

CLASSICAL MOTIFS IN THE *POLISH HISTORIES* OF DŁUGOSZ*

By

WŁADYSŁAW MADYDA

In the year of Mickiewicz [1955, the one hundredth anniversary of the death of Adam Mickiewicz, a Polish poet of the Romanticism] it is fitting to begin these remarks about Długosz as the precursor of humanists in Poland by calling to mind the twenty-sixth and twenty-seventh lectures of the first course taught by Mickiewicz at the Collège de France. In these lectures, he compares the “philosophical system” of Philippe de Commines (*Memoirs*) and Machiavelli (*Il Principe*) with the system of Johannes Longinus (i.e. Długosz). Philippe de Commines, who writes his *Memoirs* a few years after Długosz and greatly favours the feudal system, bases his political principles upon shrewdness, giving an example of the division between politics and morality. Machiavelli, who is searching for a means of uniting Italy, bases himself on certain unspecified recollections of antiquity and, when he becomes convinced that his “system” is worthless, he “loses faith in the republic of Florence and in the entire human race. He begins to worship despotism and wishes to rationalise and establish a type of truly ‘Mongolian’ system of violence and destruction” (A. MICKIEWICZ, *Literatura słowiańska. Kurs pierwszy*, in: *Dziela*, vol. IX, Warszawa 1952, p. 15). In contrast, Długosz’s work presents a complete system of morality and politics, a “Jagellonian” system. The reason for this is that the author “draws life from one conception of morality, more specifically, from the Christian conception. According to Długosz, all strength lies in truth, with truth defined by the principles of the Gospel, as accepted by the Church” (*ibid.*, p. 16). Among these arguments, Mickiewicz unexpectedly remarks (p. 18) that the number of books in Długosz’s work equals (in his opinion) that of Livy and adds:

It is also possible to compare him to Livy because both appear in a time of a fundamental crisis of the state, and both wish to leave a great legacy by drawing meaning from the past and throwing a new light on the future. Both equally respect

* Originally published in Polish in “Eos” XLIX 1957–1958, fasc. 2, pp. 177–201.

the lessons of the past and are convinced that without understanding the processes of the past one cannot understand or direct the future (*ibid.*, p. 18).

The focus of the discussion that follows will be to demonstrate to what extent Długosz was drawing upon Livy, not in his mediaeval “system” and world view, but in his language and style. Długosz, in the Preface to his *Histories*, refers to Cicero’s opinion (*De orat.* II 62) that history, being first and foremost a rhetorical work should be written by an intelligent, experienced person of great culture and good social manners, and he laments *ad nauseam* that he himself does not possess these assets. He also criticizes the refined tastes of his contemporaries who applaud only what is marked by the Tullian (i.e. Ciceronian) charm which he himself so sadly lacks. He demands to be compared not with ancient authors, but only with those who are his contemporaries. Although he is rendered speechless by his respect for ancient authors, he is not tongue-tied (*balbus*) in comparison to other authors of his own time (*moderni*), and while his dry and thin little talent does not permit him to emulate the talents of ancient writers, it permits him to revere and admire them. These were the emotions that the ancient writers evoked in Długosz; in his reading, he drew from them more than just the words and phrases which moulded his speech and style and helped him rival other contemporary early humanists, but he also drew upon classical motifs. It is these “flowers of antiquity”, primarily from Livy but also from other classical writers, that will be investigated here.

Writing in the middle of the 15th century, Długosz is not the first representative of humanism among us. There were others in his company, e.g. Grzegorz of Sanok, Jan of Ludzisko, Andrzej Grzymała of Poznań, Jan Elgot, Sędziwój of Czechło. The first of these was the focus of the doctoral dissertation (*De Gregorii Sanocei studiis humanioribus*, 1900) of Professor T. SINKO, which was assigned and directed by Professor K. MORAWSKI. Professor SINKO returned to the topic of Polish humanism in his *Przyczynki z Kodeksu mogińskiego*, edited together with Fr. K. MICHALSKI (Kraków 1917) and announced a systematic investigation of Polish humanism in his Latin analysis of Długosz’s Preface to the *Polish Histories*, published in 1951 (*De Długossii praefatione Historiae Polonorum* in the book entitled *Studia z dziejów kultury polskiej*). Professor SINKO also influenced a young assistant, K. KUMANIECKI (*Podanie o Wandzie w świetle źródeł starożytnych*, *Pamiętnik Literacki XXII–XXIII* 1926) to follow this train of investigation in the chair of Classical Philology at the Jagellonian University. When the realization of part of the investigation into neolatinist authors and Długosz in particular became the collective domain of the Joint Chairs of Classical Philology of the Jagellonian University, several of the assignments were divided among the members and assistants of this association. Professor J. SCHNAYDER was the first to present his conclusions on the influence of Sallust on Długosz (*Eos XLVI* 1952–1953, fasc. 2., pp. 141–160). The observations published here are the second work presented within the scope of this undertaking.

I. LIVY

From Livy, Długosz learned how to vary his descriptions of battles, how to focus upon important episodes in battle, how to sketch the mood of the fighters and the inventing of stratagems. Livy's descriptions surface under his pen even when he is drawing upon a later source, i.e. Master Vincent (called Kadłubek). For example, in Book I (*Polish Histories*, vol. I, ed. A. PRZEŹDZIECKI, p. 76), Długosz describes the ruse of Przemyśl, who has decided to confuse the enemy by using a large number of helmets positioned on a hillside. He writes: "vani terroris vanaeque ad pugnam simulationis instruit apparatus". The ruse itself is taken from Kadłubek, but its description stems from Livy. The above quotation reflects various phrases in Livy, such as: "discusso [...] vano apparatu hostium" (VII 17, 5) and in particular "instructo vani terroris apparatus" (VII 14, 10). This last quote from the Roman historian deserves closer examination. Gaius Sulpicius, the Roman dictator, intends to instill fear into his enemies in some way and quickly finds the appropriate stratagem: "omnia circumspicere atque agitare coepit [...] sollerti animo rem novam excogitat". Długosz is quite clearly influenced by Livy, mimicking him when describing the stratagem of Przemyśl: "tacitus circumspiciens diuque agitans [...] sollerti rem insolitam animo excogitat". Furthermore, Sulpicius also uses pretence to increase the apparent numbers of his army: he orders his camp-followers to put on the armour belonging to captives or to soldiers too ill to fight, to mount pack mules and to hide themselves on the hillside. During the fight, these men are supposed to come out of the woods and to terrify the enemy by their very numbers "after having prepared the appearance of what would inspire groundless fear" – "instructo vani terroris apparatus". Długosz also ascribes a similar ruse to the Tartars, who led horses on which they had placed likenesses of men in order to instill fear by their apparent numbers: "vani terroris apparatus [...] secum trahebant" (IV, p. 592). Let us move on from the stratagem of Przemyśl, to whom Długosz ascribes the role of both saviour and providence after the defeat of the Polish army at the hands of the Hungarians and Moravians. The praises that Długosz showers upon him are drawn almost word for word from Livy (XXV 37). The Roman historian describes the providential results of the actions of L. Marcius during the war with Hannibal. Here again, it is worthwhile to compare the phrases used, as this comparison will throw light upon the method used by our historian. For example, Długosz's phrase *exercitibus deletis* is a short version of Livy's expression "cum deleti exercitus [...] viderentur". In the phrase "rem publicam [...] existimantibus amissam" the participle *amissam* is drawn from Livy's sentence "amissaeque Hispaniae viderentur". The hailing of Przemyśl as a saviour, found in the sentence "vir unus restituit hanc (*scil.* rem publicam) retinuitque" corresponds to the words "vir unus res perditas restituit" in Livy. *Erat ea tempestate* at the beginning of the next sentence corresponds to the sentence in Livy that

begins in *erat in exercitu*. The description of Przemysł as *vir quidam impiger* has its source in Livy's description *impiger iuvenis*. Furthermore, the thought that the abilities of Przemysł greatly outweighed his birth: "industriæ disciplinaeque militaris aliquanto quam pro sorte, in qua erat, expertior, ingenio denique atque industria quam prosapiae genere clarior". This expansion of the terse expression of the Roman author: "animique et ingenii aliquanto quam pro fortuna, in qua natus erat, maioris" is typical of Długosz. Similarly, the description of the source of the military genius of Przemysł is based on the continuation of Livy's argument. The comparison is as follows. Długosz: "ad naturalem indolem frequens proeliorum, in quibus militaverat, accesserat exercitatio". Livy: "ad summam indolem accesserat Cn. Scipionis disciplina, sub qua per tot annos omnis militiae artis edoctus fuerat". Then Długosz prepares the stratagem of Przemysł with the words: "is cum apud hostes omnia negligentius agi explorasset, ad consilium magis dolosum quam audax animum adiecit". This is a reworking of Livy's conclusion (XXV 37): "par negligentia in castris fuit [...] ob hoc cum omnia neglecta apud hostes essent, exploratis eis Marcius ad consilium prima specie temerarium magis quam audax animum adiecit".

As mentioned before, the stratagem itself is drawn from the *Chronicles* of Kadłubek. However, the description of the assault on the deceived Panonians and Bohemians once again stems from the continuation of the story in Livy and, in fact, from two non concurrent passages: first, partly from the end of chapter 37 and second, from the beginning of chapter 39. Chapter 38 is omitted by Długosz as superfluous. Here is Długosz's description of the lack of discipline and carelessness among the enemy: "diffugisse Polonos, qui apparuerant, rati solutioribus ordinibus in stativa revertuntur". Livy: "Carthaginienses metu substitisse (*scil.* Romanos) rati contemptim rursus et sedato gradu in castra abeunt". Finally, there is the final defeat of the foe. Długosz: "a tergo et a lateribus somno stratos et corpora curantes prima vigilia hostes aggressus fortissime et audacissime alienatis a memoria periculi Polonorum sensibus et hostium tela intrepide excipientibus..." Livy: "pars semisomnos hostis caedunt [...] pars portas occupant, ut fugam intercludant. Hostes simul ignis, clamor, caedes velut alienatos sensibus nec audire nec providere quicquam sinunt".

In the above comparison, attention should be drawn to the phrase: "alienatis a memoria periculi sensibus". In this way, Długosz describes the courage of the Polish fighters, a courage that does not take danger into consideration; Livy, on the other hand, applies the phrase *alienati sensibus* to the enemy, i.e. the Punic, and says that they were out of their senses with fear. Thus Długosz departs considerably from the primary source (i.e. XXV 39) and subconsciously refers to another section in Livy (VII 15), where we read about the bravery of the Romans stirred by the exhortation of their leader: "tantos pudor stimulos admovit, ut ruerent in hostium tela alienatis a memoria periculi animis". Echoes of this section in Livy resound in Długosz's description of the battles of Bolesław Krzywousty:

“animo [...] a memoria periculi, quod a fronte et a tergo imminebat, alienato primus irruit” (I, p. 557).

All of the above remarks arise from the description of one stratagem employed by Przemyśl. In fact, both his names “Przemyśl” (“trick, stratagem”) and “Leszek” refer on the one hand to this *industria* of Marcius, and on the other, through “Lestko”, to the German word *List*.

Let us examine another stratagem: the undercutting of the trees in the forest so that they may fall on the enemy army (III, p. 277). This is exactly what happened to the Polish army in 1359, while it was hastening to Moldavia in aid of Stephen: as soon as the Poles entered the forest, the weakened trees began to fall and crush those passing underneath. The description of this calamity is fashioned after Livy’s description of the defeat of the consul designate L. Postumius in Gaul. The comparison follows.

Livy: “silva erat vasta [...] qua exercitum traducturus erat”.

Długosz: “silvae erant vastae [...] quas [...] transiturus erat”.

Livy: “eius silvae dextra laevaue circa viam Galli arbores ita inciderunt, ut inmotae starent, momento levi impulsae occiderent”.

Długosz: “earum silvarum dextra laevaue secus viam Valachi de parte hostili ita serris arbores inciderant, ut inmotae starent, ictu facile impulsae prociderent”.

Livy: “ubi intravit agmen saltum, tum extremas arborum succisarum impellunt. Quae alia in aliam instabilem per se ac male haerentem incidentes ancipiti strage arma viros equos obruerunt, ut vix decem homines effugerent”.

Długosz: “Polonis itaque saltum inrantibus Walachi extremas arborum succisarum impellunt aliam in aliam cadentem et ruentem atque viciniorem praecipitantem et strage ancipiti viros equos armaque sine bello obruunt et devincunt”.

Livy: “nam cum exanimati plerique essent arborum truncis fragmentisque ramorum”.

Długosz: “arborum siquidem truncis et ramorum fragmentis milites insignes exanimati et oppressi sunt”.

Livy: “ceteram multitudinem inopinato modo trepidam Galli saltum omnem armati circumsedentes interfecerunt”.

Długosz: “cetera omnis multitudo inopinato malo percussa sub iugum et de ditionem venit”.

Let us pass from a one-time ruse to the more extensive tactics of cavalry raids: the opponent seeks to avoid a confrontation but attacks the enemy unawares, especially at night. This is one of Długosz’s favourite scenes. Some examples include:

Hungari [...] non faciebant pugnandi copiam, sed in castris et munimentis caeterisque abditis locis se continebant et tam nocte quam interdiu ex insidiis opportunitate conspecta Caesaris exercitum infestabant pabulatoresque et caeteros Almannos passim par agros palantes aut capiebant aut trucidabant (I, p. 301; cf. I, p. 303 et passim).

One could consider that, with such common tactics, Długosz does not need to depend on Livy. Even in this case, however, Długosz's imagination is grounded in the text of the Roman historian.

Let us examine the hit-and-run tactics of Masinissa, as described by Livy (XXV 34). The fundamental elements of such tactics are: (1) the constant harrying of the enemy both by day and by night; (2) not only abducting soldiers gathering wood, but also penetrating up to the very gates of the camp; (3) the spreading of terror in every nook and cranny. Thus, in the case of Masinissa: (1) “*adsidue dies noctesque infestus aderat*”; (2) “*ut non vagos tantum procul a castris lignatum pabulumque progressos exciperet, sed ipsis obequitaret castris invecusque in medias saepe stationes omnia ingenti tumultu turbaret*”; (3) “*nec aut locus aut tempus ullum vacuum a metu ac sollicitudine erat Romanis*”. These three elements are also used by Długosz to describe the tactics used by Bolesław Krzywousty in the war against Emperor Henry (I, pp. 478 ff.): (1) “*continua infestatione nocte et interdium lacessebat*”; (2) “*in hostes palatos, qui aut praedatum aut pabulatum ibant, faciens impetum et incursiones [...] gentes [...] gratia pabulandi longius ab exercitu progressas dietim invadens et usque ad ipsa castra caesarea fugans et caedens*”; (3) “*quodlibet nemus, silvula aut rubus suspecta habebantur*”.

Following Livy's example, Długosz also singles out smaller episodes, phases or circumstances of the battle itself. *Clamores dissoni* (chaotic uproar, e.g. I, p. 350) characterizes the clash of battle at Lake Trasimene (Livy XXII 5) or at Zama (XXX 34). During the battle of Grunwald (IV, p. 58), Zbigniew Oleśnicki reports to the king that he was unable to reach the embattled armies or to communicate by mouth because of the noise: “*quoniam apud illas prae strepitu et tumultu neque consilium accipi poterat neque imperium*”. This is the way that Długosz exploits Livy's description (XXII 5) of the battle of Lake Trasimene: “*ceterum prae strepitu ac tumultu nec consilium nec imperium accipi poterat*”. Similarly, the phrase: “*neutro exercitu referente pedem*” (in the description of the battle of Grunwald, IV, p. 54) recalls Livy's statement: “*nec ullo exercitu referente pedem*” (XXI 8).

Długosz describes the dispersal of the routed enemy with the words: *addere percussis timorem* (IV, p. 463). These words are drawn from Livy, e.g. “*addidit facile Masinissa percussis terrorem [...] ut turbatos vidit hostes, addidit percussis terrorem*” (XXX 33).

In the entry for the year 1137 (I, p. 558), the Polish historian recounts the defeat of Bolesław Krzywousty when surrounded by the Rusyns and Hungarians. At one point, Bolesław lost his horse and intended to leave the field of battle on foot; fortunately, a simple soldier approached him and offered him his horse, asking to be gratefully remembered:

cape [...] Princeps clarissime, hunc equum nondum fessum et non tam tuae, quam nostrae et communi consule saluti, ne morte aut captivitate tua casum hunc nobis funestiosem, hostibus dolosa et iniquissima acie nobiscum dimicantibus laetiosem facias.

This, too, is an episode drawn from Livy's description of the defeat of the Romans at Cannae (XXII 49) and it is modelled after the actions and words of the military tribune Gn. Lentulus to the defeated consul, L. Aemilius: "L. Aemili [...] cape hunc equum, dum et tibi virium aliquid superses et comes ego te tollere possum ac protegere. Ne funestam hanc pugnam morte consulis feceris".

Next, let us discuss the natural circumstances which decide the course of the battle. In the description of the battle of Grunwald (IV, p. 37), we read that the winds themselves proved favourable for Jagiełło by blowing dust in the eyes of the Teutonic Knights: "in hostium vultus et ora flatum et pulverem vertisse". Długosz adds that the verses of the Roman poet Claudian (VII 96–98) can also be applied to Jagiełło as they describe a similar help on the part of nature itself. However, when we examine this excerpt from Claudian, we see that the Roman poet described a somewhat different situation: the gale deflected the spears of the enemies towards themselves. In fact, Długosz is drawing upon a detail in Livy, once again in the description of the Roman defeat at Cannae (XXII 46): "ventus [...] adversus Romanis coortus multo pulvere in ipsa ora volvendo prospectum ademit". This circumstance, which decided the result of the battle, appealed to Długosz. In the entry for the year 1045 (I, p. 294), describing the defeat of the Hungarians in the war with Emperor Henry, Długosz writes: "turbo [...] vehemens pulverem in ora Hungarorum coniecit et vultus Hungarorum obscurans quasi et elementa videres armis Caesaris favisse, Caesari victoriam praebuit". Similarly, in the description of the battle in which the Hungarian king Władysław conquers Oldimir, prince of the Comani (II, p. 466, in 1285): "tempestat ingens coorta ora et vultus Comanorum verberans et obcaecans magno adiumento Hungaris fuit, ut vincerent".

Finally, following Livy, Długosz also describes the circumstances which precede and end the battle. In the entry for the year 1107 (I, p. 458), he describes how Bolesław Krzywousty gives an ultimatum to the inhabitants of Białogard: he sends them two shields and orders them to choose ("utro uti velint, dare optionem"). The red shield signifies the destruction of the town, the white, peace and the mercy of the conqueror. These words recall the words of Quintus Fabius: "utrum placet, sumite" (XXI 18), as he brings the choice between peace and war to the Carthaginians in the folds of his toga.

Livy's model is quite prominent in the description of the cause for the defeat at Worskła (III, p. 528). When Spytko of Melsztyn recognizes an enormous risk in joining battle, he decides to parley with the Tartars, and for this he is accused of cowardice. Thus he agrees to the battle, but washes his hands of it and proclaims that the other leaders, his rivals, should show the same skill in arms in battle as they have with their tongues:

se omnis culpa, omnis sanguinis fundendi, omnis infelicis pugnae postquam monuisset nec impetrasset, quid in rem satius foret, testabatur exsortem; viderent, ut aequae manus in certamine iuxta ac linguam in iurgando promptas ac pugnae ostenderent.

Here, too, Długosz draws upon Livy's narrative (XXII 44) of the dispute of the Roman consuls before the battle of Cannae. Following the example of Fabius Cunctator, Varro counsels delaying the battle and in advance disclaims the responsibility for any eventual defeat:

si quid proictis ac proditis ad inconsultam atque improvidam pugnam legionibus accideret, se omnis culpa exsortem, omnis eventus participem fore diceret; videret, ut quibus lingua prompta ac temeraria, aequae in pugna vigerent manus.

Spytko of Melsztyn is particularly sharp with Szczukowski: "qui ferox rapidusque, lingua immodicus, illum mordacius carpendo dixerat" (*ibid.*). The manner in which Szczukowski is characterized, as shown above, is modelled after the characterization of Marcus Minutius, who opposed the delaying tactics of Fabius Cunctator: "ferox rapidusque in consiliis ac lingua immodicus" (XXII 12, towards the end). Varro's reply can again be discerned in Długosz (IV, p. 727), when Władysław Warneńczyk angrily dismisses Jan Hunyadi who is advising him to flee from the field of battle: "viderit [...] si tam promptam habeat manum iuxta ac linguam habuerat".

What about the effects and consequences of defeat? Długosz relates (IV, p. 68) how the news of the defeat of the Teutonic Knights at Grunwald reached Marlborck and what impact it had there. A breathless messenger arrives from the field of battle and announces that Jagiełło has defeated the master of Prussia in a "great massacre" ("magna caede [...] vicisse"). This is an echo of the words of the praetor M. Pomponius who reported the defeat at Lake Trasimene as follows: "pugna magna victi sumus" (XXII 7). At Marlborck, the messenger exaggerates and reports that Jagiełło destroyed all the forces: "omnesque illius copias delevisse [...] astruebat" (IV, p. 68). This exaggeration is also based on Livy's model, since similar news reached Rome after the battle of Cannae: "deletasque omnes copias allatum fuerat" (XXII 54). According to Długosz, the defeat had a great effect in Marlborck (IV, p. 69). Fear and terror were to influence the Teutonic Knights to consider abandoning Marlborck and fleeing for their lives: "singulis in maerorem et consternationem animi versis omnes de castro Marienburgk deserendo et de fuga, quo sors quemque tulisset, ineunda omnes cogitationes suas verterant". This is reminiscent of Livy (XXIII 20), who ascribes a similar state of mind to the Petelians when the Romans denied them aid in the war with Hannibal: "tantus repente maeror pavorque senatum eorum cepit, ut pars profugiendi, qua quisque posset, ac deserendae urbis auctores essent".

Unfortunately, Jagiełło was not able to take advantage of his victory at Grunwald. We learn from the *Histories* (IV, p. 65) that, soon after the battle, some of the king's councillors encouraged him to remain at the scene of battle with his entire army for three days. Others insisted that he should advance on Marlborck without any delay (*pulsa omni mora*) in order to annihilate the Teutonic Knights completely. The model and perhaps also the source of such insistence was Livy's

description of the advice which Maharbal gave to Hannibal after the battle of Cannae (XII 51). Maharbal also believed that an immediate advance on Rome was imperative (*minime cessandum*). Jagiełło, however, did not seize the chance but halted his army. According to Długosz, it was then that it became clear that the king and his councillors did not know how to exploit victory: “nescire uti parta victoria” (IV, p. 66). Seeking the reasons for such unfortunate action on the part of Jagiełło, our historian considers that perhaps fortune does not bestow its benefits on anyone in full (“fortunam nulli ad plenum gratificari consuevisse”). This is a reworking of Maharbal’s statement: “non omnia nimirum eidem di dedere: vincere scis, Hannibal, victoria uti nescis” (*ibid.*).

The speeches of leaders before the fighting begins constitute a separate section in Długosz’s battle descriptions. Believing the views of the Hellenistic theorists of historiography promulgated by Cicero, that history is the *opus oratorium maxime*, Długosz without any compunction places in the mouths of Polish leaders imaginary speeches that are, however, fashioned on ancient models, particularly those of Livy. A classic example of this is the speech of Władysław Łokietek at Płowce (III, pp. 148 ff.). This speech begins with Łokietek recalling the ingratitude of the Teutonic Knights, who, unmindful of past favours, are following the mad leader, Wincenty z Szamotuł: “qui pro impartitis et susceptis a Regno nostro et gente beneficiis, furiosum sequendo palatinum, patriam nostram [...] delere conati sunt”. This is a reworking of Scipio’s words concerning the ingratitude of the Carthaginians (XXI 41): “pro his impartitis furiosum iuvenem (*scil.* Hannibalem) sequentes oppugnatum patriam nostram veniunt”. Łokietek believes that madness is driving the Teutonic Knights, otherwise they would respect God and the favours they had received: “quos nisi superbiae et inexpletae avaritiae terras nostras residuas occupare gestientis exagitaret furor et facinus, respicerent profecto, si non Deum coelestesque superos [...] beneficia certe”. This also is based on Scipio’s suggestion: “quem nisi Saguntinum scelus agitare respiceret profecto, si non patriam victam, domum certe patremque...” (*ibid.*). In Łokietek’s speech, there follows the thought that the Teutonic Knights are driven by an insatiable desire to spill Polish blood: “incredibilis in illis aviditas Regni nostri aut occupandi aut evertendi, insatiabilis sanguinis nostri fundendi sitis”. Here, Długosz has for a short interval abandoned Scipio at Ticinus, and has drawn upon the speech of Vibius Virrius, who, by warning the inhabitants of Capua of the ruthlessness of the Romans, tried to convince them to break their alliance with Rome: “tanta aviditas supplicii expetendi, tanta sanguinis nostri hauriendi est sitis” (XXVI 13). This mention of the thirst for blood enticed Długosz to employ a similarly effective threat: if you do not spill the blood of your enemy, he will drink yours – “hauriet hostis tuum, si suum sanguinem fundere detraxeris”. Here, Długosz develops the terse thought of M. Popillius Laenas in his speech to his soldiers: “hauriendus aut dandus est sanguis” (VII 24). Taking up Scipio’s arguments, Łokietek next urges each man to think of defending his

homeland, his wife and his children rather than of defending himself. Długosz (III, p. 148): “Unusquisque nostrum non se, sed coniugem, sed liberos, sed patriam caeteraque pignora defendere cogitet”. Livy (XXI 41): “Unusquisque se, non corpus suum, sed coniugem ac liberos parvos armis protegere putet”. The same parallel surfaces when Łokietek then observes that the future of the homeland will be determined by the courage shown in battle: “idque in animo et in respectu habeat, qualis nostra virtus in praesenti certamine enituerit, talem deinde fortunam et patriae, liberorum et pignorum nostrorum fore”. Livy: “identidem hoc animo [...] reputet qualis nostra vis virtusque fuerit, talem deinde fortunam illius urbis ac Romani imperii fore” (*ibid.*).

The idea of contrasting the call to arms for the Poles and the Teutonic Knights also stems from the ancient source: “dispar praetera pugnandi nobis et illis ratio”. It suffices to recall a similar phrase in Catiline’s speech before battle (Sall. *Cat.* 59): “praeterea, milites, non eadem nobis et illis necessitudo impendet”. The description of the army of the Teutonic Knights as *variarum gentium colluvies* is also an echo of Livy’s description of Hannibal’s army: *ex conluvione omnium gentium* (XXII 43).

It is worth adding that, immediately following Łokietek’s speech, the fighting begins and it is described in typical formulas from antiquity. Długosz: „sic fatus [...] canere signa iubet”. Sallust (*Cat.* 59): “haec ubi dixit [...] signa canere iubet”. Długosz: “orabat postremo nonnullos ex nomine appellans”. Sallust (*ibid.*): “unumquemque nominans appellat”. Długosz: “in cadentium [...] aut sauciatorum numerum [...] Cruciferi vegetas iubebant succedere acies”. Sallust (*Cat.* 60): “Catilina [...] integros pro sauciis arcessere”.

Łokietek’s speech demonstrates how skillfully Długosz creates a new whole by interweaving various motifs. In addition to this, however, we can also find in the *Histories* examples of an almost diametrically opposed method of exploiting ancient models. Fragments of one speech in Livy can be found in various places and are put to different uses as the need arises. Thus, for example, Hannibal’s speech to Scipio before Zama. The Carthaginian leader, attempting to obtain peace from Scipio, employs arguments which Długosz to some extent considers to constitute political wisdom. Hannibal assures Scipio that they should certainly be able to reach some type of sensible agreement if there is good will and a peaceable spirit on both sides: “animo tantum nobis opus est non abhorrente a quietis consiliis” (XXX 30). Długosz takes up and uses this statement several times, each time in a different context, i.e. in the speech of the Polish envoys to Witold (IV, p. 383): “elige potius et sequaris iustam coronationem et a quietis consiliis non abhorreas”; in the characterization of Świdrygiełło (IV, p. 451): “de quo plurimum confidens ab omnibus honestis et quietis consiliis abhorrebat”.

As the Carthaginian leader is asking Scipio for peace, he realizes that he is doing so in circumstances that are more favourable to the Romans: “in meliore vestra fortuna de pace agitur”. Thus he tries to make his arguments as persuasive

as possible so that, *in spite of this*, Scipio might agree. For Hannibal, this is only a wish, but Długosz takes it as a certainty, for he maintains that particularly in favourable circumstances (rather than despite of them) the victor should magnanimously agree to concessions. An almost verbatim echo of Livy's words can be found in the justification for the peace treaty with the Teutonic Knights in 1435 (IV, p. 568): "non enim victoriae superioris felicitate Poloni elati pacem fastidiebant, sed tunc maxime de pace agendum putabant, cum res eorum essent in meliori et altiori fortuna". Moreover, in the negotiations of the peace of Thorn, Kazimierz Jagiełłończyk follows the directives of Hannibal: "pax ipsa Kazimirum Poloniae regem mulcebat, qui etsi se arbitraretur et iure et victoriis superiorem, in meliori tamen sua fortuna videns de pace agi atque in secundis rebus satius quam in adversis sapere sollertissimum ducens pacem acceptat" (V, p. 456).

During the course of his speech, Hannibal expresses his bitter experience which resembles a warning as he states that has known enthusiasms that are more overwhelming than useful: "novi spiritus magnos magis quam utiles". Długosz repeatedly expresses this train of thought in various ways. Thus Władysław Jagiełło warns Witold against carrying out his ambitious plans with the help of the Teutonic Knights, since the defeats they had inflicted should curb his enthusiasm: "ut quoque novos spiritus, quos induerat, magnos magis quam utiles [...] corripere" (IV, p. 382). And slightly later (IV, p. 419), Długosz cites the following thought in his description of the hostile actions of Świdrygiełło towards Jagiełło: he trusted only in the fortunes of the moment ("praesentem tantummodo fortunam metiens") and the deceitful enthusiasms of fate ("novos sibi sed inutiles magnitudine fortunae subministrante spiritus").

In subsequent arguments, Hannibal proclaims that had the gods given common sense to those who experience success, these fortunate people would consider not only what happened, but also what may happen. In this way, he gives Scipio to understand that even his success may not last. Długosz ascribes Jagiełło's rejection of the offer of peace by Grand Master Heinrich von Plauen to his blindness and lack of understanding of this truth: "secundis rebus rectum consilium auferentibus et non pensantibus consiliariis breves et mutabiles vices rerum esse nec umquam fortunam alicui simpliciter indulsisse" (IV, p. 82).

Next, Hannibal expresses his opinion that peace assured is better than hoped-for victory: "melior tutiorque est certa pax quam sperata victoria". Długosz repeats this thought twice. First, he places it in the mouth of Grand Master von Wende, who in 1410 counselled the Teutonic Knights to negotiate a peace with the Poles (IV, p. 26): "cum belli eventus dubius sit [...] meliorem certam pacem quam speratam victoriam iudico"; next, in his account of the speech of the legates to Jagiełło at the Council of Basel (IV, p. 494): "certam magis cum Cruciferis et aliis suis suscipere pacem quam speratam victoriam".

Hannibal justifies his thinking with the reminder that nothing is more unreliable than war: "nusquam minus quam in bello eventus respondent". Długosz as-

sociates this caution with war that is undertaken without a worthy cause: “verum, ut fit in bello aequitate omissa suscepto, eventus desiderii Alexandri Withawdi nusquam minus respondebant” (in relation to the war with the inhabitants of Psków in 1426, IV, p. 341). He repeats it, referring to the Poles Mikołaj Czajko and Mikołaj Komorowski, with respect to the assault on the town of Aperiaż in 1442: “ambo aviditate gloriae, lucri et famae capti, non prospicientes actus huius modi subiectos esse casibus et nusquam minus quam in bello respondere eventus” (IV, p. 674).

In subsequent arguments, Hannibal reminds Scipio that the fortunes of a moment can destroy both achieved and expected success: “simul parta ac sperata decora unius horae fortuna evertere potest”. In Długosz, we read for the year 1442 that Jan Giskra tried to avoid battle because he did not want to risk his past successes to the fortunes of a single day: “ne si dimicatione succumberet, omnes successus suos superioribus annis habitos uno die damnaret” (IV, p. 676). Here, Długosz replaced “hour” by “day”, but he retained “day” in the speeches of the opponents of the coronation of Władysław Jagiellończyk: “ne tot annorum et sudorum spatia in unius horae committerent discrimen” (IV, p. 544).

Finally, in the conclusion to his speech, Hannibal presents Scipio with the example of M. Atilius, who did not know how to achieve moderation in success and paid for it: “non statuendo felicitate modum [...] quanto altius elatus erat, eo foedius corruit”. The same pride was shown by the inhabitants of Psków in the war with Witold in 1426: “eventibus aliquot elati pacem abnuunt nuntiosque sine pacis spe felicitati suae non statuendo modum vanos remittunt” (IV, p. 341).

Here and there, Długosz also draws upon other speeches from Livy. Before his clash with Jarosław, Bolesław Chrobry gives a speech to his soldiers, indicating that even without hope of victory, the compulsion of circumstances should of itself be an adequate incitement to bravery: “quae (*scil.* spes) si non subesset, necessitas tamen, quae maximum ac ultimum est telum, stimulare deberet” (I, p. 199). The thought that necessity is the ultimate and most important missile comes from Livy (IV 28), who places it in the mouth of one of the Volscians, Vettius Messius: “virtute pares, necessitate, quae ultimum ac maximum telum est, superiores estis”. Livy’s metaphor, which is bracketed by the words: “virtute pares [...] necessitate superiores estis” returns in Długosz in a slightly different form a few lines below: “dum itaque virtute non possumus, necessitate superiores evadamus”.

Before engaging in battle with Wszewołod, Bolesław Śmiały gives a speech to his soldiers. The structure of the first sentence already indicates that it is based on a Latin model: “Decernendi cum hoste, quod frequentibus votis optastis, nunc vobis oblata est facultas” (I, p. 350). These words are an echo of those spoken by the consul M. Porcius Cato as he was encouraging his soldiers during battle in Spain: “tempus [...] quod saepe optastis, venit, quo vobis potestas fieret virtutem vestram ostendendi” (XXXIV 13). Perhaps Długosz was also recalling the

speech of Cataline (Sall. 20): “En illa, illa, quam saepe optatis, libertas, praeterea divitiae [...] in oculis posita sunt”.

Without a doubt, the books containing the account of the Punic War had the greatest impact on Długosz. From the *Histories* as a whole it is obvious that he was most familiar with this part of the work of the Roman historian; in fact, he virtually knew it by heart and draws upon it on many and various occasions. Długosz must have also had a special affinity for Hannibal, as is demonstrated both by his inclusion of echoes of Hannibal’s speeches (as discussed above) and by his quite frequent references to Livy’s characterization of Hannibal. Examples abound.

When Długosz describes the virtues of Ziemowit, the son of Piast, particularly in his role as a military leader, he stresses his toughness and physical endurance: “frigoris enim, inediae et caloris patiens, cibum potumque pro naturali mensura, non pro voluptate sumebat, vigiliarum somnique non disterminans tempora, crebris vicibus inter custodias stationesque militum excubabat” (I, p. 105). This is a virtually word-for-word borrowing from Livy’s characterization of the young Hannibal (XXI 4): “caloris ac frigoris patientia par; cibi potionisque desiderio naturali, non voluptate modus finitus; vigiliarum somnique nec die nec nocte discriminata tempora [...] multi saepe militari sagulo opertum humi iacentem inter custodias stationesque militum conspexerunt”. Similarly, Długosz’s comments on the modest apparel of Ziemowit (“habitus suus nullam pompam redolens vix procerum et nobilium habitui aequabatur”) are an amplification of Livy’s brief mention of the clothing of Hannibal: “vestitus nihil inter aequales excellens”. At the same time, the phrase *inediae patiens* in the first sentence also stems from Sallust’s characterization of Catiline (Sall. *Cat.* 5).

Długosz also likens the young Bolesław Krzywousty to Hannibal, saying: “tanta [...] virtus, ut saepe inter milites nocturnas observantes excubias somni aestusque patiens integro vigiliarum tempore versaretur; et si quando somno pressus foret, sagulo tantummodo militari opertus, nuda humo teneros componebat artus” (I, p. 413). He describes Bolesław’s pugnacity in these words: “ad primos accurrebat dimicaturus”, while Livy describes Hannibal’s belligerence as follows: “princeps in proelium ibat”. It follows that the entire narration of the warlike ardour of Bolesław Krzywousty, who desperately longs to go to war at Sieciech’s side, can be seen as a “pleasing digression” (*amoenum deverticulum*), drawn from Livy’s description of the relationship of the young Hannibal with his father Hasdrubal. In any case, Długosz’s assessment of Bolesław Krzywousty as an exceptional leader, who by his very presence inspired his soldiers with eagerness to fight (“nec Poloni alio duce ad capessenda pericula plus audaciae ostentarent”, I, p. 449) has its source in Livy’s praise of Hannibal (XXI 4): “neque milites alio duce plus confidere aut audere”.

When he presents the attributes and ambitions of Przemysław, Prince of Poznań, Długosz remarks that he was distressed by the loss of certain lands:

“irritabant ingentis spiritus virum Prussia, Slesia, Saxonia Wratislaviaque ademptae” (II, p. 526). This was modelled on the concerns of Hannibal: “angebant ingentis spiritus virum Sicilia Sardiniaque amissae” (XXI 1). Moreover, the mention that Przemysław obtained the good will of everyone by his personal merits, rather than by anything he inherited from his father or mother, and that he gained the admiration of those who “were placed both higher and lower than he” (“facile in se tam primorum quam inferiorum favorem converterat”) has been taken from Livy’s observation about Hannibal’s popularity among the army: “primo statim adventu omnem exercitum in se convertit” (XXI 3). Finally, Długosz enhances his description of the character of Władysław Warneńczyk with a reference to Hannibal’s character with these words: “primus ad pugnam, ultimus proelio confecto excedebat” (IV, p. 689), which correspond to Livy’s: “princeps ad proelium ibat, ultimus conserto proelio excedebat”.

Długosz did not draw only upon Hannibal for the features with which he characterized the figures from the history of Poland. Earlier, we indicated the resemblance that is found between the characters and deeds of Przemysław and M. Minutius. The description of Minutius: “animique et ingenii aliquanto quam pro fortuna, in qua erat natus, maioris” (XXV 37) appears for a second time in Długosz (I, p. 558) in his characterization of the knight who, in battle, gives up his horse to Bolesław Krzywousty, while in his characterization of Mieszko I (I, p. 159) he introduces the attributes of M. Portius Cato, also borrowed from Livy (XXXIX 40). The parallel follows. Długosz: “ingenium facile et ad omnia, quaecumque agere vellet, accommodatum et versatile”. Livy: “huic versatile ingenium sic pariter ad omnia fuit, ut natum ad id unum diceres, quodcumque ageret”.

Following Livy’s example, Długosz also attempts to portray the nature of a crowd by comparing it with the sea. Like the sea, a crowd is difficult to quiet once it is roused: “ea enim natura multitudinis perhibetur esse, quae et freti; si enim quando fluctus suos impellentibus flatibus civerit, non facile ad priorem potest reduci tranquillitatem” (I, p. 61). Here, the starting point for Długosz was Livy’s comparison (XXVIII 27), although it is based on a different *tertium comparationis* (instability of temperament): “multitudo omnis sicut natura maris; ut venti et aerae cient, ita aut tranquillum aut procellae in vobis sunt”.

The speech of Hannibal previously mentioned has already indicated that Długosz drew his political wisdom from ancient sources. Another proof of his dependence in this area is Długosz’s narration of the interim regimes of twelve prefects who replaced kings (I, p. 61). These regimes did not benefit the Poles, because each of the twelve was directed by his own ambitions and intentions: “tendendo enim quisque rectorum ad suas ambitiones et consilia dedere documentum in administranda re publica multorum imperium non posse fieri utile neque diuturnum”. Długosz drew this lesson from Livy (IV 31), who describes the fatal results of a disagreement among three military tribunes: “tres [...]

profecti sunt Veios documentoque fuere, quam plurium imperium bello inutile esset. Tendendo ad sua quisque consilia, cum aliud alii videretur, aperuerunt ad occasionem locum hosti”. Clearly, from Livy’s comments about army discipline, Długosz has drawn conclusions about the political system of a nation.

Długosz’s dependence on Livy can be seen not only in his use of motifs in the subject matter, but also in the compositional elements. In the entry for the year 1103 (I, p. 443), when Długosz begins to describe the deeds of Bolesław Krzywousty, he inserts a separate preface to this section of his work just as Livy does at the beginning of his description of the Punic Wars (XXI 1). The following comparison demonstrates the degree of imitation. Długosz: “Egregiam operis nostri partem, in quam Divinitate propitia utcumque perventum est, inchoaturus, id primum mihi praefari liceat, quod et plerosque rerum scriptores in vertice suorum operum professos memini”. Livy: “In parte operis mei licet mihi praefari, quod in principio summae totius professi plerique sunt rerum scriptores”. Each historian justifies the need for a new introduction by the outstanding importance of the wars and times that he is intending to describe. Długosz: “tempora me et bella [...] memoranda descripturum”. Livy: “bellum maxime omnium memorabile [...] me scripturum”.

At the same time, Livy mentions that, in their fight against each other, both nations (Rome and Carthage) were relying more on hatred than on strength: “odiis prope maioribus certarunt quam viribus”. This is one of Długosz’s most beloved phrases, as is shown by the following examples: (1) II, p. 432 (referring to the war between Bolesław Wstydlivy and Władysław Opolski): “maioribus prope odiis quam armis bellum gesturi”; (2) III, p. 386 (referring to the civil wars in 1379): “odiis magis quam armis certando”; (3) III, p. 425 (1383, referring to the war between Domarat and Sędziwój Świdwa): “infestioribus se odiis aliquanto quam armis [...] bella gessisse fatebantur”; (4) IV, p. 453 (1431, referring to the mutual acts of revenge by the Poles and the Teutonic Knights): “saeviebant [...] ut non solum dextris, sed etiam maioribus prope odiis viderentur certasse”; (5) V, p. 456 (1466, referring to the achievements of Rudolph, the Papal Legate): “disiunctissimosque populos odiis prope maioribus certantes quam viribus ad pulcherrimam et uniformem idemptitatem reduxerit”; (6) V, p. 482 (1467, referring to the civil war in Bohemia): “quodque magnis utrimque tam viribus, quam odiis gerebatur”.

The following example from the conclusion of the *Histories* (V, p. 700) is interesting from the linguistic rather than the compositional standpoint. Livy quite correctly uses the term *praefari* in his introduction (XXI 1) to the part of his work that he considers to be self-contained: “in parte operis mei licet mihi praefari”. Długosz, however, on the penultimate page of his work, in the overall conclusion, writes: “Hoc autem consecutum mihi in conclusione et fine operis mei praefari firmaliter licet, quod plerosque catholicos viros videmus consecutos”. It appears that the classical meaning of *praefari* has been lost, and that the verb now has

a new meaning, “to speak out”; nevertheless, the attraction to the classical model remains and can be discerned even from the syntax alone (*quod*, etc.).

Clearly, the most important impact of Livy on Długosz can be seen in the domain of lexicon and phrases, especially the spectacular ones. The sentence: “speciosioraque magis quam tutiora dantibus consilia credidit” (referring to Prince Witold, IV, p. 399) is the fruit of the author’s ability to appropriate sentences from Livy, such as: “celerioraque quam tutiora consilia magis placere ducibus” (IX 32), or: “consilium imperatoris in speciem audacius, re ipsa tutius” (XXVII 45). Livy’s famous phrase: “perfidia plus quam Punica” (XXI 4) returns in the phrase: “plus quam Punica fraus” (I, p. 91); the expression: “homines raptio vivere adsueti” (Liv. XXVII 12) is used to characterize the Bohemians (IV, p. 680) and others as well. In the entry for the year 1376, Długosz describes the life and death in exile of Władysław Biały, and adds the observation that he sentenced to exile not just himself but his funeral as well: “non sibimet ipsi solum, sed etiam funeri voluntarium indixit exsilium” (III, p. 363). This brilliant saying is drawn from Livy (XXXIX 52), who uses it on the occasion of the death of Scipio: “absens citatus voluntarium non sibimet ipse solum, sed etiam funeri suo exilium indixit”.

II. CICERO

In comparison to Livy, Długosz’s borrowings from other Latin authors are much less numerous. Even those, however, can be explained in the light of the literary ambitions of our historian. There is a clear trace of Cicero’s *Scipio’s Dream* in the passage where Gedeon convinces Kazimierz to assume the rule (II, p. 98) by the following argument: “omnibus etenim [...] qui patriam adiuverint, auxerint, defenderint, certum et definitum in caelo est locum fore, ubi beati sempiterno fruuntur aevo”. This is a repetition of the words of Scipio the Elder: “sic habeto: omnibus, qui patriam conservaverint, adiuverint, auxerint certum esse in caelo definitum locum, ubi beati aevo sempiterno fruuntur” (*Rep.* VI 13). In passing, it is worth noting with what freedom Długosz exploits the Roman text. In Cicero, the words *certum* and *definitum* are predicate adjectives referring to *locum*, while Długosz employs them in a separate sentence, *certum et definitum est...* In I, p. 199, Długosz uses a sentence from *De amicitia* with similar versatility. Here, Bolesław Chrobry encourages his soldiers to be brave by saying that no one should give way to cowardice in the hope of benefitting from a few more years of life: “paucorum annorum accessio unumquemque vestrum non moveat”. In this way, Długosz exploits the expression (*Lael.* 11) ascribed to Scipio: “Quid igitur hunc paucorum annorum accessio iuvare potuisset?”

Most of Długosz’s reminiscences from Cicero are taken from the speeches against Catiline. In I, p. 511, we read that after the return of Zbigniew, the councillors and dignitaries, seeng in him an implacable enemy, reproach Bolesław

for his excessive lenience. Długosz paints him in hues drawn from the first *Catilinarian Oration*. The parallels follow. Długosz: “pestem atque istam, quam hic in te et in nos omnes iam diu machinatur, in ipsum retorque”. Cicero (*Cat.* I 1): “oportebat in te conferri pestem, quam tu in nos machinaris”. Długosz: “vitamque suam iustis debitisque suppliciis eripe ac hominem bonorum omnium inimicum, hostem patriae, latronem Poloniae interfice”. Cicero (*Cat.* I 13): “homines bonorum inimicos, hostis patriae, latrones Italiae [...] aeternis suppliciis mactabis”. However, the phrase: “iustis debitisque suppliciis eripe” is drawn from the middle of Cicero’s speech (*Cat.* I 8): “dubitas [...] vitam istam multis suppliciis iustis debitisque ereptam fugae sollicitudinique mandare?” Again it is worth noting the independence with which Długosz exploits Cicero’s text: *suppliciis eripe* in Cicero means “to snatch life away from retribution”, while in Długosz it means “to strip life away by retribution”. The epithet *exitiosum prodigium* attributed to Zbigniew seems to come from the second *Catilinarian Oration* (*Cat.* II 1): “nulla iam perniciēs a monstro illo atque prodigio...”.

Isolated phrases from the *Catilinarian Orations* also resound in the other books of the *Histories*. Thus Prince Czartoryski is proud of killing the great Prince Zygmunt (IV, p. 658): “pestem patriae et bonorum omnium hostem”, which is borrowed both from the conclusion to the first *Catilinarian Oration* (I 13) quoted above and also from chapter 12 of the same speech, where the phrase *rei publicae pestis* appears.

In another passage of the *Histories* (III, p. 165), Długosz narrates that in 1334 Casimir the Great exterminated the “rabble of bandits” (*sentina praedonum sublata*). He likely found his inspiration for this metaphor in the first *Catilinarian Oration* (I 5): “tuorum comitum [...] sentina”.

III. CICERO AND SALLUST

Długosz’s independence in exploiting the Roman motifs can be seen in the way he combines the source material. As is well known, Sallust, when presenting the conspiracy of Catiline, omits the first speech of Cicero against Catiline because it had already been published and was known to readers. Długosz, meanwhile, links in his imagination the speech of Cicero with the text of Sallust, thus creating for himself a new whole, and imitates it twice in an interesting way.

Here is the first example. In I, p. 476, we find the description of the trial of Zbigniew, who was captured after the battle and brought before Bolesław. The prosecutor is Sieciech (modelled on Cicero), while Zbigniew defends himself in the style of Sallust’s Catiline. Długosz: “callidissimo figmento facinus suum tegere excusareque et purgare coepit”. Sallust: “postremo dissimulandi causa aut sui expurgandi... in senatum venit” (*Cat.* 31). Zbigniew asks that the slanders levelled against him not be believed: “rogans et obsecrans, ne ad delationes calumniosas per eum diluendas damnationis periculo illum subicerent, obicerent

contumeliae, dederent exiliationi pluribusque aliis pro tempore utens verbis”. This is Długosz’s counterpart of the description of the actions of Catiline by Sallust (*ibid.*): “postulare a patribus coepit, ne quid de se temere crederent”, etc.

Moreover, as mentioned before, Sallust did not consider it necessary to mention the first *Catilinarian Oration*, referring his readers to the speech which had already been published. Długosz has no such scruples and without hesitation places Cicero’s speech into the mouth of Sieciech:

Quousque tandem – inquit – Sbignee, nostra patientia abutere, quam diu dolis tuis nos lacesses et fallacis, quem ad finem sese ista temeritas tua efferet? Quousque nostra vexatio, nostra invasio, nostra direptio, nostra calamitas tibi erit libera et impunita? Quam vero gratiam et quam indignam tum fratri tuo, Principi nostro clarissimo, tum nobis refers, attende, qui te ex illicito natum connubio pravis studentem actionibus, nulla virtutum commendatione cognitum, maternam redolentem infamiam, stirpem ac semen malorum hominum, mente conscelerata ac nefaria praeditum de pernicie populi Polonici, de exitio Regni nostri acerba et crudelia exquirentem studia non modo nullis ac meritis eras non affecit supplicis aut in terrarum ultima velut portentum monstruosum non detrusit, sed in participium et communionem Regni admisit.

It is easy to discern that this is a merging of subsequent thoughts from Cicero’s first *Catilinarian Oration*, I 1: “Quousque tandem abutere, Catilina, patientia nostra? Quem ad finem sese effrenata iactabit audacia?”; I 5: “(Catilinam) videmus intestinam aliquam cotidie perniciem rei publicae molientem”; I 8: “tibi uni multorum civium neces, tibi vexatio direptioque sociorum impunita fuit ac libera”; I 28 (Rome is speaking, reproaching Cicero for his indolence): “praeclaram vero populo Romano refers gratiam, qui te, hominem per se cognitum, nulla commendatione maiorum tam mature ad summum imperium per omnes honorum gradus extulit”; I 30: “delebitur [...] stirps ac semen malorum omnium”; I 9: “hic, hic sunt [...] qui de nostro omnium interitu, qui de huius urbis atque adeo de orbis terrarum exitio cogitent”.

The second example of the association of Cicero’s speech with the text of Sallust occurs in the *Histories* at IV, pp. 200 f. (entry for the year 1416). Cardinal Francis of Florence attacks John of Falkenberg for having written a pamphlet against Jagiełło in the words: “Qua – inquit – temeritate, qua mentis alienatione, vir spurcissime et abominande, ex arcula putrida depravatae conscientiae tuae virum [...] optimum insectaris?” Up to this point, only the heightened tone recalls the insistent questioning at the beginning of the first *Catilinarian Oration*. Immediately, however, a correspondence of the words used is also seen: “illustrata, crede mihi, iam sunt veritate tua mendacia, victa temeritas, stultitia confutata, in tuam ignominiam sempiternam”. Cicero’s model (I 3) reads: “si illustrantur, si erumpunt omnia? Muta iam istam mentem, mihi crede [...] luce sunt nobis clariora tua consilia omnia”. Later, the speaker presents the indications of the general revulsion towards Falkenberg: “nemo itaque est ex patribus conscriptis,

nemo mediocribus, nemo ex infirmis, qui te luce, qui oculis, qui congressu, qui conspectu dignum putet velut hominem malevolum superis atque hominibus inivisum”. Here Długosz is transforming into statements the questions found in Cicero (I 7): “Quis te ex hac tanta frequentia totque tuis amicis ac necessariis salutavit?” Moreover, Falkenberg’s behaviour towards the Grand Master of the Teutonic Knights is also modelled upon the behaviour of Catiline. Długosz: “tum ille [...] in furore versus...”, Sallust: “tum ille furibundus”, and the words that Długosz uses in the insulting declarations of Falkenberg (“improperiis et contumeliis [...] exputis”) are likely modelled on Sallust’s remark: “male dicta alia cum adderet”.

IV. SALLUST

In the *Histories*, simple borrowings from Sallust are more numerous than Cicero–Sallust combinations. Długosz frequently uses turns of phrase from Sallust’s characterization of Cataline for his own ends. He finds them useful when he enumerates the traits of the Polish nation: “frigoris iuxta atque inediae patiens [...] in rapinas et ipsa prona [...] alieni appetens” (I, p. 49; cf. Sall. *Cat.* 5). He uses similar terms in his characterization of Bolesław Krzywousty: “inediae, alboris, vigiliae patiens” (I, p. 561). In V, p. 20, he ascribes to the Masovian prince Bolesław the Catilinian trait, *animus vastus* (*ibid.*).

More complex associations of ideas which have counterparts in the Roman historian’s work must be considered both carefully and warily. For example, we read in *Histories* IV, p. 328 that prince Zygmunt Korybut decides to return to Bohemia and assume the throne with the aid of the Poles: “numerosa Polonorum colluvie, qui aut sua patrimonia profuderant aut iudiciis damnati aut aere alieno gravati erant”. It is difficult to resist the impression that Długosz is following in Sallust’s footsteps in his description of the associates of Catiline: “quicumque [...] bona patria laceraverat, quique alienum aes grande conflaverat [...] convicti iudiciis” (*Cat.* 14). He is also impressed by the tactics of Catiline. In I, p. 490, he presents the preparations of the Pomeranians for the fight with Bolesław Krzywousty. The Pomeranians agree to leave their horses behind and fight on foot so that the danger would be equal for everyone: “quatenus adaequato periculo fiducialius pertinaciusque proelium ab universis gereretur et fugae spes nulli subesset”. Długosz has taken the tactics that he found in Sallust and also possibly in Livy, and ascribed it to the Pomeranians. The former (*Cat.* 59) writes this about Catiline: “dein remotis omnium equis quo militibus exaequato periculo animus amplior esset”, the latter (III 62) reports a similar conduct on the part of the cavalry during one of the battles with the Sabines: “equites [...] ex equis desiliunt [...] et aequato primum periculo pudore deinde animos peditum accendant”.

According to Sallust, Catiline demonstrated significant courage in the battle of Pistoria, when he was acting as both leader and soldier: “strenui mili-

tis et boni imperatoris officia simul exsequebatur” (*Cat.* 60). This is an image which Długosz uses over and over: “et ducis et militis officio egregie functus” (I, p. 448, referring to the bravery of Żelisław); “et ducis et militis officium gerens” (II, p. 442, referring to Bolesław, Prince of Legnica), “non ducis solum, sed et militis opera usus” (I, p. 286, referring to Casimir the Restorer; II, p. 398, referring to Swarnon); “non militis solum, sed et ducis munere fungens” (III, p. 150, referring to Wincenty of Szamotuły); “et optimi imperatoris et audacissimi militis exsequebatur munera” (IV, p. 689, referring to Władysław Warneńczyk).

Długosz’s imagination was also to a large degree influenced by his reading of *Bellum Iugurthinum*. When he narrates the fortunes of Łokietek, who is forced to hide from Waclaw and endure poverty (III, p. 5), Długosz borrows the text almost verbatim from Sallust (*Iug.* 72). The parallels of sentences and phrases follows. Długosz: “ab eo [...] tempore dies aut nox tempusve ullum Duci Wladislao Loktek quietum [numquam] fuit”. Sallust: “neque post id locorum Iugurthae dies aut nox ulla quieta fuit”. Długosz: “neque loco neque mortali cuiquam praeter paucos satis fidere”. Sallust: “neque loco neque mortali cuiquam aut tempori satis credere”. Długosz: “Polonos Bohemosque iuxta in suspicione habere, circumspectare omnia”. Sallust: “civis hostisque iuxta metuere, circumspectare omnia”. Długosz: “egestatemque contra decus regium tolerare”. Sallust: “alio atque alio loco, saepe contra decus regium, noctu requiescere”. However, the mention of poverty quarrelling with the dignity of a king may also stem from *Iug.* 33, where we find the phrase: “contra decus regium cultu quam maxime miserabili”.

Other details that Długosz adds to his characterization of Łokietek are drawn from *Iug.* 85. Thus the sentence: “doctus frigora et caumata, imbres ac solem iuxta pati, humi requiescere inedia et quemlibet laborem tolerare” is an echo of the proud words of Marius: “doctus sum [...] hiemem et aestatem iuxta pati, humi requiescere, eodem tempore inopiam et laborem tolerare”.

Echoes of the *Bellum Iugurthinum* can be found even in the later books of the *Polish Histories*. In IV, p. 725, Długosz gives certain details just prior to the death of Władysław Warneńczyk. Over and over again, Jan Hunyadi sends messengers to urge the king to save himself through flight. The king replies that such behaviour is not fitting, that he does not want to stain his honour, and that in any case he does not know whether he will be alive tomorrow even if his flight should be successful. This is taken from *Iug.* 106, where Sulla reacts to Volux in the same way. Here also, the parallels of thoughts and words are worth noting. Here is the reaction of king Władysław to the proposal that he should flee: “animo feroci respondens negat sibi et sanguine suo fugam competere”. Sulla’s refusal reads: “animo feroci negat se totiens fusum Numidam pertimescere”. Both men refer to the possibility that they will die soon even if their flight would be successful. Władysław Warneńczyk says of himself: “malleque se in ea pugna cadere quam [...] de protrahenda vita per fugam ignominiosam cogitare [...] inexploratum habens an etiam per fugam evasurus sit et post evasionem ad

crastinum victurus”. Sulla: “mansurum potius quam [...] turpi fuga incertae ac forsitan post paulo morbo interiturae vitae parceret”. Both state that they will not betray their army in peril. Władysław Warneńczyk: “et quamvis certum discrimen adesse videat, mansurum potius et gloriosam mortem appetiturum, quam militibus suis proditis in turpem fugam dilapsurum”. Sulla: “etiamsi certa pestis adesset, mansurum potius quam proditis quos ducebat [...] vitae parceret”.

There is also no lack of less marked similarities in lexicon and syntax. In IV, p. 404, we read that Prince Witold’s hopes of the corruptibility of Poles were disappointed: “cui apud Polonos omnia venum ire in animo haeserat”. Jurgurtha harbours similar hopes with respect to Rome: “cui Romae omnia venire in animo haeserat” (*Iug.* 28).

Długosz owes more of such associations to his reading of the *Bellum Catilinae*. The appeal: “ut provideret, ne quid detrimenti res publica pateretur” (V, p. 626) is a repetition of the well-known Roman formula (*Cat.* 28). The phrase *virtus spectata* (V, p. 658) stems from *Cat.* 20. Telefus’ exhortation to the soldiers to place their hopes of victory and survival in their own right hands (IV, p. 673) resembles the appeal of Catiline: “memineritis [...] libertatem atque patriam in dextris vestris portare” (*Cat.* 58).

In conclusion, it is worth mentioning the sentences in Długosz that resemble Sallust in form rather than in meaning. In IV, p. 332, the envoy of Frederick of Brandenburg wants to show his master in a positive light: “is rogabat, ne quid rex de eo suggestione prava narratum vel narrandum crederet nec hostem se illi monstraret: se eo animo semper fuisse erga Regem et Regnum, ut nihil nisi felix et faustum optaret”. It is easy to discern that Cataline’s justification of himself before the senate (*Cat.* 31) serves a model for Długosz: “postulare [...] coepit, ne quid de se temere crederent: ea familia ortum, ita se ab adolescentia vitam instituisse, ut omnia bona in spe haberet”.

V. TRACES OF JULIUS CAESAR, FLORUS, FRONTINUS AND JUSTIN

In the *Polish Histories*, there is also no lack of echoes from Julius Caesar’s *De bello Gallico*. In I, p. 56, Długosz considers that one of the reasons for the virtues and noble traditions of the Poles is that they have no trade with merchants and are therefore not exposed to wares that lead to a softening of their manly spirits: “oblectamenta ad luxum pertinentia, quibus maxime humanus et ferox animus remittitur et relanguescit”. This reminds us of the characteristics of the Belgae (whom merchants also do not visit) which are well known from Caesar (*Gal.* I 1): “minime ea, quae ad effeminandos animos pertinent, important”, or the Germani (*Gal.* IV 2). Another echo is also raised when Długosz mentions wine, for a little later Caesar writes: “vinum ad se omnino importari non patiuntur, quod ea re ad laborem ferendum emollescere homines atque effeminari arbitrantur”.

Caesar's influence can also likely be discerned in Długosz's characterization of the Lithuanians. The explanation of why free men among them fall into slavery is somewhat difficult to believe: "frequenter insuper et liberi, debitis aut aere alieno nexi, aut iudiciis damnati, dum solutionem facere nequeunt, in servorum condicionem retruduntur. Quod et plerisque per violentiam, calumniam aut iniuriam solet provenire" (III, p. 474). These comments constitute the development of the customs found in Gaul (*Gal.* VI 33): "plerique, cum aut aere alieno aut magnitudine tributorum aut iniuria potentiorum premuntur, sese in servitutem dicant". Finally, Długosz, like Caesar, states that the number of armed men that must be sent to serve a prince during war is dependent on the wealth of each estate (III, p. 474): "locupletissimus ut quisque est, ita plures in bellum principi suo armatos praebet". Here the model was Caesar's remark on the number of retainers serving a Gallic knight in war: "ut quisque est genere copiisque amplissimus, ita plurimos circum se ambactos clienstesque habet" (*Gal.* VI 15).

From the *Stratagemata* of Frontinus, Długosz drew on material concerning military strategy, as can be seen by two borrowed episodes that decide the outcome of the Battle of Puck (entry for the year 1462, V, p. 354). The first describes the manoeuvre of Paweł Jasiński, who, by a charge from the side, shatters the extended lances of the Teutonic Knights: "in protensas hostium iam lanceas per transversum velocissime impingens et lanceas hostiles dispellens omnes ictus earum frustravit". It appears that Długosz remembered a course of action described by Frontinus (*Strat.* II 3, 20). The Roman author narrates that Aemilius Paulus led his cavalry in the same way when fighting with the armies of Perseus: "equites a sinistro cornu praeter oram phalangis iussit transcurrere citatis equis tectis, ut obiectis armis ipso impetu praefringerent hostium spicula". Here, Frontinus illustrates, as it were, the principles of attacking the Macedonian phalanx discussed by Livy (XLIV 41). According to Livy, a frontal attack on the phalanx is to be avoided; it should rather be attacked from the side (*a latere*), because the strength of a phalanx in close formation with extended spears cannot be overcome: "cuius confertae et intentis horrentis hastis intolerabiles vires sunt".

The second example that occurs during the same battle of Puck is also drawn from Frontinus. Here, Piotr Dunin for some time shields his infantry with cavalry, which parts only at the moment of the attack and enables the infantry to attack: "equite peditem velans non prius illum quam ad congressum verniretur, detexit" (V, p. 462). According to Frontinus (II 5, 34), Crassus acts in the same way in a battle with fugitives: the cavalry retreats by degrees, draws the Gauls and Germans into ambush, and finally parts to reveal the infantry: "quo cum barbari insecuti essent equite recedente in cornua subito acies Romana adaptata cum clamore procurrit".

This description struck Długosz's imagination and it is often repeated on the pages of the *Histories*, as is the lateral cavalry attack discussed earlier. In V, p. 71 (entry for the year 1450), during the fighting in Moldavia, Bogdan once again

uses cavalry to mask the presence of infantry: “turma equitum hostilium tegebat peditum; in quam cum regius exercitus in acie stantem incurrisset, illa retrorsum cedens peditem ostendit”.

The characteristic feature of Długosz’s method is to enlarge on motifs which consist of merely a few sentences in the Roman authors. In I, p. 410, he describes at length a fight with shadows during the night during the siege of Nakło. The besieging Poles would see their own shadows in the moonlight and take them for the enemy. They would rouse from sleep and attack the shadows, thinking that they were pursuing the enemy: “crederentque quas ipsi faciebant umbras, hostium iam supervenientium [...] corripiebant arma [...] quasi extemplo cum hoste discrimen pugnae initari”. Although Długosz provides a rather long disquisition in order to explain the army’s error as due to natural causes, it is difficult to believe him as this constitutes a literary enlargement of a short comment of Florus on an incident during the war with Mithridates (*Epit.* III 5, 23): “nocturna ea dimicatio fuit et Luna in partibus. Quippe quasi commilitans cum dea a tergo se hostibus, a facie Romanis praebuisset, Pontici per errorem longius cadentis umbras suas quasi hostium corpora petebant”.

The Polish historian also draws upon Justin in his description of the battle of Grunwald in order to provide some rhetorical flourish to his work. Długosz narrates (IV, p. 61) how the Teutonic Knights, considering victory as certain, prepared wagons with chains for captured enemies: “repertae [...] fuere aliquot in Cruciferico exercitu quadrigae [...] vinculis tantummodo et catenis onustae, quas Cruciferi certam sibi ominati [...] victoriam nec proelium meditati sed triumphum [...] conduxerant”. This is a scene borrowed from Justin (XXXIV 2), where the Achaians were counting on certain victory against Mummius and gathered wagons to transport future spoils. The provenance of Długosz’s passage is strengthened by the correspondence of incidental comments in each author. Długosz: “nec proelium meditati sed triumphum”. Justin: “praedam non proelium cogitantes”. Długosz: “certam sibi ominati [...] victoriam”. Justin: “velut nihil negotii Romano bello suscepissent”.

VI. POETS

Długosz’s reading of the Roman poets influenced the lexicon and style of the *Histories*, rather than its content. He shows familiarity with the beginning of Lucan’s *Pharsalia*. The Roman poet announces that he will sing of bloody civil wars: “bella [...] plus quam civilia [...] populumque potentem in sua victrici conversum viscera dextra cognatasque acies” (I 1–4). The elements of motifs from this preface recur in Długosz, singly or in combination.

The following are examples of combinations of elements: In IV, p. 594 (referring to the kingdoms of Poland and Hungary): “regibus eorum in viscera propria convertentibus gladiis et circa bella plus quam civilia occupatis”; in II, p. 526

(referring to the dejection of Przemysław, Prince of Poznań): “lugebat [...] provincias mutuis cladibus collidi et plus quam civili belli gladio in propria viscera converso discerpi”; in V, p. 677 (referring to civil war in Italy): “universa Italia in propria viscera arma convertit civilesque, stridente funesto Marte, aguntur clades”.

Much more frequently, motifs from the passage of Lucan mentioned above occur singly and are more loosely incorporated into the text. Here are examples: (A) In II, p. 144 (referring to the battle by the river Mozgawa in 1195): “cognata arma, acies fraternae, signa communia”; in IV, p. 618 (referring to the accusations levelled against Kazimierz Jagiełło): “mucronem horrendum inter unitos populos, cognatas acies, seruerit”; in V, p. 633 (referring to swarms of locusts fighting): “proeliantium more cognatae illae acies mutuo congregiuntur”. (B) In II, p. 180 (referring to the battles of Russian nobles): “mucrone in propria viscera verso confligunt”; in II, p. 246 (referring to the battles of Konrad Mazowiecki with Bolesław Wstydlivy): “omnesque conatus et studia contra Boleslaum [...] non secus quam in propria viscera convertit”. (C) In II, p. 373 (entry for the year 1259): “in bellum atrox et plus quam civile [...] pertractae sunt”; in V, p. 549 (entry for the year 1471): “plus quam civili bello se mutuo consumebant”.

Traces of other Latin poets are much less frequent. In V, p. 653, Długosz draws from Cicero (*Tusc.* I 15) the expression of Ennius: “per ora plebis volitare” (Ennius has *virum* instead of *plebis*) and from Vergil (*Aen.* III 57) he borrows the phrase “sacra fames auri” (V, p. 618; cf. V, p. 551). Vergil’s phrase “furor arma ministrat” (*Aen.* I 150) is in Długosz transformed into “iusta ira vires subministrante” (III, p. 394). Here and there, verses are embedded into prose text. In I, p. 49, Długosz narrates the founding of Gniezno by Lech and the very first sowing of that untouched (*virginalis*) earth, heretofore undisturbed by the plow: “rastrot intacta nec ullis saucia vomeribus”. This is, of course, an echo from Ovid’s *Metamorphoses* (I 101 f.). In I, p. 68, he foretells the fame of Krak, stating that his mound will never be destroyed by the times to come: “nulla illud edax posset abolere oblitterareque apud posteros vetustas”. This too is a reworking of a passage from Ovid (*Met.* XV 872 ff.): “opus exegi, quod [...] nec poterit ferrum nec edax abolere vetustas”.

In the same way that in these examples poetry and prose are woven together, classical and Christian motifs converge in the conclusion of the entire work. In the epilogue (V, p. 700), Długosz decks the premonition of his death with motifs from classical mythology (cf. T. SINKO, *De Długossii praefatione Historiae Polonorum*, p. 41). Both these conscious and subconscious correspondences testify to our historian’s deep and accurate familiarity with the works of Roman authors. They also testify to his far-reaching literary ambitions. Thus T. SINKO is correct in calling Długosz one of our first “protohumanists” from the mid 15th century.