

⁹ Ajoutons que très joliment les unités qui composent AB selon un parallélisme (XZ' // XZ) respectent entre elles des chiasmes assez perceptibles (s + v / v + s deux fois de X à X, puis l + v / v + l (en 5d) de 4c à 5d), tandis que les unités qui composent B et B selon un chiasme respectent entre elles des parallèles (v + s // v + s deux fois de X à X, puis v + l (en 5d) de 5d à 6ab).

¹⁰ Comment ne pas penser ici au Cantique de frère Soleil ou des créatures de François d'Assise, où se succèdent dans la louange le frère Soleil (puis sœur Lune et les Etoiles), frère Vent, sœur Eau et notre mère la Terre (après frère Feu) dans un climat de contemplation pour ainsi dire à l'opposé de celui de Qo1 où, si les éléments sont frères en quelque sorte avec l'humanité (son "histoire"), c'est sur un fond de désillusion.

¹¹ Cette correspondance (avec effet d'inclusion) de 4 à 11 nous dissuade de nous écarter de l'interprétation classique de dwr en 1,4 comme nous y invite G.S. Ogden, The interpretation of dwr in Ecclesiastes 1.4, JSOT 34(1986), pp. 91-92, qui veut élargir le sens de dwr et l'entendre des cycles de la nature. Qu'il s'agisse d'ailleurs de cycles dans notre texte n'est pas si clair (voir notamment Lys, pp. 114 et 117, à propos du vent est des fleuves).

¹² Tout comme, en ordre inverse, dwr... wdwr en 4. D'ailleurs cwlm et dwr wdwr constituent une de ces paires de mots stéréotypés relevées par Y. Avishur, Stylistic Studies of Word-Pairs in Biblical and Ancient Semitic Literatures, AOAT 210, Neukirchen 1984 (voir à l'index p. 764). L'ordre habituel est celui donné ci-dessus: cwlm // .dwr wdwr. En 4 Qo casse pour ainsi dire le parallélisme de deux façons, d'abord en inversant l'ordre des termes, puis en opposant ce qui habituellement est de même sens: ici les âges s'en vont et s'en viennent mais la terre se (main)tient. Ainsi les âges peuvent bien sombrer dans le passé ou surgir pour l'avenir, cela ne change rien à la terre: elle est aussi constante, pourrait-on dire, que les événements qui donnent une fausse impression de nouveauté selon 10. Ces oppositions entre les divers emplois de cwlm et de dwr sont d'un type voisin de celles que nous avons relevé dans notre n.7 au sujet des verbes bw' et hlk en 4-7. A propos de bw', Lys trouve paradoxal cet emploi du même verbe en deux sens opposés (p. 110), mais précisément n'est-ce pas dans la manière de Qohélet, et plus précisément encore dans celle de notre passage?

¹³ A. Maillot, Frères, il faut mourir: la contestation, commentaire de l'Ecclesiaste, Lyon 1971, p. 11.

Jadwiga OSSOWSKA

THE POLISH CONTRIBUTION TO THE EXPEDITIONS TO THE HOLY LAND IN THE CRUSADES' ERA

So far, there has been a lack of analytic approach to the question of the participation of Polish society in the expeditions to the Holy Land both in Polish and foreign historiography¹. Thus, there is a necessity of discussing the problem. The cycle of war campaigns, united with a common name of the first Crusade, was like a bolt from the blue for the contemporary societies. The enthusiasm of the so-called first Crusade passed by the countries of East Europe and Poland the more². According to some testimony, Urban II was to summon also Poles, Czechs and Hungarians to participate in that Crusade. As it is known, his general council speech has not been preserved but the Pope's question was included in the reconstruction of the speech: "sed nunquid vos Germani, Saxones, Poloni, Bohemi, Hungari etsi Turcas et Saracenos intra viscera saevire vestra nondum sentitis, quam a vobis distent, vel fretis vel fluminibus ignoratis?"³ As it appears from it, Urban II indicated the threat of even such distant countries by the expansive Islam. I shall explain it later on, that only the appeals of organizers of the so-called second Crusade met a response on the part of East Europe and Poland also. However, it was the internal situation of Poland that was to decide about the character and the scale of Polish participation in those escapades at that time.

During the reign of two kings of Jerusalem kings Baldwin I (1100-1118) and Baldwin II (1118-1131) Crusaders' dominions in the Middle East became firmly established. At the same time some social stabilization within different ethnical elements of the Kingdom of Jerusalem was achieved. Such a state was not to be for long, unfortunately, because after 1127 Crusaders met such a serious enemy like the ruler of Mosul, Imad ad-Din Zangi⁴. He managed to stop the offensive of Franks coming from Europe and, what was more, he even started some aggressive activities. In December 1144 the oldest dominion of Crusaders in the Middle East, Edessa collapsed which, as P.K. Hitti writes - "Because of its proximity to Baghdad and its control of the main routes between Mesopotamia and the Mediterranean, this city

half a century had been the outer rampart of all Latin states in Syria⁵. For Europe, it was a signal that was to mobilize the feudal West to a new effort of a Crusade. Soon, also the Papacy undertook some action of propaganda expressing its approval for the agitation of the founder of the Cistercian Order, Bernard of Clairvaux.

As it is well known, Polish magnates did not take part in the first Crusade, although some pilgrims from Poland came to the oecumenical council to Clermont because Poland was among countries mentioned in the apostolic benedictio of Urban II⁶. Events, taking place on the territory of the Holy Land, did not call forth a response on the part of the country of Piasts. However, this country was considerably weakened as a result of the succession act by Bolesław the Wrymouth. Some investigations of T. Grudziński, recently supported by J. Hauziński's settlements show that as a consequence of mutual Polish-German agreement, concluded in Merseburg on 15 August 1135, the Polish country acknowledged feudal dependance from the Empire⁷. The succession act, establishing Władysław II the Grand Duke of Polish dukes had to reconcile this with the dependance from Germany while, at the same time, the Roman Emperor (German) acted most probably as a guarantor of the establishments of the Wrymouth's last will. Such a state of affairs was not accepted by the dukes who were also against the centralizing policy of the oldest one in the family. In 1142-1146 a serious political crisis started in Poland which ended with the exile of Władysław II and his wife Agnes, a relative to the imperial German line⁸. As it is known, in spring 1146 exiled Władysław appeared at a courtial assembly in Kain, hoping that the German king Conrad III would come to his assistance and guarantee him the position of the Grand Duke, threatened by his half-brothers. In consequence, Conrad III decided on an intervention against Poland in summer 1146. Falling in August, the intervention action did not manage to achieve its aim when stopped at the Polish fortifications. With the coming fall Conrad abandoned overcoming them, obeying advice of Eastern margraves, demanding only the younger of brothers as a hostage and satisfying himself with paying him a considerable ransom of Pomerania. Thanks to these establishments both brothers, and Władysław's II antagonists at the same time, Bolesław the Curly and Mieszko the Old got Conrad's agreement to possess the country. A momentary compromise with the opposition in Poland suited the German ruler who was being drawn to a great overseas expedition by the Papacy. In return for this, Conrad III expected the Apostolic See to recognize the coronation of his juvenile son Henry for the king of Germany, and sought the support of Eugene III in the quarrels with German dukes who were not pleased with his centralizing policy⁹. He also cared for the friendly attitude of Roman Curia about his Polish "brother-in-law" Władysław II, excommunicated by the archbishop of Gniezno, Jakub of Żnin. Having mobilized the French, while making preparations to the second Crusade, Bernard of Clairvaux came to Germany in the

second half of 1146¹⁰. On 27 December 1146, a meeting of the Roman king and the founder of the Cistercian Order took place in Spir. Conrad III took an oath to participate in the Crusade. In mid-May 1147 Conrad, together with his nephew Frederick of Swabia left Regensburg and arrived at Constantinople. In September, he left the capital of Byzantium and crossed to the territories of Asia Minor. Nicaea was the first city he reached up¹¹. From there, conducted by Greek guides, German Crusaders wended their way to Dorylaeum soon however, Conrad's troops were running out of food. Turkish troops appeared in the rear of the Crusaders' army, pressing the enemy hard. In such a situation, on October 26, 1146, the king of Germany ordered a retreat, coming back to Nicaea¹². Connected with the progress of this expedition moments were investigated by a Byzantine author John Kinnamos (Kynnamos), born in 1143. He was a personal secretary (basilicos grammaticos) to the Emperor Manuel I (1143-1180) and he wrote his work soon after the death of the ruler¹³. Due to his function Kinnamos got an access to the most top-secret materials of the Byzantine Imperial Chancellery. With a great ease he could go through confidential daily reports coming to the capital, Constantinople from different sides of the Empire, as well as from lands situated beyond its borders but still being an object of Constantinople autocrats' interests. Kinnamos' relations about the situation in the Empire are the most reliable then. Describing the moment of Conrad's army retreat from the vicinity of Dorylaeum, in October 1147, the Byzantine historiographer relates: "As stated, the Germans had been frequently defeated by the Turks and lost many of their men, once they abandoned passage through Philomilion they hastened back. Coming to Nikosia (Iznik), they met there the French, who were marching on the road and other kings who were bringing with them large forces, one of these ruled the Czechs' nation and had seemingly been appointed king by Conrad, the other that of the Poles who are a Scytic people and dwell beside the Western Hungarians"¹⁴.

M. Mendys, who as the first one in Polish literature paid attention to this report, assumed correctly, that the term "the ruler of Poles" meant a Polish duke because the Byzantine historiographer precisely described the location of "Poland" as a country bordering upon West Hungary¹⁵. It was not a description of Czech country because it was mentioned separately. The term "ruler", "king" gave evidence that a member of a ruling family was meant there. It could be none of Władysław's brothers because, at that time, Mieszko and Bolesław were active in the North of their country, in Pomerania and Prussia, and the youngest one, Henry was still juvenile then. According to Mendys, this duke could be only Władysław the Exile. As the mentioned above evidence states, Władysław II accompanied Conrad III in the fights on territories of Asia Minor, together with the Czech ruler, Władysław as well¹⁶. Also, similarly to the Czech duke, the ruling "Pole" was in the van of

a considerable detachment of knights. It can be assumed that the Polish vassal of the Roman king, just like his Czech counterpart, took part in further overseas ups and downs of Conrad III. We know, that in spring 1148 the last one left Constantinople again and was transferred to Acca aboard Byzantine Ships¹⁷. In Acca, Conrad met the French king, Louis VII with whom he planned details of the expedition against Damascus¹⁸. Baldwin III, the king of Jerusalem and the Templars, most probably bribed by the Muslim party, persuaded him to stop the fights for Damascus, though. After five days they raised the siege and the army of Crusaders, chased by mobile troops of Turkish cavalry, withdrew to Galilee¹⁹. Soon afterwards, Conrad sailed to Constantinople to start the returning journey to Germany in spring 1149. There are not serious obstacles to assume that Władysław II did not desert his German seignior (feudal lord). Undoubtedly, he took part in the fights for Damascus what showed him dissimilar customs and so different in character art of war of the Saracens. It would have been a valuable lesson, especially for a later founder of a separate branch of Silesian Piasts, a growing-up duke Bolesław called the Tall. According to B. Zientar his peregrinations in the suite of Władysław II are very likely²⁰. It is still a matter of future, though, to show the participation of Władysław II in particular stages of Conrad's II expedition in more probable light. The concealment of Władysław's II participation in the second Crusade is also significant. Jan Długosz did not mention the Exile neither and his information about Polish contribution to Crusades ends with the following sentence: "Also some lords and Polish knights, to deserve the promised reward, voluntarily took the cross, went together with the Emperor and were fighting in his army until his return"²¹. The fourth son of Bolesław the Wrymouth, Henry of Sandomierz is the second Polish liege lord that can be connected with expeditions to the Holy Land. A precise or rather sure date of his pilgrimage is not known. Polish annuals state it usually for 1154²². Henry stayed in Palestine for about one year, fighting under the leadership of the king of Jerusalem, Baldwin III and, after that, he came back in glory to his country. Jan Długosz was writing that the only aim and purpose of Henry of Sandomierz was to: "contribute to God's sake"²³. However, it seems certain that a decision about the younger brother's participation in the expedition to the Holy Land was made by his elder brothers who, in this way, wanted to gain the Pope's favour in the conflict with Władysław II and, perhaps on a larger scale, the support for the policy of Poland independent from Germany. It is also assumed quite rightly, that Henry's expedition was to be a counterbalance to the Exile's Crusade. Henry did not take part in the conflict with the seignior of Polish dukes but it can be expected that he was on the side of his own brothers. After his return, the duke of Sandomierz devoted all his wealth for St. John's hospital and building of a monastic church in Zagość on Nida, objects destined for the Knights of St. John of Jerusalem, brought from Palestine²⁴. That endowment was also affirmed

by Casimir the Just. Not being able to afford another overseas expedition, Henry of Sandomierz took part in a big "Crusade" against the Prussians organised by Bolesław the Curly during which he most probably died²⁵. Iaxa of Miechów (died 1176), an offspring of the clan of the Little Poland Gryfs, belonged to the same generation of Polish crusaders as Henry of Sandomierz. According to some tradition, written down in the Great Poland chronicle, Iaxa was to be a Serbian duke. Thus in the former literature he was identified with the West Slav duke, Iaxa so-called from Kopalnica, the duke of the Spraws. However, most probably they were two different persons, though.

Iaxa of Miechów belonged to the most outstanding representatives of the Little Poland lords. Together with another lord of the Little Poland, Świętosław, Iaxa was in the van of a rebel against Bolesław the Curly, in the last period of his reign. Polish annals report that this liege lord set for the Holy Land to fight against the Muslims in 1162²⁶. It is assumed, that he also stayed in Palestine for about a year. Afterwards, he came back to Poland together with one of canons of St. Augustine Rule belonging to the Order of Regular Canons of the Holy Grave²⁷. Having come to the country Iaxa established a number of foundations for the Church. Among others, he founded the monastery of the Order of the Holy Grave in Miechów which he granted with three villages: Miechów, Zagórzycze and Komorów. He also founded a convent of Premonstratensians in Zwierzyniec (a suburb of Cracow today) granting it with several villages. His endowments were affirmed by Polish dukes later on. The territorial disintegration, getting deeper in the second half of XII cent., did not favour organising common performances of Piast dynasts on the international forum. They, and what also seems quite right, their clergy were interested exclusively only in their own matters. Thus, till 1217 there is lack of any mention about anybody's participation in the Crusade action on the territory of the Holy Land. Interests in the fate of overseas Crusades passed to the organization of campaigns against less distant and easier foe, whom were non-Christian nations of the Baltic Sea.

A short while before 1924 K. Maleczyński turned B. Włodarski's attention to a document inserted in The Diplomatic Code of the Arpads bearing a date of 1246, in form of a transumpt of Władysław IV from 1274²⁸. This document, primarily issued by the Hungarian king Bela IV for some "fidei Leustah", a son of some Bohm, was a confirmation of feudal rights of the mentioned to the land of "Turuch"²⁹. It was reminded because some right of one of the offsprings of the said "Leustah" to the feud was questioned. In the original document king Bela IV says among others: "pater noster in Christo, karissimus Andreas [...] cum suis proximis expulerat, dum pro defensione Terre Sancte et Sacri Sepulcri Domini cum ceteris regibus et ducibus christianis, eorum pro Christi cruore affectantes effundere sanguinem, mare transivissent, Bohma filium Gyurk in acie et sub vexillo ducis Polonie, per sua acta virtu-

osa et servitia fidelia navantem, suos progenitores cine eorum excessibus et culpis de regno Hungarie expulsos extitisse, veri more pastoris recognoscenc, velud ovem errantem in Regnum suum reduxisset [...]”³⁰.

For us, the value of this report lies in the mention that during the Crusade of Andrew II, the king of Hungary, a Polish knight "Bohma, a son of Gyurk" covered himself with glory while fighting "under the flag and in the troop of a duke of Poland" (in acie et sub vexillo ducis Polonie). It should be mentioned that before the appearance of B. Włodarski's contribution in 1924 the fact of participation of any Polish duke together with some knights in the Hungarian king's expedition had not been known³¹. In 1213 Innocent III gave a signal for a new Crusade and the oecumenical council of Lateran (1215) stated its beginning for 1217. By force of the council resolutions a tax was imposed on the Pope and the cardinals (1/10th of their income) and on the clergy (1/20th of their annual income)³². That Crusade, generally known as the fifth one, was realized already after the death of Innocent III (died on July 16, 1216), at the time of his successor, Honorius III (1216-1227). French, Italian and Frisian knighthood under the leadership of the king of Hungary, Andrew II and the prince of Austria, Leopold VI took part in it³³. Andrew II, who is more interesting to us here, got engaged in the Crusade because of his second marriage with sister of Henry of Flanders, Latin Emperor of Byzantium³⁴. Setting out for such a distant and expansive expedition the king of Hungary hoped that, when coming back from Palestine, he would ascend the Constantinopolitan throne, as after Henry's death, the throne was vacant. The Hungarian king's army, which the said "dux Polonie" accompanied, reached Spalato (Split) in Dalmatia in August 1217 and joined the troops of the prince of Austria that had arrived a bit earlier³⁵. The Crusaders reached Palestine but did not bring about any serious influence to change the situation. Some of them, coming from the Hungarian knighthood, under the leadership of the titular king of Jerusalem, John de Brienne and the Pope's legate, Pelagius attacked Egypt already in 1217 and, after a long siege, captured Damietta, the key-position in the delta of the Nile. However, this success was overpaid with an unlucky expedition to Cairo during which the Crusaders, surrounded by the Muslims, avoided an ultimate defeat for the price of returning Damietta and withdrawing from Egypt. The Hungarian king contented himself with the arrival at Acca and a short stay in Palestine. At the beginning of 1218, in spite of insistences of the cardinal-legate Pelagius of Albano, he wended his way home, to Europe³⁶. He was coming back by land through Antioch, Bithynia, Nicaea and territories of the Latin Empire. On the way, he started new family relations engaging his eldest son Bela with a daughter of the Nicæan Emperor, and his second son Andrew with a daughter of the Armenian king³⁷.

Having crossed the Bulgarian border he was stopped by the tsar Ivan Asen II, who in 1218 mounted the Bulgarian throne after defeating and blinding of his prede-

Bugenhafen and Kantzow, some tradition of him was preserved that he participated in an expedition to Palestine during which he died⁴⁵. What is true, his person does appear in a document from the last months of 1219, but already in the diploma of the next year Ingarda, Casimir's II wife is related to as a widow⁴⁶.

B. Włodarski quite rightly expressed his doubts that the news about her husband's death in Palestine could not have reached Pomerania in a few months. What is more, he noticed that Ingarda did not mention her husband's death during any Crusade in any documents⁴⁷. M. Kulecki's doubt is even more important when he points out that the Hungarian document would not have described Casimir of Szczecin as a Polish duke⁴⁸.

It should be considered then, who of Polish dukes would have sojourned in Hungary in 1217. Despite the fact, that already in 1921 R. Grodecki questioned Odonic's exile to Hungary in 1218 alluding to an uncertain chronology of events on the Polish political scene, the evidence of the Annal of Gniezno supports such an epilogue of the conflict between Władysław Odonic and his opponents in Poland⁴⁹.

As B. Kürbisówna indicates, this source, covering up a period of 1192-1247 and being cortical in character, is linked up with subsequent dukes ruling in the Great Poland, that is with Mieszko the Old and Władysław Odonic (interesting to us here), Przemysław I and Bolesław⁵⁰. Included in the Annal of Gniezno chapter information about dukes of the Great Poland is of a great importance then, so the mention of 1217, that Władysław Odonic "fugavit in Ungarian"⁵¹ cannot be shaken. The same news, repeated in the Chronicle of the Great Poland in the context of events of 1217 limited to a phrase: "his uncle, having gathered the army, drew the fleeing one from the city of Calisia, all the way down to Hungary"⁵² undergoes the following reconstruction in Annalium of Długosz: "Władysław Piwacz (the Spitting), not trusting his uncle and fearing that he would throw him into dungeon, flees from the Calisia castle at night, and together with only seven camerades makes his way to Cracow, to Leszek the White. Having come to the Hungarian king, Andrew he explained the reasons of his roaming and met with a kind reception and support on his part"⁵³.

And really, Władysław Spindleshanks managed to draw out Odonic from the Great Poland. As Rev. J. Umiński proved the protective bulla of Honorius III of Feb. 9, 1217 was to take care of his dominions against some possible aggressors at the time of his absence in the country⁵⁴. Where did he turn to then? Most probably, unlike Długosz wants, not to Leszek the White dwelling in the Wawel castle, whom he approached much later, but for sure, he made his way to Hungary, through the dominions of Casimir, the duke of Oświęcim and Racibórz who was at war terms with both Henry the Bearded and Władysław Spindleshanks at that time. This points of the assumed hypothesis brings two possibilities: either both cousins set out to survive the Crusade adventure together or Odonic, equipped by the duke of Opole, went down

cessor Boril. The Bulgarian tsar forced the Hungarian king to give him his daughter for a wife then³⁸. The princes was to get Belgrade and Branicz regions as a dowry, which lands previously had belonged to Bulgaria but had been conquered by the Hungarians later on. The Latin Empire was especially interested in coming this marriage into life because at that time it was itself threatened by the ruler of Epirus, a descendant of the Greek dynasty that had ruled in Byzantium some time ago³⁹.

These details are so important because the duchess of Opole Viola, the wife of Casimir, the duke of Opole and Racibórz came from the Balkan circle⁴⁰.

In the scientific literature, four candidates were chosen out of contemporary Polish dukes who might be the anonym mentioned in the Arpads' diploma, that is Władysław Odonic, Henry the Pious, Casimir of Opole and Casimir of Szczecin. Władysław Odonic, a son of the duke Odon (Otto) and a grandson of Mieszko the Old, had a long-lasting quarrel with Henry the Bearded about Calisia, although previously, it was just the Bearded who had helped Odonic to regain his patrimony. In later years a quarrel started between them that even came on for a trial to the Roman Curia. During the course of canonical proceedings some fights started between Odonic and his uncle from the Great Poland, Władysław Spindleshanks. They interrupted the investigations. At the beginning of 1217, Spindleshanks forced out Władysław Odonic from Calisia and negotiated some treaty with Henry the Bearded, which was affirmed by the Pope on May 9, 1218⁴¹. There is little to say about the second candidate Casimir, the duke of Opole and Racibórz, the elder son of Mieszko the Stumbling. Gaps in diplomatic material and records are not a useful indication in his case. Still, some document exists in which there is a mention about Casimir's deputation to Leszek the White in 1217. The castellan of Oświęcim, Falisław appears as an envoy here. W. Dziewulski suggests that Falisław's mission to Cracow might have had some connection with a Crusade⁴². Nevertheless, the most important trace is, as K. Jasiński wants, the fact that within years 1212-1220 Casimir married a Bulgarian princess, Viola⁴³. W. Dziewulski suspects that the agreement on that marriage took place during Andrew's II return journey from the Crusade when the Hungarian king was stopped by the tsar Ivan Asen II in the Bulgarian country⁴⁴.

The third of the dukes, that can be considered here, is Henry the Pious, a son of Henry the Bearded. His mother was St. Jadwiga (Hedwig), the own sister of the Hungarian queen Gertrude, the first wife of Andrew II. Some warm relationships existed between the court of Wrocław and the Hungarian court. In 1217 Henry was 26 so he was mature enough to set out for such a risky escapade. He was also wealthy enough. However, in the light of diplomatic material his person cannot be taken into consideration so much.

The fourth and the last potential Crusader of Andrew's II expedition might be the duke of Szczecin, Casimir II. Until the times of two Pomeranian chroniclers

alone obligating himself to support the ruler of Opole in future and to bring Casimir an attractive bride from the expedition as well. The second one of these eventualities seems more probable. Casimir could fear some lust of conquering his dominions on the part of his uncle Henry the Bearded during Casimir's absence from Wrocław. Furthermore, the Hungarian record explorers the term "dux Poloniae" which Casimir never used satisfying himself with a modest title of "the duke of Opole" (dux de Opel)⁵⁵. So as to me, the duke of the Great Poland, Władysław Odonic would be the companion of Andrew's II Crusade. His, somehow accidental, participation in the Crusade adventure of the Hungarian king remained anonymous to non-Polish sources. Whereas, the appearance of the Bulgarian princess Viola on the Polish political scene was a permanent reminiscence of that Crusade.

Some attention should be paid to two, contemporary to the fifth Crusade crusaders-would-be, that is the archbishop of Gniezno, Henry Kietlicz and the duke of Cracow and Sandomierz, Leszek the White, son of Casimir the Just.

Thanks to the discovery of the list of bishops participating in the Fourth Oecumenical Council of Lateran in November 1215, made by Achilles Luchaire in a canton library in Zurich, the mentions of Polish sources about delegates from Poland, together with Henry Kietlicz (died on March 22, 1219) as a leader, taking part in the council were confirmed⁵⁶. Leading the Polish Church from 1198, Kietlicz distinguished himself as a constant realizer of reforms in the Roman Catholic Church and a devoted executor of Innocent's III instructions. As a result of temporary steps on the part of the archbishop of Gniezno "the greatest among medieval popes Emperor" (L. Ranke)⁵⁷, addressed several dozen letters to Polish dioceses that were to judge controversial problems of political nature and regulate the matter of religious life. Henry Kietlicz stayed in Rome twice: for the first time, for a few months on the turn of 1206, and for the second time during the oecumenical council in 1215. Rev. J. Umiński pointed out already the close relationships among Henry Kietlicz and some Roman cardinals, like for example the cardinal-presbyter Santa Maria Maggiore, Cencio Savelli, as the Pope - Honorius III (1216-1217)⁵⁸. Going through the diplomatic material of church circles we learn about Kietlicz's Crusade obligations. A monographer of Gniezno metropolitans, Rev. J. Korytkowski writes about it like that: "A venerable shepherd, out of personal reverence and earnest participation in the fate of the Holy Land, on his own account, having gathered a tropp of pious knights, intended to make his way to Palestine as a leader of them. He would have reached his aim without fail if his poor health and sad events in Mazowia (a ravaging raid of Jaćwieżans and Prussians as far as Płock) had not stopped him"⁵⁹.

It is hard to say when and where the archbishop of Gniezno took a Crusade vow. It could have already happened during the general oecumenical council in Rome, although quite probably also in Poland, in the archsee of Gniezno. From some later

Honorius' III letter, releasing the archbishop and other Polish volunteers from the vow to pilgrimize to the Holy Land, it results that some group of Polish Crusaders joined the Crusade promises of the metropolitan of Gniezno. The intended expedition was not realized because of hoary Kietlicz's bad health and destructive invasion of the Jaćwieżans and Prussians in Mazovia. As it was already mentioned, Kietlicz obtained a release from the taken vow in exchange for taking part in an expedition against pagans of the North. The Pope promised all participants of fights against Northern pagans parallel favours and privileges to those which belonged to Crusaders fighting in the Holy Land⁶⁰. In this way, the programme of holy war in defence of the Cross – the Crusade broadened to pagan nations of the Baltic Sea, what created a dangerous precedent for later Crusade action of the Teutonic Order⁶¹.

It may be, that Leszek the White took the Crusade vow together with the metropolitan of Gniezno. But most certainly the duke of Cracow and princeps of Polish dukes did that under the pressure of the imperious metropolitan of Gniezno. When insisted by Honorius III, who made the matter of Crusades the main aim of his pontificate, Leszek explained that he could not fulfill the given promise because he had to defend Polish borders threatened by the pagans; he was also lacking in suitable people with whom he could set out for such a distant expedition. He also confessed, which is an accent of some not-hidden irony, that he was used to drink beer and honey and such drinks were out of question in the Holy Land⁶². On his part he suggested to organize a Crusade against pagans of the Baltic Sea and promised to pay a definite sum of money for the purposes of the war in the Holy Land⁶³. Being a man of quiet nature Honorius III treated those explanations seriously and in his bulla of April 17, 1221 he dispensed Leszek the White⁶⁴. It is worth to quote the basic text of the Papal document here: "Having heard once, that our beloved son, a noble man L(eszko), the duke of Poland, solemnly took an oath that he would sail to help the Holy Land or set out with reinforcements for freshly converted Prussians, because he was postponing the fulfillment of his oath, we reprimanded him with our letter with paternal love, worried about his salvation and we sent him a rebuke through others to fulfill truly what he had already promised."

While not long ago, we were informed as a sure thing that yonder duke, heavy with the corpulence of his body, could sail to support the Holy Land with great difficulties only or hardly at all, especially when having changed habit into nature, neither wine nor plain water can he drink, having got used to drink only beer or honey, or should he even arrive, he could not lead the way for a squad of warriors from such far-away lands and, because of different inconveniences, he would be able to spend the time fruitfully there – but being a neighbour of Prussians, he can easily override the land with numerous knighthood, not only to defend the newly converted but, with the grace of the Lord, also to convert other pagans with his labour and

devotion. In order to attain this – as I am informed – he intends to found a new city in the middle of their land and to make a market of salt and iron there, of which they are in severe need, so that coming there to satisfy the need, they will easier listen to and more efficiently hear out the words of the (eternal) life from the mouths of preachers, and will be getting used to other habits of the faithful in this way. Whereas we, called out from two sides, when one land or another needs the promptest help, knowing neither the exterior appearance of this duke nor conditions for the success of this intention in the said land, with all our trust, turn to you, who by reason of neighbourhood can more easily examine this, to act in our name. So, recommending you with this apostolic brief, we persistently lay claim on you to consider scrupulously prospects for a success of the intention of this kind and to order the mentioned duke one of two things, what will suit his salvation and the advantage of the Christian belief better, according to our opinion"⁶⁵.

With this, all traces connecting Polish dukes with the Papal programme of Crusades to the Holy Land end up. In Polish lands the tendency that started already in 1147 with the participation of some Polish magnates in the Crusade of Saxon counts against the Polabian Slavs became predominant⁶⁶. Afterwards, this tendency, aimed at the pagan nations of the Baltic Sea and approved by the Papacy, was a permanent element of Polish Crusade ideology. It cannot be said yet, that Polish feudal circles totally lost enthusiasm for distant, oversea Crusades after 1217. And still, in 1232 the voivode of Cracow, Pakosław makes his way to the Holy Land on his own account together with a troop of men in arms. He wins glory there, fighting against the believers of Islam⁶⁷.

Pilgrimizing to the Holy Land in 1346 Wojciech of Pakość, the voivode of Brześć and Kujawy was dreaming about fights against "the Saracens" for sure when, as the great Romanian historian N. Iorga showed⁶⁸, he came close to the arden propagator of an oversea Crusade in XIV cent., the chancellor of the Kingdom of Cyprus, Filip de Meziers.

The fellowship of Polish Crusaders belonging to the magnate circle and fighting in the Holy Land is small. It consists of such persons like: Władysław II the Exile, Henry of Sandomierz, Iaxa of Miechów, Władysław Odonic, perhaps also Casimir I of Opole and Racibórz, the voivode Pakosław. Including the Gryf Casimir II of Szczecin among them will not enrich the list much. Most of these figures participated in the Crusading adventure quite accidentally and, for sure, without any special enthusiasm. This was the result of internal political relationships of contemporary Poland, undergoing the culminating point of its provincial division. Early, already in the second part of XII cent., Polish feudal environment begins to avoid the participation in the expeditions to the Holy Land, replacing it with engaging itself in fights against the Baltic Sea pagans. Still one cannot make little the account of those relationships

which the contemporary political and religious ideology created between Polish feudal circle and a programme of some broader understood Crusade. As medieval written testimonies contain little mention about the direct participation of Polish knights in the Crusades to the Holy Land, which I pointed out above, the more decidedly they say about their general interest in the Crusading ideology. This interest will find expression especially in the great number of foundations for the orders of knighthood, including the Teutonic Order also. The dissemination of Crusading elements of the Catholic Cult is connected with it as well. However, I leave these plots to be subjects of separate studies.

Notes

¹ Generally on this matter see R. Grodecki, Polska wobec idei wypraw krzyżowych, Przegląd Współczesny II, n° 3, 1923, pp. 103-116; J.S. Bystroń, Polacy w Ziemi Świętej, Syrii i Egipcie 1147-1914, Kraków 1930; S.A. Korwin, Stosunki Polski z Ziemią Świętą, Warszawa 1958; M. Kulecki, Polacy wśród krzyżowców w XII i XIII w., Mówią Wieki XXI, n° 1, 1977.

² J. Hauziński, The Papal propaganda of the Crusade and the earliest feudal monarchies in Central Europe (the article is prepared to collective work of the Polish historians).

³ Urbani II oratio in Concilio Claromontano habita, Patrologia Latina CLI, Parisiis 1860, col. 580.

⁴ H.A.R. Gibb, Zengi and the Fall of Edessa [in:] A History of the Crusades, Editor-in-Chief Kenneth M. Setton, I: The First Hundred Years, Philadelphia 1955, pp. 449-462.

⁵ P.K. Hitti, History of the Arabs. From the Earliest Times to the Present, (Seventh ed.), London 1960, p. 644.

⁶ Cf. n. 3; a reconstruction of the Pope's speech see D.C. Munro, The Speech of Pope Urban II at Clermont, The American Historical Review XI, 1905-1906, pp. 231-242.

⁷ T. Grudziński, O akcie sukcesyjnym z czasów Bolesława Krzywoustego, Czasopismo Prawno-Historyczne XXIV, part 1, 1972, pp. 46-59; cf. J. Hauziński, Polska a Królestwo Niemieckie w II połowie XII wieku [in:] Niemcy - Polska w średniowieczu, ed. by J. Strzelczyk, Poznań 1986, pp. 137-155.

⁸ Cf. G. Labuda, Zabiegi o utrzymanie jedności państwa polskiego w latach 1138-1146, Kwartalnik Historyczny LXVI, 1959, pp. 1147-1168.

⁹ Cf. B. Töpfer, E. Engel, Vom staufischen Imperium zum Hausmacht-königtum. Deutsche Geschichte vom Wormser Konkordat 1122 bis zur Doppelwahl von 1314, Weimar 1976, p. 39.

¹⁰ See collective French biography of St. Bernard - Bernard de Clairvaux, Paris 1952, pp. 604-605; cf. B. Töpfer, E. Engel, I.cit.

¹¹ On his crusading expedition cf. R. Grousset, Histoire des croisades et du royaume franc de Jerusalem, II: Monarchie franque et monarchie musulmane, Paris 1935, pp. 232-234; cf. S. Runciman, A History of the Crusades, II: The Kingdom of Jerusalem and the Frankish East 1100-1187, London 1952, p. 267; V.G. Berry, The Second Crusade [in:] A History of the Crusades, I, p. 484.

¹² R. Grousset, op.cit., pp. 235-236; S. Runciman, op.cit., p. 268; V.G. Berry, I.cit.

¹³ On his person and work cf. Ch.M. Brand, Introduction to: Deeds of John and Manuel Comnenus by John Kinnamos. Translated by Charles M. Brand, Columb. UP, New York 1976.

¹⁴ Original text see: Johannis Cinnari Epitome rerum ab Joanne et Manuele Comnenis gestarum, Corpus Historiae Byzantinae XXI, Berolini 1884, I.II.18, p. 84; English translation p. 70.

¹⁵ M. Mendys, Udział Władysława II w krucjacie r. 1147, Rocznik Zakładu Narodowego im. Ossolińskich, vols. 1-2, Lwów 1928 (y. 1927), p. 425.

¹⁶ Cf. W. v. Giesebrecht, Geschichte der deutschen Kaiserzeit, IV: Staufer und Welfen, Braunschweig 1877, p. 257.

¹⁷ R. Grousset, op.cit., II, p. 250; S. Runciman, op.cit. II, p. 279.

¹⁸ William of Tyre, Historia rerum in partibus transmarinis gestarum, L.XVII, vol. I [in:] Recueil des Historiens des Croisades. Historiens Occidentaux, Paris 1844, pp. 758-759; he gives a list of the ecclesiastical and secular magnates present, but not mentioned of the Czech's and Poland's dukes.

¹⁹ William of Tyre, op.cit. I. XVII, 2-5, pp. 760-767; see reconstruction of the factors by modern historian S. Runciman, op.cit., pp. 281-285.

²⁰ B. Zientara, Bolesław Wysoki - tułacz, repatriant, malkontent. Przyczynek do dziejów politycznych Polski XII wieku, Przegląd Historyczny LXII, part 3, 1971, p. 371.

²¹ Ioannis Dlugossii Annales seu Cronicae incliti Regni Poloniae, Liber V et VI: "Ex baronibus insuper et militaribus Polonie aliqui voluntarii cruce assumpta premium propositum merituri, secuti imperatorem transfretarunt et in suo exercitu, donec rediret, militando versati sunt", pp. 41-42.

²² Ibidem, p. 43, but the Emperor's crusading travel through Poland not crossed over, that is suggests some of the Polish medieval sources (analogically see: Rocznik kapitulny krakowski, Sędziwoja, krakowski (abreviat.), lubiński, Krasieńskich sub anno 1147 [in:] Monumenta Poloniae Historica, ed. by A. Bielowski, II, Lwów 1872, pp. 775, 798, 833, 875; sub annum 1150, 1160 [in:] Monumenta Poloniae Historica, III, Lwów 1878, pp. 69, 155 (further been not. as MPH).

²³ Ioannis Dlugossii Annales, I.cit.

²⁴ Cf. Z. Kozłowska-Budkowa, Repertorium polskich dokumentów doby piastowskiej, Kraków 1937, n° 62 and n° 78.

²⁵ Cf. Polish Annals: Kapitulny krakowski, MPH, II, p. 798 (sub a.1167); Traski i Krakowski, ibidem, p. 834; Sędziwoja, ibidem, p. 875; Katalogi biskupów krakowskich, MPH, III, p. 352 (XVIII Oct. 1166).

²⁶ Cf. A. Wędzki's article Jaksa tzw. z Miechowa [in:] Słownik Starożytności Słowiańskich, II, Wrocław-Warszawa-Kraków 1965, pp. 309-310.

- 27 Rocznik Miechowski, MPH, II, p. 882: "Iaxa ivit Ierosolimam et 1163 fratres dominici sepulchri venerunt Mechovia cum uno canonico misso a Monacho patriarcha".
- 28 Cf. B. Włodarski, O udziale Polski w wyprawie krzyżowej Andrzeja II w 1217 roku, Kwartalnik Historyczny XXXVIII, 1924, p. 29, and n. 1.
- 29 Ibidem, pp. 29-36.
- 30 Codex Diplomaticus Arpadianus, ed. G. Wenzel, VII, Budae 1864, n° 136, p. 207 (Monumenta Hungariae Historica. Pars I. Diplomataria t. XII).
- 31 This opinion is accompanied by silence in R. Grodecki's work, Polska wobec idei wypraw krzyżowych, see n. 1.
- 32 Cf. C.J. Hefele, Conciliengeschichte, V. Freiburg i./Breisgau 1863, p. 805.
- 33 R. Grousset, op.cit., III, p. 200 (a short note); S. Runciman, op.cit., III, pp. 146-149; T.C. Van Cleve, The Fifth crusade [in:] A History of the Crusades, II: The Later Crusades 1189-1311, Philadelphia 1962, pp. 386-389.
- 34 Cf. A. Dančeva-Vasilieva, Bałgaria i Latinska imperija (1204-1261), Sofia 1985, p. 106, pp. 111-113.
- 35 T.C. Van Cleve, op.cit., p. 388.
- 36 S. Runciman, op.cit. III, p. 149; cf. T.C. Van Cleve, op.cit., p. 393.
- 37 B. Hóman, Geschichte des ungarischen Mittelalters, II, Berlin 1943, pp. 19-20.
- 38 A. Dančeva-Vasilieva, op.cit., pp. 112-113; cf. Istorija na Bałgarija, III: Vtora Bałgarska daržava, Sofia 1982, p. 163; on the familiar relations of the Asenian dynasty see I. Božilov, Familiata na Asenevci (1186-1460). Genealogija i prosopografija, Sofia 1985, p. 78.
- 39 Cf. A. Dančeva-Vasilieva, op.cit., pp. 115-117.
- 40 W. Dziewulski, Bułgarka księżna opolska, Śląski Kwartalnik Historyczny. Sobótka XXIV, n° 2, 1969, pp. 159-183; cf. discussion with Dziewulski's opinion by W. Swoboda, Księżna kaliska Bułgarka? Przyczynek do rozbioru krytycznego Annalium Długosza, Studia i Materiały do dziejów Wielkopolski i Pomorza XIII, n° 2, 1980 (y. 1979), pp. 61-78.
- 41 Codex Diplomaticus nec non epistolaris Silesiae. Edidit Carolus Maleczyński, Tomus III: Annos 1221-1227 comprehendens, Wrocław 1964, n° 260, pp. 18-20.
- 42 W. Dziewulski, op.cit., p. 167.
- 43 Cf. K. Jasiński, Rodowód Piastów śląskich, III: Piastowie opolscy, cieszyńscy i oświęcimscy, Wrocław 1977, p. 18.
- 44 W. Dziewulski, op.cit., p. 168.
- 45 Cf. R. Röhricht, Beiträge zur Geschichte der Kreuzzüge, II, Berlin 1878, p. 373.
- 46 Pommersches Urkundenbuch, I, Stettin 1868, n° 193 and n° 197.
- 47 B. Włodarski, op.cit., p. 36, what is contradictory to Pomeranian sources: Iste Casimirus secundus, visitans sanctum Domini, quod Hierosolimis est sepulcrum, ibidem difunctus, I, Greifswald 1843-1862, n° 294.

- 48 M. Kulecki, Polacy wśród krzyżowców w XII i XIII w., Mówią Wieki XX, 1977, n° 1, p. 8.
- 49 Cf. Monumenta Poloniae Historica. Series Nova (further: MPH NS), Tomus IV. Annales Poloniae Maioris, Warszawa 1962, p. 3: "Item anno Domini Millesimo CCXVII Wladislaus obtinuit Kalis et filium Odonis fugavit in Ungariam"; contr. to it see R. Grodecki, Kwartalnik Historyczny XXXV, 1921, pp. 15-17.
- 50 Brigida Kūrbisówna, Dziejopisarstwo wielkopolskie XIII i XIV wieku, Warszawa 1959, pp. 61-62.
- 51 See supra n° 49.
- 52 Chronica Poloniae Maioris, recensuit et annotavit Brigitta Kūrbis, Warszawa 1970, p. 80: "Wladislaus patruus suus congregato exercitu ipsum de castro Kalisz fugientem usque in Hungariam profugavit".
- 53 Ioannis Długossii Annales... Liber V et VI, p. 221: "Wladislaus vero Piwacz de favore patris diffusus carceribus se deputandum pertimescens squaloribus, cum septem tantummodo comitibus nocturno tempore ex castro Kalischiensi dilapsus versus Cracoviam ad Lestkonem Album contendit et ad Andream Hungarie regem perveniens causis itineris expositis, humane amiceque ab illo exceptus, fatus et habitus est".
- 54 Cf. J. Umiński, Henryk arcybiskup gnieźnieński zwany Ketliczem (1199-1219), Lublin 1929, pp. 203-204; the Papal's Document see Codex Diplomaticus Maioris Poloniae, I, Poznań 1877, n° 91.
- 55 Cf. Codex Diplomaticus nec non epistolaris Silesiae, II (1205-1220). Ediderunt C. Maleczyński et A. Skowrońska, Wrocław 1959, for example n° 181, III, for example n° 250, 269, 302, 308.
- 56 S. Kętrzyński, Wiadomość o udziale Polski w IV Łataneńskim Soborze, Przegląd Historyczny III, 1906, p. 141.
- 57 Cf. B. Kumor, Historia Kościoła w Polsce, edited by B. Kumor and Z. Obertyński, I, part 1 (to 1506), Poznań-Warszawa 1974, pp. 115-118.
- 58 Cf. J. Umiński, op.cit., pp. 24-25.
- 59 J. Korytkowski, Arcybiskupi gnieźnieńscy, prymasowie i metropolici polscy od roku 1000 aż do roku 1821, I, Poznań 1888, p. 335.
- 60 Codex Diplomaticus Maioris Poloniae, I, n° 102.
- 61 Cf. H. Łowmiański, Anfänge und politische Rolle der Ritterorden an der Ostsee im 13. und 14. Jahrhundert [in:] Der Deutschordensstaat Preussen in der polnischen Geschichtsschreibung der Gegenwart, edited by U. Arnold and M. Biskup, Marburg 1982, pp. 36-85.
- 62 For it indicates the followings Pope's words: "Nuper autem nobis est pro certo relatum, quod idem dux corporis gravedine gravis vix aut numquam posset in terre sancte subsidium transfretare presertim cum ex accidenti verso in naturam nec vinum nec simplicem aquam bibere valeat, consuetus potare tantum cerevisiam vel medonem", Codex Diplomaticus Silesiae, n° 260, p. 19, (editor: C. Maleczyński).
- 63 Ibidem, "vir L(estco) dux Polonie sollempniter voverat se transfretaturum in subsidium terre sancte vel profecturum in auxilium Prutenorum noviter conversorum".
- 64 Ibidem, pp. 18-20 (full text).
- 65 Also in A. Theiner, Monumenta Poloniae Vaticana, I, Romae 1862, n° 26.

⁶⁶ Cf. K. Myśliński, Sprawa udziału Polski w niemieckiej wyprawie na Słowian Połabskich [in:] Ars Historica. Prace z dziejów powszechnych i Polski, Poznań 1976, pp. 357-376.

⁶⁷ Kodeks Dyplomatyczny Małopolski, II: 1153-1333, ed. F. Piekosiński, Kraków 1886, n° 404, p. 50.

⁶⁸ Cf. N. Jorga, Philippe de Mézières (1327-1405) et la croisade au XIV^e siècle, Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des Hautes Etudes CX, Paris 1896, p. 76; cf. J. Hauziński, Polska w "Le Songe du vieil pelerin" Filipa de Mézières, Roczniki Historyczne XXXIX, 1973, pp. 105-119.

Bibliographie

Krzysztof PILARCZYK

PUBLICATIONS OF BELLARMINO BAGATTI. SUPPLEMENT

Bellarmino Bagatti (born 11 XI 1905) is the prominent contemporary Palestinologist. His works in the field of the archaeology, the history of art and the biblical sciences concern Palestine from the beginning of our era, the monuments of culture connected with the genesis and the history of the Christianity. We connect his name with the archaeological investigations led in Jerusalem (at the basilica of the Holy Sepulchre, at the church "Dominus Fleuit", on the Mount of Olives), Bethlehem, Emmaus - Qubeibeh, Ain Karem and indubitably the most important - led under his direction by Studium Biblicum Franciscanum - in Nazareth. He contributed to the discovering of the remnants of the material culture of Palestine. The results of his works show the new aspects of the history of the Christianity, first of all its connections with the Judaism and are deeply connected with the history of the dogmas (the christology, the mariology and the ecclesiology).

Most of his works Bagatti published in the journals founded in the time of his activity in Jerusalem, at the Custody of the Holy Land. This were: *Studii Biblici Franciscani Liber Annuus* (1949-) and in two series of publications *Studium Biblicum Franciscanum - Collectio Maior* (1941-) and *Collectio Minor* (1961-).

The first proof of preparing the bibliography of Bagatti's works was undertaken by dr. A. Storme, who published the results of that in *Studia Hierosolymitana*: in onore del P. Bellarmino Bagatti (1. Studi Archeologici. Jerusalem 1976. *Studium Biblicum Franciscanum: collectio maior*; n. 22) for the 70 jubilee of B. Bagatti. The Bibliography contains the register of B. Bagatti's publications from 1929 to 1975.

Collecting this bibliography I used Storme's work, which I supplemented completing that of Storme, with the data from period 1975-1985. It was possible thanks to my quest made in the library of Studium Biblicum Franciscanum in Jerusalem.

The abbreviations, except one - LA SBF (= Liber Annuus Studium Biblicum Franciscanum), I took from the annuals *Elenchus Bibliographicus Biblicus* (Rome).