

# Reviews

Acta Poloniae Historica  
78, 1998  
PL ISSN 0001 – 6829

Zbigniew Dalewski, *Władza, przestrzeń, ceremoniał. Miejsce i uroczystość inaukuracji władcy w Polsce średniowiecznej do końca XIV w. (Authority, Space, Ceremonial. The Place and Inauguration of the Ruler in Mediaeval Poland to the End of the Fourteenth Century)*, Warszawa 1996, Instytut Historii PAN and Neriton, pp. 284

The beginnings of the Polish state and the establishment of ducal and regal rule attracted the attention of several generations of historians. It seems, however, that new research horizons are constantly arising; recently, this has been the case due to the newly published Ph.D. dissertation by Zbigniew Dalewski. We are dealing with a study as interesting as it is inspiring for further reflections, especially considering that it produces a certain feeling of dissatisfaction and provokes a number of critical remarks.

The author decided to capture the essence of Polish statehood by examining inauguration rites legitimising supreme authority. He devoted considerable attention to an analysis of spatial aspects, i.e. authority over centres conceived as the carriers of power — Gniezno, Poznań and Cracow.

Among the several *sedes regni principales* known from written sources, the author recognised only two, namely Cracow and Gniezno, as integral designates of the early supreme authority of the Piast dynasty. In his reflections, he resorted to studies on archaeological sources as well as universally known written sources. It is a pity that to a considerable degree these publications are no longer topical<sup>1</sup>. I have in mind works by E. Dąbrowska on castle-towns in the basin of the upper Vistula and especially the Stradów stronghold<sup>2</sup> or publications by K. Żurowski about Gniezno<sup>3</sup>. A new analysis of archaeological sources from Stradów demonstrated that the castle-town is younger by 200–250 years, i.e. it originates not from the seventh–eighth centuries but from the tenth century or even the beginning of the eleventh century<sup>4</sup>. The remaining strongholds also call for chronological verification<sup>5</sup>; they include Chodlik<sup>6</sup>, which I would not place on par with Stradów as regards the spatial construction of fortifications. Consequently, it is not the downfall of the large Little Poland castle-towns but their emergence which should be associated with the Piast state or, in the opinion of some researchers, the Bohemian state.

The same holds true for Great Poland. By way of example, most recent studies show that Kruszwika was not the oldest and most vibrant settlement centre in the region of Lake Gopło; this rank was held by Mietlica, situated on the southern end of Gopło, where a

<sup>1</sup>In my opinion the published version of the Ph.D. thesis should contain altered parts dealing with the outcome of archaeological research known for the past few years.

<sup>2</sup>E. Dąbrowska, *Wielkie grody dorzecza górnej Wisły — próba klasyfikacji (Great Castle-towns in the Basin of the Upper Vistula — an Attempted Classification)*, "Archeologia Polski", vol. 16, 1971, pp. 445–464; eadem, *Wielkie grody dorzecza górnej Wisły (Great Castle-towns in the Basin of the Upper Vistula)*, Wrocław 1973; J. Polewski, *Stan badań nad datowaniem okresu wczesnośredniowiecznego w Małopolsce (State of Research into Dating the Early Mediaeval Period in Little Poland)*, in: *Stan i potrzeby badań nad wczesnym średniowieczem w Polsce (State and Needs of Research into the Early Middle Ages in Poland)*, Poznań — Wrocław — Warszawa 1992, pp. 233–237; idem, *Podstawy metody datowania okresu wczesnośredniowiecznego w Małopolsce (Bases and Methods of Dating the Early Mediaeval Period in Little Poland)*, "Zeszyty Naukowe UJ", vol. 1031, Prace Archeologiczne, № 52, 1992, especially pp. 76–85.

<sup>3</sup>K. Żurowski, *Gniezno — stołeczny gród pierwszych Piastów w świetle badań archeologicznych (Gniezno — the Capital Castle-town of the First Piasts in the Light of Archaeological Research)*, in: *Początki państwa polskiego (The Beginnings of the Polish State)*, vol. 2, Poznań 1962, pp. 61–90.

<sup>4</sup>U. Maj, *Stradów, stanowisko I. (Stradów — Site I)*, part I, *Ceramika wczesnośredniowieczna (Early Mediaeval Ceramics)*, Kraków 1990, p. 14.

stronghold appeared in the eighth–ninth century. The origin of the Kruszwica castle–town was established as the turn of the tenth century<sup>7</sup>.

Even more interesting is the outcome of dendrochronological analyses of timber from the oldest fortifications of Gniezno and Cracow. In the case of Gniezno, the dendrochronological method, much more precise than its C14 counterpart, determined dates from the mid–tenth century (about 940–about 980)<sup>8</sup>, while Wawel Hill (the so-called “Great Moravian rampart”) was associated with the beginning of the eleventh century (approximately 1016)<sup>9</sup>. Those findings cast a completely new light on the beginnings of fortifications in both centres and the sacral stone buildings on Wawel Hill, and compel us to take a new look at the construction activity pursued by the Premyslid dynasty, as suggested by some researchers.

Equally sensational are dendrochronological ascertainments concerning a cultural group described as the Tornow–Klenica group, whose range encompassed also Great Poland between the Warta and the Odra. Heretofore dating (sixth–tenth century) was shifted to the second half of the ninth century and the tenth century<sup>10</sup>. In this context, the declaration made by Thietmar [II 29 (I)] about a tribute paid by Mieszko I *usque in Varta fluvium* appears to become clearer. There remains the question of the years into which we should transfer the capture of these lands by the Piast dynasty. Did it take place as late as the reign of Mieszko I, or already during the lifetime of his father; what were the circumstances of the origin of the

<sup>5</sup>By way of example, archaeological research conducted in the stronghold in Zawada, commune of Tarnów, confirmed the existence of a defensive object whose first stage took dates back to the period of Lusatian culture, and the second — to mid–ninth century — eleventh century, J. Okoński, *Pradzieje Tarnowa (Earliest History of Tarnów)*, Tarnów 1990, pp. 109–121. On the dating of the stronghold in Zawada Lanckorońska, commune Zakliczyn, see: J. Poleski, *Podstawy*, pp. 83–84. The verification of older research showed that the first of the existing strongholds, known as Zamczysko, also originated at the time of Lusatian culture. It was rebuilt at the turn of the ninth century and existed up to the mid–eleventh century, when it was replaced by a second object, known as Mieścisko, J. Okoński, *Grodzisko w Zawadzie Lanckorońskiej (Stronghold in Zawada Lanckorońska), “Mówią Wieki”*, 1990, № 3, pp. 27–30; it has been recently recognised that both strongholds Grodzisko and Zamczysko date from the early medieval period, see: J. Poleski, *Stratygrafia i chronologia osadnictwa na grodzisku w Zawadzie Lanckorońskiej (Stratigraphy and Chronology of the Settlement of the Stronghold in Zawada Lanckorońska)*, “Acta Archeologica Carpathica”, vol. 39, 1995–1996, pp. 85–130; M. Krąpiec, *Chronologia wału grodziska w Zawadzie Lanckorońskiej w świetle analiz dendrologicznych (Chronology of the Defensive Rampart in the Zawada Lanckorońska Stronghold in the Light of Dendrological Analysis)*, *ibid.*, pp. 131–137.

<sup>6</sup>J. Poleski, *Podstawy*, p. 79.

<sup>7</sup>B. and W. Dzieduszyccy, *Kruszwicki ośrodek władzy i jego przemiany w XI–XII wieku (The Kruszwica Centre of Rule and Its Transformation in the Eleventh–Thirteenth Century)*, in: *Lokalne ośrodki władzy państwowej w XI–XIII wieku w Europie Środkowo–Wschodniej (Local Centres of State Rule from the Eleventh to the Thirteenth Century in Central–Eastern Europe)*, ed. S. Moździoch, Wrocław 1993, p. 165; W. Dzieduszycki, *Sociotopograficzne przeobrażenia wczesnośredniowiecznych miast polskich (model kruszwicki) (Sociotopographical Transformations of Early Mediaeval Polish Towns (the Kruszwica Model))*, “Kwartalnik Historii Kultury Materialnej”, vol. 32: 1984, no. 1, p. 5–16.

<sup>8</sup>T. S. [awicki], *[A]ll[3] Rekonstrukcja odsadzki wału obronnego grodu gnieźnieńskiego ([A]ll[3] Reconstruction of the Offset of the Defensive Rampart in the Castle–town of Gniezno)*, in: *Gniezno. Pierwsza stolica Polski. Miasto świętego Wojciecha. Katalog wystawy (Gniezno. The First Capital of Poland. The Town of St. Wojciech. Exhibition Catalogue)*, Gniezno 1995, pp. 88–89, here: bibliography of unpublished dendrochronological studies.

<sup>9</sup>J. Firlet, *Stratygrafia kulturowa na stanowisku Kraków–Wawel rejon VIII (międzymurze) w świetle badań wykopaliskowych (Cultural Stratigraphy of the Kraków–Wawel Site, Region VIII (Internurall) in the Light of Excavation research)*, “Acta Archeologica Waweliana”, vol. 1, 1993, table 1 on pp. 17–18, pp. 69–75; A. Kukliński, *Pierwsze odkrycie wału wczesnopiastowskiego (?) na Wawelu datowanego dendrochronologicznie (First Discovery of a Dendrochronologically Dated Early Piast (?) rampart on Wawel Hill)*, “Sprawozdania Archeologiczne”, vol. 47, 1995, pp. 237–254, especially pp. 244–251; Z. Pianański, *Wawel obronny. Zarys przemian fortyfikacji grodu i zamku krakowskiego w X–XIX (Defensive Wawel. Outline of Changes in the Fortifications of the Town and Castle of Cracow from the Tenth to the Nineteenth Century)*, Kraków 1991, pp. 26–33.

<sup>10</sup>M. Dulinicz, *Problem datowania grodziska Tornow i grupy Tornow–Klenica (The Dating of the Tornow Strongholds and the Tornow–Klenica Group)*, “Archeologia Polska”, vol. 39, 1994, fasc. 1–2, pp. 31–49, especially p. 42, ft. 8; *idem*, *Datowanie absolutne i względne wybranych stanowisk wczesnośredniowiecznych Słowiańszczyzny Zachodniej (Absolute and Relative Dating of Select Early Mediaeval Sites of Western Slavdom)*, “Światowit”, vol. 39, 1994, pp. 19–28.

tributary relation and did it start in 964 or earlier? The establishment of the time of those events could be facilitated by the recent studies by Z. Kurnatowska on changes in the territorial organisation in Great Poland, whose legible traces are found in archaeological material<sup>11</sup>. One could ask whether the events in question could be connected with the subsequent claims of the Magdeburg archdiocese as regards the Poznań bishopric. We cannot exclude the possibility that in view of the cultural distinction of the lands concerned and their relations with the region between the Łaba and the Odra, the annexation of the terrains between the Odra and the Warta into the Piast state was one of the reasons for a separate bishopric for Western Great Poland. Were the claims of the German Church based, to a certain extent, upon the cultural proximity of the terrains on both banks of the Odra, or were they supported by historical facts, unmentioned in written sources, such as the relations (actual or postulated) with the bishopric in Brandenburg, founded in 948 and from 968 subjected to the archdiocese in Magdeburg?

Concentrating his attention on Great Poland and Little Poland, the author devoted insufficient space to the role of Mazovia and Silesia in the Piast state. I have in mind his opinion that Mazovia was entrusted to the younger dukes<sup>12</sup> and the term *ducatus*, applied by Gallus Anonymus [II, 16] to describe Silesia. Consequently, the examined study lacks a distinct indication whether the author recognises Silesia to be a pertinence of Gniezno or Cracow, whether the parallel division of the state between Zbigniew and Bolesław was caused by the geographic location of the districts or whether the issue at stake were “spatial aspects of authority”, including the higher ranking position of Great Poland (the cradle of the dynasty) and thus also the status of Zbigniew as the presumed senior ruler<sup>13</sup>.

The author acknowledges Poznań to be the third territorial designate of the supreme authority of the Piast dynasty. In doing so, he echoes the earlier theses by O. Balzer and Z. Wojciechowski about an intention to contrast new Christian Poznań with old Gniezno and its pagan traditions<sup>14</sup>. Poznań was envisaged not only as the new Christian necropolis of the Piast dynasty but also as the place of its first coronation. This thesis appears to be insufficiently confirmed. True, Z. Kurnatowska recently verified the chronological results of archaeological research conducted in tombs no. 186 and 187 in the Poznań cathedral<sup>15</sup> but their interpretation as the burial sites of Mieszko I and Bolesław the Brave still produces doubts among archaeologists and historians<sup>16</sup>, a fact which the author mentions in one of the footnotes without, however, presenting his own stand. The thesis proposed by J. Bieńiak, and supported by A. Gąsiorowski, claiming that Janko of Czarnków was the author of a description of Poznań as the burial site of Bolesław the Brave also calls for further discussion<sup>17</sup>. Just as uncertain is the contention about Poznań as the site of the coronation of

<sup>11</sup>Z. Kurnatowska, *Próba odtworzenia zarządu terytorialnego państwa pierwszych Piastów w Wielkopolsce (Attempted Reconstruction of the Territorial Administration of the State of the Early Piasts in Great Poland)*, in: *Obromość polskiej granicy zachodniej w dobie pierwszych Piastów (The Defence of the Polish Western Frontier During the Early Piast Era)*, Wrocław 1984, pp. 81–91; eadem, *Z badań nad przemianami organizacji terytorialnej w państwie pierwszych Piastów (From Research on Changes in the Territorial Organisation of the First Piasts)*, “Studia Lędzkie”, vol. 2, 191, pp. 11–22; eadem, *Przemiany lokalnych ośrodków władzy w XI–XII wieku w Wielkopolsce (Changes in Local Centres of Authority from the Eleventh to the Thirteenth Century in Great Poland)*, in: *Lokalne ośrodki*, pp. 21–29.

<sup>12</sup>H. Łowmiański, *Dynastia Piastów w wczesnym średniowieczu (The Piast Dynasty in the Early Middle Ages)*, in: *Początki państwa polskiego (The Beginnings of the Polish State)*, Poznań 1962, pp. 150–151; G. Labuda, *Początki klasztoru w świetle źródeł pisanych (The Beginnings of the Monastery in the Light of Written Sources)*, in: *Materiały sprawozdawcze z badań zespołu pobenedyktynskiego w Mogilnie (Report Material on Research into the Post-Benedictine Complex in Mogilno)*, fasc. 1, Warszawa 1978, pp. 45, 57 ft. 94.

<sup>13</sup>R. Grodecki, *Zbigniew, książę polski (Zbigniew, Duke of Poland)*, in: *Studia staropolskie. Księga ku czci Aleksandra Brücknera (Old Polish Studies. Book in Honour of Aleksander Brückner)*, Kraków 1928, pp. 71–105.

<sup>14</sup>O. Balzer, *Stolice Polski (Capitals of Poland)*, Lwów 1916, pp. 8–9; Z. Wojciechowski, *Gniezno — Poznań — Kraków na tle kształtowania się państwa Piastów (Gniezno — Poznań — Cracow Against the Background of the Moulding of the Piast State)*, in: *Studia historyczne (Historical Studies)*, Warszawa 1955, pp. 171–193.

<sup>15</sup>Z. Kurnatowska, *Archeologiczne świadectwa o najstarszych grobowcach w katedrze poznańskiej (Archaeological Testimony about the Oldest Tombs in Poznań Cathedral)*, “Roczniki Historyczne”, vol. 55–56, 1989–1990, pp. 71–82.

Bolesław the Brave. Even if we recognise that Poznań was the seat of the first missionary Polish bishops, we still lack reliable sources confirming the existence of a diocesan organisation in Poland prior to the year 1000. The missionary character of the activity pursued by the first bishops, recently recalled by G. Labuda<sup>18</sup>, inclines to reflections on the correctness and range of the meaning of the term “Poznań bishopric”, employed for the period preceding the Gniezno synod. We should inquire about the identity of the person who performed the coronation — since he was probably an archbishop, the coronation took place in Gniezno<sup>19</sup>. Additionally, if we connect the circumstances which accelerated the creation of a Church organisation (the martyrdom of Adalbert, bishop of Prague, entrusted with a Christianisation mission in Prussia by Bolesław the Brave) with the events which took place during the synod of 1000 (the symbolic of the behaviour of Emperor Otto III) then we too shall be inclined to support the thesis in favour of Gniezno.

Unfortunately, the author did not devote more attention to the return of the royal insignia by Bezprym<sup>20</sup> or their exportation by Rycheza<sup>21</sup>. This was by no means an insignificant episode, and its role in the establishment, or rather restoration of royal power, was of essential importance. One should undoubtedly ask about the place of the storage of the royal insignia and the person guarding them, specially considering that Rycheza too was crowned, and her role and stand in those events could be depicted in a totally new light. Another gap in the interpretation of the problem in question is the intentional omission of the coronation of Jadwiga d’Anjou. I am aware of the fact that this undertaking would require a considerable expansion of the discussed study, but let us hope that in the future the author will return to this topic.

The above presented remarks do not by any means belittle the author’s accomplishments, especially in view of the fact that he could not be familiar with part of the cited literature owing to the date of its publication. On the other hand, it is important for most recent archaeological findings to be popularised among historians and to return to closer research contacts, such as those which existed at the time of studies into the beginnings of the Polish state.

Elżbieta Kowalczyk

<sup>16</sup>A. Gąsiorowski, *Najstarsze polskie pochówki monarsze w świetle źródeł pisanych (Oldest Polish Regal Burials in the Light of Written Sources)*, “Roczniki Historyczne”, vol. 55–56, 1989–1990, pp. 85–93; i d e m, *Tradycja poznańskich grobów monarszych (The Tradition of Royal Tombs in Poznań)*, in: *Kultura średniowieczna i staropolska. Studia ofiarowane Aleksandrowi Gieysztorowi w pięćdziesięciolecie pracy naukowej (Mediaeval and Old Polish Culture. Studies Offered to Aleksander Gieysztor on the Fiftieth Anniversary of Scientific Work)*, Warszawa 1991, pp. 231–239, here — oldest literature; H. Zöll-Adamikowa, *Pochówki dostojników kościelnych i świeckich w Polsce wczesnopiastowskiej (na podstawie źródeł archeologicznych)* (*Burials of Church and Secular Dignitaries in Early Piast Poland (upon the Basis of Archaeological Sources)*), *ibid.*, pp. 38–39, 41, 63–65.

<sup>17</sup>J. Bierniak, *Fragment 1333–1341 w twórczości dziejopisarskiej Janka z Czarnkowa (Fragment 1333–1341 in the historiography of Janko of Czarnków)*, “Zapiski Historyczne”, vol. 49, 1984, fasc. 1, p. 25.

<sup>18</sup>G. Labuda, *Organizacja kościoła w Polsce w drugiej połowie X wieku i kościelne znaczenie zjazdu gnieźnieńskiego w roku 1000 (The Church Organisation in Poland in the Second Half of the Tenth Century and the Significance of the Gniezno Convention of 1000)*, in: *Studia nad początkami państwa polskiego (Studies on the beginnings of the Polish state)*, vol. 2, Poznań 1988, pp. 426–526. The missionary role of Bishop Unger is indicated by the activity pursued in Gdańsk in 997 by Wojciech (Adalbert), bishop of Prague. The fact that he baptised people could signify the absence of an institutionalised Church organisation in Poland; otherwise, administering this sacrament could have been regarded as a violation of the rights of the diocesan bishop for Poland.

<sup>19</sup>At this point it seems worth adding that the view that Gniezno was the site of the first Piast coronations was recently supported by G. Labuda on the margin of his reflections on another topic examined by Z. Dalewski: G. Labuda, *Przeniesienie koronacji królewskich z Gniezna do Krakowa w XIV wieku (The Transference of Royal Coronations from Gniezno to Cracow in the Fourteenth Century)*, in: *Cracovia, Polonia, Europa. Studia z dziejów średniowiecza ofiarowane Jerzemu Wyrozumskiemu w sześćdziesiątą piątą rocznicę urodzin i czterdziestolecie pracy naukowej (Cracovia, Polonia, Europa. Studies on Mediaeval History Offered to Jerzy Wyrozumski on His Sixty Fifth Birthday and Fortieth Anniversary of Scientific Work)*, Kraków 1995, pp. 46–59.

<sup>20</sup>*Annales Hildeshemensis*, in: *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptorum* (further as: MGH SS), vol. III, ed. G. H. Pertz, Hannoverae 1839, p. 98, A.D. 1031.

<sup>21</sup>*Brunwilarensis monasterii fundatorum actus*, in: MGH SS, vol. XI, Hannoverae 1883, p. 137, A.D. 1031.

Janusz Łosowski, *Kancelarie miast szlacheckich województwa lubelskiego od XV do XVIII wieku (Chanceries of Private Towns Owned by Noblemen in the Lublin Voivodeship from the Fifteenth to the Eighteenth Century)*, Lublin 1997, Polskie Towarzystwo Heraldyczne — Oddział w Lublinie, Agencja Wydawniczo-Handlowa Antoni Dudek, pp. 273

The history of chanceries in several biggest towns of pre-partition Poland (Cracow and Kazimierz, Poznań, Lublin, Toruń, Gdańsk, Przemysł and Warsaw) is the topic of a considerable number of publications. But no one had embarked upon this the history of small towns' chanceries since 1985, when Henryk Samsonowicz discussed this question in the Late Middle Ages. The recent book by Janusz Łosowski has proved to be a veritable breakthrough and, I hazard the expression, a sensation in this domain of historical research, being the first extensive and thorough monographic work on small town chanceries to appear not only in Polish but in worldwide historiography. In addition, it comprises an examination of completely new and heretofore unknown aspects of the history of those offices.

Before I present the book and justify my praises of its author — here are two critical remarks concerning general premises: the object and method of research.

The assumption that "the basic tasks of a chancery included the production of documents" (p. 47, with reference to an article by Bohdan Ryszewski whose views Łosowski simplifies and thus deforms<sup>1</sup>) is extremely unfortunate and does not reflect the essential functions and role of the offices in question. The production of documents was not, after all, an aim or activity pursued for its own sake, and mediaeval and early modern municipal chanceries were not established for the purposes of bureaucracy. Much more apt is the definition proposed by Henryk Samsonowicz who wrote that the fundamental task of town chanceries was rendering effective the professional activity of members of the municipal commune: merchants and artisans but also landowners<sup>2</sup>. Chanceries provided services for suitable town offices and their clients by issuing documents for assorted legal activities important in public and private life. They also stored and protected the produced or entrusted documentation. The significant findings made by Łosowski indicate that the chanceries of gentry towns served not only the inhabitants of the latter but also the residents of gentry estates: the gentry, the manor administration, Jews living in the countryside, peasants as well as the population of other towns and Church institutions (pp. 176–190). Furthermore, town chanceries fulfilled many other functions, including the dissemination of legal knowledge and the creation and popularisation of culture. A limitation of their role to the production of acts (in the quoted article Ryszewski wrote that "in the Old Polish period the production of documents comprised only part of chancery functions", p. 99) would denote not only a restriction of the problem but a complete deformation of the historical significance of such functions, and comprise an exclusively archival viewpoint. Fortunately, the author did not narrow down his research in such a manner.

It is inadequate also to describe research into the history of town chanceries as interdisciplinary, i. e. a combination of the methods of diplomatics and archival studies (pp. 12, 113). These two fields constitute specialised domains of research within a single science, namely history, and turning them into distinct scientific disciplines is contrary to the basic principles of the general methodology of science. We could speak about truly interdisciplinary research if we were dealing with a merger of the historical method and philology, economy,

<sup>1</sup>B. Ryszewski, *O niektórych podstawowych pojęciach archiwalnych (kancelaria, magistratura, zespół archiwalny, archiwum) (On Certain Basic Archival Concepts — Chancery, Magistracy, Archival Collection, Archive)*, "Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Mikołaja Kopernika w Toruniu", Nauki humanistyczno-społeczne, fasc. 35, Historia V, 1969, pp. 99–100.

<sup>2</sup>H. Samsonowicz, *Z badań nad kancelarią małych miast w Polsce w XV wieku (Studies in the Polish Small Town Chancery during the Fifteenth Century)*, "Miscellanea Historico-Archivistica" vol. 1, 1985, p. 224.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. A. Wyrobisz, *Uwagi o kalendarzu jarmarków miastach Korony w XVI wieku (Remarks on the Calendar of Town Fairs in the Crown during the Sixteenth Century)*, "Studia Polonica Historiae Urbanae" vol. I, 1996, pp. 27–31.

sociology, social psychology, etc. (*nota bene*, to a certain extent such a venture could be worthwhile).

Janusz Łosowski conducted a thorough examination of the chanceries of 20 gentry (i. e. private) towns (out of a total of 33) in the Lublin voivodeship from the fifteenth to the eighteenth century; this is the number of towns with extant documentation. In chapter I he discusses the structure of the municipal authorities and all their instances, from owners and their representatives or plenipotentiaries, appropriate town offices and courts, to lower ranking officials. Chapter II considers the organisation of chancery work, i. e. the time and place of chancery activities. Detailed analyses of town books from Łęczna (1625 and the eighteenth century) and Bełżyce (the last years of the sixteenth century and the seventeenth century) confirmed earlier observations made by Samsonowicz as regards the seasonal nature of chancery work in small towns, clearly correlated to the farming calendar. It is probably worth taking a second look at this problem from the point of view of the Church calendar (church patrons' festivals) and the dates of fairs<sup>3</sup>. Chapter III is a survey of extant town books from the Lublin voivodeship, whose contents are discussed by the author in chapter IV (the most copious). Dividing the entries in town books into official and unofficial, among the former Łosowski distinguished perpetual (pertaining to the sale–purchase of real estate, donations, dowries as well as inventories), temporal (concerning, assorted credit operations), judicial and administrative entries. The unofficial entries include patterns, chronicle notes and maxims. The second variety in particular deserves further detailed examination both as documentation of the historical consciousness of the townspeople and as records of events unmentioned in other sources. It is in the oldest book of Baranów from 1571 that Łosowski discovered a note about its foundation in 1544 by Piotr Firlej (p. 148, ft. 366). Although this date of the *locatio* of Baranów was known, it was regarded as uncertain or, at any rate, undocumented since neither the privilege nor the *locatio* act are extant; in 1827, alderman Dobrowolski, speaking in the name of the town before the General Prosecutor's Office of the Kingdom of Poland in an attempt to prove the town's municipal rights was compelled to admit that the privilege issued by King Zygmunt I the Old "was burnt by the Swedes or perhaps never granted"<sup>4</sup>. The meticulous and exhaustive classification of town book entries conducted by Łosowski could be extremely useful for subsequent research into the history of small towns.

Chapter V is devoted to assorted types of chancery documentation: documents, letters, and loose acts. The next chapter presents the social usefulness of town documentation by defining social groups served by the chanceries, a topic I mentioned above.

The extremely interesting and important chapter VI focuses on town scribes. Łosowski managed to collect information about 328 scribes working in 22 chanceries in question in the Lublin voivodeship during a period of over 200 years. This copious material provides numerous important data not only about the scribes themselves, but also about the town community and the culture–creating function fulfilled by chanceries. Nonetheless, I would not describe the scribes as a social group (p. 192). Despite the fact that the author knows so many of them, their scattering in time and space must have been the reason for the absence of ties indispensable for the existence of a group. Two examples of scribes representing similar claims towards the municipal authorities, and revealing an awareness of their own importance (pp. 220–221), are separated by 150 years and therefore cannot be treated as an argument in favour of the emergence of a *sui generis* group mentality.

The reviewed book is not only a study on the history of Old Polish chanceries in the gentry towns of the Lublin voivodeship. It does not consider exclusively the activity of such chanceries and the acts produced therein but offers a totally new perception of the history of towns and the urbanisation of the country, as well as Old Polish society; obviously, the author discusses primarily the burghers but also writes about local and regional communities. Small towns belonging to the gentry were more than local centres, regional markets or concentrations of a population which was to a great extent involved in agriculture and animal husbandry, as

<sup>4</sup>Central Archives of Historical Records (AGAD), KRSW 32441. Cf. A. Wyrobisz, *Polityka Firlejów wobec miast w XVI wieku i założenie Janowca nad Wisłą (The Town Policy of the Firlej Family during the Sixteenth Century and the Foundation of Janowiec on the Vistula)*, "Przegląd Historyczny" vol. LXI, 1970, № 4, p. 582.

well as the crafts, services and trade. They also satisfied the legal needs of local and regional communities and thus were indispensable for their proper functioning. The contemptuously treated small agrarian towns were an integral part of the structure of a region which could not exist without them. By resigning from regarding town chanceries exclusively as offices producing acts, Janusz Łosowski provides historians with new instruments for research into the history of towns and society. The role played by small private towns in the culture of particular regions and the country as a whole still awaits suitable studies.

Andrzej Wyrobisz

*Die Albertus-Universität zu Königsberg. Höhepunkte und Bedeutung. Vorträge aus Anlaß der 450. Wiederkehr ihrer Gründung.* Herausgegeben von Hans Rothe und Silke Spielert. Bonn 1996. Kulturstiftung der deutschen Vertriebenen, 171 S.

Die Vorträge, die im Jahre 1995 an der Rheinischen Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität Bonn aus Anlaß des 450. Jahrestages der Gründung der Universität Königsberg in Preußen gehalten wurden, wurden nunmehr in der Form eines kleinen Bandes veröffentlicht. Er enthält insgesamt zehn Texte, von denen sechs die eigentlichen Vorträge sind, die übrigen Gelegenheitsäußerungen enthalten und darüber hinaus einen Anhang, der als Quellenmaterial bezeichnet werden darf.

Die Texte der Begrüßungen des Rektors der Bonner Universität, Professor Max Huber, des Gastes aus Tartu/Dorpat, Helmut Piirimäe und Hans Rothe aus Bonn enthalten die bei derartigen Gelegenheiten üblichen Allgemeinheiten, denen bloß publizistischer Wert beizumessen ist. Es sei dabei bemerkt, daß von den erwähnten drei Rednern nur dem estnischen Gast eigefallen war, den Teilnehmern der anniversären Festlichkeiten das nächste Jubiläum im deutschen Königsberg zu wünschen (S. 14).

Das 450jährige Jubiläum der ehemaligen Albertus-Universität, die in dem damaligen Lehen der polnischen Könige, dem Herzoglichen Preußen, dem späteren Ostpreußen, in Königsberg (dem heutigen russischen Kaliningrad) 1544 gegründet wurde, ist längst vorbei. Die aus diesem Anlaß entstandene wissenschaftliche Produktion wird uns aber noch einige Zeit beschäftigen. Das äußerlich unscheinbare Büchlein, dem wir nun unsere Aufmerksamkeit widmen möchten, nimmt unter diesen Publikationen doch einen besonderen Platz ein. Es wurde nicht ohne einen tieferen Sinn dem Andenken von Gerd Brausch (1917–1995) gewidmet, dessen Haltung gegenüber den wichtigen Problemen der ostpreußischen Geschichte in vielen Punkten auch den Ansichten der anderen Autoren des hier besprochenen Bandes ziemlich nahe war. Die Tatsache, daß die Publikation im Verlag der Kulturstiftung der deutschen Vertriebenen erscheint, ist in diesem Zusammenhang nicht ohne Bedeutung. In den letzten Jahrzehnten wurden nämlich sowohl von der deutschen, als auch von der polnischen Preußenforschung mehrere ehrliche und zugleich gelungene Versuche unternommen, selbst die schwierigsten Probleme der gemeinsamen Geschichte mit ruhiger Distanz und ohne politisch und auch "gesellschaftlich" bedingte Vorurteile wissenschaftlich zu behandeln. Unter dieser Hinsicht kann man, nicht nur erst seit der Wiedervereinigung Deutschlands in den Grenzen von Potsdam, sondern bereits seit den 70er Jahren einen grundlegenden Umschwung beobachten, der sich vor allem darin ausdrückt, daß die historischen Forschungen nicht mehr einen direkten Anschluß an die aktuelle politische Situation haben, wie es in den späten 40er und dann in den 50er sowie 60er Jahren, und zwar auf beiden Seiten: in dem damaligen Westdeutschland und der Volksrepublik Polen der Fall war. Die DDR kann hier ausgeklammert werden, weil dort die Forschung über diesen Themenkreis praktisch im Rahmen der jeweiligen Weisungen "von oben" sich bewegen mußte und vordergründig Propagandaaufgaben an der sogenannten ideologischen Front zu erfüllen hatte. Gewissermaßen als institutionelle Symbole der damaligen Zeit dürfen auf deutscher Seite der Göttinger Arbeitskreis und der Johann-Gottfried-Herder-Forschungsrat in Marburg, sowie auf polnischer Seite das Westinstitut in Posen (Poznań, Instytut Zachodni) angesehen werden. Damals glaubte man noch, den Verlauf der von den Siegermächten 1945 festgesetzten Grenzen zwischen dem damals geteilten Deutschland und dem zum Ostblock gehörenden Polen mit

dem Mittel der historischen Forschung und der Popularisierung ihrer Ergebnisse beeinflussen zu können, auf beiden Seiten im entgegengesetzten Sinne. Der Kalte Krieg schien damals, fast bis zum Ausgang der "Ära Chruschtschow", noch gewisse Möglichkeiten offenzulassen. Die mit dem Mauerbau in Berlin begonnenen drei Jahrzehnte der Fixierung der Grenzverhältnisse und insbesondere die damit verbundenen demographischen Prozesse haben derartige Konzeptionen zum Scheitern verurteilt, was bei dem Zusammenbruch des kommunistischen Systems in Ost- und Osteuropa deutlich zum Vorschein kam. Zur Selbstverständlichkeit wurden gemeinsame Forschungsvorhaben und institutionell verankerte Zusammenarbeit auf dem Gebiet der historischen Forschung und Lehre.

Der 450. Jahrestag der Gründung der Albertina eignete sich vorzüglich dazu, diese Form der im neuen Sinne aufgefaßten wissenschaftlichen Zusammenarbeit weiterzuentwickeln: da das frühere Königsberg nunmehr zu Rußland gehört und an die Wiederherstellung der politischen Verhältnisse in diesem Raum aus der Zeit vor 1939/1945 oder gar 1918 als unvorstellbar betrachtet werden muß, können die Ereignisse, Begebenheiten und Entwicklungen, die sich auf das alte Königsberg beziehen, mit der erwähnten Distanz vorurteilsfrei zum Gegenstand der objektiven Forschung werden. In dem konkreten Fall der Albertus-Universität darf die Objektivität umso eher erwartet werden, da an diesem Gegenstand Forscher aus zumindest vier Ländern: Deutschland, Polen, Rußland und Litauen interessiert sind — und darüber hinaus auch diejenigen aus Lettland und Estland.

Die Bestätigung dieser Tatsachen finden wir gleich im ersten Aufsatz des hier rezensierten Bandes: Iselin G u n d e r m a n n berichtet (S. 23–44) über *Die Anfänge der Albertus-Universität zu Königsberg*. Es ist dabei besonders hervorzuheben, daß die Autorin die (auch ethnische) Vielfältigkeit der frühesten Zusammensetzung des Lehrkörpers der Albertina weitgehend berücksichtigt, indem sie die in Frage kommenden Personen unter diesem Gesichtspunkt charakterisiert und sich nicht nur auf ihre wissenschaftlichen Qualifikationen beschränkt. Was aber hier besonders gelobt werden sollte, das ist die Tatsache, daß im Rahmen des Aufsatzes die Verleihung der "akademischen Rechte" an die Königsberger Lehrstätte durch den König von Polen, Sigismund August, 1560 erfolgt ist, wodurch erst die Albertina zu einer richtigen Universität wurde und die wissenschaftlichen Grade und Titel an ihre Discipuli verleihen durfte, entsprechend gewürdigt worden ist. Das ist zwar keine Neuentdeckung, die Tatsache selbst wurde jedoch in den älteren Bearbeitungen entweder überhaupt übergangen oder nur so am Rande beiläufig erwähnt. Ohne dieses Privileg gäbe es aber in Königsberg höchstens ein akademisches Gymnasium, wie in Danzig, Elbing und Thorn.

Der Aufsatz von Reinhold B r e i l *Kants Lehre vom Staatsrecht und die preußischen Könige* (S. 45–62) ist eine theoretische Abhandlung, in der es sich um einen Vergleich der Konzeptionen des großen Königsberger Philosophen über eine den rationalen Grundsätzen eines ausgeträumten Staatsaufbaus entsprechende Lösung der Struktur staatlicher Institutionen mit der praktischen Tätigkeit der hohenzollernschen Könige handelt.

Der Aufsatz von Menso F o l k e r t s *Die Begründung der Königsberger Mathematisch-Physikalischen Schule (Bessel–Jacobi–Neumann)* (S. 63–70) beschreibt auf populärwissenschaftlicher Ebene die Rolle der im Titel genannten Gelehrten: Jacobi war ein "reiner" Mathematiker, Bessel ein genialer Astronom–Autodidakt, und Neumann Physiker. Als positiv darf wohl beurteilt werden, daß der Verfasser dabei das neueste Schrifttum berücksichtigt hat, darunter auch die Monographie über Friedrich Wilhelm Bessel, die von einem an der Kaliningrader Universität tätigen polnischen Mathematiker, Kazimierz Ławrynowicz (Kazimir Lavrynowič) 1995 in Basel veröffentlicht wurde.

Im nächstfolgenden Aufsatz behandelt Hans–Bernd H a r d e r eine Episode aus dem Leben des österreichischen Literaturhistorikers Josef Nadler (1884–1963): *Josef Nadler in Königsberg (1925–1931)* (S. 81–94). Nadler war im Kreise der deutschsprachigen Literaturwissenschaftler Vertreter derjenigen Richtung, die zwar nicht rigoros wissenschaftlich, dafür aber allgemein verständlich als "großdeutsch–patriotisch" bezeichnet werden dürfte. Sein fast sechsjähriger Aufenthalt in Königsberg übte einen wesentlichen Einfluß auf die Interpretationen aus, die er in seinen späteren Werken und in den revidierten Neuausgaben der früheren Werke zur Schau stellte. Es sei betont, daß der Verfasser bei dieser Gelegenheit auch eine hypothetische Beeinflussung der Anschauungen Naders durch seine Kenntnis der Ansichten



der ostmitteleuropäischen Literaturforscher, darunter derjenigen des polnischen Professors Stanisław Dobrzycki, in Erwägung genommen hat. Bedauernd ist es aber, daß dabei diejenigen Publikationen Nadlers, die während der nationalsozialistischen Herrschaft veröffentlicht wurden, und die auch in einem gewissen Maße durch seine Königsberger Eindrücke beeinflußt zu sein scheinen, wie z.B. "Das stammhafte Gefüge des deutschen Volkes" (1934, danach mehrere Auflagen bis einschließlich 1941), oder "Deutscher Geist — Deutscher Osten" (1937) unberücksichtigt blieben.

Der Aufsatz von Friedrich R i c h t e r: *Die Wirtschaftswissenschaften an der Albertus-Universität zu Königsberg 1900–1945. Einige Elemente ihrer Entwicklung* (S. 95–122), welcher an einige quellenmäßige Publikationen über das gleiche Thema anknüpft, die von dem Verfasser bereits früher veröffentlicht wurden, hat einen selbständigen Quellenwert, obwohl er natürlich nicht als Quelle im ursprünglichen Sinne des Wortes etwa im Geist von Ernst Bernheim verstanden werden darf.

Der dem unterzeichneten Rezensenten einst persönlich bekannte, inzwischen verstorbene Gerd B r a u s c h, der sich in Privatgesprächen als ein vorzüglicher Erzähler historischer Begebenheiten erwies, gibt in seinem im traditionellen nationalen deutschen Ton gehaltenen Aufsatz: *Die Albertus-Universität vom ersten Weltkrieg bis zum 400jährigen Jubiläum* (S. 123–140) eine kurzgefaßte, aber inhaltsreiche Darstellung des letzten Vierteljahrhunderts des Bestehens der Königsberger Alma Mater. Er schreibt darin auch über wesentliche Tatsachen, die Götz von Selle in seiner inzwischen beinahe zur Klassik gewordenen Monographie verschweigen mußte (oder vielleicht auch wollte).

Als Quellenmaterial sind die beiden letzten Positionen des Bandes zu betrachten: Hans G e r l a c h s *Bauliche und planerische Tätigkeit in den Jahren 1920–1945* (S. 141–154) und eine kleine Sammlung von elf Abbildungen, von denen die Fotos aus 1944 und den darauf folgenden Jahren den größten Eindruck hinterlassen.

Im großen und ganzen kann der besprochene Band als eine wenngleich bescheidene, so doch interessante und aufschlußreiche Würdigung des 450. Jahrestages der Gründung der Albertina von seiten der deutschen Vertriebenen betrachtet werden.

Jerzy Serczyk

Bartel R a n i s c h, *Beschreibung derer vornähmesten Gebäude in der Stadt Danzig*, hrsg. von Arnold B a r t e t z k y und Detlev K r a a c k, Verlag Herder-Institut, Marburg 1997, 107 pp., Quellen zur Geschichte und Landeskunde Ostmitteleuropas, I, 22 ill., index of personal, geographical and object names, plan of 17th c. Gdańsk enclosed in the pocket of the jacket.

The publication of Bartel Ranisch's very little known work (perhaps because of the poor legibility of the existing copies — one has been preserved in the Gdańsk Library of the Polish Academy of Sciences, call number MS Ortm fol. 33, another in Herder Institut Library of Marburg, call number 7 IX D 17), containing a description of the most important public buildings of Gdańsk is beyond any doubt a significant scientific event. It seldom happens that researchers may be given access to such an interesting and unexploited source concerning the history of late 17th c. and early 18th c. Gdańsk. This small-size text, for some time considered to be lost or non-existent, throws interesting light not only on the architecture of Gdańsk but also on the relations, mentality and everyday life of its inhabitants. Bartel Ranisch, the son of a mason who came to Gdańsk from Lower Saxony, born in 1648, followed in his father's footsteps: he served his apprenticeship in the Gdańsk guild, became a master in 1672, and soon was granted civil rights and was appointed to the post of City Council mason (*Ratsmaurermeister*), i.e. actually the chief master-builder of the city. In this capacity he remained for over 30 years until his death (probably around the year 1709). In 1695 he published a work entitled *Beschreibung aller Kirchen-Gebäude der Stadt Danzig* (printed in Jan Zachariasz Stolle's publishing house), which contained a description of the churches of Gdańsk. In the following years he worked on the description of secular city buildings, however, he did not live long enough to see his work published. Thus the book under discussion is its first edition.

In comparison with R. Curicke's well-known work (*Der Stadt Danzig historische Beschreibung*, prepared in 1645, but published only by the author's son, Georg Reinhold Curicke, Amsterdam–Gdańsk 1687) Ranisch's description is more modest and thematically confined to architecture. It enumerates the town gates, both townhalls (of Main and Old Town), Artus' Hall, both Armouries, the Town Court, the Prison Tower and the Chamber of Torture, the House of Forced Labour (sometimes called the Reformatory, Germ. *Zuchthaus*), the so-called *Raspelhaus* i.e. a prison where dyes were obtained from Brazilian wood, the Orphanage, the Almshouse (*Spendehaus*), the House of Orphans, the Crane. The work makes no mention of the hospitals. Each of the mentioned buildings has been described very accurately — Ranisch first informs us about the interior layout and destination of particular rooms, and then describes the characteristics of the external construction of the building and its façade. He views the buildings he describes with the eye of a professional mason, i.e. a representative of the laborious middle-middle class who valued the usefulness and not the frequently rich decoration of buildings. Especially the ideological programme contained in the sculptures and paintings that adorned the Gdańsk buildings was to him completely incomprehensible and it even can be said that he was not interested in it at all. On the other hand he was engrossed in the material used for construction, in the characteristic features of the latter, and above all interested in the functionality of the building and its rooms. As a result Ranisch's reader will learn a lot about the functioning of the Townhall, the operation of its gates — the important control points of contact between the town and its environs, the organization of the prison and living conditions in the House of Forced Labour. Especially of the latter Ranisch tells us a lot. There can be no doubt about the prison character of this institution, he always calls its inmates prisoners (*Gefangene*), never boarders or charges (*Insassen*), as the inmates of hospitals were then usually called. He also enlarges on the development of the House at the end of the 17th c. and the erection of a new building, the so-called *Raspelhaus* — in this way the looms were separated from the workshop which produced dyes. The new building was erected in the years 1698–99 and Ranisch, as a town-mason, probably directed the work, for he exhibits in the book his excellent knowledge of the interior architecture of the building, among other things the special construction of its cells, intended to cause more suffering to the prisoners (small single rooms, forcing the prisoner to sit on the sharp edges of bricks with bent back, as the low ceiling did not let him to straighten himself out, a special "bed" where the outstretched prisoner was clasped with iron bars, so that he could not move). Ranisch describes these contraptions and details, which now arouse our horror, with indifferent factuality and even approval. However, for the people of the 16th–17th c. cruelty was a normal element of everyday life, inscribed in the penitentiary system on the strength of an age-long tradition. The mentioned fragments of his work should constitute a decisive argument against the attempts, made recently, to idealize the Gdańsk *Zuchthaus* and to present it not as a prison, but a humanitarian educational centre.

Of interest is the fact emphasized by the editors that Ranisch had no access to the town archives, which made dating some buildings difficult. This is one more proof of the fact that the Gdańsk City Council tried to keep the affairs of the town secret. The extent to which an average burgher was afraid of the upper élite that ruled the town is testified by Ranisch's submissive attitude towards the councillors, his constant care not to make them angry by some heedless word.

Ranisch's text was complemented by drawings to which he constantly refers in his list. Unfortunately, these illustrations got lost. The editors took care to fill this gap by placing in the book illustrations from R. Curicke's work or other etchings from the same period, presenting the buildings in question. These illustrations considerably heighten the value of the edition, and for the researcher into everyday life constitute a mine of precious information. Thus e.g. ill. 16 (an etching from 1705) with a view of the Almshouse presents among other things a yard with groups of small children playing (one can make out the type of games and the objects used for them) and near by prisoners performing various types of work (again we have here interesting details concerning the technology of production). Ill. 17 (an etching from 1705) shows the cross-section of the House with rooms serving various purposes, presenting furniture and people engaged in everyday occupations. It should be regretted that fragments

of these etchings have not been blown up as they present people and their actions almost in photographic close-up and are very instructive.

Ranisch's text has been published in an exemplary way, it is also provided with notes and a very interesting, comprehensive commentary. At the end (pp. 101–103) there is a selective bibliography, perhaps too short. There are very few lapses in the book. On p. 56, note 354, it should have simply been said that women–vendors should not make it difficult for the burghers to buy fish for their own needs. On p. 65–66 the etching presenting the Prison Tower and the Chamber of Torture has been mistakenly attributed to Samuel Donnet (1709); in fact Donnet used Peter Willer's work reproduced already in 1687 in Curicke's work on p. 59. While discussing Artus' Hall (p. 74) it should have been mentioned that it was a meeting place not only of local but also foreign merchants and skippers, e.g. those coming from the Netherlands and from Lübeck. On p. 75 what Ranisch defines as "the arrival of the Emperor and Pope" is certainly the famous border by Łukasz Evert from 1585 presenting the victorious entrance of Polish King Casimir Jagellon in Marienburg in 1460.

Ranisch's work enriches and substantiates our knowledge of Gdańsk. We owe a debt of gratitude to the editors and sponsors for giving us access to this treatise which has not been used by researchers so far.

*Maria Bogucka*