

Jacek Soszyński (IHN PAN)♦

BETWEEN TEXTUAL BORROWING AND FORGERY.
ON COMPILATORY PRACTICES OF MEDIEVAL UNIVERSAL
CHRONICLERS BASED ON MARTINUS POLONUS*

Abstract. The author's goal is to add to the understanding of the issue of where the border line is that marks the passage from an enlarged copy (an augmented or developed version) of a given chronicle to an independent authorial entity. In this context a side question arises concerning the acceptability of textual borrowing in the face of medieval authorial practices and conventions, i.e. where compiling ends and falsifying begins. The aforementioned issues are discussed on the basis of five historiographical texts composed between the mid-thirteenth and the third quarter of the 15th cent. Their common denominator is their affinity with the famous *Chronicle of Popes and Emperors* by Martin the Pole (or of Oppavia). Examining the character of the borrowings, their ideological stance, and their political opinions, the author reaches the conclusion that it was not the copy-and-paste technique frequently employed by the chroniclers, but their intentions that decide whether the resulting works should be treated as new entities, sometimes even forgeries.

Keywords: textual borrowing, medieval compilations, medieval universal chronicles, medieval manuscripts, Martinus Polonus (Oppaviensis) Königsberg World Chronicle.

♦ Address for correspondence: Nowy Świat 72, 00330 Warszawa, Poland. Email: jsoszynski@ihnpa.pan.pl.

* This text is a reworked version of an article which appeared in Lithuanian. See J. Soszyński, *Kur baigiasi skolinimasis ...*. I would like to thank the two anonymous reviewers, invited to read my text by the editor of *Organon*, who alerted my attention to certain deficiencies of my argument and helped me to improve it.

The chronicle of Martinus Polonus belongs to the few medieval texts which have received not only very wide attention, were read and copied all over Latin Europe, but also supplied a significant amount of material that was used by other authors to supplement the contents of their own works. Universal chroniclers in particular found Martinus most useful. It is difficult to find a late-medieval world chronicle that does not depend directly or indirectly upon his work. Hence, the *Cronicæ Martinianæ* (Martinus-type chronicles, as they were called at the time) are particularly well suited for research on textual borrowing.

In 2006 I published a study in which I attempted to determine the authentic relationships between four universal chronicles which previously were all treated as *bad* copies of the mid-thirteenth-century *Chronicon Pontificum et Imperatorum* by Martin the Pole (Martinus Oppaviensis)¹. I argued, that if the first chronicle actually was the work of Martin, the other three were independent historiographical texts composed in the early decades of the 14th and in the second half of the 15th cent. by different authors in different countries. These historiographers followed their own, at times conflicting, political and ideological agendas. Only the external similarity of these chronicles could account for the fact of their misattribution, and that this external similarity was not coincidental but deliberate. In this article, starting with some of the observations I made investigating the four aforementioned chronicles, I would like to bring into the picture two more texts and take a broader look at one of the aspects of the originality of medieval historiography. I would like to discuss the issue, when – in that time of authors continuously borrowing one from another – does a text cease to be a *text with additions* and become a new historiographic entity or a forgery.

With respect to modern texts, intellectual property rights render the question posed above meaningless: any borrowing lacking credit is considered an abuse. But, in the Middle Ages it was not so. Introduction of whole fragments, even substantial, taken from other authors into one's own work was very frequent and raised no objections. It was not the wording used, but the authorial role that mattered². This attitude even found theoretical corroboration in the famous distinction by Bonaventure, who distinguished four types of writing activities: (1) the scribe who copied someone else's words; (2) the compiler who copied the words of others composing one's own work; (3) the commentator who copied someone else's words and added his own explanations; and (4) the author who put into letters his own thoughts, adding from time to time the thoughts of others to confirm his views³. It is perhaps worth emphasizing here that the technical act of writing has been put alongside the mental process of creating a text, while two intermediate steps were acknowledged: compiling and commenting. During the Middle Ages, as far as I know, nobody challenged this

¹ See J. Soszyński, *Sacerdotium – imperium – studium*.

² See A. J. Minnis, *Medieval Theory of Authorship ...*. For the discussion of issues related to authorship in the Middle Ages see S. Ranković, I. B. Budal & al. (eds.), *Modes of Authorship in the Middle Ages*.

³ See Bonaventura, *Commentarius ...*, pp. 14–15. For a detailed discussion of these views and literature of the subject see J. Soszyński, *Sacerdotium – imperium – studium*, pp. 42–89.

distinction. Hence, one can assume that this was a commonly shared opinion and that textual borrowing on a scale unthinkable by modern standards was considered completely legitimate. On the other hand, there is also little doubt as to the fact that the category of forgery was also known, and that it was present in legal codifications¹. In such cases, however, one dealt with dishonest intentions, the will of the perpetrator that his creation be taken for what it is not².

My encounter with the issue of medieval borrowing started with the *Wilanów Manuscript*, a fascinating composite volume comprising chiefly historical and geographical works³. Its origins are most probably related to the famous Polish chronicler Jan Długosz, who during the late fifteen–sixties and the seventies served as a tutor and teacher to the sons of King Casimir IV the Jagiellon. In my opinion, in this capacity he composed the *Wilanów Manuscript* as a textbook for his charges⁴. To this end, he selected three originally independent manuscripts, which dealt with universal history, the history and geography of the Holy Land, and the national history of Poland respectively⁵. Having put them together, he supplemented the received materials with additions sewn into the book on individual pieces of paper and with marginal glosses. In its finished form, the *Wilanów Manuscript* is a comprehensive, textbook of history, completed with deliberation⁶.

The text that triggered my curiosity was the universal chronicle that opens the whole manuscript. On the first two hundred folios of the volume, the reader encounters a world chronicle, which for many years was attributed to Martinus Polonus⁷. A deeper analysis of the text of this chronicle unearthed four layers of literary work, performed by four independent authors over a period of nearly

¹ The term *falsum* was known already in Roman law, and that this offence was prosecuted with public prosecution. See *Falsum* in: W. Wołodkiewicz (ed.), *Prawo rzymskie*, pp. 59–60

² See *Ioannis Saresberiensis Metalogicon* I, XXIV, 11, who recalling the didactic practices of his teacher Bernard of Chartres dubbed unwarranted textual borrowing a theft (*furtum*): *Quibus autem indicebantur praeexercitamina puerorum, in prosis aut poematibus imitandis, poetas aut oratores proponebat, et eorum jubebat vestigia imitari, ostendens juncturas dictionum et elegantes sermonum clausulas. Si quis autem ad splendorem sui operis, alienum pannum assuerat, deprehensum redarguebat furtum; sed poenam saepissime non infligebat*. From the same 12th cent., are to be found traces of controversies between lawyers in Bologna concerning the authorship of glosses to the individual parts of the *Corpus iuris civilis*. See Ch. H. Haskins, *The Renaissance of the Twelfth Century*, p. 201.

³ In: Warsaw, Biblioteka Narodowa, Ms 8052 III [MSPL 00032].

⁴ Długosz's role in the coming into existence of the *Wilanów Manuscript*, though very probable, is still a conjecture, and needs to be verified by further research. It is supported by numerous interdependencies between the *Wilanów Manuscript* and the undisputed works by Długosz. Conclusive arguments should be provided by a comparative palaeographical analysis of the hands present in both the *Wilanów Manuscript* and the so-called autograph of the Długosz chronicle, which is still not done.

⁵ For a complete description of its contents see J. Soszyński, *Between the Middle Ages and the Renaissance ...*. I no longer uphold the traditional attribution of the composition of the manuscript to Michał of Lipie, which I repeated in that article.

⁶ The creating of such textbooks by late medieval and early modern teachers for the use of their noble students is corroborated e.g. by A. Kamler, *The Jagiellons vis-à-vis the Book ...*, p. 90.

⁷ See A. Bielowski, [introduction to:] *Kronika Boguchwała ...*, p. 462, G. Waitz, [Preface to:] *Chronica Regia Coloniensis*, p. XXV, W. Semkowicz, *Przewodnik po zbiorze rękopisów wilanowskich*, p. 24 & Th. Kaepfeli, *Scriptores Ordinis Praedicatorum medii aevi*, p. 123.

250 years. The first one naturally was the original chronicle of Martin the Pole¹. The second layer was a reworking by an anonymous Frenchman, prepared during the second and third decades of the 14th cent.² Following the example of Jan Długosz, I will call it *Martinus Gallicus*, or to avoid any misunderstanding just *Gallicus*³. Layer number three is a reworking of *Gallicus* performed by yet another anonymous compiler, this time a German by nationality, who judging by his emphasis on matters related to Cologne, was a clergyman from that city. The German historiographer composed his chronicle in the fourteen–twenties; I will refer to it as the *Cologne Universal Chronicle*⁴. The fourth layer is the universal chronicle prepared by Długosz as part of his textbook for the king's sons. Basically, it is a copy of the Cologne chronicle reworked by various additions, which are either inscribed by distinctly different hands in the margins or added on additional folios of various sizes, sewn into the block of the book.

In *Sacerdotium – imperium – studium* I compared the three first layers to find out the motivations standing behind the reworkings⁵. I left the fourth layer (allegedly Długosz) out of the scope of my enquiry, because of the chronological gap separating it from the first three, and because the universal chronicle composed by Długosz should not be interpreted independently from the rest of the *Wilanów Manuscript*. A comparison exposed that the major difference between the three earlier chronicles was their divergent ideological stances on supreme power over all peoples inhabiting the world. Martin the Pole represented the doctrine of papal domination over lay rulers in his capacity as the vicar of Christ. This doctrine was developed during the investiture contest and reached its highest point during the pontificate of Innocent III (1198–1216)⁶. Moreover, Martin represented the traditional view prevalent in the former centuries that Christianity rests upon two pillars: the spiritual authority of the pope (*sacerdotium*) and the lay power of the emperor (*imperium*). The political

¹ Due to its great popularity and number of extant manuscripts – over 400 – the *Chronicle of Popes and Emperors* of Martin the Pole (or of Oppavia) has no single generally accepted critical edition. The majority of modern scholars use the nineteenth-century edition by *Martini Oppaviensis Chronicon ...*, although A.–D. von den Brincken published in 2014 her new internet edition. See Martin von Troppau, *Chronicon Pontificum et Imperatorum*. For a general account of Martinus with basic literature see A.–D. von den Brincken, *Martin of Opava ...* & J. Soszyński, *Recent Polish Investigations ...*. For the afterlife of the Chronicle of Martinus in England see W.–V. Ikaš, *Martin von Troppau ...*.

² This text is available in a seventeenth-century printed edition: *Martini Poloni, archiepiscopi Consentini ...* and in manuscript copies. The five manuscript copies extant in Polish collections are listed in: J. Soszyński, *Sacerdotium – imperium – studium*, pp. 26–28.

³ In his chronicle Długosz – *Ioannis Dlugossii Annales ...*, p. 106 & p. 141 – twice referred to the mysterious chronicler *Martinus Gallicus*. In the commentary added to the critical edition of Długosz, the reader finds a hypothesis that it might be a reference to the chronicle of Martin the Pole. However, Długosz's text clearly corresponds to p. 213b of *Gallicus*' printed edition of 1574. Such parallels between Długosz's chronicle and that edition are more frequent. This demonstrates that Długosz used the French reworking and that he distinguished between the original Martinus Polonus and the French reworking, calling the latter Martinus Gallicus, i.e. a *Gallicanised version of Martinus*.

⁴ The *Cologne Universal Chronicle* has no printed edition. As far as I know, it survived in one manuscript copy only. For a more detailed description of this text see J. Soszyński, *Martini Poloni Continuatio Coloniensis ...*.

⁵ See J. Soszyński, *Sacerdotium – imperium – studium*.

⁶ See J. Soszyński, *Papal Plenitude of Power and World History ...*.

developments of the second half of the 13th and early 14th cent. changed the scene dramatically. The emperor was reduced to the role of a local German monarch, while the pope became increasingly dependent on the king of France. Additionally, there appeared a potent new social and political factor in the power struggle – the universities – which proposed a new doctrine of three pillars supporting Christianity, adding *studium*, the power of knowledge, to the *sacerdotium/imperium* dichotomy.

Out of the three contending rulers, the king of France was undoubtedly the strongest with respect to political and military power. But, as to ideological recognition his claim to supremacy was the weakest: he could claim neither imperial nor papal authority. Only learning was popularly linked with France, and Paris was widely viewed as its seat¹. The other two pillars of Christianity were traditionally associated with the Germans (empire) and Italians (papacy). Thus, the French royal propagandists came up with the concept of a simultaneous ideological assault on all three universal powers. The chronicle of Gallicus puts forward precisely this programme: the three petals of the French royal fleur-de-lis represent faith, wisdom, and chivalry, the three characteristic features of the French nation: fidelity to the Church, love of learning, and military prowess. Thus, the three universal powers: *sacerdotium*, *studium*, and *imperium* and the institutions that embody them, papacy, university, and empire, should also belong to France. This was the gist of Gallicus' message².

Gallicus had a strong argument. Of the three powers in question, the *studium* in widespread belief was based in Paris. Pope John XXII – Jacques Duèze, a Frenchman born in Cahors – resided in Avignon and had to rely on the support of the French monarch. Only the imperial title still remained outside the reach of the French king, resting with the king of Germany, but Louis IV the Bavarian had constant problems with opposing princes, and had to rely more on diplomacy than on martial superiority. It required little imagination to conclude that the king of France would sooner or later claim the imperial throne.

The chronicle of Gallicus did not have to wait long for a response from Germany. Written during the fourteen–twenties, the *Cologne Universal Chronicle* is a reworking of Gallicus' effort. The German historiographer removed some of Gallicus' additions and inserted a lot of other materials borrowed from the *Chronica regia Coloniensis*, the vernacular *Kölner Prosa-Kaiserchronik*, and other sources³. But the fundamental change in ideological perception of the universal powers governing the world came from the *Tractatus super Romano Imperio* by Jordan of Osnabrück and the writings of Alexander of Roes⁴. In

¹ For the doctrine of *translatio studii* see J. Soszyński, *Sacerdotium – imperium – studium*, pp. 175–188.

² For a detailed discussion of Gallicus' argument see J. Soszyński, *Sacerdotium – imperium – studium*, pp. 188–213.

³ See G. Waitz, [Preface to:] *Chronica Regia Coloniensis*, p. XXV.

⁴ For the full account of the political ideas of Alexander of Roes see his treatise *Memoriale de prerogativa imperii Romani*; shortened versions of his views are to be found in his *Noticia seculi* and in political poem *Pavo*. The *Tractatus super Romano Imperio* by Jordan of Osnabrück has survived only in the copies of *Memoriale*. See A. von Roes, *Schriften*, pp. 16–21.

brief, the empire by divine rule protects the world from the Antichrist. Hence, the fall of the empire will bring the end of the world. Moreover, the Italians, the French, and the Germans due to their national predispositions and historical conditioning are preordained to hold the universal powers of priesthood, learning, and imperial dominance respectively. This is a system relying on balance. If this balance be disturbed, world order will collapse and eschatological consequences will follow. Therefore, it is in the interest of all people that the Germans remain in possession of the imperial throne.

Finally, there remains to be settled the relationship between Martin the Pole and his two descendants. Gallicus nearly doubled the inherited text by Martin, and the Cologne historiographer added approximately 50% to the text of the French writer. They changed not only the contents of the original but also the ideological message of the original. There is little doubt that both the chronicles of Gallicus and his Cologne opponent were independent works from Martin the Pole. According to Bonaventure's distinction the authors of Martin's reworkings were allowed to do so: they qualified as compilers. So, why did they retain the external appearance of the *Chronicon Pontificum et Imperatorum*? Why did their chronicles still begin with the unchanged introduction naming Martin as the author: *Quoniam scire tempora summorum pontificum ac imperatorum necnon aliorum patrum ipsorum contemporaneorum quam plurimum inter alios theologis ac iuris peritis expedit, ego frater Martinus Ordinis Predicatorum domini pape penitentiarius et capellanus ...*?¹ Was it just simple negligence? One could reluctantly accept such an explanation, if it happened once, but twice! It seems hardly possible that two undoubtable men of learning, after having devoted considerable time and effort to compose big historiographical treatises, would forget to take credit for their work, unless ... Unless their effort was driven by ill will.

Martinus Polonus was extremely popular. Anna–Dorothee von den Brincken lists over 400 extant medieval manuscripts of his chronicle. He was copied, imitated, quoted, and referred to. There appeared the term *chronica Martiniana* as the synonym of pope/emperor type chronicles². In Poland the name *Martinus* became the synonym of *historian*³. Already in the second half of the 13th cent., Martin became a scholastic authority in the field of historiography. Hence, it seemed worthwhile to some French scholar to rework Martin's chronicle to meet the needs of the Capetian political programme. He wanted to convince the reader either that this is what Martin's chronicle professed or at least should have professed. Similarly, recognising the ideological potential of

¹ See Martin von Troppau, *Chronicon Pontificum et Imperatorum* [my stress], *Martini Poloni, archiepiscopi Consentini ...*, p. 17 & Warsaw, National Library, Ms 8052 III, f. 4.

² For the importance and popularity of Martin's chronicle see A.–D. von den Brincken, *Martin von Troppau*; his manuscripts are listed in A.–D. von den Brincken, *Studien zur Überlieferung ...* & W.–V. Ikaš, *Neue Handschriftenfunde ...*

³ Until the end of the 19th cent. Gallus Anonymous, the author of the earliest Polish chronicle (*Chronica Polonorum*; early 12th cent.), was frequently referred to as Martinus Gallus. Similarly, the anonymous Franciscan of German origins, the author of the *Flores temporum* (ca. 1290), in some of the later medieval copies is called *Martinus minorita*.

a France-oriented Martinus chronicle, a Cologne cleric found it advisable to revise it by doing away with the unacceptable from the German point of view content and introducing the correct opinions. Although his aim was polemical, he refused to pick up the gauntlet openly. He decided to play a trick on Gallicus. He left the introduction and many of the additions by Gallicus unaltered, but took care to convey the proper message concerning the empire and its national adherence. All in all, both the French and the German versions of Martin were intended to be taken for something else than they really were. Consequently, they were forgeries.

The situation was different with regard to the reworking of the Cologne chronicle performed most probably by Jan Długosz. This chronicle came into existence as part of a textbook to assist Długosz in his educational efforts. This textbook – the *Wilanów Manuscript* – is a collection of independent texts aiming to cover universal history in general, the history of the Kingdom of Poland, and the history and geography of the Holy Land. The entire book delivers a clear religious and patriotic message of obvious didactic character. The universal chronicle was only part of a larger entity and was never intended to be made public. Indeed, it never did acquire wider attention. If Długosz neglected to remove the preface by Martin the Pole or make it known that it was compiled by him, he did so because the persons to whom the book was addressed and who actually read it, knew very well who put it together. He most probably also had no pretence to claim its authorship. He simply enlarged his copy of the Cologne chronicle by additions he deemed necessary. The general ideological message of the universal chronicle was also not altered. In the second half of the 15th cent. it was irrelevant – hardly anybody cared any more about the French–German disputes concerning universal powers. It was the mass of historical data provided by the chronicle that mattered. Hence, the question whether his universal chronicle was composed in bad faith is beside the point. If it was Długosz indeed – and much points to the fact that it was – he assumed authorial responsibility for the whole *Wilanów Manuscript*, not just one of its segments.

After 2006, I encountered two more chronicles which contain significant portions of the chronicle of Martin the Pole. The first one is the *Königsberg World Chronicle*, which was widely popular among the members of the Teutonic Knights¹, while the second is the universal chronicle kept at the Archives of the Warmia Archdiocese in Olsztyn, a text which to date has never attracted the attention of modern historians. In both cases, the amount of borrowings from Martinus Polonus is so high that has misled historians as to the true identity of the chronicles in question. But, in both cases the chroniclers do not use the original Martinus introduction. Their texts open with independent beginnings. It is their endings which are identical, or nearly identical, with Martinus.

The *Königsberg World Chronicle* is known a little better. Research performed upon it – chiefly in the 19th cent. – demonstrated that to a large extent it

¹ See J. Wolf, *Königsberg World Chronicle* ...

is a Latin translation of the first German vernacular prose chronicle, the *Sächsische Weltchronik*¹. The latter was composed in mid-thirteenth century in Magdeburg or the whereabouts of that city, and circulated in numerous copies and versions both vernacular and Latin, until the 16th cent. It was so popular that not later than in the 14th cent. it acquired in the German-speaking world the status of a standard universal chronicle. The manuscript tradition of the *Sächsische Weltchronik* is so complicated that up to now it has no comprehensive critical edition. Among the several available printed editions, the 1877 attempt by Ludwig Weiland is considered as relatively best². This situation did not help with the preparation of a critical edition of the *Königsberg World Chronicle*, although the manuscript list of this historiographical work, comprising only three items, is far simpler. There is still no such edition available.

The *Königsberg World Chronicle* owes its name to its oldest and best known manuscript, which until World War II was kept in Königsberg in East Prussia (now Kaliningrad in Russia)³. The manuscript came into existence towards the end of the 13th cent. During the following century, it became the property of Bartholomew of Radam, bishop of Sambia in the years 1358–1378, who bequeathed it alongside many other books to his chapter. After the secularisation of the Teutonic Knights and the conversion of Prussia to Protestantism, the manuscript shared the fate of other books of the Sambian Chapter, eventually to become part of the Königsberg Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek. There it remained until the end of World War II, when it most probably perished in the evacuation of the city in early 1945⁴. However, due to the fact that it received some interest from historians in the 19th and early 20th cent. we are reasonably well acquainted with its contents⁵.

During the 19th cent. another copy of the *Königsberg World Chronicle* emerged, preserved among the manuscripts of St. Mary's Church in Gdańsk⁶. It was copied in that city or its whereabouts in 1427 or shortly before. Already in the 15th cent. it formed part of the chained library of the aforementioned church, and with it after the triumph of Protestantism in Gdańsk gradually faded into oblivion. Discovered towards the end of the 18th cent., it became the property of the Danziger Stadtbibliothek, and now is kept at the Gdańsk Library of the Polish Academy of Sciences, the successor to the German city library.

¹ See J. Wolf, *Königsberg World Chronicle ...*. For a comprehensive account of the state of research and a detailed description of extant manuscripts of the *Sächsische Weltchronik* see J. Wolf, *Die sächsische Weltchronik ...*.

² See *Sächsische Weltchronik*.

³ Königsberg, Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek, Ms 1150.

⁴ The fate of the Königsberg manuscripts has been examined by historians from many countries, in particular Germany, and has a considerable literature. Remnants of the Königsberg collections are to be found in various places in Germany, Poland, Lithuania, and Russia. Unfortunately, no trace of Ms 1150 has ever been found.

⁵ All available information has been gathered in J. Wolf, *Die sächsische Weltchronik ...*, pp. 67–69.

⁶ Gdańsk, Polska Akademia Nauk, Biblioteka Gdańska, Ms Mar. F 305. For a more detailed description of this manuscript and its contents see O. Günther, *Katalog der Handschriften ...*, pp. 423–437.

Until lately, this manuscript was considered the only extant copy of the *Königsberg World Chronicle*¹. However, during my research work in Polish manuscript repositories, I found a previously unknown copy of the Königsberg chronicle. The circumstances of that finding were to become one more incentive to write this article.

Conducting a systematic search for copies of the *Chronicle of Popes and Emperors* by Martin the Pole in Polish repositories, I turned to explore the holdings of the Library of the Cracow Chapter. There is no modern catalogue of this collection; therefore, scholars are still using the nineteenth-century work by Ignacy Polkowski, although it does not meet the standards of modern scholarship. In this catalogue I soon noticed Ms 219, professing to contain a copy of the chronicle that interested me. Polkowski identified the text as the *Cronica Fratris Martini*, but added a reservation: *In comparison with known printed editions the chronicle is different and strangely abridged*.² Upon closer scrutiny, the *strangely abridged* copy turned out to be a cluster of two different chronicles: the work of Martin the Pole and the *Königsberg World Chronicle*. The two chronicles were copied consecutively without any indication of passing from one text to the other, and because the Königsberg chronicle closes with a long borrowing from Martin, it is little wonder that Polkowski mistook it for an abridgement of the work by the famous Dominican.

The *Königsberg World Chronicle* came into being during the last decades of the 13th cent., presumably the 1280s. Historians have pointed to three locations where the chronicle could have been composed: Saxony, Silesia, and Prussia. There is no need to discuss here in detail the reasons which persuaded various historians to opt for each location. Suffice to say that none of them are decisive, and the issue is still open. The time of its composition is based on the fact that the last pope mentioned is Nicholas III, whose pontificate lasted from 1277 to 1280. This dating remains well in line with the palaeographical dating of the Königsberg manuscript to the last decade of the 13th cent., which at best could have been only a copy of the autograph.

The author of the Königsberg chronicle made liberal use of Martinus, but had no interest in hiding his own identity under the name of the famous Dominican. The reader finds no sign of the Martinus introduction, only bits and pieces from the main body of the chronicle. There are two types of borrowings from Polonus: fragments copied verbatim and paraphrases. Both are numerous, although I cannot offer any statistics. The problem lies in the fact that both extant copies are removed circa two hundred years from the original, and are full of small textual variants. The differences are not serious. The majority are grammatical modifications or synonyms. This in many cases renders the differentiation between a verbatim borrowing from Martinus Polonus and a paraphrase difficult. In the secondary literature, one also finds a statement that starting with the reign of Lothair III (1125–1137), the author of the *Königsberg*

¹ See J. Wolf, *Königsberg World Chronicle* ...

² I. Polkowski, *Katalog rękopisów* ... , p. 156.

World Chronicle supplemented his text with additions from Martinus Polonus¹. This statement is so general that it fails to convey what really happens with the chronicle. Beginning with the reign of Lothair III the Königsberg chronicle practically relies completely on Martin, a lot of the material being taken over literally. Nevertheless, the author of the Königsberg chronicle had his composition rules and followed them consistently. First of all, he had his own order according to which he constructed the description of each imperial reign. Then, he added to it facts and stories taken from the papal part of the chronicle of Martin, and from other sources too. To illustrate his method let us compare the reign of the aforementioned Lothair III, in the extensive version provided by the Gdańsk manuscript², with the latest edition of the Dominican chronicler:

<i>Königsberg World Chronicle</i> ³	Martinus Polonus ⁴
<u><i>Lotharius imperare cepit anno Domini Mo Co XXVIo LXXXIXus ab Augusto et regnavit XI annis.</i></u>	<i>MCXXVII. Lotharius imperavit annis XI.</i>
<u><i>Huius tempore fames valida fuit et fere totam Ytaliam invasit. Calixto pape successit Honorius, deinde Innocencius.</i></u>	<i>Huius tempore fames valida fuit et fere totam Italiam invasit.</i>
<i>Lotharius imperator faciens exercitum in Ytaliam properat et cum archiepiscopis et episcopis papam Innocencium secum Romam deduxit. Petrum quoque Leonis, qui papatum invaserat, compescens in sede Lateranensi potenter papam Innocencium collocavit, et in ecclesia Lateranensi ab eodem Innocencio Lotharius in imperatorem coronatur. Hic primo imperii sui anno contra Bohemos vadens, quorundam suorum</i>	<i>Hic imperator factus exercitum in Italiam parat et cum archiepiscopis et episcopis papam Innocentium secum Romam duxit.^[5] Petrum quoque Leonis, qui papatum invaserat, compescens in sede Lateranensi potenter papam Innocentium collocat^[6], et in ecclesia Lateranensi ab eodem Innocencio Lotharius in imperatorem coronatur. Hic primo imperii sui anno contra Bohemos vadens, quorundam suorum</i>

¹ See J. Wolf, *Königsberg World Chronicle*, p. 971.

² The version in the Cracovian manuscript is shorter by more than half (Kraków, Archiwum i Biblioteka Krakowskiej Kapituły Katedralnej, Ms 219, p. 145).

³ Gdańsk, Polska Akademia Nauk, Biblioteka Gdańska, Ms Mar. F 305, f. 39va–39vb.

⁴ Martin von Troppau, *Chronicon Pontificum et Imperatorum*.

⁵ See critical apparatus: *deduxit*.

⁶ See critical apparatus: *collocavit*.

principum traditorem magnam stragem suorum militum passus est. Hic etiam post suam coronacionem zelo Dei et ecclesie accensus, tamquam vere catholicus et ecclesie advocatus vires imperii denuo excitavit et contra Rogerum comitem, qui se contra papam erexerat et regnum Sicilie occupaverat, una cum papa Innocencio Apuliam potenter intravit, hinc fugato comite Rogero, in Siciliam constituerunt ducem Apulie comitem Raynonem. Huic victorie Pysani cum navigio summo pontifici quam plurimum astiterunt. Eo etiam tempore Romani contra voluntatem Innocencii pape senatum renovare conati sunt. Per idem tempus in Francia tanta siccitas fuit, ut flumina, lacus, fontes et putei sicarentur. Ignis quoque, qui per rimas terras subintraverat, nec ymbribus nec frigore nec alia arte biennio extingui poterat.

principum traditione magnam stragem suorum militum passus est. Hic etiam post suam coronationem zelo Dei et ecclesie accensus, tamquam vere catholicus et ecclesie advocatus, vires imperii denuo excitavit. Et contra Rogerium comitem, qui se contra papam erexerat et regnum Sicilie occupaverat, una cum papa Innocencio Apuliam potenter intravit, ac fugato comite Rogero in Sicilia^[1] constituerunt ducem Apulie comitem Raynonem. Huic victorie Pisani navigio summo pontifici quam plurimum astiterunt. Eo etiam tempore Romani contra voluntatem Innocencii pape senatum renovare conati sunt. Per idem tempus in Francia tanta siccitas fuit, ut flumina, lacus, fontes, et putei sicarentur. Ignis quoque, qui per rimas subintraverat terram, nec imbribus nec frigore nec alia arte biennio extingui poterat.

In the table above, the textual differences in comparison with the Chronicle of Martinus are emphasized by underlining. The comparison demonstrates that the reign of Lothair III breaks up into three parts, which for reasons of clarity, I separated from one another by placing them in different paragraphs. Part one (*Lotharius imperare cepit [...] regavit XI annis*), although derives its material from Martinus, uses the constructional pattern characteristic for the entire Königsberg chronicle. It lists the number of Lothair's reign in the descending line from Augustus, which Martin never did, as he was more interested in synchronizing the subsequent emperors with the more important in his opinion papal pontificates. Part two (*Huius tempore fames [...] deinde Innocencius*), takes one sentence from Lothar's bio by Martin and supplements it with another sentence build upon the contents of the papal segment of the *Chronicle of Popes and Emperors*. The situation is completely different in part three (*Lotharius imperator faciens [...] extingui poterat*). All the sentences were copied word for word from Martinus. The minimal differences can be accounted for by possible changes that occurred already during copying of the *Chronicle of Popes and*

¹ See critical apparatus: *Siciliam*.

Emperors. Some are even present in the critical apparatus provided by the editor.

If one compared other imperial reigns in the Königsberg chronicle with appropriate parts of Martinus, the outcome would be much the same. Hence, there is little doubt that the German historiographer used Martin the Pole extensively. But by no means did he copy his source thoughtlessly. He reworked it. His emphasis was on the empire, the papacy remained in the background. On the whole, by modern standards, the number of paraphrases and textual borrowings from Martinus is big enough to accuse him of plagiarising. But, according to the medieval views systematically set out by Bonaventure, he was a compiler, nearing even to the category of author. He was writing his own chronicle, his goals were different, perhaps independent from the *Sachsische Weltchronik* too, but this last issue requires a separate enquiry.

The last chronicle to be discussed in this article is the least known and up till now modern historiography has failed to notice it. It is preserved in a single copy kept at the Archives of the Warmia Archdiocese in Olsztyn¹. The manuscript comprises 90 paper folios, bound in a reused parchment leaf, originally part of a liturgical manuscript with musical notation. The text is executed in a cursive hand, typical for the middle of the 15th cent. Indeed, it can be dated quite precisely, for it carries a colophon: *Et sic est finis in vigilia sancti Johannis Baptiste anno Domini M° CCCC° XLIII° etc* (f. 87v). The chronicle is the only text to be found in the manuscript; otherwise it holds only a handful of short notes concerned with historical matters. The name I proposed for the text in question, the *Olsztyn Universal Chronicle*, should be treated as a provisional measure, because the only connection it demonstrates with Olsztyn is its present place of keeping. There are no other indications linking it with that city.

The *Olsztyn Universal Chronicle* breaks up into three distinct sections. The first one (ff. 3r–16r) narrates the history of the world from Creation to the birth of Christ. The text provides a comprehensive relation of the six days of Creation, the history of Adam and his descendants (ff. 3r–6r), and next goes on to recount the contents of Genesis, Leviticus, Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, and Kings (ff. 6r–12r). Having done this, the historiographer goes back to Adam, to recount the history of the Old Testament, but this time concentrating on peoples other than Israel, namely on the inhabitants of Babylon, Medes, Persians, and Trojans, whose downfall allows him to pass on to the Romans (ff. 12r–13v). The last folios of the first part are devoted to Rome under the reign of the kings and the days of the Republic. The establishment of the empire, which coincided with the birth of Christ – as with many other universal chronicles – is interpreted as the culmination point of Old Testament history, and the beginning of a new era. From then on, time would be reckoned according to papal pontificates and imperial reigns. The Olsztyn chronicle organizes papal and imperial reigns separately: first comes the history of the popes (section two, ff. 16r–35v) to be followed by the history of the empire (section three, ff. 35v–87v).

¹ Olsztyn, Archiwum Archidiecezji Warmińskiej, Ms AB H 285 [MSPL 00023].

The author of the Olsztyn chronicle made use of Martin's text quite extensively. It can be estimated that circa 80% of his text is taken over from Martin, but he found no use for the original Martinus introduction. The two latter sections are practically copied from the Dominican chronicler. Already in the first section we find borrowings from Martin, although they are short and combined with materials stemming from other sources. These other sources are yet to be named, only the presence of quotations from books of the Old Testament is certain, even if the mediation of a Bible abbreviation of the sort of Peter Comestor's *Historia scholastica* cannot be ruled out. The catalogue of the emperors is copied from Martin nearly literally. This is not the case with the popes. Here, the author selected his data consciously. This is obvious even from a simple comparison of the volume of both texts – if Martin's *popes* and *emperors* are practically the same in length, in the case of the Olsztyn chronicle, the emperor section is approximately twice as long. Evidently, the history of the empire was much more important for the Olsztyn author.

The catalogue of the popes, in accord with the doctrine of the plenitude of papal power, is opened by Christ, announced as *summus pontifex*. It is closed by Clement IV, who reigned during the years 1265–1268, although his death is not recorded. The line of emperors is brought to the death of Frederic II (1250). Both the endings of *popes* and *emperors* are taken word for word from Martinus Polonus. For someone who is well acquainted with Polonus and the complicated story of his chronicle, everything seems to add up to a coherent entity. Researchers working on the *Chronicle of Popes and Emperors* established that it came into being over a prolonged period, from the early 1260s to 1277. Compiling his chronicle, executed in the form of a synchronistic table of the reigns of popes and emperors, Martin excerpted various histories and inserted these fragments into his own work. When his manuscript was full, he had it copied in a new one in such a way as to provide more space for new entries, and moved on to other sources. The old manuscript he would give away. However, the discarded manuscripts would not end their lives as such, but were copied by their new owners or their colleagues, starting independent branches of the *stemma codicum*. In this way his chronicle functioned not as one text, but as a set of subsequent redactions, that modern historians distinguish as versions A*, A**, A, C, and Cc. Redaction A started its independent life around the break of the 1260s and the 1270s. On the contrary to redaction C, it comprised only two books – *The Popes* and *The Emperors*, lacking the account of ancient history¹. So could it be that the author of the Olsztyn chronicle had the possibility to use redaction A, which he supplemented with his own version of ancient history based on the Bible? Obviously, this would be a neat explanation. Unfortunately, it is not so. In the text of his first section we find fragments of Martin that are

¹ For a more detailed account of the *growth* of the chronicle see Marcin Polak, *Kronika papieży i cesarzy*, pp. 42–44.

pertinent to redaction C!¹ In the light of this, the origins of the Olsztyn chronicle seem completely independent.

Until the Olsztyn chronicle is thoroughly researched we can only point to moments in history, which limit its time of coming into being. And these are: not earlier than the last quarter of the 13th cent., and not later than 1443, when Ms AB H 285 was copied. If I were to point to a more precise time within that period, I would place it in the first half of the 15th cent. This is only an intuition based on the fact that the author is more interested in lay than sacred history and on his interest in Old Testament history. This brings to mind the devotional practices of the Brethren of the Common Life, who used universal chronicles to contemplate the wonders of God's creation and attain higher spiritual perfection². Nevertheless, these are intuitions not facts or even well motivated conjectures, so further investigation is necessary.

Returning to the main issue discussed in this article, the Olsztyn chronicler obviously took a lot of material from Martinus. But his use of the *Chronicle of Popes and Emperors* can be qualified as compilatory authorship, which was acceptable and honourable at the time. He made no pretence to hide his own ideas under the name of the famous Dominican – he did not copy the Martinus introduction. His intention was to write an account of world history emphasizing the role of the lay emperors. His work is an independent historiographical entity, although at this stage of research we cannot state when and where he wrote his chronicle.

To answer the question posed at the beginning of this article – when does a text cease to be an enlarged copy of an old chronicle and start to be an independent work – I have brought into discussion two examples of reworkings which came into being in bad faith and three instances of chronicles which make extensive use of verbatim fragments of an earlier historiographical work but with no intention of abusing its authority or fame. Out of the five reworkings, I qualified only one as an enlarged copy of its parent text: the alleged Długosz chronicle. The other chronicles have to be considered independent historiographical pieces. They are independent due to their novel ideological or political message. The two reworkings, which owe their existence to an attempt at maliciously taking over the authority of Martinus, can be classified even as forgeries of sorts, for their authors wished to convince their readers that they were dealing with the original *Chronicle of Popes and Emperors*. Finally, the analysis of these five reworkings points to the fact that it is the authorial intention that matters most, and in the cases when this intention differs from the goals of the original author (in the discussed cases Martinus Polonus), we can safely assume that the reworked chronicle is an independent historiographical being.

¹ E.g. Olsztyn, Archiwum Archidiecezji Warmińskiej, Ms AB H 285 [MSPL 00023], f. 12r: *A creacione mundi usque ad Christum sicut dicit Orosius ad beatum Augustinum scribens [...] Quorum regnorum duo media minora, primum et ultimum maiora*. See Martin von Troppau, *Chronicon Pontificum et Imperatorum (Historia Romana, De quatuor regnis maioribus)*.

² See L. C. Ward, *Authors and Authority ...*, pp. 171–188.

Bibliography

Manuscript sources

- Gdańsk, Polska Akademia Nauk, Biblioteka Gdańska, Ms Mar. F 305 [MSPL 00136].
- Königsberg, Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek, Ms 1150 (lost).
- Kraków, Archiwum i Biblioteka Krakowskiej Kapituły Katedralnej, Ms 219 [MSPL 01106].
- Olsztyn, Archiwum Archidiecezji Warmińskiej, Ms AB H 285 [MSPL 00023].
- Warszawa, Biblioteka Narodowa, Ms 8052 III [MSPL 00032].

Printed sources

- Alexander von Roes, *Schriften*, (eds.) H. Grundmann & H. Heimpel, Hiersemann, Stuttgart 1958.
- Bonaventura, *Commentarius in I. librum Sententiarum*, in: *Doctoris Seraphici S. Bonaventuræ S.R.E. episcopi cardinalis opera omnia*, vol. 1, Collegium S. Bonaventuræ, Quaracchi 1882.
- Ioannis Dlugossii Annales seu cronicae incliti Regni Poloniae*, Lib. I–II, PWN, Varsaviae 1964.
- Ioannis Saresberiensis Metalogicon*, (eds.) J. B. Hall & K. S. B. Keats-Rohan, Brepols, Turnhout 1991.
- Martini Oppaviensis Chronicon pontificum et imperatorum*, (ed.) L. Weiland in: *MGH Scriptores*, vol. 22, Hahn, Hannover 1972, pp. 397–475.
- Martini Poloni, archiepiscopi Consentini, ac summi pontificis poenitentiarij, chronicon expeditissimum, ad fidem veterum manuscriptorum codicum emendatum et auctum, opera Suffridi Petri Leouardiensis Frisij V. I. C.*, ex officina Christophori Plantini, Antverpiæ 1574.
- Marcin Polak, *Kronika papieży i cesarzy*, (eds.) A. Fabiańska & J. Soszyński, Wydawnictwo Marek Derewiecki, Kęty 2008.
- Martin von Troppau, *Chronicon Pontificum et Imperatorum*, (ed.) A.–D. von den Brincken [available at <https://data.mgh.de/ext/epub/mt/>, retrieved on Sept. 15, 2021].
- Sächsische Weltchronik*, (ed.) L. Weiland in: *MGH Deutsche Chroniken*, vol. 2, Hahn, Hannover 1877, pp. 1–384.

Secondary works

- Bielowski A., [introduction to:] *Kronika Boguchwała i Godysława Paska*, (ed.) W. A. Maciejowski, *Monumenta Poloniae Historica*, vol. 2, [nakładem własnym], Lwów 1872, pp. 454–466.
- Brincken von den A.–D., *Martin von Troppau* in: H. Patze (ed.), *Geschichtsschreibung und Geschichtsbewusstsein im Späten Mittelalter*, Thorbecke, Sigmaringen 1987, pp. 155–193.
- Brincken von den A.–D., *Studien zur Überlieferung der Chronik Martins von Troppau* in: *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters* 41, 1/1985, pp. 460–531 & 45, 2/1989, pp. 551–591.

- Brincken von den A.–D., *Martin of Opava [Martin of Poland]* in: G. Dunphy & C. Bratu (eds.), *Encyclopedia of the Medieval Chronicle*, vol. 2, Brill, Leiden 2010, pp. 1085–1088.
- Günther O., *Katalog der Handschriften der Danziger Stadtbibliothek*, vol. 5: *Die Handschriften der Kirchenbibliothek von St. Marien in Danzig*, Kommissions-Verlag von A. W. Kafemann GmbH, Danzig 1921.
- Haskins Ch. H., *The Renaissance of the Twelfth Century*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA – London 1992.
- Ikas W.–V., *Martin von Troppau (Martinus Polonus), O.P. ([obit] 1278) in England: Überlieferungs- und wirkungsgeschichtliche Studien zu dessen Papst- und Kaiserchronik*, Reichert, Wiesbaden 2002.
- Ikas W.–V., *Neue Handschriftenfunde zum Chronicon pontificum et imperatorum des Martin von Troppau* in: *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters* 58, 1/2002, pp. 521–537.
- Kaeppli Th., *Scriptores Ordinis Praedicatorum medii aevi*, vol. 3, Ad S. Sabinæ, Roma 1980.
- Kamler A., *The Jagiellons vis-à-vis the Book and the Education of the Nobility* in: A. Chamera–Nowak, D. Embree & J. Soszyński (eds.), *Book versus Power: Studies in the Relations between Politics and Culture in Polish History*, Peter Lang GmbH, Frankfurt am Main 2015, pp. 89–103.
- Minnis A. J., *Medieval Theory of Authorship: Scholastic literary attitudes in the later Middle Ages*, Scholar Press, London 1984.
- Polkowski I., *Katalog rękopisów kapitulnych katedry krakowskiej*, part 1: *Kodexa rękopiśmienne 1–228*, Akademia Umiejętności, Kraków 1884.
- Ranković S., Budal I. B. & al. (eds.), *Modes of Authorship in the Middle Ages*, Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, Toronto 2012.
- Semkowicz W., *Przewodnik po zbiorze rękopisów wilanowskich*, (ed.) P. Bańkowski, PWN, Warszawa 1961.
- Soszyński J., *Between the Middle Ages and the Renaissance: The Wilanów Manuscript Reconsidered* in: *Medievalia Philosophica Polonorum* 34, 2001, pp. 199–206.
- Soszyński J., *Sacerdotium – imperium – studium. Władze uniwersalne w późnośredniowiecznych kronikach martyniańskich*, Oficyna Wydawnicza ASPRA–JR, Warszawa 2006.
- Soszyński J., *Recent Polish Investigations into the Life and Works of Martinus Polonus of Oppavia*, in: *Rediscover: Final Conference Proceedings: Prague, 15 September 2010*, National Library of the Czech Republic, Praha 2010, pp. 89–107.
- Soszyński J., *Papal Plenitude of Power and World History: Papal Political Ideology in the Chronicle of Martin the Pole* in: A. Chamera–Nowak, D. Embree & J. Soszyński J. (eds.), *Book versus Power: Studies in the Relations between Politics and Culture in Polish History*, Peter Lang, Frankfurt am Main 2015, pp. 45–72.
- Soszyński J., *Martini Poloni Continuatio Coloniensis: A Historiographical Misapprehension* in: K. M. Kincses (ed.), *Hadi és más nevezetes történetek*.

- Tanulmányok Veszprémy László tiszteletére*, HM Hadtörténeti Intézet és Múzeum, [Budapest] 2018, pp. 477–482.
- Soszyński J., *Kur baigiasi skolinimasis ir prasideda klastojimas? Apie vėlyvųjų viduramžių kronikininkų rašytojiškas praktikas* in: R. Čapaitė (ed.), *Surasti tiesą: pagalbiniai istorijos mokslai falsifikatų tyrime*, Lietuvos istorijos institutas, Vilnius 2021, pp. 237–256.
- Waitz G., [Preface to:] *Chronica Regia Coloniensis*, (ed.) G. Waitz, Hahn, Hannover 1880, pp. V–XXV.
- Ward L. C., *Authors and Authority: The Influence of Jean Gerson, and the Devotio Moderna on the Fasciculus Temporum of Werner Rolevinck* in: J. Hogg (ed.), *Die Kartäuser und Ihre Welt: Kontakte und Gegenseitige Einflüsse*, vol. 1, Institut für Anglistik und Amerikanistik, Universität Salzburg 1993, pp. 171–188.
- Wolf J., *Die sächsische Weltchronik im Spiegel ihrer Handschriften. Überlieferung, Textentwicklung, Rezeption*, Wilhelm Fink Verlag, München 1997.
- Wolf J., *Königsberg World Chronicle* in: G. Dunphy & C. Bratu (eds.), *Encyclopedia of the Medieval Chronicle*, vol. 2, Brill, Leiden – Boston 2010, p. 971.
- Wołodkiewicz W. (ed), *Prawo rzymskie. Słownik encyklopedyczny*, Wiedza Powszechna, Warszawa 1986.