Images and Narratives: Germans and Jews in the “Annales seu Cronicae incliti Regni Poloniae” of Jan Długosz

The “Annales” of Jan Długosz (1415–1480) comprise the greatest chronicle of medieval Poland. The chronicler tells the history of Poland across twelve books, from its mythological beginnings up to the second half of the fifteenth century, against a European background. Inspired by the 500th anniversary of the chronicler’s death in 1980, and his 600th birthday in 2015, a broad range of studies have been initiated on Jan Długosz and his work in recent decades. The chronicle reaches beyond a dynastic point of view; the monarchs and their families are not at the heart of the story, but rather the Polonia – the Polish lands, and the Poloni – the political and social elites. Długosz constructs their historical

---

importance against a comparative background of other communities, looking not just at neighboring territories and kingdoms, but also at social groups within the Polish realm.

Among the neighbors of Poland, the Lithuanian and Ruthenian territories became part of the kingdom in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, but this does not change Długosz’ perspective. He continues to treat them as different entities, even though he emphasizes their subordination to the “Corona Regni Poloniae.” The Jews, on the other hand, cannot be categorized territorially; they are treated as a religious “Other,” relating not just to the Polish but also to the Christian realm. In the chronicle Germans represent one of the most important neighbors of Poland, but they are also described as a factor within the Polish political landscape. Długosz discusses in great detail the diplomatic and military encounters with the Holy Roman Empire and Poland’s territorial neighbors like Saxony, Brandenburg, and the Teutonic Order in Prussia. The stories about Germans as a factor of domestic politics, however, present them as a “foreign” influence, but never link them to the influence of German territorial powers. The stories about Jews and Germans are more elaborate in the “Annales” than in other works of Polish medieval historiography; Długosz tells stories about Germans to explain what he understands as specifically Polish, and stories about Jews to tell about Christianity. The image of the “Other” is used as a mirror of the “Own”. This is what Bernhard Waldenfels called the “responsive phenomenology of the stranger.” Analyzing the narrative strategies in the chronicle’s reports on Germans and Jews draws attention to the contexts, in which the “Other” is mentioned, and to the effects Germans and Jews have on the Poles, and Christians, respectively.
In the first book of the “Annales,” Długosz provides his readers with a general concept of dealing with the “Other within.” In a short chapter on the nature and customs of the Poles he writes:

Foreign newcomers and strangers, even though there might be talent and virtuous habits visible in them, [the Poles] only rarely admit to leading positions in offices, maybe after some time or the passing of a generation, and even if it occurs that way, it seldom goes on without envy. Oh, if the Poles would use the honorable example of the Spaniards, who do not despise of the descent of any man, who distinguishes himself by virtue, and they [even] assign bishoprics and high dignities to neophytes from the Jews or Saracens, and through such generosity they make their country blossom even more.7

As a negative example, Długosz hints at the Czechs, who regard it an assault to their honor if not every office in the kingdom remained in the hands of one and the same family, even if the office-holder might be dishonest and incompetent or invalid.8

In this case, Długosz uses a story about others (Spaniards and Czechs) to explain his own ideas of how to deal with strangers in Poland. He rejects the thought of exclusion on principle like in Bohemia, but he sees the prospect of integration as hinged on conditions. If a non-Christian changes faith, he may be awarded an office, but only then – the conversion constitutes a necessary pre-condition; it shows the will of the “Other” to discard his difference and to submit to the religious order. Likewise, the Germans – as the article shows – have to submit to the political order of the Polish realm in order to become accepted. When those conditions are met, the status of being “Other” is overcome, and there is no need for exclusion anymore. Długosz develops a normative concept of dealing with the “Other,” which in his mind is not yet realized in Polish society. In contrast to Bohemia, he points out, in Poland integration is possible, but even after a long period of time accompanied by negative emotions; a sort of mental dissociation remains.

This mental dissociation in the image of Jews and Germans within the chronicle of Jan Długosz has attracted the most scholarly attention. In 1973 Jerzy Kloczowski criticized the older Polish historiography for not distinguishing between the image of Germans as military opponents and the image of Germans living in Poland, which led to the construction of a one-sided history of conflict. In his article on “Poles and strangers in the fifteenth century,” Kloczowski underlines that Długosz viewed not only Christian foreigners in general in a positive light, but also Germans in particular, even though the battles against
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the Teutonic Order remained one of the core questions of the fifteenth century.9 Ten years later, Sławomir Gawlas demanded a separate analysis of the Germans living in Poland when studying Długosz’ attitude toward foreigners. Gawlas points out that the chronicler had no objections against foreigners living in the kingdom of Poland, as long as they did not take part in political life. Therefore, he had no complaints against German immigration, e.g. from burghers, if there was no harm to the Polish population. With respect to the thirteenth century as the epoch preceding the reunification of the kingdom, Gawlas emphasizes that the sources Długosz had at his disposal did expose the conflicts even more than Długosz himself. This must be taken into account in the interpretation of the chronicler’s assessments.10 In its time Gawlas’ article on the “national consciousness of Jan Długosz” constituted not just a new perspective within Polish medieval studies, but it marked a definite departure from a political appropriation of historiography, criticized already by Jerzy Kłoczowski. An echo of an older, politicized history is still present in an article by Jadwiga Krzyżaniakowa from 1987, where she states that Długosz correctly assessed the threat arising from German immigration to Poland, and that Długosz thought it was especially dangerous if princes supported German immigrants and were influenced by them.11

In his image of Jews, Długosz emphasizes different features. Whereas the remarks on Germans are directed towards the secular, political sphere, the image of Jews is linked to the divine order and secondly concerns the repercus-

sions of Jewish presence in Poland to the political sphere. The thought of divine intervention in politics permeates the whole chronicle, but it is especially prominent with regard to the Jews. Jews are presented as being fundamentally different, but conversion to Christianity was able to overcome their status as “Others,” as Długosz explains. The image of Jews in the “Annales” has been researched primarily by scholars of Jewish history; in the area of Christian religious history, Urszula Borkowska deals with the presentation of Jews and other non-Catholic groups in her various studies on the writings of Jan Długosz.

Borkowska also remarked that the chronicler had not just collected information but tried to augment it in order to achieve historic truth. She points out that, for Długosz, historic truth can be reached through caritas patriae, the service for the fatherland with sword and feather, through utilitas, the benefit for one’s countrymen and the fatherland, and most of all by the right balance, which prevents the chronicler from one-sided praise or condemnation. If the available information is not sufficient, the chronicler is called to illustrare and to amend (extendere, amplificare) it. In this way the diligence of the historian makes it possible to supplement and complete the originally scarce information and to present them clearly.

In Długosz’ works the confrontation with difference is used to bring out the qualities of “the Own.” Episodes with repeating motifs show the chronicler’s narrative strategy. To Długosz, Otherness is not a fundamental quality, something

that lies in the person itself, but a disturbance of order that can be resolved by integration into the political or religious order.

In the German as well as in the Jewish case the narrative program becomes visible only through an overview of all the episodes dealing with each of them. In the case of the Germans the chronicle reaches a certain end-point in the times contemporary to the chronicler. Examples from the early Piast monarchy and the era of principalities are written as a history of conflict where the political order is endangered by the harmful influence of foreigners; in the times of the re-united kingdom the Germans are described as having accepted their place in the political order, therefore no longer posing a threat.

The Jewish case is presented differently. There are short remarks where Jews are mentioned en passant but with negative connotations, and there are few episodes in which Jews are described in detail. Here the emphasis lies on Christian-Jewish interaction, where the Jews are portrayed as a disturbance of the divine order rather than a danger to the political system.

**Germans as a factor in Polish politics**

The image of Germans in Polish politics and society in the “Annales” is not uniform. There are three different narrations about Germans that can be differentiated by time. In the early Piast monarchy, from the first kingdom to the introduction of the principle of seniority – the division of the Polish realm into several principalities in 1138 – the presence of Germans at court became associated with crises of power, caused or intensified by the preferential treatment of the foreigners. During the period of principalities between 1138 and the reunification of the kingdom in 1320, the narration diversifies. Again, Germans in the retinue of the dukes are cast as problematic, leading to the expulsion either of the Germans or of the monarch together with the foreigners. In other contexts, when Germans are mentioned for example as settlers, there are no negative associations linked to their presence in Poland. This trend continues in the late Piast and Jagiellon kingdom of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, where Germans at court are not described as influential and/or problematic anymore. On the contrary, the chronicle underlines the growing admiration for Poland by Germans in that period.

The “Annales” mention the influence of German immigrants in Poland for the first time in relation to the crisis of the early Piast monarchy in the times of king Mieszko II (1025–1034). Mieszko was the second member of the Piast dynasty to be King of Poland, following his father, who was crowned shortly before his death in 1025. Since 1013, Mieszko had been married to Richeza, a princess from a
Saxon aristocratic family and granddaughter to emperor Otto II. Długosz alludes to a connection between this marriage and the political problems the monarchy faced. Thus the chronicler relates under the year 1030 that the Polabian tribes had deserted Mieszko because of two reasons – the first being the idleness and injustice of the king, and the second the family ties to Germans due to mutual marriages. The chronicler’s criticism concerned a phenomenon that was far from rare – marriages between Polish and German elites were widespread and continued to be so; and the princesses were always accompanied by German or – if the marriage was in the other direction – Polish knights.

In fact, Długosz appears not to be critical of those matrimonial ties themselves. He merely uses the ties between Mieszko and the German princess against the background of the catastrophe of the early Piast monarchy to discuss fundamental problems in political order. This becomes clear when he tells the story of the events after Mieszko’s death in 1034. Długosz reports that the Polish nobles blamed Richeza for the political unrest und discord in Poland at that time:

Queen Richsza (=Richeza) herself for a long time, when her husband had been alive and later on, after his death, has hated the Poles, detested their customs and language, and often hurled insults at them. Moreover, she kept Germans at her court and in offices. To tell the truth, she passed the Polish barons and their sons by and detested them, and even though they came from outstanding and noble families, when it came to handing out offices or bestowing money she gave priority to the German newcomers, even thought they might be people of ignoble and low descent.

According to the chronicle, Richeza’s actions violated the political order on various levels and, through these actions, brought disaster to her husband and the land. She preferred the newcomers to the Polish barons, violating also social hierarchies, as the Polish lords came from outstanding and noble families while the foreigners may have been of ignoble and low descent. Długosz calls the Germans newcomers and because of that assigns a lower status to them. It does not concern him that these relations might look different from Richeza’s
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perspective – since the queen as well as her protégées both came from German lands, as the chronicler states immediately prior.

Therefore, the problem was not in the mere presence of the foreigners, but in the conscious policy of Richeza, which the chronicler describes as hostile towards the Poles. Długosz repeats his accusation in the next paragraph, writing that at first she despised everything Polish, and then arbitrarily imposed her will and filled only the Germans in with her plans, disrespected the advice of the Poles and pushed them to the margins, while giving the higher offices away to Germans. There was more to explain Richeza’s actions than just her being a foreigner, as she violated not only the social order, but also the hierarchy of gender: Richeza, the chronicler tells, “oblivious to her strengths and her female gender, was unable to use her luck wisely and did not hear wise advisers.”21

The crisis, which Richeza’s multiple violations of the order had evoked, was the gentile uprising after the death of Mieszko II that brought the monarchy to collapse and forced Richeza to flee the land together with her son Kazimierz. She did not return to Poland, while Kazimierz later managed to restore the rule of the Piast dynasty (with help from imperial forces), for which historiography awarded him the title “the Restorer” (“Odnowiciel”).

A queen who endangers the kingdom because she violates the gender roles assigned to her, as well as the hierarchy between “own” and “foreign,” was not just a means for Długosz to explain the catastrophe of the monarchy so soon after the glorious beginnings under Mieszko I and Bolesław Chrobry. He regarded the connection between the double violation of social roles and the danger to the kingdom to be so central that he repeated this story at the beginning of the third book through the example of Hungary after the death of king Stephen the Holy (1038). In this case, too, it was a German wife (Gisela, the sister of Emperor Henry II) of King Stephen, who – after the death of her husband – preferred Germans over the locals. In doing, so she weakened the position of Stephen’s proclaimed heir (Peter Orseolo, a relative of Gisela and a foreigner himself) until in the end both were driven out of the country and the new king Aba expelled all Germans from Hungary.22

In this example, Długosz shows how the crisis can be overcome and order restored without foreign interference. The chronicler does not omit, however, that
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22 Długosz, Annales seu Cronicae, vol. 2, liber III, 42–43. On the basis of a chronicle from the fourteenth century that, however, provides a much less detailed account than Długosz, see Ryszard Grzesik, Polska Piastów i Węgry Arpadów we wzajemnej opinii (do 1320 roku) [Poland under the Piasts and Hungary under the Arpads in their reciprocal opinions] (Warszawa: Sławistyczny ośrodek wydawniczy, 2003), 72 with note 576 (p. 170).
Aba also violated his duties as a ruler, so that in the end his retinue turned against him and expelled him as well. Peter Orseolo was allowed to return and decreed that Hungarians should live henceforth according to their own laws.23

The motif of a Polish monarch’s foreign wife, who prefers Germans and hates Poles, returns in Długosz’ account of the twelfth century. Here again, the German princess and her advisors appear in the context of a major crisis in Polish history: the division of the Polish among the sons of Duke Bolesław III “Wrymouth” in 1138, together with the futile struggle of Bolesław’s eldest son Władysław, who tried to protect the unity of monarchical rule against the claims of his younger brothers. In the end Władysław was driven out of the country and dies in exile.

The “Annales” describe how in 1121 Władysław married Agnes (of Babenberg),24 who Długosz introduces under the name of Cristina as the daughter of Emperor Henry IV, while conceding that he had no reliable information – according to some she might have been the daughter of Henry V, he adds.25 According to Długosz, Agnes/Cristina “because of haughtiness and pride despised all Poles. She removed them from her table and company and used exclusively the services of the German. She claimed that just the presence of Poles offended because of their bad smell; even the way they dressed was unbearable. She even hated the Polish priests, just like any secular person, and never showed them any respect.”26

In the light of the further developments, the relevance of this episode becomes apparent. In accordance with the testament of his father, Władysław assumed the title of Duke of Silesia and Senior (high duke) of all Poland, when in 1138 the Polish lands were distributed among the sons of Bolesław. In the following years Władysław frequently fought against his younger brothers as well as against the powerful palatine Piotr Włostowic. After his flight in 1146 he pledged all of Poland to the German King Konrad III, a half-brother of Władysław’s wife, and as vassal of the Holy Roman Empire secured German military support. Neither Konrad’s intervention, nor a military campaign by Emperor Frederick Barbarossa in 1157,

24 Agnes von Babenberg was the daughter of duke Leopold of Austria, granddaughter of Emperor Henry IV, half-sister of king Konrad III. See Aleksander Semkowicz, Krytyczny rozbiór Dziejów polskich Jana Długosza (do roku 1384) [A critical analysis of the Polish History by Jan Długosz] (Kraków: Wydawnictwo Akademii Umiejętności, 1887), 161; her marriage took place probably after 1123. Stanisław Rosik, Bolesław Krzywousty [Bolesław the Wrymouth] (Wrocław: Chronicon 2013), 226 gives the year 1125, Mariusz Dworsatschek, Władysław II Wygnaniec [Władysław II, the Exiled] (Kraków: Wilczyska, 2009), 29–30 dates it between 1123 and 1127, and Kazimierz Jasiński, Rodowód pierwszych Piastów [The genealogy of the first Piasts] (Poznań: Wydawnictwo Poznańskiego Towarzystwa Przyjaciół Nauk, 2004), 204 between 1123 and 1124.
managed to restore his power. Władysław stayed in Thuringia until his death in 1159; only in 1163 did his sons return to Poland and became dukes of Silesia.\(^{27}\)

The history of the wedding and the behavior of Władysław’s wife are told to illustrate and explain the resistance against his policy by his younger brothers, who she allegedly removed from table and company, and by the clergy – Archbishop Jacob of Żnin excommunicated Władysław in 1146, – as well as by secular persons, for example the palatine Piotr Włostowic, to all of whom she did not pay any respect. Thus in this episode, already, all later conflicts find an explanation.

For Długosz it is furthermore important to explain Władysław’s political failure and death in exile. His defeat was not just the outcome of a dynastic struggle but had its roots in a double violation of norms – in the politically active role of his wife (who initially tried to defend Cracow against the younger brothers after Władysław’s flight at the end of 1145) and the preferential treatment of the Germans.

Already a generation earlier the chronicle takes up the German motif and links it with the older half-brother of Duke Bolesław Wrymouth. Through this connection, Zbigniew is marked as an usurper: “Born out of wedlock and raised among Czechs and Germans he was so infected and saturated with insidious customs that he even wronged his father repeatedly and to cause the downfall of his brother [...] he frequently led Czechs, Germans, Pomeranians and Prussians into the country.”\(^{28}\) Zbigniew was presumably born from a marriage in the so-called “Slavic rite” no longer accepted by the church. In the opinion of the chronicler he had no legitimate claims to power and allied himself with foreign powers against his own family. Długosz does not dwell on the fact that Pomeranians and Prussians were still pagans; Zbigniew’s upbringing among Czechs and Germans were more important to the chronicler. Zbigniew was defeated by his younger brother Bolesław Wrymouth; he was blinded in 1112 and died shortly afterwards.\(^{29}\)

The motif of Germans in the retinue of Polish dukes is developed again in the history of the principalities, especially during the thirteenth century. In telling these stories Długosz could lean on contemporary chronicles from Great Poland, which used the concept of “Polonia” in a double sense – meaning on the one hand the province of Great Poland, but on the other hand sometimes all of Poland as well. These chronicles argued against the striving for hegemony by Silesian dukes in the first half of the thirteenth century, presenting the dukes of Great Poland as “natural lords” and delegitimizing their Silesian competitors by associating
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them with foreigners. This motif appears with great intensity in relation to Duke Bolesław III of Silesia, also called Bolesław “the Horned” (Rogatka) or “the Bald” (Łysy). Between 1242 and 1257 the “Annales” no less than eight times talk about the duke’s relationship to Germans. These stories are supplemented by accounts of a conflict between the sons of Duke Henry the Bearded at the beginning of the thirteenth century and a short notice on the death of Duke Siemomysł of Kujawy, who had been driven from his duchy for more than ten years because he had favored the Germans. Apart from these episodes dealing with Germans in the retinue of a Polish prince, the chronicle mentions Germans in that period also in other contexts, when they are not associated with abuse of power or political crises.

Any stories about Germans in the retinue of Polish rulers are still associated exclusively with conflicts. However, in contrast to the early Piast times, it is now the (male) rulers who surround themselves with Germans, and it is not so much political catastrophes that follow from such contacts, but the fears among the Polish nobility that matter.

Długosz introduces the reader to an episode from the year 1213, based on an account of the late thirteenth century in the so-called Polish-Silesian chronicle. It describes a conflict between the sons of Duke Henry the Bearded, Konrad and Henry II, the Pious. Konrad was said to oppose the planned partition of the realm, in which he would have been awarded territories in the northern peripheries of Silesia (Lausitz/Łużyce and the land of Lebus/Lubusz), whereas Henry the Pious would become Duke of Silesia. Długosz wrote: “Konrad felt offended and upset by that, and from his very nature he treated the Poles friendly and courteously, whereas to the Germans he was [their] most determined enemy [...] therefore he decided to remove him [duke Henry the Pious] and all the Germans who supported him from Silesia.”30 Modern historiography treats this episode as fictional; Konrad died in the same year, in which the fight against his brother was said to have taken place (1213), and there is no mention in any other sources apart from the Polish-Silesian chronicle about a plan to divide the realm of duke Henry the Bearded in that time or a conflict between the brothers.31 It is interesting that Długosz does not portray Henry the Pious in a negative light or as a loser in the

conflict with his brother. The chronicler uses the episode to describe an opposition that would become relevant for his understanding of the dynastic struggles, which dominates the narration of Polish history in the thirteenth century. The argument is that a duke could associate either with “the Poles” or with “the Germans,” and the solution to these conflicts lay in removing the Germans (at least) from the retinue of the duke and therefore from political influence.

German influence and its negative consequences for a duke who relied on it constitutes the core motif of Długosz’ narration about Duke Bolesław II “the Horned (Rogatka),” son of Duke Henry the Pious, who reigned in the northern parts of Silesia (duchy of Liegnitz/Legnica) between 1241 and 1278 and often fought with his Piast neighbors in order to enlarge his territories. The first mention of Bolesław’s military ambitions the “Annales” note under the year 1242. Bolesław fought in parts of Great Poland that had been taken by Duke Henry the Pious after the death of Duke Władysław Odonic of Great Poland in 1239: “Bolesław, called ‘the Bald’ committed very many unbearable acts of violence against the knights and the common people of Great Poland, and the valued just any Germans and newcomers, even ragged ones and simpletons [...], he was profliigate and generous to the Germans,” thus the nobles of Great Poland turned to the sons of Władysław Odonic, Przemysław and Bolesław the Pious, and accepted them as “natural heirs” to their land.32 In 1249, Bolesław Rogatka tried to annex the duchy of Wrocław, the demesne of his younger brother Henry III, “aided by Saxons and Germans and other wandering soldiers.”33 During the fight, Bolesław was taken hostage and released after giving his word of honor not to attack his brother again. Nevertheless, he thirsted for revenge and “handed over his fortresses to the Germans, in order to be free to sow devastation among his own.”34

Bolesław’s problems did not end there, as already in the following year he “was pressured by German soldiers, who he brought into the land, to hand out the promised salary, [and therefore] he got rid of all his horses, armor, possessions and jewels, and paid off less than half of the amount he was due for the hired

soldiers”.\textsuperscript{35} In this situation Bolesław, who is called by the chronicler constantly “the Bald,” according to the “Annales” ordered the imprisonment of one of his few trusted men “hoping to extort money for Germans and advisors [...] he hands the prisoner over to the Germans, whom he owed money, so that they could extort it from him. In doing so, he offended all Polish lords so much [that] they left Bolesław the Bald in hatred for his increasing from day to day tyranny.”\textsuperscript{36} The incident described in this episode did not happen this way; Długosz took it from a Great Polish chronicle that was openly hostile to Bolesław.\textsuperscript{37} However, six years later, in 1256, Bolesław Rogatka did try to abduct Bishop Thomas of Wrocław. The “Annales” tell that the duke attacked the bishop “in the night during sleep time together with his Germans (whose instigation and council are said to have propelled him [Bolesław] to this act).”\textsuperscript{38} Both stories complement one another, showing the duke spiraling into perdition because of the ill advice given by his German retinue. From the very beginning it was the Germans who made the duke turn against his own (=Polish) nobles and advisors, and in the end they were responsible for his act of treason and sacrilege.

In contrast to the early medieval episodes, Długosz does not tell Bolesław Rogatka’s story as a tale of imminent catastrophe – the duke still ruled his territory for more than 20 years after his failed attack on the Bishop of Wrocław. The “Annales,” however, provide such a narrative, albeit by using another character. In 1287, shortly before the attention of the chronicle fully turns to the efforts of re-uniting the kingdom, Długosz mentions the death of duke Ziemomysł of Kujawy, and explains that he had returned to power only “after 12 years of exile from his duchy for that reason that he had usually treated the Poles with contempt and favored the Germans, and preferred them to Poles, and tried to break the rights of the knights, take away their hereditary possessions and to remove the Polish nation from the land.”\textsuperscript{39} Shortly after taking over the duchy of Inowroclaw, after his father’s death in 1267, Ziemomysł had used German knights in a conflict with the Bishop of Kujawy and local nobles. He was driven from the country twice by invasions from neighboring Great Poland and allowed to return to his principality in 1278 only after solemnly swearing that he would not use German knights or the sons of German knights to serve him in the land or at court, to abolish all privileges given to them and to make decisions only with the mature counsel.
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\textsuperscript{37} Mularczyk, “Książę legnicki Bolesław II Rogatka,”, 101–102.
\textsuperscript{38} Długosz, \textit{Annales seu Cronicae}, vol. 4, liber VII, 107.
\textsuperscript{39} Długosz, \textit{Annales seu Cronicae}, vol. 4, liber VIII, 248.

The image of a long, fierce, and ultimately successful struggle against Germans influencing Polish politics relates exclusively to the realm of knights and the ducal retinue. Other immigrants from German lands, if they are noted in ethnic categories and not just as “hospites” (guests), are described usually without negative overtones. Długosz presents an interesting example of this when he writes about Duke Leszek the Black (“Czarny”) of Sieradz, whose rule over the principal territory of Cracow (1279–1288) was contested by local nobles, aided by dukes from neighboring territories, against whom he leaned on the support of Hungarian troops and the Cracow burghers.\footnote{Paweł Żmudzki, \textit{Studium podzielonego królestwa–książę Leszek Czarny} [A study of the partitioned kingdom – prince Leszek the Black] (Warszawa: Neriton, 2000).} The “Annales” describe one of Leszek’s victories in 1285, emphasizing that the “German burghers of Cracow” had remained faithful to Leszek and defended the Cracow castle, whereas the nobles had defected to Duke Konrad of Mazovia.\footnote{Długosz, \textit{Annales seu Cronicae}, vol. 3, liber VII, 235.} In reward for their loyalty, Duke Leszek granted the townsmen the right to build a moat, a well, towers, and walls, and the right “that the unrestricted power over [these enforcements] should be held solely by the Germans, even though the knights cursed at that and protested severely [fearing] that in some [future] time the Germans might raise their head against him [i.e. the duke]. And eventually, from that time on Duke Leszek Czarny showed and expressed his sympathy for the German burghers of Cracow with such pleasure and kindness that he adopted their customs even with
his hairstyle and clothing." Długosz does not dwell on the admonition of the Polish nobles; in the context of that story the chronicler leaves no doubt that the duke’s problems were caused by the Polish knights and not by the German burghers. The burghers were Germans, but they did not try to influence the politics of the duke or push aside the Polish nobles, therefore the “Annales” could present them in a positive light.

With the restitution of the Polish kingdom at the turn of the fourteenth century, the narration changes again. While military conflicts, especially with Brandenburg or the Teutonic Order in Prussia, continued to be a major issue in Polish politics for a long time, the Germans living in Poland ceased to be perceived as a danger to the political order. In his narration of the fifteenth century, Długosz reverses the roles and depicts the Poles as role models for the Germans.

In his description of the civil war in Lithuania after the death of Grand Duke Vytautas in the 1430s, the chronicler offers an assessment of the military virtues of the Polish, Ruthenian, and German knights and soldiers engaged in this conflict. “Prince Zygmunt Korybut [...] time and again in numerous battles saw the superiority, bravery, and courage of the Polish troops and the faint-heartedness of the Ruthenians and Germans.”

In 1440, when Władysław, the elder son of king Władysław Jagiełło, at the age of only 16, after being King of Poland already for six years, was elected by the Hungarian estates to become King of Hungary as well, the “Annales” report the reactions to the young king: “it was with a very wonderful and unfamiliar power that not only the Hungarians but also the Germans cordially greeted King Władysław. For when they had not known and never seen him, a lot of them either dismissed him or treated him hatefully. But once they had beheld, when they perceived him as a youth in the prime of life, pleasant in conversation, in his generosity and his charming voice” they were convinced that he was the right person to rule the Hungarian kingdom.

After Władysław’s untimely death in the battle of Varna in 1444, his brother Kazimierz, the Grand Duke of Lithuania, had been the first choice for election to the Polish throne. Kazimierz, however, waited for several years before he accepted

---

the Polish crown in 1447. Fearing that the Jagiellon might not be willing to accept
the conditions necessary to become King of Poland, the Polish aristocracy, led by
the Archbishop of Gniezno and the Bishop of Cracow, began to look for other can-
didates. Długosz describes how the Archbishop of Gniezno opted for margrave
Frederic of Brandenburg as a candidate in 1446:

[...] for his reason, which in him was visible even when he was young of age, and which grew
in the course of time and filled up, as well as for his knowledge of the Polish language and
the proximity of possessions. He was followed by the bishop of Cracow [...] who cast the
second vote and explained, that nobody is likewise useful and likewise suitable to govern
the Kingdom of Poland, like the aforementioned margrave Frederic, because he is the most
reasonable among the German princes, he is restrained and humble, and he was raised in
the Kingdom of Poland.\textsuperscript{46}

In the end, Frederic of Brandenburg did not become King of Poland. The reason
why Długosz relates the story of his election in such detail is that it shows how
the relations between Poles and Germans changed. In the eleventh century, it
had been family ties to the German dynasty and the influence of the Germans at
the Polish court that endangered the young monarchy; in the twelfth century, the
chronicler points out that Zbigniew had been raised among Germans and Czechs,
which explains his bad character. In the thirteenth century, Germans in the
retinue of Polish dukes in various principalities had caused harm and were finally
expelled. After the reunification of the kingdom, the close ties between Polish
and German elites continued, but then, in the middle of the fifteenth century, it
was a German prince, raised in the Kingdom of Poland and versed in the Polish
language, who was thus deemed suitable to become king.

Długosz’ image of the Jews

There are very few references to Jews in Polish chronicles. Apart from short notes
in the Chronicles of Vincenty Kadłubek\textsuperscript{47} from the early thirteenth century, and
Maciej of Miechowa\textsuperscript{48} from the turn of the sixteenth century, only Jan Długosz
elaborates on the Jews as a topic. He draws a multi-layered picture of the Jews and
integrates them into the larger narrative. Jewish themes appear in various places

\textsuperscript{46} Długosz, \textit{Annales seu Cronicae}, vol. 10, liber XII, 30.
\textsuperscript{47} Marian Plezia (ed.), \textit{Magistri Vincentii dicti Kadłubek Chronica Polonorum} [The chronicle of
the Poles by Magister Vincentius called Kadłubek] (Kraków: Secesja, 1994) (Monumenta Poloni-
æ Historica, N.S. 11), Book 4, 133.
\textsuperscript{48} Matthias Miechovita, \textit{Chronica Polonorum} [Chronicle of the Poles] (Kraków: Krajowa Agencja
Wydawnicza, 1986; 1st print: Cracoviae, 1521), CCCXLI.
throughout his chronicle, and in different functions, making his account unique in Polish medieval chronistics.49

In the “Annales,” Długosz refers not only to things related to Jews in Poland, but also adds tales from Silesia, neighboring Bohemia and Germany, and in one case even Italy to his narration. The oldest references (to 989 and 993) associate Jews with the sale of Christian slaves in Prague. In the first passage he tells about St. Adalbert (in Polish: Wojciech, in Czech: Vojtěch), the Bishop of Prague, later martyr and patron saint of Poland; the chronicle criticizes those sins of the Bohemian elites which St. Adalbert tried to fight, such as polygamy, the practicing of pagan and blasphemous rites, and the sale of their own Christian subjects into slavery to Jews.50 Shortly afterwards Długosz takes up the issue of slavery again, when he refers to Adalbert’s return to Prague after his stay in Rome, his attempts to lead the people on the Christian path and his despair over the fruitlessness of his efforts. When Adalbert had been overwhelmed by exhaustion and despair, he heard a divine voice admonishing: “You sleep, and I am again sold to the Jews.”51 Afterward he went to market and redeemed all the Christian slaves there. In this episode Długosz establishes the link between the Jewish presence in history and divine intervention.

The next episodes concern the fourteenth century. First the chronicler draws the attention of his readers to the anti-Jewish pogroms in the times of the plague in 1348/1349. Persecuted by Christians, the Jews preferred to kill themselves and their relatives in order not to fall into the hands of the Christians. The chronicle qualifies however, that the persecutions did not end Jewish presence completely, as in some provinces and towns they had been pardoned because of greed (on the part of local authorities).52 Again, Długosz offers no direct criticism of the Jews. He does not blame the plague on them, yet he appears convinced that they should have become extinct were it not for the sins of Christian authorities.

Shortly after the report on the catastrophe of the Jews in central Europe, the “Annales” present a tale of Jewish origins in Poland by referring to the biblical motive of Esther. Długosz narrates the story of the unsuccessful marriage plans between king Kazimierz the Great and princess Adelheid of Hesse, and the romance between the king and Christine Rokyczana. In this context he introduces the story of the Jewess Esther and King Kazimierz: when Kazimierz had sent away Christine Rokyczana, because she had been bald and leprous, he took the Jewess Esther for her beauty and elegance as a mistress and had two sons with her. Through the

49 Borkowska, Treści ideowe w dziełach Jana Długosza, 17, 186.
52 Długosz, Annales seu Cronicae, vol. 5, liber IX, 252.
influence of Esther, Długosz continues, the king had granted some Jews in the kingdom excessive privileges and freedoms, which others (meaning: Christians) suspected to be forgeries, and which insulted and offended God’s majesty; their stench lingered up to the present day. One son from this relation died early of a natural death; the other, however, was struck dead by a peasant during a dispute over transportation duties during the reign of King Władysław Jagiełło. Especially atrocious yet had been the fact that the daughters born through the relationship with Esther had been allowed to take the Jewish faith.53

This episode provides a legend of origin to explain the Jewish presence in Poland and their position within the social order.54 It signals the high social status ascribed to the Jews and forms an analogy to the Ruthenian legend of origin, where Długosz introduces Rus’, not – like in the other chronicles – as brother, but nephew of Lech, the protoplast of the Poles.55 In early modern times the Esterke-story became popular also in Jewish chronicles; at the end of the sixteenth century it is retold in the chronicle of David Gans (Tsemah David, Prague 1595). In the Hebrew text, though, it becomes difficult to tell if Esther had been the mistress or the wife of the king.56

In the following episodes, leading up to the middle of the fifteenth century, Długosz changes his narrative strategy by inserting a series of small episodes in which divine intervention against the Jews becomes apparent. The first deals with a fire in the town of Wrocław in 1361. Długosz initially criticizes the Christian burghers – like in the story about the slave market in Prague – before the Jews are woven into the tale. During the fire, the burghers of Wrocław failed to extinguish the flames in time, so that almost the whole town burned down. After the fire, however, they all came to the conclusion that the fire had been a sign of God. They turned to attack the Jews, whose number within the town walls had been great, murdering some of them and expelling those who remained from the town.57

55 Długosz, Annales seu Cronicae, vol. 1, liber I, 89–90; See also Kłoczowski, “Polacy a cudzoziemcy w XV wieku,” 47.
The “Annales” report about an anti-Jewish riot in Prague during Holy Week of 1389.58 A contemporary chronicle from Germany describes the incident in the following way: A priest had been on his way to administer the sacraments to Christians not far from the Jewish street. A Jew had then “thrown a little pebble upon the monstrance,” which caused the riot. The chronicler adds a phrase denoting his distance from the story: “That is what the Christians said.”59 Długosz’ report lacks such doubts: Jews had shouted blasphemies and thrown a rock at the priest holding the monstrance. As punishment from the just God for this blasphemy, the riot against the Jews followed.60 There was no mention of the symbolic dimension of the throwing of a stone (or pebble), rather Długosz presents it as a corporal assault on the priest.

Ten years later, in 1399, the “Annales” tell about a miracle in Poznań originating in a case of desecration of the host. A woman had been given a host in the monastery, which she later took out of her mouth in order to sell it to the Jews. At the place where the host was later found, a miracle occurred prompting King Władysław Jagiello to fund a Carmelite monastery there.61 Like in the tale about the fire in Wrocław, Długosz works through associations. The story only tells about the intention of selling, and that the host was indeed later found. Later on, beginning in the seventeenth century, the motif reappears in anti-Jewish polemical literature up to the eighteenth century and acquires ever greater detail with each retelling.

Another eight years after the Poznań miracle, the chronicle provides a detailed account of the anti-Jewish riots and plundering in Cracow.62 Długosz situates the riots in the week after Easter and associates them with a legend of ritual murder. In contrast to other episodes, this story takes up a whole section in the


59 Arthur Wyss (ed.), Die Limburger Chronik des Tilemann Elhen von Wolfhagen, München: Monumenta Germaniae Historica 1993 [MGH Deutsche Chroniken, 4,1], 79. Tileman Elhen von Wolfhagen (ca. 1347–1402/06) was contemporary to the incident.

60 Długosz, Annales seu Cronicae, vol. 6, liber X, 178.


chronicle and is divided into several sub-episodes. In the beginning the chronicler provides a general characterization of the Jews, where he already introduces elements guiding the interpretation of the following incidents.

“The Jews in Cracow have become numerous and wealthy, through unworthy usury, so much that they have become haughty and provoked hatred, because they conducted without punishment certain crimes, and the secular authorities neglected to prevent it strictly. Thus, upon them came God’s punishment, which sometimes turns out more severe, for with its strictness it is meant to balance out the negligence of man, when out of minor cause, as it sometimes happens, the wrath of the people broke out.” Before the chronicler reveals this “minor cause,” he explains how the information about the alleged crime found its way to the public:

Magister Budek, a canon from Wiślica, had just ended his sermon and was about to leave the pulpit, when he paused and said that a sheet, which lay on the pulpit, contained a request and an admonition to tell the people about an incident, but he had willfully passed over this request, because a comparable warning had caused great disturbances in Prague. At the insistence of the masses, who were a little too eager to know the news, and at their pleading that he should not hesitate to tell what it was about, he went back to the pulpit, more inconsiderate than befits for a magister and preacher, and announced the unworthy request. The request contained the message that the Jews living in Cracow had the night before murdered a Christian child and had accomplished ungodly atrocities with the child’s blood, and they had thrown rocks at a priest who took the holy sacrament to a sick person.

It did not take long for the public to react: “After hearing that the whole people began, like having received a signal, a riot, and they started to take revenge vehemently and cruelly on the Jews. They plundered one Jewish street and killed many.” But the authorities reacted as well. The Starosta of Cracow and the king’s representative in Cracow intervened and ended the riot as well as the plundering.

Still there is more to report about this incident; Długosz continues:

As it already looked like everybody had returned to their homes; and the Jewish street was surrounded by guards, and the bells of the town hall tolled to call the councilors to assemble in order to punish the leaders of the riots and plundering, a voice from the people was

---

63 On the relation to the note on the Prague incident of 1389, see Hanna Zaremska, “Jan Długosz o tumulcie krakowskim w 1407 roku [Jan Długosz on the uproar in Cracow in 1407],” in Między polityką a kulturą [Between politics and culture], Cezary Kuklo (ed.) (Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1999), 160.
heard that the magistrate and the town authorities had called to plunder the Jews.65 When the people heard this, they ran together in great unanimity from all parts of the city and began anew with the plundering and murder of the Jews, and nobody dared to stand up against them. And once the unreasonable rage of the masses had started to murder and plunder, there was no way to stop it; In order to better end the uproar, fire was laid to Jewish houses – if it was done by a Christian or a Jew could not be determined.

The fire spread quickly, only the building of the university (which was situated in the Jewish quarter) could be saved by the efforts of the student youth.

Some Jews had fled to the tower of St. Anna’s church. They defended themselves till evening, but as fire was laid [to the church] they surrendered voluntarily [...] in the end a multitude of those who had been saved, let themselves be christened. Furthermore, all Jewish children, who were spared or saved from the flames by Christians, were born again in the Holy Well of the baptism. Tremendous riches that were found in Jewish homes were forfeited in the plundering. From this many Christians enriched themselves, and their wealth grew remarkably. As the uproar receded, in Jewish homes many treasures were found, buried in the sand or hidden in the sewers.

At the same time, the “Annales” reports similar incidents, not just in Cracow, but also in the Silesian towns of Nissa and Frankfurt as well as in Canterbury in England, where, likewise, “the Jews suffered by the just God’s permission the same judgement.”

In her recent analysis of Długosz’ account, the Polish historian Hanna Zaremska differentiates between two levels: the moralizing statement and the factual validity of the story.66 She touches only briefly on the narrative strategy and concentrates on the factual analysis of the account. Długosz appears to be well informed about the incident in Cracow in the early fifteenth century; most of the people identified by name in his story indeed were present in the city at that time. Problematic, however, is the core of the tale – the motif of alleged ritual murder, for which the contemporary court records offer no hint at all (in contrast to the plundering). Zaremska associates Długosz’ account with a note in the Collectarium of the Cistercian monastery of Mogila near Cracow, which said that in the same year Christians had killed a Jew because of a certain scholar, whom the Jews had killed on their holiday.67 She adds that Długosz himself had not believed in the story of ritual murder in Cracow, even though he thought the reports about the events in Trento 1475 (see below) trustworthy.68

65 Zaremska, “Jan Długosz o tumulcie,” 160 points out that the rioters might have expected a favorable attitude of the magistrate.
67 Zaremska, “Jan Długosz o tumulcie,” 163.
68 Zaremska, “Jan Długosz o tumulcie,” 160.
The “Annales” indeed deliver a suggestive story shifting the responsibility for the uproar from the plunderers to the Jews. It begins with the tale about Jewish wealth, haughtiness, and their protection by the authorities having provoked the hatred of the people. At the very beginning Długosz introduces the motif of God’s punishment against the Jews. In the same paragraph the first of a series of “severability clauses” appears, underlining the chronicler’s distance to his own report: the pogrom had occurred “out of minor cause, as it sometimes happens” – the (alleged) murder of a child as a “minor cause”?

The next lines tell the story how Magister Budek (a historically confirmed preacher) orchestrated the uproar of the congregation – announcing the note, refusing to read it, and finally giving in to the pressure. Długosz tries to describe the actions of the priest as comprehensible by referring to the violation of a priest in Prague in 1389, a story he relays earlier. On the other hand, he distances himself from Budek by claiming that the priest’s succumbing was “more inconsiderate than befits for a magister and preacher.” The uproar and the plundering happened “like having received a signal,” and the reaction of the authorities was indicated already in the beginning. When telling about the fire set to Jewish houses, Długosz again works through associations by claiming that it could not be determined if a Christian or a Jew had caused the fire. When the preacher of St. Anna’s church granted the Jews sanctuary, the rioters set fire even to the church – and the chronicler neither condemns this act of sacrilege nor does he attempt to relativize it, because the incident directly leads to the surrender of the Jews and the baptism of the saved. To emphasize the divine background of these incidents, Długosz refers to similar cases in other towns, where the Jews suffered the same just judgment of God.

The following accounts are even shorter than those above, little more than remarks inserted into the main narrative. But even these episodes from the middle of the fifteenth century serve to highlight God’s wrath against the Jews. During the year 1454 the chronicler notes the defeat of the Polish troops in the battle of Chojnice against the Teutonic Order. Again, he uses the scheme of criticizing the Christians first before he puts their misfortune into the context of the Divine by associating it with Jews. He states “many would believe that the defeats of the king and the Poles arose from injustice […], but essentially it was the Jewish privileges that drew God’s wrath unto king and people.” The year before King Kazimierz the Jagiellon had confirmed the Jewish privileges in the kingdom, right after the confirmation of the privileges of the nobles, who had waited for six years for this act after Kazimierz had been elected and crowned King of Poland. The Catholic clergy, especially Cardinal Zbigniew Oleśnicki, who Długosz served as

---

a secretary at that time, had protested sharply against the confirmation of the Jewish rights and used the defeat against the Teutonic Order to unite the opposition against the king. Kazimierz the Jagiellon was forced to revoke the Jewish privileges in 1454.70 When, in 1455, a fire broke out in Cracow near St. Thomas’ church, the chronicler ascribes this calamity to the Jewish privileges as well, even though they had already been revoked. He explains that Cracow Jews had stored valuables near St. Thomas church – again distancing himself in the same sentence by adding “as is believed by many.”71

Both episodes reflect Długosz’ close relation to Cardinal Oleśnicki and his pronounced opposition against both the king and the Jews. Thus, in the last accounts relation to Jews, situated after Oleśnicki’s death, show a change in the chronicler’s attitude,72 who is getting closer to the court and changes the way he portrays the Jews as well. His general opinion remains negative, but religious arguments become less pronounced.

For the year 1464 he relates how an army of crusaders on their way against the Ottoman Empire looted and plundered the Jewish quarter of Cracow, and emphasized that the bishop and vojevode were side by side in granting the Jews protection in the royal castle. Długosz adds that in other Polish towns Jews had been harmed or killed if they had not received sanctuary in castles of fortified places. He reports that the king imposed a fine on the town of Cracow for not defending the Jews, but he himself could not detect any wrongdoing by the magistrate.73 A link between Jews and Ottomans appears again in the year 1477, when the chronicle describes the war between the German emperor and the Ottoman Empire in Hungary. On this occasion Długosz accuses Jews of acting as spies for the Ottomans.74 Lastly, he delivers an account from the year 1475 of the trial about the alleged ritual murder in Trento.75 Citing the records of the prosecution, he could abandon the distancing clauses he had added in his account of 1407, thereby legitimizing his interpretation of the earlier incident retrospectively.

* *

72 Borkowska, Treści ideowe w dziełach Jana Długosza, 117 with additional literature.
73 Długosz, Annales seu Cronicae, vol. 11, liber XII, 80–81.
74 Długosz, Annales seu Cronicae, vol. 11, liber XII, 405.
75 Długosz, Annales seu Cronicae, vol. 11, liber XII, 368–369.
The article shows that images of the “other” in the “Annales” are far more than just representations of the chronicler’s opinions. Długosz combines various episodes to convey a message to his readers. The tales about Germans and Jews do not aim at understanding the “other,” but rather at explaining important issues of the “own.” “Strangers” matter to the chronicler only in so far as they are relevant for the message to his audience, therefore his phenomenology of strangers is not absolute (valid/important in itself), but responsive.

This responsivity is explained in the remarks “on the nature and customs of the Poles” in the first book of the “Annales,” where Długosz talks about ways of becoming “own” as a specific process of conversion. He praises the integration of converted Jews and Saracens in Spain, but from his remarks on Poland and Bohemia it becomes apparent that the “talent and virtuous habits” of foreigners should be treated accordingly – as evidence of their will to integrate into Polish society.

Długosz’ story about Germans – taken as a whole – is such a conversion story. In the first part, the chronicler describes in detail the strangeness and danger they present, the examples from Poland for added emphasis followed by analogous stories from Hungary. The second part paints a more differentiated picture – in the retinue of Polish princes, Germans continue to be associated with political crises, but the examples of Ziemomyśl of Kujawy and Leszek the Black of Cracow indicate a fundamental change. The expulsion of the Kujawyan duke symbolizes the end of the problematic presence of Germans in the centers of power; the defense of Leszek the Black by the burghers of Cracow shows them in a new, positive role. The third part completes the conversion story. Długosz elaborates on how the Poles are recognized as role models by Germans, culminating in the prospect of the margrave of Brandenburg as a candidate for the Polish throne – because he was raised among Poles and was familiar with their ways and customs.

Interestingly, the story about Jews is not about conversion. The chronicler mentions a case of Jews converting to Christianity in the context of the Cracow riots, but this is merely a marginal aspect of the whole tale. The story about the Jews is a story of entanglement, of continuous challenge. Długosz does not embrace this entanglement but contests it strongly. The single act of conversion mentioned in the context of the 1407 events depicts an ideal, but not the reality of Jewish-Christian relations. On the whole, Długosz’s account of these relations is far more critical and less one-sided than in the case of the Germans.

There is no evolution in the story about Jews – they present a looming danger to Christian/Polish society from the very beginning to the last pages of the chronicle. Christian behavior towards Jews is criticized frequently as well – not just the indulgence of the kings, but also the greed of the rioters or the inappropriate proceeding of the preacher in Cracow.
Długosz uses this story to underline the importance of divine intervention. Already in the first episode, God himself interferes and urges St. Adalbert to save Christians from slavery under Jews. The next episodes have to be interpreted in pairs. The chronicle relates the persecution of Jews in other countries in the middle of the fourteenth century before giving a detailed account of Esterke’s romance with King Kazimierz, which functions as a legend of origin for the Jewish position in Polish society. The incidents of Prague in 1389, and Cracow in 1407, illustrate how much Jewish presence influenced every-day life; the riots are interpreted as signs of “divine justice.” In the middle of the fifteenth century, the chronicle directs the readers’ attention to the role of Jews in political life, and again emphasizes divine intervention in punishing the king and nobility (defeat against the Teutonic Order in 1454) as well as the Jews (fire in the Jewish quarter in Cracow in 1455). In the last book, Długosz relates how the bishop and vojevode saved Jews from plundering crusaders in 1464, and contrasts this with suspicions about Jewish espionage for the Ottoman Empire in 1477. Both episodes receive merely brief mentions, but they convey an important message: the Christian authorities acted virtuously and saved the Jews from harm; on the other hand, the Jews would not become part of Polish society but remain a foreign and dangerous element.

Both stories cannot be read as accounts of Długosz’ perception of either Germans or Jews, but as skillfully constructed tales offering distinct messages concerning ideals and realities of Polish society in the Middle Ages.