



Sławomir Zonenberg. *Stosunki krzyżacko-mendykankie w Prusach do 1466 roku* [Relations between the Teutonic Order and Mendicant Orders in Prussia until 1466]. Bydgoszcz: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Kazimierza Wielkiego, 2018. 424 pp. ISBN: 978-83-8018-186-1.

The reviewed volume provides a summary and expands the author's earlier studies, some of which have already been published in the form of articles in journals and edited volumes; this refers particularly to studies focusing on the relations between the Teutonic Order and the Franciscans and Dominicans in Prussia until 1466.¹ It is worth noting that the volume under review was published exactly 100 years after the PhD thesis of Werner Roth which dealt with Franciscan and Dominican activities in Teutonic-Order Prussia until 1466;² thus, it seems natural to consider what new material it may provide with regard to the relations between the Teutonic Order and the mendicants in Prussia. In answering this question, one has to note that Zonenberg had access to sources that were unknown to W. Roth and to results of numerous, detailed studies conducted over the last 100 years. He also addresses the broader question of the Teutonic Order's contacts with the mendicants in Prussia, that is also with the Carmelites and Augustinian hermits. Including these two orders is particularly justified, because it allows to identify similarities and differences in the Teutonic Order's attitudes toward individual mendicant orders active in the area. In this context, some objections can be raised toward the adopted chronological framework, particularly with regard to ending the analysis in the year 1466. The explanation provided for this is similar to the one offered in Roth's work, namely, the change of the borders ratified in the Second Peace of Thorn

¹ Sławomir Zonenberg, "Stosunki dominikańsko-krzyżackie w Prusach do 1466 roku," in *Klasztor dominikański w Toruniu w 750. rocznicę fundacji*, ed. Piotr Oliński, Waldemar Rozyński, and Juliusz Rączkowski (Toruń: Wydawnictwo Naukowe UMK, 2013), 43–77; Sławomir Zonenberg, "Die Beziehungen zwischen dem Deutschen Orden und den Franziskanern in Preußen bis zum Jahre 1466," in *Leben zwischen und mit den Kulturen. Studien zu Recht, Bildung und Herrschaft in Mitteleuropa*, ed. Renata Skowrońska and Helmut Flechenecker, Studienreihe der polnischen historischen Mission 2 (Toruń: Wydawnictwo Naukowe UMK, 2015), 69–113; Sławomir Zonenberg, "Stosunki zakonu krzyżackiego z franciszkanami kustodii pruskiej do 1466 roku. Część I: do końca XIII wieku," *Sensus Historiae* 24/3 (2016): 93–109; Sławomir Zonenberg, "Stosunki zakonu krzyżackiego z franciszkanami kustodii pruskiej do 1466 roku. Część II: XIV–XV wiek," *Sensus Historiae*, 25/4 (2016): 9–26.

² Werner Roth, *Die Dominikaner und Franziskaner im Deutsch-Ordensland Preußen bis zum Jahre 1466* (Königsberg: Drewes Buchdruckerei, 1918).

(Toruń), as a result of which most of the Prussian mendicant friaries came under Polish rule as part of Royal Prussia. A number of important arguments, however, favor considering the entire period when the Teutonic Order had close relations with the mendicants in this area, that is until 1525. First, the smaller Teutonic-Order State in Prussia still included mendicant friaries: Dominican, Franciscan, and Augustinian hermits. Second, there were still new foundations of Franciscan Observants in the region after 1466, and a Carmelite friary functioned temporarily in Riesenburg (Prabuty). Third, there were still spheres that involved contact between the Teutonic Order and the mendicant friaries in Royal Prussia, particularly when it came to the collection of alms (Dominicans from Elbing (Elbląg)) and the Teutonic Order's initiatives pertaining to the mendicants in Royal Prussia (such as the Teutonic Order's plans to establish a Franciscan Observant friary in Elbing).

The volume is comprised of an introduction (pp. 11–21), four chapters (pp. 23–320), and a conclusion (pp. 321–327). It also includes a list of cited sources and studies (pp. 329–374), an index of persons (pp. 375–410) and geographical place names (pp. 411–420), as well as a short summary in English (pp. 421–424). Individual chapters focus on the Teutonic Order's relations with the Dominicans (pp. 23–197), the Franciscans (pp. 199–276), the Augustinian hermits (pp. 277–300), and the Carmelites (pp. 301–320). Each chapter ends with a summary which outlines the main conclusions resulting from the discussed facts. The chapters' varying length results primarily from the state of preservation of the sources and does not necessarily reflect the nature of the relations between the Teutonic Knights and individual mendicant orders. For example, the text dealing with the Dominicans is more than two times longer than the one concerning the Franciscans, while the chapter focusing on the Carmelites only partially refers to the relations with the Teutonic Knights and also presents the general conditions of the functioning of the Carmelite friary in the Young Town Danzig (Gdańsk, Germ. Jungstadt Danzig). Presenting the relations between the Teutonic Order and individual mendicant orders in a chronological order is the simplest solution, but it comes with serious disadvantages. As a result, a number of detailed questions which are related to various aspects of Teutonic Order-mendicant relations are not addressed in a comprehensive way. Above all, the study lacks consistently made comparisons, as individual comparative remarks appear only as side notes to the chronological presentation of the events. Issues such as the Teutonic Order's attitudes toward foundations of mendicant friaries, personal and institutional relations of individual brother knights with mendicant friaries, mutual relations in the spheres of religion (including liturgy), or the role of the Teutonic Order as an arbiter in conflicts between the mendicants and civic authorities are all referred to in various parts of the study. Since it is arranged in chronological order, the

analysis frequently returns to these problems without referring to relevant data presented earlier. The study, therefore, does not attempt to provide a comprehensive analysis of specific issues that would cut across the chronological presentation of data. This is a serious omission and, as a result, many facts are presented without relating them to other, similar processes, which makes it difficult to draw deeper, more comprehensive conclusions. Instead, the author could have drawn from the example of the structural solutions used in the already mentioned study by W. Roth which could have been adapted to the broadened thematic framework of his new research and to the needs of a chronology-based argument. Consequently, the reader might get the impression of a certain degree of chaos, for example with regard to the following sequence of issues: the foundation of the Franciscan friary in Thorn (Toruń) (pp. 202–208), Franciscans serving as bishops (p. 209), relations between the Franciscans and the Teutonic Order as well as their role as witness in important documents relating to the Teutonic Order (pp. 210–212), the foundation of the Franciscan friary in Kulm (Chełmno) (pp. 213–214), changes in the attribution of the friaries in Thorn and Kulm to Franciscan provinces (pp. 215–216), once again about Franciscans serving as witnesses in the Teutonic Order's documents (pp. 220–221), the foundation of the Franciscan friary in Braunsberg (Braniewo) (p. 224), the general assessment of Franciscan attitudes toward the Teutonic Order in the first half of the 14th century (p. 236), the Franciscan foundation in Wehlau (Znamensk) (p. 242), the new foundation charter of the town of Neuenburg (Nowe) on the Vistula River (p. 245), and finally about the foundation of the Franciscan friary in Wartenburg (Barczewo) (p. 245). Sadly, this also applies also to other chapters of the study.

It seems that, at least in the context of the 13th century, it would be better to approach the problem of Teutonic Order-mendicant relations more broadly, including not just Prussia but also Livonia. This has been done, for example, by Anti Selart whose article, unfortunately not cited in the reviewed volume, focuses on mendicant activity in the entire Baltic sphere during the time of archbishop Albert Suerbeer.³ It ought to be emphasized that the presentation of the Teutonic Order's contacts with the Dominicans and Franciscans in Prussia in the 13th century, presented in this study on the basis of the cited sources and literature, results

³ Anti Selart, "Die Bettelmönche im Ostseeraum zur Zeit des Erzbischofs Albert Suerbeer von Riga (Mitte des 13. Jahrhunderts)," *Zeitschrift für Ostmitteleuropa-Forschung* 56 (2007): 475–499.

in fact from the skilful summarizing of the conclusions of earlier, detailed studies by other authors, notably Jan Powierski⁴ and Marian Dygo.⁵

It is also noteworthy that, throughout the book, the literature of the subject is cited and used in a very accurate and careful way. This is less so, however, with regard to the manuscript sources that are not noted in available publications. Careful research in the old archives of the Teutonic Order, currently held in the Geheimes Staatsarchiv Preußischer Kulturbesitz in Berlin, would have shed additional light on important issues. For example, the cartulary Ordensfoliant no. 16 preserves a notary act that describes in detail the negotiations regarding the Franciscans' right to preach indulgences and collect alms in Prussia. One party in these deliberations was represented by a member of the Teutonic Order, Andreas Ruperti, who, at the time, was serving as a rector of the church of St. Mary in the Main Town Danzig (Gdańsk, Germ. Rechtstadt Danzig). The negotiations took place on 4 April 1446, in Marienburg (Malbork) and were connected with setting the conditions of publicizing the indulgence document issued by Pope Eugene IV with the intention of providing assistance to the defense of the island of Rhodes against the Turks. The Franciscans were represented by a custodian from Danzig (Gdańsk) whose name is not provided (though, most likely, it was Johannes Zevelt), as well as by the previous custodian, Jacob Orlob, who was *lector principalis* in the convent in Thorn (Toruń).⁶ The whole case involved allegations that Andreas Ruperti was obstructing the preaching of the papal indulgence in Danzig. In order to solve this, the papal nuncio, the Franciscan (Observant) Antonio de Troya, arrived in the city as early as 12 August 1445.⁷ The results of these negotiations were presented to him by Johannes Zevelt in a letter dated 8 April 1446. In the letter, Johannes explains that he had traveled to Marienburg (Malbork) at the request of the Teuton-

⁴ See, for example, Jan Powierski, "Świętopełk gdański i Kazimierz kujawsko-łęczycki w rywalizacji z zakonem krzyżackim o ziemie bałtyjskie w latach 1250 – połowa 1252," *Rocznik Gdański* 41/1 (1981): 37–88; Jan Powierski, "O początkach miasta Chełmży i kapituły chełmińskiej (chełmżyńskiej)," in *Ojczyzna bliższa i dalsza. Studia historyczne ofiarowane Feliksowi Kirykowi w sześćdziesiątą rocznicę urodzin*, ed. Jacek Chrobaczyński, Andrzej Jureczko, and Michał Śliwa (Kraków: Wydawnictwo Secesja, 1993), 101–123.

⁵ Marian Dygo, *Studia nad początkami władztwa Zakonu Niemieckiego w Prusach (1226–1259)* (Warszawa: Uniwersytet Warszawski, 1992).

⁶ Berlin, Geheimes Staatsarchiv Preußischer Kulturbesitz, XX. Hauptabteilung [further cited as: GStA PK, XX. HA], Ordensfoliant no. 16, pp. 1073–1077.

⁷ Antonio de Troya became papal nuncio for the Danish and Saxon provinces of the Franciscan order in 1444. Pope Eugene IV made him responsible for the preaching of the indulgence and collecting donations for the holy war against the Turks. For details, see Dominicus de Gubernatis, *Orbis seraphicus: historia de tribus ordinibus a seraphico patriarcha Sancto Francisco institutis* (Anissonios: [s.n.], 1685), 248.

ic Order's Grand Master Konrad von Erlichshausen who had asked him whether Andreas Ruperti was obstructing the preaching of the indulgence and was hostile toward Antonio. To these questions, we are told, Johannes said "no."⁸ In 1447, in turn, there was a conflict between the Teutonic Order's clergy from Danzig (Gdańsk) and its surroundings and both local Franciscans and Dominicans. The friars' activities were met with resistance, and mutual allegations were raised in sermons preached during Lent. This situation was harmful to everyone involved, so, on June 7, 1447, the grand master intervened to put an end to it by sending a letter to the Provincial of the Dominicans in Poland.⁹

A number of other issues should also have been addressed more broadly. This includes, among others, the context of the foundation of the Franciscan friary in Danzig and the role which the Teutonic Order sought to play in this process (pp. 251–256). Such an analysis would have been possible by using the published correspondence from the Teutonic Order's official in Rome (the *Generalprokurator*) to the Order's grand master. Interesting information regarding the efforts to establish the new friary are also provided by sources other than the discussed supplication of the Teutonic Order's Grand Master Michael Kuchmeister (1414–1422), submitted to Pope Martin V before October 1419 (p. 252).¹⁰ Valuable information can also be found in the correspondence of the Teutonic Order's official in Rome, Johann Tiergart.¹¹ His letter to Michael Kuchmeister, sent from Florence on 2 December 1419, mentions the talks which he had with the representative of the Franciscan Order who, as we are told, had already obtained the relevant papal bull. He also recalls his negotiations with regard to obtaining the building plot and setting the relations between the Franciscans and the rector of the church of St. Mary in the Main Town Danzig (this position was held, at the time, by Andreas von Slommow who was a member of the Teutonic Order).¹² The description provided by Tiergart indicates that the foundation of the Franciscan friary was set against the background of a complex diplomatic play. The Teutonic Order was trying to block the issuing of the papal bull that would confirm the new Franciscan foundation because it had been prepared without the Order's involvement and consulta-

⁸ GStA PK, XX. HA, Ordensbriefarchiv no. 9072; H. Niedermeier, "Die Franziskaner in Preussen, Livland und Litauen im Mittelalter," *Zeitschrift für Ostforschung* 27, H. 1 (1978): 16.

⁹ GStA PK, XX. HA, Ordensfoliant no. 16, pp. 1188–1189.

¹⁰ Urkundenbuch des alten sächsischen Franziskanerprovinzen, Tl. II. Die Kustodie Preussen, ed. Leonhard Lemmens, (Düsseldorf: L. Schwann, 1913), 118 no. 441.

¹¹ *Die Berichte der Generalprokuratoren des Deutschen Ordens an der Kurie*, Bd. III, Johann Tiergart, Th. 1 (1419–1423), ed. Hans Koeppen (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966), 70–72 no. 9.

¹² *Die Berichte der Generalprokuratoren*, III.1, ed. Koeppen, 70.

tion. The Teutonic Order's official negotiated with the Franciscan representative and tried to persuade him to closely cooperate with the Teutonic Order. During the talks, Tiergart found out that the Franciscans had already submitted a supplication, asking the pope to grant a permission to build a friary in the proximity of Danzig (Gdańsk) (*ein convent zu buwen by Danczke*) and to grant the faithful visiting the new Franciscan church in the diocese of Włocławek the same indulgence as the one granted to the Portiuncula chapel in Assisi. However, this latter request was not fulfilled. The Franciscan representative showed Tiergart the supplication submitted to the pope and was also going to present to him the agreed project of the papal bull. In the end, however, he did not do so. As a result, the Teutonic Order's official (*Generalprokurator*) ordered the arrest of the Franciscan so that he would not be able to take the bull to Prussia. At this point, the higher hierarchy of the Franciscan Order intervened with the help of one of their officials who appealed to cardinals Jordan Orsini, Pierre de Foix, and Juan Martini de Murillo who were traditional supporters of the Franciscans (the cardinal protectors of the Franciscans). On the next day, Cardinal Orsini summoned Johann Tiergart to discuss this matter. He presented himself as both a friend of the Teutonic Order and as a protector of the Franciscans, and he advised Johann to release the Franciscan representative and to allow him to take the papal bull to Prussia. This is indeed what happened soon afterwards.¹³ The entire situation, therefore, involved not just a conflict of colliding spheres of competence, but also prestige, since the Teutonic Order wanted to present itself as the founder of the new friary. These attempts, however, were blocked by the Franciscans who quickly obtained the papal bull on their own. As a result, when the pope informed the Franciscan minister general about granting the permission to build the new friary he did not mention the Teutonic Order as having any role in these actions.¹⁴ This omission most likely resulted from deliberate actions of the Franciscan representative and thus caused hostility from the Teutonic Order's official, Johann Tiergart, who tried to stop the papal bull from getting to Prussia and explained his failure to do so in a letter to the grand master.

Zoneberg also mentions the plans to establish a second Carmelite friary in Prussia and notes the role played in this context by the archbishop of Cologne, Dietrich II of Mörs (p. 308). However, it ought to be noted that these plans might also have been inspired by the Provincial of the Carmelites in England, the philosopher and theologian Thomas Netter of Walden, who was involved in negotia-

¹³ Die Berichte der Generalprokuratoren, III.1, ed. Koeppen, 71–72 no. 9.

¹⁴ This document was published by Paul Simson, *Geschichte der Stadt Danzig*, Bd. IV, *Urkunden bis 1626* (Danzig: A.W. Kafemann, 1918), 88 no. 125.

tions between Poland and the Teutonic Order in 1419.¹⁵ Another objectionable detail is that it seems unlikely that the Dominican friary in Dirschau (Tczew) had no less than one “Lan” (German: Lahn or Hufe) of land, that is around 16.8 hectare (p. 121). The document that the author cites in this regard indicates merely that the area of the friary was counted among the total number of the city’s “Lans.”¹⁶ Also, contrary to the author’s opinion, it seems unlikely that the Teutonic Order could remove mendicant orders from its domains if they did not comply with the Teutonic Order’s expectations (p. 30). Similarly, there is no evidence in the sources supporting the author’s assertion that the Teutonic Order influenced the decision to establish the Franciscan friary in Braunsberg (Braniewo) which was founded by the bishops of Ermland (p. 224), especially since there is also no evidence for such an influence in the context of other foundations by bishops in Ermland, namely, the Franciscan friary in Wartenburg (Barczewo) (pp. 245–246) and the friary of Augustinian hermits in Rößel (Reszel) (pp. 278–279).

In Zonenberg’s volume, sources dealing with the relations between the Teutonic Order and individual mendicant orders are cited by the author and arranged chronologically, which naturally brings certain advantages. As has been noted, this structure leaves little space for deep analysis and searching for new conclusions. After reading the volume, one is left with a number of questions which are not posed in it. Among the most important ones is the question concerning the direct relations between the Teutonic Order and the highest officials of individual mendicant orders, including superior generals and minister generals, as well as provincial superiors and provincial ministers. Cited documents indicate that such relations were often important tools of mediation during conflicts between the Teutonic Order and individual friaries in Prussia. Were there two different levels of contact with the mendicants: “local,” with individual friaries in various cities, and “institutional,” with entire mendicant orders? Further research would also be needed to investigate to what extent the Teutonic Order’s policy of founding friaries in Prussia was influenced by the Order’s earlier experiences of contacts with mendicants in the Holy Roman Empire? Was the Teutonic Order the principal initiator of monastic foundations, particularly with regard to friaries of the Carmelites and Augustinian hermits, or, rather, did it merely accept and support the endeavors initiated by these orders themselves? Much needed is also a comparative study analyzing the relations of the Teutonic Order with mendicants in Prussia and Livonia.

¹⁵ For Thomas’s correspondence, including letters dealing with his contacts with the Teutonic Order, see *Monumenta Historica Carmelitana*, ed. Benedictus Zimmerman (Lirinae, 1905–1907), 442–482.

¹⁶ *Preußisches Urkundenbuch*, Bd. VI, Lief. 1, 1362–1366, ed. Klaus Conrad (Marburg: Elwert Verlag, 1986), 152 no. 272.

Was the Order's policy toward the mendicants in these two regions coordinated, particularly in the context of the Franciscans whose friaries in Prussia and Livonia formed part the same Franciscan province of Saxony? One has to agree with the author that the Teutonic Order exerted its influence over the development of the network of mendicant friaries in Prussia and over their location within individual cities (p. 324). This analysis concurs with Roth's earlier statement that the Dominicans had complicated relations with the Teutonic Order whose relations with the Franciscan friaries were, in turn, particularly close (pp. 197, 275, 324, 326). One of the reasons for this was that Dominican friaries in Prussia formed part of the province of Poland and had personal contacts with friaries in the kingdom of Poland. It seems that the author overestimates the importance of the issues of ethnicity as well as language and cultural spheres which, after all, were very similar for all the mendicant friaries, including those of the Dominicans (pp. 275, 300, 320).

The author's good use of most of the important literature of the subject has already been noted. However, it is the reviewer's duty to list some of the works that were omitted. Sadly, the volume does not make use of some studies that would shed light and contribute to the discussion concerning many of the issues addressed by the author. Above all, the analysis does not refer to the extensive study of Paul Reh,¹⁷ which focuses on the relations between the Teutonic Order and Prussian bishops in the 13th century, including those who had Dominican or Franciscan backgrounds. As for more recent works, no reference is made to the already mentioned article by Anti Selart. Zonenberg's work would also have benefited from referring to the study by Grzegorz Białuński, which focuses on the relations between the Teutonic Order and the Augustinian hermits in Rößel (Reszel).¹⁸ It should also be noted that the role of the cardinal protector of the Dominican Order, Branda de Castiglione, in reforming the friary in Danzig (Gdańsk), has already been discussed in a study dealing with reforms of the mendicant friaries in Royal Prussia;¹⁹ the study in question provides an edited version of a document which is mentioned in the reviewed volume in a very general way.

Zonenberg's volume is well written and well edited. Among the few errors, there is an inaccurate reference to the study by Venancio Diego Carro who is listed

¹⁷ Paul Reh, "Das Verhältnis des deutschen Ordens zu den preußischen Bischöfen im 13. Jahrhundert," *Zeitschrift des Westpreußischen Geschichtsvereins* 35 (1896): 37–151.

¹⁸ Grzegorz Białuński, "Dobra za granicą. O pozawarmińskich posiadłościach ziemskich klasztoru w Reszlu w XIV–XVI wieku," *Komunikaty Mazursko-Warmińskie* 2/252 (2006): 209–217.

¹⁹ Rafał Kubicki, "Próby reformy konwentu gdańskiego dominikanów na tle reformy innych klasztorów mendykanczkich Prus Królewskich w XV w.," in *Ecclesia semper reformanda. Kryzysy i reformy średniowiecznego Kościoła*, ed. Tomasz Gałuszka, Tomasz Graff, and Grzegorz Ryś (Kraków: Societas Vistulana, 2013), 515–534.

as two separate individuals in the bibliography (pp. 69, 340). The book is also very presentable, though it would be better if the volume's cover were more durable.

Overall, it is the main value of this volume that it collects and orderly arranges the results of current research regarding the functioning of the mendicant orders in Prussia; particularly in the context of their relations with the Teutonic Order. In a way, therefore, it documents the progress achieved in studying this subject since the publication of the already mentioned PhD thesis by W. Roth. The obtained results demonstrate the need to conduct further, comprehensive studies which would provide a broader perspective; particularly by comparing the situation in Prussia and Livonia, and by considering the contacts between the Teutonic Order and the mendicants in the Holy Roman Empire in the light of their possible impact on the situation in Prussia.

*Rafał Kubicki (Gdańsk)**

* ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2171-5713>