

Sources of a Story About the Murdered Croatian King in the Hungarian-Polish Chronicle*

Ryszard Grzesik

Poznań, Republika Poljska

In this article author deals with the one of the most disputable medieval narrative sources - so called - Hungarian-Polish Chronicle. His analysis of the chronicle is concentrated on the data that describes death of a Croatian king. Comparing this data with other known facts from the Croatian and Polish histories, authors suggests more detail investigation of the records preserved in this chronicle.

The Hungarian-Polish Chronicle is the one of the most disputable medieval narrative sources in Europe. It presents the history of Hungary since the escaping of the Hungarians from their former homeland in East Hungary under the leadership of Aquila or Attila to the time of Saint Ladislav, who lived at the end of the 11th century. The chronicler described the history in a very epical and fictitious manner. Three main parts can be distinguished in the Chronicle. The first one contains the history of Hungary in the pre-Christian time i.e. wanderings of the Hungarians throughout Europe under the authority of Aquila / Attila, creating the new Hungarian state in *Sclauonia* and a short fictitious genealogical list of the Attila dynasty containing three generations between Aquila / Attila¹ and Géza. We can entitle it: the origins of the new Hungarian state. The second one described the life of St. Stephen, the first Christian king of Hungary; and the third one told about the history of Hungary after the death of St. Stephen. Each part of this story is based on the written and oral sources. Generally the first part described the events basing on the Hungarian lost *Gesta Ungarorum*, using also the tradition of Attila, which was alive during the whole Middle Ages in Hungary. Its roots were partly oral and partly scholarly. The second part, which is the largest part of the whole composition, was based almost without exceptions on the most popular Legend of St. Stephen, written by bishop of Győr (Raab) Hartvic. The third part returned to the story of the lost *Gesta*.

The discussion on the Chronicle concentrated on the question of the source value of a story. According to the rules of the source criticism, time and place of the origin of a narrative should be the basic stage while answering this question. The scholars dated the composition of a Chronicle for a wide period, since the late 11th century until the 14th century. They located its origin place in Hungary or in Poland, because there was a lot of Polish information in the text

*I am very grateful to Mrs. Zofia Grzesik, MA, for Her very kindly help in the translation of this text from the Polish into English.

¹ This ruler occurred as Aquila in the longer version, and Attila in the shorter. I do not know if the name Attila is the *lectio difficilior*, or it is only the erudition correction of the writer of the manuscript of the shorter redaction.

except of the Hungarian. The only known manuscripts, which could be divided in two textual families, are still preserved in the Polish libraries. One should tell after more detailed investigation that the source was probably composed in the 20s of the 13th century in Slavonia, that means in contemporary Croatia. Coloman, the second son of the Hungarian king Andrew II and a brother of the future king Béla IV was the prince of Croatia at that moment. Coloman was earlier a king of Halich Rus, afterwards he was comes (*ispán*) of Spiš / Spisz / Zips / Szepes. Two textual premises led me to this conclusion: a story of an alleged marriage of a daughter of the Halich prince, Mstislav to a future king of Hungary, St. Ladislav (who was canonized in 1192) and the story of Croatia². This story will be a subject of my more detailed analysis.

The story belongs to the first part of the Chronicle. We read in the 3rd chapter of the Chronicle that the Hungarians led by their ruler, Aquila or Attila, conquered Croatia and *Sclavonia* after a long trip throughout the whole Europe. They planned to fight against Rome, but the angel had occurred to Aquila / Attila and asked him to avenge the murdered king Casimir (or in other version: Krezimir = Krešimir), who was killed by his subjects. King Casimir was a very good, pious and humble ruler. If Attila had obeyed this order, one of his descendants would have returned to Rome as a victor: not as the conqueror but the Christian ruler who will receive the perpetual crown. Therefore the Hungarians went through Italy, where they built the city of Aquileia, crossed the Carinthian Alps and arrived at the border of Croatia and *Sclavonia*. The great battle against the local rulers lasted eight days. Afterwards the Hungarians and their ruler Aquila crossed the Drava River and saw the plain and the fertile land, which was similar to their former homeland. Similar country lied, also, east of the Danube and Tisa, where only the shepherds and ploughmen lived. The Hungarians counted that they were twenty-five years in the journey. Aquila - Attila decided to stay there. He ordered his people to marry the *uxores sclauas et chrwatas*, he named the Slavonic country Hungary and divided the territory amongst his barons. Aquila - Attila *missis autem nunciis suis accepit a principe sclauorum filiam de tribu eadem, et copulauit sibi eam in uxorem*³.

It seems that this story is a typical legitimization story, which proved the Hungarian power over South-Slavonic territories. Attila was an avenger of the murdered king of Croatia, therefore he, and his descendants, could rule over that state. It was not the only one legitimization story in the Chronicle and in the Hungarian medieval historiography. I would return to this motif later.

The story about the conquest of Croatia by the Hungarians ruled by the alleged king Aquila / Attila seems to be very fictitious. But I see the relics of three separate source-traditions there. The first one was a story of a lost *Gesta Ungarorum*. This is a virtual source, which has occurred in the historical discussion since about 200 years. The scholars, who dealt with a source criticism, observed that all medieval Hungarian chronicles have common places, which could be explained on the way of lost common source. This common source was a chronicle composed in the second half of the 11th century or at the beginning of the 12th century. It probably described the Christian history of Hungary, but there were some remarks about the earlier homeland of the Magyars and their way to the Carpathian Basin and its conquest⁴. The lost

² I analyzed the topic of the source-value of the Chronicle in a book: R. Grzesik, *Kronika węgiersko-polska. Z dziejów polsko-węgierskich kontaktów kulturalnych w średniowieczu* [The Hungarian-Polish Chronicle. Studies of the Polish-Hungarian Culture Relationship in the Middle Ages], Poznań 1999.

³ *Chronica Hungaro-Polonica*, pars 1 (textus cum varietate lectionum), ed. B. Karácsonyi, Szeged 1969 (*Acta Historica*, t. 26) [henceforth: *Chron.*], chapter 3, p. 18 (both quotations). The whole story p. 16-20.

⁴ Synthetic overview in Polish: R. Grzesik, *Kronika węgiersko-polska*, p. 54-55 (here the most important Hungarian works). There is a monograph of the Hungarian historiography in English, with special stressing of the period 1918-

Chronicle was reworked several times after its first composition, and the traces of several variants can be observed in the Hungarian medieval historiography, which we know nowadays. I think that the description of the land out of the Drava, of the Danube and the Tisa could be derived from the lost *Gesta*. The detailed analysis shows that the other Hungarian chronicles described this territory in the same manner, using almost the same words. The information about the shepherds lived in contemporary Great Hungarian Plain was one of the arguments for the existence of the lost *Gesta* for the most exact searcher of this topic, Bálint Hóman. He observed that the phrase about the pastors of the Romans (*pastores Romanorum*) occurred in the *Gesta* of the Anonymous Notary, in the Relation of Brother Richard about his Search of Eastern Hungary and in the Description of Eastern Europe from 1308⁵. It shows that our Chronicle also belonged to the great family of the lost *Gesta Ungarorum*.

But the description of a new land is only a little fragment of the Croatian story. I have found the pure Croatian tradition in this fragment, or rather two separate stories, which could be told in Croatia. A story of a murdered king is the first one. The Polish scholars who investigated the Chronicle had problems with its interpretation. In the longer text, which was generally estimated as a proper version of the Chronicle, one can read the name of the king: Casimir. This name is typical to the Polish Piast dynasty⁶. Stanisław Pilat, the editor of the Chronicle in the first volume of the *Monumenta Poloniae historica* noted only that this fact is unknown⁷. Ernest Swieżawski, the Positivist Warsaw historian of the second half of the 19th century observed that the person of Casimir symbolized the person of Peter, the last Croatian ruler. This person was mixed with Peter Krešimir II. The uprising of the magnates against the ruler symbolized, according to him, the independent tendencies of the Polish magnates in the 13th century⁸. The British historian and a very good specialist in the Hungarian history, Clayton Aylmer Macartney interpreted our story as a Polish rewriting of the Croatian tradition. The Polish chronicler changed the name of the Croatian ruler Peter Krešimir IV into Casimir, because he remembered the fact of the uprising of the subjects against Casimir the Restorer⁹. Brygida Kürbisówna also thought, that the both traditions: about the murdered king Krešimir and about the uprising against Casimir were mixed in Poland. She also observed that only in one manuscript of the shorter version of the text the name *trezimirus*, Krešimir was written, which is the *lectio difficilior* of the Chronicle¹⁰.

1945: S. B. Vardy, *Modern Hungarian Historiography*, New York, Guildford (Surrey) 1976 (but the medieval chronicles were also described). See also: R. Marsina, *Medieval Hungarian Narrative Sources and Slovak Historiography*, *Studia Historica Slovaca*, vol. 13, 1984, p. 29-51.

⁵ B. Hóman, *A Szent-László-kori Gesta Ungarorum és XII-XIII. századi lezármazói*, [The *Gesta Ungarorum* from the Time of Saint Ladislaus and Its Rewritings from the 12th and 13th Century], Budapest 1925, p. 34, 36-37, 39, 46. Cf. J. Deér, *Ungarn in der Descriptio Europae Orientalis*, *Mitteilungen des Österreichischen Instituts für Geschichtsforschung*, vol. 45, 1931, p. 11.

⁶ J. Hertel, *Imiennictwo dynastii piastowskiej we wcześniejszym średniowieczu* [The Names of the Piast Dynasty in the Early Middle Ages], Warszawa-Poznań-Toruń 1980 (*Roczniki Towarzystwa Naukowego w Toruniu*, vol. 79, fasc. 2), p. 114-121.

⁷ *Kronika węgiersko-polska* [The Hungarian-Polish Chronicle], ed. S. Pilat, *Monumenta Poloniae historica*, vol. 1, Lwów 1864, p. 497 n. 6; p. 498 n. 8.

⁸ E. Swieżawski, *Zarysy badań krytycznych nad dziejami, historiografią i mitologią do wieku XV* [Outlines of the Critical Research on the History, Historiography and Mythology until the 15th Century], part 1, Warszawa 1871, p. 33-38.

⁹ C. A. Macartney, *The Medieval Hungarian Historians*, Cambridge 1953, p. 177-178.

¹⁰ B. Kürbisówna, *Studia nad Kroniką Wielkopolską* [Studies on the Chronicle of Great Poland], Poznań 1952, p. 140-141.

None of the Polish historians nor C. A. Macartney (except of Jan Leśny¹¹) has mentioned the opinions of the South Slavonic historians who analyzed the story of the Hungarian-Polish Chronicle in the context of the Croatian story of the murdered king Zvonimir. Vjekoslav Klaić, who considered the Chronicle in the terms of this context as the first, thought that the author of the Croatian version of the Dioclean Chronicle used the narration of the Hungarian-Polish Chronicle¹². Ferdo Šišić also mentioned that the description of the murdered Casimir was similar to the story of Zvonimir. The name of the king was changed just in Poland. The purpose of the story was to show the death of the last king of Croatia and the beginning of the Hungarian occupation of the country¹³. Nikola Radojčić was of the opinion that the Hungarian chronicler knew about the Croats that they had their kings and one of them was Krešimir. The purpose of a story was to prove the historical and moral rights of the Hungarians to Croatia¹⁴. Stipe Gunjača thought that our story contained the reflex of the real event: the murdering of the king Zvonimir¹⁵. Nada Klaić thought that only the one rational fact was noted there: the place of the death of the last Croatian king, Peter on the border between the proper Croatia and Slavonia¹⁶. Ivo Goldstein observed that our story was the first stage of the formulating of the Zvonimir's story, when the name of the murdered king was not established yet in the oral tradition¹⁷. I think this is a good explanation of the motif of the murdered king in our Chronicle.

The Croatian medieval tradition associated the story of the murdered king with the name of Zvonimir. He probably descended from the undirected lineage of the Trpimirović dynasty and was infinitely a *ban* of Slavonia. We do not know exactly the events in Croatia in the mid-seventieth of the 11th century. The king Peter Krešimir IV disappeared from the sources in a secret way. We hear about the Norman comes Amico, who, at that time, murdered a Croatian king. Is it possible that it was Peter Krešimir IV, who died from the hand of Amico? How did Zvonimir take over the power? But we know that Zvonimir was an ally of the Pope Gregory VII, who sent his legate Gebizo to crown Zvonimir in October 1075. He died in the year 1089 a natural death¹⁸. According to Thomas of Split there was anarchy among the Croats after Zvonimir's death. One of the magnates escaped to Hungary and asked the king Ladislas for help. It was the origin of the Hungarian rule over Croatia¹⁹.

¹¹ J. Leśny, Zvonimir, in: Słownik starożytności słowiańskich [Lexicon of the Slavonic Antiquities] (henceforth: SSS), vol. 7, part 1, Wrocław-Warszawa-Kraków 1980, p. 177. Prof. Jan Leśny was a scholar of the Croatian and Serbian medieval history, specialist of the mission of St. Cyril and Methodius and of the Nemanjić dynasty. His unexpected illness and death in July 1994 in the age of 47, before he educated his disciples, finished the Polish research on the Serbian Middle Ages.

¹² V. Klaić, Slavonija od X do XIII stolecia [Slavonia from the 10th until the 13th Century], Zagreb 1882, p. 32 n. 44.

¹³ F. Šišić, O smrti hrvatskoga kralja Zvonimira [About the Death of the Croatian King Zvonimir], Vjesnik Hrvatskoga Arheolokoga Društva, New Series, vol. 8, 1905, p. 27-28.

¹⁴ N. Radojčić, Legenda o smrti hrvatskoga kralja Dimitrija Zvonimira [The Legend of the Death of the Croatian King Dimitrije Zvonimir], Glas Srpske Kraljevske Akademije, vol. 171, Series II, vol. 88, 1936, p. 51-55.

¹⁵ S. Gunjača, Kako i gdje je svršio hrvatski kralj Dimitrije Zvonimir, s dodatkom: O grobu kralja Zvonimira na Kapitolu kod Knina [How and Where Died the Croatian King Dimitrije Zvonimir, With Appendix: About the Tomb of the King Zvonimir in Kapitol near Knin], Rad Jugoslavenske Akademije Znanosti i Umjetnosti, vol. 288, 1952, Odjel za filozofiju i društvene nauke, vol. 4, p. 204-324.

¹⁶ N. Klaić, Povijest Hrvata u ranom srednjem vijeku [History of the Croats in the Early Middle Ages], Zagreb 1971, p. 49, 488-489; eadem, Povijest Hrvata u srednjem vijeku [History of the Croats in the Middle Ages], Zagreb 1990, p. 147.

¹⁷ I. Goldstein, Kako, kada i zašto je nastala legenda o nasilnoj smrti kralja Zvonimira? (Prinos proučavanju mehanizma nastajanja legendi u hrvatskom srednjovjekovnom društvu) [How, When and Why Was Composed the Legend of the Violent Death of the King Zvonimir (Outlines of the Study of the Mechanism of the Legend-Composition in the Medieval Croatian Society)], Radovi Sveučilišta u Zagrebu, Institut za Hrvatsku Povijest, vol. 17, 1984, p. 35-54.

¹⁸ Biographical details as well as the development of his posthumous tradition v. J. Leśny, Zvonimir, p. 176-177.

¹⁹ Thomas Archidiaconus, Historia Salonitana, ed. F. Rački, Monumenta spectantia historiam Slavorum Meridionalium, vol. 26, Scriptores, vol. 3, Zagreb 1894, chapter 17, p. 57.

According to the scholars the Croatian version of the Dioclean Chronicle was the first notification of the developed Zvonimir's tradition. This version is a Croatian translation of this Chronicle from the 14th or 15th century with several interpolations. One of them told the story of a good king (*dobri kralj*) Zvonimir. According to the Croatian translator he was asked by the Pope and an Emperor to participate in a Crusade. However, his subjects rejected to leave their wives and possessions, therefore they organized the uprising, in which they killed the king. When the Hungarian king Béla I (*Bela prvi*) heard about the death of Zvonimir, collected his army and went to avenge him. He connected Croatia to Hungary. The main idea of this story is lose of independence as a result of a political crime²⁰.

When we compare the story of the Croatian version of the Dioclean Chronicle with the narration of the Hungarian-Polish Chronicle, we observe some similarities between them. It is the situation of the uprising against the ruler, which ended with the killing of a king. The profile of the king is also similar - he was drawn as a good and pious man. Also the consequences were the same: the Hungarian intervention. However, the Croatian translator wrote with nostalgia for the lost independence of the state, while the author of the Hungarian-Polish Chronicle proved the Hungarian rule over the country. I think that the Chronicle noted the early stage of the creation of the tradition about the murdered Croatian king²¹.

It is, however, not the only one information derived from the Croatian oral tradition. I think that the chronicler found some facts about Split in Croatian oral tales, as well. He wrote that the king of Croatia and Slavonia lived near the sea in the city named Sipleth, which was converted to Christianity by St. Paul Apostle, who built here the cathedral and was the first bishop during five years²². It was well known in the Middle Ages that Split lied on the territory of the former palace of Diocletian, near Salona. *This city was the head of all Dalmatia*²³. The city played also an important role in the structures of the Church, as the see of the metropolis²⁴. Therefore the words of the chronicler that St. Paul has baptized the city and founded the bishopric there seems to be interesting. I think that a kind of tradition about the Dalmatian mission of St. Paul could exist in the medieval Dalmatia. Constantine Porphyrogenitus mentioned in his famous work that there were several islands in Pagania, amongst them *another large island, Meleta, or Malozeatai, which St. Luke mentions in the 'Acts of the Apostles' by the name of Melite, in which a viper fastened upon St. Paul by his finger, and St. Paul burnt it up in the fire*²⁵. In this context, very significantly sounded the words of Thomas of Split, the author of the Chronicle of

²⁰ Ljetopis Popa Dukljanina [The Annals of the Priest of Dioclea], ed. V. Mošin, Zagreb 1950, chapter dVIII, p. 66-68. The Polish translation of the Dioclean Chronicle (Historia Królestwa Słowian czyli Latopis Popa Duklanina [The History of the Kingdom of the Slavs or The Annals of the Priest of Dioclea], ed. J. Leśny, Warszawa 1988) did not contain a story of the Croatian version.

²¹ More detailed analyze R. Grzesik, Kronika węgiersko-polska, p. 82-90.

²² Chron., chapter 3, p. 19: *Rex uero sclauonie et chrwacie circa mare delectabatur in ciuitate, que Sipleth dicitur, quam sanctus paulus apostolus ad fidem christianam conuertit, et ipsam episcopalem kathedram V annis tenuit, deinde ordinato episcopo romam peccit.*

²³ Constantine Porphyrogenitus, De administrando imperio, ed. by Gy. Moravcsik, transl. by R. J. H. Jenkins, Budapest 1949 [henceforth: DAI], vol. 1, chapter 30, p. 141 (Greek text p. 140 v. 18); Testimonia najdawniejszych dziejów Słowian. Seria grecka [Testimonies of the Most Ancient History of the Slavs, Greek Series], ed. by A. Brzóstkowska (transl., introductions), W. Swoboda (commentaries), part 2: Pisarze z V-X wieku [Writers from the 5th-10th Century], Wrocław-Warszawa-Kraków 1989, p. 318.

²⁴ A. Wędzki, Split, SSS, t. 5, Wrocław-Warszawa-Kraków 1975, p. 364.

²⁵ DAI, chapter 36, p. 165 (Greek text p. 164 v. 16-20). Cf. also Testimonia najdawniejszych dziejów Słowian. Seria grecka, ed. by A. Brzóstkowska, W. Swoboda, part 3: Pisarze z VII-X wieku, Warszawa 1995, p. 449-450. W. Swoboda mentioned in the commentary (ib., p. 473 n. 67): "It is, however, possible that this information of Constantine reflected a local tradition".

Split. He wrote that *Saint Paul was the first Apostle who spread the Christ Gospel from Jerusalem until Illiricum, but he did not go personally to preach, but he sent his disciple, Titus, as he told to Timothy: Crescens went to the Galats, Titus to Dalmatia*²⁶. Thomas the Archdeacon of Split knew about the tour of St. Paul to Dalmatia, but stressed that he was not the Apostle of Dalmatia. It was his disciple, Titus, who converted the Dalmatians. This fragment of the Thomas' Chronicle sound as it was a polemic with the false idea about the Paul's mission in that region.

The researcher of the Hungarian medieval chronicles who recognize the first years of the existence of the Hungarians in the Carpathian Basin know that several stories from the Hungarian oral tradition were used in their narration. They glorified the heroism of the conquerors and legitimized the rule of the Magyars over the whole territory²⁷. The author of the *Gesta Hungarorum*, Anonymous Notary of the king Béla III mentioned Menumorout (Ménmarót) as the local opponent of the Hungarians. He occurred in the story in the 11th chapter as the son of Morout and occupied the *territory between Tisa and the forest Igfon, which lies near Transilvania and from Maros (Mureş) River until Szamos (Someş) River*²⁸. Arpad sent to him the envoys with donations and with request to receive some territory to the Magyars. Menumorout did not want to obey Arpad's order, therefore the Hungarians attacked him and occupied the capital castle, Bihar²⁹. However, he won the Hungarians on the line of the Körös (Criş) River near Szeghalom³⁰. In the further part of his story Anonymous Notary forgot probably that he had written about the defeat of the prince and he described Menumorout's dilemmas, what to do against the Hungarians, once more. At the end he made peace with them and he gave his daughter to the Arpad's son, Zulta, and until his death he ruled quiet and peaceful in his principedom Bihar. Zulta inherited his territory, which he connected to the rest of Hungary³¹.

The name of Mémarót is a compound of two words of the Turk origin: *mén* ('great') and *marót* ('the Moravian')³². If we translated it, it would sound: The Great Moravian. I think that this story, which was used by Anonymous Notary for the legitimization purpose, contains the reflex of the real events of the Hungarian-Moravian relationship from the turn of the 10th century. It is popularly believed that the Hungarians destroyed the Great-Moravian state. Some scholars, however, think that there was infinitely a peaceful Hungarian infiltration into the territory of the Great Moravia. The Polish historian Idzi Panic thought that the civil war between the sons of Svatopluk I took place in the Great Moravia after his death. According to him, the Hungarians helped to one of the sides. He was based on the account of Constantine Porphyrogenitus who wrote about the division of the country between the three sons of Svatopluk and the civil

²⁶ Thomas Archidiaconus, *Historia Salonitana*, chapter 3, p. 7: *Primus itaque beatus Paulus apostolus (fuit), qui ab Jerusalem usque Illiricum repleuit euangelio Christi: non tamen ipse per se intrauit Illiricum predicare, sed mist Titum discipulum suum, sicut dicit ad Timoteum: Crescens abiit in Galatiam, Titus in Dalmatiam.*

²⁷ R. Grzesik, *Legitimierungsfunktion der Ungarisch-polnischen Chronik*, in: *The Medieval Chronicle. Proceedings of the 1st International Conference on the Medieval Chronicle. Driebergen/Utrecht 13-16 July 1996*, ed. by E. Kooper, Amsterdam-Atlanta, GA 1999, p. 144-154.

²⁸ Die "Gesta Hungarorum" des anonymen Notars. Die älteste Darstellung der ungarischen Geschichte, wyd. Silagi Gabriel, Veszprémy László, Sigmaringen 1991 (Ungarns Geschichtsschreiber, Bd 4.) (henceforth: An.), chapter 11, p. 52: *Terram vero, que est inter Thisciam et silvam Igfon, que iacet ad Erdevelu, a fluvio Morus usque ad fluvium Zomus.*

²⁹ An., chapter 20, p. 68-70.

³⁰ An., chapter 28, p. 78-80.

³¹ An., chapter 51-52, p. 116-120.

³² Gy. Györffy, *Krónikáink és a magyar őstörténet - Régi kérdések - új válaszok* [Our Chronicles and the Hungarian Prehistory. Old Questions - New Answers], Budapest 1993 (reprint of the edition from 1948 with Author's commentaries), p. 20-21; W. Swoboda, Menumorout, SSS, vol. 8, Wrocław-Warszawa-Kraków 1992-1996, p. 439-440

war between them³³. If this ally really had taken place, it would have to be sealed with a marriage. Maybe the tradition written by the Anonymous Notary reflected these events. The scholars from the former Czechoslovakia, who investigated the existence of the Great-Moravian tradition in Hungary observed that the Hungarian Slavs could preserve some traces of this tradition, such as the legend of the Svatopluk's death on the Mount Zobor near Nitra, noted by Cosmas of Prague³⁴. It is possible, that some legends about the Great Moravia arose in the milieu of the Hungarian Slavs. But not only the Slavs could be the bearers of such tales. In my opinion, the stories connected with the Great-Moravian history were known also amongst the Hungarians. While analyzing the Menemorout's story, one can discover that it was told from the pure Hungarian point of view. We observe the efforts of the Magyars to triumph over the local ruler and we read that they were successful in the peaceful way. Therefore I think that it could be the original Hungarian story about the marriage of the Hungarian dauphin to the daughter of a Great-Moravian ruler, and it was the same story which was included by the Anonymous Notary in his work³⁵.

The traces of this story went to Croatia, because it was a tale, which was generally known in the whole territory of the Hungarian Kingdom. But there is also another possibility for explanation of the existence of these motifs there. One knows that Croatia had close connections with the Great Moravia. The disciples of St. Cyril and Methodius escaped there after their being expelled from the country by Svatopluk I, when St. Methodius died. Since the end of the 9th century Croatia had created one of the centers of the Slavonic liturgy and the Glagolitic literature, which preserved its importance during the Middle Ages and the Modern Times. It would be strange if the disciples, who settled there, would not know the tales about the Great-Moravia and the fate of the Great-Moravian State. It is well known that a Great-Moravian tradition about Svatopluk existed amongst the South Slavs, as the Dioclean Chronicle shows³⁶. I would think therefore that the tradition of the Moravian-Hungarian relationship could have existed both amongst the Magyars and the Slavs. Maybe the story of the marriage of the Hungarian dauphine to the Slavonic princess was written on the basis of the Slavonic - Croatian

³³ I. Panic, *Ostatnie lata Wielkich Moraw [The Last Years of the Great Moravia]*, Katowice 2000, p. 143-144, 153-154. Cf. DAI, chapter 41, p. 180-181; *Az Árpád-kori magyar történet bizánci forrásai. Fontes Byzantini historiae Hungaricae aeo ducum et regum ex stirpe Árpád descendendum*, ed. by Gy. Moravcsik, Budapest 1988, p. 49-50.

³⁴ *Die Chronik der Böhmen des Cosmas von Prag*, ed. by B. Bretholz, München 1923, reprint 1980, Book I, chapter 14, p. 33-34; M. Kucera, *O historickom vedomí Slovákov v stredoveku [About the Historical Consciousness of the Slovaks in the Middle Ages]*, *Historický časopis*, vol. 25, fasc. 2, p. 229. Cf. also remarks about the presence of the Great-Moravian tradition in Hungary: J. Steinhübel, *Velkomoravská historická tradícia zadunajských Slovákov [The Great-Moravian Tradition of the Transdanubian Slovaks]*, *Historický časopis*, vol. 38, fasc. 5, p. 693-705; M. Homza, *Pokus o interpretáciu úlohy kňažnej Adelaidy v Uhorsko-poľskej kronike [Trial of the Interpretation of the Role of the Princess Adelheid in the Hungarian-Polish Chronicle]*, *Historický časopis*, vol. 47, fasc. 3, p. 369 (both Authors thought that only the Slavs could be the bearers of the Great-Moravian tradition in Hungary); L. Havlík, *Moravské a české tradice v uherských kronikách [The Moravians and the Bohemians Traditions in the Hungarian Chronicles]*, *Slovanský přehled*, Year 1969, fasc. 5, p. 337-343 did not excluded the knowledge of the Great-Moravian tradition by the Magyars.

³⁵ This alternative conclusion is a result of my discussion with the Slovak historian, Martin Homza, who in several works defended the opinion that the story of the Hungarian-Polish Chronicle reflected the Hungarian-Moravian relationship. Recently cf. M. Homza, *Mulieres suadentes. Presviedčajúce ženy. Štúdie z dejín ženskej panovníckej svätosti v strednej a vo východnej Európe v 10.-13. storočí [The Founding Females. Studies on the History of the Rule Sainthood in the Central and Eastern Europe in the 10.-13. Century]*, Bratislava 2002, p. 122 ff.

³⁶ *Letopis Popa Dukljanina*, chapter 9, p48-57. Cf. fundamental in the Polish historiography analyze of the Mission of St. Cyril and Methodius: J. Leśny, *Konstantyn i Metody apostołowie Słowian. Dzieło i jego losy [Constantine and Methodius, the Apostles of the Slavs. The Work and Its Fates]*, Poznań 1987. S. Graciotti, *Hrvatska glagoljska književnost kao kulturni posrednik između evropskog Zapada i istočnih Slavena [The Croatian Glagolitic Literature as the Cultural Mediator Between the European West and the East Slavs]*, *Slovo*, vol. 21, 1971, p. 311-320 (the existence of the secular motifs in the medieval Balkans).

story, where the descendant of the lady was not specified exactly (*filia de tribu eadem*). But it is also probable that the author of the Hungarian-Polish Chronicle knew the Hungarian tale about this fact, the same as the written by Anonymous Notary. This question will be discussed later.

I have tried to analyze three main source-traditions, which were found out in the Croatian story of the Hungarian-Polish Chronicle (the 3rd chapter). It was:

1. The source-tradition of the Hungarian lost *Gesta Ungarorum*, from which the description of a new homeland of the Magyars was derived.
2. The Croatian oral tradition. I have tried to prove that two Croatian legendary stories were covered up: a) the story of a murdered king of Croatia, which served the Croatians to explain the loss of their independence, and the Hungarian author of the Chronicle to show the Hungarian rights to the Slavonic and Slavonian territories³⁷; b) the story of St. Paul Apostle's mission in Dalmatia.
3. The general Hungarian story of a marriage of a Hungarian dauphine to a daughter of the local (Slavonic) ruler. It is up for discussion if it was a Hungarian legitimization story of the Hungarian origin, which was known in the curial and chivalry circles or if the Slavonic and Croatian version of a story did exist and was used.

In my paper I have tried to show that the narrative sources contain rich layer of the written and oral tradition, which could be discovered during the critical analysis. I hope that the further discussion will enrich our picture of the culture of the medieval Hungarian Kingdom.

Izvori o ubijenom hrvatskom kralju u ugarsko-poljskoj kronici

U ovom radu autor je pokušao proučiti tri ključna izvora koje su se sačuvale u trećem poglavlju Ugarsko-poljske kronike (tzv. "Hrvatska priča"). Prvi izvor je preuzet iz izgubljene *Gesta Ungarorum*, a riječ je o opisu nove domovine Mađara. Drugi izvor predstavlja hrvatska usmena predaja. Riječ je o dvije hrvatske legende. Prva govori o ubijenom hrvatskom kralju i Hrvatima služi da bi objasnili zašto su izgubili svoju nezavisnost. Istovremeno, mađarski pisac Ugarsko-poljske kronike koristi ovu priču kako bi pokazao da Mađari imaju pravo na Slavoniju i sveukupno na područja naseljena Slavenima. Druga hrvatska legenda govori o misiji Svetog Pavla Apostola u Dalmaciji. Treći izvor je mađarska priča o ženidbi ugarskog prijestolonasljednika za kćer jednog slavenskog vladara. Može se raspravljati da li je riječ o priči kojom su Mađari objašnjavali svoje podrijetlo i koja je kao takva bila poznata u mađarskim crkvenim i viteškim krugovima, kao i o tome da li je postojala slavenska odnosno hrvatska inačica te priče. Autor članka je pokazao da se kritičkom analizom Ugarsko-poljske kronike može doći do novih spoznaja o bogatoj isprepletenosti pismene i usmene predaje u tom djelu. Autor smatra da će se daljnjim istraživanjem doći i do novih spoznaja o kulturnom životu srednjovjekovnog ugarskog kraljevstva.

³⁷ I think that the word Slavonia has in our Chronicle double meaning: it denotes the territory of the Slavs in the wider sense and the defined territory near Croatia, contemporary Slavonia in the narrower. Another is the opinion of M. Homza, *Pokus o interpretácii*, p.367 n. 73; idem, *Mulieres*, p. 125 n. 76, according to whom Slavonia denoted the whole Slavonic territory and reflected the Great-Moravian-Hungarian relationship. Cf. also my critical note of the article of M. Homza in: *Studia Źródłoznawcze*, vol. 38, 2000, p. 126.