Western Frankish Chroniclers' Accounts about the Bohemian and Central European History in the 10th and First Half of the 11th Century

Jakub Izdný

OPEN ACCESS

The core of the sources concerning the history of Central Europe in the 10th Century could be found in the charters, annals and chronicles originating in the territory of the Ottonian/Salian Empire. Especially in the case of so called East Central Europe,[1] we could gain the clear majority of the important information from the quite limited number of sources of this kind, without any serious hope for finding an important information anywhere else. This enclosed group of sources is quite well known, examined and could only provide a new interpretation by using a very innovative and different attitude. If we consider the national history of Bohemia, Hungary or Poland, the corpus of the sources is usually already edited in some 19th or early 20th Century's edition,[2] consisting of the said charters, annals, chronicles of the empire, several "domestic" sources coming from the younger periods (mostly even the 12th Century)[3]

1 The term East Central Europe describes the medieval state formations of Piast, Árpádian and Přemyslid dynasties, that were slowly creating the Polish, Hungarian and Bohemian state. The term itself underwent a certain criticism and is fully dependant on the discussion about the term Central Europe. For further reading about these terms in medieval context see e. g. N. BEREND — P. URBAŃCZYK — P. WISZEWSKI, *Central Europe in the High Middle Ages. Bohemia, Hungary and Poland, c. 900 — c. 1300*, Cambridge 2013, pp. 1–39.

2 The "domestic" editions considered generally as the most important include *Fontes rerum Bohemicarum*, started in 1874 by Josef Emmler in Prague for Bohemian space, *Monumenta Poloniae historica* (MPH) originally published in Lwów 1864–1893 by August Bielowski for Polish history and finally *Scriptores rerum Hungaricarum* (SRH), published by Imre Szentpétery in Budapest in 1937–1938 for Hungarian space. The editors' attitudes and natures of the actual corpuses presented there slightly differ. These main editions are accompanied by certain other collections of charters or catalogues of sources comprising information about certain country or region (*Magnae Moraviae fontes historici* or *Catalogus fontium historiae Hungaricae*). Similar is the case of the modern Slovakian edition *Pramene k dejinám Slovenska a Slovákov*, depending mostly on the existing editions. General overview of the "imperial" sources is of course presented in the German series *Monumenta Germaniae Historica* (MGH).

3 Each country has its own "national chronicle", but these sources also vary to a great extent: From a typical history of the nation, such as the one written by Kosmas of Prague

OPEN ACCESS

and some hagiographical sources, that give us some interesting but — from a strict historiographical point of view — rather dubious information.

On the other hand, there is a slightly different case if we question the early Hungarian history. The period of the Hungarian invasions, the so called "kalandozások",[4] could be naturally traced in the vast number of varied sources that are to be found all around Europe.[5] A large number of the authors described the Hungarian raids that affected all the parts of the European continent (except the islands and Scandinavia). This does unfortunately not mean, that the history of the Hungarian raids is clearer or less dubious, but the Hungarian historiography — probably because of this phenomenon — generally tends to be more "open" to the information coming from these sources, however far they were written from the described space.[6] That includes even the case of the later information concerning the "settled" period of the Hungarian 10th and 11th Century.[7]

If we look more closely on the Bohemian historiography of the 10th Century, we realize that especially the sources originating in the Western Frankish Empire are passed without a further interest.[8] It's a natural phenomenon if we consider the

(published as *Die Chronik von Böhmen des Cosmas von Prag* by B. BRETHOLZ in Berlin 1923 (MGH Scriptores rerum Germanicarum, nova series II; further as "Kosmas"), an expanded biographies of the rulers of the country as in case the Anonymous "Gaul" (the text published as MPH nova series II by K. MALECZYŃSKI in Kraków 1952 is now reproduced with some corrections and English translation by P. W. KNOLL and F. SCHAER as *Gesta principum Polonorum: The Deeds of the Princes of the Poles* in: *Central European Medieval Texts III*, Budapest — New York 2003, further cited as "Anonymous Gaul") or a wholly mythical story of the origin of the tribe, *Gesta Hungarorum*, created by another Anonymous from the Hungarian court (in: SRH I, pp. 13–117).

4 The Hungarian word "kalandozás" describes the phenomena from an interestingly different point — it means "to wander" or "go on adventure".

5 The general overview of the picture of these invasions in contemporary sources was presented by M. G. KELLNER, *Die Ungarneinfälle im Bild der Quellen bis 1150: Von der „Gens detestanda" zur „Gens ad fidem Christi conversa"*, München 1997.

6 A convincing information about Magyar life and history could be found even in the Spanish Muslim sources, e. g. I. ZIMONYI, *A New Muslim Source on the Hungarians in the Second Half of Tenth Century*, in: CHRONICA, Vol. 44, 2004, pp. 22–31. Hungarian invasion of 942 lead to Muslim Andalusia and some of the warriors were held as captives and then even hired as guards there.

7 See L. VESZPRÉMY, *Adémar de Chabannes krónikájának magyar vonatkozásai. Textus és kontextus*, in: Századok, Vol. 138, No. 2, 2003, pp. 459–467 and e. g. the common use of Adémar's chronicle in the chapter *The Kingdom of Hungary* (written by N. BEREND, J. LÁSZLOVSZKY and B. Zs. SZAKÁCS) in the work *Christianization and the Rise of Christian Monarchy: Scandinavia, Central Europe and Rus' c. 900–1200*, ed. N. Berend, Cambridge 2007, pp. 319–368.

8 For example, the presence of the Bohemian duke Boleslav at the battle of Lechfeld (as described by Flodoard of Reims) is rejected by V. NOVOTNÝ, *České dějiny I.1*, Praha 1912 and then this information is omitted at all by Boleslav's latest biographer M. LUTOVSKÝ, *Bratrovrah a tvůrce státu: Život a doba knížete Boleslava I.*, Praha 2006. The accounts of Richer and Rudolph Glaber don't bring many actual news (although his news about St. Adalbert were evaluated in the work of E. DĄBROWSKA, *Cluny a św. Wojciech:*

OPEN ACCESS

quality of these sources: The information given by these authors are very short, hardly bring any actual new information, concern a very questionable terms and orthography of the names occurring in the text and finally there is a serious doubt that the sources of the writers' information were somewhat reliable. On the other hand, it is not a wise attitude to refuse these texts in general, for it may still be a useful source for the given period. If we bear in mind the limits that are affecting the general quality of the information, we can trace some important data even in these dubious and questionable accounts. This data will of course not directly change the historiographical picture of the events of the 10th century in Bohemia (and Central Europe), but they can provide an important addition to the general picture of the European history and the position of the given region in the intellectual world of that time. The trend of omitting these sources was slightly changed recently, when Marie Bláhová used some of the Western Frankish chronicles for her short study about the death of St Adalbert,[9] which probably shows, that the Western Frankish sources could find another position in Czech historiography. An attempt of a general description of these sources and their relevance and importance for Bohemian and Central European historiography will be presented in this short study.

The most fruitful information coming from the Western Frankish space could be found in four chronicles of the 10th and first half of the 11th century. The most important chroniclers of this period — Flodoard of Reims,[10] Richer of Reims,[11] Adémar of

Relacja „Historiae libri Quinque" Rudolfa Glabera o męczeństwie św. Wojciecha, in: Kwartalnik historiczny, Vol. 110, No. 3, 2003, pp. 5–13.), Adémar of Chabannes was until now omitted completely thanks to the alleged younger interpolation of the text (see below).

9 M. BLÁHOVÁ, *Smrt svatého Vojtěcha: Zamyšlení nad zprávami nejstarších pramenů*, in: E. DOLEŽALOVÁ — P. SOMMER (Eds.), *Středověký kaleidoskop pro muže s hůlkou*, Praha 2016, pp. 425–434, here 428–429.

10 The canon and historian of the church in Reims (†966). Three certain works of this authors are known: History of his church in Reims, a collection of poems called "De Triumphis Christi" and his chronicle, mostly described as Annals. From the two mostly used editions — G. PERTZ, in: *MGH SS III*, Hannover 1839, pp. 368–408 and P. LAUER, *Les Annales de Flodoard*, Paris 1905, I will quote the easy accessible German one, further as "Flodoard". The work was discussed lately in: E. ROBERTS, *Flodoard of Rheims and the Tenth Century*, University of St. Andrews 2014; S. LECOUTEUX, *Les Annales de Flodoard de Reims (919–966) dans la tradition historiographique du Moyen Âge*, EPHE Paris 2011; S. LECOUTEUX, *Le contexte de rédaction des Annales de Flodoard de Reims (919–966)*, in: Le Moyen Âge. Revue d'histoire et de philologie, Vol. 116, 2010, pp. 51–121, 283–318 and S. FANNING — B. S. BACHRACH (Eds.), *The Annals of Flodoard of Reims, 919–966*, Peterborough 2004 (with the English translation of the work).

11 The monk of the same city, follower of Flodoard's work. His text presents a chronicle of the second half of the 10th century, surviving only in the author's autograph. It was edited lately by H. HOFFMANN, as *MGH SS XXXVIII*, Hannover 2000 (further as "Richer"). For further reading see e. g. J. LAKE, *Richer of Saint-Rémi: The Methods and Mentality of a Tenth-century Historian*, Washington 2013; J. GLENN, *Politics and History in the Tenth Century: The Work and World of Richer of Reims*, Cambridge 2004.

OPEN ACCESS

Chabannes[12] and Rudolph Glaber[13] — bring us some information mostly concerning the Hungarian and Bohemian history. It is probably a very interesting and important finding, that we can't get very much information about the third member of the triad of the newly established monarchies of the East Central Europe: Poland (or to be more exact: Piast realm). Only the Adémar's Chronicle brought us the name of the host of St Adalbert in Poland, the "*rex Sclavanie Botesclavus*".[14] Even Rudolph Glaber, who mentions the same story, describes the route of St. Adalbert as a direct mission "from Prague (*Braga*) to Prussia".[15] It is quite interesting that the core of the information about the Central Europe in the Western Frankish sources almost omits the existence of the Piast realm at all. We can possibly explain this by the speed of the transmission of the information and a certain conservativism during this period. While the regions of Bohemia were in the focus of the Western chroniclers since the year 805, when Charlemagne first conquered this region,[16] and the information about the Hungarian raids was coming with the attacking Hungarians to the homeland of the chroniclers, the emergence of the "Polish"[17] state came up only in 960's and it took

12 Adémar (†ca 1034) was a productive author and composer of Central-West France. His chronicle was lately published by P. BOURGAIN in: *Corpus Christianorum. Continuatio mediaevalis CXXIX*, Tournhout 1999 (further as "Adémar"). From a vast amount of secondary literature see e. g. D. F. CALLAHAN, *Jerusalem and the Cross in the Life and Writings of Ademar of Chabannes*, Leiden 2016; J. GRIER, *The Musical World of a Medieval Monk: Adémar de Chabannes in Eleventh-century Aquitaine*, Cambridge 2006; Y. CHAUVIN, *Adémar de Chabannes, Chronique*, Turnhout 2003 and R. A. LANDES, *Relics, Apocalypse, and the Deceits of History: Ademar of Chabannes, 989–1034*, Cambridge 1995.

13 Glaber was a well-educated *enfant terrible* of the French monasteries in the first half of the 11th century. Except the interesting chronicle, he also wrote a biography of a Cluniac William of Volpiano. Major recent works concerning his chronicle include R. ROMAGNOLI, *Le Storie di Rodolfo il Glabro (Strutture culturali e modelli di santità cluniacensi)*, Bologna 1988; E. ORTIGUES — D. JOGNA-PRAT, *Raoul Glaber et l'historiographie clunisienne*, in: Studi medievali, Vol. 26, 1995, pp 537–572; G. M. CANTARELLA, *Appunti su Rodolfo il Glabro*, in: Aevum, Vol. 65, 1991, pp. 279–294; J. FRANCE, *Rodulfus Glaber and French Politics in the Early Eleventh Century*, in: Forschungen zur westeuropäischen Geschichte, Vol. 16, No. 1, 1989, pp. 101–112. The most recent edition has been published by M. ARNOUX as *Raoul Glaber: Histoires*, Turnhout 1996; but for me only the slightly older *Cronache dell'anno mille (Storie)*, Milano 1989 edited by G. CAVALLO and G. ORLANDI (further as "Glaber") was accessible.

14 Adémar, p. 152.

15 Glaber, pp. 28–29.

16 Charlemagne's campaign is noted almost by every single source describing this period, and the traces of this information could be found even in Kosmas, pp. 59, 93–94.

17 The actual name of Poles and Polish state and nation appears in the sources first at the end of the 10th century. This probably underlines the unsure attitude that the authors of the 10th and 11th century had to the very existence of a new political unit of the East Central Europe. For further readings see P. URBAŃCZYK, *Slavic and Christian Identities during the Transition to Polish Statehood*, in: I. GARIZPANOV — P. GEARY — P. URBAŃCZYK (Eds.), *Franks, Northmen and Slavs: Identities and State Formation in Early Medieval Europe*, Turnhout 2008, pp. 205–222. Adémar still uses the term "Slavic" for the description of the rule of Boleslav the Valiant, although he also knows the name "*Polliana*" which is on the other hand only one of the four provinces mentioned in this connection (see below).

OPEN ACCESS

some time before the name and idea of a new region found its place in the intellectual map of the Western Frankish writers.[18]

The oldest Western Frankish Chronicle covering the period of the 10th Century are the so-called Annals of Flodoard. The basis of Flodoard's work really resembles the classical annalistic form, mentioning the history year by year, not trying to explain some motives and consequences by leaving this strict chronological order and reminding us thusly how thin is the borderline between annals and chronicle in the said period. Flodoard describes the period of 919 to 966, with the focus to the Western Frankish history, but being very sufficiently informed about the situation "behind the river Rhine", in the emerging Ottonian Empire. Thanks to this knowledge of the Ottonian history, Flodoard can give us some very interesting and important information not only to the period of Hungarian raids (which he catches up for the years 919, 922, 924, 926, 933, 935, 937, 951 and 954)[19] but also several interesting facts about the history of Bohemia. We must bear in mind, that especially the exact years of the certain campaigns in Flodoard's work are quite reliable and hardly we can find any mistake, which is quite unusual for the annals of the given period.

Flodoard brings us especially three interesting reports concerning directly the East Central Europe:[20] First, there is an interesting account of the battle at Riade.[21] Frankish chronicler describes it quite exactly, although with some interesting mistakes. According to him the Hungarian army was divided in three units: one of them heading in Italy, the other to Henry's realm. The third unit is then completely forgotten in the account. One possible explanation of this fact is brought by the message of Widukind of Corvey,[22] who describes the attack to Saxony as an action of two separated groups, one of which was destroyed in Thuringia just before the Riade battle. The other part of Hungarians could then be the third army mentioned by Flodoard. Even the phrase "*ad internetionem sternit*" used by Flodoard for describing the Hungarian defeat resembles more the information of Widukind, who says, that the main armies never actually clashed and the success of Saxons was merely the chasing of the Hungarians away. Giving so much credit to Flodoard's information enables us to take seriously also the account, that Henry the Fowler's army consisted not only from Saxons and Bavarians but from "the other tribes subjugated to him". We can say, that

18 On the other hand, the Polish authors payed attention to the Adémar's news, especially about the international figure of St. Adalbert already — see N. MIKA, *Postać sw. Wojciecha w europejskiej historiografii wieków średnich — prezentacja wybranych wzmianek źródłowych*, in: A. BARCIAK (Ed.), *Środkowoeuropejskie dziedzictwo świętego Wojciecha*, Katowice 1998, pp. 43–59, namely 53ff and D. A. SIKORSKI, rec. *Kronika Ademara z Chabannes — odzyskane źródło dla najwcześniejszych dziejów Polski*, in: Studia źródłoznawcze, Vol. 40, Warszawa 2002, pp. 215–220.

19 See respectively Flodoard, pp. 368, 370, 373–374, 376, 381, 383–384, 400 and 402.

20 A minor and hardly decipherable message about the campaign of Henry the Fowler against Sarmatians (i. e. Slavs, see below) in 924 (FLODOARD, p. 374) could unfortunately hardly bring any more accurate information. We can only anticipate, that this message was a source for Richer — see below.

21 Flodoard, p. 381.

22 Widukind of Corvey, *Rerum gestarum Saxonicarum libri tres*, ed. P. HIRSCH — H.-E. LOHMANN, Hannover 1935, pp. 56–57 (further as "Widukind").

OPEN ACCESS

by these tribes Flodoard could mean the "German tribes" such as Thuringians, Swabians and (Eastern) Franks,[23] who were omitted by the account of Flodoard. The West Frankish author could even question the "Frankish" nature of the power of "*princeps Transrhenensis*",[24] how he described Henry the Fowler, by such an "omission". On the other hand, there is another possibility, already mentioned by certain scholars:[25] By the "subjugated tribes", Flodoard could mean rather some Slavic tribes that Henry defeated before the battle at Riade as he planned the decisive clash with the invaders.[26] Slavs of the Elbe region were subjugated very forcibly, which possibly diminishes the possibility of their useful help. On the other hand, there is still a possibility that in the same time probably less violently pacified duke Wenceslas of Bohemia was ready to help to his new "dominus".[27] The Czech historiography traditionally sees the contact between Henry and Wenceslas as somewhat sensitive topics.[28] Maybe because of this attitude, the local historiography never fully examined all the circumstances of the given "Slavic" campaign of Henry the Fowler, especially in the context of the preparations against the Hungarians.[29] Bearing this context in mind, it is not that hard even to attribute scars on the St Wenceslas's skull[30] to the fights with Hungarians (so far, the scars rather could "attest" his brave resistance against the "German" enemy). The Bohemian duke could really act as an ally of Henry I in the battle of Riade in a somewhat similar position as his younger brother at Lech.

Unfortunately, Flodoard doesn't mention expressly what "tribes" does he mean. It's significant for his work, that he didn't use the word "Slav" or "Slavic" anywhere. His term for Slavs is the older Roman term identifying the population of Eastern Europe with the nomadic Sarmatians[31] and in one case the younger term for the gen-

23 Flodoard uses the word *gentes* in the connection "*Germaniae Galliaeque gentes*" (p. 377).

24 Flodoard, p. 369.

25 "The ‚ceterae gentes subjectae' of Flodoard's *Annales* ... were most probably Slavs," according to K. J. LEYSER, *Medieval Germany and Its Neighbours*, London 1982.

26 WIDUKIND, p. 55 describes the anti-Slavic campaign in 928/929 as a beta-test of Henry's army. In fact, the Ottonian king could try to fight the possible allies of Hungarians and prepare his flanks for the defence.

27 The final agreement of these rulers is attested by the same source (Widukind, p. 50: "(Henricus) regemque eius in deditionem accepit").

28 A general overview of the nationalistic historiography discussing this topic is presented by O. KRÁLÍK, *Labyrint dávných dějin českých*, Praha 1970, pp. 81–116. The modern Czech historiography tends to describe the problem in a more neutral way, but it is still influenced by the original tradition widely.

29 For example, F. M. BARTOŠ, *Kníže svatý Václav u Vidukinda*, in: Svatováclavský sborník I. Kníže Václav Svatý a jeho doba, Praha 1934, p. 838 totally overturned the actual idea of Widukind's account by interpreting the whole story as a great plan against the Slavs (!), which was the *reason*, why Henry accepted even the expensive truce with the Hungarians.

30 The traumatology of the Wenceslas' skull was described by E. VLČEK, *Nejstarší Přemyslovci: Fyzické osobnosti českých panovníků. Atlas kosterních pozůstatků prvních sedmi historicky známých generací Přemyslovců s podrobným komentářem a historickými poznámkami*, Praha 1997, pp. 124–133, especially page 130, where two healed wounds on the skull are described.

31 Flodoard, pp. 374, 403 and 404.

OPEN ACCESS

eral Slavic population "Wends" (*Wenedorum*).[32] As the Western Frankish population lacked any contacts with the neighbours of their Eastern relatives, this attitude is rather expectable and we see a same name "Sarmatians" given to the Slavic population by Flodoard's "successor" Richer.[33] Flodoard clearly uses the term Sarmatians as a general name for a population, not a specific country or people — Sarmatians in his world could have several rulers — *principes* and *reges*.

The second case when Flodoard expressly describes the situation behind the Eastern border of East Frankish realm is a short sentence added to the text of the year 950 without any context: "King Otto, who besieged a big castle of Weneds, called *Proada*, accepted the subjection of their king (sic!); but he also subjected the Hungarians."[34] By the mentioning of Hungarians, the author is probably already anticipating the results of the big campaign in 955. It is interesting, that when describing this campaign later (see below), Flodoard is mentioning the participation of Boleslav (or his soldiers?), but in this specific case Flodoard doesn't mention (and maybe even know) the name of the ruler of Weneds and we may even ask if he was aware that the present king of Weneds and later mentioned duke/king of Sarmatians were the same person. The use of a different name for the tribe would imply, he did not, although the connection with the Hungarians is somewhat strange in this case.

Even more interesting is, that the target of Otto's campaign is specified to Prague (which name, however deformed, stays probably out of question). The other two sources referring closer to this campaign give us a different name of the besieged fortress — *Nova*[35] or *Niuunburg*.[36] Both names relate possibly to the same place, which could make us reject the Flodoard's message as dubious, as he was probably only identifying the capital of Bohemians and probably already most important castle of Prague with the target of the campaign that wasn't in fact known to him. On the other hand, if Flodoard did not identify the campaign of 950 with the later news about Boleslav, and because he used a different term for Bohemia here, we can also anticipate, that the whole message came from some specific Flodoard's source, which could also increase a chance, that the name of Prague was already present in the original report.

32 Flodoard, p. 400. This particular case refers to the encounter between Otto and Boleslav in 950 (see below). Is it possible, that Flodoard really distinguished Slavs (Sarmatians) and Bohemians (Wends)?

33 Richer, pp. 51, 73 and 75.

34 See the note 32. The same campaign is attested by Widukind, pp. 108–109 and several other sources, such as *Reginonis abbatis prumiensis chronicon cum continuatione treverensi*, ed. F. Kurze, MGH SRG LX, Hannover 1890, p. 164 (further as "*Continuator*") and *Die Chronik des Bischofs Thietmar von Merseburg und ihre Korveier überarbeitung*, ed. R. Holtzmann, MGH SRG nova series IX, Berlin 1935, p. 40 (further as "Thietmar").

35 Widukind, p. 108.

36 See the charter in: *Diplomata regum et imperatorum Germaniae: Die Urkunden der Deutschen Könige und Kaiser 1: Die Urkunden Konrad I., Heinrich I. und Otto I.: Conradi I., Heinrici I. et Ottonis I. Diplomata*, ed. T. von Sickel, MGH, DD, Hannover 1879–1884, chart no. 126, pp. 207–208 issued there. There are several theories localising the "New castle" to many regions of Bohemia. From the recent ones, Mladá Boleslav was proposed by R. TUREK, *Widukind Korvejský a starší české dějiny*, Sborník kruhu přátel Muzea hl. m. Prahy, Vol. 1, 1988, p. 60 and Žatec by M. LUTOVSKÝ, *Bratrovrah a tvůrce státu*, p. 120.

OPEN ACCESS

There is also a chance to reconcile this two news. While Flodoard was informed about the campaign to Prague, Widukind and Otto himself could be aware of a new castle present there. It was not the Prague castle, but it could be the other fortress on top of the hill next to the Prague agglomeration — Vyšehrad. Unfortunately, the archeologic research completed lately by the publication of an impressive survey,[37] didn't prove the presence of any fortified structures on the top of the hill already in the half of the 10th century. On the other hand, Widukind's message would be much clearer, if we put the scene of the story right between the two castles[38] of Prague and Vyšehrad. According to the Widukind's account Otto besieged the castle where only Boleslav's son was present (*Nova* — Vyšehrad?), but was afraid of the danger (coming possibly from Prague — *Proada*?) and ordered to stop the attack. Boleslav (himself!) then left the castle (i. e. Prague?) to negotiate. Flodoard's account (would it be considered reliable) could in fact bring a light to the confusing text of Widukind.

The year 955 brought two important battles for the king Otto and both are registered also by the Flodoard's *Annals*.[39] The first is of course the battle of Lech (Lechfeld, Augsburg).[40] It's not necessary to describe the battle, it's consequences and the details that reached Flodoard's scriptorium. The main cause, why this episode is very important for us, is the actual presence of the Boleslav (or originally "*Burislao*") himself, that is mentioned by Flodoard. It is interesting that Boleslav is noted together with Conrad the Red as the two noteworthy allies of Otto in the battle, giving us a very good reason to hope that Flodoard was deeply sure about the duke's participation in the battle.[41]

In the same year, Otto fought the battle at Raxa against the rebelling Obotrites, ruled by two dukes — Nakon and his brother Stojhněv.[42] These two persons are probably meant by Flodoard, when he's referring to the "two Sarmatian kings"[43] that were defeated — again not only by Otto, but also by the king "*Burislao*," adding that he was recently subjugated by Otto. It is hard to decide if Flodoard was really connecting this information with the account from the year 950. Flodoard's formulations are vague and it is interesting, that he's mentioning the subjugation of Boleslav at first by the second appearance of his person, almost suggesting that the subjugation happened between the two battles (which is of course a nonsense). Neither is Flodoard referring expressly to the event of 950, which is another indication that he did in fact *not* match these events in his mind.

However, we must know, that Boleslav's actual presence at Lech or even presence of a Bohemian army in the battle against the Slavs is attested only by Flodoard. Had this information come not from a West Frankish chronicle but from some single East

37 V. MOUCHA — B. NECHVÁTAL — V. VARADZIN, *Vyšehrad: Knížecí a královská akropole: Svědectví archeologie*, Praha 2015.

38 The charter mentioned above in the note 32 clearly says „suburbio Niuunburg".

39 Flodoard, p. 403.

40 For further reading about the battle, its consequences and other sources to the event see e. g. Srov. M. G. KELLNER, *Ungarneinfälle im Bild der Quellen bis 1150*, pp. 161–173.

41 The existing literature is much less sure — see the note 8.

42 See e. g. Widukind, pp. 130 and 133ff.

43 Flodoard, p. 403.

OPEN ACCESS

Frankish annals, we would surely accept the presence of Boleslav at Lech or at least his soldiers in both battles. The information is completely plausible and — bearing in mind the global reliability of the Flodoard's work — I would consider the information quite acceptable. Boleslav's possible presence at Lech as well as the other battle fought by Bohemians against Hungarians in the same year[44] only attests, that the Bohemian support provided to Otto during the decisive conflict is important not only as an event partially uncovering the Bohemian history of the 10th century, but as an information showing us the nature of the relation between Bohemia and the Empire. Boleslav was very actively helping Otto to defeat his biggest opponents and — by doing so — sealing his own position within the imperial aristocracy. It would be acceptable to presume, that Flodoard's information is right and Boleslav was able to give support personally even in the battle at Raxa.

The last Flodoard's information about the eastern border of the East Frankish Empire appears at the year 958, when another fight with Sarmatians is fought by Otto.[45] This information could be confirmed by the chronicle of Widukind and Regino's Continuator. The first mentions approximately in the same time a big "killing" done by the "barbarians".[46] The second author attributes the two campaigns against Slavs to the years 957 and 959.[47]

The second author I'm going to investigate — Richer of Reims — was to a big extent using the chronicle of Flodoard.[48] On the other hand, he was not mentioning very much information of the Ottonian eastern border, even if he could use the material of his source. The Hungarian attack is mentioned only once and could be probably attributed to the year 937.[49] Without possible specification, the author mentions the subjugation of "Sarmatians" done by Henry the Fowler and even without any fight.[50] The only case, when we can think about the "subjugation without any fight" is probably the campaign to Prague in 929 (mentioned above). While some historians somehow automatically think about a big war event between Henry and Wenceslas,[51] we could bear in mind, that hardly any actual fight is attested.[52] On the other hand, we

44 A rather mysterious information comes from *Annales Sangallenses* (in: MGH SS I, Hannover 1826, p. 79). Although the nature of the information and its impossible confirmation resembles the news from Flodoard, the other battle with Hungarians is generally accepted by the scholars (e. g. H. BEUMANN, *Die Ottonen*, Stuttgart — Berlin — Köln, 2000, p. 79; LUTOVSKÝ, *Bratrovrah a tvůrce státu*, p. 135). In fact, it would be the only specific battle between Slavs and still non-Christian Hungarians, that is mentioned in the written sources after the fall of Great Moravia.

45 Flodoard, p. 404.

46 Widukind, p. 136. An attack against Redars is mentioned already in 957 (ibidem).

47 *Continuator*, p. 169. His account is on the other hand full of such mistakes.

48 Richer, *Einleitung*, p. 2.

49 Richer, p. 103.

50 Ibidem, p. 51.

51 The last author anticipating a very serious military operation, with several battles is V. VANÍČEK, *Svatý Václav: Panovník a světec v raném středověku*, Praha 2014, pp. 111–112.

52 Widukind pp. 50–51, the author who gives us the most detailed account of the story, doesn't mention any fight at all (especially in comparison with the other parts of Slavic campaign he described before and after). The annals on the other hand seem to under-

OPEN ACCESS

can hardly consider Richer's message a good argument for the other possibility. The short notice is too vague and unspecific for this purpose.

The last Richer's message about East Central Europe looks quite definite on the first sight. Richer is mentioning a war between Otto and *Bulizlav*, the duke of Sarmatians.[53] This event could be easily attributed to the period of war between Otto and Boleslav of Bohemia in 936–950, probably directly to the campaign in 950.[54] This could on one hand support the possibility, that already Flodoard was aware of the connection between the events of 950 and the person of Boleslav I. — just as his follower Richer. But if we look more precisely, the event is mentioned in Richer's text only during the excurse of the second half of the 950's. Because of this, we could easily understand Richer's information also as a mistake taken from the Flodoard's a little chaotic information about the year 955.[55] According to Richer's interpretation, Boleslav could be Otto's adversary and not an ally even in the year 955.

The more definite information we can get from the Richer's chronicle is a definite lack of interest for the (East) Central European Affairs. Richer's life in the second half of the 10th century was much less affected by the threats of Hungarian raids, then the one of his predecessor. This could be the most important reason, why he omits this geographical space generally. Also, the connection between the two heirs of a former Carolingian Empire — Ottonian and West Frankish, already partly Capetian Empires — was already loosen and because of this the attention, payed to the events behind the Rhine, sunk. This trend is attested by the next important chronicles from the first half of the 11th century, that we are to talk about — Adémar and Rudolph Glaber. Although the information about the Eastern Frankish/Holy Roman Empire are generally present in their work, we almost lack any information about the eastern neighbours of this Empire. The West Frankish intellectual or rather historiographical world in the chronicles shrunk after the half of the 10th century on a tighter, maybe somehow "national" level.

Adémar of Chabannes represents the generation born at the end of the 10th century. Because of this, he brings us a very different picture of the history. The old Carolingian world is already replaced by the new and already stable political forms. Adémar's Chronicle is also not very much concerned with the events behind the eastern borders of the neighbour of his realm. In fact, it is only one version of his chronicle, that brings us an enclosed insert containing the information about East

stand the event rather as a typical war campaign, although they give us no information about any specific battle, pillage or losses on both sides (*Annales Ratisponenses*, in: MGH SS XVII, Hannover 1861, p. 583). The *Continuator*, p. 158 (misdated to 928) probably derived his account from them. Although the campaign of Henry and Arnulph of Bavaria was for sure not only a peaceful negotiation, maybe the campaign was so swift and the will of Wenceslas to collaborate so open, that only a few clashes occurred before a final negotiation, that was rather a "diplomatic" one. The theory of no actual war between Wenceslas and Henry is supported e. g. by P. CHARVÁT, *Václav, kníže Čechů*, Praha 2011, pp. 134–137 and D. TŘEŠTÍK, *Počátky Přemyslovců*, Praha 2003, p. 392.

53 Richer, p. 173.

54 See the note 34.

55 The same interpretation presents the commentary of the latest Richer's edition (as mentioned above) or J. LAKE, *Richer of Saint-Rémi*, p. 136, note 247.

OPEN ACCESS

Central Europe. The chapter is still quite long, but on the other hand filled with many mistakes and hardly verifiable information. Despite this fact, the attention paid to this relation rose recently and the originality of the insert is probably confirmed.[56]

The Adémar's story appears after the message of the death of Otto II[57] and starts with the information about the Christianisation of Hungarians: They accept the new religion especially thanks to the effort of the two bishops — Adalbert and Bruno. Following lines are in fact a comparative biography of the two heroes. The first is without a doubt the Prague bishop St Adalbert (Vojtěch),[58] the second is an interesting mixture between Bruno of Querfurt, the missionary archbishop who really was present at the Géza's "court" for some time,[59] and Bruno of Augsburg, a member of the Ottonian family, living in the same time.[60] The biography of St Adalbert is full of unusual stories, not related by any other source.[61] The whole mission of St Adalbert is in fact described as originating in an emperor's joke, that was taken seriously by the bishop. Adalbert is leaving Prague (*Pragra* or *Pragin*) not as a displeased bishop (which is the "original" story), but after peacefully arranging his nameless successor.[62] His missionary target is first Poland (*Polliana*), where "the name of Christ was unheard by anybody". Adalbert is being responsible — according to Adémar — for converting of "*Polliana*", *Sclavinia*, *Waredonia* (could it be the land of Wends, or

56 Recent study on this topic as a Hungarian-Polish problem was presented by A. QUÉRET-PODESTA, *Poland and Hungary in the Chronicle of Adémar de Chabannes*, in: D. BAGI — G. BARABÁS — Z. MÁTÉ (Eds.), *Hungaro-Polonica. Young Scholars on Medieval Polish-Hungarian Relations*, Pécs 2016, pp. 17–31. For the question of the originality of the said insert see L. VESZPRÉMY's work cited in the note 7.

57 Adémar, pp. 151–154.

58 The latest biography of this saint was written by G. LABUDA, *Święty Wojciech. Biskup — męczennik, patron Polski, Czech i Węgier*, Wrocław 2000.

59 The latest work dedicated to his personality is *Der heilige Brun von Querfurt: eine Reise ins Mittelalter: Begleitband zur Sonderausstellung Der heilige Brun von Querfurt — Friedensstifter und Missionar in Europa, 1009–2009 im Museum Burg Querfurt, [19. Juni bis 20. Dezember 2009]*, Querfurt 2009. The Hungarian period of his life is described by V. MÚCSKA, *Bruno z Querfurtu a Uhorsko*, in: Historia Slavorum Occidentis, No. 1, 2014, pp. 61–72.

60 The confusion between two Brunos could be supported by the fact, that even Bruno of Augsburg was for some time present at king Stephen of Hungary's court. Bruno had to flee in exile to his brother-in-law after an unsuccessful rebellion against his brother, emperor Henry II. See Thietmar, p. 276.

61 The "normative" version of Adalbert's story is given by two *vitae*, written almost immediately after his death — first, traditionally attributed to the abbot John Canaparius of Rome (ed. J. KARWASIŃSKA, MPH nova series IV/1, Warszawa 1962; further as "Canaparius"); second written by abovementioned Bruno of Querfurt (ed. J. KARWASIŃSKA, MPH nova series IV/2, Warszawa 1969; further as „Bruno"). As a possible source for the unusual story of Adémar, a lost life of St Adalbert mentioned by Anonymous Gaul, pp. 34–35, the so-called *Liber de passione Sancti Adalberti* is proposed, see QUÉRET-PODESTA, *Poland and Hungary*, pp. 24–30.

62 According to BLÁHOVÁ, *Smrt mučedníka Vojtěcha*, p. 428, note 48, Adémar could know the story of the slightly enigmatic bishop Strachkvas (Christian?) mentioned by Kosmas, pp. 52–55.

OPEN ACCESS

Wagrians?)[63] and *Cracovia*. It is interesting that according to the chronicle, the land of Polish Slavs is divided to the four provinces, which could correspond with the four main regions occupied by the Piast power — Greater Poland, Mazovia, Silesia and *Cracovia* (Lesser Poland).[64] The subsequent mission to the Prussians, who are called *Pincenators* by the author, is described similarly to the original Adalbert's *vitae*,[65] except for a one detail — the body of Adalbert is gained first by some merchants who brought it (back) to *Sclavinia*. Only after that it is bought for some precious gifts by Boleslav the Valiant (*rex Sclavorum*), that is said to be baptised personally by St Adalbert. It is interesting that, despite the original claim, no reference is made to any Adalbert's relationship with the said Hungarian mission.[66]

The life of Bruno, given by Adémar, is an interesting mixture of different traditions. Bruno is here considered to be the bishop of Augsburg and relative of Ottonians, but on the other hand his missionary biography corresponds with the life of Bruno of Querfurt. The start of his missionary life is said to be influenced by Adalbert's example. Bruno arranges his successor which should be the famous saint bishop of Augsburg Odalric, being in fact some two generations older than the two Brunos.[67] His missionary aim is the land of "White Hungarians" (subsequent Adémar's information about the Black Hungarians who should resemble the Ethiopians is also a source for an interesting historiographical debate)[68] and the land of Russians. Bruno should baptise Géza (*Gouz*) who is said to be the first Hungarian ruler who accepted the Christian name Stephen. His godfather should be personally the emperor Otto (probably Otto III), giving to Géza not only his land for free reign, but also the Holy Lance,

63 QUÉRET-PODESTA, *Poland and Hungary*, p. 22 proposes also a third possibility — the name of the river Warta mentioned in Thietmar's *Chronicle* (Thietmar, p. 75).

64 An effort of the author to describe the whole lands of Slavs by a complete and symbolical number 4 is probably another good explanation, see QUÉRET-PODESTA, *Poland and Hungary*, pp. 23. If Adémar was really using a lost biography of St Adalbert (see above), it is possible, that the information about "independent" *Cracovia* was originating from it, being a reference to the political situation at the end of the 10th century, when Kraków was only shortly occupied by Poles (as taken from Bohemians; see Kosmas, p. 60)!

65 Canaparius, pp. 64–67 and 81–84; Bruno, pp. 28–41 and 62–69.

66 Which on the other hand is a firm part of the "usual" Adalbert's story, see Bruno, p. 19 and 56.

67 See e. g. M. WEITLAUFF (Ed.), *Bischof Ulrich von Augsburg 890–973: Seine Zeit — sein Leben — seine Verehrung: Festschrift aus Anlass des tausendjährigen Jubiläums seiner Kanonisation im Jahre 993*, Weißenhorn 1993.

68 We can find the same term in the actual works of Bruno, such as *Vita quinque fratrum eremitarum* (ed. J. KARWASIŃSKA, MPH nova series IV/3, Warszawa 1973, p. 52) and *Epistola ad Henricum regem* (ibidem, p. 100). The term is usually explained as a description of some other Hungarian duchy, possibly in Transylvania (ruled by Gyula) or at the river Maros (Ajtony's duchy). Adémar reminds once more the topic of Black Hungarians with a very short notice, that Stephen later actually conquered and converted their land, which could refer to both duchies (Adémar, p. 155). See also BEREND — LÁSZLOVSZKY — SZAKÁCS, *The Kingdom of Hungary*, p. 345. The resemblance of Ethiopians is probably an author's own fantasy, but on the other hand a good compliance with the original Bruno's work shows us the reliability of Adémar's information.

OPEN ACCESS

spike of the Lord and lance of St Maurice.[69] The information of the baptism of Géza is in fact the only closer message about the baptism of this duke. It is for sure not a mistake that merges the story of Géza with the one of St Stephen,[70] because Adémar then continues with the second baptism of the young Stephen who is given the same name as his father and — at the same time — a wife of the imperial progeny (Gizella of Bavaria). Bruno then continues to the land of *Pincenators*, where he is bestially tortured and killed. His body is said to be bought and revered in Russia, that is nevertheless still devoted to idols and Christianised only later by "some Greek".[71]

Adémar also caught up a part of the story of a Gniezno meeting between Otto III and Boleslav. The story is told in a reverse order in comparison to the contemporary message written by Thietmar of Merseburg.[72] Otto first goes to Aachen, where he discovers the body of Charlemagne[73] and then only sends the emperor's golden throne to Boleslav as a possible equivalent for the relics of Adalbert. For this price, Otto receives an arm of Adalbert and lets two churches in Aachen and Rome to be built to honour the Adalbert's glory. Short notice of the Hungarian space is also contained in the Adémar's relation of the pilgrimages to the Holy Land. King Stephen is personally interested about the fate of noble pilgrims and gives some gifts to them.[74]

Adémar's story is an interesting mixture of the information originating probably from the sources close to the most popular and probably more reliable lives of these two martyrs and from possible other sources, unknown to us, combined with some plain mistakes and finally probably even with some author's own inventions added to the storyline. Rather than a "historical" story, Adémar brings to his readers some hagiographical biographies. Being thus not very trustworthy source, the unique information is still more and more considered valuable, as I said before, especially by the Hungarian historiography. We can hardly assume, that the storyline of St Adalbert will bring some more direct information about Bohemian

69 It is interesting, that the story about the lance contained in the chronicle of Anonymous Gaul, p. 36–37 refers positively about Polish duke Boleslav receiving the relic. On the other hand, we clearly know about the presence of a lance as a symbol of power on the court of Saint Stephen — see QUÉRET-PODESTA, *Poland and Hungary*, pp. 28 and BEREND — LÁSZLOVSZKY — SZAKÁCS, *The Kingdom of Hungary*, p. 349 for further references.

70 AQUÉRET-PODESTA, *Poland and Hungary*, p. 19 is wrong in this case, but the information is still a very dubious one — BEREND — LÁSZLOVSZKY — SZAKÁCS, *The Kingdom of Hungary*, p. 353–354.

71 We have very little information about the Eastern European missionary fate of Bruno, that is usually collected from many contradictory sources. The main text focused on his martyrdom is a short *Hystoria de predicacione episcopi Brunonis cum suis capellanis in Pruscia et martirio eorum* written by a certain Wibert (ed. G. H. Pertz, MGH SS IV, Hannover 1841, pp. 579–580.

72 Thietmar, pp. 183–187.

73 For a further information and literature about the event see K. GÖRICH, *Otto III. öffnet das Karlsgrab in Aachen. Überlegungen zu Heiligenverehrung und Traditionsbildung*, in: G. ALTHOFF — E. SCHUBERT (Eds.), *Herrschaftsrepräsentation im ottonischen Sachsen*, Sigmaringen 1998, pp. 381–430. Adémar's information is considered an important source here.

74 Adémar, pp. 184–185.

OPEN ACCESS

history,[75] but still we can bear in mind, that the story itself and the role the Bohemian space is playing there is quite interesting. Bohemia at the end of the 10th century seems to be for Adémar an already Christianised space with a stable church administration and a firm part of the Ottonian world. Adalbert was the only person who represented Bohemia in the intellectual world of the West Frankish author.

The same or similar attitude is to be found in the chronicle of Rudolph Glaber, the fourth subsequent author of a big Western Frankish chronicle. Glaber is writing an interesting piece of work, with a very complicated storyline mixing the chronological order with a lot of excursions, parables and some hagiographical stories. From the East-Central European point of view, Glaber brings three important excursions. First of them is a story very similar to the message of Adémar. It also starts with a death of the emperor, but in Glaber's case it is Otto I[76] (possibly a mistake, that could originate from a misinterpreting of the original source, which could be the same as Adémar used, if not Adémar himself).[77] In the story, Adalbert leaves his fatherland *Bethem* and city of *Braga* to preach to the Prussians, converting many of them to Christianity. The origin of Adalbert is even specified by the church that he administered before — a church of the martyr *Vitiscold*, which in fact could be an amalgam of the name of St Vitus and St Wenceslas. Later on his journey Adalbert prophetically announces his death to the disciples and companions, then he is killed for a desecration of a pagan sacred spot and his dead body is brought "back to the fatherland" (!)[78] by them almost immediately. Many details of this story are unique and could be as well the author's invention as some indirect confirmation of the other uncertain motives mentioned in the other texts — such as the direct conflict with pagans.[79] We can even assume a possible link between Adalbert and Glaber, that could originate in their affiliation to the monastery of Cluny.[80]

75 The only exception is probably the title of archbishop attributed to St Adalbert and Prague. This information could be added to the portfolio of indications, that Dušan Třeštík uses for the support of the theory, that Prague was the original object of the efforts of Otto III who established the "archbishopric of St Adalbert" in 999 and located it a year later in Gniezno only because Prague was already in a deep crisis of government after the death of Boleslav II. For the latest discussion of this problem see M. MATLA-KOZŁOWSKA, *Czy państwo Przemyślidów u schyłku X wieku „zasługiwało" na arcybiskupstwo? Na marginesie dyskusji o planach ufundowania arcybiskupstwa św. Wojciecha w Pradze*, in: D. A. SIKORSKI — A. M. WYRWA (Eds.), *Cognitio gestorum: Studia z dziejów średniowiecza dedykowane Profesorowi Jerzemu Strzelczykowi*, Poznań — Warszawa 2006, pp. 131–147.

76 Glaber, pp. 28–29.

77 The similarities between these two messages reach further. For example, a similar deformation of the name Bohemia — *Bethem/Bevehem*. Even the mentioning of the pilgrim routes and the personal interest of king Stephen about the pilgrim-movement (see below) imply a possible dependence of the younger author to the older text.

78 Compare it with the theories about the archbishopric in Prague in the footnote 74. When Glaber was writing the last versions of his chronicle, Adalbert's body was already in Prague.

79 See BLÁHOVÁ, *Smrt svatého Vojtěcha*, p. 429.

80 DĄBROWSKA, *Cluny a św. Wojciech*, passim.

OPEN ACCESS

The other excursions of Glaber, concerning the East-Central Europe, are mostly directed to the Hungarian history.[81] Glaber in a general overview describes in a stereotypical way their invasions to Europe, ending only with their acceptation of Christianity.[82] Their Christianisation is mentioned again in the chapter, that connects the event with the king Stephen (omitting the role of his father) who is then presented especially as a protector of pilgrims heading to the Holy Land (with a following description of this whole phenomena of the time).[83] Glaber is quite informed about the contemporary events, mentioning twice the German-Hungarian wars, that accompanied the crisis of succession after the death of Stephen. The Emperor Henry is however presented as the one who appointed the king Aba, who in fact was his direct opponent and enemy.[84] Describing the decisive battle against this king, Glaber on the other hand uses the information contained also in imperial annals — the decisive role of a miraculous shade, that helped the imperial army to obtain a final victory.[85]

The last information about the "eastern politics" of the Holy Roman Empire is a short notice of the fights against Lutici, the rebellious pagan tribe.[86] Lutici are described only as a one of the tribes of Germania, barbarians, not as a people of Slavic descent (although the origin of Adalbert is positively described as Slavic in the chronicle). Glaber describes an indefinite war between them and the emperor Conrad II, that should be set in 1033. This war, described as a single event, is probably standing for the series of conflicts between Saxony (with only occasional direct participation of Conrad) and Lutici from 1033 to 1035, that positively was not that decisive as Glaber describes. The previous alliance between Lutici and the emperors Henry II and Conrad II aiming against the Polish state, is of course concealed.

As we see the general picture of the information provided by important West Frankish chronicles to the topics of Eastern-Central European history of the 10th and beginning of the 11th century, we can conclude, that the awareness of the authors about the subject was not continuous and reliable. This is surely not a surprise. It is a question if we could speak about a decreasing tendency of awareness, but we can say, that Flodoard is partially informed about the campaigns and political tendencies of the Eastern Frankish Empire towards the East, Richer almost omits them, Adémar is giving us only one general excursion and Glaber only few shorter. The actual references could depend on a specific source, but in general we can say, that the connection between the West and East Frankish world in this question slowly faded away.

81 See A. GYÖRKÖS, *La relation de Raoul Glaber sur les premières décennies de l'Etat hongrois*, in: K. PAPP — J. BARTA (Eds.), *The First Millennium of Hungary in Europe*, Debrecen 2002, pp. 120–125.

82 Glaber, pp. 44–47.

83 Glaber, pp. 112–113. The importance of the Hungarian pilgrim path was lately deliberated by F. CURTA, *East Central Europe: The Gate to Byzantium*, in: Byzantinische Zeitschrift, Vol. 108, No. 2, 2015, pp. 22–23.

84 Glaber, pp. 274–275.

85 Glaber, pp. 282–285, compare it to the message of *Annales Altahenses Maiores* (in: MGH SS XX, Hannover 1868), p. 800.

86 Glaber, pp. 238–239.

OPEN ACCESS

The biggest and more important role for the picture of East-Central Europe in the West Frankish environment is played by saints. The role of saints and especially of saint Adalbert while questioning the picture of Central Europe in the Western European view is probably essential. The stories of his martyrdom are contained even in the Glaber's work, that otherwise payed no attention to the Bohemian history (and totally omitted the polish part of Adalbert's story). Certain parts of Adalbert's story were definitely taken from the official hagiographies and the importance of this saint is a crucial moment of an actual awareness concerning the East-Central European question in Western Europe.

From the Bohemian and Central European point of view, we should not underestimate these sources. Although the information provided by these sources could be sometimes proven wrong, it is definitely not a general quality of all these sources. Especially Flodoard's chronicle can be considered as an important and probably trustworthy. Following the recent trust put in the so far neglected part of Adémar's chronicle, another changes of our view of the Central European history around the year 1000 are expectable. The other important fact is, that even from their "wrong" information we can collect an important data about the mechanisms of spreading news around Europe and about the picture of Central Europe in the West.

WESTERN FRANKISH CHRONICLERS' ACCOUNTS ABOUT THE BOHEMIAN AND CENTRAL EUROPEAN HISTORY IN THE 10TH AND FIRST HALF OF THE 11TH CENTURY

ABSTRACT

The study summarizes the information about Bohemia (and East Central Europe in general) that is given by the Western Frankish chronicles of the 10th and first half of the 11th centuries. These contributions were mostly omitted or refused by general majority of the Czech historiography. Recent changes of attitude to the relevance of these sources could bring a new view on these sources. The information about Bohemia contained in these sources could also help us to expose a possible relations and stereotypes about our region in Western Europe in the 10th and 11th century.

KEYWORDS

East Central Europe; Western Frankish Empire; chronicles; Bohemia; saints

Jakub Izdný | Institute of World History, Faculty of Arts, Charles University, Nám. Jana Palacha 2, 116 38, Praha 1, Czech Republic, jakub.izdny@ff.cuni.cz