Queen Jadwiga of Anjou’s influence on the composition of the Polish episcopate
Wpływ królowej Jadwigi Andegaweńskiej na kształt personalny polskiego episkopatu

Abstract
This article aims to present Queen Jadwiga’s actual influence on nominations for episcopal sees during her reign (1384–1386) and joint rule with Władysław Jagiełło (1386–1399). Until now, except for Krzysztof Ożóg, researchers expressed only a marginal interest in the subject. The author cites relevant views contained in all major studies on Jadwiga’s reign as well as analyses all available sources, mainly printed ones, both papal documents and chronicles, with special regard to the works of Jan Długosz. Using the induction method, the author analyses 22 nominations for episcopal sees. Contrary to the views expressed in the literature of the subject, Jadwiga did not influence all episcopal nominations she has been attributed with. Nonetheless, in some cases (e.g. Piotr Wysz from Kraków, Andrzej Jastrzębiec from Vilnius) we may argue that she exerted noticeable pressure; in other instances it was probably only more or less subtle. In all analysed nominations, whenever her role was clearly proved in sources, we may notice that Jadwiga was invariably cooperative in the common ecclesiastical policy which she pursued together with her husband. For example, both took advantage of the Holy Sees’ vulnerability in
the era of the Occidental Schism, which allowed them to push their own candidates for episcopal seats. The present analysis revealed that with regard to the majority of most prestigious bishoprics in the Kingdom of Poland it was Jagiełło who had key influence on candidates for episcopal nominations, building his own political power base. At the same time, certain episcopal promotions, especially those in Ruthenia, Moldova and Mazovia, were reported inadequately and in few sources, hence Jadwiga’s and Władysław’s influence on the nominations of bishops can only be hypothetically determined.
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**Abstract**

The aim of this article is to show the real influence of the Polish queen Jadwiga Andegaweńska on the appointment of bishops in the period of her reign (1384–1386) and together with Władysław Jagiełło (1386–1399). To date, researchers, with the exception of Krzysztof Ożoga, have only marginally devoted their attention to this issue. The author followed the opinion of investigators in all important works dedicated to the reign of queen Jadwiga, and also analyzed all available sources, mainly printed, both papal provenience and historical works, with a special attention to the works of Jan Długosz.

The author, using an inductive method, analyzed all 22 appointments to the bishopric. In contrast to the existing literature, Jadwiga did not have the influence on all the bishop appointments attributed to her. In the case of some bishops (e.g. Kraków Piotr Wysz, Vilnius Andrzej Jastrzębiec) one can, however, notice that her pressure was evident. In other cases it was likely only more or less subtle. In all cases, when Jadwiga’s role was clearly evidenced, it was shown that she cooperated constantly with her husband, pursuing an integrated ecclesiastical politics. Both employed the weakness of the papacy in the era of the great schism, which allowed them to promote their own candidates for episcopal seats. The present analysis revealed that with regard to the majority of most prestigious bishoprics in the Kingdom of Poland it was Jagiełło who had key influence on candidates for episcopal nominations, building his own political power base. At the same time, certain episcopal promotions, especially those in Ruthenia, Moldova and Mazovia, were reported inadequately and in few sources, hence Jadwiga’s and Władysław’s influence on the nominations of bishops can only be hypothetically determined.
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The question of Queen Jadwiga’s influence on the composition of the Polish episcopate has only been given a cursory treatment in the majority of studies on her life. In fact, it has rarely been the subject of a separate study. Remarkably, some researchers who based their works less on the content of sources and more on their own beliefs, their noticeable admiration for Jadwiga and their own assumptions (also where sources were absent), assured the reader of Jadwiga’s overwhelming role in the decision to appoint a given bishop whilst remaining oblivious to her husband’s position and will. Examples of such views include e.g. “classic” publications by Jadwiga Stabińska, Rev. Bolesław Przybyszewski and Wanda Maciejewska. The first study unquestioningly assumes not only the queen’s exclusive role in Piotr Wysz’s promotion to the Kraków bishopric but also quite freely discusses “exceptional ability to staff episcopal sees,” as supposedly evidenced (in addition to the bishopric of Kraków) by the “nominations of: Andrzej as the Bishop of Vilnius (Wilno), Maciej as the Bishop of Przemyśl, Jakub Strepa as the Archbishop of Halych (Halicz).” The same view is echoed in an almost hagiographical biography of Jadwiga by Rev. Bolesław Przybyszewski, according to whom Jadwiga “elected” Andrzej Jastrzębiec, Jakub Strepa and Maciej, and “elevated Piotr Wysz to the new provision.” Maciejewska claims e.g. that

It is not without Jadwiga’s influence that Franciscan Jakób Strepa was put forward as a candidate by the Holy See for the vacant archbishopric of Halych […], especially that over the years she had gained influence with the Curia. A year later, she again endorsed her chancellor Maciej for the vacant bishopric of Przemyśl.

Maciejewska entirely overlooks the significance of Władysław Jagiełło’s will as the king and ignores the fact that the supplication to the Pope contained a request of the royal couple. Still, she attributes the nomination of Andrzej Jastrzębiec as the Bishop of Vilnius solely
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to Jadwiga. Similarly, it was reportedly only thanks to the queen that Chancellor Piotr Wysz became the Bishop of Kraków.\(^5\) Charlotte Kellogg also concludes that “Jadwiga successfully pushed Piotr Wysz as the candidate for the seat, without considering that the Holy Father had another candidate for the vacant position.”\(^6\) This opinion was also voiced by Stanisław Kijak.\(^7\) Jerzy Wyrozumski, one of the most accomplished Polish mediaevalists, acknowledged Jagiełło’s role in Piotr Wysz’s episcopal nomination, concluding that “given the fact that Piotr Wysz was the queen’s chancellor and close collaborator, this must have been mostly the result of her influence.”\(^8\) Jarosław Nikodem, Queen Jadwiga’s biographer, as well as Jan Drabina emphasise that the royal couple acted in tandem when dealing with nominations of Polish bishops, also in Wysz’s case.\(^9\) Krzysztof Ożóg expresses a similar view, albeit in his studies on the circumstances of the dispute over the Kraków bishopric in 1392 Jadwiga’s role is seen as slightly more significant than Jagiełło’s.\(^10\) Although, when discussing the monarch’s creative role in shaping Poland’s ecclesiastical elite, the author of the present article acknowledges the royal couple’s joint effort in the case of Wysz, he also stresses Jagiełło’s initiative in the appointment of other bishops.\(^11\)

To date, only Krzysztof Ożóg has attempted to deal more comprehensively in a separate study with Jadwiga’s influence on the composition of the Polish episcopate – precisely, the episcopate of the entire Polish-Lithuanian monarchy (since 1386). In so doing, he analysed merely a few
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6 Charlotte Kellogg, \textit{Jadwiga} (Kraków: Wydawnictwo Księży Jezuitów, 1933), 201.
7 Stanisław Kijak, \textit{Piotr Wysz biskup krakowski} (Kraków: Gebethner & Wolff, 1933), 12.
8 Jerzy Wyrozumski, \textit{Królowa Jadwiga między epoką piastowską i jagiellońską} (Kraków: Universitas, 1997), 113.
9 Nikodem, \textit{Jadwiga}, 361–362; Jan Drabina, \textit{Papiestwo–Polska w latach 1384–1434} (Kraków: Wydawnictwo UJ, 2003), 30–33.
10 Krzysztof Ożóg, “Spór o biskupstwo krakowskie w roku 1392 na tle stosunków Polski z papieśtwem u schyłku XIV wieku,” \textit{Kwartalnik Historyczny} 104 (1997): 3–20; \textit{idem}, “Maffiolus Lampugnani nominat na biskupstwo krakowskie, biskup płocki: meandry kariery kurialisty rymskiego w okresie schizmy zachodniej,” \textit{Roczniki Humanistyczne} 48 (2000): 345–367; \textit{idem}, “Kurozwęccy a spór o biskupstwo krakowskie w roku 1392,” \textit{Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego. Prace Historyczne} 123 (1997): 57–74; \textit{idem}, “Kościół krakowski wobec wielkiej schizmy zachodniej i ruchu soborowego u schyłku XIV i w pierwszej połowie XV wieku,” in \textit{Kościół krakowski w życiu państwa i narodu polskiego}, ed. Andrzej Pankowicz (Kraków: PAT, 2002), 31–32 (where the author concluded e.g. that “thanks to Jadwiga’s insistence the Krakow’s Church gained one of the most eminent shepherds in its history”).
11 Tomasz Graff, \textit{Episkopat monarchii jagiellońskiej w dobie soborów powszechnych XV wieku} (Kraków: Societas Vistulana, 2008), 155–158.
of the more relevant examples of episcopal appointments, on the basis of which he came to the conclusion that it is clear or very likely that Jadwiga must have influenced – on her own or together with Jagiello – the nomination of as many as 7 bishops: Bishop of Vilnius Andrzej Jastrzębiec (1388), Archbishop of Gniezno Dobrogost (1394), Bishop of Włocławek and Duke of Legnica Henryk (1389), Bishop of Kraków Piotr Wysz (1392), Bishop of Przemyśl Maciej of Sandomierz (1392), Archbishop of Halych Jakub Strepa (1392), Bishop of Poznań Wojciech Jastrzębiec (1399). The researcher also mentions Jadwiga’s (failed) attempts to elevate Mikołaj of Gorzków to the bishopric of Vilnius (1398) and Andrzej Łaskarzyc to the bishopric of Włocławek (1398). One should also mention studies by Władysław Abraham and Tadeusz Trajdos as well as Krzysztof R. Prokop’s dictionary entries. When discussing nominations for Ruthenian and Moldovan bishoprics, the aforementioned researchers suggest that the steps taken by Jadwiga and her husband had a decisive role in the matter, although the researchers’ conclusions are mostly based on circumstantial evidence. Moreover, authors such as Leszek Zygner and Anna Salina firmly believe that Jakub Kurdwanowski’s rise to the position of the Bishop of Płock in 1396 was due to the support of the royal couple. As previously mentioned, the findings by those and other researchers on the nominations for Polish bishoprics raise serious doubts in connection with the ambiguity of judgements concerning Jadwiga’s actual influence on the composition of the Polish episcopate. Surprisingly, no one has so far attempted to analyse all (i.e., 22) nominations for episcopal
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14 Tadeusz M. Trajdos, Kościół katolicki na ziemiach ruskich Korony i Litwy za panowania Władysława Jagiełły (1386–1434), Vol. 1 (Wrocław: Ossolineum, 1983), 150; idem, “Polityka króla Władysława Jagiełły wobec Kościoła katolickiego na ziemiach ruskich Królestwa Polskiego i Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego,” Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego. Prace Historyczne 141 (2014): 326.
15 Krzysztof R. Prokop, Arcybiskupi halicy i lwowscy (Biały Dunajec–Ostróg: Wolanie z Wołynia, 2010), 29; idem, Biskupi pomocnicy w diecezjach polskich w dobie przedtrydenckiej (Kraków: s.n., 2002), 233; idem, Polscy biskupi dominikanie. Słownik biograficzny (Kraków: Drukarnia Akcydensowa Dorosz, 2013), 74; idem, Polscy biskupi franciszkanckie. Słownik biograficzny (Kraków: s.n., 2003), 141.
16 Leszek Zygner, Biskup Jakub z Kurdwanowa herbu Syrokomla (ok. 1350–1425) (Toruń: Wydawnictwo Naukowe UMK, 2020), 59–63, 271; Anna Salina, Polityka książąt mazowieckich wobec władz Kościoła od początku XIV wieku do 1526 roku (Poznań: Wydawnictwo Poznańskie, 2011), 73.
chairs during the reign of Queen Jadwiga (1384–1386) and heir joint reign with Władysław Jagiełło (1386–1399), even though such analysis appears necessary to arrive at the full picture of personnel changes in the Polish episcopate, or to present factors which played a role in those nominations.

However, before I provide a comprehensive analysis of nominations for each relevant bishopric, it would be worth outlining Jadwiga’s father policy towards the Church. Louis the Great took particular care to nominate bishops in the lands under his reign himself. Like in other European countries, in Louis’s monarchy the king interfered heavily with the local episcopal appointments, as bishops played an essential part in the kingdom’s political life, often assuming strategic offices. Thus, it was in the king’s interest to staff the most sensitive positions with people he could trust. Obviously, in theory bishops were elected freely and canonically by chapters (in Poland as late as from the beginning of the 13th century), and their decision was subsequently approved by the Pope; however, the king’s interference very often had a bearing on the outcome of the election and canons were forced to opt for the royal candidate. If the outcome was unfavourable for or not agreed with the sovereign, he would effectively scuttle the election, making it immediately clear to the messengers who brought news of the chapter’s decision that he would not support it and even work against it. Louis even resorted to imprisoning bishops elected against his preference and openly putting pressure on the pope so that he latter preconized the “right” candidate. Meanwhile, the papacy, which from the 14th century onwards made claims for the so-called ‘reservation’, could not ignore the monarch’s will, since papal influence had been weakened by the Western Schism. In any case, in the triangle of power consisting of the pope, the chapter and the monarch, it was the monarch whose will usually prevailed in the event of a dispute over the nomination for a prestigious bishopric. Still, we should not overlook other factors, such as the pressure put by local magnates or the candidate’s own resourcefulness. The Teutonic Knights usually tried to
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exert a modicum of influence on the Roman Curia with regard to the nomination for the bishopric of Włocławek, which included the Pomera-
nian Archdeaconry.\(^{19}\) The issue of the claims of the bishops of Lubusz
for authority over local bishops was still relevant in Ruthenia, despite
the Pope's prohibition to extend such claims in 1375, and Polish, Lithu-
anian and Hungarian (or even Bohemian, in the case of the bishopric of
Volodymyr) influences repeatedly clashed in the region.\(^{20}\) Legally and
formally, the Pope had the final say and decided whether a given person
was to receive the bishopric, but in fact he acted somewhat at the bidding
of individual monarchs. Ascending the Polish throne in 1384, Jadwiga was
formally crowned Queen of Poland and cultivated the Angevin tradition
of royal interference with episcopal nominations. Note, however, that
she started her reign as a 10-year-old girl.\(^{21}\) Directly before her arrival,
there was a significant reshuffling in Polish episcopal sees, which took
place without her participation, in those challenging months, as Polish
lords awaited the future monarch's arrival in the country. Two episcopal
appointments were decided in the first half of 1384. Dobrogost, a Doctor
of Law at the University of Padua, was made Bishop of Poznań;\(^{22}\) in turn
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19 Jan Fijałek, *Ustalenie chronologii biskupów włoclawskich* (Kraków: Główny Skład
w Księgarni Gebethnera i Sp., 1894), *passim*; Kazimierz Bieszcz, “Walka Zakonu krzy-
żackiego z Polską o przynależność kościelną archidiakonatu pomorskiego,” *Roczniki
Towarzystwa Naukowego w Toruniu* 34 (1937): 13–21.
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Świętosław, the first Catholic Bishop of Łuck (1404–ca. 1410),” *Historia Slavorum Occi-
dentis*, 24 (2020): 11–34.
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22 *Kodeks Dyplomatyczny Wielkopolski* [henceforth: *KDW*], Vol. 3, ed. Ignacy Zakrzewski
(Poznań: Tow. Przyjaciół Nauk Poznańskiego, 1879), No. 1821; *Kronika Jana z Czarnko-
wa*, 136, 142; *Ioannis Dlugossii Annales seu cronicae incerti Regni Poloniae* [henceforth:
*Annales*], lib. X 1370–1405 (Warsaviae: PWN, 1985), 140; *Ioannis Dlugossii Vitae Episco-
porum Poloniae* [henceforth: *Vitae*], eds. Ignacy Polkowski, Zegota Pauli, in
*Opera Omnia*, Vol. 1 (Cracoviae: s.n., 1887), 503; Stanisław Trojanowski, “Dobrogost,”
in *PSB*, Vol. 5, 245–246; Antoni Gąsiorowski, “Dobrogost,” in *Wielkopolski Słownik
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the bishopric of Włocławek was given to Jan Kropidło, Bishop of Poznań, Władysław of Opole’s nephew, a former student of law and theology at the University of Bologna, despite his insufficient age (i.e. 30 years) required for the position (he was born ca. 1360). Dobrogost’s approval by the Pope’s provision could have been the sum of many factors, presumably the consent of Elisabeth of Bosnia’s Buda court (albeit Dobrogost as the Archbishop-Elect of Gniezno had previously been held captive by order of her deceased husband, who captured him on the way to Rome for his confirmation) and some insistence on part of Siemowit, Duke of Mazowia. Władysław of Opole’s relations with the Curia were likely a factor in the nomination of Jan Kropidło, who after his graduation from university was conferred the bishopric of Poznań in 1382 thanks to his uncle’s and Louis of Hungary’s influence, although, admittedly, no source contains any relevant information. Therefore, Kropidło received the bishopric of Włocławek in spite of the fact that the Chapter had already elected Teodoryk, who was even approved by Bodzęta (Bodzanta), the Archbishop of Gniezno. Later on, Kropidło proved a constant nuisance to Jadwiga and Jagiełło, but Dobrogost loyally served the royal couple e.g. as a diplomat in Rome, and even lent them money. His flare for finance...
and accounting could be attributed to his professional background since he had worked as a papal collector early in his ecclesiastical career.\(^{27}\)

Also, one may hardly speak of any effect that Queen Jadwiga could have had on the papal approval of Bernard, Archbishop of Halych, in 1385, as Ruthenia was at that time part of the Kingdom of Hungary.\(^{28}\)

Still, other cases, from 1388 until the queen’s death, require analysis in the context of the present issue, all the more that in the 1380s Jadwiga herself was in her early mature years.

From her early years, Queen Jadwiga enjoyed exceptionally good relations with Jan Radlica, Bishop of Kraków, physician and intellectual, who showed her the intricacies of big politics.\(^{29}\)

Nevertheless, in the first years of her reign, and then during the first years of her joint rule with Jagiełło, her impact on the composition of the episcopate must have been negligible, as it was her husband who had the final say in this area. In the context of the above discussion, it should be mentioned that sources of the period contain evidence that Polish bishops swore an oath to the monarch.\(^{30}\)

The royal policy of nominations for individual bishoprics was surely part of the process of building the monarch’s own political faction, and those appointed to the most prestigious posts were often selected from the staff of the royal chancery, i.e. the sovereign’s most trusted circle.\(^{31}\)

When Jagiełło became king of Poland, on the one hand he had to face the political status quo dominated by the coterie of the magnates of Lesser Poland, on the other hand, by promoting people loyal to him to lay and ecclesiastical posts, he was able to gradually form a circle of trusted advisors, as it were, creating new ruling elites who owed their rise to the position solely to the monarch. Accordingly, in this respect we may agree with Jerzy Sperka that the king “gained advantage over the Cracovian lords in the chancery by building his own political power base.” Thanks to his support, chancery officials without prior connections to the then political elite were conferred episcopal honours, which led to their inclusion in the royal council.”\(^{32}\)

\(^{27}\) Drabina, *Papiestwo–Polska*, 22–23.

\(^{28}\) Abraham, *Powstanie*, 308.

\(^{29}\) Anna Strzelecka, “Jan z Radliczyc,” in *PSB*, Vol. 10, 469–471.

\(^{30}\) Fijałek, *Ustalenie*, 34; Korytkowski, *Arcybiskupi*, 759.

\(^{31}\) Artur Kuźma, “Kancelaria królewsksa Andegawenów i Jagiellonów jako środowisko awansu na drodze do arcybiskupstwa gnieźnieńskiego,” *Roczniki Humanistyczne* 48 (2000): 5–28.

\(^{32}\) Jerzy Sperka, “Wojciech Jastrzębiec – faworyt króla Władysława Jagiełły,” in *Wojciech Jastrzębiec w służbie monarchii i Kościoła*, eds. Bożena Czwojdrak, Feliks Kiryk, Jerzy Sperka (Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego, 2018), 21.
A member of a distinguished royal family, Jadwiga was certainly more respected by the Roman Curia than her husband, a former pagan, whose merits, admittedly, as an arch-Christian ruler were increasingly often acknowledged by the Holy See in Rome.\(^{33}\) Interestingly, it was 17-year-old Jadwiga who received from Pope Boniface IX in the 3rd year of his pontificate (29th December 1391) an assurance that he would always support her decisions concerning ecclesiastical policy. Furthermore, he even apologised to her for having at times acted against her will, justifying that he had failed to become aware of her requests at the right time. He went as far as to suggest that their mutual correspondence should contain a special marking which would allow him to immediately recognise the queen’s will with regard to candidates for ecclesiastical offices: \textit{Hortamur eandem serenitatem tuam, ut aliquod signum speciale nobis velis destinare per nos custodiendum}.\(^{34}\) Did he mean Martha and Mary’s sign which, according to Mieczysław Gębarowicz, was present on the queen’s signet ring that she always wore on her finger?\(^{35}\) The Pope claimed that many would-be hierarchs in their impudence asked Jadwiga to elevate them, knowing that she was unable to refuse without “harm to the dignity of her royal majesty,” and that she wrote to the Holy See to support them against her own will, for she wished to promote other candidates to the ranks in question.\(^{36}\) Was it Boniface’s oblique manner of saying that he was aware that Jadwiga and her husband tried to exercise a consistent ecclesiastical policy not only towards lower-ranking beneficiaries but also with regard to episcopal nominations, so on many occasions she could not officially support a candidate of her own choice?\(^{37}\) This seems

\(^{33}\) Drabina, \textit{Papiestwo–Polska}, 13–37.

\(^{34}\) BP, Vol. 3, No. 283; \textit{Annales}, X, 232–233; cf. Graff, \textit{Episkopat}, 158; \textit{idem}, “Osobowość Jadwigi Andegaweńskiej w świetle kontaktów Polski ze Stolicą Apostolską w okresie schizmy zachodniej w latach 1388/9–1399,” in Świat kobiet w Polsce w średniowieczu i w epoce nowożytnej, eds. Wojciech Iwańczak, Agnieszka Januszek–Sieradzka, Janusz Śmoluńa (Kraków: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Akademii Ignatianum, 2018), 536–556.

\(^{35}\) Cf. Mieczysław Gębarowicz, \textit{Psalterz floriański i jego geneza} (Wrocław–Warszawa–Kraków: Ossolineum, 1965), 22, 31–34. Interestingly, when citing the content of the papal bull, Jan Długosz did not intend to reveal the vulnerability of papacy in the age of the Occidental Schism; rather, he presented the document as an example of universal reverence for Queen Jadwiga as a model of saintly life.

\(^{36}\) \textit{Annales}, X, 232–233.

\(^{37}\) Jan Drabina, \textit{Papiestwo–Polska}, 30. Although the author holds that the papal bull referred only to nominations of lower-tier ecclesiastical positions and did not pertain to bishoprics, he contradicts himself by writing that the document guaranteed “the fulfilment of all her [i.e. Jadwiga’s] requests in Church matters”. It appears that the Pope actually meant the entirety of Jadwiga’s wishes concerning appointments for
very likely, considering that we do know that, on the outside, despite certain disagreements in her private life with a husband who travelled widely, the queen tried to defend him against slurs and commended him as a great ruler. Jadwiga referred to Władysław in her correspondence as e.g. *vir meus predilectus* and assured the Pope of the king’s loyalty to him, describing Władysław as *filius Sanctitatis Vestre devotissimus*.\(^{38}\) Piotr Wysz, a scholar and a person trusted by both parties, acted as an intermediary between the Pope and Queen Jadwiga. Not only did Boniface call him officially his protonotary but also a ‘beloved son’ and the protector of Jadwiga’s position and dignity, invariably loyal both the Holy Father and the queen of Poland.\(^{39}\)

As already mentioned, in the period relevant for this study (1384–1399), there were 22 nominations for bishoprics in the Metropolitan Archdiocese of Gniezno and the Archdiocese of Halych, including hierarchs from the Mazovia fiefdom and Moldova, which became a fiefdom in 1387 (during part of this period the bishops of Seret were formally subordinate to the Hungarian Archdiocese of Kalocsa).\(^{40}\) Mazovia and Moldova were considered due to the legal character of the relations between the lords of those fiefdoms and Polish monarchs.\(^{41}\) Thus, in total there were 17 episcopal nominations strictly within the borders of the Kingdom of Poland and Lithuania. It is worth noting that the Archdiocese of Gniezno contained 5 most prestigious and wealthiest episcopal sees in the Polish-Lithuanian territory, with cathedrals situated in Gniezno, Kraków, Włocławek, Poznań and Vilnius. In the Archdiocese of Halych, established as late as 1375, impecunious and still in its formative stage, diocesan sees included: archdiocesan Halych (with archbishops usually residing in Lviv), and Chełm, Przemyśl and Volodymyr both low-ranking benefices and bishoprics, as long as this did not go against his own policy. In fact, Boniface IX had no intention of giving up his prerogatives in the area, as proved by the preconization of Maffiolus de Lampugnano for the bishopric of Kraków without consultation with the Polish court. At the same time, the Pope’s goodwill in response to Jadwiga’s requests with regard to lower rank benefices can certainly be seen in the queen’s multiple supplications which were dealt with by the Curia favourably and expeditiously. See BP, Vol. 3, Nos. 92–93, 108, 116, 119–120, 122, 194, 317, 360.

\(^{38}\) Adam Sachetnik [Czesław Skowron], “Prośba świętej Jadwigi królowej o pierwszy odpust jubileuszowy w Polsce,” in *Dzieło Jadwigi i Jagielly w sześćsetlecie chrztu Litwy i jej związków z Polską*, compiled by Wojciech Biliński (Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Archidiecezji Warszawskiej, 1989), 261; Graff, “Osobowość,” 536–556.

\(^{39}\) *Annales*, X, 232–233.

\(^{40}\) Salina, *Polityka*, 72–73; Władysław Abraham, “Biskupstwa łącinnie w Mołdawii w wiekach XIV i XV,” *Kwartalnik Historyczny* 16 (1902): 172–207.

\(^{41}\) The matter pertains to the election of 3 consecutive bishops of Płock and 2 bishops of Moldova during Jadwiga’s reign.
However, suffragan bishops did not always stay in their dioceses, sometimes serving as auxiliary bishops in another area (e.g. bishops of Volodymyr performed this function in the Archdiocese of Prague). Theoretically, in the Archdiocese of Halych there were also bishops who were yet to become local archbishop’s suffragans, e.g. the bishops of Kiev (Kijów), Lviv (Lwów) and Kamianets-Podilskyi (Kamieniec), actually functioning as titular hierarchs and auxiliary bishops in wealthier Polish dioceses or elsewhere. It would be interesting to first discuss episcopal appointments which are most extensively covered in available sources.

During Jadwiga’s reign there were 2 provisions issued with regard to the Archcathedral of Gniezno, i.e. in 1389 for Jan Kropidło and 1394 for Dobrogost of Nowy Dwór, the latter with connections to the Polish royal court. Both hierarchs were translated from another bishopric, namely Kropidło was moved from the bishopric of Włocławek and Dobrogost from the bishopric of Poznań. Of special interest are the circumstances surrounding the translations, such as the conflict between the Kraków court and Władysław of Opole (Kropidło’s paternal uncle). Competition for formally the most prominent position in the Polish church had begun after Archbishop Bodzęta’s death in December 1388. Initially, Władysław of Opole proved more effective, since it was thanks to his influence with the Curia that Urban VI moved Władysław’s nephew from the bishop’s seat in Włocławek to the position of the Archbishop of Gniezno. Długosz held that Kropidło showed little consideration for the king’s permission or consent, neither did he pay attention to the fact that the Chapter had elected another candidate – thus hurting the elect proposed by the king. Krzysztof Ożóg wrote that the move had not been approved by the king, and “certainly not by Jadwiga, since the royal couple supported Dobrogost of Nowy Dwór, former Bishop of Poznań.” Jan Drabina shares Ożóg’s view of the situation. The problem is that the

42 On the Polish bishops’ order or precedence see also: Graff, Episkopat, 85–132.
43 Prokop, Biskupi pomocniczy, passim; Paweł Czaplewski, “Tytularny episkopat w Polsce średniowiecznej,” Roczniki Towarzystwa Przyjaciół Nauk Poznańskiego 40 (1913): 91–162; 43 (1915): 67–164.
44 Fijałek, Ustalenie, 33–34.
45 BP, Vol. 3, No. 200; Acta Bonifacii papae IX, ed. Edmund Długopolski, in Monumenta Poloniae Vaticana, Vol. 8 (Kraków: Polska Akademia Umiejętności, 1939–1946), No. 185; Liedtke, “Jan Kropidło,” 436–438.
46 Annales, X, 179–180; Długosz, Vitae, 366.
47 Ożóg, “Jadwiga,” 54.
48 Drabina, Papiestwo–Polska, 26, 32.
Queen Jadwiga of Anjou's influence on the composition of the Polish episcopate

sources do not mention Jadwiga's will in the matter. Długosz himself only wrote about the king's insistence and the favourable response of Pope Boniface IX, who was anxious that Jagiełło would defy papal authority. The chronicler also pointed to Jagiełło's hostility towards Kropidło, whose appointment infuriated the monarch, so after Bodzenta's death the king *magno indignacionis nubilo contra illum furente a Gneznensi exclusus*. On that occasion, Jadwiga probably did not object to steps taken by her husband with the aid of his advisors. In any case, her name is not mentioned in the bull of provision for Dobrogost as the Archbishop of Gniezno of 26th January 1394. The king also prevented Jan Kropidło's appointment for the bishopric of Poznań, in spite of the fact that the latter had obtained another provision on the same date on which Dobrogost was moved. This was far from simple, since the Pope transferred Jan on 31st July 1394 to the bishopric of Kamianets but allowing him to retain administration of the bishopric of Poznań. Jagiełło personally appeared in Poznań in 1395, when the Chapter announced 'Sede vacante', which meant that the bishop's seat had been vacated. As regards Kropidło, despite some scheming on part of the Teutonic Knights, the king ultimately caused the appointment of his notary and Prague master Mikołaj Kurowski for the seat of the Bishop of Poznań. On 13th June 1395 Kurowski already appeared as a bishop-postulate for the bishopric of Poznań, and he was granted the papal provision on 20th August the same year. At that point Kurowski had not yet received the highest degree of orders and had to travel to Rome in person to take care of his own affairs. Among surviving documents there is even an *Instrumentum*
procuratorii ad prosequendum postulacionem apud Sedem Apostolicam
and Jagiello's letter to the Pope in support of Kurowski, where the king's
intercession is clearly noticeable, but without any mention of Jadwiga.53
Note that Długosz in his account of those events in *Annales* erroneously
refers to the new Bishop of Poznań as “Dobrogost” instead of “Kurowski,”
despite the fact that several lines earlier he has already described the cir-
cumstances of Dobrogost’s appointment for the archbishopric of Gniezno
and commented that the Pope consented to the nomination, fearing that
Władysław Jagiełło would change his obedience.54

Queen Jadwiga must have been able to cooperate both with Dobro-
gost and Mikołaj Kurowski, even if Jagiełło had played a leading role
in their promotion. As noted by Robert Bubczyk, apart from Piotr Wysz
and Wojciech Jastrzębiec, it is Dobrogost and Kurowski who are featured
most frequently on the lists of members of the episcopate witnessing
documents issued by Jadwiga.55 Already in 1389, out of spite for Kropidło,
Jagiełło caused the Włocławek bishop’s seat to be conferred on Bishop
of Cambrai and Duke of Legnica Henryk VIII, a friend of Piotr Wysz

53 Cod. ep., I/1, No. 36; Władysław Seńko, *Piotr Wysz z Radolina i jego dzieło Speculum aureum* (Warszawa: Instytut Tomistyczny, 1996), 218–220.
54 *Annales*, X, 208; cf. correct information on Kurowski’s appointment: Długosz, *Vitae*, 503. The new Poznań bishop-elect was supposed to be the one who qui aput Hedwigim reginam Polonie familiaritatus fungebatur officio, which was translated into Polish as “the queen’s hofmeister.” In official documents, however, Jadwiga’s hofmeister is titled magister curie or hofmeyster. Nonetheless, neither Kurowski nor Dobrogost are men-
tioned with such a title in documents; perhaps it is a trace of the presence of one
of them in the queen’s nearest circle. See Grażyna Rutkowska, “Urzędnicy królowej
Jadwigi Andegaweńskiej. Spis,” in *Nihil superfluum esse. Studia z dziejów średniowie-
cza ofiarowane profesor Jadwidze Krzyżaniakowej*, eds. Jerzy Strzelczyk, Józef Dobosz
(Poznań: UAM, 2000), 379–380. Citing Długosz, Irena Sulikowska-Kurasiowa also
attributes Kurowski with the function of hofmeister in her *Dokumenty królewskie*,
223, No. 60. The publishers of “Annales” did not rectify the chronicler’s mistake (men-
tioning Dobrogost instead of Kurowski and confusing both bishops’ biographies).
Robert Bubczyk unquestioningly copies the error in his “Charakterystyka współrzą-
dów Jadwigi Andegaweńskiej i Władysława II Jagiełły w Polsce,” *Annales Universitatis
Mariæ Curie–Skłodowska, Sectio F* 52/53 (1997–1998): 37, footnote 57, claiming that
in 1394 Dobrogost, the queen’s hofmeister became Bishop of Poznań, although the
context of Długosz’s narration indisputably suggests that it was Kurowski.

55 Bubczyk, “Charakterystyka,” 42.
from the royal court, which took place in accordance with the papal bull issued before 15 October 1389.\textsuperscript{56} One may only speculate that Piotr Wysz, Jadwiga’s trusted man, may have had a modicum of influence on the candidature put forward by her husband.\textsuperscript{57} Moreover, in 1399 Jagiełło went as far as to have Kropidło imprisoned when the latter was travelling disguised as a merchant to assume another bishopric, i.e. the one in Chełmno, following his translation from Kamięń Pomorski.\textsuperscript{58}

The appointment of Andrzej Jastrzębiec, a Franciscan from Lesser Poland, for the post of the Bishop of Vilnius was clearly a sign of the royal couple’s cooperation, linked to the Christianization of Lithuania commenced in 1387. Jastrzębiec had formerly been a hierarch in Seret (Moldova), and the supplication in favour of his candidature was submitted by both the king and the queen, as noted by Pope Urban VI in March 1388 (Andrzej Jastrzębiec actually became Bishop of Vilnius 2-3 years later).\textsuperscript{59} Nevertheless, drawing from Długosz’s account, some researchers suggest that Andrzej’s translation from Seret to Vilnius was only possible thanks to the king’s intercession.\textsuperscript{60} This opinion is voiced, among others, by

\textsuperscript{56} *Annales*, X, 179; Długosz *Vitae*, 532–533; Bronisław Włodarski, “Henryk,” in PSB, Vol. 9, 419; Jerzy Sperka, *Wojny Władysława Jagiełły z księciem opolskim Władysławem (1391–1396)* (Cieszyn: Polskie Towarzystwo Historyczne, 2003), 20, 35; cf. Graff, *Episkopat*, 155–156. Please note that Jerzy Sperka “understood the loss of the Włocławek bishopric by Duke of Opole Jan Kropidło in favour of Henryk as a natural consequence of his attempts to become Archbishop of Gniezno after Bodzanta’s death. In any case, the steps were to be taken with the support of Władysław of Opole. Sperka also suggests that in spite of Jagiełło’s approval the relations between the monarch and Henryk, the new Bishop of Włocławek, were far from harmonious, since the latter took an oath of allegiance to the king in 1394 […]. However, Sperka’s interpretation may not reflect reality, as the oath may have been merely a kind of collateral, some reassurance for Polish court in the sensitive period of its struggle with Władysław of Opole. Also Jan Kropidło’s attitude during this time is a distinct proof that despite his bad relations with Jagiełło, Kropidło was perfectly able to tread a delicate path to make the biggest possible political gains.” On Henryk’s oath of allegiance see *Codex Diplomaticus Regni Poloniae et Magni Ducatus Lithuaniae*, ed. Maciej Dogiel, Vol. 4 (Vilnae: s.n., 1764), No. 69.

\textsuperscript{57} Likewise Ożóg, “Jadwiga,” 54: “Jadwiga may also have taken part in this operation through Piotr Wysz.”

\textsuperscript{58} Fijałek, *Ustalenie*, 37; Liedtke, “Jan Kropidło,” 437.

\textsuperscript{59} *Codex diplomaticus ecclesiae cathedralis necnon dioecesis Vilnensis* [henceforth: KDKW], Vol. 1, eds. Jan Fijałek, Władysław Semkowicz (Cracowiae: Akademia Umiejętności, 1932–1948), No. 10; BP, Vol. 3, No. 51; Krystyna Pieradzka, “Andrzej,” in PSB, Vol. 1, 102–103; Prokop, *Biskupi pomocniczy*, 189–191; Ożóg, “Jadwiga,” 60–61; Abraham, *Powstanie*, 285–287; Czaplewski, “Tytularny episkopat,” 139–143; Marcin Sepiał, “Krag rodzinny Andrzeja herbu Jastrzębiec biskupa Wilna 1388–1398,” *Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego. Prace Historyczne* 128 (2001): 71–78; cf. Marek D. Kowalski, “Nieznaný dokument papieski dla Andrzeja, pierwszego biskupa Seretu i Wilna, i powstanie biskupstwa wileńskiego,” *Studia Żródlznawcze* 53 (2015): 123–134.

\textsuperscript{60} *Annales*, X, 163.
Jan Fijałek and more recently by Krzysztof R. Prokop. Other authors, e.g. Krystyna Pieradzka, and the aforementioned Jadwiga Stabińska, Rev. Bolesław Przybyszewski and Wanda Maciejewska credit only Jadwiga with Jastrzębiec’s transfer to Vilnius.

However, the best-known instance of the royal couple’s joint interference with the nomination of a Polish bishop was the dispute between Pope Boniface and the Kraków Chapter over the successor to the seat of the Bishop of Kraków after Jan Radlica’s death in January 1392. Disregarding Jadwiga and Jagiełło, the Chapter elected Sieciej of Chmielnik, which was supposedly in line with the intentions of the Kurozwęcki family; meanwhile, the Pope placed Maffiolus de Lampugnano, Archbishop of Messsina, on the seat of the Bishop of Kraków. None of those steps could have been approved by Jadwiga or Jagiełło due to the rank of Poland’s second bishopric. The royal couple wanted the position to be filled by Piotr Wysz, a doctor of both laws educated in Prague and Padua, queen’s chancellor since 1391 and initiator of the restoration of the University of Kraków. Paradoxically, as we know, he was also close to the Pope, who several months earlier had made him his confidant in his communications with Jadwiga. Eventually, the royal couple prevailed in the diplomatic scuffle, taking advantage of the fact that Henryk, Bishop of Płock, fell in love with Vytautas’s (Witold’s) sister Rimgailė (Ryngałła), and the Pope was able to move Maffiollus to the vacant bishopric in Mazovia.
The decision was presumably influenced by the mission of Polish diplomats Wojciech Jastrzębiec and Piotr Strzelicz to Rome\(^\text{69}\) as well as some intercession on part of a cardinal, perhaps Cosimo di Migliorati, who supported Wysz in the Curia.\(^\text{70}\) In line with the will of the monarchs, the Kraków Chapter finally proposed Piotr Wysz as their candidate following Sieciej of Chmielnik's resignation,\(^\text{71}\) and Pope Boniface IX preconized Wysz as the Bishop of Kraków on 4th December 1392.\(^\text{72}\) In the preconization document the Pope did not mention any pressure exerted by the royal couple in the matter. Still, for Długosz, who probably drew from local accounts, the situation left no room for doubt. In his *Kalendarz krakowski*, the chronicler wrote: *Cui Petrus Visch de Radolina, quamvis Sethegius de Chmyelik cantor Visliciensis et canonicus Cracoviensis fuisset canonice electus, succedit per suffragia Wladislai Polonie regis et Hedwigis regine.*\(^\text{73}\) Similarly, in *Katalog biskupów krakowskich* he mentioned the royal couple's pressure on the Pope in the matter: *Et licet Bonifatius papa nonus quendam Manisiolum Romanum nepotem suum germanum in Cracouiensem episcopum promouisset, resistente tamen Wladislao rege et Hedwigi regina, cassata sua promotione.*\(^\text{74}\) In this particular case, Długosz also mentioned Jadwiga's anger, since the queen was frustrated with the Chapter's failure to provide her with food during her stay in the episcopal village of Jaksicie, an event which supposedly contributed to the nomination of Piotr Wysz: *Propter quod Hedwigis regina Poloniae occasione habita, quasi in villagio Jaxicze episcopali parum sufficienter fuisset necessariis procurata indignatione concipiens Petrum Wisch utriusque iuris doctorem, cancellarium suum, promouere ad sedem Cracoviensem in animum induxit.*\(^\text{75}\) One may conjecture that Jadwiga influenced the Chapter's decision through Nawoj of Tęczyn, brother of her close collaborator Jan of Tęczyn, chatelain of Wojnicz, and through other canons from her nearest circle.\(^\text{76}\) Interestingly, there is an extant note containing

---

\(^{69}\) Biblioteka Jagiellońska [henceforth: BJ] MS. 191, sheet 312r; 723, k. 169v–170r; Seńko, *Piotr Wysz*, 279; *Elementa ad fontium editiones*, I: *Polonica ex libris “Obligationum et solutionum” Camaeræ Apostolicae ab a. 1373*, collegit Ioannes Lisowski (Romae: Institutum Historicum Polonicum Romae, 1960), Nos. 50, 86.

\(^{70}\) Cod. ep., Vol. 2, No. 24; Gębarowicz, *Psalterz*, 23–25.

\(^{71}\) BJ, MS 326, sheet 103v–104r.

\(^{72}\) BP, Vol. 3, No. 320; KDKK, Vol. 2, No. 390; *Annales*, X, 192, 195–196; Seńko, *Piotr Wysz*, 297.

\(^{73}\) *Najdawniejsze roczniki krakowskie i kalendarz*, 112–113.

\(^{74}\) Długosz, *Vitae*, 420

\(^{75}\) Ibidem.

\(^{76}\) Ożóg, “Spór,” 11–12.
a description of those turbulent events and the indignation of one of the members of the Chapter at the royal couple’s course of action.77 Whatever the balance of forces in the 1392 appointment for the Bishop of Kraków, it is very unlikely that Jadwiga acted on her own in support of her chancellor Wysz. Aware of the value of Wysz’s candidature, Jagiełło could have accepted it, even if he himself wanted a different person in the bishopric of Kraków.78 Jadwiga’s respect for Piotr Wysz was visible in her efforts to bestow a red hat on him, as evidenced in her letters to a cardinal on this subject.79

The claim that Jadwiga was sometimes unable to successfully push her candidate is proved by the case of Mikołaj Gorzkowski, a Prague doctor of canon law, whom the queen, according to Długosz, failed to make Bishop of Vilnius after Andrzej Jastrzębiec’s death in 1398.80 According to the chronicler, Gorzkowski was a pious man of many virtues and hunc quidem virum Hedvigis Polonie regina dum viveret pri dilatacione fidei sollicita, mortuo, primo episcopo Vilnensi Andrea, pro sua virtute substitutire decreverat.81 Nevertheless, Jagiełło and Vytautas preferred Jakub Plichta, a Franciscan, according to some researchers probably due to his surname and background as a Franciscan lector in Kraków, a Pole, yet in the light of accounts on the election a vicarium Lythuaniae, eiusdemque nationis et lingue was chosen.82 Długosz believed that Jadwiga’s plan to make Gorzkowski Bishop of Vilnius did not materialise only because of her sudden death: Sed eius piissimum propositum immatura mors impedivit,83 which is misleading in that Plichta’s predecessor Andrzej

77 BJ, MS 461, f. 154v: Ego D. attendens et considerans, quod P. quem proponitis eligere in episcopum Cracoviensem, est periiurii vel falsi cessionis vel adulterii crimen irrestitutus quodque est publice de tali crimine infamatus vel excommunicatus. Que vobis denuntio, apollo ad sedem apostolicam, ne vos alii gravati concanonici mei ad electionem ipsius accedere accepiet et apostolos peto instanter, instantius et instantissime, c. Constitutus, De electione, Statuimus et cum in multis; cf. Seńko, Piotr Wysz, 297.
78 Ożóg, “Spór,” 10.
79 Cod. ep., Vol. 2, No. 24; Nikodem, Jadwiga, 361; Gębarowicz, Psalterz, 23–25.
80 “Gorzkowski Mikołaj” (ed.), in PSB, Vol. 8, 336–337; Marceli Antoniewicz, “O pochodzeniu i rodzinie biskupa wileńskiego Mikołaja zwanego Gorzkowskim,” Zeszyty Historyczne 2 (1994): 137–153; Wiesiołowski, “Episkopat,” Annex, 290–291; Graff, Episkopat, passim; Ożóg, “Jadwiga,” 61–62.
81 Annales, X–XI 1406–1412, (Varsaviae: PWN, 1997), 26–27.
82 KDKW, No. 34; Czesław Baran, “Plichta Jakub,” in PSB, Vol. 26, 734; Fijałek, “Uchwała, passim; Ożóg, “Jadwiga,” 61–62.
83 Annales, X–XI 1406–1412, 27.
Jastrzębiec died on 14th November 1398 and the decision to nominate the Bishop of Vilnius had to be made immediately that year, i.e. when the queen was still alive, and accepted by her. As requested by Jagiello and Vytautas, Jakub Plichta was elected by the Vilnius Chapter as early as on 1st December 1398 with Jagiello and Vytautas’s consent. Already on 5th May 1399, Paduan Doctor of Law Jan (Janusz) of Lubień handled the matter of paying the provision fee on his behalf. Therefore, Czesław Baran was rather imprecise in his claim that Plichta was “put forward by Vytautas” as a counter-candidate for Gorzkowski, who was proposed by the Polish royal court. Jerzy Ochmański also erred in his suggestion that the new Bishop of Vilnius “was presumably […] Vytautas’s cardinal, since Jadwiga during her life wished to place Mikołaj of Gorzków in the Vilnius Bishop’s seat, and he would have gained the support of Jagiello himself.” Leaving aside a bizarre interjection by Ochmański, too firmly based on Długosz, who wrote that the during her life the queen wanted to place Gorzkowski in that position, as if it were possible after her death in the first place, we should abandon this particular train of thought. This is confirmed by a clear message in the source on Plichta’s election as well as Jagiello and Vytautas’s agreement on the matter. Obviously, Vytautas could have been first to propose the candidate. As we know, the queen tried, even against her own will, to carry out a common ecclesiastical policy with her husband. In the face of tensions in Lithuania, several months after Vytautas had struck an agreement with the Teutonic Knights on the island of Salin, Jadwiga was perfectly aware that she could not afford to raise ostentatious and politically harmful objections in this matter (relations with her husband were also a factor in this case). Her objection would mean breaking an already fragile thread of understanding between the Kraków court and Vytautas, who at that time was preparing his ambitious eastern plans, dreaming of subjugating the Grand Duchy of Moscow.

84 KDKW, No. 34: Plichta was elected by the Chapter’s decision *nullo penitus discordante nec coacti nec compulsi divina favente clementia, ex consensu serenissimi principis domini Vladislai Dei gracia regis Polonie summi principis Lythuanie et heredis Russie et fundatoris, ac illustri Allexandri alias Vitowti ducis Lythuanie et Russie terrarum.*

85 Władysław Abraham, “Sprawozdanie z poszukiwań w archiwach i bibliotekach rzymskich do dziejów Polski w wiekach średnich za lata 1899–1913,” in Archiwum Komisji Historycznej, s. II, Vol. 1 (Kraków: Polska Akademia Umiejętności, 1923), 26.

86 Baran, “Plichta,” 734.

87 Ochmański, Biskupstwo wileńskie, 12–13.

88 Cf. Jarosław Nikodem, Witold Wielki Książę Litewski (1354 lub 1355 – 27 października 1430) (Kraków: Avalon, 2013), 179–187.
It is likely that Queen Jadwiga also failed in her attempts to promote Andrzej Łaskarzyc, a lawyer educated in Padua, her chancellor (1396–1397), who after Henryk’s death was elected bishop by the Włocławek Chapter on 12th December 1398.\(^{89}\) Obviously, we may speak of failure only if Łaskarzyc’s election was inspired by Jadwiga, which seems highly probable. Again, however, we may only speculate on this. In any case, Jagiełło’s influence and will finally prevailed. The king preferred another candidate to his wife’s chancellor, let alone Kropidło, who also hoped to receive this bishopric. By the will of Jagiełło, the seat was ultimately taken by royal protonotary Mikołaj Kurowski, formerly Bishop of Poznań, in spite of the fact that it was the Pope who formally reserved the right to nominate a bishop after Henryk’s death.\(^{90}\) Nevertheless, Boniface IX tried to right the wrong that Łaskarzyc had experienced, allowing him to derive income from the bishopric of Włocławek until Andrzej became bishop.\(^{91}\) Perhaps Jadwiga’s attempt to elevate Łaskarzyc, Piotr Wysz’s close relative, was some form of compensation for the loss of his former position to Wojciech Jastrzębiec, who became the queen’s new chancellor\(^{92}\) and quickly won the royal couple’s favour. It was Jastrzębiec who acted as the royal envoy to Pope Boniface IX in 1399 and allowed them to obtain the Pope’s consent to be the godfather of the future royal baby.\(^{93}\) During his stay in Rome, on 16th April, Jastrzębiec (an alumnus of

\(^{89}\) Fijałek, *Ustalenie*, 43, 90–91; Abraham, “Sprawozdanie z poszukiwań (1888),” 32; Karol Piotrowicz, “Andrzej Łaskarz,” in PSB, Vol. 1, 103–106; Marian Frontczyk, “Andrzej Łaskarz z Gosławic herbu Godziemba biskup poznański,” *Nasza Przeszłość* 30 (1969), 129–130; Krzysztof Ożóg: “Udział Andrzeja Łaskarzyca w sprawach i sporach polsko–krzyżackich,” in *Polska i jej sąsiedzi w późnym średniowieczu*, eds. Krzysztof Ożóg, Stanisław Szczur (Kraków: Societas Vistulana, 2000), 162–163; see also Rutkowska, “Urzędnicy,” 377; Graff, *Episkopat, Henrikus indicem*; Wiesiołowski, “Episkopat,” Annex, 278–279; Nowacki, *Dzieje archidiecezji poznańskiej*, Vol. 2, 80–81; Jurek, *Biskupstwo poznańskie*, 326–328; Andrzej Łaskarz dyplomata, duchowny 1362–1426 (Konin: Setidava, 2015).

\(^{90}\) Długosz, *Vitae*, 533–534; Fijałek, *Ustalenie*, 37, 43; KDW, Vol. 3, No. 2001, BP, Vol. 3, No. 591.

\(^{91}\) Abraham, “Sprawozdanie z poszukiwań (1888),” 32; BP, Vol.3, No. 650.

\(^{92}\) The circumstances of that particular change in the office of the queen’s chancellor, together with Bishop Piotr Wysz’s temporary removal from authority, which affected the opening of the restored university, are yet to be fully explained in research. We should add that the queen’s behaviour at that time was perceived by some as a sign of depression due to the absence of the expected pregnancy. See e.g. Gębarowicz, *Psalterz*, 63–66.

\(^{93}\) Jadwiga Krzyżaniakowa, “Wojciech Jastrzębiec,” in *Wielkopolski Słownik Biograficzny*, 832–833; eadem, Kancelaria królewska, 51–62; Grażyna Lichończak-Nurek, Wojciech herbu Jastrzębiec. Arcybiskup i mąż stanu (ok. 1362–1436) (Kraków: PAT, 1996); Korytowski, *Arcybiskupi*, Vol. 2, 76–146; idem, *Prątaci i kanonicy*, Vol. 2, 189; Władysław
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a presently unknown university), was granted a papal bull under which Kurowski was to be transferred to the seat of the Bishop of Włocławek, as well as his own provision for the bishopric of Poznań. It is likely that at that time, together with Janusz of Lubień, he requested provision for Jakub Plichta, Bishop of Vilnius. However, on 5th May of the same year, in a letter to the royal couple the Pope referred to him the “Poznań elect.”\footnote{Annales, X, 225, 230–231; Długosz, Vitae, 506; BP, Vol. 3, Nos. 591, 601–602, 604–605; KDW, Vol. 3, No. 2001; Vetera, Vol. 1, No. 1041; KDKK, Vol. 2, No. 237; Fijałek, Ustalenie, 43–44; Abraham, “Sprawozdanie z poszukiwań (1923),” 26; Kłapkowski, Działalność, 3–4; Lichończak–Nurek, Wojciech herbu Jastrzębiec, 27.} Tomasz Jurek claims that Wojciech so effectively performed his mission of an envoy with regard to the christening of the royal child and Kurowski’s translation “that the Pope himself nominated him for the vacant bishopric of Poznań – which obviously had to be agreed in advance with the monarch.”\footnote{Jurek, Biskupstwo poznańskie, 322.} This sentence suggests that this nomination for the seat of the bishop was surprising even to Jastrzębiec himself. In reality, leaving for Rome, Wojciech could hope for the best,\footnote{According to Władysław Kłapkowski, Jastrzębiec left for Rome already as the Poznań elect, which is presumably the author’s reminiscence due to the fact that Jastrzębiec had been dubbed as such by the Pope in a letter of 5th May 1399 to Jagiełło (KDKK, Vol. 2, No. 437). See Kłapkowski, Działalność, 3; cf. Fijałek, Ustalenie, 44.} since he his was supported as a candidate both by Jadwiga and Jagiełło rather than only by the king, as claimed e.g. by Jadwiga Krzyżaniakowa.\footnote{Krzyżaniakowa, Wojciech Jastrzębiec, 832.} However, in the light of Długosz’s Annales, Kurowski’s translation and the provision for Jastrzębiec were possible only thanks to Jagiełło’s efforts (i.e. as held by Jurek and Krzyżaniakowa). According to the chronicler, the monarch was indifferent to the requests of dukes of Opole concerning Jan Kropidło’s return to Włocławek.\footnote{Annales, X, 225.} On the other hand, in Vitae episcoporum Długosz clearly mentions both the queen’s and the king’s involvement in Jastrzębiec’s case. Wojciech was supposedly promoted on their request: \textit{ad instantiam et intercessionem Vladislai secundi Poloniae Regis, et Hedvigis consortis suae Poloniae Reginae, apud quam Cancellariatus officio fungebatur, et in quem propensioni favore utebatur, ad ecclesiam...}
Długosz’s second opinion may echo certain accounts on both monarchs’ support in promoting Jastrzębiec to the bishopric. Whether the official (unknown as of today) letters of recommendation for Wojciech or the oral request mention the names of both monarchs as referees, or they name only king as the referee, is a matter of secondary importance. It is obvious that Jagiello supported Wojciech and appreciated his achievements, considering him a valuable advisor and diplomat. Undoubtedly, being the queen’s chancellor, Jastrzębiec also enjoyed her favours in his endeavours to become Bishop of Poznań, albeit the king’s will and opinion were decisive in this matter. Władysław took initiative in deciding on the appointments for major and prestigious Polish bishoprics i.e. the so-called big politics, which Jadwiga accepted and tried not to object publicly to her husband’s plans for episcopal nominations. Jarosław Nikodem was thus correct in asserting that “there was no difference in opinion between the king and the queen in terms of ecclesiastical policy.”

Any impact the royal couple may have had on the appointment of the Bishop of Płock at that time remains a mystery. It seems that the dukes of Mazovia, the local chapter and local political deals were normally the key factors considered by the Pope when making such a decision. Oddly, before March 1390 the Chapter elected Henryk Duke of Mazovia for the office of the Bishop of Płock, and Henryk had only been conferred subdiaconate orders. He was preconized by the Pope on 18th March 1390, as of the right the latter had previously reserved. Interestingly, information of this act was sent, in a customary manner, to Jagiello but not to Jadwiga. From other sources we learn that the Polish king later on used Henryk to establish contacts with Vytautas and in the talks with the Teutonic Order. Was it therefore not only the request of the dukes of Mazovia, as argued by Danuta Poppe and Anna Salina, or even the supplication of the Płock Chapter, as formally stated by Boniface IX, but also a veiled message on part of the king that played a role in the duke’s appointment? In any case, Henryk, holder of the title electus confirmatus Plocensis nec non dux Masovie, himself delayed the consecration, and finally decided

99 Długosz, *Vitae*, 504–505.
100 Nikodem, “Jadwiga,” 222, 360–362, 399–401; cf. Drabina, *Papiestwo–Polska*, 30–31.
101 Nikodem, “Jadwiga,” 360.
102 Abraham, “Sprawozdanie z poszukiwań (1888),” 30–31; *Acta Bonifacii*, No. 103 A; BP, Vol. 3, Nos. 237–238.
103 Poppe, “Henryk,” 413–414; Salina, *Polityka*, 234–235.
to marry Rimgailė without waiting for papal dispensation.\(^\text{104}\) As we know, this paved the way for Maffiolus, who became Bishop of Płock, having formally been transferred by Pope Boniface from the bishopric of Kraków in 1392, following a heated dispute with the royal couple over the appointment. After Maffiolus’s death, Jakub Kurdwanowski was preconized for the bishopric of Płock on 31st July 1396. Kurdwanowski was educated as a Doctor of Law and auditor of the Roman Rota, a person outside of the political deal of Mazovia, initially not accepted by the dukes of Płock, who clearly did not have any say in his elevation.\(^\text{105}\) As previously mentioned, Leszek Zygner and Anna Salina are almost certain that Jadwiga and Jagiełło supported Jakub, which cannot be ruled out entirely (note that the Pope informed the king but not the queen of the preconization). Nevertheless, in absence of relevant sources, we are left only with speculations and the fact that Kurdwanowski himself was highly influential with the Curia and stayed in Rome as Boniface IX made his decision.\(^\text{106}\)

In the second part of the present discussion, we shall take a closer look at Jadwiga’s potential influence on episcopal nominations in Ruthenia as well as the Diocese of Seret in Moldova. Back then, the structures of the Roman Catholic Church in Ruthenia were still in a formative stage, and a lot of activity in the region was mostly of missionary character, mainly with the support of the Franciscan and Dominican orders. Theoretically, diocesan borders in Ruthenia overlapped with the borders of Orthodox dioceses. Thus, nominees came mostly from the mendicant orders, were often of plebeian background, and did not play any major political role, except for the Archbishop of Halych and the Bishop of Przemyśl. They usually held the function of an auxiliary bishop, e.g. in the Archdiocese of Gniezno.\(^\text{107}\) We may theoretically assume that Jagiełło might have

\(^{104}\) Nikodem, “Jadwiga,” 290; Jasiński, “Henryk,” 160–161.

\(^{105}\) BP, Vol. 3, No. 451; Annales, X, 216–217; Aleksander Świeżawski, “Jakub z Korzkwi,” in PSB, Vol. 10, 357–358.

\(^{106}\) Zygner, Biskup, 59–63, 271; idem, “Początki kariery kościołowej Jakuba z Kurdwanowa herbu Syrokomla,” in Duchowieństwo kapitulne w Polsce średniowiecznej i wczesnowożytnej, ed. Andrzej Radzimiński (Toruń: UMK, 2000), 197–214; Salina, Polityka, 73; cf. Tomasz Graff, “Review of: Leszek Zygner, Biskup Jakub z Kurdwanowa herbu Syrokomla (ok. 1350–1425),” in Kwartalnik Historyczny (pending publication).

\(^{107}\) Paweł Kielar, “Studia nad kulturą szkolną i intelektualną dominikanów prowincji polskiej w średniowieczu,” in Studia nad historią dominikanów w Polsce, Vol. 1, ed. Jerzy Kloczowski (Warszawa: Polska Praw. Dominikanów, 1975), 350 et seq., 485; Abraham Powstanie, 299; idem, Początki arcybiskupstwa łacińskiego we Lwowie (Lwów: Tow. Miłośników Przeszłości Lwowa, 1909),16–17; idem, “Biskupstwa łacińskie w Mołdawii,” 172–207; Trajdos, Kościół katolicki na ziemiach ruskich, 150–151; Prokop, Biskupi pomocniczy, passim.
been more acquiescent to Jadwiga’s suggestions with regard to episcopal nominations in less prestigious Ruthenian bishoprics. Both Jadwiga and Jagiełło enjoyed particularly good relations with the mendicant orders, especially with the Dominicans.108 Anyway, sources concerning episcopal promotions to Ruthenian and Seret seats are scant, and little is known of the circumstances of episcopal nominations; consequently, researchers tend to intuitively assumed that the royal couple put forward their own candidates for those offices.109 Are their assumptions correct? After all, Jagiełło or Jadwiga were yet to gain full control over episcopal seats in Ruthenia, for their authority was likely limited only to the nominations of the Archbishop of Halych and the Bishop of Przemyśl (Stefan, Bishop of Chelm, whose nomination was supported by Władysław of Opole’s support had been active from the 1380s). At that time, many matters in the organisation of the Church were still fluid and not provided for by law.110 As Władysław Abraham rightly points out, in 1390 Pope Boniface IX, based on an account provided by the Archbishop of Halych, even concluded that: *quod debiti modus et forma divini officii celebrandi in eadem Haliciensi et cathedralibus ac aliis sibi subjectis ecclesiis dicte provincie non servabantur, nec suffraganei dicte Haliciensis ecclesie residencebant in cathedralibus ecclesiis.*111 In the same year, Eryk, Bishop of Przemyśl complained about the Orthodox schismatics taking over the cathedral, saying that *nullus unquam ante nos personaliter katholicus sponsus scilicet pontifex habitavit* in his diocese.112

Paweł Kielar OP argues that Jadwiga and Jagiełło, whenever they could, actively supported the Roman Catholic Church in organisation across Ruthenia and elsewhere. According to Kielar, “The King and Queen Jadwiga promoted and set tasks for the Dominican mission.”113 To verify this claim, let us analyse specific examples of episcopal appointments in the region. During Jadwiga’s reign from 1384 to 1386 and her joint reign with Jagiełło from 1386 to 1399, there were only 4 instances of episcopal nominations in the Archdiocese of Halych, two of which were

---

108 Maciejewska, *Jadwiga*, 124–133.
109 E.g. Abraham, *Jakub*, 9; Trajdos, *Kościół katolicki na ziemiach ruskich*, 150.
110 Jan Fijałek, “Biskupstwa wołyńskie Polski i Litwy w swych początkach,” in *Sprawozdanie Akademii Umiejętności, Wydz. Hist.-Filoz., za kwiecień 1911* (Kraków: Akademia Umiejętności, 1912), 9–21.
111 Abraham, *Powstanie*, 291; for the text, see *Akta grodzkie i ziemskie z czasów Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej z archiwum tzw. Bernardyńskiego we Lwowie* [henceforth: AGZ], Vol. 3, eds. Oktaw Pietruski, Xsawery Liske (Lwów: Seyfarth, Czajkowski, 1872), No. 51.
112 Abraham, *Powstanie*, 291, 294; text AGZ, Vol. 8, No. 20.
113 Kielar, *Studia*, 350.
for the archbishopric of Halych: Bernard (1380/85–90) and Jakub Strepa (1391–1409); one for the bishopric of Przemyśl (Maciej (1392–1419); one in Volodymyr (Włodzimierz) (Mikołaj, ca. 1390–1400). The list should include the provision for Bishop of Lviv Jerzy (1391–1401), although in legal terms, under the papal bull establishing the Archdiocese of Halych in 1375, he was not a suffragan to the Archbishop of Halych; thus, to all intents and purposes, we may treat him as a titular bishop. Moreover, the bishops of Kiev also worked in the region, but in fact their positions were also titular, e.g. Mikołaj from the Dominican Order witnessed a failed attempt to make Siemowit III king of Poland in 1383. Little is known of those bishops; there are issues with determining the duration of their pontificates or even disputes over their names (e.g. some claim that during Jadwiga’s reign there was also a bishop named Filip).114 We do not even know whether under Jadwiga there was any preconization for the Bishop of Kiev. The Diocese of Kiev became part of the metropolitan archdiocese, at that time referred to as the Archdiocese of Lviv, during Michał Trestka’s pontificate (1410–1429).115 The same can be said of the bishops of Kamianets, who in practice were also titular bishops. The history of the Diocese of Kamianets goes back to the early 1380s, when Dukes Koryatowicz requested the Roman Curia to establish a Catholic bishopric. After Bishop Rokozjusz or Roskosius (rather a legendary than real figure) died in 1398, he was to be succeeded by Aleksander, Bishop of Kamianets; however, there are signs that it was Aleksander who became the first Bishop of Kamianets ca. 1384, nominated by Demetrius, Cardinal and Archbishop of Esztregom, in connection with Hungarian

114 *Kronika Jana z Czarnkowa*, 130; see also Władysław Abraham, “Uzupełniony katalog dawnych łacińskich biskupów kijowskich,” *Collectanea Theologica* 18 (1937): 413–426; Tadeusz M. Trajdos, “Biskupi dominikanie w średniowiecznym Kijowie,” in *Klasztor w Kościele średniowiecznym i nowożytnym*, eds. Marek Derwich, Anna Pobóg–Lenartowicz (Warszawa–Wrocław–Opole, DiG, 2010), 65–108; Prokop, *Biskupi dominikanścy*, 42–44, 110–111; idem, *Biskupi kijowscy obrządku łacińskiego XIV–XVIII w. Szkice biograficzne* (Biły Dunajec–Ostróg: Wołanie z Wołynia, 2003), 17–20; idem, *Biskupi pomocniczy*, 337–338; 211–212; Ireneusz Wysokiński, “Kościół łaciński na ziemiach ruskich Korony i Litwy w początkach panowania Jagiellonów (in connection with a book by Tadeusz M. Trajdos entitled “Kościół katolicki na ziemiach ruskich Korony i Litwy za panowania Władysława II Jagiełły (1386–1434),” *Przegląd Historyczny* 76 (1985), 548–549; cf. Graff, *Episkopat*, 65–66 – which mentions Filip as the Bishop of Kiev (Kijów) from ca. 1406 to ca. 1410.

115 *BP*, Vol. 3, No. 1398: *ad provinciam Leopoliensem eccl. Premissliensis, Chełmensis, Camenecensis, Wlodimiriensis, Seretensis et Kyouiensis pertinere teneantur* (1412). See also: Abraham, *Początki*, 44–45; Graff, *Episkopat*, 53, 95.
in the absence of resources, it is pointless to look for any traces of Jadwiga’s involvement in the nomination for this bishopric. Interestingly, in a deed granting Podolia as a fiefdom to Spytko of Melsztyn (1395), the queen emphasised the importance of the fact that the land was to be ruled by a Catholic liegeman intensely loyal to the Crown. This was in contrast to the document issued by Jagiello, which was more neutral in terms of religious beliefs.

I have also omitted the nomination of Stefan, Bishop of Chełm from the Dominican Order, who was probably preconized thanks to king Louis and mostly due to the support of Władysław of Opole, governor of Ruthenia, already in the 1370s. The Polish court was definitely able to exert real influence on most episcopal nominations in Ruthenia only after 1387, i.e. after the re-annexation of Ruthenia following Jadwiga’s visit in the same year. For this reason, the appointment of Dominican friar Bernard for the seat of the Archbishop of Halych could have been, as already mentioned, the effect of the pressure of the Buda court and Władysław of Opole, or even Louis himself – since the date on which Bernard assumed his duties as the archbishop is unknown. Abraham refers to him as a “snake in the grass released by Hungarian authorities,” who would spend years abroad, and only appeared in Ruthenia to provoke fierce arguments. His predecessor Maciej appears as a witness in a document from October 1380, whereas Bernard as an archbishop is only mentioned in November 1385. Bernard’s trial was held before Eryk, Bishop of Przemyśl, and Cardinal Demetrius. The Pope summoned Jagiello to aid with the enforcement of the judgment (excommunication,
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116 Władysław Abraham, “Założenie biskupstwa łacińskiego w Kamieńcu Podolskim,” in Księga pamiątkowa ku uczceniui 250-tej rocznicy założenia Uniwersytetu Lwowskiego przez króla Jana Kazimierza r. 1661, Vol. 1 (Lwów: Uniwersytet Lwowski, 1912), 3–39; idem, “Aleksander,” in PSB, Vol. 1, 66; Tadeusz M. Trajdos, “Kościół katolicki na Podolu (1340–1434),” in Kamieniec Podolski. Studia z dziejów miasta i regionu, Vol. 1, ed. Feliks Kiryk (Kraków: AP, 2000), 129–157; Graff, Episkopat, 60.

117 Trajdos, Kościół katolicki na ziemich ruskich, 138–140; Nikodem, Jadwiga, 325–326.

118 Abraham, Powstanie, 353; Prokop, Biskupi pomocniczy, 297–299; Anna Sochacka, “Stefan,” in PSB, Vol. 43, 147–149. He was first approved as the Bishop of Chełm on 30th June 1383. He was an auxiliary bishop in the dioceses of Poznań and Włocławek. Sochacka speculates that his difficulties in managing the Diocese of Chełm were not only the result of insufficient funding but also Jagiello’s aversion to him as a protégée of Władysław of Opole.

119 Abraham, Jakób, 8; idem, Powstanie, 308–310.

120 Idem, Powstanie, 302–303.

121 Ibidem, 308.
forfeiture of income and suspension of archbishop’s authority), which, in the light of Bernard’s death paved the way for the preconization of a Ruthenian Franciscan vicar Jakub Strepa on 27th June 1391. Jakub Strepa was consecrated in Tarnów by Maciej, Bishop of Przemysł, Jadwiga’s chancellor. Although historiographers like to see it as a result of Jadwiga’s and Władysław’s influence, this could have equally been a fact from which we should not draw far-reaching conclusions. Nonetheless, Władysław Abraham even claims that “undoubtedly, the royal couple: noble and pious Jadwiga and ardent believer Jagiello” as well as their advisors took those matters into consideration. More recently, in line with Abraham’s another suggestion, Maciej Wilamowski assumes that Strepa’s consecration in Tarnów was meant to accentuate his connections with Ruthenian starost general Jan of Tarnów, who likely promoted him at the royal court. Sadly, due to scarcity of sources, we are again left only with speculations. On the other hand, it is rather unlikely that Strepa’s rise to the archbishopric of Halych was attributable only to his own creativity and potential influence with the Roman Curia, without any steps taken by the Kraków court. It is noteworthy that the Holy See formally reserved its exclusive right to nominate the Archbishop of Halych, yet the lack of any reaction on part of Polish diplomats or attempts to persuade Pope after the archbishopric was vacated following Bernard’s death would appear at least puzzling. Conversely, Jadwiga’s support for the nomination of Maciej of Sandomierz, the queen’s chancellor, as the new Bishop of Przemysł seems more obvious. Krzysztof Ożóg is convinced that Jadwiga’s influence as the cause of Maciej’s elevation; Tadeusz Trajdos expresses a similar view, arguing that Maciej “left for Przemysł at the request of his patron queen Jadwiga,” while Anna Strzelecka is more conservative, claiming that the Polish royal court must have had certain expectations. Unfortunately, although Jadwiga’s sup-

122 Ibidem, 309–311; idem, “Bernard,” in PSB, Vol. 1, 458; idem, Jakób, 21; idem, Początki, 17–22.
123 BP, Vol. 3, No. 231.
124 Annales, X, 198.
125 E.g. Ożóg, “Jadwiga,” 62. By analogy, we may equally discern Zbigniew Oleśnicki’s favourable disposition e.g. towards Grzegorz of Sanok. Although he was consecrated Archbishop of Lviv by Oleśnicki, the latter was not overly amicable towards Grzegorz.
126 W. Abraham, Jakób, 9
127 Maciej Wilamowski, Strepa (Strzemię) Jakub, in PSB, Vol.44, 319; cf. Abraham, Jakób, 21.
128 Ożóg, “Jadwiga,” 58.
129 Trajdos, “Polityka króla,” 326.
130 Anna Strzelecka, “Maciej,” in PSB, Vol. 19, 9.
port for her chancellor appears the most likely option, also in this case me may only rely on indirect accounts contained in available sources. A question worth asking is whether Boniface IX, by his preconization of Jadwiga’s chancellor, wished to compensate her for the anguish she suffered that year on account of the nomination for the bishopric of Kraków. In any event, Maciej eventually became Bishop of Przemyśl by the Chapter’s decision before 27th March 1392 and awaited the Pope’s bull of provision until 28th October the same year. He was a well-educated man; in addition to being Master of Arts, he held a baccalaureate in law from the University of Prague. He served as Jadwiga’s chancellor until August 1393, i.e. after he became bishop. Tadeusz Trajdos claims that it was Maciej who together with Piotr Wysz inspired Jadwiga’s activity in Ruthenia. Trajdos calls them a peculiar coterie, and adds that even Archbishop of Halych Jakub Strepa did not want to antagonise them, hence his acceptance of Wysz’s decision to annex disputed territories to the Przemyśl diocese in 1398 r.

At this point I shall refer to episcopal nominations concerning individuals who figure less prominently in available sources, i.e. Jerzy, Bishop of Lviv and Mikołaj, Bishop of Volodymyr. Admittedly, in curial documents, the process of the appointment of Jerzy, a Franciscan, son of Eberhard, as the Bishop of Lviv in the years 1390-91, after the death of his predecessor Konrad is well-evidenced but contains no mention of Jadwiga’s or her husband’s influence on the nomination; moreover, we may suppose that it did not happen in reality and was merely a sign of the prudence of German Franciscans. Jerzy probably never stayed in Lviv, since it was the city that Jakub Strepa, Archbishop of Halych, chose as his own seat. In fact, Jerzy, Bishop of Lviv, was a suffragan in Halberstadt, Germany. He was evidently only a titular bishop. The mystery behind this nomination puzzled Władysław Abraham, who rightly pointed out that Jerzy’s appointment had consequences also for the Archbishop of Halych, because papal documents suggest that he was a metropolitan bishop to his Lviv suffragan, which formally was not the case. Anyhow,

131 Ibidem, 9–10; Krzyżaniakowa, Kancelaria królewska, 21–23; Sułkowska-Kurasowa, Dokumenty królewskie, 232–233, No. 75; Wiesiołowski, “Episkopat,” Annex, 280–281; Rutkowska, “Urzędniczy,” 377; Ożóg, “Jadwiga,” 58; Graff, Episkopat, 57–59.
132 Trajdos, Kościół katolicki na ziemiach ruskich, 217. On the dispute see also: AGZ, Vol. 7, No. 21; BP, Vol. 3, No. 494.
133 Acta Bonificii, No. 102; BP, Vol. 3, No. 148 (provision of March 1390), No. 216 (German bishops to accept an oath from the Lviv elect in May 1391) and No. 228 (information on the consent to perform episcopal acts of 3rd July 1391); cf. Zdzisław Obertyński, “Thomas, der erste Bischof von Lwów,” Collectanea Theologica 18/1–2 (1937): 533–540.
the researcher concluded that the bishops of Lviv simply came from mendicant orders, and the Holy See nominated them *ad titulos vagos*. Perhaps a plot on part of the bishops of Lubusz may have been a factor, since they strove to make their claims for authority over Lviv bishoprics. Of significance is the fact that when Ruthenia was taken over by Poland, i.e. only 3 years prior to Jerzy’s nomination, Jan, Bishop of Lubusz, founded a fraternity in Lviv, which was an act of episcopal authority.\(^{134}\)

We may assume that Mikołaj, Bishop of Volodymyr, was only a titular bishop, probably a Czech. Like his predecessors, he had connections to the Archdiocese of Prague, where in practice he held the office of a suffragan.\(^{135}\) Theoretically, Jagiełło who had real authority in Volhynia (Wołyń) before the Ostrów Agreement, being the founder of the monastery in Lutsk (Luck), to which the Dominicans arrived from Kraków, could have a say in Mikołaj’s nomination. Still, it appears that the papal provision should be attributed to the court of Venceslaus IV or the contacts of the nominee.\(^{136}\) However, Trajdos suggests that since the Dominicans probably had their permanent mission in Lutsk before 1390, this may have been the place where “Mikołaj, missionary Bishop of Volodymyr, an ordinary since 1380, resided.”\(^{137}\)

However, Jadwiga and Jagiełło’s constant support of Dominican missions in Ruthenia could certainly be linked with the nominations of the bishops of Seret, Moldova.\(^{138}\) According to Trajdos, Bishop Jan Sartoris, son of a tailor, a theologian and expert on St. Thomas Aquinas, received the Diocese of Seret precisely thanks to the intercession of the royal couple; in the years 1388–1394 Sartoris was their confessor (*confessor domini regis et reginae Poloniae*) and Kraków suffragan bishop.\(^{139}\) It seems that this conclusion is highly probable due to the Sartoris’s connections to the Kraków court. Still, it must be noted that the royal couple’s intercession is not evidenced anywhere in the sources. It would be also useful to specify the date on which Sartoris received the bishopric of Seret, since according to Marek Kowalski’s research his predecessor Andrzej Jastrzębiec was

\(^{134}\) Abraham, *Powstanie*, 305–309.

\(^{135}\) Graff, “A usurper,” 22; Trajdos, *Kościół katolicki na ziemiach ruskich*, 74–75; Prokop, *Biskupi pomocnicy*, 364–365.

\(^{136}\) Fijałek, “Biskupstwa wołyńskie,” 9–21.

\(^{137}\) Trajdos, *Kościół katolicki na ziemiach ruskich*, 75.

\(^{138}\) Abraham, “Biskupstwa łacińskie w Mołdawii,” 183–184.

\(^{139}\) Trajdos, *Kościół katolicki na ziemiach ruskich*, 149–150; cf. Kielar, “Studia,” 296, 299, 485–487; Stanisław Dobrzanowski, “Jan Sartoris,” in *Słownik Polskich Teologów Katolickich*, Vol. 2 (Warszawa: ATK, 1982), 131; Prokop, *Biskupi pomocnicy*, 233–234.
appointed Bishop of Vilnius as late as in 1390 or even 1391.\textsuperscript{140} While the document itself is unavailable, 1386 and 1388, cited in literature as the years of Sartoris’s provision, should be moved forward by 2 to 3 years.\textsuperscript{141} After Sartoris’s death, from 8th June 1394 the Seret Diocese (as proved by sources) was ran by a Stefan, whom we may identify as the prior of the Dominican monastery in Kraków. In practice, he also held the office of the Kraków suffragan. Interestingly, he also was the first Bishop of Seret to be formally subordinated to the Metropolitan Archbishop of Halych.\textsuperscript{142} In this particular decision of the Pope we should notice the influence of the Kraków court. This must have been unwelcome news for Sigismund of Luxembourg, King of Hungary, as it curbed Hungarian authority in Moldova. Nevertheless, such reasoning is based solely on commonly known reports in the literature of the subject on the royal couple’s good relations with the Dominicans, the conjecture that Stefan had previously functioned as a prior of the Kraków Dominican monastery and the assumption that Polish diplomats used those nominations to strengthen Polish influence in the new fiefdom.

What conclusions can therefore be drawn from the above discussion, following an analysis of all episcopal nominations in the years 1384–1399? Contrary to what has so far been suggested in most studies on the life of Queen Jadwiga, appointments for key bishoprics depended mostly on Jagiełło’s decisions, and Jadwiga’s role in this area is often overrated by researchers, even if in the light of ambiguous sources or the absence of such sources, more circumspection in drawing conclusions would be advisable. Nonetheless, Jadwiga’s influence on (some) episcopal nominations, both in reference to prestigious bishoprics and those in the Archdiocese of Halych, was present, although it was far more subtle, all the more that Jadwiga avoided publicly objecting to her husband’s plans concerning ecclesiastical policy. Meanwhile, Jagiełło in certain cases appeared to have agreed to episcopal nominations proposed by Jadwiga, e.g. appointments of her chancellors: Piotr Wysz, Bishop of Kraków, and probably Maciej, Bishop of Przemyśl. However, when competing candidatures were proposed, she was prepared to back down, as noticeable in the king’s elevation of Mikołaj Kurowski to the bishopric of Włocławek and Jakub Plichta to the bishopric of Vilnius, although

\textsuperscript{140} Kowalski, “Nieznany dokument,” 132.

\textsuperscript{141} E.g. Prokop, Biskupi pomocniczy, 233–234.

\textsuperscript{142} BP, Vol. 3, No. 370, 428; Trajdos, Kościół katolicki na ziemiach ruskich, 16, 149–155, 202, 207; Kielar, “Studia,” 297, 299,350, 375, 442, 485–486; Prokop, Biskupi pomocniczy, 299–300.
both Gorzkowski and Łaskarzyc, candidates put forward by Jadwiga, were conferred relevant posts after the queen's death. We may interpret this as Jagiełło's fulfilment of the will of his late wife. This perception is in line with Długosz, who stressed that Gorzkowski became Bishop of Vilnius only after Jakub Plichta died, operante devotissimo rege Wladislao et optimum intencionem consortis sue prudentissime Hedvigis exequente, prefectus. Some episcopal nominations of the period can be clearly attributed to decisions made by both monarchs, who pursued a common ecclesiastical policy (e.g. translation of Andrzej Jastrzębiec to the bishopric of Vilnius, appointment of queen's chancellor Wojciech Jastrzębiec as the Bishop of Poznań or nominations for certain bishoprics in Ruthenia). With regard to Ruthenia, in some isolated cases we may also notice the absence of any greater pressure from either Jadwiga or Jagiełło on the award of a less important, titular bishopric. Also, one should not disregard the fact that the episcopal candidates supported by Jadwiga were eminent intellectuals who wished to breathe new life into the spirit of the Church, e.g. Piotr Wysz, Maciej of Sandomierz, Andrzej Łaskarzyc and Mikołaj Gorzkowski. By supporting those individuals the queen expressed the royal couple's commitment to the Church's growth in the Polish-Lithuanian kingdom, both in lands which had been Catholic for centuries and those where the Catholic organisation was still missionary in character.
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