

## **The principles of the Cuius regio project and the history of Silesia between 1526 and 1740**

### **Abstract:**

The articles gathered in the volume present the second stage of research on the region of Silesia, encompassing the period 1526-1740 and conducted under the patronage of the European Science Foundation as a portion of the project “Cuius regio. An analysis of the cohesive and disruptive forces determining the attachment and commitment of (groups of) persons to and cohesion within regions”. The objective of the project is to identify the factors occurring in each period which consolidated the Silesia region, or alternatively led to its disintegration, in several primary areas: administrative, economic and cultural/artistic. The specificity of the region’s history during its time under Habsburg rule led to a focus of attention on the political and cultural orientations of the people and social groups of Silesia. Their activities and attitudes were treated as the primary indicators revealing the social dimension of efforts to unify the region of Silesia with other countries of the Kingdom of Bohemia, as well as with the other political and territorial organisms composing the Habsburg dominion in Central Europe. These processes were also observed from the perspective of the political objectives pursued by Czech monarchs in that period. Analyses of events and phenomena of the time revealed periods of royal anti-regional policies towards Silesia accompanied by periods of policies intended to strengthen its regional identity within the Kingdom of Bohemia, within the context of efforts to achieve the overarching goal consisting in the monarchical centralization of authority.

### **Keywords:**

Silesia, regional history, regionalism

This book is the second in a series dedicated to the history of Silesia, following a publication devoted to the period of history until 1526<sup>1</sup>; it presents the history of Silesia from 1526 to 1740, with special attention placed on the development of the internal cohesion of the region. This study has been conducted under the auspices of the European Science Foundation under the *Cuius regio: An analysis of the cohesive and disruptive forces determining the attachment and commitment of (groups of) persons to and the cohesion within regions* programme<sup>2</sup>. It has been financed by the

---

<sup>1</sup> *The Long Formation of the Region Silesia (c. 1000-1526)*, ed. Przemysław Wiszewski, Wrocław 2013 (=Cuius regio? Ideological and territorial cohesion of Silesia, eds. Lucyna Harc, Przemysław Wiszewski, Rościław Żerelik, vol. 1), <http://www.bibliotekacyfrowa.pl/publication/46981>

<sup>2</sup> More information on the project is available at [www.cuius-regio.eu](http://www.cuius-regio.eu).

Polish Ministry of Science and Higher Education<sup>3</sup>. The programme, initiated and led by Professor Dick de Boer from Groningen, aims to develop a research method for studying regions that would allow comparative analyses of the processes of their formation in different parts of Europe.

The Polish research team examining the issues of Silesia as a region is led by the following project members: Lucyna Harc, Przemysław Wiszewski and Rościsław Żerelik. Moreover, renowned experts on specific historical periods have been invited to participate in the project. Their work has been coordinated by a specialist in the field of research on a given period of the history of Silesia and a member of the grant team. For the part discussing the period 1526-1740, the project involved experts in the fields of history, art history and the history of literature from Hamburg (Arno Herzig), Zielona Góra (Cezary Lipiński) and Wrocław (Jacek Dębicki, Mateusz Goliński, Lucyna Harc, Piotr Oszczanowski, Gabriela Wąs). The issues related to the role of administration and economy in the processes of integration and disintegration of the region have been referred to globally. Issues concerning social groups, as well as ethnic and linguistic issues, have been presented within two sub-periods: from 1526 until the early 17<sup>th</sup> century and from the Thirty Years' War to the cessation of Silesia's affiliation to the Bohemian Crown. The last two chapters present the development of regional and artistic identities separately. All the works of the team studying the period 1526-1740 have been supervised by Gabriela Wąs and Lucyna Harc.

### **The outline of the history of Silesia between 1526 and 1740<sup>4</sup>**

The chronology of the history of Silesia adopted in the publication marking the beginning of the modern era in 1526 is primarily an ordering procedure. Cultural, political, social and economic phenomena, in the context of their regional specificity, are in fact long-lasting processes which began many decades before 1526, while individual phenomena characteristic of the previous epoch had not yet finished by the late 16<sup>th</sup> century, and sometimes lasted even longer. Therefore, the

<sup>3</sup> *Cuius Regio. An analysis of the cohesive and disruptive forces destined the attachment of (groups of) persons to and the cohesion within regions as a historical phenomenon*, decision of the Minister of Science and Higher Education No. 832/N-ESF-CORECODE/2010/0.

<sup>4</sup> Detailed literature on particular issues has been collected in the following sections of this book. For general studies of the history of Silesia during this period see: *Geschichte Schlesiens*, vol. 2: *Die Habsburger Zeit 1526-1740*, ed. Ludwig Petry, Sigmaringen 1988, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. The latest bibliography on the history of Silesia prepared in cooperation with Herder Institute in Marburg, Slezské zemské Museum in Opava and the University of Wrocław is available online at: [http://www.wroclaw-uw.sowwwa.pl/sowwagi.php?&lang=en\\_GB](http://www.wroclaw-uw.sowwwa.pl/sowwagi.php?&lang=en_GB) (accessed on the 20<sup>th</sup> August, 2013).

lower chronological limit of the discussed epoch could have been demarcated otherwise, i.e. earlier, as some historians have done<sup>5</sup>. Leaving aside considerations about the actual end of the Middle Ages and the beginning of the modern period in Silesia, it is clear that the epoch framed by the years 1526 and 1740 – regardless of whether it is called ‘modern’ or just perceived as some stage in the modern period – has so many features characteristic only for itself that it can be isolated as a compact and homogeneous time unit in the history of Silesia.

In contrast to the previous period, which is characterized by Silesia’s volatile and unstable political affiliations, in 1526-1740 the region belonged permanently to the Kingdom of Bohemia, even though for the first decade the Bohemian king still had to struggle with Hungary, which refused to recognize this fact. According to the Peace of Olomouc of 1479, the affiliation of Silesia, along with Moravia and Lower and Upper Lusatia, to the Kingdom of Bohemia was suspended and authority over those lands was granted to the Hungarian King. The condition for the return of those lands to Bohemian rule was a payment of 400,000 guilders to Hungary<sup>6</sup>. During the reign of the Kings of the Jagiellonian dynasty, who ruled both the Kingdom of Bohemia and the Kingdom of Hungary (Ladislaus, the King of Bohemia from 1471 and the King of Hungary from 1490, as well as his son Louis, who ruled both kingdoms from 1516 to 1526), this issue remained unsettled. In the year that Ferdinand I of Habsburg assumed power (1526), the state affiliation of Silesia, in a political sense, continued to be in limbo. At that time, Silesian dukes and estates unequivocally chose to affiliate themselves with the Bohemian monarchy. In addition to a decidedly long tradition of such state formation, whose impact was considerable, the threat of direct involvement of Silesia in the war conducted by Hungary against Turkey was also of importance, above all in the aspect of supplying financial and human provisions. After 1526, Turkey seized a large central part of the Kingdom of Hungary. The disintegration of the remaining area into royal Hungary and the south-eastern part known as Transylvania was due to the fact that some members of the Hungarian political community petitioned Ferdinand and others to side with John Zápolya. Faced with the prospect of further Turkish expansion, Zápolya was placed in an extremely difficult situation which ultimately not only enabled Ferdinand to make an advantageous pact with Zápolya in 1538 concerning the seizure of the Hungarian Crown, but also finally closed the issue of Hungarian claims over Silesia. In addition to political will and the activity of various political

---

<sup>5</sup> Norbert Conrads, *Książęta i stany. Historia Śląska (1469–1740)*, translated by Lidia Wiśniewska, Wrocław 2005.

<sup>6</sup> Karl Bosl, *Handbuch der Geschichte der Böhmischen Länder*, Stuttgart 1974, p. 104.

forces which was particularly prevalent in Silesia, what helped consolidate the region's affiliation with the Kingdom of Bohemia was the relative stability of other state borders in this part of Europe.

Throughout the period 1526-1740 the Bohemian throne was occupied by rulers from the Habsburg dynasty, who represented a fairly uniform governing strategy in relation to Silesia. This strategy consisted of efforts to expand the range of the monarch's power. This purpose was served by a policy of integration, which mainly took two forms. In the 16<sup>th</sup> century, the idea of integration initiated by Ferdinand I (1526-1564) was to try to create administrative links between Vienna, Prague and Silesia, excluding Prague in the second period of his reign. Despite the conceived projects, the royal offices and institutions did not fulfil the tasks they were obliged to follow, or performed them only partially. The governing of Silesia was performed primarily through an estate system of offices and institutions. It was only during the Thirty Years' War that a small, yet important – from the monarchy's point of view – reform took place. The office of the governor of Silesia was transformed into a collegial institution: the Superior Office. This allowed the governing system of Silesia to be a transparent mechanism for executing the royal will. The second type of integration policy characteristic of the 17<sup>th</sup> century and the first four decades of the 18<sup>th</sup> century was based on the idea of Catholic confessionalization. Silesia, mostly Protestant before the war's outbreak, was to be dominated by Catholics. Affiliation to a Roman-Catholic confession was to guarantee fidelity to the Habsburgs' rule. It was, therefore, a process of integration based on a political ideology strongly connected with religious values. Its main objective and the greatest achievement was the conversion to Catholicism of a significant part of the Silesian elite, especially aristocrats<sup>7</sup>.

Another important consequence of dynastic change in the Bohemian throne in 1526 was the increased distance of Silesia from the centre of power. Until then, the centre of power had been placed in the Kingdom of Bohemia, primarily in Prague. In the days of the Jagiellonian Kings, their simultaneous occupation of the Hungarian and Bohemian thrones was the cause of rivalry between the elites of these kingdoms for political influence, yet because the monarchy did not formulate plans for one kingdom to dominate, they were balanced. In the period 1526-1740 the centre of power was Vienna, except for a short period of time during the reign of Rudolf II (1576-1611), who in 1582 moved his court to Prague. The distance between the region of Silesia and the centre of power became greater not only geographically,

---

<sup>7</sup> Jarosław Kuczer, *Baronowie, hrabiowie, książęta. Nowe elity Śląska (1629-1740)*, Zielona Góra 2013.

but also in a political sense. Within the contemporary political scene the existing competitors for political influence and participation in the central authority, i.e. figures from the Bohemian estates, were soon joined by lords and nobles of the Austrian lands.

As early as in the 16<sup>th</sup> century this fact had led to the Silesian elites being pushed to the political margins within the domain of the Habsburg dynasty. At the same time, the Habsburgs sought to rebuild the Kingdoms of Bohemia and Hungary so that these lands would become a permanent part of the territory ruled by them, united with their hereditary countries in the Reich. In implementing this plan for the ruling dynasty, the territories in the Kingdom of Bohemia that received the greatest focus were primarily Bohemia<sup>8</sup>, followed by Moravia. Silesia, on the other hand, held an inferior position within the new political and estate structure of the popularly-named Habsburg monarchy, which was planned and was gradually emerging in that epoch, especially since the period of Ferdinand II (King of Bohemia from 1617, Emperor from 1619 to 1637). This did not mean, of course, that the Habsburgs were ready to abandon their rule over this relatively rich country, which provided the monarchs with considerable income. However, the consequence of following the priorities of the Habsburgs' dynastic policy, for whom the ultimate goal was to create their own, hereditary monarchy, was the disintegration of the Kingdom of Bohemia. It lost three of the five countries which had been its constituents at the beginning of this period: Lower and Upper Lusatia in the 1630s, and from 1740 to 1742 almost the whole of Silesia. The rapid and permanent loss of most of the Silesian lands can equally be attributed to the efficient military aggression of Frederick of Prussia, and to the nature of the internal policy of the Habsburgs.

Silesia also benefitted from a period of territorial and political stabilization in 1526-1740. The fluctuating numbers of not only duchies and other types of sovereignty but also their borders, so characteristic of former times, were markedly inhibited in the period around 1526. During the epoch under discussion there were 16-17 duchies. Beside them there were four, and from 1697 six, free-state countries and several smaller separate forms of territorial ownership. The dominant dynasty among the princes was the Piast dynasty. The rulers of one line of the family ruled in the Duchies of Legnica, Brzeg, and Wołów, members of the second line ruled in the Duchy of Opole and Racibórz, while members of the third line ruled in the

---

<sup>8</sup> Jaroslav Pánek, *Das politische System des böhmischen Staates im ersten Jahrhundert der habsburgischen Herrschaft*, 'Mitteilungen des Instituts für österreichische Geschichtsforschung', 97 (1989), Nos. 1-2, pp. 53-82.

Duchy of Cieszyn. The princes of the Poděbrady family ruled in the Duchy of Ziębice (until 1569) and Oleśnica. Until 1621 the Duchy of Krnov belonged to the Hohenzollern dynasty. The Saxon Wettins holding a *lieu* Duchy of Żagań and the electoral Hohenzollerns of Brandenburg in the Duchy of Krosno were also Silesian vassals, yet they were not perceived as lords of the land by nature. However, changes of ownership in the duchies were substantial. They were connected with the dying out of all old Silesian lines of dukes in the 17<sup>th</sup> century (the line of the Poděbrady family died out in 1647, followed gradually by other lines of the Silesian Piasts – the last family that died out were the Dukes of Brzeg and Legnica in 1675) and the passage of their duchies, in accordance with the established legal and state tradition, to the direct possession of the Bohemian king while maintaining their affiliation to Silesia. More important and larger territorial units were preserved by the king in the form of the so-called hereditary duchies. To the duchies which were already ruled directly by the king from a previous epoch, that is Wrocław, Głogów and Świdnica-Jawor, in the period after 1526 also joined such duchies as, among others, Legnica, Brzeg and Opole-Racibórz. Some of them were given by the king to his Catholic supporters, the families of Liechtenstein, Auersperg and Lobkowitz, who by the grace of the king were raised to the titular dignity of dukes. The regional identity of Silesian elites was also disrupted by the claims of foreign families and rulers to whom the Habsburgs had political commitments, which were satisfied by assigning them Silesian duchies or placing them in long-term *lieu*. In this way, the turn of the 18<sup>th</sup> century saw the appearance in Silesia of sovereigns of individual Silesian duchies such as Gabriel Bethlen or Albrecht von Wallenstein, as well as members of the dynasties ruling in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. In 1646-1666 the Duchy of Opole and Racibórz was pledged to the Polish branch of the House of Vasa, and in the years 1691-1737 Oława, along with its princely title, was passed to James Louis Sobieski, son of King John III, who was married to the sister of the wife of Leopold I. Such dynastic relationships with the Habsburgs, as well as the pro-Habsburg policy carried out during the Thirty Years' War by Sigismund III Vasa – who was married first to Anne and then to Constance, the sisters of Ferdinand II – were crucial for the establishment of Charles Ferdinand Vasa to the throne of the Bishopric of Wrocław (1626-1655). However, the presence of the Polish ruling families in Silesia at this time did not stem from the policy of the then Polish-Lithuanian Kingdom – its political interests in this epoch went in a vastly different geographical direction: towards the east and south-east because of the union with Lithuania and the Turkish threat – but it resulted rather

from dynastic interests, whose aims were to provide territories for younger members of families or to acquire assets for their own dynasties.

Another aspect that supports the decision to mark the beginning of the period as 1526 and the end as 1740 is the fairly uniform political system that existed within Silesia during this period. On the one hand – according to convincing studies conducted by historians of law<sup>9</sup> – the earlier date is related to the completion of the formation of the political estate of Silesia, where many basic elements had been formed at the end of the previous period but whose consequences were not fully visible until the age under discussion. Another argument connected with state and politics for determining the lower and upper time limits of the period was the formation of central institutions of power in the region which administered Silesia as a political and territorial entity, and the determination of the specific practice of governance in Silesia. The change in the source of power divides the 1526-1740 period into two sub-periods: the first period of 1526-1629/39 characterized by a duality of power in the province – the power of the estates and royal power – and the second period of 1629/39-1740, in which the monarch was the only source of power. The indicated dates mainly refer to particular acts issued by the monarch at that time.

The relationship between the power of the king and that of the estates takes on its full meaning only after taking into account a very important phenomenon in the history of 16<sup>th</sup>-century Silesia, namely the developing Reformation movement. One consequence of this was an increased sense of separateness among the Silesian political, economic and cultural elites, the vast majority of whom were gradually converting to Protestantism in the 16<sup>th</sup> century, against the power of the Catholic monarchs. This separateness made itself visible not only in the religious sphere but also in the political one. Despite the expansion of their realm of sovereignty, throughout the 16<sup>th</sup> century the kings also had to put up with the increasing autonomy of the region. During the 16<sup>th</sup> century Ferdinand I, Maximilian II and Rudolf II had, when ascending to the throne, in addition to confirming all the privileges of estates and the country, also expressed in Silesia their intention to abide by the rules of the religious Peace of Augsburg promised by Ferdinand for the first time in 1556. In a practical sense, the range of religious freedom enjoyed by Silesian Protestants was much wider than that foreseen in the principles of the Peace of Augsburg. Protestant parishes, along with the churches and schools, existed not only throughout

---

<sup>9</sup> Kazimierz Orzechowski, *Ogólnośląskie zgromadzenia stanowe*, Warszawa–Wrocław 1979; *idem*, *Historia ustroju Śląska 1202-1740*, Wrocław 2005.

the areas remaining under the rule of their fellow believers, but also in the territories of Catholics, and even belonging to the bishop and monasteries<sup>10</sup>.

The combination of religious conflict between Protestant estates and their Catholic rulers with the conflict for political power was not only an ad hoc dispute. Behind it lay the striving for legal and political redevelopment, in which the estates were in favour of an estate monarchy, and the kings opted for a kingdom with centralized monarchical power. This led to a dramatic confrontation between those forces in the period 1609-1620. In 1609, the Bohemian and Silesian estates formed a confederacy for the first time to force Rudolf II to safeguard their religious and political rights. In view of the united forces of the estates, the sovereign issued two Letters of Majesty for Bohemia and Silesia, introducing an almost complete formula of freedom for Lutheranism in Silesia. Another concession for Silesia was the king's pledge not to appoint general bishops of Wrocław to the position of a governor of Silesia, who had held this office since 1536 when all lay Silesian dukes became Protestants. In this way, in 1609 for the first time a Lutheran, Duke Charles II of Oleśnica, became the governor of Silesia.

The attempt to stop the transformation of the Bohemian monarchy into an estate monarchy first by Matthias, and then by Ferdinand II, concluded in a clash of royal and estate forces, which began in 1618 as the Defenestration of Prague. It was initiated by the Bohemian estates, who, having performed the act of renouncing allegiance to the king, persuaded the Silesian estates to further joint steps. They proposed a second confederation on the basis of full equality for the regions, an act which was signed by the Silesians on the 31st July 1619. They dethroned Ferdinand II and appointed Frederick V, Elector Palatine, as the new king. The defeat of the estates' troops in the Battle of White Mountain in 1620 quickly turned into a disaster for the estate movement and the Silesians, at the mercy of Ferdinand II, signed the so-called Dresden Accord in 1621. Their price for the confirmation of the Letter of Majesty in terms of the freedom of the Lutheran religion was their political submissiveness and withdrawal from the relationship with the Bohemian estates, who were subjected to cruel and bloody reprisals. The second renouncement of allegiance to the king in 1633 by the Silesian estates, along with their joining the anti-Habsburg forces with the intention of even deserting the Kingdom of Bohemia in order to liberate themselves from the rule of the Habsburgs, concluded in submission to the Peace of Prague in 1635, which brought even more humiliating political reprisals. Repressions during the two times when Silesia took an active part in the

---

<sup>10</sup> Colmar Grünhagen, *Geschichte Schlesiens*, vol. 2: *Bis zur Vereinigung mit Preußen 1527-1740*, Gotha 1886, pp. 3-107.

Thirty Years' War were limited to individuals who specifically revealed their anti-Habsburg attitude. However, the Thirty Years' War was an extremely difficult period for the people of the land of Silesia. On several occasions it had been the venue for serious hostilities, which caused massive losses of property and people. Historians estimate that the population diminished by one-fifth to one-third. Silesia also served as a winter shelter and supply area for the troops, which led to the country's economic collapse due to the system of financing the war, the so-called contribution.

The legal status of the Lutheran confession in Silesia became a subject of discussion during negotiations which concluded with the Peace of Westphalia in 1648. Silesian Lutherans were assured of freedom of religious worship and the ownership of the churches in the duchies where the power, at the time of establishing peace, was still held by independent Protestant dukes, that is in the Duchies of Brzeg, Legnica and Oleśnica, and also the city of Wrocław and the Duchy of Ziębice, which had reached an agreement on religious freedom with the king back in 1571. Silesian history in the second half of the 17<sup>th</sup> century is characterized on the one hand by Silesian Protestants raising complaints against violations by the Catholic monarchs – Ferdinand III, Leopold I and Joseph I – of their religious rights provided for in the Peace of Westphalia, and on the other hand by the rather monotonous favouritism of the Habsburgs in the public life of Silesia over everything that supported monarchical Catholicism. This procedure involved both seizing Lutheran churches in the areas which had been given the freedom to practise Lutheranism by the Peace of Westphalia, as well as the systematic removal of Protestants from all public authorities and institutions, especially from the Diet of Silesia, the office of governor of Silesia and the municipal councils. Therefore, the next milestone in the social history of Silesia was the Altranstädt Convention of 1707 – a convention which complied with the provisions of the Peace of Westphalia regarding the rights of the Lutherans in Silesia and the restoration of their ownership of churches forced by a military threat from the Swedish King Charles XII on the Emperor of the Reich and the Bohemian King, Joseph I. The long reign of Charles VI (1711-1740) as the King of Bohemia was the last Habsburg to rule over the whole region of Silesia. In 1720, without resistance, the Silesian Diet adopted the resolution of the Pragmatic Sanction, ensuring the succession went to Charles' daughter, Maria Theresa.

The period 1526-1740 is also distinguished by the creation of modern Silesian culture, which was diverse in its forms and content, and individualist in its expression. What developed from around the mid-16<sup>th</sup> century and throughout the 17<sup>th</sup> century until the Thirty Years' War was a specific 'late Silesian humanism', which

can be also described as evangelical humanism. It was characterized by a symbiosis of the late Renaissance humanism with evangelical religious ideas<sup>11</sup>. The period leading to the Thirty Years' War had been a source of continuous, vivid flourishing of Silesian intellectual circles. One of its trends was expressed in the development of modern historiography, which exhibited proto-national features, where the love of the homeland solidified with a desire for ethno-cultural separation<sup>12</sup> (the works of Joachim Cureus, Nicholas Henel, Nicholas Pol and the continuation of this trend in the 17<sup>th</sup> century historiography such as of Frederick Lucae). Another important trend of late humanism was associated with the turn of the intellectual elites of Silesia towards medical and botanical sciences, which inspired the Silesian Protestants to study at the Catholic universities of Padua, Bologna, and Venice<sup>13</sup>. Due to their strong philosophical and humanistic profile, the studies became a medium of re-establishing the direct contact of the Silesians with the cultural centres of late Italian humanism. This contact strongly influenced the revival of interest in literature and art. Most prominent Silesian physicians and jurists at that time were also poets. Many of them were honoured, by imperial grace, with the titles *poeta coronatus* and *comes palatinus* (John Crato von Crafftheim). Moreover, in the 17<sup>th</sup> century, especially in the second half, and at the beginning of the 18<sup>th</sup> century, two Baroque confessional cultures developed in parallel in Silesia. Although the Catholics had for a long time been a distinct religious minority in the Silesian community, and it was only after intensive efforts of the Habsburg authorities that they began to match the number of Protestants within the first 40 years of the 18<sup>th</sup> century, it was Catholic Baroque art that dominated the artistic landscape of Silesia in the modern period. This phenomenon was influenced on the one hand by the activity of secular and ecclesiastical patronage, which was far more powerful than in Protestantism, and on the other hand by the much more important role of art in spirituality and religiosity of that confession. The Jesuit architectural complexes in such cities as Wrocław and Legnica, and Cistercian ones in rural areas such as Lubiąż or Krzeszów, all of them of European artistic standing – mentioned by way of example only, since a list of the Catholic artistic edifices in Silesia and the com-

<sup>11</sup> Arno Lubos, *Der Späthumanismus in Schlesien*, 'Jahrbuch der schlesischen Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität zu Breslau', 2 (1957), pp. 107-147.

<sup>12</sup> Matthias Weber, *Zur Konzeption protonationaler Geschichtsbilder. Pommern und Schlesien in geschichtlichen Darstellungen des 16. Jahrhunderts*, [in:] *Konstruktion der Vergangenheit. Geschichtsdenken, Traditionsbildung und Selbstdarstellung im frühneuzeitlichen Ostmitteleuropa*, eds Joachim Bahlcke, Arno Strohmeier, Berlin 2002, pp. 55-79.

<sup>13</sup> Claudia A. Zonta, *Schlesische Studenten an italienischen Universitäten in der Frühen Neuzeit*, Stuttgart 2000; Manfred Komorowski, *Silesia accademica. Promotionen, Inauguraldissertationen, Biographien schlesischer Ärzte und Juristen im 17. Jahrhundert*, [in:] *Kulturgeschichte Schlesiens in der Frühen Neuzeit*, ed. Klaus Garber, vol. 1, Tübingen 2005, pp. 321-360.

munities that initiated them would be very long – have continued to play a decisive role up to today in determining the qualities of architectural landscape throughout those lands.

Despite the oppressive social and economic situation caused by terrible devastations left by the Thirty Years' War and the intensive policy of re-Catholicization pursued by the Habsburgs, the 17<sup>th</sup> century was the most abundant period in the history of Protestant culture in that country in terms of literature and poetry. Martin Opitz, one of the greatest poets of Silesia and the creator of German Baroque poetics, lived and worked until 1639. A few years after the war followed a generation of artists that were under his direct influence, including, among others, Christopher Köler and Andreas Tscherning. The most prominent author in the new generation of poets was Andreas Gryphius (1616-1664), who was directly inspired from antique and new-Latin classical works. The next generation of poets, including Christian Hoffmann von Hoffmannswaldau (1616-1679) and Daniel Caspar von Lohenstein (1635-1683), constituted the core of the so-called Second Silesian School, referring in their works of poetry and lyrics both to Petrarch and to a Neapolitan artist, Giambattista Marino<sup>14</sup>. The intense spiritual life of the Silesian Evangelists in this period was also manifested in the creation of a spiritual and religious trend referred to as Silesian mysticism and related to specific religious literature. Its most prominent creators were Jakob Böhme, Daniel Czepko von Reigersfeld and John Scheffler, more commonly known as Angelus Silesius, the name which he assumed after his conversation to the Catholicism<sup>15</sup>.

The essays presented in this volume are considerably expanded versions of the articles published in Polish in the second issue of the *Śląski Kwartalnik Historyczny Sobótka* quarterly (2013).

---

<sup>14</sup> Manfred Fleischer, *Späthumanismus in Schlesien*, München 1984, p. 40.

<sup>15</sup> Józef Piórczyński, *Absolut, człowiek, świat. Studium myśli Jakuba Böhme'go i jej źródeł*, Warszawa 1991; Józef Kosian, *Mistyka śląska. Mistrzowie duchowości śląskiej Jakub Boehme, Aniol Ślązak, Daniel Czepko*, Wrocław 2001. For specialist biographical articles concerning most of the people mentioned in this paragraph see: *Śląska Republika Uczonych = Schlesische Gelehrtenrepublik = Slezská vědecká obec*, eds Marek Hałub, Anna Mańko-Matysiak, vol. 1-5, Wrocław 2004-2012.



Map 1. Territorial-political division of Silesia c. 1675 (Dariusz Przybytek)