

Zofia Wilk-Woś
(WSB Merito University, Łódź)
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5315-1169>

Between cooperation and competition.
The relations between the Church
in Gniezno and the Church in Wrocław
in the fifteenth century

<https://doi.org/10.26881/sds.2024.27.12>

Keywords: archbishops of Gniezno, metropolitan, bishops of Wrocław, Silesia, Gniezno chapter, Wrocław chapter

Introduction

Despite serious political changes on the map of Central Europe towards the end of the Middle Ages (particularly the question of where Silesia should belong), the metropolitans of Gniezno managed to maintain supremacy over the Wrocław bishopric. However, both the complex political situation in the region and the situation in the universal Church had a significant impact on the relations between the metropolis and the Church in Wrocław. The network of connections between them still existed, although it was not equally strong and visible in all spheres. The links were various in nature: legal (stemming from the subordination of Wrocław bishopric), personal (contacts between the archbishop and the bishop of Wrocław and members of the respective chapters), and cultural (exchange of thought and knowledge, traditions, probably also books and liturgical and cult objects), but the character of the latter ones is hardly visible in the sources.

This article aims to present the relations between archbishops of Gniezno and bishops of Wrocław and contacts between members of the two chapters, and makes an attempt to assess the situation

in the period. The paper is a voice in the discussion. The issue of the supremacy of the metropolis of Gniezno over the bishopric of Wrocław in the Middle Ages has been analysed in more detail by Kazimierz Dola, Ignacy Subera and Wincenty Urban.¹

The authority of the metropolitan involved certain prerogatives that had an impact on the nature and strength of relations between the archbishop of Gniezno and his suffragan bishops, including the bishop of Wrocław. According to the decretals, the *ius metropoliticum* included: (1) the right to confirm the election of suffragan bishops and to consecrate them, (2) the right to convene and preside over provincial synods, (3) the right to supervise the subordinate dioceses and conduct their visitations, (4) the right to censure suffragan bishops in less important matters, (5) the right to perform the role of the judge of second instance (appeals from decisions of the courts of suffragan bishops), (6) the right to guarantee indulgences. The obligations of suffragan bishops, in turn, included participation in provincial synods and following post-visitatio recommendations and other ordinances of the metropolitan.²

The archbishopric of Gniezno, with three subordinate bishoprics in Kraków, Wrocław and Kołobrzeg, was established in AD 1000 during the visit of Emperor Otto III to Gniezno (his pilgrimage to St Adalbert's grave). The Polish Church was submitted to direct jurisdiction of the pope, which meant that it was made independent from the control of the German Church. The decision of Prince Bolesław the Brave on the ecclesiastical structure in Poland marked the beginning of relations between archbishops of Gniezno and bishops of Wrocław, including their cooperation and, in the course of time, also competition. Following the founding and development of cathedral chapters, contacts between prelates and canons became a significant element in these relations.³

¹ K. Dola, *Związki diecezji Wrocławskiej z metropolią gnieźnieńską w latach 1418–1520*, "Studia Theologica Varsaviensia" 1977, t. 15, nr 1, pp. 147–188; W. Urban, *Studia nad dziejami Wrocławskiej diecezji w pierwszej połowie XV wieku*, Wrocław 1959; I. Subera, *Separatystyczne dążenia kapituły Wrocławskiej do uniezależnienia się od metropolii gnieźnieńskiej*, cz. 2, "Prawo Kanoniczne" 1969, t. 12, nr 1–2, pp. 3–34.

² K. Dola, *Związki diecezji Wrocławskiej...*, p. 151.

³ For more about the beginnings of the Church in Poland, see W. Abraham, *Organizacja kościoła w Polsce do połowy wieku XII*, Poznań 1962; T. Silnicki, *Początki organizacji Kościoła w Polsce za Mieszka I i Bolesława Chrobrego*,

In the present discussion, it is also important to note the changes which occurred in the functioning of the Polish Church due to the feudal fragmentation. The division of the state into provinces did not lead to changes in diocesan organisation and strengthened the role of the episcopate. In the Polish lands, the thirteenth century was the period of introducing reforms of the Lateran council (reforms of Archbishop Henryk Kietlicz) and the formation of ecclesiastical courts. On the other hand, the political situation – the rivalry between the Piast princes – made bishops engage in current politics, sometimes very actively. They took advantage of conflicts between the princes to strengthen the position of the Church in their dioceses, particularly the economic position. Conflicts between bishops and princes became more common. It should be remembered that the Church played a significant role in the process of reunification of the Polish state and in the promotion of this idea. Importantly, the changes of boundaries between individual duchies and internal conflicts among Bolesław the Wrymouth's descendants did not affect the ecclesiastical province of Gniezno.⁴

In the period of feudal fragmentation, the supremacy of Gniezno over the whole Polish Church was not questioned. Moreover, there were no plans to adjust the borders of the dioceses to political boundaries (although we cannot overlook failed attempts by Charles IV to separate the diocese of Wrocław from the Gniezno metropolis, related to the creation of the ecclesiastical province of Prague in 1344).⁵ Thus, the area of one diocese periodically covered the territories of several duchies. Władysław Łokietek and Casimir

in: *Początki państwa polskiego. Księga Tysiąclecia*, t. 1: *Organizacja polityczna*, red. K. Tymieniecki, Poznań 1962, pp. 319–361; J. Dowiat, *Historia Kościoła katolickiego w Polsce (do połowy XV wieku)*, Warszawa 1968; *Historia Kościoła w Polsce*, red. B. Kumor, Z. Obertyński, t. 1: *Do roku 1764*, cz. 1: *Do roku 1506*, Poznań–Warszawa 1974; T. Silnicki, *Dzieje i ustrój Kościoła katolickiego na Śląsku do końca w. XIV*, Warszawa 1953; D.A. Sikorski, *Kościół w Polsce za Mieszka I i Bolesława Chrobrego. Rozważania nad granicami poznania historycznego*, Poznań 2013.

⁴ On the Polish Church in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, see *Polska dzielnicowa i zjednoczona. Państwo, społeczeństwo, kultura*, red. A. Gieysztor, Warszawa 1972; J. Maciejewski, *Episkopat polski doby dzielnicowej 1180–1320*, Kraków–Bydgoszcz 2003; J. Dobosz, *Monarchia i możni wobec Kościoła w Polsce do początku XIII wieku*, Poznań 2002; W. Baran-Kozłowski, *Arcybiskup gnieźnieński Henryk Kietlicz (1199–1219). Działalność kościelna i polityczna*, Poznań 2005.

⁵ R. Żerelik, *Dzieje Śląska do 1526 roku*, in: M. Czaplinski, E. Kaszuba, G. Wąs, R. Żerelik, *Historia Śląska*, red. M. Czaplinski, Wrocław 2002, p. 81.

the Great managed to reunify Poland in the fourteenth century, but unfortunately were not able to extend their authority over all Polish lands. Most of Silesian Piasts remained under Bohemian supremacy.⁶

Gniezno and Wrocław: Connections, cooperation and competition

Silesia did not become a part of the unified Kingdom of Poland. Another factor at play in the fifteenth century was the papal policy of limitation of archbishops' powers, which caused problems for the archbishops of Gniezno (who also held the title of Primate of Poland) in exercising their authority over other Polish bishoprics. The Wrocław Church and its bishops became a particular challenge in this respect, and the pontificate of Bishop Konrad, the duke of Oleśnica, was a particularly difficult period. The political situation of the diocese of Wrocław was quite complex: it was subordinate to the metropolis of Gniezno, and the duchies on its territory were a part of the Kingdom of Bohemia. Moreover, two bishops of Wrocław, Wencleslas as the duke of Legnica and Konrad as the duke of Oleśnica, were vassals of the king of Bohemia, and their excessive submission to the metropolitan could be misinterpreted by the Bohemian ruler. During the times of subsequent bishops, Piotr Nowak, Jošt of Rožmberk and Rudolf von Rüdesheim, who came from outside the diocese, the relations with Gniezno improved. The candidature of the latter was supported by Archbishop Jan Gruszczyński. In the period under consideration, the relations between Wrocław and Gniezno suffered also because of the political situation in Silesia – the Hussite wars, conflicts between local dukes (particularly between Bishop Konrad and his brother Konrad the White), the struggle for influence between the King of Germany and Hungary Sigismund, Polish King Władysław and the Grand Master of the Teutonic Order.⁷

⁶ For more, see J. Dąbrowski, *Dzieje polityczne Śląska w latach 1290–1402*, in: *Historia Śląska od najdawniejszych czasów do roku 1400*, t. 1, oprac. W. Semkowicz et al., red. S. Kutrzeba, 2nd ed., Kraków 2013, pp. 327–562; K. Dola, *Dzieje Kościoła na Śląsku*, cz. 1: *Średniowiecze*, Opole 1996; R. Żerelik, *Dzieje Śląska do 1526 roku...*; A. Paner, *Luksemburgowie w Czechach. Historia polityczna ziem czeskich w latach 1310–1437*, Gdańsk 2004.

⁷ On the political and ecclesiastical situation in Silesia, see K. Dola, *Dzieje Kościoła na Śląsku*, cz. 1...; R. Żerelik, *Dzieje Śląska do 1526 roku...*; J. Sperka,

The situation in Silesia became more complicated because of the conflict between Bishop Konrad and the Wrocław chapter, caused by the dispute over the attitude towards Pope Eugene IV and the council in Basel. Konrad took an oath of obedience to the pope, while the chapter supported the council and its decisions. The dispute with the chapter and the conflict with his brother Konrad the White, which led to open war, ruined the diocese. Its financial situation and the position of the chapter made Konrad resign from the office of bishop in 1444.⁸ However, in summer 1445 Eugene IV ordered him to re-take the diocese, threatening those who resisted with excommunication.⁹ Although the pope's position initially aggravated the conflict, leading to the secession of Nysa, in 1446 the bishop and the chapter came to an agreement.¹⁰ In 1447, the chapter decided to swear obedience to the pope.¹¹

It should be noted that in the fifteenth century Rome stressed the supremacy of the archbishop of Gniezno over the Wrocław bishopric. In 1417, after the resignation of Bishop Wenceslas, Pope Martin V (in accordance with his prerogatives) appointed Duke Konrad, the dean of the cathedral chapter, as bishop of Wrocław.¹² In such cases a bishop could receive episcopal consecration from any bishop of his choice, not necessarily his metropolitan. However, the pope, in his letter to Konrad, reminded him that being consecrated by another bishop and taking the episcopal oath before him cannot become a pretext to question or limit the rights of the archbishop of Gniezno in relation to the bishop of Wrocław.¹³ Forty years later, Pope

Książęta śląscy w relacjach Polski z Czechami w początkowym okresie rewolucji husyckiej, "Studia z Dziejów Średniowiecza" 2022, t. 25, pp. 281–305; J. Sperka, *Przyjaźń, wrogość, współpraca: król Władysław Jagiełło wobec książąt śląskich*, in: *Jagiellonowie i ich świat. Konflikty Jagiellonów*, red. B. Czwojdrak, J. Sperka, P. Węcowski, Kraków 2023, pp. 7–46.

⁸ W. Urban, *Studia nad dziejami...*, Wrocław 1959, pp. 176 *et seq.*; T. Graff, *Episkopat monarchii jagiellońskiej w dobie soborów powszechnych XV wieku*, Kraków 2008, p. 293.

⁹ W. Urban, *Studia nad dziejami...*, p. 180; J. Drabina, *Stanowisko papieża w kwestii obsady Wrocławskiego biskupstwa w XV wieku*, "Colloquium Salutis. Wrocławskie Studia Teologiczne" 1967, t. 8, p. 101.

¹⁰ J. Drabina, *Stanowisko papieża...*, p. 102; R. Żerelik, *Dzieje Śląska do 1526 roku...*, p. 97.

¹¹ T. Graff, *Episkopat monarchii jagiellońskiej...*, p. 294.

¹² W. Urban, *Studia nad dziejami...*, p. 123.

¹³ K. Dola, *Związki diecezji Wrocławskiej...*, p. 155; cf. W. Urban, *Studia nad dziejami...*, p. 123.

Callixtus III reminded a papal collector of Peter's pence in the Prague archbishopric – incidentally, a Wrocław canon, Henryk Roraw – that the Wrocław bishopric was not a part of the Prague province, but belonged to the Gniezno province. King Casimir Jagiellon intervened in this matter at the request of Archbishop Jan Sprowski.¹⁴

Several popes confirmed the supremacy of the archbishops of Gniezno by charging them with the execution of papal bulls for the Wrocław bishopric. In April 1426, Martin V requested that his bull should be announced and executed by Archbishop Wojciech Jastrzębiec.¹⁵ In 1463, Pius II assigned the role of executors to the metropolitan and the papal legate Hieronymus, archbishop of Crete,¹⁶ and in 1491 Innocent VIII appointed Archbishop Zbigniew Oleśnicki in the same role.¹⁷

We can also mention the document issued by Pope Sixtus IV and addressed to Archbishop Oleśnicki of 4 March 1482, which confirmed his rights as the metropolitan; it was issued on the same day as the bull announcing the translation of Bishop Johannes Roth. The pope recommended the diocese of Wrocław and its new shepherd to the care of the archbishop: “mandantes quantenus eundem Johannem episcopum et dictam ecclesiam Wratislaviensem sibi commissam, suffraganeam tuam, habeas propensius commendatos in ampliandis et conservandis eiusdem Wratislaviensis ecclesiae iuribus”.¹⁸ Innocent VIII, the successor of Sixtus IV, in the bull of 26 March 1491, reiterated that the bishop of Wrocław was subordinate to the metropolitan of Gniezno. The bull is evidence of a conflict between Bishop Roth and the Wrocław chapter over the imprisonment of some canons by the bishop. The conflict led to the exemption of the chapter from the bishop's jurisdiction and submitting it directly to the Holy See. Archbishop Oleśnicki, as the

¹⁴ Archiwum Archidiecezjalne w Gnieźnie [Archdiocesan Archives in Gniezno, hereafter: AAG], Dyplomy gnieźnieńskie, Gn 468; W. Urban, *Studia nad dziejami...*, p. 295; K. Dola, *Związki diecezji Wrocławskiej...*, p. 156.

¹⁵ Cf. G. Lichończak-Nurek, *Wojciech herbu Jastrzębiec, arcybiskup i mąż stanu (ok. 1362–1436)*, Kraków 1996, p. 176.

¹⁶ *Politische Correspondenz Breslaus im Zeitalter Georgs von Podiebrad, Abt. 1: 1454–1463*, hrsg. v. H. Markgraf, Breslau 1873 (“Scriptores rerum silesiacarum”, Bd. 8), no. 148B, p. 186.

¹⁷ K. Dola, *Związki diecezji Wrocławskiej...*, p. 158.

¹⁸ W. Urban, *Szkice z dziejów diecezji Wrocławskiej. Biskup Jan Roth (1482–1506)*, “Studia Theologica Varsaviensia” 1967, t. 5, nr 1, p. 14; K. Dola, *Związki diecezji Wrocławskiej...*, p. 158.

executor of the bull, was to ensure that Bishop Roth would respect the exemption and would not appeal.¹⁹

Bishop Konrad, who has been mentioned above, had difficult relations with the archbishops. In one of his studies, Wincenty Urban writes that “even if the relations between Konrad and the archbishopric of Gniezno were not severed, they were very loose”.²⁰ According to Grażyna Lichończak-Nurek, from the very beginning of his pontificate Konrad ostentatiously demonstrated his desire to become independent from Gniezno. She stresses that during his consecration Konrad did not take an oath before the then archbishop, Mikołaj Trąba, but he swore directly to the pope, which in her view meant the rejection of legal subordination of Wrocław to Gniezno.²¹ However, as mentioned above, Konrad’s attitude met with a rebuke from the pope, who reminded him that he was subordinate to the metropolitan.

According to some scholars, the failure of the metropolitan visitation in Wrocław planned for 1426 can be explained by open hostility of the local clergy. The growing threat of Hussite influence in the region made Pope order the archbishop to conduct a visitation of the entire Gniezno province, including the diocese of Wrocław (the bull of 13 November 1424).²² But when in 1426 Archbishop Jastrzębiec planned to arrive there, Bishop Konrad and the Wrocław clergy did not agree. The reason behind this refusal were probably the Hussite wars, although Jan Długosz blamed Konrad, explaining that he was afraid that his abuses in the diocese would be revealed. In his negative assessment of the bishop, the chronicler even accused him of threatening to poison the metropolitan if he laid an interdict on the diocese.²³ It is difficult to agree

¹⁹ W. Urban, *Szkice z dziejów diecezji Wrocławskiej. Biskup Jan Roth...*, pp. 26–27; K. Dola, *Związki diecezji Wrocławskiej...*, p. 158.

²⁰ W. Urban, *Jeszcze o egzempcji diecezji Wrocławskiej*, “Prawo Kanoniczne” 1968, t. 11, nr 1–2, p. 322, note 15.

²¹ G. Lichończak-Nurek, *Wojciech herbu Jastrzębiec...*, p. 175.

²² *Bullarium Poloniae*, vol. 4: 1417–1431, eds. S. Kuraś, I. Sułkowska-Kuraś, H. Wajs, Romae–Lublina 1992, no. 1433; *Acta capitulorum nec non iudiciorum ecclesiasticorum selecta*, ed. B. Ulanowski, vol. 2: *Acta iudiciorum ecclesiasticorum dioecesium Gneznensis et Poznaniensis (1403–1530)*, Kraków 1902 (“Monumenta Medii Aevi Historica”, vol. 16), no. 189; G. Lichończak-Nurek, *Wojciech herbu Jastrzębiec...*, p. 155.

²³ Długosz, lib. 11, p. 223; *Joannis Dlugossii senioris canonici Cracoviensis Vitae Episcoporum Poloniae. Catalogus Episcoporum Wratislaviensium* [hereafter:

with Długosz, particularly if we remember that a few months later Konrad asked Jastrzębiec for help in his fight against the Hussites, calling the archbishop *mee ecclesie principalis pastor*.²⁴ The archbishop's reply was very friendly; he informed Konrad about Władysław Jagiełło's planned crusade against the Hussites.²⁵

The threat of Hus's teachings was an important element in the relations between Archbishop Jastrzębiec and Bishop Konrad. In his letter of 19 March 1430, the archbishop presented the decisions of the synod held at *Łęczyca*, which had been convened in relation to Hussite matters. He reminded Konrad that it was necessary to control the books used by the clergy on the territory of his diocese. Moreover, in the letter we have information that the synod started to correct irregularities in services, beginning with the Good Friday service.²⁶

One point of controversy among scholars has been the statute *De alienigenis sive extraneis nisi qualificatis non recipiendis*, issued by Bishop Konrad on 1 October 1435, which restricted membership in the Wrocław chapter to people from Silesia:

forever hereafter no one born outside the lands of Silesia which belong to our Wrocław Church can receive canonries, prebends, dignities or offices in the said our Wrocław Church when they become vacant unless he is a master of theology or a doctor of canon or civil law, or has passed the licentiate examination in theology or is a bachelor of theology at a faculty, or is a master of arts or medicine [...].²⁷

Joannis Dlugossii Catalogus], ed. I. Polkowski, in: *Joannis Dlugossii senioris canonici Cracoviensis Opera omnia*, vol. 1, eds. I. Polkowski, Ż. Pauli, Cracoviae 1887, p. 473.

²⁴ *Codex epistolaris saeculi decimi quinti*, t. 2, ed. A. Lewicki, Kraków 1891 ("Monumenta Medii Aevi Historica", t. 12), no. 166.

²⁵ *Ibidem*, no. 167.

²⁶ *Synody diecezji Wrocławskiej i ich statuty*, red. J. Sawicki, Wrocław 1963 ("Concilia Poloniae", vol. 10), pp. 126–127; G. Lichończak-Nurek, *Wojciech herbu Jastrzębiec...*, p. 159; I. Subera, *Separatystyczne dążenia kapituły Wrocławskiej...*, p. 23.

²⁷ "[...] statuimus et ordinamus, quod deinceps et inantea nullus extra partes Slezie, in quibus ipsa nostra ecclesia Wratislaviensis consistit, genitus, nisi in theologia magister vel in altero iurium doctor aut cum rigore examinis licentiatus vel in theologia baccalaureus formatus seu artium vel medicinae magister existat, ad canonicatus, praebendas, dignitates, personatus et officia ipsius ecclesiae nostrae Wratislaviensis tempore vacationis alicuius vel aliquorum ipsorum perpetuis futuris temporibus recipiant" – *Statuta Capituli Ecclesiae Cathedralis Wratislaviensis ex anno 1482/83*, ed. K. Dola, Wrocław–Opole 2004, p. 112.

According to Jan Drabina, this regulation had a decisive impact on the composition of the chapter and its political position.²⁸ Jan Długosz, who has been mentioned above, considered the statute to be anti-Polish.²⁹ The statute itself explains that the introduction of the above regulation was dictated by the damage caused by the variety of nations and languages in the chapter, by the fact that its members followed different customs and ways of behaviour, and by the problem of revealing the secrets of the chapter.³⁰ Kazimierz Dola points out that one of the reasons was the fact that from the 1350s the number of canons from outside the diocese was rising as a result of filling Church benefices through papal provisions. The new regulation was meant to indirectly prevent the system of papal reservations.³¹ On the other hand, Konrad's participation in the consecration of a new archbishop, Wincenty Kot, in 1437 clearly shows that he accepted the authority of Gniezno.³²

The relations between the archbishop of Gniezno and the bishop of Wrocław became closer after the death of Bishop Konrad. Following his election by the Wrocław chapter, Bishop-Elect Piotr Nowak requested confirmation from Archbishop Kot and not from Pope Nicholas V, which was in line with the position of the Council of Basel.³³ Dola suggests that this decision was dictated by the financial situation of the bishopric rather than the doctrine of the council.³⁴ Two envoys from the Wrocław chapter went to Gniezno – they were both well known to Archbishop Kot: Canon Jarosław Kąkolewski, who was also a member of the Gniezno chapter, and Canon Andrzej Skoda, a relative of the archbishop.³⁵ Taking into consideration the advice of the chapter and the opinion of Tomasz Strzępiński, a lawyer and rector of Kraków University, the

²⁸ J. Drabina, *Wrocławska kapituła katedralna i jej stosunek do politycznych wydarzeń lat 1453–1471*, "Śląskie Studia Historyczno-Teologiczne" 1969, t. 2, p. 183.

²⁹ Joannis Dlugossii Catalogus, p. 472.

³⁰ *Statuta Capituli...*, pp. 110–112.

³¹ K. Dola, *Wrocławska kapituła katedralna w XV wieku. Ustrój – skład osobowy – działalność*, Lublin 1983, p. 119.

³² Długosz, lib. 11–12, p. 170; S. Hain, *Wincenty Kot prymas Polski (1436–1448)*, Poznań 1948, p. 20.

³³ S. Hain, *Wincenty Kot...*, p. 100; K. Dola, *Wrocławska kapituła katedralna...*, p. 215.

³⁴ K. Dola, *Wrocławska kapituła katedralna...*, p. 190.

³⁵ Długosz, lib. 12, p. 53; K. Dola, *Wrocławska kapituła katedralna...*, p. 215.

primate agreed for the confirmation³⁶ and announced his decision on 10 October 1447.³⁷ On 22 October, the suffragan bishops of Gniezno and Wrocław performed the consecration, and after the ceremony the new bishop took an oath of obedience to the archbishop of Gniezno and Pope Nicholas V.³⁸ But that oath was not enough for the pope: he cancelled the confirmation on the grounds that both hierarchs had broken the canon law. Following their request for absolution, the pope pardoned the culprits, stopped taking the fees for the Apostolic Camera and confirmed the election of Piotr Nowak as bishop.³⁹

It should be noted that at the beginning of 1448, Bishop Nowak asked the archbishop to convene a provincial synod. In his reply of 16 March 1448, Archbishop Kot stated that such a decision required the consent of the other Polish bishops.⁴⁰

The involvement of archbishops of Gniezno in episcopal elections in Wrocław could be evidence of the state of relations between the metropolitan and his suffragan. One of Kot's successors, Archbishop Jan Gruszczyński, was engaged in the election of Rudolf von Rüdeshheim, whose candidature he supported. He sent his envoys to Wrocław to convince the chapter to accept this candidate.⁴¹

Provincial synods, meetings of cathedral chapters, visitations and episcopal consecrations were occasions providing an opportunity for the hierarchs and chapter members to meet face to face. Gniezno and Wrocław canons could meet in person at the royal court, at the consistory office in Gniezno, or, considering that many clerics had several benefices, during the meetings of other chapters; they could also meet in Rome, where they went on various business (e.g. to obtain papal provisions for benefices).

As mentioned above, the visitation of the diocese by Archbishop Jastrzębice planned for 1426 fell through. However, the sources

³⁶ S. Hain, *Wincenty Kot...*, p. 100; W. Urban, *Studia nad dziejami...*, p. 212.

³⁷ Archiwum Archidiecezjalne we Wrocławiu (Archdiocesan Archives in Wrocław), Zbiór dokumentów, S18a, S18b.

³⁸ AAG, Dyplomy gnieźnieńskie, Gn. 446; Długosz, lib. 12, p. 53; W. Hain, *Wincenty Kot...*, pp. 100–101.

³⁹ W. Urban, *Studia nad dziejami...*, p. 214; T. Graff, *Episkopat monarchii jagiellońskiej...*, p. 294.

⁴⁰ *Codex epistolaris saeculi decimi quinti*, t. 3, ed. A. Lewicki, Kraków 1894 ("Monumenta Medii Aevi Historica", t. 14), nos 21, 22; S. Hain, *Wincenty Kot...*, p. 117.

⁴¹ W. Urban, *Szkice z dziejów diecezji Wrocławskiej. Biskup Rudolf z Rüdeshheim (1468–1482)*, "Studia Theologica Varsaviensia", t. 4, nr 1, p. 124.

inform us that some archbishops of Gniezno did stay in Wrocław on other occasions. Primate Wincenty Kot arrived in the city on 5 January 1439, but his visit was not ecclesiastical in nature: he was heading the legation of the king of Poland for peace negotiations with Emperor Albert.⁴² The annalist Zygmunt Różyc notes that the Wrocław clergy and burghers did not go out to welcome their metropolitan.⁴³ This can be explained not only by hostility towards the Poles caused by the political situation in Silesia, but also by the fact that he was not coming to Wrocław as an ecclesiastical superior. Dola observes that considering the situation at the time, a solemn welcome of the archbishop could be interpreted as a provocation.⁴⁴ However, the acceptance of the authority of the metropolitan is evidenced by the fact that a day later, at Epiphany, Archbishop Kot celebrated a solemn mass at Wrocław Cathedral.⁴⁵ The situation was different in 1454: when Archbishop Jan Sprowski arrived in the city (18 December), he was given a solemn welcome as the metropolitan. He was met by the suffragan bishop, prelates, canons and abbots and was led in a procession to the gates of the cathedral.⁴⁶

⁴² Długosz, lib. 11–12, p. 200.

⁴³ *Sigismundi Rositzii Chronica et numerus episcoporum Wratislaviensium*, in: *Silesiacarum rerum scriptores*, vol. 1, ed. F.W. de Sommersberg, Lipsiae 1729, p. 78.

⁴⁴ K. Dola, *Związki diecezji Wrocławskiej...*, pp. 164–165.

⁴⁵ *Sigismundi Rositzii Chronica...*, p. 78; S. Hain, *Wincenty Kot...*, p. 154.

⁴⁶ *Die Chronica des Breslauer Domherrn Stanislaus Sauer (†1535)*, ed. H. Hermann, "Münchener Theologische Zeitschrift" 1953, vol. 1(1–2), p. 113: "Eodem anno die 18. Decembris que fuit feria quarta quatuor temporum, venit Wratislaviam D. Joannes Archiepiscopus Gnesonensis susceptus a Capitulo et Suffraganeo ac duobus duorum hic monasteriorum Abbatibus egrotante D. Episcopo; processum et obuiam fuit usque ad pedem pontis deductusque fuit ante hostium Ecclesie S. Joannis cum cantu 'Vere felicem presulem'. Quo in loco in sede ad id preparata genufexit osculatusque est Sanctorum reliquias, accepto demum aspersorio a prelato majori astantes aspersit. Benedicto deinde incenso thurificatus a prelato majori circumstantes et ipse thurificauit. Exosculato demum euangelio inter prelatos medius ipse ad summum altare processit, cantante choro 'Sacerdos et Pontifex'. Deinde cantatum fuit Te deum laudamus habitaque oratio in ejus commendacionem; a Suffraganeo fuit dicta demum versiculus et collecta Protector noster aspice. Deus et Dominus exaudi cum collecta Omnipotens sempiterna Deus qui facis mirabilia magna solus. D. Archiepiscopus benedixit clero et populo oblatisque duobus aureis ad altare in ciuitatem ad hospiciam diuertit. Ultimo 1455 in die Natiuitatis Christi D. Archiepiscopus celebrauit summam missam presente Ladislao rege qui obtulit tres aureos factoque prandio cum D. Episcopo recepit ab eo et a canonicis fidelitatis iuramentum".

The accumulation of benefices was the reason why only clerics were members of the Gniezno and Wrocław chapters, and why the membership of these bodies was not very large in the fifteenth century. Perhaps this was also the result of the statute *De alienigenis* mentioned above.

In the period under discussion, there were several canons who were members of both chapters: Mikołaj Borkowicz,⁴⁷ Mirosław Brudzewski,⁴⁸ Jan Chebda of Niewiesz,⁴⁹ Jarosław Kałolewski,⁵⁰ Jakub of Sienno,⁵¹ Mikołaj Spycimir,⁵² Tomasz Strzępiński⁵³ and Piotr Wolfram.⁵⁴ We should turn attention to two of them: Jan Chebda and Jarosław Kałolewski. They both received prebends in Wrocław pursuant to papal provisions, and neither of them came from Silesia. Chebda had close ties with the Gniezno chapter; he did not live in Wrocław, but he had his canon house there. He was considered a supporter of Bishop Konrad and Pope Eugene IV, and was one of the candidates in the episcopal election after Konrad's death in 1447 (he received one vote). Two years later, he lent 1,500 florins to Bishop Nowak for the redemption of property pledged by Bishop Konrad.⁵⁵ Jarosław Kałolewski, in turn, was more actively involved in the life of the Wrocław chapter; he took part in several meetings and in the episcopal election of 1447. After the election of Piotr Nowak, he was sent as an envoy to the archbishop with the chapter's request for the confirmation of the bishop-elect.⁵⁶ He also travelled with bishop's letters to Gniezno in 1448.⁵⁷

⁴⁷ K. Dola, *Wrocławska kapituła katedralna...*, p. 337.

⁴⁸ M. Czyżak, *Kapituła katedralna w Gnieźnie w świetle metryki z lat 1408–1448*, Poznań 2003, pp. 375–377; K. Dola, *Wrocławska kapituła katedralna...*, p. 339.

⁴⁹ M. Czyżak, *Kapituła katedralna w Gnieźnie...*, pp. 342–344; K. Dola, *Wrocławska kapituła katedralna...*, pp. 339–340; P. Dembiński, *Poznańska kapituła katedralna schyłku wieków średnich. Studium prozopograficzne 1428–1500*, Poznań 2012, pp. 457–462.

⁵⁰ M. Czyżak, *Kapituła katedralna w Gnieźnie...*, pp. 351–352; K. Dola, *Wrocławska kapituła katedralna...*, p. 360; Dembiński, *Poznańska kapituła katedralna...*, pp. 490–491.

⁵¹ K. Dola, *Wrocławska kapituła katedralna...*, p. 397.

⁵² *Ibidem*, pp. 399–400.

⁵³ M. Czyżak, *Kapituła katedralna w Gnieźnie...*, pp. 398–399; K. Dola, *Wrocławska kapituła katedralna...*, p. 405; Dembiński, *Poznańska kapituła katedralna...*, pp. 676–679.

⁵⁴ M. Czyżak, *Kapituła katedralna w Gnieźnie...*, pp. 387–388; K. Dola, *Wrocławska kapituła katedralna...*, p. 416.

⁵⁵ W. Urban, *Studia nad dziejami...*, pp. 224, 289.

⁵⁶ Długosz, lib. 12, p. 53; K. Dola, *Wrocławska kapituła katedralna...*, p. 360.

⁵⁷ *Codex epistolaris...*, t. 3, nos 21, 22.

The important occasions when most of the canons, especially non-resident ones, could meet were chapter meetings and elections of new bishops. It is worth noting the custom of inviting to episcopal elections only those non-resident canons who lived in the province of Gniezno (statute: *Canonici intra provinciam tantum constitute vocantur ad electionem*).⁵⁸ This fact also confirms that the diocese of Wrocław belonged to this province.

Three canons who were members of both chapters and professors of Kraków University were important figures in the period: Tomasz Strzępiński, Mikołaj Spicymir and Piotr Wolfram.⁵⁹ They most likely provided considerable legal and intellectual support to both chapters. For instance, Archbishop Kot requested that Strzępiński should analyse the legitimacy of the election of Piotr Nowak as bishop of Wrocław.⁶⁰

Wrocław canon Andrzej Skoda, in turn, was an interesting figure who must have had an influence on the relations between Gniezno and Wrocław owing to his personal connections with Archbishop Kot. Indeed, Skoda, who came from Biechów in Wielkopolska, was from the same heraldic clan (called Doliwa) and was his relative; he was also a relative of Jan Furman, the custodian of Gniezno Cathedral and a Poznań canon.⁶¹ Although the sources provide a record of unfavourable opinion about him – “a Pole of tall stature and narrow mind” (*Andreas Szkoda, Polonus, statura longus, animo vastus*)⁶² – some scholars believe that he could have been the author of a codification of statutes of the Wrocław chapter, which was created during the pontificate of Rudolf von Rudesheim.⁶³ Together with Nicholas Stock he represented the chapter at provincial

⁵⁸ *Statuta Capituli...*, p. 154.

⁵⁹ For more, see K. Ożóg, *Uczeni w monarchii Jadwigi Andegaweńskiej i Władysława Jagiełły (1384–1434)*, Kraków 2004; T. Graff, *Praląci kapituły krakowskiej wobec kryzysu Kościoła w latach 1439–1449*, in: *Ecclesia semper reformanda. Kryzysy i reformy średniowiecznego Kościoła*, red. T. Gałuszka, T. Graff, G. Ryś, Kraków 2013, pp. 337–355.

⁶⁰ S. Hain, *Wincenty Kot...*, p. 100; W. Urban, *Studia nad dziejami...*, p. 212.

⁶¹ W. Urban, *Fundacja ku czci Eucharystii kanonika Andrzeja Skody z XV w.*, “*Studia Theologica Varsaviensia*” 1969, t. 6, nr 2, p. 71; K. Dola, *Wrocławska kapituła katedralna...*, pp. 397–398.

⁶² *Statuta Capituli...*, p. 136.

⁶³ W. Urban, *Fundacja ku czci Eucharystii...*, p. 71; K. Dola, *Wrocławska kapituła katedralna...*, p. 24.

synods in Łęczyca (1441) and Piotrków (1442).⁶⁴ In 1447, together with Canon Kałkolewski, Skoda was an envoy to Archbishop Kot, his relative, in the matter of the confirmation of the bishop-elect of Wrocław.⁶⁵ We should stress his important position in the chapter and at the court of Bishop Nowak. Skoda participated in all meetings of the general chapter we know of and was a witness to many documents issued by the bishop.⁶⁶

Members of the Wrocław chapter attended provincial synods, sometimes as representatives of their bishop. The *nuncii et procuratores* of Bishop Konrad were in Wieluń in 1420, and Piotr Wolfram, Gniezno scholaster and Wrocław canon, probably had his authorisation in Kalisz the same year.⁶⁷ We do not know whether bishop's representatives were present at the synod in Łęczyca in 1430, but in May of the same year Bishop Konrad announced the decisions of that synod in his diocese.⁶⁸ Deans Nicholas Stock and Andrzej Skoda represented the chapter in Łęczyca in 1441 and in Piotrków in 1442.⁶⁹ At this point, it is important to note the issue of implementation of decisions taken by provincial synods. In his decrees of 1452 Bishop Nowak stressed that in case of delay on the part of the bishop of Wrocław, the agreed statutes and regulations should be implemented by the archbishop of Gniezno.⁷⁰

Sometimes the Wrocław chapter asked the archbishops for help. For example, when Bishop Konrad imprisoned his brother Konrad the White, the chapter requested that the archbishop should intervene for his release.⁷¹

It should be noted that the metropolitan court of Gniezno was the court of second instance for appeals from the bishop's court in Wrocław. The archbishops and their officials issued decisions in cases concerning the clergy and citizens of the Wrocław diocese. Acknowledging the judicial authority of archbishops of Gniezno meant acknowledging their supremacy. For example,

⁶⁴ K. Dola, *Wrocławska kapituła katedralna...*, p. 211.

⁶⁵ Długosz, lib. 12, p. 53.

⁶⁶ K. Dola, *Wrocławska kapituła katedralna...*, p. 117.

⁶⁷ *Ibidem*, p. 176.

⁶⁸ G. Lichończak-Nurek, *Wojciech herbu Jastrzębiec...*, p. 159; I. Subera, *Separatystyczne dążenia kapituły Wrocławskiej...*, p. 23.

⁶⁹ K. Dola, *Wrocławska kapituła katedralna...*, p. 211.

⁷⁰ K. Dola, *Związki diecezji Wrocławskiej...*, p. 179.

⁷¹ *Ibidem*, p. 166.

in 1465, in their dispute over the bishop's estate called Ujazd, Bishop Jošt warned Duke Nicholas of Opole that he would turn to the metropolitan as his superior in matters concerning ecclesiastical freedom and bishop's rights.⁷²

Pursuant to the bull of Innocent VIII mentioned above, the Wrocław chapter was exempt from the jurisdiction of the local bishop. The pope's decision was a consequence of a long dispute between Bishop Johannes Roth and the chapter. The conflict escalated dramatically after the death of King Matthias Corvinus. The bishop even imprisoned several canons, and the chapter asked the Wrocław city council for protection.⁷³ This conflict was also well known to the archbishop. Members of the Wrocław chapter – Cantor Oswald Straubinger and Canon Nicolaus Merboth – appealed to the metropolitan court in December 1490.⁷⁴

In the archbishop's court, parties to disputes often entered important documents into the archbishop's files. For example, in July 1485, the bull of Innocent VIII from January 1484 for the monastery of St Vincent in Wrocław was entered (Provost Nicolaus appeared before the archbishop on behalf of Abbot Jan).⁷⁵

Conclusion

Summing up, it should be stressed that bishops of Wrocław realised that maintaining their subordination to Gniezno could help them to remain independent from political authority. At the same time, they had to take into account pressure on the part of Bohemian rulers, who were concerned about ecclesiastical connections of Wrocław with Gniezno. This is evidenced by a prohibition issued by Matthias Corvinus to Bishop Rudolf in 1477 forbidding him to give benefices in the diocese of Wrocław to Poles or clerics

⁷² *Politische Correspondenz Breslau im Zeitalter Georgs von Podiebrad*, Abt. 2: 1463–1469, hrsg. v. H. Markgraf, Breslau 1874 ("Scriptores rerum silesiacarum", Bd. 9), no. 189B, p. 13.

⁷³ W. Urban, *Szkice z dziejów diecezji Wrocławskiej. Biskup Jan Roth...*, pp. 25–26.

⁷⁴ AAG, Akta działalności arcybiskupa Zbigniewa Oleśnickiego: ACap., A3, ff. 76–77v.

⁷⁵ *Ibidem*, f. 178.

coming from Poland.⁷⁶ However, it is important to remember that the ban was imposed in the period of an armed conflict with Poland.

In the statutes of the Wrocław chapter which were issued during the pontificate of Bishop Rudolph it is clearly confirmed that the diocese of Wrocław is a part of the metropolis of Gniezno.⁷⁷ In Wrocław codifications we can find several statutes of the diocese of Gniezno, mainly those issued by Archbishops Janisław and Mikołaj Trąba⁷⁸ (e.g. *De praelatis et canonicis non captivandis*).⁷⁹ The diocesan synod held in Wrocław in January 1423 accepted the statutes of Trąba and determined how the codification should be announced.⁸⁰

Competition between Gniezno and Wrocław is clearly visible in political relations, particularly in the period of strong Hussite influence in Silesia. We can see, then, that the situation in the universal church had a strong impact on the relations between the two ecclesiastical centres.

The political situation sometimes forced the archbishops to get involved not only in the matters related to the ecclesiastical dependence of Wrocław. We mentioned above that Archbishop Wincenty Kot became involved in the conflict between Bishop Konrad and his brother Konrad the White. The same archbishop was one of the signatories of the peace documents with Silesian towns in 1447. Archbishop Jan Gruszczyński was engaged in the election of Rudolf von Rüdeshelm, whose candidature he supported.

Although state borders had changed and Silesia did not become a part of the Polish kingdom, the connections between Gniezno and Wrocław still existed as both sides understood that that they were mutually beneficial. For bishops of Wrocław, they gave them a certain level of independence from Bohemian rulers, and for the metropolitans, they helped them to maintain sovereignty over the entire ecclesiastical province created by the first Piasts.

⁷⁶ K. Dola, *Związki diecezji Wrocławskiej...*, p. 170; R. Żerelik, *Dzieje Śląska do 1526 roku...*, p. 102.

⁷⁷ K. Dola, *Wrocławska kapituła katedralna...*, p. 27.

⁷⁸ W. Urban, *Statuty kapituły katedralnej we Wrocławiu*, "Prawo Kanoniczne" 1966, t. 9, nr 1–2, p. 341; K. Dola, *Wrocławska kapituła katedralna...*, p. 27.

⁷⁹ *Statuta Capituli...*, p. 40.

⁸⁰ *Synody diecezji Wrocławskiej...*, pp. 121–123.

Bibliography

Archival sources

- Archiwum Archidiecezjalne w Gnieźnie (Archdiocesan Archives in Gniezno)
- Dyplomy gnieźnieńskie, sygn. Gn 446, Gn 468.
 - Akta działalności arcybiskupa Zbigniewa Oleśnickiego: ACap., A3.
- Archiwum Archidiecezjalne we Wrocławiu (Archdiocesan Archives in Wrocław)
- Zbiór dokumentów, sygn. S18a, S18b.

Printed sources

- Acta capitulorum nec non iudiciorum ecclesiasticorum selecta*, ed. B. Ulanowski, vol. 2: *Acta iudiciorum ecclesiasticorum dioecesum Gneznensis et Poznaniensis (1403–1530)*, Kraków 1902 (“Monumenta Medii Aevi Historica”, vol. 16).
- Bullarium Poloniae*, vol. 4: *1417–1431*, eds. S. Kuraś, I. Sułkowska-Kuraś, H. Wajs, Romae–Lublina 1992.
- Die Chronica des Breslauer Domherrn Stanislaus Sauer (†1535)*, ed. H. Hermann, “*Münchener Theologische Zeitschrift*” 1953, vol. 1(1–2), pp. 102–118.
- Codex epistolaris saeculi decimi quinti*, t. 2, ed. A. Lewicki, Kraków 1891 (“Monumenta Medii Aevi Historica”, t. 12).
- Codex epistolaris saeculi decimi quinti*, t. 3, ed. A. Lewicki, Kraków 1894 (“Monumenta Medii Aevi Historica”, t. 14).
- Joannis Dlugossii Annales seu Cronicae incliti Regni Poloniae*, lib. 11: *1413–1430*, ed. K. Baczkowski *et al.*, Varsaviae 2000.
- Joannis Dlugossii Annales seu Cronicae incliti Regni Poloniae*, lib. 11–12: *1431–1444*, ed. K. Baczkowski *et al.*, Varsaviae 2001.
- Joannis Dlugossii Annales seu Cronicae incliti Regni Poloniae*, lib. 12: *1445–1461*, ed. K. Baczkowski *et al.*, Varsaviae 2003.
- Joannis Dlugossii senioris canonici Cracoviensis Vitae Episcoporum Poloniae. Catalogus Episcoporum Wratislaviensium*, ed. I. Polkowski, in: *Joannis Dlugossii senioris canonici Cracoviensis Opera omnia*, vol. 1, eds. I. Polkowski, Ž. Pauli, Cracoviae 1887.
- Politische Correspondenz Breslaus im Zeitalter Georgs von Podiebrad*, Abt. 1: *1454–1463*, hrsg. v. H. Markgraf, Breslau 1873 (“*Scriptores rerum silesiacarum*”, Bd. 8).

- Politische Correspondenz Breslaus im Zeitalter Georgs von Podiebrad*,
Abt. 2: 1463–1469, hrsg. v. H. Markgraf, Breslau 1874 (“Scriptores
rerum silesiacarum”, Bd. 9).
- Sigismundi Rositzii Chronica et numerus episcoporum Wratislaviensium*,
in: *Silesiacarum rerum scriptores*, vol. 1, ed. F.W. de Sommersberg,
Lipsiae 1729.
- Statuta Capituli Ecclesiae Cathedralis Wratislaviensis ex anno
1482/83*, ed. K. Dola, Wrocław–Opole 2004.
- Synody diecezji Wrocławskiej i ich statuty*, red. J. Sawicki, Wrocław
1963 (“Concilia Poloniae”, vol. 10).

Secondary works

- Abraham W., *Organizacja kościoła w Polsce do połowy wieku XII*,
Poznań 1962.
- Baran-Kozłowski W., *Arcybiskup gnieźnieński Henryk Kietlicz
(1199–1219). Działalność kościelna i polityczna*, Poznań 2005.
- Czyżak M., *Kapituła katedralna w Gnieźnie w świetle metryki z lat
1408–1448*, Poznań 2003.
- Dąbrowski J., *Dzieje polityczne Śląska w latach 1290–1402*, in: *His-
toria Śląska od najdawniejszych czasów do roku 1400*, t. 1, oprac.
W. Semkowicz et al., red. S. Kutrzeba, 2nd ed., Kraków 2013,
pp. 327–562.
- Dembiński P., *Poznańska kapituła katedralna schyłku wieków śred-
nich. Studium prozopograficzne 1428–1500*, Poznań 2012.
- Dobosz J., *Monarchia i możni wobec Kościoła w Polsce do początku
XIII wieku*, Poznań 2002.
- Dola K., *Dzieje Kościoła na Śląsku*, cz. 1: *Średniowiecze*, Opole 1996.
- Dola K., *Wrocławska kapituła katedralna w XV wieku. Ustrój – skład
osobowy – działalność*, Lublin 1983.
- Dola K., *Związki diecezji Wrocławskiej z metropolią gnieźnieńską
w latach 1418–1520*, “*Studia Theologica Varsaviensia*” 1977, t. 15,
nr 1, pp. 147–188.
- Dowiat J., *Historia Kościoła katolickiego w Polsce (do połowy XV wieku)*,
Warszawa 1968.
- Drabina J., *Stanowisko papieży w kwestii obsady Wrocławskiego bis-
kupstwa w XV wieku*, “*Colloquium Salutis. Wrocławskie Studia
Teologiczne*” 1967, t. 8, pp. 97–115.
- Drabina J., *Wrocławska kapituła katedralna i jej stosunek do poli-
tycznych wydarzeń lat 1453–1471*, “*Śląskie Studia Historyczno-
-Teologiczne*” 1969, t. 2, pp. 183–204.

- Graff T., *Episkopat monarchii jagiellońskiej w dobie soborów powszechnych XV wieku*, Kraków 2008.
- Graff T., *Prataci kapituły krakowskiej wobec kryzysu Kościoła w latach 1439–1449*, in: *Ecclesia semper reformanda. Kryzysy i reformy średniowiecznego Kościoła*, red. T. Gałuszka, T. Graff, G. Ryś, Kraków 2013, pp. 337–355.
- Hain S., *Wincenty Kot prymas Polski (1436–1448)*, Poznań 1948.
- Historia Kościoła w Polsce*, red. B. Kumor, Z. Obertyński, t. 1: *Do roku 1764*, cz. 1: *Do roku 1506*, Poznań and Warszawa 1974.
- Lichończak-Nurek G., *Wojciech herbu Jastrzębiec, arcybiskup i mąż stanu (ok. 1362–1436)*. Kraków 1996.
- Maciejewski J., *Episkopat polski doby dzielnicowej 1180–1320*, Kraków and Bydgoszcz 2003.
- Ozóg K., *Uczeni w monarchii Jadwigi Andegaweńskiej i Władysława Jagiełły (1384–1434)*, Kraków 20004.
- Paner A., *Luksemburgowie w Czechach. Historia polityczna ziem czechskich w latach 1310–1437*, Gdańsk 2004.
- Polska dzielnicowa i zjednoczona. Państwo, społeczeństwo, kultura*, red. A. Gieysztor, Warszawa 1972.
- Sikorski D.A., *Kościół w Polsce za Mieszka I i Bolesława Chrobrego. Rozważania nad granicami poznania historycznego*, Poznań 2013.
- Silnicki T., *Dzieje i ustrój Kościoła katolickiego na Śląsku do końca w. XIV*, Warszawa 1953.
- Silnicki T., *Początki organizacji Kościoła w Polsce za Mieszka I i Bolesława Chrobrego*, in: *Początki państwa polskiego. Księga Tysiąclecia*, t. 1: *Organizacja polityczna*, red. K. Tymieniecki, Poznań 1962, pp. 319–361.
- Sperka J., *Książęta śląscy w relacjach Polski z Czechami w początkowym okresie rewolucji husyckiej*, “*Studia z Dziejów Średniowiecza*” 2022, t. 25, pp. 281–305.
- Sperka J., *Przyjaźń, wrogość, współpraca: król Władysław Jagiełło wobec książąt śląskich*, in: *Jagiellonowie i ich świat. Konflikty Jagiellonów*, red. B. Czwojdrak, J. Sperka, P. Węcowski, Kraków 2023, pp. 7–46.
- Subera I., *Separatystyczne dążenia kapituły Wrocławskiej do uniezależnienia się od metropolii gnieźnieńskiej*, cz. 2, “*Prawo Kanoniczne*” 1969, t. 12, nr 1–2, pp. 3–34.
- Urban W., *Fundacja ku czci Eucharystii kanonika Andrzeja Skody z XV w.*, “*Studia Theologica Varsaviensia*” 1969, t. 6, nr 2, pp. 69–74.

- Urban W., *Jeszcze o egzempcji diecezji Wrocławskiej*, "Prawo Kanoniczne" 1968, t. 11, nr 1–2, pp. 319–325.
- Urban W., *Statuty kapituły katedralnej we Wrocławiu*, "Prawo Kanoniczne" 1966, t. 9, nr 1–2, pp. 329–354.
- Urban W., *Studia nad dziejami Wrocławskiej diecezji w pierwszej połowie XV wieku*, Wrocław Urban W., *Szkice z dziejów diecezji Wrocławskiej. Biskup Jan Roth (1482–1506)*, "Studia Theologica Varsaviensia" 1967, t. 5, nr 1, pp. 11–72.
- Urban W., *Szkice z dziejów diecezji Wrocławskiej. Biskup Rudolf z Rüdesheim (1468–1482)*, "Studia Theologica Varsaviensia", t. 4, nr 1, pp. 123–166.
- Żerelik R., *Dzieje Śląska do 1526 roku*, in: M. Czapliński, E. Kaszuba, G. Waś, R. Żerelik, *Historia Śląska*, red. M. Czapliński, Wrocław 2002.

Streszczenie

Między współpracą a rywalizacją. Relacje między Kościołem gnieźnieńskim i wrocławskim w XV wieku

W XV wieku relacje arcybiskupów gnieźnieńskich z biskupami wrocławskimi ulegały zmianom. Zarówno sytuacja polityczna na Śląsku, jak i polityka papieska miały wpływ na te bardzo złożone, czasem trudne, a nawet wrogie stosunki: prowincja śląska nie weszła przecież w skład zjednoczonego Królestwa Polskiego, terytorium biskupstwa znajdującego się pod zwierzchnictwem metropolii gnieźnieńskiej stanowiło wówczas część królestwa czeskiego, a biskupi wrocławscy byli wasalami króla Czech. Wpływ na omawiane stosunki miały także wojny husyckie, konflikty pomiędzy miejscowymi książętami, walka o wpływy pomiędzy władcami Czech i Polski czy konflikty pomiędzy biskupem a kapitułą wrocławską.

Biskupi wrocławscy zdawali sobie sprawę z faktu, że utrzymanie zależności od metropolitów gnieźnieńskich może pomóc im w utrzymaniu niezależności od władzy politycznej. Biskupi wrocławscy musieli liczyć się z naciskami ze strony władców czeskich, niezadowolonymi z więzi kościelnych Wrocławia z Gnieznem.

Związek pomiędzy dwiema kapitułami gnieźnieńską i wrocławską widać w składzie kapituł katedralnych. Część kanoników gnieźnieńskich to jednocześnie członkowie kapituły wrocławskiej. W XV w. liczba ta nie była tak duża. Być może wynikało to ze statutu *De alienigenis*, który ograniczał członkostwo w kapitule do osób ze Śląska.

Powiązania miały zatem zarówno charakter prawny (wynikały z podległości biskupstwa wrocławskiego, sąd metropolitalny gnieźnieński był drugą instancją dla sądu biskupiego wrocławskiego), personalny (kontakty między arcybiskupem i biskupem wrocławskim oraz członkami ich kapituł) oraz kulturowy (wymiana myśli i wiedzy, tradycji, zapewne też ksiąg, przedmiotów liturgicznych i kultu), choć charakter tych ostatnich jest słabo dostrzegalny w źródłach.