

JACEK CHACHAJ

THE DEVELOPMENT OF A PARISH NETWORK
AND THE BEGINNINGS OF DECANAL STRUCTURE
IN THE DIOCESE OF KRAKÓW UNTIL THE END
OF THE TWELFTH CENTURY.

AN ATTEMPT AT A SUMMARY

In the final years of the previous century, several studies on the medieval development of the parish network in the Diocese of Kraków (mainly in its western part) were written at the Institute of History of the Catholic University of Lublin (KUL).¹ Detailed research was undertaken on individual

Dr JACEK CHACHAJ is an assistant professor at the Department of Historiography and Methodology of History, Institute of History of the John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin (KUL); e-mail: chachaj@kul.lublin.pl

The Polish version of the article was published in *Roczniki Humanistyczne* vol. 56, issue 2 (2008).

¹ Unfortunately, only some of these works have appeared in print: M. LAOUDJI, *Rozwój średniowiecznej sieci parafialnej w dekanacie Lelów* (Lublin, 1993 [typescript, KUL]); Elżbieta GDULA, *Rozwój sieci parafialnej w archidiakonacie krakowskim w latach 1325–1358* (Lublin, 1994 [typescript, KUL]); Leszek PONIEWOZIK, “Kształtowanie się sieci parafialnej w dekanacie Wysocice w średniowieczu,” *Roczniki Humanistyczne* 43, no. 2 (1995): 5–56; Jacek CHACHAJ, “Rozwój sieci parafialnej w dekanacie Zator do końca XVI wieku,” *Archiwa, Biblioteki i Muzea Kościelne* 68 (1997): 221–308 (henceforth abbreviated as *ABMK*); Izabella MAIN, “Rozwój sieci parafialnej w dekanacie Pszczyna do końca XVIII wieku,” *Roczniki Humanistyczne* 45, no. 2 (1997): 159–220. These studies, created under the direction of Professor Eugeniusz Wiśniowski, were a continuation of earlier research conducted mainly in the same environment: Przemysław SZAFRAN, *Rozwój średniowiecznej sieci parafialnej w Lubelskiem* (Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 1958); S. JOP, “Sieć parafialna archidiakonatu sandomierskiego do końca XVI wieku,” *Sprawozdania Towarzystwa Naukowego Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego* 7 (1958): 154–158 (henceforth quoted as *STNKUL*); Stanisław LITAK, “Sieć parafialna archidiakonatu radomskiego w okresie przedrozbiorowym,” *STNKUL* 9 (1958): 102–107; Bolesław KUMOR, “Powstanie i rozwój sieci parafialnej w Małopolsce południowej do końca XVI w.,” *Prawo Kanoniczne* 5, nos. 3–4 (1962): 175–233; *Prawo Kanoniczne* 6, nos. 1–4 (1963): 441–532; Stanisław LITAK, “Formowanie sieci parafialnej w Łukowskim do końca XVI wieku. Studium

deaneries, the boundaries of which, like those of other church administrative units in the diocese, can be attested as existing in the mid-14th century in accurate records of papal tithing.² This was important because it enabled comparisons or summaries of findings with respect to particular works, which in turn made it possible to draw more general conclusions. As a result, it became possible to put forward hypotheses concerning the hereto unresolved issues related to the oldest period during which the church network in the Kraków diocese formed, as well as the beginnings of the decanal structure in this diocese. Interestingly, it was noted that starting in 1177–1179 (i.e. from the time of fighting resulting from a rebellion against the reign of Mieszko Stary in Kraków and ending ultimately with the agreement between Kazimierz Sprawiedliwy and Mieszko I Piłtonogi whereby certain areas of the Kraków province became part of the Duchy of Racibórz) some 14th-century deaneries were permanently intersected by the fluctuating political border between the Krakow region and Silesia.³ Since it appears that, in principle, no church administrative units were created whose borders would not coincide with political borders, and the goal was rather for church divisions to reflect the divisions imposed by the State,⁴ the conclusion can be drawn that deaneries were created before 1177, although for some other reasons it seemed sensible to trace the creation of the deanery structure before the year 1173. The creation of deaneries in the Archdeaconry of Kraków should be attributed to Bishop Gedko, and their erection should probably be regarded as a single administrative act, not a prolonged process.⁵

geograficzno-historyczne,” *Roczniki Humanistyczne* 12, no. 2 (1964): 5–136; Eugeniusz WIŚNIEWSKI, *Rozwój sieci parafialnej w prepozyturze wiślickiej w średniowieczu. Studium geograficzno-historyczne* (Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1965); Henryk GROCHOLSKI, “Powstanie archidiaconatu zawichojskiego i jego najstarsze kościoły do połowy XIV w.,” *Roczniki Humanistyczne* 13, no. 2 (1965): 151–162; Jerzy KURZEJA, “Rozwój średniowiecznej sieci parafialnej w dekanacie Oświęcim,” *Roczniki Humanistyczne* 27, no. 2 (1979): 15–37; Barbara RZEWUSKA-KURZEJA, “Rozwój sieci parafialnej w prepozyturze kieleckiej w średniowieczu,” *Nasza Przyszłość* 59 (1983): 69–96.

² Jan PTAŚNIK, editor, *Monumenta Poloniae Vaticana* [henceforth quoted as MPV], vol. 1 (Kraków: Polska Akademia Umiejętności, 1913), 104–248.

³ Details on this subject can be found in Jacek CHACHAJ, “Powstanie dekanatów w archidiaconacie krakowskim,” *Rocznik Muzeum w Gliwicach* 11/12 (1997): 9–17.

⁴ This can be exemplified by the creation of deaneries encompassing Silesian parishes which had previously been part of the deaneries lying on both sides of the political border: Bytom Deanery in 1331, Nowa Góra Deanery in 1335, and Pszczyna Deanery in 1350 (MPV, vol. 1, 371; vol. 2, 234).

⁵ Jacek CHACHAJ, “Powstanie,” 17–18.

The next step was to compare the hypothesis discussed above with an analysis of the findings concerning the number of the oldest churches both in the deaneries analysed in the 1990s and in the areas researched earlier. It turned out that in the case of deaneries whose extent corresponded to the one attested by the earliest sources, the number of the oldest churches built by the end of the twelfth century was usually close to ten. In the deaneries which had been created by way of dividing the older (perhaps original) deaneries, the number of the oldest churches was obviously smaller, but the total number of churches built before the year 1200 was also close to ten (which was the case with the deaneries of Oświęcim and Pszczyna, which in the early 14th century still constituted one deanery). Things were slightly different with the provostry of Wiślica, where in the area of four examined deaneries (out of five) it was found that there were about 20 churches which had been built before the end of the twelfth century. Therefore an assumption was made that initially two deaneries existed which had been divided into smaller units still before 1325.⁶ All this led to the conclusion that the deaneries located in the western part of the archdeaconry and the Diocese of Kraków, recorded in tithing inventories, could be the primary ones, created in the late twelfth century, while the original deaneries located in the east of the Kraków archdeaconry were divided into smaller ones, which must have been the result of the ongoing development of the parish network (the change of the decanal structure itself might have been related to the separation of the Wiślica and Kielce provostries from the archdeaconry of Kraków).

In the unexplored parts of the Kraków archdeaconry, and in the absence of other data (for example, the size of the parish district or *ius patronatus* estate), the only indicator showing the rate of development of the parish network with some certainty could be the amount of revenue earned by individual churches. Indeed, the regularity was found a long time ago that the oldest churches derived the highest income (those with an attested history dating back to at least the twelfth century often had revenues exceeding even 10 grivnas, while of the 52 churches created in the archdeaconry of Kraków only fewer than 10% had revenues higher than 2 grivnas in the years 1325–1358).⁷ Of course, there were exceptions to this rule, but they did not undermine the general regularity (which had statistical significance only), while the assumption that older churches benefited from higher incomes could

⁶ Jacek CHACHAJ, "Pierwotna średniowieczna sieć dekanalna w diecezji krakowskiej," *ABMK* 71 (1999): 383–384.

⁷ Eugeniusz WIŚNIEWSKI, *Rozwój*, 20–23; Elżbieta GDULA, "Rozwój sieci," 177–178.

only be ultimately validated by doing a thorough research on individual deaneries. Bearing in mind that the revenue of churches would decrease over time (for example, where some of their income was taken away to finance new parishes that had been detached from them), it should be assumed that some of the old parishes did not maintain the original revenue levels. By comparing the number of parish churches with an income exceeding 3 grivnas in the areas of individual deaneries listed for the area of the archdeaconry of Kraków in 1326, we noticed a certain regularity. Of 13 deaneries, the amount of grivnas received ranged from 8 to 12 in nine of them, in two the revenue was much higher (17 and 20), while two other deaneries earned markedly lower revenues (6 and 5). Greater numbers of parishes with high incomes were found in the deaneries of Niegowić and Prandocin, i.e. in areas located in the immediate vicinity of Kraków. This could have been due to the older history of settlement in those areas, which undoubtedly resulted in a higher average income. On the other hand, deaneries with the smallest number of churches earning a high revenue (the deaneries of Pałacznica and Zręcin) seemed to be units formed shortly before 1325 as a consequence of the parish network becoming denser (the Pałacznica deanery might have been one unit that included the deanery of Pleszów, while the borderland deanery of Zręcin, occupying the south-eastern edges of the Kraków archdeaconry, might have been created by detaching it from the deanery of Tarnów, which became incorporated into the provostry of Wiślica).⁸

Finding links between the regularities referred to above made it possible to put forward a proposal regarding the hypothetical original decanal division in the archdeaconry of Kraków, as well as the number of churches erected within both the archdeaconry itself and the entire diocese. It seemed quite probable that in the twelfth century, apart from the four archdeaconries lying in the borderland regions (those of Sandomierz, Zawichost, Lublin and Radom), 16 deaneries were created in the Kraków archdeaconry (which at the time included areas that would become provostries of Wiślica and Kielce). As a result, the archdeaconry of Kraków probably had at least 150–160 churches, and the entire diocese nearly 200 churches in total.⁹ It should be remembered that this was a rather cautious estimate since it assumed the existence of about ten churches in each deanery of the Kraków archdeaconry

⁸ It should be kept in mind that these are the only proposals regarding the recreation of the hypothetical original division of the Diocese of Kraków into deaneries. It is hard to find any sources to substantiate these proposals, and the main criterion to be considered when attempting to recreate the oldest deanery divisions is the geographical location of individual church buildings.

⁹ Jacek CHACHAJ, "Pierwotna średniowieczna," 386.

and in each four archdeaconries located in the east of the diocese. In the twelfth century, however, there were still churches in Kraków and its immediate vicinity, which in the 14th century were not part of any deanery of the Kraków archdeaconry.

It can hardly be expected that the hypotheses put forward above should be accepted. It seems, however, that their verification could be achieved by undertaking thorough research on the parish network in the other deaneries of the Kraków archdeaconry or more extensive, comprehensive studies on the development of church networks in larger territories. Unfortunately, it should be said that in recent years, with one exception, such research has not been undertaken. However, we can find a handful of studies making reference, in a greater or lesser degree, to the subject matter outlined above, or those whose authors addressed, directly or indirectly, topics that are relevant for the hypothesis we have proposed.

As early as in the 1990s, a very well documented source work by Jerzy Rajman was published on the medieval borderland between Silesia and Lesser Poland.¹⁰ In a comprehensive manner, the author addresses many aspects related to this geographical area. Amongst others, he touches upon the issues of settlement, formation of state administration centres, the population and even local religiousness. For us, however, the most important is the fact that the author tries to undermine the prevalent view, based on the account provided by *Kronika Wielkopolska* (*Chronica Poloniae maioris*), that Kazimierz Sprawiedliwy (Casimir the Just) handed over the castellanies of Oświęcim and Bytom to Mieszko Płatonogi (Tanglefoot) in 1179. The very fact of identifying the unquestionable—for already attested by Master Wincenty Kadłubek in his chronicle—acquisitions of King Mieszko, made at the expense of the Kraków region in 1179, with the regions of Bytom and Oświęcim had already been challenged by Marian Łodyński 90 years earlier. That author questioned, as it seems, only the date, not the extent of the territorial changes (suggesting that the said towns might have become part of the Duchy of Racibórz upon the baptism of Kazimierz Mieszkowicz). That was not an issue of major importance for his dissertation, and the researcher did not hesitate to show doubts as to whether the issue was ever to be resolved given the source material we have available.¹¹ Meanwhile, Rajman

¹⁰ Jerzy RAJMAN, *Pogranicze śląsko-małopolskie w średniowieczu* (Kraków: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersytetu Pedagogicznego w Krakowie, 1998).

¹¹ Marian ŁODYŃSKI, "Udział książąt śląskich w zamachu z r. 1177. Przyczynek do dziejów Bolesława Wysokiego i Mieszka Raciborskiego," *Kwartalnik Historyczny* 22 (1908): 35, 36.

tried to establish exactly when and which areas that had once formed part of the historical province of Kraków became part of the Duchy of Racibórz. By investigating the numerous, scattered source references, he came to the conclusion that the issue of “several towns” mentioned by Wincenty Kadłubek, which in 1179 were handed over to Mieszko by Kazimierz Sprawiedliwy, was still unresolved. He argued in favour of interpreting this term as signifying several towns of minor significance, located in the borderland between the provinces of Kraków and Racibórz. Mikołów could have been such a place, and King Kazimierz’s donation “would not have implied serious changes to the border.” According to Rajman, the annexation of Bytom, Oświęcim and other cities to Silesia was the result of the expansive policy undertaken by Mieszko Płatonogi around 1195, and then continued by his successors.¹²

Rajman’s arguments are important because the dating we have adopted for the creation of deaneries in the Kraków archdeaconry is based on the premise that since 1179 the areas of some deaneries were crossed by a political border. Therefore, challenging the fact that the Silesian-Lesser Poland border was moved eastwards in 1179 seems to seriously undermine the hypothesis we have put forward above. However, this is not the case at all because Rajman has doubts as to the extent of the border change, described in the Wielkopolska Chronicle, while not denying the very fact of the change, as noted by Wincenty Kadłubek. The shift of even isolated and insignificant borderland cities from Kraków Province to Racibórz Province gave rise to a situation where the areas of some deaneries that first appeared in 1325 were split by the political border anyway (if we accept Rajman’s arguments—probably the ones of Oświęcim and Sławków). After 1179, the Silesian-Malopolska border was never consistent with the borders dividing the dioceses of Kraków and Wrocław. In fact, the hypothesis on the emergence of deaneries in the Kraków archdeaconry before 1179 could be challenged only in two instances. In the first case, we would have to demonstrate that at some point after this date the border between the provinces of Kraków and Racibórz ran along the borderlines of certain specific deaneries, attestable at the end of the first quarter of the 14th century. In such a case, it would even

¹² Jerzy RAJMAN, *Pogranicze*, 177–180. The author pointed out the fact that Bytom was fortified by Mieszko in 1200, which could mean that the castle was captured only after the Battle of Mozgawa. In his opinion, Siewierz was taken over by the dukes of Opole and Racibórz in 1202 or later, and Oświęcim shared this fate between 1217 and 1228 (perhaps in 1225). Apart from Mikołów, in his earlier works, Rajman mentioned Pszczyna as part of the king’s donation.

be highly probable to date the establishment of deaneries lying west of the political border (since their creation could be justified by the fact that some of the churches had been isolated from Krakow by that dividing line). However, a more in-depth analysis of the ample data collected by Rajman leads to the conclusion that the situation described above never occurred. The second case would be true if we assumed that the small and insignificant donation from 1179 was treated by the contemporaries as a temporary state, basically not challenging the fact that the donated medieval cities belonged with the region of Lesser Poland. It should be said that this assumption is unlikely, though it cannot be ruled out. If we assume that the situation described above did take place, then we would have to agree that a larger-scale modification of the borders and the division of the later deaneries with a political border and with greater practical consequences did not occur until after 1195, or even at the beginning of the 13th century. On the one hand, this would necessitate a change in the *terminus ante quem* of the establishment of rural deaneries in the Kraków archdeaconry (at least to 1195), and the association between the decanal reform and Bishop Gedka would be undermined. On the other hand, however, even if we adopted this scenario, the core of the hypothesis on the emergence of deaneries as early as in the twelfth century and on the number of churches existing at that time would not be radically changed. For it is impossible to move the time when deaneries in the western regions of the diocese were created too far into the 13th century if only because of low political stability at the time. Additionally, the question why it was decided at some point to create deaneries the borders of which did not coincide with the political borders would remain unanswered.

Several works have also been published in which the authors analysed the formation of bodies of senior church administration in the Diocese of Kraków. However, they seem to neglect the issue of an emerging network of deaneries. Dealing with the establishment of the Zawichost archdeaconry, Tadeusz Lalik interpreted this event as an element of the campaign ran by the bishop of Kraków intended to streamline diocesan administration. He also pointed out that archdeaconries were marked out only in areas comprising Sandomierz Province, while Kraków Province was not subject to any church administrative divisions.¹³ Interestingly, the author described the creation of the archdeaconry with the seat in Zawichost in the context of

¹³ Tadeusz LALIK, "Zawichost we wczesnym średniowieczu." *Szkice zawichojskie*, edited by Teresa Dunin-Wąsowicz and Stanisław Tabaczyński (Zawichost-Warszawa: IAI PAN, 1999), 43.

a wider phenomenon, namely this centre gradually losing its status to in favour of Sandomierz. In Lalik's opinion, the next stage of this process took place during the reign of Kazimierz Sprawiedliwy, when the archdeaconry was created.¹⁴ In our deliberations, the most important thing is that Lalik, unlike most researchers who regard the emergence of archdeaconries in the eastern parts of the Diocese of Kraków as resulting from a single decision, suggests that it was a process which was extended over some time. He locates the establishment of the Zawichost archdeaconry some time after 1191, although other archdeaconries (at least the one of Sandomierz) are assumed to have been created earlier. In fact, the only argument put forward by the author which would speak in favour of the creation of the Zawichost archdeaconry later than the other archdeaconries of the borderland was the fact that the church in Świeciechów, later becoming the property of the Zawichost archdeaconry, belonged to the Sandomierz collegiate church in 1191.¹⁵ We must say that this argument is not convincing, but it should not be underestimated either. We must not forget, however, that at the time of its creation the Zawichost archdeaconry included churches in the amount that Lalik described as "several churches at most."¹⁶ If we assume that it was created later than the neighbouring archdeaconries of Sandomierz and Lublin, we should assume that these churches belonged with those archdeaconries. The question arises whether church administration units with more than 20 churches scattered over relatively large areas could fulfil their function.

Recently, Józef Dobosz summed up the findings available in literature and repeated his earlier¹⁷ claim that the foundation date of the Kielce collegiate church by Gedka in 1171 and the date of the first source reference attesting to the existence of the Lublin archdeacon (1198), the creation of administrative districts around Kraków, Sandomierz, Wiślica, Lublin, Kielce and Zawichost should be placed within these time limits.¹⁸ In comparison with earlier views on the creation of archdeaconries and provostries in the Diocese of Kraków, the only difference is that the Wiślica and Kielce provostries are regarded as parts the structures created as early as in the twelfth century. This is not a fundamental issue for the hypothesis we outlined at the

¹⁴ Ibid., 42–43.

¹⁵ Ibid., 48.

¹⁶ Ibid., 49.

¹⁷ Józef DOBOSZ, *Działalność fundacyjna Kazimierza Sprawiedliwego* (Poznań: Instytut Historii UAM, 1995), 134.

¹⁸ Józef DOBOSZ, *Monarchia i możni wobec Kościoła w Polsce do początku XIII wieku* (Poznań: Wydawnictwo Poznańskie, 2002), 432.

beginning. Actually, the most important question related to the difference between the view that the provostries were created later and the argument put forward by Dobosz is when and why deaneries appeared in the Wiślica provosty, for no deaneries existed in the 14th century except in the Kraków archdeaconry. Accepting Dobosz's view, who sees the emergence of an "archidiaconal-provostry" structure in the province ruled by Kazimierz Sprawiedliwy as resulting from the duke's cooperation with Bishop Gedko,¹⁹ only one answer can be given. As there were too many churches in the area of the Wiślica provosty (unlike in other administrative units established simultaneously in the east of the Kraków diocese) to allow the provost to effectively perform his control and inspection functions, it was immediately divided into deaneries (probably initially two). If we accept the above argumentation, we would have another argument, rather unexpectedly, to claim that Bishop Gedko simultaneously established local structures of a higher degree in the eastern part of the Kraków diocese and deaneries in the archdeaconry of Kraków covering the remaining part of the archdeaconry. It seems doubtful that there should be a well-developed administrative system in one part of the diocese, covering even two intermediary administrative tiers between the parish and the bishop, while in the other only a local archdeaconry existed, which at any rate would not have been able to fulfil its role, having its jurisdiction in about half of the diocese.

As regards the number of churches built in the diocese of Kraków until the end of the twelfth century, Eugeniusz Wiśniowski recently commented on that in his synthetic study of parish structures in medieval Poland.²⁰ Summarizing the results of his research to date, he emphasized the strong correlation between the state of settlement and the development of the parish network in particular regions of the Kraków diocese. At the same time, the author tried to prove, on the basis of the well-researched period of church network development starting from 1325, that the findings to date regarding the number of churches erected by the end of the twelfth century are probably too cautious, which results from the insufficiency of source material. As a result, he questioned the amount of 177 parish churches existing in the diocese of Kraków at the end of the twelfth century (this number resulted from calculations based on earlier studies and it appeared in the literature as

¹⁹ Józef DOBOSZ, *Działalność fundacyjna*, 134.

²⁰ Eugeniusz WIŚNIEWSKI, *Parafie w średniowiecznej Polsce. Struktura i funkcje społeczne* (Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL, 2004).

early as in the 1960s²¹). Starting with the well-attested figure of about 467 parish churches existing in 1325, he pointed out that in the years 1201–1325 the number would have had to increase by 290, which does not seem likely. In conclusion, the author argued that before the 13th century there must have been more than 177 churches in the diocese of Kraków. He claimed that there were probably about 250 of them. In the latter part of his argument, Wiśniowski proposed that the number of about 250 churches existing in the diocese in the twelfth century, mainly in the regions of dense settlement, was probably sufficient to satisfy the religious needs of the majority of the population.²²

Andrzej Niewiński's work on the church network of the Krakow urban complex is a valuable contribution to the research to date on the system of churches existing in the Krakow diocese.²³ His findings suggest that by the end of the twelfth century twenty-two churches had been erected in this area (ten in the Wawel complex, six in the area which was to be found in the city walls of the 13th-century city with a royal charter, one in the future district of Kazimierz and five in the area of open settlements); of those twenty-two churches, seven were probably parish centres. Undoubtedly, it was the largest cluster of sacred buildings in the Polish lands at the time, and since the 13th century some of the temples on the Wawel Hill have disappeared.²⁴ Therefore, we can make a reasoned guess that while certain rural deaneries in the Kraków archdeaconry were being erected in the latter half of the twelfth century, the vicinity of the city of Kraków were treated as a separate church administrative unit corresponding to a deanery.

In 2003, another, and so far the latest, study was written in the series concerning the development of the parish network in individual deaneries of the diocese of Kraków. Ewa Kacprzak addressed this issue in respect of the Jędrzejów deanery.²⁵ This valuable yet unpublished study contains information on 25 church centres operating within the Jędrzejów deanery until the end of the 15th century, four of which were only ephemeral. The oldest registry of parishes existing in the explored area, preserved in the Acts of the Apostolic Camera of 1326, shows evidence of 14 churches. Of these, there

²¹ Eugeniusz WIŚNIEWSKI, *Rozwój*, 110.

²² Eugeniusz WIŚNIEWSKI, *Parafie*, 31–33.

²³ Andrzej NIEWIŃSKI, *Przestrzeń kościelna w topografii średniowiecznego Krakowa. Próba syntezy* (Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 2004).

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 56, 57, 102, 103, 125, 157, 172.

²⁵ Ewa KACPRZAK, *Rozwój sieci parafialnej w dekanacie jędrzejowskim w średniowieczu* (Lublin, 2003 [typescript, KUL]).

are written sources only in the case of Brzeźnica/Jędrzejów, providing for a more precise dating of the foundation of the church. It was probably founded in the early twelfth century, although it cannot be ruled out that this happened at the very end of the previous century. Apart from Jędrzejów, the author also included five other churches in the group of sacred buildings built before the end of the twelfth century. She looked at such aspects as the amount of income, the size of the parish district and the church's dedicated patron. She would also take into account the local population and the settlement structure.

It seems that the study could have put forward bolder proposals although the author's caution seems understandable given the complete absence of written sources. As a matter of fact, the only point of reference for the deanery is the said parish of Jędrzejów. Since we know that the parish was established in the early twelfth century at the latest, other parishes may have been created in that century, each serving a comparable number of villages in the parish district and having a similar revenue. The author followed this line of reasoning and logically justified her arguments concerning the emergence of the five parishes before 1200.²⁶ A more detailed analysis of the data compiled in this work concerning all medieval parishes existing in the area of the Jędrzejów deanery and a glance at the geographical distribution of individual churches²⁷ begs the question whether there were any other local parishes with a history going back to the twelfth century. In all probability, this group could be taken to contain at least three more churches, although there might as well have been more of them in this area of established settlement.²⁸

²⁶ Ibid., 28–34. Apart from Jędrzejów, the author included Imielno, Krzcięcice, Mokrsko, Sędziszów and Piotrkowice among the parishes established before 1200. All these parishes counted from 9 to 15 villages in the parish district (12 in Jędrzejów in the 15th and 16th centuries), earning a revenue at least equal to that of the Jędrzejów parish, sometimes much higher.

²⁷ In this respect, the summary table on p. 69 and the map of parish districts are of particular value.

²⁸ This group includes mainly the parishes of: Mieronice, which was a parish with two parish priests as well as offering a separate income for the prebendary and having 7 villages in the parish district; Grudziny with a revenue of 8 grivnas and a parish district encompassing 6 villages in the 16th century (it cannot be ruled out that part of the parish of Nawarzyce, established in the 14th century, also belonged to the parish of Grudzin); and Dzierzgów with 11 villages in the parish district and a revenue higher than in Jędrzejów. Interestingly, if we accept that only those parishes which Kacprzak believes to be the oldest existed before 1200, we must assume that during this period the entire north-western part of the deanery (representing nearly a third of its area) was without a church. This gap could have been filled by the parish of Dzierzgów. For similar reasons, it seems that we should also consider the emergence of parishes along the south-western periphery of the deanery before the end of the twelfth century. In the 14th century, there were parishes of Słupia and Obiechów in this area, which included 11 villages in total, and the revenue

Therefore, overall, the work of Ewa Kacprzak validates the hypothesis of the existence of about 10 churches before the year 1200 in the areas of particular deaneries of the Kraków archdeaconry.

Finally, we cannot ignore the huge study written by Bolesław Kumor on the history of the Diocese of Kraków in the pre-partition era,²⁹ mainly because in several instances the author discusses the development of the diocese's parish network and the emergence of the structure of rural deaneries. First of all, it should be argued that the wealth of the sources used by the researcher is impressive as well as the vastness of the issues and the sheer extent of the time span that he outlined for the work in question. We must also remember that the processing of such enormous source material entails human errors, which should not fundamentally affect the general picture of the phenomena presented by the author. It seems, however, that the discussed monograph of the diocese of Kraków lacks more general summaries of specific topics, which would enable the reader to grasp the author's idea of specific problems. Kumor adopted a method of presenting the conclusions formulated by earlier researchers (in fact without evaluating individual works) and providing comprehensive lists of facts recorded in the sources. It seems, however, that some of those lists were not well thought out, which may be misleading to the less careful reader. For example, in the case of the tables listing parishes of the Kraków diocese, the author elected to present alphabetically groups of parishes within different time frames within which, in his opinion, specific parishes were erected.³⁰ At this point, however, Kumor showed a very strong preference for taking the first source reference to be a moment which was not much removed from the time when a particular parish was established. Knowing all too well that the first comprehensive source making reference to parishes in the diocese are the registers of papal tithes (1326), and that for a large number of those parishes these lists are the first mention of their functioning (despite being established before the 14th cen-

of the Obiechów parish (where there was a prebendary besides the parish priest) was more than three times as much as that of Jędrzejów. Also the south-eastern limits of the Jędrzejów deanery could have been included in one of the oldest parishes. In the 14th century, there were three parishes there (Lubcza, Wrocieryż and Góry), which included a total of 11 villages, and their combined revenue equalled that of the parishes with the highest income.

²⁹ Bolesław KUMOR, *Dzieje diecezji krakowskiej do roku 1795*, vols. 1–4 (Kraków: Wydaw. św. Stanisława BM Archidiecezji Krakowskiej, 1988–2002).

³⁰ *Ibid.*, vol. 4, Table 34, pp. 185–200; Table 35, pp. 204–215; Table 36, pp. 217–226; Table 37, pp. 228–234; Table 38, pp. 238–249.

ture), he listed all of these parishes in a table entitled “Development of the parish network in the first half of the 14th century.”³¹

If we move on to the issues of direct interest to us, we will perceive certain inconsistencies in Kumor’s reasoning as regards the beginnings of the decanal structure in the diocese of Kraków. He started off by saying that the first source references to deans of the diocese of Kraków go back to the mid-13th century (1252 and 1253). Then, alluding to the fact that the legends about St Stanislaus, written down at that time, attributed to this bishop the appointment of archdeacons, presbyters and deans, he came up with a logical conclusion that at that time no one remembered who, in fact, had called the aforementioned offices to life. That was supposed to imply that rural deaneries had been established two or three generations earlier since Kumor was likely to link the function of archdeacons, presbyters and deans with the existence of archdeaconries and rural deaneries.³² Further on Kumor’s book presents the first attestable cross-section of the deanery network of the Kraków diocese from 1325; however, the author failed to avoid making some minor mistakes.³³ In the light of what we have said about the deaneries, the conclusion which the author offers on the same page may seem surprising. Kumor states that some of the 14th-century deaneries “seem to have been created as early as in the 13th century,” and goes on to enumerate twelve deaneries as those erected in the 13th century.³⁴ All in all, we do not know why some of the deaneries which can be verified as ones from the 14th century were supposed to be erected in the 13th century (apparently the author suggests that the remaining six were created after 1300), since the deans themselves (and according to Kumor’s suggestion this is not about the members of collegiate chapters, but rural deans) were established in the diocese some 60–90 years before the middle of the 13th century, that is in the latter half of the twelfth century.

³¹ *Ibid.*, Table 35, pp. 204–215.

³² *Ibid.*, 143–144.

³³ *Ibid.*, 144–146. The author stated that in the years 1325–1327 there were ten deaneries in the Kraków archdeaconry and the Wiślica provostry, but there were actually 18 as shown by the list of individual deaneries given on the same page. Then Kumor writes that in 1350 there were 21 deaneries, but Table 28 indicates 22 deaneries. The next fragment of the work was devoted to changes in the network of deaneries in the period 1331–1350 (145–146). Unfortunately, its ending is completely bizarre because the author stated that “in 1330 as many as 6 deaneries were created,” which can be sensibly explained only by saying that the researcher’s perspective became heavily distorted when he intended to summarize the changes that took place in two decades after 1330.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, 145.

In his work, Kumor also touches on the formation of the network of churches in the earliest period of the diocese's existence. Also in this part of the book, he first sums up the views of earlier researchers, reiterating Wiśniowski's earlier view who claimed that there were 177 churches in the diocese at the end of the twelfth century.³⁵ Kumor's line of reasoning might suggest that the issue of the formation of a parish network in the diocese of Krakow has almost completely been ignored in research to date. Admittedly, the author scrupulously enumerates both older studies from the 1960s and 1970s and works of the younger generation of historians, but the latter do not seem to have inspired his trust since the only comment he makes about them is that they rely mainly on diplomatic materials and accounts of church visitations, and that virtually in all cases their authors did not conduct their research on the "extremely relevant" *Acta episcopalia*, *Acta officialia* and *Acta administratoria*. Besides, he raises another objection that those authors failed to utilize the archival files of individual parishes.³⁶ Leaving aside the validity of the above objections, we can only add that there are almost no written sources on the earliest period of parish network formation (not even random references can be found in the sources mentioned by the author), which necessitated the use a specific research method. This had already been developed by Wiśniowski and successfully used in later research. It involved a comparative analysis of such elements as parochial revenue, size and the shape of the parish district, the invocation of the church and its patronage. Kumor's sceptical view of the existing studies is all the more surprising as he was familiar with the said method and that it was used in those studies.³⁷ Summing up the state of research concerning the parish network in the Kraków diocese, the author concludes that most of its area has already been researched, with the exception of the archdeaconry of Kraków, where the only the deaneries of Bytom, Pszczyna, Oświęcim, Zator, Wysocice, and Lelów were explored.³⁸ It seems, however, that the author overestimated the scale of gaps in the Kraków archdeaconry when saying that it comprised around 16 deaneries in the year 1600, and only five (we do not know why not the six mentioned elsewhere) "were properly researched." That was supposed to imply that 11 deaneries had not been analysed in this way.³⁹ Mean-

³⁵ Ibid., 181.

³⁶ Ibid.

³⁷ Ibid., 183.

³⁸ Ibid., 184.

³⁹ Ibid., 182.

while, it is sufficient to compare the map of the deaneries of the Kraków archdeaconry from the 14th and 16th centuries to find out that we are dealing with a misunderstanding. The 14th-century deaneries were much larger than those of the 16th century, as it was customary to divide those units of church administration due to the growing density of the parish network (mentioned in fact by Kumor). Some works on the growth of the parish system dealt with the deaneries in their earliest and consequently the largest, attestable perimeters. As a result, if we look at the map of the Kraków archdeaconry, we will come to the conclusion that nearly half of its area has been researched.

A sizeable portion of the chapter devoted to the development of the parish network in the diocese of Kraków is filled with tables compiled by the author, providing data related to the beginnings of individual parishes. Kumor states that to create them he used the results of the earlier research and his own explorations. At the same time he says that the literature related to this issue is “vast and impossible to utilize in full.”⁴⁰ Thus it seems sensible to randomly verify the data furnished by Kumor. The tables are structured in such a way that the individual columns provide: the parish name, time of its erection, source or relevant literature, the first reference date, and the source of information.⁴¹ The table, then, appears to be transparent and well documented in terms of its source base.

If we look at the information provided regarding the 61 temples built in the area of the former Zator deanery until the end of the 16th century,⁴² we will notice first of all that four (Inwałd, Przybradz, Rybna, Zygodowice) are not at all accounted for in this compilation (which constitute over 6.5% of all churches in the area). Of the remaining 57 churches, in the case of 21 (which constitutes almost 37%) the information provided by Kumor is wrong, contains minor or bigger errors, or is doubtful to say the least. In order to see the scale of the problem we are dealing with, we need to refer in detail to the information provided by the table in question.

The first parish to raise serious doubts is that of Przeginia. Kumor names it Przeginia—Najświętszy Salwator and dates its creation to the 11th century. Unfortunately, the “documentation” column has only words “(a.k.a. Rybna).” The author believes that the first reference to this parish comes from 1228, and the document was published in the first volume of *The Diplomatic Code*

⁴⁰ Ibid., 184, together with footnote 461.

⁴¹ Bolesław KUMOR, *Dzieje*, vol. 4, 185ff.

⁴² For a full list of churches, see Jacek CHACHAJ, “Rozwój,” 280–303.

of the Kraków Cathedral.⁴³ At this point it should be noted that in 1325 there were two parishes in the diocese of Kraków in towns called Przeginia, one of which was part of the deanery of Zator. The table demonstrates Kumor's ignorance of this fact. Unfortunately, we do not know the source on which Kumor relies to provide the invocation of the church or why he dates its erection to the eleventh century. However, "alias Rybna" suggests that we are dealing with a parish that belongs to the deanery of Zator because in the period between 1338 and 1358 the centre of this parish was transferred to Rybna.⁴⁴ The question of documenting the first mention of the church in Przeginia, which allegedly dates back to 1228, looks even worse. It is so because the document referenced by Kumor concerns the tithing of the Norbertine monastery in Dłubnia-Imbramowice collected from places like Przeginia. However, in this case we can think of the vicinity of Olkusz (in other words a different Przeginia), and the document gives no account of the church in Przeginia.⁴⁵

We find the information concerning St. Andrew's Church in Tyniec somewhat puzzling. Contrary to the unanimous opinion of historians dating the establishment of the abbey and the church in Tyniec to the 11th century,⁴⁶ Kumor's dating is "before 1150." He referred to the relatively old findings of Antoni Bazieliuch.⁴⁷ We can only say that it is in vain to seek confirmation of Kumor's dating. He believes that St. Andrew's Church in Tyniec was contemporary or even older than the one in Kraków under the same name. The Kraków church was supposedly founded by Sieciech, the palatine of King Władysław Herman before 1098, or possibly by his son going by the same name (then we would say the foundation occurred at the beginning of the twelfth century).⁴⁸ So we don't really know where Kumor took the date of 1150 from, which he assumed to be the probable time when the church was erected. There is also no justification for his reference at this point to the message of Długosz contained in the *Liber Beneficiorum* of the Kraków diocese for the canon from Kraków did not speak about the time when the Tyniec church was established.

⁴³ Bolesław KUMOR, *Dzieje*, vol. 4, 186.

⁴⁴ Jacek CHACHAJ, "Rozwój," 237–239, 292–293, 295.

⁴⁵ *Kodeks Dyplomatyczny Katedry Krakowskiej Świętego Wacława*, part 1. Edited by Franciszek Piekosiński (Kraków: Akademia Umiejętności, 1874), no. 21, 28–29.

⁴⁶ Recently in Józef DOBOSZ, *Monarchia*, 135, page including the literature.

⁴⁷ Bolesław KUMOR, *Dzieje*, vol. 4, 191.

⁴⁸ Antoni BAZIELIUCH, "Początki kultu Św. Andrzeja Apostoła w Polsce," *Nasza Przeszłość* 7 (1958): 264.

Another inconsistency in Kumor's argumentation can be seen in the information about Zator. He advocates the view that the church was erected in the twelfth century, and believes that the first mention of the church was supposed to come from 1292.⁴⁹ It turns out, however, that he has based his conviction about the 12th-century origin of the Zator church on the hypothesis about the existence of a deanery with the seat in Zator already in the twelfth century, which he demonstrates by providing a reference to a specific article.⁵⁰ It is significant that he did not share this hypothesis, as it seems, when discussing the beginnings of the decanal network in the archdeaconry of Kraków. Other doubts are related to the claim that the first mention of the church in Zator comes from 1292. The document referred to by Kumor was a deed for the sale of the location right by Duke of Cieszyn Mieszko to Rudiger and Peter, the brothers of the duke's chaplain Arnold. It does, however, contain an excerpt telling about donating half of a Franconian lan of land to the church built there,⁵¹ but we cannot be absolutely certain that this is an already existing church and that the formulation is merely a phrase which was a fixture of every location act granted under German law.

Similar doubts apply to the parish of Zalas. In his table, Kumor supplies information about the creation of the local church in 1321 and records the first mention of that parish in 1325. He refers to the document created by Przedpełk of Zalas from 1321, establishing the sołtys' office in this village (Pol. *sołtystwo*), and to the registers of papal tithing.⁵² It should be noted that the document contains ample information about the recent location of the village of Zalas in 1321, so it should be assumed that it was just being settled. In this document, Przedpełk of Zalas expressed his will to build a church in the village, and nothing suggests that the church already existed at that time.⁵³ Nor does the church appear, contrary to Kumor's statement, in the oldest records of papal tithing for the year 1325, but it emerges in the re-

⁴⁹ Bolesław KUMOR, *Dzieje*, vol. 4, 192.

⁵⁰ Jacek CHACHAJ, "Niemieckie osadnictwo na terenie dekanatu zatorskiego w średniowieczu," *Roczniki Humanistyczne* 47, no. 2 (1999): 5.

⁵¹ Stanisław KURAŚ and Irena SUŁKOWSKA-KURASIOWA, editors, *Zbiór Dokumentów Małopolskich*, part 4. (Wrocław–Warszawa–Kraków: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, Wydawnictwo PAN, 1969), no. 885, 27–29. The above fragment (page 28) reads: "Ecclesiae etiam ibidem constructae alterum dimidium mansum Franconicum."

⁵² Bolesław KUMOR, *Dzieje*, vol. 4, 215.

⁵³ Zygmunt Luba RADZIMIŃSKI and Bronisław GORCZAK (editors), *Archiwum książąt Lubartowiczów Sanguszków w Sławucie*, vol. 2 entitled 1284–1506 (Lwów, 1888), no. 7, 8–9.

cords for the following year with a clear remark that it is a new church (*quia nova est ecclesia*).⁵⁴

There are many errors in Kumor's compilation with respect to incorrect dating (the date is typically too late) of the first record of the church's existence. He states that the church in Babice was built before 1373, allegedly the date of the first mention.⁵⁵ However, it already appears in the records of Peter's Pence in 1337, although—as it seems—originally it was only the second church of the Regulice parish (probably a filial church, periodically fulfilling the role of the parish centre).⁵⁶ The church in Bachowice, whose foundation was dated by Kumor to 1350,⁵⁷ undoubtedly existed (probably as a filial church) already a quarter of a century earlier.⁵⁸ We do not know why the first mention of the Acts of the Apostolic Camera concerning the parish in Czernichów was located by Kumor before 1337 since it goes back to 1326.⁵⁹ As a result, the first mention of that parish was assigned a wrong date in the table.⁶⁰ It is worth noting that in the case of this parish it is quite probable that it was recorded as early as in the mid-13th century.⁶¹ Similarly, it is wrong to date the creation of the church in Jaroszowice to as late as “before 1350”⁶² because it also appears in the oldest records of papal tithing for the year 1325.⁶³ The author claims that the church in Spytkowice was first recorded in 1356.⁶⁴ Interestingly, it was already noted in lists by 30 years earlier⁶⁵ and there are serious indications that it already existed in 1229.⁶⁶ The parish of Tęczynek was first recorded in 1335,⁶⁷ not in 1346, as reported by Kumor.⁶⁸ In the case of the parish of Wieprz, the author dates the first record

⁵⁴ MPV, vol. 1, 202.

⁵⁵ Bolesław KUMOR, *Dzieje*, vol. 4, 217.

⁵⁶ Jacek CHACHAJ, “Rozwój,” 263–264, 280.

⁵⁷ Bolesław KUMOR, *Dzieje*, vol. 4, 204.

⁵⁸ Jacek CHACHAJ, “Rozwój,” 281.

⁵⁹ MPV, vol. 1, 130.

⁶⁰ Bolesław KUMOR, *Dzieje*, vol. 4, 206.

⁶¹ Jacek CHACHAJ, “Rozwój,” 234–235.

⁶² Bolesław KUMOR, *Dzieje*, vol. 4, 208.

⁶³ Jacek CHACHAJ, “Rozwój,” 243–244, 284–285.

⁶⁴ Bolesław KUMOR, *Dzieje*, vol. 4, 223.

⁶⁵ MPV, vol. 1, 128.

⁶⁶ In 1229 in Spytkowice, while attending to solemn Mass, Henry the Bearded was taken prisoner by Konrad Mazowiecki, as described in *Kronika książąt polskich* (MPV, vol. 3 (Lviv, 1878), 486). Since there was a castle in Spytkowice, it is very likely it also had a church. Jacek CHACHAJ, “Rozwój,” 236, 296; Jerzy RAJMAN, *Pogranicze*, 53.

⁶⁷ MPV, vol. 1, 372.

⁶⁸ Bolesław KUMOR, *Dzieje*, vol. 4, 204.

of it to 1326,⁶⁹ despite the fact that all other mentions from the registers of papal tithing date back to a year before.⁷⁰ There is also an error consisting in listing one parish twice in table form, each time with a different date of its foundation. Kumor mentions Marcyporęba parishes twice (once giving the date of the first record as 1335 and elsewhere as 1373)⁷¹, the same for Sanka (1325 and 1373).⁷² Of the parishes that were founded in the fifteenth century, in the case of four the researcher suggests a later date of the first mention than it was actually the case. According to the table, the earliest reference of the parish of Leńcze comes from 1420,⁷³ from 1598 in the case of the parish of Maków Podhalański,⁷⁴ about 1470 for the parish in Płaza,⁷⁵ and 1513 for the parish of Ryczów.⁷⁶ However, the first mentions of the parishes listed above come from the years 1417 (Leńcze),⁷⁷ 1434 (Maków Podhalański)⁷⁸, 1410 (Płaza),⁷⁹ and about 1470–1480 (Ryczów), respectively.⁸⁰ It is significant that in the case of Płaza and Maków these references were included in *Acta Officialia*, whose insufficient use was blamed by Kumor on the authors of other studies.

The less significant flaws visible in this table include minor mistakes made by Kumor in giving the wrong page in a cited source (the example of Morawica⁸¹), the switching over of digits in the date of the first mention (this is why according to the author, the first mention of the church in

⁶⁹ Ibid.

⁷⁰ In fact, the oldest records of papal tithing published in the MPV date back to 1326 and refer to the previous year. It seems, however, that a consistent approach should be followed and uniform dating should be adopted for all mentions from a comprehensive source.

⁷¹ Bolesław KUMOR, *Dzieje*, vol. 4, 210; vol. 4, 223.

⁷² Ibid., 213, 223.

⁷³ Ibid., 230.

⁷⁴ Ibid., 241.

⁷⁵ Ibid., 231.

⁷⁶ Ibid., 242.

⁷⁷ In 1417, Mikołaj, the rector of the church in Leńcze, was mentioned, who enrolled in the University of Kraków: *Album studiosorum Universitatis Cracoviensis*, vol. 1. Edited by Ż. Pauli. (Kraków: Typis et impensis Universitatis Jagellonicae, 1883–1887), 41.

⁷⁸ Jacek CHACHAJ, "Rozwój," 272, 287.

⁷⁹ Ibid., 271, 291.

⁸⁰ Ibid., 273, 295.

⁸¹ Bolesław KUMOR, *Dzieje*, vol. 4, 196. Here, the author referred to the 4th volume of *Monumenta Poloniae Historica*. He did that probably on the basis of earlier findings mentioning the first reference to Świętek, the parish priest of Morawica (Jacek CHACHAJ, "Rozwój," 289 with footnote 642), recorded in *Cuda Świętego Stanisława*. This is evidenced by the number of the page where this reference is supposed to be in MPH, i.e. 289, which is an obvious mistake (this page contains information in preparation!). In fact, the mention in the MPH is on page 297.

Przytkowice comes from 1354,⁸² when in fact it was 1345⁸³), or inconsistency in mentioning the first reference (why mention a Liszki document from 1366 recording the church's revenue in connection with the transfer of the village to the Magdeburg law, since the author has already given the records of papal tithing for 1325, which make reference to a parish in Liszki⁸⁴). The same category of errors includes the author's indecision regarding the date of the first mention of the parish of Zembrzyce (5, 28 or 30 November 1530).⁸⁵

We do not know whether similar doubts arise with respect to the content of the tables concerning parishes located in other areas of the Kraków diocese, but our superficial analysis leads us to believe that these tables should be approached with great caution. Apart from very valuable compilations (no one has undertaken a similar task before), the large number of errors they contain affects their overall assessment. It can even be said that the final compilation of all the information we currently possess about the beginnings of the parish in the Krakow diocese has not been prepared in a proper manner and remains a research proposal. To sum up, it should be stated that Kumor's work, despite his aspirations to fill a gap in historiography regarding the initial period of formation of the parish network in the diocese of Kraków, did not bring any new findings or even a synthetic summary of the research to date.

Comparing all of the above-mentioned views of various researchers on issues related to the hypothesis presented at the beginning concerning the beginnings of parish and decanal structures in the diocese of Kraków, we come to the conclusion that the essential elements of this hypothesis have not been undermined, although in some less important aspects, it seems desirable to subject it to certain amendments (especially as regards the time when the Wiślica and Kielce provostries were called into existence⁸⁶). It seems that we should stick to the proposal that the division of the diocese of Kraków into smaller administrative units was originated by Bishop Gedko. He took these steps probably as part of his cooperation with Bolesław Kędzierzawy and Kazimierz Sprawiedliwy, who were in power in Kraków

⁸² Bolesław KUMOR, *Dzieje*, vol. 4, 223.

⁸³ MPV, vol. 2, 187.

⁸⁴ Bolesław KUMOR, *Dzieje*, vol. 4, 209.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, 243.

⁸⁶ It seems that acceptance of the proposal to establish those units as early as in the twelfth century makes our hypothesis more coherent.

and Sandomierz, at the same time implementing a deeper organizational reform of the diocese. This probably happened in 1170s (probably between 1171, when a collegiate church was founded in Kielce, and 1173, when Mieszko Stary took over power in Kraków). Based on stronger and better-equipped centres in the east of the diocese, administrative districts (archdeaconries or rural provostries) were established with centres in Sandomierz, Zawichost, Lublin, Radom, Wiślica and Kielce, and due to the large number of churches, the Wiślica prepository was probably split into two deaneries. These districts covered the Sandomierz province. At the same time, the province of Kraków was incorporated into the territory of the huge archdeaconry of Kraków, within which 11 rural deaneries were probably created. The churches in Kraków and the surrounding areas were not included in these deaneries, being probably under the direct authority of the archdeacon. It is much more difficult to comment on the number of churches existing in the diocese at that time. Assuming that each of the deaneries or territorial units corresponding deaneries could count about ten churches, we would arrive at nearly 200 churches (we must remember that in the vicinity of Kraków and in the area of at least some archdeaconries of the eastern churches there could have been more than ten). This would mean that by the end of the twelfth century, with the creation of new church centres, this number could have increased by several dozen more churches.

Finally, it must be stressed that it seems necessary to suggest further research on the body of issues outlined in this article, as the studies conducted in recent years do seem to have exhausted this subject area. Authors approach issues related to the origins of parochial and decanal structure either marginally or chaotically, a manner which does not inspire trust in their findings. In the absence of new detailed studies, we will still be doomed to formulating more or less reliable hypotheses.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- CHACHAJ, Jacek. "Pierwotna średniowieczna sieć dekanalna w diecezji krakowskiej [The original medieval network of deaneries in the Diocese of Kraków]." *ABMK* 71 (1999): 379–387.
- CHACHAJ, Jacek. "Powstanie dekanatów w archidiakonacie krakowskim [The emergence of deaneries in the Kraków archdeaconry]." *Rocznik Muzeum w Gliwicach* 11/12 (1997): 9–20.
- DOBOSZ, Józef. *Działalność fundacyjna Kazimierza Sprawiedliwego* [The foundation activity of Casimir the Just]. Poznań: Instytut Historii UAM, 1995.
- KUMOR, Bolesław. *Dzieje diecezji krakowskiej do roku 1795* [The history of the Diocese of Kraków until 1795], vols. 1–4. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Św. Stanisława BM, 1998–2002.

- LALIK, Tadeusz. "Zawichost we wczesnym średniowieczu [Zawichost in the early Middle Ages]." *Szkice zawichojskie* [Zawichost sketches], edited by Teresa Dunin-Wąsowicz and Stanisław Tabaczyński, 39–55. Zawichost-Warszawa: IAiE PAN, 1999.
- NIEWIŃSKI, Andrzej. *Przestrzeń kościelna w topografii średniowiecznego Krakowa. Próba syntezy* [The church space in the topography of medieval Kraków. An attempt at synthesis]. Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 2004.
- RAJMAN, Jerzy. *Pogranicze śląsko-małopolskie w średniowieczu* [The Silesian-Lesser Poland borderland in the Middle Ages]. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersytetu Pedagogicznego w Krakowie, 1998.
- WIŚNIEWSKI, Eugeniusz. *Parafie w średniowiecznej Polsce. Struktura i funkcje społeczne* [Parishes in medieval Poland. The structure and social functions]. Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL, 2004.

THE GROWTH OF A PARISH NETWORK AND THE BEGINNINGS
OF DECANAL STRUCTURE IN THE DIOCESE OF KRAKÓW
UNTIL THE END OF THE TWELFTH CENTURY.

AN ATTEMPT AT A SUMMARY

Summary

The paper is an attempt to sum up studies to date on the development of the parish network and the organisation of deaneries in the Diocese of Kraków until the end of the twelfth century. Historians at large and Church historians in particular who dealt with these issues in the 1990s put forward a hypothesis concerning the establishment of deaneries and a number of temples in the Krakow diocese before 1200. The paper confronts this hypothesis with the claims of historians. In the recent years, either indirectly or directly, they have addressed the development of the territorial organisation of the Kraków diocese until the end of the twelfth century. The paper offers a critical appraisal of their findings. In conclusion, the hypothesis is put forward that the establishment of the network of deaneries in the Kraków diocese was a one-time action. The initiative was most obviously Bishop Gedko's in the 1170s, as a result of which there appeared over 1200 churches in the territory of the Kraków diocese.

Key words: Kraków diocese; parish network; deaneries; Bishop Gedko; Middle Ages.

Translated by Tomasz Pałkowski



The preparation of the English version of *Roczniki Humanistyczne (Annals of Arts)* and its publication in electronic databases was financed under contract no. 836/P-DUN/2018 from the resources of the Minister of Science and Higher Education for the popularization of science.