

Tomasz Graff

The Pontifical University of John Paul II in Krakow

Servants of the devil or protectors of Christianity and apostles among pagans? Shaping the image of Poland and Poles in the context of steps taken by Wladyslaw II Jagiello's diplomacy against 'Satira' by John Falkenberg

The Council of Constance was the most important mediaeval international congress in which Poles participated. During its proceedings, as well as afterwards, Polish diplomats constantly had to face accusations of supporting pagans, heretics and schismatics. Such defamatory statements were mostly the effect of the propaganda orchestrated by the Teutonic Order and its allies. The Teutonic Knights were intent on debasing their rivals, hoping for a favourable settlement of the dispute with Poles and Lithuanians on the forum of the Council, thanks to – among others – the kindness of some council fathers and the Sigismund of Luxembourg. This smear campaign was all the more dangerous because a large proportion of opinion-forming West-European elites believed the Teutonic propaganda. For that reason Jagiello particularly insisted that his representatives in Constance create an image of a Christian monarchy, ruled by a pious king, defender of the border of Christendom, who inspired a union with the Orthodox Church as well as effectively contributed to preaching the gospel to the last barbarian peoples of Europe, i.e. Lithuanians, who had been in the process of Christianization for several decades, but first and foremost, the Samogitians. The peaceful methods successfully applied towards the latter were supposed to

stand in sharp contrast to the brutal acts of the Order. Steps taken by Polish diplomacy and propaganda effectively influenced the views of religious and intellectual elites gathered in Constance. A moment of special importance in the struggle was the appearance of a satirical piece written by John Falkenberg, a Dominican monk. However, the very scale of fierce accusations contained in his *Satira* surpassed even the Teutonic onslaught, and the Order tried to dissociate itself from the work. The publication of the satire was then a peculiar test for the Polish diplomats participating in the Council as well as a perfect opportunity for building a positive image of Jagiello and his monarchy. The significance of that stage of the Council of Constance has not always been appreciated by historiographers. This is noticeable e.g. in the figure of Paul Włodkowiec, who became famous at the Council as an innovative scholar, advocating the concept of *ius gentium*, effectively undermining the methods which the Teutonic Order used against pagans. It is this particular part of his council activity which has been so far highlighted by the literature on the subject.¹ Meanwhile, much less attention was paid to the final period of Włodkowiec's stay in Constance, when the subject of John Falkenberg's *Satira* hit the public eye; the matter was still discussed in 1424. Moreover, when Polish researchers did look closer at the issue, they frequently decried Włodkowiec and Polish representatives for being unnecessarily inflexible, too attached to national pride and driven by emotions.²

1. Cf. e.g. P.W. Knoll, *"A pearl of powerful learning": the University of Cracow in the fifteenth century*, Leiden-Boston 2016, pp. 238–244; K. Ożóg, *Uczni w monarchii Jadwigi Andegaweńskiej i Władysława Jagiełły (1384–1434)*, Kraków 2004, pp. 92–94, 212–215, 332; K. Grzybowski, *Włodkowica nauka o państwie a proces doktrynalny*, „Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego. Prace Historyczne” 1961 nr 8, pp. 23–33; S.L. Belch, *Paulus Vladimiri and his Doctrine Concerning International Law and Politics*, vol. I–II, London–The Hague–Paris 1965; T. Brzostowski, *Paweł Włodkowiec*, Warszawa 1954; L. Ehrlich, *Paweł Włodkowiec i Stanisław ze Skarbimierza*, Warszawa 1954; J. Sondel, *Zawsze wierny. Uniwersytet Jagielloński a Kościół rzymskokatolicki*, Kraków 2006, pp. 212–229, 287–293 (in which Falkenberg was called a “paid Teutonic agent”). A sceptical view on the ingenuity of Paul Włodkowiec's concept of *ius gentium* was expressed by H. Boockmann, *Johannes Falkenberg, der Deutsche Orden und die polnische Politik: Untersuchungen zur politischen Theorie des späteren Mittelalters mit einem Anhang: Die Satira des Johannes Falkenberg*, Göttingen 1975, pp. 225ff; cf. a polemical opinion of K. Górski, *Nowa praca o Falkenbergu*, „Komunikaty Mazursko-Warmińskie” 1976 nr 4 (134), pp. 564–565.
2. E.g. A. Prochaska, *Sobór w Konstancji*, 2nd ed., Kraków 1996, pp. 67–83; Z.H. Nowak, *Dyplomacja polska w czasach Jadwigi i Władysława Jagiełły (1383–1434)*, in: *Historia dyplomacji polskiej*, t. 1: *Połowa X w. – 1572*, red. M. Biskup,

Others, in more recent years, such as Krzysztof Ożóg, believed that the Polish diplomacy's actions against John Falkenberg's 'Satira' and the insistence on appealing on the matter to the next Council were a desperate defence of the Polish interest, as "the honour and good name of king Władysław Jagiello and the Kingdom of Poland" were at stake.³ Krzysztof Baczkowski was of similar opinion: in his synthesis of late-mediaeval history of Poland he identified the Polish struggle against 'Satira' with actions against the Teutonic Knights, and held that if Falkenberg's work had been regarded as heretical, it would have affected the Order, too. According to this distinguished researcher, pope Martin V delayed making the judgement in the matter of 'Satira', as he did not want to alienate the Order; the issue finally compromised the Order anyway and "proved the skill and tenacity with which the Polish diplomats defended the reputation of their king, state and nation".⁴ On the other hand, foreign historians tend to underline the firm stance of Poles on the appeal against 'Satira' to the next Council, but all except few, such as Hartmut Boockmann, do not analyse the problem in too much detail.⁵ In the face of such divergent views held by the experts on the subject, the aim of the present article will be to re-analyse known sources concerning the above-described problem and find answers to two questions: 1) did the Polish delegation in Constance select optimum *modus operandi* against the Falkenberg's satire and 2) if, at the end of the Council, the effect of such steps was positive for Jagiello's monarchy? Therefore, this article expresses another point of view on the subject, which, although well-known in historiography, is usually discussed either too emotionally (due to patriotic feelings of Polish historians) or too superficially – when it accompanies an analysis of a broader context of the work of the Polish delegation in Constance.

Warszawa 1980, p. 335; T.Graff, *Sobór w Konstancji wobec monarchii polsko-litewskiej*, „Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego. Prace Historyczne” 41 nr 2 (2014), pp. 521–524.

3. K. Ożóg, *Uczni...*, op. cit., pp. 220–222.
4. K. Baczkowski, *Dzieje Polski Późnośredniowiecznej (1370–1506)*, in: *Wielka Historia Polski*, t. 3, Kraków 1999, pp. 113–114.
5. H. Boockmann, *Johannes Falkenberg...*, op. cit. Recently the matter was discussed in a separate work by J. Miethke, *Die Polen auf dem Konstanzer Konzil. Der Konflikt um den Dominikaner Johannes Falkenberg*, in: *Das Konstanzer Konzil: 1414–1418. Weltereignis des Mittelalters. Essays*, Hrsg. K.-H. Braun, Stuttgart 2013, pp. 106–110. However, the author did not go beyond the findings of subject literature to date.

'Satira' by John Falkenberg was probably written 2 years before the commencement of the proceedings of the Council of Constance.⁶ According to an account by John Długosz (Johannes Longinus), the work was presented to archbishop Nicolas Trąba during a feast in Paris he hosted for local professors in the spring of 1416.⁷ As K. Ożóg accurately pointed out, archbishop Nicolas Trąba returned to Constance in May the same year, and Poles brought an official charge against Falkenberg in early 1417. Accordingly, Ożóg claims that 'Satira' may have reached Constance in late 1416. Otherwise it is difficult to account for such a long delay in pressing charges.⁸ However, it seems that one may find a different but equally likely solution to the problem. We must bear in mind that such delay could easily be explained by a broader context to the work of Polish diplomacy in Constance.

Back then strenuous effort was being made in order to settle the dispute with the Teutonic Knights using methods provided for in law. In May 1416 in Inowrocław, the truce with the Order was extended thanks to the mediation of Sigismund of Luxembourg and Charles VI. Both parties made it clear that contentious matters should be presented to the Council. This event led to further extensions of the truce, towards the end of the Council also under the supervision of a new pope Martin V. Paul Włodkowiec also played part in the process.⁹ The Polish delegation to Constance had high expectations concerning the potential resolution of the Polish-Teutonic

6. H. Boockmann, *Johannes Falkenberg...*, op. cit., pp. 189ff.
7. *Ioannis Dlugossii Annales seu cronicae incliti Regni Poloniae* [hereinafter: *Annales*], XI: 1413–1430, Warszawa 2000, pp. 66–69.
8. K. Ożóg, *Uczeni...*, op. cit., pp. 217–218. Similar views expressed in: K. Baczkowski, *Polityka Zygmunta Luksemburskiego wobec Polski w dwu pierwszych dekadach XV wieku a Mikołaj Trąba*, in: *Mikołaj Trąba. Mąż stanu i prymas Polski. Conference material*. Sandomierz, 13–14 June 2008, red. F. Kiryk, Kraków 2009, p. 85; K. Pieradzka, *Dwie polskie relacje kronikarskie o soborze w Konstancji*, in: *Mediaevalia w 50. rocznicę pracy naukowej Jana Dąbrowskiego*, Warszawa 1960, pp. 211–219.
9. *Die Staatsverträge des Deutschen Ordens in Preussen im 15. Jahrhundert*, Bd. 1, Hrsg. E. Weise, Königsberg 1939, pp. 113, 115, 122, 129–130; *Die Berichte der Generalprokuratoren des Deutschen Ordens an der Kurie* [hereinafter: *Berichte*], Bd. 2, Hrsg. v. H. Koeppe, Göttingen 1960, p. 249; *Codex epistolaris saeculi decimi quinti* [hereinafter: *CE*], vol. 2, ed. A. Lewicki, Cracoviae 1891, no. 72, 73, 84; Z. H. Nowak, *Międzynarodowe procesy polubowne jako narzędzie polityki Zygmunta Luksemburskiego 1412–1424*, Toruń 1981, pp. 73–79; K. Ożóg, *Uczeni...*, op. cit., pp. 216–217; K. Baczkowski, *Polityka Zygmunta Luksemburskiego...*, op. cit., p. 85. See also: P. Bar, *A Tortuous Path to Reconciliation and Justice: Sigismund of Luxembourg as Arbiter in the Dispute between the Teutonic Knights and Poland (1412–1420)*, "Journal of East Central European Studies" vol. 66/1 (2017), pp. 3–40.

dispute on a doctrinal basis, with active involvement of the rector of the Cracow University and other intellectuals, including those from abroad.¹⁰ For that reason it seems equally likely that Poles, faced with the concurrence of several possibilities to settle the dispute with the Order, waited for the right moment to formally raise the matter of the satire by Falkenberg, a polemicist instructed the Teutonic Knights. To act reasonably was desirable anyway, as in the eyes of the Council Fathers the image of the Polish-Lithuanian monarchy and their rulers was increasingly positive, to which, among other things, contributed the Polish delegates' active participation in the work on reforming the Church, proactive approach in promoting a union with the Orthodox Church and successful Christianization of Samogitia. Such steps successfully belied the anti-Polish and anti-Lithuanian Teutonic propaganda.¹¹ Meanwhile, Paul Włodkowic wrote numerous letters against the Order, to name but 'Saevientibus olim Pruthenis', trying to prove that the Teutonic Knights are a heretical sect, deserving condemnation and abolition, harmful to Christian body and soul and devoid of any rights to land and property they possessed. According to master Paul such right should, however, be recognised in pagans on the basis of natural law and the law of nations. Conversion by the sword, annexation of their goods and land, as practised by the Teutonic Order, was a violation of all laws: divine, natural, canonical and civil; it was an unjust war as well as a path to sin for other Christians collaborating with the Order. Włodkowic's view was that the only right method of evangelizing pagan neighbours was to preach God's word peacefully. If pagans live in peace, no-one has the right to invade them and convert to Christianity by force. The rector of the Cracow University also addressed the question of the scope of pontifical and imperial power over the infidels. In his deliberations he negated the emperors' power to have the land of pagans at their disposal, which went against the endowments bestowed upon the Order; he also emphasized that popes may intervene in pagans' affairs

10. J. Wyrozumski, *Mikołaj Trąba a sobór w Konstancji*, in: *Mikołaj Trąba...*, op. cit., pp. 39–40; K. Ożóg, *Uczni...*, op. cit., p. 214.

11. T. Graff, *Episkopat monarchii jagiellońskiej w dobie soborów powszechnych XV wieku*, Kraków 2008, pp. 199–219; A. Rütther, *Geheimdiplomatie – Schauprozess – Medienkrieg Polen – Litauen und der Deutsche Orden um die Zeit; des Konzils von Konstanz (1414–1418)*, „Biuletyn Polskiej Misji Historycznej” 2013, nr 8, pp. 43–74; T. Silnicki, *Sobory powszechne a Polska*, Warszawa 1962, pp. 66ff.

only in certain circumstances.¹² Paul Włodkowic appeared as a scholar, not as an official envoy of the Kingdom and Jagiello, which was probably a form of safeguard in anticipation of opposition to his claims.¹³ Such circumspection was anyway advisable, since, as Stefan Kwiatkowski rightly pointed out, "Spiritual foundations of armed conflicts with pagans had been set in the mediaeval Western mentality for many centuries. Thus if they were to be disputed, it could not have been on grounds of some special moral sensibility of one of the parties to the conflict and exceptional corruption of the other, as historiographers supposed, but rather due to the evolution of basic philosophical, theological and legal concepts."¹⁴ Still, all those concerned were aware that Włodkowic's addresses are perfectly in line with other steps taken by Poland against the Teutonic Order at the Council. Poles wanted to go even further by proposing that the Order should be abolished and declared heretical.¹⁵ The Polish-Lithuanian monarchy tried very hard to appear in the eyes of the West not as a political parvenu, suspect in terms of the purity of faith, but as a fully-fledged member of the mediaeval 'christianitas', unlawfully attacked by Teutonic Knights.¹⁶ Nevertheless, the latter were not idle and organized a wide-ranging campaign in response to claims publicly presented by Włodkowic.¹⁷ John Falkenberg was also one of polemicists who served the Order. In two letters (one non-extant), the Dominican friar, slightly modifying his views previously voiced in 'Sati-ra' claimed that Paul Włodkowic had unfairly accused the Order and that Jagiello and Witold were pseudo-Christians and servants of the devil, who had handed over weapons to pagans and schismatics, teaching them how to fight the faithful. For this reason Poles, their king and dukes, being fierce

12. *Polska w okresie monarchii stanowej 1346–1454*. Selected works, compiled by R. Heck, Warszawa 1955, pp. 161–162; *Pisma wybrane Pawła Włodkowica*, issued by L. Ehrlich, t. I, Warszawa 1966, pp. 2–98, 113–137; *Berichte*, II, no. 164; K. Ożóg, *Uczeni...*, op. cit., pp. 92–94, 206–216.
13. K. Ożóg, *Uczeni...*, op. cit., p. 214.
14. S. Kwiatkowski, *Zakon Niemiecki w Prusach a umysłowość Średniowiecza*, Toruń 1998, p. 33.
15. *Berichte...*, op. cit.
16. S. Kwiatkowski, *Zakon Niemiecki...*, op. cit., p. 115.
17. *Acta Concilii Constantiensis* [hereinafter: *Acta Concilii*], Hg. v. H. Finke, Bd. IV, Münster 1928, pp. 68–709; S. Kwiatkowski, *Zakon Niemiecki...*, op. cit., pp. 112–158; A. Prochaska, *Sobór...*, op. cit., pp. 52–55; H. Boockmann, *Johannes Falkenberg...*, op. cit., pp. 234–256; A. F. Grabski, *Polska w opiniach Europy Zachodniej XIV–XV w.*, Warszawa 1968, pp. 332–340; K. Ożóg, *Uczeni...*, op. cit., pp. 214–215.

opponents of the Church, were supposed to lose their crown and kingdom and, deprived of their knightly belts, become slaves. Their goods should be seized, and their hubris was so immense that led Witold, a shoemaker's grandson hungry for victory, to an ungodly declaration that he would take his horses to drink the water of Rhine.¹⁸ According to Falkenberg, all Christians who allied themselves with Poles and pagans against the Teutonic Knights will suffer the pain of eternal damnation. Therefore, the Council should hand down an appropriate punishment for Poles. Falkenberg even took the opportunity to fulminate against Paul Włodkowic. The Dominican said: "Paul, defender of pagans and Ruthenians, who are blatantly heretical and who increased their strength, and the Church, often devastated, surrenders by saying that it is a sin and an unforgivable mistake for Christians to smite peaceful pagans in order to spread the Christian faith. Thus he should be considered an advocate of pagans and heretics rather than a loyal and true Christian."¹⁹ Among other intellectuals who supported the Order one should note the figure of John Urbach, who disagreed with Włodkowic, having a different understanding of the application of natural law to pagans. In the view of Urbach, pagans breach natural law by their own idolatry, thus waiving any rights, also including moral ones. Quoting St. Augustine, Rudolf Arzt argued that slaying pagans is part of the divine plan, in which people are predestined either for salvation or damnation. Bishop Jacob Balardi of Lodi expressed a similar opinion, seeing the need for a total separation of the world of pagans from the world of Christians. He believed that refraining from oppression against the infidel may even provoke God's anger. Such views, based on Augustinianism, met with criticism on part of Poles, whose foundations were mainly Thomistic and decretistic.²⁰

Interestingly enough, Paul Włodkowic replied to letters from his opponents only after 1417 in a two-volume treatise entitled 'Quoniam error', when the case of 'Satira' by John Falkenberg had busied the Polish party for many months. In the light of the concept of just and unjust wars as well as natural law, master Paul condemned the Order's acts directed against peaceful pagans. Paul believed that wars should not be a means of spreading

18. *Polska w okresie monarchii stanowej...*, op. cit., pp. 162–164.

19. *Polska w okresie monarchii stanowej...*, op. cit., p. 163. Cf. also: Johannes Falkenberg, *Veteres relegentes historias*, red. M. Bobrzyński, in: *Starodawne Prawa Polskiego Pomniki*, t. V, issued by M. Bobrzyński, U. Heyzmann, Kraków 1878, pp. 197–231.

20. S. Kwiatkowski, *Zakon Niemiecki...*, op. cit., pp. 116 ff.

the faith, and that the Order of Teutonic Knights betrayed the mission of knightly orders to defend the Holy Land. In his reply to John Urbach's treatise he did not hesitate to accuse him that his views are similar to Falkenberg's outrageous theses.²¹ Poles intended to use the case of Falkenberg's 'Satira' against the Teutonic Knights, whereas the Teutonic Order, mindful of the risk, distanced itself from the work and its author. Not everybody knew that even before the Council of Constance the Grand Master, advised by John Abezier, who later became bishop of Warmia, denounced 'Satira' as too radical and dangerous, and ordered its author to leave the Order's land.²² It was a clever move on part of Teutonic diplomacy but those gathered in Constance perfectly knew the Dominican's connections with the Teutonic Knights.²³ Therefore Poles wanted the work to be universally condemned.

The complete text of 'Satira' has been known to researchers since as late as the 1970s, when it was published independently of each other by Zofia Włodek and Hartmut Boockmann.²⁴ The friar's opusculum can be unquestionably called a primitive pasquinada. John Falkenberg based his idea on the Augustinian tradition, which the Teutonic Knights referred to, justifying their plundering raids in the vein of crusaders' ideology. According to Falkenberg, pagans, heretics and schismatics could, and even had to be fought by the sword, as they harmed the true Church and were sons of the devil destined for damnation. Whoever availed themselves of Satan's help (like Jagiello, Witold and their subjects) was, at the same time, his servant. The use of coercion towards the forces of evil was thus a necessity, and

21. *Pisma...*, op. cit., II, pp. 325–326; S. Kwiatkowski, *Zakon Niemiecki...*, op. cit., pp. 138–143; K. Ożóg, *Uczeni...*, op. cit., pp. 215–216.
22. J. Fijałek, *Dwaj dominikanie krakowscy: Jan Biskupiec i Jan Falkenberg*, in: *Księga pamiątkowa ku czci O. Balzera*, t. I, Lwów 1925, p. 39.
23. Marian Biskup even claimed that the Teutonic Knights tried to distribute Falkenberg's *Satira* in many copies at the Council. However, such view should not be accepted. On the contrary, the Order seemed to try to distance itself as much as possible from Falkenberg's work. Cf. M. Biskup, *Spór zakonu krzyżackiego z Polską i Litwą na soborze i przed sądem polubownym króla Zygmunta Luksemburskiego*, in: *Państwo Zakonu Krzyżackiego w Prusach. Władza i społeczeństwo*, red. M. Biskup, R. Czaja, Warszawa 2008, p. 240.
24. *Iohannis Falkenberg Satira contra hereses et cetera nephanda Polonorum et eorum Regis Jaghel*, ed. by Z. Włodek in: *La Satire de Jean Falkenberg. Texte inédit avec introduction, Mediaevalia Philosophica Polonorum*, vol. 18, 1973, pp. 51–95; H. Boockmann, *Johannes Falkenberg...*, op. cit., pp. 313–353. See also: P. Bar, *Omnes Poloni essent heretici. Kauza Jana Falkenberga a diskuze o pojmu "hereze" na kostnickém koncilu.*, in: *Cesta k rozmanitosti aneb Kavárenský povaleč digitálním historikem středověku*, ed. T. Klimek, R. Modráková, Praha 2016, pp. 55–64.

combating them was a just war. God's people were then allowed to take all possessions from the unlawful, and making peace with the infidels was impossible. Also, one cannot forgive the sins of servants of the devil, as it is possible to forgive harms suffered by man, not by God. Those who offended Lord with their acts and existence should thus be annihilated. Falkenberg openly called for an extermination of the Polish nation and the 'idol' of Poles, as they threatened the Universal Church. Accordingly, subjects of the Polish king were idolaters paying homage to an idiot on a throne. The friar also accused Poles of shedding Christian blood and poisoning the faithful with heresy. The harm done by Poles to the Church should therefore be avenged so as not to offend God. Poles were responsible for all crimes, heresy, and even apostasy from the true religion and return to paganism. Those who participated in a godly work of killing Poles and contribute to their king's death were worthy of salvation. In contrast, the inert might face the prospect of a deadly sin. Those who helped the Polish king would also be condemned, unless they made atonement, and the pope granted them a special indult or they were absolved when in danger of death. In the work of killing Poles, Christian monarchs should be unflinching and strive to annihilate the entire nation or at least greater part thereof. Polish knights should be wiped off the surface of the earth by the force of Christian armies, and the captured should be hanged in full sun on branches. No mercy could be shown, as Jagiello's subjects and the king himself were contemptible and hateful heretics as well as shameless dogs returning to their vomits:

Et ergo indubie omnes, qui ad hereticorum exterminium ex caritate se accinxerint, vitam merentur eternam. Sed Poloni et eorum rex Jaghel sunt odibiles heretici et impudici canes reversi ad vomitus sue infidelitatis. Et ergo securissime omnes non solum principes seculi, verum eciam inferiores, qui ad Polonorum et eorum regis Jaghel exterminium ex caritate se accinxerint, vitam merentur eternam.²⁵

The exhortation to kill Jagiello was partly in line with John Petit's views on tyrannicide, albeit the discovery of 'Satira' revealed considerable differences in the matter.²⁶ According to Petit, to murder a tyrant was not a sin but

25. H. Boockmann, *Johannes Falkenberg...*, op. cit., p. 352.

26. K. Górski, *Nowa praca...*, op. cit., pp. 565–566.

a merit. His opinions became widely known when Duke of Orléans, brother of the French king, was murdered by assassins in the pay of Duke of Burgundy. It was then that Petit was commissioned by Duke of Burgundy to write a treatise in which he tried to prove that it was acceptable for anyone to kill a vassal who plots against his lord. The efforts of Gerson and Bishop of Paris led to condemnation and public burning of the book.²⁷ However, Duke of Burgundy appealed to the Council in this matter. On 6 July 1415, the day of Jan Hus's death, during the 15th session of the Council, the sentence "Quilibet tyrannus potest et debet licite et meritorie occidi [...]"²⁸ was condemned as heretical without any reference to Petit's name; it was also emphasized that such ungodly, indecent, demoralizing statements threaten the political system and the order of the state. Despite the sentence, the problem of tyrannicide was still discussed during the sessions of the Faith Commission, where 60 out of 80 theologians voted in favour of accepting Petit's theories. Consequently, French envoys appealed against the Commission's sentence to the Council.²⁹ Interestingly enough, the French were represented by Simon of Teramo, who also represented the Polish side.³⁰ Over the subsequent months both sides of the conflict attacked each other in emotion-driven treatises. Petit's adversaries included John Gerson (the chancellor of the University of Paris) and Peter d'Ailly. The fact that John Falkenberg himself supported the Burgundian delegation in the dispute added spice to the whole affair.³¹ H. Boockmann noted that the front line between opponents over Petit's theories overlapped with the dividing lines in the Falkenberg case.³²

The trial which commenced following the charges brought by the Polish delegation in early 1417 had therefore a wider context, which mostly affected its later course, to name but the resistance of some Council Fathers against the reintroduction of the contentious issue of tyrannicide into the agenda of plenary sessions. It was symptomatic that Gerson, along with

27. A. Prochaska, *Sobór...*, op. cit., p. 47.

28. *Dokumenty Soborów Powszechnych, t. 3: (1414–1445)*, comp. by A. Baron, H. Pietras, Kraków 2003, pp. 142–143.

29. A. Prochaska, *Sobór...*, op. cit., pp. 47–48.

30. K. Ożóg, *Szymon z Teramo adwokat polski w Stolicy Apostolskiej i na soborach w Konstancji i Bazylei*, „*Nasza Przeszłość*” 1992, nr 78, pp. 169–185.

31. A. Prochaska, *Sobór...*, op. cit., pp. 48–49.

32. H. Boockmann, *Johannes Falkenberg...*, op. cit., pp. 263 ff; cf. K. Górski, *Nowa praca...*, op. cit., pp. 565–566.

Poland's steps against Falkenberg, tried to resume proceedings against Pet- it. The fact was aptly commented by Antoni Prochaska, who noted that in this way the chancellor of the Parisian university shook his right hand with the rector of the University of Cracow.³³ In any case, Gerson had his reasons to detest Falkenberg, who not only supported the Burgundian position on tyrannicide, but also dared to claim that Gerson does not do credit to the University of Paris and should go back to school to learn logic. Falkenberg did not hesitate to attack cardinal Peter d'Ailly, either.³⁴ The issue of 'Satira' was thus a sensitive matter and the Polish delegation had to take subse- quent steps with utmost care.

The charges brought in early 1417 clearly called for the condemnation of 'Satira' as a heretical work at variance with the Church's dogmas.³⁵ The Order's procurator Peter von Wormditt notified the Grand Master of the entire affair. In the letter we find that it is little wonder that Polish bishops took an opportunity to arrest Falkenberg. Interestingly enough, the procu- rator, who personally disliked the Dominican, called such course of action on part of the Polish delegates as the right one ("Und die polenisschen biss- choffe die haben Falkenberg alhie mit rechte arrestirt und clagen in an vor eynen ketczer").³⁶ Thanks to Peter von Wormditt we also learn that certain steps in connection with 'Satira' had not much sooner been taken by Jagiel- lo himself, who approached the Grand Master with complaints and blamed him for Falkenberg's opuscle.³⁷ This launched the struggle for the honour of the Polish monarch and his subjects, which soon slipped out of Jagiello's delegates' control.

The fate Falkenberg and his opuscle no longer depended on reasona- ble arguments, but instead became subject of international political game. It should be noted that while Poles accused Falkenberg, the case of Petit was obstructed by Sigismund of Luxembourg. At the same time, the issue of 'Satira' became the subject of a debate between nations.³⁸ Thus the Roman king pretended to be an ally of Poland, probably hoping to take advantage

33. A. Prochaska, *Sobór...*, op. cit., pp. 48–49.

34. A. Prochaska, *Sobór...*; J. Fijałek, *Dwaj dominikanie...*, op. cit., p. 53.

35. *Berichte...*, op. cit., no 197; W. Brandmüller, *Das Konzil von Konstanz*, Bd. II, Pad- erborn 1997, pp. 167–169; A. Prochaska, *Sobór...*, op. cit., pp. 49–50; H. Boockmann, *Johannes Falkenberg...*, op. cit., pp. 263–265; K. Oźóg, *Uczeni...*, op. cit., p. 218.

36. *Berichte...*, op. cit.

37. *Berichte...*, op. cit.; H. Boockmann, *Johannes Falkenberg...*, op. cit., pp. 263–265.

38. A. Prochaska, *Sobór...*, op. cit., p. 50.

of the policy which sought to weaken the papacy in favour of conciliarism. Moreover, being a seasoned politician, Sigismund must have expected that the Polish delegation would be implicated in an infamous dispute on the forum of the Council. In such a case he would gain additional instruments and forms of pressure both towards Poland and the Teutonic Order.³⁹ Meanwhile, Poles hoped that John Falkenberg's case would gain as much publicity as possible, in addition to general condemnation and burning of 'Satira', and perhaps even the author himself. Such developments would mean a great triumph of the Polish delegation acting in defence of their king and state. Therefore, even in the absence of prospects of resolving the dispute with the Teutonic Knights, at least success in terms of publicity would be achieved, which would ricochet against the Order and its diplomacy. The trouble was that Poles seemed not to notice the dangers lurking behind such scenario and probably did not even think that by fighting for a just cause they may simply harm their good reputation which they had earned in previous months and years of Constance. Nevertheless, no problems were initially anticipated, and Falkenberg himself was arrested.⁴⁰ It was presumably with great satisfaction that Poles welcomed the sentence of life imprisonment passed by the General Dominican Chapter. The Chapter concluded that Falkenberg's work was inspired by an evil spirit and constituted a libel against the Polish king and the Kingdom of Poland.⁴¹ Furthermore, the Chapter made it clear that Falkenberg had been scandalizing the Dominican order for many years, 'irritating' the recently deceased master general of the Order Thomas de Firmo.⁴² At the Council, the Falkenberg's case was handled by the Commission of Faith, whose composition could also fill Poles with high expectations, at the very least thanks to the presence of cardinals Francis Zabarella and Peter d'Ailly.⁴³ Summoned before the Commission, Falkenberg was called by the Florentine humanist Zabarella a scoundrel, liar and disgusting person; 'Satira' was described as an abominable work which was taken out by the friar from the dirty hiding

39. K. Baczkowski, *Polityka Zygmunta Luksemburskiego...*, op. cit., p. 87; Z.H. Nowak, *Międzynarodowe procesy...*, op. cit., p. 77.

40. *Berichte...*, op. cit.; H. Boockmann, *Johannes Falkenberg...*, op. cit., p. 264.

41. A. Prochaska, *Sobór...*, op. cit., p. 51.

42. J. Fijałek, *Dwaj dominikanie...*, op. cit., p. 38.

43. *Acta Concilii...*, op. cit., no. 450, pp. 410–413; H. Boockmann, *Johannes Falkenberg...*, op. cit., pp. 265–266.

place of his corrupt conscience. In contrast, he considered Jagiello an outstanding king who over the centuries displayed many virtues and merits for spreading the faith, which could only be equalled to the works of the early apostles. According to Zabarella, entire Christendom praised Jagiello and his immaculate morals. The Council Fathers were also convinced about Geminid's innocence. According to the cardinal, the friar's outburst at the Polish king was wholly unfounded, as it was based on silly and inaccurate accusations. Zabarella hoped that the friar, who was an affront to his vocation, would reach his old age in a squalid prison to pay for his disgraceful acts. For nobody, even the meanest of men, could not bear to see Falkenberg living amongst other people.⁴⁴

At the same time, Falkenberg was criticized by Gerson, chancellor of the University of Paris.⁴⁵ As we already know, the Teutonic Knights did everything to distance themselves from any connections with the arrested Dominican. Thus, the Polish delegation had basis to expect a favourable judgement passed by the Commission and a positive outcome of the whole affair on the forum of the entire Council. On 4th June 1417 the Commission announced a draft condemning 'Satira' and calling for the protection of the honour of Jagiello, who was likened to a wrestler fighting for the Church. 'Satira' was described as heretical and redolent of heresy ("principalis conclusio hereticalia; heresim sapientia"), scandalous, indecent, rebellious and worthy of being burned. The teachings which it contained were also banned from being spread. In addition, the author was to subject himself to atonement without the right to appeal to the Council.⁴⁶ However, the draft never became resolution of the Council, as erroneously recorded for the posterity by John Długosz.⁴⁷ The opponents of the condemnation of Falkenberg's work were also present in Constance. Among the French, Franciscans and Dominicans figured prominently, most importantly Burgundians with bishop Arras Martin Poree, representative of John of Valois.⁴⁸ The Burgundians argued that a possible condemnation Falkenberg's beliefs would

44. *Annales...*, op. cit., pp. 68–69.

45. K. Ożóg, *Uczni...*, op. cit., p. 219.

46. *Acta Concilii...*, op. cit., pp. 431–432; L. Ehrlich, *Paweł Włodkowiec...*, op. cit., pp. 96–99; H. Boockmann, *Johannes Falkenberg...*, op. cit., pp. 265–266; A. Prochaska, *Sobór...*, op. cit., p. 51; J. Fijałek, *Dwaj dominikanie...*, op. cit., p. 51.

47. *Annales...*, op. cit., p. 67.

48. *Acta Concilii...*, op. cit., pp. 441–449, pp. 356–410; H. Boockmann, *Johannes Falkenberg...*, op. cit., pp. 265–279; W. Brandmüller, *Das Konzil von Konstanz*, op. cit., Bd.

be tantamount to reprobating leaders of crusades such as e.g. Godefroy de Bouillon or St. Louis.⁴⁹ Despite lack of unanimity, the pro-Polish faction prevailed among the French, since on 9 July 1417 the Commission's draft was accepted by majority of votes.⁵⁰ Many Germans were initially in favour of condemning Falkenberg's work, but it was successfully defended by Dinkelsbühl, who said that there was no certainty as to how true the Polish accusations were. Thus the case was referred to the plenary sessions. Representatives of Spain and England did not resolve to discuss the Falkenberg case, although his claims were universally regarded as immoral. Italians were split into two blocs, as the Dominican master general defended Falkenberg, questioning the legitimacy of Polish claims.⁵¹ We should emphasise the great contribution of Italian advocate Simon of Teramo to preparation of the final version of the text containing the condemnation of 'Satira' on 4 January 1418.⁵² At the same time the zeal of the Polish king and of the inhabitants of his kingdom was extolled to the skies. This coincided with the presentation of an enthusiastic account of the progress of the christianization of Samogitia (Poles had arranged sending a delegation of christened Samogitians to Constance, and Samogitians lodged a complaint against the Teutonic Order). Having praised Jagiello and Witold the Poznań bishop elect Andrew Łaskarzyc asked a rhetorical question: "Should we claim that anyone after the Apostles did so much for Christianity as those two rulers?"⁵³ The Council thanked Jagiello and Witold for their achievements and called the Polish king another Judas Maccabeus, praising him for his eagerness to promulgate the faith. Jagiello was called Constantine the Great and Witold's contribution to christianization was also acknowledged.⁵⁴ The

II, pp. 169ff; K. Ożóg, *Uczeni...*, op. cit., pp. 218–219; K. Górski, *Nowa praca...*, op. cit., p. 565.

49. H. Boockmann, *Johannes Falkenberg...*, op. cit., p. 272; K. Górski, *Nowa praca...*, op. cit., p. 566.

50. *Acta Concilii...*, op. cit., pp. 361–362.

51. H. Boockmann, *Johannes Falkenberg...*, op. cit., pp. 263–282; K. Górski, *Nowa praca...*, op. cit., p. 565.

52. K. Ożóg, *Uczeni...*, op. cit., p. 219.

53. *Codex epistolaris Vitoldi Magni Ducis Lithuaniae 1376–1430*, red. A. Prochaska, Kraków 1882, nr 651 (Samogitians' complaint, cf. ibidem, pp. 1018ff); A. F. Grabski, *List Władysława Jagiełły i Witolda do soboru w Konstancji (1417)*, „*Nasza Przeszłość*” 25 1966, pp. 281–284; A. Prochaska, *Sobór...*, op. cit., pp. 31ff; T. Silnicki, *Arcybiskup Mikołaj Trąba*, Warszawa 1954, p. 162; T. Graff, *Episkopat...*, op. cit., pp. 207–208, 214.

54. CE, vol. 2, no 67; A. Prochaska, *Sobór...*, op. cit., p. 35, W. Szyborski, *Władysław Jagiełło – władca idealny czy święty?*, in: *Sprawiedliwość – Tradycja*

developments lead to another order to burn 'Satira' as a scandalous opuscle, which contained multiple falsehoods etc. and "in fide et bonis moribus erronea, hereticalia et heresim sapientia". It was also emphasised that anyone who supported Falkenberg's views would face anathema.⁵⁵ Martin V slightly modified the formula on 21 January, but due to the stance of Burgundy he decided not to present the entire case on the forum of the Council, fearing re-escalation of tensions towards the end of sessions.⁵⁶ The pope presumably did not expect that Paul Włodkovic and other members of the Polish delegation, in spite of the threat of scandal, would not cease to defend the honour of their ruler and their kingdom. On 22 April, during the last session of the Council, dramatic events took place, in which Paul Włodkovic played one of the most important roles. After the final Holy Mass at the Council, an advocate of Poland named Caspar of Perugia suddenly voiced his demand that the Council Fathers should condemn 'Satira' as the nations had already done. This led to an unseemly argument, since some members of the French and Spanish nations denied the fact. They were replied by Simon of Teramo and Augustine of Pisa. Among the confusion, Paul Włodkovic rose, announcing that he would like to supplement the protest read out by Caspar of Perugia. He intended to read the whole document without omissions that had been made to date. Martin V sternly ordered Paul to be silent, saying that he would confirm only that which the Council had passed so far 'conciliariter' instead of 'nacionaliter'. The pope's words did not discourage Włodkovic, who wanted to read out the entire protest. Martin V ordered him to be quiet on pain of anathema and commanded to read out the ban on appealing against the pope's decisions or repealing his judgments in matters of religion. Upon hearing this, Włodkovic turned to notaries and requested them to write down a declaration of protest on behalf of Jagiello and Witold for the next Council. His justification was the harm that he had suffered as well as being denied the right to speak in public.⁵⁷

– *Współczesność*, red. P. Nowakowski, J. Smółucha, W. Szymborski, Kraków 2006, pp. 59–60.

55. *Acta Concilii*, IV, pp. 431–432; L. Ehrlich, *Paweł Włodkovic...*, op. cit., pp. 96–99; H. Boockmann, *Johannes Falkenberg...*, op. cit., p. 284; K. Ożóg, *Uczni...*, op. cit., p. 219.

56. *Acta Concilii...*, op. cit., p. 431; J. Fijałek, *Dwaj dominikanie...*, op. cit., pp. 56–58.

57. J. D. Mansi, *Sacrorum Conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*, vol. XXVII, Venetis 1783, pp. 1195ff; *Magnum Oecumenium Constaniense concilium*, ed. by H. v. der Hardt, vol. IV, Francofurti-Lipsiae 1699, col. 1549–1563; *Berichte...*, op. cit., no. 258;

In their protest, Poles argued that Falkenberg's libel is of a heretical nature and should be officially condemned by the Council, as had been previously done by judges of faith, nations and cardinals. The request stemmed from the fact that otherwise Polish envoys would be accused of gross negligence, as the Council gathered in order to eradicate heresy which was eroding the Church. It was claimed that if 'Satira' had not been condemned, it would have corrupted the faithful. The Polish delegation emphasized that their steps are first and foremost the fulfilment of the will of God, and only then the will of rulers who they represented. The honour and reputation of Jagiello and Witold as well as their states were under threat anyway and it would have been unthinkable for the Council to make excuses due to ignorance of the matter. This was true even more so that Falkenberg's allies tried, wherever possible, to promote his teachings by the power of their hatred.⁵⁸

Therefore Wladyslaw Jagiello and Witold's delegates decided to defend the honour and good name of their sovereigns and the countries they reigned over. On 1 May 1418 the Polish delegation, supported by Maurice Rvačka and other scholars, submitted a formal appeal in the Franciscan church. Its content was authored by Paul Włodkovic, who was named in the document as "Magister Paulus Wladimiri Custos et canonicus ecclesie Cracouiensis".⁵⁹ One should note a passage on the Kingdom of Poland's unwavering loyalty towards the Church. Poland was its shield and protector against barbarian nations:

Nam eorum operam ad protectionem et augmentum christiane Religionis non attendens insuper quanta semper deuocione quanteque dilectionis feruore ab antiquo celeberrimum Polonie Regnum sub obediencia Romane Ecclesie semper existens

W.Brandmüller, *Das Konzil von Konstanz*, op. cit., Bd. II, pp. 411ff; L.Ehrlich, *Paweł Włodkovic...*, op. cit., pp. 102–107; K.Ożóg, *Uczeni...*, op. cit., p. 220; T.Graff, *Episkopat...*, op. cit., pp. 209–210; H.Boockmann, *Johannes Falkenberg...*, op. cit., pp. 282–286; A.Prochaska, *Sobór...*, op. cit., pp. 67–69; T.Silnicki, *Arcybiskup...*, op. cit., Warszawa 1954, p. 171.

58. *Sobory...*, op. cit., t. 3, pp. 266–269; J.D.Mansi, *Sacrorum...*, op. cit., vol. XXVII, pp. 1202–1203; *Magnum Oecumenium...*, op. cit., vol. IV, col. 1560.

59. *Kodeks dyplomatyczny katedry krakowskiej św. Wacława*, part 2, issued by F.Piekosiński, Kraków 1883, no. 581.

fideliū scutum fuerat et defensio, barbaras naciones christianas sanguinem sicientes indefesse propulsando.⁶⁰

Poles argued further that 'Satira' was an attack on the holy faith, threatening the monarchs whose kingdoms bordered on non-Christian lands. After all, Falkenberg promised eternal life to those who would help bring about the fall of the Polish-Lithuanian monarchy.⁶¹ Paul Włodkovic's argument that Poland was the bulwark of Christendom had been increasingly used since the 14th century by Poland in communication with the Holy See and neighbours.⁶²

Poles' determination during their last days in Constance was so noticeable that their vehemence and assertiveness become the stuff of gossip and stories which today can hardly be verified. Presenting the appeal to the pope on 4 May became legendary. According to an anonymous report prepared for the Grand Master and firmly rejected by some historians, e.g. by H. Boockmann⁶³, Poles wanted to hand in the appeal directly to the pope in his palace, and, faced with resistance on part of the porter, they broke down the door, and Martin V himself was forced to run from the intruders from chamber to chamber. When the appeal had finally been submitted, the pope acknowledged it, however he bitterly protested against such conduct.⁶⁴ Even if the incident did not actually take place, certainly the story served as a mocking account in some circles hostile to Poles, and maybe even among the opponents of Martin V. A vivid anecdote about the pope being chased by Poles indeed had to sound hilarious. In any event, several days later at the consistory (10 May) knights Zawisza Czarny and Janusz of Tuliszków publicly announced that they were going to defend the appeal "with hand and mouth". Also archbishop Nicolas Trąba acted courageously, violating

60. *Kodeks dyplomatyczny...*, op. cit., p. 435; cf. J. Fijałek, *Dwaj dominikanie...*, op. cit., p. 57.

61. *Kodeks dyplomatyczny...*, op. cit., pp. 436–438.

62. J. Tazbir, *Polska przedmurzem Europy*, Warszawa 2004, pp. 12–13. While enumerating first cases of arguments on Poland as a bulwark, frontier or shield of Christendom, the author does not refer to the Polish appeal of 1418. Cf. K. Baczkowski, *Argument obrony wiary w służbie dyplomacji polskiej w XV wieku*, in: *Ludzie – Kościół – wierzenia. Studia z dziejów kultury i społeczeństwa Europy Środkowej (średniowiecze – wczesna epoka nowożytna)*, red. W. Iwańczak, S.K. Kuczyński, Warszawa 2001, pp. 195–212.

63. H. Boockmann, *Johannes Falkenberg...*, op. cit., p. 287.

64. *Berichte...*, op. cit., no. 258, 266.

the rules of the consistory by saying the following words after the pope rose to close the session: "Holy Father, we would like to uphold our appeal".⁶⁵

The reaction of the Polish diplomacy was full of dramatic gestures and speeches and probably not to everyone's taste. Most did not understand the stubbornness of Poles, as it could seem what they had obtained a satisfactory verdict from the commission. Apart from that, everyone probably grew weary of several years of sessions, which, because of Poles' protest, could not end peacefully. It was not without satisfaction that procurator of the order Peter von Wormditt informed the Grand Master about the scandalous and shameful conduct of the Polish delegation.⁶⁶ Naturally, the malicious and subjective account by a Teutonic Knight did not fully reflect the mood which permeated the Council in Constance. All the same, it could have been a trace of consternation caused by the behaviour of Poles. We also need to add that the boldness of the Polish delegation was for the most part due to the support given by Sigismund of Luxembourg, who was present at the consistory and who probably prevented Jagiello and Witold's delegates from being imprisoned.⁶⁷ The imprisonment was very likely, as even an indictment against members of the Polish delegation was read out, stating that the appeal was submitted unlawfully. Paul Włodkowic was also accused of holding certain beliefs contrary to principles of faith and offend the dignity of the Supreme Pontiff and the emperor. The Italian prosecutor moved for an interrogation of the Cracow scholar. Paul Włodkowic defended himself by saying that his claims were announced in response to Teutonic accusations contained e.g. in the Falkenberg's offensive treatise. In any case, the claims were subjected to the Council's objective judgement.⁶⁸ Admittedly, Włodkowic achieved his intended purpose, as the Teutonic procurator Peter von Wormditt had to repeatedly explain to the Council that the Teutonic Knights had not inspire Falkenberg to write "Satira". Peter von Wormditt later informed the Grand Master of the events. Eventually, pope

65. T. Graff, *Episkopat...*, op. cit., p. 211; A. Prochaska, *Sobór...*, op. cit., p. 72; J. Fijałek, *Dwaj dominikanie...*, op. cit., p. 64.

66. B. Bess, *Johannes Falkenberg OP und der preussisch-polnische Streit vor dem Konstanzer Konzil*, „Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte“ 1896, Bd. 16, p. 455.

67. K. Baczkowski, *Polityka Zygmunta Luksemburskiego...*, op. cit., pp. 87–88. Therefore one cannot agree with Marian Biskup, who wrongly claimed that the Falkenberg case was silenced thanks to Sigismund of Luxembourg. Cf. M. Biskup, *Spór zakonu krzyżackiego...*, op. cit., p. 240.

68. A. Prochaska, *Sobór...*, op. cit., pp. 71–72.

Martin V showed mercy for Poles, stating that he would not act as demanded in the indictment. Then he handed the Falkenberg case over for review by a commission of 3 cardinals.⁶⁹ On 14 May the commission prepared the conclusion of the judgement, demanding that the 'Satira' be torn to pieces and trampled as an "erroneum et bonis moribus contrarium ac alias scandalosum, sediciosum, crudelem, iniuriosum, impudens et piarum aurium offensivum". Falkeneberg himself was to be held prisoner until the time when atonement would be specified.⁷⁰ According to the judgement, the condemned 'Satira' was not considered a heretical work and no burning was ordered, as meticulously noted in his letter to the Grand Master by the procurator of the Teutonic Order.⁷¹ This was far from satisfactory for the Poles, but for third parties with less knowledge on the contentious matter the dissatisfaction and tenacity of the Polish delegates could be seen as excessive litigiousness. Meanwhile, for the more refined intellectuals it was obvious that the attitude of the Jagiellonian delegation constituted a threat to the authority of the pope, who made it clear that the Holy See is the highest instance in matters of faith.⁷² In this way Poles rekindled the discussion on the pope's and the Council's scope of authority. The attitude of the Polish-Lithuanian delegation unquestionably heightened tension during the last phase of the Council, even more so that the Polish side was joined by luminaries of the then intellectual elite, such as supporter of Poles John Gerson, who in his treatise stressed that in the case of doubt as to papal decision on matters of faith, as in the Falkenberg case, an appeal to the Councils should be made.⁷³ On the other hand, for Martin V, who wished to reinforce strong pontifical power, such conciliarism-based views were unacceptable. At his request, a draft bull decrying Poles for the appeal to the future Council, as well as denouncing conciliarism was prepared; it was never published.⁷⁴ The conflict was echoed in a slightly embellished account by John Długosz.

69. A. Prochaska, *Sobór...*, op. cit., pp. 72–73.

70. Berichte..., op. cit., no. 258; B. Bess, *Johannes Falkenberg...*, op. cit., pp. 460–464; L. Ehrlich, *Paweł Włodkowic...*, op. cit., pp. 128–132; H. Boockmann, *Johannes Falkenberg...*, op. cit., pp. 288, 299–302; K. Ożóg, *Uczeni...*, op. cit., p. 221.

71. Berichte..., op. cit.; J. Fijałek, *Dwaj dominikanie...*, op. cit., p. 64.

72. A. Prochaska, *Sobór...*, op. cit., pp. 73–80.

73. K. Ożóg, *Uczeni...*, op. cit., pp. 221–222.

74. K. Górski, *Nowa praca...*, op. cit., p. 565; H. Boockmann, *Johannes Falkenberg...*, op. cit., pp. 288–289; K. Pieradzka, *Uniwersytet Krakowski w służbie państwa i wobec soborów w Konstancji i Bazylei*, in: *Dzieje Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego w latach 1364–1764*, t. 1, red. K. Lepszy, Kraków 1964, pp. 107–108.

According to the chronicler, Poles (by which he meant lay knights) in Constance were prepared to fight and die in defence of their king and kingdom. In the view of many Council Fathers, they could have caused a new schism.⁷⁵ It was John Długosz who probably added a moving scene of reconciliation of pope Martin V with Poles in order to add some drama to his account. The event allegedly wrung tears of emotion among its participants and witnesses.⁷⁶ Undoubtedly a description of the departure of Poles by Ulrich von Richental, a witness to the event, is closer to the truth. His account suggests that Poles left Constance without a grand farewell ceremony.⁷⁷ One must also remember that Polish-Lithuanian representatives were greatly satisfied to see the pontifical procession leave with John Falkenberg sitting on a mule inside a cage at the far end, closely guarded.⁷⁸

At this point we should address the question of the outcome of the steps taken by the Polish delegation against John Falkenberg's 'Satira'. Some historians, following Antoni Prochaska's line of argument, more or less aptly criticise Polish tenaciousness in the matter of appeal to the next Council, calling it a harmful and unnecessary, as it destroyed the successes that Poland had achieved at the Council.⁷⁹ In "Historia Dyplomacji Polskiej" Zenon Hubert Nowak comments that Poles, willing to assault the Teutonic Order, made a gross miscalculation. Nowak puts it even more emphatically, "Their obstinacy, which went too far for diplomats, did not prove beneficial to Poland in relations with the Papal State".⁸⁰ However, such opinion, to a certain extent valid, does not include positive aspects of Polish determination and thus seems far-fetched. Indeed, at the end of the sessions the hard-earned reputation which Poles gained in the previous years at the

75. Annales..., op. cit., pp. 79–80.

76. Annales..., op. cit., p. 80.

77. Ulrich von Richental, *Chronik des Konstanzer Konzils 1414–1418*, Hg. T. M. Buck, Memmingen 2011, p. 134.

78. J. Fijałek, *Dwaj dominikanie...*, op. cit., p. 70.

79. A. Prochaska, *Sobór...*, op. cit., pp. 69ff. According to Prochaska (p. 69) the protest and the appeal "made the worst impression possible". The author also wrote in similar vein in his recent article analysing an evolution of the image of the Polish-Lithuanian monarchy during the Council sessions, in which he mentioned mistakes made by the Poles and acknowledging only partial success in the case of *Satira*. Cf. T. Graff, *Sobór w Konstancji wobec monarchii polsko-litewskiej*, pp. 521–524, albeit several years before the author had expressed largely positive opinions on Polish activity in the last phase of the Council: T. Graff, *Episkopat...*, op. cit., pp. 211–212.

80. Z. H. Nowak, *Dyplomacja polska...*, op. cit., p. 335.

Council was undoubtedly damaged, yet the harm was not as big as it may seem, since thanks to Paul Włodkowic's speeches and acts of other members of the Polish delegation, the anti-Polish Teutonic propaganda was no longer equally effective or credible. From that point on, the West looked at countries ruled by Jagiello as fully legitimate members of 'christianitas'. Even more importantly, Poles realised that they had to defend their interest with determination worthy of representatives of a proud country like the Jagiellonian kingdom. In this context, the Council of Constance should be seen as a milestone in shaping the self-awareness of Polish elites and the image of the Polish-Lithuanian monarchy in the eyes of its Western neighbours.⁸¹ One must also remember that Poles perfectly realised that their key objective, i.e. a favourable resolution of the Polish-Teutonic dispute, could not be achieved in Constance. In the view of future struggle with the Order, it was wise to show an adamant attitude in the Falkenberg case, obviously considering any potentially negative impression on the participants of the Council. In addition, thanks to skilful Polish propaganda, especially Paul Włodkowic's speeches, the game had a political context, and contrary to Nowak's opinion, it had to affect the Teutonic Knights, even indirectly. It is also hard to speculate about any significant deterioration in relations with the Holy See in the years that followed, as in that period Martin V displayed great kindness to Polish-Lithuanian monarchs and their subjects, and despite temporary tensions he had to reckon with them in his political activity in this part of Europe.⁸²

The sessions in Constance having been completed, the subject of Falkenberg's 'Satira' was also publicly discussed in Poland. The king wanted to know if his representatives had done what they could at the Council. He also ordered that the pasquinade be translated into Polish and read out to his advisers so that they were able express their opinions. According to John Długosz, Jagiello was advised to treat the libel lightly, even more so that the friar had already been punished. However, if the king wished to raise accusations against the treatise, he should have hired an equally impertinent monk in order to write a similar libel.⁸³ Yet one should doubt Długosz's account, as the Polish diplomacy continued to take the then still

81. A. Prochaska, *Sobór...*, op. cit., p. 98; cf. K. Baczkowski, *Dzieje Polski późnośrednio-wiecznej...*, op. cit., p. 114.

82. J. Drabina, *Papiestwo – Polska w latach 1384–1434*, Kraków 2003, pp. 65–67.

83. *Annales...*, op. cit., pp. 84–85.

open case of 'Satira' seriously. In his "Annales", John Długosz admitted that Jagiello connected Falkenberg's libellous output with Teutonic involvement, of which he kept reminding pope Martin V. Długosz cited a letter from the king to the pope, in which the former denounced pro-Teutonic papal legates and complained that the Order branded him as a destroyer of the Church and Christian faith.⁸⁴ Pope was informed about the situation in Poland, among others, by Peter Wolfram. In November 1418 he did not hesitate to notify Martin V of envoys who were to be sent from Poland in connection with Falkenberg's case.⁸⁵ It is then clear that the issue of 'Satira' figured prominently in the history of Polish diplomacy right after the Council of Constance, and it was in the interest of the state to bring the case to a positive ending. This view was shared by a large proportion of the Polish elite in power, as evident e.g. at the Convention of Jedlnia on 3 March 1419, where some magnates expressed their dissatisfaction with the progress of the Falkenberg case by criticizing the leader of the delegation, primate Nicolas Trąba. However, the accusations were promptly withdrawn.⁸⁶ At an earlier convention in Łęczycza it was decided that king Jagiello would write a letter to the pope demanding that Falkenberg be handed over to lay authorities to be burned at the stake.⁸⁷ After many decades, case still stirred emotions in Poland, which is confirmed by a slightly embellished account by John Długosz. The chronicler did not hesitate to hurl abuse at Falkenberg, writing that out of the mouth of this obscure and foul-smelling monk oblivious of his vocation came not satire but dirty and revolting vomit.⁸⁸ Poles finally did not see John Falkenberg dying at the stake, but the firmness of their diplomacy did bear fruit. However, Martin V delayed solving the problem longer than enough, which was convenient for him for some time, particularly in the context of the complex geopolitical situation in Central Europe. The Holy See had to consider the developments in Bohemia, even more so that the Hussites had offered the crown to Jagiello and Witold.⁸⁹ Moreover, it could not disregard the yet another increase in

84. Annales..., op. cit., pp. 90–96.

85. CE, vol. 2, no. 91.

86. K. Baczkowski, *Polityka Zygmunta Luksemburskiego...*, op. cit., p. 88; T. Silnicki, *Arcybiskup...*, op. cit., p. 183–184.

87. Annales..., op. cit., pp. 87.

88. Annales..., op. cit., pp. 67–68.

89. For more details on the subject see J. Grygiel, *Życie i działalność Zygmunta Korybutowicza. Studium z dziejów polsko-czeskich w pierwszej połowie XV w.*, Wrocław

tension amid the Polish-Teutonic conflict following a scandalous judgement of Wrocław passed by Sigismund of Luxembourg in 1420.⁹⁰ The fact that Jagiello and Witold were let down by the Roman king led to a thaw between the papacy and the Polish-Lithuanian monarchy. This opened a whole host of diplomatic possibilities for Martin V and temporarily reinforced his position in relations with Poland — in connection with the expectations which Poland harboured for the so-called Roman trial and the mission of papal legate Antonio Zeno of Milan in the years 1422 to 1423.⁹¹ Note the instrumental role in the Polish diplomacy played by Paul Włodkovic, who was present in Rome at that time, and who defended Polish interest before the pope and the cardinals in the clash with the Teutonic Order. Thanks to his effort, the judgement of 1339 was included in the documents of the trial, which resulted in the counteraction of the Teutonic Knights and Sigismund of Luxembourg, so effective that the pope forbade Antonio of Milan to take action against the Wrocław judgement.⁹² At the same time, the Polish-Teutonic war continued; a peace treaty was eventually concluded at Lake Melno.⁹³ The end of this phase of the conflict with the Order paved the way for Poland to take a more flexible stance in the Falkenberg case. The pope also knew

1988; J. Nikodem, *Polska i Litwa wobec husyckich Czech w latach 1420–1433. Studium o polityce dynastycznej Władysława Jagiełły i Witolda Kiejstutowicza*, Poznań 2004; T. Graff, *Hierarchia kościelna państwa jagiellońskiego wobec problematyki czeskiej w pierwszej połowie XV wieku*, in: *Wspólnoty małe i duże w społeczeństwach Czech i Polski w średniowieczu i w czasach wczesnonowożytnych*, red. W. Iwańczak, J. Smółucha, Kraków 2010, pp. 121–140.

90. *Annales...*, op. cit., pp. 110–125; J. Krzyżaniakowa, *Czy znali prawdę i czy chcieli ją powiedzieć? Wyrok wrocławski w zeznaniach świadków na procesie w 1422–1423 roku*, in: *E scientia et amicitia. Studia poświęcone prof. E. Potkowskiemu w sześćdziesięciopięciolatecie urodzin i czterdziestolecie pracy naukowej*, Warszawa–Pułtusk 1999, pp. 97–107; A. Prochaska, *Wyrok wrocławski*, „Przegląd Historyczny” 1909 t. 8, pp. 49–62, 154–166, 269–283; Z. H. Nowak, *Międzynarodowe procesy...*, op. cit., pp. 81ff; Z. H. Nowak, *Materiały źródłowe do sprawy wyroku wrocławskiego Zygmunta Luksemburskiego w procesie polsko-krzyżackim z 1420 r.*, „Zapiski Historyczne” 41 nr 3 (1976), pp. 149–165; J. Goll, *König Sigismund und Polen 1420–1436*, „Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung” 16 (1895), pp. 222–275; cf. K. Ożóg, *Uczeni...*, op. cit., pp. 222–226.
91. K. Baczkowski, *La missione del nunzio Antonio Zeno in Polonia negli anni 1422–1423*, „Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego. Studia Italo-Polonica” 1987 nr 3, pp. 15–27; Z. H. Nowak, *Międzynarodowe procesy...*, op. cit., pp. 110ff; K. Ożóg, *Uczeni...*, op. cit., pp. 227–249.
92. K. Ożóg, *Uczeni...*, op. cit., pp. 227–242.
93. *Dokumenty strony polsko-litewskiej pokoju melneńskiego z 1422*, issued by P. Nowak, P. Pokora, Poznań 2004.

that the libeller which he had confined was a special form of warranty that Poland would withdraw its appeal to the next Council, as it was the pope's prerogative to confirm the commission's judgement of May 1418. Only this step taken by Martin V would make it possible to publicly humiliate the controversial Dominican and to recant his scandalous statements.⁹⁴ Martin V also expected that bringing the Falkenberg case to an end would encourage Poland to take more vigorous steps against the Hussites.⁹⁵ Poles were perfectly aware of the obvious fact that it was in the best interest of the Holy See that the appeal to the Council was withdrawn as soon as possible. In any event, time was on the side of Jagiello's monarchy; according to the 'Frequens' decree, the next Council was to gather in Pavia in the year 1423, where Poles could expect their appeal to be examined. Had the case been brought up during its sessions, it would have undermined the pope's authority, which Martin V certainly did not want to happen.

Admittedly, the Council of Pavia-Siena was not as spectacular as the one in Constance, but Jagiello and Witold, justifying absence of other hierarchs, made sure that their representatives were present. The Polish episcopate's sole representative at the Council was a Constance veteran, Poznań bishop Andrew Łaskarzyc. In addition, Paul Włodkovic, still in Italy, was an important figure in the Polish-Lithuanian diplomatic work. Both remained in close contact with Poland, and the Poznań bishop was one of the most influential Council Fathers.⁹⁶ Unfortunately, we do not know of any royal instructions for Łaskarzyc, but the Falkenberg case must have been on his agenda. In any event, as Jagiello's representative, the bishop did not submit an official request for the re-examination of the Falkenberg case, which would have been a follow-up to the Polish appeal lodged 6 years before. The matter was presumably dealt with in a more oblique manner, in Łaskarzyc's personal communication with pope Martin V towards the end of August 1423. The main point of the negotiation was summoning the pope to arrive in Sienna, which he finally failed to do.⁹⁷ Anyway, the problem of the later fate of Falkenberg, held in the papal prison, and the manner in which his earlier claims were to be recanted, were certainly discussed, with

94. J. Fijałek, *Dwaj dominikanie...*, op. cit., p. 66.

95. J. Fijałek, *Dwaj dominikanie...*, op. cit., p. 72.

96. T. Graff, *Episkopat...*, op. cit., pp. 219–220; K. Ożóg, *Uczeni...*, op. cit., pp. 227–249, 280–284.

97. K. Ożóg, *Uczeni...*, op. cit., p. 282.

both Poland and the Holy See willing to reach a compromise. To this end, each item of the ceremony to be held on 17 January 1424 was planned in detail. A prelude to this event was a papal bull of 10 January of the same year, in which Martin V approved the judgement passed in May 1418 by the commission of 3 cardinals, as well as stressed the devoutness of the faith of Jagiello and the inhabitants of the Kingdom of Poland. The pope also called Poland a remarkable part of the Church militant. He also emphasized that Falkenberg's condemnation was being announced of the pope's own will, without any pressure and with no connection to the request of the Polish king.⁹⁸ A consistory was scheduled to be held 7 days later, at which, in addition to the pope, cardinals and many church and lay officials, royal envoys were present: Andrew Łaskarzyc, Paul Włodkowic and Jacopode de Paravesino, as well as Polish clergymen such as Mirosław of Brudzewo and Adam of Będkowo and other Poles who had arrived in Rome to attend ceremony. Teutonic representatives were present, too.⁹⁹ Nothing therefore stood in the way of releasing John Falkenberg from the prison in the Castle of St. Angel and making him publicly humble himself and revoke his offensive views. Martin V addressed the kneeling monk with these words, "You have written a work offending the honour of the Polish king. Let me hear your resolution in the hope that it will be good."¹⁰⁰ In response, Falkenberg recanted his pasquinade, making it clear that it had been commissioned.¹⁰¹ Such statement of the monk was not especially pleasing to the Teutonic delegates who heard him say those words, although they might have been relieved that Falkenberg did not explicitly name the Order as the inspirer of 'Satira'. On the formal side, suitable notarial deed were duly prepared, with copies for the Polish party collected by Paul Włodkowic and Andrew Łaskarzyc.¹⁰² Jagiello and Witold therefore had no reason to delay withdrawing the appeal. This was taken care of by the royal secretary Nicolas

98. *Bullarium Poloniae*, vol. 4, ed. et cur. I. Sułkowska-Kuraś et S. Kuraś ac H. Wajs, Romae 1992, no. 1284; B. Bess, *Johannes Falkenberg...*, op. cit., pp. 458–464; H. Boockmann, *Johannes Falkenberg...*, op. cit., p. 299; J. Fijałek, *Dwaj dominikanie...*, op. cit., pp. 71–72; L. Ehrlich, *Paweł Włodkowic...*, op. cit., pp. 199–201; A. Prochaska, *Sobór...*, op. cit., p. 95; K. Ożóg, *Uczeni...*, op. cit., p. 249.

99. CE, vol. 2, no. 134; H. Boockmann, *Johannes Falkenberg...*, op. cit., pp. 299–303.

100. Translated in: A. Prochaska, *Sobór...*, op. cit., pp. 95–96; cf. J. Fijałek, *Dwaj dominikanie...*, op. cit., p. 74.

101. CE, vol. 2, no. 134.

102. J. Fijałek, *Dwaj dominikanie...*, op. cit., p. 75.

Lasocki and the Polish procurator in the curia John Milis Bressanone, who submitted a cancellation of the appeal on behalf of the rulers of Poland and Lithuania at the general consistory on 26 November 1425. Soon afterwards, on 13 December of the same year, Martin V thanked the Polish king for this step. He again emphasized that Jagiello had secured his interest only thanks to the pope's decision. So the monarch's withdrawal of the inappropriate appeal was praiseworthy, as the Roman pontiff was highest instance of appeal on Earth.¹⁰³

To summarise the effects of the work of Polish diplomacy against Falkenberg's 'Satira', one may risk a statement that the entire operation, until the final months of the Council, held hopes for a diplomatic success, with Jagiello and Witold's representatives, led by Paul Włodkowic and Nicolas Trąba, effectively influencing its course in spite of many adverse circumstances. Nevertheless, the attitude of Martin V, driven by his own motives, who obstructed the Council's resolution which condemned the Dominican's pasquinade, triggered an excessively emotional response of the Polish delegates. Undoubtedly, contrary to opinions of contemporary Polish historians quoted at the beginning of this article, lodging an appeal to the next Council in the case of Falkenberg's work had a temporarily negative effect on Polish relations with the Holy See and the reputation which Poland had earned during the sessions of the 'concilium'. Still, the long-term effects of Poland's uncompromising policy brought tangible benefits. By combining efforts with other measures taken by the Polish-Lithuanian diplomacy, part of Europe's intellectual elite was not as willing as before to believe in accusations directed against Jagiello and his Catholic subjects concerning their support for pagans and creating threat to the entire 'christianitas'. Their achievements in the area of promulgating faith and defending the frontier of Christendom were increasingly acknowledged, with some (albeit few), such as Francis Zabarella, seeing Jagiello as a ruler who should be hailed the last apostle of barbarian Europe, to whom Lithuanians owed

103. *Liber cancellariae Stanislai Ciołek. Ein Formelbuch der polnischen Königskanzlei aus der Zeit der hussitischen Bewegung*, issue J. Caro, vol. 1, Vienna 1871, no. 88; *Bullarium Poloniae...*, op. cit., no. 1636; cf. K. Ożóg, *Uczeni...*, op. cit., pp. 249–250; J. Drabina, *Papiestwo – Polska...*, op. cit., pp. 86–87; J. Fijałek, *Dwaj dominikanie...*, op. cit., p. 72.

their christianization.¹⁰⁴ Another positive effect of the work of Polish diplomacy against Falkenberg's libel was that political luminaries, including the pope, could finally see that Poles are more and more aware of the growing geopolitical significance of the Jagiellonian monarchy and highly valued the honour of their king and their country. For that reason, they could not tolerate groundless accusations and slander now that they thought of themselves as legitimate participants of international politics, shared responsibility for the future of the Church and Christian Europe.

104. Apart from Jagiello, the title of 'the last apostle of barbarian Europe' could be given to St. Hedwig of Anjou, and — despite some historiographers' claims as to his use of religion to his own interests — Witold, the Grand Duke of Lithuania. One should not also forget leading representatives of Poland's and Lithuania's political elites, who, working aside monarchs, contributed to the formation, and then (in spite of difficulties) maintenance of the Polish-Lithuanian union. For barbarian Europe ceased to exist largely thanks to a great work of the union commenced in 1386 through the marriage of Hedwig, queen of Poland, and newly christened ex-pagan Grand Duke of Lithuania Jagiello.

Bibliography

Primary sources:

- Acta Concilii Constantiensis*, Hg. Heinrich Finke, Bd. I–IV, Münster 1896–1928.
- Bullarium Poloniae*, ed. et cur. I. Sułkowska-Kuraś, S. Kuraś, H. Wajs, vol. 4, Romae 1992.
- Codex epistolaris Vitoldi Magni Ducis Lithuaniae 1376–1430*, ed. A. Prochaska, Kraków 1882.
- Codex epistolaris saeculi decimi quinti*, ed. A. Lewicki, vol. 2, Kraków 1891.
- Die Berichte der Generalprokuratoren des Deutschen Ordens an der Kurie*, Hrsg. H. Koeppen, Bd. 2, Göttingen 1960.
- Die Staatsverträge des Deutschen Ordens in Preussen im 15. Jahrhundert*, Hrsg. E. Weise, Bd. 1, Königsberg 1939.
- Dokumenty Soborów Powszechnych*, t. 3: (1414–1445), opr. A. Baron, H. Pietras, Kraków 2003.
- Dokumenty strony polsko-litewskiej pokoju mełneńskiego z 1422*, opr. P. Nowak, P. Pokora, Poznań 2004.
- Ioannis Dlugossii Annales seu cronicae incliti Regni Poloniae*, XI:1413–1430, Warszawa 2000.
- Iohannis Falkenberg Satira contra hereses et cetera nephanda Polonorum et eorum Regis Jaghel*, ed. Z. Włodek, in: *La Satire de Jean Falkenberg. Texte inédit avec introduction, Mediaevalia Philosophica Polonorum*, vol. 18 (1973), pp. 51–95.
- J. Falkenberg, *Veteres relegendes historias*, red. M. Bobrzyński, in: *Starodawne Prawa Polskiego Pomniki*, red. M. Bobrzyński, U. Heyzmann, t. V, Kraków 1878, pp. 197–231.
- Kodeks dyplomatyczny katedry krakowskiej św. Wacława*, red. F. Piekosiński, cz. 2, Kraków 1883.
- Liber cancellariae Stanislai Ciołek. Ein Formelbuch der polnischen Königskanzlei aus der Zeit der hussitischen Bewegung*, Hg. J. Caro, Bd. 1, Wien 1871.

- Magnum Oecumenium Constaniense concilium*, ed. Hermann v. der Hardt, vol. I–VI, Francofurti-Lipsiae 1696–1700.
- J. D. Mansi, *Sacrorum Conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*, t. XXVII–XXVIII, Venetiis 1783–1785.
- Pisma wybrane Pawła Włodkowica*, red. L. Ehrlich, t. I–III, Warszawa 1966–1969.
- Polska w okresie monarchii stanowej 1346–1454. Wybór tekstów*, opr. R. Heck, Warszawa 1955.
- U. von Richental, *Chronik des Konstanzer Konzils 1414–1418*, Hg. T. M. Buck, Memmingen 2011.

Secondary works:

- K. Baczkowski, *La missione del nunzio Antonio Zeno in Polonia negli anni 1422–1423*, „Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego. Studia Italo-Polonica” nr 3 (1987), pp. 197–231.
- K. Baczkowski, *Argument obrony wiary w służbie dyplomacji polskiej w XV wieku*, in: *Ludzie – Kościół – wierzenia. Studia z dziejów kultury i społeczeństwa Europy Środkowej (średniowiecze – wczesna epoka nowożytna)*, red. W. Iwańczak, S. K. Kuczyński, Warszawa 2001, pp. 195–212.
- K. Baczkowski, *Dzieje Polski późnośredniowiecznej (1370–1506)*, Kraków 1999.
- K. Baczkowski, *Polityka Zygmunta Luksemburskiego wobec Polski w dwu pierwszych dekadach XV wieku a Mikołaj Trąba*, in: *Mikołaj Trąba. Mąż stanu i prymas Polski. Materiały w Konferencji. Sandomierz 13–14 czerwca 2008 roku*, red. F. Kiryk, Kraków 2009, pp. 71–88.
- P. Bar, *A Tortuous Path to Reconciliation and Justice: Sigismund of Luxembourg as Arbiter in the Dispute between the Teutonic Knights and Poland (1412–1420)*, „Journal of East Central European Studies” vol. 66/1 (2017), pp. 3–40.
- P. Bar, *Omnes Poloni essent heretici. Kauza Jana Falkenberga a diskuze o pojmu “hereze” na kostnickém koncilu.*, in: *Cesta k rozmanitosti aneb Kavárenský povaleč digitálním historikem středověku*, ed. T. Klimek, R. Modráková, Praha 2016.
- S. L. Belch [Bełch], *Paulus Vladimiri and his Doctrine Concerning International Law and Politics*, vol. I–II, London–The Hague–Paris 1965.

- B. Bess, *Johannes Falkenberg OP und der preussisch-polnische Streit vor dem Konstanzer Konzil*, „Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte” 16 (1896), pp. 385–464.
- M. Biskup, *Spór zakonu krzyżackiego z Polską i Litwą na soborze i przed sądem polubownym króla Zygmunta Luksemburskiego*, in: *Państwo Zakonu Krzyżackiego w Prusach. Władza i społeczeństwo*, red. M. Biskup, R. Czaja, Warszawa 2008, pp. 238–240.
- H. Boockmann, *Johannes Falkenberg, der Deutsche Orden und die polnische Politik: Untersuchungen zur politischen Theorie des späteren Mittelalters mit einem Anhang: Die Satira des Johannes Falkenberg*, Göttingen 1975.
- W. Brandmüller, *Das Konzil von Konstanz*, Bd. II, Paderborn 1997.
- T. Brzostowski, *Paweł Włodkowic*. Warszawa 1954.
- J. Drabina, *Papiestwo – Polska w latach 1384–1434*. Kraków 2003.
- L. Ehrlich, *Paweł Włodkowic i Stanisław ze Skarbimierza*, Warszawa 1954.
- J. Fijałek, *Dwaj dominikanie krakowscy: Jan Biskupiec i Jan Falkenberg*, in: *Księga pamiątkowa ku czci O. Balzera*, t. I, Lwów 1925.
- J. Goll, *König Sigismund und Polen 1420–1436*, „Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung” 16 (1895), pp. 222–275.
- K. Górski, *Nowa praca o Falkenbergu*, „Komunikaty Mazursko-Warmińskie” 134, nr 4 (1976), pp. 561–569.
- A. F. Grabski, *Polska w opiniach Europy Zachodniej XIV–XV w.*, Warszawa 1968.
- T. Graff, *Episkopat monarchii jagiellońskiej w dobie soborów powszechnych XV wieku*, Kraków 2008.
- T. Graff, *Sobór w Konstancji wobec monarchii polsko-litewskiej*, „Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego. Prace Historyczne” 41 nr 2 (2014), pp. 509–526.
- T. Graff, *Hierarchia kościelna państwa jagiellońskiego wobec problematyki czeskiej w pierwszej połowie XV wieku*, in: *Wspólnoty małe i duże w społeczeństwach Czech i Polski w średniowieczu i w czasach wczesnonowożytnych*, red. W. Iwańczak i J. Smołucha, Kraków 2010, pp. 121–140.
- J. Grygiel, *Życie i działalność Zygmunta Korybutowicza. Studium z dziejów polsko-czeskich w pierwszej połowie XV w.*, Wrocław 1988.
- K. Grzybowski, *Włodkowica nauka o państwie a proces doktrynalny*, „Zeszyty Naukowe UJ. Prace Historyczne” 8 (1961), pp. 23–33.

- P. W. Knoll, *"A pearl of powerful learning": the University of Cracow in the fifteenth century*, Leiden-Boston 2016.
- J. Krzyżaniakowa, *Czy znali prawdę i czy chcieli ją powiedzieć? Wyrok wrocławski w zeznaniach świadków na procesie w 1422–1423 roku*, in: *E scientia et amicitia. Studia poświęcone prof. E. Potkowskiemu w sześćdziesięciopięciolate urodzin i czterdziestolecie pracy naukowej*, Warszawa–Pułtusk 1999, pp. 97–107.
- S. Kwiatkowski, *Zakon Niemiecki w Prusach a umysłowość Średniowiecza*, Toruń 1998.
- J. Miethke, *Die Polen auf dem Konstanzer Konzil. Der Konflikt um den Dominikaner Johannes Falkenberg*, in: *Das Konstanzer Konzil: 1414–1418. Weltereignis des Mittelalters. Essays*, Hrsg. K-H. Braun, Stuttgart 2013, pp. 106–110.
- J. Nikodem, *Polska i Litwa wobec husyckich Czech w latach 1420–1433. Studium o polityce dynastycznej Władysława Jagiełły i Witolda Kiejstutowicza*, Poznań 2004.
- Z. H. Nowak, *Dyplomacja polska w czasach Jadwigi i Władysława Jagiełły (1383–1434)*, in: *Historia dyplomacji polskiej, t. 1: Połowa X w. – 1572*, red. M. Biskup, Warszawa 1980, pp. 299–393.
- Z. H. Nowak, *Materiały źródłowe do sprawy wyroku wrocławskiego Zygmunta Luksemburskiego w procesie polsko-krzyżackim z 1420 r.*, „Zapiski Historyczne” 41 nr 3 (1976), pp. 149–165.
- Z. H. Nowak, *Międzynarodowe procesy polubowne jako narzędzie polityki Zygmunta Luksemburskiego 1412–1424*, Toruń 1981.
- K. Ożóg, *Szymon z Teramo adwokat polski w Stolicy Apostolskiej i na soborach w Konstancji i Bazylei*, „Nasza Przeszłość” 78 (1992), pp. 169–185.
- K. Ożóg, *Uczeni w monarchii Jadwigi Andegaweńskiej i Władysława Jagiełły (1384–1434)*, Kraków 2004.
- K. Pieradzka, *Dwie polskie relacje kronikarskie o soborze w Konstancji*, in: *Mediaevalia w 50. rocznicę pracy naukowej Jana Dąbrowskiego*, Warszawa 1960, pp. 207–233.
- K. Pieradzka, *Uniwersytet Krakowski w służbie państwa i wobec soborów w Konstancji i Bazylei*, in: *Dzieje Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego w latach 1364–1764*, red. K. Lepszy, t. 1, Kraków 1964, pp. 91–137.
- A. Prochaska, *Sobór w Konstancji*, wyd. II, Kraków 1996.
- A. Prochaska, *Wyrok wrocławski*, „Przegląd Historyczny” nr 8 (1909), pp. 49–62, 154–166, 269–283.

- A. Rüther, *Geheimdiplomatie – Schauprozess – Medienkrieg Polen– Litauen und der Deutsche Orden um die Zeit des Konzils von Konstanz (1414–1418)*, „Biuletyn Polskiej Misji Historycznej” 8 (2013), pp. 43–74.
- J. Sondel, *Zawsze wierny. Uniwersytet Jagielloński a Kościół rzymskokatolicki*, Kraków 2006.
- T. Silnicki, *Arcybiskup Mikołaj Trąba*, Warszawa 1954.
- T. Silnicki, *Sobory powszechnie a Polska*, Warszawa 1962.
- W. Szymborski, *Władysław Jagiełło – władca idealny czy święty?*, in: *Sprawiedliwość – Tradycja – Współczesność*, red. P. Nowakowski, J. Smołucha, W. Szymborski, Kraków 2006.
- J. Tazbir, *Polska przedmurzem Europy*, Warszawa 2004.
- J. Wyrozumski, *Mikołaj Trąba a sobór w Konstancji*, in: *Mikołaj Trąba. Mąż stanu i prymas Polski. Materiały w Konferencji. Sandomierz 13–14 czerwca 2008 roku*, red. F. Kiryk, Kraków 2009, pp. 33–44.
- Zawisza Czarny z Garbowa herbu Sulima*, red. B. Możejko, S. Szybkowski, B. Śliwiński, Gdańsk 2003.

Abstract

Tomasz Graff

Servants of the devil or protectors of Christianity and apostles among pagans? Shaping the image of Poland and Poles in the context of steps taken by Władysław II Jagiello's diplomacy against 'Satira' by John Falkenberg

The author analyses the legal action of the Polish delegation against the *Satira* by Dominican friar John Falkenberg, which appeared at the Council of Constance (1414–1418). In his work, Falkenberg called for the extermination of the Polish nation as well as the king Władysław Jagiello. He announced that those who would achieve this aim would attain salvation. The Polish delegation, especially Paul Włodkowiec and archbishop Nicolas Trąba, made efforts aimed at the recognition of the Dominican's work as heretical. Falkenberg was arrested and his work was condemned by the Commission of Faith, however it was not recognized as heretical. The new pope Martin V, in turn, did not want the verdict of the commission to become a resolution of the Council. In response, Poles, despite the threat of anathema, at the last session of the Council, appealed against the *Satira* to the next council, which undermined the authority of the pope.

In the article, the author shows the factors which prevented Poles from achieving complete success in the Falkenberg case. He addresses the question whether the determination of the Polish envoys in the defence of honour of their ruler and state in the final days of the council brought positive results in the years after the council. The author gives consideration to the question whether the actions of Polish diplomacy against 'Satira' combined with other steps on the international forum contributed to a certain extent to creating Jagiello's image as the last apostle of the barbarian Europe.

Keywords:
Satira by John Falkenberg, the Council of Constance, Władysław Jagiello, Paul Włodkowiec, apostles of Europe.

Abstrakt

Tomasz Graff

Słudzy diabła, czy obrońcy chrześcijaństwa i apostołowie pogan?

Kształtowanie wizerunku Polski i Polaków w świetle działań

dplomacji Władysława Jagiełły przeciw „Satyrze” Jana Falkenberga

Słowa kluczowe:
„Satyra” Jana
Falkenberga, sobór
w Konstancji,
Władysław
Jagiełło, Paweł
Włodkowic,
apostołowie
Europy.

W trakcie obrad soboru w Konstancji (1414–1418) Władysława Jagiełłę oczerniała krzyżacka propaganda i jej sprzymierzeńcy, dlatego też wielu poddawało w wątpliwość autentyczność jego nawrócenia. Z drugiej strony wśród niektórych ojców soborowych władca ten był postrzegany jako król arcychrześcijański, apostoł Litwy i Żmudzi. W tym kontekście autor analizuje prawne działania polskiej delegacji przeciw „Satyrze” dominikanina Jana Falkenberga, która pojawiła się na soborze. Falkenberg wzywał w niej do eksterminacji narodu polskiego i króla Władysława Jagiełły. Wg niego Ci, którzy się do tego przyczynią, będą mieć zapewnione zbawienie. Polska delegacja, a szczególnie Paweł Włodkowic i arcybiskup Mikołaj Trąba próbowali doprowadzić do uznania pisma dominikanina za heretyckie. Falkenberga co prawda aresztowano, a komisja wiary potępiła jego dzieło, ale nie uznała tekstu za heretycki. Nowy papież Marcin V nie chciał, by wyrok komisji stał się uchwałą soborową. Mimo groźby klątwy papieskiej Polacy złożyli apelację w sprawie „Satyry” na ostatniej sesji soboru, co godziło w autorytet władzy papieża. Autor w artykule pokazuje czynniki, które przeszkodziły Polakom w odniesieniu pełnego sukcesu w sprawie Falkenberga. Stara się także odpowiedzieć na pytanie, czy determinacja polskich posłów w ostatnich dniach soboru w obronie swojego władcy i państwa przyniosła pozytywne efekty, również w kolejnych latach po zakończeniu concilium. Autor zastanawia się także, czy działania polskiej dyplomacji przeciw „Satyrze” w połączeniu z innymi akcjami na forum międzynarodowym przyczyniły się do budowania wizerunku Jagiełły jako ostatniego apostoła barbarzyńskiej Europy.