



Katarzyna Chmielewska<sup>1</sup>

## Bohemian rulers of the Luxembourg dynasty and the Poděbrady family in the medieval Silesian and Kłodzko chronicles of canons regulars in Kłodzko, Wrocław and Żagań

### Abstract

The author based on three monastery chronicles of the Late Middle Ages analyses the method of portraying the Bohemian kings from the Luxembourg and Poděbrady families and tries to point out factors which influenced this method of chronicle narration. The sources for this article are canons' regulars chronicles in Żagań, Wrocław and Kłodzko: *Catalogus abbatum Saganensium*, *Chronica abbatum Beatae Mariae Virginis in Arena* i *Cronica Monasterii Canonicorum Regularium in Glac*. The figures of rulers appear in the chronicles mainly in the context of their relationships with the particular monastery, especially when it comes to property matters: granting, rights and taxes. The other aspect in which the rulers are mentioned in the chronicles are the conflicts between secular and Church power. From the analysis of the texts a conclusion can be drawn that the picture of the rulers is diverse in different places where the chronicles were written and the attitude of the local society towards the particular ruler. It is best seen on the example of George of Poděbrady, a Hussite on the Bohemian throne. The chronicle of Żagań has a separate position – apart from the local issues, it presents the general information, unrelated to Church, including the ruling persons.

**Key words:** canons regulars, monastery chronicles, historiography, the Middle Ages, Bohemian rulers

---

<sup>1</sup> Dr hab. Katarzyna Chmielewska prof. UJD, Wydział Humanistyczny, Instytut Historii, Uniwersytet Humanistyczno-Przyrodniczy im. Jana Długosza w Częstochowie, al. Armii Krajowej 36a, 42-200 Częstochowa, e-mail: k.chmielewska@ujd.edu.pl, nr ORCID: 0000-0002-0713-3805.

## Introduction

In the Late Middle Ages monastic historiography developed among other various genres in Silesia (Mrozowicz 2000b: 141–159; Cetwiński 2002: 29–35). The Cistercians and canons regulars were leading in this process. The chronicles describing the history of monastic houses appeared in Wrocław, Żagań and Kłodzko, the institution on the border with Silesia, strongly connected, dependent and inferior to it. The works of this type were created mainly for the internal purpose of the congregation, they presented the history of the monastery, the origins of the founding and the figure of the founder (Proksch 1994: 24–31). The important part of these pieces was the detailed description of the ever-changing assets of the institution, proving the rights to the properties and reforms conveyed in the monastery (Mrozowicz 2001a: 78–84). The focus on the world inside the walls of the monastery naturally reflected in the view of the outer world, described in the chronicles. People, occurrences and events of this *externum* appeared on the pages often when they were directly connected to the monastery in which the chronicle was being written (Chmielewska 2015: 337–339).

The aim of this article is to show the way in which the monastic chroniclers – the canons regulars – described the Bohemian rulers of the Luxembourg and Poděbrady dynasties and also to try to explain the reasons of such a shaping of the narration.

The oldest of the analysed chronicles is *Catalogus abbatum Saganensium* presenting the history of the Żagań abbey. The first author of the Catalog was one the most prominent leaders of the congregation, Ludolf of Einbeck, better known as Ludolf of Żagań. The chronicle was continued by Piotr Waynknecht, the prior of the monastery, and after him by four more authors up to 1616. The next work piece, *Chronica abbatum Beatae Mariae Virginis in Arena* depicts the story of the Wrocław monastery. Its first abbot was Jodok of Głucholazy. His version did not survive to the present time, however, the version of his successor – Benedict Johnsdorf – did, which is basically the Jodok's work completed with some elements and continued up to 1470 (Matusik 1967: 45–50, 1968: 186–191). The chronicle was later written by the ensuing writers and comes to the year 1779. The youngest of the presented chronicles is *Cronica monasterii canonicorum regularium (s. Augustini) in Glacz*. Its author was Michael Czacheritz of Nysa, the eighth superior of the congregation. He described the history of the institution from its foundation and continued writing up to 1489. The chronicle was finished in 1524 by other authors.

## Rulers presented as the benefactors of the monasteries

In every one of the three presented works we can find information about Bohemian rulers from the Luxembourg and Poděbrady dynasties. Very often these works depict them as the benefactors and grantors of the particular monastic institutions, they found the monasteries, confirm the rights owned by the convents or give them privileges. And so, from the Kłodzko chronicle we can find out that the monastery was founded by the Arnošt of Pardubice, the first archbishop of Prague (*Cronica monasterii* 2003: 5). The act of founding happened with the support of the emperor Charles IV. The emperor had a fond sentiment towards the canons regulars and always tried to help and support their monastery (Iwańczak 2006: 348–349). In the Wrocław chronicle we can see the location permission given by the Charles IV (*Chronica abbatum* 1839: 196, 200). The ruler in 1372 in the document of the privilege confirmed all the assets and properties of the monastery. His son – Wenceslaus also wrote the renewal act on the same topic (*Chronica abbatum* 1839: 212–213). In a different document Wenceslaus IV confirmed the rights and city privileges of the Wrocław monastery concerning Sobótka and other investments (*Chronica abbatum* 1839: 209, 212).

The Kłodzko chronicle mentions receiving such rights and assets as well. The documents by Sigismund of Luxembourg in 1434 confirm the full rights and all the properties of the Kłodzko monastery (*Cronica monasterii* 2003: 34). Michael Czacheritz recalls the founding privilege confirmed by the consecutive Bohemian kings: Charles, Wenceslaus, Sigismund and Albrecht. He also mentions documents by Sigismund of Luxembourg and Wenceslaus IV confirming various rights of the Kłodzko canons regulars (*Cronica monasterii* 2003: 36–37, 39–40, 136–137). The Kłodzko chronicle often names the son of George of Poděbrady, the duke of Münsterberg and Kłodzko, Henry I. Duke Henry and his wife were one of the greatest benefactors of the convent of canons regulars (*Cronica monasterii* 2003: 233–234).

## Monasteries as participants in the conflicts between secular and spiritual power

Monastic chronicles were focused on the reporting the history of their institution. The history of a monastery is a part of the history of the region which includes this monastery. The abbey and its residents, usually against their will were involved in the vortex of events

happening among the wealthy. Examples of such events are conflicts between the secular and spiritual authorities. Chroniclers describe these situations from the point of view of the monastery and they do not go into details about the reasons or the course of action. One such instance was described in the chronicle of Piasek Island in Wrocław. It presents the situation which took place in the city in 1339. There was a culmination of disputes between the Wrocław archbishop Nanker and the Bohemian king John the Blind who was at the time the sovereign of the Wrocław Duchy (Mandziuk 2004: 37–41; Iwańczak 2012: 151–152). The king came to Bohemia and took the Milicz castle which belonged to the bishopric. The bishop Nanker was outraged and excommunicated King John and his supporting citizens and put the interdict on the duchy. In response, the king ordered all church assets in the Wrocław Duchy to be taken. The majority of the clergy in the area took the bishop's side and exposed themselves to the king. The chronicle reports the antagonisms and focuses on the most important question – the material losses. The leader of the monastery, Konrad of Włocławek supported the bishop and because of that the monastery was harassed by the secular. The canons of Piasek and all the bishop Nanker's supporters were banished and their properties were seized (*Chronica abbatum* 1839: 193–194). The chronicler does not give the readers any judgement of the ruler, he only lists all the material losses of the abbey with details.

Almost half a century later in Wrocław there was a conflict between spiritual and secular authorities once again. This time, it happened between the Wrocław city council supporting King Wenceslaus IV and the cathedral chapter (Dola 1996: 116–117). The seeds of conflict was the Christmas gift of a few barrels of beer given by the Rupert, Duke of Legnica to his brother Henry who was the dean of the Wrocław chapter. This gift broke the prohibition to bring beer into the city of Wrocław and led to the so-called “beer war” (Mrozowicz 2000a: 396–397). The chronicle does not describe the reasons for the conflict in details, it only mentions that it started because of “jura ecclesiastica et ecclesie libertatem” (*Chronica abbatum* 1839: 206). The chronicler reports the conflict focusing mainly on the imprisonment of the abbot and the material losses of the monastery plundered by the king's troops. According to the author of the chronicle, Wenceslaus IV was moved by the bearing of the abbot, released him from prison, and allowed him and other brethren return to the monastery. The chronicler explicitly praises the behaviour of the abbey's leader, underlines his credits and emphasises that it was because of his strength and confidence that the king decided for the

canons. The chronicler expresses himself very enigmatically and clearly praises his superior. In a similar matter Jan of Czarńków presents the events of the conflict. The chronicler from Greater Poland explains the causes of the dispute very precisely and exaggerates the issue of the robberies and thefts of the Bohemian soldiers with the king's permission (*Joannis de Czarńkow* 1872: 695–696).

A similar situation occurred in the Kłodzko monastery, but because it involves the Duke of Münsterberg, Henry the Elder.

### *Catalogus abbatum Saganensium* as the source of the wider viewpoint of the world

The annalistic report of the event outside the walls of the monastery was a little different in the *Catalogus abbatum Saganensium*. Both of its authors, Ludolf and Peter Waynknecht, more frequently allowed themselves to express their wider afterthoughts. Their fuller point of view on the world has already been discussed in the literature (Bering 2001: 30–31). The chroniclers of Żagań described the figures and achievements of the Bohemian rulers not only when it came to the monastery's matters. The question of the shifting royal power in Bohemia and the consequences for the region was material worth writing down in the chronicle. The information about the person on the Bohemian throne and their orders was crucial, from the point of view of the authors, for the abbey in the fiefs of the Kingdom of Bohemia. In this manner Charles IV, Holy Roman Emperor and the King of Bohemia was described among others. Ludolf gives him and the following rulers separate chapter in his work. The chronicler writes about Charles using only superlatives, he was the ideal ruler for Ludolf (*Catalogus abbatum* 1835: 210–212). The emperor was often presented in this way in the medieval historiography (Filipek-Misiak 2015: 76–89). The Żagań chronicler clearly points out that the ruler was intelligent and educated, he spoke several languages, supported knowledge and scholars. Ludolf also appreciates such traits of Charles as justice, modesty and humility. He also praises the king's efficient and long-term rule and Christian compassion; he focuses on the cooperation with papacy for the spread of Christianity and generosity towards the clergy. Ludolf writes about building churches, founding and equipping multiple monasteries.

The opposite of Charles, for the chronicler, was the king's son Wenceslaus IV (*Catalogus abbatum* 1835: 212–217). The rule of Wenceslaus was negatively described. The chronicler wrote even: “Quid

de hoc Wenczeslao boni scribam? Nihil.” (*Catalogus abbatum* 1835: 213). Contrasting Charles and Wenceslaus was used to show the ideal ruler and the bad ruler (Barciak 2013: 67). According to the chronicle, Wenceslaus did not appreciate scholars and educated people, he could not win over subjects and allies outside the borders of the country. He oppressed the Church, plundered its assets and persecuted its representatives. The chronicler describes many disputes between Wenceslaus and the Church or potentates. The chronicler blames him for passivity towards the schism in the Roman Church. He mentions that Wenceslaus boasted that he would be the one deciding who was going to become the next pope. Ludolf adds that under his reign every subject, no matter of what origin, lived a worse life than during the time of his father, Charles. The Žagaň chronicler was not isolated in his opinion. The negative judgement on Wenceslaus was common in the historiography of the time (Čornej 1987: 71–109; Hübnerová 2016: 294–320).

The successor of Wenceslaus on the Prague throne was Sigismund of Luxembourg, the son of Charles and stepbrother of Wenceslaus. The first chronicler, Ludolf briefly mentions the founding of the university in Hungary and many wars between Sigismund and Turkey. In one sentence he notes many praiseworthy achievements of the ruler and the respect he has from the clergy and laymen (*Catalogus abbatum* 1835: 217–218). On the pages of chronicle there is a comment made much later “ad tempus, quia postmodum in multis tyrannizavit”. The next Žagaň chronicler, Waynknecht describes the seizure of power in Bohemia after the death of Wenceslaus, the role of Sigismund in the council of Constance and the capture and trial of Jan Hus (*Catalogus abbatum* 1835: 279–280). Monastic chroniclers, as people of the Church paid much attention to the rulers’ approach towards the institution. They praised the decisions which helped to strengthen the influence of church institutions and criticized the behaviour which lessened the role and financial status of the Catholic Church. Waynknecht stresses that Sigismund invaded ill-disposed Bohemia under the pretext of the fight against heresy, but he did nothing to uproot it, he only plundered the clergy’s assets to use them for the army. There are notes on Sigismund’s death in the chronicle, about the conflict over his legacy and seizure of power by his son-in-law Albert (*Catalogus abbatum* 1835: 307–310).

## George of Poděbrady and his son, Henry I, the Duke of Münsterberg and Kłodzko

The Bohemian ruler whose name appears the most frequently in the chronicles is George of Poděbrady. He is mentioned in all three works, but in a different way in each of them. Wrocław and Žagaň chroniclers are definitively unfavourable towards the king. Very often in their story the ruler was disrespectfully called Girsickcus (*Catalogus abbatum* 1835: 349, 352), Gyrzikus (*Chronica abbatum* 1839: 254) or Girsicus (*Catalogus abbatum*, 1835: 351). The attitude of the author of the Wrocław chronicle towards George was nothing unusual in the city. Wrocław and its citizens were negatively-minded towards the king and they questioned the legality of his election (Drabina 1968: 129–146; 1971: 249–266). Michael Czacheritz, the author of the Kłodzko chronicle never allowed himself to such expressions. He always called him “Georgius rex Bohemie”, only once he added: “appellatus Jorssik” (*Cronica monasterii* 2003: s. 112).

The most extensive report on the election and rule of king George is made by the author of *Catalogus abbatum Saganensium*. He stresses that the king achieved his position by a ruse. Although he was a fan of Hussitism, he swore obedience to Rome and its representatives and publicly declared his loyalty to the Church and aspiring to the unity of faith. Mutual contacts between King George and the pope Pius II were friendly at first, but they worsened with time (Iwańczak 2002: 29–33; Smołucha 2008: 167–175, 217–224, 237–265). The chronicler also describes the situation in Silesia and mentions the resistance of some of the Silesian cities to accept the power of King George. He reports the complicated relations with the papacy ended with George being denounced a heretic, reclaiming his honours and releasing all his subjects from the order for obedience to the king (*Catalogus abbatum* 1835: 340–345).

There are other notes about George of Poděbrady in the chronicles. The first chronologically was made by the author of the Žagaň chronicle when he reported the last moments of the life of Ladislaus the Posthumous and the rumours that circled the country after his death. Some of them blamed George of Poděbrady and John of Rokycany for the death of Ladislaus (*Catalogus abbatum* 1835: 337–339). Waynknecht describes the disputes over the throne after the death of the king. The Žagaň chronicler, negative towards George, commented that

the power moved from a high, aristocratic and honourable family to a mediocre one (*Catalogus abbatum* 1835: 399). The Kłodzko chronicle also refers to the death of Ladislaus the Posthumous. It also informs of the rumours of his death, one of which was the plague (*Cronica monasterii* 2003: 104–105).

The most information about the ruling of George of Poděbrady on the Bohemian throne can be found in the chronicle of the monastery in Kłodzko. Its author describes the visit of George of Poděbrady in Kłodzko in 1458; he brings the attention to the inappropriate behaviour of the population of the city (*Cronica monasterii* 2003: 112). The chronicler provides no details, only mentioning the whispering among the gathered onlookers on the route of the ruler's ride and calls this behaviour shameful. He appreciates the actions of the king who supported him in the dispute with the Kłodzko starost Jan von Warnsdorf (*Cronica monasterii* 2003: 172–173, Šandera 2009: 104–105). The starost accused the provost Michael of wasting the monastery wealth on journeys, but the ruler completely accepted the provost's explanation and the legitimacy of his business trips. In 1476, the Kłodzko Duchy governed by George's sons arranged an interdict to be placed by the nuncio Rudolf of Rüdesheim. The matters concerning the interdict in the Kłodzko Duchy were discussed with many details in the chronicle (*Cronica monasterii* 2003: 179–245). The author quotes or mentions many documents containing the name of King George (*Cronica monasterii* 2003: 179–180, 181, 186–188). He also mentions the ambassadorial mission of the Polish king Casimir Jagiellon whose task was to make an arrangement between George of Poděbrady and the Catholic party in Bohemia (*Cronica monasterii* 2003: 191–192, 195–197). Much more frequent in this chronicle are the mentions of George's son, Henry the Elder, who by the power of King George was made the first count of Kłodzko.

We cannot find information about the political actions of Henry at his father's side or his independent achievements after the death of king George. In the monastery's chronicle there are only those actions of the duke which had the clear and direct connection to the history of canons regulars in Kłodzko. Michael Czacheritz, the author of the chronicle wrote about Duke Henry with respect and friendliness.

He did that even when he described the duke's actions that put the monastery to the loss or inconveniences. We can find many pieces of this type of information, which should not surprise because of the tough situation of the Kłodzko monastery at the time of the interdict. The interdict forbidding the practice of religious ceremonies on the whole county resulted in the conflict between the clergy – compliant to the



Church power represented by the nuncio and the secular power of Duke Henry and his officials. Because of this situation, the canons regulars in Kłodzko found themselves in a very difficult position. Complying to the interdict meant retaliation by the duke, whilst ignoring it resulted in lots of signs of the unpleasantness from the Church power. Taking either of these sides could cause troubles and harassment. The canons regulars in Kłodzko who did not wish to be excluded from the Church complied fully with the decisions of the nuncio.

The provost Michael attempted to reverse or soften the restrictions of the interdict with care for the religious life of his congregation and all citizens of the county. The punishment on the Kłodzko land lasted for almost six years from the April of 1467 to the beginning of 1473. For the provost and canons it meant a plethora of troubles (Chmielewska 2016: 100–101). Because of that, they were often exposed to the anger of Duke Henry who at one point even banished them from the monastery (*Cronica monasterii* 2003: 193–194). Finally Czacheritz managed to soothe the relations with Henry the Elder and from that time forward the cooperation between the canons regulars and the duke's family were excellent (*Cronica monasterii* 2003: 233–234, 238). In his chronicle, Czacheritz never blamed Henry for the situation, he understood the uneasy political circumstances that dominated the county. In the chronicle we cannot find any expression of dislike towards Duke Henry.

The relations between canons regulars in Silesia and King George of Poděbrady were tense and complicated. On the one hand, he was a heretic condemned by the Catholic church, on the other hand, he ruled the kingdom and the fiefs where the properties of the monasteries were situated. Despite all of that, it was better to keep good relations with him and his representatives, respect the orders and in special instances refer to the royal justice. There is a fragment from the *Chronicae abbatum Beatae Mariae Virginis in Arena* which supports the pragmatic approach to the political reality. Nicholas Schönborn, who was the abbot at the time, wanted to gain a tax exemption from properties in the Duchy of Świdnica (*Chronica abbatum* 1839: 241–243). When George was in Świdnica, the abbot went for his audience and paid homage in the name of the Wrocław congregation of canons regulars. Let us remember that this is the same king believed to be a heretic and the one often described in a disparaging way as Gyrzikus. The abbot decided to take this step to protect the assets of the monastery from confiscation. According to the chronicle, Nicholas asked the convent for the advice in this matter. Opinions were divided, some brethren were strongly against the acceptance of George as a king, the other encouraged such actions that

could help the assets of the monastery. The abbot decided to pay homage to the king. It resulted in the generation of extremely negative opinions about him from the secular citizens of Wrocław and some of his inferiors (Matusik 1974: 73–75). The echo of these negative reactions to the actions of Schönborn can be found in his contemporary city writer in Wrocław, Peter Eschenloer (Eschenloer 1827: 99–100; 1872: 54). The negative judgement of the Wrocław canons regulars resulted mainly from the way Eschenloer treated monasteries – as an integral part of the city community (Wiszewski 2003: 192–195). Benedict Johnsdorf, the chronicler himself did not see anything bad in the actions of his predecessor. He considered the interest of the monastery and the protection of its possessions as the most important task of the superior, which justified questionable decisions. He even said: “*prelatus, qui est principalis administrator monasterii, potest et debet cum consilio sanioris partis fratrum, licet paucorum, indempnitati monasterii providere juxta posse.*” (*Chronica abbatum* 1839: 242) – the superior, who is the main administer of the monastery may, or even should, with the advice of the wise group of brethren, no matter how small the group is, take all pains to protect the assets of the monastery.

## Conclusions

As seen on the examples above, the figures of Bohemian monarchs do not take foremost places in the medieval monastic chronicles of the canons regulars from Kłodzko, Wrocław and Żagań. It should not surprise the reader – none of the analysed monasteries was founded by a king or located near a royal residence and none of the chroniclers played a significant role in politics. Because of that, the kings were not foreground characters in the chronicles’ reports. They appear on the pages when chronicles describe events from the life of their institution, in which the rulers were of the great importance. Chroniclers inform about the kings’ decisions that influenced the assets of the monasteries. They note diligently the goods given by the rulers, the confirmations of the properties, tributes and taxes as well as exemptions from them. There are many pieces of information about even the smallest gifts. Financial and economic matters are one of the most important topics in the monastic chronicles. It does not mean they are the only topic.

The analysed chronicles, typically of this genre of historiography focus on the history of the particular institution. They usually do not deal with the events and problems of the outer life, but they do not

completely ignore it either (Chmielewska 2015: 338–340). Chroniclers concentrate on the history of their own monastery and present it as a sequence of the actions of abbots and provosts and their services for the institution. Usually the Bohemian rulers occur in the chronicles in this context. The chroniclers could not have omitted the Bohemian rulers who at the time were the overlords of the local dukes of Silesia. Monks themselves often fell under the power of the monarch, because some of their properties were the royal fiefs. A monarch's decisions – directly and indirectly – influenced the life of all the subjects including the residents of the monasteries. The Bohemian rulers are mentioned in all three work pieces not only in the context of the economy, but also when it comes to the conflicts between the king and the representatives of the Church. In such situations the ruler acting in the monastery's favour is usually described in a more friendly way.

Chronicles reported the situations, in which canons regular, sometimes against their will and intentions, became involved in a dispute between the local bishop and the representative of the royal power or the monarch himself. Similarly, chroniclers – Catholic clergymen – did not leave out such a crucial issue as the seizure of the throne by King George of Poděbrady, a supporter of Hussites and declared a heretic by Rome. On the example of the attitude towards this king, a clear difference between the Żagań and the Wrocław chronicles and the author of the Kłodzko chronicle is seen. In every one of the analysed pieces the information about the Bohemian rulers can be found, but the depiction by every chronicler was different. Apart from the obvious individual characteristics of each author and their writer's temperament, a fundamental difference resulted from the geographical location of the monasteries. The Wrocław and Żagań canons regulars have a much stronger negative opinion about George of Poděbrady, which is the result of the unfriendly attitude towards the king's rule by the citizens of these cities (Drabina 1971: 249–250). Wrocław was the main place of the resistance against King George (Czechowicz 2017: 150–151). Czacheritz had a different perspective on the matter. Kłodzko, where the monastery is situated, was a sovereign duchy and the land of the Kingdom of Bohemia, opposite to Silesia, the land of the Bohemian Crown. It was ruled by Duke Henry the Elder, the son of George of Poděbrady. This fact, in an obvious way, influenced the citizens' of the duchy point of view on the Bohemian king.

The Żagań chronicle takes a special place, because its authors have a wider perspective on the world, not so restricted to the monastery and its closest surroundings. On its pages we can find short stories and the characteristics of the kings' rulings and the characteristics of the rulers,

which cannot be found in the other works. The authors of the Żagań chronicle willingly mention the information about domestic events. In their narration they include notes about issues unconnected to the monastery and the region in which it was located (Pobóg-Lenartowicz 2002: 437). We can read about the popes, the emperors, the wars around the Christianity, or even events from far-flung countries. Ludolf and Waynknecht treat these types of messages as “facta notabilia”. They list and introduce the personages living in their times, who are considered important edifying examples (Pobóg-Lenartowicz 2013: 241–252; 2016: 97–109).

It is worth noticing that a broader interest in the matters of the wider world was also familiar to the residents of the Wrocław monastery. In this institution of canons regulars, two chronicles dedicated to contemporary political events were created. The former is *Chronica Bohemorum* by Benedict Johnsdorf, which was a short lecture on the history of Bohemia and Silesia up to the time of the author (Matusik 1974: 70–74). The latter is the *Casus facti seu in terminis* by the same author which presents the conflict between the monastery of the Virgin Mary and the city of Wrocław concerning the borders of the jurisdiction on the Arena Island. It also contained a few pieces of information about the contemporary time of the author (Mrozowicz 2000b: 152–154; 2001b: 174–178).

The chroniclers, always most focused on the life of their own monastery, included some affairs from the history of their region, duchy, kingdom or diocese of the Common Church in their narrations. The more events happened in the political life of the time and the greater was the influence of these matters and the larger emotions they created in the society, the more they appeared on the pages of the chronicles. They influenced the management of the monastery and the condition – including the spiritual condition – of its residents. They were matters not to ignore, and as Johnsdorf wrote in his chronicle when describing the tasks of the superior (Chmielewska 2010: 595–596) and ordering him to observe the current affairs: “bona temporalia sui monasterii seu ecclesie, sine quibus, jure testante, spiritualia diu subsistere nequeunt” (*Cronica abbatum* 1839: 157) – because without a proper foundation in the temporal matters the spiritual matters cannot function.

## References

### Sources

- Catalogus abbatum Saganensium*, 1835, ed. G.A. Stenzel [in:] *Scriptores Rerum Silesiacarum*, vol. 1, ed. G.A. Stenzel, Josef Max & Komp., Breslau.
- Chronica abbatum Beatae Mariae Virginis in Arena*, 1839, ed. G.A. Stenzel [in:] *Scriptores Rerum Silesiacarum*, vol. 2, ed. G.A. Stenzel, Josef Max & Komp., Breslau.

- Cronica monasterii canonicorum regularium (s. Augustini) in Glacz*, 2003, ed. W. Mrozowicz, Centrum Badań Śląskoznawczych i Bohemistycznych Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego, Wrocław.
- Eschenloer P., 1827, *Geschichten der Stadt Breslau*, ed. J.G.Kunisch, vol. 1, Josef Max & Komp., Breslau.
- Eschenloer P., 1872, *Historia Wratislaviensis et que post mortem regis Ladislai sub electo Georgio de Podiebrat Bohemorum rege illi acciderant prospera et adversa*, ed. H. Markgraf [in:] *Scriptores Rerum Silesiacarum*, vol. 7, ed. G.A. Stenzel, Josef Max & Komp., Breslau.
- Joannis de Czarnkow Chronicon Polonorum*, 1872, ed. A. Bielowski, "Monumenta Poloniae Historica", vol. II, own print run, Lwów.

### Secondary Literature

- Barciak A., 2013, *Luksemburgowie na tronie czeskim w opinii inicjatora Katalogu opatów zagańskich Ludolfa* [in:] *Rycerze, wędrowcy, kacerze. Studia z historii średniowiecznej i wczesnonowożytnej Europy Środkowej*, eds. B. Wojciechowska, W. Kowalski, Wyd. Uniwersytetu Jana Kochanowskiego, Kielce.
- Bering P., 2001, *Struktury narracyjne w późnośredniowiecznych łacińskich kronikach regionalnych*, Gnieźnieńska Oficyna Wydawnicza „Tum”, Gniezno.
- Cetwiński M., 2002, *Klasztory śląskie a rozwój średniowiecznej historiografii śląskiej* [in:] *Metamorfozy śląskie. Studia źródłoznawcze i historiograficzne*, ed. M. Cetwiński. Wyd. AJD w Częstochowie, Częstochowa.
- Chmielewska K., 2010, „*Ad laudem bonorum et vindicandam malorum*” – o powodach spisania śląskich średniowiecznych kronik kanoników regularnych [in:] *Klio viae et invia. Opuscula Marco Cetwiński dedicata*, ed. A. Odrzywolska-Kidawa, Wydaw. DiG, Warszawa.
- Chmielewska K., 2015, *Klasztor i jego problemy w średniowiecznych śląskich i kłódzkich kronikach kanoników regularnych*, Wydaw. AJD w Częstochowie, Częstochowa.
- Chmielewska K., 2016, *Książę ziębiicki i hrabia kłodzki Henryk Starszy i jego rodzina w oczach autorów Kroniki klasztoru kanoników regularnych w Kłodzku*. „Kłodzki Sborník” 11.
- Čornej P., 1987, *Tajemství českých kronik. Cesty ke kořenům husitské tradice*, Paseka, Praha.
- Czechowicz B., 2017, *Idea i państwo. Korona Królestwa Czech w latach 1457–1547. Si noster rex Jiřík czy occupator regni Bohemiae? Rządy w Koronie Jerzego z Podiebradów*, vol. 2, Quaestio, Wrocław.
- Dola K., 1996, *Dzieje Kościoła na Śląsku*, część I: Średniowiecze, Wyd. Świętego Krzyża, Opole.
- Drabina J., 1968, *Ośrodki kaznodziejskie Wrocławia jako centra walki z Jerzym z Podiebradu*, „Acta Universitatis Wratislaviensis” 70, *Historia* 14.
- Drabina J., 1971, *Stosunek wrocławskich zakonników do króla Jerzego z Podiebradów*, „Śląskie Studia Historyczno-Teologiczne” 4.
- Filipek-Misiak A., 2015, *Karol IV Luksemburski jako ideał władcy w Catalogus abbatum Saganensium Ludolfa z Żagania*, „Historie – otázky – problemy” 7.
- Hübnerová K., 2016, *Herrscher der Krise – die Krise des Herrschers König Wenzel IV. als Projektionsfläche zeitgenössischer Propaganda*. „Biuletyn Polskiej Misji Historycznej = Bulletin der Polnischen Historischen Mission” 11.
- Iwańczak W., 2002, *Katolicy i husyci w czasach Jerzego z Podiebradu* [in:] *Stosunki międzywyznaniowe w Europie Środkowej i Wschodniej w XIV–XVII wieku*, eds. M. Dygo, S. Gawlas, H. Grala, Wydaw. DiG, Warszawa.

- Iwańczak W., 2006, *Uwagi o religijności ziem czeskich drugiej połowy XIV wieku* [in:] *Ecclesia – cultura – potestas. Studia z dziejów kultury i społeczeństwa. Księga ofiarowana Siostrze Profesor Urszuli Borkowskiej OSU*, eds. P. Kras, A. Januszek, A. Nalewajek, W. Polak, Wydaw. Towarzystwa Naukowego „Societas Vistulana”, Kraków.
- Iwańczak W., 2012, *Jan Luksemburski: dzieje burzliwego żywota i bohaterskiej śmierci króla Czech i hrabiego Luksemburga w 21 odsłonach*, PIW, Warszawa.
- Mandziuk J., 2004, *Historia Kościoła Katolickiego na Śląsku, średniowiecze*, t. 1, cz. 2 (1302–1417), Oficyna Wydawniczo-Poligraficzna „Adam”, Warszawa.
- Matusik L., 1967, *Ze studiów nad średniowieczną kulturą umysłową kanoników regularnych na Śląsku. Jodok z Glucholazów*, „Sobótka” 22.
- Matusik L., 1968, *Kilka uwag w sprawie „Kroniki klasztoru na Piasku we Wrocławiu”* [in:] *Studia z dziejów kultury i ideologii ofiarowane E. Maleczyńskiej w 50. rocznicę pracy dydaktycznej i naukowej*, eds. E. Heck, W. Korta, J. Leszczyński, Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, Wrocław.
- Matusik L., 1974, *Próba spojrzenia na postawę polityczną środowiska wrocławskich kanoników regularnych w średniowieczu*, „Acta Universitatis Wratislaviensis” 195, Historia 23.
- Mrozowicz W., 2000a, *Konflikty między miastem Wrocław a klasztorem kanoników regularnych na Piasku w późnym średniowieczu* [in:] *Klasztor w mieście średniowiecznym i nowożytnym*, eds. M. Derwich, A. Pobóg-Lenartowicz, Pracownia Badań nad Dziejami Zakonów i Kongregacji Kościelnych „Larhcor”, Wrocław – Opole.
- Mrozowicz W., 2000b, *Średniowieczne śląskie dziejopisarstwo klasztorne* [in:] *Tysiącletnie dziedzictwo kulturowe diecezji wrocławskiej*, red. A. Barciak, Societas Scientiarum Favendis Silesiae Superioris – Instytut Górnośląski, Katowice.
- Mrozowicz W., 2001a, *Kronika klasztoru kanoników regularnych w Kłodzku. Ze studiów nad średniowiecznym dziejopisarstwem klasztornym*, Wyd. Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego, Wrocław.
- Mrozowicz W., 2001b, *Z dyskusji nad początkami klasztorów w średniowiecznej historiografii śląskiej* [in:] *Origines mundi, gentium et civitatum*, eds. S. Rosik, P. Wiszewski, Wyd. Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego, Wrocław.
- Pobóg-Lenartowicz A., 2002, *Wątki czeskie w kronikach śląskich kanoników regularnych*, „Acta Universitatis Carolinae – Philosophica et Historica” 1–2, *Z pomocnych věd historických* XVI.
- Pobóg-Lenartowicz A., 2013, *Uczeni i sławni mężowie w „Katalogu opatów żagańskich”* [in:] *Rycerze, wędrowcy, kacerze. Studia z historii średniowiecznej i wczesnonowożytnej Europy Środkowej*, eds. B. Wojciechowska, W. Kowalski, Wyd. Uniwersytetu Jana Kochanowskiego, Kielce.
- Pobóg-Lenartowicz A., 2016, *Papieże i papieństwo w „Katalogu opatów żagańskich”* [in:] *Kościół w Polsce a sąsiedzi*, eds. J. Grabowski, T. Rutkowski, Wydaw. Neriton, Warszawa.
- Proksch C., 1994, *Klosterreform und Geschichtsschreibung in Spätmittelalter*, Böhlau-Verlag Köln–Weimar–Wien.
- Šandera M., 2009, *Hanuš Welfl z Varnsdorfu. První zemský hejtmán Kladského hrabství*, „Kladský Sborník” 6. Supplementum.
- Smolucha J., 2008, *Polityka Kurii Rzymskiej za pontyfikatu Piusa II (1458–1464) wobec Czech i krajów sąsiednich. Z dziejów dyplomacji papieskiej w XV wieku*, Księgarnia Akademicka, Kraków.
- Wiszewski P., 2003, *Życie zakonne w oczach elity intelektualnej Śląska średniowiecznego i nowożytnego. Przemiany pewnego motywu* [in:] *Studia z historii średniowiecza*, ed. M. Goliński, Wyd. Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego, Wrocław.

**Czescy władcy z dynastii Luksemburgów i Podiebradów  
w średniowiecznych śląskich i kłodzkich kronikach kanoników regularnych  
z Kłodzka, Wrocławia i Żagania**

Streszczenie

Autorka na podstawie trzech kronik klasztornych powstałych w późnym średniowieczu analizuje sposób przedstawienia czeskich królów z dynastii Luksemburgów i Podiebradów oraz stara się wskazać przyczyny, które wpłynęły na taki właśnie tok narracji kronikarskiej. Podstawę źródłową tych rozważań stanowią kroniki spisane w klasztorach kanoników regularnych reguły św. Augustyna w Żaganiu, Wrocławiu i Kłodzku: *Catalogus abbatum Saganensium*, *Chronica abbatum Beatae Mariae Virginis in Arena* i *Cronica Monasterii Canoniorum Regularium in Glacz*. Postacie władców pojawiają się w tych źródłach przede wszystkim w kontekście ich związków z konkretnym klasztorem, szczególnie w sprawach majątkowych dotyczących nadań, praw własności i podatków. Królowie czescy wspominani są też na kartach kronik przy okazji opisów konfliktów między władzą świecką a kościelną. Z analizy tekstu dzieł wynika, że obraz panujących jest zróżnicowany, zależny od miejsca powstania kroniki i stosunku lokalnej społeczności do konkretnego władcy. Najlepiej uwidacznia się to na przykładzie Jerzego z Podiebradu, husyty na tronie czeskim. Osobne miejsce w tym zestawieniu zajmuje kronika żagańska przedstawiająca oprócz zagadnień lokalnych także informacje o ogólnym ponadklasztornym charakterze, w tym informacje o osobach panujących.

**Słowa kluczowe:** kanonicy regularni, kroniki klasztorne, dziejopisarstwo, średniowiecze, czescy władcy