

# **Antoni Mironowicz**

---

## **The Methodist mission on the Polish lands until the dawn of 11th century**

---

Elpis 15/27, 17-32

---

2013

Artykuł został opracowany do udostępnienia w internecie przez Muzeum Historii Polski w ramach prac podejmowanych na rzecz zapewnienia otwartego, powszechnego i trwałego dostępu do polskiego dorobku naukowego i kulturalnego. Artykuł jest umieszczony w kolekcji cyfrowej [bazhum.muzhp.pl](http://bazhum.muzhp.pl), gromadzącej zawartość polskich czasopism humanistycznych i społecznych.

---

Tekst jest udostępniony do wykorzystania w ramach dozwolonego użytku.

# THE METHODIAN MISSION ON THE POLISH LANDS UNTIL THE DAWN OF 11<sup>TH</sup> CENTURY

MISJA METODIAŃSKA NA ZIEMIACH POLSKICH DO KOŃCA XI WIEKU

ANTONI MIRONOWICZ

UNIWERSYTET W BIAŁYMSTOKU, AMIR@UWB.EDU.PL

**Slowa kluczowe:** Misja chrystianizacyjna, Kościół w Polsce, misja metodiana

**Keywords:** Byzantine Church; Great Moravia; Poland; Sts Cyril and Methodius

The process of Conversion of the Slavs was commenced with the contact of the Slavic people and the Byzantine culture which was initiated by the mission of Sts. Cyril and Methodius. Apart from the exceptional role of Bulgaria and the Great Moravia in the development of the Cyrillo-Methodian legacy the Ruthenian lands became the heir of this great religious and cultural tradition. Before we move on to the problem of the presence of the Methodian rite on the Polish lands it is worth recalling the basic facts of the activity of Sts. Cyril and Methodius in the area of the Great Moravia.

Constantine and Methodius came from Thessaloniki, the second most important city centre in Byzantium. The city took pride in old Christian traditions. Among Southern Slavs Thessaloniki called Solun, were treated with great deference. The prestige of Solun was mainly due to the presence of St Paul and the grave of St Demetrius the patron of the city, commonly worshipped by all Slavs<sup>1</sup>.

Constantine and Methodius were the sons of a high Byzantine clerk. Constantine was born in the year 826 as a last of the seven siblings. Methodius, born before 820 was probably given the name Michael during the baptism ceremony. The areas of Thessaloniki and the whole Macedonia were inhabited by the Slavs. Constantine and Methodius had a possibility to learn their language and traditions. Methodius, at first became the archon of the administrative district north of Thessaloniki. Soon after he relinquished his family and joined one of the monasteries on the Mount Olympus in Bithynia (Asia Minor). At this time, Mount Olympus had a similar role to the one later achieved by Mount Athos. Methodius had great recognition among monks owing to his humility and education. His personal attributes were the main reason he was chosen the hegumen of the Polychron Monastery.

The younger brother, Constantine having gained a decent education at home continued his studies in Constantinople. He entered a monastery in the capital of Byzantium and received the minor holy orders (deacon). Thereafter, Constantine adopted the position of chartophylax (librarian) from the patriarch Ignatius (847-858, 867-877) at the Church of Hagia Sophia in Constantinople. Constantine not wanting to engage in political events on Bosphorus devoted his life to education and in about 850 began to give lectures on philosophy at imperial university. Once Michael III became the Byzantine emperor (842-867), Constantine settled down in one of the monasteries on the Mount Olympus. During his stay in the monastery Constantine together with a future patriarch Photios (858-867, 877-886) took part in the mission among the Arabs (855). During his mission the monk showed an outstanding skill in making contacts with non-Christian people. Appreciating Constantine's skills the new patriarch Photios moved him together with his brother Methodius to missionary work among Khazars inhabiting the lands East of the Black Sea in the year 860. During the mission the monk managed to find the relics of the pope St Clement (92-101), worshipped especially in Byzantium and the whole Christian world. The discovery of the relics of St Clement brought great glory to the monk, who after the return to Byzantium settled down in the capital Holy Apostles Monastery<sup>2</sup>. At that place he began to work on preparing the Slavonic alphabet. During the Khazar mission Constantine understood the significance of spreading religion in the languages of the converted nations. Constantine used the evangelistic experience gained among the Khazars in the Moravian mission.

Constantine initiated the works on creating the Slavonic alphabet and the transliteration of the Gospel and liturgical texts to Slavonic long before the start of Moravian

mission in 863 . The missionary created the writing system called “Glagolitic alphabet”. The name of the writing is derived from the old Slavic word “glagol” which means “to speak” in the contemporary understanding. The creator of the Slavic writing was convinced that every nation should have its own writing in conformity with the requirements of a language. The Slavic Macedonian-Bulgarian dialect from the areas of Thessaloniki well known to Constantine and Methodius became the basis of the vocabulary of the translated texts. At first, the addressees of Constantine’s work above all meant to be the Slavs inhabiting the borders of the Byzantine Empire. It turned out, however that the Slavic writing found its main recipients in the areas inhabited by the Southern Slavs and the Great Moravia.

The Great Moravia gained even greater political significance during the reign of Mojmir I (820-846) who in about 831 under the influence of the East Francia decided to convert to Catholicism. Parallel with the Great Moravia the infiltration of Christianity occurred in the neighbouring Bohemia state. Rastislav (846-870), the son of Mojmir I, led a vast Christianizing action, bringing the missionaries from Italy, Greece and Germany<sup>3</sup>. Salzburg and its suffragans supported by the East Francia played a decisive role in this accomplishment. The Great Moravia led numerous wars against this country. To separate the Bavarian Church and state Rastislav solicited in Rome and Constantinople for the establishment of the diocese at his lands. The Holy See would not grant his request as the Great Moravia was seen as a poorly Christianised country. In such situation the Moravian envoys went to the Byzantium in 862, where the Emperor Michael III approved of the fact that the missionaries were sent in order to carry out the evangelising activity. Rastislav aspired to create Moravian diocese and spread the faith in the Slavic language<sup>4</sup>.

The request of the prince of the Great Moravia was only partially fulfilled by the Byzantine emperor Michael III. The emperor designated the most suitable and prepared people for the mission; however, he could not send a bishop to the church province in the jurisdiction of the Pope. The arrival of two Byzantine missionaries to the Great Moravia at the beginning of 864 was a challenge issued to the German clergy. Constantine and Methodius’ activity in the area of Moravia became a great evangelising success. Within the fourteen months the Greek missionaries educated numerous candidates to become clergy. The Slavic liturgy became significantly popular in the language comprehensible to the faithful. Meanwhile, the German clergy worried about losing their influence and supported by king Louis II the German of East Francia (840-876) began to eradicate the activity of Constantine and Methodius. Under these circumstances the missionaries headed to Rome via Pannonia

and Venice. The arrival of the Greeks at the Holy See was meant to acquire the papal recognition of their activity in the area of the Great Moravia and the Slavic language as a liturgical one.

It was generally believed in Rome that only Greek, Latin and Hebrew were sanctified languages. In such situation the evangelisation carried out by the Byzantine missionaries in Slavic language was treated as heresy by the German and Italian clergymen. Constantine and Methodius came to Rome at the end of 867 at the invitation of the pope Nicholas I (858-867). However, the pope died on 13<sup>th</sup> November 867 and did not see the missionaries. Therefore, they were received by his successor, Hadrian II (867-872)<sup>5</sup>. The new pope, thankful for the relics of St Clement brought by the missionaries became interested in the evangelisation of the Slavs and accepted the Slavic liturgy. Hadrian II ordered the church services to be carried out in Slavic in the most important Roman churches and ordained Constantine’s disciples. Methodius<sup>6</sup> was certainly among the newly ordained clergymen. During his stay in Rome Constantine entered one of the Greek monasteries and took the monastic name Cyril. In the period of the greatest triumph of the Slavic liturgy in Rome, on 14<sup>th</sup> February 869 the Greek monk died unexpectedly and was buried in the Basilica of Saint Clement in Rome.

The death of Cyril was a massive blow for the Slavic mission. The main initiator of the achievements to date left. Methodius had to carry the major burden of the continuation of missionary activities among the Slavs. Methodius put himself at the disposal of the Holy See which referred him with the mission to Pannonia. Owing to the endeavours of the Pannonian prince Kocel’ (833-874) the metropolitan diocese in Sirmium (contemporary Syrmia) was reactivated. The pope named Methodius, who came to Pannonia at the beginning of 870, archbishop of Sirmium. The successes of his mission became universally known. The hierarchy of the Church of Salzburg acted against the apostle of the Slavs and condemned Methodius’ activity at the synod in Regensburg followed by his imprisonment in one of the German monasteries at the beginning of 871. Pope John VIII (872-882) having been informed by Kocel’ of the incarceration of the Greek bishop demanded his release under the threat of anathema to the Bavarian episcopate. As a result of the papal intervention, Methodius was released in 873. and recommenced his missionary activity in the area of the Great Moravia<sup>7</sup>. The arrival of Methodius to the Great Moravia coincided with the separation of this country from the monarchy of East Francia. The prince Svatopluk (870-894), who was formerly a vigorous opponent of the Slavic mission, became its unsung supporter in a new political situation. During his reign the Great

Moravia had gone through the period of immense development. The Moravia, Slovakia, Bohemia region, the areas by the upper Tisza as well as the lands inhabited by the tribe of Vistulans and Lusatian Sorbs all created Svatopluk's state. Together with territorial development of the state the feudal relations as well as the system of fortified settlements began to shape. In the lands of the Great Moravia the first early urban settlements were raised, brick rotundas of the Slavonic rite were erected, furthermore the economy and culture developed<sup>8</sup>.

Svatopluk was ready to support Methodius, as he personified the symbol of the independence of the Moravian Church. Svatopluk's support given to Methodius did not last long. The Moravian prince who strove to capture the lower Pannonia had to cooperate with Salzburgian clergy who possessed unlimited power in the lands of prince Kocel<sup>9</sup>. Ultimately, having political benefits in mind, the Moravian ruler decided to collaborate with Latin clergy that represented the interests of Salzburg. The wavering position of the Holy See and indecisiveness of the pope John VIII towards the Slavic liturgy in Moravia had influence on such decision. The pope by sending Methodius to Moravia in 873 forbade him to celebrate the service in Slavic and allowed only for the liturgy in Greek and Latin. On the other hand, Rome sanctioned liturgy in Slavic. The indecisive standpoint of the pope was probably dictated by the accusations of heresy against Methodius issued by his objectors. The opponents of the Greek ruler accused him of obeying the filioque formula according to the doctrine established at ecumenical councils determined by St John of Damascus. As early as in the 9<sup>th</sup> century, the Latin Church was in favour of origin of the Holy Spirit from the Father and Son. The case of filioque was found irrelevant in Rome, as nobody treated it as a violation of the dogma of faith. The Holy See did not accept the origin of the Holy Spirit from the Father and Son as dogma until 1014. In 879 pope John VIII called Methodius to Rome and demanded personal explanation of his activity. Under the influence of the clarifications the pope exonerated the bishop Methodius and in June 880 issued a bull sanctioning his activity.

The papal bull constituted the highest recognition of the activity of Cyril and Methodius. The pope conferred the rank of archbishop of Moravia on Methodius, appointed two of his suffragans and allowed them to disseminate the liturgy in Slavic language on all Slavic lands. The protégé of Svatopluk, a German cleric Wiching with the title of the bishop of Nitra became one of Methodius' curates. The pope ordered Wiching to obey Methodius as archbishop. John VIII asked Svatopluk to send one more candidate for the post of bishop to be ordained, so that archbishop Methodius would consecrate the rulers with the help of his

curates. The following paragraphs of the bull were most significant for the development of Methodian mission: "We also order that all priests, deans or clergy of all rites, or the Slavs, or people of any different nationality who inhabit your lands [Svatopluk's – A.M.] were subject to and fully obey the named brother and your archbishop, and would not do anything without his knowledge. (...) We rightly approve the Slavic letters devised by Constantine the Philosopher, that by their means God may be truly praised. We also direct that the words and acts of our Lord Jesus Christ (i.e. the Gospel) be explained in that language"<sup>10</sup>. Having gained the support of pope John VIII Methodius returned to Moravia and from there, he eventually set off to Constantinople in 881.

The relations between Rome and Constantinople could be described as decent. The patriarch Photios and emperor Basil I (867-886) sought to have good relations with the pope. In such situation bishop Methodius was received at Bosphorus with great respect. The Byzantine Orthodox Church supported the evangelization of the Slavs in their mother tongue. The support of the patriarch and emperor Basil I raised the authority of Methodius in the view of Moravian prince. The missionary from Byzantium despite the opposition of German clergy could continue his activity in the area of the Great Moravia and Pannonia. The last years of his missionary work (883-885) the ruler concentrated on the transliteration of liturgical texts. The translation of the Holy Bible made by bishop Methodius was a great event, as neither of the East European countries was in possession of the fully translated text of the Gospel in their mother tongue<sup>11</sup>. Methodius died on 6<sup>th</sup> April 885; however, his evangelistic mission in Slavic was continued by his disciples.

Shortly before his death Methodius appointed his disciple Gorazd for the office of archbishop of Moravia. The bishop claimed that the local superior should find support of Svatopluk and German clergy. The events went in a different direction. Wiching used the death of Methodius to present to the new pope Stephen V (885-891) accusations against the Slavic clergy. The German bishop accused him of heresy and disobedience to the Holy See. The pope, influenced by the false accusations forbade using Slavic liturgy and sent his legacies to the Great Moravia in order to familiarize with the situation on the spot<sup>12</sup>. Unfortunately, the papal legacies came too late. Wiching, with the help of Svatopluk removed the Moravian archbishop Gorazd from his office and banished the disciples of Cyril and Methodius. The inspiring role of Svatopluk in the process was not questioned. The prince feared that the Slavic liturgy would cause the ideological resonance between the Great Moravia and the Francia with Bavarian Church. Another reason for

the battle of the German clergy with the Slavic liturgy was a compulsory abandonment of Pannonia by the archbishop of Salzburg, Riphald, as facing the competitiveness of the Slavic liturgy the congregation rejected Latin services<sup>13</sup>. The German clergy was afraid of a similar attitude of the inhabitants of the Great Moravia.

The successor of Svatopluk, Mojmir II (894-907) aspired to rebuild an independent ecclesiastic Moravian province. At his request, the legacies of pope John IX (889-900) ordained the Moravian metropolitan bishop and three of his suffragans. It is highly probable that despite the protests of Bavarian clergy, Gorazd became the metropolitan bishop. The Moravian ecclesiastic province with Slavic liturgy restored before 900 survived only just several years. The Great Moravia internally contradicted and surrounded by hostile neighbours, collapsed as a result of a Hungarian raid in 906. The Hungarian invasion and domination of German clergy caused the flight of the disciples of Methodius from the Great Moravia to the territory of the Balkan countries, Bohemia state and Poland.

The disciples of Methodius at about 925 carried out missionary activity in the area of Dalmatia and Croatia, Serbia and Bosnia. Many of them found refuge in the area of the contemporary Bulgarian state. Among them was Constantine called the Younger, the future Bulgarian bishop in Preslav, Clement and Naum. In Ohrid Clement set up a monastery of St Panteleimon and created a missionary centre for the whole area of Macedonia. His work was continued by Nahum who came from Pliska, the new capital of Bulgarian state. They both contributed to the development of culture and Cyrillic education<sup>14</sup>. The Cyril-Methodius tradition in Bohemia state had a special value in the analysis of the beginning of Christianity on Polish lands.

The legacy of Cyril and Methodius in Bohemia state did not find numerous publications. Bohemia state as a closest neighbour of Moravia was under the influence of its cultural and political influence. Surely, the missions of the disciples of Methodius reached the Bohemia state and after 885. Many of them found refuge in these lands. Historian Cosmas mentions the baptism of the Bohemia prince Bořivoj (894). The historian calls him the first of the Bohemia princes baptised by ‘the reverend Methodius the bishop of the Moravia in the age of emperor Arnulf and the king of the Moravia Svatopluk’<sup>15</sup>. Together with Bořivoj, his wife Lyudmila and the court were baptised. Thus, the process of evangelisation of the lands of Vltava was commenced. The first temple of St Clement relating with its style to the Moravian rotundas was erected in Left Hradec nearby Prague. Bořivoj’s baptism triggered an uprising among his pagan surroundings. The prince was forced to seek refuge in Moravia and only after getting help from Svatopluk he

managed to regain the throne by Vltava. There, he founded a second temple devoted to the Theotokos and placed the Methodian clergy. After his death (899) the Bohemia state went under the rule of Svatopluk and thereafter they became subordinated to the German state (The Kingdom of East Francia). This fact did not foster the development of Slavic liturgy. After the collapse of the Moravia and the dissolution of East Francia, Vratislaus I became the ruler of the Bohemia state. During his reign the Moravia, Silesia and the land of Vistulans were included in the borders of the country. His successor, Vaclav I (921-929) fostered the development of the Latin Christianity. Despite such tendencies, there exist known facts acknowledging the knowledge of the Slavic writing among the first Přemyslids. The Slavic texts and the tradition of Methodian liturgy were maintained in the Bohemia state until 12<sup>th</sup> century<sup>16</sup>.

\*

The proximity of the Polish lands and the Great Moravia and later with the Christianised Rus and Bohemia state must have had great impact on the shape of their faith. The Christianisation of the Polish lands commenced during the reign of the Moravian prince Svatopluk. In Polish historiography this issue was broadly presented. The entire literature focusing on this subject matter can be divided into the adherents and opponents of the notion regarding the presence of Methodian mission in Poland<sup>17</sup>. The newest publications, taking into account the archaeological discoveries acknowledge the presence of the Slavonic rite in the Polish lands before and after 966. Owing to the fact that the literature up to date devoted to the Slavonic rite scrupulously raised numerous controversial aspects, in my dissertations I shall not come back to them but rather focus on discussing the history of the Methodian mission in Poland. Knowingly, I shall neglect the presentation of the over a century-old discussion of historians regarding the functioning of the Slavonic rite in Poland. I am aware of the fact that the presented reconstruction of the history of Methodian liturgy is purely hypothetical in numerous instances; however, the lack of sources does not allow for a thorough clarification of the problem matter. It should be noted that the arguments raised against the presence of the Slavonic rite are based on the same source base as the one used by the adherents of the notion that the evangelisation process of Lesser Poland and Silesia was started when Methodius was still alive. Despite numerous doubts as far as the interpretation of sources and historical facts I am convinced that the Slavic liturgy functioned at the Polish lands before the official Christianisation of the country. Touching upon the named problem matter in this dissertation stems from the fact that the Orthodox Church in the Republic of Poland referred to the Cyril-Methodian

tradition and its seizure of the whole liturgical and cultural wealth.

In the post-war years the discussion of the existence of Slavic ecclesiastical province was commenced by Jerzy Umiński who analysed the record of Gallus Anonymus of two ecclesiastical provinces<sup>18</sup>. J. Umiński placed the capital of the province in Cracow with the Cracovian bishops up till Sula (1037) at the head of. The thesis was further developed by Henryk Paszkiewicz, Karolina Lanckorońska, Jerzy Klinger and Zbigniew Dobrzański. Thus, the created concept proved the creation of the Methodian bishopric in Cracow after the banishment of the Slavonic rite clergy from Moravia. According to the conception, the disciple of Methodius Gorazd escaped from Poland and moved the seat of the Moravian bishopric to Cracow and, thus the capital of the state of Vistulans would become, in a certain way, the continuation of the Methodian ecclesiastic province<sup>19</sup>. In the times of Bolesław Chrobry (the Valiant) (992-1025) in Cracow, there existed a Slavic cathedral of St Michael next to the new Latin cathedral. The words of the chronicler Vincent Kadlubek informing of the fact that bishop Stanislav died *inter infulas* – between the two cathedrals are clearer in such circumstances<sup>20</sup>. K. Lanckorońska treats the bishoprics in Sandomierz and Wiślica as suffragans of Cracow. According to this concept, after the year 1000 Bolesław Chrobry limited the activity of the Slavic clergy and Casimir the Restorer (Kazimierz Odnowiciel) (1034-1058) ordered the Cracovian bishop Aaron Latinization of the Methodian rite. The reactivated Slavonic rite was eliminated by Bolesław the Generous (1058-1079) after the king had been banished from the country. The presented notions constitute only a hypothetical version based on the premise that the Slavonic rite functioned in the country of the first Piast dynasty. Not all presented facts should be treated as credible. However, the doubts do not give the reason for the negation of the presence of the Slavonic rite in Poland. Analysing the stipulations of historiography devoted to the Slavic liturgy one may present a probable version of its development and fall.

\*

The beginnings of the Methodian mission should be connected with the expansion of the Great Moravian state over the land of Vistulans. The prerequisite for the possibility of carrying out such a mission was the support of the secular authorities. Favourable circumstances for the mission came up after the return of Methodius to Moravia from the imprisonment in Swabia in summer 873. Svatopluk wanting to weaken the influence of the German clergy after the war between Moravia and Germany supported the Methodius' activity. According to the *Life of Saint*: "since that day the word of God started to spread over all cities

and pagans (started to) believe in the true God, shedding all their mistakes. A fortiori, the Moravia began to broaden its borders in all directions and defeat all its enemies as even they persistently account for that fact"<sup>21</sup>. The account of the commencement of expansion of Moravia after the return of Methodius is unquestionable. *The Life of Methodius* was arranged chronologically; consequently the expedition of prince Svatopluk against the Vistulans took place in 875. According to the source, the preliminary offensive role was credited to the price of the Vistulans, who persecuted Christians. "He [Methodius] also possessed prophetic abilities, as many of his predictions come true and one or two of which we shall recount. The pagan prince, of great strength, sitting by Vistula, railed heavily against the Christians and did them wrong. Hence, he ordered a messenger to pass on these words: «It shall be wiser for you, son, to accept christening from your own will at your lands rather than be forced to do so in captivity at foreign ground and you shall remind me». And so it happened"<sup>22</sup>. The source acknowledges directly that Svatopluk's retaliatory expedition was successful. As a result, the prince of the Vistulans was deprived of the throne and his principality was incorporated into Moravia. The prince of the Vistulans could have also kept his throne as a ruler independent of Svatopluk. No matter what form of dependency of the Vistulans from the people of Moravia was established, Svatopluk's expedition opened up the lands north of Carpathian Mountains for evangelisation. Hence, the subsequent expeditions of the Moravian prince broadened the influence of the Slavonic rite on the Bohemia lands (the baptism of prince Borivoj – 884) and Opole Silesia.

*The Life of Methodius* mentioned the occupation of these lands right after the conquest of the land of Vistulans. "Some other time, when Svatopluk battled against the pagans with no success and the combat prolonging, [Methodius] at the nearest Mass, that is the service [praising] St Peter, sent to him the following words: If you pledge that you shall spend the day of St Peter with your warrior at my place [in church], I trust God shall hand them over to you in no time. And so it happened"<sup>23</sup>. The dependence of Silesia towards the Moravia could have taken place after the conflict with Bulgaria had ended (882) and subordination of the Bohemia state (883). The reign of Svatopluk over the land of Vistulans and Silesia is documented in historical sources. The range of the Moravian bishopric that would reach the river Bug and Styr in the North has been established on their basis<sup>24</sup>. The document mapping out the border of the bishopric of Prague issued by the emperor Henry IV (1084-1106) in 1086 became the base for outlining such influence of the Moravian state. According to the document, the bishopric of Prague encompassing the

former Moravian lands reached the river Bug and Styr. The document was meant to confirm the Bohemia claims to the Polish lands under the rule of Boleslaw the Bold. Even though their source was deemed a forgery and cannot constitute the proof for the Moravian expansion reaching the river Bug, it directly confirms that the Bohemia inherited the Moravian succession at the Polish lands<sup>25</sup>.

Cracow entered the system of the Great Moravian state and later on the Bohemia one. The central role of the capital Cracow in the state of the Vistulans does not arouse controversies. There arises a question of the presence of the temples with the Slavonic rite and the time of establishing the bishopric of Cracow in its area. Each attempt of answering that question shall present a construction solely based on presumptions and not stemming from a deep analysis of historical sources. The suggestions of Józef Widajewicz regarding the establishment of the bishopric of Cracow in 900 find no grounds<sup>26</sup>. The bishopric would not be established without the consent of the prince of Cracow and Moravian one. The policy of the German clergy and the Hungarian invasion shattered all attempts of establishing the Slavonic dominion. After the collapse of the Great Moravian state a large number of Methodian clergy emigrated from Moravia to the Polish lands. Even in Bohemia, after the Latin liturgy dominion (906) the Slavonic rite was maintained in certain monasteries until the end of the 14<sup>th</sup> century. Therefore, not determining its form, the Methodian liturgy could be continued in the area of the Lesser Poland<sup>27</sup>, all the more so because there was no interest of the Latin mission in the matters of the land of the Vistulans. The Bulgarian centres with the disciple of Methodius, Gorazd were interested in the Slavic mission. K. Lanckorońska even proves that after the abandonment of the disciples of Methodius from Moravia the Slavonic ecclesiastical province was moved to Cracow and as a result two metropolitan bishops used to stay in the town during the reign of Boleslaw Chrobry (the Valiant). These suggestions were based on historiographical combinations rather than on the content of historical sources.

The most credible conception on the date of the establishment of the Slavic bishopric in Cracow has been presented by an outstanding Polish mediaevalist Henryk Łowmiański. According to the scholar, the establishment of the Slavic bishopric took place in the middle of the 10<sup>th</sup> century (before the year 972). The introduction of the bishop to Wawel occurred after the establishment of the Latin missionary bishopric in Poznan, that is in 968 Cracow used to compete with Gniezno on the Polish lands as an organisational-state centre and it was incorporated into Poland only at the end of the reign of Mieszko I (960-992). The land of the Vistulans benefited from the political and

church support on the part of the Bohemia state. The mission of bishop Jordan, limited to the state of Polans did not encompass Cracow as the named area was subdued to the Bulgarian patriarchate. The patriarchate during the Rus-Byzantine war was not interested in broadening its influences and establishing the Slavic archbishopric in Cracow. The establishment of the bishopric of Cracow had to take place before 970 as in that year the Bohemia prince, Boleslaw I obtained the papal approval for the establishment of the bishopric of Prague. The bishopric of Prague made claims to the Southern areas of Polish lands<sup>28</sup>. It is possible that a second bishopric could be established in Wiślica, Sandomierz, Przemyśl, Wrocław or Smogorzów<sup>29</sup>, as in the Ruthenian relations on the activity of bishop Adalbert one can find the records made in plural that he fought “the Slavic bishops.”

The historical relations and archaeological sources confirm the development of the Slavonic rite in the area of Cracow and the Southern Polish lands in the second half of the 10<sup>th</sup> century. The bishopric of Cracow was liable to the jurisdiction of Bulgarian patriarchate, and after its abolition in 972 most probably the one of Constantinople. The establishment of the Slavic hierarchy by the Vistula River suggests the existence of close relationships between Cracow and Bulgaria. The cult of St Michael, to whom the first cathedral in Cracow was dedicated to, was exceptionally popular in Byzantium and Bulgaria. The economic contacts of the Lesser Poland with Bulgaria strengthened the infiltration of Eastern Christianity into the Polish lands. It does not seem, however, that the bishopric of Cracow would constitute the continuation of the Methodian ecclesiastical province since Constantine Porphyrogenitus considered the Croat areas [Lesser Poland] pagan<sup>30</sup>. It is possible that the Bulgarian interest in Cracow was resulting from the presence of the disciples of Methodius on the Polish lands and the continuation of his missionary activity by Gorazd. Although Gorazd was on his own in the area of Bulgaria, he supported the activity of the Slavic clergy on the Polish lands<sup>31</sup>.

The forged bulla of pope John XII (955-964) directed to the Bohemia prince Boleslaw I (929-971) with regards to the establishment of the bishopric of Prague indirectly confirms such submission. The bull, despite being forged has a historic background. The document enumerates the papal appeal to Boleslaw I so that he would not appoint a clergyman belonging to a Bulgarian or Ruthenian rite (“sect”)<sup>32</sup>.

The historical literature broadly analyses the matter of the Christening of Mieszko I. This act, so important for the country is known only from skimpy texts contained in the *Chronicle* of Gallus Anonymus and the *Chronicle* of Thietmar. In the *Chronicle* of Thietmar one can find an information that the “faithful follower of Christ [princes Dobrawa

– A. M.] seeing her husband submerged in various pagan mistakes wondered of a way they could reunite in faith”<sup>33</sup>. What is interesting in this section of the *Chronicle* is the fact that Mieszko was not called a pagan but “submerged in various pagan mistakes.” The princess instead of converting her husband to Christianity ponders of a way to “reunite in faith.” It seems less than probable that at that time Dobrawa would marry a pagan. The hypothesis that was raised numerous times claiming that Mieszko was Christian before the marriage with Dobrawa; however, of a different rite from his wife should be reconsidered. The German chronicler does not give any circumstances of the Christening of the Polish king. The first lines of the *Rocznik Krasińskich* (Krasieński’s Annal) inform us that „Myeschko per Cirulum et Methodium baptizatur et per Adalbertum confirmatur” (“Mieszko was Christened by Cyril and Methodius and confirmed by Adalbert”). The record of Mieszko’s I Christening by Cyril and Methodius and his confirmation by Adalbert is only seemingly irrational. This source should be interpreted as a tale of two different religion traditions. According to such interpretation Mieszko I was Christened in the Methodian rite and confirmed in Latin by bishop Adalbert. The above mentioned hypothesis is partially confirmed by Gallus Anonymus who stated that Mieszko being blind at birth regained his sight during his First Haircut<sup>34</sup>. The ceremony is called a pagan ritual by the chronicler. The Christening of Mieszko I, as incomprehensible to the chronicler finds its analogy in the Eastern Church. Christening is described in the Greek Church as “photismos” meaning “to regain one’s sight”. Similarly, the ritual of the First Haircut did not have to be pagan. In the Eastern rite of Christening the First Haircut are its permanent element<sup>35</sup>. The results of the archaeological studies around the area of the Poznań cathedral confirm these speculations. The three discovered baptismal fonts, the wall separating the nave from the chancel on the pattern of the Easter iconostasis as well as two annexes by the apse on the pattern of the Byzantine “prothesis” and the room called “diaconicon” all confirm the Eastern character of the oldest Christian cult centre in the area of Poznań<sup>36</sup>. As resulting from the above, it is most probable that Mieszko I was at first Christened in the Slavonic rite and he accepted the Latin ritual after he married the Bohemia princess Dobrawa and the arrival of bishop Jordan. It is unquestionable that once Mieszko accepted the Latin rite, the problem of regulating the mutual relation between the two rites came up. The projects of the organisation of Church in Poland must have been drawn up during the life of Mieszko I.

The foundation of the ecclesiastical province in the Slavonic rite in Poland was a difficult task. No wonder, Mieszko I in his future projects had to strive to make close contacts with the pope. The genesis of the submission of

the land of Piasts under the direct command of the Holy See (*Dagome iudex*)<sup>37</sup> may be found in that fact. Gallus Anonymus accurately noticed that Bolesław “treated the honour of the Church and the interest of [his own – A. M.] country with greatest care.” The ecclesiastical province of the Slavonic rite originated from the religious and state needs. Apart from its missionary activity, the political aims as important as the conversion to Christianity by Volodymyr the Great (980-1015) were deeply hidden. There is a close interrelation between these events. The ecclesiastical province of Kiev was founded in about 988, however, the Mieszko’s document *Dagome iudex* was written in the years 988-922. Most probably, a missionary bishopric of the Greek Church that could threat the interests of Poland was established in 922 in Volodymyr Volynsky. The Polish ecclesiastical province of a Slavonic rite received its final shape after 992<sup>38</sup> as a result of the foundation of the Latin archbishopric in Gniezno. It is difficult to assume that Rome would recognize its priority to the ecclesiastical province of Gniezno. Thus, both ecclesiastic organisations came to life simultaneously or nearly at the same time. However, it is unknown whether a partition of the state’s territory between the two ecclesiastical provinces took place. Vincent Kadlubek points out that both ecclesiastical provinces were treated as “twin” ones<sup>39</sup>. It does not mean, however that both ecclesiastical units had an equal legal status.

The sources do not include data that would unequivocally point the seat of the Slavic bishoprics. One can only presume what area laid under the Slavic ecclesiastical province. The Slavic ecclesiastical province could encompass the areas of Sandomierz, Przemyśl, Halyč, Lublin and even the lands of Buzhans, regained by Bolesław Chrobry (the Valiant) in 1018. The territorial status of Polish Slavic ecclesiastical province underwent constant changes depending on the scope of the missionary work of clergy and the influence of the state of Piasts in the East. The seat of the province should be searched for in the Southern part of the Polish lands which used to belong to the Great Moravia. The political situation of the land of Cracow after the collapse of the Great Moravian state, its adhesion to Bohemia state in the second half of the 10<sup>th</sup> century and regaining Cracow by Mieszko I at the dawn of his reign had a significant influence on the future developments. Most scholars claim that Cracow was the seat of the Slavic ecclesiastical province. However, a different town of as strong political position as Cracow and belonging to the Great Moravia could be the seat of the ecclesiastical province. The most plausible town to act as one could have been Sandomierz<sup>40</sup>. Gallus, enumerating *sedes regni principals* treated Sandomierz equally to Cracow, Wrocław and Płock<sup>41</sup>. However, there are numerous facts indicating that the Slavic ecclesiastical

province had its seat in Cracow. Sandomierz could only constitute the seat of the Slavic bishopric. In the autograph of *Annalia* by Jan Długosz (Johannes Longinus) under the year 1030. One can find the information of the death of the bishop of Sandomierz, the name of whom was removed. K. Lanckorońska and J. Klinger connect the aforementioned fact with the note in *Rocznik Krakowski* that mentions bishop Roman deceased in the same year together with another bishop Lambert. According to the scholars, the scraped out name could be read as Roman<sup>42</sup>.

Facts and historical sources argue for such hypothetical reconstruction of the establishment of the Eastern rite bishoprics. The sources kept the information of the fact that during the reign if Bolesław Chrobry two ecclesiastical provinces used to exist in Poland. S. Kętrzyński<sup>43</sup> devoted a special study to the named fact and F. Dvornik<sup>44</sup> acknowledged his stipulations. The oldest Polish chronicle of Gallus Anonymus dated at the beginning of the 12<sup>th</sup> century states that: "suo tempore [of Bolesław Chrobry – A. M.] Polonia duos metropolitanos cum suis suffraganeis continebat"<sup>45</sup>. What Gallus stated was acknowledged by Vincent Kadlubek who stipulated that in the times of Bolesław Chrobry "adhuc tenellas fidei primitias, adhuc in cunis vagientem ecciesiam tam tenero amplexu, tam adulta fovit teneritudine, ut geminam metropolim instituerit"<sup>46</sup>. On the other hand, in the *Rocznik kapitulny krakowski* one can find two notes: "1027. Ypolitus archiepiscopus obiit, Bossuta successit", "1028. Stephanus archiepiscopus obiit"<sup>47</sup>. In the years presented via the annual neither archbishop Hipolit nor Stefan were seated in any of the known archbishop capitals. Such archbishops could only be in Poland, especially when "Bossuta" in Polish means "Bożeta"<sup>48</sup>. It is hard to image that within the dozen or so months a three-fold change at the archbishop capital in Gniezno would take place and that there would be enough time for two full *sedis vacans* and the beginning of the third one. In addition, there might have not been enough time to designate two successors of archbishop Hipolit, to ordain them and let alone the time to rule. The above mentioned information becomes clearer when we presuppose that one of the notes relates to the cathedral in Gniezno and the other one – to another, functioning at that time in Poland.

One of the evidence for the existence of the Slavonic rite cathedral was the sound of the names of first two bishops of Cracow. The information is derived from the *Katalog biskupów krakowskich* (*The Catalogue of the Bishops of Cracow*). The credibility of the *Katalog* is undeniable. The oldest of them is kept in the copy from the 13<sup>th</sup> century; however it was drafted on the basis of later records. Before the foundation of the Latin bishopric in Cracow (1000) a Slavonic rite bishop Prochor (Prohorius, Prochoros) used

to reside in the town. The second one in the catalogue of the bishops of Cracow was a clergyman of a German origin Prokul (Proculphus, Proculos)<sup>49</sup>. There are no grounds for the affirmation of the fact that Prochor resided in Cracow in the times of Methodius or shortly after his death. A letter of the German episcopate dated 900 to the pope John IX (898-900) could not neglect the fact of the existence of the bishopric of Cracow in the area of Moravian ecclesiastical province. It seems that Prochor could have been the first ordinary of the Slavonic rite diocese of Cracow established before 970 or one of his successors before the year 1000.

Nestor gives just a partial information about the existence of the Slavonic rite in *Powieść doroczna* (*Primary Chronicle*). The chronicler informed that two Greek missionary brothers and their disciples handled the mission of Christianisation that encompassed the Danube Slavs, Moravians, Bohemia, Lendians and Polans from Dnieper River. "They were in fact one Slavic nation: the Slavic peoples who reside by the Danube River and that were conquered by the Hungarians, and the Moravians, Bohemia and Polans called the Rus nowadays. It is for them that the scripture was translated in Moravia, the writing of which was called Slavic and the writing exists in Rus and among the Danube Bulgarians"<sup>50</sup>. The aggregated treatment of the three nations could only be possible due to their common religious traditions, but also and more importantly because of the common liturgical language – Slavic.

Yet another source – *Opowieść o piśmiennictwie słowiańskim* (*The Tale of the Slavic Literary Activity*) – represents additional excerpt devoted to the activity of St Cyril. "During the reign of emperor Michael and Irene the Orthodox the philosopher Constantine was sent do Moravia by emperor Michael, as the Moravian prince asked for the philosopher. Thence, he went there and taught the Moravians and Lendians and Bohemia and other peoples and reassured the true faith in them, and he wrote scriptures in Ruthenian language and taught them well. And since then he departed to Rome and as he became sick he put on black robes and he was given the name Cyril. Out of the sickness he died eventually. Many years later, Adalbert came to Moravia and to the Bohemia peoples and Lendians and destroyed the true faith and rejected the Ruthenian scripture. He introduced the Latin writing and faith and burned the pictures of the true faith, chopped the bishops and presbyters and banished the others"<sup>51</sup>. Although the source in historiography evokes numerous doubts, in the context of other documents confirms the existence of the Slavonic liturgy, the scope of which was limited in Bohemia state and Poland by bishop Adalbert.

The presented relation does not contradict with the activity of bishop Adalbert. The Latin bishop did not fight the Slavic language in liturgy but the foreign hierarchy that was

kept within the borders of his jurisdiction. It seems most plausible that at the end of the 10<sup>th</sup> century during the activity of bishop Adalbert, the hierarchy of Bulgarian or Ruthenian origin was situated on the Polish lands. The opinions regarding the role of bishop Adalbert in the development of the Latin liturgy in historiography are quite diversified. Most scholars claim that St Adalbert was not an opponent of the Methodian rite. His person is presented differently in Ruthenian sources. There is an excerpt in *Chronografia (The Chronography)* of dean Samuel which directly relates to the attitude of bishop Adalbert to the Slavonic liturgy. According to the source St Adalbert “destroyed the true faith and rejected the Ruthenian scripture. He introduced the Latin writing and faith and burned the pictures of the true faith, chopped the bishops and presbyters and banished the others and went to Prussia where he was killed, Adalbert - the Latin bishop”<sup>52</sup>. The transmission, found implausible by Polish historiography, encompasses numerous accusations against the Latin clergyman. In the light of the preserved sources, bishop Adalbert did not “kill” and did not “banish” the clergymen but introduced the Latin rite<sup>53</sup>.

The Slavonic rite was undoubtedly fought by the advocates of the „trilingual heresy”. The named actions were undertaken especially after the previously mentioned bulla of pope John VIII forbidding Methodius to carry out the Slavic liturgy and recommending the service in Greek or Latin. It stems out that the Latin bishops did not oppose the Greek liturgy but would rather fight against the Slavonic liturgy and rival hierarchy. There is no evidence for the activity of bishop Adalbert reaching Cracow in the area of which the cathedral of St Michael would function. It seems that analogically to the situation in Moravia after the year 885 . the secular authorities began to abolish the clergy using the Slavonic liturgy. In case of Polish lands the process took place during the reign of Boleslaw Chrobry.

The *Chronicle* of Cosmas informs of the abolishment of Slavic monks during the times of Boleslaw Chrobry. The source mentions some *persecutio christianorum* that took place in Poland in 1022. That laconic note is proven correct in *Paterikon Pieczerski* of monk Polykarp in *Żywot Mojżesza Węgrzyna* (The Life of Moses Węgrzyn). The saint evokes anger of Boleslaw Chrobry as he was given First Haircut by the monk arriving from Athos<sup>54</sup>. The prince, in the framework of consolidation of the Latin Church structures that started at the convention in Gniezno through the abolishment of monks strove to limit the influence of the Slavonic rite hierarchy. A resulting from the above, the tradition of persecution of the Slavonic rite in Rus during the times of Boleslaw Chrobry has its partial justification, though it was unjustly connected with the person of St Adalbert.

The intentions of the liquidation of the Slavonic hierarchy were not realised as the chronicler Gallus mentions that the followers of the Slavonic and Latin rite were bawling Boleslaw Chrobry at his grave. The excerpt of the Gallus’s chronicle that tells in the laments about the great sorrow and grief of the Polish nation because of the death of the king has an essential meaning for the confirmation of the existence of the Slavonic rite. “Tanti viri funus mecum omnis homo recole, Dives, pauper, miles, clerus, insuper agricole. Latinorum et Slavorum quotquot estis incole”<sup>55</sup>. The word “Latini” universally meant the followers of the Roman Church of the Latin rite. The term “Slavi” should be placed on the same religious plane. In the 16<sup>th</sup> century this term still had a religious connotation<sup>56</sup>. Under this term the chronicler described the followers of the Methodian rite. A different interpretation of the Gallus’s *Chronicle* is given by the historians<sup>57</sup>, who questioned the Methodian mission on the Polish lands.

A difficult to answer question remains the issue why so little information or its lack is to be found in the oldest Polish chronicles. Gallus must have had the sense of unity of the Polish state, even though he divided the nation as per the Latin and Slavonic rite. Gallus was mostly interested in the “Latin” Poland. The chronicler omitted the legends that Vincent Kadlubek writes about and connected with Cracow. He did not mention a powerful prince known from the *Żywot św. Metodego (The Life of St Methodius)* who was staying by the Vistula River. He did not mention a word of the Great Moravian reign over the territory of Poland. He placed the armed forces of Boleslaw Chrobry in Poznan, Gniezno, Włocławek and Giecz. He omitted Wrocław, Cracow, Przemyśl, Halyč and other towns. Gallus informed of a Bohemia raid in 1038/1039 over Gniezno and Poznań; he did not mention however. The plunder of Cracow and Wrocław. We get to know of this fact from Cosmas’ *Chronicle*. Cracow until the end last quarter of the 11<sup>th</sup> century did not exist in the Gallus’s *Chronicle*. After all, the town became the capital of the seigneurial district of Poland by the testament of Boleslaw III the Weymouth (1102-1138). On one hand Gallus dedicated his work to the Latin bishop of Cracow and on the other he showed a pregnant silence towards the “Slavic” past of Cracow<sup>58</sup>. Of course, with such attitude of the author it is hard to expect closer information of a Polish Slavonic ecclesiastical province. Vincent Kadlubek and Johannes Longinus had a similar attitude. The Latin clergy insisted on omitting the traditions related to Cyril and Methodius.

\*

The confirmation of the existence of Christian temples in the 10<sup>th</sup> and 11<sup>th</sup> century are archaeological excavations. The remains of the Slavonic cult are to be found

in Ostrów Lednicki, Cracow, Wiślica, Przemyśl and many other towns. Those centres were not under the control of the Latin Church and remained under the influence of the Byzantine civilisation with Slavonic liturgy and Cyrillic writing. One of the examples is the church of the Blessed Virgin Mary (today's' Sts Felix and Adaukt) on Wawel in Cracow which with its architectural style refers to Bohemia rotundas connected with the Cyril-Methodian tradition<sup>59</sup>. The archaeological excavation in Ostrów Lednicki revealed a massive Christian centre from the 10<sup>th</sup> century. The found chapel on the layout of the Greek cross has an added palatium<sup>60</sup>. A similar rotunda with an impressive palatium – the bishop's residency from the 10<sup>th</sup> century was discovered under the chancel of the Roman-Catholic cathedral in Przemyśl<sup>61</sup>.

There are numerous tracks of the Slavonic rite in Wiślica. A baptismal font and a church from the end of the 10<sup>th</sup> century as well as a grave chapel reflecting the non-Latin character of this centre from the 11<sup>th</sup> century was found in its area. A four graves with heads directed to the East, characteristic of the Eastern rite were found in its premises. The deceased were buried in the naves and the chancel in the Latin Church. The graves in Wiślica contain interments of high church dignitaries. On their basis Zofia Wartołowska states that Slavic bishops were buried in the chapel. The discovery of the square palatium connected with the body of the rotunda constituted the confirmation of the thesis<sup>62</sup>. The original Roman collegiate church in Wiślica was probably embellished with numerous wall painting in Byzantine style, similarly to the Gothic church raised later on (in the 14<sup>th</sup> century) by Casimir the Great at the same place. According to Johannes Longinus, Casimir after the erection of the church regretted that he did not build in another place. As Longinus criticises the original construction of the church we can suppose that king's dissatisfaction was caused by too many elements moved to the new temple from the old one. Bishop, Jakub Zadzik (1628-1635) visiting the church in the 17<sup>th</sup> century wrote that the "Greek" paintings covered the whole interior of the church<sup>63</sup>.

The archaeological excavations in Wiślica are closely related to the archaeological discoveries by the Salvator's Church in the district of Zwierzyniec in Cracow. The oldest building found under the temple is Greek cross-shaped. A stone Roman rotunda<sup>64</sup> was raised on the rubble of the rotunda from the 10<sup>th</sup> century. Similar architectural tendencies are to be found around the cathedrals of Poznań and Płock. The latter building was erected during the times of Władysław Herman (1079-1102) by his wife, Bohemia princess Judith - daughter of duke Vratislaus II (1061-1085), a known adherent of the Slavonic rite. In Płock architectural complex there is a "prothesis" and "diaconicon"

in both side apsyde niches of the temple. The whole Płock rotunda was built in a shape of "trikonchos" with Byzantine "narthex" refers to similar types of buildings to be found in the Balkans<sup>65</sup>. The Polish rotundas were not that different of the Bohemia or Moravian ones. The presence of this type of rotundas on Polish lands can be justified by the Christianisation and belonging to The Lesser Poland and the Great Moravia.

The news of the existence of the Slavonic rite on the Polish lands in the 11<sup>th</sup> century is found indirectly in the written sources and the analysis of the historical events. The letter of the Swabian princess Matilda to Mieszko II (1025-1034) is one of the types of such sources. The princess wrote in the letter that the king would pray not only in his own language (Slavic) but also in Latin and Greek. "Since in your own tongue and in Latin you can praise God, you have also desired to add Greek. This book *ordo Romanorum* I am sending you so that there would be nothing unknown to you in celebrating God's service"<sup>66</sup>. The text confirms the existence of strong Greek influence during the reign of Mieszko II. The named influence appeared as early as during the reign of Bolesław Chrobry (the Valiant) when the diplomatic connection were made with the Byzantium. The contacts with the Byzantium did not interfere with fighting off the Slavonic rite by Chrobry. On the court of the Hungarian king Stephen I there was a large group of Byzantine clergy. Therefore, the influence of the Greek Church onto the Polish lands was something natural. The Kiev ecclesiastical province adjacent to Poland was still under the jurisdiction of the Constantinople patriarchate. In Piast Poland numerous Slavic and Greek liturgical book embellished with Byzantine miniatures were kept<sup>67</sup>. It is difficult to assume that they were assigned for solely for the use of spouses of Piasts, who were of an Eastern rite. Otherwise, state-Church factors referred to the Slavonic liturgy. The Brunwilarian monk states that one of the reasons for Mieszko's II divorce with his wife Richeza was the "barbarian rite of the Slavs"<sup>68</sup>. Mieszko II could have been the adherent of the named rite during the times of the conflict with the emperor. He definitely stopped supporting it when he became imperial vassal.

Yet another "proof" for the functioning of the Slavonic liturgy on the Polish lands in the 11<sup>th</sup> century was the case of the so-called "pagan reaction". Some of the scholars interpret the words of Gallus regarding the rebellion raised by the subjects against the bishops as the fight of two rites. "The subjects raised the rebellion against the reign of the magnates and made themselves rulers. Moreover, moving away from the Catholic faith (*de fide catholica deviantes*), that cannot be uttered without lament, against bishops and clergymen, they grabbed God's domiciles and those worthy

they slew with swords and others they stoned”<sup>69</sup>. The remittance puzzles with the fact that the rebels occupied the seats of bishops and clergymen, and churches. The question arises, why was it now that the rebellion broke out against the Christians and not any earlier. According to numerous historians it was a rebellion of the adherents of the Slavonic rite, later on called the “pagan reaction”<sup>70</sup>.

By accepting such assumption, Masław should be considered Christian, as he was a cup-bearer from Mieszko’s II court. It is hard to imagine a pagan to serve a similar function. Gallus informed that due to the rebellion of pagans and other reasons the people of Greater Poland, were fleeing beyond the Vistula River to Mazovia<sup>71</sup>. If this was an area dominated by pagans, the people of Greater Poland would have to search for another shelter. The chronicler emphasised that Mazovia was “heavily populated and its power rose significantly”<sup>72</sup> due to the massive inflow of the people from the West and South (because of the expedition of Kiev in 1031). One can suppose that Masław by opposing Casimir coming back from the exile strove to gather around the followers of the Slavonic rite. The action against the lands of Buzhans, the lands belonging to Yaroslav I the Wise (1019-1054) could have been taken from Mazovia. Thus, the active part of the Kiev prince who organised two military expeditions on Mazovia in the war is explained. According to the chronicler Nestor, Yaroslav gained victory without the participation of the army of Casimir the Restorer. Both sides paid much attention to winning over the Mazovian opponent. It is without doubt that Yaroslav communicated with his brother-in-law Casimir as far as the faith of Mazovia, before Masław was defeated. The Mazovian land was regained by the Restorer, and according to H. Paszkiewicz, let to church unification with the Latin rite<sup>73</sup>. Having defeated Masław, before the war with Pomeranians – “with pagans” Casimir the Restorer encouraged his warriors to present similar valour as in the battles with “false Christians”<sup>74</sup>. As Gallus only previously mentioned the war with Mazovia, one can only suspect whom he had on mind when relating to the term.

The following facts constitute a confirmation of the thesis that Masław’s rebellion was not a “pagan reaction”. The cathedral churches in Cracow, Poznań, Gniezno, Płock and other towns were not destroyed during the rebellion. It was the Bohemia people and not the “Polish nation returning to paganism” that burnt the cathedral in Gniezno, the churches in Ostrów Lednicki, Trzemeszno or the cathedral in Poznań in 1039. The cathedral in Płock was burnt the army of the Kievan prince Yaroslav the Wise in 1031 and rebuilt by an alleged “pagan” Masław. The Wawel Cathedral; however, was demolished by the Hungarians in 1086. The last one of the cathedrals, crucial in this dissertation,

was burnt by the Ruthenians in 1135. The enumerated facts question the character of the events in Mazovia presented by the chroniclers.

The victory of Casimir the Restorer enabled him to put the church affairs in order. The endowment of a pallium of Pope Benedict IX to the bishop of Cracow, Aaron with the jurisdiction over all ordinaries, “que in toto regno sunt Slavonica”<sup>75</sup> was to lead to the assimilation of the Slavonic rite with the Latin Church in Cracow. The Polish church province on the eve of schism in Church was largely connected with Rome. The Western Christian option won in Poland as it was with the Moravian state at the beginning of the 10<sup>th</sup> century.

Whether the reforms of the establishment of church put an end of the activity of the Slavic clergy still remains an open question. It seems that the reform itself did not eliminate the parish with Slavonic liturgy. Some historians are willing to acknowledge the fact that such Slavic hierarchy existed during the reign of Bolesław the Bold and his conflict with bishop Stanislav was treated as a battle of two rites. The adherents of this view use numerous arguments that confirm the named hypothesis. Some scholars claim that one of the traditions regarding the origin of the bishop of Cracow is deriving Stanislav from the family of Rurykowicze. The name Stanislav has clear Methodian connotations occurring in the Balkans and Rus in the 10<sup>th</sup> century. The dates that Stanislav was consecrated and assumed the cathedral bishopric remain unknown. The catalogue of the bishops of Cracow as precise with the names of other bishops remains strangely silent about his case. Scholars indicate the relations of Stanislav with the Bohemia prince Vratislaus II, the adherent of restoration of the Slavonic liturgy on Bohemia lands. In the times of the conflict between pope Gregory VII and emperor Henry IV, the latter could have used the question of the Slavonic liturgy as an element of anti-papal coalition. The anti-pope chosen by the emperor took the name Clemens, popular in Cyril-Methodian tradition.

In 1079 bishop Stanislav rose against the king “in defence of his people against ruin and harm”, and as a result he was sentenced to death. The conflict that came into existence against a background of church affairs had to exacerbate due to the political or personal factors that led to irremediable effects. The actions undertaken by the bishop caused king’s repressions. It is true that, despite being a clergyman himself, Gallus would not hesitate calling Stanislav “traitor” and judge his deeds as “sinful”. The chronicles similarly assessed the king’s revenge<sup>76</sup>, but also said that the Bolesław’s fate was “injustice”<sup>77</sup>.

The fact that with the abandonment of the king from the cathedral in Gniezno, the archbishop Bogumilus resigns and is replaced by archbishop Henry, supported by the emperor

Henry IV is truly puzzling. The archbishop Bogumilus moved to a hermitage in Dobrowa where he died in 1092. It is highly probable that the bishop of Cracow stood trial of the metropolitan bishop of Gniezno<sup>78</sup> beforehand and, as a result had his limbs cut (“truncatio membrorum”).

The most important duty of the metropolitan bishop of Gniezno was defence of the Latin rite in Poland. One cannot exclude the conjecture that archbishop feared of king's wrath or was convinced that the actions of Stanislav were harmful to the country. According to Vincent Kadlubek the bishop was quartered “inter infulas” – between two cathedrals. The chronicler almost certainly meant the two existing cathedrals – the Latin of St Waclaw and Slavic one of St Michael. Bogumilus, as an archbishop of Gniezno had to take part in the trial against bishop Stanislav and, presumably that was the reason why he was removed, together with king Boleslaw, by the imperial-Slavonic faction<sup>79</sup>.

Henryk Paszkiewicz pointed out to one more source that allows for a slightly different interpretation of the conflict. The letter of Gregory VII (1073-1085) to Boleslaw the Bold dated April 1075 unambiguously indicated close relations between the Holy See and Boleslaw<sup>80</sup>. According to H. Paszkiewicz, the passage in the letter of Gregory VII concerning the need of establishment a metropolitan seat in Poland does not relate to Gniezno but a different Slavonic metropolis. There is no proof bearing testimony of the liquidation of the latter one by the pope. The initiative undertaken by Boleslaw the Bold to retain the Slavonic liturgy was fully justified by the political events. Gregory VII understood the weigh of the initiative for the Church, especially when Vratislaus II also turned to the pope with the request of introduction of the Slavonic liturgy in the Bohemia state (after 1075)<sup>81</sup>.

Iziaslav, the son of Yaroslav the Wise favoured the church plans of Boleslaw the Bold. Living in exile, Iziaslav was affiliated with Rome and, thus became an intercessor of the Slavonic rite dependent on the pope<sup>82</sup>. That would explain why Gregory approving of the church plans of Boleslaw the Bold in his letter strove, at the same time, to reconcile the both conflicted monarchs regarding them as executors of a common idea. The question of the organisation of the Slavonic ecclesiastical province on the Polish lands during the years 1075-1079 assumed a heavy political character. The note in *Rocznik kapituły krakowskiej*, being an obituary notice states that the deceased Boleslaw the Bold „constituit episcopatus per Poloniam”<sup>83</sup>. The coronation (1076) indicates that Boleslaw was still in close relations with Gregory VII. The German chronicler mentions fifteen bishops taking part in the ceremony<sup>84</sup>. It is possible that the number was exaggerated, but it is hard to accept that there were “only few bishops” in Poland at the

of 1076 as stated by the pope in his letter from 1075. We have to assume that Boleslaw was successful in creating the organisation of church, making use of the presence of papal legates in his country. Owing to the fact that in the early 12<sup>th</sup> century there were only four Latin bishops in Poland subdued to the archbishop of Gniezno, one can suppose that the remaining number of sovereigns during the reign of Boleslaw the Bold encompassed the dignitaries of a Slavonic rite.

In this context the conflict between the king and the bishop of Cracow, Stanislav is differently interpreted by Henryk Paszkiewicz. According to the scholar, the conflict had lasted several years<sup>85</sup> before the bishop died. Bishop Stanislav refused to return the lands that previously belonged to the Slavonic ecclesiastical province of Sandomierz<sup>86</sup> and were taken by ordinaries of Cracow. The assumption is confirmed by the aforementioned letter of Gregory VII, within which the pope claims that the metropolitan capital in Poland is not settled (“episcopi terrae vestrae non habentes certum metropolitanae sedis locum”)<sup>87</sup>. The existence of the Slavonic metropolis, according to Paszkiewicz, is therefore unquestionable and the conflict between the king and the bishop developed in the background of the competition between the two rites and concerned the territorial issues of the bishoprics. As there exist premises for such digressions, yet the lack of sources does not give ground for an explicit recognition of the conflict between bishop Stanislav and the king as the battle for a place of the Slavonic liturgy in the county.

It has to be acknowledged; however, that Boleslaw the Bold was the last of the Piasts who wanted to retain both liturgies. After king's death the people living in the areas of the River Bug and Dniester faithful to their church traditions, wanting to keep Slavic in liturgy, began to incline towards the Ruthenian and Kievan metropolis. The trend had serious consequences, not only of a religious nature.

In this context it is worth taking into consideration the events that took place after the capture of Cracow by Ladislaus II of Hungary in 1086. The son of Boleslaw the Bold, Mieszko returning from the exile died in Cracow and his body was burnt in the presence of bishops<sup>88</sup>. The ritual was characteristic of the Slavonic rite and may constitute a confirmation of the fact that the Methodist religious tradition was retained in Cracow. Władysław Herman's ritual was respectful towards the memory of bishop Stanislav. After Mieszko's death he ordered the relics of St Stanislav to be moved from Skałka to Wawel, which was the beginning of his cult<sup>89</sup>. The canonisation of bishop Stanislav took place in 1253 and martyr's cult was developed by the Polish clergy in the 13<sup>th</sup> century. Władysław Herman unambiguously sympathised with the Latin liturgy and close relations to

Rome. The parishes with the Slavonic liturgy finally ceased to exist during his reign<sup>90</sup>.

The studies of the Old Polish church terms demonstrate a significant influence of the Old-Slavonic language over the Polish Christian terminology<sup>91</sup>. The influence of the Greek tradition is visible in the oldest Polish hymn devoted to Blessed Virgin Mary, called *Bogurodzica*<sup>92</sup>. In the old breviaries of the Polish clergy one could find a prayer to Sts Cyril and Methodius<sup>93</sup>. Churches devoted to St Clement that were the object of a special worship from the "Slavic apostles" were erected in Silesia and Lesser Poland. In the found calendar Wiślicki from the 14<sup>th</sup> century<sup>94</sup> among the saints who were especially worshipped we can find a figure of St Gorazd whom Methodius appointed his successor as the archbishop of Moravia. The cult of St Gorazd could

not come from the Red Ruthenia in the 14<sup>th</sup> century due to the lack of the cult of the named saint in the Ruthenian Church. The cult of St Gorazd is an element of an old tradition reaching the end of the 10<sup>th</sup> century when the Slavonic liturgy existed in the Lesser Poland.

The presented influence of the Methodian rite on the Polish lands had a significant influence in the shaping of the religious tradition in the local Orthodox Church. In the land of the Piasts and Jagiellons the named tradition rooted in the cult of Bulgarian and Greek saints of the Church-Slavonic liturgy, rituals and culture. The awareness of the role of Cyril and Methodius in the introduction of Christianity in Poland shall be especially cultivated in the Eastern Church. The evangelisation of the Great Moravia, Bohemia and Poland shall be attributed to the Slavonic Apostles.

## Przypisy

<sup>1</sup> W. Soboda, *Zywoty, cuda i kult św. Dymitra*, [w:] *Słownik Starożytności Słowiańskiej*, vol. VII, part 1, Wrocław – Warszawa 1982, pp. 294-296.

<sup>2</sup> K. Potkański, *Konstantyn i Metodeusz*, Kraków 1905, pp. 177-208; *Zywoty Konstantyna i Metodego*, Polish translation with the introduction and commentary as well as the supplement of reconstructed Old Church Slavonic texts by T. Lehr-Splawiński, Poznań 1959; J. Klinger, *O istocie prawosławia*, Warszawa 1983, pp. 366, 367; A. Naumow, *Pasterze wiernych Słowian*, Kraków 1985, pp. 8-12; J. Leśny, *Konstanty i Metody, apostolowie Słowian, dzieło i jego losy*, Poznań 1987, pp. 28-38; A. Mironowicz, *Kościół prawosławny w państwie Piastów i Jagiellonów*, Białystok 2003, p. 28-29.

<sup>3</sup> *Zywoty Konstantyna i Metodego*, pp. 106, 107.

<sup>4</sup> Josef Cibulka claims that the request was issued to the Constantinople in 863 and the arrival of Cyril and Methodius to the Moravia was not until the beginning of June 864. J. Cibulka, *Początki chrześcijaństwa na Morawach*, translated by M. Erhardt i C. Piernikarski, Warszawa 1967, p. 148. O sytuacji wyznaniowej i politycznej w Wielkich Morawach cf.: H. Łowmiański, *Początki Polski*, vol. IV, Warszawa 1970, pp. 358-363.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. the so called Italian legend published by P. Megvaert i P. Deves in „*Analecta Bollandiana*”, issue no. 73, 1955, pp. 375-461.

<sup>6</sup> *Zywoty Konstantyna i Metodego*, pp. 84, 85. The clergymen were ordained by the bishop of Ostia Antica, cardinal Gauderich. J. Cibulka, *Początki chrześcijaństwa na Morawach*, p. 165.

<sup>7</sup> *Magnae Moraviae fontes historici*, vol. III, Pragae – Brunae 1969, pp. 167-170; J. Leśny, *Konstanty i Metody*, pp. 58-62.

<sup>8</sup> H. Łowmiański, *Początki Polski*, vol. IV, pp. 477-479; L. E. Havlik, *Morava v 9-10 století*, Praha 1978; G. Labuda, *Kraków biskupi przed rokiem 1000. Przyczynek do dyskusji nad dziejami misji metodiińskiej w Polsce*, „*Studia Historyczne*”, R. XXVII, 1984, z. 3 (106), pp. 378-380; A. Mironowicz, *Kościół prawosławny w państwie Piastów i Jagiellonów*, p. 31.

<sup>9</sup> Prince Kocel' was allied with Frankish rulers. Cf.: F. Dvornik, *Les Slaves, Byzance et Rome au IX<sup>e</sup> siècle*, Paris 1926, pp. 226, 227.

<sup>10</sup> *Magnae Moraviae fontes historici*, vol. III, pp. 197-208; T. Lehr-Splawiński, *Konstantyn i Metody*. Supplemented and foreworded by F. Ślawski, Warszawa 1967, pp. 117-131; H. Łowmiański, *Początki Polski*, vol. IV, pp. 373-375.

<sup>11</sup> *Zywoty Konstantyna i Metodego*, p. 118; O. Narbutt, *Historia i typologia ksiąg liturgicznych bizantyjsko-słowiańskich*, Warszawa 1979, p. 15.

<sup>12</sup> *Magnae Moraviae fontes historici*, vol. III, pp. 217, 218.

<sup>13</sup> J. Cibulka, *Początki chrześcijaństwa na Morawach*, p. 132; A. Mironowicz, *Kościół prawosławny w państwie Piastów i Jagiellonów*, pp. 32-33.

<sup>14</sup> More cf.: J. Leśny, *Konstanty i Metody*, pp. 75-119.

<sup>15</sup> *Kosmasa Kronika Bohemiaów*, vol. I, chapter. 10, translated, introduction and commentaries compiled by M. Wojciechowska, Warszawa 1968, p. 109; H. Łowmiański, *Początki Polski*, vol. IV, pp. 414-419.

<sup>16</sup> J. Leśny, *Konstanty i Metody*, pp. 102-109.

<sup>17</sup> For the presence of the Slavonic rite at the lands, among others were: K. Potkański, *Kraków przed Piastami*, „*Rozprawy Akademii Umiejętności Wydziału Historyczno-Filozoficznego*”, vol. XXXV, Kraków 1898, pp. 161-170; idem, *Lechia – Polanie – Polska. Wybór pism*, Warszawa 1965; J. Widajewicz, *Państwo Wiślan*, Kraków 1947; idem, *Prohor i Prokul, najdawniejsi biskupi krakowscy*, „*Nasza Przeszłość*”, no 4 (1948), pp. 17-32; J. Umiński, *Obrządek słowiański w Polsce IX-XI wieku i zagadnienie drugiej metropolii polskiej w czasach Bolesława Chrobrego*, „*Roczniki Humanistyczne KUL*”, R. IV (1953), z. 4, Lublin 1954; K. Lanckorońska, *Studies on the Roman-Slavonic Rite in Poland*, Rome 1961; H. Łowmiański, *Początki Polski*, vol. IV, pp. 472-515; J. Klinger, *O istocie prawosławia*, Warszawa 1983, pp. 365-421; A. Naumow, *Pasterze wiernych Słowian*, Kraków 1985, pp. 8-12; J. Leśny, *Konstanty i Metody*, pp. 28-38; Z. Dobrzyński, *Obrządek słowiański w dawnej Polsce*, parts 1-3, Warszawa 1989; *Chrześcijaństwo w Polsce*, pod red. J. Kłoczowskiego, Lublin 1992, pp. 23-27; F. Kmietowicz, *Kiedy Kraków był, Trzecim Rzymem*, Białystok 1994; S. Szczur, *Misja cyrylo-metodiana w świecie najnowszych badań*, [w:] *Chrystianizacja Polski południowej. Materiały z sesji naukowej odbytej 29 czerwca 1993 roku*, Kraków 1994, pp. 7-23; H. Paszkiewicz, *Początki Rusi*, Kraków 1996, pp. 417-445; R. Żerelik, *Obrządek słowiański w południowej Polsce*, [w:] *Prawosławie. Światło wiary i zdrój doświadczenia*, pod red. K. Leśniewskiego i J. Leśniewskiej, Lublin 1999, pp. 439-447; M. Bendza, *Chrystianizacja ziem Polski*, [w:] *Kościół prawosławny w dziejach Rzeczypospolitej i krajach sąsiednich*, Białystok 2000, pp. 68-89; A. Mironowicz, *Kościół prawosławny w państwie Piastów i Jagiellonów*, pp. 34-54. A completely different stance on the presence of the Slavonic rite at the Polish lands was presented by: K. Buczek, *Pierwsze biskupstwa polskie*, „*Kwartalnik Historyczny*”, vol. LII, Warszawa 1938; W. Abraham, *Organizacja Kościoła w Polsce do połowy wieku XII*, issue 3, Poznań 1962, pp. 158-161; T. Lehr-Splawiński, *Czy są ślady istnienia liturgii cyrylo-metodiana w dawnej Polsce*, [w:] *Od piętnastu wieków. Szkice z przeszłości i dziejów kultury polskiej*, Warszawa 1961, pp. 43-47; T. Silnicki, *Początki organizacji Kościoła w Polsce za Mieszka I i Bolesława Chrobrego*, [w:] *Początki państwa polskiego. Księga Tysiąclecia*, pod red. K. Tymienieckiego, vol. I, Poznań 1962; J. Dowiat, *Historia Kościoła katolickiego w Polsce do połowy XV w.*, Warszawa 1968; *Historia Kościoła w Polsce*, pod red. B. Kumora i Z. Obertyńskiego, Poznań – Warszawa 1974; W. Korba, *Czy Kraków był metropolią kościelną w połowie XI wieku?*, [w:] *Ars Historica*, Poznań 1976, pp. 321-340; G. Labuda, *Kraków biskupi przed rokiem 1000*, „*Studia Historyczne*”, R. XXVII, 1984, z. 3 (106), pp. 371-412; idem, *Zagadka zanigionej metropolii w Polsce za czasów Bolesława Chrobrego*, [w:]

- tegoż, *Studia nad początkami państwa polskiego*, vol. II, Poznań 1988, pp. 527-548.
- <sup>18</sup> J. Umiński, *Obrządek słowiański w Polsce IX-XI wieku*, pp. 1-44.
- <sup>19</sup> K. Lanckorońska, *Studies on the Roman-Slavonic Rite in Poland*, pp. 18-28; J. Klinger, *O istocie prawosławia*, pp. 374-380; Z. Dobrzański, *Obrządek słowiański...*, part 1, p. 36; H. Paszkiewicz, *Początki Rusi*, pp. 417-445; A. Mironowicz, *Kościół prawosławny w państwie Piastów i Jagiellonów*, pp. 35-36.
- <sup>20</sup> *Monumenta Poloniae Historica* (hereafter: MPH), vol. II, Warszawa 1952, p. 296.
- <sup>21</sup> *Żywoty Konstantyna i Metodego*, p. 113.
- <sup>22</sup> Ibidem, p. 114.
- <sup>23</sup> Ibidem, p. 115; H. Łowmiański, *Początki Polski*, vol. IV, p. 476, 477. Cf. J. Vašica, *Slovanská liturgie sv. Petra, „Byzantinoslavica”*, vol. VIII, 1939-1946, pp. 1-54.
- <sup>24</sup> J. Widajewicz, *Państwo Wiślan*, p. 55; A. Mironowicz, *Kościół prawosławny w państwie Piastów i Jagiellonów*, p. 37.
- <sup>25</sup> T. Wasilewski, *Wiślicka dynastia*, pp. 23-32; H. Łowmiański, *Początki Polski*, vol. IV, pp. 477-493.
- <sup>26</sup> J. Widajewicz, *Państwo Wiślan*, p. 72.
- <sup>27</sup> K. Budzyk, *Szkice i materiały do dziejów literatury staropolskiej*, Warszawa 1955, s. 13-17; Z. Dobrzański, *Obrządek słowiański...*, cz. 1, s. 31-41.
- <sup>28</sup> H. Łowmiański, *Początki Polski*, vol. IV, pp. 513, 514.
- <sup>29</sup> K. Lanckorońska, *Studies on the Roman-Slavonic Rite in Poland*, pp. 46-48; I. J. Kramarkowie, *U źródła archeologii*, Wrocław 1972, pp. 180-184; H. Paszkiewicz, *Początki Rusi*, pp. 425, 426.
- <sup>30</sup> H. Łowmiański, *Początki Polski*, vol. II, pp. 166-171.
- <sup>31</sup> K. Lanckorońska claims that the bishopric of Cracow was established by Gorazd and was the continuation of the Methodian ecclesiastical province, cf.: K. Lanckorońska, *Studies on the Roman-Slavonic Rite in Poland*, pp. 18-20; A. Mironowicz, *Kościół prawosławny w państwie Piastów i Jagiellonów*, p. 39.
- <sup>32</sup> H. Łowmiański, *Początki Polski*, vol. IV, pp. 509, 510.
- <sup>33</sup> *Kronika Thietmara*, translated by M. Jedlicki, Poznań 1953, p. 220.
- <sup>34</sup> Gall Anonim, *Kronika polska*, translated by R. Grodecki, Kraków 1923, p. 69.
- <sup>35</sup> Other arguments in favour of the Christening of Mieszko I in the Slavonic rite were mentioned by: J. Klinger, *O istocie prawosławia*, s. 380-384 i Z. Dobrzański, *Obrządek słowiański...*, part 1, pp. 42-68.
- <sup>36</sup> K. Józefowiczówna, *Z badań nad architekturą przedromańską i romańską w Poznaniu*, Wrocław 1963, pp. 39-42, 56; J. Klinger, *O istocie prawosławia*, pp. 384-386; A. Mironowicz, *Kościół prawosławny w państwie Piastów i Jagiellonów*, p. 40.
- <sup>37</sup> G. Labuda, *Znaczenie prawnopolityczne dokumentu „Dagome iudex”*, „Nasza Przeszłość”, IV, 1948, pp. 36-39; S. Kętrzyński, *W sprawie pierwszych biskupstw polskich*, „Przegląd Historyczny”, R. XXXIX, 1949, p. 57; idem, *Dagome iudex*, „Przegląd Historyczny”, R. XLI, 1950, pp. 150, 151.
- <sup>38</sup> Gallus stipulated that the establishment of both ecclesiastical provinces had been the work of Bolesław Chrobry (the Valiant) who started his reign in 992., H. Paszkiewicz, *Początki Rusi*, pp. 422, 423.
- <sup>39</sup> „Qui [Boleslaus] (...) tam adulta fovit tenerit udine, ut geminam metropolim instituerit, ut debitas suffraganeorum dioceses utrique deputaverit, ipsarumque dioecesum distinctiones certis limitibus insculpsert”, MPH, vol. II, p. 276.
- <sup>40</sup> S. Kętrzyński, *O zaginionej metropolii czasów Bolesława Chrobrego*, „Prace Instytutu Historii Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego”, vol. I, Warszawa 1947, pp. 16, 17, 20; A. Buko, *Początki Sandomierza*, Warszawa 1998, p. 64-68.
- <sup>41</sup> MPH, vol. II, pp. 75, 83.
- <sup>42</sup> W. Semkowicz-Zarembina, *Powstanie i dzieje autografii Annaliów Jana Długosza*, Kraków 1952; J. Klinger, *O istocie prawosławia*, pp. 390, 391; P. Dymel, *Tradycja rękopiśmienna Roczników Jana Długosza*, Warszawa 1992.
- <sup>43</sup> S. Kętrzyński, *O zaginionej metropolii...*, pp. 5-46; A. Mironowicz, *Kościół prawosławny w państwie Piastów i Jagiellonów*, pp. 41-42.
- <sup>44</sup> F. Dvornik, *The Making of Central and Eastern Europe*, London 1949, pp. 198-199; H. Paszkiewicz, *Początki Rusi*, pp. 417, 418.
- <sup>45</sup> *Galli Anonymi Cronica*, ed. C. Maleczyński, [in:] MPH, vol. II, p. 30.
- <sup>46</sup> Tamże, vol. II, p. 276.
- <sup>47</sup> Tamże, vol. II, pp. 294, 296.
- <sup>48</sup> *Slownik staropolskich nazw osobowych*, vol. I, z. 2, Warszawa 1966, p. 239.
- <sup>49</sup> *Katalogi biskupów krakowskich*, compiled by W. Kętrzyński, [w:] MPH, vol. III, Warszawa 1963, pp. 313, 328; J. Widajewicz, *Prohor i Prokul*, najdawniejsi biskupi krakowscy, „Nasza Przeszłość”, R. IV, 1948, pp. 17-32; F. Dvornik, *The Making*, p. 251; K. R. Prokop, *Poczet biskupów krakowskich*, Kraków 1999, pp. 19-22.
- <sup>50</sup> *Kroniki staroruskie*. Selected, and provided the foreword and annotations: F. Sielicki, Warszawa 1987, p. 29.
- <sup>51</sup> MPH, vol. I, p. 90; H. Łowmiański, *Początki Polski*, vol. IV, p. 506.
- <sup>52</sup> MPH, vol. I, pp. 89, 90; J. Klinger, *O istocie prawosławia*, pp. 386-388.
- <sup>53</sup> H. Łowmiański, *The Slavic Rite in Poland and St. Adalbert*, „Acta Poloniae Historica”, vol. XXIV, Warszawa 1971, pp. 5-21; A. Mironowicz, *Kościół prawosławny w państwie Piastów i Jagiellonów*, pp. 43-44.
- <sup>54</sup> MPH, vol. IV, Warszawa 1961, p. 815.
- <sup>55</sup> MPH, vol. II, p. 39.
- <sup>56</sup> B. Paprocki, *Herby rycerstwa polskiego*, wyd. K. Turowski, Kraków 1858, p. 19.
- <sup>57</sup> W. Abraham, *Organizacja Kościoła w Polsce do połowy XII w.*, pp. 110, 113, claimed that the chronicler did not mean the difference in rites but rather in nationalities. Cf.: M. Plezia, *Kronika Gala na tle historiografii XII wieku*, „Rozprawy Polskiej Akademii Umiejętności”, vol. XLVI, Kraków 1947, pp. 154, 155; W. Szcześniak, *Obrządek słowiański w Polsce pierwotnej rozważony w świetle dziejopisarstwa polskiego*, Warszawa 1904; T. Lehr-Sałwiński, *Misja słowiańska św. Metodego a Polska*, „Rocznik Krakowskiego Słowiańskiego”, 1932, pp. 3-12; A. Mironowicz, *Kościół prawosławny w państwie Piastów i Jagiellonów*, p. 46.
- <sup>58</sup> H. Paszkiewicz, *Początki Rusi*, pp. 425, 426.
- <sup>59</sup> A. Szyszko-Bohusz, *Rotunda świętych Feliksa i Adaukta na Wawelu*, „Rocznik Krakowski”, R. XVIII, Kraków 1918, p. 18; V. Mole, *Nowy pogląd na rotundę św. Feliksa i Adaukta*, „Przegląd Historii Sztuki”, R. III, 1932/1933, pp. 23-30; K. Żabokrycka, *Rotunda wawelska w świetle nowych badań i odkryć archeologicznych*, „Studia do dziejów Wawelu”, vol. II, Kraków 1960, pp. 335-400.
- <sup>60</sup> Ibidem, vol. II, pp. 435-440; M. Sokołowski, *Ruiny na Ostrowie jeziora w Lednicy*, Kraków 1976, pp. 103-146.
- <sup>61</sup> J. Hawrot, *Problematyka przedromańskich i romańskich rotund bałkańskich, czeskich i polskich*, „Buletyn Historii Sztuki”, R. XXIV, no. 3-4, Warszawa 1962, pp. 279-280; A. Źaki, *Palatium i rotunda*, „Z otchłani wieków”, R. XXVIII, Poznań 1962, pp. 128-131; A. Kunysz, *Przemysł w starożytności i wczesnym średniowieczu*, [w:] *Przemysł w starożytności i średniowieczu*, pod red. A. Kunysza i F. Perkowskiego, Rzeszów 1966, p. 38.
- <sup>62</sup> Z. Wartolowska, *Osada i grób w Wiślicy w świetle badań wykopaliskowych*, [w:] *Rozprawy Zespołu Badań nad polskim średniowieczem Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego i Politechniki Warszawskiej*, Warszawa 1963, pp. 11, 18, 35.
- <sup>63</sup> J. Zathey, *O kilku przepadłych zabytkach rękopiśmiennych Biblioteki Narodowej w Warszawie*, [w:] *Studia z dziejów kultury polskiej*, Warszawa 1949, pp. 76, 85; F. Z. Weremiej, *Śladem zaginionych ogniw*, Warszawa 1977, p. 120; A. Mironowicz, *Kościół prawosławny w państwie Piastów i Jagiellonów*, p. 47.
- <sup>64</sup> J. Hawrot, *Pierwotny kościół pw. Salvatora w Krakowie*, „Kwartalnik Archeologii i Urbanistyki”, R. I, z. 2, 1956, pp. 157-172.
- <sup>65</sup> W. Szafranowski, *Dzieje Płocka*, Płock 1978, pp. 37-62; idem, *Matka Krzywoustego*, „Notatki Połockie”, no. 2 (123), Płock 1985, pp. 14-21; Z. Dobrzański, *Obrządek słowiański...*, part 3, pp. 402-408.
- <sup>66</sup> MPH, vol. I, pp. 323, 325.
- <sup>67</sup> W. Semkowicz, *Paleografia łacińska*, Warszawa 1951, pp. 103, 104, 134, 157, 301-303.
- <sup>68</sup> *Monumenta Germaniae Historica* (dalej: MGH), vol. XIII, Script. XI, p. 403; H. Paszkiewicz, *Początki Rusi*, p. 421; A. Mironowicz, *Kościół prawosławny w państwie Piastów i Jagiellonów*, p. 48.
- <sup>69</sup> MPH, vol. I, p. 19; J. Klinger, *O istocie prawosławia*, p. 399.
- <sup>70</sup> H. Paszkiewicz, *Początki Rusi*, pp. 429-432; J. Klinger, *O istocie prawosławia*, p. 399; Z. Dobrzański, *Obrządek słowiański...*, part 2, pp. 301-318.
- <sup>71</sup> *Galli Anonymi Cronica*, „Illi vero, qui de manibus hostium evadebant, vel qui suorum sedicionem devitabant, ultra flumen Wysla in Mazoviam fugiebant”, MPH, vol. II, p. 43.
- <sup>72</sup> *Galli Anonymi Cronica*, „Erat enim eo tempore Mazovia Polonis illuec antea fugientibus, ut dictum, in tantum populosa, quod agricolis rura,

animalibus pascua, habitatoribus loca (non satis) erant spaciose”, ibidem, p. 45.

<sup>73</sup> H. Paszkiewicz, *Początki Rusi*, pp. 429-431.

<sup>74</sup> MPH, vol. II, p. 47. The issue has been elaborated on by: J. Bieniak, *Państwo Mieclawa. Studia analityczne*, Warszawa 1963 i B. Krzemieńska, *Bretislav I. Kríže a obnova českého stánu v první polovině 11. staletí (1000-1041)*, Praha 1969; A. Mironowicz, *Kościół prawosławny w państwie Piastów i Jagiellonów*, p. 49.

<sup>75</sup> MPH, vol. III, p. 340.

<sup>76</sup> MPH, vol. II, pp. 52-53.

<sup>77</sup> Ibidem, p. 55.

<sup>78</sup> The letter of pope Paschal II (1099-1118) to archbishop (of Gniezno) mentions sentencing the bishop by the archbishop without the knowledge of the pope. M. Gębarowicz, *Polska, Węgry czy Sycylia odbiorą listu Paschalisa II*, „Kwartalnik Historyczny”, vol. LI, 1937, pp. 513-553, established that the letter relates to Poland and was written to the archbishop of Gniezno. Gębarowicz's view is shared by: K. Maleczyński, *Bolesław III Krzywousty*, Wrocław 1975, p. 191; K. Górski, *O sprawie św. Stanisława, „Nasza Przeszłość”*, vol. IV, 1948, p. 74; H. Paszkiewicz, *Początki Rusi*, pp. 438, 439.

<sup>79</sup> Such interpretation of the conflict between bishop Stanislav and king Bolesław the Bold is shared by: H. Paszkiewicz, *Początki Rusi*, pp. 437-442; J. Klinger, *O istocie prawosławia*, pp. 401-407; Z. Dobrzański, *Obrządek słowiański...*, part 2, pp. 346-368. However, K. Lanckorońska sees the king as a defender of the Slavonic rite, cf.: K. Lanckorońska, *W sprawie sporu między Bolesławem Śmiałyem a św. Stanisławem, „Teki Historyczne”*, vol. LI, 1958, pp. 1-15. The full analysis of the conflict is presented by T. Grudziński, *Bolesław Śmiały – Szczodry i biskup Stanisław. Dzieje konfliktu*, Warszawa 1986; A. Mironowicz, *Kościół prawosławny w państwie Piastów i Jagiellonów*, p. 51.

<sup>80</sup> MPH, vol. I, p. 367; E. Caspar, *Das Register Gregors VII, Epistolae selectae*, II (I), 1920, pp. 233-235.

<sup>81</sup> For the Bohemia's desires to come true would have to be at the expense of the Latin rite. The problem of the Slavic faith in Poland looked quite different. Moreover, Gregory VII needed the help of Bohemia Latin clergy that was largely German, in his battle against emperor Henry IV. Gregory VII led different politics in different countries with regards to the Slavonic rite. G. Hoffmann, *Papst Gregor VII und der christliche Osten*, [in:] *Studi Gregoriani*, I, 1947, p. 179.

<sup>82</sup> A. Ziegler, *Gregor VII und der Kiever Grossfürst Izjaslav*, [w:] *Studi Gregoriani*, I, 1947, pp. 387-411.

<sup>83</sup> MPH, vol. II, p. 918. see.: T. Wojciechowski, *Szkice historyczne jedenastego wieku*, Warszawa 1951, p. 135.

<sup>84</sup> „Dux Polenorum (...) regiam dignitatem regiumque nomen sibi usurpavit, diadema imposuit, atque ipso die natalis Domini a 15 episcopis in

regem est consecratus”, *Lamberti Hersfeldensis Annales*, MGH, Script. V, p. 255.

<sup>85</sup> What Gregory VII had written in the quoted letter to Boleslaw the Bold about the bishops in Poland, whose dioceses were too vast for them to diligently fulfill their duties, must have referred to the bishopric of Cracow in the first place. As the papal letter was written in response to the king's appeal to the Holy See (cf.: T. Wojciechowski, *Szkice historyczne jedenastego wieku*, Warszawa 1951, p. 175), one may assume that the beginnings of the said conflict reach the times before 1075. It is possible that the bishop of Cracow, Lambert (1061-1071) „neglexit pallium petere” under the influence or pressure of the king. On assuming this hypothesis, we can suppose that Boleslaw the Bold was against the excessive development of the bishopric of Cracow at the expense of Polish „Slavonic” lands from the very beginning of his reign. Consequently, he was stepping away from the policy of Casimir the Restorer and Aaron. Longinus states that the controversies regarding the election of the successor of the archbishop of Cracow, Aaron lasted two years after his death. Only after king's pressure Lambert-Sula was appointed at the vacant post (Dlugossius, *Opera*, I, p. 386). According to H. Paszkiewicz, the difficulties related to the nomination of the successor of Aaron, who was appointed during the reign of Casimir the Restorer were connected with the new church policy of Boleslaw the Bold and his efforts to strengthen Church organisation of the Slavonic rite in Poland. That fact especially concerned the bishopric of Cracow. H. Paszkiewicz, *Początki Rusi*, pp. 436, 437.

<sup>86</sup> S. Kętrzyński, *O zaginionej metropolii*, pp. 43-45.

<sup>87</sup> MPH, vol. I, p. 370.

<sup>88</sup> J. Klinger, *O istocie prawosławia*, p. 407; Z. Dobrzański, *Obrządek słowiański...*, part 2, pp. 388, 389; A. Mironowicz, *Kościół prawosławny w państwie Piastów i Jagiellonów*, pp. 52-53.

<sup>89</sup> J. Umiński, *Obrządek słowiański w Polsce IX-XI wieku*, p. 29; J. Klinger, *O istocie prawosławia*, p. 407; Z. Dobrzański, *Obrządek słowiański...*, part 2, pp. 381-398.

<sup>90</sup> Some scholars indicate that after St Stanislav the last bishops of the Slavonic rite in Cracow were Lambert III (1092-1101) and Czesław (1101-1104). Compare.: K. Lanckorońska, *Studies on the Roman-Slavonic Rite in Poland*, p. 80 i n.; J. Klinger, *O istocie prawosławia*, p. 408; Z. Dobrzański, *Obrządek słowiański...*, part 3, pp. 391-416, 476.

<sup>91</sup> E. Klich, *Polska terminologia chrześcijańska*, Warszawa 1927, pp. 146, 147.

<sup>92</sup> J. Birkenmajer, *Wzory greckie „Bogurodzicy”*, „Przegląd Literacki”, vol. XXXI, 1934, pp. 249-266; F. Dvornik, *The Making*, pp. 124, 125.

<sup>93</sup> MPH, vol. I, pp. 88, 89.

<sup>94</sup> J. Zathey, *O kilku przepadłych zabytkach rękopiśmennych...*, pp. 74-86.

Antoni Mironowicz

## Misja metodiana na ziemiach polskich do końca XI wieku

### Streszczenie

Sąsiedztwo ziem polskich z Wielkimi Morawami a później ze schrystanizowaną Rusią i Czechami musiało wpływać na ich oblicze wyznaniowe. Chrystianizacja ziem polskich została rozpoczęta za panowania księcia morawskiego Świętopelka. W historiografii polskiej problematyka ta została obszernie zaprezentowana. Najnowsze publikacje, uwzględniające odkrycia archeologiczne, potwierdzają obecność obrządku słowiańskiego na ziemiach polskich przed i po 966 r. Początki misji metodianej należy wiązać z ekspansją Państwa Wielkomorawskiego na kraj Wiślan. Warunkiem koniecznym do przeprowadzenia takiej misji było poparcie władzy świeckiej. Sprzyjające okoliczności do tej misji nastąpiły po powrocie Metodego na Morawy z więzienia w Szwabii latem 873 r. Świętopelk, pragnąc po wojnie morawsko-niemieckiej osłabić wpływ duchowieństwa niemieckiego, poparł działalność Metodego. Według *Żywota świętego*, „od tego też dnia zaczęła się bardzo rozrastać nauka Boża po wszystkich miastach i poganie [zaczeli] wierzyć w Boga prawdziwego, porzucając

swoje błędy. Tym bardziej też państwo morawskie zaczęło rozszerzać swoje granice na wszystkie strony i wrogów swoich zwyciężać pomyślnie, jak to i oni sami ciągle opowiadają”.

*Żywoł Metodego* został ułożony w porządku chronologicznym, z czego wynika, że wyprawa księcia Świętopelka na Wiślan nastąpiła w 875 r. Według tego źródła, pierwszy w roli zaczepnej wystąpił książę Wiślan, który prześladował chrześcijan. „Był zaś w nim [Metodym] także dar proroczy, tak że spełniało się wiele przepowiedni jego, z których jedną lub dwie opowiemy. Książę pogański, silny bardzo, siedzący na Wiśle, urągał wiele chrześcijanom i krzywdy im wyrządzal. Posławszy zaś do niego, kazał mu powiedzieć: «Dobrze będzie dla ciebie, synu, ochrzczyć się z własnej woli na swojej ziemi, abyś nie był przymusem ochrzczony w niewoli na ziemi cudzej i będziesz mnie wspominał». Tak się też stało”

Relacje historyczne i źródła archeologiczne potwierdzają rozwój obrządku słowiańskiego na terenie Krakowa i południowych ziem polskich w drugiej połowie X w. Biskupstwo krakowskie podlegało jurysdykcji patriarchatu bułgarskiego, a po jego likwidacji w 972 r. zapewne konstantynopolitańskiego. Powstanie hierarchii słowiańskiej nad Wisłą sugeruje istnienie bliskich kontaktów między Krakowem i Bułgarią. Kult św. Michała, pod którego wezwaniem znajdowała się pierwsza krakowska katedra, był szczególnie popularny w Bizancjum i Bułgarii. Kontakty handlowe Małopolski z Bułgarią wzmacniły infiltrację chrześcijaństwa wschodniego na ziemie polskie. Nie wykluczone jednak, że zainteresowanie Krakowem w Bułgarii wynikało z pobytu na ziemiach polskich uczniów Metodego i kontynuacji jego działalności misyjnej przez Gorazda. Gorazd, chociaż sam przebywał na terenie Bułgarii, wspierał działalność duchownych słowiańskich na ziemiach polskich.

Potwierdzeniem istnienia świątyń chrześcijańskich w X i XI ww. są wykopaliska archeologiczne. Ślady kultu słowiańskiego znajdujemy w Ostrowie Lednickim, Krakowie, Wiślicy, Przemyślu i wielu innych miastach. Ośrodkie te nie były pod kontrolą Kościoła łacińskiego i pozostawały pod wpływem cywilizacji bizantyjskiej z liturgią słowiańską i pismem cyrylickim. Jednym z takich przykładów jest kościół Najświętszej Marii Panny (dziś św. Feliksa i Adauktka) na Wawelu w Krakowie, który swym stylem architektonicznym nawiązuje do rotund czeskich, związanych z tradycją cyrylo-metodiańską. Wykopaliska archeologiczne w Ostrowie Lednickim odkryły wielki ośrodek chrześcijański z X w. Odnaleziona kaplica na planie krzyża greckiego posiada dobudowane palatium. Podobną rotundę z okazałym palatium odkryto pod prezbiterium katedry rzymskokatolickiej w Przemyślu i wielu innych miejscowościach.

*Antoni Mironowicz*

## **The Methodian mission on the Polish lands until the dawn of 11<sup>th</sup> century**

### **Summary**

The process of Conversion of the Slavs was commenced with the contact of the Slavic people and the Byzantine culture which was initiated by the mission of Sts. Cyril and Methodius. Apart from the exceptional role of Bulgaria and Great Moravia in the development of the Cyrillo-Methodian legacy the Russian lands became the heir of this great religious and cultural tradition. Before we move on to the problem of the presence of the Methodian rite on the Polish lands it is worth recalling the basic facts of the activity of Sts. Cyril and Methodius in the area of Great Moravia.

The presented influence of the Methodian rite on the Polish lands had a significant influence in the shaping of the religious tradition in the local Orthodox Church. In the land of the Piasts and Jagiellons the named tradition rooted in the cult of Bulgarian and Greek saints of the Church-Slavonic liturgy, rituals and culture. The awareness of the role of Cyril and Methodius in the introduction of Christianity in Poland shall be especially cultivated in the Eastern Church. The evangelization of the Great Moravia, Czech and Poland shall be attributed to the Slavonic Apostles.

Rozmiar artykułu: 2,3 arkusza wydawniczego