

DARIUSZ POLIŃSKI

WOOD AND EARTH FORTRESSES OF THE TEUTONIC ORDER IN THE TERRITORY OF NORTH-EASTERN POLAND

Abstract: The following article is a discussion on wood and earth fortresses of the Teutonic Order in north-eastern Poland. It is simultaneously an attempt at organising information about less known facilities, their forms and application of building materials, as well as their function and chronology. Source data for these fortresses is not widely known or very laconic, mostly derived from mentions in written sources. 16 fortalices are discussed, seven of which were situated in the former territory of the Bartians or its border, five in the Galindians' land, three in the Pogesanians' area, and one in the Sassinians' territory. It was noticed that fortresses constructed in the 14th century from scratch prevailed. Other fortalices were built, or were in most cases adapted for the Order's needs as early as the 13th century. A part of the analysed fortresses functioned in the administration-territorial system within the framework of the Teutonic reign in Prussia. They were seats of the Order's officials, mostly those of lower ranks: bailiffs, procurators and reeves. As far as the form of the discussed type of fortress is concerned, the most important data was provided by the facilities in Pisz and Szestno, situated in the former territory of the Galindians. Finally, it should be emphasised that in further studies on the issue of Teutonic wood and earth fortresses the most important and key role must be played by archaeological research.

Keywords: territory of north-eastern Poland, Late Middle Ages, the Teutonic Order, Prussians, wood and earth fortresses

In one of my previous works¹ I discussed more recent studies on some wood and earth fortresses of the Teutonic Knights. Features which underwent archaeological research of various scope (mainly situated in the Land of Chełmno), were discussed taking into account a division into premises with defensive layouts gained from indigenous inhabitants and later adapted to the Order's needs, and structures constructed by the Teutonic Knights independently (in a place where there used to be a stronghold) and built from scratch. The analysis also takes into consideration transformations into brick fortresses. Furthermore, traits of defensive architecture which the Order encountered after the arrival in the territory of the Land of Chełmno and Prussia were discussed. Moreover, it was pointed out that Teutonic wood and earth fortresses varied in terms of their form and size, which probably resulted from the fact that they were constructed by different contractors. Their functions varied, too. Most frequently they were small village fortresses with clearly stressed household functions, though sometimes they served as an Order's seat, a military facility, or a watchtower². Yet until recently such buildings were

referred to in archaeological literature as strongholds, and what was left from them as remains of strongholds. However, the type or the form of a facility examined in the field should be determined as precisely as possible.

Written sources, on the one hand, confirm the diversity in terms of Late Medieval defensive and defensive-residential architecture (e.g., *castrum*, *castellum*, *fortalicium*, *turris*)³. On the other hand, beside interchangeable application of some names (e.g., *castrum seu fortalicium*, *fortalicium alias thwyerdz*), the applied terms do not inform precisely about the character of defensive fortalices; at most, they mention their existence⁴. B. Guerquin claims that the Latin word *castrum* corresponded to the Polish term "stronghold", and only at the turn of the 15th and 16th century it was replaced with the term "castle"⁵. Apart from that, the data from these sources does not determine the time of origin of strongholds.

³ Kajzer 1980, 28; Guerquin 1984, 14; Kołodziejki 1994, 13; Kajzer 2003, 66; Pietrzak 2003, 19-21.

⁴ E.g., R. Grygiel believes that the term *fortalicium* used in written sources stands for a defensive tower on a mound (Grygiel 1996, 235). This, however, is unconvincing on account of a wider range of the application of the term *fortalicium* (cf. Kołodziejki 1994, 13).

⁵ Guerquin 1984, 14.

¹ Poliński 2007.

² Poliński 2007, 241-242.

In the case of multiphase facilities it is difficult to guess whether source mentions refer to initial or final stages of their existence⁶. In Prussian fortified architecture the Latin words *domus* and *castrum* were from the very beginning reserved for seats of Teutonic commanders and the Order. Furthermore, they were used interchangeably⁷. The German equivalent of *domus* was the word *hus*. The term *hus* is identified with Polish ‘castle’, however with a clear emphasis on the residential function⁸. In the 14th-century chronicle by Jeroschin there are three terms used for a castle: *burc*, *vestin* and *hus*. They were used synonymously; furthermore, *hus* might have meant the actual commander’s castle. On the other hand, in *The older chronicle of the Grand Masters* (15th century) castles were centres of territorial power, which was expressed by means of using the term *slosz*⁹. It should be emphasised that at the end of the 14th and in the first half of the 15th century in Teutonic sources, written in German, there appeared different forms of the term *hus*: *huß*, *husz*, *huws*¹⁰. For example in *The Great Book Of Offices* the seat of Teutonic procurators in Pień is referred to as *huws*¹¹: however, it is hard to say on that basis a brick facility was meant, as some researchers presume¹². This is because excavations pointed out that in the times of Teutonic rule it was a wood and earth building¹³. Moreover, Pień was never a seat of the Teutonic Order, which questions the assumption that the term *hus* was always used for a commander’s seat¹⁴.

Next, I will continue my discussion on wood and earth defensive fortresses of the Teutonic Order in north-eastern Poland (the Warmińsko-Mazurskie Voivodeship). It will simultaneously be an attempt at organising information about less known facilities, their form and application of building materials, as well as their function and chronology. Source data for these fortresses is not widely known and/or very laconic, mostly derived from mentions in written sources (mainly from the chronicles by Dusburg, Wigand of Marburg, or Jeroschin). I will discuss 16 fortalices, seven of which were situated in the former territory of the Bartians (Barciany I and II, Reszel, Bartoszyce, Kętrzyn and Mołtajny) or its border (Lidzbark Warmiński), five in the Galindians’ land (Pisz, Szczytno, Szestno, Wielbark and Węgorzewo), three in the Pogesanians’ area (Pasłęk, Ostróda and Morąg), and one in the Sassinians’

territory (Nidzica). It should be marked that archaeological research embraced only five fortresses – brick castles in Ostróda, Reszel, Szczytno, Szestno and Węgorzewo. Thus, there appeared a possibility to verify the statement that they may have been wood and earth fortalices in their earliest stages. Unfortunately, apart from exceptionally interesting results of the works at Szestno, this research has not contributed much to the discussed issues (see below).

It is known that part of the earliest defensive premises of the Order were fortresses gained on local inhabitants during the conquest of the Prussian land and directly after it was completed. They were strongholds, thus for their potential modernisation mainly wood and earth was used for obvious reasons. Later on, some of these fortresses underwent transformation into brick castles. Among the facilities which were not transformed into brick fortalices there was a fortress in Barciany (I)¹⁵. In Barciany there was the main town of Barta, located possibly on the so-called castle hill. It was mentioned in the 16th century by the chronicler Henneberger¹⁶. According to M. Arsyński, it might have later served the Order¹⁷. After the capture of the premise by the Teutonic Knights (before 1257¹⁸), it might have functioned as a temporary watchtower, possibly till the beginning of the 14th century, precisely till about 1325. This is because the first mention about a new stronghold in Barciany (II; *Bartinburg*)¹⁹ comes from that time. The new premise was located most probably to the north-west of the former structure²⁰. The transformation into a brick castle was done in the case of the stronghold in Reszel. However, it took place when the facility already belonged to the Bishop of Warmia²¹. In this town, in the place of the former stronghold of the Bartians²², a Teutonic watchtower was constructed (*castrum Resel*) in 1241²³. However, it was destroyed by the Prussians in the following year. After suppressing the first Prussian uprising and reaching an agreement in Dzierzgoń in 1249 the fortalice was rebuilt²⁴. During the second Prussian uprising (in 1262) the

¹⁵ The premise in Lidzbark Warmiński may also be mentioned. It certainly had a form of a watchtower and existed most probably in 1241-1251. However, in this case its connection with the Prussian stronghold *Lechburg*, conquered in 1241 by the Teutonic Knights is not certain (Salm 2003a, 268). In 1251 this fortress was handed by the Order to the Bishop of Warmia (Haftka 1999, 152).

¹⁶ Górski and Arsyński 1967, 5, 36.

¹⁷ Górski and Arsyński 1967, 37.

¹⁸ The mention of Henryk von Alfelt, the commander of Barciany (PR, 152), is interpreted as a misleading one (Torbus 1998, 350).

¹⁹ SRP I, 280.

²⁰ Haftka 1999, 29.

²¹ Officially the transfer took place as early as 1254, though the fortress was not manned by the bishop’s garrison until 1300 (Haftka 1999, 271).

²² Most probably the remains of this facility were exposed during excavations in the 1970s – they were under the south wing of the brick castle (Haftka 1999, 271).

²³ SRP I, 65, 366; Dusburg, 59.

²⁴ Haftka 1999, 271.

⁶ Kajzer 1988, 20-21; Kołodziejcki 1994, 13.

⁷ There were also exceptions to this rule. E.g., in the Land of Chełmno, a knightly residence in Plemięta (which was a wooden tower on a mound, as demonstrated by excavations), is identified with *castrum Clementis* from the chronicle by Dusburg (Powerski 1985).

⁸ Józwiak and Trupinda 2012, 96-97.

⁹ Józwiak and Trupinda 2012, 36, 38.

¹⁰ Józwiak and Trupinda 2012, 98.

¹¹ GÅ, 463, 490.

¹² Józwiak 2005, 98.

¹³ Poliński 2013, Pień.

¹⁴ Poliński 2013, 10-11.

withdrawing Teutonic garrison themselves burnt the fortifications²⁵. At the end of this uprising (in 1273?) the watchtower was rebuilt again²⁶. The brick castle was raised in the 14th century, probably after the year 1350²⁷.

Another group are fortalices constructed independently by the Teutonic Knights in the place where there used to stand a stronghold, so as a matter of fact on the remains of a stronghold. Thus, a field form had to be adapted. These fortresses were transformed into brick castles. The examples are the facilities in Bartoszyce and Pasłek. In Bartoszyce a Teutonic fortalice was built in 1240 during the conquest of Bartia²⁸. Nevertheless, in 1264 the fortalice was conquered and seized by Prussian insurrectionists²⁹. In 1273, when the Bartians surrendered to the power of the Order, the fortalice was demolished and burnt by the Sudovians³⁰. After suppressing the second Prussian uprising (after 1274), the defensive premise in Bartoszyce was rebuilt again as the Teutonic facility (the seat of a procurator). Some researchers believe that this was done with the use of brick³¹, whereas in Pasłek the Teutonic fortalice was raised in the place of a Prussian stronghold (*Pazulak*), most probably built at the beginning of the 13th³² or in the 12th century. The Teutonic fortalice (*Pozlak*) is mentioned in the location charter of the town in 1297. A brick fortalice (procurator's seat) which replaced this facility was constructed in 1320-1339³³.

The first wooden Teutonic watchtower in Kętrzyn (*Rastenburg*) was built about 1329. It was situated on a small plateau rising by the Guber River, the right – bank tributary of the Łyna River, in the place of an old Prussian settlement *Rast*³⁴. This fortalice was a chain link of a defensive system on the border of *Wildnis* – the area grown with wilderness, which separated the previously reclaimed land of the Teutonic State from Lithuania. The facility might have been destroyed twice during the Lithuanian invasion under the command of Olgierd and Kiejstut in the years 1345 and 1347³⁵. It is believed that in place of this fortalice a brick castle was built in the years 1360-1370³⁶.

The next group are facilities raised from scratch which evolved or could have evolved into brick castles. In most cases (beside the fortalice in Szestno) it is not certain as there is no credible source evidence that the brick castle was built in the same place where the former wood and earth fortalice existed. The following fortifications belong to this group: Barciany (II), Nidzica, Pisz, Szczytno, Szestno, Wielbark and perhaps Moraq.

Another Teutonic fortified premise in Barciany (*Bartenburg*) was, according to Wigand of Marburg, raised in 1325³⁷, as one of the links of a fortress chain which were built in the neighbourhood of the contemporary border with Lithuania³⁸. The chain also embraced fortresses in Szczytno, Mrągowo, Ryn, Bezląwki, Kętrzyn, Barciany and Węgorzewo. There is no credible source information about construction details of the first fortifications in Barciany. It is accepted that the first mentions refer to a fortress of a temporary character preceding the later facility. According to M. Haftka, wood and earth fortifications were built in the years 1325-1353³⁹. The beginning of the construction of the brick castle dates back to the 4th quarter of the 14th century⁴⁰. From 1349 comes a mention about a reeve in Barciany⁴¹, and under the year 1361 in the chronicle of Wigand of Marburg we can find a mention about a procurator (*Pfleger von Barten*)⁴². At the beginning of the 14th century a fortress in Nidzica⁴³ was built. In this fortalice⁴⁴ an official of the Order resided (a bailiff), subordinate first to the commander of Dzierzgoń, and next (from 1341) as a procurator, to the commander of Ostróda. The construction of the brick castle was initiated after 1370 and finished about 1400⁴⁵. The next fortalice (in Pisz) was, beside Elk, the south-easternmost Teutonic stronghold. The facility (*Johannisburg*) was most probably built in 1345, in the times of the Grand Master Henryk Dusemer⁴⁶. It was commanded by a procurator subordinate to the power of the commander in Bałga. As M. Haftka believes, the most essential

²⁵ SRP I, 102; Dusburg, 105.

²⁶ Haftka 1999, 271.

²⁷ Rzempoluch 1993, 18.

²⁸ Dusburg, 59.

²⁹ Dusburg, 116.

³⁰ Dusburg, 141.

³¹ Salm 2003b, 85; Rzempoluch 1993, 3.

³² Haftka 1999, 225.

³³ Czubieli 1986, 65; Rzempoluch 1993, 120; Salm 2003c, 370.

³⁴ Czubieli 1986, 26; Rzempoluch 1993, 54; the facility was undoubtedly raised in 1344 (Codex, No. 81; SRP II, 508; cf. Toepfen 1998, 90).

³⁵ SRP II, 508; Wigand, 78-81. From the report of Wigand of Marburg it appears that damages concerned the town of Rastenburg (*oppidum*). He writes that inhabitants were either killed or taken into captivity and everything what the Teutonic Knights found there was destroyed. So, a possible destruction of the Order's fortress is only a hypothesis (cf. Rzempoluch 1993, 54). However, it is very probable.

³⁶ Guerquin 1984, 171; Czubieli 1986, 26.

³⁷ SRP II, 584; cf. above.

³⁸ Steinbrecht 1920, 78.

³⁹ Haftka 1999, 29.

⁴⁰ Górski and Arszczyński 1967, 46-50. The construction of the first brick elements of the castle in Barciany is dated by C. Steinbrecht to 1380-1390 (Steinbrecht 1920, 78). According to K.-H. Clasen, however, the facility was built in the years 1380-1410 (Clasen 1927, 120).

⁴¹ PUB IV, 479.

⁴² SRP II, 530.

⁴³ According to some researchers, the facility might have been created as early as the half of the 13th c., as a Teutonic watchtower in the Sassinians' land (Czubieli 1986, 49; Haftka 1999, 190).

⁴⁴ The first mention about the castle in Nidzica comes from 1359 (Czubieli 1986, 49), so it most probably refers to the wood and earth fortress.

⁴⁵ Salm 2003d, 316-317.

⁴⁶ SRP II, 508; Wigand, 78-79. According to C. Henneberger, 'a fortified hunting court' was created in 1268 (cf. Wigand, 79). It is, however, too early a dating (Haftka 1999, 234).

defensive element of this wood and earth premise was a latrine tower (*dansker*), placed on the Pisa River⁴⁷. The fortalice was destroyed by Lithuanian raids in the years 1361 and 1366⁴⁸. The brick castle was not raised until 1378⁴⁹. According to A. Rzempełuch, such a late construction of a brick structure, results from a minor defensive significance of the damaged fortalice⁵⁰. In Szczytno, on the other hand, about 1349⁵¹ there was a seat of a Teutonic procurator commanding the southern part of the Elbląg commandery⁵². K.-H. Clasen, on the basis of the chronicle of Wigand of Marburg, claimed that before it was destroyed by the Lithuanians the premise had been exclusively wooden⁵³. At the end of the 14th century a brick castle was raised in its place⁵⁴. In the years 1924, 1938 and 1969 excavations were carried out at Szczytno. However, they did not provide any information on the first fortalice of the Order in this town⁵⁵. On the other hand, the facility in Szestno (*Seehesten*) is mentioned in the first half of the 15th century⁵⁶. The Teutonic fortalice, situated on the conquered lands of Prussian Galindians, existed at least from 1348, or even 1330⁵⁷. It was burnt by the Lithuanians. In the years 1367-1371, in the place of the burnt premise which was a wood and earth structure, a brick castle was raised (on a terrain hump

separating two lakes, Salent and Juno, in the neighbourhood of a river joining them). From 1401 it was a seat of a procurator subordinate to the commander of Bałga⁵⁸. In 1986, during excavations at Szestno, remains of a facility were found in one of trenches. They were located on a mound cut with a southern line encircling the wall of the castle. The wall damaged part of layers connected with the former fortalice. According to M. Głosek, its main element was a wooden house with a basement. Unfortunately, it was not possible to determine its size. The house burnt shortly after being raised, most probably during a Lithuanian raid. Sparse portable finds connected with this facility prove that before the fire its equipment was removed⁵⁹. A small number of discovered pottery shards do not differ from the material connected with the beginnings of the brick castle. According to M. Głosek, this confirms that the wood and earth fortalice was raised by the Order in 1348⁶⁰. However, in Wielbark a so-called *Wildhaus* was founded, as it is believed, during the reign of the Land Master Fryderyk von Wildenberg (1317-1324)⁶¹. It was also assumed that the premise took its name from him (*Willenberg?*, *Wildenberg?*). In 1362 there was a procurator in this town⁶². The opinions on the construction of the brick castle in Wielbark differ. According to A. Rzempełuch, it was built at the end of the 14th century⁶³, and J. Salm believes that it took place only at the end of the 16th century⁶⁴. In the case of another fortalice, i.e., the earliest Teutonic fortalice in Morağ, there is no closer data on its location. It might have been situated on Lake Morağ, which was later drained. A. Rzempełuch believes that the wood and earth facility, raised about 1280 (?), was later transformed into a brick castle⁶⁵. According to J. Salm, a completely new fortress was built. It was raised about 1370⁶⁶, whereas the construction was probably initiated soon after transforming the procurator's seat into a manor (*advocatia*), which happened in 1331⁶⁷. The newly built brick facility functioned as the centre of the manor subordinate to the commander of Elbląg⁶⁸.

Apart from the discussed defensive fortresses, the first Teutonic fortalice in Węgorzewo was created from scratch. However, it was not converted into a brick facility. The premise (*Angerborg*) was constructed in 1335⁶⁹ on

⁴⁷ Haftka 1999, 234-235.

⁴⁸ SRP II, 529, 554-555. The descriptions of the capture of the Teutonic stronghold in Pisz by the Lithuanians can be found in the chronicle by Wigand of Marburg. In 1361, when the facility was being conquered for the first time, its administrator (*prefectus*) Johann Kollyn, together with his men, hid in the latrine tower (*dansker*), but he was captured by the Lithuanians (Wigand, 112-113). He was later released, as in 1366, when the Lithuanians were conquering the (rebuilt) fortress again, he was commanding the defense again. This time, Kiejstut who led the Lithuanian troops decided to burn the Teutonic fortalice. The current of the Pisa River was used for floating burning boats in the direction of the *dansker*; the boats had been earlier loaded with wood soaked with tar. The boats were directed in such a way that the wind carried fire onto the Teutonic fortifications. In such circumstances Johann Kollyn did not defend the facility, but took to flight (SRP II, 554-555; Haftka 1999, 235).

⁴⁹ Salm 2003e, 386. In written sources from the mid- 14th century the fortress *Johannisburg* is referred to as *befestigte Jagdbude* – a fortified hunting court (cf. Haftka 1999, 235). On the other hand, this description may refer to the earlier wood and earth phase of the facility.

⁵⁰ Rzempełuch 1993, 130.

⁵¹ Establishing the stronghold in Szczytno in 1266 (Grunau, 38) was regarded as unbelievable by T. Torbus (Torbus 1998, 559).

⁵² SRP II, 568.

⁵³ SRP II, 568; Clasen 1927, 106.

⁵⁴ Torbus 1998, 562.

⁵⁵ Czubieli 1986, 86; Torbus 1998, 562. J. Tytus-Wańkowska, taking into account all available information on the fortress in Szczytno, assumed hypothetically that the first phase of the facility (from the first half of the 14th century) was a wooden fortalice (Tytus-Wańkowska 1975).

⁵⁶ Torbus 1998, 236.

⁵⁷ According to M. Czubieli, the first fortalice of the Order was built in Szestno in the place of remains of a Prussian stronghold (Czubieli 1986, 88).

⁵⁸ Czubieli 1986, 88-89; Salm 2003f, 480; Głosek 2005, 251.

⁵⁹ Głosek, forthcoming. Information concerning archaeological research on the Teutonic Order's castle in Szestno has been acquired from Professor M. Głosek, whom I would like to thank.

⁶⁰ Głosek, forthcoming.

⁶¹ Jähniel 2000, 101.

⁶² Rzempełuch 1993, 136; cf. also Toeppen 1998, 94.

⁶³ Rzempełuch 1993, 136.

⁶⁴ Salm 2003g, 536.

⁶⁵ Rzempełuch 1993, 85.

⁶⁶ Salm 2003h, 313.

⁶⁷ Czubieli 1986, 46-47.

⁶⁸ Czubieli 1986, 46; Salm 2003h, 313.

⁶⁹ SRP II, 548. M. Haftka believes that the facility might have been built in 1256 or even as early as 1235 (Haftka 1999, 341).

the order of the Grand Master Dytryk von Altenburg at the outflow of the Węgorapa from Lake Mamry. It was repeatedly burnt by the Lithuanians, among others in 1365 (after seizing the fortress, Kiejstut's troops captured 8 people)⁷⁰. After the fire in 1397 the fortalice was not rebuilt, and a year later a construction of a stone-brick castle was initiated on the Węgorapa island, situated about 2 kilometres to the north of the outflow of the river. The new structure was meant to be a reeve's seat⁷¹. A similar situation can probably be seen in Ostróda⁷². It is known from written sources that in 1332 it was a seat of a procurator subordinate to the commander in Dzierżgoń⁷³. However, as early as from 1341 Ostróda constituted a centre of commandery (the first commander of Ostróda was Henryk von Metz)⁷⁴, created on the southern frontier of the Teutonic state. The location of the facility, which was firstly the seat of a procurator and next of a commander, has not been determined despite excavations undertaken in the years 1968-1969 and 1974-1975⁷⁵. The construction of the castle in Ostróda was initiated by the commander Günther von Hohenstein⁷⁶, perhaps as early as from 1349 (the works lasted as long as till 1380)⁷⁷. However, as C. Steinbrecht concluded on the basis of mentions in the chronicle by Wigand of Marburg, the old wood and earth procurator's fortress functioned in parallel to the seat of the commander and was most probably completely destroyed during the Lithuanian raid in 1381⁷⁸.

One more Teutonic defensive fortress can be mentioned, which was presumably also constructed mainly with the use of wood and earth, i.e., Mołtajny. Little is known about it. In 1384 in the town a structure referred to as *Wildhaus* was raised. It disappeared before the end of the Middle Ages⁷⁹.

In sum, some issues can be generalised in order to stress the most essential elements. Taking into account

⁷⁰ SRP II, 548; Wigand, 152-153.

⁷¹ Łapo 1996, 80; Toepfen 1998, 95, 100; Salm 2003i, 535. Some researchers claim that the Teutonic Order's brick castle in Węgorzewo was built in the place of an Old-Prussian settlement or a previous Teutonic watchtower (Grigat 1930, 32; Łapo 1996, 79). During test excavations within the castle courtyard (only one small trench) it was observed that most accumulations are of an embankment nature. One piece of pottery was found, which was dated to the mid-13th century (Łapo 1996, 80, Fig. 2).

⁷² L. Czubieli claims that the seat of the Teutonic reeve (procurator) was established on a Prussian settlement (Czubieli 1986, 59).

⁷³ PUB II, no. 749; cf. also Torbus 1998, 565. According to M. Haftka, this facility might have been created as early as the 1270s (within the island; Haftka 1999, 217).

⁷⁴ PUB III/1, no. 401.

⁷⁵ Gula 1975; Torbus 1998, 569. According to T. Torbus, the wooden seat of the procurator of Ostróda was probably located to the east of the later brick premises (Torbus 2010, 172).

⁷⁶ SRP III, 114.

⁷⁷ Torbus 1998, 568.

⁷⁸ SRP II, 608-609; Steinbrecht 1920, 55.

⁷⁹ Rzempoluch 1993, 61.

the locations of the discussed fortalices, with the consideration of former defensive facilities and the continuation in the form of brick castles, it was noticed that fortresses created in the 14th century from scratch prevailed (10 premises, that is 62.5%)⁸⁰. They were mostly situated in the area previously belonging to the Galindians (Pisz, Szczytno, Szestno, Wielbark and Węgorzewo), but can also be found in Bartia (Barciany II and Mołtajny), Pogesania (Morąg and Ostróda) or Sasna (Nidzica). With the exception of three fortalices (Węgorzewo, Ostróda and probably Mołtajny), all the remaining Order's fortresses from this group evolved into brick facilities. However, it is prevalently uncertain whether the brick castles were raised in the same place as the former wood and earth fortalices. The other group of discussed defensive facilities were adaptations of the strongholds gained on the local inhabitants (about the mid-13th century, so during the conquest of Prussia), which were not transformed into brick castles⁸¹. These were fortalices situated in Bartia and on its border (Barciany I, Reszel and Lidzbark Warmiński) and created in the place of previously existing strongholds (on their remains) or settlements (Bartoszyce and Kętrzyn in the former territory of the Bartians and Pasłek in Pogesania).

A very important element in the analysis of the Teutonic wood and earth fortresses is their chronology. It should be emphasised that in the examined territory most of them were not built until the 14th century – nine buildings, that is 56.2% (all described as Galindians' fortalices, Sassinians' Nidzica and Kętrzyn, Barciany and Mołtajny related to the territory of the Bartians). The latest among them is the fortalice in Mołtajny (1384). Other fortalices were built, or in most cases adapted for the Order's needs as early as the 13th century. During the conquest of the Prussian (mostly about the mid-13th century) fortresses in Bartia (Barciany I, Reszel and Bartoszyce), on its border with Warmia appeared (Lidzbark) and perhaps in Ostróda and Morąg (Pogesania). The beginning of the functioning of the fortalice in Pasłek dates back to 1297. In the 13th century wood and earth fortresses in Lidzbark Warmiński and Bartoszyce ceased to exist, and the end of the existence of the others is connected with the following century. The fortalice in Mołtajny is perhaps an exception, as it undoubtedly existed as long as the beginning of the 15th century. The whole period of use of the described Teutonic fortresses encompassed between a few (e.g., Lidzbark Warmiński) and a dozen or so years (e.g., Bartoszyce, Barciany I-II, Nidzica, Szczytno, Węgorzewo). In all probability, the fortalices in Barciany, Węgorzewo, Nidzica and Ostróda functioned for the longest period (about 50-100 years).

⁸⁰ Including the fortalice in Mołtajny.

⁸¹ The brick fortress in Reszel was created after 1350, about 100 years after the wood and earth fortalice had been handed to the Bishop of Warmia.

A part of the discussed fortresses functioned in the administration-territorial system within the Teutonic reign in Prussia. It is known from written sources that they were seats of the Order's officials, mostly those of lower ranks: bailiffs (Nidzica in Sasna), procurators (Nidzica and Pisz, Szczytno and Wielbark in Galindia, Barciany II in Bartia, and also Ostróda in Pogesania) and reeves (Barciany II)⁸². The fortalices referred to in literature as watchtowers, in the Bartia territory and on its border (Barciany I, Bartoszyce, Reszel and Lidzbark Warmiński) were anchorages in the process of the conquest of Prussia. The chain links of the defensive system of the Teutonic state on the border of the *Wildnis* were the defensive fortresses in Kętrzyn and Barciany (II; also the former territory of the Bartians), as well as Szczytno and Węgorzewo (Galindia).

As far as the form of the described fortress is concerned, the most important data is known for the facilities in Pisz (the procurator's seat) and Szestno, situated in the former territory of the Galindians. Information concerning Pisz is derived from the descriptions of the capture of the fortalice by the Lithuanians in the years 1362 and 1366, as stated in the chronicle by Wigand of Marburg. It can be concluded from them that the main defensive element of this structure was a wooden tower functioning as a latrine/dansker and/or granary, located by the Pisa River.

Also the term *befestigte Jagdbude* (fortified hunting court) is meaningful. It, occurs in written sources from the second half of the 14th century, and it most probably refers to the discussed defensive fortress. Concerning the first Teutonic Knights' fortalice in Szestno, constructed probably in 1348, it was a wooden house on a mound with a basement, as it can be concluded from the excavations.

Finally, it should be emphasised that in further studies on the issue of Teutonic wood and earth fortresses the most important and key role must be played by archaeological research. Beside attempts at localising these facilities in the field, which may most probably prove impossible in some cases, and the identification of the defensive fortresses known from written sources with the facilities in the field (the remains of strongholds and castles), it is extremely desirable to examine fortalices which were transformed into brick castles. In this case, these are the facilities in Barciany I, Węgorzewo, Ostróda and probably Moltajny, if it turns possible to localise their remains. Possibilities offered by field works of that kind are shown in the research on the procurator's court in Pień in the Land of Chełmno. Some interesting conclusions in the discussed issue can also be drawn from the results of the works on Teutonic brick castles, as evidenced by the research on Szestno.

Sources

- Codex – *Codex diplomaticus Warmiensis oder Regesten und Urkunden zur Geschichte Ermlands*, C. P. Woelky (ed.). Braunsberg 1864.
- GÄ – *Das Grosse Ämterbuch des Deutschen Ordens*, W. Zieseimer (ed.). Danzig 1921.
- Dusburg – *Kronika ziemi pruskiej*, J. Wenta (ed.). Toruń 2004.
- PR – *Preussische Regesten bis zum Ausgange des 13. Jhs*, M. Perlbach (ed.), Bd. I. Königsberg 1876.
- PUB II – *Preussisches Urkundenbuch*, M. Hein and E. Maschke (eds.), Bd. II (1309-1335). Königsberg 1932-1939.
- PUB III/1 – *Preussisches Urkundenbuch*, M. Hein and H. Koeppen (eds.), Bd. III/1 (1335-1341). Königsberg 1944.
- PUB IV – *Preussisches Urkundenbuch*, H. Koeppen (ed.), Bd. IV (1346-1351). Marburg 1960.
- Grunau – *Simon Grunau's Preussische Chronik*, M. Perlbach (ed.), Bd. I. Leipzig 1876.
- SRP – *Scriptores rerum Prussicarum. Die Geschichtsquellen der preussischen Vorzeit bis zum Untergang der Ordensherrschaft*, T. Hirsch, M. Toeppen, E. Strehlke (eds.), Bd. I-III. Leipzig 1861-1866.
- Wigand – *Chronicon seu Annales Wigandi Marburgensi, equities et fratris Ordinis Teutonici (Kronika Wiganda z Marburga, rycerza i brata zakonu niemieckiego)*, J. Voigt and E. Raczyński (eds.). Poznań 1842.

Literature

- Clasen K.-H. 1927. *Die mittelalterliche Kunst im Gebiete des Deutschenordensstaates Preussen I: Die Burgbauten*. Königsberg.
- Czubiel L. 1986. *Zamki Warmii i Mazur*. Olsztyn.

⁸² In the case of the fortalice in Ostróda we can also speculate on its possible function as a seat (1341). However the mention on the commander is rather connected with the brick castle (cf. above).

- Głosek M. 2005. *Zagadkowy, nowożytny przedmiot ceramiczny z zamku w Szestnie na Mazurach*. In: J. Olczak (ed.), *Przeszłość z perspektywy źródeł materialnych i pisanych*. Archaeologia Historica Polona 15 (2). Toruń, 251-254.
- Głosek M. *Zamek w Szestnie, gm. Mrągowo w świetle badań archeologiczno-architektonicznych*. Forthcoming.
- Górski K., Arszyński M. 1967. *Barciany. Dzieje zamku i ziemi do połowy XV wieku*. Olsztyn.
- Grigat F. 1930. *Besiedlung des Mauerseegebiets*. Königsberg.
- Grygiel R. 1996. *Dzieje rezydencji*. In: R. Grygiel, T. Jurek, *Doliwowie z Nowego Miasta nad Wartą, Dębna i Biechowa. Dzieje rezydencji i ich właścicieli*. Łódź, 11-284.
- Guerquin B. 1984. *Zamki w Polsce*. Warszawa.
- Gula J. 1975. *Badania wykopaliskowe w latach 1968-1969 na terenie zamku w Ostródzie*. „Wiadomości Archeologiczne” 39 (3), 373-383.
- Haftka M. 1999. *Zamki krzyżackie w Polsce. Szkice z dziejów*. Malbork, Płock.
- Jähnig B. 2000. *Wykaz urzędów. Dostojnicy zakonu krzyżackiego w Prusach*. In: Z. H. Nowak, R. Czaja (eds.), *Państwo zakonu krzyżackiego w Prusach. Podziały administracyjne i kościelne od XIII do XVI wieku*. Toruń, 95-127.
- Jóźwiak S., Trupinda J. 2012. *Krzyżackie zamki komturskie w Prusach. Topografia i układ przestrzenny na podstawie średniowiecznych źródeł pisanych*. Toruń.
- Jóźwiak W. 2005. *Prokuratorstwo krzyżackie w Pieniu w ziemi chełmińskiej (1414-1422). Powstanie – funkcjonowanie – likwidacja*. „Zapiski Historyczne” 70 (2-3), s. 95-105.
- Kajzer L. 1980. *Studia nad świeckim budownictwem obronnym województwa łęczyckiego w XIII-XVII wieku*. Acta Universitatis Lodzianis. Folia Archaeologica 1. Łódź.
- Kajzer L. 1988. *Archeologiczny rodowód dworu. Przemiany siedzib obronno-rezydencjonalnych Polski centralnej w późnym średniowieczu i czasach nowożytnych*. Łódź.
- Kajzer L. 2003. *Dzieje zamków w Polsce*. In: L. Kajzer, S. Kołodziejski, J. Salm, *Leksykon zamków w Polsce*. Warszawa, 13-75.
- Kołodziejski S. 1994. *Średniowieczne rezydencje obronne możnowładztwa na terenie województwa krakowskiego*. Kraków.
- Łapo J. M. 1996. *Sprawozdanie z sondażowych badań wykopaliskowych prowadzonych na dziedzińcu zamku w Węgorzewie w 1995 roku*. „Studia Angerburgica” 1, 78-81.
- Pietrzak J. 2003. *Zamki i dwory obronne w dobrach państwowych prowincji wielkopolskiej. Studium z dziejów państwowych siedzib obronnych na przełomie średniowiecza i nowożytności*. Łódź.
- Poliński D. 2007. *Krzyżackie warownie drewniano-ziemne w świetle badań archeologicznych*. In: J. Olczak (ed.), *Studia z dziejów wojskowości, budownictwa, kultury*. Archaeologia Historica Polona 17. Toruń, 241-257.
- Poliński D. 2013. *Pień. Siedziba krzyżackich prokuratorów w ziemi chełmińskiej*. Toruń.
- Powierski J. 1985. *Średniowieczne Plemięta w świetle źródeł pisanych*. In: A. Nadolski (ed.), *Plemięta. Średniowieczny gródek w ziemi chełmińskiej*. Warszawa, Poznań, Toruń, 29-47.
- Rzempołuch A. 1993. *Przewodnik po zabytkach sztuki dawnych Prus Wschodnich*. Olsztyn.
- Salm J. 2003a. *Lidzbark Warmiński*. In: L. Kajzer, S. Kołodziejski, J. Salm, *Leksykon zamków w Polsce*. Warszawa, 268-274.
- Salm J. 2003b. *Bartoszyce*. In: L. Kajzer, S. Kołodziejski, J. Salm, *Leksykon zamków w Polsce*. Warszawa, 85.
- Salm J. 2003c. *Pasłęk*. In: L. Kajzer, S. Kołodziejski, J. Salm, *Leksykon zamków w Polsce*. Warszawa, 370-372.
- Salm J. 2003d. *Nidzica*. In: L. Kajzer, S. Kołodziejski, J. Salm, *Leksykon zamków w Polsce*. Warszawa, 316-319.
- Salm J. 2003e. *Pisz*. In: L. Kajzer, S. Kołodziejski, J. Salm, *Leksykon zamków w Polsce*. Warszawa, 386.
- Salm J. 2003f. *Szestno*. In: L. Kajzer, S. Kołodziejski, J. Salm, *Leksykon zamków w Polsce*. Warszawa, 480.
- Salm J. 2003g. *Wielbark*. In: L. Kajzer, S. Kołodziejski, J. Salm, *Leksykon zamków w Polsce*. Warszawa, 536.
- Salm J. 2003h. *Morąg*. In: L. Kajzer, S. Kołodziejski, J. Salm, *Leksykon zamków w Polsce*. Warszawa, 313.
- Salm J. 2003i. *Węgorzewo*. In: L. Kajzer, S. Kołodziejski, J. Salm, *Leksykon zamków w Polsce*. Warszawa, 535-536.
- Steinbrecht C. 1920. *Die Baukunst des Deutschen Ritterordens in Preussen 4: Die Ordensburgen der Hochmeisterzeit in Preussen*. Berlin.
- Toeppen M. 1998. *Historia Mazur. Przyczynek do dziejów krainy i kultury pruskiej*. Olsztyn.
- Torbus T. 1998. *Die Konventsburgen im Deutschordensland Preussen*. Schriften des Bundesinstituts für Ostdeutsche Kultur und Geschichte 11. München.
- Torbus T. 2010. *Zamki krzyżackie. Deutschordensburgen*. Wrocław.
- Tytus-Wańkowska J. 1975. *Badania architektoniczne zamku w Szczytnie*. Olsztyn. Manuscript in PP PKZ.

Streszczenie

Drewniano-ziemne warownie zakonu krzyżackiego na terenie północno-wschodniej Polski

Niniejszy tekst stanowi kontynuację rozważań na temat drewniano-ziemnych założeń obronnych zakonu krzyżackiego, tym razem w odniesieniu do obecnych terenów Polski północno-wschodniej (województwo warmińsko-mazurskie). Jest też jednocześnie próbą uporządkowania informacji o mniej znanych obiektach, ich formie i zastosowanych materiałach budowlanych oraz funkcji i chronologii. Dane te są mało znane lub bardzo lakoniczne, przeważnie zaczerpnięte ze wzmianek w przekazach pisanych. Omówiono 16 obiektów obronnych, spośród których siedem było położonych na dawnym terytorium Bartów (Barciany I i II, Reszel, Bartoszyce, Kętrzyn i Mołtajny) bądź jego pograniczu (z Warmią – Lidzbark Warmiński), pięć – w ziemi Galindów (Pisz, Szestno, Szczytno, Wielbark i Węgorzewo), trzy – na obszarze Pogezanów (Pasłęk, Ostróda i Morąg), a jeden obiekt – na terytorium Sasinów (Nidzica). Badaniami archeologicznymi objęto tylko pięć warowni – zamki murowane w Ostródzie, Reszlu, Szczytnie, Szestnie i Węgorzewie. Zaistniała więc możliwość weryfikacji twierdzenia, że w najstarszych fazach mogły być one fortalicjami drewniano-ziemnymi. Niestety, prace te, poza niezwykle interesującymi badaniami zamku w Szestnie, wniosły niewiele do poruszanej problematyki.

Zaobserwowano, że przeważały warownie powstałe w XIV stuleciu na „surowym korzeniu” (10 obiektów). W większości były one położone na terenie dawniej należącym do Galindów, ale też były związane z Barcją, Pogezanią i Sasinią. Z wyjątkiem trzech fortalicji (Węgorzewo, Ostróda i zapewne Mołtajny) pozostałe warownie Zakonu z tej grupy ewoluowały w kierunku założeń murowanych; aczkolwiek przeważnie nie jest pewne, że zamek murowany powstawał w tym samym miejscu, co wcześniejsza fortalicja drewniano-ziemna. Pozostałe analizowane obiekty obronne stanowiły adaptacje zdobytych na miejscowej ludności grodów (ok. połowy XIII w., a więc w trakcie podboju ziem pruskich), które nie uległy transformacji w zamki murowane (fortalicje położone w Barcji i na jej pograniczu oraz powstałe na miejscu dawniej istniejącego grodu bądź osady).

Bardzo istotnym elementem analizy drewniano-ziemnych warowni krzyżackich jest ich chronologia. Należy zauważyć, że na badanym terytorium większość z nich powstała dopiero w XIV w. – dziewięć obiektów (m.in. wszystkie pięć fortalicji galindzkich); najmłodsza wśród nich jest fortalicja w Mołtajnach (1384 rok). Pozostałe fortalicje zbudowano, a raczej w większości przypadków zaadaptowano do potrzeb Zakonu już w XIII stuleciu, w trakcie podbijania ziem pruskich (przeważnie ok. połowy XIII w.). W tymże stuleciu zakończyły funkcjonowanie drewniano-ziemne warownie w Lidzbarku Warmińskim i Bartoszycach, natomiast kres istnienia pozostałych wiąże się już z kolejnym stuleciem. Wyjątkiem jest prawdopodobnie założenie w Mołtajnach, które istniało jeszcze, jak można przypuszczać, co najmniej na początku XV w. Cały okres użytkowania opisywanych warowni Zakonu zawierał się w okresie od kilkunastu do kilkudziesięciu lat; najprawdopodobniej najdłużej funkcjonowały założenia obronne w Barcianach (I i II), Węgorzewie, Nidzicy i Ostródzie (ok. 50-100 lat).

Część analizowanych warowni pełniło funkcje w systemie administracyjno-terytorialnym władztwa krzyżackiego w Prusach. Wiadomo z przekazów pisanych, że stanowiły one siedziby urzędników Zakonu niższej rangi: komornika i prokuratorów oraz wójta. Punkty oparcia w zdobywaniu ziem pruskich stanowiły fortalicje, określane w literaturze jako strażnice, na terytorium Barcji i na jej pograniczu. Ogniwami systemu obronnego państwa krzyżackiego na granicy *Wildnis* były założenia obronne w Kętrzynie i Barcianach II (dawnie terytorium Bartów) oraz Szczytnie i Węgorzewie (Galindia).

Jeśli chodzi o formę opisywanych założeń obronnych, to najistotniejsze informacje związane są z obiektami w Pisz (siedziba prokuratora) i Szestnie, położonymi na dawnym terytorium Galindów. Wiadomości dotyczące Pisza czerpiemy z opisów zdobywania fortalicji przez Litwinów zawartych w kronice Wiganda z Marburga. Wynika z nich, że głównym elementem obronnym tego obiektu była znajdująca się nad Pisz wieża drewniana. Z kolei pierwszą fortalicję Zakonu w Szestnie (z 1348 roku) stanowił drewniany i podpiwniczony dom na kopcu.

Należy podkreślić, że w dalszych studiach nad problematyką drewniano-ziemnych warowni zakonu krzyżackiego najistotniejsze i kluczowe znaczenie mają badania archeologiczne. Poza próbami lokalizacji i identyfikacji założeń obronnych znanych ze źródeł pisanych z obiektami w terenie (grodziskami i zameczyskami), bardzo pożądane jest badanie fortalicji, które nie uległy transformacji w zamki murowane. Jakie potencjalnie możliwości dają tego rodzaju prace terenowe pokazują badania prokuratorowskiego dworu Pień w ziemi chełmińskiej.