

ARTICLES

Zbyszko Górczak (*Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań, Poland*)

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9258-145X>

zbyszkog@amu.edu.pl

UNSUCCESSFUL ATTEMPTS AT THE INCORPORATION OF CITIES IN THE DISTRICT DUCHY OF GREATER POLAND IN THE 13TH CENTURY

Abstract: In the second half of the 13th century, the process of incorporation or institution of cities (a.k.a. the process of granting municipal rights) under German law began in Greater Poland. By 1314, i.e. until the end of the existence of a separate district duchy of Greater Poland, 51 successful city incorporations were carried out in its area, by princes and clerical as well as secular feudal lords. At the same time, there were also 8 unsuccessful incorporation initiatives (14%). An unsuccessful settlement is a settlement that did not lead to the creation of a town or a settlement that had to be repeated after some time, especially with the consent of another ruler or another settlement owner. The article discusses these failed ventures while attempting to analyse the specific reasons for the failures. The following factors or their combinations can be pointed out: periodic unrest and political instability in the region, limiting the circle of potential settlers only to newcomers from abroad (with the exclusion of the locals), unclear legal and ownership status of the settlement being incorporated, competition from a nearby, stronger center, lack of sufficient support from the feudal owner (especially in the case of clerical and private feudals). At this early stage in the development of urban life, it is also possible to see a clear advantage of monarchical incorporations, which usually had a greater chance of success and further successful development. A similar distribution of unsuccessful and successful granting of municipal rights to towns (15%) has been noted by the literature in medieval Silesia.

Keywords: city location, incorporation, Greater Poland, Middle Ages

<https://doi.org/10.14746/sho.2023.41.1.001>

INTRODUCTION

The question of the origins of cities and urban life in Poland, and more broadly in the countries of Central and Eastern Europe, has been highly controversial, especially in older literature on the subject. German historiography from the 19th century onward presented a theory about the “colonial” roots of the institution of a city in the eastern part of the continent. Cities were supposed to have been established there only from the 12th–13th centuries as a result of the influx of colonialists from the West (mainly from Germany), bringing to the new lands of Western Europe political and organizational patterns, referred to by the general name of “German law” (*ius Teutonicorum, ius teutonicum*). The granting of such organizational and legal forms in the act of so-called “incorporation under German law” was to mark the creation of the institution of the city. This view was combined with theses about the general civilizational inferiority of the Slavs and other peoples of Central and Eastern Europe, incapable of independently producing and developing urban settlements. In response, Central European historiography, especially Polish, adopted the thesis of the native, pre-local roots of urban life in this part of the continent. Numerous fortified settlements and craft settlements were supposed to be settlements with an urban character. In the case of Poland and specifically Greater Poland, the oldest Piast strongholds were already considered “cities”, and sometimes the beginnings of cities were even seen in the pre-state period (9th–10th centuries). The adoption of the principles of German law and the incorporation of cities initiated in the 13th century were intended only as a reform, giving an improved framework for the development of already existing centers. These disputes had a political and ideological context in the 19th and 20th centuries, which made objective judgment difficult.

Underlying the above controversy was a different understanding of the definition of “city.” The word simply means “place” in Slavic languages. A place was so special that it could become a general term for a certain category of settlements. In Western Europe, the basic criterion distinguishing an urban settlement from the surrounding villages was the legal status of its settlement and its inhabitants – the burghers. During the revival of the commodity-money economy in the 11th–12th centuries, Western European cities actually became communities (communes) of their inhabitants, who had special rights vis-à-vis the rulers or feudal owners of the settlement and organized institutions of self-government. Under Central

European and Polish conditions, there could be no talk of such a special status for fortified towns or craft settlements in the early Middle Ages. Attempts made in the older literature to search for native equivalents of Western "municipal law" – this role was to be played by the market law (*ius forense*) – ultimately ended in failure. In this situation, Polish historiography treated the legal aspect of the definition of a city as secondary, attaching more importance to economic elements – the pre-local cities (craft settlements) were supposed to be centers of lively commercial and craft activities. In the absence of written sources, archaeological research played a major role in proving these theses. However, there was a difficulty in distinguishing between traces of workshops producing various kinds of artefacts, discovered in large numbers, as remnants of handicraft production (destined as a tribute to princely stores) or craftsmanship (destined for sale and the basis for the manufacturer's livelihood). It should also be added that assessments of the high degree of economic development of individual centers were often formulated too optimistically, which has also been criticized in more recent literature.

Nowadays, the view that cities and urban life in the modern, Western European meaning of these terms (which is how we also understand them today), indeed appeared in Central Europe and Poland only in the 13th century, as a result of acts of granting municipal rights under German law, can be considered accurate. Earlier settlements can be considered at most as pre-urban centers, lacking distinctive legal and organizational features. The role of location as the founding act of an urban community becomes all the more significant in this situation. What can be debated, however, is the size of the physical share of the settlers of Western (German) and native origin in the formation of the population of located towns (for a discussion of the origins of cities on Polish soil, see Łowmiański, 1985: 657–692).

The first town locations began to emerge on Polish soil in Silesia, thanks to Prince Henry the Bearded (Złotoryja 1211, Wrocław 1214, Środa Śląska 1223). In Greater Poland, city incorporations appeared one generation later. The initiation of this process is usually attributed to Duke Władysław Odonic, an otherwise not very prominent ruler and usually harshly judged in historiography. It is not clear which of the towns in Greater Poland were incorporated first. The former hypotheses about Poznań Śródka, supposedly located on the right bank of the Warta River as early as 1231, did not hold up (Likowski, 1922). The oldest surviving text of the incorporation act concerns Powidz (1243 or 1245), however, it mentions the modeling of settlers' rights on the privileges granted to Gniezno residents. Gniezno thus appears to

be the oldest established town in Greater Poland. It received this status before 1243/1245, according to most researchers, nevertheless, at the hands of Władysław Odonic (who died in 1239). The action of incorporation was continued by the duke's sons: Przemysław I and Bolesław Pobożny¹ (Przemysław I located Poznań in 1253), and then the last Piast of Greater Poland – Przemysław II. In the second half of the 13th century, church feudal lords (archbishops of Gniezno, bishops of Poznań, richer monasteries) joined in, followed by secular magnates (Gostyń became the first private town to be located in 1278). By the end of the existence of the separate duchy of Greater Poland (1314), 51 cities (30 monarchical, 9 ecclesiastical, 12 private) were successfully incorporated into the district (Górczak, 2002).²

After some regression during the reign of Władysław Łokietek (1314–1333), the next acceleration of the wave of locations occurred during the reign of Casimir the Great (1333–1370). The revival continued also under the rule of the first Jagiellons. A total of 158 towns were located in Greater Poland by 1500 (159 in Silesia, 186 in Lesser Poland, 83 in Mazovia) (Bogucka and Samsonowicz, 1986: 84–86).

LOCATION INITIATIVES IN THE DISTRICT OF GREATER POLAND IN THE XIII AND XIV CENTURIES

The action of founding towns in Greater Poland in the 13th century, which was not slowed down even by the rapid changes in the political situation of the district at the turn of the 13th/14th century, in which clerical feudal and lay magnates increasingly joined in addition to the princes, was based on general economic growth, the development of rural settlements and the creation of new trade routes. The latter, basically, bypassed Greater Poland in the early Middle Ages, and only the establishment of the Teutonic Order state in Prussia and the rapid economic growth of the Kingdom of Bohemia led to the launch of a route connecting the Prussian lands through Greater Poland and Silesia with Bohemia. It led from Toruń through Słupca, Pyzdry, Jarocin, and Kalisz towards Wrocław and

¹ Further: Bolesław the Pious.

² For a discussion of the origins and conditions for the process of city incorporations on Polish lands in the thirteenth century against a broad comparative background of other countries of Central and Eastern Europe, together with a collection of literature, see Gawlas (2005).

Bohemia, having several local branches of varying importance and popularity. Tertiary on a pan-European scale, this so-called "Toruń route" nevertheless played a major role in the activation of long-distance trade and in the development of actions of location in 13th-century Greater Poland.

Generally, successful economic conditions formed the basis for successful settlement ventures in the district area, which led to the establishment of the aforementioned 51 incorporated towns before 1314. However, the incorporation of an urban settlement was a complicated and costly undertaking, requiring obtaining permission and possible additional privileges from the prince, choosing the right site, finding an energetic organizer of the settlement – the so-called "founder", recruiting and bringing in settlers with capital, business contacts, skilled craftsmanship, etc., supporting them during the development and erection of buildings. The benefits of a successful location usually turned out to be significant, both for the feudal owner and the entire area, but one had to wait several or even a dozen years for them. In this situation, the establishment of cities was initially decided by the princes themselves and only gradually were joined by secular and ecclesiastical feudal lords.

However, not all location initiatives in the district of Greater Poland were successful. It happened that, despite the issuance of a location privilege or a location act, the city did not ultimately come into existence or did not maintain its status for too long, and there may have been a need to renew the location act at a later time. We consider unsuccessful attempts at an urban location to be such cases as follows: the lack of traces of later city functioning, the short-lived possession of city status, the need to repeat the location, especially when it was done again at a clear temporal distance or in the case of a different tenant (owner and founder). During the period of the existence of the separate duchy of Greater Poland, traces of eight such defined, unsuccessful attempts to locate urban settlements, made in the territory of the district before 1314, can be found. Most of them were ventures of church dignitaries and institutions (Ciężęń, Łądek, Panigródz) and lay magnates (Dupin, Ryszewo). Łubnice was attempted to be located, without final success, first by private owners, then by the Cistercian monastery in Ołobok. Two unsuccessful locations concerned ducal settlements (Zduny, Danków). At the same time it should be added here that in the case of two of the mentioned settlements, still in the 13th century, another attempt at urban location was made, this time successfully. These were the town of Łądek, founded by the nearby Cistercian monastery in Łądek, and Zduny, which was eventually located by the Bishop of Wrocław Thomas I.

Tracing unsuccessful incorporation efforts allows us to shed light on the difficulties and obstacles faced by feudal city founders, aldermen and the townsmen themselves. Particularly instructive are examples of locations that were successfully renewed after several or more years. This is because the question arises as to what factors changed and what determined the success of the next attempt.

ŁUBNICE IN THE RUDA (WIELUŃ) REGION

Chronologically the oldest and, at the same time, several unsuccessful attempts at town location were made in the settlement of Łubnice in the Ruda (Wieluń) region. In the 13th century, the area remained under the rule of the Piasts of Greater Poland and was part of their district, and only in subsequent centuries did it become a part of the Sieradz land. Situated on the south-eastern fringes of the duchy, however, the Ruda land had already changed its political affiliation several times before. After southern Greater Poland was captured in the 1330s by the Silesian Duke Henry I the Bearded, handed over the lands of Kalisz and Ruda to the young princes of Opole, the sons of the late Casimir I, under the protection of their mother, the dowager princess Wiola. This was in compensation for the Opole principality taken over by Henry, which was important to him as a link between Breslau and the land of Cracow, where he also ruled and over which he fought a long-standing battle with Prince Conrad of Mazovia. An important role at the court of the young princes of Opole was played by representatives of the Gryfit family, temporarily removed from Cracow (Zientara, 1997: 282, 315). It was to one of them, the castellan of Cracow Klemens Klimontowic, that Duchess Wiola granted permission, in 1238, to establish a "free market" in Łubnice, whose status and privileges were to be modeled on the regime of Środa Śląska, i.e. on the then popular so-called "Środa law", one of the local varieties of Magdeburg municipal law (KDW I: No 214). This act was renewed the following year in his own name by Duchess Wiola's eldest son, Duke Mieszko II Otyły, with Łubnice then being called a village (*villa*) (KDW I: No 223). It can be assumed that the privileges concerning Łubnice were a form of reward for the merits of a prominent personage from the entourage of the Opole princes. However, Klemens was primarily associated with the land of Kraków, and it does not seem that he showed much interest in the rather distant Łubnice. All the more so because after the death of Henry II the Pious, in the battle

of Legnica in 1241, the so-called "monarchy of the Silesian Henrys" collapsed, and the rule of the Dukes of Opole in the Ruda land, exercised by their grant, did not promise to be permanent. In this situation, the castellan, most likely, did not make any concrete efforts with regard to the incorporation of Łubnice. Relatives and heirs of Klemens also showed no interest in the domains in the Ruda land. In 1245 Raclaw's widow and the deceased's brother, Wierzbięta, granted the estates they owned there to the Cistercian monastery in Ołobok. Among the donated villages were also Łubnice, without specifying the status of the settlement (KDW I: No 244). At the same time, the previous permission of Princess Wiola and Duke Mieszko II remained valid, and it was probably on the basis of this permission that the Cistercian nuns of Ołobok now made efforts to incorporate the town.

It is likely that in 1246, the abbess entered into a contract with the village headman Konrad, whom she entrusted to carry out the incorporation of Łubnice. The supposed date of this contract was established by Henryk Likowski (1923: 90-92). The act itself has not survived, and we learn of its contents on the basis of a document from the dukes of Greater Poland, Przemysław I and Bolesław the Pious, dated 1253, allowing the monastery to incorporate Łubnice under Środa rights (KDW I: No 316). In the meantime, in 1249, the rule of the Opole princes in the Ruda land came to an end and it returned to the rule of the Piasts of Greater Poland. The aforementioned document of 1253 raises doubts in the literature on the subject, since many researchers have questioned its authenticity. According to Maria Bielińska, it was probably drawn up at the end of the 13th century to defend the monastery's property rights against the starosts of nearby Bolesławiec. At the same time, the author believes that the forger relied on a lost act of location issued to the village headman Konrad, so the information contained therein can be considered true. According to Franciszek Sikora, on the other hand, the document is authentic, which makes the accuracy of the information it contains regarding the location of Łubnice and the village leader Konrad all the more important (Bielińska, 1967: 257; Sikora, 1968: 41-44). The matter is complicated by the fact that in the same year 1253 Przemysław I and Bolesław the Pious issued yet another document regarding Łubnice. In it, they confirmed the possessions of the Ołobok monastery, while giving permission for the transfer to German law and the location of markets in the towns of Łubnice and Ołobok. In doing so, Łubnice was referred to as a market (*forum*) (KDW I: No 311). Like the previous one, this act is questionable. It is known from four redactions, which

differ significantly in content. M. Bielińska considered it forged (the forger expanded the content of the authentic ducal privilege), according to F. Sikora. However, the oldest redaction (the so-called redaction A) can be considered authentic, while the others are forgeries from the end of the 13th century (redactions B and C) and the 14th century (redaction D). They, significantly, expanded the scope of the immunities granted to the monastery's property, and it is in them that references to both markets were included. The earliest and probably authentic redaction A was in fact about the permission to carry out village locations (Bielińska, 1967: 255–256; Sikora, 1968: 41–44). It can therefore be assumed that in 1253 Łubnice was still not a town, and probably did not have a market either. The last time we hear of a market in Łubnice was in 1266, when Prince Boleslaw the Pious ordered a change in the market day on which it would operate. Namely, he moved it from Saturday to Wednesday, which he justified by the fact that a new market had been established in the nearby town of Bolesławiec, which he had located (this is also the first information about the location of Bolesławiec). In the ducal document, Łubnice was once again referred to as a village (KDW I: No 421).

The attempt to carry out town location, or at least to establish a market in Łubnice, ultimately failed. A number of factors contributed to this. The geographical location of the planned town itself seems favorable; it lay on the route leading from Kalisz towards Krakow, and could also serve the nearest rural area. Good prospects are evidenced by the future successful development of the princely town of Bolesławiec. However, the timing of the intended location of Łubnice did not turn out to be the best. The Ruda land changed its political affiliation several times and lacked the stability necessary for long-term economic endeavors. In addition, the first recipient of the location privilege, castellan Klemens, did not seem very interested in the estates in southern Greater Poland, and it can even be assumed that it was more of Duchess Wiola and her son Mieszko Otyły who sought to bind this significant personage to the Ruda land, which could have strengthened their own, not very secure, position. The political and ownership changes that followed in the not-too-distant future created a completely new situation. Efforts to locate Łubnice were undertaken by the Cistercian monastery in Ołobok, traces of which remain in the (admittedly suspicious) registry of the contract with the village headman Konrad. Consent to these plans was granted by the new rulers of the Ruda land, the Dukes of Greater Poland. However, the Cistercians also soon lost interest in Łubnice.

Even in the very act of granting these estates from 1245, it was assumed that if the convent gave up possession of Łubnice, it would then fall to the Benedictine nuns from the Lesser Poland monastery in Staniątki (KDW I: No 244). This was probably the result of rifts among the donor family members, some of whom preferred the Cistercian nuns, and others the Benedictines. Although Łubnice remained with the Cistercians, it became the subject of dispute. Another dispute concerned the location of the convent and its possible relocation to Łubnice (originally planned by the family of Comes Klemens as a separate foundation (Kucharski, 2002: 73–74, 80–82, 86). The very act of granting these estates in 1245 assumed that if the convent gave up possession of Łubnice, it would then fall to the Benedictines nuns from the Lesser Poland monastery in Staniątki (KDW I: No 244). This ultimately did not happen, but a similar eventuality was apparently considered. The final blow to the reluctantly emerging city was dealt by Boleslaw the Pious, deciding in the 1360s to carry out the location in nearby Bolesławiec. Giving the new city a name referring to the person of the prince showed that he attached great importance to this incorporation, and supported the settlement in many ways, supporting, for example, the erection of buildings (KDW I: No 471). One of the prince's decisions favorable to Bolesławiec was to change the market day in Łubnice, which the ruler explicitly justified so that it would not interfere with the market in Bolesławiec. At the same time, it is not at all certain that the aforementioned market in Łubnice functioned at all. Moreover, one can get the impression that the person most interested and making concrete efforts in the matter of Łubnice was the aforementioned village administrator Konrad, who approached both the abbess of the Ołobok monastery and the dukes of Greater Poland. Successful implementation of the incorporation would have brought Konrad considerable benefits, but he encountered a lack of interest and more decisive support on the part of the settlement's owners (first the Castellan Klemens and his heirs, then the Ołobok monastery) and subsequent princes. They did grant the appropriate permissions, but Boleslaw the Pious eventually decided to incorporate his own ducal town in Bolesławiec and consistently supported the settlement. The nascent town was also not helped by the ownership disputes over the endowment and monastic property of Łubnice. The successful development of the new center ultimately doomed the chances of Łubnice.

LĄDEK

Another chronological example of an unsuccessful attempt at an urban location in Greater Poland concerns the town of Lądek, which belonged to the Cistercian monastery at Ląd. Situated on the eastern outskirts of the district, the Lądek castellany was, in the years 1239–1261, the subject of rivalry between the dukes of Greater Poland (to whom it traditionally belonged) and Casimir I Konradovic, Duke of Kuyavia and Sieradz-Łęczycza. It was he who issued a document in 1250 to Abbot Krystian allowing the monastery to locate the town on the site of the “free market of St. Nicholas” (the later town of Lądek was founded there). The act granted municipal rights to five named Poles and to all Germans (Theutonici) who would arrive there. The term “Germans” in the documents of those times often referred to people who had a “German right” to settle, but were not necessarily genuine newcomers from the lands of the western neighbor. However, since the five aforementioned Poles were enumerated separately, it can be assumed that the issuer and recipient of the document did indeed have German nationals in mind in this case (KDW I: No 290). In the Cistercian monasteries, existing on Polish soil at the time, there was a clear predominance of the German element, since most of the monks had come from Germany. Individual convents also maintained lively contacts with their mother houses, usually German, and benefited from their help in attracting possible settlers. This makes it plausible to assume that the Ląd monks indeed intended to locate the town on the basis of German newcomers, granting the privileges of the new settlement law to only a few Poles, probably the most prominent people associated with the “St. Nicholas market” (among them was, for example, Jan, the market judge). According to Henryk Łowmiański, it was this attitude of the convent that became the reason for the failure of the first attempt at incorporation. At such an early stage of the colonization process, German settlers were reluctant to come to minor, provincial centers, settling rather in larger towns (e.g., Gniezno, located before 1239, or Poznań, which was granted city rights in 1253). The more distant Lądek did not attract too many of them, and plans for the location fell through, despite a good economic base in the form of the already operating “St. Nicholas Market” (Łowmiański, 1985: 719–720).

The monks did not give up and in 1269 made another attempt to establish a city. This time permission was granted by Prince Boleslaw the Pious of Greater Poland, who in 1261 regained the Ląd castellany.

He allowed both "Germans" and "free Poles" to be endowed with the privileges of city law – primarily residents of an existing settlement – and a special group of the monastery's subjects, referred to as "beavers" (KDW I: No 440). They constituted one of the categories of servant population and originally probably remained in the service of the prince, after which, with the gradual disintegration of the servile organization, the ruler granted them to the monastery. By 1269, they were no longer engaged in beaver hunting, rather, they were engaged in activities related to the operation of the "St. Nicholas market." Now, so to speak, "top-down", they were to be admitted to municipal law. According to M. Bielińska, the duke's act was forged by extending immunity clauses. However, she considered the essential part of the document authentic (Bielińska, 1967: 294). The mention of "free Poles" and a separate passage dedicated to the monastic beavers prove that; this time the Cistercians decided to base their location plans primarily on the local Polish population, relying less on newcomers from Germany. H. Łowmiański emphasized that this very change of approach determined the success of the second attempt (Łowmiański, 1985: 720). The scholar then used this example as an argument for his own thesis of the predominance of the native Polish element in the incorporation undertakings as early as the 13th century, which seems debatable. Nevertheless, in the case of Łądek, the restriction of the first attempt to establish the town to German settlers must indeed have contributed to its failure. One can also point to another factor working against the 1250 initiative, which was, of course, the state of political uncertainty resulting from the rivalry over the Łąd castellany between the Piasts of Wielkopolska and Kujawy. These anxieties certainly hampered economic ventures, especially in view of the hopes, presumably, nourished that the new town would become involved in trade traffic between Silesia and the lands of the Teutonic Order, passing, after all, across the Wielkopolska-Kujawy border. In general, Łądek had a promising basis for its location in the first half of the 13th century: a well-developed rural settlement in the area, a successfully functioning "St. Nicholas' market", a significant settlement in neighboring Łądek, and a favorable course of trade roads leading from the Prussian lands towards Silesia. These advantages are emphasized by Andrzej Wędzki, but at the same time, he points out that around the middle of the 13th century, this favorable prosperity had already begun to break down. The Łąd castle, the object of many years of battles between the Piast princes, passing from hand to hand and destroyed several times, was

losing its importance. Moreover, this unrest contributed to shifting the trade route more to the west from the middle of the 13th century. It crossed the Warta River in Pyzdry, a dozen kilometers distant, which (located before 1257) was quickly growing into the new seat of power of the princes and a significant economic center (Wędzki, 1966: 42–45, 55–60; 1960: 67–68). These considerations were decisive in the failure of the first attempt. The next one, undertaken nineteen years later, on totally different principles and in a different political situation, was successful, but moderately so. The town of Łądek never gained the importance that corresponded to its previous administrative and economic position as a settlement and market center (Wędzki, 1966: 44–45). In a sense, the founding of Łądek, although one of the oldest in Greater Poland, proved to be late. Both attempts were made at a time when the former center of political and economic life in the area was in gradual decline.

A separate idea for explaining the complications of Łądek's urban location was presented by Henryk Münch. He considered that the act of Boleslaw the Pious of 1269 did not actually mean the re-location of the settlement, which had been in continuous operation since 1250, but only a kind of approval by the Duke of Greater Poland. This is because the Cistercians would have concealed from the new ruler (who had regained the surrounding lands a few years before) the 1250 act of location issued by his opponent, the Duke of Kuyavia Casimir Konradovic, and asked for a new location privilege (Münch, 1946: 76–77, footnote 2). This hypothesis is difficult both to prove and disprove. While the concealment of the act itself (the content of which, however, survived to our times) could be carried out, it seems improbable to hide the very existence of an urban settlement organized under new rules. It should also be borne in mind that the ordinances contained in the two documents are, however, significantly different, above all in the aforementioned issue of admitting people of Polish origin to the municipal law in Łądek. It seems more likely to explain that the first attempt at incorporation failed for the reasons indicated above. All the more so since the renewed incorporation also, ultimately, brought moderate success.

CIAŻEŃ

Almost at the same time, the intention to locate a town in Ciążeń, not far from Łądek, was undertaken by Boguchwał II (Bogufał II), Bishop of Poznań. Ciążeń, located about 10 km to the west, was the centre of the bishop's property. The hierarch sought permission from Duke Przemysł I to establish a market in this settlement, as well as to settle "Germans and other newcomers" there, which could be considered tantamount to urban location. The duke's act was sometimes questioned in the older literature on the subject, mainly, due to the erroneous date of issuance – supposedly in 1260 (Przemysł I was already dead by then) – included in the surviving copy entered in the book of privileges of the Poznań bishopric. Eventually, however, its authenticity was recognized, mainly, due to the research of Oswald Balzer, who corrected the date of issuance to 1251 (KDW I: No 293; Bielińska, 1967: 249). This venture, however, ended in failure, probably for reasons similar to those that affected the unsuccessful first location of Łądek. The wording of Przemysł I's act seems to indicate that preference was also given, primarily, to Germans in the case of Ciążeń, who, at such an early stage in the process of city location in Greater Poland did not make it to provincial Ciążeń. An additional factor was the proximity of Pызdry, successfully located before 1257, i.e. at the same time when the idea of locating Ciążeń was taken up. The ducal town of Pызdry, located about 10 km east of Ciążeń, enjoying the protection of his brother and co-ruler, and finally the successor of Przemysł I – Duke Bolesław the Pious, soon grew into one of the main urban centers of the district, and it was probably they who attracted candidates for settlers (Górczak, 2007). Moreover, the development of the town contributed to the above-described shift of the trade route, which henceforth crossed the Warta valley precisely in Pызdry. It may be added here that Ciążeń was exceptionally unlucky. In 1504 another attempt to locate a city settlement was made by the Poznań bishop Jan Lubrański, however, this initiative also ended in failure (Górczak, 2002: 100). At that time, there were already several towns in the immediate vicinity, located back in the 13th century – including the aforementioned Pызdry and Łądek, as well as Słupca. In addition, at the beginning of the 15th century, Zagórow was founded, located southeast of Ciążeń, on the other side of the Warta River. In this situation, there was simply not enough room for another town in the area, and after the second failure of the location, the settlement remained a village.

ZDUNY

A thirteenth-century town in Greater Poland, whose location process has left an unusually large number of written sources, is Zduny, located on the southern borders of the district. As many as four directly related documents have survived, issued between 1261 and 1267 by Prince Boleslaw the Pious and Bishop Thomas I of Wrocław. The first is an act of location of a town under Środa law in the princely village of Zduny (Zdunki), issued by Boleslaw the Pious to the village headman Lambert (Lamprecht; KDW I: No 602). However, the process of establishing a new town was reluctant, and a few years later the settlement was still referred to as a village (*villa*). It was so named in two consecutive ducal deeds, issued in 1266 and 1267. The exchange of Zdunek was sanctioned, and carried out by Duke Boleslaw with Bishop Thomas. The first document further allowed the settlement to be granted German law, and the second to carry out urban location (KDW I: No 424, 606). The fourth diploma was issued by the aforementioned bishop of Wrocław, Thomas I, again locating Zduny under city law in 1267 and instructing Lambert, already known from an act of 1261, to carry out this action (KDW IV: No 2056 [430a]). All these documents are preserved in their originals and do not raise any objections to their authenticity. At the same time, the external features of the duke's diplomas and the manner of dictation indicate that the three documents of Boleslaw the Pious were, in fact, drawn up in the chancellery of the Bishops of Wrocław and were most likely presented in finished form to the duke for acceptance and confirmation (Bielińska, 1967: 280, 289–290).

The interpretation of the partially contradictory information of documents concerning Zdun has sparked a lively discussion in the literature on the subject. The view of the failure of the first (ducal) location of 1261 and its renewal a few years later by Bishop Thomas I was expressed at one time by Oskar Lange (1925: 32). Grzegorz Kryg later polemicized with this thesis, pointing to the generally favorable economic conditions for the location initiative (the settlement's favorable location on a trade route) and the too-short interval between the two attempts, which could not have significantly improved these conditions. Moreover, he emphasized the rather vague content of the 1261 document, which should be understood, in his opinion, as "a kind of survey" of the possibility of carrying out the localization on the part of the Wrocław Church (Kryg, 1993: 17–18). While pointing out the successful economic circumstances, he did not draw at-

tention to the inevitable legal complications related to the ownership status of Zduny. H. Łowmiański, on the other hand, considered that the proper initiator of the location was the village leader Lambert, who wished to transform the village of Zdunki into a town and persistently sought to do so, first from the duke, and in the face of the monarch's scant interest, then involving the bishop in the matter. It was Lambert's energy and persistence that made it possible to overcome the difficulties encountered and bring the process of location to a successful conclusion (Łowmiański, 1985: 716–717). Marta Młynarska-Kaletynowa introduced an additional element to consider the issue of Zdun's location, drawing attention to another act of Boleslaw the Pious of 1262, in which the Duke granted exemptions from tributes to the property of the Bishopric of Wrocław located in the area of the Starogród castellany (KDW I: No 603). This document also survives in the original and also bears the features of a dictation from the office of the Bishops of Wrocław (Bielińska, 1967: 284–285). According to M. Młynarska-Kaletynowa, Zduny lay precisely within the aforementioned castellany, while other properties of the Church of Wrocław are missing there. This would suggest that already before 1262 the settlement was in the hands of the Bishops of Wrocław, and that the acts of 1266 and 1267 were only a formal confirmation of the exchange carried out a few or a dozen years earlier (Młynarska-Kaletynowa, 1973: 48). Tomasz Jurek agreed with this conclusion, then presented another one, that Duke Boleslaw did not participate directly in the process of locating Zduny, as it was from the very beginning a venture of Bishop Thomas I, and the duke's document of 1261 is not an act of location as such, but a location privilege, i.e. permission to carry out the location, issued as a result of the bishop's efforts. Thomas I realized this acquiescence in 1267, issuing his own act of location, mentioned above (Grygiel and Jurek, 1999: 245).

The fact, that the initiator and consistent implementer of the plan to transform Zduny into a city was Bishop Thomas I is beyond doubt in light of the surviving source material. The motives of the hierarch's interest in Zduny can also be easily explained. It was located on the aforementioned Toruń route, leading from Silesia to the Prussian lands of the Teutonic Order, moreover neighboring the Church of Wrocław's possessions centered around Milicz, already located on the Silesian side of the border, south of the Barycz River. Thomas I probably intended to gain a foothold north of the river valley, which would have had a beneficial effect on the development of the Milicz estates (Grygiel and Jurek, 1999: 244–249). Their possible expansion in a southerly direction, i.e. in the area of the Duchy of

Wrocław, had practically been blocked by the presence, in this area, of the vast domains of the Cistercian monastery in Trzebnica (Kryg, 1993: 19). It seems questionable, however, to treat the deed of 1261 only as princely permission for the future location of the town of Zduny, which, incidentally, was to be carried out by Bishop Thomas. This is so because it is contradicted by the literal content of the document, which speaks explicitly of a town location carried out at the will of the duke and entrusted to the village headman Lambert. It seems that the duke issued the act at the request of the bishop, in whose chancellery the diploma itself was prepared (perhaps bending the reality a bit), but he personally did not attach much importance to the undertaking. As a result, the first attempt failed, and there was a need to renew the location in 1267, after the ownership issues had already been fully and formally sorted out. In 1267 Bishop Thomas was able to act as the full-fledged owner of the settlement and to grant it a city charter in his own name. He took advantage of the pattern of Środa law often used in Silesia and southern Greater Poland (already indicated in the 1261 document of Boleslaw the Pious), which gave a relatively large amount of power over the city to the feudal owner. This time the process of location was brought to a successful conclusion and the city was actually founded. Another thing is that it did not fulfil the long-term plans attached to it by the Bishops of Wrocław and was eventually sold into private hands in the 14th century (Grygiel and Jurek, 1999, 250–253).

In the context of our deliberations, it should be assumed that the founding of the town of Zduny proceeded with considerable difficulties, as evidenced by the unfulfilled act of location from 1261. The reason for this was the legal and ownership status of the settlement, which had not been fully regulated, and the lack of greater interest on the part of Duke Boleslaw the Pious, who, at the request of Bishop Thomas, confirmed the documents initiated by the hierarch and drawn up in his chancellery, but this was the end of the ruler's involvement. This state of affairs changed only after the formal settlement of ownership issues, which allowed the bishop to act on his own behalf and bring the location to completion. The sovereign Lambert, the actual executor of Thomas I's plans, also played his part.

PANIGRÓDZ

The actions of the Cistercian monastery in Łekno can be considered an unsuccessful attempt at urban location with regard to Panigródz, a village in north-eastern Greater Poland, located near Kcynia. As early as 1233, Prince Władysław Odonic allowed the monastery to settle forty German colonists there using the Chełmno law (KDW I: No 149). This was one of the varieties of Magdeburg law, however, Chełmno law was also used for rural locations. And probably such a location was in question at the time, as it seems very unlikely that the town was founded by a deed of 1233.³ At such an early stage in the development of the colonization campaign, it is difficult to assume that provincial Panigródz would be the first urban settlement located in the district. All the more so since, apart from the mention of "Chełmno law", nothing in the content of the act gives grounds for a similar interpretation. Perhaps it was about the establishment of a market? If so, however, it is not known whether it actually began to function. Another complication may have been the application of Chełmno law, which was only then just being formulated. The plan to locate a town in Panigródz was undertaken half a century later, in 1283. The monastery then applied for a relevant document from Prince Przemysław II, allowing the settlement to organize a market and granting a number of rights and privileges, used by all towns (burghers) in the territory of the Duchy of Greater Poland (KDW I: No 521). Again, it is not entirely clear whether this was about the establishment of the market itself or the actual city location, the extensive privileges and the mention of equality in rights with other settlements with city status rather suggest the latter. Ultimately, the transformation of Panigródz into a city did not occur and the village remained as it was (Wędzki, 2007: 136–138; Rogalski, 1988: 255; urban status of Panigródz in 1283 was accepted by W. Kuhn, 1968: 114). What remains now is to try to answer the question of the reasons for the failure. The successful development of the oldest urban center in this part of Wielkopolska (Pałuki) became a model and an incentive for similar projects, but in this case, the proximity proved too close, as it was only a few kilometres away.

³ This is how R. Krzysztofik (2007: 58–59) seems to treat this act.

DANKÓW

Another settlement that did not eventually achieve the status of a city was Danków, located on the Liswarta River, now within the borders of the Silesian province. In the 13th century, it lay within the territory of the Ruda (Wieluń) land then part of the Duchy of Greater Poland. Conveniently located on the border of the Piast dynasty of Greater Poland, the town often hosted conventions and rallies of great political importance (Grabarczyk and Nowak, 2018: 26–30). This circumstance probably contributed to an attempt to locate the town in the last quarter of the 13th century by one of the dukes, probably Boleslaw the Pious or Przemysł II. Danków's case is all the more confusing because the settlement's urban status is informed by only one source, namely, a suspicious document by Przemysł II, dated 1283. By this act, the prince established the institution of a higher municipal court in Kalisz and determined the territorial scope of its jurisdiction. The text lists a number of towns in Greater Poland that were to be under the authority of the Kalisz court, and for as many as nine of them, this is the first mention in written sources of the urban status of a settlement. Among these settlements was also Danków (KDW I: No 528). The document raised doubts in historiography, particularly in favor of its lack of authenticity, and was voiced by a prominent expert in medieval diplomacy, Stanisław Krzyżanowski, who at the end of the 19th century had the opportunity to study the, subsequently, lost original (Krzyżanowski, 1890: 48, 65–66, 186–187). Following in the footsteps of this scholar's thought, it can be assumed that the duke's deed was forged at the inspiration of the municipal authorities of Kalisz, to whom it brought significant benefits and expanded powers. At the same time, the good knowledge of political events in Greater Poland of the period presented by the hypothetical forger proves that the forgery was made at a time not too distant from the inserted date of 1283, but probably already after the death of the ruler in 1296, during the years of confusion and struggle over the legacy of Przemysł II. On the other hand, a change in the assessment of the document's reliability can be seen in the more recent literature on the subject, especially in monographic studies on the individual cities mentioned in the text. Their authors were usually interested in confirming the earliest possible beginnings of the urban status of a given settlement, and defending the authenticity of the 1283 Act proved to be very helpful in doing so (discussion see. e.g. Młyńska, 1960: 122–123). The weight of the arguments raised against the opinion of S. Krzyżanowski is, admittedly, weakened by the current inability to examine the lost original.

From the point of view of our considerations, however, this issue is of secondary importance. The possible principals of the forger (the municipal authorities of Kalisz?) would not, after all, be interested in inserting the name of a non-existent city into the content of a document, if they were to benefit from the exercise of superior judicial power over it. Regardless of whether we consider the act authentic or forged at the turn of the 13th/14th century, it should, therefore, be assumed that Danków was such a city at that time, or at least there was an attempt to carry out the intention of the urban location of this settlement⁴. The latter eventuality seems more probable in view of the fact that the locality ultimately failed to maintain its city status and continued to function as a village in later centuries. The mention in the act of Przemysł II is, therefore, the only trace of the unsuccessful attempt to locate Danków as a city. The idea itself was probably born in connection with the settlement's political role as a convenient place for princely conventions. This, however, was not enough, as there was a lack of clear economic rationale, and the imminent political turmoil that eventually led to the separation of Ruda (Wieluń) land from the duchy of Greater Poland deprived the nascent city of the protection of the rulers of that district.

DUPIN AND RYSZEWO

In the mid-1880s there were two unsuccessful attempts to locate private towns, in Dupin (now Dubin in today's Rawicz district) and Ryszewo near Żnin. The first of these was undertaken by Comes Stefan of the Awdaniec family, the second by the ducal judge Andrzej. Permission for the location was granted in both cases by Duke Przemysł II, doing so in 1284 and 1285 (KDW I: No 549, 555). This ruler successfully developed the location campaign, and supported similar actions by church and secular feudals. It was in the last quarter of the 13th century that a wave of settlements of private towns appeared in the Duchy of Greater Poland, and the oldest of them became the aforementioned Gostyn, which was successfully located in 1278 by commissar Mikołaj Przedpełkowic of the Łodzia family, the future governor of Kalisz (KDW I: No 474). However, not all such initiatives were successful. Private city founders sometimes lacked perseverance, and material resources or failed to obtain sufficient ducal support

⁴ The unsuccessful attempt to locate Danków is mentioned (in a rather enigmatic way) by Grabarczyk and Nowak, 2018: 32.

in the form of customs privileges, tax exemptions, and the like. Dupin remained a village for the next century and a half, and only in the early 15th century was it again located, and its status as a city, at that time, is confirmed by a reference from 1427. However, it never grew into a larger centre. It had become already too late for that in view of the relatively high density of urban settlements in south-western Greater Poland. It eventually lost its city rights in the 19th century (Krzysztofiak, 2007: 28–29). The foundation of the town of Dupin on the land of a pre-existing rural settlement is mentioned by H. Münch (1946: 165–166).

Even less fortunate was Ryszewo, which was endowed with a city charter along the lines of Kalisz (i.e. Środa law). There are no traces that Judge Andrzej made any concrete effort to implement the ducal privilege he had obtained and the settlement ultimately remained a village.

UNSUCCESSFUL LOCATION IN THE DISTRICT OF GREATER POLAND COMPARED TO OTHER DISTRICTS OF POLAND

Thus far, we have counted eight unsuccessful attempts at urban locations made in the area of the district duchy of Greater Poland during its existence (i.e. until 1314). At the same time, 51 urban settlements were successfully located in Greater Poland. This means that of the total 59 initiatives, 14% of them failed. Bearing in mind that this was the pioneering period of the introduction of new legal and economic solutions brought by the urban location under German law, the percentage of unsuccessful initiatives can be considered moderate. All the more so because two of the originally unsuccessful locations (Lądek, Zduny) were successfully renewed as late as the 13th century. On the other hand, we are probably not informed about all such attempts. In most of the cases (seven), the location documents issued in connection with them (either Act of location or permits to carry it out) have survived, which are now the main or even the only traces of the failed venture. Meanwhile, many of the towns successfully located at that time in Greater Poland (and Poland in general) do not have such documents. They were lost over the following centuries, and we eventually learn about the fact of such an action only after some time, when the sources report on a city already in existence. In the case of unsuccessful locations, the relevant documents may have disappeared all the more easily, as the motivation for preserving them was much less. Thus, our knowledge of failed ventures probably remains incomplete.

The issue of unsuccessful town locations was also taken up in relation to other Polish districts. In the case of Silesia, Wiesław Drobek indicated 28 towns that were unsuccessfully located in this district during the Middle Ages (Drobek, 1999: 51–52). In view of the 159 successful ventures (Bogucka and Samsonowicz, 1986: 84–86), this gives a percentage of failures of the order of 15%, which is very similar to our findings relating to 13th-century Greater Poland. Furthermore, a closer analysis of unsuccessful town locations in Silesia with regard to the 13th century was carried out by Franciszek Lenczowski, who enumerated seven such cases (and thus a number similar to the situation in Greater Poland): four ducal, two ecclesiastical, and one private locations. The author considered the main reason for the failures to be commercial competition from neighboring centers located in close proximity (Lenczowski, 1965: 24–27).

Unsuccessful localizations of Lesser Poland were dealt with by Feliks Kiryk, who counted nine unsuccessful initiatives (five ecclesiastical and four private) in this district during the entire medieval period (until the end of the 15th century). At the same time, none of these attempts took place in the 13th century. Such a low number of indicated unsuccessful undertakings is probably due to the preliminary and review nature of the author's research that has extended into the modern era (Kiryk, 1981; 2013: 2–7). The total number of cities successfully located in the Lesser Poland region in the 13th–15th centuries was determined in the literature to be 186 (Bogucka and Samsonowicz, 1986: 84–86). Thus, the percentage of unsuccessful attempts would only be less than 5%, which seems a very small number. However, it is difficult to compare this number with the percentage of 14% of unsuccessful town locations in Greater Poland obtained above. This is due to the fact that we are comparing different time frames, and the depth of the Author in question's survey may also be debatable. At the same time, the two named Authors did not attempt to identify and analyse the reasons for the indicated failures. F. Kiryk, for instance, contented himself with stating that they are difficult to determine and were probably of an individual nature (Kiryk, 1981: 2). It is worth noting, however, that none of the Małopolska examples cited referred to monarchical locations. The rulers had much more power to support the cities they founded than ecclesiastical or private feuds, which can also be seen in the case of Greater Poland, especially in situations where there was competition between neighboring centers founded at about the same time. The ducal city usually emerged victorious from this competition.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Of the aforementioned eight attempts at unsuccessful city locations in thirteenth-century Greater Poland, two were the work of princes (the first location of Zduny, Danków), three of ecclesiastical institutions (the first location of Łądek, Ciężęń, Panigródz), and two of private feudals (Dupin, Ryszewo). In the case of Łubnice, the protracted process of localization was carried out initially under private patronage, then by an ecclesiastical institution, namely the Cistercian monastery in Ołobok. The above distribution of failed initiatives suggests at first glance that ownership issues did not play a major role in these failures. It should be noted, however, that the location of Zduny was carried out by Duke Boleslaw the Pious only formally, and from the very beginning it was, in fact, the Bishop of Wrocław Thomas I who eventually, after several years, renewed the work and successfully completed it. On the other hand, the case of the princely Danków, too, remains somewhat unclear, as there are no surviving location documents, and the authenticity of the source informing about the settlement's urban status is controversial. The loss of the Ruda land by the Dukes of Greater Poland subsequently prevented them from possibly further supporting the settlement. In this situation, it should be concluded that the person of the founder of the new city, however, had an important role in the success of the whole enterprise and monarchic locations had a greater chance of success. This is indirectly confirmed by the cases of Łubnice, Panigródz or Ciężęń, which did not develop in the face of competition from nearby ducal cities: Bolesławiec, Kcynia, Pyzdry. Moreover, in the case of the collision of interests of Łubnice and Bolesławiec, the sources preserved traces of clear favoritism by Boleslaw the Pious of the town founded by him and bearing the name of the ruler (the transfer of the market day; KDW I: No. 421).

In addition to the undeniable advantage of monarchical locations, other reasons for failure can be identified:

- instability of power and political unrest. Although the second half of the 13th century was a period of relative stability for the duchy of Greater Poland under the local Piast line, all of them: Przemysł I, Boleslaw the Pious and Przemysł II, furthermore, supported localization initiatives and also undertook them themselves. However, some of the border regions also became the subjects of rivalry with other Piast dynasties at the time, passing from hand to hand periodically. This was the case, for example, with the Ruda (Wieluń)

land and the Łąd castellany. This situation adversely affected three of the unsuccessful attempts to establish a city: Łubnice, the first location of Łądek, Danków. On the other hand, it should be remembered that in the last few decades of the existence of the Duchy of Greater Poland, after the assassination of Przemysław II in 1296 and the extinction of the local Piast line, the district experienced a 20-year period of frequent changes of the throne, unrest and civil wars, and foreign invasions. However, this did not significantly weaken the localization campaign, which continued to develop intensively, enjoying strong support from King Wenceslas II and later the Dukes of Głogów. We do not find examples of unsuccessful localizations in this twenty-year period. Thus, political instability did not automatically have to mean the inability to undertake a successful localization initiative.

- the strict approach of princes and landowners regarding the origin of possible settlers. The benefits of the successful settlement were usually obtained after a few or a dozen years, and the transition to new, privileged settlements of the local population, hitherto burdened with numerous traditional benefits to the prince, caused temporary losses to the monarchy's income. For this reason, especially in the first period, efforts were made to limit the possibility of settling in the new city only to newcomers from outside, that is, mainly from Germany. This corresponded to the short-term interests of the monarch, and a similar solution was also advocated by clerical feudalists of foreign origin (especially monks from Cistercian convents). In the early days of the location campaign, in smaller, provincial centres, this must have resulted in a lack of sufficient settlers. This was the most likely reason for the failure of the first attempt to locate Łądek by the Cistercians from Łąd in 1250. The second attempt, made twenty years later and already allowing, explicitly, for the participation of the local population (sometimes even obligatory), was successful. Similar factors were probably also at play in the case of nearby Ciężęń, located unsuccessfully by the bishop of Poznań, following the initiative of the monastery.
- proximity to a stronger urban center. Although, in Greater Poland at that time, the urban network was very sparse and places attractive from the economic point of view (general settlement development, the course of trade routes, etc.) were not in short supply, there were situations when, in particular, private or church land-

owners tried to establish a city near an already existing center (encouraged by the success of a neighbor or trying to take advantage of a common, favorable location), and sometimes the process of location dragged on to such an extent that such a center grew sideways a few or more years later. The literature expresses the view that the distance between urban centers, to avoid mutual competition, was about 30 km in 13th-century Greater Poland, and the radius of economic "service" by the city for the agricultural hinterland was about 15 km. (the distance possible to travel by horse-drawn cart in both directions in one day) (Wiesiołowski, 1981: 386; alike Rogalski, 1988). In several of the cases mentioned above, the distance separating neighboring centers turned out to be much less. Fierce competition between such close cities often led to the withering away of one of them. This situation affected Panigródz (located in the vicinity of Kcynia), as well as Ciężęń and Łubnice, near which Pызdry and Bolesławiec were established, respectively. It should be added here that all of the competing and winning towns mentioned here were princely locations, which is another argument in favor of the overall advantage of monarchical initiatives.

- unclear legal and ownership status of the settlement. Settlement of such issues was usually a prerequisite and necessary condition for further steps on the path of locating a settlement under German law, both in the case of a village and a town. It happened, however, that these issues were not fully clarified, or changes and complications arose early in the course of the location process. We are dealing with such cases in relation to Łubnice and Zduny. Łubnice, which initially belonged to the representatives of the magnate family of the Gryfits, and then later to the Cistercian convent in Owińska (which, by the way, did not rule out ceding the settlement to the Benedictines from Staniątki), in fact, did not arouse much interest in any of the subsequent owners. The main and most consistent promoter of the location campaign was probably the village leader Konrad, who was, personally and materially, involved in it. In view of frequent changes in ownership and the indifference of successive feudal owners of the settlement, however, he did not achieve his goal. The subsequent princely location of nearby Bolesławiec developed the local space, so to speak, and ultimately doomed Łubnice's chances. In the case of Zduny, the bishop

of Wrocław, Thomas I, strove to establish a town, enlisting Prince Boleslaw the Pious, the owner of the settlement, for this plan. The prince issued an Act of location, most likely prepared in the bishop's office, but showed little interest himself in the venture. In turn, the lack of land ownership made it difficult for the bishop to act. As a result, the first attempt at localization failed and Thomas I had to repeat it, by way of an exchange with the prince, previously obtaining ownership of the settlement.

- shifting trade routes. Thirteenth-century Greater Poland generally lay on the side-lines of routes of importance to pan-European trade at the time. The only route of supralocal importance formed around the middle of the 13th century led from Bohemia and Silesia towards the Prussian lands of the Teutonic Order. It crossed the eastern part of the district, leading from the south through Kalisz, Pызdry, and Konin towards Toruń. It had a number of local variants and branches. In the conditions of Greater Poland, it allowed some cities to join the transit trade and was one of the bases for their development. Pызdry, for example, benefited from it. At the same time, however, local dislocations of this route may have contributed to the weakening and decline of some centers. Such a fate befell, for example, Łąd and the nearby town of Łądek. The once-important crossing of the Warta River conditioned the development of the local market settlement, and also augured well for the initiative to establish a locational town. However, the road moved several kilometers westward in the second half of the 13th century, crossing the river in the aforementioned Pызdry. The hopes of the Bishops of Wrocław for the dynamic development of Zduny, located on the northern side of the crossing of the Barycz River valley, also failed to materialize. This situation contributed to the ceding of the town to private hands in the 14th century.
- the inability to sufficiently support the location. This was, especially, true of private magnates, whose position was usually not as stable as that of institutional clerical feudals, depending on the often changing balance of power at the ducal court. They also had fewer opportunities to support the new city, such as customs concessions or tax privileges. In fact, sometimes they showed no particular interest in the location, such as the Lesser Griffins, who were endowed with the right to found the town of Lubnice in the Ruda land by the temporary rulers of that land, the

Dukes of Opole (probably partly in their own interest of the Opole people). Dupin and Ryszewo settlements, which, in the 1380s were attempted to be located by the magnates of Przemysł II's entourage, also failed.

Thus, the reasons for the individual failures of each localization initiative could have been very different, sometimes there were several of them together. Nevertheless, the majority of undertakings were successful, and the several percent failure rate should be considered low – all the more so because of the eight cases indicated above, two settlements were located once again in the 13th century, with positive results this time. The conditions for the development of urban life in thirteenth-century Greater Poland, thus, proved favorable. They were based on general population growth, the spread of immunities that gave more economic freedoms, rural colonization and expansion of arable land acreage, as well as the introduction of new, more efficient agricultural techniques, the revival of trade, and the commodity-money economy. The latter factor in particular has already directly influenced the emergence and development of cities. Estimates carried out in the literature indicate that in late medieval Greater Poland, among large and medium-sized towns, a significant share was held by settlements endowed with municipal rights, precisely, in the early period of the location wave, that is, in the 13th century. This testifies to the high degree of accuracy of the decisions made by their founders at that time (Wiesiołowski, 1981: 390; this author puts the mentioned share at 45%).

This thirteenth-century success story contrasts somewhat with the situation in the late medieval and early modern periods, in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. The general conditions mentioned above were still relatively favorable, and the negative effects of the predominance of the manorial and serfdom system that was developing at that time were to become apparent only in the future, yet a great many of the location initiatives of that period ended in failure. Newly founded towns were often relegated to the status of villages or else they vegetated, with their inhabitants supporting themselves mainly by agricultural activities, and the settlement formally only had municipal rights. This was due to the already considerable level of urbanization in the district, sufficient for the economic relations of the time. New settlement initiatives were mainly undertaken by private landowners, including many representatives of the middle gentry. They often did so for reasons of prestige and ambition, as there was a conviction that a magnate should have at least one, if not sev-

eral urban settlements in his estate. Thus, such settlements were established without regard to economic conditions and many initiatives failed. Admittedly, there are examples of towns founded at that time that were to develop successfully in the future and are now counted among the main centres of Greater Poland, such as Piła, founded in the mid-15th century, or Leszno, founded a century later. Their success, however, was due to special circumstances (the location of Piła in the still poorly urbanised and forested north of Greater Poland, and in the case of Leszno, an influx of religious emigrants from Bohemia and Silesia) and did not happen immediately. The overall balance of late medieval location initiatives turns out to be much less favorable than the effects of similar activities in the second half of the 13th century.

Zbyszko Górczak, Prof. Dr., employee of the Faculty of History of Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań. Specialises in economic and social issues of late-medieval Poland and Greater Poland, in particular, the development of large landholdings in the 15th and early 16th centuries (secular and clerical), as well as the problem of city locations and urban life in Greater Poland.

REFERENCES

Archive materials

- KDW – *Kodeks dyplomatyczny Wielkopolski (1877–1881)* Zakrzewski, I. (ed.), Vol. I–IV. Poznań: Biblioteka Kórnicka.
- Likowski, H. (1923) *Klasztor cysterek w Ołoboku (typescript of doctoral thesis)*. Poznań: Archiwum UAM w Poznaniu. Wydział Filologiczno-Historyczny, sign. 153/80.

Literature

- Bielińska, M. (1967) *Kancelarie i dokumenty wielkopolskie XIII wieku*. Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, Wydawnictwo Polskiej Akademii Nauk.
- Bogucka, M., Samsonowicz, H. (1986) *Dzieje miast i mieszczaństwa w Polsce przedrozbiorowej*. Warszawa: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich – Wydawnictwo.
- Drobek, W. (1999) *Rola miast zdegradowanych w sieci osadniczej Śląska*. Opole: Instytut Śląski.
- Gawlas, S. (2005) 'Przełom lokacyjny w dziejach miast środkowoeuropejskich', in Kur-natowska, Z., Jurek, T. (eds) *Civitas posnaniensis. Studia z dziejów średniowiecznego Poznania*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Polskiego Towarzystwa Przyjaciół Nauk, pp. 133–162.
- Górczak, Z. (2002) *Najstarsze lokacje miejskie w Wielkopolsce (do 1314 r.)*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Wojewódzkiej Biblioteki Publicznej i Centrum Animacji Kultury w Poznaniu.
- Górczak, Z. (2007) 'Lokacja miejska Pyzdr na tle początków miast wielkopolskich', in Czerniak, R.M. (ed.) *Civitas Pyzdry. 750 lat lokacji miasta*. Pyzdry: Muzeum Regionalne w Pyzdrach, pp. 13–37.
- Grabarczyk, T., Nowak, T. (2018) 'Danków i okolice do XVI wieku', in Grabarczyk, T., Kobus, A. (eds) *Osiem wieków Dankowa nad Liswartą*. Lipie: Gmina Lipie, pp. 23–43.

- Grygiel, R., Jurek, T. (1999) *Zduny. Późnośredniowieczne i nowożytnie rezydencje właścicieli miasta*. Łódź: Wydawnictwo Fundacji Badań Archeologicznych im. Profesora Konrada Jażdżewskiego, Muzeum Archeologiczne i Etnograficzne w Łodzi.
- Kiryk, F. (1981) 'Lokacje miejskie nieudane, translacje miast i miasta zanikłe w Małopolsce do połowy XVII stulecia', *Kwartalnik Historii Kultury Materialnej*, 29, pp. 373–383.
- Kiryk, F. (2013) *Miasta małopolskie w średniowieczu i czasach nowożytnych*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo AVALON.
- Kryg, G. (1993) *Zduny. Od pradziejów do upadku Rzeczypospolitej*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo WiS.
- Krzysztofik, R. (2007) *Lokacje miejskie na obszarze Polski. Dokumentacja geograficzno-historyczna*. Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego.
- Krzyżanowski, S. (1890) *Dyplomy i kancelaryja Przemysła II. Studium z dyplomatyki polskiej XIII wieku*. Kraków: Drukarnia Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.
- Kucharski, G. (2002) 'Klasztor cysterek w Łubienicach nad Prosną', *Nasza Przeszłość*, 97, pp. 65–87.
- Kuhn, W. (1968) *Die deutschrechtlichen Städte in Schlesien und Polen in der ersten Hälfte des 13. Jahrhunderts*. Marburg an der Lahn: J.G. Herder-Institut.
- Lange, O. (1925) *Lokacja miast Wielkopolski właścicielom na prawie niemieckim w wiekach średnich*. Lwów: Red. Pamiętnika Historyczno-Prawnego.
- Lenczowski, F. (1965) *Ze studiów nad problemami miast śląskich do końca XIV wieku*. Opole: Instytut Śląski.
- Likowski, H. (1922) *Miasto książęce Śródką. Kartka z dziejów Poznania w latach 1231–1253*. Poznań: Drukarnia „Dziennika Poznańskiego”.
- Łowmiański, H. (1985) *Początki Polski*. Vol. VI. Part 2: *Polityczne i społeczne procesy kształtowania się narodu od początku*. Warszawa: PWN.
- Młynarska-Kaletynowa, M. (1973) *Pierwsze lokacje miast w dorzeczu Orli w XIII w.* Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich – Wydawnictwo Polskiej Akademii Nauk.
- Młyńska, M. (1960) 'Proces lokacji Kalisza w XIII w. i pierwszej połowie XIV wieku', in Gieysztor, A., Dąbrowski, K. (eds) *Osiemnaście wieków Kalisza. Studia i materiały do dziejów Kalisza i regiony kaliskiego*. Vol. I. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Poznańskie, pp. 122–123.
- Münch, H. (1946) *Geneza rozplanowania miast wielkopolskich XIII i XIV wieku*. Kraków: Polska Akademia Umiejętności.
- Rogalski, B. (1988) *Kształtowanie się form przestrzennych sieci osadniczej Wielkopolski średniowiecznej*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Politechniki Poznańskiej.
- Sikora, F. (1968) *Dokumenty i kancelaria Przemysła I oraz Bolesława Pobożnego 1239–1279 na tle współczesnej dyplomatyki wielkopolskiej*. Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, Wydawnictwo Polskiej Akademii Nauk.
- Wędzki, A. (1960) 'Zarys dziejów Słupcy i powiatu słupeckiego', in Jasiewicz, Z. [et al.] *Dzieje ziemi słupeckiej*. Słupca–Poznań: Wydawnictwo Poznańskie, pp. 55–145.
- Wędzki, A. (1966) 'Rozwój osadnictwa i podziały terytorialne ziemi łądzkiej do końca XIV wieku', *Slavia Antiqua*, 12, pp. 1–141.
- Wędzki, A. (2007) 'Rozwój sieci miejskiej na Pałukach w średniowieczu', in Wędzki, A. (ed.) *Przechadzki po Wielkopolsce*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Poznańskie, pp. 133–143. First publication: (1992), *Żnińskie Zeszyty Historyczne*, 5 pp. 10–22.
- Wiesiołowski, J. (1981) 'Sieć miejska w Wielkopolsce w XII–XVI wieku. Przestrzeń i społeczeństwo', *Kwartalnik Historii Kultury Materialnej*, 29, pp. 385–399.
- Zientara, B. (1997) *Henryk Brodaty i jego czasy*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo „Trio”.