniła się w społeczność pełną rozmachu, ambitną i spontaniczną. Zróżnicowanie pochodzenia regionalnego skutkowało konfliktami. Atomizację i dezintegrację społeczną wynikającą z odmierności regionalnych, pogłębiały dodatkowo różnice mentalne wynikające z faktu, że bardzo znaczna część nowych mieszkańców Wrocławia miała wiejskie korzenie. Zdaniem Autora, to co było w pierwszych latach po wojnie powodem poważnych problemów, stało się w dłuższej perspektywie czasu źródłem pozytywnych przemian w mieście. Ścieranie się różnych systemów wartości, świadomości społecznej i tożsamości kulturowej, czyniło bowiem z mieszkańców miasta ludzi szczególnie wyczulonych na problem odmierności oraz kształtowało postawy otwartości i tolerancji. Drugim, obok zróżnicowanego pochodzenia terytorialnego, czynnikiem mogącym mieć wpływ na kształtowanie się swoistej dla wrocławian tożsamości zbiorowej, była ich wcześniejsza mobilność. Trzecim czynnikiem, który należy uwzględnić analizując źródła przemiany wrocławian w społeczność otwartą na wartości kulturowe, to ich wiek. Była to bowiem społeczność „młoda” w porównaniu do mieszkańców innych dużych miast.

⁵⁰ Piotr Sztołpka, *Socjologia. Analiza społeczeństwa*, Kraków 2002, p. 341; Chumiński, *Procesy*, pp. 381–382.

ADRIEN QUÉRET-PODESTA
(Olomouc)

**FROM OPAVA TO SPIŠ. CHRONICAL OF THE POPES AND
THE EMPERORS BY MARTIN OF OPAVA AS THE SOURCE
OF THE GEORGENBERGER CHRONICLE**

I

The so-called *Georgenberger Chronicle* (Polish: *Kronika ze Spiskiej Soboty*, Hungarian: *Szépeßszombati Kronika*, German: *Georgenberger Chronik*, Slovakian: *Spišskosobotská kronika*) is the second after the 14th-century *Chronicon Henrici de Mügelin Germanice conscriptum*¹, and the last Middle Ages Hungarian chronicle written in German (*Ostmitteldeutsch*). The Polish name of the work, translating as *Chronicle from Spiska Sobota*, is taken from the town where its only known copy is presently held (Hungarian: Szépeßszombat, German: Georgenberg, Slovakian: Spišská Sobota), which today constitutes a part of the city of Poprad². This chronicle is a rather short work (5 pages of manuscript) clearly conceived as a chronicle. It contains an abbreviated presentation of the history of the Kingdom of Hungary, with particular attention paid to the history of German urban communities in Spiš. The author is, unfortunately, unknown to us, but was most certainly a member of one of those communities. The precise date of the drafting of the chronicle also remains unknown: the last entry concerns 1457, but the majority of the last page of

¹ *Chronicon Henrici de Mügelin Germanice conscriptum*, ed. Eugenius [Jenő] Travnik, [in:] *Scriptores rerum Hungaricarum tempore ducum regumque stirpis Arpadianae gestarum*, vol. 2, Budapestini ²1999 (edition 1: 1938), pp. 87–223.

² Štátny Archív v Prešove, pracovisko Archív Poprad, Magistrat Mesta Spišská Sobota, file no. 10034 (file number during my visit to the archives in March 2016; this is scheduled to change in the future. The manuscript has been digitized and made available on computers in the reading room). I would like to extend my heartfelt gratitude to the archive's employees, particularly Ms Kollarova and Ms Šlampořova for their help during my visit to the archives.

the manuscript is missing, which has led some researchers to suspect that the chronicle may also cover the beginning of the 1460s³; in any event, the chronicle was most likely written at the beginning of the latter half of the 15th century. As for the sources used in the chronicle, the situation is somewhat better, as the chronicler lists two sources in the work itself, specifically, two chronicles.

The first of the two chronicles is mentioned in the prologue to the work, where it is given the rather general designation of “Hungarian chronicle” (“dy ungerische cronica”)⁴. Its use is not restricted only to the beginning of the work; indeed, we may state that the “Hungarian chronicle” is the author’s primary source of information on the history of the Kingdom of Hungary through the mid-14th century. Analysis of the text proves that the chronicle is part of the *Illustrated Chronicle* family. The Slovakian researcher Július Sopko has even proffered the hypothesis that the author of the *Georgenberger Chronicle* could have used *Chronicle* written by Henry of Mügel⁵, but the content of the list of nations that settled in Hungary during the times of Géza and Stephan I is closer to the text of the *Illustrated Chronicle* itself.

A mention of a second chronicle occurs in the description of the great famine which affected the residents of Spiš after the Mongol invasion of the Kingdom of Hungary⁶. In this passage, the anonymous chronicler refers to a “Martinian chronicle” (“dy cronica [sagit] martiniana”). Some scholars, like Béla Pukánszky, the chronicle’s second publisher, have claimed that this reference is a second invocation of the *Illustrated Chronicle*⁷; according to this conception, the adjective created from the name “Martinus” is a mistake, and should instead be the adjectival form of the name “Marcus”, from the name of the alleged author of the *Illustrated Chronicle*. However, it should be emphasized that neither the *Illustrated Chronicle*, nor other chronicles from that group contain a detailed description of the famine suffered by the residents of Spiš following the Mongol invasion. The majority of researchers identify the “Martinian chronicle” with the work of the Silesian chronicler from the

³ Kálmán Demkó, *A szepes-szombati krónika*, [in:] *A Szepesmegye Történelmi Társulat évkönyve*, vol. 7, Levoča 1891, pp. 2–4.

⁴ *Chronicon, quod conservatur in Monte S. Georgii*, ed. Béla Pukánszky, [in:] *Scriptores rerum Hungaricarum*, vol. 2, p. 279.

⁵ Július Sopko, *Kroniki stredovekého Slovenska. Stredoveké Slovensko očami kralovských a mestských kronikárov*, Bratislava 1995, p. 103.

⁶ *Chronicon, quod conservatur in Monte S. Georgii*, p. 282.

⁷ *Ibidem*, p. 276.

Dominican order named Martin of Opava (also known as Martin the Pole)⁸, and comparison of the two texts confirms the accuracy of this identification:

<i>Georgenberger Chronicle:</i>	<i>Chronicle of Martin of Opava, Imperatores, 1239:</i>
<i>Auch so ist so grosser hunger gewest, daz dy mutter ire kynder haben gessin, und dy lewte haben das ertrich von einem berge vor mel mussen essen, als dy cronica sagit martiniana.</i>	[...] <i>ut pre fame pervalida matres puerorum suorum vescerentur carnibus, et plerique pulvere cuiusdam montis pro farina uterentur.</i>

II

Identification of the *Martinian Chronicle* cited in the *Georgenberger Chronicle* is thus clear; however, we should examine its role in the narrative construction of that work. To more precisely define this role, it should be stressed right away that in spite of the numerous analogies between descriptions of the Mongol invasion in both texts, they also contain discrepancies. These concern in particular the date of the invasion (1239 according to Martin of Opava, during the reign of Frederick II⁹, while in the *Georgenberger Chronicle* it is 1235, following the coronation of Béla IV¹⁰), and the representation of Henry II the Pious (“Henry, the noble prince of Silesia”¹¹ / King Henry, son of St. Hedwig¹²). The absence of information on Henry in Hungarian chronicles suggests that the *Chronicle* by Martin of Opava may have been used. Also, information about the death of Koloman, brother of King Béla¹³, could have come from the work of the Opava scholar (this information is also contained in the *Chronicon Posoniense*¹⁴, but this source does not contain any of the other stories present in our chronicle); however, there is no way to state how the author

⁸ *Martini Oppaviensis chronicon pontificum et imperatorum*, ed. Ludwig Weiland, [in:] *Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Scriptorum in folio*, vol. 22, Hannover 1872, p. 472.

⁹ *Martini Oppaviensis chronicon*, s. 472: “Eiusdem Frederici imperatoris temporibus anno Domini 1239”.

¹⁰ *Chronicon, quod conservatur in Monte S. Georgii*, p. 282: “Anno des hern MCCXXXV ist Bela seyn sun konig worden und hot regiret XXXIIIIII jor. Pey dis gezeiten als Anno des hern sein dy Thatam in daz Lant komen...”.

¹¹ *Martini Oppaviensis chronicon*, p. 472: “nobilis Dux Zlesie Henricus”.

¹² *Chronicon, quod conservatur in Monte S. Georgii*, p. 282: “konig Heynrich sand Hedwigen sun”.

¹³ *Ibidem*, p. 282: “Sein pruder Colomanus wart dirschlagen...”.

¹⁴ *Chronicon Posoniense*, ed. Sándor Domanovszky, [in:] *Scriptores rerum Hungaricarum*, vol. 2, pp. 42–43.

learned that Henry was the son of St. Hedwig. It should also be added that some elements of the description contained in the *Georgenberger Chronicle* are not present in the work by Martin of Opava, and that they originate with certainty from Hungarian chronicles: the number of Mongols (500,000) and description of the actions of King Béla during the invasion¹⁵. It should also be added that the indication of the mountain whose soil the inhabitants were said to have eaten as flour, as well as information contained at the end of the passage about the Czech intervention and the founding of the walled city of Levoča after the invasion¹⁶, are present neither in the work of Martin of Opava, nor in the Hungarian chronicles¹⁷.

Comparison of the description of the Tatar invasion in the writings of Martin of Opava and in the *Georgenberger Chronicle* demonstrates clearly that the most important element taken from the *Chronicle* of the Silesian Dominican is a fragment of a sentence on the consequences of the famine, which the author translated into German and incorporated into his own work, also citing the source of the information. It should, however, be stressed that there is one fundamental difference between those fragments: the location where the famine took place. From the work by Martin of Opava we know only that the famine affected “those countries, and Hungary the most” (“*terras illas, maxime Ungariam*”)¹⁸, while the author of the *Georgenberger Chronicle* not only stated that this event took place in Spiš, but also suggested a concrete location. As he writes, it was “where the Carthusian cloister is located” (“*Es ist czu glewben das das ist geschen, off dem berge do der Kartuser closter ley*”)¹⁹. This cloister is usually identified as the ancient Carthusia located near the village of Letanovce (Hungarian: Létánfalva, German: Lethensdorf), south-west of Levoča; the second Carthusian cloister in Spiš, the so-called Red Cloister, was located not on mountain, but along the bank of the Dunajec²⁰ near Lechnica.

¹⁵ *Chronicon, quod conservatur in Monte S. Georgii*, p. 282.

¹⁶ *Ibidem*.

¹⁷ On the Tatar episode in Hungarian sources and the Chronicle of Martin of Opava, see Ryszard Grzesik, *Węgierska i polska tradycja o najeździe tatarskim w 1241 roku*, “*Roczniki Historyczne*”, 69, 2003, pp. 79–84, 87–88. On the use of this fragment of the Chronicle of Martin of Opava in other historiographical traditions see e.g. Gábor Bradács, *A Tatárjárás Osztrák Elbeszélő Forrásainak Kritikája*, “*Hadtörténelmi Közlemények*”, 127, 2014, pp. 7–8, 16–17.

¹⁸ *Martini Oppaviensis chronicon*, p. 472.

¹⁹ *Chronicon, quod conservatur in Monte S. Georgii*, p. 282.

²⁰ About the cloister see Rafał Witkowski, *Zakon kartuzów w Europie Środkowej od początku XIV do połowy XVI wieku = The Carthusian Order in Central Europe from the Beginning of the Fourteenth to the Middle of the Sixteenth Century*, Salzburg 2011, pp. 429–434.

It should be stressed that the anonymous chronicler also tried to locate the episode of consumption of soil from the mountain by the inhabitants of Spiš: according to him, this event took place on the mountain where the Carthusian cloister stands, because “the inhabitants of Spiš surrounded that mountain with a wall that can still be seen today, and where they took refuge with their children and wives, hiding from the cruelty of the Tatars” (“dy Czipser haben czu derselben czeit denselben den pergk mit einer mawer omczogen alz man daz noch syd, vnd aldo haben sy sich mit kynd vnd weib behaldyn vur der Tatarn grawsamkeit”)²¹. It should also be added that the name of that place would seem to confirm its use as a shelter during the times of the Mongol threat²²: in Latin it is “Lapis Refugii, e.g.” the Stone of Refuge (Hungarian: Menedékkő [sometimes Menedékszírt], Slovakian: Skala útočišťa), and characterizes the rocky features of the terrain, but there is no way to say whether this concerns natural rock formations or defensive walls. Of course, the name appears in diplomatic sources, on the seal of the cloister, and, importantly for us, in an entry located in the margin of the only preserved copy of the *Chronicle*, next to the fragment on the Tatar invasion²³.

These remarks clearly demonstrate that the placement of the consumption of soil from the mountain by the inhabitants of Spiš at “Lapis Refugii” is doubtlessly the result of intervention by the author of the *Georgenberger Chronicle*. The combination of information drawn from the *Chronicle* of Martin of Opava on survival strategies with the local tradition of the stay of inhabitants at “Lapis Refugii” allowed him to stress the extent of the suffering felt by the inhabitants of Spiš during the Mongol occupation. Presentation of the dramatic ways in which the residents of Spiš managed to survive the great famine following the Tatar invasion is designed to attest that they suffered at least as much, if not more, than other inhabitants of Hungary.

In his monograph on the issue of famine in the Middle Ages, the German historian Fritz Curschmann stressed that cannibalism was “the most serious phenomenon caused by famine”²⁴. Information about people who were said to eat other people as a means of surviving famine can be found in ancient and Early

²¹ *Chronicon, quod conservatur in Monte S. Georgii*, p. 282.

²² See Witkowski, *Zakon kartuzów*, pp. 422–423.

²³ Štátny Archív v Prešove, pracovisko Archív Poprad, Magistrat Mesta Spišská Sobotka, file no. 10034, fol. 7^v.

²⁴ Fritz Curschmann, *Hungersnöte im Mittelalter. Ein Beitrag zur deutschen Wirtschaftsgeschichte des 8. bis 13. Jahrhunderts*, Leipzig 1900, p. 59.

Middle Ages sources²⁵, but it can also be found in sources from later periods²⁶. Among the described cases of cannibalism, the most striking are those of parents eating their children. Some episodes, such as events described in the *Georgenberger Chronicle* and the *Chronicle* of Martin of Opava, or the telling of the great famine at the beginning of the 14th century in England, emphasize the widespread character of the phenomenon²⁷; however, there is also information on individual incidents, such as the *Annals of Fulda*, which contains a colourful story – largely inspired by the Bible, particularly the story of Abraham and Isaac (Gen. 22, 1–12) – of a father who wanted to kill and eat his son, but at the last minute found a dead deer²⁸, or in 14th-century Kłodzko, where a mother was said to have eaten her own children²⁹. It should be observed that numerous sources emphasize the role of the mother in such episodes; Julia Marvin perceives in the mother-cannibal story the impact of the Old Testament story contained in the Book of Second Corinthians (2Cor 6, 28–29) about the mothers from Samaria who ate their own young³⁰.

The story of eating soil instead of flour is less common in sources describing episodes of famine. Apart from the *Georgenberger Chronicle* and the *Chronicle* of Martin of Opava, a similar episode can be found in the *Annales Bertiniani*, which describes how people ate “bread” baked from soil and a very small amount of flour³¹. Concerning the problem of the lack of flour, it is also worth citing a report on famine in the Kłodzko region according to which people were said to lick dust from the walls of mills³². Louise Mallart, author of a work on cannibalism in the Middle Ages, also posits that tales of eating soil/dirt were less common than cannibalism, and stresses the rarity of combinations of such stories with those of

²⁵ Vincent Vanderberg, “*Fames facta est ut homo hominem comederet*”. *L’Occident médiéval face au cannibalisme de survie (Ve-XIe siècle)*, “Revue Belge de Philosophie et d’Histoire”, 86, 2008, pp. 217–272.

²⁶ See Julia Marvin, *Cannibalism as an Aspect of Famine in two English Chronicles*, [in:] *Food and Eating in Medieval Europe*, eds. Martha Carlin, Joel T. Rosenthal, London 1998, pp. 73–86 and Wojciech Mrozowicz, *Kłęski żywiołowe w ziemi kłodzkiej w średniowieczu*, [in:] *Człowiek i przyroda w średniowieczu i we wczesnym okresie nowożytnym*, eds. Wojciech Iwańczak, Krzysztof Bracha, Warszawa 2000, pp. 218, 222.

²⁷ Marvin, *Cannibalism*, p. 80.

²⁸ Vanderberg, *Fames facta est*, pp. 245–246.

²⁹ Mrozowicz, *Kłęski żywiołowe*, p. 218.

³⁰ Marvin, *Cannibalism*, p. 80.

³¹ Curschmann, *Hungersnöte im Mittelalter*, pp. 58–59.

³² Mrozowicz, *Kłęski żywiołowe*, p. 218.

children being eaten by their mothers³³. Juxtaposition of those two extreme strategies for surviving famine would seem to demonstrate how serious the starvation affecting the inhabitants of Spiš was in the perception of the anonymous chronicler.

This attempt at showing that the residents of Spiš experienced the worst suffering during the Tatar occupation is, of course, an important element the chronicle's narrative, which tries to present them as good and devoted subjects of the Kingdom of Hungary. The analysis of the manuscript of the chronicle suggests that it expresses a broader ideological programme; indeed, it should be observed that the second text contained in the manuscript is a document confirming the privileges granted to the residents of Spiš by Sigismund of Luxembourg in 1433. It should also be added that this manuscript was, for a time, bound with a copy of the so-called *Zipser Willkür*³⁴, a legal document of the German communities in Spiš edited on the basis of the *Sachsenspiegel* in 1370.³⁵ The manuscript context allows us to pose the hypothesis that the depiction of German residents of Spiš in the *Georgenberger Chronicle* was supposed to demonstrate how their loyalty to the Hungarian rulers made those privileges well-deserved.

III

The analysis of the use of a fragment from the *Chronicle* of Martin of Opava on the consequences of the famine following the Mongol invasion in the *Georgenberger Chronicle* shows that it is characterized by two primary traits: combination of knowledge from chronicles with local tradition, and the introduction of elements of the local landscape. Similar traits also appear in other fragments of the *Georgenberger Chronicle*, justifying their classification as typical for the chronicler's approach to his work. Stories from the primary source, i.e. from a chronicle

³³ Louise Mallart, *Les représentations de l'anthropophagie dans l'Occident médiéval (VIe-XIVe siècle)*, Clermont-Ferrand 2011 (Mémoire de Master, 2), pp. 46–47. I would like to express my gratitude to the author for making her work available.

³⁴ Štátny Archív v Prešove, pracovisko Archív Poprad, Magistrat Mesta Spišská Sobota, file no. 10035 (file number during my visit to the archives in March 2016; this is scheduled to change in the future. The manuscript has been digitized and made available on computers in the reading room).

³⁵ See Maria Papsonová, *Die Zipser Willkür aus Spišska Sobota: Untersuchungen zum Laut- und Formenstand*, Bratislava 1980; Ilpo Tapani Piirainen, Mária Papsonová, *Das Recht der Spiš/Zips. Texte und Untersuchungen zum Frühneuhochdeutschen in der Slowakei*, Bd. 1–2, Oulu 1992 pp. 37–71; Katalin Gönczi, Wieland Carls, *Sächsisch-magdeburgisches Recht in Ungarn und Rumänien. Autonomie und Rechtstransfer im Donau- und Karpatenraum*, Berlin–Boston 2013, pp. 117–121.

belonging to the *Illustrated Chronicle* family, are frequently a starting point for digressions about the German residents of Spiš. A second example can also be mentioned involving the introduction of local topography to the *Georgenberger Chronicle*: in a story about the murder of a royal clerk at the beginning of Ladislaus the Cuman's reign (he ruled in the years 1272–1290), the author claims that this event took place in Spišský Štvrtok (Hungarian: Csütörtökhely, German: Donnersmarkt, Polish: Spiski Czwartek), for, in 1428, the local residents found a large number of bones and armour (“panczer”) in a well in front of the church, as well as in some cellars (“keller”)³⁶.

Analysis of the presented fragments demonstrates that the author was relatively familiar with Spišský Štvrtok and the surrounding area, primarily separated by a distance of 10 kilometres from “Lapis Refugii”, which constitutes a serious argument in favour of the hypothesis that the *Georgenberger Chronicle* was created in the central part of the Spiš, i.e. in the Spišský Štvrtok-Levoča area. It should also be added that this hypothesis can be reconciled with the conception of the chronicle as an element legitimating the position of the German residents of Spiš, as Spišský Štvrtok was a central point for the Spiš cities under Hungarian rule after the Spiš Pledge of 1412, which makes it a good candidate for the location of the composition of texts intended to determine the legal status of the residents of Spiš.

³⁶ *Chronicon, quod conservatur in Monte S. Georgii*, p. 283.

PAWEŁ JAWORSKI
(Institute of History, University of Wrocław)

THE LIFE AND WORK OF PRINCESS DAISY HOCHBERG VON PLESS (1873–1943) – AS REFLECTED IN PUBLICATIONS

Princess Maria Teresa Olivia Cornwallis-West, known as Daisy, from 1891 the wife of Hans Heinrich XV von Hochberg, Prince von Pless, has for years been the subject of intense interest of scholars researching the history of Silesia and of the European aristocracy. Presently there is a large number of publications about the life of the Princess available in Poland. Among the most prominent of them are catalogues devoted to exhibitions with her as the main subject, primarily the 2011 exhibition of photographs of the Princess and members of her social milieu organized by the Castle Museum in Pszczyna¹. Two years later, an exhibit of her jewels was prepared in Pszczyna with great pomp and documented in a special publication². Portraits of the Princess presented in the castles in Książ and Pszczyna, as well as mementoes and keepsakes left behind by the Princess, arouse unceasing interest and make her a central figure of those two Silesian capitals. The Princess is also quite popular on the internet, attested to by the greater number of sites and entries devoted to her compared to other members of the Hochberg family³. This popularity in Poland was certainly enhanced by the 1986 film *Magnate (Magnat)*,

¹ This was marked by the publication of a bilingual catalogue: Russell Harris, *Daisy, księżna von Pless: szczęśliwe lata. Katalog wystawy fotografii z Archiwum Studia Lafayette w Victoria&Albert Museum w Londynie, Muzeum Zamkowe w Pszczynie / Princess Daisy von Pless: The Happy Years by Russel Harris Catalogue of the exhibition of photographs from the Lafayette Studio Archive of the V&A, London, The Castle Museum in Pszczyna, Pszczyna 2011.*

² *Klejnoty księżnej Daisy. Wystawa czasowa 4 VI – 30 XI 2013 r. ze zbiorów Muzeum Narodowego w Warszawie, Muzeum Zamkowego w Pszczynie oraz kolekcji prywatnej*, ed. Maciej Kluss, Pszczyna 2013.

³ See the relatively large website devoted to the Princess's biography: https://pl.wikipedia.org/wiki/Maria_Teresa_Oliwia_Hochberg_von_Pless (accessed: 20.09.2016).

directed by Filip Bajon, loosely based around the history of the Hochberg family of Pszczyna in the first half of the 20th century, presented on television in the extended version of a series titled *The White Calling Card* (*Biała wizytówka*).

Maria Teresa Olivia, the oldest daughter of col. William Cornwallis-West, owner of Ruthin castle in south Wales and the Newlands estate in southern England, and Maria Adelaide Fitzpatrick, married Hans Heinrich XV, Prince von Pless, at the age of 18. He was the heir to a tremendous fortune in Silesia, which consisted of extensive lands and mines around the castle in Pszczyna (German: Pless) and Książ (German: Fürstenstein). These riches gave the prince's young bride a life of luxury she had not known before.

The details of her life are known to us from autobiographical books. Afflicted by poverty following a complicated divorce and illness (most likely multiple sclerosis), she decided to use her systematic diary entries, which she had written for decades. The first autobiographical volume was published in 1929, and covers the period of 1873–1918⁴. The next contains diary entries from 1895–1914, published in 1931 and containing extensive introductory remarks⁵. The third and last volume was printed in 1936, and constitutes a complement to the previous volumes, bearing the significant title *What I Left Unsaid*⁶. To date, the first two books have been published in Polish.

These books have allowed us to learn that the primary obligation of a well-born and gifted maiden (Daisy boasted of having two Kings of England among her forefathers) was to marry well, preferably during her first season in society. As a result of her betrothal and marriage, she unexpectedly landed in Prussia. Daisy knew that her husband had “purchased” here (“I did not realize it clearly at the time, but I was just being bought”)⁷. She also cited other examples in addressing the subject of the marriage market, where money and ancestry counted most. She considered Prussian etiquette boring, and burdensome during royal visits: “I do not for a moment wish to insinuate that the Emperor was a tedious guest. Far from it; he was always delightful. It was the proceedings during his stay that were such

⁴ *Daisy Hochberg von Pless by Herself*, London 1928. Polish edition: Daisy Hochberg von Pless, *Taniec na wulkanie 1873–1918*, trans. Mariola Palcewicz, Kraków 2002.

⁵ *Better Left Unsaid (From My Private Diaries) by Daisy Princess of Pless*, New York 1931. Polish edition: *Lepiej przemilczeć. Prywatne pamiętniki Księżnej Daisy von Pless z lat 1895–1914*, trans. Barbara Borkowy, Wałbrzych 2013.

⁶ *What I Left Unsaid by Daisy, Princess of Pless*, Dutton 1936.

⁷ *Daisy Hochberg von Pless by Herself*, p. 47.

a bore”⁸. She was irritated that “one cannot get on the green grass away from servants”⁹. She described with disgust the habit of spitting: “All over Germany the disgusting spitting habit used to be general”¹⁰. Ultimately, she was to write “The state, too as I have said, irked me”¹¹. She was nonplussed by the habit that women walked in public wearing exclusively black clothes, and could never speak one-to-one with a man¹². As she judged it, “But all Germany was primitive then”, and she had a poor opinion of Prussians¹³. Interestingly, her opinion of Austrians was different, whom she viewed as similar to the English. One member of the aristocracy from the nearby southern border she described as “Just charming and dear and natural”¹⁴.

From the beginning she felt the need to engage in a civilizing mission, and began promoting sanitary devices from her native England. She led to the installation of toilets in the seats of the clan in Pszczyna and Książ. She attempted to take advantage of her acquaintances, including with the Emperor, to obtain state funds in order to do so at a regional scale. Daisy also worked at promoting the wares of Silesian lacemakers. She got gradually more engaged in charitable activity, saying in her diary “I have a longing to cast something from me”¹⁵.

She organized receptions to which she invited i.a. the Emperor. At balls in Germany and England she met members of royal families from many different countries. Regular visits to England provided her with relief. In general, she was an active traveller. She was regularly not only in England, but also the Riviera, sometimes Berlin, Vienna, and Budapest. Travelling was one of the most significant threads in the tapestry of her life. As she put it, “All my life movement has been to me a vital necessity. I have craved it as men crave wine”¹⁶. She loved riding ships and yachts. Hunting, which she actively participated in, was an important form of entertainment for her. She boasted in her diary that during one hunting trip she had shot three bears and five deer, of which two or three she killed on

⁸ *Ibidem*, pp. 261–262.

⁹ *Ibidem*, p. 57.

¹⁰ *Ibidem*, p. 55.

¹¹ *Ibidem*, p. 57.

¹² *Ibidem*, pp. 63–64.

¹³ *Ibidem*, p. 60.

¹⁴ *Better Left Unsaid*, p. 220.

¹⁵ *Ibidem*, p. 130.

¹⁶ *Ibidem*, p. 5

horseback, the novelty of which led to her surprise at actually hitting them¹⁷. Fascinating to her were automobile races and gambling at casinos in Monte Carlo.

She followed the international situation, particularly the development of German-British relations. She viewed their increasing degradation at the beginning of the 20th century with concern. Daisy certainly painted a colourful picture of daily life in the aristocratic circles of Europe. She revealed a sort of model of marriage in high society – from arrangement, through abiding numerous betrayals and returns by husbands, concluded with its dissolution.

Shallow and narcissistic, she registered the passage of time with authentic sorrow. She commented on her 29th birthday in a manner that may seem odd to the contemporary reader, declaring that it seemed almost impossible, that it was a mistake, and she hated getting old¹⁸. Aware of her beauty, she noted with satisfaction examples of interest and adoration from men, particularly those highest in the social hierarchy and her particular milieu. At times attacked for describing matters of little import, “unrestrained idiocy and forthrightness”¹⁹, the Princess reflected the atmosphere of her times of *belle époque*, followed by the years of World War I and the time just after. Daisy’s expansive reflections have become a valuable and frequently-cited collection of materials for scholars working on her biography. It comes as no surprise that her life has turned into an object of interest to history buffs and professionals alike.

The first work on the Polish market devoted to Princess Daisy was a small book by Andrzej Konieczny, *Secrets of the White Lady* (*Sekrety białej damy*), published in 1989²⁰. In the absence of a proper historical approach (without even a bibliography), the work proposes a fictional tale peppered with dialogue. He offered a curt justification for his work: “The life of Princess Daisy was an exceptionally colourful one, rich in unusual experiences and secrets that continue to fascinate many even today”²¹. He focused on stories, such as the legend of the pearl diver dead of exhaustion, who had pushed himself beyond his limits to gather as many pearls for the Princess’s necklace as possible. He took the title itself from

¹⁷ *Ibidem*, p. 123.

¹⁸ *Ibidem*, p. 104.

¹⁹ Such claims about the style and the mentality of the Princess were made by the American author Virginia Woolf, in a letter to a friend. At the same time, she admitted she could not stop reading Daisy’s diaries and ruminating on her life. See Barbara Borkowy, *Siostry. Daisy von Pless i Shelagh Westminster*, Wałbrzych 2016, p. 375.

²⁰ Andrzej Konieczny, *Sekrety białej damy*, Katowice 1989 (Śląskie Epizody Historyczne).

²¹ *Ibidem*, p. 14.

a popular local tale of the Princess's spirit – the “soul of the white lady” – appeared to selected visitors to the seat of the Hochberg clan.

The first proper scholarly biography was the publication of Beata Górniołek and Bronisława Jeske-Cybulska titled *Princess Daisy. The Dame of Książ and Pszczyna (Pani na Książu i Pszczynie)* from 2001²². The authors emphasized the source of their interest in Daisy, writing that the Princess was considered the most famous resident of the castles in Książ and Pszczyna, yet contrary to her husband, she never performed any official functions. In the biography they also focus attention to details concerning the functioning of the households. The authors succeed in locating archival documents registering the number of portions of particular meals and their costs²³. A valuable observation is that parties famous around the entire province did not enjoy the participation of members of the cultural community²⁴. The authors are confident that what led to the dissolution of her marriage was a lack of interest on the part of her husband, who was content to seek “pleasures outside the home”, and the Princess's illness²⁵.

Next, two richly-illustrated biographies were published: one by the amateur English historian W. John Koch²⁶, and another by the London-based art historian Barbara Borkowy²⁷. Both works are similar in composition, following the common chronological structure of biographical works. With one difference, that Borkowy proposed a simultaneous discussion of Shelagh Westminster, Daisy's sister. It can be assumed that the tale of Shelagh would follow her life, remaining ever in the shadow of her famous sister. But the author achieved an interesting effect. As it turned out, both Princesses experienced a strikingly similar fate. They both married impossibly rich aristocrats, led rich social lives, travelled around the world, hunted, birthed heirs, and survived the loss of a child. They both ultimately divorces. They sang and played on-stage. They devoted themselves to charitable work.

Both Koch and Borkowy focused on the Princess's private life, her generally difficult relations with her husband. However, Koch is discreet about the secrets of her intimate life, while Borkowy writes in unvarnished terms about her unfulfilled

²² Beata Górniołek, Bronisława Jeske-Cybulska, *Księżna Daisy. Pani na Książu i Pszczynie*, Mikołów 2001.

²³ *Ibidem*, p. 123.

²⁴ *Ibidem*, p. 117.

²⁵ *Ibidem*, p. 159.

²⁶ W. John Koch, *Daisy Princess of Pless 1873–1943. A Discovery*, Edmonton 2002. Polish edition: *Daisy, księżna pszczyńska*, trans. Zdzisław Żygulski, jr., Pszczyna 2012.

²⁷ Borkowy, *Siostry*.

desire and attempts at defeating loneliness in her marriage. This picture is painted in-depth and literally. On the one hand, Borkowy writes directly about the periods of sexual disinterest of Hans Heinrich XV von Pless in his wife and his love affairs. On the other hand, she devotes quite a number of pages to the Princess's flirtations.

It can generally be stated that Borkowy's narrative is more granular, based in some places on contemporary press stories. She strives to provide an accurate account of everyday life. Particularly interesting is a description of a journey by ferry in 1895 to India, in which the author sheds light on how the passengers maintain hygiene and how they are given fresh food. The Princess's fascination with what was a new means of travel at the end of the 19th century, the automobile, is another interesting part of the story.

Both authors write of Daisy's longing for England, and of her irritation with the Prussian lifestyle and etiquette. W. John Koch summarised it thus: "Daisy's strong ties to the country of her birth, and her rejection of Prussian traditions, comprised the two poles between which Daisy's restless life took its course. A study of her character and of the development of her personality cannot avoid the speculation of whether ultimately Daisy's life was symbolic for the failed symbiosis of the character of the two nations of England and Germany at a very troubled, unsettled time in their history, or whether Daisy Pless simply remained an outsider throughout her life, a rebel in the vanguard of her class and of womanhood"²⁸. The British amateur historian emphasized that "Daisy's first diary offers captivating picture of the restless, often superficial nature of a hectic social life of the international set of which the Prince and Princess of Pless were prominent members"²⁹. Koch added that Daisy had turned the Książ castle into a foreign enclave, a place for gatherings of an international society. It was home to concerts, balls, dinners and theatre presentations, while Daisy shone as an exceptionally active figure, the life of the party. Borkowy even claimed that "their [the Princesses'] energy seemed limitless"³⁰. Daisy frequently took on the role of singer and actor.

The Princess's biographers clearly demonstrate that her social activity, particularly charitable, was an important element in her life. Already at the beginning of her life in Prussia she was visiting local hospices, hospitals, old-age homes, making generous donations to benefit the poor. However, with time, particularly

²⁸ Koch, *Daisy*, p. 4.

²⁹ *Ibidem*, p. 48.

³⁰ Borkowy, *Siostry*, p. 105.

after the flood of 1900, her shock at the sanitary conditions of Silesian towns led her to lobby for extensive investments like cleaning the river near Wałbrzych, or distributing milk to the children of young mothers. One famous example was the aid she provided to Silesian laceweavers, who were able to escape the exploitation of intermediaries. Her engagement helped the craftwork of artisans from around Jelenia Góra appear not only in other regions of Germany, but also abroad. Yet Borkowy takes a somewhat harsh view of her activity, writing “Could she have done more? Surely she could, if she hadn’t been distracted by another wave of guests, parties, and travels”³¹.

Both authors also focused on Daisy’s contacts with the rulers and diplomats of Germany and the United Kingdom in the years leading up to World War I, pointing to her attempts at explaining to both sides how much the deterioration in relations was the result of misunderstanding and mutual ignorance as to the policies of the two countries. The Princess enjoyed direct access to Kaiser Wilhelm II, as well as to the Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs of the United Kingdom, Lord Rosebery, and the minister and MP Winston Churchill. Nevertheless, doubts would be justified as to her understanding of political realities in the Europe of her time, and the authors referred to above overestimate the Princess’s influence on the opinions of German and British politicians of the era, regardless of their shared opinion that she herself could be trusted and was worthy of great sympathy. Indeed, she undertook various initiatives (albeit without much success) aiming at reinforcing German-British friendship: she collected donations from British wives of Germans for the English Nursing Fund (set up to mark the diamond jubilee of Queen Victoria), and organized a collection drive to gather funds for maintenance of the graves of all soldiers killed in the Boer wars.

Borkowy offers a realistic depiction of the wartime activity engaged in by Daisy and Shelagh, writing about the beginning in a somewhat joking manner. She determined that it was a common practice among female British aristocrats to fulfil what they felt to be their patriotic duty by volunteering to serve as medical personnel. As Borkowy claimed, in the first weeks of the war “ambulances of the competing dames stole the injured from one another, to demonstrate who was more active”³². However, Daisy’s work in German field hospitals turned out to be problematic for both her husband and herself, as any contact with British prisoners of

³¹ *Ibidem*, p. 119.

³² *Ibidem*, p. 288.

war was considered politically suspect and inappropriate. She was even accused of treason against her new homeland.

The reasons for the popularity of historical figures are not always obvious. In the case of Princess Daisy, I am inclined to agree with Beata Górnioćzek and Bronisława Jeske-Cybulska, who summarized the issue in three words: “travel, diaries, and pearls – these became a living legend soon after her death”³³.

*

Martin Šandera, *Jindřich starší z Minsterberka. Syn husitského krále. Velký hráč s nízkými kartami*, Praha: Vyšehrad, 2016, pp. 275.

The year 1498 saw the death, at his residential castle in Kladsko, of the third son of the former Czech King George of Poděbrady (died 1471), Henry the Elder of Münsterberg. At that time he had ruled, in addition to the small Duchy of Münsterberg (Polish: Ziębice), the Duchy of Oels, the County of Kladsko and the Frankenstein (Polish: Ząbkowice Śląskie) dominion. The relations between the founder of the Oels-Münsterberg princely line and Silesia had known a number of reversals. Besides property gains they included recurrent military conflicts with the Silesian principalities augmented by the fact that in the first half of his life the prince acted as an Utraquist and the Silesian milieu perceived him as a heretic. In 1472 Henry converted and the witnesses to his last will included the then Bishop of Várad and representatives of the great Silesian monasteries. This fact points to the chequered history of the personality to whom Martin Šandera devoted his attention.

The biography of Henry the Elder of Münsterberg was published as part of the series “Great Personalities of Czech History”, whose volumes cover the period from the Middle Ages to the 20th century. The authors of the series of biographies purposefully target a wider readers’ audience while preserving the formal attributes of scholarly texts, including the use of extensive citations of sources and comments, and Martin Šandera proceeded by the same token. This Medieval scholar associated with the University of Hradec Králové placed an emphasis on the book’s literary treatment. He does not ask questions before the reader to which he intends to find answers, and equally omits any considerations of methodological nature. In some passages of the biography the author goes as far as to construct literary plots (Henry’s jealousy of the attention received by his elder brother), and elsewhere

³³ Górnioćzek, Jeske-Cybulska, *Księżna Daisy*, p. 258.

the content of a passage gives way to a well-worn cliché (“the dawning of a new age was felt in the air”). In some chapters going outside the (strictly maintained) chronological framework, in which he reconstructs, for example, the princely court, he shows that he is able to critically assess a series of different sources and draw from them a number of conclusions about the administrative structures of the principality, the prince’s approach to the creation of the residence, and the princely representation. He does not ignore the symbolic communication acts and the reception of correspondence. Most of the chapters respect the timeline, however.

Henry the Elder of Münsterberg was the third son of Czech King George of Poděbrady (died 1471), whose ascent was firmly linked with the post-Hussite period. In the 1440s the Czech Crown Lands lived through a long interregnum. The final victor in the struggle of the noble groups was George of Poděbrady, who succeeded in being made Governor of the Land. He kept himself at the apex of power during the brief reign of Ladislaus the Posthumous (died 1457), after whose sudden death the Estates of Bohemia chose him as Czech king. The throne was now taken by a staunch Utraquist refusing any questioning of the agreements between the Council of Basle and the Hussites, the *Compacta*. However, the Pope challenged the validity of the *Compacta*, his policy supporting actively the domestic opposition and Poděbrad’s foreign opponents. In the opening chapters of Henry’s biography it is the activity of his father that becomes the prime mover. The young prince wages in his father’s service military campaigns, while the political plans of Henry of Poděbrady envisage his children’s marriages and together with his father (and subsequently father-in-law and wife) Henry the Elder of Münsterberg finds himself anathematised by the Pope. Martin Šandera made use of his long-term research on the Poděbrady dynasty and the east Bohemian nobility and guides the reader reliably through the sequence of military campaigns and political talks which the king’s third son attended. The role of Poděbrady’s son gradually shifted from spectator to actor. A significant turning point in Henry’s life (and in those of his brothers) was the achievement of the rank of Reich Prince bestowed by Emperor Friedrich III on him and on his younger brother Henry the Younger called Hynek. Henry’s second-born son Victor had received the honour a few years earlier. Only the eldest of the brothers – Boček – was denied the promotion because of his mental retardation. An important turning point in the lives of his three younger brothers was a gradual takeover of properties accumulated by their father. In December 1465 Henry invested his sons with the Duchy of Münsterberg, the

County of Kladsko, and a third of the Principality of Opava, which enabled them to run their own courts and make full use of their acquired titular capital. The inheritance was very fragmented in administrative terms and sometimes encumbered by third-party claims. It is a pity that Martin Šandera did not devote more space to these matters although he followed in minute detail the future property changes made by direct decisions of the Münsterberg prince.

As the residence where his family stayed most often Henry chose the Kladsko Castle. His father had achieved the elevation of Kladsko – an independent administrative unit administered by Kladsko vogts (reeves) – to a County. However, Kladsko remained part of the Kingdom of Bohemia and the northern border of the Kladsko County remained the provincial border. Unlike the other possessions of Henry, in particular the Duchy of Münsterberg, Kladsko did not find itself during Henry's disputes with the Silesian princes under their military pressure. On the contrary, the prince repeatedly lost control over Münsterberg. After his father's death and the division of the possessions the bond between Henry the Elder of Münsterberg and Kladsko appeared even stronger. A 'princely council' met in session in the castle as well as a court tribunal presided by the county governor. The official agenda went through a newly established Kladsko office. The princely court was subject to the supervision of a marshal and comptroller and a scribe. Catholic priests with close links to Wrocław acted in the office organisation and as witnesses for a number of documents. Their engagement at the court of a man branded even before his conversion in 1472 as a heretic is remarkable. Martin Šandera believes that the form of the Kladsko court could have reflected elements of the workings of his ruling prototype, the court of the Ansbach margraves and perhaps, to a limited extent, the Silesian princes, at whose courts Henry did not spend much time. We can allow together with the author for a marked influence of Henry's wife Ursula of Brandenburg. In spite of devastating raids on Silesia at the time of his father's struggle for the Bohemian Crown Henry changed his approach to the church institutions and strove for the establishment of good relations with the abbots of the monasteries in the vicinity. One of the canons of the Wrocław Augustinian monastery even became tutor to the prince's children. Henry did not completely succeed in repairing the relations (despite some friendly overtures) with the superiors of the Augustinian monastery or the Johannite commends in the County of Kladsko proper. Some of this was due to a clash between the land governing notions and the defence of the received privileges on the part of the

monastic communities. Martin Šandera devoted great attention to nobles accepted into princely services. Apart from a representative of the local Panwitz dynasty they were often newcomers who acquired property in the land on arrival. The turning point in the policies of the Kladsko Count and Prince of Münsterberg marked the Kladsko Governor Hanuš Welfl of Varnsdorf, who had been involved in two decades of short wars on the Kladsko-Silesia frontier. Shortly after Henry's conversion Welfl left Kladsko. The new governors acted more as administrators of large properties than as commanders of military forces. We can admit the possibility that Henry had to sacrifice Welfl's services in exchange for a settlement of his relations with the Silesian milieu.

The conversion of Henry the Elder of Münsterberg together with the death of George of Poděbrady in the preceding year were seminal moments in his career. As Henry would not be caught in the trap of an uncertain struggle for his succession, he endorsed the candidature of Vladislaus II of Bohemia to the Czech throne. His elder brother Victor – paradoxically – actively defended the candidature of his jailer, Matthias Corvinus. The duel between the two main pretenders to the Crown ended with a stalemate in the form of the Olomouc Peace of 1477 and the division of the government in the Crown Lands. Henry became a subject of both rulers. As Count of Kladsko and holder of a number of possessions in Bohemia he was a subject of Vladislaus II of Bohemia, and by virtue of holding the Münsterberg principality, of Matthias Corvinus. At a time of escalating military clashes he found himself in a conflict of loyalty. Here too he showed himself to be an astute politician. Without losing his high position at the Prague court he was rewarded for his small-scale military campaigns against the enemies of Corvinus in Upper Silesia with liberation of the hitherto occupied Münsterberg. Henry's younger brother Hynek was also staying at the Hungarian court at that time. Nonetheless, the relations with the Hungarian and Czech king saw another change in the 1480s. Matthias Corvinus first expelled the sons of Poděbrady from their properties in Upper Silesia, which he was preparing for his illegitimate son Jan. The pretext for a final showdown was a multiple marriage alliance between three male descendants of Henry the Elder of Münsterberg and the daughters of Prince John II of Opole. An armed conflict now flared up over the duchy that was to pass to Corvinus according to earlier agreements. Facing the mobilised forces of the King of Hungary and Bohemia, Henry and his brothers had slender chances of success. The outcome of the conflict was their forced capitulation and renouncement of all the Silesian

possessions. Only the early death of Matthias Corvinus prevented the departure from Silesia from being definite. The desperately indebted prince gradually sold off his (east Bohemian) properties. Thanks to intercessors at the court of Vladislaus of Bohemia from the ranks of the high Czech nobility, the king finally returned to the prince Münsterberg and Frankenstein and, in exchange for claims to the dynastic family domain in central Bohemia, also the orphaned Duchy of Oels and Volov (Wołów) in Lower Silesia. Šandera's consideration that some of the Czech nobility purposefully shaped the futures of their offspring in Silesia to make space for a further property growth in Bohemia probably goes in the right direction.

In the conclusion of the book Martin Šandera interrupts once more the chronological flow of his narration and writes several thematic chapters. In them he attempts to reveal the character traits of the Münsterberg prince and to comprehend the links with his relatives. In the subsequent chapter he reflects on Henry's acting in the role of governor of the land. Only in these passages do we learn more about the links between the prince and the towns subject to him. Henry's world that Martin Šandera intends to reconstruct is presented as an aristocratic world with scant attention paid to the urban milieu. In this context it is necessary to take the author to task for not exploring in more depth the questions raised several decades ago by the Czech historian Josef Macek. In an eponymous synthesis of the society of the Jagellonian era Macek pointed out the incompatibility of the princely Reich titles held by the sons of George of Poděbrady and the stratification of the Czech nobility. The sources corroborate that the title of Reich Prince caused some embarrassment in the provincial community of the Duchy of Opava, which extracted from Victor of Poděbrady a special promise that neither the title nor the ceremonial rites would infringe the provincial rights. It is a pity that Martin Šandera did not try to trace the reactions of the individual provincial communities to the privileged position of the sons of George of Poděbrady. In the period in question the community of Silesian princes was headed by the Bishop of Wrocław. Was his position threatened by the Reich titles of Poděbrad's sons? In what position did the new princely dynasty move in the administration of pan-Silesian affairs? The administration of the conglomerate of direct property holding, fiefs, and pledges demanded that Henry the Elder of Münsterberg ceaselessly move across different power domains and the same can be said of the communication with rulers' courts and the provincial Czech and Silesian milieu. Further research devoted to late Medieval princely dynasties will probably follow in this direction. Although the

biography of the Elder of Münsterberg has not avoided some minor errors (for example, Namyslov was not part of the Duchy of Oels; the Duchy of Opava was not held by Jan Korvín until his death) but it created a good point of departure for future research with its consistent heuristics.

Martin Čapský

(*Institute of History, University of Pardubice*)

*

Luděk Březina, *Mezi králem a stavy. Dolnolužické zemské fojtství na prahu novověku (1490–1620)*, Praha: Casablanca, 2016 (Tempora et Memoria, 3), pp. 312.

For several generations, Lusatia has been the subject of lively interest on the part of Czech historians. They have done much to ensure that the region's attachment to the Kingdom of Bohemia *de facto* through 1635, and its *de iure* – lasting much longer, in the opinion of some until 1918 – would not be forgotten¹. The research follows two separate strands – one concerns “older” history until the first half of the 17th century, while the other addresses more recent events, from the Enlightenment and Czech national rebirth, as well as the awakening of a new nation of Lusatian Serbs. The first line of inquiry is the subject of the dissertation written by Ludek Březina at Charles University in Prague under the direction of prof. Lenka Bobková, the tireless promotor of research on Czech crown lands, particularly Lusatia. Reference to this fact is necessitated by review of the article, whose author emphasizes in a foreword the role played by her mentor as a catalyst for interest in Sorbian studies (p. 9). This inspiration was well-aimed, as it led to the preparation of a book that, on the one hand, was aligned perfectly with previous scholarship on the ruling elite of another crown land, i.e. Silesia², while on the other it is a publication that runs counter to existing historiography, particular

¹ This interpretation was presented by Zdeněk Boháč, *České země a Lužice*, Tišnov 1993.

² Johannes Kopietz, *Die böhmische Landeshauptmannschaft in Breslau unter dem Könige Johann und dem Kaiser Karl IV.*, Breslau 1907. More recently Ewa Wólkiewicz, “*Capitaneus Slesie*“. *Królewscy namiestnicy księstwa wrocławskiego i Śląska w XIV i XV wieku*, [in:] *Monarchia w średniowieczu, władza nad ludźmi i władza nad teritorium. Studia ofiarowane Profesorowi Henrykowi Samsonowiczowi*, eds. Jerzy Pysiak, Aneta Pieniądz-Skrzypczak, Marcin R. Pauk, Kraków 2002, pp. 169–225; Kazimierz Orzechowski, *Generalny starosta Śląska. Ewolucja urzędu*, [in:] *Studia historycznoprawne*, ed. Kazimierz Orzechowski, Wrocław 2004 (Acta Universitatis Wratislaviensis, 2616, Prawo, 278), pp. 117–133 and a study in *Hejtmanská správa ve vedlejších zemích Koruny české*, eds. Lenka Bobková, Martin Čapský, Irena Korbelařová, Opava 2009 (Acta Historica Univesitatis Silesianae Opaviensis – Supplementum, 7).

popular science works, which have seemingly ignored the politicized status of the Lower Lusatian Margraviate with its centuries-long dependence on the Prague political scene³. Lower Lusatia, divided after 1945 between the Federal Republic of Germany and the Republic of Poland, is not accented by either of those states in their administrative divisions, and they are being shorn of their historically-conditioned physiognomy⁴; this is manifested in the treatment of their Polish fragments as parts of Greater Poland and Upper Silesia⁵.

Alongside the foreword (pp. 9–12), the book contains an introduction (pp. 13–26), which discusses primarily the existing subject literature. The introduction to the main body of the dissertation comes in the first of four chapters (the author decided against numbering chapters and sub-chapters), in which there is an outline of the history of the Margraviate of Lusatia, and from the times of Matthias Corvinus – the Margraviate of Lower Lusatia, as well as a presentation of the development of the local estate structure and the role played in it by the bailiff as the primary representative of the Bohemian Crown in that area (*Dolní Lužice, zemští fojti a stavy ve středověku* [Lower Lusatia, bailiffs and estates in the Middle Ages], pp. 27–53). This short chapter demonstrates how the author successfully freed himself from the historiographical stereotypes that cast a shadow on presentations of the dyarchy of the Bohemian Crown in the period of 1469–1490 (King George and, from 1471, Vladislaus II the Jagiellonian in Prague and the surrounding area, Matthias Corvinus in the Crownlands, and until 1479 for significant portions of Bohemia). The scholar correctly interprets the process, taking place under Matthias's rule, within which crown lands under his control were fashioned into a common political space, particularly Silesia, constituting the foundation of his power in the Bohemian state, and the two Lusatias (p. 47). Tendencies set into motion during the Corvinus era were of deep significance in successive decades, and were subjected to detailed analysis by L. Březina; this is visible even in a work which is primarily devoted to the role of the royal office, by definition determining the

³ E.g. *Bibersteinowie w dziejach pogranicza śląsko-łużyckiego*, ed. Tomasz Jaworski, Zielona Góra 2006 – the title of the book itself is misleading, as it refers to Czech clan lands. A more suitable title would refer to it as the Czech-Lusatian-Silesian borderlands.

⁴ For example: *Brandenburgisches Klosterbuch. Handbuch der Klöster, Stifte und Kommenden bis zur Mitte des 16. Jahrhunderts*, eds. Heinz-Dieter Heimann, Klaus Neitmann, Winfried Schich et. al., vol. 1–2, Berlin 2006.

⁵ E.g. Adam Wojnałowicz, *Rola Bibersteinów w rozwoju osadnictwa na Śląsku*, [in:] *Bibersteinowie*, pp. 59–71, where, contrary to the title, there is primarily mention of... the Lower Lusatian town of Żary.

strength of the bonds of the most peripheral crown lands with the Crown of Bohemia as the core of the Crown (it should be noted that, in opposition to Moravia, Silesia and Upper Lusatia, Lower Lusatia did not share a border with Bohemia, and it was most strongly impacted by centrifugal forces, including the temptations of its neighbours, particularly the Hohenzollerns and Wettins).

The next three chapters are of key significance. The period covered in the work is divided into three fragments, setting as temporal borders the years 1526 and 1555. The first of them is associated with a change in the dynasty occupying the Bohemian throne, while the second with change in the office of the bailiff. This leads to a certain concern as to whether the periodization should consistently follow changes on the throne (making 1564 a more preferable second date) or important political events (1547 comes to mind), or perhaps important changes in the office that is being analysed. This not the year 1526 would serve as the caesura, but rather 1539, when Jindřich Tunkl of Brničk, the long-serving bailiff appointed back in the Jagiellonian era, died⁶. The compromise adopted by L. Březina, does not provide us with periods of similar length (36, 29 and 65 years, respectively), thus it can only be justified by the metamorphosis indicated in the title of the work, referring to the relations of the royal officer and the estates of the Margraviate. Is this justification legitimate?

In the second chapter (*Dolnolužické fojtství za vlády jagellonských králů (1490–1526)* [*Lower Lusatian bailiffs in the era of the Jagiellonian kings*], pp. 54–105), as in the next two chapters, first the political backdrop of the Bohemian Crown is presented, with successive subchapters detailing the activities of various bailiffs and the more salient problems they faced, such as the quarrel over the Spremberski estates and a portion of the Biberstein inheritance. The third chapter (*Dolnolužické zemské fojtství na počátku vlády Habsburků (1526–1555)* [*The Lower Silesian bailiffs at the inception of Habsburg rule*], pp. 106–174) encompasses primarily the latter portion of the term of office served by the Moravian magnate Count Albrecht Šlik (von Schlik). The key issue of this period was (first) the formation of the Bohemian estates and the Schmalkaldic War, in which Lower Lusatia, like Silesia, remained loyal to Ferdinand I and (save for the von Minckwitz

⁶ It is worth noting the fact omitted by L. Březina that in 1523 King Ludwik gave Jan Bezdrůžicki of Kolovrate a guarantee of the office of bailiff for Lower Lusatia after the death of Jiří Tunkl of Brničk; cf. *Kolovratské a berkovské listiny ve Statním archivu zemědělském. Zvláštní otisk, rozšířený o rejstřík, ze sborníku prací žáků prof. dr. G. Friedricha*, ed. Václav Černý, Prague 1931, p. 31, no. 89.

brothers) avoided the punishments meted out to Bohemia and the cities of Upper Lusatia. Nevertheless, they did not manage to sidestep later measures taken by the monarch to reinforce central authority, including (and perhaps primarily) in the fiscal sphere. As L. Březina demonstrated, the role of the bailiff was significantly enhanced also because of his extremely frequent letters to the king informing him of the situation in the Margraviate, quickly receiving feedback with decisions and instructions.

The accession to office by Bohuslav Felix Hasištejnski of Lobkovice in 1555 opens the next, longest period (*Dolnolužické zemské fojstství ve znamení stavovské převahy (1555–1620)* [*Lower Lusatian bailiffs under estate domination*], pp. 175–245). During his rule and that of his successors (Jaroslav Hasištejnski of Lobkovice, Karl von Kittlitz, and Heinrich Anselm von Promnitz), the tendency that commenced in the middle of the 16th century was weakened. In the spirit of the classic dissertation by Joachim Bahleki on the mutual opposition of centralism and regionalism in the Bohemian monarchy at the time⁷, it could be said that the estates of the Margraviate gained the upper hand on the royal authorities, while the royal office increasingly transformed into an estate office. Ultimately it was a period when the bailiff (Jaroslav Hasištejnski of Lobkovice) *de facto* ceased to perform his office at the end of the rule of Maximilian II, and the estates ruled themselves in their own name and in the name of the king (in that precise order). A *novum* in this period was the establishment in 1564 of a new office – the governor, who adopted a portion of the bailiff’s powers, particularly fiscal. This signalled a slow regression in the bailiff’s prestige, both in the eyes of the estates and of the monarch. The chapter closes with a brief presentation of the role of Lower Lusatia during the first years of the Thirty Years’ War.

At the end (pp. 246–254) the author summarizes his thesis, while pages 255–294 contain a list of sources and literature, accompanied with a list of illustrations and of names of locations mentioned in Czech, Sorbian, German, and Polish, with indexes at the end.

Returning to the question posed above of whether the adoption of 1555 as a caesura is justified, I am inclined to say that it is not. The year 1564 would seem of greater significance, not necessarily due to the death of Ferdinand I, but rather the weakening of the position of the bailiff through the appointment of a new royal office.

⁷ Joachim Bahleke, *Regionalismus und Staatsintegration in Wiederstreit. Die Länder der Böhmisches Krone im ersten Jahrhundert der Habsburgerherrschaft (1526–1619)*, München 1994.

The author, writing in Czech about past Bohemian crown lands whose territory is presently within the borders of the German and Polish states, was faced with the dilemma of which toponyms to employ: historical Czech, or those resulting from today's political divisions. He adopted a hybrid solution: for more well-known cities (itself problematic) he used the Czech names, while German was used for the remaining ones. This was a poor decision, all the more so when considering there are also names in Sorbian, naturally closer to Czech than to German. In my opinion, Czech names should be used consistently when they exist, and for places without Czech names, Sorbian should be used. German and Polish could appear in brackets alongside the first mention of a given name. Of course, a table of correlations is always useful, and one is to be found at the end of the book.

These few doubts and critical remarks do not change the fact that we are presented with a very good, valuable, and significant contribution with this dissertation. Considering it from the perspective of early-modern historiography of the Czech state focused outside of Prague – and thus with a Wrocław accent – we have been given a work depicting the scale and the strength of the bonds linking over a 130-year period (1490–1620) Lower Lusatia with both the Prague political centre, as well as Silesia as a region within the Crown of St. Wenceslas with its own political gravity. Indeed, it is interesting that at the cusp of the period under discussion, processes were underway parallel to those taking place in the Moravian-Silesian borderlands. I have here in mind the “strong pull” of the Wrocław political milieu within the framework of the Bohemian Crown, capable of incorporating the Duchy of Opava into the structures of Silesia. Political decisions of 1482 led to integration of Lubsk, which had been Lower Lusatian, with the portion of Silesia (Duchy of Głogów) that was in the hands of the Hohenzollerns. It was only in later decades of the 16th century that the bond loosened between the northern portion of the Głogów region (now the Duchy of the Krosno Hohenzollerns with the Lubsko part of Lower Lusatia) and the Bohemian Crown. Of interest, however, is the seemingly unwitting appearance on the pages of the reviewed work of the Lower Lusatian estates' attachment to their association with the Bohemian state organism. I would even risk the opinion that this issue should be given its own treatment – starting with the book under review here. Perhaps the penultimate sentence of my review will encourage L. Březina to take up this particular thread.

Bogusław Czechowicz

(Institute of History, University of Opole)

*

Barbara Kalinowska-Wójcik, *Między Wschodem i Zachodem. Ezechiel Zivier (1868–1925). Historyk i archiwista*, Katowice: Archiwum Państwowe w Katowicach, 2015, pp. 328.

Examining the picture located on the cover of the biography of Ezechiel Zivier, we see an intellectual from the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries. He is looking to the side, somewhere beyond us. The impression he gives off is one of being lost in his thoughts and far away from everyday matters. The title of the publication, *Między Wschodem i Zachodem* [*Between East and West*], suggest the suspension of the hero somewhere between two civilizations and cultural circles. Is the argument advanced in the title of the work by Barbara Kalinowska-Wójcik associated only with Zivier's origins and his life's path from the small Wieluń do the centre of his contemporary Europe, or rather with the broader processes of migration and assimilation of Eastern European Jewry, which Zivier exemplifies? Or was this also influenced by the fields touched by his scientific interests, continually brushing up against the border between those two worlds? Perhaps this argument of Kalinowska-Wójcik is associated with the deliberate suspension of the Upper Silesian in his new homeland between various religions and confessionals, the contemporary nations then forming, and the diverse forms of social activity by the Silesian intelligentsia?

The biography under discussion is devoted to an individual who has been essentially forgotten, and perhaps in life never well-known. When looking back on his diverse output as an archivist, historian, and social activist, we may observe that only one sentence, concerning his opinion on the borderland character of Upper Silesia, passed on to us a few years after his death by rector of the Katowice Cathedral Fr. Emil Szramek, served as the basis for the composition of an intellectually influential work titled *Górny Śląsk jako problem socjologiczny* [*Upper Silesia as a Sociological Matter*] (1934).

Zivier was born in Wieluń, in 1868, to a Jewish family. At the time, Jews enjoyed formal equality in Tsarist Russia, a measure introduced in the face of significant social and political resistance that soon evolved into the phenomenon of pogroms against the Jewish population, pushing it westward towards Europe and beyond the Atlantic.

Although Wieluń was but a mere 20 km from the Prussian border, this was a border of two different worlds. The young Zivier followed a path typical of Jewish children in the Kingdom of Poland, subjected to socialization within a Jewish family and community, then going to the local secondary school. When he left, he had an impressive command of languages, supposedly encompassing Russian, Polish, German, English, French, Hebrew, Greek and Latin, which bears witness to the good system of education within the Kingdom.

Completion of secondary school was the end of Zivier's life in Russia. Owing to the "numerus clauses" affecting Jewish candidates to that country's universities, he decided to pursue his education in Prussia, where such practices did not constitute official educational policy. The choice fell on the university in Wrocław (Breslau), where, in 1888, he began his studies in the Chair of Slavic Languages and Literatures. He was tutored by Władysław Nehring, the outstanding linguist and Slavic philologist. He also began theology studies at the liberal Jewish Seminary, which he did not finish.

In 1892, Zivier began working for the Hochbergs of Pszczyna (Pless), one of Germany's richest aristocratic families. They gave him work as an archivist. He moved to Pszczyna with his family (in 1896 he married the widow Johanna Freund) in 1903. With time, Zivier began to supply the Hochbergs with historical arguments necessary to defend their mining privileges. His new duties came with a pay rise (at the time of his death he was third on the company's pay table), but also with the placing of the Pszczyna archives in spacious rooms.

At the same time, his social role throughout the entire region was growing. From the beginning of the 20th century, Zivier participated actively in the intellectual life of the Opole (Oppeln) region, i.a. as the first publisher and lead author of the monthly "Oberschlesien" (Upper Silesia) (it was in the introduction to the first volume that his remarks on the borderland nature of Upper Silesia were published). He also engages in the life of various social associations and the Jewish commune. Earlier, from 1898, he began his involvement in the activity of Jewish freemasonry (B'nai B'rith), which the author of his biography – undoubtedly justifiably – highlights as the most important ideological declaration of the work's central figure.

He combines his professional work with the social engagement of the German Jews (he initiated the creation of an archive of the Jewish commune), as well as in the historiographical field. Apart from publications on the development of mining, he also composed a history of Poland during the Jagiellonian period. In

the 20th century he began taking active part in political debates in the place of the Jewish population in Germany, as well as the political fate of Upper Silesia after the Great War.

After the carving up of the region, he takes Polish citizenship, and dies in Pszczyna on 22th August 1925. The structure of the book reflects Zivier's main research areas and his life path. Apart from a methodological introduction and biographical chapter, the publication is composed of three chapters describing his activity as an archivist, historian, and social activist. It is filled out by a bibliography of the subject's works and other relevant supplemental materials (abstracts, indexes, and a bibliography of sources and literature used).

The most extensive of them is the chapter devoted to Zivier's founding of the Pszczyna archive, which was likely influenced by the scholarly interests and professional work of the author. Barbara Kalinowska-Wójcik is a member of the young generation of Katowice historians and archivists. In her professional life, she is associated with the University of Silesia in Katowice (undergraduate and graduate studies, as well as work at the Institute of History's Department of Archival Science and Silesian History), and with the State Archives in Katowice, where she is also employed. The publication dedicated to Zivier, printed in 2015, is an amended version of her 2005 PhD thesis.

In taking on the challenge of a biography of Zivier, the author crosses into an unexplored region. There are few articles giving consideration to Pszczyna archival activities, and those that do exist are quite occasional. This led the author to engage in broad archive queries, mainly at the Pszczyna Branch of the State Archives in Katowice, once the Archive of the Dukes of Pszczyna, founded by Zivier. There she found manuscripts of his scholarly works and correspondence regarding archival and publishing matters, as well as other official Pszczyna acts. The source base was comprised of sources acquired in other regional archives and the University of Wrocław Archives. Queries in other archives generated little useful material.

This is how a biography was prepared describing not only Zivier's life and most important fields of activity, but also his search for identity, which resulted from the meeting of East European Jews with their integrated German counterparts. Discreetly, in a paragraph or a sentence, the author attempts to perceive and outline the broader historical backdrop, aligning the decisions and attitudes of the book's

central focus with the cultural transformations taking place among various groups and institutions.

Among the important and frequently non-functional determinations made by B. Kalinowskiej-Wójcik in the margins of Zivier's biography, we may observe the emergence of another picture of Upper Silesian society at the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries, different from that generally accepted in the scholarly literature. It is not so much a backwards and extremely conservative one, as the progressive circles of the time were already claiming, but a modern society based on old foundations. A collectivity that quickly catches up to the progress made in culture, and which enters into the socio-political debate of the time. This other reality is visible in the role played by the Hochbergs for and in the region. They are not, in Kalinowska-Wójcik's view, the primary factor in the tardiness of the lands east of the Elbe, but rather constitute a regional elite, rationally pursuing a policy of growing their own company and making efforts in support of the development of Upper Silesia's culture. The employment of an archivist with a university degree along with the provision of support for scientific and social work would seem appropriate in the context of such a policy of remembrance. Hiring Zivier, the Hochbergs paid no heed of his Russian citizenship and Jewish origins, which is another fact in their favour.

Observing the accelerated cultural evolution of Upper Silesia at the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries, the author uses this as the background for the creation and development of regional archives, which evolved into research centres. Pszczyzna and Zivier himself are an excellent example. They are also evidence that regional elites reacted to a broader turn of European society towards history. Zivier himself, with his positivist conviction of the possibility of "objectively" writing history, quickly became an anachronism among the circle of Upper Silesian humanists.

The third group of observations made by Kalinowska-Wójcik concerns modern nations, including the Jewish one. The author devotes the last and shortest chapter of the work to Zivier's activity in this field, and in it she analyses the most pressing questions of European ideology and politics of the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries from the perspective of the fate of the individuals. In this particular case, the phenomena of the absorption and exclusion of the Jewish population by the German nation is addressed, thus considering even the genesis of the Holocaust. The three solutions comprising the choice facing both the hero of the biography

and the entire Jewish community, outlined and described as an aside to the biography of Zivier, can be labeled as: full assimilation and blending into other groups, retaining confessional independence within other national groups, and the construction of a separate national group. Zivier chose the middle ground, and undertook to retain Jewish identity within the framework of the German political nation.

A certain flaw of the book is the absence of a characterization of the hero as a flesh and blood person: family father, friend, and companion. The publication presents a picture of an individual withdrawal from daily life, which is governed by professional and scholarly work. However, it is difficult to hold this against Kalinowska-Wójcik, as there are simply no personal sources to draw on.

In conclusion, just a few words in reference to the one of the book's objectives and its fundamental argument of Zivier being suspended between different worlds. It is doubtlessly correct, but is in my view overly static, and I would prefer to emphasize the fact that Zivier quickly traversed a certain border and was far down the road between East and West. He did not burn bridges, and owing to his professional and scientific interests he frequently returned to the East. But his self-identification had become grounded in Western notions not later than by the conclusion of his studies. This means that neither religion nor nationality were the most important elements of identity for him. Zivier rather considered himself a member of the German intellectual elite, and linked his and his family's future with the German nation.

Following this constastation, we should call into question the possibility of restoring the work of Zivier to Upper Silesian memory. This is the objective set out in the book's introduction. In my opinion, this is a case of wishful thinking, grounded in the ideology of "multiculturalism", and a very difficult task to carry out.

In assessing the work, it is worth urging that it quickly be translated into German. The biography of Ezechieł Zivier is, after all, a fragment primarily of the German history of Upper Silesia, the eastern German lands. German historiography has rejected this heritage for decades and expelled it from social discourse. By the same token, this book by B. Kalinowska-Wójcik could fill a significant gap in the German market.

Bernard Linek
(Silesian Institute, Opole)

*

Robert Żurek, *Pojednanie. Kościół katolicki i relacje polsko-niemieckie po 1945 r. Katalog wystawy = Reconciliation in progress. Catholic church and the Polish-German relations after 1945. Exhibition catalogue*, Wrocław–Berlin: Ośrodek “Pamięć i Przyszłość”, 2015, pp. 159, ill.; *7 Cudów Wrocławia i Dolnego Śląska*, eds. Wojciech Mrozowicz, Wojciech Kucharski, Wrocław: Ośrodek “Pamięć i Przyszłość”, 2016, pp. 190, ill.; *Wrocław 1945–2016*, ed. Wojciech Kucharski, Wrocław: Centrum Historii Zajezdnia, Ośrodek “Pamięć i Przyszłość”, 2016, pp. 322, ill.

Founded in Wrocław just under a decade ago, the “Remembrance and Future” Centre, presently known as the Depot History Center, is one of Wrocław’s most important cultural institutions engaged in the promotion of Polish national heritage. It offers a multifaceted approach to popularization of the historical and cultural heritage developed in Lower Silesia by Poles after World War II. As the Mayor of Wrocław, Rafał Dutkiewicz, wrote in his introduction to the publication *Wrocław 1945–2016*, the Depot History Center is “a place of modern exhibits, educational projects and events associated with the newest history of our city and region, but also a place for reflection on the future of Europe”. Over the short few years of its operation, the institution has initiated numerous important exhibitions which have always been accompanied by catalogue publications.

In conjunction with the 50th anniversary in 2015 of one of the most important documents for the process of Polish and German reconciliation, the Letter of Reconciliation of the Polish Bishops to their German Brothers (on 18th November 1965), a special exhibit was organized in Wrocław. The project was carried out as part of the 2016 European Capital of Culture (ECC). The exposition was accompanied by a catalogue titled *Reconciliation. The Catholic Church and Polish-German relations after 1945* written by Robert Żurek. This is a standard exhibit guidebook, in the main presenting colour and black-and-white illustrations accompanied by information about titles, authors, burial grounds, and background. The illustrative material is very diverse, from photographs, through reproductions of artwork, satirical items, poster art. and press clippings, to simplified maps and diagrams. This portion of the catalogue is accompanied by concise elaborations (in Polish and English) intended to present the issues addressed by the exhibit. Like the exhibit itself, the catalogue is also divided into several parts. The publication includes an introduction

titled *Reconciliation. The Catholic Church and Polish-German Relations after 1945*. The main portion of the catalogue is divided into the *Introduction* and seven chapters sorted by chronological and thematic criteria, focused on the history of Polish-German relations viewed through the lens of the activity of Christian church institutions and their faithful against the backdrop of European history after 2015.

In terms of substantive content and composition of the message, the publication performs the role of a catalogue and guide to the exhibit. Nevertheless, the condensed nature of some information, such as that about more unfamiliar incidents, assumes that the reader has a working knowledge of the issue being presented. This may make it less accessible for people lacking a certain familiarity with the subject. That said, the catalogue composed by R. Żurek is a valuable complement to the exhibit, and deserves praise for its substantive and editorial quality.

The “Remembrance and Future” Centre was also the organizer of one of the most important exhibits in Wrocław during ECC 2016. *Seven Wonders of Wrocław and Lower Silesia* (Wrocław – Town Hall – February–May 2016) proved tremendously popular among both residents of Wrocław and the Lower Silesia region, as well as numerous visitors from around the country and abroad. The large-scale exhibition was also accompanied by a catalogue (of the same title) prepared with the editorial input of Wrocław historians Wojciech Mrozowicz (Institute of History, University of Wrocław) and Wojciech Kucharski (“Remembrance and Future” Centre). The list of authors also includes other outstanding Wrocław scholars associated with the University, local museums (National Museum and Museum of Architecture), and journalists.

As the editors emphasize in their introduction, the exhibition and the catalogue publications constitute a sort of “journey in the footsteps of the region’s most valuable artefacts as a way of introducing selected aspects – in this case, the seven wonders – of Lower Silesia and Wrocław”. The idea behind the entire undertaking can be summarized in the popular expression “the grass is always greener on the other side of the fence”, but perhaps it would be more accurate to say, “the problem is, you don’t appreciate your own lawn enough”. The authors provide solid evidence that cultural “wonders” need not be sought in far-off places, but rather are essentially within arm’s reach. The popularity achieved by the exhibition provides confirmation of this fact.

On the one hand, *Seven Wonders of Wrocław and Lower Silesia*, is a classic catalogue with elements of a guidebook. On the other hand, it constitutes a popular science publication addressing selected events in the history of Lower Silesia,

discussing cultural, social, and even nature-related topics in extensive detail. Like the exhibition, the catalogue is divided into seven chapters describing the areas that the “wonders” are associated with: *Landscape, Language, Art, Science, Architecture, and Religion*. The final chapter, *Encounters*, is the thread that ties together the concept of the exhibition referring to the words of Pope John Paul II, who said of Wrocław that it is “a city of meetings, a city that brings people together”. The multicultural nature of Lower Silesia is emphasized, which has exerted tremendous influence on the local population and artwork created by it. Particular chapters discuss the wonders referred to in the title – artefacts in a broader historical and cultural context, but with the assumption that the reader possesses elementary knowledge of the region’s history (a bilingual formula was adopted, i.e. the texts are written).

The texts inside the catalogue, placed alongside one another in English and in Polish, are accompanied by numerous and mostly colourful illustrations presenting particular pieces on display – artefacts of cartography, manuscripts and antique books, paintings and sculptures, artistic crafts, photographs of architectural monuments and important events, etc. The entirety makes up a compact and interesting presentation of the history of Wrocław and Lower Silesia. We should also emphasize the attention to detail evident in the editorial work of the catalogue’s creators. These elements justify a very positive assessment of the catalogue.

The crowning achievement of the years of activity conducted by the “Remembrance and Future” Centre in 2016 was the ceremonial inauguration of the Depot History Center, whose primary project is a modernistic exhibition of scenography titled *Wrocław 1945–2016*, which presents the history of the city and its people in the period indicated by the title (the project was realized as part of the ECC programme). This tremendous undertaking is accompanied by an expansive 300-page catalogue bearing the same title as the exposition itself. The scientific editor of the publication is W. Kucharski, who assembled a team of scholars representing a range of scientific, cultural, archival and educational institutions, not only from Wrocław and Lower Silesia but also other regions of Poland.

The catalogue they prepared is comprised of eight chapters, arranged in accordance with the history of Polish lands from 1918. By starting from this date, we can follow the paths of those whose association with Wrocław begins in 1945 and lasts until 1989 and later. The long chapters are divided into smaller sections, preceded by a brief historical introduction devoted to selected issues of political, social, economic and cultural life, as well as the daily goings-on of the city. The rich narrative

is interwoven with notes addressing specific events and remarkable personalities. An important complement to the main text and notes are the not-infrequently detailed captions under illustrations. The substantive content and manner of presentation make the catalogue so accessible as to be capable of reaching a broad audience, including those with a moderate interest in history. On the other hand, the historical tidbits included should prove attractive to those passionate about the past.

The publication is distinguished by its rich and diverse graphical design. Alongside illustrations of selected objects displayed at the exhibition, there are photographs of people and events, reproductions of documents, posters, and announcements. Many illustrations are published here for the first time. The extreme attention to detail of the catalogue's makers should be emphasized, in respect of both content and editing, which justifies a very favourable review. A catalogue-guide constructed in this manner facilitates a fuller understanding of the exhibition, helping to impose order on the wealth of information transmitted during the viewing of this multifaceted presentation. It can also be considered an important work on the post-war history of Wrocław.

Exhibition catalogues are special publications owing to the tasks they are supposed to perform. When their primary function as guides has finished following the close of the exhibition, they become an interesting record of it. It can be said of all three of the catalogue publications reviewed here that they tell the history of Wrocław and Lower Silesia – as do the exhibitions themselves – in a lively and unusual way. While the limited scope of this review does not allow for a more critical examination of their content, it is certain that they will remain relevant and attractive popular science publications on the history of the region long after the conclusion of ECC in Wrocław.

Joanna Nowosielska-Sobel
(*Institute of History, University of Wrocław*)

*

“CzasyPismo: on the history of Upper Silesia”, 1, 2012 – 1 (9), 2016.

In the course of the 20th century, Silesia, taken from Poland in the Middle Ages, again found itself almost in its entirety within the borders of the Polish state as a result of two World Wars. The national, regional and cultural situation that endured in a part of it referred to as Upper Silesia continues to impact the shape of the region

to this day. It is inhabited by various populations. Among them are native Silesians, whose predecessors occupied these lands back in times of German rule. Some of them consider themselves to be Poles, others Germans, and still others – no small portion – in a recent census defined themselves as members of the Silesian nation. There is also a group, difficult to count, which does not profess a clear national identity. Within a few years after the end of World War II, the majority of the German population inhabiting Upper Silesia had been forcefully removed. At the same time, Poles from both the central part of the country, as well as from the Eastern lands lost to the Soviet Union in 1945 arrived to take their place. This national and cultural melting-pot gave rise to a range of conflicts in the post-war decades, which were intensified by a harsh nationalist policy imposed by the communist governing Poland at the time. Not only did they refuse to recognise the German national minority in Poland until 1989, but they also refused to permit native Upper Silesians to celebrate their regional distinctness and cultural self-identification. This policy was also applied to the massive amounts of historical publications written about Upper Silesia. They emphasised the entirely and unchangingly Polish nature of the land, as well as only Polish geopolitical arguments concerning the state it belongs to¹.

¹ A visible effect of the breakthrough at the end of the 1980s was an innovative and highly-publicized exhibition presented in Wrocław and organized by the Berlin-based Gesellschaft für interregionalen Kulturaustausch along with the Silesian Institute. It led to the production of a large bi-lingual catalogue titled “*Awaken, my heart, and think*”. *A contribution to the history of relations between Silesia and Berlin–Brandenburg from 1740 to the present day* [“*Wach auf, mein Herz, und denke*”. *Zur Geschichte der Beziehungen zwischen Schlesien und Berlin–Brandenburg von 1740 bis heute* / „*Przebudź się, serce moje, i pomyśl*”. *Przyczynek do historii stosunków między Śląskiem a Berlinem–Brandenburgią od 1740 roku do dziś*], eds. Klaus Bździach *et al.*, Berlin–Opole 1995. In subsequent years, Poland saw the publishing of numerous synthetic historical works on Upper Silesia, including with the participation of German and Czech authors. See e.g. *Historia Górnego Śląska. Polityka, gospodarka i kultura europejskiego regionu*, eds. Joachim Bahlcke, Dan Gawrecki, Ryszard Kaczmarek, Gliwice 2011; Arno Herzig, Krzysztof Ruchniewicz, Małgorzata Ruchniewicz, *Śląsk i jego dzieje*, Wrocław 2012; *Polityka państw narodowych wobec języka na Górnym Śląsku w XIX i XX wieku*, eds. Michał Lis, Łucja Jarczak, Leokadia Drożdż, Opole 2013; *Leksykon mitów, symboli i bohaterów Górnego Śląska XIX-XX wieku*, eds. Bernard Linek, Andrzej Michałczyk, Opole 2015. At the same time, an increasing number of books appeared taking up previously unexplored issues in Upper Silesian history. See e.g.: *Oni decydowali na Górnym Śląsku w XX wieku*, eds. Janusz Mokrosz, Mirosław Węcki, Katowice–Rybnik 2014; *Górny Śląsk i Górnoszlązacy. Wokół problemów regionu i jego mieszkańców w XIX i XX wieku*, ed. Sebastian Rosenbaum, Katowice–Gliwice 2014; *Wywózka. Deportacja mieszkańców Górnego Śląska do obozów pracy przymusowej w Związku Sowieckim w 1945 roku. Faktografia – konteksty – pamięć*, eds. Sebastian Rosenbaum, Dariusz Węgrzyn, Katowice 2014. The freedom of expression that came with the end of communism in Poland also allowed for the publication of books addressing current topics of import to Upper Silesia. See: Michał Lis, *Śląsk Opolski w warunkach transformacji ustrojowej państwa od 1989 roku*, Opole 2013.

Since the peaceful dismantling of communism in Poland began in 1989, the social situation in Upper Silesia has slowly undergone normalisation. However, the emergence of the (legal) Silesian Autonomy Movement and hundreds of thousands of supporters of the Silesian nationality have long contributed to apprehension present at the central political levels of the Polish state.

The last few decades have seen in this region a virtual explosion of social activity, symbolised by the eruption of diverse periodicals devoted to local, Upper Silesian matters. Since 2012, the efforts of the Regional Cultural Institute in Katowice have resulted in the publishing of the cultural quarterly “Fabryka Silesia” [“Silesian Factory”]. It also publishes articles on historical subjects. In 2012, the Katowice division of the Institute of National Remembrance began publishing a half-yearly journal titled “CzasyPismo: on the history of Upper Silesia” (the word “CzasyPismo” in the title is a play on words, essentially untranslatable – translator’s note). It should be emphasised that the Katowice division of the Institute of National Remembrance – Commission for the Prosecution of Crimes against the Polish Nation is one of the best in Poland. In general, the research teams of the INR have engaged in painstaking and beneficial work, establishing the history (insofar as archival materials have survived) of crimes committed against Poles by communists, German Nazis, and Ukrainian nationalists. I would like to emphasize that for some time the rich experience gathered in the course of this primary research has been leading with increasing frequency to successful historical syntheses. Against this quite positive background, the Katowice division of the INR is doubtlessly a star of the first order.

The periodical edited by a young (but fruitful in publications) research team under the leadership of prof. Adam Dziurok attempts at low cost (only black and white illustrations are used, only the covers are in colour, displaying images of contemporary Silesian art) to present a cross-section of Upper Silesian issues. The authors are researchers – historians – not only from Upper Silesia, but also from other Polish academic centres. It should be noted that the authors writing for the half-yearly include a large group of the present day’s most prominent specialists in Upper Silesian issues. This is a significant boost to both the level and the prestige of the periodical.

In order to make the publication more accessible to a broad readership base, the editors have decided to leave out some elements characteristic of academic writing (such as footnotes). However, it can be observed that authors frequently

submit for publication the results of *stricte* scientific studies, adapted nevertheless to readers of a less academic inclination. One of the riches of each edition of “CzasyPismo” comes in the form of archival photographs. Frequently, these have never been published and come from private, family archives, known previously to a very small number of people. The periodical’s circulation oscillates between 1700 and 2000 copies (in the poor budgetary conditions typical for Poland, this is an impressive number), and every volume contains around 200 pages. The first volume, from 2012, says in an introduction *From the Editors* that “CzasyPismo is a journal about time (the past). Our primary focus, however, is the 20th century [...]. We want [...] to concentrate on the history of Upper Silesia – within the historical borders of that region, thus including Silesian Cieszyn² – and neighbouring regions, including the Dąbrowskie Basin³, as well as the Częstochowa⁴ and Żywiec areas⁵. We will place particular emphasis on the issue of the functioning of totalitarian systems – Nazism and communism – as well as their impacts on the region’s society”.

In the nine editions of the periodical issued to date, a broad range of issues important to Upper Silesia has been explored. At times, these have encompassed collections of articles. Alongside this more serious (at times very much so) work, lighter fare has also been published on the pages of the half-yearly.

Nevertheless, the primary content of „CzasyPismo” has consisted of serious deliberations on issues important to Upper Silesians, both those from before the war and those arriving after 1945. The most salient of them include the following issues of widespread interest: Polish, German, and Silesian nationalism; the issue of national self-identification (or the lack thereof); discussions on the three Silesian uprisings (of 1919–1921), which decided about the division of the previously German Upper Silesia into its Polish and German parts; the Polish-German competition in the divided Upper Silesia during the inter-war period (1918–1939); the tragic events resulting from German rule in the Polish part of Upper Silesia during

² Part of the historical Upper Silesia, until 1918 within the borders of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, in 1920 (to the present day) divided between Poland and the then-Czechoslovakia.

³ Dąbrowskie Basin – the northern portion of the region where coal is mined, bordering the Upper Silesia region, until 1918 within the borders of the Russian empire. Since then, it has been a part of the Polish state.

⁴ Częstochowa region – a portion of historically central Poland, in 1793–1807 part of the Kingdom of Prussia, in contemporary Poland the city of Częstochowa is located in the northern part of the Silesia province, encompassing also the eastern portion of historical Upper Silesia.

⁵ Żywiec region – until 1772 within the borders of Poland, during 1772–1918 part of the Habsburg empire. From 1918, in Poland, and since 1998 within the borders of the Silesia province.

World War II; the history of Upper Silesians enmeshed in the issue of the Volkslist⁶; the dramatic (and at times tragic) fate of the Upper Silesian population after World War II: the so-called rehabilitation (concerning signatories of the Volkslist) and verification (recognition of previously German citizens as members of the Polish nation); the nationalist policies of Polish authorities forbidding the native Upper Silesian population from any – even regional-cultural – distinctness from the Polish nation. A theme present in successive issues of “CzasyPismo” is the so-called Tragedy of Upper Silesia. This term is understood by Upper Silesians to signify the bloody repressions of the Red Army against the civilian inhabitants of Upper Silesia; their unlawful imprisonment in camps, where on occasion genocide was committed; the mass forced expulsion of Upper Silesians to the Soviet Union: to forced labour in Siberia, Kazakhstan, and other industrial regions. How many of these people never returned to their families...

“CzasyPismo” is an important periodical, edited by Upper Silesians whose forefathers came from all over Poland and the German part of Upper Silesia. Published with what is – by today’s standards – a rather large circulation, it may reach a decent number of readers. It is doubtlessly an important voice, taking up issues that have remained fresh in the minds of the region’s inhabitants over the last few decades. I feel that the underlying concept of the journal is a good one, and the content presented in it can prove educational to readers unfamiliar with the dramatic history of Upper Silesia.

Grzegorz Strauchold
(*Institute of History, University of Wrocław*)

⁶ During World War II, Germany, occupying what had before been the Polish part of Upper Silesia, introduced the so-called “Volkslist” (German Nationality List) for native Silesians. Those who signed it were granted the rights afforded to members of the German nation (including larger rations). At the same time, they were obliged to serve in the German army. Failure to sign the document led to very harsh repressions by Germans, including men – frequently the sole breadwinners of large families – being put in concentration camps. After World War II, those who had signed the “Volkslist” were considered by the communist authorities as traitors, and subjected to harsh repressions.

WOJCIECH KUCHARSKI
(The “Remembrance and Future” Centre, Wrocław)

SPACES FOR HISTORY. HISTORICAL PROJECTS BY THE EUROPEAN CAPITAL OF CULTURE

“Spaces for beauty” served as Wrocław’s primary slogan during its time as the European Capital of Culture. This slogan encapsulates the goal that the city set for itself during the ECC celebrations: “creating open, dynamic, and inviting spaces to satisfy the human desire for interaction with works of art and culture”¹. Space here is treated as a collection of various spheres of human life, each with its own history. Paraphrasing that slogan – “spaces for history” means the part of ECC in which history is the key to thinking about the city. From the very beginning this historical context accompanied implementation of the idea of ECC. The first sentence on the official webpage of the project was “Wrocław entered the competition for European Capital of Culture 2016 with a story to tell...”². What is this story? The authors of ECC explain that, for centuries, Wrocław was a splendid, culturally-developed city which experienced a cataclysm brought about by World War II. Not only was the city subjected to tremendous destruction, but it also lost its residents. They were replaced by new ones, who spent the post-war decades creating a new identity and culture³. These new residents, as Gregor Thum has written: “succeeded – even if it took several decades, and within the context of a process that remains ongoing – in putting down roots and making a foreign city their own”⁴. This declaration would seem to indicate that history, and more

¹ *Przestrzenie dla piękna na nowo rozważone. Aplikacja Wrocławia o tytuł Europejskiej Stolicy Kultury 2016*, Wrocław 2011, p. 14.

² <http://www.wroclaw2016.pl/o-esk> (access: 11 December 2016).

³ *Ibidem*.

⁴ Georg Thum, *Obce miasto Wrocław 1945 i potem*, trans. Małgorzata Słabicka, Wrocław 2008, p. 44.

precisely a new perspective on the history of the city, a reckoning with that history, was an important context in thinking about whether and why Wrocław should be made the European Capital of Culture. In the final version of the application, four out of the nine reasons cited for the city's entry directly invoked historical issues. They are worthy of mention here. Wrocław entered the competition for ECC because: 1) it is a city which has existed for a thousand years at the juncture of various nations and cultures, 2) in the 20th century it experienced a total exchange of its population and had to "deal with" its multinational past, 3) Lower Silesia, with its metropolis of Wrocław, is a region which boasts the largest concentration of historical monuments in Poland, a portion of which is of considerable importance for European and world heritage, and finally 4) Wrocław's polysemiotic character is a historical issue deserving of exploration⁵. Regardless of the extent to which the ECC program departed from the original application, it can doubtlessly be said that the projects related to history and executed in 2016 were perfectly in line with the initially assumed goals.

The ECC's eight curatorial areas (architecture, film, literature, music, opera, performance, visual arts, theatre) do not include history, yet it functions as a glue binding them together. I would classify historical projects into four groups: heritage of the past, architecture and urban design, accepting otherness, and art history. The leading institutions engaged in their execution were the "Remembrance and Future" Centre, the Municipal Museum of Wrocław, the Museum of Modern Art, the Museum of Architecture, and the Impart Wrocław 2016 Festival Office.

The ECC program was carried out over a period of several years, but this review is focused on events of 2016. Of the roughly 2000 projects organized under ECC, over 200 of them were leading projects; of those, several dozen were focused on history. It is not possible to list them all, which is why I will focus on only the most important of them.

The European Capital of Culture kicked off with a majestic outdoor spectacle titled "Awakening". Its creator, Chris Baldwin, wanted to develop a process that would encompass then entire city, "in which history is intertwined with the present, creating a unitary and unique *esprit* of the city". Four ghosts approached the downtown from four regions of the city. These ghosts symbolized rebuilding (the post-war history of the city), flood (an experience of far-ranging importance in the

⁵ *Przestrzenie dla piękna*, pp. 9–10.

process of implanting post-war residents), innovation (contemporary Wrocław), and multiple faiths (a city located at the intersection of cultures and religions). This event gave clear indication of how important historical references would be in 2016, particularly those invoking the most recent history of the city.

Post-war history was accented most strongly in two projects: the spectacle of *Cantata Flow*, and the main exhibit at the Depot History Centre (a new space for historical projects made available during ECC) – *Wrocław 1945–2016. Flow* – a multi-spectacle presented along the Odra river, was comprised of four acts: *Decades of building and dance*, about the 1920s and 1930s in Breslau, a time in which modernist architecture flourished and a fascination with new media abounded; *Destruction* – devoted to the levelling of the city during Festung Breslau; *Quiet and reawakening* – tells the story of Breslau's transformation into Wrocław, the arrival of new residents and their life in communist times; *Reconstruction, Flood, Reconstruction* – depicted both the destructive strength of the largest flood in the city's thousand-year history and its unusually important role in the process of establishing and taming the place.

A similar narrative line was used in the exhibit organized by the “Remembrance and Future” Centre at the Depot Historical Centre, but it was complemented with an exceptionally important pre-war element⁶. The exhibit at the Depot did not address the post-war history of the city itself (as we might infer from the title), but rather of its residents, and these “new residents” were not born in pre-war Breslau, but rather in the Second Polish Republic (both in terms of time and place). Beginning in 1945, Wrocław saw the arrival of people bearing memories of Poland from the inter-war period, with its mythical, idealized pre-war Lviv – which is how it was portrayed by the exhibit. New arrivals to the city on the Oder also brought with them experiences of World War II, in both its antihuman and geopolitical dimension. The primary consequences of the war came in the form of a change of borders, the occupation of nearly half of Europe by totalitarian communism, and large-scale migrations of populations. The post-war history of Wrocław and its new residents was divided into six main segments: *A foreign city 1945–1948*, *Cementing the “people’s power” 1945–1955*, *Behind the iron curtain 1945–1989*, *City on the Oder 1956–1980*, *Solidary Wrocław 1980–1989*, *The Meeting Place 1989 and later*⁷. The exhibit is of a scenographic and narrative character. It is designed

⁶ *Wrocław 1945–2016*, ed. Wojciech Kucharski, Wrocław 2016.

⁷ *Ibidem*, pp. 8–11.

for the visitor not only to learn about the history of the city and its residents, but also to tackle it themselves by stepping into the shoes of the exhibit's heroes. Alongside the expansive scenography, the exhibit also includes over 1,500 original pieces. The largest of them is an American rail wagon that travelled around Lower Silesia starting at the end of the 1940s. The smallest is a stamp from the first congress of "Solidarity". Alongside hundreds of everyday items, the exhibit also includes memorabilia from Tadeusz Różewicz, Tadeusz Strugała, Tymoteusz Karpowicz, Professor Władysław Czapliński, Ewa Szumańska, and many other famous Bratislavians. The exhibit displays the exhibits of Wrocław's citizens from over the past 70 years. It shows how a destroyed, foreign city was rebuilt and "tamed".

An interesting and important complement to this subject came in the form of two exhibitions organized by the Wrocław Contemporary Museum (WCM). *The Germans didn't come* addresses the issue of Wrocław's relation to its German heritage⁸. It presents works by Polish and German artists. The title refers to apprehension related to losing one's new home, and Pole's feelings of temporariness in the so-called "Western Lands". For years after the war this was symbolized by unpacked suitcases in Polish homes. At the same time, the authorities employed fear of Germans returning to the "Recovered Lands" as an instrument for strengthening the communist regime. The exhibit provides a different perspective on the city. As Michał Bieniek wrote, it was built "around such ideas as emptiness, erasure, memory, presence/absence"⁹. The second exhibit at the WCM, *Wild fields*, was devoted to the Wrocław avant-garde. It presented nearly 500 works (including from the visual arts, theatre, film, architecture, design, everyday life) of the most outstanding artists, including Jerzy Grotowski, Jerzy Ludwiński, and Stanisław Dróżdż. Art served as a pretext to tell the story of post-war Wrocław as a place for artists¹⁰. The exhibit was a smash success and was also presented in Slovakia, Germany, Croatia, and Hungary.

It should also be noted that the ECC included two exhibits devoted to Polish-German reconciliation: *Reconciliation / Versöhnung in progress... The*

⁸ See: review of exhibit written by Krzysztof Ruchniewicz: <http://krzysztofruchniewicz.eu/niemcy-nie-przyszli/> (access:15 December 2016).

⁹ <http://muzeumwspolczesne.pl/mww/kalendarium/wystawa/niemcy-nie-przyszli/> (access: 15 December 2016).

¹⁰ <http://muzeumwspolczesne.pl/mww/kalendarium/wystawa/dzienie-pola-historia-awangardowego-wroclawia-2/> (access:15 December 2016).

*Catholic Church and Polish-German relations after 1945*¹¹ and *Forgiveness and reconciliation. Cardinal Kominek. The unknown father of Europe*¹². They emphasized Wrocław's contribution to Polish-German reconciliation in the activities of Cardinal Bolesław Kominek, author of the 1965 address of Polish bishops to German bishops, which has since become a central element of European heritage.

In 2016, the story of Wrocław from "Festung Breslau" to the end of People's Poland was the subject of two editions of archival film reviews about Wrocław – *Scenes of Wrocław*. The historical films were accompanied by a screening of *The Battle of Wrocław*, a document covering the largest protests seen in Poland during the martial law period¹³. Even the 37th edition of the Stage Songs Review included three galas (Polish, German, and Lviv-themed) focused on the history of the city.

The second strand in the historical projects of ECC 2016 is brought together by a story of shared Polish, German, Lviv/borderlands, and Silesian heritage. The European Capital of Culture saw the opening of an exhibit titled *7 wonders of Wrocław and Lower Silesia*, organized by the "Remembrance and Future" Centre. The exhibit presented Lower Silesia and Wrocław's most important historical monuments, of European and global importance, in seven categories: landscape (the oldest map of Silesia, drafted by Martin Helwig), language (the Henrykowski Book with its first edition in Polish), art (Hans Pleydenwurff's *Sacrifice in the Temple*), science ("Miscellanea Curiosa Medico-Physica Academiae Naturae Curiosorum sive Ephemerides Germanicae", the world's first journal devoted to medicine and the life sciences), architecture (Max Berg's design for Centennial Hall), religion (*Legende der heiligen Hedwig* of 1451, the largest collection of German-language texts about St. Hedwig) and meetings (*Address of the Polish bishops to their German Brothers in Christ's Pastoral Office*)¹⁴. The main landmarks were complemented by dozens of unique pieces rarely shown to the public. The interactive exhibit made use of scenography, and during a 45-minute journey around the areas mentioned above, visitors could experience the 1000-year multicultural history of Silesia.

¹¹ Robert Żurek, *Pojednanie / Versöhnung in progress... Kościół katolicki i relacje polsko-niemieckie po 1945 r.*, Wrocław 2015.

¹² *Przebaczenie i Pojednanie. Kardynał Kominek nieznan ojciec Europy*, eds. Krzysztof Po- mian, Karolina Ciejka, [Wrocław 2016].

¹³ <http://kadrywroclawia.pl/> (access: 15 December 2016).

¹⁴ *7 cudów Wrocławia i Dolnego Śląska*, eds. Wojciech Mrozowicz, Wojciech Kucharski, Wrocław 2016.

The story of Silesia's place in Europe's heritage was also told by an exhibit titled *Vratislavian Europe*, organized by the National Museum in Wrocław. The exhibit was focused around two themes: the art of Bartholomeus Strobel, an outstanding painter from Wrocław, and the activities of the Wrocław bishop Karol Ferdynand Waza as a patron of the arts. The exhibit gave the first such broad presentation of Strobel's work, including *Feast of Herod with the Beheading of St John the Baptist* from the Museo del Prado in Madrid, in the form of original video art. However, among the monuments associated with Bishop Waza, deserving of particular attention were works by Wilhelm Hondius, Tobias Kramer, Hans Rieger, and Johan Pfister, as well as works of artistic handicraft, including the ruby dress of Our Lady of Częstochowa, the gold plaque *Vision of Emperor Constantine* from the Jasna Góra collection, and the coronation medal of King Ladislaus IV Waza. Art historians spent over two years preparing the exhibits, discovering new facts and confirming previous hypotheses. Some works also underwent serious renovation to prepare them for display¹⁵.

The largest infrastructure-related undertaking concerning history carried out in Wrocław in 2016 was the *Pan Tadeusz* Museum, developed as a branch of the Ossolineum. The museum organizes a range of educational and exhibition activities, and boasts a permanent exhibition devoted to Polish romanticism. The primary piece is an original manuscript of Adam Mickiewicz's epic *Pan Tadeusz*. The narrative axis of the exhibit is built around the text of the epic and its author's life. In many places, the historical context of the times in which Adam Mickiewicz crafted his works overshadows their contents. The exhibit puts on display the romantic values and patriotic thought which took root in Polish culture over centuries. The last piece of the exposition is *Mission Poland*, devoted to the biographies of Jan Nowak-Jeziorański and Władysław Bartoszewski. The exhibition designers employed scenography and modern exhibition tools, including multimedia and interactive presentations. The most important elements, however, are the relics, of which 700 have been gathered. The placement of this museum in Wrocław serves to yet again emphasize the borderland traditions cultivated in this city on the Oder, including the exceptionally important role played by the Ossolineum in the development of a post-war identity for the city¹⁶.

¹⁵ <http://wroclawskaeuropa.pl/wroclawska-europa-wystawa/> (access: 16 December 2016)

¹⁶ <https://muzeumpanatadeusza.ossolineum.pl/pl/o-muzeum> (access: 16 December 2016).

In 2016, Wrocław both organized a number of exhibitions and invited curators to present masterpieces of European and world art. Worthy of distinction are works presented in the Municipal Museum of Wrocław: *Masterpieces of painting from the Berlin National Gallery, Marc Chagall and artists of the European avant-garde*, and at the Museum of Modern Art – branch of the National Museum – *Summer residence. The Marx collection visiting Wrocław*, which presented works by Andy Warhol, Robert Rauschenberg, Joseph Beuys, and Anselm Kiefer.

The exhibit *Persecuted art*, organised at the Municipal Museum, provided a very interesting perspective on Wrocław's pre-war history. The subject of the exhibit was the work of the Jewish painter, graphic artist and architect Heinrich Tischler, as well as the artists gathered in his circle. Tischler was an exceptionally well-rounded artist whose work was influenced by experiences of World War I and persecution suffered at the hands of the Nazis. Fear and uncertainty are particularly salient in pieces from the latter period. He also drafted architectural plans close to his master, Hans Poelzig. He was arrested just after *Kristallnacht* in 1938, and died in December 1938 because of injuries suffered in a concentration camp¹⁷.

An exceptional project carried out by the National Museum was the theatre spectacle *Museum of Dreams* by Jacqueline Kornmüller and Peter Wolf. It was comprised of eight performances inspired by eight works of art: *Meeting* by Władysław Podkowiński, *Evening* by Wassily Kandinski, *A portrait of Julia Gerard de Fes-tenburg with daughter Karolina* by Marcin Jabłoński, *A lashing* (unknown) 1486–1487, *Triptych of the Holy Family* from the Workshop of the Master of polptyk from Gościszowice, *Escape to Egypt* by Martin Johann Schmidt, *Saint Barbara* by Thomas Weissfelot, *Jacob's Dream* by Johann Twenger, and *Portrait of Prince Janusz Radziwiłł* by David Bailly. Invited to the project were writers and composers, who created prose and music inspired by the aforementioned pictures, which resulted in interdisciplinary works of art. Each performance was a combination of art, theatre, music and literature.

Architecture was one of the curatorial areas covered by ECC. The Wrocław Museum of Architecture, the only museum of its kind in Poland, organized a number of exhibits devoted to the history of architecture and urban planning. *The road to modernity. The 'Werkbund' neighbourhood 1927–1932* – this was the first exhibit portraying all six modernistic Werkbund residential complexes in Stuttgart,

¹⁷ <http://www.wroclaw2016.pl/sztuka-przesladowana> (access: 16 December 2016).

Brno, Zurich, Prague, Vienna, and Wrocław. These neighbourhoods played an exceptional role in the development of modern architecture and urban planning¹⁸. The exhibit served as a very interesting backdrop to the main city planning project of ECC – the WUWA2 model neighbourhood, which was directly inspired by the 1929 Wrocław exhibit Werkbund WuWA (Wohnung und Werkraum).

The work of one of Wrocław's most remarkable architects was the subject of the exhibit *Patchwork. The Architecture of Jadwiga Grabowska-Hawrylak*. It is difficult to find another architect who has left such a mark on Wrocław's post-war architecture. It is enough to recall that she is the author of the "Manhattan" estate located on Grunwald Square.

The place of pre-war Lviv as one of the foundations of contemporary Wrocław's identity is also attested by the exhibit organized for ECC titled *Lviv 24 June 1937, city, architecture, modernism*. There is no important historical event associated with the date in the title; rather, it is supposed to emphasize that the key to understanding the exhibit is the everyday life of Lviv's inhabitants. The exposition presented original architectural designs, models of buildings, photographs, archival films, works of art and posters documenting the modernistic architecture of Lviv set in a historical context. The exhibit was accompanied by an expansive publication titled *Lviv: city, architecture, modernism*¹⁹.

It is worth adding at the close that many of the activities undertaken in the field of history during the year of the ECC have made a lasting contribution to the city. Wrocław has gained two new spaces devoted to history: the Depot History Centre, and the *Pan Tadeusz* Museum. Wrocław's image as a city rich in history, located at the junction of cultures and uniting East with West, has been cemented.

¹⁸ *Droga ku nowoczesności. Osiedla Werkbundu 1927–1932*, ed. Jadwiga Urbanik, Wrocław 2016.

¹⁹ *Lwów: miasto, architektura, modernizm*, eds. Bohdan Cherkes, Andrzej Szczerski, Wrocław 2016.

SPIS TREŚCI / CONTENTS

Editorial, Editorial Board.....	5
---------------------------------	---

ARTYKUŁY I STUDIA MATERIAŁOWE / ARTICLES AND STUDIES

Teresa Kulak, Historical conditions and manifestations of the culture-forming role of Wrocław in the perspective of the past millennium.....	15
Wojciech Mrozowicz, Silesia – the meeting land of Eastern and Western civilisations. Testimony of the <i>Book of Henryków</i> and other medieval Silesian sources.....	41
Jan Zdichynec, Upper Lusatia and Silesia at the turn of the Middle Ages and the Early Modern Era in comparative perspective. Selected aspects of social, cultural and church development in the given period.....	57
Gabriela Wąs, “A culture bridge”? Early modern Silesia as a region of several historiographies.....	73
Wojciech Kunicki, Literature in 17 th - and 18 th -century Silesia – the region at the crossroads of cultures.....	85
Tomasz Przerwa, Transfer of tourist and sporting practices in 19 th and 20 th centuries from the Silesian perspective: regional models in an age of mass and national culture.....	103
Jędrzej Chumiński, Social conditions of the development of culture in post-war Wrocław.....	121

MISCELLANEA ŹRÓDŁOWE / SOURCE MISCELLANEA

Adrien Quéret-Podesta, From Opava to Spiš. <i>Chronical of the Popes and the Emperors</i> by Martin of Opava as the source of the <i>Georgenberger Chronicle</i>	137
--	-----

ARTYKUŁY RECENZYJNE I RECENZJE / REVIEWS

Paweł Jaworski, The life and work of Princess Daisy Hochberg von Pless (1873–1943) – as reflected in publications.....	145
Martin Šandera, <i>Jindřich starší z Minsterberka. Syn husitského krále. Velký hráč s nízkými kartami</i> – Martin Čapský.....	152
Luděk Březina, <i>Mezi králem a stavy. Dolnolužické zemské fojtství na prahu novověku (1490–1620)</i> – Bogusław Czechowicz.....	157

Barbara Kalinowska-Wójcik, <i>Między Wschodem i Zachodem. Ezechiel Zivier (1868–1925). Historyk i archiwista</i> – Bernard Linek	162
Robert Żurek, <i>Pojednanie. Kościół katolicki i relacje polsko-niemieckie po 1945 r. Katalog wystawy</i> – Joanna Nowosielska-Sobel	167
“CzasyPismo: on the history of Upper Silesia” (vol. 1 of 2012 – vol. 1 (9) of 2016)– Grzegorz Strauchold	170

KRONIKA NAUKOWA / SCIENTIFIC CHRONICLE

Wojciech Kucharski, Spaces for history. Historical projects by the European Capital of Culture	175
--	-----

Na łamach „Śląskiego Kwartalnika Historycznego Sobótka” są publikowane materiały (rozprawy, artykuły, miscellanea źródłowe, recenzje, polemiki i inne) w językach polskim, czeskim oraz w językach kongresowych. Materiały należy nadsyłać drogą elektroniczną lub pocztą (z załączeniem wersji elektronicznej). Adresy Redakcji znajdują się na stronie redakcyjnej.

Składane teksty należy przygotowywać według instrukcji znajdującej się na stronach: <http://www.wtmh.nino.pl/sobotka.html> lub <http://sobotka.uni.wroc.pl> (zakładka: Info dla autorów).

Nadsyłane teksty są recenzowane przez dwie osoby wskazane przez Redakcję i na tej podstawie kwalifikowane do druku. Procedura recenzowania jest opisana na wyżej wymienionych stronach internetowych.

Redakcja zastrzega sobie prawo proponowania zmian lub skrótów przedkładanych tekstów.

All contributions (studies, articles, source miscellanea, reviews, polemics) are published in Polish, Czech or international languages as English, German, French, Spanish or Russian. They should be sent to e-mail address: sobotka@hist.uni.wroc.pl or by mail to Editorial Office (but together with an electronic version). Contributions should be prepared according to detailed instructions for authors available at the journal's websites: <http://www.wtmh.nino.pl/sobotka.html> or <http://sobotka.uni.wroc.pl> (Info for Authors).

Each text is reviewed by two specialists chosen by the Editorial Board and after positive conclusion qualified for printing. Detailed proceeding is described at the websites given above.

The Editorial Board retains discretion of suggesting changes or shortening texts.

ŚLĄSKI KWARTALNIK HISTORYCZNY SOBÓTKA

Informacja o kwartalniku

„Śląski Kwartalnik Historyczny Sobótka” jest najważniejszym z wydawnictw Wrocławskiego Towarzystwa Miłośników Historii. Ukazuje się od roku 1946, najpierw jako półrocznik i rocznik pod tytułem „Sobótka”, a od roku 1957 jako kwartalnik pod obecnym tytułem. W czasopiśmie publikowane są materiały dotyczące badań nad dziejami Europy Środkowo-Wschodniej, ze szczególnym uwzględnieniem Śląska.

Dodatkowe informacje o czasopiśmie oraz spisy treści numerów bieżących i archiwalnych znajdują się na stronach: <http://sobotka.uni.wroc.pl> i <http://www.wtmh.nino.pl/sobotka.html>.

Wykaz dostępnych numerów archiwalnych znajduje się na stronie <http://www.wtmh.nino.pl/sobotka.html>.

Information on the quaterly

“Śląski Kwartalnik Historyczny Sobótka” (Silesian Historical Quarterly Sobótka) is the most important publication of the Wrocław Historical Society, the Wrocław branch of the Polish Historical Society. It has been in circulation since 1946. It was first published biannually; however, since 1957, it has been published quarterly under the current title. The aim of the journal is to contribute to the development of research on the history of East Central Europe, with the primary focus on Silesia.

Additional information about the journal and tables of contents of current and archival issues can be found on the pages: <http://sobotka.uni.wroc.pl> and <http://www.wtmh.nino.pl/sobotka.html>.

A list of available archival issues can be found on the <http://www.wtmh.nino.pl/sobotka.html>.