

Marcin Rafał Pauk

**MONETA EPISCOPALIS
EPISCOPAL COINAGE IN POLAND AND BOHEMIA
AND ITS GERMAN CONTEXT***

I

The minting activity of Polish bishops through to the end of the thirteenth century was the subject of a professional study of Stanisław Suchodolski years ago.¹ From that time the state of knowledge on the topic has not undergone any fundamental changes, although new publications or reinterpretations of earlier known numismatic artifacts should be noted. For this reason the resumption of this issue, and in addition, by a historian not dealing with numismatics as a main research direction, requires justification. This is a consequence of the conviction that this phenomenon should be analysed with regard to the relationship between secular and ecclesiastical authority in the early states of Central Europe, and above all with regard to the comparative background supplied by the broadly developed eleventh- and twelfth-century minting activity of German bishops. Simply put, I link episcopal and monastic minting closely to the functioning of the structures of the imperial Church, subordinate to royal authority and fulfilling essential administrative and political functions in the structures of the German Reich. Its organisation on the areas east of the Elbe and Oder Rivers had to have been a more or less complete appropriation of Ottonian-Salian patterns. It is necessary then to also seek analogies and models for ways of remunerating Church institutions, immunity and regalia in the Reich between the tenth and twelfth century.²

* This article was published in Polish in *Przegląd Historyczny*, ci, 4 (2010), 539–71.

¹ Stanisław Suchodolski, *Moneta możnowładcza i kościelna w Polsce wczesnośredniowiecznej* (Wrocław, 1987).

² A programme for research regarding this issue in Central Europe has been outlined in an earlier study: Marcin R. Pauk and Ewa Wólkiewicz, “Ministri enim

This context as well as attempts to relate to the realities of Western Europe was markedly lacking in earlier works. In the book cited above, Stanisław Suchodolski directly stated that coinage practices in the German Reich were completely different from Polish practices and consciously avoided their treatment in his analysis of non-monarchical coinage in the Piast state.³ It seems that in the context of the current knowledge on the topic of the appropriation of politico-legal solutions and ideological concepts from the Reich this approach no longer seems sufficient.⁴ It was influenced above all by a fundamental – and largely justified – critique of the opinions of Marian Gumowski, who, referring to the analogy of episcopal minting in the Reich tried to prove that Polish bishops were similarly active in this area as early as the eleventh century. He thus interpreted the finding of a large number of so-called cross-deniers as the results of domestic coinage production of the Church hierarchs.⁵ In his polemic with Gumowski, Ryszard Kiersnowski underscored foremost the fundamental differences in the relations between Church and monarchical authority in the Reich and early Piast Poland. He claimed that the German Church dignitaries in the Ottonian period possessed significantly greater independence; ‘they were never a compliant instrument in the hand of secular rulers as the Bohemian or Polish clergy had been to the mid-eleventh century, and could not be eliminated from their share of the coinage income’.⁶ Coinage activity of German bishops was thus supposed to be exclusively the result of the decentralisation of power in the Ottonian Reich, atypical of the supposedly far more centralised Piast monarchy. Knowledge of the functioning of the structures of

altaris ministri curie facti sunt”. Ottońsko-salicki “system” Kościoła Rzeszy i jego oddziaływanie w Europie Środkowej XI–XII wieku’, in Józef Dobosz (ed.), *Kościół w monarchiach Przemysławów i Piastów* (Poznań, 2009), 105–38; on the topic of the concept of *Reichskirchensystem* see Timothy Reuter, ‘The “Imperial Church System” of the Ottonian and Salian Rulers: A Reconsideration’, *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 33 (1982), 347–74.

³ Suchodolski, *Moneta możnowładcza*, 108–9.

⁴ See esp. Sławomir Gawlas, *O kształt zjednoczonego Królestwa. Niemieckie władztwo terytorialne a geneza społeczno-ustrojowej odrębności Polski* (Warsaw, 1996).

⁵ Marian Gumowski, *Corpus nummorum Poloniae* (Cracow, 1939), tab. IX–XXIX; *idem*, ‘Prawo mennicze biskupów polskich w wiekach średnich’, *Ateneum Kapłańskie*, 17–18 (1926), 1–9.

⁶ Ryszard Kiersnowski, *Pieniądz kruszcowy w Polsce wczesnośredniowiecznej* (Warsaw, 1960), 242–3.

the *Reichskirche* in the tenth and eleventh centuries – established not only in more recent works, but already at least from the time of publication of the monograph of Leo Santifaller⁷ – permits the assessment that Kiersnowski's argumentation (abstracting here from a fair assessment of numismatic material) was based on false historical assumptions. Without returning to Gumowski's opinions it is worth making a second attempt to set the relatively meager material and written evidence regarding the coinage activity of Polish and Bohemian bishops in the context of episcopal coinage in the Reich.⁸ Yet it is necessary to reckon with the possibility of fundamental differences, as well as substantial delays and modifications undergone by the institutions and political systems known in the German Reich in the region of 'Younger Europe'.

II

We derive knowledge of episcopal coinage in the Reich from both numismatic as well as written sources, i.e., the considerable number of royal privileges. Neither of these sources, however, offers a complete picture of minting activity of the Church between the tenth and twelfth centuries, as these sources rarely complement each other. A certain share of imperial privileges has most evidently remained on parchment alone, as we do not possess any material traces of the existence of episcopal minting in the form of coins. A classic example of this is the Saxon bishopric of Verden, the minting privilege of which was granted by Otto I and confirmed by successive rulers, while no material proof of the realisation of these powers are known.⁹ This

⁷ See fn. 19 below; Stefan Weinfurter wrote extensively about the Liudolfings' pursuit of centralisation in *idem*, 'Die Zentralisierung der Herrschaftsgewalt im Reich durch Kaiser Heinrich II', *Historisches Jahrbuch*, 106 (1986), 241–97.

⁸ The comparative background of episcopal mintage in Moravia, albeit unusually laconic, has been characterised by Suchodolski, *Moneta możnowładcza*, 109–10.

⁹ See Bernd Kluge, *Deutsche Münzgeschichte von den späten Karolingerzeit bis zum Ende der Salier (ca. 900 bis 1125)* (Sigmaringen, 1991), 68; e.g., the Halberstadt bishopric as early as the pontificate of Bishop Hildeward received two royal privileges for the minting of coins in Seligenstadt (974) and Halberstadt (989), whereas the oldest episcopal coins date back to the period of the rule of Arnulf, the successor to Hildeward, cf. Bernd Kluge, 'Die Anfänge der Münzprägung in Halberstadt', *Nordharzer Jahrbuch*, 14 (1989), 17–28.

case highlights one of the main methodological problems – the lack of representativity of numismatic artifacts. While researching written sources it is necessary to bear in mind the existence of a substantial number of forged charters. Quite numerous minting privileges from the Ottonian and Salian era most probably came out of the scriptorium in Stavelot during the abbacy of Wibald in the second quarter-century of the twelfth century.¹⁰ And conversely, we can also come upon the following situation: the minting activity of the bishop can be confirmed by numerous types of coins, while we do not possess a written confirmation of his minting authorisation. The bishopric of Hildesheim during the pontificate of Bernward (993–1022) provides an example of this; those coins were struck in two mints – in Hildesheim and Mundburg;¹¹ but the oldest privilege confirming bishop minting authority comes from the times of Henry IV.¹² This problem also applies to such an important episcopal see and active minting centre as Cologne. The issue is additionally complicated by ambiguous terminology: e.g., *donatio/concessio monetae* does not always indicate the power to issue currency independently, but just the granting of minting income and local supervision over the circulation of royal currency belonging to the competency of counts.¹³

While the dynamic development of episcopal minting in the Reich came in the Stauffian era, during which the process of development of

¹⁰ These include, i.a., all granting of the power of coinage to the Bavarian bishops from the turn of the eleventh century, cf. Wolfgang Hahn, 'Numismatisch-rechtshistorische Betrachtungen zur Geschichte der bayerischen Bischöfe, insbesondere derer von Regensburg', *Berliner Numismatische Forschungen*, 5 (1991), 13–22; most broadly on the diplomatics of Wibald of Stavelot in Hans C. Faußner, 'Zu den Fälschungen Wibalds von Stablo aus rechtshistorischen Sicht', in *Fälschungen im Mittelalter*, iii: *Diplomatische Fälschungen* (i) (MGH Schriften, 33/3, Hanover, 1988), 143–200. This issue requires further research, I believe.

¹¹ Bernd Kluge, 'HILDENESHEM und MVNDBVRUC. Bischof Bernward als Münzherr', in Michael Brandt and Arne Eggebrecht (eds.), *Bernward von Hildesheim und das Zeitalter der Ottonen. Katalog der Ausstellung* (Hildesheim and Mainz, 1993), 323–35.

¹² *Heinrici IV diplomata*, ed. Dietrich v. Gladiss and Alfred Gawlik, MGH, *Diplomata regum et imperatorum Germaniae*, iv, 2 (Weimar, 1952), no. 218.

¹³ Norbert Kamp, 'Probleme des Münzrechts und Münzprägung in salischer Zeit', in Bernhard Diestelkamp (ed.), *Beiträge zum hochmittelalterlichen Städtewesen* (Städteforschung, Series A: Darstellungen, 11, Cologne and Vienna, 1982), 104–6; Norbert Kamp, *Moneta regis. Königliche Münzstätten und königliche Münzpolitik in der Stauferzeit* (MGH Schriften, 55, Hanover, 2006), 1–16.

ecclesiastical territorial lordships began to flourish, the transfer of the power of coinage has come to be regarded as one of the distinguishing elements of the imperial Church 'system' in the Reich as early as the Ottonian and Salian times. It is worth bringing up the opinion of Berndt Kluge, who underscored that the phenomenon of interest was rooted far back in the Liudolfing period, reached its greatest dynamism under the rule of the Salian dynasty, but only came into full bloom under the Hohenstaufens.¹⁴ The twelfth century, therefore, was an era of unquestioned domination of ecclesiastical coinage across the entire Empire.¹⁵

Authorisation to mint coins belonged to the privileges often granted to Church institutions – bishoprics and royal monasteries – as early as the late Carolingian era.¹⁶ Fourteen such privileges are known from the period between the rule of Louis the Pious (814) and the death of the last Carolingian ruler of East Francia (911); ten of them were granted to bishoprics.¹⁷ The era of Otto I was groundbreaking for German minting activity overall; it also brought a decisive change in the area of minting privileges,¹⁸ the height of which came during the rule of his grandson, Otto III. A large number of new benefices

¹⁴ Kluge, *Deutsche Münzgeschichte*, 68: 'Was in ottonischer Zeit seine Wurzel und in staufischer Zeit seinen Höhepunkt hat, erlebt in salischer Zeit seine erste Blüte: die Herrschaft der Bischöfe im deutschen Münzwesen'; *ibidem* (68–76) synthetical discussion of ecclesiastical minting in Germany; see also Bernd Kluge, 'Umriss der deutschen Münzgeschichte in ottonischer und salischer Zeit', in *idem* (ed.), *Fernhandel und Geldwirtschaft. Beiträge zum deutschen Münzwesen in sächsischer und salischer Zeit. Ergebnisse des Dannenberg – Kolloquiums 1990* (Sigmaringen, 1993), 1–16.

¹⁵ For a general characterisation of the monetary system in the Reich of the Hohenstaufens see Erich Nau, 'Münzen und Geld in der Stauferzeit', in Reiner Hausscherr (ed.), *Die Zeit der Staufer. Geschichte – Kunst – Kultur*, 5 vols (Stuttgart, 1977–9), iii, 87–102; Kamp, *Moneta regis*, 16–87.

¹⁶ Peter Volz, 'Königliche Münzhoheit und Münzprivilegien im Karolingischen Reich und die Entwicklung in der sächsischen und fränkischen Zeit', *Jahrbuch für Numismatik*, 21 (1971), 157–86.

¹⁷ Sebastian Steinbach, *Das Geld der Nonnen und Mönche. Münzrecht, Münzprägung und Geldumlauf der ostfränkisch-deutschen Klöster in ottonisch-salischer Zeit (ca. 911–1125)* (Berlin, 2007), 33.

¹⁸ Bend Kluge, 'OTTO REX / OTTO IMP. Zur Bestandsaufnahme der ottonischen Münzprägung', in Bernd Schneidmüller and Stefan Weinfurter (eds.), *Ottomische Neuanfänge. Symposium zur Ausstellung "Otto der Grosse, Magdeburg und Europa"* (Mainz, 2001), 85–112.

or their confirmations were maintained during the reign of all of his successors through to Henry IV. In sum, the Liudolfings drew up 83 charters granting or affirming the authorisation of the power of coinage for their ecclesiastical recipients.¹⁹ During this period these concessions were specific to the eastern region of the former Carolingian Empire.²⁰

The degree of fragmentation of coinage production and the German Church's share in it is illustrated by the number of approx. 85 mints, distinguished on the basis of coins from the Salian period (1024–1125) in the possession of Church institutions. The Swabian bishoprics held the longest traditions of minting their own coins – at times, as in the case of Strasbourg, reaching back to the pre-Ottonian period. The first issuer of episcopal coins in Augsburg was Bishop Ulrich (923–73), a close associate of Otto I. The share of other hierarchs in minting activity (Dietrich of Metz [965–84], Willigis of Mainz [975–1013], or the already mentioned Bernward of Hildesheim) can be explained by their personal and political proximity to rulers of the day.²¹ Archbishop Bruno (953–65), the brother of Emperor Otto I serving as the duke of Lotharingia at the same time coined deniers with his own name in Cologne. This minting activity remained as just an episode, however, and it is deemed that it was related rather to his title of duke, as it was not until the period between 1027 and 1036 when Archbishop Pilgrim resumed the archbishopric's own coinage issue in Cologne.²² During the rule of Henry IV all bishops

¹⁹ A listing of bishopric minting privileges together with other economic and judicial authorisations (markets, customs, hunting *regale*, lordships) has been correlated in Leo Santifaller, *Zur Geschichte des ottonisch-salischen Reichskirchen-systems* (2nd edn Vienna, 1964), 97–105; Steinbach, *Das Geld der Nonnen*, 34–8, with an itemisation of documents for monasteries; for a syncretical work on this topic also see Thomas Vogtherr, *Die Reichsabteien der Benediktiner und das Königtum im hohen Mittelalter (900–1125)* (Stuttgart, 2000), 143–51.

²⁰ On the dissimilarities of the West Frankish realities in this area see Reinhold Kaiser, 'Münzprivilegien und bischöfliche Münzprägung in Frankreich, Deutschland und Burgund im 9. – 12. Jahrhundert', *Vierteljahrschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte*, 63 (1976), 289–338; also see *idem*, *Bischofsherrschaft zwischen Königtum und Fürstenmacht. Studien zur bischöflichen Stadtherrschaft im westfränkisch-französischen Reich im frühen und hohen Mittelalter* (Pariser Historische Studien, 17, Bonn, 1981), 99–112.

²¹ Kluge, 'OTTO REX / OTTO IMP', 96.

²² Manfred van Rey, *Einführung in die rheinische Münzgeschichte des Mittelalters* (Mönchengladbach, 1983), 88–9.

in the Reich without exception possessed the powers of coinage in the diocesan capital or in one of their market places within the bishopric boundaries. Related to this phenomenon was the gradual assumption of minting supremacy, the first stage of which was adding the initials or name of the bishop issuer on royal coins; the next stage being the appearance of the hierarch's very own likeness or that of the holy patron of the bishop's cathedral (e.g., St Stephen in Halberstadt, St Kilian in Würzburg) next to the ruler's likeness and name. One can speak here of a characteristic coinage condominium of the king and bishop, which, according to the opinion of a share of researchers, had already taken place several decades earlier but is difficult to identify due to the fact of the coinage of royal coins in ecclesiastic mints.²³ This process usually ended in the complete elimination of any external evidence of royal minting authority, which took place in most cases during the second half of the eleventh century. Transformations in the iconography of coins and the content of their legends occurred to a greater extent during the rule of Conrad II. During this time coins of Archbishop Poppo of Trier appeared (about 1027), i.a., next to the aforementioned deniers of Archbishop Pilgrim of Cologne, and signs of royal minting authority ultimately disappeared there after 1060. In Cologne the same process occurred at a significant moment – after 1062 during the pontificate of Anno II, an archbishop of great political aspirations, who seized the protectorate of juvenile Henry IV by force during this time. In Mainz as well as Erfurt (which also belonged to the archbishop of Mainz), cities which had been locations for both royal and ecclesiastical minting activity since the times of Henry II, the royal name remained on the archbishopric coin for a relatively long period, until about 1080.²⁴

The elimination of signs of royal supremacy was rarely a one-way process, determined unequivocally. It is worth following this process, for instance in the case of the well-identified Würzburg coins. The activity of the royal mint at that time is attested for as early as the rule of the last East Frankish Carolingians; the royal name and

²³ Kenneth Jonsson, 'Coin Circulation in Viking-Age Germany', in Stanisław Suchodolski (ed.), *Money Circulation in Antiquity, the Middle Ages and Modern Times: Time, Range, Intensity* (Warsaw and Cracow, 2007), 118–23.

²⁴ Christian Stoess, 'Münzrecht von König und Erzbischof in Mainz während der späten sächsischen und frühen salischen Kaiserzeit (975–1030)', in Kluge (ed.), *Fernhandel und Geldwirtschaft*, 111–18.

the name of the locality could be seen on coins. During the rule of Otto II this last was replaced by the name of the patron saint of the Würzburg cathedral, St Kilian, and during the reign of Otto III the effigy of the saint also appeared on the coin. Circa 1000 the ruler's name disappeared from the coin for the first time, only to suddenly but briefly reappear under the rule of Henry II. During the years 1020–40 iconography and legends related to monarchs underwent a repeat elimination on behalf of St Kilian and the name of the town and subsequently – for the first time – the monogram of Bishop Bruno (1034–40). The return of the royal name during the rule of Henry IV again proved to be short-lived, after which the episcopal iconography and legends decidedly became prevalent: during the pontificate of Erlung (1106–21) both the hierarch's name and effigy were visible on the coins.²⁵ The question must remain open as to what degree the elimination of signs of secular power and consolidation of the minting supremacy of bishops during the Salian period was due to the intentional policy of strengthening the structure of the Church in the Reich by Conrad II, and then the weakness of royal authority in the regency period after the death of Henry III and conflict of Henry IV with the pope and the Saxon opposition.

The genesis of the coinage prerogatives and character of minting activity of German Church institutions is an exceedingly complicated issue and exhibits a fair degree of regional differentiation. In Bavaria, enjoying a significant degree of political autonomy in the tenth century, traditionally classified among the regions of weak influence of royal authority, episcopal coinage powers were broader from the beginning of the eleventh century, with the diminution of ducal prerogatives.²⁶ It is no accident, it is claimed, that the issues of following bishops: of Eichstätt and Salzburg (ca. 1009), Freising (ca. 1018), Ratisbon (ca. 1047) and Passau (from ca. 1061) were related to political maelstroms, royal interference and changes in the ducal throne of Bavaria.²⁷

²⁵ Hans-Jörg Kellner, 'Die frühmittelalterliche Münzprägung in Würzburg. Beiträge zur Münzkunde Würzburgs I', *Jahrbuch für Numismatik und Geldgeschichte*, 24 (1974), 109–70.

²⁶ On the policy of limiting the prerogatives of dukes in Bavaria and Swabia by Henry II by promoting bishoprics see Weinfurter, 'Die Zentralisierung der Herrschaftsgewalt', 269–79.

²⁷ Kluge, *Deutsche Münzgeschichte*, 75–6; Hahn, 'Numismatisch-rechtshistorische Betrachtungen', 13–14.

The most characteristic in this context is the case of Ratisbon, where the oldest coins of Bishop Gebhard III (1036–60) from ca. 1047 were an unmistakable continuation of the coins of the deceased Duke Henry VII. The relatively late activity of all Bavarian hierarchs in this regard resulted from the fact of the maintenance of ducal supremacy. A break in the ducal coin issues can be observed between 1047 and 1111, when the Ratisbon mint was under the exclusive responsibility of the bishops.²⁸

Numismatic sources sometimes point to the lack of continuity of coin production – longer breaks could exist between one hierarch's issue and the next; sometimes these were one-time emissions. The minting activity of two Halberstadt bishops from the eleventh century, Brantho and Burchard I, whose pontificates date from 1023 to 1059, may serve here as an example. During the single decade between 1035/6 and 1045/6, four issues of their deniers are known.²⁹ We also register divergences in the organisation of actual production and the range of minting authorisations in individual centres. Numismatic sources – especially in the southern area of the Empire – point to the production of episcopal coins along with royal ones in the same mints, while in Saxony and Lotharingia the functioning of separate mint workshops was already a fact in the second half of the eleventh century.³⁰

The withdrawal from the centralising minting policy of the Carolingians, which can be observed during the second half of the tenth and eleventh centuries, was mainly caused by a change in the economic reality. It is precisely through economic change, and not political factors, that Norbert Kamp explains the sudden growth in the number of mints between the Rhine and Elbe Rivers between 950 and 1050.³¹ The not so numerous economic sources – foremost peasant duty registers – note the continuous growth in the significance of money rent in the economies of German monasteries during the tenth and eleventh centuries. Despite the fact that the lion's share

²⁸ Kluge, *Deutsche Münzgeschichte*, 65; Wolfgang Hahn, 'Das Herzogtum Bayern in der Münzpolitik der salischen Könige', in Kluge (ed.), *Fernhandel und Geldwirtschaft*, 73–84.

²⁹ Bernd Kluge, 'Die Halberstädter Münzprägung unter den Bischöfen Brantho (1023–1036) und Burchard I (1036–1059). Eine stempelkritische Untersuchung', *Berliner Numismatische Forschungen*, 3 (1989), 13–27.

³⁰ *Idem*, 'Umriss', 7.

³¹ Kamp, *Moneta regis*, 4–6.

of German minting production of the day – about 95 per cent of the known artifacts – come from hoards found in the Baltic belt as broadly understood, in Russia and Poland, and thus had come to be a subject of trade, the German mints in the period of interest to us operated primarily on a local scale. The chronology of hoarding of treasures discovered within the borders of the Reich reflects the steady increase in the circulation rate of money and monetary production within the two-century period between 925 and 1125. A feature indicating the function of local regions of coin circulation is the relatively small differentiation of hoards, markedly dominated by coins struck in mints not so distant from the place of their deposition.³²

Nearly all charters of German rulers with monetary conferrals unambiguously indicate the organic relationship between minting rights and the institution of market and customs houses.³³ These donations are linked almost without exception to the conferral of public jurisdiction to bishops and abbots for markets in concrete centres of settlement together with customs revenue. Markets, coins and customs duties, as well as occasional immunity, appear usually as a complex of royal powers, now delegated to the ruling hierarch in a central place in their diocese or other economically important settlement within the bishopric bounds. They form an inseparable whole to such a degree – as they already had in the oldest charters from the Carolingian period – that when Church institutions did not come into possession of coinage powers, in contrast to market and customs

³² Wolfgang Hess, 'Pfennigwährungen und Geldumlauf im Reichsgebiet zur Zeit der Ottonen und Salier', in Kluge (ed.), *Fernhandel und Geldwirtschaft*, 17–36; *idem*, 'Bemerkungen zum Innerdeutschen Geldumlauf im 10., 11. und 12. Jahrhundert', in Kenneth Jonsson and Brita Malmer (eds.), *Sigtuna Papers: Proceedings of the Sigtuna Symposium on Viking-Age Coinage 1–4 June 1989* (Commentationes de Nummis Saeculorum IX–XI in Suecia Repertis, n.s., 6, Stockholm, 1990), 113–20; K. Jonsson, 'Coin Circulation', 109–24.

³³ On the relationship between monetary circulation and the organisation of markets in the Reich, see Wolfgang Hess, 'Zoll, Markt und Münze im 11. Jahrhundert. Der älteste Koblenzer Zolltarif im Lichte der numismatischen Quellen', in Helmut Beumann (ed.), *Historische Forschungen für Walter Schlesinger* (Cologne and Vienna, 1974), 171–93; more broadly on the topic of the supply of customs revenues to the bishopric see Reinhold Kaiser, '*Teloneum episcopi*. Du tonlieu royal au tonlieu épiscopal dans le civitates de la Gaule (VIe – XIIe siècle)', in Werner Paravicini and Karl Ferdinand Werner (eds.), *Histoire comparée de l'administration (IVe – XVIIIe siècles)* (Beihefte der Francia, 9, Munich, 1980), 470–85.

income, this was explicitly noted in the diploma.³⁴ This last fact seems to contradict the occasional opinion that it was exclusively an issue of diplomatic pertinence formula, which often did not have a basis in reality. The authorisations listed above also accompanied the conferral of entire counties, which had become a common practice since the late Liudolfing times.³⁵ The context of the occurrence of coinage powers points unequivocally to the economic aims of these donations. Furthermore, it was strongly associated with the development of early town settlements, and also with the expansion of bishops' supremacy over their residential centres through the intermediary of those delegated with economic and jurisdictional authority by the ruler.³⁶

The legal bases for delegating imperial minting rights came to be a subject of theoretical considerations on a broader scale only in the era of the imperial struggle with the papacy and the Investiture Controversy. The author of the anonymous treaty *De investitura episcoporum* written ca. 1109, possibly in the Liège circle (but also ascribed to Sigebert of Gembloux), counted the conferral of *moneta* together with the customs duty and jurisdiction to *iura civitatum*, delegated (along with other components of the diocesan remuneration) to the bishops by the king. Due to this provision, the ruler was to be entitled to the right to investiture.³⁷ In the Concordat of Worms we find

³⁴ As a case in point, see two permissions for the foundation of markets and collection of customs revenues *excepta moneta*, granted in 1004 by Henry II to the monasteries in Sulzburg and Andlau: *Heinrici II diplomata*, ed. Harry Bresslau and Hermann Bloch (MGH, *Diplomata regum et imperatorum Germaniae*, 3, Hanover, 1890–93) (hereafter: MGH DH II), nos 78 and 79; see Steinbach, *Das Geld der Nonnen*, 38; Kaiser, 'Münzprivilegien', 321–4.

³⁵ Most extensively on this topic, Hartmut Hoffmann, 'Grafschaften in Bischofs-hand', *Deutsches Archiv*, 46 (1990), 375–480.

³⁶ On the role of royal privileges in the development of town settlements in the case of Hildesheim, see Stefan Petersen, 'Stadtenstehung im Schatten der Kirche. Bischof und Stadt in Hildesheim bis zum Beginn des 13. Jahrhunderts', in Uwe Grieme, Natalie Kruppa and Stefan Pätzold (eds.), *Bischof und Bürger. Herrschaftsbeziehungen in den Kathedralstädten des Hoch- und Spätmittelalters* (Veröffentlichungen des Max-Planck-Instituts für Geschichte, 206, Studien zur Germania Sacra, 26, Göttingen, 2004), 143–5.

³⁷ Jutta Krimm-Beumann, 'Der Traktat "De investitura episcoporum" von 1109', *Deutsches Archiv*, 33 (1977), 78–9: 'Postquam autem a Silvestro per christianos reges et imperatores dotata et exaltate sunt ecclesie in fundis et aliis mobilibus, et iura civitatum in theloneis, monetis, villicis et scabinis, comitatibus, advocatiis, synodalibus bannis per reges delegata sunt episcopis, congruum fuit et consequens,

the already unequivocally feudal legal interpretation of this material. In the twelfth century German hierarchs sometimes directed their own coinage policy on the pattern of territorial lords. An example here may be the activity of the Magdeburg archbishop Wichmann (1152–92), known foremost for his colonial initiatives, a bishop who introduced the mandatory coin exchange on his territorial lordship twice per year.³⁸ German minting in the eleventh and twelfth centuries could be deemed as a sensitive barometer not only of deep economic transformations, but also for social and political phenomena, chiefly rivalry for power in conditions of advancing territorialisation of political structures in the Empire. Minting coins independently came to be one of the most salient signs of the functioning of territorial lordship.

III

The fact of the influence of German conceptual and organisational models on the structure of the Polish and Czech Church in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, just as the close personal connections between the two institutions raise no doubts among researchers, although numerous specific issues have not yet been the subject of separate research. Beyond the question of the influence of the imperial Church in the Reich on the form of relations between religious and secular authority east of the Elbe, the scope and form of the influence of the model of construction of episcopal territorial lordship on Central Europe in the following period also seems to be a meaningful subject of study. This phenomenon appeared in the German Reich in full together with the progressive decentralising of authority in the

ut rex, qui est unus in populo et caput populi, investiat et intronizet episcopum et contra irruptionem hostium sciat, cui civitatem suam credat, cum ius suum in domum illorum transtulerit'; in contrast to earlier opinions, the author ascribed authorship to Sigebert of Gembloux (older edition: 'Tractatus de investitura episcoporum', ed. Ernst Bernheim, in MGH, *Libelli de lite imperatorum et pontificum XI. et XII. conscripti*, ii [Hanover, 1893], 502); see also Johannes Fried, 'Der Regalienbegriff im 11. und 12. Jahrhundert', *Deutsches Archiv*, 29 (1973), 466 f.

³⁸ Mathias Puhle, 'Zur Münzpolitik Erzbischof Wichmanns', in *idem* (ed.), *Erzbischof Wichmann (1152–1192) und Magdeburg im hohen Mittelalter. Stadt – Erzbistum – Reich* (Magdeburg, 1992), 74–8; on attempts to introduce a regional monopoly on the episcopal coin in the 12th century see also Kamp, 'Probleme des Münzrechts', 95 f.

twelfth and thirteenth century.³⁹ The significant share of Church hierarchs resulted in large part from the earlier delegation on them of ruling powers within the framework of the imperial Church system in the Ottonian and Salian period, among which the judicial prerogatives of the counts, customs and market income and coinage rights should be indicated first and foremost. In the thirteenth century the process of creation of sovereign episcopal territories reached its greatest height in Silesia and West Pomerania, where in the following century we see the fully-formed territorial lordships in possession of the Wrocław bishops (Duchy of Nysa [German: Neisse]) and Kammin (territory of Kołobrzeg [Kolberg]).⁴⁰ Other Polish Church hierarchs also manifested similar aspirations – as we may judge – at the end of the thirteenth century, if only to mention here the bishops of Cracow Prandota, Paul of Przemanków and Muskata. By way of colonisation, they constructed a huge estate in the region of the Łysogóry mountains, created a secular knight clientele and erected fortified residences, executed the ducal privileges of immunity and were often in sharp conflict with the dukes.⁴¹ The limited scope of minting activity of hierarchs of the Polish Church in the twelfth and thirteen centuries could have therefore resulted from both of the following circumstances: in the earlier period, from imitating solutions characteristic of the imperial Church, while later on, the ‘emancipation’ of Church minting in the direction of complete coinage supremacy in the settled areas of territorial lords, which, as we know, took place in the fourteenth century in the case of Kammin and Wrocław.⁴²

³⁹ Synthetically on this topic Sławomir Gawlas, ‘Rzesza Niemiecka w XII–XIII wieku’, in Henryk Samsonowicz (ed.), *Rozkwit średniowiecznej Europy* (Warsaw, 2001), 198–250; Benjamin Arnold, *Princes and Territories in Medieval Germany* (Cambridge, 1989).

⁴⁰ For Silesia see esp. Josef Pfitzner, *Besiedlungs-, Verfassungs- und Verwaltungsgeschichte des Breslauer Bistumslandes* (Prager Studien aus dem Gebiete der Geschichtswissenschaft, 18, Reichenberg, 1926); Thomas Wunsch, ‘Territorienbildung zwischen Polen, Böhmen und dem deutschen Reich: Das Breslauer Bistumsland von 12. bis 16. Jahrhundert’, in Jochen Köhler and Reiner Bendel (eds.), *Geschichte der christlichen Lebens im schlesischen Raum* (Münster, 2002), 199–264.

⁴¹ See Sławomir Gawlas, ‘Człowiek uwikłany w wielkie procesy – przykład Muskaty’, in Roman Michałowski et al. (eds.), *Człowiek w społeczeństwie średniowiecznym* (Warsaw, 1997), 391–401.

⁴² Borys Paszkiewicz, ‘Nysa i Ujazd – mennice brakteatowe biskupstwa wrocławskiego na początku XIV wieku’, *Folia Numismatica*, 8–9 (1993–4), 59–62; *idem*,

Traces of minting activity of the Polish bishops are, however, older than traces of their attempts to create territorial lordships. Monetary finds attest to this foremost; written sources to a significantly lesser extent. Here we touch the same interpretational problems that we ran into in the case of minting in the Reich. Their scale seems to be greater, however, due to the paucity of source material as well as, to a certain extent, the deeply-rooted historiographical notions regarding the form of socio-political relations in the Piast monarchy.⁴³ The realisation of the oldest known minting privilege, which, according to *The Annals of the Poznań Cathedral Chapter*, the bishop of Poznań received in 1232 from Duke Ladislas Odowic for his mint in Krobia, is not supported by any known coin specimens. The very same situation – not foreign to earlier Western European realities, either – relates to monetary rights of the archbishop of Gniezno conferred in the years 1284 and 1286 in Greater Poland and Masovia.⁴⁴

The identification of coins of Church issuers – particularly those from the second half of the twelfth and thirteenth century – continues to create serious problems for researchers regarding the appearance of these same iconographic motifs on ducal coins and potential episcopal issues, and with time, the widespread use of anepigraphical bracteates. Therefore – as can be judged on this basis – a certain share of the products of episcopal coinage shall remain forever beyond the possibility of correct interpretation. Significant in this regard are difficulties with the attribution of twelfth-century coins with the effigy of a bishop in pontificate garb and crosier in hand, which bishop could be identified in some situations as St Adalbert as the patron saint of the ruling dynasty, political community and Gniezno cathedral or possibly its issuer – i.e., the archbishop of Gniezno.⁴⁵ Such controversies and polemics were particularly aroused by the recognition of some researchers of a large bracteate with the effigy of St Adalbert and

Pieniądz górnośląski w średniowieczu (Lublin, 2000), 200–4; Ryszard Kiersnowski, 'Monety biskupów kamięńskich z XIII i XIV wieku', *Wiadomości Numizmatyczne*, 6 (1962), 1–27.

⁴³ For example the theory of the far-reaching centralisation of Piast authority, which was supposed to be behind the total monopolisation of coinage production, cf. Kiersnowski, *Pieniądz kruszcowy*, 243.

⁴⁴ Cf. Kluge, *Deutsche Münzgeschichte*, 68.

⁴⁵ Borys Paszkiewicz, 'Święty Wojciech i monety', in Antoni Barciak (ed.), *Środkowoeuropejskie dziedzictwo świętego Wojciecha* (Katowice, 1998), 302.

the legend SCS ADELBIRTUS EPS GNVH as an archbishop coin and at the same time the oldest known issue of a Church hierarch.⁴⁶ The separation of the inscription into two parts, where the first part is a caption under the Saint's effigy, and the second is the issuer's symbol, however, has raised the fundamental doubts of other scholars. Stanisław Suchodolski has advocated for the ducal attribution of the coin; his opinion may be confirmed by the general state of knowledge regarding the cult of St Adalbert as a patron saint of the dynasty and political community during the period of Boleslav the Wry-mouthed, most recently enriched with the discovery of lead ducal seals with the effigy of this saint.⁴⁷

The depiction of saints, common to German numismatics of the eleventh and twelfth centuries, is unequivocally interpreted by German numismatists as a symbol of the ecclesiastical issue. The saint is often depicted lacking his most obvious attributes, e.g., the aureole, which makes the effigy similar to that of a Church hierarch wielding the episcopacy.⁴⁸ On this basis, Stanisław Suchodolski believes that the ambiguity in coin depictions could have been intentional.⁴⁹ We face similar issues in the interpretation of Polish coins – as we can see in the case of the aforementioned bracteate with St Adalbert. Here, however, just as in Bohemia, where the effigy of St Wenceslas appeared on ducal coins for two centuries – the presence of religious symbolism is not so easily recognised as an indicator of Church coinage; sometimes it is simply a relatively certain indicator of the mint whereabouts. This problem concerns deniers from as early as the eleventh century which depict the head of John the Baptist, attributed to Boleslav II the Generous. The presence of this

⁴⁶ See Edwin Rosenkranz, 'O gnieźnieńskich brakteatach ze św. Wojciechem z czasów Bolesława Krzywoustego', *Pomerania Antiqua*, 6 (1975), 585–96; Andrzej Schmid, 'Duży brakteat ze św. Wojciechem monetą arcybiskupstwa gnieźnieńskiego', *Gniezno. Studia i materiały historyczne*, 4 (1995), 179–88.

⁴⁷ Stanisław Suchodolski, 'Kult svatého Václava a svatého Vojtěcha pryzmatem raně středověkých polských mincí', *Numismatický sborník*, 20 (2005), 29–41, esp. 35; Ryszard Kiersnowski similarly wrote earlier, 'O brakteatach z czasów Bolesława Krzywoustego i roli kultu św. Wojciecha w Polsce', in Gerard Labuda (ed.), *Święty Wojciech w polskiej tradycji historiograficznej. Antologia tekstów* (Warsaw, 1997), 321–2 (1st edn in *Wiadomości Numizmatyczne*, 3 [1959]).

⁴⁸ Kluge, *Deutsche Münzgeschichte*, 84.

⁴⁹ Stanisław Suchodolski, '[C]AZIMIR DVX – brakteat Leszka Białego?', *Wiadomości Numizmatyczne*, 44 (2000), 66.

iconographic motif indicates their Wrocław origin, and it also appears one hundred years later on the denier of the Wrocław bishop, attributed to Siroslaus II or Lawrence. Eleventh-century coins are deemed to be ducal issues, though numismatists recognise the certain role of the Wrocław bishop John I or the clergy in his circle in working out the ideological message engraved on those deniers.⁵⁰ In fact, however, the simultaneous presence of symbols of minting supremacy of the ruler and the symbol of the Church issuer is a feature typical of the early phase of episcopal minting in the Reich. Is it then not worth revisiting the opinion of Ryszard Kiersnowski, who suspected the ‘limited contribution of the Wrocław bishop as the owner or mint supervisor’ years ago, despite the recognition of the ducal nature of those issues’?⁵¹ It is possible, then, that as early as the second half of the eleventh century we are dealing with the oldest trace of the involvement of a Polish bishop in minting activity. It seems, however, that taking a step beyond a hypothesis will be exceedingly difficult in this case.

Accordingly, the chronological time-frame of minting activity of bishops of the Polish ecclesiastical province does not reach back further than the middle of the twelfth century, at this point. This allows us to speak of the significant delay of this phenomenon in comparison to the Reich, but not in comparison to the neighbouring countries of Central Europe. Minting of Church hierarchs in the Arpad monarchy is not known of at all to this point, however, in Bohemia – as I try to prove below – while it was probably older chronologically, it did not distinguish itself particularly in its scale and significance in comparison to the coin production of the bishops of the Polish ecclesiastical province. The oldest certain bishop issue east of the Oder River remains the deniers with the effigy and name of Sigfrid, the bishop of Kammin, not being a suffragan of the archbishop of Gniezno. These artifacts, dated by Richard Kiersnowski to be from the period before 1191 probably show a patterning on contemporary Lübeck deniers of Bishop Dietrich I as well as Danish deniers and bear the symbol of the ruler’s minting supremacy in the form of Duke Casimir’s name on

⁵⁰ Stanisław Suchodolski, ‘Początki mennictwa we Wrocławiu’, in Zofia Kurnatowska (ed.), *Słowiańszczyzna w Europie średniowiecznej*, ii (Wrocław, 1996), 125.

⁵¹ Kiersnowski, *Pieniądz kruszcowy*, 270 f.; he regarded a share of those coins as the issues of Boleslav the Brave, which opinion later came into question.

the reverse.⁵² The denier and bracteate identified as productions of the Wrocław bishop mint from the period of the pontificate of Siroslaus II (1170–98) or one of his successors,⁵³ and the denier from the hoard of Ujma Duża, quite convincingly attributed to bishop of Włocławek Stephen (ca. 1187–1207/8) both probably originated in the same period.⁵⁴ To this point no coins have been discovered that could be attributed to the Płock or Poznań bishops – despite the latter’s possession of the oldest known minting privilege for the production of their own coinage in the Krobia mint. The coin issues of the bishops of Cracow, depicting the bishop and name of the patron saint of that cathedral – St Wenceslas – are much later, because they reach possibly to the pontificate of Ivo Odrowąż (1218–29).⁵⁵

The recognition of possible coins as of the archbishops of Gniezno present much difficulty due to the identity of the depiction of the Church issuer and St Adalbert. Artifacts may be considered as such when the effigy of the bishop in his pontifical robes with a crosier occurs seated on a throne, which is not typical for this saint’s iconography – as it does on the Greater Poland coin with the name of Duke Mieszko, lost today, and on the bracteate depicting the bishop on the throne and a legend in Hebrew, probably issued between 1177 and 1181.⁵⁶ The coinage privileges conferred a century later to the metropolitan bishop from the 1280s, anticipating the striking of coins for the archbishop castellanies of Żnin and Łowicz have not yet seen their reflection in numismatic material.

⁵² Kiersnowski, ‘Monety biskupów kamieńskich’, 6–7; *idem*, ‘Mennice i minceże na Pomorzu Zachodnim w drugiej połowie XII wieku’, *Materiały Zachodnio-Pomorskie*, 6 (1960), 326 f.; at this point without certainty as to the episcopal character of this issue Suchodolski, *Moneta możnowładcza*, 67–74.

⁵³ Suchodolski, *Moneta możnowładcza*, 75–80; cf. *idem*, ‘Zmiany w chronologii i atrybucji monet polskich z XII/XIII w. w świetle skarbu z Głogowa’, *Wiadomości Numizmatyczne*, 36 (1992), 114 and 117, where he rather acknowledged the coins as issues of the bishop Lawrence (1207–28), though due to their dynastic origin it would possibly be worth considering their attribution to Yaroslav (1198–1201).

⁵⁴ *Idem*, *Moneta możnowładcza*, 88 f.; it is worth adding here that a coin with the purported image of the Annunciation is also found in the set, which could be a reference to the Marian dedication of the Włocławek cathedral. The interpretation of this scene raises justified doubts, however – cf. Witold Garbaczewski, *Ikonaografia monet piastowskich 1173 – ok. 1280* (Warsaw and Lublin, 2007), 224, 227.

⁵⁵ Suchodolski, *Moneta możnowładcza*, 81–7.

⁵⁶ Garbaczewski, *Ikonaografia monet*, 246.

Perhaps the short list of the oldest episcopal issues in Poland should be extended by the bracteate from the so-called ‘Cracow’ hoard, on which the half-length portrait of the bishop and crosier appears, as well as the reverse legend GEDE.⁵⁷ It would seem that its attribution to the Cracow bishop Gedko would be the most obvious of possible interpretations. Such an attribution would somewhat change the picture of minting of Cracow bishops, which to this time has presented quite modestly, especially considering the material possibilities and political aspirations of these hierarchs in the second half of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. This attribution, however, has encountered serious objections from numismatists, who date this artifact to being from the first quarter of the thirteenth century based on its metrological features, and want to see it as the issue of Duke Leszek the White. The presence of the effigy of the hierarch, who died two decades prior to minting, has been explained either as an attempt to promote the cult of the bishop (yet traces of this do not appear later); or, as the ideological need of the circle of the sons of Casimir the Just, for whom the Cracow bishop was once a political mainstay.⁵⁸ Such a form of political propaganda at least two decades after the passing of Gedko from the scene would seem to be quite ineffective and not very convincing. Perceiving the image of Bishop St Adalbert, who according to the relation of *Vita I* visited Gdańsk before leaving for Prussia, and in the legend – the shortened name of Gdańsk – is truly an interpretational meander.⁵⁹ Locating the name Gdańsk on the coin was supposed to be a propagandist move, underscoring the close relationship of the Gdańsk principality (under the rule of Swietopelk aiming at emancipation) with the rulers of Cracow. Yet it is difficult to determine how the incidental presence of the saint in Gdańsk was to have legitimised the rule of Leszek the White over the Baltic.

⁵⁷ Borys Paszkiewicz and Bogumiła Haczewska, ‘Skarb z XII–XIII wieku z Krakowa – drugie zbliżenie (nieznane brakteaty polskie)’, *Notae Numismatice*, 5 (2004), 90, nos 21 and 107.

⁵⁸ Stanisław Suchodolski, ‘Czy wyobrażenia na monetach odzwierciedlają rzeczywistość, czy ją kreują (Przykład monety polskiej w średniowieczu)’, in Marcin Fabiański (ed.), *Dzieło sztuki: źródło ikonograficzne, czy coś więcej? Materiały sympozjum XVII Powszechnego Zjazdu Historyków w Krakowie 15–18 września 2004* (Warsaw, 2005), 55; Garbaczewski, *Ikonografia monet*, 256; the project initiator for the die could be Vincent Kadlubek himself, according to the author (338).

⁵⁹ Paszkiewicz and Haczewska, ‘Skarb z XII–XIII wieku’, 107.

This would be a reference to an association so subtle that it would be probably completely imperceptible even for the circle of those familiar with hagiography, literate recipients. Formulating more or less fantastic conceptions, none of the researchers of the artifact to this day has noticed the fact that the postulated minting period of this coin according to metrological data almost ideally fits the period of the pontificate of another Polish hierarch named Gedko – the bishop of Płock during the years 1206–23. If we have already rejected the attribution of the coin to the bishop of Cracow, Gedko, it would seem we should consider the possibility of attributing it to his Płock namesake, although that would certainly ruin the picture that existed hitherto of Masovian minting of the day.

IV

Church minting in the Přemyslid monarchy left even fewer traces of itself than in Poland. Yet, this is not evidence of its lesser significance. The oldest written source on the topic of interest is the unprecedented in Central Europe privilege for the bishop of Olomouc Henry Zdík, whose issuer was the German king, Conrad III. It was drawn up in Bamberg, most probably in May 1144, and is only known from a fourteenth-century copy in the book of fiefs (*Lehnbuch*) of the bishopric. The charter was first and foremost an argument in the estate quarrel of the Moravian bishops with the bishops of Prague. Its subject was the stronghold Podivín, located on the south-east border of Moravia together with pertinences, which the bishop of Prague – as the royal charter claims – leased illicitly until the times of Conrad III. After the conflict was resolved in royal and ecclesiastic tribunal on behalf of Olomouc, to stave off further conflict, Duke Ladislav conferred the *predium* of Želiv by way of compensation to Otto, the bishop of Prague. Thus Conrad III confirmed Bishop Henry's ownership title to Podivín together with the privilege of minting public coins in the stronghold without any secular interference as well as broad immunity for all categories of subjects in the bishop's estates in Moravia.⁶⁰

⁶⁰ *Die Urkunden Konrads III und seines Sohnes Heinrich* (hereafter: MGH DK III), ed. Freidrich Haussmann, MGH, *Diplomata regum et imperatorum Germaniae*, ix (Vienna, Cologne and Graz, 1969), no. 106 (older edn: *Codex diplomaticus et epistolaris Regni Bohemiae* [hereafter: CDB], ed. Gustav Friedrich, i [Prague,

The royal charter bears the features of the diction of Wibald of Stavelot, who appears on the list of witnesses. The abbot of Stavelot and Malmedy has been numbered as among the most influential personalities of the twelfth-century Church; as a diplomat and chancellor he also played an extremely important role in the courts of Lothar III and Conrad III.⁶¹ Henry Zdík's contacts with Wibald are attested to not only by their common presence on the list of witnesses to royal charters, but also by the preserved letter of the bishop of Olomouc to the abbot of Stavelot, dated to being from the years 1149–50. These close relations probably did not remain without influence on the shape of the royal privilege. Zdík was named in it as an individual especially valued by the German king and chosen on the basis of his piety.⁶² Moreover, we know of the efforts of the abbot of Stavelot, supporter of ecclesiastical reform and *liberatas ecclesiae*, on the issue of the securing of the material interests of the Church in written form, which in some cases took the form of falsifications of imperial privileges, especially those that related to episcopal minting rights.⁶³ Despite the opinions of older Czech literature, the diploma of Conrad III does not figure among forged charters,⁶⁴ but the broad range of powers of coinage of the bishop of Olomouc in Podivín may be due to the influence of the charter diction of Wibald of Stavelot.

The special status of the stronghold Podivín, as well as the circumstances of the outbreak and course of the long-term conflict between the bishops of Prague and Olomouc have already been discussed

1904–7], no. 138): 'Ad cumulandum vero nostre devocionis benivolenciam in eodem castro percussuram monete publice tibi concedimus et confirmamus, super quo regia auctoritate precipimus, ne quis dux aut comes eam interdicere aut corrumpere ullo modo audeat, penam a nostra maiestate debitam suscepturus, qui adversus nostra instituta venire ausu temerario temptaverit'.

⁶¹ Philip George, 'Wibald von Stablo', in Norbert Angermann *et al.* (eds.), *Lexikon des Mittelalters*, ix (Munich, 1998), 57 f.; Wolfgang Petke, *Kanzlei, Kapelle und königliche Kurie unter Lothar III. (1125–1137)* (Cologne, 1985), 234–7.

⁶² MGH DK III, no. 106: 'Quem ob religionis immaculate meritum preceptorem et tamquam mediatorem in his, que ad dei cultum principaliter pertinent, pre omnibus regni nostri pontificibus elegimus'.

⁶³ Faußner, 'Zu den Fälschungen', *passim* (esp. 149).

⁶⁴ Saša Dušková, 'K problematice dvou nejstarších listin olomouckého kostela na Podivín, minci a immunity', in Jiří Sejbal (ed.), *Denárová měna na Moravě* (Numismatica moravica, 6, Brno, 1986), 313–14.

numerous times in Czech scholarship.⁶⁵ Nonetheless, they continue to raise many uncertainties as to the purported location of that episcopal seat, relating to the tradition of the Moravian diocese from the times of the Mojmir dynasty. Little lends itself to such interpretations, however, except for the geographic proximity to the major centres of Great Moravia and the conviction of the symbolic value of the location, the dispute over which continued for a surprising length of time and saw an end only in the first decades of the thirteenth century.⁶⁶ Notwithstanding, the ongoing political problems must be kept in view, not only the prestige-related and historical conditions of the conflict. The restoration of the Moravian bishopric in 1063 was an element of the policy of Vratislav II – the strengthening of the direct influence of the dukes of Prague in Moravian districts. Next to the ruling ducal brothers in Znojmo and Brno, a third political factor appeared in the person of a bishop, strongly dependent on the centre of authority in Prague. In a dispute between hierarchs, Vratislav II advocated decisively against the claims of his brother, Prague bishop Jaromir Gebhard. Moravian bishops could thus count on the support of the ruler in matters of property. A clear turnaround occurred, however, after Břetislav II took the throne, who after placing his nominee Herman on the bishop's throne in Prague in 1099 set out for Moravia and returned the restored stronghold of Podivín to him.⁶⁷ This situation turned out to be quite long-lasting, as the stronghold served as a residence for the Prague ordinaries as late as the times of Bishop Meinhard (1123–34).⁶⁸ During the times of Ladislav II and Henry Zdík, the alliance between the prince and the bishop of Olomouc against the Moravian dukes had already become an element in the political constellation. The unequivocal stance of Zdík as a proponent of the interests of the Prague court earned him

⁶⁵ Recently Martin Wihoda has written most extensively on this topic in *idem*, 'Causa Podivín', *Časopis matice moravské*, 117 (1998), 283–91 (older literature there).

⁶⁶ Cf. Martin Wihoda, 'Velehradská tradice', in Luděk Galuška, Pavel Kouřil and Jiří Mitáček (eds.), *Východní Morava v 10. až 14. století* (Brno, 2008), 134 f.

⁶⁷ *Cosmae Pragensis Chronica Bohemorum*, ed. Berthold Bretholz, MGH, SS rer. Germ., s.n., ii (Berlin, 1923), lib. 3, cap. 9, p. 169.

⁶⁸ The fact of the death of Bishop Meinhard in the court of Sekyř in 1134 has been verified, see *Canonici Vissegradensis continuatio Cosmae*, ed. Josef Emler, *Fontes Rerum Bohemicarum*, ii (Prague, 1874), 219.

bitter enemies in the persons of dukes and some of the magnates, and even led to an attempt on the life of the bishop. Without delving into a detailed examination of these issues, well-considered in the literature, it would be befitting to pay some attention to the very functioning of the Podivín estate complex, and in particular the local mint.

The privilege of the German king was confirmed several years later in the charter of Duke Ladislav II for Bishop Henry, dated by its publisher to be from the years 1146–8. Its tenor is generally in accordance with the wording of the document of 1144 – although it does not mention a word about the existence of the previous privilege – and in addition, it unequivocally points to the earlier functioning of the episcopal mint in Podivín.⁶⁹ In this context, it is especially interesting that the name of the stronghold – clearly in the possessive form – was formed from the name of its founder the baptised Jew Podiva.⁷⁰ Also known from later Polish analogues, the involvement of Jewish merchants in the organisation of ducal coinage, and earlier in the slave trade supplying large sources of ore, lends the view that this Podiva could have played the role of master of the ducal mint.⁷¹ The Hebrew name of Nacub appears on coins from as early as the turn of the eleventh century, struck in the Prague mint and attributed to Boleslav II and Boleslav III.⁷² Both the very establishment of the Podivín mint and the possible moment of its transfer to episcopal supremacy are difficult to determine, however, as we don't know of any coin artifacts from the eleventh century that could unequivocally qualify as its products. The conception of Vaclav Richter formulated years ago, according to which the Podivín mint was supposed to be

⁶⁹ CDB, i, no. 157: 'Iura quoque antique institutionis super eodem castro reformare intendentes, monetam ut primo fuit inibi fieri statuimus'. For information about this document see Jan Bobek, *Mincovnictví olomouckých biskupů ve středověku* (Numismatica Moravica, 7, Brno, 1986), 75–7; recently on the minting rights of the bishop of Olomouc in Podivín Jiří Sejbál, 'The Minting Rights of the bishops of Olomouc in the 13th Century', in Ryszard Kiersnowski *et al.* (ed.), *Moneta mediaevalis: studia numizmatyczne i historyczne ofiarowane Profesorowi Stanisławowi Suchodolskiemu w 65. rocznicę urodzin* (Warsaw, 2002), 309–24.

⁷⁰ *Cosmae Chronica Boemorum*, lib. 2, cap. 21, p. 113: 'castrum ... Podiuium dictum a conditore suo Podiua, Iudeo sed postea catholico'.

⁷¹ See Stanisław Suchodolski, *Mennictwo polskie w XI i XII wieku* (Wrocław, 1973), 96 f., where there is older literature on the topic of Jewish mint masters during the times of Mieszko III the Old.

⁷² Zdeněk Petraň, *První české mince* (Prague, 1998), 134 f.

the continuation of an even older one, dating back to the era of Great Moravia and located in the nearby Sekyř Kostel should perhaps be deemed too bold. In order to support this claim, the researcher gave a philological argument only, recognising that the name Sekyř (Zekir), occurring in early medieval sources, comes from the Semitic term *sekkah*, meaning a mint itself or the activity of coin minting.⁷³ This view correlates well with information about the origin of the founder of the Podiviň stronghold.

This stronghold together with appurtenances was without doubt the oldest known element of endowment of the Prague bishopric. It could be assumed that this was a donation of Duke Oldrich, made shortly after the conquest of Moravia by the Přemyslids, and so as early as the 1120s or 1130s; this conclusion being prompted by the reference made to ‘nobile castrum ... quod eidem ecclesie pietatis intuitu fuit ab O. quondam Boemie duce collatum.’ These words are contained in the papal letter of 1201 to archbishop of Salzburg Eberhard II, regarding charges brought by the canon of the Prague Chapter Arnold against the then bishop of Prague Daniel II.⁷⁴ It can only be Duke Oldrich who is intimated by the initial ‘O.’. But the question remains open as to whether the tradition about its conferral survived in the Prague Chapter, or rather this was about the underscoring of the ancient date of the property by invoking the name of the ruler, who as the first of the Přemyslids extended Bohemian rule across Moravia. The fierce rivalry between the two bishops, lasting to the first decades of the thirteenth century, as to which bishopric would possess the estate demands the recognition of the particular value of this complex. It is worth noting that the property included the only fortified stronghold in the Přemyslid state known of before the thirteenth century, confirmed to be in the possession of a Church institution. More complete data on the composition of the episcopal estates in southern Moravia was provided by Kosmas. In the early twelfth century and probably earlier, next to the stronghold on the Thaya River this complex included the manor Sekyř Kostel – as can

⁷³ Václav Richter, ‘Podiviň, Zekirkostel a Slivnice’, *Sborník prací Filosofické fakulty brněnské university, F2: řada uměnovědná*, 7 (1958), 72–80; see esp. Jaroslav Pošvař, ‘Moravská mincovna v Podiviňě’, *Numizmatické listy*, 9 (1954), 7–15; *idem*, *Moravské mincovny* (Numismatica Moravica, 3, Brno, 1970), 137–43.

⁷⁴ CDB, ii, ed. Gustav Friedrich (Prague, 1912), no. 23.

be judged on the basis of chronicle entries – the frequented bishop residence, and the market settlement Slivnice. Kosmas also locates the market in Sekyř Kostel in another place of his work. In his day, the income from this market was owned by the Prague Cathedral Chapter, endowed with it by Duke Otto.⁷⁵ It is not clear, however, whether this market was one in the same with the market functioning in the settlement of Slivnice, yet this seems probable. The location of the entire settlement complex is not known precisely today. One may only guess that a customs house would have stood next to the market. The longevity of the conflict is explained – I believe – by the large economic importance of these properties, confirmed by their organisation as a town under German law very early, probably as early as the 1220s, without needing to bring up arguments of an ideological nature.⁷⁶ The circumstances surrounding the stronghold, market and coinage powers at the Podivín complex coming into the possession of the Prague bishopric correspond to the well-authenticated practice in the Reich of conferring bishops and monasteries coinage rights together with market and customs income. The existence there of an old, significant market settlement makes the presence of a mint in Podivín probable as early as the eleventh century.

Yet there are no known coins that could be unequivocally identified as its products. Admittedly Jan Bobek has identified a range of Moravian deniers from the eleventh century and first quarter of the twelfth century as Church issues originating mainly from the hoard of Rakvice, attributing them to successive Olomouc bishops (John I, Jaromir-Gebhard as bishopric administrator, Andrew and John II), but this attribution raises justified doubts and has not been accepted by the majority of Czech researchers.⁷⁷ Key grounds supporting the thesis of Church provenience of these coins is (next to the very location of the hoard in proximity to Podivín) their purely religious iconography and lack of traces of minting supremacy of the ruler. The

⁷⁵ *Cosmae Chronica Boemorum*, lib. 3, cap. 33, p. 204.

⁷⁶ The presence of Godfried, specified as *iudex de Podevin*, in the role of witness in an episcopal document from 1222 may testify to the existence of a community under German law, see CDB, ii, no. 237.

⁷⁷ Bobek, *Mincovníctví olomouckých biskupů*, 40–69; e.g., Jan Šmerda does not classify these coins as episcopal in *Denáry české a moravské. Katalog mincí českého státu od X. do počátku XIII. století* (Brno, 1996), 118, recognising that they come from ducal mints in Brno or Olomouc.

depiction of St John, St Wenceslas and St Peter on these coins can not conclusively indicate Church production, and the readings of the very damaged inscriptions proposed by Bobek raise many doubts.⁷⁸ It seems highly likely, however, that at the beginning of the second quarter of the twelfth century the executor of coinage prerogative in Podivín – Sekyř Kostel was none of the Olomouc hierarchs, but the bishop of Prague, Meinhard. According to the determinations of Pavel Radoměřsky, two types of deniers should be attributed to Meinhard, known only from the hoard of Běhařov in western Bohemia, deposited ca. 1135. These coins depict a bishop with crosier and cross as well as the model of a church. One type bears the name of the hierarch and the signature ZK, which the above-mentioned researcher deciphered as the mark of the Zekir mint.⁷⁹ According to Radoměřsky, the powers to issue coins were strictly connected to the possession of this estate complex, and not with the regular authorisation of Prague or Olomouc bishops to independent minting of coins. In addition, he surmises that the products of this mint could be imitations of the broad deniers from the Rakvíce hoard, recognised to this point as the oldest issues of the Austrian Babenbergs.⁸⁰

The coins bearing the name of Henry on their obverse side, attributed to the Bishop Henry Zdík, are currently recognised (albeit not without controversy) as the first twelfth-century issues of the Olomouc bishops, although they are probably not from the Podivín mint. They are dated to the 1230s, which could indicate minting activity earlier than the privilege of King Conrad III, at an episcopal mint most probably installed in the capital of the diocese.⁸¹ Jan Bobek characterised as many as eight types of deniers already linked in the

⁷⁸ The effigy of St Peter most certainly refers to the dedication of the older cathedral in Olomouc; see latest Josef Videman, 'Neznámý moravský denár s opisy SCS PETRUS / SCS IOHANNES', *Numizmatické listy*, 64 (2009), 3–9; yet there is no determination as to whether this indeed is an episcopal coin struck in Podivín.

⁷⁹ Pavel Radoměřsky, 'Tajemna mincovna Zekir (zvana též Sekýř) na Jižní Moravě. Poklad z Běhařova u Klatov', *Archeologické rozhledy*, 44 (1992), 251–3.

⁸⁰ *Ibidem*, 253–5.

⁸¹ See Sejbal, 'The Minting Rights', 312; Šmerda, *Denáry české a moravské*, 116–17. Recently Josef Videman and Luboš Polanský raised fundamental doubts about the attribution of these coins to the bishop of Olomouc, see *idem*, 'Mincovníctví biskupa Jindřicha Zdíka', in Jana Hrbačová (ed.), *Jindřich Zdík (1126–1150), olomoucký biskup uprostřed Evropy* (Olomouc, 2009), 180 f. Also includes a catalogue of purported bishop coins.

older literature with the person of Zdík. Only four of them, however, (types I–IV) bear the name of the hierarch on the obverse side, linked with the effigy of St Wenceslas on the reverse – the patron saint of a new cathedral erected by Zdík in Olomouc, which replaced the old cathedral of St Peter. Only one denier (type VI according to Bobek) bears iconography unambiguously indicating its episcopal issue, as on it an individual is visible with a crosier in his hand.⁸² The attribution of those coins, known mainly from the hoard of Rakvice, seems to be convincing.

The Moravian coin issues of Bishop Meinhard raise the question of the minting activity of the bishops of Prague, which has been much more weakly recognised than the analogous activity of the bishops of Olomouc. Much controversy continues to be raised among researchers by the probably oldest trace of minting activity of a bishop east of the Reich's territories – coins from the end of the tenth century, identified as the issue of St Adalbert, bishop of Prague.⁸³ Gustav Skalsky has already recognised the denier bearing the legend HIC DENARIVS EST EPIZ(copi) as such, currently known from approx. ten copies.⁸⁴ The artifacts are known mainly from archeological finds in Poland, having been deposited at the earliest after 1004. Mainly their iconographic convergence with coins of Boleslav I, and the reading of the ruler's name on the reverse (though not without doubts) as the possessor of minting supremacy speaks for their Czech provenience.⁸⁵ The last word on the interpretation of this coin belongs to Stanisław Suchodolski, who (accepting the traditional attribution of episcopal coins to Bishop Adalbert) proposed a new interpretation of the not very legible letter sequence on the reverse as 'et favore Bolezlai stabilitus'. This would mean that the bishop had received the privilege of minting his own coins from the ruler. Thus, the researcher – in my view quite

⁸² Bobek, *Mincovníctví olomouckých biskupů*, 78–90.

⁸³ More broadly on the topic during recent years Petraň, *První české mince*, 160–74 and Stanisław Suchodolski, 'Monety świętego Wojciecha', in Cezary Buško *et al.*, *Civitas & villa. Miasto i wieś w średniowiecznej Europie Środkowej* (Wrocław and Prague, 2002), 447–52.

⁸⁴ Gustav Skalský, 'Denáry pražského biskupa Vojtěcha Slavníkovce', *Numismatický časopis československý*, 5 (1929), 26–46.

⁸⁵ Recently L. Polanský, 'The 10th Century Bohemian Deniers in the Light of Revised Finds', in Suchodolski (ed.), *Money Circulation*, 146 f., additionally noticed the convergence of the typeface with products of the ducal mint of Vyšehrad.

rightly – countered the interpretation of the Prague bishop's minting activity as a manifestation of his independence from the authority of the Přemyslids and recognised that Adalbert's princely pedigree was not a significant factor in this matter.⁸⁶ But these assertions lead to the inevitable conclusion that the issuer of the aforementioned coins could equally likely be St Adalbert's successor to the episcopal see of Prague – Thiadag. This Saxon monk of the Corvey monastery served as imperial chaplain and was a member of the Czech court even before taking on the title of bishop.⁸⁷ Direct contact with the environment of that episcopate, knowledge of the remuneration model of the imperial bishoprics at the end of the tenth century as well as his close relations with Boleslav II speak to the hypothesis that this hierarch would have been able to obtain an appropriate minting privilege from the ruler more easily than his predecessor. This hypothesis is all the more likely as the remaining cases of supposed coin issues by Adalbert are very dubious.

The second type linked earlier to the person of the bishop of Prague, bearing on the obverse the legend reading as ADAL(BERTUS) (EP)ISCO(PUS), comes from the hoard of Poděbrady and is known from just a single specimen. According to researchers, it has characteristics similar to the coins of Soběslav, son of Slavnik, which were struck in the mint of Malin. And in this case a reading of the legend raises serious doubts, although the bishop's provenience of this artifact cannot be unequivocally ruled out. Even more hypothetical is the connection of the Bishop Adalbert's person to another artifact, uncovered in Gotland and bearing the name Adalbertus.⁸⁸ Not much points to its Czech origin, and several other German bishops from the tenth and eleventh centuries also held the same name. If we accept as credible the interpretation that known coins of the type HIC DENARIUS were coins of St Adalbert or Thiadag, the beginnings of the minting of the Prague bishops undergo a shift of even thirty

⁸⁶ The opinion that the issues of Adalbert as a member of the dynasty of Libice had to be set exclusively in the context of the sovereign mint of the Slavniks and not episcopal minting was thus thoroughly rejected. Additionally on this topic Kiersnowski, *Pieniądz kruszcowy*, 242 f.

⁸⁷ On his person and the circumstances of the assumption of the Prague bishopric recently Joanna A. Sobiesiak, *Bolesław II Przemysłida († 999). Dynastia i jego państwo* (Cracow, 2006), 216 f.

⁸⁸ Suchodolski, 'Monety świętego Wojciecha', 451 f.

years earlier in relation to the hypothetical moment of the Podivín mint start-up. Settlement of all doubts relating to the 'Adalbert' coins undoubtedly belongs to the numismatists. The role of the historian can only be to state that it is entirely plausible and consistent with the realities of the end of the tenth century that the suffragan bishops of Mainz, being *de iure* members of the Reich episcopate and having close relations with the Church and political elite of, or deriving from, the Empire of that time, could have obtained the powers of coinage and issued their own coins. Without doubt they would have been capable of attaining the right to mint coins on the model of the German bishops.

V

Concluding his argumentation twenty years ago, Stanisław Suchodolski rejected the manifestational value of the early minting activity of Polish bishops. He recognised, first and foremost, its economic significance to those Church institutions bestowed with the minting privilege. He also underscored the clear in his opinion chronological convergence between the minting production of these institutions authenticated by artifacts and the conduct of more broadly envisioned, and thus unusually expensive, construction projects at sacred edifices. The minting activity of secular Polish magnates of the eleventh to twelfth century – the palatines Sieciech and Peter Wszeborowic, famous founders of monasteries – was to allay the same needs.⁸⁹ Written sources confirm such a correlation relatively late and in a specific form, however – in 1244 Duke Boleslav the Bald granted to the bishop and chapter of Wrocław the right to strike just four silver *grzywna* 'secundum cursum monete' weekly in the ducal mint for the needs of construction work at the cathedral.⁹⁰ The Cistercian nuns of Trzebnica were conferred a privilege of a similar nature in 1269.⁹¹ Yet

⁸⁹ Likewise Stanisław Trawkowski, 'Charakter denarów palatyna Sieciecha', in *idem, Opuscula medievistica. Studia nad historią społeczną Polski wczesnopiastowskiej* (Warsaw, 2005), 203 (1st edn in Kiersnowski *et al.* [eds.], *Moneta mediaevalis*).

⁹⁰ *Schlesisches Urkundenbuch* (hereafter: SUB), ii, ed. Winfried Irgang (Vienna, Cologne and Gratz, 1978), no. 272.

⁹¹ Cf. Tadeusz Lalik, 'Uwagi o finansowaniu budownictwa murowanego w Polsce do początku XIII wieku', in *idem, Studia średniowieczne* (Warsaw, 2006), 213 (1st edn in *Kwartalnik Historii Kultury Materialnej*, xv, 1 [1967], 61).

it is difficult to come to any general conclusions on the basis of these instances, and earlier cases of the occurrence of such provisions are purely hypothetical. A case in point: Stanisław Suchodolski connected the issue of supposed coins of the bishop of Wrocław Siroslaus II with construction work at the Wrocław cathedral. This view about the completion of the reconstruction of the cathedral, begun at the reign of Bishop Walter and completed by his successor is based entirely on the interpretation of the hierarch's seal from 1189, on which he is presented with the model of a church in his hands.⁹² Suchodolski himself soon afterward changed the conception of the construction of the cathedral from minting profits in the context of new findings, attributing the aforementioned deniers to Bishop Laurence.⁹³ Nevertheless, researchers seem to occasionally generalise their conclusions on the basis of slender evidence, linking each case of construction activity of a bishop with minting activity. Borys Paszkiewicz claimed that the minting activity of St Adalbert as the bishop of Prague served to allay financial needs connected with the construction of the cathedral, while it is well-known that the new edifice rose in the place of the tenth-century rotunda of St Wenceslas as late as the mid-eleventh century.⁹⁴

In seeking possible analogies that would make the relationship between the conveyance of the powers of coinage to the bishops or abbots and their funding activity likely, it is worth paying attention to the situation in the Reich.⁹⁵ Nowhere do relatively numerous German sources allow for the determination of a strict relation between construction investments and imperially-conferred minting privileges

⁹² Adam Źurek, 'Summum Wratislaviense', *Śląski Kwartalnik Historyczny Sobótka*, lxvi, 1 (2006), 70; Edmund Małachowicz, 'Dwie romańskie katedry we Wrocławiu', in Tomasz Janiak (ed.), *Architektura romańska w Polsce. Nowe odkrycia i interpretacje* (Gniezno, 2009), 101–5.

⁹³ Suchodolski, 'Zmiany w chronologii', 114.

⁹⁴ Borys Paszkiewicz, 'Święty Wojciech i monety', in Barciak (ed.), *Środkowo-europejskie dziedzictwo*, 294.

⁹⁵ See Reiner Hausscherr, *Dombauten und Reichsepiskopat im Zeitalter der Staufer* (Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur. Abhandlungen der Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse, 5, Stuttgart, 1991); Frank G. Hirschmann, 'Die Bischofssitze um 1100 – Bautätigkeit, Reform und Fürsorge vor dem Hintergrund des Investiturstreites', in Jörg Jarnut and Matthias Wemhoff (eds.), *Vom Umbruch zur Erneuerung? Das 11. und beginnende 12. Jahrhundert – Positionen der Forschung* (Mittelalterstudien, 13, Munich, 2006), 427–52.

for bishoprics and monasteries of the Reich. These privileges were usually connected with the transfer of customs and market income, which should rather be viewed as the satisfying of local economic needs. Charters confirming the conferral of coin minting privileges most often do not contain any information regarding the allocation of their income, including its spending for construction purposes, and sometimes rather just contain standard formulations relating to religious and eschatological motivations.⁹⁶ The construction of immense cathedral edifices were not supported by emperors via the endowment of minting privileges; the case of eleventh-century Spires (Speyer) speaks to this most distinctly. The chronology of construction efforts at that cathedral is quite well known, the cathedral being the most impressive of sacred edifices of the Reich at the turn of the century, closely connected with the ideological plans of the Salian dynasty. The cathedral's construction began under the rule of Conrad II, and the date of its consecration, 1061, marks the first phase of construction. The second phase, its expansion, came in the last quarter century during the rule of Henry IV (ca. 1080–1106).⁹⁷ During the period of those several decades, the bishop and canons of Spires were recipients of a significant number of royal conferrals and privileges. Yet the only known privilege for the Spires bishopric related to minting had already been issued in 1009 by King Henry II. He bestowed upon the bishop the public rights to be exercised at the Marbach marketplace, which included the jurisdiction, toll, and 'potestas faciendi ... monetam forma pondere et puritate Spirensium, sive Wormatiensium denariorum'.⁹⁸ The reason for the aforementioned donations was the known poor material condition of the Spires diocese and the desire to prevent the circulation of counterfeit coins on the local market ('ad

⁹⁶ The only evidence of attribution of minting income known to me, found in the charter of Henry II for Echternach in 1023, certainly does not change this state of affairs: 'ad ecclesie ornamentum et praebendae sue augmentum'. Construction work is probably not alluded to by the first of the entries, but rather the securing of candles and paraments for the monastery church, see MGH, DH II, no. 490. On the reasons for conferrals evident in the charters of the Carolingian day see Volz, 'Königliche Münzhoheit', 182 f.

⁹⁷ Caspar Ehlers, *Metropolis Germaniae. Studien zur Bedeutung Speyers für das Königtum (751–1250)* (Veröffentlichungen des Max-Planck-Instituts für Geschichte, 125, Göttingen, 1996), 378–80.

⁹⁸ MGH DH II, no. 190.

distruendas in circuitu falsas monetas'), but not the special expense of the bishop for construction purposes. Similar cases abound. King Henry II took part in the consecration of a new cathedral in Utrecht in June 1023, and several months later the ruler granted the Drenthe county to Bishop Adalbold II of Utrecht. Nothing indicates, however, that this donation had any sort of connection with the expenses the hierarch bore for the construction of his cathedral. The bishop was guaranteed the privilege of coinage powers in Utrecht itself as well as a tithe from the royal minting income from the entire diocese by Otto I as of 936 and 948.⁹⁹ With respect to the lack of unequivocal Western European analogies and the hypothetical nature of the conclusions based on Polish sources, it would be safer to say that episcopal minting activity could have been one of the sources for financing the monumental architecture. Yet it would be difficult to speak of a kind of rule according to which the episcopal coinage powers and activity would have always been linked with the undertaking of construction investments.

In response to the question regarding the purpose of the episcopal coin issues, we must refer to the scarce written sources in this area – particularly to ducal privileges. As I have previously indicated, the relation between Church coinage to the economic needs of the local market and the dynamic development of the early towns in the eleventh century, and sometimes to the appropriation of complete supremacy over these centers by local bishops is clearly visible.¹⁰⁰ The minting privileges of rulers known in Moravia and Poland – identical to the earlier privileges of German kings and emperors – relate to concrete market settlements, and also predominantly to centres of management of episcopal or monastic possessions, creating greater

⁹⁹ 'Ottonis I diplomata', ed. Theodor Sickel, in *Conradi I., Henrici I. et Ottonis I. Diplomata* (MGH, *Diplomata regum et imperatorum Germaniae*, i, Hanover, 1879–84), nos 6 and 98.

¹⁰⁰ The case of Cambrai is particularly indicative: those bishops, indeed, received coinage powers in the town from Charles the Simple, but they had to share power with the local counts. But the elimination of the count's influence occurred as early as the beginning of the reign of Otto I in 941 and 948, and the basis for episcopal supremacy, besides the abbacy of Saint-Géry, was the power of coinage and customs, see Kaiser, 'Münzprivilegien', 304; Steffen Patzold, "...inter pagensium nostrorum gladios vivimus". Zu den "Spielregeln" der Konfliktführung in Niederlothringen zur Zeit der Ottonen und frühen Salier', *Zeitschrift der Savigny – Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte, Germanistische Abteilung*, 118 (2001), 66–79.

settlement complexes. The Moravian cases of Podivín and Slivnice illustrate this principle quite markedly, but we also find this clearly on Polish lands in the thirteenth century. The oldest known minting privilege, granted in 1232 to Paul, bishop of Poznań, by Ladislas Odowic, foresaw minting in Stara Krobia, an old-time market settlement.¹⁰¹ The privileges of immunity and granting of regalia to the bishopric were confirmed in 1244 by the sons of Odowic despite the opposition that it aroused among the Greater Poland nobility. In the opinion of Roman Grodecki, this was to speak for the realisation of the powers contained in the privilege.¹⁰² Episcopal coins that would be products of the Krobia mint are not known. The great privilege for the Cistercian abbey at Lubiąż, an extension of the donation already made in 1225, was another grant at that time for Bishop Paul from Ladislas Odowic. The duke gave the monks 2,000 manses of arable land in the castellany Nakło with the right to found a town under German law, within which a *moneta specialis* was supposed to be minted.¹⁰³ In addition, the ruler's conferral to the same monastery of 3,000 manses near Wieleń (nearly contemporary in time to the previous granting) mentions the bestowing of an unspecified amount of material benefits *in moneta* along with income from regalia (beaver and fishes) and the judiciary.¹⁰⁴ In confirmation of this conferral conducted in 1239 a separate minting privilege of Odowic reads of the rights to mint

¹⁰¹ Mieczysław Brust, 'Geneza i początki miast w dobrach biskupów poznańskich w Wielkopolsce (XIII–XIV wiek)', 2 pts, *Nasza Przyszłość. Studia z Dziejów Kościoła i Kultury Katolickiej w Polsce*, 100–1 (2003–4), pt. 2, 101–9, lays out the formation of the settlement complex at Krobia before the first half of the twelfth century. It is possible that the Krobia Church dedicated to St Gilles is evidence of the affiliation of Krobia with bishop possessions as early as the second half of the eleventh century, as the bishop of Poznań Franko was a promoter of his cult according to the relations of Gallus Anonymus. The bishop supposedly invoked the intercession of the saint and monks of Saint Gilles on behalf of a child successor for Ladislas Herman and Judith of Bohemia.

¹⁰² Roman Grodecki conducted a comprehensive analysis of this privilege in *idem*, 'Przywilej menniczy biskupstwa poznańskiego z 1232 r.', in *idem*, *Polityka pieniężna Piastów* (Cracow, 2009), 33–67 (reprint from the edition of 1921).

¹⁰³ SUB, ii, no. 37: 'Monetam eciam specialem in eadem civitate habendam iam dicto abbati ob fidei argumentum libertate muniendo cum omni utilitate concedere curavimus'.

¹⁰⁴ SUB, ii, no. 31: 'cum omni iure et libertate in castoribus, piscariis, moneta, iudiciis et aliis libertatibus, quas contuli cum prima donatione, que sita est in territorio de Nakel'.

moneta specialis in one of three *civitates forenses* that were supposed to be founded on the aforementioned territory under German law.¹⁰⁵ The duke also granted the inhabitants of the aforementioned territory an exemption from customs and market duties. The lack of any traces of development of coinage production in this case may be explained by the fact that the Cistercians of Lubiąż were never able to manage the granted area and establish market settlements.¹⁰⁶ As a side issue related to Lubiąż minting, it is worth adding that coins are known that were most likely to have been minted by two other Cistercian monasteries – the abbeys in Jędrzejów and Wąchock in Lesser Poland. The Cistercians at Łekno also received minting rights for their territory in Pomerania in 1255.¹⁰⁷ The issues of monastic coinage, while not considered further in this study, reflect similar interpretational difficulties to episcopal coinage. It is worth sharing the opinion of Borys Paszkiewicz that ‘monastic minting had an economic character and served the rationalisation of the economy in monastic estates’.¹⁰⁸

The settlement of Buk most likely had an early town character; it was conferred to the Poznań bishopric by the dukes of Greater Poland including full title to banal lordship, customs, inns and coins, which is confirmed by the privilege of 1257.¹⁰⁹ The nature of the minting

¹⁰⁵ SUB, ii, nos 160 and 161.

¹⁰⁶ Waldemar Könighaus, *Die Zisterzienserabtei Leubus in Schlesien von ihrer Gründung bis zum Ende des 15. Jahrhunderts* (Deutsches Historisches Institut Warschau, Quellen und Studien, 15, Wiesbaden, 2004), 35; cf. Borys Paszkiewicz, ‘Mennictwo klasztorne w średniowiecznej Polsce’, in Anna Pobóg-Lenartowicz and Marek Derwich (eds.), *Klasztor w kulturze średniowiecznej Polski* (Opole, 1995), 326 f., who notices the possibility of identifying Lubiąż coins in the bracteate hoards as being from Silesia and Greater Poland.

¹⁰⁷ Suchodolski, *Moneta możnowładcza*, 96–102; Paszkiewicz, ‘Mennictwo klasztorne’, 325–30; *idem*, ‘The Coins of the Jędrzejów Abbey’, in *Studia numismatica. Festschrift Arkadi Molvogin 65*. (Tallin, 1995), 147–50.

¹⁰⁸ Paszkiewicz, ‘Mennictwo klasztorne’, 329; yet it is difficult to agree with the opinion that this was a phenomenon exclusive to Benedictine monasteries in the West, as in Saxony alone four abbeys of canonesses in Quedlinburg, Ganderheim, Essen and Herford were issuing their own coins as early as the Salian period.

¹⁰⁹ *Kodeks dyplomatyczny Wielkopolski* (hereafter: KDW), i, ed. Ignacy Zakrzewski (Poznań, 1877), no. 357; Brust, ‘Geneza i początki miast’, pt. 2, 84–92, notes a settlement there of early town features, located in the proximity of a stronghold, which also came into the possession of the bishopric. It was established under German law before 1295.

privileges is not sufficiently clear – it is believed that, as in Krobia, it concerned the title to independent coin minting.¹¹⁰ This title was unequivocally formulated in the privilege of Ladislas the Short of 1314. The king allowed the bishop of Poznań to mint his own coins (probably identical to the ducal coin in terms of the standard) in a successive administrative centre of the bishopric's estate in Greater Poland – Słupca, a settlement lying on the territory of the episcopal castellany of Ciężęń, founded just before 1290 and granted the law of Środa in 1296.¹¹¹ The solicitation of bishops for minting privileges at their market settlements indicates that they must have attached considerable weight to this type of economic activity. The complete lack of episcopal coins in numismatic stocks known so far is thus the more surprising. On the other hand, the policies of dukes conferring immunities and privileges to Church institutions should not be interpreted exclusively as a deference to the self-emancipating Church, or forced narrowing of ruler's prerogatives and revenues. The role of immunity as an instrument of power is receiving more and more emphasis – indeed, more in keeping with the Western European interpretation of this phenomenon.¹¹² The case of Ladislas Odowic distinctly shows that he treated support for ecclesiastical institutions – the Poznań bishopric and monastery of Lubiąż – as a way to strengthen of his own political position and secure peripheral areas of his territorial rule.¹¹³

Sławomir Gawlas has recently pointed out the close relationship between the aforementioned conferrals of minting titles and colonising activity and establishing settlements under German law.¹¹⁴

¹¹⁰ Suchodolski, *Moneta możnowładcza*, 91; differently Grodecki, 'Przywilej menniczy', 66 f., who believed that this was rather the conferral of a minting payment, known as *obraz*, or that the episcopal minting, functioning earlier in Krobia, was transferred to Buk.

¹¹¹ KDW, ii, ed. Ignacy Zakrzewski (Poznań, 1878), no. 964; on Słupca see Brust, 'Geneza i początki miast', pt. 1, p. 164–70.

¹¹² Cf. Sławomir Gawlas, 'Polityka wewnętrzna Przemysła II a mechanizmy dążeń i konfliktów w Wielkopolsce jego czasów', in Jadwiga Krzyżaniakowa (ed.), *Przemysł II. Odnowienie Królestwa Polskiego* (Poznań, 1997), 70 f.; Josef Žemlička, *Počátky Čech královských 1198–1253. Proměna státu a společnosti* (Praha, 2002), 204–10.

¹¹³ A concise and accurate assessment of the politics of Ladislas Odowic: Gawlas, 'Polityka wewnętrzna Przemysła II', 69–71.

¹¹⁴ Sławomir Gawlas, 'Komerccjalizacja jako mechanizm europeizacji peryferii na przykładzie Polski', in *idem* (ed.), *Ziemia polskie wobec Zachodu. Studia nad rozwojem średniowiecznej Europy* (Warsaw, 2006), 98 f.

A comprehensive organisation of the local market occurred with the establishment of market settlement under German law, with simultaneous organisation of its village hinterland and coin issue, serving local trade and exchange and payment of tithes. Models for these approaches were supplied by the mechanisms worked out on the terrain of German colonising expansion between the Oder and Elbe in the second half of the twelfth century.¹¹⁵

In addition, on the basis of the minting privileges for the archbishop of Gniezno – not supported by numismatic sources as is also with the case of Poznań – we can observe their clear relationship with the existence of the bishop's castellanies.¹¹⁶ The ducal permissions to mint independent coins obtained by Archbishop James in 1284 and 1286 relate to two twelfth-century estate complexes around Łowicz and Żnin. The foundation of the latter under the law of Środa occurred between 1267 and 1284, and the existence of a market there is certified by the Bull of Gniezno. During the thirteenth century the archbishops managed to eliminate the remains of ducal possession in the form of the stronghold in Żnin itself, conjoin Church possessions and broaden the scope of immunity obtained just before 1136.¹¹⁷ The privilege of Przemysław II for Archbishop James Świnka of 1284 foresaw the minting of a special coin – most probably according to the ducal standard but with his own die – in two mints in Żnin itself

¹¹⁵ The activity of the aforementioned archbishop of Magdeburg Wichman is often pointed to here, see Sławomir Gawlas, *O kształt zjednoczonego Królestwa. Niemieckie władztwo terytorialne a geneza społeczno-ustrojowej odrębności Polski* (Warsaw, 1996), 53.

¹¹⁶ On the latter, broadly in Karol Modzelewski, 'Między prawem książęcym w władztwem gruntowym', pt. 1: 'Z zagadnień początków poddaństwa w Polsce', *Przegląd Historyczny*, lxxi, (1980), 209–31; *idem*, 'Między prawem książęcym a władztwem gruntowym', pt. 2: 'Instytucja kasztelanii majątkowych Kościoła w Polsce XII–XIII w.', *ibidem*, lxxi, (1980), 449–80; Stanisław Trawkowski, "Homines ascriptici castellanie de Voybor". W sprawie genezy kasztelanii kościelnych', in Waldemar Bukowski *et al.* (eds.), *Cracovia – Polonia – Europa. Studia z dziejów średniowiecza ofiarowane Jerzemu Wyrozumskiemu w sześćdziesiątą piątą rocznicę urodzin i czterdziestolecie pracy naukowej* (Cracow, 1995), 221–7; Pauk and Wólkiewicz, "Ministri enim", 119–25.

¹¹⁷ *Castellatura Znegnensis* is first mentioned in 1234 (KDW, i, no. 174); that market was in the possession of the archbishop just before 1136. Extensively on the development of the centre, Mieczysław Brust, 'Lokacje miejskie w wielkopolskich dobrach arcybiskupów gnieźnieńskich w XIII i XIV wieku', *Nasza Przeszłość. Studia z Dziejów Kościoła i Kultury Katolickiej w Polsce*, 95 (2001), 83–98.

as well as a location of choice in the Łąd castellany.¹¹⁸ Two years later the archbishop estates concentrated in the Łowicz castellany received the coinage privilege from the Duke Boleslav II of Masovia, while in 1298 the same ruler permitted the archbishop to mint a coin with his own die in Łowicz, but according to the standard of the ducal coin minted in Płock.¹¹⁹ Although we do not have direct evidence that James Świnka conducted any more extensive colonialisation efforts on the Łowicz territory, the fact remains that it was the most expansive Church estate complex, counting more than 110 settlements in the mid-fourteenth century. Solicitation of the title to mint independent coinage for both archbishop territories described as castellanies clearly indicates the pursuit of the development of the territorial lordship of the archbishops.

Following this interpretation, it is possible to propose a similar explanation of the aims of the minting activity of the Cracow bishops in the first half of the thirteenth century. The issue is a response to the question of whether the coin emission dating back to the first quarter of that century and attributed to Ivo Odrowąż do not remain related to the colonising initiatives in bishop and chapter estates in the region of Łysogóry, which were bestowed in the privilege of Leszek the White for the settlement of German colonists in the Church castellanies of Kielce and Tarczek, evidenced only by the papal confirmation of 1227.¹²⁰ Particularly appropriate places for the location of episcopal mints would certainly have been Tarczek or Kielce – the seats of prepositures and collegiats as well as the administrative centres of the episcopal estate territories. In the case of the former location – as the name itself suggests (which means little market) – this was an old-time marketplace, established under German law between 1227 and 1253.¹²¹ The beginnings of a settlement established under German

¹¹⁸ KDW, i, no. 542; Suchodolski, *Moneta możnowładcza*, 94.

¹¹⁹ *Nowy Kodeks Dyplomatyczny Mazowsza*, ii, ed. Irena Sułkowska-Kuraś and Stanisław Kuraś (Warsaw, 1989), no. 76 and 103.

¹²⁰ *Kodeks Dyplomatyczny Katedry Krakowskiej św. Wacława* (hereafter: KDKK), i, ed. Franciszek Piekosiński (Cracow, 1874), no. 17; Feliks Kiryk provides basic information on both centres, see *idem*, *Urbanizacja Małopolski. Województwo sandomierskie XIII–XVI wiek* (Kielce, 1994), 54 f., 148.

¹²¹ Marek Jończyk, 'Z problematyki badań nad kasztelanią tarską w dobie średniowiecza', in Krzysztof Bracha (ed.), *Bodzentyn. Z dziejów miasta w XII–XX wieku*, (Kielce, 1998), 25–31; Stanisław Trawkowski, 'Zagadka prepozytury tarskiej',

law in Kielce are more difficult to recognise, although it must have already been functioning before the end of the thirteenth century.¹²² Both locations were described as *loca forensia* in the privilege of King Wenceslas II from 1295, permitting the bishop of Cracow Jan Muskata to raise fortifications.¹²³ The simultaneous chronological occurrence of episcopal coins and the colonising effort at the foot of Łysogóry mountains does not seem to be circumstantial. This assumption is additionally strengthened by the fact that the utilisation of mines most probably entered into the possessions of the Cracow Church as early as the thirteenth century, confirmed by the separate privilege of the Czech king for Bishop Jan Muskata.¹²⁴

The bishop of Włocławek Wolimir, strongly freeing himself from the sovereignty of the Kuyavia dukes, did not decide to accentuate his sovereignty with an attempt to mint coinage independently. *Ius ducale* was in this regard completely respected by the hierarch, though – as is known – he contested ducal authority to control the construction of a fortification. The weakening of ducal minting supremacy took place in this case as well with a privilege so broad it was unprecedented, granted by Duke Siemomysł on behalf of the bishopric in 1268, most evidently under the pressure of unfavourable political circumstances.¹²⁵ In the episcopal estates in the area of Kuyavia, the ducal coin was still used, but mint masters of the ruler stopped supervising its circulation with the exception of forgery issues. In this case as well, however, the fines charged by the ducal mint masters were supposed to replenish the Church treasury.¹²⁶ Monetary relations were regulated

in *idem*, *Opuscula medievistica*, 132–46 (1st edn in Helena Chłopocka *et al.* [eds.], *Mente et litteris. O kulturze i społeczeństwie wieków średnich* [Poznań, 1984], 175–87).

¹²² For a recent work on the beginnings of Kielce see Czesław Hadamik, *Pierwsze wieki Kielc. Kasztelania kielecka od przełomu XI i XII do połowy XIV stulecia* (Kielce, 2007), 106–13.

¹²³ KDKK, i, no. 101.

¹²⁴ The issue of this lost document is discussed by Hadamik, *Pierwsze wieki Kielc*, 47 f. The title to exploit the mine was confirmed by Ladislas the Short for the bishop in 1306. Suchodolski points to the relation between mining privileges and monastic coinage in the 13th century, see *idem*, *Moneta możnowładcza*, 102.

¹²⁵ The political circumstances surrounding this privilege have been discussed by Jadwiga Karwasińska, *Polityczna rola biskupa Wolimira (1259–1278)*, in *eadem*, *Wybór pism: Kujawy i Mazowsze* (Warsaw, 1997), 194–6 (reprint of the edition from 1928).

¹²⁶ *Codex Diplomaticus Poloniae*, ii, 1, ed. Leon Rzyszczewski and Aleksander Muczkowski (Warsaw, 1848), no. 94.

in a similar way on the territory of the bishop's castellany in Wolbórz under the privilege of Leszek the Black of 1273. Here again the ducal coin was to remain in circulation, but the mint masters of the ruler were deprived of the prerogative of its exchange and the pursuit of forgers, who were to be judged by the bishop's reeve (*scultetus*), and whose court punishments were divided in half.¹²⁷

VI

The reasons for the imperial conferral of coinage privileges to Church institutions in the Reich – just as other aforementioned treasury and jurisdictional privileges – should be viewed within a general conception of the functioning of the imperial Church. They were a form of compensation from the monarch for the bishoprics and monasteries which bore real material burdens, particularly those of the *servitium regis* during imperial visitations, the sending of armed contingents on royal war expeditions, and the not uncommon personal involvement of the bishops in these expeditions. In keeping with the findings of German researchers, the frequency of royal visits to bishop towns rose during the period of Henry II and the first Salian rulers, though a direct relationship between the royal *itinerarium* and the chronology and quality of conferrals has not been able to be determined unequivocally.¹²⁸ The Saxon and Rhenish bishoprics dominate on the lists of those receiving conferrals during the Liudolfing period, however, and they were those most often visited by the rulers. The oldest imperial privileges on behalf of bishops – including coinage privileges – derive from as early as the late Carolingian period. In the most recent literature, the theory of a Church imperial 'system' in the Reich as a discovery of the Ottonian period is treated skeptically. Its ideological bases were deeply rooted in the conception that had already been developed during the time of Louis the Pious, that the Emperor and episcopate shared responsibility for the people entrusted unto them by God, to bring them to eternal salvation. The practical realisation of these ideas involved the leveling of bishops as well as counts in

¹²⁷ *Ibidem*, no. 100.

¹²⁸ Herbert Zielinski, *Der Reichsepiskopat in spätottonischer und salischer Zeit (1002–1125)* (Stuttgart, 1984), 203–18; Raymond Kottje, 'Zur Bedeutung der Bischofstädte für Heinrich IV', *Historisches Jahrbuch*, xcvi/xcviii (1978), 131–57.

the performance of designated political tasks; in consequence, from the turn of the tenth century bishops were endowed with prerogatives of secular power, which was to facilitate the realisation of their *ministerium*. This model of relation between ruler and episcopate was most certainly adopted from the western part of the Reich east of the Rhine and Meuse, in its more complete form not before the era of Liudolfings.¹²⁹

Summing up the present considerations, it is necessary to be aware of the unusually significant qualification contained in the work of Stanisław Suchodolski, according to whom the number of coins struck by non-ducal issuers is certainly significantly greater than numismatists have been able to identify to this point.¹³⁰ This applies especially to ecclesiastical issues. Progress in numismatic research may fundamentally transform the state of current knowledge, which seems to be confirmed particularly by the research of Adam Kędzierski on dies of eleventh-century cross-deniers. He interpreted some of these artifacts, recovered en masse in hoards on Polish territory – recognised to this point without exception as Saxon issues – as productions of domestic mints, including the mint operating at the order of the count palatine Sieciech. He did not rule out the possibility of connections of some ‘hybrids’ with episcopal minting activity – which is to a certain extent a return to Gumowski’s concept, which would seem to have been completely discarded.¹³¹ The large number of hitherto unattributed bracteates from the twelfth and thirteenth centuries offers an opportunity to enrich the existing findings, though their unambiguous classification will certainly not be easy.

The turn of the fourteenth century is a very critical break point for the issue under examination. Episcopal minting was able to survive and develop – and with varied success – only where episcopal territorial lordship had been successfully established. This occurred in Silesia, where minting sovereignty was guaranteed to the Wrocław bishops by the concord with Henry IV Probus as of 1290, as it was in West Pomerania, where the process of the emergence of territorial

¹²⁹ Recently especially Steffen Patzold, *Episcopus. Wissen über Bischöfe im Frankenreich des späten 8. bis frühen 10. Jahrhundert* (Mittelalter-Forschungen, 25, Ostfildern, 2008), 521 f.

¹³⁰ Suchodolski, *Moneta możnowładcza*, 103.

¹³¹ Adam Kędzierski, ‘Polskie denary krzyżowe w skarbie ze Słuszkowa’, *Wiadomości Numizmatyczne*, 42 (1998), 21–46.

lordship of the bishops of Kammin was initiated with the purchasing of titles to supremacy in the Kołobrzeg castellanies.¹³² These processes are a faithful reflection of phenomena which had taken place with advanced notice in the German Empire.

Notwithstanding, can the earlier cases of episcopal minting activity be explained by the influence of their German analogues? Similar to the case of Church castellanies, I am apt to see the grants of coinage privileges to Polish and Bohemian Church institutions as modelled after economic behaviour of the German emperors toward the imperial Church. This was a relatively late reception, corresponding in degree to conditions in the domestic money economy, developed fully not earlier than the second half of the twelfth century. It may be, however, that among the large number of unidentified coins from the period from the end of the eleventh century until the thirteenth century there are other unrecognised issues of the hierarchs of the restored Polish Church. The superiority of numismatics over history in this area is evinced in the never-ending growth of source material. It would therefore be worthwhile for researchers of medieval money to take into account paradigm changes related to the entirety of socio-political relations in Central Europe.

trans. Zofia Szozda

¹³² Kiersnowski, 'Monety biskupów kamięńskich', 14 f., as the first certain episcopal issues, not counting the ephemeral 12th-century coins of Bishop Siegfried, identify the coinage production of the Kołobrzeg (German Kolberg) mint from the end of the 13th and the beginning of 14th century.