

*Steffen Hope*

<https://orcid.org/0009-0001-6037-7753>

Department of Archaeology, Conservation and History, University of Oslo

*Grzegorz Pac*

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8371-9560>

Faculty of History, University of Warsaw

**HOLY BISHOPS, PAPAL CANONISATION  
AND THE LEGITIMISATION OF POWER  
IN THIRTEENTH-CENTURY NORWAY AND POLAND:  
THE CASES OF EYSTEIN ERLENDSSON OF NIDAROS  
AND STANISLAUS OF KRAKÓW\***

**Abstract:** This article explores two mid-thirteenth-century attempts to canonise holy bishops from the so-called peripheries of Latin Christendom. That two ecclesiastical centres – the metropolitan see of the Nidaros Church Province and the episcopal see of Kraków – both sought to attain papal acknowledgement of the veneration of a holy episcopal predecessor and did so in the same historical period, is understood to be a response to a general trend in the Latin Church. More specifically, we interpret these attempts in light of the paradigm of the holy episcopal champion fighting for the freedom of the Church, a recalibration of the idea of the holy bishop that emerged as a result of the canonisation of Thomas of Canterbury in 1173, and which was promoted throughout the Latin Church from that point onward. Due to the popularity of the new type of the holy bishop, the episcopal champion became a form of symbolic capital that conferred greater

---

\* The research leading to these results has received funding from the Norwegian Financial Mechanism 2014–2021 (2019/34/H/HS3/00500). This article is part of a joint research project of the University of Warsaw and the University of Oslo “Symbolic Resources and Political Structures on the Periphery: Legitimation of the ELITES in Poland and Norway, c. 1000–1300”. We would like to thank the Director of the Archives and Library of the Kraków Cathedral Chapter, Rev. Dr Wojciech Baran, for his help and kindness. We would also like to thank Sarah Thomas for her invaluable feedback in the process. The article is published under the CC BY 4.0 licence.

prestige onto the saints, their cult centres, and the guardians of those cult centres, i.e., the clergy. Through a comparative study of two unconnected cases, we see how peripheral agents could actively adopt central trends to strengthen their own legitimisation of power vis-à-vis both rulers and other ecclesiastical institutions.

**Keywords:** saints, canonisation, bishops, rulers, Thomas of Canterbury (Thomas Becket)

## INTRODUCTION

In medieval Latin Christendom, the cult of saints provided a broad array of holy figures who were, first of all, important patrons and heavenly intercessors. Moreover, the saints also functioned as symbolic capital in the sense that social groups, institutions or individuals could use their veneration of saints and their institutional, historical or personal ties to the saints as a way to project and enhance their own prestige, and receive recognition through their connection to holy men and women. This symbolic capital could communicate group identity to audiences across social and geographical spectrums. In other words, the veneration of a saint was more than just ensuring heavenly aid in times of trouble; it was also a way to affect one's status in the eyes of one's own community members, as well as the eyes of other communities or social groups. The popularity, or symbolic value, of a given saint type, depended on the period and the locality in question.<sup>1</sup> While saints of all types received some degree of veneration throughout all of Latin Christendom, the popularity of specific types, such as a virgin, martyr, or holy ruler, could vary from Church province to Church province and from polity to polity. Similarly, certain saint types could be defined in new ways that were in tune with prevailing religious trends, meaning that which characteristics were seen as indicative of sanctity sometimes changed. The present article explores how changes in the type of the holy bishop during the twelfth century affected the cult of saints in thirteenth-century Poland and Norway.

In the late twelfth and thirteenth centuries, developments in both the secular and religious spheres affected the symbolic value of the holy bishop, one of the most common saint types in medieval Latin

---

<sup>1</sup> Bernhard Scholz, 'The Canonization of Edward the Confessor', *Speculum*, xxxvi, 1 (1961), 38–60.

Christendom.<sup>2</sup> In the late twelfth century, the holy bishop began to be described as a champion of the Church,<sup>3</sup> someone who defended the rights of the Church against secular abuses and who would give their life or suffer persecution for the cause. This conception was based on the ideals of the Gregorian reform, which were widespread in the upper echelons of the ecclesiastical world of the twelfth century.

The holy bishop, as a champion of the Church, was a new version of a well-established form of symbolic capital. It is important to note that the symbolic capital was the same but was now recalibrated. This recalibration came about with the canonisation of Archbishop Thomas of Canterbury in 1173, whose murder three years earlier had sent shockwaves through the Latin Church. One consequence of this development was that the holy bishop became more important on the peripheries of Latin Christendom, such as Norway and Poland, where the cult of holy predecessors of the episcopal sees had previously been less popular or entirely absent.

As we shall demonstrate, the recalibration of the holy bishop as a champion of the Church resulted in similar responses in both Norway and Poland. At almost exactly the same time, in the second quarter of the thirteenth century, campaigns were undertaken to acquire papal canonisation for a bishop in both of these two polities, namely Archbishop Eystein Erlendsson of Nidaros<sup>4</sup> (r. 1161–88) and Bishop Stanislaus of Kraków (d. 1079). The outcomes of these two campaigns differed: that of Stanislaus succeeded, whereas that of Eystein did not. Moreover, each campaign was motivated by specific local circumstances. Despite these differences, however, the two cases serve to show why this symbolic capital in its recalibrated version was important, and why attempts to attain that capital followed a similar pattern in both Norway and Poland during the same historical period. By comparing these two cases, we see how Norway and Poland both were influenced

---

<sup>2</sup> Donald Weinstein and Rudolph M. Bell, *Saints & Society. Christendom, 1000–1700* (Chicago–London, 1982), 126, 202–4.

<sup>3</sup> Kay Brainerd Slocum, *Liturgies in Honor of Thomas Becket* (Toronto, 2004), 124.

<sup>4</sup> In this text, we use both Nidaros and Trondheim, which both are medieval names for the modern Norwegian city. ‘Nidaros’ is here used for the Norwegian Church Province, while ‘Trondheim’ is here used for the town and the metropolitan see.

by the dominant trends and impulses in the contemporary religious discourse of Latin Christendom, and how such trends and impulses could resonate in similar ways and initiate similar responses from two different church organisations which had no recorded contact with one another in this period, and which are unlikely to have influenced one another. The similarities of these cases will demonstrate that both polities took part in a shared religious discourse since both the Norwegian and the Polish churches sought to employ this symbolic capital for legitimisation purposes.

In this employment of symbolic capital, we see examples of how peripheral elites actively turned to the centre to find methods for strengthening their legitimacy, rather than the centre diffusing those methods to a passive periphery. This two-way communication between the periphery and the centre complicates the notion that diffusion always takes place from the centre outwards.<sup>5</sup> In our two cases, we see two important aspects of the role that the periphery played in that communication. First, Polish and Norwegian bishops turned to a saint-type, namely the holy bishop, who was also their institutional predecessor, that had previously not been very popular in their respective peripheries, but was now imbued with greater symbolic value than before. Secondly, because the value of this symbolic capital would be increased through papal canonisation, both Polish and Norwegian clerics sought to attain the canonisation of their own holy bishop to make their symbolic capital as valuable as possible. This two-tiered process of employing the available symbolic capital – venerating a holy figure and then having that figure’s holiness confirmed by papal approval – supports the idea that impulses were actively extracted from the centre by actors on the periphery.

The cases of Eystein and Stanislaus show how one impulse from the centre was employed in two different so-called peripheral polities at the same point in history. A comparative study of these examples allows us to gain a greater understanding of each canonisation process and its local context, and also to obtain a more nuanced view of centre-periphery relations and Latin Christendom as a whole. Through our comparison, we add greater depth to our understanding of the impact of the holy bishop-champion throughout the Latin Church,

---

<sup>5</sup> Robert Bartlett, *The Making of Europe: Conquest, Colonization, and Cultural Change, 950–1350* (Princeton, 1993), 269–91.

as we move away from the one-sided dissemination process as an explanation of the success of this saint type, and instead see this success as a consequence of more dynamic exchanges. Moreover, a comparative approach to these two examples of the canonisation process will give us a better understanding of the phenomenon of papal canonisation. We also set each case in a much wider background, which better explains the course of each case and gives us a deeper insight into each canonisation process and its local context. In Eystein's case, a comparative perspective enables us to see beyond the ultimate failure of the proceedings and the limited source material and better understand why the proceedings began and why the canonisation attempt was sustained for more than twenty years. In the case of Stanislaus, a comparative perspective sheds light on the relationship between various elites in the Duchy of Kraków and a range of ecclesiastical elites throughout Poland.

#### BACKGROUND

The holy episcopal predecessor, who was a champion of the Church, gained an unprecedented degree of importance in thirteenth-century Norway and Poland, and this must be understood against two interconnected historical strands. The first strand is the general history of the figure of the holy bishop in Latin Christendom. The canonisation of Thomas of Canterbury in 1173 was a watershed moment in this history, as it ushered in a new phase of how the holy bishop was described. The second strand consists of the history of the cult of saints in Norway and Poland. These two strands will be considered here as a backdrop to the respective cases of Eystein and Stanislaus. In addition, it is important to see each case in the light of its particular historical context, but this will be done when examining the individual canonisation attempts in detail. For now, however, we must understand the general shift in Latin Christendom that recalibrated the importance of the holy bishop as symbolic capital.

Holy bishops emerged early in the cult of saints, and they included both martyrs (e.g. Polycarp, d. c. 155) and confessors (e.g. Martin of Tours, d. 397). Due to their early inclusion in the collegium of saints, holy bishops were venerated throughout all of Latin Christendom and were among the saints introduced to newly converted regions, such as Poland and Norway. Throughout the Middle Ages, they remained

one of the most important and numerous groups of saints,<sup>6</sup> partly because bishops orchestrated the veneration of their institutional predecessors, who could also appear as the founder of the diocese.<sup>7</sup>

The importance of holy bishops – both as saint-type and as individual figures – depended on the prevailing trends within a locality and on the vagaries of the specific historical circumstances. For instance, where episcopal power was particularly strong, the potential for the development of a cult centred on a bishop was particularly high.<sup>8</sup> In such cases, the institutional resources for initiating, developing and maintaining that cult were easily employed. In many cases, the institutions creating the cult of saintly bishops were the sees they once governed, and their promoters were their institutional successors.<sup>9</sup> For example, German bishops promoted the veneration of their predecessors, but they also sought to have the sanctity of their predecessors acknowledged at the highest possible level, whether at an episcopal synod or by papal canonisation. The hagiographical output from the eleventh and, especially, the twelfth centuries also shows the

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Weinstein and Bell, *Saints & Society*, 202–4. On holy bishops and their hagiography, see esp. Stephanie Haarländer, *Vitae episcoporum. Eine Quellengattung zwischen Hagiographie und Historiographie, untersucht an Lebensbeschreibungen von Bischöfen des Regnum Teutonicum im Zeitalter der Ottonen und Salier* (Stuttgart, 2000); Daniel Alt, *Sanctus Episcopus. Das Bischofsideal von früh- und hochmittelalterlichen Bischofsviten im Spannungsfeld von Anspruch und Wirklichkeit* (Herne, 2012); and the collection John S. Ott, Trpimir Vedriš (eds), *Saintly Bishops and Bishops' Saints* (Zagreb, 2012).

<sup>7</sup> E.g. Dionysus in Paris, Eucharius, Valerius and Maternus in Trier, Augustine in Canterbury, or Sigfrid in Växjö.

<sup>8</sup> Note that bishops and their various activities, especially those related to their duties within their own diocese, have been the subject of lively research in recent years. These have been partially summarized in Andreas Bihrer, 'Bishop and Diocese in the Early and High Middle Ages. The 'Episcopalization of the Church', in European Comparison', in Andreas Bihrer and Hedwig Röckelein (eds), *Die „Episkopalisierung der Kirche“ im europäischen Vergleich, Studien zur Germania Sacra. Neue Folge 13* (Berlin–Boston, 2022), 1–20; Stephan Bruhn, 'Bischöfe und ihre Diözesen im nachkarolingischen ostfränkisch-deutschen Reich (850–1100). Eine programmatische Einführung', in Andreas Bihrer and Stephan Bruhn (eds), *Jenseits des Königshofs: Bischöfe und ihre Diözesen im nachkarolingischen ostfränkisch-deutschen Reich (850–1100)*, Studien zur Germania Sacra. Neue Folge 10 (Berlin–Boston, 2019), 3–19.

<sup>9</sup> Note that monastic institutions also venerated holy bishops as their patrons, especially when they were their founders. In many cases, especially in the Empire, those monasteries were, however, owned by bishoprics and thus remained closely linked to the bishopric of which the saint had been the shepherd in the past. Cf. Haarländer, *Vitae episcoporum*, 25, 552–3.

continuous importance of episcopal influence on the veneration of holy bishops, as a large part of this corpus is dedicated to German bishops.<sup>10</sup> The strong position of episcopal power in the Empire coincided with bishops' efforts to secure papal approval of their predecessors' cults from the tenth century onwards, a time when papal canonisation was not an established, nor even a common, procedure.<sup>11</sup>

Such strong episcopal influence was not confined to polities in the centre, since it can also be seen on the peripheries. We see this influence most clearly in the case of Iceland, where the position of the bishop was particularly strong, partly due to the lack of a king. As a consequence, the only Icelandic individuals who were officially recognised as saints were bishops of Iceland's two dioceses, Skálholt and Hólar.<sup>12</sup> Similarly, the strong position of bishops in Denmark might be one of the explanations for the several cults of local native bishops which emerged from the late eleventh century onwards.<sup>13</sup>

In Norway, the figure of the holy native bishop does not seem to have resonated strongly, if at all. By 1200, there were three cults of native saints, but none of them were bishops.<sup>14</sup> In Poland, the figure of a saint missionary bishop was present from the very earliest stage of Christianisation. Saint Adalbert (Polish: Wojciech; Czech: Vojtěch), whose cult remained the only vibrant one that had its origin in the Piast lands

<sup>10</sup> Alt, *Sanctus Episcopus*, esp. 348–66.

<sup>11</sup> See especially Ulrich of Augsburg, Gerard of Toul, Conrad of Konstanz, Gotthard of Hildesheim. See Otfried Krafft, *Papsttunde und Heiligsprechung. Die päpstlichen Kanonisationen vom Mittelalter bis zur Reformation. Ein Handbuch* (Köln–Weimar–Wien, 2005), 56–7 and for particular cases: 19–25, 44–54, 74–85.

<sup>12</sup> Stéphane Covaux, 'Les saints évêques de Scandinavie du X<sup>e</sup> au XII<sup>e</sup> siècle', in Corinne Péneau (ed.), *Itinéraires du savoir de l'Italie à la Scandinavie (X<sup>e</sup>–XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle) – Études offertes à Élisabeth Mornet* (Paris, 2009), 67. See also Jonas Wellendorf, 'Whetting the appetite for a vernacular literature: The Icelandic *Hungrvaka*', in Ildar Garipzanov (ed.), *Historical Narratives and Christian Identity on a European Periphery* (Turnhout, 2011), 124–5. Cf. Margaret Cormack, *Saints in Iceland. Their Veneration from the Conversion to 1400* (Brussels, 1994), 98–103, 115–17, 159–65.

<sup>13</sup> See Anna Minara Ciardi, 'Saints and Cathedral Culture in Scandinavia', in Haki Antonsson and Ildar Garipzanov (eds), *Saints and their Lives on the Periphery* (Turnhout, 2010), 59–63; Sara E. Ellis Nilsson, *Creating Holy People and Places on the Periphery. A Study of the Emergence of Cults of Native Saints in the Ecclesiastical Provinces of Lund and Uppsala from the Eleventh to the Thirteenth Centuries* (Bohus, 2015), 69–96.

<sup>14</sup> The cult of Swithun in Stavanger was based on the translation of a relic, and he was neither a missionary, a founding figure, nor a holy predecessor.

until 1200,<sup>15</sup> was untypical within the context of the aforementioned examples, however. He was not a native bishop in the strict sense: during his life Adalbert was not related directly with any Polish bishopric, as he was a bishop of Prague. His association with Poland and the veneration he enjoyed there was due to his body, after the saint's martyrdom in Prussia, having been brought to Gniezno, where it was laid to rest. However, already in the early twelfth century some traces of the tradition presented Saint Adalbert ahistorically as the first archbishop of Gniezno.<sup>16</sup> In Poland, therefore, the idea of the cult of the former bishop or, as in this case, the bishop-founder of the diocese, seems to be, although in quite specific form, employed already before the thirteenth century.

The absence of holy bishops native to Poland and Norway prior to the thirteenth century at first appears puzzling, since both these polities can point to bishops who might easily be seen as suitable candidates for sainthood. With respect to Norway, Stéphane Coviaux points to the case of Bishop Reinald of Stavanger, executed on the orders of King Harald Gilli in 1135.<sup>17</sup> Another example is that of Bishop Torsten of Oslo, who was murdered in unclear circumstances before 1169.<sup>18</sup> Neither of these two had a cult devoted to them, which might suggest that the holy bishop did not resonate in early twelfth-century Norway. The evidence from Poland suggests a similar attitude, as we here also find two examples of murdered bishops: Stanislaus, whom we focus on here, and Werner, bishop of Płock, who was

---

<sup>15</sup> Roman Michałowski, 'Le culte des saints du Haut Moyen-Âge en Pologne et en Europe occidentale', in Marie-Louise Pelus-Kaplan and Daniel Tollet (eds), *La Pologne et l'Europe occidentale du Moyen-Âge à nos jours. Actes du colloque organisé par l'Université Paris VII-Denis Diderot. Paris, les 28 et 29 octobre 1999* (Poznań-Paris, 2004), 29–41; Grzegorz Pac, Steffen Hope, 'Saints and legitimization of bishoprics in Poland and Norway until c. 1200', in Wojtek Jezierski, Hans Jacob Orning, and Grzegorz Pac (eds), *Elite Legitimation in High Medieval Poland and Norway: Comparative Studies* (forthcoming, Turnhout, 2025).

<sup>16</sup> Czesław Deptuła, *Galla Anonima mit genezy Polski. Studium z historiozofii i hermeneutyki symboli dziejopisarstwa średniowiecznego* (Lublin, 1990), 325; Marcin R. Pauk, 'Quicquid pertinebat ad imperium: Kościół w Polsce a Rzesza do połowy XII wieku', in Józef Dobosz, Marzena Matla, and Jerzy Strzelczyk (eds), *Chrzest Mieszka I i chrystianizacja państwa Piastów* (Poznań, 2017), 270–1.

<sup>17</sup> Coviaux, 'Les saints évêques', 51–9, 63–4.

<sup>18</sup> *Regesta Norvegica* (Oslo, 1989), I, n. 131.



murdered in the early 1170s by a local noble.<sup>19</sup> While Stanislaus and, to a very limited extent, Werner eventually came to be venerated, this did not happen immediately, but developed a long time after their respective deaths. The reluctance to venerate murdered bishops in Norway and Poland is, however, not untypical within Latin Christendom prior to the late twelfth century. Both at the centre and in the peripheries, bishops were murdered by their fellow Christians, imprisoned, or exiled. With a few exceptions, such bishops were not venerated.<sup>20</sup>

Thus, as André Vauchez notes, although the cult of holy bishops was popular in Latin Christendom from the earliest times, the model of the saintly prelate who endured persecution and was sometimes even killed “enjoyed its greatest success between the late twelfth and early fourteenth century”. He sees the murder of Archbishop Thomas of Canterbury in 1170 and the subsequent events as decisive elements in this process.<sup>21</sup> Thomas was canonised by Pope Alexander III in 1173, and the cult was quickly disseminated via ecclesiastic, monastic and dynastic networks in the following decades.<sup>22</sup> The veneration of Thomas effectively recalibrated the figure of the holy bishop into a champion for the liberties of the Church and, thereby, a martyr for the reformist cause.<sup>23</sup>

<sup>19</sup> On Werner, see recently Paweł Figurski, ‘Przekaz ideowy i datacja *Mors et miracula beati Vernerii*’, *Studia Źródłoznawcze*, 48 (2010), 39–57.

<sup>20</sup> Such exceptions include Conrad of Trier (d. 1066), Peter II of Poitiers (d. 1115), and Adelperto of Trent (d. 1172). Meanwhile if we count only murdered bishops, twelve such cases can be identified in France from the end of tenth to the early thirteenth century, while in Germany we find no fewer than seven from the reigns of Henry IV (1054–1105) and Henry V (1105–25) alone. Reinhold Kaiser, ‘Mord im Dom. Von der Vertreibung zur Ermordung des Bischofs im frühen und hohen Mittelalter’, *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte: Kanonistische Abteilung*, 79 (1993), 95–134; Myriam Soria, ‘Les évêques assassinés dans le Royaume de France (XI<sup>e</sup>–XII<sup>e</sup> siècles)’, in Natalie Fryde and Dirk Reitz (eds), *Bischofsmord im Mittelalter – Murder of Bishops* (Göttingen, 2003), 97–120; Myriam Soria, *Audebert, La crosse brisée. Des évêques agressés dans une église en conflits, royaume de France, fin X<sup>e</sup> – début XIII<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Turnhout, 2005), esp. 17–18; Krzysztof Skwierczyński, *Recepcja idei gregoriańskich w Polsce do początku XIII wieku* (Toruń, 2016), 211–38.

<sup>21</sup> André Vauchez, *Sainthood in the Later Middle Ages* (Cambridge, 1997; 1st edn in French 1981), 167–73 (quotation at 167; see also reference to Eystein at 171).

<sup>22</sup> For a general overview of the spread of Thomas’ cult, see Kay Brainerd Slocum, *The Cult of Thomas Becket. History and Historiography through Eight Centuries* (London–New York, 2019), 67–103.

<sup>23</sup> Slocum, *Liturgies in Honor*, 219–20; Slocum, *The Cult*, 102.

Thomas became a reference point, and indeed a benchmark, for measuring sanctity. Donald Prudlo states that “Thomas’s canonization set a new pattern for the popes”, in that the letter of canonisation now was addressed to all the churches of Latin Christendom, not just the church province or polity where the saint rested.<sup>24</sup> The cult of Thomas became a flagship effort for the reformist cause, which had the whole papal infrastructure behind it.<sup>25</sup> One early example of the efficiency of this new paradigm for holy bishops is the case of Albert of Louvain, who was assassinated in 1192 and whose biographer explicitly likened him to Thomas.<sup>26</sup> Even in the cults of non-ecclesiastical saints, such as Magnus of Orkney, hagiographers drew on the Thomas material to adapt their protagonist in accordance with the popular reformist martyr.<sup>27</sup>

In short, we find two new cults and two canonisation attempts centred on holy bishops, namely Stanislaus and Eystein, in areas where such figures were of limited importance. That these cases emerged around this time can be explained within the context of the great popularity of the cult of Thomas of Canterbury in Europe, including in peripheral areas,<sup>28</sup> and the new model that the cult exemplified.

---

<sup>24</sup> Donald Prudlo, *Certain Sainthood. Canonization and the Origins of Papal Infallibility in the Medieval Church* (Ithaca, NY, 2016), 37. This is recently supported by Ian L. Bass, ‘England’s Two Thomases: Episcopal Models of Sanctity Embodied in Thomas Becket and Thomas de Cantilupe’, in Peter Coss, Chris Dennis, Melissa Julian-Jones, and Angelo Silvestri (eds), *Episcopal Power and Personality in Medieval Europe, 900–1480* (Turnhout, 2020), 159–61.

<sup>25</sup> Cf. Miri Rubin, ‘Choosing Death? Experiences of Martyrdom in Late Medieval Europe’, *Studies in the Church History*, 30 (1993), 170.

<sup>26</sup> Raymond Schmandt, ‘The Election and Assassination of Albert of Louvain, Bishop of Liège, 1191–92’, *Speculum*, xlii, 4 (1969), 659.

<sup>27</sup> Haki Antonsson, *St. Magnús of Orkney – A Scandinavian martyr-cult in context* (Leiden, 2007), 42–67. Although Magnus was killed already in 1115, the hagiographical corpus of his cult was mainly developed after 1173.

<sup>28</sup> Cf. Slocum, *The Cult*, esp. 67–88; Bertil Nilsson, ‘The cult of Saint Thomas Becket in the Swedish Church province during the Middle Ages’, *International Journal for the Study of the Christian Church*, xx, 3–4 (2020), 230–50; György Györffy, ‘Thomas à Becket and Hungary’, *Hungarian Studies in English*, 4 (1969), 45–52. For Norway, see Anne J. Duggan, ‘Eystein, Thomas Becket, and the Wider Christian World’, in Kristin Bjørlykke, Øystein Ekroll, Birgitta Syrstad Gran, and Marianne Herman (eds), *Eystein Erlendsson – Erkebiskop, politiker og kirkebygger* (Trondheim, 2012), 27–43; Steffen Hope, ‘Thomas Becket i liturgi og historie’, in *Musikk og Historie*, 4 (Trondheim, 2021), 72–81. For Poland, see below, in the section on Saint Stanislaus.

The new type of holy bishop was perhaps especially well suited to the veneration of a holy predecessor since that predecessor was not only a champion of the universal reformist cause, but also the patron of a particular ecclesiastical institution, such as the entire Norwegian Church in the case of Eystein and the bishopric of Kraków in the case of Stanislaus. The widespread dissemination of this recalibrated holy bishop meant that this version of the holy bishop became a new and important form of symbolic capital in Latin Christendom, because it was based on a point of reference that practically all church provinces knew.

To have a patron who resembled Thomas not only guaranteed heavenly aid, it also conferred additional prestige to the community in question; it signalled the community's membership in the universal Church, and indicated the community's allegiance to the pope. But in order to make the most of this symbolic capital, it was necessary to have the holy bishop canonised by the pope. This form of recognition within the cult of saints had been known since the late tenth century, and was gaining in popularity and importance. As the effect of a long process, which gained significant momentum in the mid-twelfth century, the 1234 decretals of Gregory IX established the papal monopoly on proclaiming sainthood, claiming that the decision of Rome was necessary to recognise a new saint.<sup>29</sup> However, as scholars of the subject have pointed out, the letter of the law did not coincide with practice: bishops continued to recognise saints without papal approval, and such cases were not usually opposed by Rome.<sup>30</sup> This means that the decision to initiate the procedure

---

<sup>29</sup> Vauchez, *Sainthood*, 21–34; Nicole Herrmann-Mascard, *Les reliques des saints. Formation coutumière d'un droit* (Paris, 1975), 100–3; recently: Prudlo, *Certain Sainthood*, 33–5; Thomas Wetzstein, 'Saints and Relics', in Andreas Winroth and John C. Wei (eds), *The Cambridge History of Medieval Canon Law* (Cambridge, 2022), 443.

<sup>30</sup> Herrmann-Mascard, *Les reliques des saints*, 104–5; Vauchez, *Sainthood*, 69, 88–93; Michael Goodich, *Vita Perfecta: the Ideal of Sainthood in the Thirteenth Century* (Stuttgart, 1982), 24–6; Aviad Kleinberg, 'Canonization without a Canon', in Gábor Klaniczay (ed.), *Procès de canonisation au moyen âge. Aspects juridiques et religieux* (Rome, 2004), 13. See also recently: Prudlo, *Certain Sainthood*, 34–5; Sari Katajala-Peltomaa, Christian Krötzl, 'Approaching Twelfth- to Fifteenth-Century Miracles: Miracles Registers, Collections, and Canonization Processes as Source Material', in Christian Krötzl and Sari Katajala-Peltomaa (eds), *Miracles in Medieval Canonization Process. Structures, Functions, and Methodologies* (Turnhout, 2018), 16–17; Wetzstein, 'Saints and Relics', 443.

of papal canonisation in the case of Eystein and Stanislaus was not necessarily a matter of course, and makes one inquire about their reasons for pursuing such a costly and time-consuming labour.

EYSTEIN ERLENDSSON OF NIDAROS AND STANISLAUS  
OF KRAKÓW

Eystein Erlendsson was the second metropolitan of the Norwegian Church Province (r. 1161–88). He was part of the reformist circle, familiar with the conflict between Thomas of Canterbury and Henry II, and probably the main figure responsible for introducing Thomas's cult to Norway. During his tenure, Eystein strengthened the ecclesiastical infrastructure, implemented rules for the Norwegian Church that were in keeping with reformist ideals, and also had an impact on the secular sphere. For instance, it was through Eystein's efforts that primogeniture and royal coronation were introduced to Norway. The coronation oath, affirmed by the boy-king Magnus V in 1163 but composed by the archbishop, established that the Norwegian king should obey the Church, a formulation that, in effect, made Norway into a reformist ideal polity. The situation changed in 1179 when the pretender to the throne, Sverrir Sigurdsson, defeated King Magnus's forces and established a new royal dynasty. The conflict between Eystein and Sverrir forced the archbishop into exile in England in the period 1180–83, and Sverrir's government weakened the position of the Church vis-à-vis the king.<sup>31</sup>

The case of Eystein Erlendsson provides us with a number of challenges, chiefly because so few sources from the canonisation have survived. Moreover, since the attempt was ultimately unsuccessful in that no formal canonisation was granted, we have no sources which record how Eystein was perceived and understood by those who venerated him. We, therefore, have to view what little material is available in light of the timing of the canonisation attempt and the political context in Norway at the time. However, the historical figure of Eystein does provide certain reference points for how his sanctity could be framed.

---

<sup>31</sup> See especially Heidi Anett Øvergård Beistad, "Han sjøl dreiv hardt på med saken" – erkebiskop Eystein og Nidarosprovinsen', in *Eystein Erlendsson – Erkebiskop, politiker og kirkebygger*, 113–33.

First of all, Eystein had been a founding figure, because although he was not the first Norwegian archbishop, he was the one who had effected the greatest changes in the Norwegian Church. Secondly, he challenged the government of Sverrir and suffered exile for the Church. While he had not given his life for the cause, exile was a common Christomimetic feature for many saints, and it was also a feature that allowed for a comparison with the archetypal holy champion, namely Thomas of Canterbury.<sup>32</sup> It is unclear when the veneration of Eystein began, and how the earliest cult was promoted within the Norwegian Church.<sup>33</sup> It is tempting to hypothesise that the early cult was influenced by the cult of Thomas.<sup>34</sup> Certainly, Thomas remained an important figure in the Norwegian Church well into the thirteenth century, as is suggested by the celebration of his translation feast, which was first established in 1220 in Canterbury and was included in the Norwegian liturgy by at least the late thirteenth century.<sup>35</sup> However, such influence remains a matter of conjecture, and other cults might also have provided inspiration. We must remember that Trondheim was already the centre of the cult of Saint Olaf, the most powerful native saint in Norway. During Eystein's archiepiscopacy, Olaf had been a key figure in cementing the authority of the Church over the king. In a letter of privilege to the Norwegian Church – signed by King Magnus V but composed by Archbishop Eystein – Saint Olaf was the true ruler of Norway, and any new king had to take the kingdom as a vassal of the holy king, a king whose relics were guarded by the Church.<sup>36</sup>

The circumstances of the earliest cult of Eystein are, in short, nebulous. What we do know is that the earliest surviving date for Eystein's veneration is 1229, the year given by several Icelandic annals for the proclamation of his sainthood.<sup>37</sup> It is likely to have taken place

---

<sup>32</sup> Cf. Michael Staunton, 'Exile in the Lives of Anselm and Thomas Becket', in Laura Napran and Elisabeth van Houts (eds), *Exile in the Middle Ages* (Turnhout, 2004), 159–80. For Eystein, see Vauchez, *Sainthood*, 171.

<sup>33</sup> Andås, 'Hinn helgi', 149–50.

<sup>34</sup> Cf. Duggan 'Eystein'.

<sup>35</sup> *Ordo Nidrosiensis Ecclesiae*, ed. by Lilli Gjerløw (Oslo, 1968), 77.

<sup>36</sup> David Brégaïnt, 'The missing saint. Saint Olaf and King Hákon Hákonsson', in Magne Njåstad and Randi Wærdahl (eds), *Helgener i nord* (Oslo, 2020), 105–27.

<sup>37</sup> In *Annales Reseniani*, in *Islandske Annaler indtil 1578*, ed. by Gustav Storm (Christiania, 1888), 24 the entry for 1229 refers to 'Helgi Evsteins Erki byscops', which means "Eystein Archbishop was sainted". In *Henrik Høyers Annaler* (in *Islandske*

during a provincial council held in Trondheim that year, although the only surviving sources from this council refer solely to a dispute between the abbey of Hovedøya and the bishop of Oslo.<sup>38</sup> That other issues were discussed is more likely than not, and one of them was probably the sainthood of Eystein. Since the council was held in his resting place, this would have been a particularly poignant moment for performing the elevation which proclaimed Eystein a saint.

In contrast, the canonisation of Saint Stanislaus has left us with an abundance of sources: an almost complete dossier on this process, as well as *miracula, vitae*, and a liturgical office. The figure of Stanislaus, eventually co-patron of Poland, has also aroused keen interest among researchers and has a large literature. In fact the so-called “affair of Saint Stanislaus” [*factum sancti Stanislai*] – that is, the reason and course of the conflict between King Bolesław II the Generous (Szczodry) and Bishop Stanislaus (Stanisław) of Kraków which led to the latter’s death (traditionally dated to 1079)<sup>39</sup> – remains one of the most discussed topics of Polish medieval studies.<sup>40</sup> Another debate is the matter of the early veneration of the murdered bishop, for which there seems to be no convincing evidence before the late twelfth century.<sup>41</sup> At this stage of its development, an important role

---

*Annaler*, 64), we find the event rendered as “Helgi Eysteins erchibiskups”. In *Oddveria Annall* (in *Islandske Annaler*, 480), the entry states that “Anno 1229 ward Helgi erchibyskup” (“In the year 1229, the archbishop was sainted”).

<sup>38</sup> *Diplomatarium Norvegicum*, ed. by Alexander Bugge, Christoph Brieckmann, Oluf Kolsrud, XVII (Kristiania, 1907–1913), no. 864, 785. The verdict of this dispute is referred to in a copy of the registers of Akershus from 1622, in which the letter containing the verdict is dated to 1229.

<sup>39</sup> Although the episcopacy of Saint Stanislaus can certainly be roughly dated to the 1070s, as Jacek Banaszkiewicz has recently convincingly demonstrated, the sequence of annual dates relating to it is a confabulation created in the thirteenth century, see Jacek Banaszkiewicz, ‘Prolog do *Rocznika kapituly krakowskiej*, św. Stanisław i czas historyczny’, in *id.*, Andrzej Dąbrówka and Piotr Węcowski (eds), *Przeszłość w kulturze średniowiecznej Polski*, i (Warszawa, 2018), 307–34.

<sup>40</sup> Skwirczyński, *Recepcja idei gregoriańskich*, 115–46.

<sup>41</sup> Gerard Labuda, *Święty Stanisław – biskup krakowski, patron Polski: śladami zabójstwa, męczeństwa, kanonizacji* (Poznań, 2000), 129–56; Agnieszka Rożnowska-Sadraei, *Pater Patriae. The Cult of Saint Stanislaus and the Patronage of Polish Kings, 1200–1455* (Kraków, 2008), 15–40. Cf., however, also arguments for an early mid-twelfth-century cult: Marian Plezia, *Dookoła sprawy świętego Stanisława. Studium źródłoznawcze* (Kraków, 1998); Jerzy Rajman, ‘Przedkanonizacyjny kult św. Stanisława biskupa’, *Nasza Przeszłość*, 80 (1993), 9–37.

was played by the chronicler and later bishop of Kraków (1208–17) Vincent Kadłubek (Master Vincentius),<sup>42</sup> who, in his *Chronica Polonorum* presented the former bishop of Kraków as a saint for the first time and framed his death as a martyrdom.<sup>43</sup>

The timing of the beginning of the cult of Saint Stanislaus does not seem to be coincidental, since it fits with the ideological changes taking place at the time. It appeared when the ideas associated with the Gregorian Reform and its specific provisions were received in Poland.<sup>44</sup> Probably the key reformist issue, which was becoming increasingly important in Poland at the beginning of the thirteenth century, was the canonical election of bishops. Indeed, Vincent Kadłubek himself was the first Polish bishop to be canonically elected.<sup>45</sup> From this time we also have testimony that shows that the investiture of a bishop by a ruler using a pastoral staff and a ring was also considered problematic.<sup>46</sup> The figure of a bishop standing up against a ruler not only fits well with the reformist ideals but also has a specific model, namely Thomas of Canterbury, even if it is difficult to estimate to what extent his example influenced the way Stanislaus was described.<sup>47</sup> However, the

---

<sup>42</sup> Danuta Borawska (*Z dziejów jednej legendy. W sprawie genezy kultu św. Stanisława biskupa* [Warszawa, 1950]) even stated that Master Vincentius had created the cult of Saint Stanislaus. This view was rejected by later scholars, who nevertheless agreed on his role in the development of the cult, see Plezia, *Dookoła sprawy, 117–29*; Skwierczyński, *Recepcja idei gregoriańskich*, 191–201; Stanislava Kuzmová, *Preaching Saint Stanislaus. Medieval Sermons on Saint Stanislaus of Cracow, His Image and Cult* (Warsaw, 2013), 23–6; Roźnowska-Sadraei, *Pater Patriae*, 47–54.

<sup>43</sup> *Magistri Vincentii dicti Kadłubek Chronica Polonorum*, ed. by Marian Plezia, *Monumenta Poloniae Historica, nova series*, 11 (Kraków, 1994), book II, chap. 20, pp. 56–9.

<sup>44</sup> Cf. esp. Skwierczyński, *Recepcja idei gregoriańskich*.

<sup>45</sup> Julia Tazbirowa, 'Pierwsze elekcje kanoniczne biskupów w Polsce', in Aleksander Gieysztor, Marian H. Serejski, and Stanisław Trawkowski (eds), *Wiek średni – medium aevum* (Warszawa, 1962), 117–23; Jacek Maciejewski, *Episkopat Polski doby dzielnicowej, 1180–1320* (Kraków–Bydgoszcz, 2003), 46–70; Skwierczyński, *Recepcja idei gregoriańskich*, 105–12.

<sup>46</sup> Skwierczyński, *Recepcja idei gregoriańskich*, 94–5.

<sup>47</sup> For a direct influence, see Borawska, *Z dziejów*, esp. 20–7; for criticism, see Waław Uruszczyk, 'Les répercussions de la mort de Thomas Becket en Pologne (XII<sup>e</sup>–XIII<sup>e</sup> siècles)', in *Thomas Becket. Actes du colloque international de Sédières, 19–24 Août 1973*, ed. by Raymond Foreville (Paris, 1975), 122–5; and Waław Schenk, 'Zagadnienie zależności kultu św. Stanisława biskupa od kultu św. Tomasza Kantuarijskiego w świetle śląskich rękopisów liturgicznych' *Roczniki Teologiczno-*

cult of the bishop of Canterbury, recorded in Poland relatively soon after his canonisation,<sup>48</sup> was probably an important inspiration for the Church of Kraków for promoting the cause of Stanislaus's sainthood.<sup>49</sup>

Unlike Trondheim, which, at the time when the cult of Eystein was promoted, was the centre of a well-established and active cult of Saint Olaf, Kraków had no important older saint. This was the case at least until 1184 when the body of Saint Florian was translated here from Italy. The translation of Saint Florian suggests, on the one hand, that the cult of Saint Stanislaus was not yet developed at that time, since the Kraków Church had decided to 'invest' in foreign patron saint.<sup>50</sup> On the other hand, on a general level, the translation indicates a growing need for Kraków to have its own active cult. A separate question, to which we will return, is why this role was ultimately fulfilled by the cult of Saint Stanislaus rather than that of Saint Florian, although the latter was not without success.<sup>51</sup>

The need to create its own strong, locally anchored cult in Kraków is interpreted in terms of an ongoing political rivalry in the last quarter of the twelfth century, a rivalry between the two centres of power: Gniezno in Greater Poland ruled by Mieszko III the Old (Stary), and Kraków in Lesser Poland under Kazimierz II the Just (Sprawiedliwy).<sup>52</sup> This context might explain the translation of Saint Florian, which Duke

---

-*Kanoniczne*, iv, 1 (1959), 73–85. Cf. Stanislava Kuzmová, 'Preaching on Martyr-Bishops in the Later Middle Ages: Saint Stanislaus of Kraków and Saint Thomas Becket', in Richard Unger and Jakub Basista (eds), *Britain and Poland-Lithuania: Contact and Comparison from the Middle Ages to 1795* (Boston-Leiden, 2008), 69–70.

<sup>48</sup> Uruszczak, 'Les répercussions', 115–19; Kuzmová, 'Preaching on Martyr-Bishops', 70; Slocum, *The Cult*, 77–8.

<sup>49</sup> Uruszczak, 'Les répercussions', 124–5; Skwierczyński, *Recepcja idei gregoriańskich*, 239; Fiorella Simoni, 'Profezia e politica nella Polonia medievale: la *Vita maior s. Stanislai*', in *ead.*, Lidia Capo and Carla Frova (eds), *Culture del medioevo europeo* (Rome, 2012), 396.

<sup>50</sup> Labuda, *Święty Stanisław*, 145, 166; Skwierczyński, *Recepcja idei gregoriańskich*, 241.

<sup>51</sup> Kazimierz Dobrowolski, *Dzieje kultu św. Floriana w Polsce do połowy XVI wieku* (Warszawa, 1923); Karolina Morawska, 'From Saint Florian to Saint Stanislaus: legitimisation of the ducal and episcopal power in Kraków in the late twelfth and early thirteenth century', in Grzegorz Pac, Steffen Hope, and Jón Viðar Sigurðsson (eds), *The Cult of Saints and Legitimation of Elite Power in East Central Europe and Scandinavia until 1300* (Turnhout, 2024), 135–58.

<sup>52</sup> Skwierczyński, *Recepcja idei gregoriańskich*, 241. Cf. Józef Dobosz, *Działalność fundacyjna Kazimierza Sprawiedliwego* (Poznań, 1995), 149.



Kazimierz was undoubtedly involved with.<sup>53</sup> The attitude of the dukes of Kraków to the nascent cult of Saint Stanislaus is not at all clear.<sup>54</sup> It is also doubtful whether the political rivalry between the Piast rulers had an impact during the long period as the cult developed before Stanislaus was canonised in 1253. Naturally, in the first half of the thirteenth century, there was no lack of conflicts between the Piasts. However, while in the last quarter of the twelfth century, Mieszko III and Kazimierz II both claimed their right to the supreme power, in the thirteenth century, this position ceased to exist, and each Piast duchy ruled independently. The idea of domination over the other dukes was, therefore, beyond the reach of both the rulers of Kraków and Gniezno.

#### CANONISATION AND RULERS: THE CASE OF TRONDHEIM

From the reign of Sverrir onwards, the relationship between the king and the Norwegian Church was marked by tension. This tension continued throughout the first decades of the reign of King Hakon IV (r. 1217–63). However, judging from the earliest correspondence concerning the case of Eystein's sainthood, this tension appears to have eased somewhat after the death of Skule Bårdsson, Hakon's father-in-law and rival, in 1240.

The earliest surviving source for the attempt to canonise Eystein is a letter from Pope Gregory IX, dated 20 April 1241. This letter is a response to now-lost supplications from Archbishop Sigurd of Norway (r. 1230–52) and his suffragans, as well as King Hakon IV.<sup>55</sup> In his response, Gregory encourages the following people to launch an investigation into Eystein's sainthood: the abbot of the Cistercian monastery of Tautra (near Trondheim), the abbot of the Benedictine monastery of Nidarholm (on an island close to Trondheim), and the prior of the Dominicans in Trondheim.<sup>56</sup> This was the beginning

<sup>53</sup> Dobosz, *Działalność fundacyjna*, 86–90; Śliwiński, 'Na marginesie działalności fundacyjnej Kazimierza Sprawiedliwego. Książę krakowski a kultury św. Wojciecha i św. Floriana', *Roczniki Historyczne*, lxi (1995), 174, 176–7.

<sup>54</sup> Skwierczyński, *Recepcja idei gregoriańskich*, 196–206; Morawska, 'From Saint Florian', 150–2.

<sup>55</sup> *Diplomatarium Norvegicum*, ed. by Christian C.A. Lange, Carl R. Unger (Kristiania, 1849), I, no. 23, p. 18.

<sup>56</sup> Given the proclamation of Eystein's sainthood in 1229, and since Trondheim was his cult centre, we can expect that these three institutions already venerated

of a long, drawn-out process that ended inconclusively. The question, then, is why Eystein's status as a saint was considered to need papal acknowledgement by 1241. To identify possible answers to this question, we must turn to the first supplications, signed by Archbishop Sigurd and other bishops as well as King Hakon. These signatories suggest that both the ecclesiastical and royal power saw the benefit of a papally acknowledged saint, and we propose two possible explanations for why each sought to reap that benefit.

If we begin with the Church, we can understand this desire for symbolic capital in the light of the internal power struggles of the past decades in Norway. These struggles, and especially Earl Skule's attempt to attain the kingship by forcefully removing Saint Olaf's relics from Trondheim cathedral in 1239, highlighted the precarious position, as well as the limits, of the Norwegian ecclesiastical power. It was perhaps this precarity that moved the Norwegian clergy to proclaim Eystein a saint in 1229, as they needed another patron to guard against secular power.<sup>57</sup> The clergy undoubtedly turned to the already well-established Saint Olaf for help in such cases. After all, during Eystein's archiepiscopacy the figure of Saint Olaf had been formulated as an ideal king, a pacific *rex iustus* and apostle of Norway.<sup>58</sup> However, the benefits of a second heavenly patron would be obvious, especially one who had strengthened Norwegian metropolitan see, had been

---

Eystein as a saint. No incontrovertible evidence of such cult activity has survived, but Øystein Ekroll has suggested that the seal of the Dominican convent might contain a pictorial representation of the sainted archbishop. The Dominican seal, dated to the period c. 1240 – c. 1280, shows two large seated figures in its upper part, while in the lower part we find three smaller figures in a posture of veneration. The left-hand figure is unmistakably Saint Olaf, and the right-hand figure is an archbishop. Since it is possible that both these central figures are the objects of the veneration of the smaller figures, the identity of the archbishop is most likely Eystein; Øystein Ekroll, 'St. Olav og olavssymbolikk i mellomalderske segl og heraldikk', in Øystein Ekroll (ed.), *Helgenkongen St. Olav i kunsten* (Trondheim, 2016), 176–77.

<sup>57</sup> Margrete Syrstad Andås suggests that the proclamation of 1229 was made to mark the consecration of the newly-constructed octagon of Trondheim cathedral (Margrete Syrstad Andås, 'Hinn helgi æysteinn erkibiskup: Presteskapets egen helgen?', in *Eystein Erlendsson – Erkebiskop*, 160). While this is likely to have played a part in the decision, we should also expect concerns about the political situation to have influenced the decision.

<sup>58</sup> Steffen Hope, 'Reformulating the sanctity of Olaf Haraldsson – Archbishop Eystein Erlendsson and the ecclesiastical image of Saint Olaf', in Andreas Bihrer and Fiona Fritz (eds), *Constructing Sanctities* (Stuttgart, 2019), 69–71.

an ecclesiastical reformer, and had been exiled as a champion of the Church standing against royal power. Saint Eystein would not only serve as a heavenly intercessor who stood close to the cause of the archbishop and his retinue, but he would also signal to ecclesiastics elsewhere in Latin Christendom that the Norwegian Church belonged to the reformist cause, just like Thomas of Canterbury had done.

The struggles came to a turning point in 1240 with the death of Skule Bårdsson, which left Hakon the sole claimant to royal power. For the Church, this juncture must have been marked by uncertainty, as there was no guarantee that the future relationship between Church and king would be peaceful and collaborative. That Archbishop Sigurd opted to strengthen the value of the symbolic capital of a holy bishop-champion with the stamp of papal authority at a time when the internal struggles were over, might therefore be understood as a move designed to strengthen the position of the Church vis-à-vis the king. If this was Sigurd's intention, its result is unclear.

From the four subsequent sources, spread across three decades, we see that Hakon does not appear among those mentioned as supporters of the canonisation. The sources are scant, and there might have been others that have since been lost, but what we know is this: in 1246, Pope Innocent IV sent a letter to the abbot of Tautra and the priors of Tautra and Nidarholm, requesting that they investigate Eystein's sanctity, which Archbishop Sigurd has told him about.<sup>59</sup> Hakon is not mentioned here, although since this is a response to a reminder from Sigurd, we should perhaps not expect him to be there either. Notably, the pope's message is dated 14 October, less than a month before his letter permitting Hakon's coronation.<sup>60</sup> A second reminder, this time addressed to Bishop Arne of Bergen and the Dominican priors of Oslo and Trondheim, is dated 5 January 1251.<sup>61</sup> On 5 April 1255, Pope Alexander IV sent a similar letter, addressed to the bishop of Stavanger, the abbot of Nidarholm and the prior of Helgeseter Abbey in Trondheim. He ordered them to investigate Eystein's sanctity.<sup>62</sup> The last source is a note in Odoricus Raynaldus's *Annales*

<sup>59</sup> *Diplomatarium Norvegicum*, ed. by Carl R. Unger, H.J. Huitfeldt (Kristiania, 1864), VI, no. 22, pp. 22–3.

<sup>60</sup> *Diplomatarium Norvegicum*, I, no. 38, pp. 29–30.

<sup>61</sup> *Diplomatarium Norvegicum*, VI, no. 23, p. 23.

<sup>62</sup> *Diplomatarium Norvegicum*, VI, no. 30, p. 28.

*ecclesiastici* (1667). For 1268, Odoricus notes that the bishop of Bergen and the abbots of Tautra and Nidarholm had been charged with further investigation.<sup>63</sup> In all these instances, only the archbishop is mentioned as a driving force in the matter. Whether the king's absence is simply due to lacunae in the source material, or his disinterest in the question of Eystein's canonisation, is impossible to say. What we can surmise, however, is that neither King Hakon nor his son and successor Magnus VI spent any significant effort in obtaining Eystein's canonisation.<sup>64</sup>

Whichever concern weighed most heavily on Archbishop Sigurd in his decision to strengthen the symbolic value of Eystein with the stamp of papal approval, we should see his supplication to the pope in light of the many pressures faced by the Norwegian Church in 1241: the uncertain relationship with the king – which did deteriorate in the coming decades, the internal struggles in Iceland, and the precarious position of the Norwegian bishops newly appointed to the Icelandic dioceses. It is no wonder, then, that Sigurd sought to maximise the symbolic capital of Saint Eystein, and that his successors would continue to do so until at least the end of the 1260s.<sup>65</sup>

That Hakon also supported the canonisation of Saint Eystein is at first not surprising, considering that secular rulers commonly participated in such petitions.<sup>66</sup> However, it is noteworthy that Hakon's support is not found in the later correspondence concerning the Eystein campaign, and his participation in 1241 must, therefore, also be seen in light of his situation in that period. Two factors may explain this. First of all, while the death of Skule had left him as the sole claimant to the Norwegian kingship, his legitimacy as king was still insecure and open to potential challenges. He was also of illegitimate birth and needed a dispensation from the pope to be

---

<sup>63</sup> Odoricus Raynaldi, *Annales ecclesiastici: ex tomis octo ad unum pluribus redacti* (Roma, 1668), *sub anno* 1268, chap. 4.

<sup>64</sup> The best overview of the process is Andås, 'Hinn helgi'.

<sup>65</sup> Beistad states that 'there was an increased internal focus on the protection and reinforcement of the metropolitan see politically, administratively, and symbolically', in the mid-thirteenth century (Heidi Anett Øvergård Beistad, 'Pope, Province, and Power', in *Scandinavian Journal of History*, xlii, 3 [2017], 308–9). This fits well with the explanation of the attempted canonisation, since the canonised holy bishop carried a great symbolic value in the period.

<sup>66</sup> Vauchez, *Sainthood*, 41. See also below, pp. 167–8.

crowned. This matter was still unresolved by 1241, and would remain so until 1247.<sup>67</sup> Moreover, the king's relationship with the pope was fraught. The pope had intervened on behalf of Bishop Pål of Hamar (r. 1232–51), who went into exile in Denmark due to his conflict with King Hakon,<sup>68</sup> and we should expect this to have hampered Hakon's chances of a papal dispensation. As Heidi Anett Øvergård Beistad notes, the king is likely to have sought Archbishop Sigurd's help in this process,<sup>69</sup> and Hakon's support of Eystein's canonisation can largely be explained by his efforts to secure Sigurd's support. This explanation is strengthened by the fact that Hakon's name does not appear again in the correspondence concerning the canonisation attempt.

While the simplest explanation for Hakon's support of Eystein's canonisation in 1241 is the king's need to secure the Norwegian crown, there is also a second, and auxiliary, explanation that must at least be considered here. Hakon's support of Eystein's canonisation might also be seen as an attempt to gain the favour of the holy bishop, and also to deny the Church some of Saint Eystein's symbolic capital. Given Hakon's turbulent relationship with the Norwegian Church, we should expect the king to be aware of how Eystein's canonisation might provide the Norwegian clergy with an even stronger position vis-à-vis royal power.

In light of the unresolved matter of Hakon's legitimacy in 1241, his support of Eystein's canonisation can, therefore, be understood as an attempt to secure support from a heavenly intercessor since the main native heavenly intercessor, Saint Olaf, was wholly on the side of the Church, at least according to the Church's representation of the holy king. Whether Hakon supported the canonisation attempt in order to curry favour with the holy bishop, sought to acquire some of the holy bishop's symbolic capital or a combination of both, it is unlikely that Hakon would have been blind to the benefits of having a share in Saint Eystein's patronage. It is more likely than not that Hakon was

---

<sup>67</sup> Beistad, 'Pope', 300. Ludvig Daae (*Norges helgener* [Christiania, 1879], 171–2) suggested that the Norwegian Church used Hakon's need for a papal dispensation for his coronation as leverage for his initial support of the canonisation. While this issue probably did play a part in the process, we cannot follow Daae in his subsequent suggestion that Hakon, after his coronation in 1247, actively sought to sabotage the proceedings, *ibid.*, 174.

<sup>68</sup> *Diplomatarium Norvegicum*, VI, no. 19, 20–1.

<sup>69</sup> Beistad, 'Pope', 300.

familiar with the circumstances following Thomas of Canterbury's death, in which the English king had repented for his part in the murder and gained the bishop-martyr's forgiveness and protection. However, these explanations do not account for Hakon's absence in the later sources. The most straightforward explanation is that with Hakon's coronation in 1247, the king had achieved the legitimacy he had sought, and he appears not to have felt the need to support the canonisation campaign.

Hakon's absence in the later sources notwithstanding, what matters for our purposes is the rationale behind his support in 1241. Both Hakon's and Sigurd's support can be explained by several interconnected motives, and we see in this canonisation attempt a node in the various related conflicts and challenges faced by both the king and the Church in mid-thirteenth-century Norway. No matter the motives and explanations for the attempt to canonise a bishop whose status as a saint was already established with sufficient authority, the attempt itself is a testament to the symbolic capital with which the mid-thirteenth century and its reception of the paradigm of Thomas of Canterbury had imbued the figure of the holy bishop, especially in the form of the holy predecessor. Papal approval was required to get the highest amount of symbolic capital from the cult, and it was for this reason that both Archbishop Sigurd and King Hakon pursued this approval in 1241. The attempt tells us that the knowledge of the symbolic value of a papally canonised holy bishop was well-known in Norway by 1241.

#### CANONISATIONS AND RULERS: THE CASE OF KRAKÓW

The position of the Kraków Church was linked to the aforementioned political importance of this centre of the Polish polity, which was associated with the authority of the High Duke in the period after the death of Bolesław the Wrymouth (Krzywousty) in 1138. However, this institution also had its own political position, for which the symbolic capital connected to the former holy bishop might be instrumental. At the turn of the twelfth century, the bishops of Kraków became key figures in the religiopolitical elite of Lesser Poland, whose influence on the appointment to the ducal throne was exceptionally important. It was the bishop who was behind the coup d'état of 1177 that brought Kazimierz II the Just to power, and the bishop's influence

on the politics of the duchy were both strengthened by the periods of minority rule of Kazimierz's successors, his son Leszek (from 1194), and grandson Bolesław (from 1227). In particular, the turbulent years from 1227 to 1243, when claims to the Kraków throne were made by various Piast dukes, increased the importance of the nobility of Lesser Poland, with the bishop at the head.<sup>70</sup>

Just as King Hakon's power in Norway was consolidated following the death of Skule Bårdsson in 1240, ducal power in the Duchy of Kraków was stabilised at the same time. From 1243 onwards, Bolesław V the Chaste, who had come of age five years earlier, achieved some stability of rule after defeating his uncle Conrad of Mazovia that year. Although he owed his power to the elites of Lesser Poland, he also had a hereditary claim to the throne. Of great importance to his position was his marriage to Kinga (Cunigunde), daughter of the Hungarian King Béla IV, which – as Paweł Żmudzki stated – “raised his prestige dramatically”.<sup>71</sup> On the one hand, it connected the duke to an established royal family; on the other hand, it sealed an alliance with a powerful neighbour, and, significantly, Kinga had brought into the marriage a huge dowry of 40,000 marks. The bishop of Kraków could not fail to notice this strengthening of the duke's rule, and it raised questions about the bishop's own position in relations with the ruler. The Kraków Church's response to it could have been, as we shall see, analogous to that in Norway.

The early 1240s were also crucial for the cult of Saint Stanislaus. Although it had undoubtedly functioned in some form in the preceding decades,<sup>72</sup> it was revived and formalised in this period. The hagiography of Saint Stanislaus links this development with a change of the Kraków bishop: Wisław, who, reportedly, had failed to take care of the proper veneration of his saintly predecessor, was replaced in 1242 by Prandota, who showed more concern about this matter.<sup>73</sup> However, it is difficult

<sup>70</sup> Overview: Bronisław Włodarski, ‘Polityczna rola biskupów krakowskich w XIII wieku’, *Nasza Przyszłość*, 27 (1967), 29–62. Cf. Karolina Maciaszek, *Bolesław V Wstydlivy. Książę krakowski i sandomierski 1226–1279. Długie panowanie w trudnych czasach* (Kraków, 2021), 41–161.

<sup>71</sup> Paweł Żmudzki, *Studium podzielonego Królestwa: książę Leszek Czarny* (Warszawa, 2000), 25.

<sup>72</sup> Overview: Rajman, ‘Przedkanonizacyjny’, 38–40.

<sup>73</sup> *Vita sancti Stanislai Cracoviensis episcopi (Vita maior)*, ed. by Wojciech Kętrzyński, *Monumenta Poloniae Historica*, 4 (Lwów, 1884), book III, chap. 4–7, pp. 395–400.

not to see this revival of the cult of the holy predecessor killed by the ruler in the context of the stabilisation of the position of the Duke of Kraków, which may have prompted the bishop of Kraków to strengthen his position and prestige through the symbolic capital provided by Saint Stanislaus.

Shortly after becoming bishop, Prandota performed the *elevatio* of the body of Saint Stanislaus.<sup>74</sup> It is not clear if Duke Bolesław was involved in these events. The *vita* of Saint Kinga, the duke's wife, written in the 1320s, states that the future saint induced the duke "that during their lifetime the solemnity of the canonisation of Saint Stanislaus be accomplished". The *vita* also informs us that during the ceremony itself Kinga excavated the bones of the saint with her own hands and washed them.<sup>75</sup> However, it is possible that this episode refers to events in 1254, after the papal canonisation.<sup>76</sup> It could also be that the whole event is merely the creation of a fourteenth-century hagiographer who wished to link the figure of his protagonist with the well-recognized saint, whose canonisation took place in her time.

What is noteworthy, however, is that the *Vita maior*, written shortly after the canonisation, in describing these events, states that the act was performed by Bishop Prandota on the advice of his chapter, without mentioning anyone else.<sup>77</sup> In the early 1250s, efforts to ensure papal canonisation began, the first evidence of which is a papal document of May 1252 in which the pope appointed the Franciscan Jacob of Velletri to investigate the case. This was the second commission; the

<sup>74</sup> *Vita maior*, book III, chap. 7, p. 399. For other sources, see *ead.*, *Świętych życie po życiu. Relikwie w kulturze religijnej na ziemiach polskich w średniowieczu* (Warszawa–Siedlce, 2008), 285, n. 115. For the discussion on dating, see Maria Starnawska, 'Dominikanie, św. Jacek i elewacja szczątków św. Stanisława przez biskupa Prandotę', in Krzysztof Ożóg, Tomasz Gałuszka, and Anna Zajchowska (eds), *Mendykanci w średniowiecznym Krakowie* (Kraków, 2008), 414–7; *ead.*, *Świętych życie po życiu*, 288–93.

<sup>75</sup> '[U]t tempore vite ipsorum sollempnitas cononisationis sancti Stanislai consummaretur', *Vita et miracula sancta Kyngae ducissae Cracoviensis*, ed. by Wojciech Kętrzyński, *Monumenta Poloniae Historica*, 4 (Lwów, 1884), n. 35, 710–11. For dating of the source, see Michalski, *Kobiety i świętość*, 48–50.

<sup>76</sup> This may suggest a statement that Kinga acted with papal permission, see Starnawska, *Świętych życie po życiu*, 287. Nor can it be ruled out, however, that the sentence about the pope's consent is an addition of the *vita's* author, who wished to emphasize the legitimacy of the whole procedure, in which Kinga took part, since he was writing at a time when such consent was seen as necessary.

<sup>77</sup> *Vita maior*, book III, chap. 7, p. 399.



previous one, as we read in the document, had consisted of the Archbishop of Gniezno, the Bishop of Wrocław and the Abbot of the Cistercian monastery at Lubiąż. Incidentally, the papal document informs us that the first commission was set up after reports of sainthood from “our venerable brother, the bishop of Kraków and the beloved sons, the chapter and the clergy of the city and diocese of Kraków”.<sup>78</sup> According to the *Annals of the Kraków Chapter*, after the commission’s work was completed, representatives of the Kraków Chapter, as well as some Dominicans and Franciscans, travelled to Rome for the canonisation of Stanislaus.<sup>79</sup> The representatives of the chapter went there again when the commission of Jacob of Velletri had finished its work.<sup>80</sup> The latter trip is also mentioned in the *Vita maior*, which states that the efforts for the canonisation of “their bishop” were undertaken in Rome by “messengers of the Church of Kraków”.<sup>81</sup> Duke Bolesław V is only mentioned once in the text, where it is written that just as Saint Stanislaus died as a result of persecution from King Bolesław II, so he was canonised under Duke Bolesław V of Kraków.<sup>82</sup>

Therefore, unlike in the case of Eystein, it appears that the duke was not among those who requested that the pope canonise Stanislaus, although the participation of the ruler in these efforts was, according to Vauchez, common and “became a rule after 1260”.<sup>83</sup> Except for the

<sup>78</sup> “[V]enerabili fratre nostro [...] episcopo Cracouiensi et dilectis filijs capitulo et clero Cracouiensis ciuitatis et diosesis”, *Innocentii pp. IV bulla mandatoria ad Jacobum de Velletri*, ed. by Roman Zawadzki, *Analecta Cracoviensia*, 11 (1979), 42. For an overview of the events related to the papal canonisation of Saint Stanislaus, see Różnowska-Sadraei, *Pater Patriae*, 41–7; Aleksandra Witkowska, ‘The Thirteenth-Century *Miracula* of St. Stanislaus, Bishop of Krakow’, in *Procès de canonisation au Moyen Âge. Aspectes juridiques et religieux*, ed. by Gábor Klaniczay (Roma, 2004), 149–63.

<sup>79</sup> „M<sup>o</sup>CCLI magister Jacobus doctor decretorum et magister Gerardus can[onici] Crac[ouienses] cum Predicatoribus et Minoribus pro canonizacione beati Stanyzlai certi nuncii et procuratores eiusdem negocii ad Romanam curiam destinantur”, *Rocznik kapituly krakowskiej*, ed. by Zofia Kozłowska-Budkowa, in *Najdawniejsze roczniki krakowskie i kalendarz*, Monumenta Poloniae Historica, nova series, 5 (Warszawa, 1978), sub anno 1251, 83–84.

<sup>80</sup> „M<sup>o</sup>CCLII magister Jacobus et magister G[erardus] de Romana curia redeunt”, *Rocznik kapituly krakowskiej*, sub anno 1252, p. 84.

<sup>81</sup> ‘[I]nstantibus ecclesie Cracoviensis nunciis pro sui canonizacione pontificis’, *Vita maior*, book III, chap. 55, p. 434.

<sup>82</sup> *Vita maior*, book III, chap. 56, p. 438. Cf. Banaszkievicz, ‘Prolog do *Rocznika*’, 325–6.

<sup>83</sup> Vauchez, *Sainthood*, 41 with n. 38.

case of Saint Stanislaus, in all other petitions requesting canonisation from East Central Europe and Scandinavia from the 1230s to the 1270s – Eystein, Margaret of Hungary, Luke Banffy from Hungary, Hedwig of Silesia and Nicholas (Niels) Aarhus in Denmark – the ruler was among the petitioners.<sup>84</sup> The case of another saint, canonised by Innocent IV, namely Edmund of Abingdon, is also significant. Here, too, the ruler is absent among the petitioners because, as Vauchez notes, drawing on a contemporary source, “Henry III did everything in his power to prevent the canonization”.<sup>85</sup>

With regards to the question of Duke Boleslaw’s part in the process, examination of the papal canonisation letter *Olim a gentilium* may perhaps reveal a significant point. Three versions of it were issued shortly after the canonisation, on 17 September 1253.<sup>86</sup> Two versions, one addressed to prelates of the Church and the other to the Archbishop of Gniezno and his suffragans, are almost identical and, among other things, establish the feast of Saint Stanislaus, set its date to 8 May, and designate the indulgences associated with the feast. These two versions are richly decorated, with the papal name written in majuscule letters, its initial executed with floral decoration, and ornamented majuscule first letters in several words. Moreover, the lead seal (*bullā*) is attached to a silk cord made of yellow and claret threads.<sup>87</sup> We are

<sup>84</sup> On Margaret of Hungary, see Gábor Klaniczay, ‘Saint Margaret: Royal and Female Sanctity’, in Ildikó Csepregi, Gábor Klaniczay, and Bence Péterfi (eds), *The Oldest Legend, Acts of the Canonization Process, and Miracles of Saint Margaret of Hungary* (Budapest–New York, 2018), 19–20, 25; on Luke Banffy: Vauchez, *Sainthood*, 41, n. 38; on Hedwig of Silesia: Krafft, *Papsturkunde und Heiligsprechung*, 589 (unspecified ‘duces eiusdem provinciae’), on Nicholas: Ellis Nilsson, *Creating Holy People*, 91.

<sup>85</sup> Vauchez, *Sainthood*, 41, n. 38. See also: Joseph Creamer, ‘St Edmund of Canterbury and Henry III in the Shadow of Thomas Becket’, in Janet Burton, Philipp Schofield, and Björn Weiler (eds), *Thirteenth-Century England XIV* (Woodbridge, 2013), esp. 130–1; Clifford H. Lawrence, *Edmund of Abington. A Study in Hagiography and History* (Oxford, 1960), 15–16, 18, 22–3.

<sup>86</sup> Archives of the Kraków Cathedral Chapter, parchment documents, nos. 27–30; State Archives in Wrocław, rep. 57, no. 31 (34). Edition of Kraków documents: *Innocentii pp. IV bulla de canonizatione sancti Stanislai*, versions: A (to the Archbishop of Gniezno and his suffragans), B (to Polish dukes) and C<sup>1</sup> and C<sup>2</sup> (*ad universam ecclesiam*), ed. by Roman Zawadzki, *Analecta Cracoviensia*, 11 (1979), 23–40. Cf. Krafft, *Papsturkunde und Heiligsprechung*, 505–14, esp. 505–7 where extensively about the surviving originals of the document. Cf. also the next footnote and fn. 89 below.

<sup>87</sup> See previous note. The letter in the version to prelates of the Church, not included in the edition, but kept in Wrocław (see fn. above), has the same formal

therefore dealing with a type of papal document called a *littera cum serico* (a “letter with silk”).<sup>88</sup> The third version of the papal canonisation letter is addressed to the Polish dukes. Most of its text is identical to the versions addressed to the clergy but differs in its concluding part. In this version, it also orders the celebration of the feast, although it does not specify the date. Interestingly, indulgences are all omitted in the version of the document *ad duces Poloniae*. Compared with the versions addressed to ecclesiastical leaders, the letter to the dukes is also much more modest in terms of decoration, since it is limited to a very basic decoration of the initial in the name *Innocentius*, and the seal is suspended from a hemp cord.<sup>89</sup> The form of the letter clearly indicates that we are dealing with a *littera cum filo canapis* (a “letter with a hemp cord”)<sup>90</sup> and suggests, as the editor of the document has it, its “mandatory character”,<sup>91</sup> i.e. that the main purpose is to issue a command to the addressee.

These differences were noted by Otfried Krafft, who also noted that the document for the Polish dukes differed from other such documents for lay recipients issued by Innocent IV’s chancellery. For instance, in the cases of Edmund of Abingdon and William of Saint-Brieuc, the canonisation letters for secular leaders contain

---

features, except for one detail: majuscule letters in several words are not actually decorated, cf. Krafft, *Papsturkunde und Heiligensprechung*, 506, n. 450; Roman Stelmach, *Katalog średniowiecznych dokumentów przechowywanych w Archiwum Państwowym we Wrocławiu* (Wrocław–Racibórz, 2014), no. 331, p. 43.

<sup>88</sup> For a recent and extensive treatment of this issue: Sabine Fees, *Das päpstliche Corporate Design. Quellen zur äußeren Ausstattung von Papsturkunden im hohen und später Mittelalter*, Archiv für Diplomatik. Schriftgeschichte, Siegel- und Wappenkunde, 21 (Köln, 2023), 147–203. Cf. Peter Herde, *Beiträge zum päpstlichen Kanzlei- und Urkundenwesen im dreizehnten Jahrhundert* (Kallmünz Opf, 1961), esp. 50–4.

<sup>89</sup> Direct contact with the document held in the Archives of the Kraków Cathedral Chapter (parchment documents, no. 30) leads us to conclude that the editor’s description of the initial as ‘less richly decorated’ than in the other versions of the letter is highly inaccurate. Unlike the decorations of the initial in the other versions, this one is not a floral decoration and is, in fact, limited to the black filling of the letter. Also the pope’s name in this version, unlike in the others, is not written in majuscule letters, as opposed to what states in the edition. Cf. *Innocentii pp. IV bulla de canonizatione sancti Stanislai*, B. 25–6, 40.

<sup>90</sup> See previous note.

<sup>91</sup> *Innocentii pp. IV bulla de canonizatione sancti Stanislai*, 26. Cf. Krafft, *Papsturkunden und Heiligensprechung*, 507.

indulgences. Moreover, the document addressed to the lay elites of England in connection with Edmund's canonisation is a *littera cum serico* (in the case of William, the original document addressed to King Louis IX has not been preserved).<sup>92</sup> Krafft, therefore, sees in both the content and form of the document to the Polish dukes traces of the pope's clear, symbolically marked reserve towards the addressees. He links this to the fact that the dukes are the successors of the ruler who murdered the holy martyr.

We suggest, however, that the modest form of the document could be linked to the reluctance that Bolesław V the Chaste of Kraków may have had towards the whole matter of canonisation. The formal differences between Stanislaus's canonisation letters can, of course, be explained by their content, namely that the documents for ecclesiastical recipients contain indulgences and therefore grant papal grace, which determines their belonging to the type of a *littera cum serico* and the associated form.<sup>93</sup> Here, however, we have to return to Krafft's observation that indulgences do occur in the canonisation documents for lay recipients, so their absence in the letter *Ad duces Poloniae* is significant. Returning to the form of the document, however, it should be noted that, as Peter Herde pointed out years ago and Sabine Fees reiterated quite recently, the rather schematic determination of the letter to one of two types (*cum serico* or *cum filo canapis*) by the papal chancellery depending on its content only, was not fully established in the period in question. In the first half of the thirteenth century, the form often depended on the actual function of the document in connection with its recipient: the same papal decision or settlement of a litigation, which was presented to all concerned in the mandatory form of a *littara cum filo canapis*, went to the petitioner as a *littera cum serico*, because for him it represented papal mercy.<sup>94</sup>

In the canonisation letter addressed to the Polish dukes, but above all to Bolesław as the main interested,<sup>95</sup> he was informed

---

<sup>92</sup> Krafft, *Papsturkunden und Heiligsprechung*, 507–8, n. 458, 513–4. Cf. *ibid.*, 445, 462.

<sup>93</sup> Cf. Krafft, *Papsturkunden und Heiligsprechung*, 1052; Herde, *Beiträge*, 51–2; Fees, *Das päpstliche Corporate Design*, 24–5.

<sup>94</sup> Herde, *Beiträge*, 52–4; Fees, *Das päpstliche Corporate Design*, 24–5. Cf. Thomas Frenz, *Papsturkunden des Mittelalters und der Neuzeit* (Stuttgart, 2000), 26–7.

<sup>95</sup> It is probably no coincidence that the document is kept in Kraków.

of the decision taken by the pope, with an order to celebrate the feast of the martyr, but without mentioning the spiritual benefits associated with it. This may suggest that the decision was not necessarily in favour of the duke, who was also not, as we mentioned above, among the petitioners for the canonisation of Saint Stanislaus. The omission of the spiritual benefits and the form of the letter may have been because the ruler would not necessarily benefit from the symbolic capital provided by his saintly patronage. It was especially so as the main topic of the saint's *vita* was the resistance of the holy bishop against the tyrannous ruler and the bishop's eventual death. Yet for the bishops of Kraków, the successors of Saint Stanislaus, the new cult, supported by the pope and rooted in the bishop of Kraków's rightful opposition to the tyrant, was an important source of prestige to Saint Stanislaus's successors. However, as stated above, the symbolic power provided by his saintly patronage might not necessarily benefit the ruler.<sup>96</sup> How powerful a legitimising tool the cult of Saint Stanislaus was for the bishop of Kraków in his relations with the duke is well illustrated by a ducal document from 1255. In it, Bolesław grants certain immunities to the Church of Kraków, as he writes, "desiring to act contrary to Bolesław, the former king of the Poles, guilty of the death and blood of the illustrious martyr of Christ and bishop Stanislaus."<sup>97</sup>

Notably, the later account of the *Chronicle of Greater Poland* (the credibility of which may nevertheless be questionable) seems to indicate that the order to celebrate the feast clearly had an effect, as its first celebration on 8 May 1254 brought together not only Bolesław himself, but also other Piast dukes.<sup>98</sup> It seems that once the new cult

<sup>96</sup> Cf. Karol Górski, 'La naissance des Etats et le „roi-saint”. Problème de l'idéologie féodale', in Tadeusz Manteuffel and Aleksander Gieysztor (eds), *L'Europe aux IXe–XIe siècles. Aux origines des Etats nationaux* (Warszawa, 1968), 430–1.

<sup>97</sup> "[P]er oppositum gerere nos uolentes Boleszlao quondam Polonorum regi, reo mortis et sanguinis preclari christi martyris et pontificis Stanizlai", *Kodeks dyplomatyczny katedry krakowskiej ś. Wacława*, ed. by Franciszek Piekosiński, i (Kraków, 1874), no. 43, 60. On Bolesław's privileges for the Kraków Church in the 1250s, see Maciaszek, *Bolesław V Wstydlivy*, 568–9; Sławomir Gawlas, 'Człowiek uwikłany w wielkie procesy – przykład Muskaty', in Roman Michałowski (ed.), *Człowiek w społeczeństwie średniowiecznym* (Warszawa, 1997), 396.

<sup>98</sup> *Kronika wielkopolska*, ed. by Brygida Kürbis, Monumenta Poloniae Historica, nova series, 8 (Warszawa, 1970), 101.

had been approved and had received Rome's support, the duke was left with no choice but to accept it, and perhaps even put his own stamp on it. In the late 1250s, he founded a Franciscan monastery in Nowy Korczyn under the patronage of the new saint.<sup>99</sup> The rulers of Kraków, and later of Poland, recognised Stanislaus as their patron saint, the first clear example of which was the seal of Bolesław V's successor, Leszek the Black, which showed the duke kneeling before the saintly bishop.<sup>100</sup>

#### NEW SAINTS AND THE INTER-ECCLESIASTICAL STRUGGLES

In the case of Eystein, in addition to concerns about the relationship with royal power, there is also another issue that might have influenced Archbishop Sigurd's desire to strengthen the symbolic capital provided by the saint, namely the situation in Iceland. The early thirteenth century in Iceland was marked by internal strife between aristocratic families, and this conflict also hampered the efforts of the Norwegian Church to reinforce ecclesiastical power.<sup>101</sup> Sigurd's attempt to control the situation can be seen in 1237, four years before our earliest source about the attempted canonisation of Eystein. In this year, Sigurd appointed Norwegians to fill the vacancies of both of Iceland's bishoprics, Skálholt and Hólar. As Heidi Anett Øvergård Beistad points out, the choice of Norwegians over native Icelanders was probably because Icelanders would have been connected to the feuding families and, therefore, been unable to represent the Church independently.<sup>102</sup> The challenges for the newly appointed Norwegian bishops in Iceland might have been part of the reason why Archbishop Sigurd saw the need to elevate the already-sainted Eystein to the status of a papally acknowledged saint. Both as a canonised saint and as a model of emulation, Eystein, as a sanctified reformist archbishop, would be useful to the new bishops in their encounters with the local aristocracy, both as a heavenly intercessor and as a source of prestige.

<sup>99</sup> Anna Agnieszka Dryblak, *Piastowskie fundacje klasztorów żeńskich w Polsce XIII w. Między recepcją obcych wzorców a tworzeniem oryginalnego modelu* (Warszawa, 2022), 202–3.

<sup>100</sup> Różnowska-Sadraei, *Pater Patriae*, esp. 103–11.

<sup>101</sup> Beistad, 'Pope', 310.

<sup>102</sup> *Ibid.*

As mentioned, the bishop had a particularly strong position in Iceland, which in turn might explain why the only native Icelandic saints were bishops. By 1237, two formally established cults flourished, namely that of Saint Thorlak of Skálholt (locally proclaimed in 1198), and that of Saint Jón of Hólar (locally proclaimed in 1200).<sup>103</sup> We should expect that bishops of both Icelandic and Norwegian origin turned to these locally rooted heavenly intercessors in their conflicts with the local aristocracy. However, the native aristocracy, whose relationship with the native saints had been cultivated for decades, would likewise turn to these native holy bishops. The addition of a new patron in the form of Eystein, who was both less well known to the native aristocracy and who – as the archbishop hoped – carried the stamp of papal approval, would boost the efforts of the bishop against secular pressures.<sup>104</sup> As a champion of the Church, Eystein could, on the one hand, serve as a helper of the embattled clergy caught in the internal strife between the wealthy families of Iceland. On the other hand, Eystein, as a former metropolitan, could also serve as a reminder of the unity of the Norwegian Church Province, which also included the Icelandic clergy. Should Icelandic clerics lose sight of their allegiance to the metropolitan see in favour of their family ties, Eystein would be a guide and, if need be, also a punisher.

The same aspect, namely relations within the church province, was also important in the case of the cult of Saint Stanislaus, promoted by the bishopric of Kraków. Here, however, it was not about the alleged metropolitan ambitions of the Kraków bishopric, seeking to gain the supreme position in the church province or competition

---

<sup>103</sup> Margaret Cormack, 'Saints of Medieval Hólar: A Statistical Survey of the Veneration of Saints in the Diocese', *Peregrinations: Journal of Medieval Art and Architecture*, 3 (2011), 7.

<sup>104</sup> In 1237, the see of Hólar had become vacant through the death of Bishop Gudmundur Arasson, who became the object of cultic veneration in the fourteenth century (Joanna Skórzewska, *Constructing a Cult: The Life and Veneration of Guðmundr Arason (1161–1237) in the Icelandic Written Sources* [Leiden, 2011], 207). It is unclear whether such a veneration was anticipated by the Norwegian Church already by the 1240s and whether the risks of secular appropriation of the veneration of a local and recently deceased bishop influenced Sigurd's efforts to have Eystein canonized. However, given that native saints could potentially favour the populace over the Church, the veneration of a native bishop was fraught with uncertainty.

with the archbishopric of Gniezno, as suggested by some scholars.<sup>105</sup> Such a competition would be reflected in the alleged rivalry between the cults of Saint Adalbert and Saint Stanislaus.<sup>106</sup> However, there is no indication that the Kraków Church was undermining Adalbert's position as patron saint of Poland,<sup>107</sup> but at most wanted to add their own saint to the pair.<sup>108</sup> On the other hand, it seems that Saint Adalbert, presented as the first archbishop of Gniezno, was perceived to strengthen the archbishopric, and this may have been an additional inspiration and point of reference for ecclesiastics in Kraków who were engaged in the promotion of the sanctity of their former bishop.

The bishops of Kraków at the end of the twelfth and the first half of the thirteenth century did not have some secret desire to become superior to the archbishops of Gniezno; rather they were involved in a dispute over who was ranked second after the archbishop. Two years after the translation of Saint Florian, in 1186, the bishop of

<sup>105</sup> Literature collected by Maciejewski, *Episkopat*, 101, n. 55. Note, however, that in the thirteenth century, there was a living tradition about the eleventh-century Bishop of Kraków, Aron, who was to receive the title of archbishop. It was also recorded in the *Vita maior*, book II, chap. 14, p. 383. For other sources, see Józef Dobosz, *Monarchia i możni wobec Kościoła w Polsce do początku XIII wieku* (Poznań, 2002), 113–17.

<sup>106</sup> For such a competition of the cults, see: e.g. Gerard Labuda, 'Św. Wojciech w literaturze i legendzie średniowiecznej', in Zbigniew Bernacki *et al.* (eds), *Święty Wojciech, 997–1947* (Gniezno, [1947]), 101–2; Gábor Klaniczay, 'Saints' Cults in Medieval Central Europe: Rivalries and Alliances', in Nils Holger Petersen *et al.* (eds), *Symbolic Identity and the cultural Memory of Saints* (Newcastle upon Tyne, 2018), 27; Jezierski, 'St Adalbertus domesticus', 241–45. For a more sceptical view, see Sosnowski, 'Oryginalność i wtórność wczesnej polskiej hagiografii (do końca XIII w.) – wybrane problemy', in Roman Michałowski and Grzegorz Pac (eds), *Oryginalność czy wtórność. Studia poświęcone polskiej kulturze politycznej i religijnej (X–XIII wiek)* (Warszawa, 2020), 539–41, 558–9.

<sup>107</sup> Saint Adalbert is mentioned by Master Vincentius, who even called the former *sanctissimus Polonorum patronus* (*Magistri Vincentii Chronica Polonorum*, book II, chap. 10, pp. 38–40; book IV, chap. 18, pp. 165–6) as well as in Saint Stanislaus' *Vita maior* (book I, chap. 2, pp. 365–6); and *Vita minor* (*Vita sancti Stanislai episcopi Cracoviensis* (*Vita maior*), ed. by Wojciech Kętrzyński, *Monumenta Poloniae Historica*, 4 (Lwów, 1884), chap. 19, p. 268); the latter presents him as an archbishop of Gniezno. For the popularity of Saint Adalbert in Lesser Poland and the Church of Kraków's support of his cult, see Sosnowski, 'Oryginalność i wtórność', 541; Piotr Węcowski, *Początki Polski w pamięci historycznej późnego średniowiecza* (Kraków, 2014), 297.

<sup>108</sup> On the liturgy of Saint Adalbert as a model for the liturgy of Saint Stanislaus, see Schenk, 'Zagadnienie zależności', 73–85.



Kraków, Pełka, succeeded in obtaining from Pope Urban III the privilege that it was the Bishop of Kraków who was to take the first place and speak first after the archbishop at the assemblies of the Church province.<sup>109</sup> However, in the first half of the thirteenth century, despite the protests of their Krakowian peers, this position was contested by the Bishops of Wrocław, who, in practice, often occupied it themselves. The privileged position of Kraków in the Gniezno Church province was, therefore, badly undermined.<sup>110</sup>

However, as Jacek Maciejewski notes, following the celebrations connected with the canonisation of Saint Stanislaus, which took place in 1254, Bishop Prandota of Kraków always appeared at the top of the list of the suffragans of the archbishop of Gniezno. Moreover, two years later, in March 1256, he received a papal letter which confirmed that very position. Significantly, in explaining the decision, the pope writes, among other things, that he wants to honour the Church of Kraków “for the respect of the holy Martyr and Bishop Stanislaus, whose glorious body rests in this church”.<sup>111</sup> The authority associated with the canonisation of Saint Stanislaus was, therefore, crucial for the renewal of the position of the Bishop of Kraków in the Gniezno Church Province.<sup>112</sup> The latter can even be seen as the primary objective of both the formalisation of the cult in the early 1240s and, above all, the efforts made in the early 1250s for papal canonisation. Interestingly, it seems that, like the Duke of Kraków, the Bishop of Wrocław immediately accepted the new cult, recognised by the pope’s authority, as its early manifestations in Silesia indicate.<sup>113</sup>

---

<sup>109</sup> Maciejewski, *Episkopat*, 109; *id.*, ‘Precedencja biskupów prowincji gnieźnieńskiej w Polsce piastowskiej, *Nasza Przeszłość*, 99 (2003), 7.

<sup>110</sup> Maciejewski, *Episkopat*, 109–11; *id.*, ‘Precedencja biskupów’.

<sup>111</sup> „Nos itaque ob beati Martiris et Episcopi Stanyzłai, reuerentiam, cuius gloriosum corpus in eadem ecclesia ut asseris requiescit ecclesiam ipsam honorare uolentes”, *Kodeks dyplomatyczny katedry krakowskiej*, no. 53, p. 69.

<sup>112</sup> Maciejewski, *Episkopat*, 111–2; *id.*, ‘Precedencja biskupów’, 20.

<sup>113</sup> Waclaw Schenk, *Kult liturgiczny św. Stanisława biskupa na Śląsku w świetle średniowiecznych rękopisów liturgicznych* (Lublin, 1959), 15–19; Różnowska-Sadraei, *Pater Patriae*, 95–103; Wojciech Mrozowicz, ‘Die politische Rolle des Kultes des Hl. Adalbert, Stanislaus und der Hl. Hedwig im Polen des 13. Jahrhunderts’, in Marek Derwich and Michel Dmitriev (eds), *Fonctions sociales et politiques du culte des saints dans les sociétés de rite grec et latin au Moyen Âge et à l’époque moderne. Approche comparative* (Wrocław, 1999), 118–9.

In the struggle to maintain the position of the Kraków bishopric, the symbolic capital provided by Saint Stanislaus was very useful. He was not only an important saint – as was Saint Florian – but he was a former bishop of Kraków. This gave his successors extraordinary authority and supplied a long tradition for the illustrious position of the Kraków Church. It is notable that by the 1240s, one Polish diocese already boasted its own saintly bishop, namely Gniezno, where Saint Adalbert was defined as the founder of the local archbishopric. For Kraków, seeking to legitimise its place next to Gniezno in the ecclesiastical hierarchy, it would be logical to employ the same ideological repertoire, i.e. the figure of a holy episcopal predecessor. For the other Polish bishops, the papal authority expressed through the canonisation of Stanislaus must have been a compelling reason to accept the new cult.

#### SYMBOLIC CAPITAL AND PAPAL CANONIZATION: SUCCESS AND FAILURE

It is notable that the proclamation of Eystein's sainthood in 1229 rested on episcopal authority, and that Stanislaus's sainthood was also initially formalised only by the episcopal *elevatio* from the early 1240s. In the former case, André Vauchez suggested that the Norwegian bishops' own initiative to proclaim the sainthood of Eystein "is probably to be explained by local ignorance of new trends", by which he meant the progressive monopolisation of the recognition of new saints' cults by the papacy.<sup>114</sup> However, as we already have mentioned above,<sup>115</sup> a broader look at the issue shows that in the thirteenth century, and even later, there is no shortage of examples of cults, usually local, established by means of the episcopal *elevatio* itself. Even if, according to the rules established in 1234, which theoretically were considered to be legally binding by the pope and the canonists, the episcopal *elevatio* should follow the papal recognition of sainthood,<sup>116</sup> the practice was often different. This is not surprising, even considering that

---

<sup>114</sup> Vauchez, *Sainthood*, 30, n. 34.

<sup>115</sup> See above, p. 153.

<sup>116</sup> Herrmann-Mascard, *Les reliques*, 103–4; Roberto Paciocco, *Canonizzazioni e culto dei santi nella christianitas (1198–1302)* (Assisi, 2006), 39–40, 72, 96–7. Cf. Starnawska, *Świętych życie po życiu*, 285–6.

a pre-existing cult with devotees and miracles was required to open an official canonisation hearing. In fact, episcopal recognition of the cult did not preclude efforts to gain papal approval later.<sup>117</sup>

Indeed, for the papacy, the change in the order of operations from that theoretically prescribed by the canons was no obstacle to the cult being recognised by Rome. Sometimes, therefore, as in the case of Edmund of Abingdon, contemporary to the efforts to canonise Eystein and Stanislaus, the translation preceded the papal recognition, which was not overlooked by those responsible for the canonisation process but, crucially, did not prevent a successful canonisation. In Edmund's case, however, the problematic nature of such a sequence of events was recognised by Albert Suerbeer, archbishop of Armagh, the author of the saint's *Historia canonizationis et translationis*, and, perhaps importantly in this context, the head of the papal commission of inquiry. In his text, Albert, apparently aware of the norms already in place, *post factum* seeks to justify in various ways the fact that the translation took place several months before papal canonisation.<sup>118</sup> However, Roberto Paciocco, who cites this case, also mentions the process of Odo of Novara (Tagliacozzo), which was ongoing in 1239, in which the opening papal document seems to refer without any reservation to the fact that the translation of his body had already been carried out.<sup>119</sup>

The case of Saint Stanislaus is similar and gives us some additional information about the real attitude of the papacy toward *elevatio* taking place before Roman canonisation. We know that the saint's *translatio* feast was celebrated both before and after the papal canonisation, in the latter case with the pope's approval. This is demonstrated by Innocent IV's papal indulgence, which was issued on 29 September 1253, just twelve days after the canonisation letter had established that Stanislaus's *dies natalis* was on 8 May. The indulgence was for an apparently already established feast of the translation of Stanislaus, although the letter did not specify the date.<sup>120</sup> The pope had, therefore,

<sup>117</sup> Wetzstein, 'Saints and Relics', 443.

<sup>118</sup> Paciocco, *Canonizzazioni*, 96–7. Cf. Lawrence, *St. Edmund of Abington*, 14–18.

<sup>119</sup> Paciocco, *Canonizzazioni*, 74.

<sup>120</sup> *Vetera documenta Poloniae et Lithuaniae*, i, ed. by Augustin Theiner (Roma, 1860), no. 113, p. 55. Cf. Plezia, 'Święto translacji św. Stanisława Biskupa', *Sprawozdania z Czynności Wydawniczej i Posiedzeń Naukowych oraz Kronika Towarzystwa*

accepted that the anniversary of this translation, supposedly dubious from the point of view of ecclesiastical norms, had been, and was being, celebrated. Moreover, the pope further strengthened the importance of this feast by offering indulgences. We should add, moreover, that the *elevatio* by Prandota was not concealed from the pope in any sense. On the contrary, the saint's demand that the bishop perform the act as well as the act itself are mentioned in the *miracula* written, after all, precisely for the Roman canonisation.<sup>121</sup>

If, in practice, the local veneration of a saint, having received episcopal recognition, did not necessarily require papal approval, we must return to the question of why, then, the bishops of the Nidaros Church Province and the bishop of Kraków decided to employ the tool of papal canonisation to bolster their cults. It might, of course, be that they felt compelled to do so because this is what the pope had decreed and that they found those Roman expectations important. However, one can see in the decision to appeal to Rome for canonisation a deliberate choice by both local churches, in order to give the cult additional legitimacy and greater significance.<sup>122</sup> This was, in fact, in line with the thinking of the papacy, which, as Donald S. Prudlo recently put it, "set papally created saints far above those who were merely the subject of unconfirmed popular veneration".<sup>123</sup> Of course, papal canonisation would not change the status of Eystein and Stanislaus as holy, but it would imbue them with added value as the symbolic capital provided by the figure of a holy bishop now could be amplified through papal approval following the paradigm initiated by the canonisation of Thomas of Canterbury. In this view,

---

*Naukowego Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego*, 16 (1968; for period 1966–1967), 229; Kuzmová, *Preaching Saint Stanislaus*, 92–4; Krafft, *Papsturkunde und Heiligsprechung*, 515, n. 496.

<sup>121</sup> *Miracula sancti Stanislai*, ed. by Wojciech Kętrzyński, *Monumenta Poloniae Historica*, 4 (Lwów, 1884), nos. 8, 27, 35, pp. 293, 305–6, 311. The saint's demands, stressed both in *miracula* and *vita maior*, may possibly be seen as justification of the *elevatio* performed by Prandota.

<sup>122</sup> The authority of papal canonization, especially on the periphery, was indicated by false claims that it had taken place in the case of cults that, if only because of the time of recognition of sanctity, were not subject to this procedure, see Haki Antonsson, 'False claims to papal canonizations of saints: Scandinavia and elsewhere', *Mediaeval Scandinavia*, 19 (2009), 171–203.

<sup>123</sup> Prudlo, *Certain Sainthood*, 35.

we see the agency of actors believed to be peripheral, who are able to increase the symbolic capital through tools – e.g., papal approval – offered to them by the centre. At the same time, the centre, in this case, the papal curia, was also among the intended audiences of these legitimisation processes carried out on the peripheries.

Although this kind of view problematises a somewhat simplistic vision of the centre-peripheries relationship, in which the former diffuses legitimising tools to passive peripheries, the division between centre and periphery remains valid. This division is illustrated by the thinking of the Roman curia itself, which seems to treat certain remote areas in a specific, one might say more suspicious way. Vauchez, who first juxtaposed Eystein and Stanislaus in his seminal book *La sainteté en Occident aux derniers siècles du Moyen Âge* used them as examples of cults from the periphery, and how the peripheral status of these saints supposedly shaped the attitude of the papal curia when reviewing the applications for canonisation. Vauchez writes: “In Roman eyes, it was *a priori* doubtful whether the servants of God venerated in these distant regions deserve to accede to the honour of canonization”.<sup>124</sup> Indeed, this attitude is suggested by the fact that the applications of both Eystein and Stanislaus had to be checked by more than one papal commission. It was certainly not at all the norm during this period, and when one looks at Vauchez’s compilation of enquiries deemed inadequate by the pope and repeated at his request in the period 1198–1276, one finds that cases from the peripheries make up a large proportion of them. Out of 18 cases with two commissions, we have as many as six from East Central Europe and Scandinavia (in addition to our two protagonists, Margaret of Hungary and Luke Banffy from Hungary, Hedwig of Silesia and Nicholas of Aarhus). The only candidate for papal canonisation from these areas who was not subjected to a double verification procedure was William of Æbelholt. Meanwhile, the total number of canonisation enquiries for this period is 48, so an additional commission was only appointed in fewer than four out of ten cases, while for the peripheral areas, this ratio was six out of seven. We should add that we lack confirmation of canonisation for 25 candidates from the period up to 1276, so slightly over half of those for whom the procedure was initiated, while of the candidates from East Central Europe and Scandinavia,

---

<sup>124</sup> Vauchez, *Sainthood*, 69–70 with n. 29.

four were rejected and three were canonised by the pope.<sup>125</sup> One can, therefore, conclude that it was more difficult for candidates from peripheral areas to be canonised, and this, at least in part, may explain why the case of Eystein failed.

The low success rate of peripheral applicants, however, does not answer the question of why one application was successful while the other was not, at least not to its intended extent. The answer lies in the circumstances of each particular case. Stanislaus's application was supported by a *vita* and an efficient cult centre that produced the necessary hagiographical material and provided sufficient evidence for the bishop's sanctity. Eystein's application seems to have been hampered by logistical problems, as the various commissions failed to execute their assignment, and the collected material did not fulfil the formal requirements of a saintly dossier, as noted by Pope Innocent IV in 1251.<sup>126</sup> Stéphane Coviaux suggests that the ultimate lack of success can be explained by a combination of several factors. For instance, the deaths of the Abbots of Nidaroholm and Tautra, two of the key investigators of the matter, must have protracted the matter. Furthermore, that the reports from the investigations were not in accordance with the formal demands which by then were in place for such dossiers must likewise have caused delays. And lastly, after several decades, it is possible that the effort lost much of its momentum and simply petered out.<sup>127</sup> This failure leads to further questions: does the failure hint at a lack of material to prove Eystein's sanctity in accordance with the rules of papal canonisation proceedings? Or should we understand the failure as indicative of the limitations of the Norwegian ecclesiastical infrastructure, limitations which might have made the commissions unable to collect and collate the required evidence? Another possibility is a lack of devotees and, as a consequence, an inadequate number of miracles.<sup>128</sup>

However, there are other possible factors for this difference in outcome. One is the presence of a second, older cult in the same

---

<sup>125</sup> *Ibid.*, 51–3.

<sup>126</sup> *Diplomatarium Norvegicum*, VI, no. 23, p. 23.

<sup>127</sup> Coviaux, 'Les saints évêques', 64–6.

<sup>128</sup> Vauchez, *Sainthood*, 37. Ludvig Daae (*Norges helgener*, 175) remarked that Eystein was "Prælaternes, ikke Folkets Helgen" ("the saint of the prelates, not the people").

centre. While Trondheim was an established centre of pilgrimage to the tomb of Saint Olaf, which could easily overshadow the tomb of Eystein, Kraków Cathedral had not become a centre of veneration for the new saint, Florian, until shortly before the cult of Saint Stanislaus began. Thus, while it may have been easier for the Kraków clergy to redirect the cult to Stanislaus (and indeed, we can point to instances, such as those recorded in the *miracula* and *vita maior*, when pilgrims to Florian ultimately obtain healings from the martyr bishop),<sup>129</sup> the metropolitan clergy may have had difficulty in making space for the new cult in the cult centre of the Norwegian patron saint and in directing some of the faithful's attention to it.

This, moreover, raises the question of the determination of these church circles. The Norwegian archbishops already had the cult of Saint Olaf under their control, which was crucial for building their position both in their relations with the secular authorities and within the church province. On the other hand, before the cult of Saint Stanislaus became widespread, the Bishops of Kraków did not have such a source of prestige. Saint Florian was still a new saint in Kraków, and his fame does not seem to have extended beyond Lesser Poland in the thirteenth century.<sup>130</sup> On the other hand, already in the pre-canonisation miracles of Saint Stanislaus, we read about pilgrims reaching his tomb from Mazovia, Gdańsk or even Bohemia and Lusatia.<sup>131</sup> Thus, for the purposes set by the Bishops of Kraków, above all those related to their position in the Gniezno Church Province, the cult of Saint Stanislaus proved to be a much more useful provider of symbolic capital.

## CONCLUSION

However we interpret the differences between the two cases, we should keep in mind that differences are only to be expected when dealing with cases from two polities with very distinct social and political contexts. Consequently, neither differences nor similarities can definitely answer the question of why one case was successful and

---

<sup>129</sup> *Miracula sancti Stanislai*, no. 26, 305; *Vita maior*, book III, chap. 8, 23, pp. 400–1, 409.

<sup>130</sup> Dobrowolski, *Dzieje kultu*, 45–51.

<sup>131</sup> *Miracula sancti Stanislai*, no. 44, pp. 317–18; *Vita maior*, book III, chap. 22, 48, 50–1, pp. 408–9, 425–30.

the other was not. Ultimately, however, the difference in outcome is not that important and may overshadow the far more interesting issue, namely that these two very distinct political entities share so many significant similarities: that bishops from both entities engaged in the same language of legitimisation – the type of the holy predecessor according to the new paradigm of the champion bishop – and that both sought to employ the same tool for using that language, i.e., papal canonisation. In both cases we see that this was done in order to communicate the legitimacy of their position, but also to acquire a saintly helper against possible encroachments from secular or other ecclesiastical powers.

It should be noted, however, that the use of these cults as symbolic capital for strengthening a bishopric's position vis-à-vis secular rulers and other ecclesiastical centres was employed differently in the two polities. In Norway, the issue of the relationship of the archbishop of Trondheim, and indeed all Norwegian bishops, with the king played a key role and was perhaps the most important reason for seeking promotion and papal recognition for the cult of the reformist champion. In Poland, however, we can only guess to what extent the strengthening of the duke of Kraków's power was important for the renewal of the cult and for the cult's formal recognition, which ultimately led to papal canonisation. On the other hand, we clearly see that one motivating factor in Poland was the relationship between different ecclesiastic centres. This is exemplified by the bishop of Kraków's effort to be ranked as the most important bishop, second only to the metropolitan in the Gniezno Church Province. In this struggle for prestige, the authority of the former bishop of Kraków, a great martyr recognised by the pope, was definitely of great importance. In Norway, we can only surmise that the cult of the former archbishop may have had a similar significance for the relations of contemporary metropolitans with the bishops of Iceland, as well as with the secular elites there.

The employment of a holy predecessor must be understood as using a typological language, and this language was communicated or authorised by the relatively new tool of papal canonisations. If we imagine a typology as a language of legitimisation, then, in other words, papal canonisation was the stylus that gave the language its form and authority. It seems that both the Norwegian bishops and the bishop of Kraków used this tool deliberately to strengthen the cults' status, which, after all, they had previously recognised. Papal canonisation,



involving, on the one hand, the local churches and, on the other, the very centre of Latin Christendom that was the papal curia, leads us to the question of the relationship between centre and periphery.

The medieval polities on the so-called peripheries have typically been seen as passive recipients of impulses diffused and disseminated from the centre. This assumption should continue to be challenged. We contend that our two cases, Eystein and Stanislaus, show that peripheral actors actively extracted trends from the centre, such as Gregorianism, the paradigm of Thomas of Canterbury, or the tool of papal canonisation. These two cases show that trends which circulated in the centre could also appear in the peripheries. Moreover, the cases of Eystein and Stanislaus also show that different peripheries adopted the central trends in the same way, which in turn demonstrates significant knowledge and understanding of these central trends. While the value of the holy bishop as symbolic capital was altered in the centre and took on the form of the champion of the Church, knowledge of that altered value encouraged clerics in Norway and Poland to turn to the centre and employ those impulses to their own ends. The same can be said of an increasingly popular form of approving the veneration of new saints, that is, papal canonisation, which, as we have seen, was used effectively by churches on the periphery. While the responses from the centre might reveal a certain prejudice against the peripheries, the peripheral elites were familiar with the central trends and employed them for their own gain, which in turn suggests that both Norway and Poland were active participants in the circulation of cultural impulses in thirteenth-century Latin Christendom.

*Proofreading Sarah Thomas*

#### SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alt Daniel, *Sanctus Episcopus. Das Bischofsideal von früh- und hochmittelalterlichen Bischofsviten im Spannungsfeld von Anspruch und Wirklichkeit* (Herne, 2012).
- Bjørlykke Kristin, Øystein Ekroll, Birgitta Syrstad Gran, and Marianne Herman (eds), *Eystein Erlendsson – Erkebiskop, politiker og kirkebygger* (Trondheim, 2012).
- Coviaux Stéphane, 'Les saints évêques de Scandinavie du X<sup>e</sup> au XII<sup>e</sup> siècle', in Corinne Péneau (ed.), *Itinéraires du savoir de l'Italie à la Scandinavie (X<sup>e</sup>–XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle) – Études offertes à Élisabeth Mornet* (Paris, 2009), 51–69.
- Fryde Natalie and Dirk Reitz (eds), *Bischofsmord im Mittelalter – Murder of Bishops* (Göttingen, 2003).

- Haarländer Stephanie, *Vitae episcoporum. Eine Quellengattung zwischen Hagiographie und Historiographie, untersucht an Lebensbeschreibungen von Bischöfen des Regnum Teutonicum im Zeitalter der Ottonen und Salier* (Stuttgart, 2000).
- Krafft Otfried, *Papsturkunde und Heiligssprechung. Die päpstlichen Kanonisationen vom Mittelalter bis zur Reformation. Ein Handbuch* (Köln–Weimar–Wien, 2005).
- Kuzmová Stanislava, *Preaching Saint Stanislaus. Medieval Sermons on Saint Stanislaus of Cracow, His Image and Cult* (Warsaw, 2013).
- Maciejewski Jacek, *Episkopat Polski doby dzielnicowej, 1180–1320* (Kraków–Bydgoszcz, 2003).
- Øvergård Beistad Heidi Anett, 'Pope, Province, and Power', *Scandinavian Journal of History*, xlii, 3 (2017), 299–328.
- Prudlo Donald, *Certain Sainthood. Canonization and the Origins of Papal Infallibility in the Medieval Church* (Ithaca, NY, 2016).
- Skwirczyński Krzysztof, *Recepcja idei gregoriańskich w Polsce do początku XIII wieku* (Toruń, 2016).
- Slocum Kay Brainerd, *The Cult of Thomas Becket. History and Historiography through Eight Centuries* (London–New York, 2019).
- Starnawska Maria, *Świętych życie po życiu. Relikwie w kulturze religijnej na ziemiach polskich w średniowieczu* (Warszawa–Siedlce, 2008).
- Vauchez André, *Sainthood in the Later Middle Ages* (Cambridge, 1997).
- Weinstein Donald and Rudolph M. Bell, *Saints & Society. Christendom, 1000–1700* (Chicago–London, 1982).

**Steffen Hope** – the cult of saints, the construction of identity, the writing of history, and how these three phenomena intersect; he also works on fragments of medieval manuscripts, and Utopian thinking in the Middle Ages; postdoctoral researcher at the Department of Archaeology, Conservation and History, University of Oslo; e-mail: s.a.b.hope@iakh.uio.no

**Grzegorz Pac** – the cult of saints, papal canonisation, queenship, and the role of women in the Early and High Middle Ages; associated professor at the Faculty of History, University of Warsaw. Recently he published *Women in the Piast Dynasty. A Comparative Study of Piast Wives and Daughters (c. 965 – c. 1144)* (Leiden–Boston, 2022); e-mail: gl.pac@uw.edu.pl