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**EXAMINING THE SLAVIC IDENTITY IN MIDDLE AGES**

**PERCEPTION OF COMMON SENSE OF SLAVIC COMMUNITY**

**IN POLISH AND BOHEMIAN MEDIEVAL CHRONICLES**

The closing report of a press centre of the organizing committee of the tenth Slavic Congress (Kiev, November 2010) does not discuss only a concept of the *literary reciprocity*. Firstly, it presents a complex ideological program which includes cultural, economical as well as political integration. Secondly, it encourages work with the youth, ecological education and inspires re-establishment of the forgotten spirituality. The report also highlights the necessity of mutual communication among scholars, journalists, politicians, artists, sportsmen and businessmen. There is no need to emphasise that the main idea of this congress – in the mechanism of throwback – refers to the distant historical Slavic unity.

The identification with the ethnonym *Slav* has alternately appeared in both Czech and Polish history along the development of an idea of Slavic nations/tribes’ congeniality.

The question of Slavic identity is essentially interconnected with such terms as ethnogenesis and topogenesis. The problem is that a great number of previously published works intended to discuss ethnogenesis does not address the questions of mechanisms behind the emergence of the Slavic identity. This has been caused by inadequate methodology as well as terminology. Since written accounts are rather scarce, it is necessary to apply an archaeological and a linguistic approach while researching the question of Slavic ethnogenesis as a process of forming and transforming identity. Complications of using a language as a distinguishing and identifying ethnical feature were obvious already in the works of antique

---

1 *Správa tlačového centra organizačného výboru X. Všeslovanského zjazdu v Kyjeve 2010* [http://www.sppr.org.pl/xzw_s_pl.htm |4 I 2013]. The reference is being used only as a illustration how various political (and popular) initiatives and movements trace the sense of cooperation of the modern day Slavic nations to the former imaginary unity. Author of the article has no sympathy towards the ideological conclusions and intentions of this meeting. The reference to this happening in an academic article is caused by the rhetoric it uses, which tries to emphasise the historical unity of the Slavs. The article will try to show the possible basis of medieval chronicles and try to show the evolution of the sense of proximity between groups and nations, which we can denominate as Slavs.
and medieval scholars\textsuperscript{2}. Particularly in the case of the Slavs, it is difficult to abandon linguistics as the “sacred” method of making such distinctions – especially when the perception of the Slavism has been based predominantly on a linguistic congeniality up until now.

The existence, as well as the form of the Slavic identity is traditionally interconnected with the emergence and forming of Slavic languages, which seemed to have been present at the emergence of individual Slavic tribes/nations\textsuperscript{3}. It would be highly fortunate if in these areas we could find an overlapping evidence of the most original pottery.

Methodological works are also no novelty within archaeology. On the other hand, these works do not make an ethnical classification of material sources any easier\textsuperscript{4}. Authors of these texts maintain that changes in material culture do not have to reflect an immediate change of population within a relevant area. Even if this thesis is accepted to the most extreme extent, it still does not disrupt the model of a massive expansion from Proto-Slavic homeland which appears in all archaeological and historical schools as well as textbooks. This model, in a way, represents a paradigm of nations’ migrations since the Tower of Babel and Jewish migration.

The works dealing with ethnical identities in the Middle Ages often refer to studies of sociologists and anthropologists\textsuperscript{5}. Objective categories have become less important than a mental level, consciousness as a bound binding a community together. The ethnical identity is perceived as a set, and system, of common features which represent the community both inward and outward and distinguish such a community from other similar ethnical groups\textsuperscript{6}.


If objective criteria\(^7\) are put aside as being impossible to apply – one defining criterion remains – and that is a myth. The myth of a common origin, ancestor, enemy, inner system of symbols and the whole communication within the group are key factors of holding the group identity together\(^8\). The name of gens is the most essential identifying feature as well as its outer representation. The name was subsequently spread by power or some form of attraction for other (predominantly military) groups\(^9\). It is well known that medieval tribes emerged in a revolutionary, not evolutionary manner. Key decisions were made directly and rationally, usually by a completely heterogeneous community.

Some scholars find this concept vague and difficult to grasp. Therefore it is quite natural that they insist on an own recorded/written memory as an inevitable element of identity’s reproduction. One may encounter a theory which might be called a methodological nihilism here\(^10\). This discourse claims an impossibility of interpretation of relevant written sources.

In case of the ethnogenesis of the Slavs, the most recent works offer a deconstruction of the Slavic identity in general. The Slavs have become an amorphous population and have been claimed to be only a construct of scribes who were claimed to be unfamiliar with the tangle of groups and communities at the borders of Imperium Romanorum. They (the Slavs) could also have been a construct of scholars who connected a linguistic group to a group represented by a special type (types) of material culture as well as to communities recorded in written sources\(^11\).

The problem is that there is no text pertaining to the Slavs left, so called origo gentis which appears only six centuries after first written sources mentioning Slavs\(^12\). Own texts represented a tool of collective consciousness’ reproduction – though often for a limited layer of society only. These texts also assisted in shap-
ing community’s memory and strengthening its myth. The name Slav persisted despite the Avar domination over the area which they had previously ruled. They never succeeded in establishing a hereditary kingdom and no Alarich or Geiserich occurred in order to unite the Slavic nations’ migration. Notations of Al-Masudi about Walinjana and their king Madž.ak (followed by all tribes of Slavs), or the first Slavs – the Zerviani of Bavarian Geographer, (same as the earliest history of Slavs from Primary Chronicle) are hard to identify and still wait for their examination in scientific literature. It looks like both of these texts preserved an ethnogenetical construction, a tradition of the first king “mužík” – son of muž, the man – human, the first in the genealogical line passing the rule and “existence” to other tribes.

Academic literature presents also an opinion of some medieval intellectuals of a Pannonian origin of all the Slavs. However, while considering the relevant area as well as chronologically defined observed period it is obvious that the territory of the Slavic nations’ emergence shifts and changes.

Tribes called Slavic (in this adjective form) are to be found in both Frankish and Byzantine literature constantly since Miracula Sancti Demetrii. These are often ethnonyms adopted by scribes from topography. In other cases, the option of a tribe’s name containing itself an inner distinguishing feature cannot be excluded.

Doubtlessly, the name “Slav” has become a literary criterion applicable together with other names as e.g. Moravian or Croat or it has been applied entirely generally, as for instance in the case of Polabian Slavs.

At some point, historiography stops discussing the Slavs, but rather simplifies the matter by referring to Bohemians, Poles and Croats. Later Pan-Slavic theories were also based on this concept and aimed to span these new self-identifications by an old, original cultural and political unity of Slavs.

Natural attempts to create the history of a dynasty (or of a political entity) as far to the past as possible have had an increasing tendency since the times of the most ancient texts. It was just natural that dynasties tried to challenge the empire based on the imperial Roman ideology with their own legendary genealogies.

---

15 D. Třeštík, Mýty kmene Čechů, Praha 2008, p. 54.
which they kept setting into broader and broader contexts (Roman history, biblical history, common Slavic origin). However, one may only ask how much of motivation was of an ideological and propagandistic character and how much of it represented actual geographical knowledge.

Any occurrence of claiming the Slavic background may have had various interpretations. It is not clear whether it signifies preservation of such memory among political and intellectual elite. A reflection of common origin myth cannot be expected within the foreign affairs of those states where the mythical genealogies had been created (either by literary centres or individuals). Therefore it is only to be discussed to what extent the Slavism served as an ideological concept of those wielding the power. The tradition captured in the Pope Dukljanin’s Chronicle stressing the memory of Slavic empire led by Svätopluk as rex iustus is still waiting for the further and deeper analysis\(^{19}\). There is no need to remind the vision of Sclovonia\(^ {20}\) of Saint Adalbert and Emperor Otto as a part of Imperium Romanorum. On the other hand, reminiscences of a Slavic king and realm in Pulkava’s Chronicle must be emphasized – which could have served as a background of imperial politics of Charles IV (or more concretely for stretching the empire to the East).

There are three key coexisting and mutually supplementing lines in texts concerning the Slavic ethnogenesis, topogenesis or mythical genealogy. These are represented by three stories: biblical (by Arabic authors of the 10\(^{th}\) century, Primary Chronicle, Chronicle of Dzierzwa and the later tradition), Antique or Roman, (quite common especially since the spread of university education) and dynastic\(^ {21}\). A dynasty was a key element of a nation’s emergence though it would be daring to maintain that it applied Slavic motifs within its ideology.

Contaminations caused by blending of traditions and myths may be frequently found even within a single text. This fact confirms that chroniclers (often political imaginators) had no lesser troubles to interpret history and own origin than current historians. Building the consciousness upon differences from the others? It should be mentioned that the “emergence” of a nation does not have to rely on

\(^{19}\) Historia Królestwa Słowian czyli Latopis popa Duklanina, trans. et ed. J. Lešny, Warszawa 1988, p. 67–73; L.E. Havlík, Dukljanšká kronika a Dalmátska legenda, Praha 1976 [= Rozpravy československé akademie věd. Řada společenských věd, 86.2], p. 13–45. I have to draw the attention to a monograph of Martin Homza dealing with this historical personality which is being currently prepared. At this moment some ideas can be found in M. Homza, N. Rácová, K vývinu slovenskej myšlienky do polovice 18. storočia, Bratislava 2010 in the part about historical person and legend of Svätopluk on pages 39–74.


a “conflicting” model. It does not have to be a result of antagonisms contributing to a quicker self-identification. Nor it has to be a result of a winner/defeated relationships nor other linguistic or any perceived differences.

Some authors have recorded the emergence of “a feudal nation” more easily, some with more difficulties. Benedykt Zientara maintains that a nation needs a myth (this magical term again) and a crisis for its reproduction and function. Myths of “old good times” or “a bloody, heroic war” constituted medieval memories, which were later recalled by “nations of the estates”.

This paper does not aim to discuss so-called Nestor’s Chronicle as this work, its information to beginnings of the Slavic history, its narrative and interconnection with the history of Rus’ would deserve a separate study. A chronicles’ overview addresses to political organisations which can be nowadays without hesitation defined as Slavic. Texts of these chronicles show how much it is relevant to actually use the adjective Slavic.

As its title signifies, this paper discusses self-identification of the Poles or the Czechs with the Sclavi, Slaves, Slaví in sources, perception of their common

26 J. Szűcs, “Nationalität” und “Nationalbewusstsein im Mittelalter: versuch einer einheitlichen Begriffsp- rache, AH.ASH 18, 1972, p. 27. Nation as a category containing something atavistic and biological have survived all the religious and humanistic traditions concerning one origin and goal of a human, the human equality of rights and cohesion. Nation had to be bound to a tradition of the statehood according to Marx and Engels. On the other hand, Stalin considered a nation to be an evolutionary stage of an ethnical group in the capitalistic era though all the societies had previously been only nationalities. (according to Jenő Szűcs feudal nation created a functional framework for integration of various links: social, ethnical, political, religious) cf. B. Zientara, Nationale Strukturen des Mittelal- ters…, p. 304.
history and attitude to the mission of Constantine and Methodius. When considering the historically possible reconstructible reality, it turns out that it is more precise to talk about ideas of elites (intellectual ones?) in both Poland and Bohemia about the history of the Slavs and their eventual ideological use. Own origins’ interpretation is a dynastic propaganda’s issue. It is an expression of a tradition and continuity which are both indispensable for a dynasty. These things worked as a magnet for those interested in joining a family – and therefore to have an access to different options; to participate in the system. The most powerful theory influencing them was the long-lasting and trustworthy one. Possession and power represented the one serious issue, but only being an exceptional personality within the layer of the powerful could have meant legitimacy.

Firstly, Nestor’s contemporary, first Polish/non-Polish chronicler Gallus Anonymus shall be addressed. He did not go back to the remote past of Primary Chronicle’s Ljachove (and their from they rising Poljane, Lutiči, Mazovšane, Pomorjane). He reflected only the echo of a political takeover, a dynastic exchange of Popiels for Piasts (exchange of tribe of Polans instead of Goplan tribe). It is possible that he deliberately avoided references to the more distanced past as he had known that he would have come across the myth of Popiels. As he himself states, his text is moved from a root to a branch – which means from geographical to political definition. More specifically, this means placing Polonia ruled by Christian Piasts to the north of Sclavonia. Gallus does not work with a motif of a direct identification of the Poles with the Slavs not with a concept of direct genealogical line from Jafet to the dynasty of Piasts. However, he incorporated the term of a Slavic land (from Thrace through the Kingdom of Hungary and Carinthia to Bavaria, from Epirus through Dalmatia, Croatia, Istria to Aquileia, from the land of Sarmatians to Saxony and Dacia), which included also Poland. This passage was not based on real observations, rather on political ambitions of a young Polish state. From Gallus’ point of view, the essential part is that when a son of a poor ploughman was raised to a position of a prince, the truce between the God and the Poles began.

28 In my opinion, through the spread of texts of Constantine, Methodius and their disciples as well as the defense (and later rejection) of the Slavic language (in whatever form) as a language of literature, law and ecclesiastical life – the Slavic tradition spread over Balkan to Ruthenia.
29 Henry IV (ex gente Saxonum) ruled as rex Teutonicorum and no longer as Imperator Romanorum (J. Ehlers, op. cit., p. 16).
30 Повесть временных лет, p. 11.
32 His ethno-geographical information are divided, firstly he names neighbours (Ruthenia, Kingdom of Hungary, Bohemia, Moravia, Saxony, Dacia). The second group has been quoted above, according to N. Kersken, Geschichtsschreibung im Europa der “nationes”: nationalgeschichtliche Gesamtdarstellungen im Mittelalter, Köln–Wien 1995, p. 525–526.
33 Ibidem, p. 526.
His story describes the mechanism of gaining and losing the rule. Further on, no Slavic adjective occurs nor the above mentioned ethnonym, except the moment when Latinorum et Slavorum (settlers of the realm) are asked to mourn the death of Bolesław I Chrobry in a “few sad verses”\textsuperscript{34}.

In addition, no word about a Byzantine mission can be found. But there is mention of a (often emphasised as typical Slavic element) “peasant” background in inthrone-dynastic ritual (as in Bohemia, Carinthia), which special Slavic dissimilarity was disproofed in a wider Indoeuropean scope\textsuperscript{35}.

In comparison, the first part of Cosmas’ Chronicle of Bohemians takes place in Roman Germania. The society to be ruled by Přemysl’s family had arrived under the leadership of a father – Čech – \textit{whoever he might have been}\textsuperscript{36}, as Cosmas puts it. A motif of \textit{patriarch Boemus’} arrival with his tribe in an empty homeland stands as a decisive argument for full property rights to take over the relevant area\textsuperscript{37}. It is known that Cosmas completely omitted the existence of Slavic monkship or scholarship\textsuperscript{38}. His approach to the Byzantine mission is quite similar – he does not mention Constantine – Cyril at all; Methodius is mentioned only in respect to the baptism of Bořivoj. In contrast to Gallus he identifies the Bohemians with Slavs at three occasions. This is the case of Břetislav’s victory over armies of the Emperor Henry III as well as preceding diplomatic negotiations. Thirdly, it is mentioned at the abduction of Judith of Schweinfurt, when Břetislav considered what he had done and how aggressively \textit{Germans who had always despised Slavs and their language with arrogance would react}\textsuperscript{39}. Cosmas perceived an ability to speak the Slavic language as an added value for instance in case of the first and third bishops of Prague (Dětmar/Thietmar and Bohdal/Thidagg). It seems to be clear that this identification with some sort of the “sec-


\textsuperscript{37} R. Wenskus, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 57.

\textsuperscript{38} He disclosed himself while commenting on a foundation of the nunnery at Saint George’s church. Pope John II wrote to Boleslaus II that in any case no rites of “Bulgarian or Ruthenian sect or in Old Slavonic” could take place. \textit{Cosmae Chronicum Boemorum}, p. 35.

\textsuperscript{39} \textit{Cosmae Chronicum Boemorum}: abduction of Judith/Jitka, p. 61, Henry’s ultimatum, s. 80, Ekkehard, the prince of Saxony finds out about the victory of the Slavs over the Emperor, p. 83.
ond identity” or linguistic – cultural group where Bohemians according to Cosmas belonged represented the way how they defined themselves against the Empire (Saxons, Teutons). In comparism to Piast, Přemysl the ploughman was called to rule over a society without a king, while Piast has a clear (same) position in society already ruled by a king.

It is especially the Monk of Sázava of all the Cosmas ‘continuators who replaces the ethnonym Bohemian with ethnonym Slav. Saxons do not attack Bohemians, but Slavs. Boleslav the Brave is a prince of Slavs, Bretislaus I is described as a jewel of Slavs. From the positionit of the monk of Sázava (where still a positive attitude towards Slavic language and liturgical books banished in 1096 could be present), he did not hesitate to provide new information regarding the Sázava monastery (as for instance its possession of relics of saints Boris and Gleb) after Cosmas who systematically concealed any notes about the fourth oldest monastery in Bohemia.

Master Vincent Kadłubek, the bishop of Cracow, later supplemented so-called legends of Greater Poland (that means mainly the dynastic legend of the Piasts) with legends of Lesser Poland – about Krak, Wanda and foundation of Cracow. Thus, the new dynastic tradition interconnected myths of Poles and Vistulans (Cracowians – Gracchovians) in order to establish ideology for a firm, legal and politically organised society. According to Brygida Kürbis Kadłubek perceived Poles on a basis of a taught tradition as a synonym for the Slavs and incorporated their history to the Roman history. Slaviae was not the only monarchy under Prince Popiel’s rule (however serves as an evidence of the self-identification), he gave the law and the principles of succession also to the neighboring countries. Furthermore, Kadłubek illustrated education

---

40 I particularly did not examine the Vita et passio sancti Vencaslai et sanctae Ludmilae aviae eius because of long lasting problems with its dating and because of the program of the text – which is focused on christianization and legitimacy of rule. Direct identification of particular groups appears when adjective forms are used in the references to the paganism of the regions, e.g. regions of Polabian Slavs, Moravia and Bohemia (or Czechs in a form of noun). It can be said, that Sclavus – paganus. In comparision, the role of the mission of saint Constantine and Methodius carries a positive image, namely because of the translation of Holy Scripture into Slavonic language. The language therefore has a sacral importance. Život a umučení svatého Václava a báby jeho svaté Ludmily, [in:] Na úsvitu křesťanství. Z naší literární tvorby doby románské v století IX–XIII, ed. V. Chaloupecký, Praha 1942, p. 104, 106. For the datation of the Vita et passio sancti Vencaslai et sanctae Ludmilae aviae eius in the context of the filiation of the legends of saint Wencelus see P. KUBÍN, Sedm přemyslovských kultů, Praha 2011, p. 149; J. Kalivoda, Nejstarší svatováclavská hagiografie v evropském literárním kontextu přelomu tisíciletí, [in:] Svatý Václav. Na památku 1100. výročí narození knížete Václava Svateho, ed. P. KUBÍN, Praha, 2010, p. 51–61.


and knowledge of authors of the Antiquity gained during university studies by the dialogue between Matthew, bishop of Cracow, and John, archbishop of Gniezhdno. However, it is not easy to determine and distinguish all the tribes to be identified with these antique Poles (Slavs). Nevertheless, it is Caranthania where they chose Gracchus – Krakus as their leader and king after having fought Danians, Gauls and Romans. From this point onwards, a continuous narrative of the history of Poles as Wandals of Wanda, Lechites (though yet without Lech), including the entry about Alexander the Great up to Piast, the son of Chościsko, follows. We don’t know how or from what “base” Vincent Kadłubek fabricated the Lechites – there was no tradition of father Lech in that time. Maybe they were the people of Lestek, or the Ljachs of Nestor (or Lędzians a group situated in Wolynhia and Sandomierz), or a contamination of all of the terms. However, the formula Wanda – Wandal (river) – Wandals is invention of the chronicler, it was his contemporary Gervase of Tilbury who used Wandalorum gens ferox-sima for the whole Slavic world.

However, there is no mention of a Slavic “sentiment” further on – as well as no appearance of the ethnonym, even in its adjective form. Hungarians are Pannonians, Ruthenians are Ruthenians and any relatedness (e.g. linguistic) is not emphasised neither between the above mentioned nor Poles. The same applies in respect to relations with Pomeranians, Bohemians or even Silesians. Scholastic Vincent Kadłubek created wide and rich history of Poles, forming a base of this ethnic-heterogenical regnum. Popularity as well as quality of Vincent’s work (being a textbook of rhetoric in the 15th century) caused its deep influence on formation process of both Polish identity and political doctrine of the independence

---

44 At this place another “Slavic” similarity appears, namely choosing a “foreign” ruler. Gracchus, Rurik, Přemysl, Samo, Hildigis – all of them were people from a foreign community; J. BANASZKIEWICZ, Polskie dzieje bocznych mistrza Wincentego Kadłubka, Wrocław 2002, p. 24.


from the Empire (as a reaction to attempts of Frederick I)\textsuperscript{50}. Before we will start with the chronicles of 14\textsuperscript{th} century we have to mention that there are no narrative sources speaking about the “Polish-Bohemian affinity” of queen Kunigunda, wife of Ottokar II of Bohemia and his cancellor Henrich the Italian (later on same position for Wenceslaus II) and it’s ideological sense\textsuperscript{51}.

A biblical tradition firstly appeared in the \textit{Chronicle} of Dzierzwa (at the turn of the 13\textsuperscript{th} and of 14\textsuperscript{th} century); Latin and Germanic history were been incorporated as well. Genealogical line from Jafet (known also from Arabs or Nestor) leads via Troy to Vandal, the ancestor of Vandals, \textit{qui Poloni nunc dicuntur}\textsuperscript{52}. Nations in the area which could be nowadays described as at least linguistically Slavic (from Pomerania, through Silesia, Rus’, Poland, Bohemia, Moravia, Pannonia, Carinthia, to Dalmatia, Croatia, Bulgaria) descended from Vandal’s sons. The reminiscence of memory or rather a perception of proximity – here justified by a blood bond (family) and reflected within a geographical framework can be observed\textsuperscript{53}. Dzierzwa’s contemporaries \textit{Chronicon imperatorum et pontificum Bawarie} (at the turn of the 13\textsuperscript{th} and of the 14\textsuperscript{th} century) and \textit{Descrip}tio \textit{Europae Orientalis} (the beginning of the 14\textsuperscript{th} century) contain original excerpts which greatly influenced other researched chronicles. Sclavonia as a term as well as a motif of common roots of the Slavic-speaking nations were strongly influenced also by work of Bartholomew the Englishman \textit{De proprietatibus rerum} spread by Friars Minor, especially in the 14\textsuperscript{th} century excerpt \textit{Brevis descriptio Slavonie}\textsuperscript{54}. Following Dzierzwa’s story, Iustinian led \textit{vandalica bella} against all the Slavs (taken from Hugo of Fleury) aiming to repel them to the broad area between the rivers Saale and Vistula. Bartholomew’s work denoted Poles as Vandals who had destroyed Italy and Africa in the times of Saint Augustine\textsuperscript{55}. Dzierzwa’s genealogical and geographical arguments show that Slavic unity had paradoxically emerged through Vandals. As predominantly Poles are Vandals, their position among other Slavic nations is quite a unique one. It needs to be emphasised that this work reflects not only geographical proximity of nations and ethnicity but also congeniality established by mythical family ties. A spread of the Polish identity can be also connected with forming of corporations of


\textsuperscript{52} \textit{Miersuae Chronicon}, \textit{[in:] MPH}, vol. II, ed. A. Bielowski, Warszawa 1961, p. 163.

\textsuperscript{53} It is appropriate to mention that Adam of Bremen or Helmond’s Chronicle had already located Vandals among e.g. Polabian Slavs or among Slavs dwelling between the rivers Oder and Vistula. Cf. A.F. Grabski, \textit{Polska w opiniach obcych X–XIII w.}, Warszawa 1964, p. 135–149.

\textsuperscript{54} \textit{Anonymi descriptio Europae orientalis: Imperium Constantinopolitanum, Albania, Serbia, Bulgaria, Ruthenia, Ungaria, Polonia, Bohemia}, ed. O. Górka, Cracoviae 1916, p. 41.

\textsuperscript{55} J. Banaszkiewicz, \textit{Kronika Dzierzwy: XIV-wieczne kompendium historii ojczystej}, Wrocław 1979, p. 44.
nobility in the 13th century\textsuperscript{56}. However, it has to be noticed that exact geographical description was on the second place, program of chronicler was to construct a rich origo gentis/regis\textsuperscript{57}.

It is only to be discussed whether this political imagination comes from political circles connected with Łokietek’s court (reflecting the idea of unifying the reign) or represents only a reaction to the above mentioned (geographically) Western works. The logic of the text of the creation of the history for gentis polonicae is simple – it was master Vincent who wrote about Vandals – who were sons of Vandal, the son of Negno and those, who conquered the quarter of Europe\textsuperscript{58}.

The Chronicle of Dalimil written in verses is dated to the same period as the Chronicle of Dzierzwa as well as the Chronicle of Greater Poland which is going to be discussed below. In case of this work, the Serbs are called Slavs. According to so-called Dalimil, their origin could be traced back to the Tower of Babel. However when he discusses the particular topogenesis, he claims that “Serbian race” came into being where lands of Greeks lie. They took over sunny world from sea to the gates of Rome\textsuperscript{59}. Another of Dalimil’s texts or rather its interpretation initiated spread of a myth of Slavic brothers whose descendants represent cognate nations. Namely, Croatia (written at the times of the Emperor Stephen Dušan) is in Serbia and it had been ruled by lech whose name was Čech\textsuperscript{60}. Dalimil was the first who located the homeland of Slavs into southern Europe and the first who mentioned senior Boemus as Čech – in Slavic language\textsuperscript{61}. This is Dalimil’s way to supplement a tradition already reflected by Cosmas or to interpret a common base used by Cosmas, too – probably contaminated with the White Croatia from the story of Croats from Constantine Porphyrogennetus\textsuperscript{62}. Referring to the title of this paper, Dalimil reflected neither the Byzantine mission nor later activities of the Slavic monks. However, venerable Methodius sanctified translatio regis from Great Moravia to Bohemia. Further on, Serb (meaning Slav) appears only twice – in regards to Polabian Slavs. It is important, that the mentioned title lech transformed to a denomination used for the forefather of Lechits – Poles, as we can observe e.g. in Silesian Chronica Principum Poloniae\textsuperscript{63}, or in later oncoming texts.

After Dzierzwa’s biblical enrichment of master Kadlubek’s Slavic-Vandalic-Polish identification, later Chronicle of Greater Poland reduces the biblical story

\textsuperscript{56} S. GAWLAS, op. cit., p. 129. This is also the period of emergence of the term lingua Polonica.

\textsuperscript{57} N. KERSKEN, op. cit., p. 527.

\textsuperscript{58} B. KÜRRIS, op. cit., p. 272.

\textsuperscript{59} Kronika tak řečeného Dalimila, ed. M. Bláhová, Praha 1977, p. 11.

\textsuperscript{60} Kronika tak řečeného Dalimila, p. 12.

\textsuperscript{61} N. KERSKEN, op. cit., p. 609.

\textsuperscript{62} D. TŘEŠTÍK, Mýty kmene Čechů, p. 59 stand against it.

and offers wider vision of Slavdom, based on concrete geographical terms, tribes and political organisations.64

The aforementioned Chronicle of Greater Poland offers an extensive etymological digression maintaining that already the most ancient books claim Pannonia to be a mother and a cradle of all the Slavic nations – mater et origo omnium Slavonicarum nacionum. The interpretation and argument is etymological.65 ‘Pán’ is translated into both Greek and Slavic languages as the one who possesses everything and therefore Slavic ‘pán’ can be used to address a magnate – maior habens – wojewodij – totum habens.66 Pannonians were ruled by biblical Nimrod (a Slav, of course).67 Three brothers originated from this tribe and these were the first Lech (!), the second Rus and the third Čech. Their descendants established kingdoms of Lechites, Ruthenians and Bohemians. Among them, the Lechites should have maintained the most powerful position within the Empire and ruled the largest territory. An anonymous author of the Chronicle of Greater Poland not only incorporated the well-known Čech, but also joined Lech (Lestko) of the Lechitae of Kadłubek with Dalimil’s lech in order to create a protoplastic figure of this Lech. In addition, he created Rus for Ruthenians. The identification with the Slavs as well as an identity common for various branches of the Slavs is obvious within the Chronicle of Greater Poland. This identity hinges upon an original common language – the language of one father Slav – ab uno patre Slavo – whose name served as a suffix in many Slavic names as for instance Tomislav, Stanislav, Janislaw, Venceslav. There is a controversy here, as two forefathers Pan and Slav appear in the text, though this might be just a matter of synonymous understanding. The chronicler also states that these nations lived in Slavic kingdoms of Pannonians, Poles, Ruthenians, and Bohemians. Later on, more Slavic kingdoms and principalities were established (namely of Bulgarians, Serbs, or the Kingdom of Dalmatia and Rascia).68 As well as other above mentioned chroniclers, this author does not mention the Byzantine mission. Significant is placing the big Sclavonia as equal to Germania, even maintaining that Slavonia was actually “bigger”.69 The “central” and strongest tribe of Slavs were the Lechits with their father Lech, chronicler served as a literary background for whole Polish kingdom
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64 B. Kürbis, Dziejopisarstwo wielkopolskie XIII i XIV wieku, Warszawa 1959, p. 316.
65 N. Kersken, op. cit., p. 529–530.
67 B. Kürbis, Studia nad Kronika wielkopolską, Poznań 1952, p. 130.
68 Kronika wielkopolska, p. 5; Kronika Boguchwała i Godysława Paska, p. 469. Slavic interpolation continues up to the page 472. It is quite remarkable that the anonymous chronicler/s wrote that both Slavs and Germanic people had descended from Jafet therefore there were according to the author no other nations in the world being so open and friendly to each other. Could it be also the reflection of political ideology of Venceslas II?
69 B. Kürbis, Dziejopisarstwo wielkopolskie... , p. 317.
and its unity – of course, with its cradle in Greater Poland (after Kadlubek’s and Dzierzwa’s Cracow)\textsuperscript{70}. In comparism to so called Dzierzwa, the description of Slavic lands tries to be more actual, more real and it is clear that the incorporation of Poland into the whole Slavic geography and history (and incorporation of Slavic history and geography into Polish history) originates in the times of Casimir the Great\textsuperscript{71}.

Jan of Maringola’s *Bohemian Chronicle* seems to be quite a complicated issue. The chronicle claims that Elys (one of those being responsible for a destruction of Troy) was the father of Elysans. After having changed their scripture – they became the Slavs (!). Eliška, mother of Charles IV, descended from this lineage and Charles himself is named as “the greatest glory of the Slavic tribe”\textsuperscript{72}. On the other hand, he provides also the second genealogical variant where Slavs (Bohemians) are sons of Noah, though according to the history Bohemians might have descended from Gomer – as well as Gauls (Franks). Subsequently he continues by locating Bohemia as a part of Germania, marked off from Pannonia by mountains and forests. His etymology has been applied up to now (in some texts) – the Slavs call themselves according to “sláva”– glory\textsuperscript{73}. Placing Bohemia into the frame of Germania – similarly as Kosmas did, or binding the history of Slavs with Germania – was not a general and usual issue. It was caused by literary (ideological) ambitions. The picture of “big Germania” (e. g. stretching towards Vistula in the *Chronicle* of Martin of Opava) is a matter of Bohemian chronicles, it hardly finds its ground in Poland\textsuperscript{74}.

A bit later *Chronicle of Pulkava* begins with the First Book of Moses. At the confusion of languages, the Slavic language emerged as well. People were named after it as the Slavs – *Slouani*\textsuperscript{75}. Passing the fields of Sennar, they crossed countries of the Greeks to lands being possessed by the Slavs also up to his period – Bulgaria, Ruthenia, Serbia, Dalmatia, Croatia, Bosnia, Carinthia, Istria and Carniola\textsuperscript{76}. A man called Čech later left Bohemia (from Boh – God) for Croatia because of a murder. Pulkava applies the direct identification. The Bohemians are simply Slavs. They share the common identity based on the sib of Lech and Čech. Moreover, some of Lech’s lineage came to Ruthenia, Pomerania and Kashubia while descendants of Čech crossed the river Morava and populated the land bearing the same name as the river. Brothers’ continuity can be seen also in another mythical history when there were two brothers clever, wealthy and just – Krok and Krak

\textsuperscript{70} N. Kersken, *op. cit.*, p. 531.
\textsuperscript{71} B. Kürbis, *Kształtowanie się pojęć geograficznych...,* p. 277.
\textsuperscript{73} *Kronika česká Jana z Marignoly*, p. 458.
\textsuperscript{74} B. Kürbis, *Kształtowanie się pojęć geograficznych...,* p. 266, 288.
\textsuperscript{75} N. Kersken, *op. cit.*, p. 613.
who founded a castle and town of Cracow. Proclaimed affinity of Slavic nations – in this case Polish and Bohemian – could also serve as a literary and ideological concept for ambitions of Charles IV to gain the Polish throne.\footnote{N. Kersken, op. cit., p. 603.}

Pulkava is the first to emphasise the missionary activities of Constantine, particularly his supposed conversion of Moravians as well as numerous Slavic lands.\footnote{Kronika česká Přibríka z Radenína, řečeného Pulkava, p. 281.} As the forefather Čech held the primacy among the Slavic nations, so the emperor made Bohemia a kingdom that continued the tradition of Great Moravia with subjected principalities and dukedoms, as for instance Poland or Ruthenia.\footnote{B. Kürbis, Studia..., p. 135.} Pulkava often applies Slav as an umbrella term for both Pomeranian and Polabian Slavs, though he also refers to the Polish dynasty as to Slavic princes. Therefore it is quite confusing when Slav functions as a defining term when the contrast between Poles and Slavs (meaning Bohemians) is stressed. Pulkava re-worked the story of Dálmil’s Čech/Kosmas’s Boemus and incorporated the brother Lech into it. The Dálmil’s lech – probably a term that was unclear even in his times, or was of a foreign origin,\footnote{Kronika Jana z Czarnkowa, ed. M.D. Kowalski, Kraków 2001, p. 67.} has to be clarified – but not according to the Greater Poland Chronicle, because Pulkava does not mention the third brother, Rus.

The Byzantine mission is clearly positively perceived by Pulkava. Saint Constantine baptised the Slavs but when he saw their obstinacy he asked the Pope to permit masses and other sacraments in the Slavonic language. It is quite surprising that similar elements or the Slavic sentiments cannot be traced in other contemporary works as for instance the one authored by Francis of Prague or Life of Charles IV.\footnote{S. Gawlas, op. cit., p. 140.}

Another Pulkava’s contemporary was Jan (Janko) of Czarnków, writing in the 1370s. However, he mentions the term “Slavic” only once while giving an account of escalation of violence between Poles and Hungarian garrisons in the streets of Cracow. Poles were searching inns and slaughtering supporters of Queen Elisabeth. This episode exactly describes multiple layers of this complicated identity. Poles pulled out of the inn one Hungarian, named Michael, called the Pagan, who was a Hungarian nobleman though of Slavic origin – they killed him in the street.\footnote{Długosz derived from an outstanding number of works from Historia Brittonum, Hugo of Flavigny, Historie Salonitana, Bohemian chronicles to Ruthenian annals, etc.}

Jan Długosz authored a compendium of (not only) the Central European medieval chronicles, composed in the 15th century. Spiritual and intellectual setting of the University of Cracow responded after the Battle of Grunwald to a controversy with Habsburgs or a work of Eneas Silvio Piccolomini. Alan being the first man to come to Europe does not appear in the Bible but represents an innovation in medieval chronicles. His ancestor was Negno whose sons, partic-
ularly the third one named Saxo established some lands (neither languages nor nations.) In the beginning, it seems that there is no feeling of Slavic congeniality in Długosz – nor does he emphasise any proximity between individual groups of the Slavs. However, then he refers to the origin of Slavs (similarly to Pulkava, or Nestor, the *Chronicle of Greater Poland* or Arabic sources earlier): he mentions the wayfaring from Sennar valley, crossing of the Danube and settling down in Pannonia – which is the oldest and most primary cradle and nurture of the Slavs. However, the God later took this land from Slavs for their sins and so they had to face barbaric cruelties of other nations. Mutual envy as well as conflicts over borders and rule over the land even caused a departure of Slavic tribes led by Lech and Čech who had been previously in control of Syrmian Dalmatia, Slavonia, Croatia and Bosnia. Długosz also briefly addresses the issue of the origin of Rus. He maintains that some claim that Rus was not the son of Lech, but he was in fact his brother (!). All three brothers set out from Croatia in order to find a new homeland.

Długosz mentions the linguistic proximity of Poles, Ruthenians and Bohemians at many points, especially as far as geographical names are concerned. The linguistic proximity and common origin create the image of the Slavic identity. He connected Slavic tribes of Obodrites, Rugians or others by consanguinity to Poles. This bond is a motivation for mythical prince Leszko to help Hungarian people who are the Slavs as well to fight against the Greeks. Cyril and Methodius are according to Długosz apostles of the Slavs, those who translated the *Holy Scriptures* into Slavonic language and established an archbishopric in Velehrad.

His extensively refined biblical and dynastic myth does not represent only a re-writing of Kadłubek, Dzierzwa, the *Chronicle of Greater Poland* or Pulkava. It is a genuine tractate based on profound knowledge of sources of different provenience. It is also interesting that the Slavs – meaning Poles – are for the first time referred to also as Sarmatians. Except for a confirmation of the common origin of the Slavs and their congeniality, Długosz as an authority inspired also humanist
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83 That means Ruthenia, Poland, Pomerania, Cashubia, Saxony, Norway and also Bohemia, Moravia, Styria, Carinthia, Lízna, Croatia, Pannonia, Serbia, Bulgaria and Helysa – the lineage of Helysa (present since Pulkava to Maciej Miechowita).


85 Their former centre should have been the castle of Psary-Krapina? over the river Huj, dividing Slavonia and Croatia.

86 S. Gawlas, Świadomość narodowa Jana Długosza, SŻ 27, 1983, p. 5.

87 Annales seu cronicae, p. 167.

authors as for instance Jan of Dąbrowka or Maciej Miechowita\textsuperscript{89} as well as other various interpretations of the origin of Slavs\textsuperscript{90} (and also e.g. its applications within the political ideology of Sigismund II Augustus)\textsuperscript{91}.

On the examples of mentioned Polish and Bohemian chronicles we can observe, that perception of common Slavic origin was not a simple topic even for their authors. Various literary threads and traditions (biblical, Roman, dynastic) were combined with the raise of geographical texts and we cannot always describe their political and ideological background (however, sometimes easily). The cradle of Slavs is firstly localized into Pannonia, in the *Chronicle of Greater Poland*. Other texts, namely former texts are not so clear about the original homeland. Firstly mentioning only the geographical term of *Sclavonia* (sometimes used only for Polish realm, or lands of Polabian Slavs), later constructing the common “Slavic sense” on the story of brothers-forefathers of Slavic nations. Language which the nations inherited *ab uno patre Slavo* as an unifying element is mentioned namely for the first time also in *Chronica Poloniae Maioris*. In chronological following Czech chronicles we can observe an evolution of the “language based Slavic feeling”, with the first reference to the mission of Saint Constantine and Methodius in the Chronicle of Přibík Pulkava from Radenín and more interesting note of John of Marignola that becoming a Slav is caused by the “change” of the scripture. We cannot claim whether the “start of the identification process” was based on a memory of common origin and history, e.g. on the Danube, in Pannonia, or it was build on a memory in a shape of an administrative-ideological unit – *regnum Sclavorum*. At the first sight, the authors of narrative sources worked with fabricated progressing intellectual concept where the closeness of languages (geographical as well) was interconnected with mythical genealogical relationships between nations. Some of the ideas are typical for the chronic will to demonstrate the knowledge of classical and coeval authors. However the will of the intellectuals to incorporate the dynasty and administrative which they served into a wider “commonwealth” is important for our conclusion. We can assume that this scholarly tradition has built a stable base for later (and much later) Slavic and Pan-


Slavic (cultural or other) mutuality and solidarity more than the imaginary unity of Slavs in the pre-historic times.

**Abstract.** The concept of Slavic solidarity is taken by some political or ideological movements as obvisosity. In its later tradition it is based mainly on the language and cultural solidarity emphasised by romantic (and earlier) literature. The very origin of closeness of nowadays (and historical) Slavic nations is there traced to assumed bio-historical root. From the perspective of scientific analysis the examination of the whole term Slav should be done at first place. In medieval Polish and Bohemian chronicles we can observe a growing phenomenon of the identification with wider name Slav and with the common history of Slavs as well. In the *Chronicle of Greater Poland*, followed by chronicle of the Pulkava of Radenín and with the work of Jan Długosz was defined the model of biblical genealogy of Slavic nations. The solidarity was based mainly on the perception of similar languages and geographical closeness and was transformed in a literary way into blood relations. Reflection of this literary concept in foreing affairs is hardly to declare, but some dynastical representatives used the intelectual concept in a literary propaganda of their goals.
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