

ARCHIVE

Danuta Borawska, 1922–91, studied History under the German occupation on a clandestine basis and obtained her M.A. degree after World War II, in 1948; her M.A. thesis was published in early 1951.¹ She owed her exquisite and early scholarly debut to her peculiar (especially given the context of the time) skill of working with use of narrative sources and special predilection for focusing, as a researcher, on clearly set problems: this, again, being based on sources, rather than divagations of some ‘classical authors’ or influential medievalists. Whilst the dissertation (as might have been expected) proposed a new view of St Stanislaus’s cult, it has offered certain fundamental observations with regards to the first-ever written life of this martyr-saint, penned in the thirteenth century by Wincenty of Kielcza, a Dominican friar. Danuta Borawska’s doctoral thesis, published 1964, has also made a lasting name for itself in Polish medievalist studies – as attested, for instance, by the study’s re-edition issued in 2013.²

*Danuta Borawska resumed the issues posed to research scholars by chroniclers’ narrative records in two articles, both of which have become classical in the Polish medievalist studies. The first – the one we present in this volume – was published in 1965, and the other in 1977, both focusing on the two major works of Polish medieval historiography: the chronicle (*Gesta principum Polonorum*) by Gallus Anonymus and the one (*Chronica Polonorum*) by Master Vincentius, called Kadłubek. The author’s penetration and clear-sightedness, and the courage to confront her own, apparently overly daring, hypothesis against the ‘binding’ views and concepts, made her ‘transfer’ the author of Gallus’s chronicle from the vicinity of the Loire, and the circle of Master Hildebert of Lavardin’s students, all the way to the Venetian Lido, where the same intellectual would have written his other work, *Historia de translatione sanctorum Magni Nicolai* Notably, the rhythmic pattern applied in the latter work is almost identical to that of Gallus’s *Chronica*.*

After some twenty years of silence, Danuta Borawska’s essay on Gallus was rediscovered as Professor Marian Plezia, the great cognoscente of the Gallus work, made it part of the ‘scholarly orthodoxy’. In his words,

¹ Danuta Borawska, *Z dziejów jednej legendy: w sprawie genezy kultu św. Stanisława biskupa* (Warszawa, 1950).

² *Eadem, Kryzys monarchii wczesnopiastowskiej w latach trzydziestych XI wieku* (Warszawa, 1964, 2013²).

the essay “has not reverberated in the science to the extent it deserved it”; putting aside the author’s speculation regarding the anonymous chronicler’s identification with certain specific historic figures, Plezia declared his readiness to “all the more strongly emphasise her true merits.”³ Presently, Tomasz Jasiński successfully follows on with threads of the ‘traditional Gallus’s’ Italian biography and identity. Borawska also had a good intuition in her research into Master Vincentius’s work as she developed her argument – in opposition to her most erudite and gifted scholar Brygida Kürbis – that sought to determine this chronicler’s dependence upon the Cistercian cultural formation, including Bernard of Clairvaux himself.

Danuta Borawska’s independent scholarly spirit was strong and ready to fight for a long time but, most regrettably, eventually yielded to an emaciating illness. She tried hard to work till her very last days, concentrating on genealogical and political relation(ship)s of Poland’s earliest rulers with the Saxon elite.⁴

trans. Tristan Korecki

Jacek Banaszekiewicz

³ Marian Plezia, ‘Nowe studia nad Gallem Anonimem’, in *Mente et litteris. O kulturze i społeczeństwie wieków średnich* (Poznań, 1984), 111.

⁴ Danuta Borawska, ‘Margrabia Miśni Ekkehard i Ludolfingowie’, *Kwartalnik Historyczny*, lxxxvi, 4 (1979), 933–50; *eadem*, ‘Mieszko i Oda w kręgu consanguineorum Ludolfingów’, in Stefan K. Kuczyński (ed.), *Spółczesność Polski średnio-wiecznej*, i (Warszawa, 1981), 11–39; for a German translation, cf. ‘Mieszko I. und Oda im Kreis consanguineorum Ludolfingorum’, *Jahrbuch für Geschichte*, xxiii (1981), 79–102.

Danuta Borawska

GALLUS ANONYMUS, OR, ITALUS ANONYMUS?*

Unceasingly reappearing in medievalists' works, the question 'Who was Gallus Anonymus?' remains a never-solved problem in erudite criticism of the earliest Polish chronicle. None of the nine hypotheses contending about the chronicler's 'nationality' or the country of his origin has gained a *communis opinio* among scholars, albeit the French-speaking countries of Provence and Flanders, alongside Hungary, have recently been taken into special consideration. There is still no consent among scholars concerning the schools where Gallus was taught the rules of *ars dictandi* and metric forms he displayed a masterly command of.

There is no need to reemphasise the cognitive values stemming, with respect to criticism and analysis of any historiographical source, from identification of the chronicler. In the case of Gallus, whose work combines the values of a content-wealthy historiographic monument, a diverse ideological programme, and illustrious polemical zeal, identification of this author should imply extended potential for critical interpretation as well as better reading of the commentaries and facts presented in the chronicle itself.

The discussion on this mysterious author has been focusing, generally speaking, around two issues. In the first place, the chronicler's situation in Poland¹, and secondly, the critical moments in Gallus's

* The function of this communiqué is to signal the author's point-of-departure in the seeking of Gallus and to indicate some heuristic results from the Italian territory. As the work is on, we have skipped parts of the apparatus and quit a deeper insight into the outlined issues of Gallus's, and bishop Maur's, cultural associations or relationships with other European hubs. [In the present edition of Danuta Borawska's article some minor corrections in the footnotes and in the Latin quotations have been introduced by the editors.]

¹ For a review of reference literature, see Marian Plezia, *Kronika Galla na tle historiografii XII wieku* (Rozprawy Akademii Umiejętności. Wydział Historyczno-

biography before his arrival in the country of the 'prince of the North'², have been taken into consideration. Insofar as the broadly tackled issues related to the chronicler's biography turned out to trigger a far-reaching controversy, there is a quite wide consensus as regards the views on the circumstances of Gallus's stay in Poland. Historians have basically not rejected anything of the author's confession scattered in the introductory epistles to the chronicle's three books. It has been accepted that the historiographer was a Benedictine monk temporarily tarrying (living) in Poland and, arguably, acting as a chaplain to the duke himself. Gallus drew the information material, and the incentive for writing a chronicle, from Chancellor Michał (Michael) and Bishop Paweł (Paul) belonging to the ducal court circle. Having completed his work and received the expected royalties, the monk apparently returned to his mysterious *locum professionis*. Such a schematic factual framework has served as a footing for the hypotheses that more specifically dealt with the circumstances of Gallus's sojourn in Poland.

Was this anonymous chronicle indeed penned by a monk who temporarily sojourned in Duke Boleslaus's country and wrote 'on commission' of high-ranking court figures? Or, did the chronicler merely fulfil a restricted role of tradition transmitter, limiting his ambition to a material reward? The affirmative answers, accepted at the earlier stage of acquaintance with the chronicle, may trigger doubts today. The accepted vision of a modest historiographer, based on Gallus's own account, is unverifiable at present. Was it possible at the moment his work was completed? Seemingly, no – his contemporaries 'did not sign' the chronicle with the author's name, after all. The concept of court censorship would explain why the *gesta* were

-Filozoficzny, ser. ii, 46, Kraków, 1947), 140 ff.; Karol Maleczyński, 'Wstęp', in *Galli Anonymi Cronica et gesta ducum sive principum Polonorum*, ed. *idem* (MPH, s.n., 2, Kraków, 1952), lxxxv–xcv. For a resumé of the follow-up of the discussion, see Brygida Kürbis and Gerard Labuda, *Studia Źródłoznawcze*, i (1957), 210–13. Also, cf. *Studia Źródłoznawcze*, ii (1958), 221.

² The opinions and views in this respect have been collected by Gerard Labuda, 'Miejsce powstania kroniki Anonima Galla', in *Prace z dziejów Polski feudalnej ofiarowane Romanowi Grodeckiemu w 70 rocznicę urodzin* (Warszawa, 1960), 113–21. Significant about the discussion that oscillates between seeing Gallus as a member of the ducal *cappella* and the hypothesis whereby he was a monk at Lubiń is Gallus's positive attitude towards all the allusions about himself. In fact, though, there are certain contradictions one might discern in the suggestions made by this author, which seem astonishingly numerous, given his status as a resolute anonym.

ubruptly brought to an end, and suggest that the chronicler fell into disfavour. We do not have to resort to such a construction: but should rather suppose that the author of the chronicle remained unknown out of his own will, and that the information leading to both court dignitaries (who probably died before the work was completed) and to the ducal *cappella* were apparent traces, not sufficient for resolving the mystery of Gallus in as early as the twelfth century.

The numerous contradictions coming to light as the author's declarations get confronted with the outcome of the study of his chronicle prevents us from accepting the traditional version. As it seems, this author's excellent command of the techniques of his contemporary poetics as well as his literary talent predestined him for an exquisite role in any ecclesiastical hub; therefore, it is hard to figure out why in the country where a serious clergy shortage was keenly felt Gallus's role remained lowly. His minute knowledge of the events taking place in his time in Poland, and his own involvement in the defence of Boleslaus the Wry-mouthed's throne seemingly do not quite fit, once again, the characteristics of a monk on a temporary stay in Poland. The feeling of contradiction grows severer as we realise that the author's attitude to Boleslaus rose high above superficial panegyricism. The chronicler consistently and meticulously selected historical episodes that illustrated the supernatural and natural qualifications of the duke for the throne, his commentary inevitably leading towards conclusions favouring the ruler. All this seemed to conceal an author who cared much more about the dynastic affairs in Poland than a monk on a temporary visit could have been suspected of.

These considerations lead us to assume that the *Gesta ducum* were actually penned by a distinguished figure at Duke Boleslaus's court. The author's involvement on the dukes's side in an internal conflict and his polemical stance against Archbishop Marcin (Martin)³ implied the necessity to apply some bold deception.

Within the group of bishops in Boleslaus's camp, the only traces of a certain expertise in legal forms and Church rituals were left by Bishop Maur (1109–18). His close relationship with Boleslaus's Cracow court – including his stay in the city where the chronicle was

³ Danuta Borawska, *Kryzys monarchii wczesnopiastowskiej w latach trzydziestych XI w.* (Warszawa, 1964, 2013²), 148. The problem of the author's tendencies and polemics will be discussed in a separate essay.

compiled⁴ and his arrival in Poland around 1110, at the time when our anonymous historiographer appeared there – oblige us to focus our attention on this man as a potential author of the *gesta*. Whilst taking this hypothesis into account does not influence the direction of our research, which should to be set by the chronicle itself, it enables to broaden the field of the research methods we use. The latter should take into account the eventuality that the author did not endeavour at all to make himself easily identifiable and moreover, outright made such identification difficult by giving false pretence.

The answer to the very basic question of what was Gallus Anonymus's location of activity prior to his arrival in Poland, should primarily be based on the data provided by the chronicle itself. Earlier literature tended to solve this issue from the point of view of the chronicler's *outside-Poland* information on the cult of St Aegidius, on southern Slavdom, as well as Hungarian affairs. The high esteem of Gallus's individuality as an author and his innovative literary techniques, compared to European literature of that time, has incited scholars to investigate into the literary phenomena which could possibly help categorise Gallus within a specific milieu in Western intellectual landscape. Karl K. Pohlheim and Feliks Pohorecki's studies on early medieval rhythmicity have supplied arguments in favour of an Italian educational background of Gallus. Marian Plezia, whose studies in the literary genre, language, and style of the chronicle led to a general recognition of a Roman provenance of Gallus, has reinforced the Provençal origin hypothesis. Finally, Karol Maleczyński in drawing up his statistically framed outline of the chronicle's literary borrowings geography, and also basing upon data depicting the appearance of rhythmic prose in Europe, tipped Flanders as Gallus's educational hinterland. Jerzy Zatycki has pointed out to Gallus's association with France (Saint-Hubert or Chartres). However, this method aroused objections amongst critics. Unsatisfactory knowledge on the occurrence of individual literary phenomena, along with inability to determine whether the chronicler was originally associated with the milieu(s) where the characteristics of his style blossomed in the most opulent fashion, or, with some peripheries where analogous phenomena appeared as well, hindered the findings and conclusions. On the other hand, it has to be admitted that the studies on the literary

⁴ Labuda, 'Miejsce powstania', 113–21.

aspects of the chronicle remarkably deepened the knowledge on the work and developed a platform for further research.

Gallus alludes to his own past in a rather vague manner: "... *exul apud vos et peregrinus: opus non ideo cepi ... ut patriam vel parentes meos ... exaltarem*" ('Introductory epistle' to Book III). Such remarks are detached from the historical facts to the extent that even with the assumption that the author wanted to make himself unrecognisable, there was no threat whatsoever that he could have been identified by his contemporaries on such a basis. And, this is why one cannot deny their credibility. No less enigmatic – and astonishing, given the context of a chronicle of the dukes of Poland – is the mention of Hungarian King Peter the Venetian [Peter Orseolo] having initiated the construction of St Peter's church in *Bazoarium*, whatever the name was meant to stand for – "*quam nullus rex ad modum inchoationis usque hodie consumavit*" (I, 18).

Since the time of Wojciech Kętrzyński⁵, historians have discerned in this phrase traces of the author's personal experience, if not some close association, related to the said church. Perhaps the key to Gallus's past should be traced along this line indeed – a somewhat awkward task as there is no *Bazoarium* functioning as a place or locality name. This *Bazoarium* has so far been situated in Hungary, as Borsod, Vasvár, or Pécs (with regard to the local St Peter's church, founded by King Peter Orseolo). But the onomastic base for identification of any of these locations as *Bazoarium* has been missing. This being the case, one has to agree with M. Plezia's remark that

Bazoarium is thus, evidently, a one-time designation used by the chronicler only once to denote a locality well known to him, without complying to its current name.

As it seems, no localities may be proposed at liberty until the issue in question – the term that offered this author a pretext for renaming a specific locality name into a conventional one – is resolved.

The tradition of Peter 'the Venetian' has been strictly related to the *Bazoarium* issue. The chronicler's warm attitude toward Peter contrasts with the unified voice of Hungarian historiographers, a hymn

⁵ Wojciech Kętrzyński, 'Niektóre uwagi o autorze i tekście najdawniejszej kroniki polskiej', *Rozprawy Wydziału Historyczno-Filozoficznego Akademii Umiejętności*, iii (1909), 61.

of hate against the Italian foreigner. Therefore, we should explore the possibility of finding the *Bazoarium* in Peter's homeland – the Venetian area. Tadeusz Wojciechowski once ventured a guess that Gallus was a Venetian of the Orseolo lineage. The chronicler's affection toward King Peter is hard to deny, all the more that the ruler's promotion as benefactor of Casimir I the Restorer occurs in the chronicle with a fashion that eschews any control, contradicting the Saxon tradition of the time and, as we may guess, by fictionally lending Peter all the merits for the house of Piast. Could it be possible that the chronicler was then a Venetian, who thus was extolling his native country and his possible *parentes*?

Looking up contemporary Venetian sources, very numerous, compared to the corresponding Polish material, it is possible, at the present stage of research, to analyze three elements of a new, still hypothetical, reconstruction of Gallus's biography:

1. *Badoari* (*Badovarii*, *Baduarii*, today: Badoer) – the great Venetian family and their relations with St Peter's Cathedral in Venice;
2. A hagiographical work by an anonymous author, entitled *Historia de translatione sanctorum magni Nicolai, terra marique miraculis gloriosi, ejusdem avunculi alteris Nicolai, Theodorique martyris pretiosi, de civitate Mirea in monasterium S. Nicolai de Littore Venetiarum*, written down after the year 1100 in rhythmic rhymed prose displaying striking analogies to the style of Gallus's chronicle;
3. A record on John Maur, archdeacon of Venice's St Peter's Cathedral; elected bishop of Torcello, who Peter Badoer, then patriarch of Grado, refused to consecrate and then had expelled before 1105;
4. In his list of the most important local families, who reportedly had settled in the Venetian isles during the Great Migration period, Venetian chronicler Andrea Dandolo mentions "*Particiaci qui nunc Baduarii appellati sunt*" in the first place.⁶ The great esteem and respect enjoyed by the Badoer family in medieval Venice had to do with several members of the family holding the dignities of doge, patriarch of Grado, and bishops of the

⁶ *Andreae Danduli Venetorum ducis Chronicon Venetum: a pontificatu S. Marci ad annum usque MCCCXXXIX*, ed. Ludovico A. Muratori (*Scriptores Rerum Italicarum*, 12, Milano, 1728), 155.

several 'Venetian' cathedrals. In the former half of the ninth century, bishop Ursus Particiacus started the construction of St Peter's church on the isle of Olivolo [*sestiere* Castello today], and consecrated the temple.⁷ The church acted as a cathedral and was termed *in castello* from the late eleventh century onwards. Peter Orseolo certainly did not commence this project, though he could have contributed to the church's reconstruction at a later date, though we know nothing about this. All the same, the church once founded by the Badoers could indeed have conventionally been named *Badoarium*.

Did *Badoarium* turn into *Bazoarium* – and, if so, how did it happen? Let us leave aside the explanation in terms of a copyist's error, as an unwelcome ultimate solution. The issue is perhaps explainable on the grounds of linguistics, due to the characteristic transition of the Latin consonants 't' and 'd' into 'z' in Italian words of Latin origin, as e.g. in *piazza* (*platea*) or *pranzo* (*prandium*).

Whereas the phonetic questions still call for a verdict from linguists, one would now be inclined to pose a hypothesis that would associate the Venetian Cathedral of St Peter *in castello* with the *Bazoarium* by Gallus, which obviously implies that the hypothesis of the chronicler's Italian, if not specifically Venetian, provenance should be considered.

The historical discussion has already offered serious arguments in favour of the Italian option. The value of F. Pohorecki's studies in early medieval rhythmic⁸ and his remarks on the associations of Gallus's writing technique with the Italian hub, whence the skills of *ars dictandi* and new forms of *cursus* developed in the eleventh century radiated in a later period to the whole of Europe, needs being appreciated.

The hypothesis of Gallus's Venetian descent, which was first put forth, as a conjecture, by T. Wojciechowski, is seemingly reaffirmed by a number of data. When accepted, this version helps understand the author's detailed knowledge of the eastern coasts of the Adriatic Sea, as demonstrated in his description of Slavdom. As we know, these lands were the expansion aerea of the Venetian state, that subordinated Dalmatia in the eleventh century. The incomprehensible insertion of 'Venice' in the description of Slavdom – in the phrase "*ubi*

⁷ *Ibidem*, 168.

⁸ Feliks Pohorecki, *Rytmika kroniki Galla Anonima* (Poznań, 1930).

Venetia et Aquileia consistunt” (as first remarked by T. Tyc⁹) – would thus be explained. It also seems that the chronicler’s characteristic familiarity with various luxury objects could have had to do with his stay in a city that was famous for its wealth and fondness for pomp and splendour.

The items to be found in the chronicle in support of Gallus’s association with Venice can be multiplied, and coincide with a considerable amount of evidence (sea-related; stylistic and linguistic analogies with the earlier *Chronicon Venetum et Gradense* by John the Deacon; and so on). Assumption of Gallus’s *Venetian* provenance does in no way preclude his possible associations with other countries, of which he has been suspected by some scholars. There were strong bonds linking Hungary and Venice at the time; hence a Venetian’s knowledge of Hungarian affairs is understandable. Gallus’s relations with France, where, since the beginning of the eleventh century sons of the local aristocracy were sent to study, remain an open issue: even if proved, the presence of such relations would not preclude the Venice-related hypothesis.

1. According to those scholars who have dealt with literary aspects of Gallus’s work testifies to his remarkable talent as a writer; and also his exquisite command of the then-most-modern stylistic rules. High esteem of *gesta*’s prosaic and poetic qualities has quite often been accompanied by the expectancy that this author was not the proverbial *auctor unius libelli* and that some other works attesting to his talent, with their characteristic stylistic traces, may still be found some day.
2. So far, the search for other works by Gallus in those places that supposedly may have been his place of origin or education have produced, though, no convincing results, whereas the discovery and identification of a contemporaneous work displaying identical stylistic qualities and distribution of *cursus* forms would be, as F. Pohorecki has postulated, the indispensable condition for the chronicler’s identification.

The hypothesis identifying Venice’s St Peter’s church as the *Bazoarium* in Gallus obviously incites one to take an interest in the Venetian literary and historical output of the time. On the basis of initial studies, which could not take into account the then-

⁹ Teodor Tyc, *Z dziejów kultury polskiej w średniowieczu* (Poznań, 1924), 112.

inaccessible Italian literature, there are no grounds for us to prove that Venice in the late eleventh/early twelfth century could have been a hub of historiographic production¹⁰; nor could it be assigned the role of centre of intellectual life which blossomed in that part of Italy at the time. One should, however, mention the appearance in Venice, probably in the sphere of influence of the bishop of St Peter's Cathedral at Olivolo, of a hagiographic work written in rhymed prose employing *cursus* forms, with its characteristic stylistic coincidences with Gallus's Chronicle.

The anonymous 'History of the Translation of the Great St Nicholas, the Saintly Uncle, another Nicholas, and St Theodor the Martyr from Myra to the St Nicholas Monastery of the Venetian Lido'¹¹, is, basically, a classical example of hagiographical work, composed of three parts: a description of the translation, a sermon, and a list of miracles. In practice, however, since the acquisition of the relics and their translation was only a fragment of a great expedition of the Venetian fleet that took part in the Crusaders' fighting in Palestine in 1100, the first part of the piece eulogised the *gesta* of Venetian Crusaders in the Holy Land and forms the basic source for discussion on the issue.

The Venetian fleet, led by a sons of Doge John and under the spiritual guidance of Henry, bishop of St Peter's Cathedral, left Venice in the autumn of 1099 and sailed, *via* Dalmatia, to Rhodos. The crew stayed there for the winter and then fought a victorious battle against the Pisan fleet off the island's coast. After their several days' stay in Myra, Asia Minor, where the relics of St Nicholas and his companions were obtained in dramatic circumstances, the Venetians then sailed via Cyprus to Jaffa, where they were welcomed by the patriarch and by Godfrey of Bouillon. Having visited all the sacred sites, "*quae peregrini querere solent et debent*", and having drawn up a series of trade agreements, the *peregrini* and the Crusaders joined

¹⁰ For a chronological breakdown of Venetian historiographic works, see Auguste Prost, 'Les chroniques vénitiennes', *Revue des questions historiques*, xxxi (1882), 542–55.

¹¹ 'Monachi anonymi Littorensis Historia de translatione sanctorum Magni Nicolai, terra marique miraculis gloriosi, eiusdem avunculi alterius Nicolai, Theodorique martyris pretiosi, de civitate Mirea in monasterium S. Nicolai de littore Venetiarum', in *Recueil des historiens des croisades. Historiens occidentaux*, v (Paris, 1895), 253.

the campaign for the conquest of Haifa, and returned afterwards to Venice, bringing with them solemnly on 6th December the sacred relics, which were deposited at the Lido monastery. The historical section of this anonymous literary piece was positively appraised by the source's editors, in the *Recueil des Historiens des Croisades*. The credibility of the hagiographical section was rejected instead by expert scholars, due to precedents related to the cult of St Nicholas.¹²

The eleventh century saw the Western Church remarkably develop the cult of a Saint, who had thitherto been worshipped mainly in the East. Nicholas's relics were transferred in 1087 from the aforementioned Myra in Lycia to Bari in Italy. This fact, recognised by ecclesiastical authorities and papacy, was practically challenged by the Venetians who carried out an action once again in order to win and import what they considered 'the true' relics of Nicholas, this time from Myra to Venice. The unrewarding task of convincing the world about the validity of the cause contrived by the Venetians was tackled by the anonymous author of the *Historia de translatione* – acting, no doubt, on initiative of those Church circles that had inspired the translation of the relics to Venice.

Ferdinando Ughelli, the first editor of the *Historia*, ascribed the work to an anonymous monk from St Nicholas's monastery in Lido, based on the allusions made by the author to his stay in the cloister.¹³ The concept, taken over by the later editions, suggests certain objections. It seems that also in this particular case we are dealing with an author who would have rather not revealed his name, given the understandable delicateness of the situation that had arisen, due to the fact that the Venetians had imported „competitive“ relics and the fear that this action would be condemned by official ecclesiastical circles. This might have driven the author to leaving false traces pointing to the monastery. And yet it is obvious that the translation of the relics was patronised by the bishop of St Peter's Cathedral, who is also the *Historia's* the main character. This evidence would make us track down the author as being part of Bishop Henry's environment, possibly one of the Cathedral's clergymen.

¹² Cf. *ibidem*, xlix. Also, cf. Bernard Leib, *Rome, Kiev et Byzance à la fin du XIe s.* (Paris, 1924), 56, n. 4.

¹³ Ferdinando Ughelli, *Italia sacra*, v: 'Arcidiocesi e diocesi Venetia et Histria' (Roma, 1653).

Objections should also be raised against the hypothetical date adopted by the editors, in which the work was composed, that is to say after the year 1116. A separate justification is required in this case: we have substantial evidence indicating that the work could have possibly been written shortly after 1100, and when Henry (who died in 1108) was still alive.

A valuable historic source, *Historia de translatione* offers Polish historians an additional value, owing to its analogies to Gallus's chronicle made apparent through the style, language, rhythmic forms and rhymes of the Venetian piece. We have to readily state that the Venetian source was more modest in size than Gallus's Chronicle. Amongst the crucial differences, we would moreover point out that, contrary to what is characteristic of the Polish chronicle, the *Historia de translatione* features no insertions in verse form, hymns or cantilenas. Like Gallus's work, the Venetian piece is written in rhymed prose using two voices rhyme; again, similarly to the chronicle, it makes a wide use of *cursus* forms. Although the two pieces represent two different literary genres, the layout of their respective contents is similar: the text is divided into small chapters, named *capitula*, entitled and numbered. Frequent quotations of epistles, orations, or utterances, with use of the *oratio recta* are the other mutually analogous phenomena.

In comparing the style and the language of the two works, attention ought to be paid on the liberty and writing fluency characteristic of both authors. Repeated words and phrases appear quite rarely in either, whilst both show an inclination towards identical grammatical and syntactical forms. A separate philological study, based on the entire *Historia* made available, would be required here.

To show some striking similarities in the style and vocabulary of the two pieces – as mutually thematically dissimilar as they are, one being an example of *sacra* and the other, of *profana* – a handful of examples should suffice.

According to M. Plezia, to whom we owe so far the most detailed and extensive description of Gallus's language and style, one of the most characteristic features of the Chronicle are its author's own utterances (written down using the *coniunctivus hortativus*), with which the author encourages further work or informs the reader that the narrative switches into a different issue. Identical utterances can be found in the *Historia*, as results from the following comparison:

Historia de translatione sanctorum ...
(*Recueil des Historiens des Croisades*)

Gallus Anonymus [MPH, S.N., 2]

p. 269 D

Nunc vero de classe aliquantulum *sileamus*, eamque Deo regendam committamus, atque Venetiam, cum legatis consolandam, narraturis passibus *redeamus*.

p. 40

Sed de Meschone *sileamus* et ad Kazimirum restauratorem Polonie *descendamus*.

p. 100

Sed de miraculis *sileamus*, nostramque materiam *teneamus*.

p. 42

... ad desolationem Polonie *redeamus*

p. 271 B

De his igitur, quae Venetiae fiebant, ad praesens satis dictum esse putamus; nunc in pelago cum classe dimissa, stylo navigantes, Hierosolimam *adeamus*

p. 109

Sed quid ... egerit obmittamus et in medio terre civitatem Albam obsidendam *adeamus*

p. 276 EF

Nunc vero, quia *longum est* de singulis rebus gestis per ordinem *enarrare*, et quia nobis propositum est corpora sanctorum Venetiam apportare, Christi praeconia praedicantes et diaboli *superbiam conculcantes*, sic multiloquium excludamus, ut coeptum breviter expleamus.

p. 52

longum existit enarrare

p. 26

nobis *longus* et infinitus labor *est enarrare*

p. 150

superbiam eorum conculcabit

p. 256

Quae autem ibi de suo regno tractaverint et ordinaverint, et multa alia de itinere proposito historiographi *luculenti narrationi* reservemus, et ad ea, quae nostrae mentis intentio et sanctissimi confessoris Nicolai devotio exigit, ipso opitulante *et stylum* et studium *applicemus*

p. 81

luculenta oratione

p. 57

et *stylum* et animum *applicemus*

p. 257 B

nec *minas* hominum timens, nec *blanditiis* animum *flectens*

p. 41

ad fidem *minis* et *blanditiis* convertebat,

p. 137

nec *minis*, nec muneribus, nec promissis cives *flectare* ... potuisset

p. 257 E	p. 45
Omnibus ergo cunitis et in servitio Dei confirmatis, nuntiatum est Pisanorum classem adesse contra eos, armatam et praeeparatam in praelium, qui in tantum superbiae fastum ascenderant, quod navim imperialem et signa imperialia sibi fecerant, et seipsos totum mundum devincentes appellabant.	[Meczlavus] ... in tantum superbie fastum conscenderat, quod obedire Kazimiro renuebat insuper etiam ei armis et insidiis resistebat.
p. 265	p. 151
<i>Tunc vero iuventus Venetica</i>	<i>Tum vero iuventus Polonica</i>
p. 266 A	p. 113
Mirabile dictu! mirabilisque Deus in sanctis suis!	<i>Mirabile dictu,</i>
	p. 127
	<i>Gloriosus Deus in sanctis suis.</i>

Gallus's work is far more extensive and features a considerable portion of verse insets. The *Historia*, written, as it were, somewhat hastily, has no long cantilenas or hymns. All the same, among the few Leonine verses comprised in this piece is Bishop Henry's prayer to St Nicholas. Strikingly, the abbot of the Provencal monastery of Saint Gilles uses identical words in his own prayer for the successor of Duke Ladislaus Herman's throne:

p. 256 B	p. 59
Praesul sancte Dei! caput huius materiei! Perfice servorum, quae poscunt vota tuorum	Euge, serve Dei, caput huius materiei! Perfice servorum, que poscunt vota tuorum

A certain amount of the analogies appearing in both texts undoubtedly consists in making use of the same phrases or expressions from the Scripture (one example being "*superbiam diaboli conculcare*"). When reading the two works carefully, we can nonetheless find that the similarities reach much deeper, beyond the verbal analogies. There is a similar inclination for certain grammatical and syntactic forms, along with obedience shown by both authors to the principles of the *ars dictandi*. The latter is true not only for the cursus and the rhyme,

these implying multiple stylistic consequences; striking is also the employment of similar clauses, such as *coma* and *cola*, and a liking for alliteration.

One could suppose that such striking similarities testify to a shared author or, at least, one, rather narrow, circle of authors. It is of course for philologists to finally decide some day, whether we are looking at an earlier work by Gallus.

The Venetian trace of the anonymous 'Gallus', whom we have almost identified as the author of *Historia de translatione*, incites us to take a closer look at the local clergy of the time – primarily, the churchmen active within the circle of St Peter's Cathedral at Olivolo, which we have identified as the *Bazoarium* in Gallus. Available sources have enabled us to encounter an intriguing figure whose biography suggests some analogy with the chronicler. The clergyman that attracts our interest is *Johannes Maurus*, archdeacon with St Peter's Cathedral, a member of the old Venetian Mauro family. At an unknown date, certainly before 1105, Johannes was appointed bishop of another Venetian cathedral, the one of Torcello. Petrus Badoarius, the then-patriarch of Grado, prevented his consecration as bishop, and Johannes was eventually expelled; as we are told by the catalogue of Torcello bishops, "*Johannes Mauro electus, qui fuit archidiaconus Olivolensis episcopatus, eiectus a Petro Badovario patriarcha, sedit ...*"¹⁴ The would-be bishop of Torcello should become the focus of our interest, for a number of reasons. He was definitely associated with St Peter's church, and possibly took part, together with Bishop Henry's men, in the Venetian crusade, which may have won him the title of *peregrinus*; lastly, he tasted the hardships of exile. The fact that he bore the surname of Maurus (Mauro) is interesting; further research could possibly associate him with Cracow bishop Maur, a contemporary of Gallus and our number-one candidate as far as the authorship of the oldest chronicle of Poland is concerned.

First published in *Przegląd Historyczny*, lvi, 1 (1965), 111–19.

¹⁴ *Chronicon Venetum quod vulgo dicunt Altinate*, ed. Henry Simonsfeld (MGH, SS,14, Hanover, 1883), 19.