

MATEUSZ GOLIŃSKI

WHAT HAPPENED IN 1355 IN ŚWIDNICA DUCHY? (IN RESPECT OF THE OWNERSHIP AND FUNCTION OF CASTLES¹)

An interesting mention about the chain of events which are said to have happened in 1355 can be found in a recently discovered and published medieval annal of Świdnica². The quest for the unknown source of the annalist's information resulted in rediscovering a note containing very similar information in a fourteenth-century codex coming from the town hall of Świdnica³. The note had been used by nineteenth-century historiography and then forgotten. Using paleographic arguments, one can assume that both the mentions are contemporaneous. This is why they can be considered equally valuable and their contents can be collated:

the mention found in the annal	the separate note
<i>Anno Domini</i> <i>M^o[CCC]LV^o dux</i> <i>Bulko optinuit castrum</i> <i>Scheczczeler, cuius possessor</i> <i>erat dominus Albertus</i> <i>Crenewicz.</i>	<i>Anno domini M^oC</i> <i>CC^oLV^o dux Bolco</i> <i>Swyd[nicensis]</i> <i>obtinuit castrum</i> <i>Scheczler cui dominus</i> <i>Alb[ertus] de Crenwicz</i> <i>possessor eiusdem castri</i> <i>presentavit.</i>
<i>Anno eodem idem dux</i> <i>Bolko subiugavit sibi</i> <i>castrum Fürstinberg</i> <i>ammonendo dominum</i> <i>Kekelonem de Czirnaw.</i>	<i>Anno eodem idem dominus</i> <i>Bolco subiugavit sibi</i> <i>castrum Fürstinb[erg]</i> <i>ammouendo dominum</i> <i>Kekelonem de Cyrlen eius</i> <i>possessorem.</i>
<i>Item eodem anno obsedit</i> <i>omnia castra in terra</i>	<i>Item eodem anno ut supra</i> <i>subdidit sibi omnia castra</i>

¹ The present paper contains only the basic theses of a forthcoming broader work with the same title.

² W. M r o z o w i c z, *Annotatio rerum notabilium. Średniowieczny rocznik świdnicki*, "Roczniki Historyczne", R. LXV (1999), pp. 99-100, no. 13.

³ State Archives in Wrocław, Acts of the Town of Świdnica, 737, p. 1.

Sweidniczensi sibi
resistencia, videlicet
Cunatswalde, Sworczin
Walde, Czeisberg.
Item extra terram
Frawdberg
castrum obsedit et
obtinuit etc.

terre Swyd[nicensis] sibi
resi[stencia], videlicet
Cunradiswalde,
Swarcinwalde, Ceysikperg.
Item extra terram
Vrewdinb[erg].

This is the only source material referring to the events in question, but from the point of view of a castle researcher, its informative value cannot be overestimated. What is more, no other equally useful material can be found in the annals of Silesia. Both the notes refer to the events, which took place in the year 1355. Bolko II, Duke of Silesia, took some steps regarding six castles and his actions were described using a number of different terms. Firstly, the duke *obtinuit* – "obtained" Schatzlar Castle, which was *presentavit* – "given away" to him by its owner, Albert of *Crenewich*. The author of the second note, who later on changed his mind about this incident, claimed that the duke *expungavit* – "seized" the castle. This conclusion might have resulted from his absent-mindedness. He could have mechanically associated the account with the events described below. Secondly, Bolko *subiugavit sibi* – "subjugated" Fürstenberg Castle *ammouendo* – by "removing" or dismissing its owner, Kekelo of *Czirraw*. Thirdly, he *obsedit* – "lay siege to" (or seized) all the castles in Świdnica district which resisted his onslaught (*sibi resistencia*): Konradswalde Castle, Schwarzwalde Castle and the Castle of Zeisberg. The author of the second note does not describe the duke's methods (the sieges), but focuses on the outcome of his actions saying that Bolko *subdidit* – "took" or "conquered" the above castles. Fourthly, outside Świdnica district,

the duke managed to *obsedit et obtinuit* – lay siege to and seize (that is to say, *subdidit*) Freudenberg Castle. The first mention ends with “etc”, which means that Bolko took some other steps as well. We do not know, however, whether his further actions were directed at Freudenberg Castle or at other fortresses.

Schatzlar Castle and the town of Schatzlar, whose name entered the Czech language and started to be spelled as Žaclěř, are situated in North-Eastern Bohemia, near the border, between Trutnov and Polish Lubawka. Fürstenberg is either present-day Książ (Fürsteinstein) or possibly nearby Stary Książ. Both the castles lie between Świebodzice and Szczawienko. Konradswalde is the castle at Konradów, in the vicinity of the village of Grzędy, Czarny Bór commune. Schwartzwalde is the castle situated near the village of Czarny Bór, and Zeisberg or Zeiskberg is Cisy Castle near Cisów, a little hamlet in the vicinity of the village of Cieszów, Stare Bogaczowice commune. Finally, Freudenberg, *alias* Freudenburg is Radosno Castle standing in the vicinity of the village of Sokołowsko, near Mieroszów. All the above castles are situated in present-day Poland and not far from each other. The two extreme structures lie at a distance of 21 km from each other in a straight line. They were erected on the Plateau and in the Wałbrzych and Kamienne Mountains, surrounding the city of Wałbrzych on three sides, North, South and West. Czech Žaclěř is situated to the Southwest of the region and remains outside this system. However, the castle stands between 18 and 33 km away from the other castles and this is why the duke’s “geographical reasons” for attacking it could have been the same as in the case of the other fortresses. Undoubtedly, the above-mentioned concentration of defensive structures suggests the existence of such arguments. It should only be noted that the territory in question could not compare to the vastness of Duke Bolko II’s domain.

The publisher of the annal offered the simplest solution to this problem quoted above. He suggested that the events described in the annal were linked with the attempts to establish a border between Bohemia and the lands belonging to Bolko II. The assumption that the seizure of Žaclěř and Radosno castles, dated at 1359, was connected with delineating the frontier seems to be well

established in contemporary Silesian historiography. Of course there is no reason to refute this hypothesis without consideration. However, having at one’s disposal the two notes, particularly the first one, one cannot ignore the fact that Bolko’s forces laid siege to Radosno, lying on the borderland, as well as to at least three other castles situated in the vicinity but within Bolko’s territory and some distance from the border. The pre-supposed settlement of the frontier would have involved the use of force and the campaign would have been simultaneous with the pacification of the duke’s own lands: regaining the fortresses situated between the border and the central part of the duchy. Ancient Silesian researchers offered different interpretations of the second mention. Gustav Adolf Stenzel discovered the note before the year 1832 and made a copy of it for local historians. August Zemplin, the chronicler of Książ, was one of them. According to him, Bolko II tried to suppress local gentry-robbers living at their own or the duke’s castles. What is more Zemplin was of the opinion that these events could be linked with the information that in 1347, Świdnica and the other towns of Świdnica district were given the right to collect special taxes to cover the costs of catching incendiaries⁴. Stenzel himself supported this assumption⁵.

Kerber, a librarian at Książ, did not agree with Zemplin’s opinion. He thought that Bolko’s predecessor, his father Bernard, failed to maintain his authority over the knights, who were becoming more and more powerful. He could not prevent burgraves, interested in their own business and not their sovereign’s affairs, from taking over castles. His energetic successor, Bolko II assisted by the towns, set about regaining his ducal rights in 1347⁶. The author of this opinion did not bother about chronology. As all the misfortunes happened during the reign of Bernard, why should Bolko, who ascended the throne as early as 1326, take such steps only after so many years? Furthermore, if the events were only the last stage

⁴ A. Z e m p l i n, *Fürstenstein in der Vergangenheit und Gegenwart*, 2. Aufl., Breslau 1843, pp. 12-13.

⁵ G. A. S t e n z e l, *Geschichte Schlesiens*, Th. 1, Breslau 1853, p. 273.

⁶ P. K e r b e r, *Geschichte des Schlosses und der Freien Standesherrschaft Fürstenstein in Schlesien*, Breslau 1885, p. 3.

in the duke's long and heroic struggle against his opponents, why was the situation never chronicled or mentioned in any other source except the note about the introduction of the special tax? And finally, why did the bad burgraves live at castles situated in only one, quite small area? Such questions were never asked in the works blaming the bad burgraves for conducting constant wars against the towns and for spreading chaos in the country. Kerber attempted to give the reason why Radosno Castle, which belonged to Bohemia at that time, appeared on this list of castles. He says in one place that Bolko decided to stop the mutinous behaviour, which had been spreading in the lands controlled by his own and the Czech burgraves living near the border. In 1355, he seized all the castles whose owners rebelled against his territorial sovereignty and "expelled the incendiaries from their hiding places." Not only did he seize his own castles, he also took Žacléř Castle and Radosno Castle lying in Bohemia. Then he handed the fortresses over to new lords. Bolko's shocking expedition into the neighbouring kingdom could be justified by the duke's friendly relations with Charles IV, which went back to 1353, when the issue of succession to the throne in the duchy was settled in favour of the Czech monarchy. In addition, the expedition was to restore order and was carried out in the name of the Crown. Thus the monarchy was supposed to be grateful for Bolko's help and assistance⁷. The above solution seems to be very important for at least two reasons. Firstly, it allows a researcher to examine the events of 1355 without taking into consideration their future political situation (they were to become part of Bolko's domain). Therefore, this assumption seems to contrast with the hypothesis suggesting that these events were connected with delineating the frontier about 1359. In addition, the armed intervention in Bohemia cannot have been a result of Bolko's attempt to enforce his ducal rights on his own territory. A careful reader must have come to the conclusion that the duke's campaign and the armed conflict spreading on both sides of the border had a more universal explanation. The historians who could not think of a possible explanation used to say

that a number of castles had to be seized in order to suppress the rebellious knights who owned them.

Thus it is hardly surprising that it was the most ancient view that had survived after a long discussion: the castles were attacked because they were the seats of bands of robbers plundering the area. Although no source information had been found to support this hypothesis, it did not raise any doubts regarding the ownership of the castles in question (because it was irrelevant) and the settlement of the frontier (because it was not important in the case of a successful armed intervention). Consequently, the "raubritter" thesis in its most basic form, which seemed very attractive to the readers of popular publications, became the dominant one in the nineteenth-century literature while the remaining hypotheses were neglected and forgotten. Ludwig Häufler and Małgorzata Chorowska ventured to verify the opinions expressed by their predecessors. According to Häufler, the crisis of the Piasts' territorial domain started only after Bolko I's death. The situation was caused by the widening territorial dispersion, the inability of the duke's fiscal system to catch up with the process of transforming the natural economy into the money-based economy and to adjust to the new conditions, which in turn resulted in the dukes pledging their territories, and finally in wars breaking out between them. Duke Bernard was too weak to cope with the situation. In addition, there came years of hunger and the duchy was badly plundered during the Polish-Czech war of 1345. Only a personality, such as Bolko II, could improve the situation. However, the duke was unable to put down the disorder on his own because there were rioters among his liegemen and officials responsible for maintaining peace. The vassals' refusal to cooperate with the duke brought about a situation where in 1347; Bolko ordered that a special tax be collected in towns. The money was to be used to buy arms and armour. Finally, the duke built up close cooperation with Charles IV and pacified the rebels together with the Czech monarch, who was undoubtedly interested in maintaining public safety. This is why in 1358; he introduced land peace in Silesia, binding on both the liege dukes and Bolko II. Among the numerous laws found in the act there was a popular obligation to fight robbers,

⁷ Ibidem, pp. 145-146.

thieves, incendiaries and murderers-incendiaries and destroy their fortresses. When the local duke seized such a fortress, its value and the value of the whole domain was to be estimated by the land peace judge and assessors. The money was to be paid to the court and subsequently used to satisfy the claims of the victims. If the sum of money was not paid, the fortress had to be pulled down. Even if the duke was allowed to keep the fortress, he had to swear that he would never give the castle or the domain away to a criminal belonging to any of the above-listed categories nor to their heirs. The fact that Bolko joined the "land peace alliance" was probably caused by his own experiences. The duke realized that his own forces were not strong enough and that he had to cooperate with his neighbours⁸.

In Chorowska's opinion, the fact that Bolko took a number of private castles by force might have been an attempt at the restitution of the castle law ("regale"). The interesting thing is that the above-mentioned researcher quoted several examples of receiving castles as fiefs in the first half of the fourteenth century. Thus Chorowska referred to the thesis about the duality of the situation existing in the second half of the thirteenth century, when the castle regale was still in force but the first cases of breaking the law could be observed. She did not, however, dare to openly transplant the hypothesis into the reality of the mid-fourteenth century. Consequently, she mentioned a few examples being evidence of the observance of the regale in Silesia in the fourteenth and the fifteenth centuries and at the same time argued that the "regale" did not operate any longer⁹.

Having at one's disposal so many plausible interpretations, one should look for more source information corresponding to the material discussed above. Let us begin by examining in chronological order the written sources mentioning Książ Castle. The first mention about this castle written after 1355 suggests that appointing a burgrave at the castle was a direct consequence of

Duke Bolko's activities. Bernard von Zedlitz, Burgrave of Książ, arrived at the castle on 18th October 1356. The fact that the fortress was then first referred to as *Furstinsteyn* may be quite significant. It was not a spelling mistake as the name Furstenberg, which had been in use from the time of the duke's grandfather, the year 1293 onwards, was still to be found in the same document among Bolko's prefixes. Bernard remained a burgrave throughout the 1360s and this office played such an important part in his life that he was still referred to as *vom Furstinsteyn genant* many years later. However, the castle itself did not become the burgrave's property and it belonged to Bolko's widow after the duke's death, although she never visited the place. Before 1386, Agnes handed the castle over to Elisabeth of Prochowice (von Parchwitz), a mysterious lady, whose social and legal status surpassed the position of the other women in the duchy.

The villain of the events of 1355 mentioned in the annals was *Kekelo de Czirnaw/Cyrnen*. When the duke took Książ, he must have put him out of office. Both the name and the surname of this knight were written down in a number of ways. He was frequently (71 times) mentioned in the duke's documents as a witness and a person holding an important position, so he must have been one of the most important personages in ducal circles. Surprisingly, after 24th January 1354, his name disappeared from his sovereign's documents. He did not die, but was never mentioned in any written source for six years. Therefore, the fact that his name reappeared in a document of 1360, where Kekelo put his signature as a second witness to a certificate issued by the duke, may mean that he was in the grace of the ruler again or, at least, that the latter had forgiven him his mean deeds. Information about Kekelo's relations with the duke is also found in the document of 1375 issued by duke's widow and containing a list of Agnieszka's properties pledged to a group of knights connected with her court. On the list are all Kekelo's properties, except Książ Castle and the town of Świebodzice. Having examined all the above-mentioned sources, one must come to the conclusion that Kekelo was "removed" from Książ in the period of his banishment from the court in the years 1354-1360, which was followed by the permanent confiscation of his property.

⁸ L. Häufler, *Die Geschichte der Grundherrschaft Waldenburg-Neuhaus unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Industrielandgemeinde Dittersbach*, Th. 1, Breslau 1932, pp. 71-76.

⁹ M. Chorowska, *Rezydencje średniowieczne na Śląsku. Zamki, paace, wieże mieszkalne*, Wrocław 2003, p. 31.

A document dated 14th April 1364, an agreement signed between the Emperor Charles IV and Otto, Margrave of Brandenburg, contains an interesting description of the duchy of Świdnica and Jawor. The area of the duchy was defined there by means of a list of properties, which fell into three categories: towns with castles, towns without castles and castles. In addition, the terminology used in the document differentiates between the town castle, the residence-house (*hus*) and the castle- "fortress" (*feste*). Thus the Świdnica-Jawor domain was composed of the following towns and castles: Świdnica, Jawor, Dzierżonów, Niemcza, Strzegom and Bolków; towns: Sobótka and Kamienna Góra; and "fortresses": Kliczków, Gryf, Chojnik, Sokolec, Konradów, Czarny Bór, Rogowiec, Grodno and Wałbrzych. The above list does not fully correspond to other analogous registers. It does not contain Książ in the first place. It does, however, constitute the only evidence, which is chronologically close to the year 1355, which interests us here, of the fact that Konradów and Czarny Bór were ducal castles marking the basic points of Bolko's domain inherited by the heir to the Czech Crown.

The village of Grzędy (Konradswaldau), lying on the eastern borderland of Kamienna Góra district, is among a number of places whose names were written down as Konradswalde. The castle at Grzędy was called Konradów, but in the German tourist literature it was sometimes referred to as Vogelgesang Castle. Its name had been derived from the nearby hamlet called Ptasi Śpiew (present-day Wojaczów). On 9th September 1364, Duke Bolko gave the fortress of Konradów together with the grange laying "outside the fortress" and the villages of Grzędy and Libenau to brothers Hans, Ulrich, Heinrich, Friderich and Albrecht von Hakeborn as a reward for their faithful service. The duke explained that he had purchased the fortress legally and he had owned it for a year and one day, which was the time required by the law. Consequently, Bolko must have bought the castle before 8th September 1363, because the duke needed a year and one day to make his possession of the castle legal. Although such a period was typical of the medieval legal system, it is not usually mentioned in Silesian documents. This might suggest that there were some unclear circumstances, which brought about

a situation where the duke was made to prove his rights to the castle. In addition, we learn that in April 1364, when the castle was mentioned on the list of the duke's fortresses, it was indeed in his possession. On the same day, Agnes, the duke's wife, exactly repeated the contents of Bolko's document and two days later by Vaclav, the three-years-old son of Charles IV, the future heir to the duchy of Świdnica and Jawor, who thus confirmed the duke's decision regarding the castle. From the formal point of view, both Agnes and Vaclav were heirs to the duchy and should confirm such important decisions as giving castles as hereditary fiefs. Such practices were, however, uncommon. Undoubtedly, the duke's rights to the castle were questions by the knights. The new owners of the castle were interested in securing their rights to the fortress so as to be able to reject any claims of Bolko's successors, which might follow the death of the duke and his wife.

We have already discussed the sentence from the document of 1364 containing the names of the ducal fortresses of *Conradeswalde* and *Swarzewalde*. The other mentions of the castle at Czarny Bór are chronologically more remote from the year 1355. They date back to 1371 and confirm the fact that the fortress was in the possession of *Wittche Behem* – Witko Czech, who was active at the courts of the dukes of Ziębica and Świdnica from 1329 onwards. He may have become the owner of the castle between 1329 and 1371 as a consequence of his service to the Fürstenberg house. Knowing the story of Kekelo from Książ, one may assume that in the case of the other knights Bolko was forced to not only "remove" them but lay siege to their castles as well. We could assume that they lost the castles they owned or usurped, fell from grace and were removed from the duke's court. However, no evidence supporting this hypothesis can be found in the source material. Witko Czech spent the year 1353 in Ziębice duchy and the royal district of Ząbkowice. His name was last recorded in a source on 2nd November 1353 to reappear only in 1360, when Witko Czech was a witness mentioned on a document issued by the duke of Ziębice. The fact that Kekelo and Witko returned to public life at the same time may have been either a coincidence or evidence of an amnesty which took place in 1360 at the latest, under which the

participants of the events of 1355 were given back their rights. However, the amnesty hypothesis does not explain why Kekelo lost Książ and his property and the Czech family were allowed to keep Czarny Bór and why Czarny Bór was listed as a ducal fortress in 1364.

The story of Cisy Castle seems to be the most mysterious among the fortresses discussed in the present paper. The name appeared in the itineraries of the rulers of Świdnica district and in the names of the knights "of Cisy". The castle is not, however, mentioned in any fourteenth-century certificate defining its formal status or confirming a change of the owner. A knight Rypert/ Rupert von *Ciskberg* is listed among the witnesses to Bolko's documents in 1341 and 1343. He has often been identified as Rypert (or more frequently Ruprecht) Unvogel, a court judge of Świdnica, coming from the Bolz family, who were very active in the years 1310-1330. The interesting thing is that eleven years had passed before Unvogel was again mentioned in documents as *Ciskberg*. On 15th May 1357, after fourteen-year silence, *Nicolas de Cyskberg* was first mentioned in written sources. This future advisor of Bolko and Agnes, the steward at the duchess' court, the owner of numerous properties, and a witness who always mentioned on the duke's documents and was also a member of the influential Bolz family. It is unclear why he called himself Nicolas of Cisy. He may have been the burgrave of Cisy though the burgrave of Cisy was never mentioned in any written source. He could have received the castle as a life or hereditary fief or inherited it from his ancestors. Finally, he may have been named after his father. With the passage of time his limited rights to the castle probably changed into full ownership. However, as far as Nicolas father is concerned, one cannot be sure whether Reyprecht Bolcze mentioned as Nicolas father as late as 1408 in a not quite reliable document could be identified as Rypert Unvogel and Rypert of Zeiskberg at the same time. Nicolas name appeared until 1401 during the Nicolas years Cisy was used by the knight and his sons as part of their family name identifying them as the lords of Cisy. The name was also used to denote the place where ducal documents were issued as Cisy turned out to be the favourite resting stage or even the destination of Duchess Agnes numerous journeys.

The widow's close personal relations with the host at the castle could be an explanation of this fact.

The simplest and therefore the most plausible version of the castle's history, where the fortress' owners were Rypert and his son Nicolas, can only be questioned for one reason: the events of 1355. Why should the owner of a besieged, rebellious castle appear before the duke who had humiliated him only two or three years ago? Should he start a brilliant career at his court? Other explanations seem equally satisfactory. For example, the duke could have made Nicolas the head of the newly seized castle or he could have given the fortress to him as a fief. Nicolas wanted to stress this fact for some reason and this is why he took the name of Nicolas von Zeiskberg. The name of the person from whom the castle was taken away remains unknown. Nicolas could have also been called after his father and Cisy Castle had been the seat of the family for a long time. However, Nicolas did not participate in the events of 1355 and concentrated on his career at court. Taking advantage of the fact that he was in the grace of the duchess, he eventually managed to recover the castle, which had once belonged to his relatives. Finally, the fact that Nicolas had the same name as his father, Nicolas "of Zeiskberg", may not have been a result of his being the owner of the castle and it was just a happy coincidence that he later took possession of the fortress. Unfortunately, the number of plausible hypothesis we can construct is evidence of our lack of knowledge in this respect.

Let us now discuss the fortress of Radosno, situated in the Suche Mountains on the Czech side of the frontier, which was then delineated by the divide. It is mentioned in written sources as the centre of the domain owned by a knight Martin von Swenkinfeld, who owed much money to many knights. According to the records, in the years 1350-1351, he was 136.800 Prague grossi in debt. The list of villages mortgaged is an interesting picture of a compact settlement complex composed of twelve villages and the local centers: the exchange centre in the town of Mieroszów and the local authority centre at Radosno Castle. The latter complex, due to its' geographical position, being a constituent part of the Radosno Castle fief, could be logically considered part of Kłodzko district. Until 1355 it was under

the jurisdiction of the local Czech court institutions as evidenced by written sources. In 1356, in Prague a *Hersco de Rozalowicz* documented the fact that he had done "liege homage" to the Emperor Charles IV, who was the king of Bohemia, and had obtained Freudenburg Castle together with the town of Mioszów and the villages belonging to the domain in return. He purchased the property from the monarch for 138.000 Prague grosi and received it as a hereditary fief. He also confirmed the monarch's right to re-buy the property within two years from 16th October onwards. If the king was absent or there was no king, the property could be returned to the Crown on a given day through, among others, Bolko, Duke of Świdnica. Thus Bolko could legally purchase the castle from the Czech monarch's liegeman on behalf of the king only between 16th October 1356 and 16th October 1358. For the time being, the king removed the liegemen, Swenkinfeld's sons, who were unable to pay off their debts, from Radosno and sent a knight who paid the mortgage off. Of course the fact that the sum of money paid for the castle was roughly the same as the sum of money owed by the debtors does not seem to have been a coincidence.

If the siege of the castle mentioned in the annals did take place and the castle was really taken in 1355, Radosno was returned to the king. Although it was the duke who removed the Swenkinfelds, the fortress became a fief and Bolko was only given the chance to purchase it one day in the future for a limited period of time. One can, however, wonder whether such a scenario corresponded to the annalists' intentions. It should only be noted that one of the mentions says that the duke not only *obsedit* but also *obtenuit* Radosno Castle. There seem to be three plausible explanations. Firstly, we have at our disposal a simultaneous note made in 1355 and this is why it does not contain any information about the following sequence of events, which occurred in 1366. Secondly, the information was written at the time when Radosno was already the property of the duke of Świdnica or his successors and the events from the past and the present are mixed. Thirdly, the incident described in the fourth sentence of the note found in the annal was by mistake linked to the date referring to the situations described in the preceding sentences.

Undoubtedly, the annals and the above-cited document of 1356 are in disagreement. The simplest solution to this problem is as follows: the siege took place between 1356 and 1358 and it was a result of the fact that the duke had difficulty enforcing the law and purchasing the castle. Unfortunately, this explanation seems unconvincing. The castle was not seized at least until 30th January 1357, because it was then that a man called Jan, known to us as *Herso de Rozdialowicz*, was appointed parish-priest at Mioszów. The interesting thing is that another man was nominated to the same parish *ad presentacionem discreti Czandomiri purgrauij Trutnouiensis* on 21st November 1362. Therefore the fief must have been re-bought between 30th January 1357 and 21st November 1362. However, the castle did not remain in Bolko's possession, but it was returned to Charles IV. The monarch did not give it as a fief to a knight, but left the management of it to his burgrave of Trutnov. The reason for Charles IV's decision remains unknown though it might have been a direct result of the negotiations regarding the future of Radosno, which were under way at that time. It can only be established to when these negotiations ended.

On 11th October 1369, Charles IV. promised that the inhabitants of Świdnica and Jawor Duchy would not be deprived of their freedom. The chart was addressed to the duchess and to 27 seven officials and magnates, whose names are listed in the document (20 of them were mentioned as burgraves of 19 castles). Number 12 on the list is Przecław of Pogorzele, *burgrav czu Vreudenberg*. He was given Radosno Castle as a life fief half a year earlier, on 13th May. Duchess Agnes presented him with the fortress to express her gratitude for his service to her dead husband. It seems that the duchess had been in the possession of the castle before 13th May, but the name of the person who had managed the castle is unknown. The following fact suggests that Agnes and her husband had been the owners of the castle before that day. On 6th March 1363, a priest's nomination to a benefice at the church in Unisław, belonging to the domain connected with Radosno, was confirmed. Bolko, Duke of Świdnica, on behalf of the emperor, presented the priest. Therefore the duke of Świdnica was the royal patron of the church in Unisław. This privilege was probably

part of the ownership of the whole domain, received between 21st November 1362 and 6th March 1363. The duke himself supervised the ownership. When his widow inherited the duchy, the situation changed within a year. Agnes was forced to give the castle to Przeclaw of Pogorzele, who was the patron of the churches under his "authority" from then onward.

Schatzlar Castle was erected on a hillock near the village of Bornflos (both the castle and the village are now called Žaclěř). *Albertus*, that is, Albrecht of *Crenewicz/Crenowicz*, was probably forced to give away the castle to the duke in 1355 because he was deeply in debt. The castle and its villages were mortgaged and Albrecht's debts amounted to 40.860 grossi. According to a document issued on 9th August 1356, Albrecht was obligated to inform the emperor or his successors on the Czech throne that Bolko, Duke of Świdnica and Jawor, had paid him back 42.000 Prague grossi, which the duke owed to Charles IV (Albrecht and his heirs had received the letters of debt from the monarch). Thus the transaction was concluded in two stages. The sides involved were the emperor, the duke and the knight mentioned above. One can only wonder why the emperor decided to give away a large sum of 42.000 Prague grossi, which the duke had owed him, to the knight. This sum of money was equal to the mortgage taken out by the owner of Žaclěř Castle and could be used to pay off the knight's creditors. One can then venture a hypothesis that the king, made Albrecht give away the castle in order to present it to Duke Bolko. The buyer paid the compensation, which was equal to the knight's debt, and eventually the money came from the king's treasury. If all went according to plan and the Žaclěř case followed the above-mentioned scenario, *dux Bolco Swydnicensis obtinuit castrum Scheczler* and the whole event happened in 1356 and not in 1355, as chronicled in the annal. Further examples suggest that the patrons of the church at Bornflos were the owners or burgraves of Žaclěř Castle. Knight Nicolas von Seiferdau presented two new vicars in 1360 and 1361. He was a member of the family of Zebrzydów, very active in Świdnica duchy. The knight appeared as an important witness to many documents issued by Bolko II in the second half of the 1350s. Therefore it can be assumed that the knight arrived at

Žaclěř Castle and in Bornflos at the beginning of 1360 at the latest sent by the same duke.

A collation of the facts discussed above and a reconstruction of events presented at the beginning of this paper lead to the conclusion that the output of historiography should be treated seriously, but, on the other hand, that it is impossible for the researcher to match all the circumstances and incidents to a single hypothesis regarding the issues in question as is the case with receiving the two Czech castles.

The succession agreement signed in Świdnica on 3rd July 1353, which made Queen Ann, the niece of Bolko II and the wife of Charles IV, and her children the heiresses and heirs to Bolko's property, was witnessed by Kekelo of *Czirnen* and some other knights from ducal circles. This is why the fact that Kekelo, the owner of Książ, opposed the duke can't have been a result of his rebellion against Bolko's agreement with the king of Bohemia. What is more, the possible consequences of this agreement did not affect Kekelo's and the other knights' interests (it should be noted that they did not accompany the duke for purely ceremonial purposes). The court in Świdnica must have been familiar with Charles IV's policy consisting in strengthening the monarch's authority by taking advantage of the towns' ambitions. However, close cooperation with Prague did not mean an unavoidable revolution in the duchy's internal affairs. If such a situation did take place, it must have been an indirect and far-reaching consequence of this agreement. After a long period of struggle against all sorts of political, economic and military threats, the duchy reached a stage of long-awaited stabilization. The old enemy, Charles IV had turned into an eager protector, which was a relief to Bolko. He did not have to be afraid that foreign foes would take advantage of the duchy's internal problems. Under the circumstances, it was no longer a matter of life and death for the duke to drum up support for his actions and earn the loyalty of all knights at all costs. Therefore if any knights from ducal circles acted against the duke's interests, Bolko was now in a position to take the necessary steps and smash the opposition. Such a scenario would explain why the conflict gradually escalated from around the winter of 1353-1354 onward. It was then that some knights (for instance, Kuneman von

Seidlitz of Kliczków, who paid homage to Queen Ann on 21st December) capitulated and accepted the new conditions offered by the duke while others, like Kekelo of *Czirnen* from Książ, retreated to their castles and opposed the duke well until 1355. However, this hypothesis is not entirely

satisfactory. It remains unclear what the concrete cause of the conflict was and why it climaxed in his seizure of several castles lying in the same area.

Translated by Zuzanna Poklewska-Parra

