

JAN SZYMCZAK

THE SADDLE IN THE ACT OF PENANCE, ON A DIVINE HORSE WITH A FLAG ATTACHED ON THE BATTLEFIELD IN THE MIDDLE AGES

Abstract: The saddle together with other forms of horse tack and equestrian equipment have considerably contributed to the subdual of the horse to man. Most probably, this is the reason why it has played a significant role in *armiscara=harmiscara*, a symbolic act of submission and reconciliation as well as public penance. The saddle made it possible for a rider to sit on a horse in balance. Besides, sitting high in the saddle, the rider gained advantage over footmen and consequently enjoyed a dominant position on the battlefield. A saddled horse served both the Slavic gods Svetovit and Triglav and divine knights conquering evil such as Archangel Michael or the saints George, Florian, Eustace, Martin. In addition to the above cultural issues, the present article also contains an analysis of a military connection between the saddle and the banner used as a means of commanding a tactical unit, noticeably called a banner. All the relevant examples come from the Battle of Płowce, fought in 1331, the battles of Grunwald and Koronowo – 1410.

Keywords: equestrian, saddle, saddle-horse, punishment, banner, Middle Ages

Horse tack and its associated accoutrements, referred to as *osiodłanie* in Old Polish, had a great influence on the course of horseback combat. Bridles, saddles and stirrups, girths, shabracks, braststraps, as well as cruppers were all forms of horse tack¹. Although all these elements seem to have been important, the saddle played a unique role². It was the rider's seat, which improved his performance in battle. Sitting high in the saddle, the horseman enjoyed a dominant position and gained advantage over footmen. Therefore, in appreciation of its riding advantages, the saddle started to be valued in a more symbolic sphere as well. Regrettably, the entry *saddle* cannot be found in the nonetheless excellent dictionary of symbols by Władysław Kopaliński, where only the entry *horse* contains the well-known Polish saying *to give someone a horse and tack*, meaning a horse with its ornamental equipment³. Another Polish proverb says that something suits somebody *as a saddle a pig*. On the other hand, *it's easier to reach heaven from a saddle* as, despite the Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse, it was mainly divine

knights conquering evil such as Archangel Michael or the saints George, Florian, Eustace, Martin who mounted horses and fought from horseback.

According to Abraham ben Jacob's account of his journey to Slavic lands, which he made around 965 AD, saddles and bridles were manufactured in Prague, Bohemia. The traveller, however, says that such objects were not particularly durable goods („selle [equestres] et frena [...] celeriter confecta caducaque”)⁴. He also mentions the fact that Mieszko I of Poland, the ruler of the Polans, who died in 992, used to present his warriors with horses. The 13th-century version of this account by al-Quazwini contains information about the ruler's practice of supplying his band of knights with saddles and bridles too. Therefore, it may be assumed that they used to receive full horse tack⁵.

Based on both written records and archaeological sources, it may be assumed that jobs connected with leather processing and manufacture were relatively common professions in our lands. Early medieval leather handicraft had already been technically and technologically advanced and developed enough to allow for a diversification as well as

¹ See Tulisow 1970a, 48-49; Tulisow 1970b, 45-46; Kirpičnikov 1973; Żygulski Jr. 1982, 53-55, 85-87, 113-114; Puchalska 1989, 384-392; Szymczak 1989, 165-204; Szymczak 1990, 303-329; Wawrzonowska 1990, 179-194; Szymczak 2003, 269-281; Świętosławski 2003, 109-118; Bołdyrew 2005, 142-190; Ławrynowicz 2005, 125-126.

² Bołdyrew 2005, 173-183; Nowakowski 2007, 161-176; Nowakowski 2008, 61-73; Bołdyrew 2016, 82-91.

³ Kopaliński 1990, 159.

⁴ *Relacja Ibrāhīma ibn Ja'kūba*, 49 (also 80-81, 146); cf. Lewicki 1954, 461; Lewicka-Rajewska 2004, 74.

⁵ *Relacja Ibrāhīma ibn Ja'kūba*, 50; cf. Lewicki 1954, 461; Lewicka-Rajewska 2004, 74.

more and more close specialization of crafts within its basic groups, based mainly on the materials used. At first, the process was typical exclusively of the largest handicraft and trade centers. However, with the passing of time, the trend spread to other urban areas. Numerous shoemaker's workshops are known to have existed. Archaeological traces of saddle production and leather manufacturing have been discovered, which seems to confirm the information provided by Abraham ben Jacob⁶.

In more recent sources, however, no information about horse tack or the saddle is to be found. Despite Gallus Anonymus' account of numerous mounted expeditions made by Bolesław III Wrymouth and his famous ancestors, his chronicles do not contain at least very basic information on the subject in question. This seems to be a consequence of the author's lecture as *Equus*, most often mentioned by him in the source, has never been characterized. The only mention refers to *Equus insellatis*⁷.

Similarly, late medieval sources, that is to say, 13th and 14th-century chronicles, provide no information on saddles used by contemporary horsemen. The first person to show saddles and present them as important and valuable objects was Jan Długosz. In the year 1413, in his *Annales*, a mention can be found of Samogitians burning their dead together with their horses, saddles and ornamental clothes. Then, in the year 1443, Vladislaus II orders that his tents, wagons, clothing and other objects, including sellis, be burnt so that they do not fall into the Turks' hands. Finally, in the year 1476, the Tartars are said to have left their crossbows and sellas behind to avoid problems while fleeing the battlefield⁸.

In spite of the fact that a battle horse played an important role in the Middle Ages, written records are not rich in accounts of horse tack. The animals were frequently praised by poets. Geoffrey Chaucer gave his Knight a good stallion and „His sadil was of burnt gold newey-bote”⁹. However, chroniclers did sometimes document private stocks of arms and armour. Jan Długosz says that in 1434, Dzierżawo of Rytwiany returned several looted, silver-decorated saddles, stirrups and bridles („sellas, strepas et frena argente circumdata”), to his great-uncle, Wojciech Jastrzębiec, the Archbishop of Gniezno at that time¹⁰. A well-known document of 1437 dealing with the division of property after the death of two voivodes of Łęczyca, Marcin (Died: 1428) and Ścibor (Died: 1435) of Jastrzębiec coat of arms, besides the value of silver coins/fiscal silver mentions the weight of silver contained in various objects. The source says that „in sella et strepis alias *strzemijenczyska* et *strzemijenije* continentur” 15 grzywnas (a measure of weight) of silver, „in

alia sella” there were 4 grzywnas of silver, in three pairs of „strepurum, videlicet *strzemijenije* et *strzemijenczyska*” (that is, stirrups and stirrup leathers) 12 grzywnas of silver; in three *frenis* – 6 grzywnas of silver, and finally „in calcaribus et in cinctura” 5 grzywnas of silver¹¹. In 1502, Mikołaj of Kurozwęki, Voivode of Lublin, complained about his son Adam, who took 8 saddles decorated with gold-plated silver from the family castle in Rytwiany¹².

Undoubtedly, the best justification for discussing the saddle mentioned in the title of the present paper is provided by Jan Długosz. Describing the arrival of Elżbieta Rakuszanka in Cracow in 1454, the author shows her future husband as surpassing everyone in royal splendor and glory. He says, „Magnificus fuit et plurimum spectatus tunc Casimirus rex in splendore suorum apparatusum, quoniam sella, frena, strepe et indumenta, preter equos, staminibus de axamento, cum fino auro textis coopertos, quadraginta millibus florenorum estimabantur”¹³. It should also be noted that leaving aside all the other costs of the ceremony, our outstanding chronicler focuses on the value of horse tack as in the author's opinion, it is the measure of the king's position and prestige, which are supposed to fill his bride-to-be and her companions with awe. Most probably, Kasper Maciejowski, Master of the Horse, also had it his goal to impress the audience when in 1577, he paraded on horseback during the wedding ceremony of Jan Zamoyski and Krystyna Radziwiłłówna. The saddle and horse tack, the cost of which was estimated at 50000 florens by the ruler himself, were lent to him by King Stephen Báthory¹⁴.

The statute of the Guild of Saddlers and Leatherworkers of Poznań issued in 1504 states that an aspiring master should make four saddles, including a battle saddle with a high pommel („sellam militarem cum capite alias heubowane”) and a saddle with iron fittings („aliam ferreo circum fabricata”)¹⁵. The cantle had a semicircular cut matching the shape of the lower edge of the rider's backplate. In order to strengthen the entire construction, particularly its rear part, the sides of the cantle were reinforced with crossing steel bars. The idea was to prevent the structure from breaking upon impact in lanced cavalry charges.

Metal fittings for cantles were most often made from coloured metals, particularly copper. Łukasz Górnicki (Died: 1603), a poet, political writer and historian, recommended the use of this material¹⁶. Two gold-coated saddles belonging to Cardinal Zbigniew Oleśnicki (Died: 1453) as well as three saddles covered in gold-coated sheet silver

⁶ Samsonowicz 1982, 142-114, 165-178.

⁷ *Galli Anonymi Cronicae*, 113.

⁸ Długosz, *Annales*, lib. 11, 22; lib. 11 et 12, 287; lib. 12/2, 379.

⁹ Chaucer 1950, 51.

¹⁰ Długosz, *Annales*, lib. 11 et 12, 129; See Lichończak-Nurek 1996, 163, 215-216.

¹¹ *Prawo polskie*, no 2700; cf. also Czwojdrak 2007, 117-118.

¹² *Matricularum Regni Poloniae summaria*, III, no 301.

¹³ Długosz, *Annales*, lib. 12/1, 178.

¹⁴ *Pamiętniki do historii Stefana króla polskiego*, 163; cf. Bołdyrew 2005, 173.

¹⁵ *Akta radzieckie poznańskie*, vol. 3, no 2098; cf. Szymczak 1990, 319.

¹⁶ Górnicki, *Dworzanin polski*, 283.

from the Mazovian Dukes' treasury (1494) were undoubtedly glamorous artifacts¹⁷. King Sigismund II Augustus' saddle collection contained parade saddles decorated not only with silver but also with gold and enamel, like „selam auream cum smalcz” made by the Merklisz brothers¹⁸. Such saddles were extremely expensive. In 1566, among other things, several Turk saddles worth 2.5 threescore groshes (150 groshes) each and an Italian velvet saddle costing 10 threescore groshes were taken away from Andrzej Ciechanowski's Lithuanian landed estate¹⁹. The proof of their value is in the price of saddles bought for Janusz II of Mazovia, worth 1 floren each. Also, in 1501, *pro sella* purchased for Prince Sigismund Jagiellon cost 2 florens²⁰.

The importance of equestrian accessories for arm and armour studies had already been noticed by the editorial board of „Fasciculi Archaeologiae Historicae” before. Fascicle 21, entitled *Studies into Mounted Warriors' Equipment in Antiquity and the Middle Ages*, came out in 2008. The saddle is the dominant topic of papers found in this publication. The contents of this fascicle should, however, be enriched with three additional issues connected with the saddle. Surprisingly, it is not the saddle's basic function, consisting in making it possible for the rider to sit on a horse in balance, that is the most important thing here. The saddle seems to belong to the sphere of customs, culture and military art, because it is perceived as a means of attaching the banner used to command a tactical unit, noticeably called a banner.

The saddle in the act of penance

Among the objects used as implements in honor punishment, there are mostly masks, wreaths and stones of humiliation, as well as other devices such as whipping posts (*L palus* or *columna infamis, statua lapidea*), pillories (*L columbar*) or jugs (*L collare* or *vinculum ferreum*). They were, however, mainly in use in municipal jurisdiction for punishing people from lower social classes²¹.

The saddle should also be added to the list. It played a significant role in the symbolic act of subjection, reconciliation and public penance, called „armiscara=harmiscara. According to the definition, it was *gravior mulcta [multa], quae a Principe viris praesertim militaribus, atque adeo magnatibus irrogari solebat*²². This mode of punishment was employed as early as the Carolingian capitularies as a penalty imposed on the most serious culprits violating public order. In the light of the capitulary issued in 866 by

Louis II, called the emperor of Italy, the practice of carrying a saddle at his back by a vassal as a token of humiliation played an important role in the act of punishment („armiscara, id est sella ad suum dorsum, ante nos a suis senioribus dirigatur”)²³. At the beginning of the 11th c., besieged by the Norman army, Hugh of Chalon approached the son of Richard II, called the Good, Duke of Normandy, (Died: 1026) carrying a saddle at his back in order to beg for mercy. Similarly, this was the way William of Alençon from Bellême humiliated himself before another Norman duke Robert the Magnificent (Died: 1035). In 1036, Geoffrey II of Anjou went through this rite of humiliation by walking several miles with a saddle at the back in order to regain the grace of his father, Fulk III the Black, Count of Anjou. In the Reich lands, magnates used to carry at their backs a dog instead of a saddle²⁴.

The saddle on a divine horse

Any of the great gods worshipped by the Veleti and Western Pomeranians owned a horse. The animal proved indispensable during fights with multiple enemies and helped them stay in charge of the country. The bridle and saddle (*frenum ac sella*) held in the watchtower/temple at Arkona remained at Svetovid's disposal and could be used for this purpose²⁵. According to the life of Saint Otto of Bamberg from Prüfening, the inhabitants of Szczecin kept a beautifully-shaped horse for their god Triglov. As befits a god, its saddle was ornamented with both gold and silver („sella [...] auro et argento [...] ornata”)²⁶. At critical moments, both the statue of Triglav and the saddle, considered an important attribute of his divine powers, were hidden by the priests²⁷. In the life of Saint Otto by Ebon, only a mention of an ordinary saddle („sella Trigelawi”) and no description can be found²⁸. For Herbord, the author of yet another life of Saint Otto, the saddle of God Triglav's horse perceived as a self-contained object of worship seemed an unnecessary addition. He did however mention the fact that the stallion led out for the divinatory spear ritual was saddled and bridled²⁹. While it is important not to overestimate the statistics of words, it is possible to clearly notice some differences in emphasis placed on the type and quality of horse tack equipped on the three divine stallions appearing in the above three sources dealing with the same subject matter.

The saddle with a banner attached

Obviously, the saddle served a warrior mainly on the battlefield. However, it should also be noted that it performed

¹⁷ Mycielski 1907, CLX; see also Gawęda 1959, 29.

¹⁸ Jawoszek 2009, 84.

¹⁹ Bochan 2001, 219.

²⁰ *Księga skarbowa Janusza II*, no 51; *Zsigmond Lengyel herceg budai számadásai*, 70, 124, 151.

²¹ See Maisel 1982, 119-136, 191; Maisel 1989, 172-178.

²² Cange du 1937, vol. 1, 395c.

²³ Dalewski 2005, 55; cf. also Dalewski 2008.

²⁴ Dalewski 2005, 60-61.

²⁵ Saxo Grammaticus, *Gesta Danorum*, 465.

²⁶ *S. Ottonis episcopi Babenbergensis vita*, 42.

²⁷ See Kiersnowscy 1970, 171; Gieysztor 1982, 123; Banaszkiewicz 2002, 63.

²⁸ *Ebonis Vita s. Ottonis*, 77.

²⁹ *Herbordi Dialogus*, 125.

another, possibly still more important function - the saddle was one of the elements belonging to the command system in battle. The banner was a prominent component part of this system. Its disappearance from sight or worse still the capture of the flag by the enemy meant the withdrawal of an army and practically its retreat from the battlefield³⁰.

At the first stage of the Battle of Płowce of 1331 – during the third charge by the Polish cavalry – the horse of the Teutonic standard-bearer Ivan holding the Flag of the Grand Master of the Teutonic Order was hit with a projectile and the flag could not be lifted from the ground. Its fall caused confusion in the ranks of the Teutonic army, which shortly led to a panicked retreat, as a result of which, only a small number of knights managed to survive³¹. Wigand of Marburg, a Teutonic chronicler, says, „hostiliter persequentes hostes, ubi frater Ywan cum vexillo ordinis corruit, quia equus eius telo transfixus, nec quisquam poterat vexillum levare, quia conclavatum fuit et grave, et fit clamor pro subsidio; unde Poloni huiusmodi videntes mutant exercitum fratrum debilem et circumdant fratres forti copia, et in tali conflictu sunt captivati 56 fratres”³².

Information about the fall of the Teutonic flag and the significance of this fact for the outcome of the battle can also be found in several other written records describing the battle of Płowce. Jan Długosz’s account contains no reference to this event. According to this chronicler, the turning point in the battle was caused by Wincenty of Szamotuły³³.

Nonetheless, the majority of historians follow in Wigand’s footsteps attributing the defeat of the Teutonic army not only to Wincenty of Szamotuły’s charge at its rear ranks but also to the panic caused by the fall of the Teutonic flag. This was the way Stanisław Zajączkowski interpreted the events as early as 1929³⁴. He explains the situation saying, „Finally, the horse of the Teutonic brother Ivan holding the flag was killed in the fighting. **As the pole was attached to the saddle**, the flag could not be lifted back, which caused a great panic among the Teutonic ranks. The Poles took advantage of the confusion and surrounded the Teutonic army on all sides inflicting a severe defeat on the enemy.”³⁵.

The question arises as to where the saddle, which is not mentioned in any of the chroniclers we are familiar with, came from. The explanation could probably be found in



Fig. 1. Banner saddle – *Codex Manesse*, 14th c., k. 54.

reference 201, added to the relevant passage in Wigand’s chronicle as published in 1863. It reads, „Nobody was able to lift the flag because it was attached [to the horse’s saddle or the knight’s armour]”³⁶.

The above hypothesis, suggesting that the flag and the saddle were structurally connected, was subsequently repeated by numerous scholars. Marian Biskup writes, „Around midday, after the third charge by the Poles, the Teutonic standard-bearer Ivan holding the flag depicting the coat of arms of the Grand Master of the Teutonic Order fell off his horse. As the pole was attached to the saddle, the flag could not be lifted. The fall of this symbolic sign caused a panic... etc.”³⁷. This explanation seems imprecise, because the fall of the standard-bearer did not automatically lead to the fall of the flag, which should have remained fixed to the saddle! However, such a situation might have ensued from the fall of the warrior’s horse, which had clearly been

³⁰ Nadolski 2010, 96-97; Ptak 2002, 314, 325, 333.

³¹ Biskup 1963, 95.

³² *Die Chronik Wigands*, 481.

³³ Długosz, *Annales*, lib. IX, 167-168.

³⁴ See Zajączkowski 1929, 241.

³⁵ „Wreszcie wśród walk padł koń brata zakonnego Iwana, który dzierzył sztandar. **Ponieważ drzewo było przymocowane do siodła**, nie było sposobu podnieść z powrotem sztandaru, wskutek czego powstała wielka panika wśród Krzyżaków. Skorzystali z tego Polacy i otoczyli wojska zakonne ze wszystkich stron, uzyskując w ten sposób nad nimi przewagę i zadając im stanowczą klęskę” - Zajączkowski 1929, 249.

³⁶ *Die Chronik Wigands*, 481. „Niemand vermochte die Fahne aufzurichten, weil sie mit Nägeln [an den Sattel des Pferdes oder an die Rüstung des Ritters] befestigt war.“

³⁷ „Okolo południa, po trzecim uderzeniu polskim, nastąpił upadek z konia chorążego krzyżackiego Iwana, dzierżącego chorągiew z godłem w mistrza. Ponieważ drzewce jej było przymocowane do siodła, nie można było jej podnieść. Upadek symbolicznego znaku wywołał panikę.” – Biskup 1963, 95; Zonenberg 1994, 35.

pointed out by Wigand of Marburg.

Although the course and aftermath of the battle of Płowce became the topic of a vivid discussion in the years 1993-2013, the issue of the circumstances of the Teutonic flag's fall was never mentioned³⁸. Piotr Strzyż notices a lack of source information on a structural connection between the saddle and the flag. Divagating on the causes of the Teutonic rider's fall, this author adds another aspect to the discussion. He says, „Around midday, after nearly three hours of strenuous fighting, an incident occurred, which proved decisive in ending the battle. The horse of the Teutonic standard-bearer Ivan holding the flag of the Teutonic Order was fatally wounded by one of the bolts shot by Polish fellow crossbowmen belonging to the king's retinue. [...] Unfortunately, the animal fell on the side to which the flagpole was permanently attached. As a result, it was impossible to quickly lift the sign. The sudden disappearance of the flag used to give orders and serving as a point of orientation in battle caused a severe panic in the Teutonic ranks. The Poles took advantage of the situation” [...] etc.³⁹

It should also be noted that with the passing of time, the flag became larger and consequently heavier. If the standard-bearer was to actively participate in its defence, he could not hold the flagpole in his hands. Based on the Latin Rule, the Statutes of the Teutonic Knights ordered that particular brothers be responsible for the protection of the flag („fratres ad custodiam vexilli”)⁴⁰. The example was set by a Teutonic standard-bearer who did not give the flag away until death, though he had his hands cut when he and a group of his fellow brothers were attacked by Lithuanians in 1385 („signiferum, qui iam amputatis manibus vexillum non dimisit, donec transfixus rueret”)⁴¹. Jan Tarnowski says,⁴² „a lot depends on the standard-bearer in a company”.

Most probably, on 15th July, 1410 at Grunwald, the Polish standard-bearer met a similar fate as the standard-bearer Ivan in the Battle of Radziejów/Płowce. Based on the



Fig. 2. Banner in the so-called martingale – H. Burgkmair the Elder, H. Burgkmair Jr., *Turnierbuch*, about 1540, k. 14.

historiography, for the allied forces, it was the most critical phase of the battle as well as its turning point. About 2 p.m., when the Teutonic Knights are fiercely fighting for victory („pro victoria adnitentibus”), the flag („magnum banderiom Polonie regis”), namely the 'gonfanon' of the Kingdom of Poland, depicting a white, crowned eagle, held by Marcin of Wrocimowice, the standard-bearer of Cracow, falls to the ground⁴³. The most outstanding Polish knights were chosen to defend the flag by fighting before the banner, in the forefront of the main body as *przedchorągiewni*. The 'gonfanon' was the tallest sign of the army and besides its symbolic role it also performed a significant military function. It could be seen from far away and was used to signal various tactical moves. Its fall to the ground or capture by the enemy meant the withdrawal of the army and practically its retreat from the battlefield. However, Jan Długosz writes that fortunately, the most skilful and experienced knights fighting under the flag managed to lift it without delay and put the banner back in its place („et suo loco restitutum”). „Thus, wishing to wipe out the disgraceful affront, the Polish knights attack the enemy most fiercely and completely smash them,

³⁸ See Jurek 1993a, 77-97; Jurek 1993b, 287-289; Ptak 1995, 139; Jurek 1995, 143-145; Jurek 2002, 99-123; Ziółkowski 2013, 57.

³⁹ „Po blisko trzech godzinach morderczych zmagani, około południa, doszło do zdarzenia, które zaważyło na dalszym przebiegu tego starcia. Oto jeden z wielu beltów, wystrzelonych przez pocztowych kuszników polskich, śmiertelnie ranił konia chorążego krzyżackiego Iwana, który dzierzył wielką chorągiew Zakonu. [...] Na nieszczęście zwierzę padło na bok, do którego było przytwierdzone na stałe drzewce chorągwi, wobec czego jej szybkie podniesienie okazało się niemożliwe. Nagłe zniknięcie chorągwi, która w ówczesnej armii służyła jako środek rozkazodawczy, a zarazem punkt orientacyjny w zamęcie bitewnym, spowodowało, że w szeregach krzyżackich wdarła się panika. Wykorzystali ją Polacy [...] itd.” – Strzyż 2009, 151-152.

⁴⁰ *Die Statuten des Deutschen Ordens*, 117; cf. Nowakowski 1988, 35; Ptak 2002, 314, 325, 333.

⁴¹ *Die Chronik Wigands*, 627; see Ptak 2002, 337.

⁴² Tarnowski, *Consilium rationis bellicae*, 141-143 – „na chorążym wiele w hufie zależy”

⁴³ Długosz, *Annales*, lib. 10 et 11, 109.

overwhelming the enemy forces who came into contact with them”⁴⁴.

Another example of a connection between the saddle and the flag is offered by Jan Długosz in his account of the Battle of Koronowo, fought on 10 November, 1410. Most probably, due to this incident, at the last stage of the battle, a royal knight Jan Naszan of the Toporczyk family from Ostrowce, near Nowe Miasto Korczyn knocked Frank Herrik⁴⁵, the standard-bearer fighting in the first line, off his horse and **having captured the enemy’s flag, folded it and fixed to his saddle** („hostili vexillo adempto selle sue contorquens”)⁴⁶. His deed caused confusion among the Teutonic ranks. The Poles took advantage of the situation, broke through the enemy ranks and forced them to retreat⁴⁷. Thus, the motif of a close connection between the saddle and the flag is repeated here again!

Undoubtedly, **a saddle so adjusted that a flag could be attached to it** was mentioned in 1509 in the Town Hall tower in Lviv, where „una sella in qua vexillum portatur” could be found⁴⁸. It seems therefore that this saddle was equipped with a sort of holder to which a flag could be fixed. The flag was to be easy to move while giving signals and placed close at hand and not behind the rider’s back! The iconography seems unambiguous in this respect. In all cases it was attached in the so-called martingale and held by the rider in his right hand! This is the way flags were carried during various ceremonies whenever possible (Fig. 1; 2). A similar solution can be observed on the battlefield, for instance, in the case of the Teutonic standard-bearer in 1385. However, the question arises as to whether the means of attaching a flag to the saddle was always the same. The picture is



Fig. 3. Banner saddle – *Codex Manesse*, 14th c., k. 42.

not clear enough to see the details, but a different fastening is shown in a battle scene found in the *Codex Manesse* (Fig. 3). In addition, in Zdzisław Żygulski’s opinion, hussars also had their wings attached „at the saddle cantle while seated”⁴⁹. Thus, there emerges another function of the saddle!

Translated by Zuzanna Poklewska-Parra

Sources

Akta radzieckie poznańskie, K. Kaczmarczyk (ed.), vol. 3, Poznań 1948.

Chaucer G. 1950. *Canterbury Tales*. London.

Die Chronik Wigands von Marburg. Hrsg. von Th. Hirsch. In: *Scriptores rerum Prussicarum* 2. Leipzig 1863.

Długosz J. *Annales seu Cronicae incliti Regni Poloniae*, lib. 1 et 2. Warszawa 1964 – lib. 12/2, Kraków 2005.

Długosz J. 1958. *Banderia Prutenorum*, K. Górski (ed.). Warszawa.

Długosz J. 1976. *Banderia Prutenorum*, S. Ekdahl (ed.). Göttingen.

Długosz J. *Roczniki czyli kroniki sławnego Królestwa Polskiego*, books 10 and 11. Warszawa 1982.

Ebonis Vita s. Ottonis episcopi Babenbergensis, J. Wikarjak and K. Liman (eds.), MPH, NS, vol. VII/2, Warszawa 1969.

Galli Anonymi Cronicae et gesta ducum sive principum Polonorum, K. Maleczyński (ed.), MPH, NS, vol. II, Kraków 1952.

⁴⁴ „Rycerze zaś polscy pragnąc zetrzeć haniebną zniewagę, w najzawziętszy sposób atakują wrogów i rozbijają kompletnie kładąc pokotem wszystkie te siły, które się z nimi starły” - Długosz, *Roczniki*, books 10 and 11, 127; Długosz, *Annales*, lib. 10 et 11, 109; cf. also Ptak 2002, 317-318.

⁴⁵ Długosz, *Annales*, lib. 10 et 11, 155; *Banderia Prutenorum* 1958, 247-248; *Banderia Prutenorum* 1976, 262.

⁴⁶ Długosz, *Annales*, lib. 10 et 11, 154; cf. Ptak 2002, 338.

⁴⁷ Spieralski 1961, 66.

⁴⁸ Górski 1902, 221.

⁴⁹ Żygulski Jr. 1982, 268.

- Górnicki Ł. 1961. *Dworzanin polski*. In: Ł. Górnicki, *Pisma*, vol. 1, R. Pollak (ed.). Warszawa.
- Herbordi Dialogus de vita s. Ottonis episcopi Babenbergensis*, J. Wikarjak and K. Liman (eds.), MPH, NS, vol. VII/3, Warszawa 1974.
- Księga skarbowa Janusza II księcia mazowieckiego z lat 1477-1490*, J. Senkowski (ed.), „Kwartalnik Historii Kultury Materialnej” 7 (1959), additional fascicle.
- Matricularum Regni Poloniae summaria*, T. Wierzbowski (ed.), part III. Warszawa 1908.
- Pamiętniki do historyi Stefana króla polskiego czyli korespondencya tego monarchy, oraz zbiór wydanych przez niego urzędzeń*, E. Raczyński (ed.). Warszawa 1830.
- Prawo polskie w praktyce sądowej XIV i XV wieku*, A. Z. Helcel (ed.). In: *Starodawne prawa polskiego pomniki z ksiąg rękopiśmiennych dotąd nieużytych, głównie zaś z ksiąg dawnych sądowych ziemskich i grodzkich ziemi krakowskiej*, vol. II, Kraków 1870.
- Relacja Ibrāhīma ibn Ja'kūba z podróży do krajów słowiańskich w przekazie Al-Bekrīego*, T. Kowalski (ed.) in cooperation with J. Kostrzewski, K. Stołyhwa, K. Moszyński, K. Nitsch, MPH, NS, vol. I, Kraków 1946.
- S. Ottonis episcopi Babenbergensis vita Prieflingensis*, J. Wikarjak and K. Liman (eds.), MPH, NS, vol. VII/1. Warszawa 1966.
- Saxo Grammaticus, Gesta Danorum*, J. Orlík and H. Raeder (eds.). Havniae 1931.
- Die Statuten des Deutschen Ordens nach den ältesten Handschriften*. Hrsg. von M. Perlbach. Halle/S. 1890.
- Tarnowski J., *Consilium rationis bellicae*, preface by J. Sikorski, T. M. Nowak (ed.). Warszawa 1987.
- Zsigmond Lengyel herceg budai számadásai (1500-1502)*, A. Divéky (ed.). Budapest 1914.

Bibliography

- Banaszkiewicz J. 2002. *Czym była i jak została zniszczona chorągiew Świętowita (Saxo Grammaticus, 'Gesta Danorum', XIV, 39, 14-28)*. In: A. Rachuba, S. Górczyński and H. Manikowska (eds.), *Heraldyka i okolice*. Warszawa, 57-70.
- Biskup M. 1963. *Analiza bitwy pod Płowcami i jej dziejowego znaczenia*. „Ziemia Kujawska” 1, 73-104.
- Bochan J.M. 2001. [Ю.М. Быхан] *Rysztunak verchavogo konia v Vialikim Kniastvie Litovskim v XIV-XVI stst.* [Рыштунак верхавога каня ў Вялікім Княстве Літоўскім у XIV-XVI стст.], „Materialy Pa Arheologii Bielarusi” 3 [„Матэрыялы Па Археалогіі Беларусі” № 3. Mińsk [Мінск], 218-223.
- Bołdyrew A. 2005. *Produkcja i koszty uzbrojenia w Polsce XVI wieku*. Warszawa.
- Bołdyrew A. 2016. *Equus Polonus. Koń w wojsku polskim w XVI wieku*. Piotrków Trybunalski.
- Cange C. du 1937. *Glossarium mediae et infimae latinitatis conditum a Carolo du Fresne domino du Cange actum* 1. Paris.
- Czwojdrak B. 2007. *Jastrzębce w ziemi krakowskiej i sandomierskiej do połowy XV w.* Kraków.
- Dalewski Z. 2005. *Rytuał i polityka. Opowieść Galla Anonima o konflikcie Bolesława Krzywoustego ze Zbigniewem*, Warszawa.
- Dalewski Z. 2008. *Ritual and Politics. Writing the History a Dynastic Conflict in Medieval Poland*. Leiden, Boston.
- Gawęda S. 1959. *Udział finansowy Krakowa w wojnie trzynastoletniej*. „Małopolskie Studia Historyczne” 2 (2/3), 19-33.
- Gieysztor A. 1982. *Mitologia Słowian*. Warszawa.
- Górski K. 1902. *Historia artylerii polskiej*. T. Korzon (ed.), Warszawa.
- Januszek-Sieradzka (ed.), *Curia Jagiellonica. Studia z dziejów dworu i kultury dworskiej w XV-XVI wieku*. Lublin, 71-99.
- Jawoszek J. 2009. *Wyroby złotnicze Zygmunta Augusta i ich twórcy w latach 1544-1548*. In: A. Jurek T. 1993a. *Uwagi o bitwie pod Płowcami*. „Ziemia Kujawska” 9, 77-97.
- Jurek T. 1993b. *Postscriptum do „Uwag o bitwie pod Płowcami”*. „Ziemia Kujawska” 9, 287-289.
- Jurek T. 1995. *O Płowcach znowu słów kilka*. „Ziemia Kujawska” 11, 143-145.
- Jurek T. 2002. *Radziejowskie pole (27 IX 1331 roku)*. In: D. Karczewski (ed.), *Radziejów poprzez stulecia*. Włocławek, Radziejów, 99-123.
- Kiersnowscy T. and R. 1970. *Życie codzienne na Pomorzu wczesnośredniowiecznym. Wiek X-XII*. Warszawa.
- Kirpičnikov A. N. 1973. [Кирпичников А. Н.] *Snaražene vsadnika i vierchovogo konia na Rusi IX-XIII vv.* [Снаражэне всадніка і верхавога коня на Русі IX-XIII вв.]. Leningrad [Ленинград].
- Kopaliński W. 1990. *Słownik symboli*. Warszawa.
- Lewicka-Rajewska U. 2004. *Arabskie opisanie Słowian. Źródła do dziejów średniowiecznej kultury*. Wrocław.
- Lewicki T. 1954. *Średniowieczne źródła arabskie i perskie o hodowli zwierząt domowych u Słowian*. „Kwartalnik Historii Kultury Materialnej” 2 (3), 444-469.
- Lichończak-Nurek G. 1996. *Wojciech Jastrzębiec arcybiskup i mąż stanu (ok. 1362-1436)*. Kraków.
- Ławrynówicz O. 2005. *Treści ideowe broni rycerskiej w Polsce wieków średnich*. Acta Archaeologica Lodziensia 51. Łódź.
- Maisel W. 1982. *Archeologia prawna Polski*. Warszawa, Poznań.
- Maisel W. 1989. *Archeologia prawna Europy*. Warszawa, Poznań.

- Mycielski J. 1907. *Inwentarz skarbcza ksiąg mazowieckich Konrada i Janusza z roku 1494*. „Sprawozdania Komisji do Badania Historii Sztuki w Polsce” 8 (1-2), CLX.
- Nadolski A. 2010. *Grunwald. Problemy wybrane* (2nd ed.). Wodzisław Śląski, Łódź.
- Nowakowski A. 1988. *O wojskach Zakonu szpitala Najświętszej Marii Panny Domu Niemieckiego w Jerozolimie zwanego krzyżackim*. Olsztyn.
- Nowakowski P. A. 2007. *Siodło bojowe w późnośredniowiecznej Polsce* (The Battle Saddle in Late Medieval Poland). „Archaeologia Historica Polona” 17 (*Studia z dziejów wojskowości, budownictwa, kultury*), 161-176.
- Nowakowski P. A. 2008. *Remarks on the Construction, Evolution and Use of the War Saddle in Late Medieval Poland*. „Fasciculi Archaeologiae Historicae” 21, 61-73.
- Ptak J. 1995. *Jeszcze o bitwie pod Płowcami*. „Ziemia Kujawska” 11, 131-142.
- Ptak J. 2002. *Chorągiew w komunikacji społecznej w Polsce piastowskiej i jagiellońskiej*. Lublin.
- Puchalska J. 1989. *Rząd konia rycerskiego w okresie średniowiecza na terenie Polski*. „Muzealnictwo Wojskowe” 4, 378-410.
- Samsonowicz A. 1982. *Wytwórczość skórzana w Polsce wczesnofeudalnej*. Wrocław et al.
- Spierski Z. 1961. *Bitwa pod Koronowem 10 X 1410*. In: *Bitwa pod Koronowem 10 X 1410. Materiały z sesji naukowej zorganizowanej w Bydgoszczy w 550 rocznicę bitwy*. Bydgoszcz, 47-67.
- Strzyż P. 2009. *Płowce 1331*. Warszawa.
- Szymczak J. 1989. *Produkcja i koszty uzbrojenia rycerskiego w Polsce XIII-XV w*. Łódź.
- Szymczak J. 1990. *Organizacja produkcji i ceny uzbrojenia*. In: A. Nadolski (ed.), *Uzbrojenie w Polsce średniowiecznej 1350-1450*. Łódź, 303-329.
- Szymczak J. 2003. *Ceny broni, koni i oporządzenia jeździeckiego*. In: A. Nowakowski (ed.), *Uzbrojenie w Polsce średniowiecznej 1450-1500* (2nd ed.). Toruń, 269-281.
- Świętosławski W. 2003. *Zbroja końska, rząd i oporządzenie jeździeckie*. In: A. Nowakowski (ed.), *Uzbrojenie w Polsce średniowiecznej 1450-1500* (2nd ed.). Toruń, 109-118.
- Tulisow J. 1970a. *Rycerski rząd koński w Polsce średniowiecznej*. „Koń Polski” 5 (3), 48-49.
- Tulisow J. 1970b. *Rycerski rząd koński w Polsce średniowiecznej*. „Koń Polski” 5 (4), 45-46.
- Wawrzonowska Z. 1990. *Rząd koński i oporządzenie jeździeckie*. In: A. Nadolski (ed.), *Uzbrojenie w Polsce średniowiecznej 1350-1450*. Łódź, 179-194.
- Zajączkowski S. 1929. *Polska a Zakon krzyżacki w ostatnich latach Władysława Łokietka*. Lviv.
- Ziółkowski K. 2013. *Bitwa pod Radziejowem-Płowcami 27 września 1331 roku. Zwycięstwo czy porażka*. In: A. Niewiński (ed.), *Człowiek i wojna. Z dziejów wojskowości polskiej i powszechnej*. Oświęcim, 50-67.
- Zonenberg S. 1994. *Kronika Wiganda z Marburga*. Bydgoszcz.
- Żygulski Jr. Z. 1959. *Ze studiów nad dawną sztuką siodlarską*. „Rozprawy i Sprawozdania Muzeum Narodowego w Krakowie” 5, 41-108.
- Żygulski Jr. Z. 1982. *Broń w dawnej Polsce na tle uzbrojenia Europy i Bliskiego Wschodu*. Warszawa.

Streszczenie

Siodło w akcie pokuty, na boskim koniu i z przemocowaną chorągwią na polu bitwy

Siodło wraz z innymi elementami rzędu końskiego i oporządzenia jeździeckiego w istotny sposób przyczyniły się do podporządkowania konia człowiekowi. Stąd zapewne odegrało ważną rolę w symbolicznym akcie poddania i pojednania oraz pokuty publicznej, jakim była *armiscara=harmiscara*. Siodło umożliwiało jeźdźcom utrzymanie się na grzbiecie wierzchowca i zapewniało przewagę wysokości rycerzom nad pieszymi wojownikami, dzięki czemu dominował on na polu walki. Osiodłany koń służył bogom słowiańskim Świętowitowi i Trzygłowi, ale także niebiańskim rycerzom zwalczającym zło, jak Archanioł Michał oraz święci: Jerzy, Florian, Eustachy, Marcin. Oprócz tych zagadnień ze sfery kulturowej w artykule poddano analizie wojskowy związek siodła z chorągwią jako środkiem dowodzenia jednostką taktyczną, zwaną właśnie chorągwią. Takich przykładów dostarczyły opisy bitew: pod Płowcami w 1331 r. oraz pod Grunwaldem i Koronowem w 1410 r.