

SŁAWOMIR ZONENBERG

(Casimir the Great University in Bydgoszcz)

THE SECOND PEACE OF TORUŃ OF 19 OCTOBER 1466  
IN THE POLISH, PRUSSIAN AND TEUTONIC HISTORIOGRAPHY  
OF THE 15<sup>TH</sup>–16<sup>TH</sup> CENTURIES

**Key words:** the Thirteen Years' War, Poland, the Teutonic Order, Royal Prussia, the Duchy of Prussia

The aim of this article is to show the changing manner of writing about the Second Peace of Toruń in the Polish, Prussian and Teutonic historiography until the end of the 16<sup>th</sup> century. So far there has been no study of this issue. However, even a cursory analysis of the chronicles shows that the chronicles included records of various length, which did not always depend on the size of a given book. What influenced the manner of writing about the peace treaty was the social and political background the author came from, the aim of the work, and the literary genre preferred by the author. Undoubtedly, the victorious part wrote most about the peace treaty and it is their contribution that is going to be presented first. In the subsequent part of the paper I shall refer to the accounts written by the Teutonic knights and their advocates.

1. ACCOUNTS OF THE WINNERS

The starting point for the deliberations in this part of the paper are two accounts by eyewitnesses – a Pole Jan Długosz (1415–1480) and a Prussian Johann Lindau (ca. 1425–1480/1483)<sup>1</sup>. It must be noted that both accounts vary in form. The chronicle by J. Długosz (a priest from Cracow) was to be

---

<sup>1</sup> See Marian BISKUP, *Działalność dyplomatyczna Jana Długosza w sprawach pruskich w latach 1454–1466*, [in:] *Długossiana. Studia historyczne w pięćsetlecie śmierci Jana Długosza*, ed. Stanisław GAWĘDA (Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego DLXI, Prace Historyczne, z. 65), Warszawa 1980, pp. 163–164; Anna STRZELECKA, *Lindau Jan*, [in:] *Polski słownik biograficzny*, vol. 17, Wrocław 1972, p. 352; Krystyna PIERADZKA, *Traktat toruński 1466 roku w obcych relacjach kronikarskich i pierwsze starania w kurii rzymskiej o jego zatwierdzenie*, *Małopolskie Studia Historyczne*, vol. 9: 1966, no. 3–4 (34–35), p. 3, footnote 2.

a historiographic work aimed at a defined reader, the objective of which was to inform and teach future generations. On the other hand, the work by J. Lindau, a town's secretary from Gdańsk, is a kind of secretarial „memorial” (note-book) written mostly for his private use in his work as the city's secretary of the Main City of Gdańsk and as a diplomat.

The historiographic, propaganda and educational aim of writing J. Długosz's chronicle influenced the manner of presenting the subject matter; thus, the work is so comprehensive and preachy. Jan Długosz's account constitutes the longest and most detailed, thus the most valuable, record of the Second Peace of Toruń in the Polish historiography of the discussed period<sup>2</sup>. It refers both to the treaty's regulations and to the description of the ceremony of signing the document along with events accompanying it. Generally, the account in *Annals* – constructed with a certain purpose, if at times somewhat chaotic, full of emotional involvement, rhetorical richness, pathos, historiographic-moral deliberations, including prophecies and prodigies, apart from presenting the conditions of the treaty and the events accompanying it – was to convey the information that the peace was the creation of God that was gracious to Poles; moreover, it was to indicate the victory of the truth and justice over the lie which would always be defeated. The treaty was signed openly and according to the requirements of the law of the time, which made the treaty irrefutable. The document was concluded in a friendly and joyful atmosphere, full of mutual respect and solemnity. Despite being a major success of Poland, the Treaty was approved of by both parties. Enemies and friends of peace were presented, including God. Thus, we may be convinced that this extensive and thorough description of the Peace of Toruń was to demonstrate its significance<sup>3</sup>. It made the impression that the treaty was something exceptional and constituted the most important event during the reign of Casimir IV Jagiellon. Undoubtedly, it must have been a major event even for the chronicler himself<sup>4</sup>.

---

<sup>2</sup> *Joannis Długossii Annales seu cronicae incliti Regni Poloniae*, ed. Christophorus BACZKOWSKI [et al.], lib. 12: (1462–1480), Cracoviae 2005, pp. 160–170: „Die Solis ... deputavit”.

<sup>3</sup> About the significance of the treaty: Marian BISKUP, *Zagadnienie ważności i interpretacji traktatu toruńskiego 1466 r.*, *Kwartalnik Historyczny*, vol. 69: 1962, no. 2, pp. 295 ff.; idem, *Trzynastoletnia wojna z zakonem krzyżackim 1454–1466*, Warszawa 1967, pp. 703–709; idem, *Polityka zewnętrzna zakonu krzyżackiego*, [in:] *Państwo zakonu krzyżackiego w Prusach. Władza i społeczeństwo*, ed. Marian BISKUP, Roman CZAJA, Warszawa 2009, pp. 273–274.

<sup>4</sup> The evidence for it is the paragraph starting the year 1467, where in the first person singular he expressed his happiness and joy from the fact that it was during his lifetime that Prussia had been incorporated into Poland; he also expressed his hope for Silesia, Lubusz Land, Słupsk Land being incorporated to Poland along with the bishoprics of Wrocław, Lubusz and Kamień – *Joannis Długossii Annales seu cronicae incliti Regni Poloniae*, lib. 12: (1462–1480), pp. 177–178: „Cepit ... accumberem”. It is also worth mentioning that originally in the *Annals*

In J. Lindau's account the description of the peace treaty constitutes part of the manual book (notebook), which he wrote for practical purposes as an aid in his secretarial and diplomatic work<sup>5</sup>. That is why, the account is very calm, devoid of pathos and moralizing. In contrast, it includes, which must be stressed, the whole content of the treaty, the text of the Grand Master's vow and the description of the ceremony of signing the treaty along with the events accompanying it<sup>6</sup>. It is the longest, the most detailed and thus the most valuable description in the Prussian historiography of the discussed period. Moreover, the account is very well written and respects the chronology of events. Johann Lindau's account shows that signing the treaty was an overt event, which took place in accordance with the legal regulations of the time and in a friendly and respectful ambience. It indicates that the conclusion of the treaty – which was referred to as „good” – was a positive event since it introduced „agreements, unity”. We may also be sure that the peace treaty was of major significance to Lindau himself<sup>7</sup>.

Both chroniclers – as it may be seen – emphasized the legal correctness of the conclusion of the treaty and the vow, thanks to which the peace treaty gained the legal force which formed the new reality which was not to be undermined. They were both content with the harmony in the country after the long and destructive war, the atrocities of which they had written about<sup>8</sup>.

Both accounts were in later periods used by subsequent generations of Polish and Prussian historiographers. Owing to the authority and availability of *Annals*, J. Długosz's account became the foundation for subsequent Polish

the paragraph followed the extract „Tali itaque ... administrari” (*Joannis Dlugossii Annales seu cronicae incliti Regni Poloniae*, lib. 12: (1462–1480), pp. 166–168), which was moved to the year 1467 either by J. Długosz or by the copyist – see *Lata wojny trzynastoletniej w „Rocznikach, czyli kronikach” inaczej „Historii polskiej” Jana Długosza (1454–1466). Komentarz krytyczny*, vol. 1, prep. Stefan M. KUCZYŃSKI with the cooperation with Karol GÓRSKI (Teutonic issues) (Łódzkie Towarzystwo Naukowe. Prace Wydziału II – Nauk Historycznych i Społecznych, no. 57), Łódź 1964, p. 236.

<sup>5</sup> Janusz TANDECKI, *Dziejopisarstwo miejskie w Toruniu i w Prusach w średniowieczu i na progu czasów nowożytnych*, *Rocznik Toruński*, vol. 38: 2011, pp. 10–11, 14; Julia MOŹDŻEŃ, *Przedstawianie świata przez kronikarzy gdańskich na przełomie XV i XVI wieku* (*Roczniki Towarzystwa Naukowego w Toruniu* (further: RTNT), vol. 95, no. 2), Toruń 2016, pp. 30–32.

<sup>6</sup> *Johann Lindau's Geschichte des dreizehnjährigen Krieges*, hrsg. v. Max TOEPPEN, [in:] *Scriptores rerum Prussicarum* (further: SRP), Bd. 4, Leipzig 1870, pp. 636–637 (the publisher of the chronicle did not publish the content of the treaty).

<sup>7</sup> At the end of the account about the peace treaty finishing the whole work there appeared very emotionally loaded words „Also ist nu eine ganzte einigkeit gemacht. Got gebe zcu ewiger seligkeit amen” – *Johann Lindau's Geschichte des dreizehnjährigen Krieges*, p. 637.

<sup>8</sup> See *Joannis Dlugossii Annales seu cronicae incliti Regni Poloniae*, ed. Christophorus BACZKOWSKI [et. al.], lib. 12: (1445–1461), Cracoviae 2003, passim; *Joannis Dlugossii Annales seu cronicae incliti Regni Poloniae*, lib. 12: (1462–1480), passim; *Johann Lindau's Geschichte des dreizehnjährigen Krieges*, passim.

chroniclers. What also increased the popularity of the long and detailed text of the treaty was its summary<sup>9</sup>. Let us underline that the summary reflects the content of the treaty accurately, which was not an easy task to achieve. Jan Długosz contributed greatly to the success of the summary<sup>10</sup>. Johann Lindau's account became most popular among Prussian burghers (from Gdańsk, Toruń, Tczew, Königsberg).

As the Teutonic issue was losing its relevance after the military activities finished in 1521 and the peace treaty of Cracow was signed in 1525 (the so called Prussian Homage) – the tendency appears to decrease the space devoted in Polish historiography to the problem of the Thirteen Years' War and the Treaty of Toruń. To some extent, it was caused by the size of chronicles, which were normally much smaller than *Annals*. However, in some cases the accounts were so scarce that only the most important information was provided<sup>11</sup>, and

---

<sup>9</sup> Its content to be found in *Die Staatsverträge des Deutschen Ordens in Preußen im 15. Jahrhundert*, hrsg. v. Erich WEISE, Bd. 2, Marburg 1955, no. 403, pp. 265–288; Maksymilian GRZEGORZ, *Analiza dyplomatyczno-sfragistyczna dokumentów traktatu toruńskiego 1466 r.* (RTNT, vol. 75, no. 1), Toruń 1970, pp. 170–219; *Związek Pruski i poddanie się Prus Polsce. Zbiór tekstów źródłowych*, ed. Karol GÓRSKI, Poznań 1949, document no. 17, pp. 85–114, 204–232; Erich WEISE, *Der zweite Thorner Vertrag vom 19. Oktober 1466. In deutscher Übersetzung, mit Erläuterung des Inhaltes*, Jahrbuch der Albertus-Universität zu Königsberg/Pr., Bd. 22: 1972, pp. 9–33; see also Przemysław NOWAK, *Dokumenty II pokoju toruńskiego z 1466 roku*, *Studia Źródłoznawcze*, vol. 43: 2005, pp. 103–106.

<sup>10</sup> *Joannis Dlugossii Annales seu cronicae incliti Regni Poloniae*, lib. 12: (1462–1480), pp. 163–166: „Condicionum... finitum est”. The chronicler provided briefly the most important provisions of the document issued on 19 October 1466 in Toruń, where King Casimir Jagiellon obliged to pay the Grand Master Ludwig 15,000 florins to pay off the mercenaries – *Joannis Dlugossii Annales seu cronicae incliti Regni Poloniae*, lib. 12: (1462–1480), p. 169: „Nec his ... donat”; *Die Staatsverträge des Deutschen Ordens in Preußen im 15. Jahrhundert*, Bd. 2, document no. 405, p. 290–291; see also *Lata wojny trzynastoletniej w „Rocznikach, czyli kronikach”*, p. 237.

<sup>11</sup> Aleksander GUAGNINI, *Sarmatiae Europae descriptio*, Spira 1581 (first edition: Cracoviae 1578), p. 20: „Tandem anno Domini 1466. Casimirus Rex ... concordiam foedusque perpetuum, suffragijs multorum Principum adductus, cum Magistro Prussiae et ordine Teutonico inijt. Ab hocque tempore Pomeraniae Ducatus, Michlouiensis quoque et Culmensis terra, Regno Poloniae adiuncta est, pro quibus Poloni 180. Annis, armis cum Crucigeris decertabant”; idem, *Rerum Polonicarum tomi tres*, Francofurti 1584, s. 114: „Tandem anno Domini 1466. Casimirus rex ... concordiam foedusque perpetuum, suffragijs multorum principum adductus, cum magistro Prussiae et ordine Teutonico inijt. Ab hocque tempore Pomeraniae Ducatus, Michlouiensis quoque et Culmensis terra, regno Poloniae adiuncta est, pro quibus Poloni 180. annis armis cum Crucigeris decertabant”; Stanisław SARNICKI, *Annales sive de origine et rebus gestis Polonorum et Litvanorum libri octo*, Cracoviae 1587, s. 367: „pax perpetua sancita fuit, Cruciferique in fidem et clientellam Polonorum recepti, et Magister eorum Princeps renunciatus, ac consiliarius regni. Ab eo tempore Pomeraniae Ducatus, Michalouiensis quoque, et Culmensis terra recuperata regno Poloniae adiungitur; pro quibus Poloni centum et octoginta annis cum Cruciferis armis decertarant”.

in some account the treaty was only mentioned<sup>12</sup>. In the Polish chronicles of the 16<sup>th</sup> century the information about the peace treaty is no longer – unlike in J. Długosz's chronicle – a separate event, which should be given individual attention. The information appears in reference to the reign of Casimir IV Jagiellon as one of the numerous contributions of the monarch. Casimir IV Jagiellon was highly appreciated by both Poles and Prussians.

It must be underlined that as far as the length and choice of content referring to the peace treaty were concerned, in Polish historiography after J. Długosz two main trends appeared. The first was established by the account by Maciej of Miechów (ca. 1457–1523), professor of Medicine and president of Cracow Academy. Maciej of Miechów in his *Chronica Polonorum* published in 1519 accurately presented<sup>13</sup> only the most important information concerning the conclusion of the peace treaty and its provisions based exclusively on J. Długosz's *Annals*<sup>14</sup>. The compactness of the information was probably determined by the size of the chronicle, which on 379 pages of 2° paper size describes the history of Poland from the earliest times up to 1506. Maciej of Miechów did not copy J. Długosz's circumlocutions and wordiness full of pathos and emotions – historical-moral deliberations, prophecies and prodigies. The distinct style of Maciej of Miechów reflects the influences of the new epoch – humanism<sup>15</sup>. The description provided by Maciej of Miechów is calm and devoid of major emotional involvement, the feeling of triumph and patriotism, which appeared

---

<sup>12</sup> Justus Ludwig DIETZ, *De vetustatibus Polonorum liber I. De Jagellonum familia liber II. De Sigismundi regis temporibus liber III*, Cracoviae 1521, p. 42: „Magistrum ordinemque Sarmatum ditioni ex pacto subiecit. In supremo rerum discrimine ordo pacem neccesariam cum Kazimiro fecit, cuius ferias ab alijs traditur”. The work was published along with the chronicle by Maciej of Miechów of 1521.

<sup>13</sup> The only shortcoming is the information that the war lasted 14 years, which was copied from J. Długosz (*Joannis Dlugossii Annales seu cronicae incliti Regni Poloniae*, s. 166: „*Sic bellum in – quatuor et decem – annos protractum*”). Jan Długosz is believed to have committed the mistake because of being emotionally moved or tired, as he many times mentioned 13 years of the war – *Lata wojny trzynastoletniej w „Rocznikach, czyli kronikach”*, pp. 235–236.

<sup>14</sup> Maciej of Miechowo, *Chronica Polonorum*, Cracoviae 1521 (the first edition: Cracoviae 1519), p. 320: „Facta est pax perpetua, die solis decima nona mensis Octobris. Et in priuilegio perpetui foederis, Rudolphus sesis apostolicae legatus, manu propria se subscripsit, et tres notarii publici. Sigillis insuper regis Kazimiri, et Lodouici Magistri Prussiae, Praelatorum quoque et Consiliariorum partis utriusque roboratum est. Tunc recuperate sunt, et ad corpus regni Poloniae, terra Pomeraniae, Chelmensis, et Michalouiensis, redierunt, pro quibus recuperandis centum et quinquaginta annis pugnatum est. Tunc etiam Culmensis ecclesia metropoli et matrici suae ecclesiae Gneznensis reunita est, quia per annos circiter ducentos, ab ecclesia Polonica abstracta, Liuonicae Rigensi (in rerum natura dum Chelmensis fundaretur nondum extanti, et per longa terrarum marisque spacia distanti) adiecta erat. Tunc quoque bellum Prutenicum quattuordecim annis sub rege Kazimiro agitatum, finitum est”.

<sup>15</sup> See also Agnieszka DZIUBA, *Wczesnorenansowa historiografia polsko-łacińska*, Lublin 2000, pp. 32–33.

in J. Długosz's account. In *Chronica Polonorum* it is stressed that the treaty was signed in accordance with all the requirements of law, which made it lawful and binding. Moreover, it was underlined that the treaty established *perpetuum foederis* („the eternal alliance, union, unity”) between the parties. It is very probable that Maciej of Miechów emphasized the legal aspect of the content of the document as the treaty was questioned by Grand Teutonic Masters – Friedrich von Sachsen (1498–1511) and Albrecht Hohenzollern (1511–1525)<sup>16</sup> in the time when the chronicle was being written.

Accounts devoted to the Second Peace of Toruń written by historiographers who used the chronicle by Maciej of Miechów are quite concise. They include the chronicles by the secretary of King Sigismund I the Old – Justus Ludwig Dietz (ca. 1485–1545)<sup>17</sup>, the self-educated nobleman Marcin Bielski (ca. 1495–1575)<sup>18</sup>, the nobleman and military commander Alexander Guagnini (1534–1614)<sup>19</sup>, the nobleman and diplomat Maciej Strykowski (1547–1586/1593)<sup>20</sup>, and the nobleman and *wojski* of Krasnystaw Stanisław Sarnicki

---

<sup>16</sup> More in: Marian BISKUP, *Polska a Zakon Krzyżacki w Prusach w początkach XVI wieku. U źródeł sekularyzacji Prus Krzyżackich*, Olsztyn 1983, pp. 17, 75 ff., 325 ff.; idem, *Polityka*, pp. 280–283.

<sup>17</sup> L.J. DECJUS, op.cit., p. 42.

<sup>18</sup> Marcin BIELSKI, *Kronika tho iesth Historia Świata*, Kraków 1564 (the first edition: Cracow 1551), ch. 395r: „Lata 1466. Dobywszy Krol Kazimierz Choynicz przez obłężenie, uczyniona iest zgoda y zapisana miedzy Ludowikiem Pruskim Mistrzem, a miedzy K. Polskim wieczna, którą Rudolf poseł Papiieski swą ręką podpisał, y sygnety Krolewskim y Pruskiego Mistrza iest zapieczętowana, a od Panow Radnych potwierdzona. Od tego czasu Pomorska ziemia ku Polsce zasię przyszła, także Michałowska y Chełmieńska, o ktore sto y pięćdziesiąt lat ustawicznie walki były. Też kościół Chełmieński ku Gnieźnieńskiemu od tego czasu przyszuszeie, iako do mathki, ktory na dwieście lat był pod sprawą Liwlantskich Mistrzow z Rygi. A tym obycaiem Krol Kazimierz udzylał sobie s Prusy pokoy, ktory czternaście lat s nimi bez przestania walkę wiodł”.

<sup>19</sup> A. GWAGNIN, *Sarmatiae*, p. 20; idem, *Rerum*, p. 114.

<sup>20</sup> Maciej STRYKOWSKI, *Ktora przedtem nigdy swiata nie widziela Kronika Polska, Litewska, Żmudzka y wszystkiey Rusi Kijowskiej, Moskiewskiej, Siewierskiej, Wołyńskiej, Podolskiej, Podgorskiej, Podlaskiej, etc. [...]*, Królewiec 1582, pp. 647–648: „Potym Mistrz sam Ludwik z Comendatory był do Torunia przyzwany Octobra dnia 10. y sstała się ugoda y pokoy wieczny przysięgą z obudwu stron umocniony, ktorego postanowienia priwilej ręką Legata Papiieskiego, y trzech Pisarzow uchwalonych, których Publicos Notarios zowią podpisan, a pieczęciami Krolewską, Mistrzowską, y Panow Rad Duchownych y Swieckich umocniony. Mistrza y Contorow Krol z wielkimi podarkami opuścił, y nad to mu dowiedziawszy się o iego niedostatku 15000. Złotyeh dla zapłacenia Zołnierzom, obiecał. W ten czas Pomorska, Chełmieńska, y Michałowska ziemie do Korony są przywroczone, o które 150. lat woyna trwała, Biskupstwo też y Kościół Chełmieński do własney Matki Gnieźnieńskiego Arcybiskupstwa przywroccon, ktore Biskupstwo od Polski oderwane przez dwieście lat w Liflanciech Rigenskiemu Arcybiskupstwu niesłusznie od Krzyżakow było przydane, W ten czas się też woyna, którą Kazimierz wiodł z Krzyżaki lat 14. (iął Miechouius fol. 320. lib. 4 pisze) skończyła, ącz Cromer lib. 26. y Herbortus z niego fol. 311. lib. 16 cap. eodem rokiem mniej kładą”.

(ca. 1532–1597; he copied from Guagnini)<sup>21</sup>. It should be noted that the above mentioned chroniclers modified the text by Maciej of Miechów. Generally, they failed to provide the day, the month and the place of signing the treaty (M. Bielski, A. Guagnini, S. Sarnicki), and if they did it, they did it erroneously (M. Strykowski), or they omitted to provide the data informing that others had already done it (J.L. Dietz). Moreover, some of them failed to transmit an important piece of information that the treaty had established *perpetuum foederis* between Poland and Prussia (J.L. Dietz, M. Bielski, M. Strykowski). A good illustration of the fact that the discussed issue did not arise major curiosity are the accounts by J.L. Dietz, M. Strykowski, A. Guagnini and S. Sarnicki. Justus Ludwig Dietz did not present the provisions of the treaty and reduced himself to state that on the basis of the treaty the Teutonic State, threatened by a total collapse, went under the Polish rule<sup>22</sup>. Maciej Strykowski did not use the information from the chronicles by J. Długosz and M. Kromer he must have been familiar with, but he based his text on a shorter account by Maciej of Miechów. What is more, he did not make an effort to check how long the Thirteen Years' War really had lasted and limited himself to the statement: „W ten czas się też woyna, którą Kazimierz wiodł z Krzyżaki lat 14. (iał Miechouius fol. 320. lib. 4 pisze) skończyła, ącz Cromer lib. 26. y Herbortus z niego fol. 311. lib. 16 cap. eodem rokiem mniey kładą<sup>23</sup>. Alexander Guagnini was the author of two works published with a six-year break. His accounts about the peace treaty are identical, and even include the same errors<sup>24</sup>. Stanisław Sarnicki, who had access to the chronicle of M. Kromer and A. Guagnini, based his account on the latter chronicle, which provides much less information and includes errors. What is more, S. Sarnicki literally rewrote some fragments from the chronicle by A. Guagnini<sup>25</sup>.

The second current in the development of chroniclers' accounts concerning the Second Peace of Toruń was marked by the account by M. Kromer (1512–1589), a diplomat and secretary of King Sigismund II Augustus. Martin Kromer, who based his account mostly on J. Długosz's chronicle, prepared a substantive and correct summary of the long and elaborate account included in the *Annals*<sup>26</sup>. In fact, he did it much better in terms of the organization of the content and the chronology of the ceremony. Undoubtedly, M. Kromer's great contribution was the fact that he made the record of the ceremony and

---

<sup>21</sup> S. SARNICKI, op.cit., p. 367.

<sup>22</sup> L.J. DECJUS, op.cit., p. 42.

<sup>23</sup> M. STRYKOWSKI, op.cit., p. 648.

<sup>24</sup> A. GWAGNIN, *Sarmatiae*, p. 20; idem, *Rerum*, p. 114.

<sup>25</sup> S. SARNICKI, op.cit., p. 367.

<sup>26</sup> Marcin KROMER, *De origine et rebus gestis Polonorum libri XXX*, Basileae 1555, pp. 572–574: „tandem... amississe”.

decisions of the peace treaty more transparent and understandable. It must be noted that he did not adopt J. Długosz's rhetorical-emotional deliberations of historical-moral nature along with prophecies and prodigies, which is the evidence of the influence of Humanism. Moreover, M. Kromer omitted some fragments of the *Annals*, the content of which could have been politically incorrect<sup>27</sup> or obsolete<sup>28</sup>. Writing the account from a certain historical perspective – after the Polish-Teutonic war of 1519–1521, among people dissatisfied with the conclusion of the Second Peace of Toruń he also included inhabitants of Prussia (apart from the groups mentioned by J. Długosz – the German emperor, German princes, the Bohemian king, the Lithuanians, some Polish magnates and mercenaries). In M. Kromer's narrative inhabitants of Prussia were to underline anxiously that leaving such a vast territory to the Teutonic knights would help them increase their power and would lead to another war. It must be stated that Kromer in his seventy-two-page-long chronicle in the 2° paper size (folio) left – in comparison with the earlier chronicles of the 16<sup>th</sup> century – a very detailed description of the peace treaty. He was also the only Polish chronicler, who, apart from J. Długosz, was really interested in the treaty. He used one of the so called complementary documents – the diploma of Grand Master Ludwig von Erlichshausen of 23 October 1466 (or its counterpart belonging to King Casimir Jagiellon) issued in Toruń, which J. Długosz failed to do<sup>29</sup>. Supposedly, it resulted from his negative attitude towards the Teutonic knights, which is easy to perceive from the way he constructed his narrative in the whole chronicle.

Accounts devoted to the Second Peace of Toruń included in the works by historiographers who used M. Kromer's chronicle are longer than the ones following the trend of Maciej of Miechów. They include chronicles by the diplomat, the castellan of Sanok and the starost of Przemyśl – a lawyer Johann

---

<sup>27</sup> What we mean here is the failure to mention Frederick III Habsburg (1452–1493) and German princes-electors as people responsible for the prolongation of the Polish-Teutonic war and not signing the peace treaty. As it is known, Frederick III was related to Catherine of Austria, Queen of Poland (1533–1572), from 1553 – the wife of the Polish king Sigismund August (1548–1572); whole Poland remained in very good relations with the Empire (the alliance with Ferdinand I of 1549) – see: Anna SUCHENI-GRABOWSKA, *Zygmunt August. Król polski i wielki książę litewski 1520–1562*, Kraków 2010, p. 246 ff.

<sup>28</sup> It refers to the failure to include the Hussite king George of Kunštát and Poděbrady (1458–1471), who, in J. Długosz's chronicle, is an ardent opponent of the Peace Treaty of Toruń – he hated it for religious reasons.

<sup>29</sup> It dispensed the Teutonic knights from giving the military aid to Poland owing to destructions and debts for the period of 20 years (excluding the war with Turkey if it had attacked Poland). The Grand Master on his territory exempted knights who had their estates there and who during the war had changed the sides and supported Poland from paying taxes for 25 years, works and any other burdens – see: *Die Staatsverträge des Deutschen Ordens in Preußen im 15. Jahrhundert*, Bd. 2, document no. 407, pp. 292–294.



Herburt (1508–1577) and Joachim Bielski (ca. 1550–1599), an envoy and secretary of King Sigismund III Vasa. It must be noted that J. Herburt did not provide the provisions of the treaty and limited himself to the statement that the regulations of the treaty had been published in the collection of documents<sup>30</sup>. However, he provided much irrelevant information about the events accompanying the signing of the peace treaty. For example, he wrote that King Casimir Jagiellon had paid the annual remuneration of 200 florins to the Pope's legate and intermediary Rudolph von Rüdeshheim; the king also offered appropriate gifts to Grand Master Ludwig von Erlichshausen and people in his entourage; he also promised to give the Grand Master 15000 florins to pay off the Teutonic mercenaries<sup>31</sup>. Joachim Bielski criticized J. Herburt that the provisions of the treaty should have been briefly presented despite the fact of them being published. He himself gave the most important information about the treaty's provisions. Yet, it is possible that his decision was influenced by the fact that his chronicle was quite long – it included 804 pages of 2° paper size (folio)<sup>32</sup>.

---

<sup>30</sup> Jan HERBURT, *Chronica, sive Historiae Polonicae compendiosa, ac per certa librorum capita ad facilem memoriam recens facta descriptio*, Basileae 1571, p. 311: „his conditionibus, quae in priuilegijs statuto insertis habentur”. The chronicler probably was thinking of the following print – *Leges seu statuta ac privilegia Regni Poloniae omnia [...]*, ed. Jakub PRZYŁUSKI, Szczucin–Cracoviae [1551]–1553, pp. 724–740.

<sup>31</sup> J. HERBURT, op.cit., pp. 311–312: „Rudolphus certe Legatus tam pulchrae pacis confectae meritam laudem apud omnes tulit, qua ille contentus, amplissima dona a Rege missa refutauit: consiliarij modo Regij titulum honoremque, tum pensionem ducentorum florenorum in singulos annos, quoad uiueret, in salinis Bochnensibus attributam, accepit, et Vuratslauiam se recepit. Magistro Ludouico, et ijs qui cum eo erant primarijs uiris, perampla, pro cuiusque conditione, ab eodem Rege data munera: quumque is, egere admodum Magistrum comperisset, praeter priora dona, quindecim millia florenorum ei ultro dono, in emerita stipendia millium, promisit”.

<sup>32</sup> *Kronika Polska Marcina Bielskiego. Nowo Przez Ioach. Bielskiego syna iego wydana*, Kraków 1597, pp. 442–443: „[1466] ... zgodzili sie nakoniec dnia 19. miesiaca Października u Torunia; gdzie y Pruski Mistrz sam przyiechał, którą ugodę z obu stron sobie podpisali y pieczętowali. Działo sie to w domu pospolitym, który zowią Gielda, w Toruniu. A była głosem czytana ludziom wszytkim ta ugoda: Niemcom czytał Legat po Niemiecku, a Polakom po Polsku Wincenty Kielbasa Nałęcz Sekretarz Krolewski. Była też potwierdzona z obu stron przysięgami, to iest Mistrza Pruskiego y Krola Polskiego, także Panow Senatorow, Kommandorow, ślachty y miast, która acz w Statucie iest dostatecznie wypisana, iednak y tu ią krotce włożę. Krol Polski niniejszy y potym będący aby dzierzał te ziemie, Chelmieńską, Pomorską, y Michałowską, ze wszytkimi miasty, zamki, wsiami, y przyległościami: k temu też z drugiey strony Wisły te miasta y Zamki, Malbork, Stum, Krysborg, Elbing, y Tolchimite, z swoimi Zoławami, y z używaniem lasow abo łowisk, y z sześciami wsi które do Hollandu przysłuszają, y z Nerynga wszytka: oprócz tylko trzech wsi które mają zastać Pruskiemu Mistrzowi, dla łowienia ryb na iezierze Habie. Mistrz Pruski ten y potym będący z swymi Zakonniki ma dzierżec ostatek ziemie Pruskiej: wszakże tym prawem aby był wierny y posłuszny zawżdy Krolow Polskich, tak ten iako y po nim będący: a tego poprawił każdy dostateczną przysięgą

What is more, the manner in which the peace treaty was presented in the Polish chronicles of the discussed period should be analyzed. The accounts concerning the peace treaty were few. Let us first discuss the 15<sup>th</sup> century sources. In *Kalendarz Płocki* [English: Płock Calendar] and *Rocznik Jana z Targowiska* [English: Annals of Jan of Targowisko] the authors do not use the term *pax* in reference to the Second Peace Treaty of Toruń, unlike J. Długosz. In contrast, they use the term *concordia* – concord, unity and harmony<sup>33</sup>. It probably resulted from the fact that both records were written shortly after 1466 – in the time when the Treaty of Toruń was fully enforced<sup>34</sup>. The annals written in the 16<sup>th</sup> century tend not to pay much attention to the content of the peace treaty<sup>35</sup>.

---

Szostego Księżyca po przyięciu urzędu swego, przyjechawszy do Krola, bez żadney odwłoki, pod straceniem Pruskiej ziemie, który też miał mieć mieysce swe w Radzie podłe Krola po lewey stronie, także y jego Kommendorow kilka mieli śiadać w Radzie. Powinien też był każdy Pruski mistrz tak ten iako y po nim będący z Krolem iechać przeciwko każdemu nieprzyjacielowi, a nieopuszczać Krola Pana swego tak czasu szczęścia iako nieszczęścia. Miał też przyimować do zakonu swego tak Polaki iako Niemce, aby ich było na poly. Niemiał też Konwent zrzucić Mistrza z urzędu ani go wybierać, jedno z wiadomością Krolewską. Nuż ieśli ktore zamki były w dzierzeniu czym, mieli sobie z nich ustąpić do pewnego czasu: a ieśliby ie kto inszy tym czasem posiadł, tedy mieli ich sobie spolnie pomoc dobywać. Więźniowie też bieli bydź wypuszczeni z obu stron: także zbiegowie abo wygnańcy mieli bydź na swe mieysca przywroceni. Chelmieński kościół miał sie zaśie wrocić do matki swey Gnieźnieńskiego kościoła, opuściwszy zakon: tylko Pomezanski miał bydź pod nim. Zamki, miasta, wsi, y inne wszystkie dochody kościelne, miały bydź przywroczone z obu stron swym kościołom. Drogi miały bydź wszędzie wolne, tak na ziemi iako y na wodzie, według starego zwyczaiu. Co wszystko tamże utwierdzili sobie z obu stron przysięgami...Wiele ich było w Prusiech co sie im nie podobała ta ugoda, iż tak wiele Krzyżakom Krol puścił, spodziewaiąc się tego iż gdy zaśie ku dostatku przyidą będą chcieć posiadać przyległe miasta y drugie dzierżawy: iakoż sie to potym okazało na Mistrzu Woyciechu z domu Brandenburskiego; o czym będzie przy Krolu Zygmuncie...Trwała ta woyna Pruska przez całe trzynaście lat”. In fact, the author of *Kronika Polska* was Joachim Bielski, who published it as the continuation of his father’s – Marcin – work and under his name, see Jerzy SERCZYK, *25 wieków historii. Historycy i ich dzieła*, Toruń 1994, p. 164; Andrzej F. GRABSKI, *Dzieje historiografii*, Poznań 2011, p. 249.

<sup>33</sup> *Calendarium Plocense*, ed. Wojciech KĘTRZYŃSKI, [in:] *Monumenta Poloniae Historica* (further: MPH), vol. 5, Lwów 1888, p. 458: „1466 dominico die inter Kazimirum regem Polonie et magistrum Prussie in Toruń concordia est celebrata”; *Rocznik Jana z Targowiska 1386–1491*, ed. Emil KALITOWSKI, [in:] MPH, vol. 3, Lwów 1878, p. 235: „[1464] ... serenissimus dominus Kazimirus rex Polonie cum ordine Cruciferorum in Prussia bellum habuit, quod tredecim annis duravit. Tandem post multa prelia et conflictus ex utraque parte habitos, ad instanciam domini Pauli pape secundi per media domini Rudolphi episcopi Laventini, cum illis concordiam iniit, et terras, que a regno Polonie defecerant, videlicet Chelmensensem, Michaloviensem, Elbingensem et Pomeranie una cum arce et monarchia eorum Marienburg recepit. Magistrum dicti ordinis in Prussia ad fidelitatem et unionem regno suo cum corporali iuramento subiecit”.

<sup>34</sup> More about the subject matter in: M. BISKUP, *Polityka*, p. 275.

<sup>35</sup> *Annales Posnanienses II*, ed. Wojciech KĘTRZYŃSKI, [in:] MPH, vol. 5, p. 884: „MCCCCLXVI concordatum est cum crucifer[is]”; *Rocznik Chotelskiego 1430–1576*, ed. August BIEŁOWSKI,

Let us now pass on to the analysis of Prussian historiography. Here – after J. Lindau – the subsequent works including the accounts concerning the Peace Treaty of Toruń were: the records of the Gdańsk skipper Kasper Wienreich (started writing in 1461), the so called *Die Danziger Chronik vom Bunde* created soon after 1466, and the records of the Toruń priest Hieronim Waldau (ca. 1427–1495) written after 1481. It must be stated that the information provided by H. Waldau is scarce. He only gave the date, place and executors of the treaty<sup>36</sup>. The account in the so called *Die Danziger Chronik vom Bunde* is more extensive and emotionally loaded. His author informs that it was the arrogance of the Grand Master and the Teutonic Order that led to them being deprived of the best part of Prussia. The Teutonic knights had treated their subjects badly; they, in turn, had been fed up with unlawfulness and had found a new ruler<sup>37</sup>. Hieronim Waldau provided the whole content of the treaty. Before he did it, he had informed that the peace treaty had been preceded with the hard and destructive civil war lasting from 1454. During the war most of the members of the all the Prussian estates supported the Polish king; the Grand Master was backed by the insignificant number of supporters. In the emotionally loaded fragment – modeled on the Gospel According to Mark 13:12<sup>38</sup> – H. Waldau wrote that during the war members of the same family had fought against each other<sup>39</sup>. To my mind, the reason why those two

---

[in:] MPH, vol. 3, p. 214: „Thorunie inter Polonie Casimirum regem et magistrum Prussie Ludovicum pax perpetua finitur die solis 19 mensis Octobris, anno domini 1466”.

<sup>36</sup> Caspar Weinreichs *Danziger Chronik*, hrsg. v. Max TÖPPEN, [in:] SRP, Bd. 4, p. 729: „Anno 1466 ...In Preussen war auch fride gemacht zwischen Ludwig von Erlichhausen dem hochmagister und dem konige von Polen, geschehen zu Torn auf s. Lucastag”; see also K. PIERADZKA, op.cit., p. 4; J. TANDECKI, op.cit., pp. 14–16.

<sup>37</sup> *Die Danziger Chronik vom Bunde*, hrsg. v. Max TÖPPEN, [in:] SRP, Bd. 4, p. 443: „Do wurden dy sachen gehandelt von beiden teilen, so das do eyn vrede in Preussen gemacht wart zzwischen dem heren konige zcu Polen Kazymiro und her Ludewig von Erlichshausen hochmeister mit seynem orden, der wart genant der ewige vrede in deme beschede, das der hochmeister dem konige und der cronen zcu Polen solde hulgen und sweren undertanigk zcu seyn mit seynem orden in Preussen, her und alle seyne nochkomelynge zcu ewigen zceyten. Disser vrede ist gemacht zcu Torn, geschen noch Christi geburt tausent vierhundert lxvj iar uff sant Lucastagk des hilgen ewangelisten. So wart der hochmeister in Preussen mit seinem orden das beste landes quit durch yren obermut, den sy iren undertanen zcu treben umb des bundes halben, den sy nicht leiden wolden zcu richten gewalt und unrecht etc. und mosten darnoch eynem andern heren undertanigk seyn”; see also K. PIERADZKA, op.cit., p. 4.

<sup>38</sup> *Pismo Święte Starego i Nowego Testamentu. Biblia Tysiąclecia*, Poznań–Warszawa 1980, p. 1173.

<sup>39</sup> *Die Aufzeichnungen des Thorner Pfarrers Hieronymus Waldau*, hrsg. v. Walter HUBATSCH, bearb. v. Udo ARNOLD, [in:] SRP, Bd. 6, Frankfurt am Main 1968, pp. 98–99: „Versus de pacacione lige inter regem et magistrum. Lvce cras Lvce planatur rege Magister. Rex fuit Kazimirus et magister Ludovicus de Erlichshawszen. (Inscriptio pacis subsequitur). Copia perpetue pacis per reverendissimum patrem et dominum Rudolphum episcopum Lavantium et apostolicum

groups of accounts differ from each other is the following: the author of the so called *Die Danziger Chronik vom Bunde* was an ardent supporter of the Prussian Confederation. The author might have been Peter Brambeck of Gdańsk, closely connected – like J. Lindau – with the governing group in Gdańsk, or even with J. Lindau himself<sup>40</sup>. On the other hand, H. Waldau, the parish priest of the Church of St. Johns in Toruń, was connected with the Bażyński family and the town council supporting the association of Prussia with Poland<sup>41</sup>. The work written by the Gdańsk skipper Wienreich constitutes records in the trade book<sup>42</sup>, which are completely private.

This division visible in the 15<sup>th</sup> century – into accounts of authors closely connected with the authorities, whose descriptions are generally extensive and detailed, and accounts of independent chroniclers, which are generally concise and brief – survived also in the 16<sup>th</sup> century. The former group includes: the writings of the Gdańsk Dominican priest Simon Grunau (ca. 1455/1470–1529/1530)<sup>43</sup>, the so called Ferber's Chronicle written in the years ca. 1526–1529 as commissioned by the mayor of Gdańsk Eberhard Ferber

---

a latere legatum inter serenissimum dominum Kaszimirum regem Polonie etc. et venerabilem dominum Ludovicum de Erlichshawszen magistrum generalem ordinis Theutonicorum practicatam, inter quos dominos exorta erat intestina gwerra incolarum Prussie anno domini 1454 et duravit in gravissimis bellis et terrarum devastacionibus usque ad annum domini millesimum quadrigentennium sexagesimum sextum. Tempore talium disturbiorum quamplurimi nobiles et terrigene cum maioribus civitatibus regi Polonie adhererunt, et nonnulli similiter magistro generali; sic fuit pater contra filium et econtra, frater contra fratrem, consanguineus contra alium, explorando detinendo tradendo necando depactando devastando igne et gladio, quod per totam terram Prussie non fuit tutus locus manendi. Cuius tenor sequitur: Inter nomine domini amen. Ad perpetuam rei memoriam. Cum inter humane voluntatis desideria etc...nos frater Ludovicus de Erlichshawszen etc. d. d. Thorn 1466 Oct. 19. (Friedensurkunde des Hochmeisters)"; see also Marcin SUMOWSKI, *Ego Jeronimus Waldaw... O tożsamości późnośredniowiecznego plebana toruńskiego*, *Zapiski Historyczne* (further: ZH), vol. 79: 2014, no. 1, p. 75; J. TANDECKI, op.cit., p. 17.

<sup>40</sup> Theodor HIRSCH, *Einleitung: Die Danziger Chronik vom Bunde*, [in:] SRP, Bd. 4, pp. 405, 407; Paul GEHRKE, *Der Geschichtsschreiber Bartholomaeus Wartzmann im Kreise seiner Abschreiber. Ein Beitrag zur Quellenkunde der Danziger Chroniken im 16. Jahrhundert*, *Zeitschrift des Westpreussischen Geschichtsvereins*, H. 41: 1900, pp. 128–129; Franz SCHWARZ, *Lindau Johannes*, [in:] *Altpreussische Biographie*, Bd. 1, Königsberg/Pr. 1941, p. 399; Jolanta DWORZACKOWA, *Dziejopisarstwo gdańskie do połowy XVI wieku*, Gdańsk 1962, p. 19; Janusz TANDECKI, op.cit., pp. 13–14; Julia MOŹDŻEŃ, op.cit., p. 44, footnote 167; Radosław KRAJNIAK, *Lindau Johann*, [www.gedanopedia.pl/gdansk/?title=LINDAU\\_JOHANN](http://www.gedanopedia.pl/gdansk/?title=LINDAU_JOHANN) (access: 11 November 2016).

<sup>41</sup> See M. SUMOWSKI, *Ego*, pp. 69–72, 78; idem, *Duchowni diecezjalni w średniowiecznym Toruniu. Studium prozopograficzne*, Toruń 2012, p. 137.

<sup>42</sup> In older literature Wienreich's work appears as a historiographic text despite not being one. Still, the narrative resembles a chronicle and that is why it is discussed here – see J. MOŹDŻEŃ, op.cit., pp. 37–38.

<sup>43</sup> *Simon Grunau's Preussische Chronik*, hrsg. v. Max PERLBACH [et al.], Bd. 2, Leipzig 1889, pp. 298–307.

(1463–1529)<sup>44</sup>, the accounts by the Gdańsk merchant Berbt Stegmann (written in the years 1527–1529)<sup>45</sup>, by Charles Rosenberg probably related to the patrician family of the Rosenbergs (died after 1542)<sup>46</sup>, by Benedict Weier – the parish priest from Sępopole in the Duchy of Prussia (died 1550)<sup>47</sup>, by the Gdańsk secretary of the city Stanisław Bornbach (1530–1597)<sup>48</sup>, by the member of the judicial bench of Gdańsk Jerzy Melmann (1521–1557)<sup>49</sup>, by the city official and merchant of Gdańsk Bartolomeo Wartzmann (ca. 1525–1578)<sup>50</sup>, by the patrician and merchant of Gdańsk Heinrich von Reden (before 1510–1569)<sup>51</sup>, by the author of the so called Chronicle of the Bażyński family of the second quarter of the 16<sup>th</sup> century<sup>52</sup>, by the author of the Prussian Chronicle of the second quarter of the 16<sup>th</sup> century<sup>53</sup>, by the president of the

<sup>44</sup> The chronicle has not survived. Supposedly, it contained the detailed account about the peace treaty. Max TÖPPE, *Kommentar: Johann Lindau's Geschichte des dreizehnjährigen Krieges*, [in:] SRP, Bd. 4, p. 637, footnote 1; J. DWORZACZKOWA, op.cit., pp. 36–42; see also Arno MENTZEL-REUTERS, *Stadt und Welt. Danziger Historiographie des 16. Jahrhunderts*, [in:] *Kulturgeschichte Preußens königlich polnischen Anteils in der Frühen Neuzeit*, hrsg. v. Sabine BECKMANN, Klaus GARBER (Frühe Neuzeit, Bd. 103), Tübingen 2005, p. 110; J. TANDECKI, op.cit., p. 14.

<sup>45</sup> Despite the fact that the chronicler provides a short note about the peace treaty in the annals' part of his compilation, we may consider him to belong to this group owing to the fact that he included in his work the copy of *Die Danziger Chronik vom Bunde* – see Biblioteka Polskiej Akademii Nauk w Gdańsku (further: BPAN Gdańsk), Ms 1265, fol. 18v–25v, 45r–47r, 74r–104v; [Bernt Stegmann's] *Hanseatische Chronik*, hrsg. v. Theodor HIRSCH, [in:] SRP, Bd. 5, Leipzig 1874, p. 497: „A. D. etc. lxxvj auf s. Lucas tagk wart der vrede gemacht zcu Torn mit konigk zu Polen Kazimiro, und her Ludowigk von Elrichshawsen hochmaister von Preussen vor sich und alle seyne nochkomelinge der krone zcu Polen zcu hulgen und zcu sweren zcu ewigen zceiten”; see also K. PIERADZKA, op.cit., p. 4.

<sup>46</sup> BPAN Gdańsk, Ms 1266 – *Coronica Dewczen Ordenns in Prewssenn angehaben zu schreiben im Jare 1529*, fol. 56v–58r (from the year 1542); see also A. MENTZEL-REUTERS, op.cit., p. 111; Joachim ZDRENKA, *Rats- und Gerichtspatriziat der Rechten Stadt Danzig*, Teil II: 1526–1792 (Sonderschriften des Vereins für Familienforschung in Ost- und Westpreußen, Bd. 63), Hamburg 1989, pp. 34–47, 366–367.

<sup>47</sup> BPAN Gdańsk, Ms 1267 – *Auszog von der Cronica deutschen Ordens zue Preussen*, fol. 116r–118r (from the year 1546).

<sup>48</sup> Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Sign. Ms. boruss. fol. 245–249 – *Cronica des Landes zu Preussen*.

<sup>49</sup> BPAN Gdańsk, Ms 58 – *Chronica und Beschreibung des Landes Preußen undt Pohlen* (so-called „Die große Melmannische Chronik”), pp. 573–583.

<sup>50</sup> Ibid., Ms 1285 – *Chronica des Landes Bruthenia*, fol. 266v–273r (the so-called 2<sup>nd</sup> edition of Wartzmann's chronicle).

<sup>51</sup> Biblioteka Uniwersytetu Mikołaja Kopernika w Toruniu, manuscript 60/III, fol. 176r–183v.

<sup>52</sup> BPAN Gdańsk, Ms 1272 – *Preussischer Cronica warhafftiger auszog etzlicher vornemer puncten*, fol. 85r–87r.

<sup>53</sup> State Archive in Gdańsk, sign. 300, R/ LL, 9 – *Preussisch Cronika ab anno domini 1260 usque ad exitum Ordinis Teutonici*, pp. 168–170.

school and the parish priest from Tczew Denis Runau (ca. 1540–1603)<sup>54</sup>, by the city's secretary of Gdańsk Kaspar Schütz (ca. 1540–1594)<sup>55</sup>, by the author of the Gdańsk Chronicle – the so called Code of Georg von Kuhnheim the Younger (1532–1611) – Albrecht Hohenzollern's confidant<sup>56</sup>, the so called Code of Michael Scrinius of 1583 – Albrecht Hohenzollern's librarian and the professor of dialectics at Königsberg University (died 1585)<sup>57</sup>, and by the musician-composer-publisher well known in the Duchy of Prussia – Matthäus Waisel (ca. 1540–1602/1607)<sup>58</sup>. It must be underlined that all of them used

<sup>54</sup> Dionysius RUNAU, *Historia und einfeltige beschreibung des grossen dreizehenjeren Kriegs in Preussen, im Jahr Christi 1454. angefangen, und im 66. der mindern Zal geendet...Sampt ein anhang und kurtzer Historien des kleinen Zweyjerigen Kriegs in Preussen, zwischen Köninge Sigmundo I. und den 34. Hohemeister Marggraff Albrechten*, Wittenberg 1582, fol. Aav–Aa2r. He dedicated his chronicle to the mayors and the city council of Toruń – see Dionysius RUNAU, op.cit., fol. A2r.

<sup>55</sup> Kaspar SCHÜTZ, *Historia Rerum Prussicarum*, Zerbst 1592, fol. R4+2r–Sr.

<sup>56</sup> BPAN Gdańsk, Ms 1262 – *Dantzker Cronica auf das Landt zu Preussen von der Zeitt do sich der Bundt hatt angefangen*, fol. 149r (37r)–149v (37v).

<sup>57</sup> BPAN Gdańsk, Ms 1271 – *Preische Chronica*, fol. 137v–139v.

<sup>58</sup> Mattheus WAISSEL, *Chronica Alter Preusscher, Eifflendischer, und Curlendischer Historien*, Königsberg 1599, fol. 243r–244r. He dedicated his chronicle to Marquis of Brandenburg and Prince – Prussian administrator Georg Frederick Hohenzollern (1543–1603; 1577/1578–1603) – see M. WAISSEL, op.cit., ch. A2r. The author of *Die älteste Thorner Stadtchronik*, who was a city councillor and the secretary of the City of Toruń (he wrote in the 2nd half of the 16th century), the inhabitant of Elbląg (?) Jerzy Ranis (died after 1564) and the publisher of Königsberg associated with the priest Albrecht Hohenzollern the publisher Johann Daubmann (before 1545–1573) – *Die älteste Thorner Stadtchronik*, hrsg. v. Max TÖPPEN, *Zeitschrift des Westpreussischen Geschichtsvereins*, H. 42: 1900, pp. 154–155; Georg RANIS, *Kurtzer auszugs Der Ankunfft, Regierung, vnd lebens Aller Hohemeister Detsches ordens in Preussen*, Elbing 1564, fol. 107v; Johann DAUBMANN, *Chronica. Kurtzer Auszug der Preussischen Chronicken, von dem Jar 1200. bis auff diese jetzige unsere zeit*, Königsberg 1566, fol. Xv. The authors give very concise information about the peace treaty; their attitude is definitely proroyal, pro-Polish and pro-federation. The size of the texts is limited. Georg Ranis dedicated his chronicle to the bishop of Chełmno Stanisław Żeliszawski (1562–1571), while Daubmann – to the Prussian prince Albrecht Frederick Hohenzollern (1568–1578), the son of Albrecht Hohenzollern (1525–1568) – G. RANIS, op.cit., ch. 1r; J. DAUBMANN, op.cit., fol. Ar; see also Udo ARNOLD, *Studien zur preussischen Historiographie des 16. Jahrhunderts*, Bonn 1967, p. 202, footnote 37; J. TANDECKI, op.cit., p. 19. The problem is show to classify the author *Thorner Denkwürdigkeiten*. According to the literature the source was prepared in the mid-16<sup>th</sup> century by a secretary or a city councilor (even by the mayor or burgrave) of the city of Toruń. The original disappeared, and its copy comes from the 18<sup>th</sup> century. It includes a very scarce description of the peace treaty – *Thorner Denkwürdigkeiten 1345–1547*, State Archive in Toruń, Kat II, XIII-4, p. 155; *Thorner Denkwürdigkeiten von 1345–1547*, hrsg. v. Albert VOIGT (Mitteilungen des Copernicus-Vereins für Wissenschaft und Kunst zu Thorn, H. 13), Thorn 1904, pp. 106, IX, XV–XVI; see also Piotr OLIŃSKI, *Nowe Miasto Toruń w nowożytnych kronikach mieszczańskich*, [in:] *Nowe Miasto Toruń. 750 lat od lokacji*, red. Krzysztof MIKULSKI, Piotr OLIŃSKI, Waldemar ROZYNKOWSKI, Toruń 2014, p. 246. The poor condition of the source does not allow us to define how extensive was the description in the original. It is not known in what percentage it was preserved and whether the author of the copy did not interfere in the original structure.

the comprehensive account by J. Lindau. Some of them also used some extracts from other sources, which were generally of Prussian or Polish origin. Only in one case the record from the so called *Die Danziger Chronik vom Bunde* did not include the content of the treaty and the Grand Master's vow. However, all of them emphasize that the treaty was concluded in accordance with the legal requirements of the time in an explicit manner, which made it legally valid. Some of the chroniclers indicate that the peace treaty – also referred to as „good” or „precious and desired treaty” – was a positive event as it introduced agreement and unity. Briefly speaking, the authors represent the historiographic trend, which to my mind was inspired by the governing classes in Prussia<sup>59</sup> – characterized (more or less) by the detailed information about the Peace Treaty of Toruń. As we know, the councils of big Prussian cities which had got rid of the Teutonic rule upon the Treaty of Toruń and achieved the desired peace, independence (autonomy) and the possibility of becoming more and more affluent thanks to the trade with Poland, were ardent supporters of the union between Prussia and the Kingdom of Poland<sup>60</sup>. The rulers of the Duchy of Prussia advocated the association with Poland as their *a lege* lawless rule in Prussia – so fiercely questioned by the German branch of the Order, German emperors and princes<sup>61</sup> – depended to a large extent on the alliance with Poland. As a consequence, historiographers associated with them supported the Polish reason of state.

The latter group – of chroniclers not connected with the governing classes – includes: the author of the *Annals of Golub*<sup>62</sup>, the continuator of the

---

<sup>59</sup> The fact that the day of signing the treaty was celebrated in Prussia shows how important the Second Peace of Toruń was for Prussia – BPAN Gdańsk, Ms 58 – *Chronica und Beschreibung des Landes Preußen undt Pohlen* (so-called „Die große Melmannische Chronik”), p. 574: „derhalben in Preußßer Landt dieser Tagk gefeieryt wird zum ewigen Gedächtnis”; see also Edmund KIZIK, *Gdański medal jubileuszowy z okazji trzechsetlecia inkorporacji Prus do Polski w 1754 roku*, *Zapiski Historyczne*, vol. 77: 2012, no. 2, p. 79, where the information is included that subsequent anniversaries of the union between the Polish Kingdom and Prussia – 1654 and 1754 – were celebrated in Prussia solemnly as national holidays.

<sup>60</sup> See M. BISKUP, *Polityka*, pp. 276, 283; Marian BISKUP, Gerard LABUDA, *Dzieje Zakonu Krzyżackiego w Prusach. Gospodarka – Społeczeństwo – Państwo – Ideologia*, Gdańsk 1988, pp. 463, 470; Janusz MAŁŁEK, *Powstanie poczucia krajowej odrębności w Prusach i jej rozwój w XV i XVI wieku*, [in:] idem, *Dwie części Prus. Studia z dziejów Prus Książęcych i Prus Królewskich w XVI i XVII wieku*, Toruń 2015, pp. 20, 23.

<sup>61</sup> More in M. BISKUP, G. LABUDA, op.cit., p. 509; Jacek WIJACZKA, *Albrecht von Brandenburg-Ansbach (1490–1568). Ostatni mistrz zakonu krzyżackiego i pierwszy książę „w Prusiech”*, Olsztyn 2010, pp. 116–142.

<sup>62</sup> *Annales Golubienses*, ed. Wojciech KĘTRZYŃSKI, [in:] MPH, vol. 4, Lwów 1884, p. 41: „Item pax facta est huius belli in anno 1466 in festo sancti Luce ewangelistę”; *Die Annalen von Gollub*, hrsg. v. Walter HUBATSCH, bearb. v. Udo ARNOLD, [in:] SRP, Bd. 6, Frankfurt am Main 1968, p. 166: „Item pax facta est huius belli in anno 1466 in festo sancti Luce ewangelistę”.

Toruń Annals<sup>63</sup>, the author of the so called Annals of Oliva<sup>64</sup>, the works by the Königsberg chronicler Paul Pole (ca. 1470–1533)<sup>65</sup>, by the historian of Elbląg Christoph Falk (died ca. 1572)<sup>66</sup>, and by the clergyman associated with Königsberg – Kaspar Hennenberger (1529–1600)<sup>67</sup>. Their accounts – as it has been already stated – are very short and limited to the provision of the date

<sup>63</sup> *Fortsetzung des Thorner Annalisten*, hrsg. v. Ernst STREHLKE, [in:] SRP, Bd. 3, Leipzig 1866, p. 399: „Anno 1466 ... facta fuit pax perpetua Thoronie XIX octobris per medium Rodolphi episcopi Lavantini, legati apostolici. [Lvce post lvce placatvr rege magister]”.

<sup>64</sup> *Die mittlere Chronik von Oliva*, hrsg. v. Theodor HIRSCH, [in:] SRP, Bd. 5, p. 634: „Pomerellia tota et maior pars Prussiae cum celeberrimo castro Mariaeburg, (quod usque hodie regibus Poloniae subset) regiae ditioni subijcitur. Porro magister magnus crucigerorum rebus non pro voto suo currentibus Regiomontum secessit ibique sedem suam posuit et per pacis conditiones eam Prussiae partem obtinuit, qua usque hodie duces Prussiae potiuntur ... Anno 1466 post multa fuit composita ac publice proclamata pax inter Prussiam, magistrum generalem et ciuitates”; *Annales Olivenses*, ed. Wojciech KĘTRZYŃSKI, MPH, t. 6, Lwów 1893, s. 368–369: „Pomerellia tota et maior pars Prussiae cum celeberrimo castro Mariaeburg – quod usque hodie regibus Poloniae subset – regiae ditioni subiicitur. Porro magister magnus crucigerorum, rebus non pro voto suo currentibus, Regiomontum secessit ibique sedem suam posuit et per pacis conditiones eam Prussiae partem obtinuit, qua usque hodie duces Prussiae potiuntur... Anno 1466 post multa fuit composita ac publice proclamata pax inter Prussiam, magistrum generalem et civitates”.

<sup>65</sup> *Paul Pole's Preussische Chronik*, hrsg. v. M. TÖPPEN, [in:] SRP, Bd. 5, pp. 191–194; see also U. ARNOLD, op.cit., p. 41; J. TANDECKI, op.cit., p. 19.

<sup>66</sup> *Christoph Falk's Elbingisch-Preussische Chronik*, hrsg. v. Max TOEPPEN, [in:] *Die preussischen Geschichtsschreiber des XVI. und XVII. Jahrhunderts*, Bd. 4, Abt. 1, Leipzig 1879, p. 23: „Also nu der mester Lodewich ken Toren gekommen ist, hot in der konig erbarlich lossen entpfangen mit entgegenreiten seiner Polen buwssen der stad toren. Dornoch, wie her zu im gekommen ist auf das rathaus zu Toren, do ist der konig gestanden mit seinen reten und och der bischof von Helsingberck. Der konig hot dem her meister Lodewig seine hant gerecht, in wilkomme gehessen, och seine geistigen heren und freunt die polnischen rete auf die rege anher, bes es gekomen ist an den bisof von Helesberck, den her Pael Legendorf. Also her dem her mester die hant wolde reichen, hot der her mester seine hant zu sich gezogen. [Das war dem bischof ein grosser hon vor dem konige und alle seinen reten, och vor den fremden], dorfor das her verboten hatte, den mester nicht dorchzuzin lossen dorch den Brunenberck. Das was dem bischofe ein grosser hon vor allen reten. Do zu der stunde nam der konig des mesters hant und des bisofes hant und gab sie bede zu hoffe vor den menschen; got wuste das hercze der beden. Der konig hot den mester begobet mit grossem geschencke. Do nu alle dinck vorbrocht was, beschreiben, geschworen und vorbrifet, do ist alles folck von einander gezogen”.

<sup>67</sup> Kaspar HENNENBERGER, *Kurtze und einfeltige Beschreibung, aller Hohemeister Deutsches Ordens S. Mariae, des Hospitals zu Jerusalem, Königsperg in Preussen 1584*, fol. li2v: „Und sollte frieden werden, musste der Hohemeister viel Landes ubergeben, und dem König traw und gehorsam zusein, schweren”; idem, *Erklärung der preussischen grössern Landtaffel oder Mappen mit leicht Erfindung aller Städte, Schlösser, Flecken, Kirchdörffer, Oerten, Ströme, Flüßer und See, so darinnen begriffen*, Königsberg 1595, p. 458: „Anno 1466. Ist auff Lucie zu Thorn der vertrag, nach dem Grossen Kriige gemacht, und der König und Ludwig von Erlingshausen der Hoemeister, mit einander versöhnet, solcher ist auch bekrefftigt von Rudolpho Bischoff zu Löenthal, Bäpstlicher Bottschaft”.



and place of signing the treaty. If, like in the case of Falk, the account is longer, it concentrates more on Grand Master Ludwig's insulting the bishop of Erm-land [Warmia] Paul Legendorf by refusing to shake his hand rather than on the provisions of the peace treaty. Despite the fact that the account by Pole is longer, it concentrates mainly on the consequences of the war and lists towns and castles which became the property of Poland or the Teutonic Order.

## 2. ACCOUNTS OF THE DEFEATED PARTY

In the case of the Teutonic chronicles and accounts written by the advocates of the Teutonic Order, whose authors write independently (with one exception)<sup>68</sup>, a clear tendency may be noticed. None of the sources provides the whole text of the treaty and the vow of the Grand Master, nor do they include the provisions of the peace treaty. Supposedly, some of the chroniclers had access to the Treaty of Toruń. They also do not inform that the Grand Master became a vassal of Poland, and that Teutonic Prussia became a fief of Poland<sup>69</sup>. What is more, they fail to provide the date and place of signing the peace treaty<sup>70</sup>. If they do it, they do it incompletely and erroneously<sup>71</sup>. Only the author of *Die jüngere Hochmeisterchronik* informs that the Teutonic State was divided as a result of the Treaty of Toruń. They inform that Poland was given Pomerania with over thirty towns and villages that Poland received (the list was inaccurate). Next, the chroniclers give the names of 78 towns and villages given to the Teutonic Order (also inaccurately and erroneously). Finally, they list over a hundred villages the Teutonic Order owned in Livonia and in the archbishopric of Riga, the bishoprics of Courland, Tallin, Ösel–Wiek and Tartu [Dorpat]<sup>72</sup>. Undoubtedly, the aim is to show how few towns and villages

<sup>68</sup> The author *Chronica Teutisches Ordens und Hospitals Sanct Marien von Jerusalem*, BPAN Gdańsk, Ms 1262, fol. 1r–111r rewrote from *Die jüngere Hochmeisterchronik*, hrsg. v. Theodor HIRSCH, [in:] SRP, Bd. 5, pp. 43–148 – see Otto GÜNTHER, *Katalog der Handschriften der Danziger Stadtbibliothek*, Teil 2, Danzig 1903, pp. 184.

<sup>69</sup> *Die jüngere Hochmeisterchronik*, pp. 142–147; *Die ältere Hochmeisterchronik (Dritte Fortsetzung)*, bearb. v. Max TOEPPEN, [in:] SRP, Bd. 3, Leipzig 1866, pp. 705–706; *Historia brevis magistrorum ordinis Theutonici generalium ad Martinum Truchses continuata*, hrsg. v. Max TOEPPEN, [in:] SRP, Bd. 4, p. 270.

<sup>70</sup> *Die ältere Hochmeisterchronik (Dritte Fortsetzung)*, pp. 705–706; *Historia brevis magistrorum ordinis Theutonici generalium ad Martinum Truchses continuata*, p. 270.

<sup>71</sup> *Die ältere Hochmeisterchronik (Dritte Fortsetzung)*, pp. 705–706; *Die jüngere Hochmeisterchronik*, p. 142.

<sup>72</sup> *Die jüngere Hochmeisterchronik*, pp. 142–147. In one of the variations of the chronicle written in *Hochdeutsch*. It said that as a result of the division of Prussia Poland had received Pomerania, Malbork, Elbląg and Chełmno Land. Having listed the lands that the Teutonic Order had received it was quickly added that it had been given another huge territory of Prussia – BPAN Gdańsk, Ms 1262: *Chronica Teutisches Ordens und Hospitals Sanct Marien von Jerusalem*, fol. 111r; *Die jüngere Hochmeisterchronik*, p. 142, footnote a.

were given to Poland and how many of them remained in the Teutonic State. The author of one of the continuations of *Die ältere Hochmeisterchronik* (created in the years 1472–1479 by a clergyman of Ermland<sup>73</sup>) focuses on the affronts taking place before and during the conclusion of the treaty, and which were generated by the bishop of Ermland Paul Legendorf and Grand Master Ludwig von Erlichshausen<sup>74</sup>. Even when he wrote that the treaty had been signed in a friendly and joyful atmosphere, he added below that such a behavior might have been artificial<sup>75</sup>. The Teutonic sources normally do not evaluate the peace, and if they do it their judgement is negative. In *Historia brevis magistrorum ordinis Theutonici generalium ad Martinum Truchses continuata* it reads that the Grand Master was forced to conclude a treaty with Poland. Moreover, the author considered the fact of Prussia being taken over by Poland to be an act against God and justice. He also hoped that the situation would change, for which he prayed everyday<sup>76</sup>. On the other hand, in *Chronica Teutsches Ordens und Hospitals Sanct Marien von Jerusalem* – that is in one of the variations of *Die jüngere Hochmeisterchronik* – it says that the division of Prussia was infamous and useless<sup>77</sup>. Thus, among Teutonic historiographers and supporters of the Teutonic Order there prevailed chroniclers who failed to provide the content of the treaty and presented it in a negative light.

To recapitulate, the comparative study presented above gives us the following image. The manner of writing about the Second Peace Treaty of Toruń was determined by the social and political background of the authors, the aim for which the works were written, the literary genre of the authors. The winning party provided the most extensive accounts about the peace treaty. Polish historiography did not present – unlike Prussian historiography – the whole text of the treaty, which was determined by the length of the chronicles and the fact that the treaty had been published in Poland. What is essential is that nobody except J. Długosz quoted the treaty directly. Accounts of Polish chroniclers of the 16<sup>th</sup> century are not emotionally loaded, are devoid of the feeling of triumph and patriotism, and are free of historical-moral deliberations, which were typical of J. Długosz's account. The reason for this was probably the fact that the accounts of neither Maciej of Miechów nor M. Kromer, so willingly quoted, did not copy the style represented by J. Długosz. Furthermore, Polish chroniclers of the second half of the 16<sup>th</sup> century tended to summarize the information provided by other sources since the Teutonic issue did not generate major interest in their times. However, it must be underlined that the very fact of including the information about the Peace of Toruń in their accounts is the evidence that they considered it to be important. Still, the account concerning the treaty no longer appears as an independent event (like in J. Długosz's chronicle), but it is part of the description of the rule of King

Casimir IV Jagiellon. Generally, the Polish chroniclers of the second half of the 16<sup>th</sup> century are much more interested in the contemporary issues than in the times of the Treaty of Toruń. What is more, the treaty concerned the peripheral territory of Prussia in the huge area of the Rzeczpospolita, the attention of which was directed towards Livonia, Muscovites and Turkey.

In Prussian historiography two authors (J. Lindau and H. Waldau) presented the whole text of the treaty. It probably resulted from the fact that their works were not strictly historiographic. It may be stated that in the whole Prussian historiography of the discussed period there exists a visible division into authors remaining closely connected with the ruling classes and independent writers. The information provided by the former is generally more extensive and detailed, whilst the information given by the latter is quite scarce. Moreover, the Second Peace of Toruń seems to have had a much bigger importance for Prussian chroniclers than for Polish ones since it had affected the history of Prussia to a larger extent.

On the other hand, the chronicles written by the Teutonic knights or advocates of the Teutonic Order tend not to include the text of the treaty and present a very negative judgement of the peace treaty, which must have been caused by political factors and propaganda.

*(transl. by Agnieszka Chabros)*

Nadesłany 3 IX 2016

Nadesłany po poprawkach 20 XI 2016

Zaakceptowany 12 XII 2016

*Dr hab. Sławomir Zonenberg, prof. UKW  
Instytut Historii i Stosunków Międzynarodowych  
Uniwersytet Kazimierza Wielkiego w Bydgoszczy  
e-mail: zonenbergs@poczta.onet.pl*

DRUGI POKÓJ TORUŃSKI Z 19 PAŹDZIERNIKA 1466 R. W POLSKIEJ,  
PRUSKIEJ I KRZYŻACKIEJ HISTORIOGRAFII XV–XVI WIEKU

## Streszczenie

**Słowa kluczowe:** dziejopisarstwo, wojna trzynastoletnia, Polska, zakon krzyżacki, Prusy Królewskie, Prusy Książęce

Na sposób pisania o drugim pokoju toruńskim poważnie wpłynęło środowisko społeczne i polityczne, z którego wywodzili się kronikarze, cel tworzenia utworów, ale także gatunek pisarski, jaki uprawiali. Najobszerniej o pokoju pisała strona zwycięska, zwłaszcza w XV w. W dziejopisarstwie polskim nie przedstawiono całej treści traktatu, co w tym przypadku wynikało z założeń utworów i ich objętości. Wpływ na to mógł mieć też od pewnego momentu fakt opublikowania treści traktatu w Polsce. Co natomiast istotne, jeśli nawet nim dysponowano, nikt – oprócz Jana Długosza – nie ekscerpował go bezpośrednio. Relacje polskich kronikarzy z XVI w. są mniej szczegółowe, a ponadto nie zawierają występującego u Długosza emocjonalnego zaangażowania, poczucia triumfu i patriotyzmu oraz rozważań historiozoficzno-moralnych. Najpewniej z tego powodu, że kwestia ta – po likwidacji państwa krzyżackiego w 1525 r. – nie budziła w ich czasach, zwłaszcza zaś w drugiej połowie XVI stulecia, już większego zainteresowania. W dziejopisarstwie pruskim dwóch autorów – tj. Jan Lindaua i Hieronim Waldaua, piszących w XV w. – zaprezentowało całą treść traktatu. Wynikało to zapewne z tego, że ich utwory nie miały charakteru stricte historiograficznego. W całym dziejopisarstwie pruskim analizowanego okresu w przypadku relacji o pokoju występuje wyraźny podział na autorów pozostających w bliskich kontaktach z rządzącymi oraz piszących od nich niezależnie. Informacje tych pierwszych są obszernie i szczegółowe, natomiast drugich – skąpe. Odnosi się ponadto ogólne wrażenie, że dla dziejopisarzy pruskich drugi pokój toruński, który silnie wpłynął na losy ich ojczyzny, miał daleko większe znaczenie niż dla kronikarzy polskich – zwłaszcza tych z XVI stulecia. W dziejopisarstwie krzyżackim i zwolenników Zakonu natomiast widać ewidentne dążenie do nieprzekazywania treści pokoju i jego bardzo negatywną ocenę. Można być przekonany, że u przyczyn takiego postępowania legły czynniki polityczno-propagandowe.

DER ZWEITE THORNER FRIEDEN VOM 19. OKTOBER 1466  
IN DER HISTORIOGRAFIE POLENS, PREUSSENS  
UND DES DEUTSCHEN ORDENS DES 15. UND 16. JAHRHUNDERTS

Zusammenfassung

**Schlüsselwörter:** Geschichtsschreibung, Dreizehnjähriger Krieg, Deutscher Orden, Königlich-preußisches Preußen, Herzoglich-preußisches Preußen, 15.–16. Jahrhundert

Die Geschichtsschreibung zum Zweiten Thorner Frieden war stark beeinflusst vom sozialen und politischen Milieu, aus dem die Chronisten stammten, von der Absicht, mit der die Werke geschrieben wurden, und auch von der literarischen Gattung, derer sie sich bedienten. Am ausführlichsten schrieb über den Frieden die siegreiche Partei, vor allem im 15. Jahrhundert. In der polnischen Geschichtsschreibung ging man nicht auf den gesamten Vertragsinhalt ein, was in diesem Fall mit der Anlage der Werke und ihrem Umfang zusammenhing. Ein weiterer Grund kann ab einem bestimmten Zeitpunkt der Umstand gewesen sein, dass der Inhalt des Vertrags in Polen publiziert wurde. Wesentlich ist jedoch, dass dennoch außer Jan Długosz niemand direkt auf ihn zurückgriff. Die Berichte der polnischen Chronisten aus dem 16. Jahrhundert sind insgesamt bereits weniger detailliert und zeigen auch nicht die bei Długosz auftretende emotionale Beteiligung, das Gefühl des Triumphs und des Patriotismus sowie historiosophisch-moralische Überlegungen. Der Grund dafür ist sicherlich, dass diese Angelegenheit nach der Auflösung des Ordensstaats 1525 in ihrer Zeit, vor allem in der zweiten Hälfte des 16. Jahrhunderts, kein größeres Interesse mehr erregte. In der preußischen Geschichtsschreibung brachten zwei Autoren, Johannes Lindau und Hieronymus Waldau, die im 15. Jahrhundert schrieben, den ganzen Inhalt des Vertrags. Das hing sicherlich damit zusammen, dass ihre Werke keinen streng historiografischen Charakter hatten. In der gesamten preußischen Geschichtsschreibung des untersuchten Zeitraums gibt es bei den Berichten über den Frieden eine klare Zweiteilung in Autoren, die in engem Kontakt zu den Regierenden standen, und solche, die unabhängig von ihnen schrieben. Die Informationen der Ersteren sind normalerweise ausführlich und detailliert, die der Letzteren dagegen spärlich. Außerdem drängt sich der Eindruck auf, dass für die preußischen Geschichtsschreiber der Zweite Thorner Frieden, der für das Schicksal ihres Vaterlands große Bedeutung besaß, eine wesentlich größere Bedeutung als für die polnischen Chronisten hatte, zumal für die in der zweiten Hälfte des 16. Jahrhunderts. Dagegen ist in der Geschichtsschreibung des Deutschen Ordens und seiner Anhänger zu erkennen, dass man offensichtlich bemüht war, den Inhalt des Friedens nicht wiederzugeben, und dass man ihn sehr negativ bewertete. Dieser Haltung lagen sicherlich politisch-propagandistische Faktoren zugrunde.

