

Karolina Maciaszek

(University of Silesia in Katowice)

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8606-810X>

---

## Offices and Officials in the Times of Bolesław V the Chaste, the Duke of Kraków and Sandomierz\*

---

*Urzędy i urzędnicy w czasach księcia krakowsko-sandomierskiego  
Bolesława V Wstydliwego*

### ABSTRACT

Bolesław the Chaste is one of the longest reigning rulers of Poland. Treacherously murdered in Gąsawa, Leszek the White (the father of Bolesław V) left his son with many unsettled matters in the field of internal politics. The reasserting of the position of the nobles was ensured by the long period of protective governance when Bolesław was underage. In the area of Bolesław's court, the Duke's office was particularly well-formed. Chancellors and vice-chancellors were supported by numerous chaplains and clerics in their work. In the times of the regency in the Chaste's time and his proper reign of the Duchy of Kraków and Sandomierz, the sources show, for the first time, the appearance of many land and court offices. In the long epoch of Bolesław the Chaste, significant changes in the system and administration of the state were recorded. Court offices were transformed into land offices. The main purpose of the article is to present the changes that have been made, the mechanisms of promotions at offices and discuss the competences and staffing of some offices.

**Key words:** Bolesław the Chaste, Lesser Poland, offices, officials, the power elite, domestic policy, administration

Bolesław the Chaste was one of the longest reigning rulers of Poland. Treacherously murdered in Gąsawa in 1227, his father, Leszek the White,

---

\* This article is a result of studies conducted by the author, broader results of which are presented in the doctoral dissertation *Otoczenie Bolesława Wstydliwego, księcia krakowskiego i sandomierskiego (1226–1279)*. The dissertation was written under the supervision of Prof. J. Sperka and defended at the Institute of History of the University of Silesia.

left his son with many unsettled matters in the field of internal politics. The reasserting of the position of the nobles was influenced by the many years of protective governance (from 1227) when Bolesław was underage. This was particularly visible in the area of the duke's chancellery. Chancellors and vice-chancellors were supported by numerous chaplains and clerics in their work. In the times of regency of Bolesław the Chaste and during his proper reign in the Duchy of Sandomierz (from 1234) and Kraków (from 1243), sources indicate the appearance of many new land and court offices. In the long period of Bolesław the Chaste, significant changes in the system and administration of the state were recorded. The main purpose of the article is to present the changes that have been made and the mechanisms of promotions at offices. I would also like to draw attention to the competences and the staffing of certain offices, especially the ones which have been subject to controversy in historiography.

The source content for the study of the issue presented in the title are, of course, numerous diplomas issued by both dukes and nobles, and primarily included in the collections of documents, the most significant being of course the sets of privileges and the codes of Lesser Poland published by Franciszek Piekosiński<sup>1</sup> and Stanisław Kuraś and Irena Sułkowska-Kurasiowa<sup>2</sup>. We also have at our disposal documents published in minor studies<sup>3</sup>. Without a doubt, works useful in the course of analysis of the men-

---

<sup>1</sup> *Kodeks dyplomatyczny katedry krakowskiej św. Wacława* [hereinafter: KDKK], pt. 1, ed. F. Piekosiński, Kraków 1874; *Kodeks dyplomatyczny Małopolski* [hereinafter: KDM], pt. 1–3, ed. idem, Kraków 1876–1887; *Kodeks dyplomatyczny miasta Krakowa 1257–1506* [hereinafter: KDMK], pt. 1, ed. idem, Kraków 1879.

<sup>2</sup> *Zbiór dokumentów małopolskich* [hereinafter: ZDM], pt. 1–8, eds. S. Kuraś, I. Sułkowska-Kurasiowa, Wrocław–Warszawa–Kraków 1962–1975; *Bullarium Poloniae* [hereinafter: BP], vol. 1: 1000–1342, ed. idem, Roma 1982. Cf.: *Kodeks dyplomatyczny Polski* [hereinafter: KDPol], vol. 1, eds. L. Ryszczewski, A. Muczkowski, A.Z. Helcel, Warszawa 1847; vol. 2, eds. L. Ryszczewski, A. Muczkowski, Warszawa 1848–1853; vol. 3, ed. J. Bartoszewicz, Warszawa 1858.

<sup>3</sup> M. Barański, *Dokument Bolesława Wstydliwego z 1236 roku*, in: *Inter orientem et occidentem. Studia z dziejów Europy środkowowschodniej ofiarowane Profesorowi Janowi Tyszkiewiczowi w czterdziestolecie pracy naukowej*, ed. T. Wasilewski, Warszawa 2002, pp. 171–176; *Dokumenty kujawskie i mazowieckie przeważnie z XIII w.*, ed. B. Ulanowski, Kraków 1888; D. Karczewski, *Nieznany dokument księżnej krakowskiej Grzymistawy z roku 1228. Przyczynek do najwcześniejszego uposażenia klasztoru Cystersów w Henrykowie*, in: *Venerabiles, nobiles et honesti. Studia z dziejów społeczeństwa Polski średniowiecznej. Prace ofiarowane Profesorowi Januszowi Bieniowskiemu w siedemdziesiątą rocznicę urodzin i czterdziestolecie pracy naukowej*, eds. A. Radziwiński, A. Supruniuk, J. Wroniszewski, Toruń 1997, pp. 89–99; K. Maleczyński, *Dwa nieznanne dokumenty jędrzejowskie z XIII w.*, 'Kwartalnik Historyczny' [hereinafter: KH] 1924, 38, pp. 456–459; idem, *Kilka nieznannych dokumentów z XIII w. przeważnie z archiwów poznańskich*, KH 1926, 40, pp. 185–196; *Przywilej lokacyjny miasta Bochni*, ed. J. Fłasza, Bochnia 1983; *Przywileje lokacyjne Krakowa i Poznania*, ed. A. Kłodziński, Poznań 1947.

tioned issue include those on specific offices or knights in particular lands<sup>4</sup> as well as those on the relations between the provinces in Mediaeval Poland<sup>5</sup>. The studies describing the actions of nobles with regard to landmark events of the 13th century related to the figure of Bolesław the Chaste are also helpful. Regardless of the passage of time, the studies on the internal situation of the Duchy of Kraków and Sandomierz after the death of Leszek the White, by Marian Łodyński and Kazimierz Krotoski, still remain significant<sup>6</sup>. We also have at our disposal a meticulous treatise on the rebellion of the nobles against Bolesław V in 1273 authored by Oskar Halecki<sup>7</sup>. Very important findings on the issue of hierarchy, significance of court and land officials in the times of the reign of Leszkowic were made by Idzi Panic,

<sup>4</sup> A. Bogucki, *Ze studiów nad polskimi urzędnikami nadwornymi w XIII w.*, 'Czasopismo Prawno-Historyczne' [hereinafter CP-H] 1977, 29, pp. 117–142; idem, *Komornik i podkomorzny w Polsce średniowiecznej*, in: *Spółczesność Polski Średniowiecznej*, vol. 3, ed. S.K. Kuczyński, Warszawa 1985, pp. 75–133; K. Buczek, *Podstolice, pstrościce i węgierce*, 'Onomastica' 1958, 41, 1, pp. 1–27; idem, *Uposażenie urzędników w Polsce wczesnofeudalnej*, 'Małopolskie Studia Historyczne' 1962, 5, 3–4, pp. 55–87; F. Dąbrowski, *Studia nad administracją kasztelańską Polski XIII wieku*, Warszawa 2007; A. Gąsiorowski, *Castellanus – przyczynek semajologiczny*, 'Slavia Antiqua' 1971, 18, pp. 207–221; T. Giergiel, *Rycerstwo ziemi sandomierskiej. Podstawy kształtowania się rycerstwa sandomierskiego do połowy XIII w.*, Warszawa 2004; K.J. Gorzycki, *Pierwszeństwo kasztelana przed wojewodą krakowskim*, KH 1890, 4, pp. 663–673; Z. Kaczmarczyk, *Kasztelanowie konarscy. Studium z historii urzędów ziemskich i nadwornych*, CP-H 1949, 2, pp. 1–23; W. Pałucki, *Studia nad uposażeniem urzędników ziemskich w Koronie do schyłku XVI wieku*, Warszawa 1962; J. Spors, *Wojewodowie Polski dzielnicowej w XII i XIII wieku. Przegląd wojewodów w kontekście ewolucji urzędu od godności nadwornej do urzędu ziemskiego*, pt. 2, 'Przegląd Historyczny' [hereinafter: PH] 1992, 83, 1, pp. 17–48; S. Urbaczyk, *O wyrazach Konary, konarski, koniuch i podkoni*, CP-H 1949, 2, pp. 23–27; J. Wroniszewski, *Nobiles Sandomirienses. Rody Dębnów, Janinów, Grzymałów, Doliwów i Powalów*, Kraków 2013; B. Wyrozumska, *Czy w Polsce średniowiecznej istniał urząd „maj”?*, *Polonia minor mediaevi. Studia ofiarowane Panu Profesorowi Andrzejowi Żakiemu w osiemdziesiątą rocznicę urodzin*, eds. Z. Woźniak, J. Gancarski, Kraków–Krosno 2003, pp. 531–535.

<sup>5</sup> A. Teterycz-Puzio, *Na rozstajnych drogach. Mazowsze a Małopolska w latach 1138–1313*, Słupsk 2012.

<sup>6</sup> K. Krotoski, *Walka o tron krakowski w roku 1228*, 'Przegląd Powszechny' 1895, 1, pp. 94–111, 244–260, 345–367; M. Łodyński, *Stosunki w Sandomierskiem w latach 1234–1239. Przyczynek do dziejów Bolka Wstydlivego*, KH 1911, 25, pp. 1–34; A. Rybarski, *Udział Toporczyków w uwięzieniu biskupa krakowskiego*, KH 1912, 26, pp. 1–12; K. Szkaradek, *Stosunki polskie po śmierci Leszka Białego*, 'Rocznik Filarecki' 1886, 1, pp. 139–231; A. Teterycz, *Małopolska elita władzy wobec zamieszek politycznych w Małopolsce w XIII wieku*, in: *Spółczesność Polski Średniowiecznej*, vol. 9, ed. S.K. Kuczyński, Warszawa 2001, pp. 65–87; P.K. Wojciechowski, *Ugrupowania polityczne w ziemiach krakowskiej i sandomierskiej w latach 1280–1286*, PH 1979, 70, 1, pp. 57–72.

<sup>7</sup> O. Halecki, *Powołanie księcia Władysława Opolskiego na tron krakowski w 1273 r.*, KH 1913, 27, pp. 213–315. Cf.: K. Supernak, *Kilka uwag o powołaniu księcia Władysława Opolskiego na tron krakowski w 1273 roku*, in: *Średniowiecze Polskie i Powszechne*, vol. 8 (12), eds. J. Sperka, B. Czwojdrak, Katowice 2016, pp. 132–166.

dealing in the studies on the attestations of the monarch's documents<sup>8</sup>. Krzysztof Bracha focused on the role of *veche* in the reign of the monarch<sup>9</sup>. As far as the determination of the composition and the mechanisms of promotion in the chancellery of Duke Bolesław is concerned, a work of invaluable importance was created by Piotr Rabiej<sup>10</sup>. Finally, it would be impossible not to mention a great tool for studying the composition of the caste of officials in the Middle Ages, i.e. *Urzednicy malopolscy XII–XV wieku*<sup>11</sup>.

The life of Bolesław V was overshadowed by the events that took place at the previously mentioned *veche* in Gaśawa, as a result of which the nearly 1.5-year-old Duke became an orphan. The candidates to the rights to care for Bolesław were numerous, as such care could endow them with real power over Kraków. In the times of regency in the period of underage Bolesław the Chaste the role of nobles, whose support to a large extent determined who was going to sit on the throne, was reasserted. It was not until 1243 that Bolesław became an independent ruler of Kraków and reigned there until 1279<sup>12</sup>.

During the reign of Bolesław the Chaste there was a recognised issue of indistinguishability, diffusion of court and land officials in the Duchy of Kraków and Sandomierz, intrinsically linked to the deepening fragmentation of the state<sup>13</sup>. Other changes also occurred in the area of administra-

---

<sup>8</sup> I. Panic, *Ze studiów nad listą świadków na dokumentach księcia malopolskiego Bolesława Wstydlwego (1243–1279)*, 'Studia Historyczne' 1990, 33, 3–4, pp. 493–501.

<sup>9</sup> K. Bracha, *Wiece Bolesława Wstydlwego 1234–1279*, KH 1987, 93, 3, pp. 663–677; idem, *Wiece Bolesława Wstydlwego 1234–1279*, Kielce 1984 (Jan Kochanowski University Archives, MA thesis; typescript, ref. no. 376/4).

<sup>10</sup> P. Rabiej, *Dokumenty i kancelaria Bolesława Wstydlwego, księcia krakowskiego i sandomierskiego*, vol. 1–3, Kraków 2005 (Jagiellonian University Archives, doctoral dissertation; typescript, ref. no. 2005/163).

<sup>11</sup> *Urzednicy malopolscy XII–XV wieku. Spisy*, eds. J. Kurtyka, T. Nowakowski, F. Sikora, A. Sochacka, P.K. Wojciechowski, B. Wyrozumska, ed. A. Gąsiorowski, Wrocław–Warszawa–Kraków 1990 [hereinafter: *UrzMał.*].

<sup>12</sup> On the fight for the throne after the death of Leszek the White cf.: K. Krotoski, *op. cit., passim*; J. Krzyżanowski, *Ostatnie panowanie Laskonogiego w Krakowie*, 'Sprawozdania z Czynności i Posiedzeń AU. Wydział Historyczno-Filozoficzny', S. II, 1907, 26, *passim*; M. Łodyński, *op. cit.*, pp. 1–34; J. Osiński, *Zabiegi książąt wroclawskich o panowanie w Malopolsce po smierci Leszka Białego*, in: *Wielkopolska – Polska – Czechy. Studia z dziejów sredniowiecza ofiarowane profesorowi Bronisławowi Nowackiemu*, eds. Z. Górczak, J. Jaskólski, Poznań 2009, pp. 129–163; S. Pelczar, *Wojna Władysława Odonica z Władysławem Laskonogim w latach 1228–1231*, in: *Średniowiecze Polskie i Powszechne*, vol. 1 (5), eds. I. Panic, J. Sperka, Katowice 2009, pp. 100–126.

<sup>13</sup> *UrzMał.*, p. 9; J. Bardach, *Historia państwa i prawa Polski*, vol. 1: *do połowy XV wieku*, Warszawa 1965, p. 251; idem, B. Leśnodorski, M. Pietrzak, *Historia ustroju i prawa polskiego*, Warszawa 1999, p. 65; M. Kallas, *Historia ustroju Polski*, Warszawa 2005, p. 105.

tion and the system in the 13th century. Court offices, central in nature, became fragmented, and when the Duke combined a few fragments with each other, the monarch lacked central offices, which would extend their power over the entirety of lands, subordinated to a single ruler. These offices were losing significance to the Duke as the organs of his authority. Combined with the office, court functions were only performed occasionally, when the ruler arrived to the particular province<sup>14</sup>. Central offices were transformed to land offices 'of representatives of local feudal lords and their interests'<sup>15</sup>. In provinces where the power of the dukes was weak, the land officials felt more associated with their own province than with the ruler<sup>16</sup>. This primarily applies to the Duchy of Kraków and Sandomierz where the position of the nobles was strong. A province that by way of integration ceased to be a separate duchy, but maintained separate organisation of offices was called a land. The division of the historical land that would be called Lesser Poland from the 14th century was determined at the lands of Kraków and Sandomierz. Both these lands had separate offices, with the exception of the offices of chancellor and *skarbnik*, which were shared by the entire province<sup>17</sup>. In the 13th century some of the court offices – according to Stanisław Szczur – were already purely nominal in nature. Such officials supposedly included the cup-bearer (in Polish: *cześnik*), the pantler (in Polish: *stolnik*), the sword-bearer (in Polish: *miecznik*), and the standard-bearer (in Polish: *chorąży*), who appeared at the side of the Duke during court celebrations<sup>18</sup>. Ambroży Bogucki also noted one more phenomenon within the scope of offices. From the second quarter of the 13th century the court officials appeared in the sources with the name of the land, e.g. 'pincerna Cracoviensis'. The names of offices were also sometimes accompanied by such attributes as 'noster', 'ducis', 'curiae'. They were added to the titles of: a chancellor, a judge, a cham-

<sup>14</sup> S. Kutrzeba, *Historia ustroju Polski w zarysie. Korona*, Poznań 2001, pp. 57–59.

<sup>15</sup> J. Bardach, *op. cit.*, p. 256.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibidem*.

<sup>17</sup> S. Arnold, *Podziały administracyjne województwa Sandomierskiego do końca w. XVIII*, 'Pamiętnik Świętokrzyski' 1930, 2, p. 58; J. Bardach, *op. cit.*, *passim*.

<sup>18</sup> S. Szczur, *Historia Polski. Średniowiecze*, Kraków 2005, p. 215. Cf.: J. Kurtyka, *Problem identyczności urzędów ziemskich krakowskich i nadwornych w wiekach XIV–XVI*, in: *Urzędy dworu monarszego dawnej Rzeczypospolitej i państw ościennych*, eds. A. Gąsiorowski, R. Skowron, Kraków 1996, p. 26 – the historian drew the attention here to the stage nature of the process of evolution of court offices to land offices, which finally occurred in the 14th century. – 'Until the end of the 13th century each office, with the exception of the castellan's office (and that of the wojski (tribune) related to it) derived its competences from the association with the duke's court, gaining land nomenclature as a result of divisions of the state to provinces, reigned by particular representatives of the Piast dynasty'.

berlain, a *skarbnik*, a sub-judge (in Polish: *podsedek*), whereas in the case of the cup-bearer, the equerry (Polish: *konarski*) and the pantler it was entirely exceptional<sup>19</sup>.

The duke's court in the 13th century comprised of secular officials, clergymen and servants. The court officials at the side of Bolesław V included chancellor, vice-chancellor, chamberlain (in Polish: *komornik*) and mint master (in Polish: *mincerz*). We should also remember about other persons present at the duke's court: chaplains and clerics, knights without offices, as well as the persons performing such functions as medic, guardian and teacher. The court was headed by a chamberlain<sup>20</sup>.

A very important position in the court structure of the ruler was held by the chancellor ('cancellarius'). The aspect of the origin of the chancellor's office – like the definition of the term 'chancellery' (in Polish: *kancelaria*) in particular provinces is highly debatable in Polish historiography<sup>21</sup>. A chancellor acted as the head of a chancellery. His duty was to supervise the writers and to guard the duke's seal. He was a supervisor to all the chaplains present at the court. Due to the office, a chancellor could have a major influence on the policy of his ruler. The increase in significance of his role is related to the necessity of handling diplomatic correspondence<sup>22</sup>. Owing to education he could act as an adviser to the ruler on the issues of national importance. As mentioned, he was entrusted by the duke with a seal, a symbol of authority used to authenticate all the legal acts and diplomatic letters. The position of a chancellor was filled by the persons who usually held high ranks in the church<sup>23</sup>. In the first period of fragmentation after 1138 the High Duke (Supreme Prince) had particular rights in relation to the other dukes, which was manifested, among other things, in directing policy of the state as a whole and maintenance of the representation of the princeps' court. The role of a chancellor of the court of Kraków in

<sup>19</sup> A. Bogucki, *Ze studiów*, pp. 136–137.

<sup>20</sup> K. Maleczyński, *Zarys dyplomatyki polskiej wieków średnich*, pt. 1, Wrocław 1951, *passim*; S. Szczur, *Historia Polski*, pp. 213–216; T. Jurek, *Przełomowy wiek XIII*, in: idem, E. Kizik, *Historia Polski do 1572*, Warszawa 2013, p. 231; W. Uruszczak, *Historia państwa i prawa polskiego*, vol. 1 (966–1795), Warszawa 2013, p. 63.

<sup>21</sup> M. Bielińska, *Kancelarie i dokumenty wielkopolskie XIII wieku*, Wrocław–Warszawa–Kraków 1967, pp. 6–7; J. Mitkowski, *Kancelaria Kazimierza Konradowica księcia kujawsko-łęczyckiego (1233–1267)*, Wrocław–Warszawa–Kraków 1968, pp. 5–7; Z. Mazur, *Studia nad kancelarią księcia Leszka Czarnego*, Wrocław 1975, pp. 5–7; E. Suchodolska, *Kancelarie na Mazowszu w latach 1248–1345. Ośrodki zarządzania i kultury*, Warszawa 1977, pp. 5–7.

<sup>22</sup> S. Szczur, *Historia Polski*, p. 215.

<sup>23</sup> *Dyplomatyka wieków średnich*, eds. K. Maleczyński, M. Bielińska, A. Gąsiorowski, Warszawa 1971, pp. 140–141; D. Kała, *Co w świetle źródeł prymarnych wiadomo o kompetencjach urzędników małopolskich z XIII wieku?*, 'Historia Slavorum Occidentis' 2014, 2 (7), p. 168.

relation to the chancellor of the other dukes is disputable. The title included in a document from 1213 for a chancellor of Leszek the White, Iwo Odrowąż, is characteristic. He uses the title 'Chancellor of Poland'<sup>24</sup>. Such title did not necessarily have to be an expression of personal ambitions of Odrowąż. This was also the title which he already appeared with earlier, in 1209. Odrowąż is referred to as the Chancellor of Poland (apart from two other persons from Poland, i.e. archdeacon Szymon and provost 'in Pollonia' Mikołaj), by a document, by means of which the students from Vicenza received revenue from the St. Vitus Church<sup>25</sup>. The term 'cancellarius Poloniae' was used in foreign relations. This title was definitely affected by the fact that Iwo held the chancellor function at the side of Leszek the White, a ruler in whose time – at least in the ideological sphere – a shade of principate still existed.

Nothing works as well for the development of a chancellery as continuity of a single ruler's reign and relative stability of this rule. This period turned out to be the 36-year reign of Bolesław the Chaste in Kraków. The aftermath of this stabilisation was the restoration of the authority of a duke's power. Along with it consolidated the seriousness of the duke's document as a basic certificate in matters related to property<sup>26</sup>. The process of unification of the form and style of the duke's documents continued<sup>27</sup>. The then forming and developing chancellery of Kraków was organised according to different principles than its contemporary chancelleries of Silesia, Kuyavia, or Greater Poland. First of all, a clear division of functions between the chancellor and the vice-chancellor is noticeable in it. The former acted as a representative of the duke's court, as an adviser to the duke and probably undertook political missions, without having significant influence on the work of the chancellery. The vice-chancellor was responsible for the 'technical' activities related to the documents. That was the person working actively in the chancellery, e.g. by dictating and writing documents, as well as adding the 'datum per manus' formula<sup>28</sup>. The subsequent chancellors in the period of underage and the reign

<sup>24</sup> KDPol, vol. 3, no. 7; K. Maleczyński, *Zarys dyplomatyki*, p. 83; *Dyplomatyka wieków średnich*, pp. 147–148.

<sup>25</sup> Cf.: *Regesto di Camaldoli*, vol. 3–4, ed. E. Lasinio, Roma 1914–1928, no. 2129; A. Paner, *Studia czy dyplomacja? Włoska podróż Iwona Odrowąża*, in: *Władcy, mnisi, rycerze*, ed. B. Śliwiński, Gdańsk 1996, p. 117.

<sup>26</sup> T. Jurek, *Rozwój dokumentu polskiego w XIII wieku*, in: *Dyplomatyka staropolska*, ed. idem, Warszawa 2015, p. 96.

<sup>27</sup> P. Rabiej, *Dokumenty i kancelaria*, vol. 1–2, *passim*.

<sup>28</sup> *Dyplomatyka wieków średnich*, p. 165–166. In the case of the chancelleries of Greater Poland and Silesia the vice-chancellor office has not developed – K. Maleczyński, *Zarys dyplomatyki*, p. 99.

of Bolesław were: Mikołaj Repczol, Bogusław, Teodoryk, Pełka, Paweł of Przemanków, and Prokop<sup>29</sup>. It should be emphasised that the latter two chancellors of Bolesław the Chaste – Paweł of Przemanków and Prokop – filled the position of the Bishop of Kraków.

The deputy chancellor was the vice-chancellor. In the case of responsible functions of the chancellor (i.e. diplomatic missions, relations with Polish and foreign courts), which required frequent travels, there appeared a need to introduce an official at the court, who would be responsible for some tasks of the capella<sup>30</sup>. The first vice-chancellor recorded in the period of Bolesław the Chaste was Mateusz. He held his position at least from 4 February 1222 to 1229<sup>31</sup>. Mateusz was supposedly followed by someone called Krzyżan, mentioned in the records only once, on 27 January 1229, in the privilege of Henryk, Duke of Silesia and Kraków for the monastery in Tyniec<sup>32</sup>. Wojciech Kętrzyński recognised the document as forged, which was primarily supported by the shade of ink and other physical ‘flaws’ in the parchment<sup>33</sup>. Bolesław Ulanowski, who knows the document from experience, refuted all the hyper-critical comments of the publisher of the privileges from Tyniec and determined the diploma of Henry the Bearded as authentic, which was confirmed by Karol Maleczyński (who recognised Krzyżan as a writer and ‘Silesian chaplain of Henry the Bearded’) and Benedykt Zientara (according to this historian, Krzyżan was a writer and vice-chancellor of Henry ‘for the matters related to Kraków’)<sup>34</sup>. According to Karol Maleczyński, after the death of Mikołaj Repczol or his retirement from the chancellor’s function, the vice-chancellor office was intentionally not filled by order of Konrad of Mazovia, and

<sup>29</sup> UrzMał., no. 1196–1201.

<sup>30</sup> *Dyplomatyka wieków średnich*, pp. 143–144.

<sup>31</sup> *Zbiór dyplomów klasztoru mogińskiego przy Krakowie*, ed. E. Janota, in: *Monografia opactwa cystersów we wsi Mogile*, Kraków 1867 [hereinafter: KDMog], no. 6 (here as a chancellor to Princess Grzymisława); KDKK, pt. 1, no. 12–13; KDM, pt. 1, no.: 10–11, 12 = *Zbiór ogólny przywilejów i spominków mazowieckich* [hereinafter: ZDMaz], vol. 1, ed. J.K. Kochanowski, Warszawa 1919, no. 273; KDM, pt. 2, no. 393; J. Mitkowski, *Nieznane dokumenty Leszka Białego*, KH 1938, 52, pp. 653–654; idem, *Początki klasztoru cystersów w Sulejowie. Studia nad dokumentami, fundacją i rozwojem uposażenia do końca XIII wieku*, Poznań 1949, p. 319; UrzMał., no. 1211.

<sup>32</sup> *Kodeks dyplomatyczny klasztoru tynieckiego*, eds. W. Kętrzyński, S. Smolka, Lwów 1875 [hereinafter: KDTyn], no. 7 (‘dominus Crisanus subcancellarius’); UrzMał., no. 1212.

<sup>33</sup> KDTyn, pp. 15–16.

<sup>34</sup> B. Ulanowski, *O założeniu i uposażeniu klasztoru Benedyktynek w Staniątkach*, ‘Rozprawy i Sprawozdania z Posiedzeń AU. Wydział Historyczno-Filozoficzny’ 1891, 17, p. 6, annot. 12; K. Maleczyński, *Zarys dyplomatyki*, p. 114; B. Zientara, *Henryk Brodaty i jego czasy*, Warszawa 1975, p. 252; UrzMał., no. 1212.



the Duke only made sure to select a new chancellor<sup>35</sup>. On 15 July 1242, in a diploma of Konrad of Mazovia, Duke of Kraków and Łęczyca, Aleksy is recorded at the described office, recognised as Krzyżan's successor. Aleksy was the chancellor of Kraków at the side of Konrad of Mazovia<sup>36</sup>, which is primarily supported by his earlier connections to the Duke of Mazovia and his family<sup>37</sup>. On 20 March 1243, so most probably soon after the return from Hungary, in Sandomierz the young Bolesław, as the Duke of Sandomierz, issued a document witnessed, among others, by vice-chancellor Benedykt, who was not included in the list of officials of the Lesser Poland<sup>38</sup>. The first vice-chancellor of Bolesław the Chaste, the Duke of Kraków and Sandomierz, was supposed to be Sobiesław, holding the office from 1248.<sup>39</sup> Twice in the documents, i.e. on 5 February 1251 and 14 September 1255, Dobiesław supposedly appeared with the vice-chancellor office<sup>40</sup>. Franciszek Piekosiński, Oswald Balzer and Karol Maleczyński (based on the similarity of the used formulas), and finally also Piotr Rabiej, identified Sobiesław and Dobiesław as a single person<sup>41</sup>. The period from 1252 to 4 October 1279 was the period of the vice-chancellor who stayed the longest in the office – Twardosław<sup>42</sup>. When Twardosław entered the Duke's circle, the number

<sup>35</sup> K. Maleczyński, *Zarys dyplomatyki*, p. 104. Mikołaj Repczol was recognised as a supporter of the interests of Konrada of Mazovia – J. Mitkowski, *Mikołaj Repczol*, in: *Polski Słownik Biograficzny* [hereinafter: PSB], vol. 21, Kraków 1976, pp. 82–83.

<sup>36</sup> KDTyn, no. 18 ('Alexius subcancellarius'; according to the publisher of the code of Tyniec the document is a forgery – *ibidem*, pp. 42–43); UrzMał., no. 1213; *Urzędniczy łęczyccy, sieradzcy i wieluniscy XIII–XIV. Spisy*, eds. J. Bieniak, A. Szymczakowa, Wrocław–Warszawa–Kraków–Gdańsk–Łódź 1985, no. A 430; K. Maleczyński, *Zarys dyplomatyki*, p. 140.

<sup>37</sup> Aleksy is referred to as the court chaplain in a document of Konrad of Mazovia of 1233 – KDM, pt. 2, no. 408 (frgd. – *ibidem*, pp. 53–54; K. Maleczyński, *Zarys dyplomatyki*, p. 140, annot. 229). He is also referred to as a chaplain by another diploma of his Duke from the years 1241–1243 – KDM, pt. 1, no. 25. Aleksy is recorded as the one drawing up the document in the presence of Duke Konrad, his sons Kazimierz and Bolesław in 1237, in which one Pakosław of Żyromin adopts his step-sons and makes them his inheritors – ZDMaz, vol. 1, no. 365.

<sup>38</sup> Z. Wdowiszewski, *Nieznane dyplomy średniowieczne do dziejów opactwa cystersów w Wąchocku*, 'Archeion' 1938–1939, 16, pp. 43–44 = ZDM, pt. 4, no. 875.

<sup>39</sup> KDPol, vol. 1, no. 35; KDKK, pt. 1, no. 30; KDM, pt. 2, no.: 429, 431; UrzMał., no. 1214. Kazimierz Bobowski assumes 1248 as the moment of permanent introduction of the vice-chancellor office to the chancellery of Bolesław the Chaste – K. Bobowski, *Jeszcze w kwestii świadków na dokumentach księcia małopolskiego Bolesława Wstydlivego*, in: *Monastycyzm. Słowiańszczyzna i państwo polskie. Warsztat badawczy historyka*, ed. idem, Wrocław 1994, p. 172.

<sup>40</sup> KDM, pt. 2, no.: 434, 448; UrzMał., no. 1215.

<sup>41</sup> F. Piekosiński, *Rycerstwo polskie wieków średnich*, vol. 3, Kraków 1901, pp. 107, 140–148; O. Balzer, *Skarbiec i archiwum koronne w dobie przedjagiellońskiej*, Lwów 1917, p. 411, annot. 2; K. Maleczyński, *Zarys dyplomatyki*, p. 115; P. Rabiej, *Dokumenty i kancelaria*, vol. 1, p. 315.

<sup>42</sup> *Liber beneficiorum dioecesis Cracoviensis* [hereinafter: LB], vol. 3, ed. A. Przędziński,

of chaplains and clerics started to decrease. This can probably mean that being in a chancellery allowed major influence to be exercised on the composition of a monarch's court.

An important role was played by the chamberlain. The term 'camerarius' is one of the most enigmatic terms related to offices of the age of Piast Poland<sup>43</sup>. As proven by Zdzisław Kaczmarczyk and Ambroży Bogucki, in 13th century Poland the position of a chamberlain as a land official did not exist yet. This office was related to court management<sup>44</sup>. Franciszek Piekosiński listed five chamberlains of Kraków who lived in the 13th century. These were supposed to be, subsequently: Bogdasz (1228–1230), Teodor Gryfita (1232), Piotr Dzierżykrajowic (1254), Piotr Witowic (1256), and Wawrzyniec Strzeszkowic (1261)<sup>45</sup>. However, according to Ambroży Bogucki, Bogdasz was an ancillary chamberlain and Teodor was a voivode. In the opinion of the same historian Piotr, son of Dzierżykraj, was supposedly a chamberlain to the duchess on 30 May 1254<sup>46</sup>. The documents of Bolesława the Chaste list four different chamberlains. Under the mentioned date of 30 May 1245, Piotr Dzierżykrajowic was listed as the chamberlain of Kraków<sup>47</sup> (which would mean that Piekosiński made a mistake, as instead of 1254, he mentioned 1245). From the privilege of Bolesław V for the monastery in Miechów of 14 September 1256 we learn about the filling of the discussed position by Piotr Witowic<sup>48</sup>. In a document of the Duke for castellan Choszczka from 1277 we observe Bogusław

---

in: J. Długosz, *Opera omnia*, vol. 9, Kraków 1884, pp. 159–160 = KDM, pt. 2, no. 485; KDPol, vol. 1, no.: 50, 53 = KDTyn, no. 24 (here also a cantor of Sandomierz); KDPol, vol.: 1, no. 55; 1, no. 59 = 3, no. 55; 3, no.: 32, 35, 43, 55; KDMog, no. 31; KDKK, pt. 1, no.: 57–59, 61–63, 69 (here also the cantor of Sandomierz), 72 (here also the cantor of Sandomierz), 79 (a doubtful doc – P. Rabiej, *Dokumenty i kancelaria*, vol. 1, pp. 87–90; vol. 2, pp. 88–89; here only as the cantor of Sandomierz), 80–81; KDTyn, no. 20–21; KDM, pt. 1, no. 60 ≠ P. Rabiej, *Dwa dokumenty Bolesława Wstydliwego dla klasztoru cystersów w Koprzywnicy z 10 września 1262 roku*, in: *Historia vero testis temporum. Księga jubileuszowa poświęcona profesorowi Krzysztofowi Baczkowskiemu w 70. rocznicę urodzin*, eds. J. Smołucha, A. Waśko, T. Graff, P.F. Nowakowski, Kraków 2008, pp. 224 – 231; KDM, pt.: 1, no.: 61, 63, 66 = 2, no. 471; 1, no.: 77, 80, 82, 88 (in the last three documents also as the cantor of Sandomierz), 94 (here only as the cantor of Sandomierz); 2, no.: 449, 451, 454–455, 472–473, 477, 480–481 (here also as the cantor of Sandomierz), 483, 626; KDMK, pt. 1, no. 1; ZDM, pt.: 1, no. 6; 4, no. 876 = K. Maleczyński, *Kilka nieznanych dokumentów*, pp. 195–196; J. Mitkowski, *Początki klasztoru*, p. 328; UrzMał., no. 1216.

<sup>43</sup> A. Bogucki, *Komornik i podkomorzy*, pp. 75–76, 132.

<sup>44</sup> Z. Kaczmarczyk, *Monarchia Kazimierza Wielkiego*, vol. 1. *Organizacja państwa*, Poznań 1939, s. 112–113; A. Bogucki, *Komornik i podkomorzy*, pp. 119–123; UrzMał., p. 68.

<sup>45</sup> F. Piekosiński, *Rycerstwo polskie*, p. 515.

<sup>46</sup> A. Bogucki, *Komornik i podkomorzy*, p. 116.

<sup>47</sup> KDKK, pt. 1, no. 40.

<sup>48</sup> KDM, pt. 2, no. 451.

mentioned as the chamberlain of Kraków<sup>49</sup>. In 1278, twice, on 13 May and 18 June, Wawrzyniec Strzeszkowic is listed as the chamberlain, in both cases mentioned without the specification of the territory of the office<sup>50</sup> (therefore, Franciszek Piekosiński's information, listing Wawrzyniec as a chamberlain in 1261 should be recognised as another writing error of this historian). In my opinion, the chamberlains of Bolesław the Chaste should also include Bogusław, who appears with the chamberlain title on the diploma of foundation of the village of Zamoście issued by the Duke in 1277. Bogusław was not in conflict with anyone in the office. Marek Barański, on the other hand, recognised that Bogusław held the office of a chamberlain, but at the court of Kinga<sup>51</sup>.

The court of Duchess Kinga operated perfectly, especially in the period of Stary Sącz. Apart from the officials who were present at the joint court of the ducal couple, the Duchess was accompanied by a clerk<sup>52</sup>, or administrator<sup>53</sup>. It should be added that in many cases the 'Kraków' court of Kinga was a sort of nursery for the future, higher-ranked officials of Bolesław V<sup>54</sup>.

<sup>49</sup> ZDM, pt. 1, no. 3.

<sup>50</sup> LB, vol. 3, pp. 159–160 = KDM, pt. 2, no. 485; KDKK, pt. 1, no. 79.

<sup>51</sup> ZDM, pt. 1, no. 3; cf.: M. Barański, *Dominium sądeckie. Od książęcego okręgu grodowego do majątku klasztoru klarysek sądeckich*, Warszawa 1992, p. 139. Although Kinga was a co-issuer of the documents of Bolesław the Chaste from 1255, in my opinion, the structure of the court of the Duchess was to a large extent determined by her husband. The Duchess gained influence on filling the positions of the officials of her court with the passage of time. It should suffice to note how late she started to issue privileges independently. Barbara Kowalska is of a different opinion. According to her, Kinga's independent organisation of her own court was an expression of her 'growing political role' – cf.: B. Kowalska, *Święta Kinga. Rzeczywistość i legenda*, Kraków 2008, *passim*.

<sup>52</sup> The function of the duchess' clerk was held by Wit. We can observe him at this position in a privilege of Kinga for the residents of Stary Sącz of 4 July 1268 and in another document of the same date for Pysz in the 'datum per manus' formula – KDM, pt. 2, no. 474–475; M. Barański, *Dominium sądeckie*, p. 141. In 1273 he was the archdeacon of Zawichost and the custodian of Sandomierz – KDM, pt. 2, no. 479; M. Barański, *Dominium sądeckie*, p. 141. On 28 May 1292, a diploma for Duchess Kinga was drawn up by her another clerk – Piotr – KDM, pt. 2, no. 519.

<sup>53</sup> Two administrators of Kinga, i.e. Mateusz and Abraham, appear in a document certifying the exchange of possessions between the Duchess and her chaplain Boguśał of 28 May 1292 – KDM, pt. 2, no. 519.

<sup>54</sup> This can be exemplified by the career of Janusz of the Topór family, whom in the years 1256–1258 we can observe in the office of the chamberlain to the Duchess – KDPol, vol. 3, no. 32; KDTyn, no. 21; KDM, pt. 2, no. 451; F. Piekosiński, *Rycerstwo polskie*, p. 152; M. Barański, *Dominium sądeckie*, p. 133. As an official of the Duke, Janusz was quickly promoted. In the years 1262–1264 he was the castellan of Radom, in 1268 he held the important Wiślica castellany. After that he took the office of the voivode of Sandomierz (1271–1283), and finally, in the years 1284–1285 he achieved the highest rank in the Duchy

The territorial administration, based on a system of gords, was headed by castellans. In the 13th century the previous authorities of particular officials were reorganised, in accordance with the concept of regalia. Internal redevelopment of the provinces into separate entities in the period of fragmentation, allowed to stop the increase of significance of the gentry, and even to reduce their influence<sup>55</sup>. The castellans were in charge of higher judicature and they commanded armies in their castellanies. A castellan was also tasked with collecting tributes from the people or enforcing services<sup>56</sup>.

The Duchy of Kraków and Sandomierz was characterised by the presence of a hierarchy of offices. The most important of the castellanies were the castellanies of Kraków and Sandomierz<sup>57</sup>. If the hierarchy of castellanies in the times of Bolesław the Chaste was to be measured by the frequency of appearance in the preserved documents of the ruler and the position on the list of witnesses (this issue is illustrated in the attached table), then apart from the two castellanies which are already listed we should include

---

of Kraków and Sandomierz, i.e. the castellany of Kraków – subsequently according to the offices held: UrzMał., no.: 670, 967, 124; J. Kurtyka, *Tęczyńscy. Studium z dziejów polskiej elity możnowładczej w średniowieczu*, Kraków 1997, pp. 95–96. In the years 1263–1270 Warcisław appeared as a cup-bearer to Kinga – KDM, pt. 1, no. 61 = M. Niwiński, *Opactwo cystersów w Wąchocku. Fundacja i dzieje uposażenia do końca wieków średnich*, Kraków 1930, pp. 158–163; KDM, pt. 1, no.: 78, 80; M. Barański, *Dominium sądeckie*, p. 135; B. Śliwiński, *Lisowie Krzelowscy w XIV i XV w. i ich antenaci. Studium genealogiczne*, Gdańsk 1993, p. 178. He finally achieved the office of the castellan of Kraków, holding this position in the years 1293–1296 – UrzMał., no. 27; M. Barański, *Dominium sądeckie*, p. 135; T. Nowakowski, *Małopolska elita władzy wobec rywalizacji o tron krakowski w latach 1288–1306*, Bydgoszcz 1992, pp. 45, 67, 72, 76. Another chamberlain of Kinga – Świętosław, son of Klemens of the Griffins, (in this function in 1270 – KDM, pt. 1, no. 80) became a castellan of Wojnicz in 1284, and a year later a castellan of Wiślica – UrzMał., no.: 1127, 1084; M. Barański, *Dominium sądeckie*, p. 137; M.L. Wójcik, *Ród Gryfitów do końca XIII wieku. Pochodzenie – genealogia – rozsiedlenie*, Wrocław 1993, p. 117, Table II. On the other hand, Sulek from Niedźwiedz, who started his career in 1275 as a vice-chamberlain to the Duchess, through a cup-bearer of Kraków and the castellany of Wiślica achieved the office of the castellan of Kraków – KDPol, vol. 1, no. 55 = KDTyn, no. 24; UrzMał., no.: 89, 1083, 125; M. Barański, *Dominium sądeckie*, p. 137; J. Sperka, *Szafrancowie herbu Stary Koń. Z dziejów kariery i awansu w późnośredniowiecznej Polsce*, Kraków 2001, pp. 27–28.

<sup>55</sup> S. Gawlas, *O kształt zjednoczonego Królestwa. Niemieckie władztwo terytorialne a geneza społeczno-ustrojowej odrębności Polski*, Warszawa 1996, pp. 74–75, 81–82; A. Teterycz, *Urzednicy sandomierscy w okresie rozbitcia dzielnicowego. Geneza, znaczenie, kompetencje*, 'Słupskie Studia Historyczne' 2000, 8, p. 45.

<sup>56</sup> J. Bardach, *op. cit.*, pp. 254–255; F. Koneczny, *Dzieje administracji w Polsce w zarysie*, Wilno 1924, p. 20.

<sup>57</sup> Z. Gloger, *Encyklopedia staropolska ilustrowana*, vol. 3, Warszawa 1974, p. 25.

the castellanies of: Wiślica<sup>58</sup>, Biecz<sup>59</sup>, Lublin<sup>60</sup>, and Małogoszcz<sup>61</sup>. Moderate significance can also be attributed to the castellanies of Brzesko<sup>62</sup>, Czechów<sup>63</sup>,

<sup>58</sup> Subsequently in accordance to the date of issue of the documents: KDTyn, no. 17 [position (hereinafter: pos.) 6 on the list of witnesses]; KDPol, vol. 1, no. 28 = *Kodeks dyplomatyczny Wielkopolski* [hereinafter: KDW], vol. 1, I. Zakrzewski, Poznań 1877, no. 221 = KDM, pt. 2, no. 417 (pos. 4.); M. Gładyszewicz, *Żywoć bł. Prandoty z Białaczowa, biskupa krakowskiego*, Kraków 1845, pp. 220–222 = KDKK, pt. 1, no. 24 (pos. 6); KDMog, no. 18 (pos. 7.); KDM, pt. 1, no. 26 (pos. 6); KDPol, vol. 3, no. 24 bis (pos. 7); KDM, pt.: 1, no. 29 (pos. 4); 2, no. 429 (pos. 3.); KDPol, vol. 1, no. 35 (pos. 7.); *Herby rycerstwa polskiego przez Bartosza Paprockiego zebrane i wydane r. p. 1584*, ed. K.J. Turowski, Kraków 1858, pp. 129–130 = KDM, pt. 2, no. 431 (pos. 2); KDKK, pt. 1, no. 30 (pos. 3); KDM, pt. 1, no. 41 (frgd.) (pos. 5.); KDKK, pt. 1, no. 35 (pos. 5); KDM, pt. 2, no.: 436 (pos. 4.), 439 = *Przywilej lokacyjny, passim* (pos. 5.); KDM, pt. 2, no. 446 (m. 7.); *Codex diplomaticus Hungariae ecclesiasticus ac civilis* [hereinafter: CDH], ed. G. Fejér, vol. 4, pt. 2, Budae 1829, pp. 354–355 = M. Gładyszewicz, *op. cit.*, pp. 228–231 = KDKK, pt. 1, no. 43 (pos. 7); KDM, pt. 2, no. 448 (pos. 3); KDPol, vol. 3, no. 33 (frgd) (pos. 5.); ZDM, pt. 1, no. 1 (pos. 5); KDTyn, no. 21 (pos. 2 – ‘Quondam castellanus Wizliciensis’); KDKK, pt. 1, no. 58 (pos. 5.); M. Gładyszewicz, *op. cit.*, s. 232–235 = KDKK, pt. 1, no. 59 (pos. 5); KDM, pt. 2, no.: 459 (pos. ), 473 (pos. 4); pt. 1, no. 77 (pos. 2); pt. 2, no.: 476 (pos. 2), 477 (frgd) (pos. 8); KDPol, vol. 1, no. 53 = KDTyn, no. 24 (pos. 5); KDM, pt. 1, no. 88 (pos. 2); KDPol, vol. 3, no. 49 = KDTyn, no. 27 (a doubtful document) (pos. 6.).

<sup>59</sup> M. Gładyszewicz, *op. cit.*, pp. 220–221 = KDKK, pt. 1, no. 24 (pos. 7); KDMog, no. 18 (pos. 9.); KDM, pt. 1, no. 26 (pos. 9); KDKK, pt. 1, pp. 87–88 (frgd) (pos. 4); CDH, vol. 4, pt. 2, pp. 354–355 = M. Gładyszewicz, *op. cit.*, pp. 228–231 = KDKK, pt. 1, no. 43 (pos. 9); KDM, pt. 1, no. 57 (pos. 7); KDPol, vol.: 1, no. 46= 3, no. 34 = KDM, pt. 1, no. 44 (frgd) (pos. 10); LB, vol. 3, pp. 356–358 = KDM, pt. 2, no. 452 (pos. 10); ZDM, pt. 1, no. 1 (pos. 6); KDM, pt. 1, no.: 53 (pos. 4), 58 (frgd) (pos. 5), 59 (frgd) (pos. 7.), 60 (document issued erroneously) ≠ P. Rabiej, *Dwa dokumenty*, pp. 229–231 (pos. 5.); KDM, pt. 1, no. 60 (document issued erroneously) ≠ P. Rabiej, *Dwa dokumenty*, pp. 224–228 (pos. 7.); KDMog, no. 31 (pos. 2.); KDKK, pt. 1, no. 78 (pos. 3); KDPol, vol. 3, no. 49 = KDTyn, no. 27 (a doubtful document) (pos. 8); ZDM, cz. 4, no. 877 (pos. 3).

<sup>60</sup> KDKK, pt. 1, no. 35 (pos. 7); KDM, pt. 2, no.: 436 (pos. 5), 447 (pos. 2); CDH, vol. 4, pt. 2, pp. 354–355 = M. Gładyszewicz, *op. cit.*, pp. 228–231 = KDKK, pt. 1, no.: 43 (pos. 8.), 58 (pos. 6.); M. Gładyszewicz, *op. cit.*, pp. 232–235 = KDKK, pt. 1, no. 59 (pos. 6); KDM, pt.: 1, no. 51 (pos. 4); 2, no.: 455 (pos. 4.), 459 (pos. 9.); 1, no. 60 ≠ P. Rabiej, *Dwa dokumenty*, pp. 224–228 (pos. 3.); 2, no. 473 (pos. 5.); KDMog, no. 31 (pos. 4.); KDM, pt. 1, no. 77 (pos. 3).

<sup>61</sup> KDPol, vol. 1, no. 28 = KDW, vol. 1, no. 221 = KDM, pt.: 2, no. 417 (pos. 7); 1, no. 29 (pos. 7.); KDPol, vol. 1, no. 35 (pos. 12.); *Herby rycerstwa*, pp. 129–130 = KDM, pt. 2, no.: 431 (pos. 3.), 449 (pos. 5.); KDPol, vol. 3, no. 32 = *Dokumenty klasztoru PP. Norbertanek w Imbramowicach (1228–1450)*, ed. Z. Kozłowska-Budkowa, Kraków 1948 [hereinafter: Imbr.], no. 5 (pos. 5.); KDPol, vol. 3, no. 33 (frgd) (pos. 6.); ZDM, pt. 1, no. 1 (pos. 7.); KDKK, pt. 1, no. 58 (pos. 7.); M. Gładyszewicz, *op. cit.*, pp. 232–235 = KDKK, pt. 1, no. 59 (pos. 7); KDM, pt.: 2, no.: 455 (pos. 5.), 459 (pos. 7.); 1, no.: 62 (pos. 2.), 80 (pos. 3.), 88 (pos. 3.).

<sup>62</sup> KDM, pt. 2, no. 424 (pos. 4); 1, no. 28 (pos. 9.); KDPol, vol. 1, no. 35 (pos. 8); KDM, pt. 2, no. 439 = *Przywilej lokacyjny, passim* (pos. 8.); KDM, pt. 1, no. 63 (pos. 3); KDKK, pt. 1, no. 78 (pos. 4); KDM, pt. 1, no. 94 (pos. 4); KDPol, vol. 3, no. 53 (pos. 4).

<sup>63</sup> M. Gładyszewicz, *op. cit.*, pp. 220–221 = KDKK, pt. 1, no. 24 (pos. 9); KDPol, vol. 3, no. 24 bis (pos. 8.); KDM, pt. 1, no. 28 (pos. 10); KDKK, pt. 1, no. 35 (pos. 9); KDPol, vol.: 1, no. 46= 3, no. 34 = KDM, pt. 1, no. 44 (frgd) (pos. 9); LB, vol. 3, pp. 356–358 = KDM, pt. 2,

Sącz<sup>64</sup>, Wojnicz<sup>65</sup>, and Zawichost<sup>66</sup>. A marginal position was represented by the castellannies of Połaniec<sup>67</sup> and Radom<sup>68</sup>, whereas a little role was played by the castellannies of Sieciechów<sup>69</sup>, Żarnów<sup>70</sup>, Łuków<sup>71</sup>, and Chrzanów<sup>72</sup>. With the exclusion of the issues related to veches, the presence of castellans at the side of the ruler was often a result of the stay of a monarch in a particular gord district.

Historiography adopts the view that Bolesław the Chaste decreased the significance of hierarchy of the voivods of Kraków for the benefit of the castellans of Kraków having less authority<sup>73</sup>. The beginnings of this phenomenon should be sought as early as in the times of reign of the father of Bolesław V, Leszek the White. Jerzy Wyrozumski claims that Duke Leszek – yet again competing for the throne of Kraków – probably accepted a condition of the lords of Kraków that the title of a voivode of Kraków will only be vested in the nobles of Kraków. Therefore, the Duke entrusted a very influential dignitary from Sandomierz – Goworek – his trusted adviser and administrator, the office of the castellan of Kraków. This is how castellan slowly started to move to the first rank, above the palatine of Kraków<sup>74</sup>.

---

no. 452 (pos. 9); ZDM, pt. 1, no. 1 (pos. 10); KDKK, pt. 1 no. 58 (pos. 9.); M. Gładyszewicz, *op. cit.*, pp. 232–235 = KDKK, pt. 1, no. 59 (pos. 9); KDM, pt. 2, no. 470 = KDW, vol. 1, no. 407 (pos. 3).

<sup>64</sup> M. Gładyszewicz, *op. cit.*, pp. 220–221 = KDKK, pt. 1, no. 24 (pos. 8); KDMog, no. 18 (pos. 8.); KDM, pt. 1, no. 26 (pos. 7); KDPol, vol. 1, no. 35 (pos. 6); KDKK, pt. 1, no. 40 (pos. 1); KDPol, vol. 1, no. 44 (pos. 1.); KDM: pt. 2, no.: 447 (pos. 1), 445 (pos. 2); pt. 1, no.: 31 (pos. 2.), 60 ≠ P. Rabiej, *Dwa dokumenty*, pp. 229–231 (pos. 4.); KDM, pt. 1, no. 60 ≠ P. Rabiej, *Dwa dokumenty*, pp. 224–228 (pos. 4.).

<sup>65</sup> M. Gładyszewicz, *op. cit.*, pp. 220–221 = KDKK, pt. 1, no. 24 (pos. 10); KDM, pt. 2, no.: 446 (pos. 8.), 450 (pos. 4.); KDPol, vol. 3, no. 33 (frgd) (pos. 8.); KDKK, pt. 1, no. 58 (pos. 8.); M. Gładyszewicz, *op. cit.*, pp. 232–235 = KDKK, pt. 1, no.: 59 (pos. 8), 60 (pos. 3); KDM, pt. 2, no. 455 (pos. 7); KDPol, vol. 3, no.: 46 (frgd) (pos. 3.), 49 = KDTyn, no. 27 (a doubtful document) (pos. 7.); KDM, pt. 2, no. 483 (pos. 2).

<sup>66</sup> KDKK, pt. 1, no. 35 (pos. 8); KDM, pt. 2, no. 449 (pos. 6); KDPol, vol. 3, no. 32 = Imbr., no. 5 (pos. 6); KDPol, vol. 3, no. 33 (frgd) (pos. 7.).

<sup>67</sup> KDM, pt. 1, no. 28 (pos. 8); KDPol, vol. 3, no. 43 (pos. 4.); KDMog, no. 32 (pos. 3.).

<sup>68</sup> KDM, pt. 1, no. 60 ≠ P. Rabiej, *Dwa dokumenty*, pp. 224–228 (pos. 8.); KDM, pt. 2, no. 472 (pos. 3); ZDM, pt. 4, no. 877 (pos. 5).

<sup>69</sup> KDM, pt. 1, no. 32 (pos. 1).

<sup>70</sup> *Ibidem*, pt. 2, no. 436 (pos. 6).

<sup>71</sup> There are no appearances of a castellan in the attestations of the documents of Bolesław V.

<sup>72</sup> KDTyn, no. 21 (pos. 3.).

<sup>73</sup> J. Wyrozumski, *Dzieje Polski piastowskiej (VIII wiek – 1370)*, Kraków 1999, pp. 88–92; M.K. Barański, *Dynastia Piastów w Polsce*, Warszawa 2005, p. 413.

<sup>74</sup> J. Wyrozumski, *Goworek*, in: PSB, vol. 8, Wrocław–Kraków–Warszawa 1959–1960, p. 390; *idem*, *Dzieje Polski*, p. 179.

In the period of reign of Leszek the White the castellan of Kraków usually appeared after the voivodes and appeared less often than the other voivodes of Kraków and Sandomierz. A separate dissertation on this matter was written by Kazimierz J. Gorzycki<sup>75</sup>. A voivode of Kraków from 1228 (a diploma of Grzymiśława from Skaryszew<sup>76</sup>) to 1243 (a diploma of Bolesław the Chaste<sup>77</sup>), regularly appeared at the first position in the witness lists. Kazimierz J. Gorzycki wrote: 'If we consider all the rules regarding witness grouping on diplomas, [...] we will understand that before 1244 the voivode of Kraków always acted as a witness before his castellan, and after 1244 it initially happened more often, and then always the other way round, so it could not have been coincidental at all'<sup>78</sup>. According to Agnieszka Teterycz-Puzio, an analysis of witness lists indicates that from 1248 Bolesław the Chaste was planning to lower the rank of the voivode of Kraków, who was increasingly often listed after the castellan of Kraków, and even fell to the third position (after the voivode of Sandomierz – assembly near Sandomierz in 1258<sup>79</sup>). Kazimierz J. Gorzycki determined that the change in hierarchy for the benefit of the castellan of Kraków is clearly visible from 2 March 1257<sup>80</sup>. According to Tomasz Jurek, the Duke managed to overcome the previously omnipotent ambitions of the voivodes of Kraków, whose position he weakened by means of increasing the significance of the local castellans<sup>81</sup>. In Korczyn, in 1262, in one of the documents of Bolesław the Chaste he was listed as the fifth (after the castellans of Kraków, Sandomierz, Biecz and the voivode of Sandomierz<sup>82</sup>), but in the second act from this assembly he was listed as the first (before the palatine of Sandomierz, the castellans of Kraków and Sandomierz<sup>83</sup>). From that year the castellan of Kraków regularly appeared at the first position in the witness lists, the voivode of Kraków was usually second<sup>84</sup>.

<sup>75</sup> K.J. Gorzycki, *op. cit.*, pp. 663–673.

<sup>76</sup> KDPol, vol. 3, no. 19; A. Teterycz-Puzio, *Na rozstajnych drogach*, p. 150.

<sup>77</sup> KDMog, no. 18; A. Teterycz-Puzio, *Na rozstajnych drogach*, p. 150.

<sup>78</sup> K.J. Gorzycki, *op. cit.*, p. 667.

<sup>79</sup> KDKK, pt. 1: no. 58, 59 = M. Gładyszewicz, *op. cit.*, s. 232–235; A. Teterycz-Puzio, *Na rozstajnych drogach*, p. 150.

<sup>80</sup> K.J. Gorzycki, *op. cit.*, p. 668. The castellan of Kraków appears after the voivode of Kraków in the KDM document, pt. 1, no. 57, inversely in these documents: KDPol, vol. 3, no. 37 = KDM, pt. 2, no. 458; KDKK, pt. 1, no. 58, 59 = M. Gładyszewicz, *op. cit.*, pp. 232–235; KDM, pt. 1, no. 53; KDMK, pt. 1, no. 1; ZDM, pt. 1, no. 1.

<sup>81</sup> T. Jurek, *Przełomowy wiek*, p. 182. Cf.: W. Uruszczak, *op. cit.*, p. 63.

<sup>82</sup> KDM, pt. 1, no. 58; A. Teterycz-Puzio, *Na rozstajnych drogach*, p. 150.

<sup>83</sup> M. Gładyszewicz, *op. cit.*, pp. 232–235 = KDM, pt. 1, no. 59; A. Teterycz-Puzio, *Na rozstajnych drogach*, p. 150.

<sup>84</sup> A. Teterycz-Puzio, *Geneza województwa sandomierskiego. Terytorium i miejsce w strukturze państwa polskiego w średniowieczu*, Słupsk 2001, Table 1; Eadem, *Na rozstajnych drogach*, p. 150.

The fact of the castellan of Kraków usually appearing as the first in attestations, followed by the voivode of Kraków and then of Sandomierz during the reign of Bolesław V, applies to the documents issued both in Kraków<sup>85</sup> and in the area of Sandomierz Land<sup>86</sup>. The mentioned order in the list was not a standard, however. Especially at the assemblies of the nobles, the palatine of Sandomierz appeared as one of the highest-ranked officials<sup>87</sup>. The voivodes of Sandomierz, Adam of the Łabędź family (1253) and Sięgniew Rawita (1262), appeared before the castellan several times (and after the voivode of Kraków), nonetheless, it should be emphasised that two out of three of these appearances have been recorded in the documents recognised as forgeries<sup>88</sup>. According to Agnieszka Teterycz-Puzio, strengthening of the position of the voivode of Sandomierz could have been related to the person of a close associate to the Duke, as in the case of the mentioned Sięgniew<sup>89</sup>. Documents numerous record his presence at the veches: as the castellan of Lublin in Oględów<sup>90</sup> and Chroberz in 1254<sup>91</sup>, as the voivode of Sandomierz, among others in Beszowa (1255)<sup>92</sup>, and Obrazów (1256)<sup>93</sup> and Zawichost (1256)<sup>94</sup>, Korczyn (1257)<sup>95</sup>, Kurów (1257)<sup>96</sup>, near Sandomierz (1258)<sup>97</sup>, and in Przedborze (1260)<sup>98</sup>.

The position of the palatines of Sandomierz was also manifested in that they were the ones to make decisions and issue documents when substituting for the duke. There is the confirmation of a sale of a part of the village of Dzierżkówiek issued in 1233 by the voivode of Sandomierz, Pakosław the Younger, which survived until our times<sup>99</sup>. In comparison to

<sup>85</sup> KDPol, vol. 1, no. 35; KDM, pt.: 1, no.: 29, 53; 2, no.: 458, 477.

<sup>86</sup> M. Gładyszewicz, *op. cit.*, pp. 221-226 = KDKK, pt. 1, no. 42; KDPol, vol. 3, no. 49 = KDTyn, no. 27; KDM, pt. 2, no. 480.

<sup>87</sup> M. Gładyszewicz, *op. cit.*, pp. 221-226 = KDKK, pt. 1, no. 42; M. Gładyszewicz, *op. cit.*, pp. 232-235 = KDKK, pt. 1, no. 59; KDPol, vol. 3, no. 23; KDKK, pt. 1, no.: 41, 58, KDM, pt.: 1, no. 27-29; 2, no. 424; KDMK, pt. 1, no. 1; ZDM, pt. 1, no. 1.

<sup>88</sup> M. Gładyszewicz, *op. cit.*, pp. 250-252 = KDKK, pt. 1, no. 39 (frgd); KDM, pt. 1, no.: 57, 59 (frgd).

<sup>89</sup> A. Teterycz, *Urzednicy sandomierscy*, p. 50.

<sup>90</sup> KDKK, pt. 1, no. 41.

<sup>91</sup> *Ibidem*, no. 42.

<sup>92</sup> CDH, vol. 4, pt. 2, pp. 354-355 = M. Gładyszewicz, *op. cit.*, pp. 228-231 = KDKK, pt. 1, no. 43.

<sup>93</sup> KDPol, vol. 3, no. 32; KDM, pt. 2, no. 449.

<sup>94</sup> KDM, pt. 2, no. 450.

<sup>95</sup> KDPol, vol. 1, no. 46= 3, no. 34 = KDM, pt. 1, no. 44 (frgd); LB, vol. 3, pp. 356-358 = KDM, pt. 2, no. 452.

<sup>96</sup> ZDM, pt. 1, no. 1.

<sup>97</sup> KDKK, pt. 1, no. 58.

<sup>98</sup> KDM, pt. 2, no. 459.

<sup>99</sup> *Ibidem*, no. 407; M. Barański, *Dokument Bolesława*, p. 176.



voivodes, castellans of Sandomierz had a weaker position. In attestations they were usually listed after both the voivodes of Lesser Poland and the castellan of Kraków<sup>100</sup>.

In the years 1253–1273 there appeared many voivodes and castellans of Kraków and Sandomierz whose family affiliation proves difficult to identify (e.g. Piotr the voivode of Kraków, Boguła and Falisław the castellans of Sandomierz, Nieustęp the voivode of Kraków)<sup>101</sup>, and this is probably the result of them originating from less significant knights. The Griffin family was not getting significant offices from the 1250s, Bolesław the Chaste did not even give the highest offices to the kin princes – of the Odrowąż family<sup>102</sup>.

The official who substituted the Duke in the matters of administration, judgements and military affairs was a voivode. The origins of the office are the subject of broad discussion in historiography<sup>103</sup>. It was definitely an office with significant competences<sup>104</sup>. In the period of regency after the death of Leszek the White the role of the nobles of Lesser Poland increased significantly, especially that of the nobles of Kraków. Palatines of Kraków: Marek, Teodor, Pakosław the Old, Włodzimierz, Klemens of Ruszcza complemented their title with the affixture 'Dei gratia', traditionally used by the rulers and bishops<sup>105</sup>. Most cases of use of the mentioned formula

<sup>100</sup> A. Teterycz-Puzio, *Formularz i pieczęć. Przyczynek do badań nad pozycją możnowładztwa w XIII wieku*, 'Klio' 2009, 13, p. 30. The locations and frequencies of appearance of the highest officials of the duchy of Kraków and Sandomierz were compiled by Krzysztof Bracha – idem, *Wiece Bolesława Wstydlivego 1234–1279*, Kielce, pp. 152–162, Table 20.

<sup>101</sup> UrzMał., no.: 448–449, 735–736, 738; J. Wyrozumski, *Nieustęp*, in: PSB, vol. 23, Wrocław–Warszawa–Kraków–Gdańsk 1978, pp. 68–69; S. Szczur, *Piotr (zm. 1273?)*, in: PSB, vol. 26, Wrocław–Warszawa–Kraków–Gdańsk–Łódź 1981, p. 368.

<sup>102</sup> Dobiesław of the Odrowąż family, a castellan of Wiślica got married to Zwinisława, daughter of the Duke of Tczew and Lubiszewo Sambor II – K. Górski, *Ród Odrowążów w wiekach średnich*, 'Rocznik Polskiego Towarzystwa Heraldycznego we Lwowie' 1926/27, 8, p. 95; *Genealogia najstarszego pnia Odrowążów w XII i XIII w.*; B. Śliwiński, *Krąg krewniaczy biskupa krakowskiego Iwona Odrowąża*, 'Zeszyty Naukowe Wydziału Humanistycznego Uniwersytetu Gdańskiego' 1984, 'Historia', 14, p. 70; idem, *Swinisława*, in: PSB, vol. 46, issue 1, Warszawa–Kraków 2009, p. 158.

<sup>103</sup> Cf.: J. Spors, *Uwagi nad genezą urzędu wojewody dzielnicowego w Polsce XII – początku XIII wieku. (Uwagi polemiczno-krytyczne i próba nowego objaśnienia genezy urzędu)*, PH 1991, 82, 2, pp. 185–208.

<sup>104</sup> Z. Wojciechowski, *Państwo polskie w wiekach średnich. Dzieje ustroju*, Poznań 1948, p. 68; S. Szczur, *Historia Polski*, p. 213. Cf.: T. Kubicki, *Komes palatyn w kronice Galla Anonima. Próba podsumowania ustaleń literatury na temat najdawniejszych dziejów wojewody*, in: *Symbolae historico-iuridicae Lodzienses Iulio Bardach dedicatae*, ed. Z. Rymaszewski, Łódź 1997, pp. 175–189.

<sup>105</sup> W. Sobociński, *Historia rządów opiekuńczych w Polsce*, CP-H 1949, 2, pp. 283–284; A. Gryguć, *Rola możnowładztwa i rycerstwa małopolskiego za panowania Bolesława Wstydlivego (1243–1279)*, in: *Spółeczeństwo i kultura do XVI wieku*, ed. J. Śliwiński, Olsztyn 1992, p. 35.

have been confirmed for Teodor of the Griffin family<sup>106</sup>. In the opinion of Janusz Bieniak, the office of provincial voivode developed at the end of the 12th century<sup>107</sup>. According to Tadeusz Lalik, the basis for authority of provincial voivode was overtaking competences of comes (in Polish: *komes*), i.e. province governor<sup>108</sup>.

In the period of regency for Bolesław the Chaste dukes repeatedly ordered voivodes to act as judges in the cases meant to be judged by the Duke. Therefore, the rulings made by the voivodes of Kraków and Sandomierz in the 1230s should not be a surprise. Between 1227 and 1241 the duchies of Kraków and Sandomierz were competed for by several members of the Piast family, which is why frequent changes occurred on these thrones. The dukes reigning in Kraków and Sandomierz seldom stayed in Lesser Poland. Władysław Spindleshanks, who also was a ruler of Greater Poland, was involved in the fight with his nephew, Władysław Odonic. This is why we can observe him in Kraków just once, in 1228<sup>109</sup>. Henryk the Bearded, who formally became the Duke of Kraków in 1231, although, in fact, he ruled there earlier, and his son Henry the Pious, due to the extensiveness of the state and the multitude of problems they had to solve, could seldom appear in Kraków. The case was similar with Sandomierz. Son of Konrad – Bolesław, only held the throne of Sandomierz in 1231. After that the duke was a cousin of Bolesław Konradowic – Bolesław the Chaste. However, the Duke and his mother Grzymiślawa – with regard to the threat from Konrad Mazowiecki – accepted the invitation of Henry the Bearded and they took refuge in the Skała Castle. Frequent absence of the rulers caused the internal rule to be handled there on their behalf by nobles, headed by voivodes. By mandate of the Duke they made judgements on the matters related to properties and issued documents. In the years 1227–1241 voivodes of Kraków issued several rulings settling disputes. As early as in 1230 voivode of Kraków Marek issued a ruling on how the monastery of Mogiła is supposed to pay the descendants of Racibór for a village bought from here earlier<sup>110</sup>. The very same Marek with a castellan of Kraków, Klemens, confirmed

<sup>106</sup> KDMog, no.: 11, 16; KDM, pt.: 1, no. 17; 2, no.: 400, 407; M. Barański, *Dokument Bolesława*, pp. 175–176.

<sup>107</sup> J. Bieniak, *Polska elita polityczna XII wieku* (pt. 1), in: *Spółeczeństwo Polski Średniowiecznej*, vol. 2, ed. S.K. Kuczyński, Warszawa 1982, pp. 14–19.

<sup>108</sup> T. Lalik, *Sandomierskie we wcześniejszym średniowieczu. Prowincja, księstwo, województwo*, in: *Studia Sandomierskie*, Sandomierz 1967, pp. 82–85.

<sup>109</sup> KDKK, pt. 1, no. 19 = KDW, vol. 1, no. 122.

<sup>110</sup> KDMog, no. 11; M. Barański, *Dokument Bolesława*, p. 175.

at the same time a knight's grant for the monastery of Miechów<sup>111</sup>. Successor of Marek at the palatium of Kraków, Teodor, confirmed in 1234 that Wincenty of Lubcza sold a part of the village of Skoruzzkowice to the monastery of Jędrzejów<sup>112</sup>. A somewhat different issue was settled in 1238 by a voivode of Kraków, Włodzimierz of the Łabędź family. Palatine as '*Nos Wlodimirus Dei gratia Cracovien. Palatinus*' issued a document for the monastery of Mogiła<sup>113</sup>, namely, he confirmed that a state payment from the village of Prandocin was obligatory<sup>114</sup>. The members of the Awdaniec family also used titles which exalted them among others. In 1233 Pakosław the Younger approved canon Sulisław's sale of the village of Dzierżkówek to the monastery of Miechów in Skaryszew<sup>115</sup>.

The role played by the voivodes of Lesser Poland in 1230s stands a testimony of the power of the nobles they were recruited from. The representatives of the most significant families became the political partners of dukes and they often had influence on their selection. Władysław the Spindleshanks, and Henry the Bearded after him, recognised the significance of the nobles of Lesser Poland. Cooperation with mutual benefits took place between the rulers of the most powerful families and dukes. Those of Lesser Poland recognised the rulers and, in return, the dukes, forced by the necessity to remain outside of Kraków for a long time, gave them freedom to shape the internal policy of the Duchy of Kraków and Sandomierz<sup>116</sup>.

The palatium of Wiślica played a special role. Wojciech is recognised as the first voivode of Wiślica, before performing that function he was a castellan of Lublin. He, as a voivode, without the determination of territory, is mentioned in the document of donation of Dzierżkówek to the Order of the Holy Sepulchre of Miechów, issued by Duchess Grzymisława on 18 November 1230<sup>117</sup>. On 17 September 1231, in a document of agreement between the Odrowąż family and the Cistercians of Mogiła, appears Mściwoj, another voivode of Wiślica. The same knight appears at the veche in Miedźna at the side of the Duke of Sandomierz Bolesław Konradowic on 5 May 1232, where he was called a voivode, without

<sup>111</sup> KDM, pt. 2, no. 401; M. Barański, *Dokument Bolesława*, p. 175.

<sup>112</sup> KDM, pt. 1, no. 17; M. Barański, *Dokument Bolesława*, p. 175.

<sup>113</sup> KDMog, no. 16.

<sup>114</sup> *Ibidem*; M. Friedberg, *Ród Łabędziów w wiekach średnich*, 'Rocznik Towarzystwa Heraldycznego we Lwowie' 1924, 7, pp. 57–58; M. Barański, *Dokument Bolesława*, p. 175; A. Teterycz-Puzio, *Formularz i pieczęć*, p. 29.

<sup>115</sup> KDM, pt. 2, no. 407; A. Teterycz-Puzio, *Formularz i pieczęć*, p. 30.

<sup>116</sup> M. Barański, *Dokument Bolesława*, pp. 175–176.

<sup>117</sup> KDM, pt. 2, no. 401; UrzMał., no.: 513, 1115.

determination of territory<sup>118</sup>. Wojciech and Mściwoj were the only voivodes of Wiślica known in history. According to Józef Spors, the voivode office in Wiślica was created by Konrad in order to introduce territorial division in the Duchy of Sandomierz to smaller political units, remaining under direct control of Konrad: Duchy of Łęczyca and Duchy of Wiślica, and his son Bolesław's region of Sandomierz, as more confined Duchy of Sandomierz<sup>119</sup>. Development of the Wiślica palatine office was not a result of provincial isolation of the Duchy of Wiślica, but a consequence of reactivation of territorial and political separateness of the former Wiślica province – a province in the time of Casimir the Just – possessing its own hierarchy of officials, and headed by a voivode. However, after the return of the region of Sandomierz, including Wiślica, to Bolesław the Chaste the provincial separation of the Wiślica region was abandoned. Nonetheless, in 1234 Duke Leszkowic mentioned existence of separate domains of Sandomierz and Wiślica, which after this year disappeared without a trace<sup>120</sup>. When discussing the role of Wiślica, it should be added that between 4 February 1256 and 10 June 1257 the first known tribune (in Polish: *wojski*) of Wiślica by the name of Piotr appeared four times, solely in the documents of Bolesław the Chaste<sup>121</sup>. The task of a tribune was to command the military as a deputy to the castellan, to supervise the knights' duty to protect the gord, and to watch over the roads<sup>122</sup>. The appearance of a tribune at that time may be related to increased activity of the duke in the arena of foreign policy<sup>123</sup>. The second and last

<sup>118</sup> KDMog, no. 12; KDM, pt. 2, no. 403; UrzMał., no. 1116. Mściwoj previously held the offices of: castellan of Sandomierz, cup-bearer of Opole and castellan of Wiślica – W. Zawitkowska, *O wiecu w Korytnicy raz jeszcze*, 'Limes. Studia i Materiały z Dziejów Europy Środkowo-Wschodniej' 2008, 1, pp. 15–18. Kromer's 'Kronika' contains information that Bolesław, son of Konrad of Masovia, who chose Wiślica as his place of stay, often organised raids from there and devastated the land of Kraków. Residents of the Kraków area in return devastated the land of Wiślica – M. Kromer, *Kronika polska*, Kraków 1832, p. 407; P. Kardys, *Wiślica w średniowieczu i w okresie wczesnonowożytnym. Studia z dziejów miasta*, Kielce 2006, p. 76.

<sup>119</sup> J. Spors, *Wojewodowie*, p. 41. Cf.: F. Piekosiński, *Rycerstwo polskie*, pp. 44–46.

<sup>120</sup> KDTyn, no. 17; J. Spors, *Wojewodowie*, p. 39. In the second half of the 13th century 'domain' was often correspondent to a duchy, but there were cases in which these two terms were not equivalent – KDPol, vol. 1, no. 35; KDM, pt. 2, no.: 439, 488; A. Teterycz-Puzio, *Status dzielnic krakowsko-sandomierskiej w XIII wieku (ducatus, terra, provincia, dominium, territorium, districtus, castelania)*, CP-H 2006, 58, pp. 140, 143–144.

<sup>121</sup> KDPol, vol. 3, no.: 32, 35; KDM, pt. 2, no.: 449, 451; UrzMał., no. 1117.

<sup>122</sup> F. Dąbrowski, *Studia nad administracją*, pp. 15–16, 19–39.

<sup>123</sup> Winter 1255/1256 was the time of a retaliatory raid to Jaćwież, which Bolesław the Chaste participated in. Somewhat earlier the Chaste made endeavours to set free his cousin Siemowit of Masovia and his wife Perejeślawa, held by Kazimierz Konradowic – *Kronika halicko-wotyńska (kronika Romanowiczów)*, introduction and annotations added

known tribune of Wiślica was not recorded in the source materials until the end of rule of Casimir the Great<sup>124</sup>.

Certain doubts were raised in historiography by the role of cup-bearers. The first cup-bearer in the area of the duchy of Kraków and Sandomierz was recorded in a document of 1223<sup>125</sup>. Ambroży Bogucki thought that a cup-bearer (in Polish: *cześnik*) (similarly to a pantler – in Polish: *stolnik*), whose task – as the name would suggest – was supposed to be management of the duke's cellar, did not fulfil his duties in the 13th century. This was supposed to be a result of their rare appearance at the court, in comparison to other subdignitaries. If cup-bearers and pantlers had really performed their duties, they would have to stay at the side of the ruler more frequently or at least as often as the other officials<sup>126</sup>. All it takes is a look at the list of officials appearing in the lists of witnesses of Bolesław the Chaste to state that it was not the case<sup>127</sup>. Attention should be drawn to the fact that the cup-bearers of Kraków rarely accompanied

---

and published by D. Dąbrowski, A. Jusupović; in cooperation with I. Juriewej, A. Majorowa and T. Wiłkuł, in: *Monumenta Poloniae Historica seria nova*, vol. 16, Kraków–Warszawa 2017, pp. 362–367; *Kronika halicko-wołyńska. Kronika Romanowiczów*, translation, introduction and comments by D. Dąbrowski i A. Jusupović, Kraków–Warszawa 2017, s. 196; B. Włodarski, *Rywalizacja o ziemię pruskie*, Toruń 1958, p. 48; P. Żmudzki, *Studium podzielonego Królestwa. Książę Leszek Czarny*, Warszawa 2000, p. 73.

<sup>124</sup> UrzMał., no. 118.

<sup>125</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 21, no. 79.

<sup>126</sup> A. Bogucki, *Ze studiów*, p. 132; P. Puziński, *Wielki leksykon rycerstwa polskiego*, Gdańsk 2007, pp. 37–38.

<sup>127</sup> Appearances of pantlers in attestations of documents of Bolesław the Chaste in chronological order: pantler of Kraków – KDM, pt. 1, no. 26; KDMog, no. 21; KDKK, pt. 1, no. 58; M. Gładyszewicz, *op. cit.*, pp. 232–235 = KDKK, pt. 1, no. 59; KDM, pt. 1, no.: 62–63, 82 (last document without a specification of the territory of the office held); KDMog, no. 33 (without a specification of the territory of the office held); KDPol, vol. 3, no. 53; LB, vol. 3, pp. 159–160 = KDM, pt. 2, no. 485 (without a specification of the territory of the office held); KDPol, vol. 1, no. 62; ZDM, pt. 1, no. 6; pantler of Sandomierz: KDKK, pt. 1, no. 41; M. Gładyszewicz, *op. cit.*, pp. 221–226 = KDKK, pt. 1, no.: 42, 40; KDPol, vol. 1, no. 44; KDM, pt. 2, no.: 449–450 (last document without a specification of the territory of the office held); KDPol, vol.: 1: no. 46 = 3, no. 34 = KDM, pt.: 1, no. 44 (frgd); 2, no. 452; KDMK, pt. 1, no. 1; ZDM, pt. 1, no. 1; KDKK, pt. 1, no. 58; M. Gładyszewicz, *op. cit.*, pp. 232–235 = KDKK, pt. 1, no. 59; KDM, pt. 1, no. 51; KDPol, vol.: 3, no.: 39 (frgd), 40 (frgd); 1, no. 55. Appearances of cup-bearers: cup-bearer of Kraków: *ibidem*, no. 35; KDM, pt.: 2, no. 431; 1, p. 41 (frgd); 2, no. 436; 1, no.: 38, 31; CDH, vol. 4, pt. 2, pp. 354–355 = M. Gładyszewicz, *op. cit.*, pp. 228–231 = KDKK, pt. 1, no. 43; KDM, pt.: 1, no. 78; 2, no. 476; ZDM, pt. 4, no. 877; KDM, pt. 2, no. 483; LB, vol. 3, pp. 159–160 = KDM, pt. 2, no. 485; KDKK, pt. 1, no.: 80–81; ZDM, pt. 1, no. 6; KDPol, vol. 1, no. 62; cup-bearer of Sandomierz – KDMog, no. 21; KDPol, vol. 3, no. 24 bis; KDM, pt. 1, no. 28; KDKK, pt. 1 no. 41; M. Gładyszewicz, *op. cit.*, pp. 221–226 = KDKK, pt. 1, no. 42; *ibidem*, no. 58; M. Gładyszewicz, *op. cit.*, pp. 232–235 = KDKK, pt. 1, no. 59; KDM, pt.: 2, no. 472; 1, no.: 88, 94.

the ruler, and if they did do so, it occurred in his entourage in Kraków<sup>128</sup>. A cup-bearer, similarly to a pantler, lost continuous relation with the court of the ruler in the 13th century and ceased to manage particular categories of servants, but gained political significance of his office<sup>129</sup>.

The rule of Duke Bolesław V provides information on the two and only *podskarbi* of Kraków. A *podskarbi* was initially the highest official in charge of treasury. In the 14th century the court *podskarbi* took over the competences of a *skarbnik*<sup>130</sup>. The first court *podskarbi* was Zdziegod, present on the list of witnesses for a privilege issued by the Chaste for the Cistercian monastery in Jędrzejów on 3 August 1250, where he appears only as a *podskarbi*, without any specification of the territory, whereas the second *podskarbi*, Bieniek, with the title of the duke's *podskarbi*, appears in a document of foundation of the village of Gołkowice issued by the duchess of Kraków on 30 March 1276<sup>131</sup>.

Certain controversies were raised in historiography by the role of a judge. The first judge in the duchy of Kraków and Sandomierz is recorded to be present in 1217<sup>132</sup>. The duty of a judge and the judge's deputy, sub-judge, was to follow procedural forms in the course of examination of cases before the duke's court and to accompany the ruler in judicial proceedings<sup>133</sup>. Ambroży Bogucki supposed that a judge could only adjudicate in more important cases, and a sub-judge was constantly at the side of the ruler and adjudicated as a substitute to the judge<sup>134</sup>. The lists of appearances of judges and sub-judges at the side of the Chaste may not so much contradict Bogucki's suppositions, but they advise caution. In the preserved source material the judges appear almost twice as frequently as the sub-judges<sup>135</sup>. As opposed to voivodes and castellans, judg-

<sup>128</sup> KDPol, vol. 1, no. 35; KDM, pt.: 1, p. 41 (frgd.); 2, no. 436; 1, no. 31; CDH, vol. 4, pt. 2, pp. 354–355 = M. Gładyszewicz, *op. cit.*, pp. 228–231 = KDKK, pt. 1, no. 43; KDM, pt. 1, no. 78; ZDM, pt. 4, no. 877; KDM, pt. 2, no. 483; LB, vol. 3, pp. 159–160 = KDM, pt. 2, no. 485; KDKK, pt. 1, no. 81; ZDM, pt. 1, no. 6; KDPol, vol. 1, no. 62.

<sup>129</sup> J. Kurtyka, *Problem identyczności*, p. 26. Cf.: Z. Gloger, *Encyklopedia staropolska ilustrowana*, vol. 1, Warszawa 1996, p. 291.

<sup>130</sup> J. Kurtyka, *Problem identyczności*, pp. 43–44.

<sup>131</sup> KDM, pt.: 1, no. 32; 2, no. 482; UrzMał., no. 330.

<sup>132</sup> UrzMał., pp. 9, 21, no. 352.

<sup>133</sup> J. Bardach, *op. cit.*, p. 255; S. Szczur, *Historia Polski*, p. 215; D. Kała, *op. cit.*, p. 171.

<sup>134</sup> A. Bogucki, *Ze studiów*, p. 118.

<sup>135</sup> Appearances of judges in the privileges of Bolesław V: judge of Kraków KDM, pt. 1, no. 26; KDMog, no.: 18, 27; KDM, pt.: 2, no. 424; 1, no. 28; 2, no.: 429, 431; KDKK, pt. 1, no. 30; KDMog, no. 22; KDM, pt. 2, no. 434; *Przywilej lokacyjny, passim* = KDM, pt. 2, no. 439; KDPol, vol. 3, no. 29 = KDM, pt.: 1, no. 40; 2, no. 447; 1, no. 31; CDH, vol. 4, pt. 2, pp. 354–355 = M. Gładyszewicz, *op. cit.*, pp. 228–231 = KDKK, pt. 1, no. 43; KDMK, pt. 1, no. 1; ZDM, pt. , no. 1; KDKK, pt. 1, no. 58; M. Gładyszewicz, *op. cit.*, pp. 232–235 = KDKK, pt. 1, no. 59;

es have not lost their competences as a result of being granted judicial immunities. It was customary for Dukes to reserve for themselves the right to call before their courts, as the revenue from the judicature constituted considerable position in the income of a duke's treasury. Therefore, the significance of a judge as an official of the court, who as a substitute to a ruler performed important judicial functions, was increasing<sup>136</sup>.

In a document issued in Skaryszew in February 1233 by the voivode of Sandomierz at that time, Pakosław the Younger, which approved the sale of the village of Dzierżkowek (near Radom) by a canon of Sandomierz, Sulisław, to the monastery in Miechów, one of the witnesses was Stronek, the first and the only judge of Radom known to the sources<sup>137</sup>. Functioning

---

KDM, pt. 2, no. 454–455; KDPol, vol. 3, no.: 36, 38; KDM, pt. 1, no. 60 ≠ P. Rabiej, *Dwa dokumenty*, pp. 224–228; KDM, pt. 1, no. 60 ≠ P. Rabiej, *Dwa dokumenty*, pp. 229–231; KDPol, vol. 1, no. 50; KDM, pt. 2, no. 470 = KDW, vol. 1, no. 407; KDKK, pt. 1, no. 69; KDMog, no. 32 (without a specification of the territory of the office held); KDKK, pt. 1, no. 78 (without a specification of the territory of the office held); KDPol, vol.: 1, no. 59 = 3, no. 55; KDM, pt. 1, no. 92; KDMog, no. 33 (without a specification of the territory of the office held); KDPol, vol. 3, no. 50 = KDTyn, no. 28; KDKK, pt. 1, no.: 79 (a doubtful document), 80; KDM, pt. 2, no. 614 (frgd.); *Akta grodzkie i ziemskie z czasów Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej z Archiwum łzw. Bernardyńskiego we Lwowie*, t. 7, eds. O. Pietruski, X. Liske, Lwów 1878–1883, no. 7 (frgd); judge of Sandomierz – KDPol, vol. 1, no. 28 = KDW, vol. 1, no. 221 = KDM, pt. 2, no. 417 (without a specification of the territory of the office held); *ibidem*, pt. 1, no. 28; CDH, vol. 4, pt. 2, pp. 354–355 = M. Gładyszewicz, *op. cit.*, pp. 228–231 = KDKK, pt. 1, no. 43; KDMK, pt. 1, no. 1; ZDM, pt. 1, no. 1; KDKK, pt. 1, no. 58; M. Gładyszewicz, *op. cit.*, pp. 232–235 = KDKK, pt. 1, no. 59; KDM, pt. 1, no. 60 ≠ P. Rabiej, *Dwa dokumenty*, pp. 224–228; KDM, pt.: 2, no. 481; 1, no. 93; KDPol, vol. 3, no. 53. Appearances of sub-judges: sub-judge of Kraków – KDMog, no.: 18, 27 (both documents without a specification of the territory of the office held); KDM, pt. 1, no. 26; KDMog, no. 22; KDM, pt. 2, no. 434; KDKK, pt. 1, no. 41 (without a specification of the territory of the office held); M. Gładyszewicz, *op. cit.*, pp. 221–226 = KDKK, pt. 1, no. 42 (without a specification of the territory of the office held); KDPol, vol. 3, no. 28; M. Gładyszewicz, *op. cit.*, pp. 221–226 = KDKK, pt. 1, no. 42 (probable appearance; without a specification of the territory of the office held); KDM, pt. 2, no. 447; KDPol, vol. 3, no. 35; ZDM, pt. 1, no. 1; KDTyn, no. 20; KDM, pt. 1, no. 82; KDMog, no. 32–33 (the last one without a specification of the territory of the office held); LB, vol. 3, pp. 159–160 = KDM, pt. 2, no. 485; sub-judge of Sandomierz – KDKK, pt. 1, no. 41; M. Gładyszewicz, *op. cit.*, pp. 221–226 = KDKK, pt. 1, no. 42; KDPol, vol. 3, no. 28; KDKK, pt. 1, no. 40; KDPol, vol. 1, no. 44 (without a specification of the territory of the office held); KDM, pt. 2, no.: 450 (without a specification of the territory of the office held), 451; K. Maleczyński, *Kilka nieznanych dokumentów*, pp. 195–196 = ZDM, pt. 4, no. 876; KDM, pt. 1, no. 61; KDPol, vol. 3, no. 43; KDM, pt.: 2, no. 626 (without a specification of the territory of the office held); 1, no. 93.

<sup>136</sup> A. Szymczakowa, *Urzednicy łączycy i sieradcy do połowy XV w.*, 'Acta Universitatis Lodzensis. Folia Historica' 1984, 20, p. 108; A. Teterycz, *Urzednicy sandomierscy*, p. 57.

<sup>137</sup> KDM, pt. 2, no. 407; UrzMał., no. 692; P. Kardys, *Z dziejów strategiczno-militarnego znaczenia Radomia w średniowieczu*, in: *Wojsko w Radomiu od średniowiecza po czasy współczesne*, ed. D. Kupisz, Radom 2008, p. 26.

of the office of a judge of Radom in 1233 confirms an growing role of Radom (although for example the castellan of Radom appeared in all the documents of Bolesław V only three times)<sup>138</sup>. A judge was an official adjudicating as a substitute to the ruler<sup>139</sup>. His appearance in Radom can confirm both the rule of Konrad of Masovia in this area, and the presence of the court of duchess Grzymisława and her underage son, who may have been residing in the nearby Skaryszew.

I already mentioned the addition of the 'Dei gratia' formula to the title by secular dignitaries. Studies of Krzysztof Skupieński also record a different phenomenon in the aspect of diplomas issued by the nobles during the fights for power in the underage period of Bolesław the Chaste. As far as the titles are concerned, the term 'nos' had previously been reserved to dukes. Other issuers were described as 'ego'. As calculated by Krzysztof Skupieński, in Lesser Poland in the 13th century the term 'ego' was used 32 times, more often before 1520, whereas the pronoun 'nos' was used 17 times in the first half of the 13th century, almost exclusively in the diplomas of voivodes. The so-called 'pluralis maiestaticus' might have therefore emphasised a dominant position among the elite, but it cannot be excluded either that the formula 'nos... dei gracia' could have been used as honorific in relation to the benefactors to the monastery<sup>140</sup>.

The sphragistic images were also somewhat a reflection of forking political aspirations of nobles holding offices in the underage period of Bolesław Leszkowic. These included i.a. the equestrian seals. The oldest one among them is the seal of Sąd Dobiesławowic of the Odrowąż family. As a castellan of Wojnice, in 1236, in a diploma for the monastery of Mogiła on the matter of the prebend of Szaniec, he used a small seal with an image of a knight with a sword on a galloping horse, surrounded by the inscription SSANDONIS FILII DOBIESLAVI<sup>141</sup>. Earlier, in 1228 Pakosław the Old Awdaniec used a seal with a bar sign<sup>142</sup>, and in two documents of 1238 he stamped a small seal, but bearing an image of an armed knight on a horse with a sword and the Divine Hand motif and an inscription 'comitis Pacoslai Maioris'<sup>143</sup>. This type of seal with a Divine Hand motif,

<sup>138</sup> UrzMał., no. 692.

<sup>139</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 12; A. Gąsiorowski, *Urzednicy zarządu lokalnego w późnośredniowiecznej Wielkopolsce*, Poznań 1970, p. 51; A. Szymczakowa, *op. cit.*, s. 108; P. Kardys, *Z dziejów*, p. 26.

<sup>140</sup> K. Skupieński, *Funkcje małopolskich dokumentów w sprawach prywatnoprawnych do roku 1306*, Lublin 1990, pp. 38, 132; A. Teterycz-Puzio, *Formularz i pieczęć*, pp. 29, 32.

<sup>141</sup> KDMog, no. 14; F. Piekosiński, *Pieczęcie polskie wieków średnich*, vol. 1, Kraków 1899, no. 104, p. 86; A. Teterycz-Puzio, *Formularz i pieczęć*, p. 24.

<sup>142</sup> F. Piekosiński, *Pieczęcie polskie*, no. 60, p. 64; *idem*, *Herby szlachty polskiej*, 'Herold Polski' 1905, p. 45; A. Teterycz-Puzio, *Formularz i pieczęć*, p. 25.

<sup>143</sup> KDMog, no. 15; KDM, pt. 1, no. 22; F. Piekosiński, *Pieczęcie polskie*, no. 111.



which symbolised divine origin of authority, had earlier been reserved for use by the dukes. Therefore, its use by Pakośław was probably a signal of weakening in the duke's authority<sup>144</sup>. An equestrian seal was also used by a castellan of Kraków, Adam Leonardowic. Such a seal was attached to the foundation act of Kraków<sup>145</sup>.

A proof to the reinforcement of the role of nobles after the death of Leszek the White are, in a certain way, the non-standard (i.e. contrary to the adopted principles) promotions in offices, as well as accumulations of high ranks in the hands of a single person. As far as the so-called non-standard promotions are concerned I would primarily like to draw attention to the highest secular offices of the duchy of Kraków and Sandomierz being held by knights promoted from offices positioned low in hierarchy or even by the nobles, who according to the preserved source material held no ranks before. An example of such a promotion could be the career of Michał (of unidentified affiliation to a family), who, before he took the office of a castellan of Kraków, had been a cup-bearer at the capital court. As Michał was recorded with the office of a castellan less than a month after the Battle of Suchodół, the reasons for his promotion could be sought in the anti-Masovian attitude of this knight<sup>146</sup>. The non-standard promotion method also applies to three castellans of Kraków. The first one was Jakub, who in the years 1228–1229 appeared in regards to the discussed title in the privileges of Duchess Grzymisława. We do not have any reliable source of information on whether this exact Jakub directly held any office earlier. Apparently, this was a person who for some reasons was of merit to the duchess-widow in the period of her fight for the rights to the throne for her son after the death of Leszek the White<sup>147</sup>. This noble probably owed a quick promotion to the castellany of Kraków to Grzymisława's favour<sup>148</sup>. Also with regard to Jakub Raciborowic – who in the documents can be observed as a castellan of Sandomierz only at a *veche* in Przedborze, probably inaugurating the independent rule of Bolesław the Chaste in the Duchy of Sandomierz, whom Jan Długosz recognised as deceased during a Tatar invasion raid – we do not have any information on him having any function earlier. Although another Jakub, discussed earlier, could have won the office owing to some special

---

<sup>144</sup> Cf. e.g.: Z. Piech, *Ikonografia pieczęci Piastów*, Kraków 1993, p. 203, no. 5 – an equestrian seal of Bolesław the Chaste.

<sup>145</sup> F. Piekosiński, *Pieczęcie polskie*, no. 114; L. Kajzer, *Uzbrojenie i ubiór rycerski w średniowiecznej Małopolsce w świetle źródeł ikonograficznych*, Wrocław 1976, p. 57.

<sup>146</sup> M. Gładyszewicz, *op. cit.*, pp. 220–221 = KDKK, pt. 1, no. 24; UrzMał., no.: 119, 714.

<sup>147</sup> KDM, pt. 1, no.: 11, 12 = ZDMaz, vol. 1, no. 273; UrzMał., no. 729.

<sup>148</sup> UrzMał., no. 115.

merits, in the case of Jakub Raciborowic we can presume that he could have significant estate, which was proven by his extensive manor<sup>149</sup>. On a forged privilege for the monastery of Wąchock, dated to 8 May 1271, the person recorded at the castellany of Sandomierz is Nieustęp, who then from the office of castellan was supposed to transfer to the palatium of Kraków<sup>150</sup>. We do not have any information on the previous career of Nieustęp. Putting aside the fact whether Nieustęp held the office of castellan of Sandomierz, considering that he was certainly a voivode of Kraków, it can be assumed with high probability that he was *homo novus* in the ruling elite of the final stage of rule of Bolesław V. We do not know the familial affiliation of Nieustęp, he was probably a member of a less significant family, as at the end of his rule Bolesław the Chaste rarely filled the highest offices with knights from powerful families. The functions of the chamberlain were also mostly held by the knights for whom it was probably the first level on the ladder of career in the offices. We can indicate, respectively, chamberlain Getko, his brother Wydźga, Mikołaj, Sąd, Wawrzyniec, Pełka, or Jan<sup>151</sup>. Only in the case of three nobles we know that they were promoted to the chamberlain of Kraków from lower offices. This applies consecutively to: Otton of the Toporczyk family, Skarbimira Awdaniec, and Wojsława (who may have belonged to the Półkoczic family)<sup>152</sup>. New people in the hierarchy of offices also held the chamberlain office of Sandomierz. This applies to all the chamberlains of Sandomierz with the exception of Mikuł<sup>153</sup>. Career at the palatium of Kraków was inaugurated by Klemens of Ruszcza, who, as we know, played a major part in expelling Konrad of Masovia from the duchy of Kraków and Sandomierz<sup>154</sup>.

The regency period provides examples of accumulation of the top secular offices in the duchy of Kraków and Sandomierz. After an accident with tragic consequences, which occurred during a Prussian plundering raid, Marek Gryfita, holding the office of a voivode of Kraków, had to move to Silesia with his other family members<sup>155</sup>. Holding the office of a voivode of Kraków and Sandomierz was combined by Pakosław the Old

<sup>149</sup> KDKK, pt. 1, no. 14; *Joannis Długossii Annales seu Cronicae incliti Regni Poloniae, consilium* ed. S. Budkowa et al., lib. VII–VIII, Varsoviae 1975, p. 15; UrzMał., no. 731.

<sup>150</sup> KDM, pt. 2, no. 477 (frgd. – M. Niwiński, *op. cit.*, pp. 17–20; P. Rabiej, *Dokumenty i kancelaria*, vol. 2, p. 73); UrzMał., no.: 449, 738.

<sup>151</sup> Consecutively: UrzMał., no.: 250–255, 258.

<sup>152</sup> *Ibidem*, no.: 257, 259–260.

<sup>153</sup> *Ibidem*, no.: 820–824, 826–827. Cf.: *Ibidem*, no. 825.

<sup>154</sup> *Ibidem*, no. 442. Cf.: KDM, pt. 2, no.: 431, 436.

<sup>155</sup> A. Rybarski, *Pochodzenie i początek rodu Odrowążów*, PH 1914, 18, p. 185.

of the Awdaniec family. As a voivode of both Kraków and Sandomierz, Pakosław was listed as a witness at the privilege of the freshly widowed duchess Grzymisława, issued on 6 December 1227 to the Cistercians of Sulejów<sup>156</sup>. Both palatia were probably held by Awdaniec from 1225 until the early 1228. The former date results from the relocation of the Griffin family to Silesia; the latter one from the fact that in March 1228, in the documents issued during a major assembly in Skaryszew, we can observe Marek at the office of voivode of Kraków<sup>157</sup>.

Another representative of the Awdaniec family combined holding offices of castellan and voivode of Sandomierz. This refers to Pakosław the Younger Awdaniec (a cousin of Pakosław the Old), who is recorded with both such notable secular dignities in a document on the property matters of the Mogiła monastery, issued on 17 September 1231<sup>158</sup>.

The actions of Bolesław the Chaste with regard to the nobles in the times of fighting for Kraków were characterised by the policy of forgiveness. The greatest supporters of Konrad and his sons (e.g. Mściwoj and his son, Mikołaj – voivodes of Kraków) owing to leniency of the Chaste reached highest dignities at his side. The policy of mercy ended in 1273, when a group of nobles attempted to deprive Bolesław of power. Some traitors were granted amnesty, but other knights were deprived of dignities, whose places were taken by new nobles<sup>159</sup>. The reasons for the revolt should not be sought in the foreign policy of the duchy of Kraków and Sandomierz. In my opinion, one of the main incentives which pushed the knights towards the coup d'état was removing the most influential families from the position of power and entrusting offices to the less significant members of families. This was probably a result of the troubles predicted by Bolesław the Chaste in relations between the nobles in power and his successor. The duke was probably consciously trying to build an elite which would owe the position and property only to him, and at the same time significantly reduce the importance of the most powerful nobles. From the 1250s there had been many highest officials with family affiliation that is difficult or impossible to identify, originating rather certainly from the lower stratum of knights (known and less affluent families, whose representatives held offices at that time include: the Łabędź, Bogoria, Półkożic, Radwanici, Rawicz, Okszyć, and Sulim families). The cause for the revolt may also have been Bolesław's 'salt'

<sup>156</sup> KDM, pt. 2, no. 393; UrzMał., no.: 436, 960.

<sup>157</sup> KDPol, vol. 1, no. 19; KDM, pt. 1, no. 11.

<sup>158</sup> KDMog, no. 12; UrzMał., no.: 730, 961.

<sup>159</sup> K. Supernak, *op. cit.*, pp. 155–162.

policy, who, aiming to consolidate the shares in salt mines, deprived the affluent nobles in secular (primarily of the Griffin family) and church institutions of significant profits<sup>160</sup>.

The role of the affluent nobles increased in the period of the regency rule for the son of the murdered Leszek the White. This phenomenon manifested in the very broad judicial authority of voivodes, the affluent nobles adding 'Dei gratia' to their titles, using the so-called 'pluralis maiestaticus' in documents, or using sphragistic images which were previously reserved by the rulers. A growing significance of the role of affluent nobles was associated with the weakening authority of the dukes of Kraków, who were often absent in the province. Some dignitaries were able to use this opportunity to accumulate the highest offices of the state in their hands.

Office filling was deprived of specific rules of going through particular levels in career. People trusted by the Duke could reach the highest positions in the state over a short period of time (without many years of holding lower offices), including the office of voivode or castellan of Kraków. Owing to their personal abilities and merits, knights could have achieved high dignities (e.g. Klemens of Ruszcza, Michał, Jakub Raciborowic, or Nieustęp). Bolesław the Chaste made efforts to move the castellan of Kraków ahead of the voivode in the time of his rule. Apart from the highest offices in the state, in the time of rule of Bolesław there were no solidified rules in the hierarchy of secular dignitaries. This applied both to the presence of officials on witness lists and to the rules for transitions from one position to another. In the period of regency for Leszkowic and during his proper rule in the duchy of Kraków and Sandomierz, sources indicate appearance of many land and court offices for the first time. In the case of Kraków land, these were standard-bearer, sword-bearer, *podskarbi* and deputy cup-bearer. The first appearances included the castellans of Biecz, Czechów, Łuków, Radom, Sieciechów, Zawichost, tribune of Lublin, judge of Radom, standard-bearer and cup-bearer of Sandomierz, and the following for Sandomierz: equerry, master of the hunt, sword-bearer, deputy cup-bearer, deputy equerry, deputy master of the hunt, sub-judge, deputy pantler, judge, *skarbnik*, voivode of Wiślica (temporarily, in the Chaste's underage period), or tribune of Wiślica<sup>161</sup>. Court offices were transformed into land offices. The disadvantage of such transformation was lesser devotion of land officials to the monarch than to their province. On the other hand, court officials *de facto* fulfilled their duties only

<sup>160</sup> *Ibidem*, pp. 147–153.

<sup>161</sup> UrzMał., no.: 61, 195, 330, 226, 1, 39, 601, 669, 1057, 1150, 591, 692, 694, 712, 768, 772, 786, 800, 820, 849, 852, 853, 879, 897, 929, 1115, 117.

in the presence of the ruler. The court was headed by a chamberlain, whereas the clergymen were headed by a chancellor. Long-term rule of a single ruler contributed to the development of chancellery and reinforcement of validity of the duke's documents. Territorial administration was headed by castellans.

Tab. 1. Positions of castellans and voivodes on witness lists of the documents of Duke Bolesław the Chaste<sup>162</sup>.

Place of publication of the document	Place and date of issue of the document	Castellan of Biecz	Castellan of Brześć	Castellan of Chranów	Castellan of Czechów	Castellan of Kraków	Castellan of Lublin	Castellan of Łuków	Castellan of Małogoszcz	Castellan of Połaniec	Castellan of Radom	Castellan of Sandomierz	Castellan of Sącz	Castellan of Sieciechów	Castellan of Wiślica	Castellan of Wojnice	Castellan of Zawichost	Castellan of Żarnów	Voivode of Kraków	Voivode of Sandomierz
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21
KDPol, vol. 3, no. 13 = <i>Schlesisches Urkundenbuch</i> , vol. 2, ed. W. Irgang, Graz-Köln 1977 [hereinafter: SUB], no. 79	Wysoki Brzeg, 21 December 1234	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3
KDTyn, no. 17	Luchania, 1234	-	-	-	-	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	-	-	-	-	7
KDM, pt. 2, no. 412	Skała, 06 June 1235	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
K. Maleczyński, <i>Dwa nieznanne dokumenty</i> , pp. 458–459 = ZDM, pt. 4, no. 874	Skała, 1235	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

<sup>162</sup> The table takes into account all the documents of Bolesław the Chaste issued until 6 December 1279, including the ones without attestation (to illustrate the frequency of appearance of particular officials in the total number of the duke's diplomas).





KDM, pt. 2, no. 434	Bochnia, 5 February 1251	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-
KDM, pt. 1, no. 41 (frgd.)	Kraków, 1251	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	4	-	-	5	-	-	-	2	3
CDH, vol. 4, pt. 2, pp. 150-151 = KDM, pt. 1, no. 38	Urzuty, 14 May 1252	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
KDM, pt. 2, no. 612 (frgd)	Kraków, 6 June 1252	-	-	-	-	4	-	-	-	-	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	3
KDKK, pt. 1, no. 35	Ogłędów, 27 August 1252	-	-	-	9	2	7	-	-	-	-	-	5	-	8	-	3	4*	
KDPol, vol. 1, no. 40	Zawichost, 1252	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
KDKK, pt. 1, no. 34 (frgd)	<i>Sine loco</i> , 1252	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
KDM, pt. 2, no. 436	Kraków, 1252	-	-	-	-	1	5	-	-	-	3	-	-	4	-	-	6	-	2
KDM, pt. 2, no. 439 = <i>Przywilej lokacyjny</i>	Korczyn, 27 February 1253	-	8	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	-	-	-	4	-	
KDM, pt. 2, no. 440	Osiek, 9 April 1253	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
M. Gładyszewicz, <i>op. cit.</i> , pp. 250-252 = KDKK, pt. 1, no. 39 (frgd)	Kraków, 1253	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	2
KDPol, vol. 3, no. 28	Sandomierz, 23 February 1254	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
KDPol, vol. 3, no. 29 = KDM, pt. 1, no. 40	Kraków, 10 May 1254	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

\* Witness list based on documents from veches of 18 June 1254 in Chroberz and of 17 April 1255 in Zawichost – KDKK, pt. 1, No. 41–42.







J. Mitkowski, <i>Początki klasztoru</i> , pp. 327–328	Zawichost, 19 May 1258	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	
KDTyn, no. 21	Zawichost, 21 May 1258	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2**	-	-	-	-	-	
KDKK, pt. 1, no. 58	Near Sandomierz, 11 June 1258	-	-	-	9	1	6	-	7	-	-	4	-	-	5	8	-	-	3	2
M. Gładyszewicz, <i>op. cit.</i> , pp. 232–235 = KDKK, pt. 1, no. 59	Near Sandomierz, 13 June 1258	-	-	-	9	1	6	-	7	-	-	4	-	-	5	8	-	-	3	2
KDM, pt.2, no. 454	Zawichost, 09 September 1258	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
KDM, pt. 1, no. 51	Zawichost, 1258	-	-	-	-	-	4	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-
KDKK, pt. 1, no. 60	Kraków, 11 April 1259	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	2	1
KDM, pt. 1, no. 53	Kraków, 03 May 1259	4	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	6
KDM, pt. 2, no. 455	Kraków, 09 May 1259	-	-	-	-	-	4	-	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	7	-	-	1	2
KDPol, vol. 3, no. 36	Kraków, 1259	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-
KDPol, vol. 3, no. 37 = KDM, pt. 2, no. 458	Kraków, 13 April 1260	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	3
KDKK, pt. 1, no. 61	<i>Sine loco</i> , May 1260	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
KDM, pt. 2, no. 459	Przedbórz, 02 December 1260	-	-	-	-	-	9	-	7	-	-	6	-	-	8	-	-	-	5	4
KDKK, pt. 1, no. 62	Kraków, 18 December 1261	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
KDPol, vol. 3, no. 38	<i>Sine loco</i> , 1261	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-

\*\* 'Quondam castellanus Wizliciensis' – KDTyn, No. 21.









BP, vol. 3, pp. 159–160 = KDM, pt. 2, no. 485	Kraków, 18 June 1278	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
KDKK, pt. 1, no. 80	Osiek, 17 August 1278	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
ZDM, pt. 1, no. 4	Korczyn, 1278	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
KDKK, pt. 1, no. 81	Kraków, 30 September 1279	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-
ZDM, pt. 1, no. 6	Kraków, 4 October 1279	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
KDPol, vol. 1, no. 62 = Imbr., no. 9	Kraków, 4 October 1279	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
KDKK, pt. 1, no. 83	Korczyn, 06 Decem- ber 1279	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	2

## REFERENCES

## Sources

- Acta grodzkie i ziemskie z czasów Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej z Archiwum łzw. Bernardyńskiego we Lwowie*, vol. 7, eds. O. Pietruski, X. Liske, Lwów 1878–1883.
- Barański M., *Dokument Bolesława Wstydlwego z 1236 roku*, in: *Inter orientem et occidentem. Studia z dziejów Europy środkowowschodniej ofiarowane Profesorowi Janowi Tyszkiewiczowi w czterdziestolecie pracy naukowej*, ed. T. Wasilewski, Warszawa 2002.
- Bullarium Poloniae*, vol. 1: 1000–1342, eds. S. Kuraś, I. Sułkowska-Kurasiowa, Roma 1982.
- Codex diplomaticus Hungariae ecclesiasticus ac civilis*, vol. 4, pt. 2, ed. G. Fejér, Budae 1829.
- Dokumenty klasztoru PP. Norbertanek w Imbramowicach (1228–1450)*, ed. Z. Kozłowska-Budkowa, Kraków 1948.
- Dokumenty kujawskie i mazowieckie przeważnie z XIII w.*, ed. B. Ulanowski, Kraków 1888.
- Gładyszewicz M., *Żywot bł. Prandoty z Białaczowa, biskupa krakowskiego*, Kraków 1845.
- Herby rycerstwa polskiego przez Bartosza Paprockiego zebrane i wydane r. p. 1584*, ed. K.J. Turowski, Kraków 1858.
- Joannis Długossii Annales seu Cronicae incliti Regni Poloniae, consilium* ed. S. Budkowa et al., lib. VII–VIII, Varsoviae 1975.
- Karczewski D., *Nieznaný dokument księżnej krakowskiej Grzymisławy z roku 1228. Przyczynek do najwcześniejszego uposażenia klasztoru Cystersów w Henrykowie*, in: *Venerabiles, nobiles et honesti. Studia z dziejów społeczeństwa Polski średniowiecznej. Prace ofiarowane Profesorowi Januszowi Bieniakowi w siedemdziesiąt rocznicę urodzin i czterdziestolecie pracy naukowej*, eds. A. Radziwiński, A. Supruniuk, J. Wroniszewski, Toruń 1997.



- Kodeks dyplomatyczny katedry krakowskiej św. Wacława*, pt. 1, ed. F. Piekosiński, Kraków 1874.
- Kodeks dyplomatyczny klasztoru tyńieckiego*, eds. W. Kętrzyński, S. Smolka, Lwów 1875.
- Kodeks dyplomatyczny Małopolski*, pt. 1–3, ed. F. Piekosiński, Kraków 1876–1887.
- Kodeks dyplomatyczny miasta Krakowa 1257–1506*, pt. 1, ed. F. Piekosiński, Kraków 1879.
- Kodeks dyplomatyczny Polski*, vol. 1, eds. L. Ryszczewski, A. Muczkowski, A.Z. Helcel, Warszawa 1847; vol. 2, eds. L. Ryszczewski, A. Muczkowski, Warszawa 1848–1853; vol. 3, ed. J. Bartoszewicz, Warszawa 1858.
- Kodeks dyplomatyczny Wielkopolski*, vol. 1, ed. I. Zakrzewski, Poznań 1877.
- Kromer M., *Kronika polska*, Kraków 1832.
- Kronika halicko-wołyńska (kronika Romanowiczów)*, introduction and annotations added and published by D. Dąbrowski, A. Jusupović; in cooperation with I. Juriewej, A. Majorowa and T. Wilkuł, in: *Monumenta Poloniae Historica seria nova*, vol. 16, Kraków–Warszawa 2017.
- Kronika halicko-wołyńska. Kronika Romanowiczów*, translation, introduction and comments by D. Dąbrowski i A. Jusupović, Kraków–Warszawa 2017.
- Liber beneficiorum dioecesis Cracoviensis*, vol. 3, ed. A. Przewdziecki, in: Długosz J., *Opera omnia*, vol. 9, Kraków 1884.
- Maleczyński K., *Dwa nieznane dokumenty jędrzejowskie z XIII w.*, 'Kwartalnik Historyczny' 1924, 38.
- Maleczyński K., *Kilka nieznanych dokumentów z XIII w. przeważnie z archiwów poznańskich*, 'Kwartalnik Historyczny' 1926, 40.
- Przywilej lokacyjny miasta Bochni*, ed. J. Flaszka, Bochnia 1983.
- Przywileje lokacyjne Krakowa i Poznania*, ed. A. Kłodziński, Poznań 1947.
- Regesto di Camaldoli*, vol. 3–4, ed. E. Lasinio, Roma 1914–1928.
- Schlesisches Urkundenbuch*, vol. 2, ed. W. Irgang, Graz–Köln 1977.
- Zbiór dokumentów małopolskich*, pt. 1–8, eds. S. Kuraś, I. Sułkowska-Kurasiowa, Wrocław–Warszawa–Kraków 1962–1975.
- Zbiór dyplomów klasztoru mogińskiego przy Krakowie*, ed. E. Janota, in: *Monografia opactwa cystersów we wsi Mogile*, Kraków 1867.
- Zbiór ogólny przywilejów i spominków mazowieckich*, vol. 1, ed. J.K. Kochanowski, Warszawa 1919.

## Studies

- Arnold S., *Podziały administracyjne województwa Sandomierskiego do końca w. XVIII*, 'Pamiętnik Świętokrzyski' 1930, 2.
- Balzer O., *Skarbiec i archiwum koronne w dobie przedjagiellońskiej*, Lwów 1917.
- Barański M., *Dominium sądeckie. Od książęcego okręgu grodowego do majątku klasztoru klarysek sądeckich*, Warszawa 1992.
- Barański M.K., *Dynastia Piastów w Polsce*, Warszawa 2005.
- Bardach J., *Historia państwa i prawa Polski*, t. 1: *do połowy XV wieku*, Warszawa 1965.
- Bardach J., Leśnodorski B., Pietrzak M., *Historia ustroju i prawa polskiego*, Warszawa 1999.
- Bielińska M., *Kancelarie i dokumenty wielkopolskie XIII wieku*, Wrocław–Warszawa–Kraków 1967.
- Bieniak J., *Polska elita polityczna XII wieku* (pt. 1), in: *Spółczesność Polski Średniowiecznej*, vol. 2, ed. S.K. Kuczyński, Warszawa 1982.
- Bobowski K., *Jeszcze w kwestii świadków na dokumentach księcia małopolskiego Bolesława Wstyliwego*, in: *Monastycyzm. Słowiańszczyzna i państwo polskie. Warsztat badawczy historyka*, ed. K. Bobowski, Wrocław 1994.
- Bogucki A., *Komornik i podkomorzy w Polsce średniowiecznej*, in: *Spółczesność Polski Średniowiecznej*, vol. 3, ed. S.K. Kuczyński, Warszawa 1985.
- Bogucki A., *Ze studiów nad polskimi urzędnikami nadwornymi w XIII w.*, 'Czasopismo Prawno-Historyczne' 1977, 29.

- Bracha K., *Wiece Bolesława Wstydlivego 1234–1279*, Kielce 1984 (Jan Kochanowski University Archives, MA thesis; typescript, ref. no. 376/4).
- Bracha K., *Wiece Bolesława Wstydlivego 1234–1279*, 'Kwartalnik Historyczny' 1987, 93, 3.
- Buczek K., *Podstolice, pstrościce i węgierce*, 'Onomastica' 1958, 41, 1.
- Buczek K., *Uposażenie urzędników w Polsce wczesnofeudalnej*, 'Małopolskie Studia Historyczne' 1962, 5, 3–4.
- Dąbrowski F., *Studia nad administracją kasztelańską Polski XIII wieku*, Warszawa 2007.
- Dyplomatyka wieków średnich*, eds. K. Maleczyński, M. Bielińska, A. Gąsiorowski, Warszawa 1971.
- Friedberg M., *Ród Łabędziów w wiekach średnich*, 'Rocznik Towarzystwa Heraldycznego we Lwowie' 1924, 7.
- Gawlas S., *O kształt zjednoczonego Królestwa. Niemieckie władztwo terytorialne a geneza społeczno-ustrojowej odrębności Polski*, Warszawa 1996.
- Gąsiorowski A., *Castellanus – przyczynek semazjologiczny*, 'Slavia Antiqua' 1971, 18.
- Gąsiorowski A., *Urzednicy zarządu lokalnego w późnośredniowiecznej Wielkopolsce*, Poznań 1970.
- Giergiel T., *Rycerstwo ziemi sandomierskiej. Podstawy kształtowania się rycerstwa sandomierskiego do połowy XIII w.*, Warszawa 2004.
- Gloger Z., *Encyklopedia staropolska ilustrowana*, vol. 1, Warszawa 1996; vol. 3, Warszawa 1974.
- Gorzycki K.J., *Pierwszeństwo kasztelana przed wojewodą krakowskim*, 'Kwartalnik Historyczny' 1890, 4.
- Górski K., *Ród Odrowążów w wiekach średnich*, 'Rocznik Polskiego Towarzystwa Heraldycznego we Lwowie' 1926/27, 8.
- Gryguć A., *Rola możnowładztwa i rycerstwa małopolskiego za panowania Bolesława Wstydlivego (1243–1279)*, in: *Spółczesność i kultura do XVI wieku*, ed. J. Śliwiński, Olsztyn 1992.
- Halecki O., *Powołanie księcia Władysława Opolskiego na tron krakowski w 1273 r.*, 'Kwartalnik Historyczny' 1913, 27.
- Jurek T., *Przełomowy wiek XIII*, in: T. Jurek, E. Kizik, *Historia Polski do 1572*, Warszawa 2013.
- Jurek T., *Rozwój dokumentu polskiego w XIII wieku*, in: *Dyplomatyka staropolska*, ed. T. Jurek, Warszawa 2015.
- Kaczmarczyk Z., *Kasztelanowie konarscy. Studium z historii urzędów ziemskich i nadwornych*, 'Czasopismo Prawno-Historyczne' 1949, 2.
- Kaczmarczyk Z., *Monarchia Kazimierza Wielkiego*, vol. 1. *Organizacja państwa*, Poznań 1939.
- Kajzer L., *Uzbrojenie i ubiór rycerski w średniowiecznej Małopolsce w świetle źródeł ikonograficznych*, Wrocław 1976.
- Kallas M., *Historia ustroju Polski*, Warszawa 2005.
- Kała D., *Co w świetle źródeł prymarnych wiadomo o kompetencjach urzędników Małopolskich z XIII wieku?*, 'Historia Slavorum Occidentis' 2014, 2 (7).
- Kardyś P., *Wiślica w średniowieczu i w okresie wczesnonowożytnym. Studia z dziejów miasta*, Kielce 2006.
- Kardyś P., *Z dziejów strategiczno-militarnego znaczenia Radomia w średniowieczu*, in: *Wojsko w Radomiu od średniowiecza po czasy współczesne*, ed. D. Kupisz, Radom 2008.
- Koneczny F., *Dzieje administracji w Polsce w zarysie*, Wilno 1924.
- Kowalska B., *Święta Kinga. Rzeczywistość i legenda*, Kraków 2008.
- Krotoski K., *Walka o tron krakowski w roku 1228*, 'Przegląd Powszechny' 1895, 1.
- Krzyżanowski J., *Ostatnie panowanie Laskonogiego w Krakowie*, 'Sprawozdania z Czynności i Posiedzeń AU. Wydział Historyczno-Filozoficzny', S. II, 1907, 26.
- Kubicki T., *Komes palatyn w kronice Galla Anonima. Próba podsumowania ustaleń literatury na temat najdawniejszych dziejów wojewody*, in: *Symbolae historico-iuridicae Lodzienses Iulio Bardach dedicatae*, ed. Z. Rymaszewski, Łódź 1997.

- Kurtyka J., *Problem identyczności urzędów ziemskich krakowskich i nadwornych w wiekach XIV–XVI*, in: *Urzędy dworu monarszego dawnej Rzeczypospolitej i państw ościennych*, eds. A. Wolaszek, K. Zamorski, Kraków 1996.
- Kurtyka J., *Tęczyńscy. Studium z dziejów polskiej elity możnowładczej w średniowieczu*, Kraków 1997.
- Kutrzeba S., *Historia ustroju Polski w zarysie*. Korona, Poznań 2001.
- Lalik T., *Sandomierskie we wcześniejszym średniowieczu. Prowincja, księstwo, województwo*, in: *Studia Sandomierskie*, Sandomierz 1967.
- Łodyński M., *Stosunki w Sandomierskiem w latach 1234–1239. Przyczynek do dziejów Bolka Wstydliwego*, 'Kwartalnik Historyczny' 1911, 25.
- Maleczyński K., *Zarys dyplomatyki polskiej wieków średnich*, pt. 1, Wrocław 1951.
- Mazur Z., *Studia nad kancelarią księcia Leszka Czarnego*, Wrocław 1975.
- Mitkowski J., *Kancelaria Kazimierza Konradowica księcia kujawsko-łęczyckiego (1233–1267)*, Wrocław–Warszawa–Kraków 1968.
- Mitkowski J., *Mikołaj Repczol*, in: *Polski Słownik Biograficzny*, vol. 21, Kraków 1976.
- Mitkowski J., *Nieznanne dokumenty Leszka Białego*, 'Kwartalnik Historyczny' 1938, 52.
- Mitkowski J., *Początki klasztoru cystersów w Sulejowie. Studia nad dokumentami, fundacją i rozwojem uposażenia do końca XIII wieku*, Poznań 1949.
- Niwiński M., *Opactwo cystersów w Wąchocku. Fundacja i dzieje uposażenia do końca wieków średnich*, Kraków 1930.
- Nowakowski T., *Małopolska elita władzy wobec rywalizacji o tron krakowski w latach 1288–1306*, Bydgoszcz 1992.
- Osiński J., *Zabiegi książąt wrocławskich o panowanie w Małopolsce po śmierci Leszka Białego*, in: *Wielkopolska – Polska – Czechy. Studia z dziejów średniowiecza ofiarowane profesorowi Bronisławowi Nowackiemu*, eds. Z. Górczak, J. Jaskólski, Poznań 2009.
- Pałucki W., *Studia nad uposażeniem urzędników ziemskich w Koronie do schyłku XVI wieku*, Warszawa 1962.
- Paner A., *Studia czy dyplomacja? Włoska podróż Iwona Odrowąża*, in: *Władcy, mnisi, rycerze*, ed. B. Śliwiński, Gdańsk 1996.
- Panic I., *Ze studiów nad listą świadków na dokumentach księcia małopolskiego Bolesława Wstydliwego (1243–1279)*, 'Studia Historyczne' 1990, 33, 3–4.
- Pelczar S., *Wojna Władysława Odonica z Władysławem Laskonogim w latach 1228–1231*, in: *Średniowiecze Polskie i Powszechnie*, vol. 1 (5), eds. I. Panic, J. Sperka, Katowice 2009.
- Piech Z., *Ikonoграфия pieczęci Piastów*, Kraków 1993.
- Piekosiński F., *Herby szlachty polskiej*, 'Herold Polski' 1905.
- Piekosiński F., *Pieczęcie polskie wieków średnich*, vol. 1, Kraków 1899.
- Piekosiński F., *Rycerstwo polskie wieków średnich*, vol. 3, Kraków 1901.
- Puziński P., *Wielki leksykon rycerstwa polskiego*, Gdańsk 2007.
- Rabiej P., *Dokumenty i kancelaria Bolesława Wstydliwego, księcia krakowskiego i sandomierskiego*, vol. 1–3, Kraków 2005 (Jagiellonian University Archives, doctoral dissertation; typescript, ref. no. 2005/163).
- Rabiej P., *Dwa dokumenty Bolesława Wstydliwego dla klasztoru cystersów w Koprzywnicy z 10 września 1262 roku*, in: *Historia vero testis temporum. Księga jubileuszowa poświęcona profesorowi Krzysztofowi Baczkowskiemu w 70. rocznicę urodzin*, eds. J. Smółucha, A. Waśko, T. Graff, P.F. Nowakowski, Kraków 2008.
- Rosenbaiger K., *Dzieje kościoła OO. franciszkanów w Krakowie w wiekach średnich*, Kraków 1933.
- Rybarski A., *Pochodzenie i początek rodu Odrowążów*, 'Przegląd Historyczny' 1914, 18.
- Rybarski A., *Udział Toporczyków w uwężeniu biskupa krakowskiego*, 'Kwartalnik Historyczny' 1912, 26.

- Skupiński K., *Funkcje małopolskich dokumentów w sprawach prywatnoprawnych do roku 1306*, Lublin 1990.
- Sobociński W., *Historia rządów opiekuńczych w Polsce*, 'Czasopismo Prawno-Historyczne' 1949, 2.
- Sperka J., *Szafraniec herbu Stary Koń. Z dziejów kariery i awansu w późnośredniowiecznej Polsce*, Kraków 2001.
- Spors J., *Wojewodowie Polski dzielnicowej w XII i XIII wieku. Przegląd wojewodów w kontekście ewolucji urzędu od godności nadwornej do urzędu ziemskiego*, pt. 2, 'Przegląd Historyczny' 1992, 83, 1.
- Suchodolska E., *Kancelarie na Mazowszu w latach 1248–1345. Ośrodki zarządzania i kultury*, Warszawa 1977.
- Supernak K., *Kilka uwag o powołaniu księcia Władysława Opolskiego na tron krakowski w 1273 roku*, in: *Średniowiecze Polskie i Powszechne*, vol. 8 (12), eds. J. Sperka, B. Czwojdrak, Katowice 2016.
- Szczur S., *Historia Polski. Średniowiecze*, Kraków 2005.
- Szczur S., *Piotr (zm. 1273?)*, in: *Polski Słownik Biograficzny*, vol. 26, Wrocław–Warszawa–Kraków–Gdańsk–Łódź 1981.
- Szkaradek K., *Stosunki polskie po śmierci Leszka Białego*, 'Rocznik Filarecki' 1886, 1.
- Szymczakowa A., *Urzednicy łączycy i sieradzczy do połowy XV w.*, 'Acta Universitatis Lodzensis. Folia Historica' 1984, 20.
- Śliwiński B., *Krąg krewniaczy biskupa krakowskiego Iwona Odrowąża*, 'Zeszyty Naukowe Wydziału Humanistycznego Uniwersytetu Gdańskiego' 1984, 'Historia', 14.
- Śliwiński B., *Lisowie Krzelowscy w XIV i XV w. i ich antenaci. Studium genealogiczne*, Gdańsk 1993.
- Śliwiński B., *Swinistawa*, in: *Polski Słownik Biograficzny*, vol. 46, issue 1, Warszawa–Kraków 2009.
- Teterycz A., *Małopolska elita władzy wobec zamieszek politycznych w Małopolsce w XIII wieku*, in: *Spółczesność Polski Średniowiecznej*, vol. 9, ed. S.K. Kuczyński, Warszawa 2001.
- Teterycz A., *Urzednicy sandomierscy w okresie rozbitcia dzielnicowego. Geneza, znaczenie, kompetencje*, 'Słupskie Studia Historyczne' 2000, 8.
- Teterycz-Puzio A., *Formularz i pieczęć. Przyczynek do badań nad pozycją możnowładztwa w XIII wieku*, 'Klio' 2009, 13.
- Teterycz-Puzio A., *Geneza województwa sandomierskiego. Terytorium i miejsce w strukturze państwa polskiego w średniowieczu*, Słupsk 2001.
- Teterycz-Puzio A., *Na rozstajnych drogach. Mazowsze a Małopolska w latach 1138–1313*, Słupsk 2012.
- Teterycz-Puzio A., *Status dzielnic krakowsko-sandomierskiej w XIII wieku (ducat, terra, provincia, dominium, territorium, districtus, castelania)*, 'Czasopismo Prawno-Historyczne' 2006, 58.
- Ulanowski B., *O założeniu i uposażeniu klasztoru Benedyktyn w Staniątkach*, 'Rozprawy i Sprawozdania z Posiedzeń AU. Wydział Historyczno-Filozoficzny' 1891, 17.
- Urbańczyk S., *O wyrazach Konary, konarski, koniuch i podkoni*, 'Czasopismo Prawno-Historyczne' 1949, 2.
- Uruszczak W., *Historia państwa i prawa polskiego*, vol. 1 (966–1795), Warszawa 2013.
- Urzednicy łączycy, sieradzczy i wieluńscy XIII–XIV. Spisy*, eds. J. Bieniak, A. Szymczakowa, Wrocław–Warszawa–Kraków–Gdańsk–Łódź 1985.
- Urzednicy małopolscy XII–XV wieku. Spisy*, eds. J. Kurtyka, T. Nowakowski, F. Sikora, A. Sochacka, P.K. Wojciechowski, B. Wyrozumski, ed. A. Gąsiorowski, Wrocław–Warszawa–Kraków 1990.
- Wdowiszewski Z., *Nieznane dyplomy średniowieczne do dziejów opactwa cystersów w Wąchoczeku*, 'Archeion' 1938–1939, 16.

- Włodarski B., *Rywalizacja o ziemię pruskie*, Toruń 1958.
- Wojciechowski P.K., *Ugrupowania polityczne w ziemiach krakowskiej i sandomierskiej w latach 1280–1286*, 'Przegląd Historyczny' 1979, 70, 1.
- Wojciechowski Z., *Państwo polskie w wiekach średnich. Dzieje ustroju*, Poznań 1948.
- Wójcik M.L., *Ród Gryfitów do końca XIII wieku. Pochodzenie – genealogia – rozsiadanie*, Wrocław 1993.
- Wroniszewski J., *Nobiles Sandomirienses. Rody Dębnów, Janinów, Grzymałów, Doliwów i Powatów*, Kraków 2013.
- Wyrozumska B., *Czy w Polsce średniowiecznej istniał urząd „maj”?*, in: *Polonia minor medii aevi. Studia ofiarowane Panu Profesorowi Andrzejowi Żakiemu w osiemdziesiątą rocznicę urodzin*, eds. Z. Woźniak, J. Gancarski, Kraków–Krosno 2003.
- Wyrozumski J., *Dzieje Polski piastowskiej (VIII wiek – 1370)*, Kraków 1999.
- Wyrozumski J., *Goworek*, in: *Polski Słownik Biograficzny*, vol. 8, Wrocław–Kraków–Warszawa 1959–1960.
- Wyrozumski J., *Nieustęp*, in: *Polski Słownik Biograficzny*, vol. 23, Wrocław–Warszawa–Kraków–Gdańsk 1978.
- Zawitkowska W., *O wiecu w Korytnicy raz jeszcze*, 'Limes. Studia i Materiały z Dziejów Europy Środkowo-Wschodniej' 2008, 1.
- Zientara B., *Henryk Brodaty i jego czasy*, Warszawa 1975.
- Żmudzki P., *Studium podzielonego Królestwa. Książę Leszek Czarny*, Warszawa 2000.

#### STRESZCZENIE

Zamordowany w Gąsawie Leszek Biały, ojciec Bolesława V Wstydlivego, zostawił swojemu synowi w spadku wiele nieuporządkowanych spraw w zakresie polityki wewnętrznej. Długie rządy opiekuńcze za małoletniego Bolesława sprzyjały umacnianiu się pozycji możnych. W zakresie dworu księcia szczególnie dobrze ukształtowała się kancelaria. Kancelarze i podkanclerze wspierani byli w swej pracy przez licznych kapelanów i kleryków. W czasie regencji i za właściwych już rządów Bolesława Wstydlivego w księstwie krakowskim i sandomierskim, źródła wykazują pojawienie się po raz pierwszy wielu urzędów ziemskich i dworskich. W długiej epoce Bolesława Wstydlivego utrwały się doniosłe zmiany w ustroju i administracji państwa. Urzędy dworskie uległy przeobrażeniu w urzędy ziemskie. Głównym celem artykułu jest przedstawienie dokonanych przemian, mechanizmów awansów na urzędach oraz omówienie kompetencji i obsady niektórych urzędów.

**Słowa kluczowe:** Bolesław Wstydlivy, Małopolska, urzędy, urzędnicy, elita władzy, polityka wewnętrzna, administracja

#### ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Karolina Maciaszek – Ph.D. in humanities; doctoral dissertation entitled *Surrounding Bolesław the Chaste, Prince of Cracow and Sandomierz (1226–1279)* defended at the Silesian University in Katowice in 2017; author of the book *Irządze i okolice w średniowieczu. Panowie z Irządz*; teacher. Her scientific interests focus on the subject of the courts of the rulers of Poland and the history of medieval knighthood, with particular emphasis on the reign of Bolesław the Chaste. E-mail: supernak.karolina@gmail.com.