

Gergely KISS:

Magdeburg/Poznań and Gniezno The emergence of the Polish ecclesiastical hierarchy and its dichotomy*

Abstract

Key words:



At first sight the emergence of the Polish church system was a fairly simple process, the most important phases of which can be regarded as follows. The Polish Duke Mieszko I took allegiance to emperor Otto I in 966, then not much later in 968 the bishopric of Poznań was set up. Three decades later, in 1000 the archbishopric of Gniezno was established, but by that time the bishoprics of Wrocław, Krakow and Kołobrzeg had already existed. Naturally there were changes occurring in the Polish church system later – such as the bishopric of Kołobrzeg ceased to exist at the beginning of the 11th century as a result of the pagan uprisings, or in the 12th century the system of *episcopalis* got enriched with newer territories, centres as the power of the Polish Duke expanded – yet these dwell on the subject of the present study only indirectly. The main issue is the dichotomy of the church governance in the Polish territories – Magdeburg/Poznań, Gniezno –, which can be explained only with examining the circumstances of how the church centres emerged.

As it is well known, the antecedent of the establishment of the bishopric of Poznań to christianize the Polish was the baptism of

* The study was made with the help of the support of the Hungarian Scientific Research Fund (OTKA) NN 109690 research proposal. I would like to say thank Norbert Kersken and Dániel Bagi for their help to write this study.

Mieszko I,¹ which on one hand intended to ensure peace between the Polish Duke and Otto I, on the other hand it provided the emperor with the possibility to expand his influence over a part of the Polish territories in accordance with his 'eastern policy'.

The 'eastern policy' (*Ostpolitik*) of the emperors of the Holy Roman empire, meaning how they considered the territories to the east, inhabited by the Bohemian, Polish and Hungarian tribes, was not uniform. While in the era of Otto I the central issue of politics was the expansion of the empire (*Imperium*) in this territory, in case of Otto III it was the expansion of Christianity (*Christianitas*). Otto I's 'eastern policy' meant creating strong German influence, dependence both in the politics and the church; the missions fit into the frames of the imperial church and the early church system emerged as its subordinate.²

Thus it is worth asking if all this reflected and if yes, how in the emergence of the Polish church system. The key to it – in my view – is hidden in clarifying the role of Magdeburg.

¹ According to Widukind (cap. 69.) Mieszko was granted the honourable title „the emperor's friend” with this. The place of the baptism is under debate, Regensburg, Gniezno and Poznań can all be raised. Cf.: Karl VÖLKER.: *Kirchengeschichte Polens*. Berlin – Leipzig. 1930. (hereafter: VÖLKER 1930) p. 8–10., KEMPF, Friedrich: *Die Missionierung der Slawen und Ungarn im 10. und 11. Jahrhundert*. In: *Handbuch der Kirchengeschichte*. Hg. Hubert Jedin. Bd. III/1.: *Die mittelalterliche Kirche*. Freiburg – Basel – Wien. 1966. 267–283. (hereafter: KEMPF 1966) p. 274–275; Jerzy KŁOCZOWSKY: *Die Ausbreitung des Christentums von der Adria bis zur Ostsee: Christianisierung der Slawen, Skandinavier und Ungarn zwischen dem 9. und dem 11. Jahrhundert*. In: *Bischöfe, Mönche und Kaiser (642–1054)*. Geschichte des Christentums Bd. 4. Hg. Gilbert DRAGON – Pierre RICHÉ – VAUCHEZ André. Deutsche Ausgabe bearbeitet und herausgeben von Egon BOSHOFF. Freiburg – Basel – Wien. 1994. (hereafter: *Bischöfe, Mönche und Kaiser*) p. 883–920. (hereafter: KŁOCZOWSKY 1994) 898., Jerzy STRZELCZYK: *A kereszténység felvétele Lengyelországban az írott források alapján [The Christianization in Poland According to Written Sources]*. In: *Európa közepe 1000 körül [The Middle of Europe around 1000]*. Ed. Alfried WIECZOREK – Hans-Martin HINZ. Stuttgart. 2000. (further on WIECZOREK – HINZ 2000) p. 297–299. (hereafter: STRZELCZYK 2000)

² Albert BRACKMANN: *Die Anfänge der Slawenmission und die Renovatio imperii des Jahres 800*. In: Idem: *Gesammelte Aufsätze zu seinem 70. Geburtstag am 24. Juni 1941 von Freunden / Fachgenossen und Schülern als Festgabe dargebracht*. Weimar. 1941. p. 56–75; Idem: *Der „Römische Erneuerungsgedanke“ und seine Bedeutung für die Reichspolitik der deutschen Kaiserzeit*. In: *Ibid.* p. 108–139; IDEM: *Reichspolitik und Ostpolitik im frühen Mittelalter*. In: *Ibid.* p. 188–210; Idem: *Die Ostpolitik Ottos des Grossen*. In: *Ibid.* p. 140–153; Idem: *Kaiser Otto III. und die staatliche Umgestaltung Polens und Ungarns*. In: *Ibid.* p. 242–258.

Following the trials of conversion tracing back to the 9th century³, it came into the forefront of interest of the Saxon dynasty to bring the eastern and north-eastern borderlands of the empire into political and ecclesiastical subordination. The significant change of the church system of the territories neighbouring the areas of the Elba, Saale and Odera in the mid-10th century served the conversion of the mentioned areas. The establishment of the bishoprics of Brandenburg and Havelberg happened in 948, two decades later there were newer establishments. The bishoprics of Meissen, Merseburg,⁴ Oldenburg and Zeitz (this latter one was placed in the nearby Naumburg in 1030) emerged in 968. The organisaion of the archbishopric of Magdeburg also fits into this program. In 937 Otto I founded the monastery of St Maurice, then the plan to change it into a centre of mission appeared first in 955, which idea was supported by pope Agapet II. The foundation of the archbishopric in 962 did not succeed despite the support of pope John XII,⁵ in all probability due to the objection of William the archbishop of Mainz and Bernard the bishop of Halberstadt. In the end, six years later – after the death of the mentioned two prelates- Otto I managed to put across his plan. The synod of Ravenna in 967 gave the permission to set up the

³ See Albert BRACKMANN: Die Anfänge der abendländischen Kulturbewegung in Osteuropa und deren Träger. In: Idem: *Gesammelte Aufsätze zu seinem 70. Geburtstag am 24. Juni 1941 von Freunden / Fachgenossen und Schülern als Festgabe dargebracht*. Weimar. 1941. p. 76–107.

⁴ Merseburg ceased to exist for a while in 981, it was reestablished in 1004. Wilhelm PFEIFFER: Die Bistümer Prag und Meißen. In: *Sacrum Pragense Millenium 973–1973*. Königstein. 1973. (Archiv für Kirchengeschichte von Böhmen-Mähren-Schlesien Band III.) p. 77–109. (hereafter: PFEIFFER 1973), here: p. 78. To sum up: Michel PARISSE: Die Reichskirche (um 900 bis 1054). In: *Bischöfe, Mönche und Kaiser*. p. 797–820. (hereafter: PARISSE 1994), here: p. 797–800. In details: Walter SCHLESINGER: *Kirchengeschichte Sachsens im Mittelalter*. Band I. *Von den Anfängen kirchlicher Verkündigung bis zum Ende des Investiturstreites*. Band II. *Das Zeitalter der Deutschen Ostsiedlung (1100–1300)*. Graz. 1962. (Mitteldeutsche Forschungen 27/I–II.) (hereafter: SCHLESINGER 1962) I. p. 21–51., 60–83.

⁵ „[...] volumus et per hanc privilegii paginam iubemus, ut Magdaburgense monasterium in regno Saxonum iuxta Albia(m) constructum [...] in archiepiscopalem transferatur sedem, que per subditos suffraganeos totum Dei gregem regere et gubernare valeat. Volumus et per hanc privilegii paginam iubemus, ut Merseburgense monasterium [...] in episcopalem delegetur sedem, que Magdaburgensi sit subdita sedi. [...] Volumus etiam, carissimi confratres, [...] ut Moguntiensis, Treuerensis, Coloniensis, Salsaburgensis, Hamaburgensis ecclesie archipresules Magdaburgensis monasterii in archiepiscopalem et Merseburgensis in episcopalem translationis sedem totis cordis corporisque viribus consentanei fautoresque presistant.” Harald ZIMMERMANN: *Papsturkunden 896–1046*. I. 896–996., II. 996–1046., III. Register. Wien. 1988–1989. (hereafter: PU) I. p. 283–284.

archbishopric and ordered the bishoprics of Brandenburg and Havelberg under the jurisdiction of Magdeburg and empowered the new archbishop and his descendants to present bishops for appropriate places, naming Merseburg, Zeitz, Meissen.⁶ Following this on 18 October 968 pope John XIII confirmed the foundation of the archbishopric in his bull, this time with the consent of Hatto II the archbishop of Mainz and Hildeward the bishop of Halberstadt.⁷

⁶ „Ipsi namque anno, una nobiscum favente et consentiente invictissimo predicto imperatore, acta est magna sinodus Rauenne duodecima kalendas Magii. [...] Nos vero [...] dignum duximus, [...] ut Magdaburch sita iuxta Albiam fluvium [...] deinceps metropolis sit et nominetur [...]. Suffraganeos vero eidem metropoli omnes unanimiter preordinavimus Brandenburgensem episcopum et Havelbergensem, his iunctis, quibuscunque imperator voluerit, in urbe Magdaburch archiepiscopus consecratur. Postea vero idem archiepiscopus et successores eius habeant potestatem per congrua loca [...] episcopos ordinare, nominative nunc et presentaliter Merseburc, Cici et Misni [...]” PU I. p. 347–348.

⁷ „Igitur quia gloriosissimus spiritualis Otto imperator augustus civitatem quam Magadaburg dicunt, in confinio saxonum et Sclauonorum, in ripa fluminis Albie, in parochia scilicet Halberstatensis episcopi fundavit et ecclesiam inibi construxit, canonicos constituit, ad quorum subsidium satis contulit, et innumeram multitudinem Sclauorum ad divine religionis cultum conduxit, confratres Hatto, sancte Magunciensis ecclesie archiepiscopus, et Hidiuardus Halberstatensis ecclesie episcopus, et comprovinciales episcopi, sicut per consentaneas et petitorias litteras ab ipsis propriis manibus roboratas, que in presentia nostra ante corpus beati Petri apostoli relecte sunt, didicimus, in predicta Magadaburg(ensi) civitate archiepiscopalem sedem privilegio apostolice sedis statui ordinaverunt, que ultra Albiam et Salam in congruentibus locis subiectos episcopos, qui nunc ordinati sunt et ordinandi futuris post temporibus erunt, habeat, nostro post Deum iudicio, qualiter eadem archiepiscopalis sedes ordinari debeat, deliberandum precantes, nem per invidiam fidei tanta Sclauorum plebs Deo noviter acquisita callidis hostis, quod absit, rapiatur insidiis.” PU I. p. 374–375. PARISSE 1994. p. 800–801. (map: p. 816); Matthias BECHER: Nagy Ottó és a magdeburgi érsekség alapítása [Otto The Great and The Foundation of The Archishopric of Magdeburg]. In: WIECZOREK – HINZ 2000. p. 431–433; KEMPF 1966. p. 269–271; Jerzy KŁOCZOWSKY: Die Ausbreitung des Christentums von der Adria bis zur Ostsee: Christianisierung der Slawen, Skandinavier und Ungarn zwischen dem 9. und dem 11. Jahrhundert. In: *Bischöfe, Mönche und Kaiser*. 883–920. (Hereafter: KŁOCZOWSKI 1994) p. 895; Christian LÜBKE: Heidentum und Widerstand: Elbslawen und christliche Staaten im 10.–12. Jahrhundert. In: *Early Christianity in Central and Eastern Europe*. Ed. Przemysław URBAŃCZYK. Warszawa. 1997. p. 123–128. Here: p. 124; L. E. V. PADBERG: A Latin Kereszténység megszilárdítása és kiépítése: az Ottók missziója a nyugati szlávoknál és a magyarorknál [The Consolidation and Configuration of Latin Christianity: The Mission of The Ottos by The Western Slavs and The Hungarians]. In: WIECZOREK – HINZ 2000. p. 421–424; László KOSZTA: Németország [Germany]. In: *Európa és Magyarország Szent István korában*. Ed. Gyula KRISTÓ – Ferenc MAKK. Szeged. 2000. p. 61–99., especially p. 61–90. In the northern borderline of the empire the archbishopric of Hamburg-Bremen had a similar role.

Not long after the baptism of Mieszko (966), the foundation of the bishopric of Poznań happened in the same year as Magdeburg was raised to archbishopric. Although the person who founded the bishopric is not known, as far as the circumstances of the foundation are concerned, there have appeared three distinguishable views. 1) According to the first in the foundation of Poznań the papacy played a fundamental role; 2) in other opinion the new bishopric – which was first under the jurisdiction of Rome – was brought under the jurisdiction of Magdeburg in the time of bishop Unger, then it became independent; 3) finally there appeared supposition about German influence in the foundation of Poznań.

In the background of the theory of the papal foundation there is the reasoning that from the 9th century the Apostolic Seat strongly supported the conversion of the Bulgarians, Moravians and Bohemians, and raising Magdeburg to archbishopric and the mission among the Slavs were considered as parts of this process. Moreover, it was also concluded from Jordan the prelate of Poznań's (968–984?) being mentioned as „the bishop of Poland” (*episcopus Poloniae*) that its foundation could be assigned to the papacy.⁸

The other group of views in connection with Poznań starts basically from the previous theory⁹ with the significant difference that they discover quick changes in the status of the bishopric. In accordance, because of Unger (?994–1012) the second bishop in line following Jordan we should count with subordination to Magdeburg, while later around the first millennium Poznań became independent with him.¹⁰ The remark of Thietmar of Merseburg about the foundation of the archbishopric of Gniezno would support the radical step according to which Unger the bishop of Poznań did

⁸ KEMPF 1966. 274–275. In Kempf's view Poznań was not subordinated to Magdeburg. Gieysztor thought the same (Aleksander GIEYSZTOR: The Consolidation of the State and the Christianization of Poland in 966. In: *History of Poland*. Eds. Aleksander GIEYSZTOR – Stefan KIENIEWICZ – Emanuel ROSTWOROWSKI – Janusz TAZBIR – Henryk WERESZYCZKI. Warszawa. 1979. p. 47–50. (hereafter: GIEYSZTOR 1979)), who thinks that in 966 Mieszko's baptism happened with Bohemian permission (Dobrava) and German support (Jordan, of Lotaringia – Lüttich – or Italian origin). Cf.: KŁOCZOWSKI 1994. p. 899.

⁹ W CONZE: *Geschichte Ostmitteleuropas von der Karolingerzeit bis ins 18. Jh.* München. 1992. (hereafter: CONZE 1992) p. 18.

¹⁰ Márta FONT: *Keresztény nagyhatalmak vonzásában. Közép- és Kelet-Európa a 10–12. században* [In The Course of Christian Powers. Middle and Eastern-Europe in the 10–12th Centuries]. Budapest. 2005. (hereafter: FONT 2005) p. 100.

not belong under the jurisdiction of the new archbishopric.¹¹ As a result of the reorganisation a situation very difficult to explain emerged. Namely if we accept that Poznań became independent from the jurisdiction of Magdeburg and that – following Thietmar of Merseburg’s remark – it did not belong under Gniezno, the bishopric got into a vacuum. It could have happened only if Poznań had been an exempt bishopric, but there is no data about it.

There can be found other explanation about the circumstances of the foundation and the position of Poznań. Even though there is no clearcut data about Poznań being organised from Magdeburg raised to archbishopric just in 968, yet the probable origin of its first bishops leads to the conclusion that the foundation of the first bishopric expanding into Polish territory fits into the “eastern policy” of Otto I’s time. While the first bishop of Poznań was supposedly, his predecessor was surely of German origin. Jordan is considered by most of the researchers a German clergyman¹² – by some of them even one from Magdeburg¹³. In 991 Unger appeared as the head of the abbey of Memleben (*Vunnigerus*), which was founded by Otto II in 975 and which can be strongly connected to Henry I and Otto I as well, and which had numerous estates in Slavic missionary territory.¹⁴ Besides Magdeburg possibly Regensburg and Augsburg can also be mentioned. The first can be referred to by the Bohemian intervention through Mieszko I’s first marriage – by Dobrava -, whereas the Polish prince’s donation to the tomb of St Udalrich of Augsburg can refer to the second.¹⁵ To sum

¹¹ *Thietmari Merseburgensis episcopi Chronicon*. Ed. Robert HOLTZMANN. München. 1996. (MGH *Scriptores rerum Germanicarum* N. S. 9.) (hereafter: THIỆTMAR) IV. p. 45. „*Nec mora, fecit [Otto] ibi archiepiscopatum, ut spero legitime, sine consensu tamen prefati presulis, cuius diocesi omnis haec regio subiecta est, committens eundem predicti martyris fratri Radimo eidemque subiciens Reinbernum Salsae Cholbergiensis aeccliesiae episcopum, Popponem Cracauaensem, Iohannem Wrotzlaensem, Vngero Posnaniensi excepto. [...]*”.

¹² Gerhard SAPPOK: *Die Anfänge des Bistums Posen und die Reihe seiner Bischöfe von 968–1498*. (Deutschland und der Osten. Quellen und Forschungen zur Geschichte ihrer Beziehungen Bd. 6.) Leipzig. 1937. (hereafter: SAPPOK 1937) p. 42–45., 73–74.

¹³ PARISSÉ 1994. p. 800–801; Gerard LABUDA: ‘Poznań’ In: *Lexikon des Mittelalters*. V. (1995) p. 627. In other view he was from Aquitania: M ROUCHE: *Aux origines d’une Église nouvelle: l’Aquitaine et la Pologne*. In: *Les contacts religieux franco-polonais du Moyen Age à nos jours*. Ed. Paris. 1985. p. 40–52.

¹⁴ In 992 Reginald was the abbey for sure. SAPPOK 1937. 74–78.

¹⁵ Bernhard PANZRAMM: *Der Einfluss der deutschen Besiedlung auf die Entwicklung des schlesischen Pfarrsystems*. In: *Beiträge zur schlesischen Kirchengeschichte. Gedenkschrift für Kurt Engelbert*. Hg. Bernhard STASIEWSKI. Köln – Wien. 1969.

up, we can say that in the organisation of Poznań mostly the German influence – mainly of Magdeburg, then Regensburg or Augsburg – can be caught.

In 977 Mieszko took a new wife, Ota the daughter of Dietmar the Saxon marquis and with it the German (Saxon) influence grew temporarily stronger. In addition, Mieszko seems to endeavour strengthening his links to the pope, basically to counterbalance the German influence. One of his last actions, his country's subordination to the papacy is also connected to it. According to the *Dagome iudex* text identified in the specialist literature with Mieszko, his and his wife, Ota's country (!), more precisely the land of Gniezno (*Schinesghe*), Silesia and Little-Poland were offered to the Apostolic Seat.¹⁶

After Mieszko's death the possibilities changed and recognising it, Bolesław the Brave's dynastic and church policy also changed. In his time Otto III was the emperor, which brought about changes in the field of the German connections as well. In fact Otto III broke with the 'eastern policy' typical of Otto I's era, which put the German interests in the foreground and was working on forming a Christian empire which plan the development of a (more) independent Polish church system fit into. It is conceivable that the offering of the country (*Dagome iudex*) identified in the specialist literature with Mieszko I can also be connected here, though these endeavours may rather be connected to Bolesław Chrobry. Apart from the people in question behind the process of independence, there must have been a strong territorial expansion.¹⁷ It was clearly expressed in the so called meeting of Gniezno. In 1000 the emperor went on a pilgrimage to the nearby tomb of Adalbert who martyred a few years earlier and with this occasion happened the foundation of the archbishopric of Gniezno with the subordination of the bishoprics of Wrocław, Krakow and Kołobrzeg.¹⁸

(Forschungen und Quellen zur Kirchen- und Kulturgeschichte Ostdeutschlands Bd. 6.) p. 1–35. (hereafter: PANZRAMM 1969), here: p. 6–7., 11; SAPPOK 1937. p. 20–21.

¹⁶ KŁOCZOWSKI 1994. p. 899–900. According to certain views based on the territories in the offering, the 'author' can rather be identified as Bolesław the Brave (Chrobry). VÖLKER 1930. p. 16–22.

¹⁷ Cf.: KEMPF 1966. 273–274.

¹⁸ Hardly aims the present study to present the literature of the meeting in Gniezno enough to fill a library. For the newer historiographic presentation of the question see: Jerzy STRZELCZYK: A gnieznói találkozó és az érsekség alapítása [The Meeting of Gniezno and The Foundation of The Archbishopric]. In: WIECZOREK – HINZ 2000. p. 302–304., for the question in details see Dániel BAGI: Remény a királyságra. A gnieznói találkozó „koronázási jelenete” a lengyel ősgestában és a mű kapcsolata a

Thietmar of Merseburg (IV, 45.) reporting about the event attributed the foundation of the archbishopric clearly to Otto III, though there must have been some Polish initiative as well. The source speaks about the foundation of the *archiepisopatus* in a detailed way. According to it, the emperor founded an archbishopric in Gniezno, but without the consent of the bishop whose jurisdiction the territory was under. He put Adalbert's (half)brother Radim to the archbishopric and subordinated the bishops of Kołobrzeg, Krakow and Wrocław (Reinbernus, Poppo, Johannes) to him. It is important to mention that at the end of the report Thietmar emphasizes that Unger the bishop of Poznań did not get under the jurisdiction of the archbishop of Gniezno.¹⁹

It is remarkable how the prelate-chronicler who reported the foundation of the archbishopric as a nearly contemporary source approached it. From his report several important information becomes known. The prelate whose territory the archbishopric was founded on did not approve of the foundation of the archbishopric. This prelate was the bishop of Poznań, this is clearly related to by the expression *prefati* used in the text, which refers to Unger named in the previous sentence. In the part about the emperor's pilgrimage to Gniezno, Thietmar mentions Unger as „the bishop of this town”, and here Gniezno was mentioned, so this strange wording can only refer to that the jurisdiction of the bishop of Poznań expanded over the whole Polish territory. From the bishoprics subordinated to Gniezno *Poznań is not only missing*, Thietmar claims that *that does not belong under Gniezno*. It means that in 1000 an independent Polish archbishopric province emerged in the way that the first 'Polish' bishopric founded three decades earlier did not belong to its territory.

This means a seemingly irresolvable contraversion, but if we take into account that basically the German emperor had a decisive say

Könyves Kálmán-kori magyar belpolitikával [Hope for The Kingdom. The “Coronation Scene” of The Meeting of Gniezno in The Polish Protogesta and The Connection of This Work to The Hungarian Internal Affairs under King Koloman The Learned]. *Századok* 137 (2003) p. 349–380.

¹⁹ THIETMAR IV. p. 45. „*Videns* (i. e. Otto III.) *autem alonge urbem desideratam nudis pedibus suppliciter advenit et ab episcopo eiusdem Ungero venerabiliter susceptus ecclesiam intriducitur, et ad Christi gratiam sibi impetrandam martyris Christi intercessio profusis lacrimis invitatur. Nec mora, fecit* [Otto] *ibi archiepisopatam, ut spero legitime, sine consensu tamen prefati presulis, cuius diocesi omnis haec regio subiecta est, committens eundem predicti martyris fratri Radimo eidemque subiciens Reinbernum Salsae Cholbergiensis aeccliesiae episcopum, Popponem Cracauaensem, Iohannem Wrotzlaensem, Vngero Posnaniensi excepto. [...]*”.

in the foundation of Poznań and the bishopric was with all probability subordinated to Magdeburg, thus embedded in the frames of the imperial church and so hardly can it be expected to integrate into the system of the independent Polish church initiated by Bolesław the Brave and accepted and supported by Otto III. The basic motive of the foundation of the archbishopric of Gniezno was Otto III's personal decision which opposed the German claims of ecclesiastical administration based in the time of Otto (Poznań, Magdeburg).

An interesting question is why this contraversion took place in Thietmar's chronicle. The explanation is relatively easy as the prelate-chronicler stood at the head of the bishopric of Merseburg (1009-1018), the foundation and 'operation' of which raised several problems. The bishopric was one of the large-scale foundations of bishoprics by Otto I in 968. As we have seen the plan of its foundation was formed in 962.²⁰ However, in 981 it temporarily ceased to exist as with the intervention of pope Benedict VII in the synod of Rome the bishop Giselhert was placed into the seat of the archbishop of Magdeburg, but a predecessor was not appointed with reference to that Magdeburg was basically founded illegally on the bishop of Halberstadt's account and without his consent.²¹ Thietmar's bishopric ceased to exist for almost a quarter of a century and could be reorganised only a few years before the appointment of Thietmar.²² In case of Merseburg, evidently not by chance, the story of Magdeburg's being raised to the rank of archbishopric repeated: the obstacle was the objection of the bishop of Halberstadt and the archbishop of Mainz before 968, who considered the foundation of the new archbishopric as the infringement of their rights of ecclesiastical administration and so did they consider – at least the bishop of Halberstadt – the foundation of Merseburg. We can read the same from Thietmar's text. The prelate-chronicler who once studied in Magdeburg, then became the bishop of Merseburg, must have been fully aware of these disputes, in his chronicle he presented what happened in Gniezno focusing rather on the German (Magdeburg) aspects and the specific double ecclesiastical administrative situation emerged so.

How the foundation of the archbishopric of Gniezno was considered is a good example of the data of the *Gesta archiepiscopatus*

²⁰ PU I, p. 283–284.

²¹ PU I, p. 527–531.

²² Cf. PU II, p. 707.

Magdeburgensis. According to it, emperor Otto III founded the archbishopric of Gniezno, putting aside the bishop of Poznań and his superior the archbishop of Magdeburg, who had jurisdiction in the Polish territory, although emperor Otto I once ordered this area under Poznań and Magdeburg. He even writes down that Otto III divided the area into five bishoprics, appointed Gaudentius at the head of Gniezno as archbishop and in three other places (Slazcholberg /Kołobrzeg?/, Krakow, Wrocław) he founded bishoprics and finally the bishop of Poznań, who disagreed, was subordinated to Magdeburg.²³ It corresponds word by word to the recording in the *Annals of Magdeburg* about the year 1000.²⁴ This description obviously shows the aspects of 'Magdeburg', though it is evident that the situation of Poznań is presented: it shows the subordination having existed earlier basically as a consequence, since the bishop of Poznań opposed Otto III's plan, it was placed under the jurisdiction of Magdeburg. The dichotomy of the ecclesiastical system is hidden in this composition, although all of its elements entwine Magdeburg.

Both texts and Thietmar's attitude are obvious, which had a great influence on their view about the beginnings of the Polish church. Despite it – as we have no data that at that time Poznań would have been the *suffraganeus* of Gniezno – we consider this dichotomy of the ecclesiastical administration as real. The dividing with five mentioned in the *gesta* and the *Annals of Magdeburg* is precise: there were altogether five dioceses in the Polish territory: Poznań

²³ „Quorum etiam preconio tactus imperator, ad illius limina causa orationis est profectus cum imperialibus donis; ubi a Bolizlao duce magnifice susceptus est et Gnesim usque perductus, in qua, eodem duce emente, a loco interfectionis translatus pausatat prefati martiris Corpus. Hanc ergo urbem devotus imperator, occurrente sibi loci episcopo, nudis pedibus intravit et post lacrimosam ad sanctum Adelbertum orationem nova illum institutione, id est archiepiscopatus in eodem loco fundatione, sed non legitima, honoravit. Nam tota hec provincia unius Poznaniensis episcopi erat parrochia, et ipsa cum omnibus futuro tempore illic fundatis episcopatibus auctoritate primi Ottonis imperatoris et pontificum apostolice sedis metropolitano Magdeburgensis archiepiscopii fuerat subiecta. Hanc ergo sine utrorumque episcoporum consensu iste imperator in quinque dividens episcopatus, in ipsa urbe Gnezi Gaudentium, beati Adelberti germanum, consecrari archiepiscopum fecit eique tres alios episcopos in tribus locis, id est Slazcholberg, Crakowe, Wortizlave, ordinatos subiecit. Poznaniensem vero episcopum non assentientem priori iuri et Magdeburgensis archiepiscopi subiectioni reliquit.” MGH SS XIV. p. 390. Cf.: Władysław ABRAHAM: *Organizacja kościoła w Polsce do połowy XII. wieku*. Lwów. 1890. (hereafter: ABRAHAM 1890) p. 56–57.

²⁴ MGH SS XVI. p. 159. Cf. ABRAHAM 1890. p. 58.

(subordinated to Magdeburg), Kołobrzeg, Krakow, Wrocław (subordinated to Gniezno), and Gniezno itself. Thus in the Polish territory there were two archbishoprics, Magdeburg and Gniezno to practise supervision.²⁵

In connection with Gniezno the question of the existence of a second archbishopric can also be raised. Yet it is supported by only one single source, the gesta by Gallus Anonymus (*Chronicae et gesta ducum sive principum Polonorum*²⁶): „Boleslaw [Bolesław I.] seemed so pious in serving God, donating church estates, founding churches and setting up bishoprics, that *in his time Poland consisted of two metropoliums and their subordinated bishoprics* [Italics are mine: K.G.]”²⁷ It is questionable if this second archbishopric -if it existed at all- can be connected to the missionary activity of Bruno of Querfurt.²⁸ As according to Thietmar, Bruno was assigned only as a missionary bishop in Magdeburg,²⁹ there could not be another archbishopric established. It is not probable either that Poznań was reorganised into archbishopric as there are no later traces of this.³⁰ The Orthodox archbishopric in Krakow does not have any clear basis either.³¹ There is a view according to which in the second metropolium the memory of a Slavic archbishopric established in the Moravian era remained, which can be connected to Metod's activity.³²

²⁵ Cf.: Gerd ALTHOFF: 'Thietmar I. (Thietmar, Bischof von Merseburg). In: *Lexikon des Mittelalters* VIII, (1998) p. 694–695. For Merseburg: PFEIFFER 1973. p. 78; PARISSE 1994. p. 797–800; SCHLESINGER 1962. p. 21–51., 60–83. For the foundation of Gniezno see hereafter: KEMPF 1966. p. 273–274; KŁOCZOWSKI 1994. p. 899–900; E.-D HEHL: A gnieźnoí érsekség alapítása egyházzjogi szempontból [The Foundation of Gniezno in The Aspect of Ecclesiastical Law]. In: WIECZOREK – HINZ 2000. p. 305–307. (hereafter: HEHL 2000)

²⁶ Its newest Hungarian translation: *Gall Névtelen: A lengyel fejedelmek avagy hercegek krónikája és tettei*. Translated, supplied with a preface and annotations by Dániel BAGI. The poems are translated by László Jankovits. Budapest. 2007. (hereafter: BAGI 2007)

²⁷ First book, 11. BAGI 2007. p. 116.

²⁸ ABRAHAM 1890. p. 75–86.

²⁹ THIETMAR VI. 94., cf.: VÖLKER 1930. p. 16.

³⁰ Gerard LABUDA: *Studia nad początkami państwa polskiego*. I–II. Poznań. 1987². II. P. 544–547; Piotr M. CWYKIŃSKI: Druga metropolia Bolesława Chrobrego a Brunon z Kwerfurtu. *Kwartalnik Historyczny* 101 (2001:4) p. 3–15., here: p. 13–15.

³¹ *Gesta Principum Polonorum – The Deeds of the Princes of the Poles*. Edited by János M. BAK – Urszula BORKOWSKA –G CONSTABLE – Gábor KLANICZAY. Translated and annotated by Paul W. KNOLL and F SCHAEER with a preface by Thomas N. BISSON. Budapest – New York. 2003. (Central European Medieval Texts 3.) p. 54., 2. note.

³² For the short but relevant presentation of this opinion see: STRZELCZYK 2000. p. 297.

In other place (First book, 6.) Gallus mentions only the archbishopric of Gniezno: „Boleslaw [I.] later bought the body of [Adalbert] for as much gold as his body weighed [a] from Prussians and placed it in Gniezno, in the metropolium with due honour.”³³ Thus based on both referring parts of the work of Gallus, in the time of Bolesław I there existed one or two bishoprics.

It may well be imagined that this unusual claim originates from that as a more serious mission started in Pomerania, Bolesław III – that is the same time as the work of Gallus was written - wanted to connect this territory to the Polish church. In the same territory Magdeburg also had a strong missionary activity, and set up a claim to this territory. The ‘official acknowledgement’ of the rights of Magdeburg happened only in 1133 well after the gesta of Gallus had supposedly been finished (1115/1116), but it can be emphasised that the pope's bull in 1133 strengthened the rights of the archbishop over the Polish church with reference to the old tradition referred by the archbishop and the regulations of former popes.³⁴ However, this

³³ BAGI 2007. p. 101.

³⁴ „Innocentius episcopus servus servorum Dei venerabili fratri Norberto Magdeburgensi archiepiscopo salutem et apostolicam benedictionem. [...] Proinde, venerabilis frater Norberte archiepiscope, querimoniam illam, quam adversus episcopos Polonie in nostra presentia deposuisti, scripture et atramento duximus commitendam. Asserebas equidem prefate regionis episcopos ex antiqua institutione Magdeburgensi ecclesie iure metropolitico subiacere et ad confirmationem tue partis auctoritatem predecessorum nostrorum Iohannis, Benedicti et Leonis beate memorie pretendebas. Quos nimirum episcopatus, qui ultra Salam, Albiam et Oderam esse tunc temporis videbantur seu qui ibidem inantea divina essent cooperante clementia disponendi, interventu Ottonis piissimi augusti supposuisse Magdeburgensi ecclesie astruebas. Quorum videlicet episcopatum nomina haec sunt: inter Albiam et Oderam Stetin et Lubus, ultra Oderam vero Pomerana, Poznin [Poznań], Gnezen, Craco[w], Vuartizlau, Cruciwiz [Kruszwica], Masouia et Laodilaensis [Włocławek]. Unde legitimis datis indutiis earundem ecclesiarum episcopos, ut tibi de tua querimonia responderent, tam per litteras, quam per nuntios semel atque secundo ad nostram presentiam invitavimus. Ipsi vero nec venerint, nec ad nos responsales aliquos transmiserunt. Visum est igitur nobis et fratribus nostris, quod nec ipsi de sua contumacia lucrari deberent nec Magdeburgensis ecclesia diutius propria iustitia privaretur, ideoque karissime frater Norberte archiepiscope, ex apostolice sedis benignitate atque iustitia de predictis episcopatibus [et terminis, quos] iam dicti predecessores nostri antecessoribus tuis concessisse et ecclesie tue pertinere noscuntur, te [in po]ss[e]ssionem mi]simus et investivimus et, ut de cetero idem episcopi fraternitati tue obediant, per scripta nostra precipimus. Nichilominus tibi tuisque successoribus et per vos Magdeburgensi ecclesie quemadmodum prenominatos episcopatus sic etiam qui in posterum inibi auxiliante domino fuerint ordinandi, ir retractabiliter possidendos iure perpetuo confirmamus. [...]”. *Schlesisches Urkundenbuch. 971–1230*. Ed. Heinrich I. APPELT. Wien – Köln – Graz, 1971. 6–7., nr. 7., *Bullarium Poloniae I*.

reference cannot be justified either from the deeds recording the establishment of the archbishopric of Magdeburg (967, 968), or from the later 'privileges' (1003, 1012).³⁵ Maybe it is not by chance that in 1136 pope Innocent II 'restored' the independence of the Polish church, acknowledged Gniezno as archbishopric.³⁶

It seems that the mentioning of one, then two archbishoprics by Gallus means a fine distinction. In the 6th chapter of the First book he emphasises that Bolesław I placed Adalbert's mortal remains in Gniezno, later in the 11th chapter he only claims that in the time of Bolesław I there were two archbishoprics. The author obviously knew how big role the emperor had in establishing Gniezno as well as the fact that by Poznań the archbishopric of Magdeburg also had influence on the Polish territory. Gallus seems to describe the real situation of the time of Bolesław I when he mentioned two archbishoprics, Gniezno for sure and Magdeburg supposedly.³⁷



1000–1342 ediderunt et curaverunt Irena SUŁKOWSKA-KURAŚ et Stanisław KURAŚ. Romae. 1982. (hereafter: BP I.) p. 6. nr. 9.

³⁵ According to a privilege written in the name of pope John XVIII (at the end of 1003) the jurisdiction of Magdeburg expanded over the territory of Zeitz, Meissen, Merseburg, Brandenburg, Havelberg and Poznań right at the moment of its establishment: „Ex hac igitur concessione Adalbertus, primus sancte Magdaburgensis ecclesie archipresul Jordanem episcopum Poznaniensis, Hugonem Cicensis, Burchardum Misnensis, Bosonem Merseburgensis, Dodilanem Brandenburgensis, Tudonem Havelbergensis ecclesie consecravit.” PU II. p. 784. The diplomas dated in 1012 and dealing with the archbishop of Magdeburg's right to pallium does not mention the territory of jurisdiction. One of them is the certified diploma of Benedict VIII, dated in October 1012 (PU II. p. 898–899.), the other is a similar, but interpolated diploma (1012 August 27). *ibid.* p. 896–898.

³⁶ *Codex Pomeraniae diplomaticus*. Hrsg. v. Karl Fr. W. HASSELBACH – Gotthard L. ROSEGARTEN J. G. L., I. Greifswald. 1862. (hereafter: CPD) I. p. 28–31; BP I. p. 6. nr. 10. A publication of the text (*Pommersches Urkundenbuch*. Bd. I. p. 786–1253. 2. Auflage. Bearbeitet von Klaus CONRAD. Köln – Wien. 1970. p. 26–27.) considers the diploma fake made after the original papal privilege of 1136. I consider the diploma original based on the *Bullarium Poloniae*. Cf.: DAVID 1928. p. 61–63; VÖLKER 1930. p. 51–59; PANZRAMM P. 1969. 1–6.

³⁷ For the time of the formation of Gallus' work see the latest: BAGI 2007. p. 28–33.

