УДК 94(438).02

Ryszard Knapiński

The Romanesque Door of Płock. State of research[1]

The Romanesque Door cast in bronze in the years 1152–1154 in Magdeburg and intended for the Płock Cathedral[2] that are presently on the western façade of the Orthodox Church of The Wisdom of God in Velikij Novgorod (USSR) were the first monument of art of this type in Poland. Together with the Door of Gniezno they belong to the best works of the European bellfounders of the 12th century.

No historical evidence has been retained that could reveal the circumstances of ordering the door by bishop Alexander of Malonne (1129–1156) and the fulfillment of the order by Riquin and his assistants. Neither was the history of the monument of art recorded in any documents. In Polish literature the first mention of the Door of Płock appeared in Franciszek Maksymilian Sobieszczański's book — *Wiadomości historyczne o sztukach pięknych w dawnej Polsce*[3]. However, we only learn that there is the door of western origin in Novgorod with a portrait of a bishop of Magdeburg. The author owed the information to Friedrich Adelung who wrote an extensive monograph about the Door from Płock, which he called the Door of Cherson.

[1] Translated from Polish by Eva Pychek.

[2] The present work is the first chapter of a comprehensive doctor's thesis entitled Credo Apostolorum w romańskich drzwiach płockich [Credo Apostolorum in the Romanesque Door of Płock]. Lublin, 1988 (Catholic University of Lublin).

[3] *Sobieszczański F.M.* Wiadomości historyczne o sztukach pięknych w dawnej Polsce [Historical news about the fine arts in ancient Poland]. Warszawa, 1847. S. 166–169; T. Dobrzeniecki (in his footnote to the article: Joachim Lelewel jako historyk sztuki w świetle badań Drzwi Płockich i Gnieźnieńskich [Joachim Lelewel as a historian of art in the light of the investigations concerning the Door of Płock and the Door of Gniezno]: BHS, R. 14: 1952 nr 1. S. 10–38) states that it is one of the first mentions in Polish literature about the monument of art that Lelewel calls the Door of Płock in Novgorod.

F. Adelung's work — *Die Korsunischen Thüren in Kathedralkirche zur Hl. Sophien in Novgorod beschrieben und erleutert*[4] was a pioneer description, frequently referred to by numerous later researchers of the subject. Up to now, F. Adelung's monography remains the most penetrating description of the Door of Płock, which is why we will dedicate quite a lot space of our paper to the discussion of that work. It is really a pity that the work has not been translated into Polish; however, it has been translated into and published in Russian[5].

In his introduction, F. Adelung expresses his regret that such an important monument of art has not been described anywhere and even its pictures have not been reproduced[6]. The man who rendered his services to the cause of publishing the paper was count Nikolai Petrovič Romancov who performed the financial patronage and cared for making the Novgorod art monument available, at least in this way, to other sister towns of Hanza.

The work contains a meticulous description of particular panels of the Door, explanations of iconographic and palaeographic character, history of the object, its name and artistic value. Part V is especially important for the history of investigations, something like the state of research where Adelung enumerates Russian and foreign authors who mentioned the monument of art in the descriptions of their journeys to Novgorod or visited Novgorod and described the city, but did not even mention the door of St Sophia's Cathedral Church.

The book also contains two supplements. The first one is a description of different door of the same Church, which was called Swedish door; the second one is a contribution to a review of mediaeval bronze doors — the author mentions about 60 of them. Many of the art monuments mentioned there have been partly or completely destroyed.

Adelung's monograph was the first one to publish an illustration of the Door — a lithographic drawing made by Schuch of Dorpat. Unfortunately, despite the assurances of the faithfulness of the image, when we compare it with photographs nowadays, we can notice a lot of simplifications and mistakes, a kind of manner, in fact, the engraver acquired making schemes of the images according to his own vision.

Inscriptions that appear side by side with images were printed on paper by F. Adelung himself, then they were transferred to the lithographic stone in their natural size. They are an exquisite help in palaeographic studies.

Apart from a folded big format sheet with a drawing of the Door, the work in question also contain six plates reproducing inscriptions; two plates with the letters of Russian and Latin alphabet and explanations of abbreviations and one plate with an illustration of the so-called Swedish Door.

[4] *Adelung F.* Die Korsunischen Thüren in Katedralkirche zur Hl. Sophien in Novgorod beschrieben und erleutert. Berlin, 1823.

[5] *Artomonov P.* Korsunskije worota nachodjascijesja u Novogorodskom Sofijskom Sobore. M., 1843.

[6] *Adelung F.* Op. cit. S. 3.

F. Adelung isolated 48 panels matching numbers to subsequent images; thus, the upper elongated panel of the left wing has 3 numbers, while it is usually treated as one composition.

The character of all the descriptions is iconographic and focused on cataloguing. Several iconographic questions were discussed in a separate chapter[7]. The author often referred to the examples of European religious art in order to emphasize the continuity of artistic tradition in which he located the Novgorod monument of art. In fact, he enumerates examples earlier than the Novgorod art monument but also he signals the occurrence of a certain specific subject in later works, e. g. Christ sitting on a rainbow in Hans Memling's picture *The Last Judgement*, 15th century from St Mary's Church in Gdańsk[8].

F. Adelung's monography is annotated. The names that we find in them show us the spectre of works that served him as a source of information. Most often, we can see: Ciampini — *Vetera monumenta*, A. L. Milin — *Dictionaire des Beaux-Arts*, J. C. W. Augusti — *Denkwurdigkeiten aus christlichen Archaologie*, Cicognara — *Storia della scoltura*, Herrard of Landsberg — *Hortus deliciarum* et al.

F. Adelung's scholarly material was much broader as he referred to many other authors. However, the thing that demands special attention is bibliography, colletted in a separate chapter entitled: «Erwahnung der Korsunchen Thuren bey in und ausländischen Schriftstellern»[9].

It is in fact the state of research of Cherson Door until the time when F. Adelung's monograph was published. As access to the works mentioned by F. Adelung is difficult or even impossible because many of them have disappeared, we are presenting here, after F. Adelung, the whole list of works gathered by him to show you the whole state of research. Thus, we would like to express our respect for his pioneer effort and his output. It will also be rendering justice to him, as several later researchers writing about the subject quoted the names of authors of elaborations earlier than Adelung,

[7] Ibid. S. 59–84. The chapter was entitled: Commentaries for explanations of some symbols and images in mediaeval art (Erläuterungen zur Erklärung einiger Symbole und Darstellungen der Kunst des Mittelalters) and it contains the following subjects: beginning and form of a nimbus — appearance, clothes and attributes of angels — Annunciation — Christ's manger — the native land, manes and regalia of the Magi — Elijah's assumption — a hand appearing among clouds as a sign of God's presence — Eve's creation — rainbow as Christ's throne — the Savior with the Sun and the Moon — animals as symbols of Evangelists — the motif of lilies in the works of art — the palm tree as a symbol of victory and peace — the painted caps of the warriors — crucifixion with four nails — the form of the Holy Cross — centaurs in the works of Christian art. The need for such commentaries was justified by Adelung in the following sentence on S. 72: «Um die eigenthümliche Poesie zu würdigen mit welcher der Künstler der Korssunschen Thuren diesen Gegenstand behandelt hat, und zugleich um einen kleinen Beitrag zu einer Kunstgeschichte biblischer Darstellungen zu liefern, stellen wir hier einige ältere und neure Bearbeitungen des Nehmlichen reitzenden Stoffes zusammen, i. e. "In order to estimate the quality of poetry, that was put in the Cherson Door by its creator and at the same time to gain even a really small input into the history of biblical images in art. We have presented here older and more recent papers concerning the above mentioned subject"».

[8] Ibid. S. 74.

[9] Ibid. S. 115 and the following.

and did not refer to his list of authors[10]. There are also works, which compiled the state of research concerning the Door of Płock without mentioning his monograph[11].

F. Adelung divided the authors into two groups:

I Reports of those who travelled to Russia and wrote about Novgorod[12].

II Casual references to the door made by native or foreign authors[13].

In both groups, the works were mentioned in chronological order and although the author pointed out that he would mention their full titles, he often used only abbreviations. In addition, here is the review of authors quoted by him:

J. Georg Gmelin made such a note in his description of the journey to Siberia in the years 1733–1743: «On the 17th we went to the main church. We saw a lot of artifacts there and the one that deserved utmost attention was the church door made of unusually yellow metal, it had two wings and it had been brought here from Korsun many years ago»[14].

Gerhard Friedrich Müller travelled to Alexandrova Sloboda in Vladimirskaya Guberniya in 1778. Watching the brass door in the chapel of St Trinity monastery he compared them with the Novgorod Door and he made a following note: «In the exquisite church of St Trinity... in a certain chapel, on the right side of the entrance, there is the two-winged brass door of the kind they have in Novgorod and it is called Korsunske Dvery (the Cherson Door) there. However, we do not often hear the name here. However, to my knowledge even in Novgorod it is an abuse when they call the door the Cherson Door. After all it has Latin inscriptions and bears the name of a bishop of Magdeburg so in spite of the fact that there was an important trade exchange between the hanzeatic cities across the Baltic Sea, it is rather hard to accept that it could have been brought from Korsun or Cherson to Novgorod»[15].

Heinrich von Reimers took part in a special emperor's mission to Otoman Porta in 1793 and described the course of the journey in three volumes. He wrote about the

[10] E.g. *Askanas K.* Brązowe Drzwi Płockie w Nowogrodzie Wielkim [The Bronze Door of Płock in Novgorod Velikij]. Płock, 1971.

[11] *Pietrusińska M.* Drzwi Płockie. Stan badań [The Door of Płock. State of research]. SPPR. T. II. P. 744.

[12] *Adelung F.* Op. cit. S. 117–120 with exceptions.

[13] Ibid. S. 123–126.

[14] *Gmelins D. Johann Georg.* Reise durch Sibirien von dem Jahr 1733 bis 1743. Göttingen, 1751. 4 B. 8-vo. Bd. I. S. 12: «Den 17-ten verfügten wir uns in die Hauptkirche. Daselbst sahen wir viele artige Sachen, worunter eine der merk würdigsten, eine aus einem besondern gelben Metalle bestehende Kirchenthüre war, die zween Flügel hatte, und vor alten Zeiten aus Corsun dahin gebracht worden». Gibbon mentions the fact of giving the Door from Korsuń (Cherson) as a gift by Vladimir Velikij in: Über den Verfall des Römischen Reichs. Bd. XV. S. 130 (no data about the place and year of the publication).

[15] G. F. Müllers notes were printed without the author's name with the title Beschrreibung einer Reise von Moscau nach dem Kloster der Heiligen Dreyeinigkeit u. s.w. im Jahre 1778, in a paper *Neues St. Petersburgischer Journal.* 1782. R. III. T. V. S. 28.

Novgorod Cathedral that it belonged to the oldest churches in Russia (built in 1044–1051) and that it had bronze door richly ornamented with gold in its interior[16].

The oldest mention about the Door of Plock dates from 1517 and comes from baron Siegmund von Herberstein. It can be found in his notes *Rerum Moscovitarum Commentarii*, which were published several times[17]. The Baron notes that he was allowed to watch the ancient door, brought from Greece, from the town of Corsun (Cherson).

The travelers to Greece are obviously interested in the Door. They note down its location in the Novgorod Church and give various kinds of information concerning its origin. Z. Hossmann mentions the Door indeed in his description *Regentensaal* in 1702, but he complains that he could not find it[18].

An Englishman William Cox in his reports from travels to Poland, Russia, Sweden and Denmark in 1784 expresses his admiration for the relief presenting biblical scenes and Passion of our Saviour, and he refers to the Novgorod tradition concerning the origin of the Cherson Door and expresses his reservation as to the theory. He begins his argument quoting the Latin inscriptions with the names of bishop Wichman and Alexander and expresses the supposition it should be accepted that the Door was probably made in Magdeburg. Finally he rejects the view and accepts another one, according to which the origin of the Door should be sought in Greece, because the inhabitants of Novgorod had frequent trade contacts with Germans but not as frequent as those with Greeks[19].

---

[16] *Reimers H. v.* Reise der Russ. Kaiserl. ausserordentlichen Gesandschaft an die Otomanische Pforte im Jahre 1793. St Petersburg, 1803. Bd. 3. S. 164.

[17] Baron Siegmund von Herberstein (1486–1566) travelled twice as a deputy of emperor Maximilian I and Charles I in 1517 and in 1526. In 1549 his work *Rerum Moscovitarum Commentarii* was published in Latin in Vienna. German translation in 1557. Compare *Bazylov L.* Historia Rosji [History of Russia]. Warszawa, 1983. T. I. P. 14; F. Adelung on S. 119 quotes after the edition of 1805: Mein Siegm. Freih. zu Herberstain Raittung und Antzaigen meines Lebens, in Kovachich's Samml. kl. noch ungedr. Stücke. Ofen, 1805. 8-vo, I. S. 147: «Da liess man mich sehen ain kupferne Kirchthür, die aus derselben gegent gezogen, und ain Statt die Sy Corsun nennen, belegert» and refers the reader for a comparison to an edition of *Rerum Moscovitarum Commentarii*. Basil [ea], 1556. P. 75; K. Askanas (*Brązowe Drzwi Płockie*. P. 28) refers to a 1549 edition and in a footnote 42 on P. 48 he quotes different editions of these notes — Fontes rerum austriacarum. T. I, 1. Wien, 1855 (Rerum moscovitarum commentarii); *Gerbersztejn S.* Zapiski o moskovitskich dielach. SPb., 1908; (The latest German edition Rerum: Mosc., 1926); Compare idem, Sztuka płocka [Art of Płock]. Płock, 1974. P. 35, 106.

[18] *Hossmann Z.* Regentensaal, 1702. S. 173 and next.

[19] *Cox W.* Travels into Poland, Russia, Sweden and Danemark etc. London, 1784. T. I. P. 452: «We entered this venerable pile through a pair of brazen gates, ornamented with various figures in alto relievo, representing the Passion of our Saviour, and other scriptural histories. The priest informed me, that, according to tradition there gates of brass were brought from the ancient town of Cherson, were Vladimir the Great was baptized, and are supposed to be of Grecian workmanship: they are in consequence of this persuasion called Korsunskie Dveri, the doors of Cherson. However, if we admit the truth of this tradition, how shall we account for the following Latin characters, which observed upon them?
P. e. Wicmannus Magideburgensis.
Alexander eps De Blucich.

In 1793, a French traveler Chantreau reports that he saw metal gates ornamented with various figures of exquisite make presenting Christ's Passion and other events of His life[20].

Some authors writing about the Door present different kind of information concerning its. One of such versions is presented by Raupach[21], who states that the Door was made in Constantinople in 11th century and was presented to Novgorod by a Greek emperor. «The door which is worth utmost attention of all the researchers of antiquities contains the figures of Greek hierarchy cast in bronze from a sacristan to a patriarch, dressed in clothes typical for a Greek court and provided with inscriptions» — Raupach. He took lectors and deacons appearing in the figurative relief ornament as representatives of the imperial court. It is an isolated kind of explanation of those figures but not devoid of justification.

An unknown traveler described his impressions in *Spazierfahrt nach Moscau* and he wrote about the double door the church in Novgorod was equipped with. As to its origin he refers to a saga that states the door was brought from Cherson. Moreover as an attentive observer he relates that according to an inscription it had probably been made by an artisan from Magdeburg[22]. Let's pay attention to the fact that the unknown author uses the term: «double door». Did he understand it as two wings, or a second pair of doors? Moreover F. Adelung in his Ist chapter entitled *An exact description of the Cherson Door* gave a piece of information: «The so-called Cherson Door is located in the west facade of the cathedral church of Holy Wisdom in the entrance, opposite the main altar. It is rather doubtful whether it really serves as an entrance, I suppose it might only be possible. Presently and also for a quite a long time it has not been used to close the main entrance, but it is open inwards and it is fastened to the wall by means of special hinges. However, the entrance is closed by the ordinary wooden door that is a protection against the influence of the weather, but not to such an extent as to keep out dust, rain and snow. The access to our monu-

Ave Maria Gracia PleHs DHS FECVGI.
Faulty reading.
The first part of this inscription seems to prove rather, that they came from Magdeburg in Germany; and it is a circumstance by no means improbable, as the inhabitants of Novgorod, through their commercial connections, maintained, even in those early times, a no less frequent intercourse with Germany than with Greece.
The text translated into German is quoted also by W. Sauerländer at the beginning of his description of the Novgorod Door» (Die Bronzetür von Novgorod. München, 1963. S. 49).

[20] *Chantreau*. Voyage philosophique, politique et litteraire fait en Russie. Paris, 1793. T. II. P. 196.

[21] *Raupach*. Reise von St. Petersburg nach dem Gesundbrunnen zu Lipezk am Don. Nebst einem Beytrage zur Charakteristik des Russen / Von D. R. Brealau, 1809. 8-vo. S. 33: «Die Hauptthüre der Kirche ist im elften Jahrhunderte zu Konstantinopel verfertigt und vom griechischen Kaiser hieher geschenkt worden. Den Alterthumsforschern ist sie in vieler Hinsicht merkwürdig. Die beyden Flügel sind aus Erz gegossen, und tragen die ganze griechische Hierarchie von Sakristan bis zum Patriarchen mit dem damaligen Kostüme und den griechischen Hof in Relieffiguren mit Üeberschriften. Materie und Arbeti sind gleich schön».

[22] Spazierfahrt nach Moscau. Leipzig, 1810. S. 41.

ment of art from the inside is only possible through the double iron door. However, it can be watched through iron bars and it is always willingly presented to the art lovers»[23]. The conclusion form the description is that at the time when F. Adelung visited Novgorod, the Door did not have any utility function, but it was hanging there as antique and honorable gate of a legendary past.

The above references concerning the Door come from travelers who wrote about the monument of art as a certain curiosity. However, there are descriptions made by travelers to Moscow through Novgorod, who do not mention the Door even though some of them stayed in the city for quite a few days[24].

Later historical elaborations did not develop the investigations of the object. Siergiej Spirydonovič Tatiščev in his *Istorija Rossijskaja* in 1784 observed that Archbishop Vasil bought the copper and gold-plated door for the Holy Wisdom Church and it was brought from Germany for a really high price[25]. A. Truhart in 1806 mentioned Wichman as a maker of the Door. He mistook the inscriptions or ignored the remaining figures favoring only the bishop of Magdeburg whom he ascribed excessive merits[26].

Nikolai Karamsin described the history of the Russian Empire in 1816–1829[27] and he mentioned the Door several times. He expressed his surprise that although it was made in Germany, it was called the Cherson Door in Novgorod[28]. He wondered at the makers of the Door wearing old Russian clothes. Enumerating their names he made a mistake reading the inscriptions as, according to him, they were made by master Abraham Wansmuth and master Nikon Messegi. The Latin inscription *Riquin me fec*[*it*] was changed into Nikon Messegi in its Russian translation while Abraham and Waismuth were taken for one person. However, N. Karamsin must be credited for posing the question of Bishop Alexander's image. When he quoted the inscription from the panel with his image: Alexander Epe oc [instead of «c» and omitting «de»] Blucich — he wondered what city it can be — Blucich? He could not solve the problem.

Paweł Swinin in his *Homeland notes* in 1821[29] regarded the door cast in copper as an object worth interest. However, the inscriptions appearing on panels, both Slavic and Latin, can mislead even distinguished experts of antiquities as to the make. Then he listed the familiar opinions. According to some of them the Door was sent by

[23] *Adelung F.* Op. cit. S. 5.

[24] F. Adelung mentions as many as 27 authors since 1534 until 1817 who made descriptions of their journey to or through Novgorod, but they did not mention the Door. *Adelung F.* Op. cit. S. 120–122.

[25] *Tatiščev S.* Istorija Rossiiskaja. SPb., 1784. T. IV. S. 134.

[26] *Truhart A.* Fama für Deutsch — Russland. Riga, 1806. Bd. II. S. 92 (Geschichte der Zeichnenden Künste in Deutschland und der vereinigten Niederlanden. Hannover, 1817. Bd. II. S. 166).

[27] *Karamsin N. V.* Istoria russkovo gosudarstva. St. Petersburg, 1816–1829. S. 363 and footnotes; Historia Państwa Rossyiskiego M. Karamzina przełożona na język polski przez Grzegorza Buczyńskiego. Warszawa, 1824–1830. T. I. S. 431; T. II. S. 76, 85; T. IV. S. 328.

[28] Ibid. T. I. S. 363.

[29] *Swinin P.* Otecestvennija zapiski. 1821. Juli; N 15. S. 9.

Vladimir of Cherson, others stated that it had come from a city belonging to Hanza. P. Swinin voted for the latest theory, justifying his view with the fact that the level of accomplishment of the Door is much lower than that of similar Grecian, i. e. Byzantine products. As far as drawing and composition were concerned, he counted it among the best examples of art being revived in Germany during the reigns of the Ottons and Hohenstaufs. The technical level of the cast in metal was very clear according to him. Moreover, he noticed that the Door was altered, i. e. it had been bigger originally and it was diminished — which can easily be noticed in those places where inscriptions were covered with the perpendicular battens of the border. Moreover, one more piece of information by P. Swinin concerning the history of the copy of the Door of Novgorod. He was told that in 1817 count M. P. Romancof had sent a clever artist in order to prepare a plastic model of the Door — i. e. a copy. The enterprise would facilitate precise studies of the distant but extraordinary and interesting monument of the past[30].

The Door was also interesting for Swedish researchers, as there was a legend according to which Ruthenians had plundered Sigtuna, the former capital of Sweden in 1187 and taken away the metal door among other booties. Georg Wallin refers to the legend in his treatise *Sigtuna stans et cadens* written in 1729[31] and claims that the keys to the Door were thrown into the lake Skarwen. As to the material there was certainly no unanimity whether it was iron or bronze. At George Wallin's time, the door was probably kept in Moscow. This very author gathering material for *Sigtuna stans et cadens* wrote a letter asking about the Door to Heinrich Brenner, a former officer of Charles XII, who had been taken prisoner by the Russians after the defeat of Połtawa. H. Brenner stayed in Novgorod in 1722 and he watched the Door in a hurry and fearing not to be punished for it. Only seven years later i. e. about 1729, he described his memories in response to G. Wallin's letter[32]. He made

[30] *Adelung F.* Op. cit., footnote 2. S. 124 explains, that it was when all the inscriptions from the Doors were printed on paper and a drawing of the whole was made. This was the illustrative material that found its way to F. Adelung's work. However, up to the time when his work was published there had not been any plaster copy.

[31] *Wallin G.* Sigtuna stans et cadens. (Place of publication not given), 1729. P. II. S. 238, XVII: «Vetus est traditio, Ruthenos hoc tempore (i. e. at the time of taking plunders from Sigtuna in 1187) inter cetera spolia, veluti opima secum abstulisse Portas urbis Sigtunensis, in lacum vero Skarwen demersisse earundem claves. Sed utrumque fabulosum est, ut patebit ex sequentibus. Primum quod ad Portas attinet, ferreas fuisse credunt, alii ex aere conflatas, easque adhunc Moscoviae adservari etc».

[32] H. Brenner was an assessor of the Royal Library in Stockholm in 1732. The letter he wrote to G. Wallin in 1729 was placed in its Latin version in Sigtuna stans et cadens, in part II on P. 238. I'm quoting after *Adelung F.* Op. cit. S. 125: «Fateor me anno MDCCXXII, cum soluta captivitate Novogrodiam Moscovia pervenissem, die inquirendis Portis Sigtunensibus anxie laborasse. Innotuit tandem, in ejusdem urbis (Novogrod) templo majori inveniri coram altari Portas argenteas, vocesque illis inscriptas a nemine Moscovitarum legi posse. Pergens igitur eo conspexi illas esse Valvas eximie magnitudinis, argenteasque, quae Choro claudendo deservirent, latinas vero inscriptiones literis monachorum aevo usitatis constare. Inter alia, si probe minimi, historiam B. Virginis Mariae cum Christo puero fugientis Aegiptum, opere

a lot of mistakes and fabrications. First of all, he was looking for the city gate from Sigtuna, but he was shown the Cherson Door — Sartunskije vorota. He supposed that Russians called Sigtuna — Sartuna, and hence the name. He stated that he had not found any gate, but he had been shown the door closing the entrance to a presbytery of a catholic church in Sigtuna. Supposedly he had seen such choir door made of silver with Latin inscriptions only and reliefs, illustrating the history of the Blessed Virgin Mary fleeing to Egypt with Baby Jesus — at the entrance to the choir of the church in Novgorod. The items of news are erroneous and fictitious, and yet they found their way to another author's work — Olaf Dalin's *Suea Rikes Historia*[33].

In 1818, 5 years before F. Adelung's work was published, a historian and connoiseur of German art Johann Gustav Büsching expressed his view upon the origin and history of the Novgorod monument of art. According to him, as well as Johannes Dominic Fiorillo, the Door was made by bishop Peter Wickmann in 11th century i. e. 100 years earlier than it is maintained nowadays. We cannot take for granted an early date of the appearance of the Door in Novgorod, e. g. after the fall of Sigtuna in 1187 as it is said. It seems impossible that it should have been taken to Novgorod during Christian battles against the pagan Slavonic tribes. J. G. Busching excluded the theory that it could have been brought as a war plunder. It may have been brought to Novgorod only after 1272 after the city had joined Hanza[34].

The above review allows us to formulate several conclusions. There was a widespread belief that the Door of St Sophia church in Novgorod had been brought there as a gift of Vladimir the Great from Cherson (Korsuń). According to this tradition there was a conviction that it was made in Greece precisely in Byzantium, even in Constantinople itself. The iconography of particular panels or the inscriptions on them were not analyzed in descriptions. However, some more inquisitive authors discerned images of the artisans. There was also a view according to which bishop Peter Wichman was credited with the accomplishment of the Door — probably like

elevato in argento expressam vidi. Lubenter omnia delineassem: ni ni suspiciones de me Moscovitarum augere visum fuisset periculosum. Portas illas Russi vocant Sartunski worota, hoc est, Portas urbis Sartun. Fieri facile potuit, ut antiquis temporibus Sigtunam apellaverint Sartunam, id est, Principis vel Regis sedem, haud aliter ac hodie Constantinopolis dici iisdem solet Sargorod, h. e. Vrbs Czari vel sedes Imperatoris. Et hinc evidens est, a Moscvitis ablatas non fuisse portas Sigtunae urbicas, ut vulgo hactenus creditum: sed valvas chorales alicujus templi Sigtunensis, illasque argenteas, nec contemnendae, pro more Rom. Catholicorum, molis ac ponderis etc».

[33] T. II. P. 120; I'm quoting after F. Adelung, S. 125, who does not mention the year of publication.

[34] *Büsching J. G. G.* Bez tytułu // Wiener Jahrbuch der Literatur. 1818. III. S. 116; *Fiorillo J. D.* Op. cit. S. 166: «Denkmähler der Skulptur haben sich erhalten, und dass man im eilften Jahrhundert zu Magdeburg die Kunst verstanden, grosse bronzene Thürflügel mit Reliefs zu giessen, davon haben wir noch ein wichtiges Zeugniss. Denn in der alten, einst so mächtigen und berühmten Hansestadt Nowogorod ist eine vor achthundert Jahren erbaute Kirche, die noch ein altes deutsches Kunstwerk enthält, nähmlich Thürflügel von Bronze mit erhabenen Figures, der Inschrift zufolge von einem Petrus Wickmann aus Magdeburg verfertiget».

St bishop Bernward of Hildesheim who was said to have managed a foundry at the beginning of 11th century.

The researchers who identified the Novgorod Door with the legendary gate of Sigtuna in Sweden presented an isolated and erroneous point of view. F. Adelung was the first one to begin scientific investigations of the object and was reliable enough both to present his own theories and the views of other authors studying the subject. a lot of other people referred to F. Adelung's pioneer work.

Polish literary output concerning the Door of Płock after a short reference by F. M. Sobieszczański, began with Joachim Lelewel. When he was staying in Brussels as an emigrant he wrote *Dzieje narodowe Polskie* [*Polish National history*], stressing the role of the working classes and the autonomous cultural development resulting from rich Slavonic tradition independent of the influence of the West[35]. The paper *The Church Door of Płock and Gniezno dating from 1133–1155* was finished in 1850 and published one year later in the IV vol. of the cycle *Poland of the Middle Ages*[36], and as a separate book in 1857[37].

[35] J. Lelewel included such a view in his paper about various nations of the Slavonic territories.

[36] *Lelewel J.* Drzwi Kościelne Płockie i Gnieźnieńskie z lat 1133, 1155 [The Church Door of Płock and Gniezno dating from 1133, 1155] // J. Lelewel. Polska wieków Średnich czyli w dziejach narodowych polskich postrzeżenia [Poland of the Middle Ages, or the remarks about Polish national history]. T. 1–4. Poznań, 1846–1851. T. 4. P. 261–329 and the part of the article concerning the Door of Płock is on P. 269–296, placed after the general introduction about Church doors, where the author made use of the material collected by *Adelung F.* Op. cit. in the second appendix entitled Beitrag zur Uebersicht der im Mittelalter verfertigten bronzenen Thüren, S. 143–160. Both authors write about 60 Church doors preserved in Europe; today they are less than that.

[37] *Lelewel J.* Drzwi Kościelne Płockie. 1857. Wyd. II. S. 1–32. The paper was reviewed by T. Dobrzeniecki in his article Joachim Lelewel jako historyk sztuki w świetle badań Drzwi Płockich i Gnieźnieńskich, BHS. R. 14; 1952. N 1. P. 10–38. According to T. Dobrzeniecki «Lelewel's paper takes up a thorough investigation of both artistic and historical questions — concerning those two pieces of Mediaeval art» (p. 13). «...And although [Lelewel] based his investigations on Adelung's work in numerous questions, however, he does not submit to the suggestions of the German researcher's authority. He finds a starting point for his own inquiry here» (p. 14) «...And in the polemic formulations, critically estimating Adelung's point of view, Lelewel's work presents an independent solution of the problem of the Door of Płock, using a wide range of arguments supporting his own statements» (p. 15).
T. Dobrzeniecki's article was reviewed by M. Morelowski in turn, BHS. year 15:1953. N 2. P. 95–96. M. Morelowski's review, biting in tone, points out the imperfections in T. Dobrzeniecki's article. The reviewer reproaches T. Dobrzeniecki for his underestimation of the Laodycea circle and the Moza region society as to the question of influence upon the origin of the Door of Płock. M. Morelowski is the only author to question the role of Bishop Alexander as the founder of the Door of Płock. He states on 96: «Do not several hundred of Płock illuminations testify to the connections with Moza? Where is the proof that allows regarding Alexander as the founder of the Door of Płock? Apart from him, also the Bishop of Magdeburg appears on them. T. Dobrzeniecki and others overlooked the fact, that there is no proof; that the "portrait" could rather point to the Saxon archbishop as a donor, and to Alexander as an addres see of the gift (my way of emphasizing. — *R.K.*). M. Morelowski supports his argument quoting prof. L. Kolankowski's statement during a discussion at the session of a Scientific Society of Toruń. L. Kolankowski also regarded this kind of solution as the more

Lelewel's thesis was that both monuments of art belong to the treasury of Polish culture. However, the Door of Płock in Novgorod — as he called it — was made in Germany by the Germans Riquin, Waismuth and Abraham but was assigned for the Płock cathedral. On the other hand, the Door of Gniezno was made in Poland and is distinguishable by conspicuously Polish character, especially on the panels presenting the scenes from St Adalbert's life. Each of these monuments of art is described in a separate part of the paper.

He took information about the Door of Płock, which he treated as «our magnificent national monument prepared for one of our dioceses», from F. Adelung whose work he described as «a fruit of extensive erudition, excellent work, and really accurate critical point of view»[38].

As he did not see the Novgorod Church himself, he reproduced the drawing of the Door after F. Adelung and relied on his description — «However, before I manage to see it myself, I must first make use of the mediation of F. Adelung, and learn about the Door what they look like»[39].

The iconographic description is enriched with comments. The researcher started from the portraits of historical personages who cooperated with one another to accomplish the work. He included bishop Alexander in the Dołęga family according to the Chronicles by Kadłubek and Długosz and he presented his role as a building contractor and an efficient administrator, pious and indefatigable. Archbishop Wichman was presented as striving to get authority from the Pope and caring for the emperor's favours — «magis saeculo quam sacris deditus»[40].

---

plausible one. As a support of his views, he presented the political and ecclesiastical situation of that time between Magdeburg and Poland after Poland had denounced German intrigues. It would have helped Magdeburg to win the potentate of Płock with such an exquisite gift and make him support German endeavours concerning their ecclesiastical supremacy over Poland. The further part of the review refers to the part of Dobrzeniecki's article in which he investigates the subject of the Door of Gniezno.

[38] Ibid. P. 271, footnote 6.

[39] Ibid. P. 272. As to the reproduced drawing Lelewel writes (footnote 6 on P. 271) that it was prepared by Rumiancov in 1817. It is a mistake. A diplomat and collector, count Rumiancov (1754–1826) did not draw the Door himself. He just had the drawing made with the intention to make a plaster copy of the monument of art. F. Adelung wrote about it twice: *Adelung F.* Op. cit. S. 4: «Die Korssunschen Thüren erscheinen hier zum erstenmale abgebildet. Die meinem Buche beigefügte lithographische Darstellung derselben, welche ich der Kunst des Hrn. Schuch aus Dorpat verdanke, lässt um so weniger zu wunschen übrig, da sie nach einersehr treuen, von mir noch besonders vor dem Originale verglichenen Zeichnung genau und sauber auf den Stein gebracht ist»; and on S. 124: «Man sagt, der Graff N. P. Romänzoff habe schon 1817 einen Künstler hergeschickt, um ein richtiges Modell dieses interessanten Denkmals des entferntesten Alterthums zu nehmen; man muss daher einre genaue Beschreibung desselben erwarten» and in the footnote 2 on the same page — «Ein Gypsabguss ist von diesem Kunstwerke und eine genaue Zeichnung der Thüren verfertigten noch nicht gamecht».
Lelewel copied F. Adelung's illustrations for his paper himself and signed them: The Door — J. L. Bruxell; compare: *Askanas K.* Op. cit. P. 10.

[40] Ibid. P. 270.

The makers of the Door — Riquin, Waismuth and Abraham probably started the work in Magdeburg about 1152. J. Lelewel considered it doubtful whether the Door had been finished and hinged during Alexander's lifetime. He described Abraham's role in the further part of the work calling him a framer[41].

Quite an extensive iconographic characteristic is the most thorough description of the contents of particular panels in Polish literature so far.

Lelewel noted the lack of logical and chronological order in the arrangement of the panels. He determined Western accomplishment of the Door on the basis of the way in which it is presented, the appearance of figures from the royal court of the 12th century, the fashions of their clothes and the architectural details (flanks, walls, columns, arches, pinnacles etc.). He noticed the influence of Byzantine art: «In all those cases [the artist of the Door of Płock] created clearly Byzantine features... Christ, angels, apostles, the fashions of their clothes, all that is Byzantine in character. The figures are nice, showing slow movement, well-built, peaceful, comfortably quiet, consistent, deep in thought». In the presentation of scenes which the artist associated with household manners, we can see a kind of departure from Byzantine style and certain innovations.

Lelewel estimated the accomplishment of the work and praised the artisan for a sense of measure in introducing innovations in relation to the general Byzantine character, for the correct composition and the expression of particular figures, for moderation in the presentation of movement and restraint as to introducing additional details — «the arrangement in every part of the panels is stylish and complete; the number of shortenings rather scarce. As to perspective — he disregards it...»[42]

A significant part of the paper in which the author showed a real independence as a researcher is the analysis of Latin and Russian inscriptions. He proves to be both a numismatist and a palaeographer. He was convinced that the Latin inscriptions are contemporary to the casting of the panels — «The inscriptions were cut after the cast had been finished... at once, during Alexander's life, the Latin ones as they are the only ones that can convey everything...» He criticized F. Adelung's view who had dated the Latin inscriptions back to the 14th century — «without care about the explanations who could provide the names of the craftsmen and bishops after one and a half or two centuries...». Such a method was qualified by Lelewel as «a graphic kind of evaluation detached from reality»[43]. He analyzed the style of letters taking into account the available material for comparison and established the date of their appearance as 1155, taking it as the date of finishing the panels[44]. Thus, according to Lelewel the time of the accomplishment of the door would be from 1152 to 1155. Also the inscriptions in the Cyrillic alphabet were analyzed by J. Lelewel. He stated

[41] We can see the author's lack of consistence as to this figure.

[42] Ibid. P. 286.

[43] Ibid. P. 287.

[44] Ibid. P. 289–290.

that they were made much later than the Door designed for the church in Płock, after the Door had been taken to Novgorod Velikij. The style of the letters allows to date them back to as early as 13th century, but if we take into account the complex character of various works connected with assembling the panels of the Door for St Sophia church he stated at last that it had been at the beginning of 15th or at the end of 14th century[45].

As to the question how the Door was brought to Ruthenia, the author created his own hypothesis of a gift of the Mazovian court for Novgorod. In 1385, Lingwen, a brother of Jagiełło and of Alexandra, the duchess of Płock, moved to Novgorod. «Thanks to the mediation of his sister and her husband Ziemowit (1381–1426) Lingwen managed to obtain the Door from the clergy of Płock and gave it as a gift to the inhabitants of Novgorod». Two bishops of Płock who were writing about it expressed their criticism of the hypothesis: Wincenty Chościak-Popiel and Antoni Julian Nowowiejski. W. Popiel's opinion was that the Door had never been brought to Płock but the inhabitants of Novgorod bought them directly from Magdeburg. A. J. Nowowiejski regarded J. Lelewel's hypothesis as unwarranted[46].

A bishop of Płock Wincenty Chościak-Popiel who had stayed in Novgorod since September 1868 (he came back in October 1875) went to visit the orthodox churches of Novgorod on October 22nd 1868, starting from St Sophia's sobor. He described his impressions then[47]. He made use of Lelewel's paper. But he also knew the works of F. Adelung and count Peter Alexandrovic Tolstoy[48].

Bishop W. Popiel was surprised that Tolstoy as an archaeologist accepted indiscriminately a theory of a German historian Thuan, according to which Vladimir the Great had supposedly taken from Cherson «two-winged copper door to Kiev, from where Bolesław II king of Poland, brought it to Gniezno and placed in the local cathedral church, wherefrom — as count Tolstoy concludes — how close the relationships between Poland and Novgorod must have been, that the Poles returned the church door to our People's Republic. Thanks to the endeavours of archiepiskop Vasil, as they regarded it as a valuable object that had belonged to Russia for a very long time»[49]. W. Popiel rejected the view that the Door of Gniezno had been brought from Kiev, for lack of arguments, and he supported his attitude with a different character

[45] Ibid. P. 291.

[46] Ibid. P. 293. a critical evaluation of this hypothesis in Pamiętniki Ks. Wincentego Chościak-Popiela, arcybiskupa warszawskiego, wydane przez ks. J. Urbana [Diaries of Father Wincenty Chościak-Popiel, the archbishop of the Warsaw diocese, edited by father J. Urban]. Kraków, 1915. P. 63 and *Nowowiejski A.J.* Płock. Monografia historyczna [Płock. a historical monography]. Płock, 1930. Ed. II. P. 187, footnote 1.

[47] *Knapiński R.* Romańskie Drzwi Płockie w Nowogrodzie Wielkim w opisie wygnańca — biskupa Chościak-Popiela [The Roman Door of Płock in Novgorod Velikij described by an exile-Bishop Chościak-Popiel]. Notatki Płockie. 1983. N 4/117. P. 3–7; Pamiętniki ks. Wincentego Chościak-Popiela. P. 55–65.

[48] *Tołstoj P.A.* Svjatyni i drevnosti Velikovo Novgoroda. M., 1862.

[49] Pamiętniki... Op. cit. P. 56.

of the Gniezno monument of art from the Byzantine craftsmanship. It would have been unimaginable to unhinge the ancient gate from the portal of the most estimable Polish church and give as a gift to a foreign city and country.

Having defended the Polish provenience of the Door of Gniezno W. Popiel rejected also the theory about the eastern, that is Ruthenian origin of the Door of Płock. He followed F. Adelung as he paid attention to the western, i. e. Latin attire of bishops and deacons. He also quoted the style of letters and the orthography of Latin and Slavic inscriptions after F. Adelung — dating the first ones back to the 13th and the other ones to the 14th century. Wherefrom he concluded that Vladimir the Great could not have taken the Door from Cherson to Kiyev, as they did not simply exist during his lifetime[50].

Describing particular panels W. Popiel gave them new names, or repeated them after J. Lelewel. His description is not systematic; however, a new element of this utterance is a supposition concerning later complements. Whom did the author see among those later added figures apart from a centaur? He did not mention them. Besides, he read the upper, double panel inscription mistakenly: «Traditio legis — Revelation of the Law» describing it as «The Last Judgment».

Bishop W. Popiel gave a lot of attention to the Founder of the Door, whom he did not call Alexander of Malonne, but he traced his descent from the Dołęga family of Szreńsk. He referred to the chronicles of Kadłubek and Długosz. He praised Alexander's achievements and qualities of character. He mentioned the cathedral of Płock as his burial place and also his tombstone and epitaph plate from 16th century in the parish church in Szreńsk[51]. Analogously to the presentation of Bishop Alexander with the assistance of deacons, he suggested transferring the panels with images of other deacons to the neighborhood of the figure of bishop of Magdeburg Wichman. W. Popiel was convinced about the ecclesiastical supremacy of the Magdeburg metropolis over the Polish dioceses. The opinion was later repeated by numerous researchers, and especially Adolf Goldschmidt (the subject will be continued in the further part of the chapter).

Inscriptions posed another problem for W. Popiel: «On the left side of bishop Alexander's head there is a Latin inscription in beautiful half-Lombard letters 'Alexander eps de Blucich' — on the right Slavonic letters 'Alexander epkp' (episkop)»[52]. However, does 'Blucich' really mean Płock? This is the opinion of Adelung and Lelewel, it is a risky thing to argue with them.

[50] Vladimir was the ruler of Kijevska Ruthenia from 980 to 1015 and he was called the Great or the Saint: Compare *Bazylov L.* Op. cit. Vol. 1. P. 87.

[51] Ibid. P. 59: «He ruled the diocese from 1129 to 1156 and he buried Bolesław Krzywousty who died in 1139, in the cathedral he had built himself, and he was also buried there». Information about the place of Alexander's burial and the epitaph plate in Szreńsk is wrong, his burial place is not known.

[52] Reading of the inscription obviously at random, without any literary accuracy either in Latin version or in the Russian one.

W. Popiel gave also some attention to the figures of the makers. He treated Abraham as a master and the remaining two moulders as his assistants. He completed the insufficient description made by J. Lelewel[53]: «Here master Abraham presented himself and his two companions. He is an elderly man, he has an isosceles cross on his breast with the letters I.C.X. on the ends of each arm, you can still discern the "C" on the lower arm. I found an important difference on panel 24; it presents the third craftsman; there is a Latin inscription above — denoting his name "Waismuth" and the same inscription in Slavonic letters beneath»[54].

Reading of the inscriptions is not complete. However, the conclusion is astonishing: «It is clearly a woman's figure, it can be seem in the facial features, hair parted in the middle and two tresses falling down on the shoulders; the person does not have a beard or moustache, like her companions. If not for a pair of pincers or a spoon she is holding in her hand turned downwards, it would be impossible to take her for a moulder as women do not work in this kind of craft, as it demands a really great strength»[55]. It is simply a young assistant of Riquin who was regarded as the master and the maker of the Door, which can be seen in the inscription around his head: «RIQUIN ME FEC IT». W. Popiel did not even mention it.

However the notes concerning the change of arrangement of the panels during a very short time, not even 20 years after Lelewel's publication and 50 years after publishing F. Adelung's work, which was a reliable source for later researchers of the subject. Moreover, W. Popiel interpreted some scenes independently, though not always accurately, he pointed to some technical details and the state in which the object was preserved[56].

---

[53] J. Lelewel formulated such a footnote: «Frider Adelung says that master Abram is holding a pair of pincers, a trowel or a scoop and a hammer. The moulder trowel is a kind of tool for cutting. It would be worthwile if someone able to watch the doors where they are could check whether the hammer occured as an effect of moulding or maybe it was carved on the mould with a chisel» (*Lelewel J.* Drzwi kościelne... Op. cit. P. 294).

[54] Pamiętniki... Op. cit. P. 60.

[55] Ibid. P. 61–63.

[56] «I am completing Lelewel's description with the following notes:
1) At the space where Lelewel has No 26, there is a figure now marked No 30 in his description. The person is holding two palms in his hands, they are pointed down, like two sheaths of oblique swords, and the inscription is "Segere" not "Jegere".
2) The pillar to which Christ is tied to be whipped, No 37, has a bird on its top, not so much a cock, rather similar to an eagle or a pigeon. At the lower end of the pillar, there is a devil's head with horns. Over the figure of a soldier standing on the left a C letter is forged.
3) The panel with a person marked No 40 is certainly of a different make than the main part of the doors; the metal is of a much lighter colour, and the holes in the incompetently moulded panel filled with lead. The whole figure much too tall, with long hair, parted in the middle, short beard, the dress without folds, tied around the waist only, he resembles Orthodox Church deacons.
4) All the panels of both separate doors are enclosed with a beautiful metal frame, but it is also of three various kinds. The most beautiful part and in the best state of preservation goes through the middle of the doors from top to bottom. There is a figure of St George killing

The last problem W. Popiel was trying to investigate was «how did the door, moulded in Germany, designed for the Płock cathedral, get to Novgorod?» He rejected J. Lelewel's hypothesis about giving them to Novgorod as a gift and formulated a new one, rejected by later investigators that the door had never been brought to Płock. Chronicles describe Bishop Alexander's generosity, but do not mention the fact of ordering any bronze door for the first church in the diocese. There is no note about any robbery during an invasion or raid either. If there had been a raid, they would have been taken by Lithuanians or Teutonic Knights but not the Novgorod inhabitants — W. Popiel continues his reasoning. Thus, he concludes, the door was never brought to Płock, but the Novgorod merchants bought them directly from Magdeburg, from a great grandson of the moulder Abraham and placed in their Orthodox Church of St Sophia. He credited Vasil Blazhenny the Archbishop of Novgorod (1330–1352) with the initiative of buying it in 1336 — he is quoting the data after Z. Herberstein, a diplomat of the emperors Maximilian, Karol and Ferdinand (diaries of 1516). It is also the version found in the Novgorod chronicles.

W. Popiel gave such a recapitulation: «When neither donation nor capture could bring this exquisite monument of art to Novgorod, it would be most conformable with the legend to ascribe it to a simple contract of buying and selling, which is indeed more laudable for Vasil's memory. A German made a cast, because it had been ordered, and when the Poles did not buy it, his great grandson or successor sold the panels showing little care that what was to adorn the catholic cathedral would go to an Orthodox Church. The Germans added the lacking panels from other casts;

a dragon on the border between panels 27 and 28. Between 31 and 32, there is a figure of death with a scythe in one hand and a shield in the other: a felled man under his feet. At last, in the fourth row, between No 35 and 36 a figure of a gravedigger is holding a spade in his hand; a four-legged monster is raising its head towards him, probably it is a worm of the never dying death waiting for a new prey.

5) The metal of the moulds is not the same. Older panels were covered with a nice patina, dark-green in color, others were gilded. The figure under No 40 was cast of simple brass or a mixture used for Orthodox Church bells.

6) The Centaur under No 48 seems to be of quite a different cast and origin. Its head is covered with fine curly hair; however, it seems the cast was not successful as the centaur lacks one hand, which does not seem to be broken. I think Lithuania had used centaur as its coat of arms before it was baptized.

7) The doors are not cast as a whole but they are composed of cast panels, half and all long at the most, and fixed to wooden gates. The panels are not situated according to the original idea, there is a disorder in their arrangement, resulting from the fact that they were hidden in the ground during the long war years, and the Church servants told me that when they were taken out the panels they fixed the panels to boards at random, where they suited better. They are not even placed in the way presented by the drawing in J. Lelewel's work which is a copy of a drawing made in 1817 for count Rumiancow.

8) There are 54 panels with inscriptions, 29 of them are Slavonic, 17 — Latin and 8 in both languages; 13 panels have no inscriptions. The letters are concave as if cut at a later time. J. Lelewel transmitted the inscriptions faithfully, and count Tołstoj admitted that spelling and shape of the Orthodox Church letters shows that they were added a whole century later than the Latin ones».

if anything else was lacking, the inhabitants of Novgorod completed it themselves and they cut the Slavonic inscriptions, at last, they fixed them to boards and hinged the door. All the misfortunes that the door founded by Alexander Dołęga had encountered did not deprive it of artistic and archaeological merit. There is something striking in it when we consider who ordered the door and had the first general thought about it and then did not buy it out, who cast it wonderfully and sold it well, who bought it and then forgot and maintains that he had got it as a gift»[57]. However, he was not consistent because in a different place he admitted that the Door had once been in Płock cathedral. In addition, here is an emotional confession of a patriot and art lover: «I approached it with a feeling we have when we meet a close relative as adult people, and we know he has never been a stranger to our heart, but for some circumstances we did not meet earlier. The door once adorned my old cathedral, opened when my predecessors entered [the church] to take over the care for the sheepfold. Where are we both meeting now? The shepherd is not with the sheep and the door of the sheepfold is taken. a symbol and reality — we have met in exile»[58].

Bishop W. Popiel's views concerning the history of the Door of Płock were adapted by father A. Brykczyński in an article published in French in *Revue de L'Art Chretien* in 1903[59]. In the introduction to the article, he came back to the question how the Door had been brought to Novgorod and he expressed an opinion that there is no explicit answer to the question. He rejected Lelewel's theory about giving the Door as a gift to Novgorod. Of all the current opinions of Russian archaeologists, he quoted the one by P. Tołstoj. He had seen the Door as a mixture of various panels, coming from various doors, put together in confusion by a barbarian's hand.

A. Brykczyński first published a photo of the Door of Płock, side by side with the copy of J. Lelewel's drawing, and he points out that the drawing is in many places inaccurate[60]. When he was describing the accomplishment of the reliefs, he paid attention to the fact that their character corresponds with the decoration of facades and column capital caps in the ecclesiastical architecture of the last tierce of the 12th century. As far as details are concerned, it is most similar to the doors from Lombardy. It is the first investigator's focus on the analogies to other works of art of that time. Although both F. Adelung and J. Lelewel enumerated 60 examples of church doors, neither of them made any reference to any other artistic environment besides Magdeburg.

The question of origin of the Door of Płock was touched in the context of describing the panels with images of bishops and masters. Describing Wichman's image,

[57] Ibid. P. 65.

[58] Ibid. P. 57.

[59] *Brykczyński A.* La porte de bronze connue sous le nom de porte de Płock // Revue de l'Art Chretien (Paris). 1903. Mars. P. 138–142.

[60] Brykczyński places an incorrectly read signature in the inscrption under the illustration — K. Bruxell, octobr. 1650, while the original version is: J. L. (Lelewel's monogram) Bruxell, October 1850.

he presented a hypothesis that the Door had been made in Magdeburg. However, there are no proofs as the image alone is not enough to give us any certainty. Out of the three moulders he took Riquin as the main master, assisted by Waismuth. Abraham is still an enigmatic figure for him. Hence, there is a kind of scientific controversy, where the views of various authors: F. Adelung, J. Lelewel, W. Popiel and A. Brykczyński collide with one another. Detailed names for particular panels were repeated by A. Brykczyński after J. Lelewel, but in some cases he adds his own opinion. A. Brykczyński noticed some differences in the accomplishment of particular reliefs, which he was trying to explain with the fact that various craftsmen had been employed. Several complements were made — he stressed, referring to W. Popiel — after taking the panels out of the ground where they had been hidden for centuries from the impending robbery and destruction by Swedes. A lot of original panels were lost. This can be an explanation of the fact that some new panels were added instead, e. g. the Centaur which was used in the Middle Ages as Novgorod's coat of arms (NB: W. Popiel treated the centaur as Lithuania's coat of arms).

The fact that the Door of Płock was made of elements of other doors is also proved by a diversity of ornaments of the border, which is equally wide everywhere, but it covers the traces of unsuccessful renovation, e. g. the figures in the right wing border do not have any counterparts in the left wing. The article closes with chosen bibliography.

The Door of Płock was raised from the darkness of oblivion and first known as the Cherson Door and then restored to its original name thanks to the publications of J. Lelewel and other Polish scientists and since the 20's of the 20th century it has become a more and more frequent object of investigations of scientists of various nationalities.

M. Gębarowicz in his article published in 1923 in the *Sprawozdania Towarzystwa Naukowego we Lwowie* (*Reports of the Lvov Scientific Society*) counted it among the most interesting monuments of art as far as the northern founding is concerned[61].

Although M. Gębarowicz knew the publications of J. Lelewel and others, he treated F. Adelung as a basis. He introduced several new plots to the general store of information about the Door i. e. the analogies to other monuments of art. Contrary to Lelewel's attitude, he did not overestimate classical or Byzantine influences but he thought that «Our monument of art can be regarded as a German work even at first sight. It can be proved by the rigidity of forms, tendency to be realistic, to present the figures as separate individuals and elaborate details, especially those concerning the attire. These features, as well as avoiding some more complex composition problems make the difference between the Door of Płock and the examples of Italian and French art»[62]. In spite of the difference, numerous foreign influences

[61] *Gębarowicz M.* Drzwi kościelne tzw. płockie w Nowogrodzie Wielkim [The so-called Płock Church Door in Novgorod Velikij]. Sprawozdania Towarzystwa Naukowego we Lwowie. R. 3: 1923. N 2. P. 65–68.

[62] Ibid. P. 66.

can clearly be seen. First of all we can trace the affinity to Lombardian visual art, as was first described by A. Brykczyński. The inspiration should mainly be sought in Verona as there is an obvious resemblance to the composition of reliefs on the right side of the main portal of San Zeno basilica. The analysis of those details like shaping the folds, hairstyles and others turn our attention to the analogies with sculptures of the Lombardian school of Wilhelm and Nikolas the authors of the facade of the Modena cathedral, who also worked in Verona. The San Zeno basilica bronze door is especially important in this respect. M. Gębarowicz treated it as a work of German art from the beginning of 11th century and the end of 12th. However, the more recent investigations mention the influences of Spanish and French art[63]. According to M. Gębarowicz they are analogous to our monument of art in the aspect of the composition of particular panels fixed on a wooden framework, shaping figures in a similar way and «solving the problems concerning perspective by placing figures from various parts of the view over or under one another, often in quite unnatural poses»[64]. Besides M. Gębarowicz wrote about «something like the traces of French influence» e. g. in the figure of God Father's movements in Eve's Creation scene. These traces would lead to the portal sculptures in Moissac and Vezelay.

Unnaturally posed figures (turned towards each other with their heads or legs) were met for the first time in the middle of 12th century in Aquitaine. The lion-shaped doorknockers have their counterparts in Lund cathedral in Denmark where Scandinavian influences met with the Lombardian ones.

The author assumed that the Door was made in Magdeburg between 1152 and 1156. The sound of the name RIQUIN points to the French-German border, wherefrom the Saxon foundry practice originated. One more subject to investigate would be the analogies with French works of visual art[65].

The author saw Bishop Alexander as the founder of the Door — bishop of the province ruled by the eldest son of Bolesław who had travelled to the West with diplomatic missions. As a knowledgeable patron of arts, he wanted to decorate one of his churches with a pair of bronze doors. Contrary to J. Lelewel, who saw the reason of ordering the Door from Germany in technical problems and the lack of possibility of producing them in Poland, M. Gębarowicz explains the foundation which did not follow the line of Liege patronage — with a new hypothesis — a diplomatic mission. This is the thing that T. Dobrzeniecki paid attention too.

Since 1450, it has generally been known that our Door was called the Cherson Door in Novgorod. According to M. Gębarowicz it had been brought there before the great fire of 1340 as a war trophy following the attacks (from 13th century) of Lithuanian and Russian tribes upon the Mazovia region.

[63] Compare *Romanini A.M.* L'arte romanica // Verona e il suo territorio... Verona, 1964. P. 741.

[64] *Gębarowicz M.* Op. cit. P. 66.

[65] Those influences «could go either through Lombardy or Lower Rhineland. The presence of Scandinavian influences can be explained with the mobility of the school of Gothland stonemasons, actively working along the Baltic coast» (*Gębarowicz M.* Op. cit. P. 67).

The research of the Płock door was also taken up by German scientists. Georg Dehio in his «*Geschichte der deutschen Kunst*» published in 1921 connected not only the Płock Door but also the one from Gniezno with the Magdeburg foundry, and thus he omitted its connection with Poland thoroughly[66].

Erwin Panofsky presented the photographs of the Nurnberg plaster mould of the Płock Door in his work devoted to German sculpture of 11th–13th centuries[67]. He adopted the name «the Cherson Door» and regarded it as a common foundation of bishops Alexander and Wichman. He saw the analogies to the door of Augsburg. As far as style is concerned, he matched the Płock Door, after A. Goldschmidt, with the author of the tombstone of Bishop Friedrich von Wettin of Magdeburg[68]. The distorted iconographic arrangement of the panels was supposed to include the «typological» presentation of the Church.

H. Beenken also published an elaboration on German Romanesque sculpture of the 11th and 12th centuries[69]. It included photos of the plaster mould of the Door from the German Museum in Nurnberg. The author accepted without any doubts that the Door was cast in 1153 in the same Magdeburg foundry where the tombstone of bishop Friedrich of Wettin had earlier been made. Thus, it is a mistake to call it «the Cherson Door». Hypothetically Beenken stated it had been brought from Płock to Russia in 1336. Unfortunately, he did not quote any circumstances to support his hypothesis.

H. Beenken regarded the Door as extraordinary in it's iconographic aspect but, thematically inconsistent. Like many others he stated that most panels presented the life of Jesus Christ, while some others were Old Testament scenes or allegories without any connection with the previous group. He expressed a conviction that both Friedrich's tombstone and the reliefs of the Door follow the earlier visual art of 11th century. Hypothetically, he accepted that the older reliefs of the door of San Zeno basilica in Verona could have served as a prototype. He also stressed the connections with the Ottonian art, which can be seen, according to him, in Eve's Creation scene following the subject from the door of Hildesheim, but less successful and more primitive.

At the beginning of 30's of 20th century thanks to the initiative of professor Richard Hamann the Germans took up the intention to publish a series of albums with photos and detailed descriptions of all the bronze doors dating back to early Middle Ages. The second volume of the series, elaborated by A. Goldschmidt was devoted to the Door of Płock and the Door of Gniezno[70]. After F. Adelung's work it is the sec-

[66] *Dehio G.* Geschichte der deutschen Kunst. Berlin, 1921. S. 170.

[67] *Panofsky E.* Die Deutsche Plastik des elften bis dreizehnten Jahrhunderts. München, 1924. S. 91–92, il. 22.

[68] *Goldschmidt A.* Die Stilentwicklung der romanischen Skulptur in Sachsen // Jahrbuch der Kgl Preussischen Kunstsammlungen. Berlin, 1900. T. XXI. S. 227.

[69] *Beenken H.* Romanische Skulptur in Deutschland 11 und 12 Jahrhundert. Leipzig, 1924. S. 54–57.

[70] *Goldschmidt A.* Die Bronzentüren von Nowgorod und Gnesen... Marburg, 1932. The Door of Płock are described on S. 7–26 and presented on 70 photos made by R. Hamann and son in

ond detailed description of the Door of Płock — in German literature they are called the Door of Novgorod. The publication was provided with 70 photos. Mentioning F. Adelung's work, A. Goldschmidt valued it very highly crediting F. Adelung's account with taking up a lot of subjects for the first time. Goldschmidt took up the task of solving many opened scientific problems. First, he considered the name of the door. It is wrongly called the Cherson Door he resolutely opted for the theory that the Door was made in Magdeburg between 1152 and 1154. He stressed its affiliation with German art. He thought that the name «the Cherson Door» referred to other, Byzantine style door, which was taken to Alexandrov in Vladimirskaya Guberniya by the order of Tsar Ivan Vasilievic to punish the inhabitants of Novgorod[71]. He then mentioned another pair of doors from a lateral chapel of St Sophia's Orthodox Church which were brought to Novgorod, but the author does not answer the question how they left Płock. Adding Russian inscriptions is dated back to 14th century, contrary to the opinion of J. Lelewel and later researchers of the problem[72]. According to A. Goldschmidt Abraham is not the only Russian master. He stated that there was one more undefined founder who was supposed to have cast the panel with a Centaur and a slim figure next to the scene with the empty Tomb. The master was supposed to have been active in 14th century at the earliest, but the author is inclined to accept that it was in 16th century[73].

As far as the iconographic arrangement, he did not notice the guiding principle connecting three kinds of images: biblical stories, allegorical figures and the images of people who had their share in the accomplishment of the Door. The biblical scenes are: the Original Sin and the History of Salvation from Annunciation to Ascension and Adoration of Christ, and then the left wing includes the scenes of Jesus Christ's childhood until His Baptism whereas the right one presents His Passion since Entering Jerusalem until Ascension — i. e. the usual twofold division. Not all the allegorical compositions of the second group are clear but most of them show the contest of the good elements with the evil ones and victory of the good. The thought is taken up by later authors. The point is, like in the figural portal decorations and in Romanesque

Novgorod. However, on S. 17 he used the term «die Türen von Plock». We are not discussing here the earlier, marginal statements by A. Goldschmidt concerning the Door of Płock, but only the extensive, meaningful work of 1932.

[71] It was probably the event described by Gerhard Friedrich Müller in 1778 in his report from the journey from Moscow to Alexandrov. Op. cit. P. 28.

[72] *Goldschmidt A.* Die Bronzentüren... S. 7, footnote 1.

[73] *Pohorecki F., Goldschmidt A.* Die Bronzentüren von Nowgorod und Gnesen...; a review in Roczniki Humanistyczne [Historical Annuals]. 1933. Vol. IX. P. 121–129. As far as historical questions are concerned the reviewer accuses the author of ignorance (*Kehr P.* Das Erzbistum Magdeburg u diese erste Organisation der christlichen Kirche in Polen // Abh. d. Preuss. Ak. d. Wiss. Jhrg. 1920. N 1. S. 123).
Walicki M., Goldschmidt A. Die Bronzentüren von Novgorod... // Biuletyn Historii Sztuki i Kultury [History of Art and Culture Bulletin], R. 3. 1934. N 1. P. 59–62. Compare: *Meyer E., Goldschmidt A.* Die Bronzentüren... // Deutsche Literaturzeitung. 1933. Jhg 54. S. 843–847 — review.

sculptures, overcoming sin. In addition, the two doorknockers with lion-muzzles remind us about it. One of them is provided with a Russian inscription «AD POZIRAJET GRIESZNYCH» (The hell devours sinners). The author counts the Door of Płock among those with a richest choice of subjects. The significance of particular panels gains typological features when you match Elijah's Ascension with the Ascension of Jesus Christ and tends to resemble Prudentius' Allegory when Christ's Victory over the hell is matched with the Victory of virtues over vices. The subject is developed in the figures from the border and the figures of monsters trampled by Gabriel, the Magi and a Knight. Moreover, the particular figures can also, in a certain way, be treated as conquerors of the evil. Among the historical figures the author mentions bishop Alexander of Płock as the person who ordered and founded the Door and bishop Wichman of Magdeburg who was a mediator and helped to accomplish the order[74].

The iconographic arrangements introduced by Goldschmidt and quoted above are the first deeper theoretical analysis, which was to present the thematic foundations of the creators of the Door. Most certainly, A. Goldschmidt regarded determining those foundations as very difficult or quite impossible, as the arrangement of the panels was changed in the course of time.

As to the inscriptions, he distinguished three groups: 1) Latin inscriptions moulded along with the reliefs, 2) inscriptions cut after moulding the panels and 3) Slavonic inscriptions cut in 14th century according to A. Goldschmidt. The author did not make any palaeographic analysis of the letters (which was earlier done by F. Adelung and J. Lelewel).

A. Goldschmidt deserves the credit for the first radical attempt at reconstruction of the original arrangement of the panels, giving motivations for his suggestions. Additionally he singled out four types of assembly signs, which were to help to set the panels together precisely. However, there are so many inconsistencies in the system that it finally did not prove to be useful.

He discussed the stylistic questions separately stating that the figures are presented *en face*, static, the folds of their clothes are rigid, without the slightest movement; the artists avoided presenting profiles and foreshortening. We can observe the prevalence of linear design and the tendency to decorate the surface; the arrangement of the folds is inconsistent, that is why the tectonics of figures is blurred. The author made the stylistic analysis confronting the door with the one of Hildesheim against the background of the Saxon sculpture of 12th century where the influence of ancient art can be seen in a soft presentation of bodies, the way of arranging the folds wrapping them and presented in a freely blowing movement as well as creating space through movement and detachment from the background.

Comparison to the Magdeburg bronze tomb slab of Archbishop Friedrich von Wettin (†1152) led to a conclusion that in the case of the Door of Płock we have to do with a trainee of the Magdeburg workshop who received the drawings with the

[74] Compare also *Poppe A.* Z nowszych badań nad Drzwiami Płockimi // Romańskie Drzwi Płockie 1154 — ok. 1430–1982. Płock, 1983. P. 34–35.

scene arrangement from the author of the tomb slab. Such a conclusion would have its justification in the fact that the panel with bishop Wichman's image is much less precisely made and finished.

Other objects to which our Door is stylistically akin are the reliefs of the earlier group of panels from San Zeno in Verona. The resemblance was spotted by A. Goldschmidt who referred to a paper by Albert Boeckler[75], the work closing a certain period of thorough and significant research of the Door of Płock for quite a long time.

The above mentioned R. Hamann did not pay much attention to our monument of art in his History of Art of 1933[76]. He expressed a conviction that the Door had probably been designed for the cathedral in Płock and associated it with the foundry of Magdeburg where the tomb slab of Archbishop Friedrich von Wettin had been cast, but he did not take up the problem of the author. He mentioned French motives in the decoration of — as he calls it — the wall of pictures describing the life of Jesus Christ. He made an analysis of forms and figures of the Door in a poetical way and compared it to the portal sculptures. Equivalents of the tympanum were the broader panels with an image of Christ, sitting on the throne among the apostles and a representative image of Christ's majesty. An equivalent of the Last Judgment would probably be found in the lion mouths. Contrary to other authors, R. Hamann associated the image of Bishop Wichman, not Alexander with the model tomb slab of Archbishop Wettin. Apart from the slab he mentioned the tombs of the prioresses of Quedlingburg convent as stylistically akin to the reliefs of the Door. The author treated the object as one of the examples of pioneer influence of German culture at the uncivilized East[77]. Hamann's work closes the range of papers concerning the Door of Płock in the period preceding the outburst of World War II.

After the war, the subject appeared anew in German literature. Generally, it has been accepted that the Door was meant for the cathedral in Płock and it really was there. However, we do not know when it was — in 13th or 14th century. It is accepted that it was undoubtedly in St Sophia's Orthodox Church around the middle of 15th century. At last, the high rank of their artistic value has been admitted. Although the arrangement of scenes has been disturbed, however it is still a point of reference for the authors of iconographic analyses who make scientific syntheses concerning the church doors. Herman Leisinger devoted a special elaboration in the cycle of *Romanesque bronzes*[78] to church doors in mediaeval Europe.

[75] *Boeckler A.* Die bronze Tür von St. Zeno in Verona. Magdeburg, 1932. It is the third volume of a monographic series about the Mediaeval bronze doors in Europe.

[76] *Hamann R.* Geschichte der Kunst. Berlin, 1933. P. 256–257. 2nd ed.: Berlin, 1935; 3rd ed.: Berlin, 1955. Translated into Polish M. Wallis, completed by M. Walicki and J. Starzyński. Dzieje sztuki polskiej [History of Polish Art]. Warszawa, 1934. Vol. I. P. 256–259; Vol. II. P. 928.

[77] We can read after the Polish translation: «The door, possibly meant for the cathedral of Płock was probably at the border of German influence. Thus German culture becomes a pioneer of the Western culture: promoting in its own dialect the ideas of style of the earlier epoch...»

[78] *Leisinger H.* Romanische Bronzen. Kirchentüren im mittelalterlichen Europa. Zürich, 1956.

According to Leisinger the tendency to decorate churches became active after 1000, when the anxiety concerning the apocalyptic end of the world was overcome. Apart from traditional Byzantine foundries, characterized by masterly skill as their products were decorated with the niello technique or incrustation, some workshops in Italy and Germany were founded. Their products were decorated in a different way than the Byzantine ones, using a relief plastic decoration.

H. Leisinger described the Door of Novgorod (meant for Płock) and of Gniezno but did not add any new elements to the state of research of our object. In 1963, a little album by Willibald Sauerländer was published with 45 photoes of the Door of Płock. The author referred to earlier research by A. Goldschmidt[79].

Sauerländer compared the formal aspect of the reliefs of Novgorod Door with others of this type: in Akwizgran, Hildesheim, Augsburg and the works regarded as made in Magdeburg (the tomb slab of Archbishop von Wettin (†1152), the so-called Wolfram's chandelier from the cathedral in Erfurt and the monumental cast of the Lion of Braunszwik), and came to a conclusion that the plasticity of our Door is heterogenous and disarrayed, equivocal and fragmentary in its program. He created an arbitrary hypothesis, that Riquin's workshop had been called from Magdeburg to Płock.

It is an isolated point of view within the scope of subject literature[80]. W. Sauerländer's attempt to assemble the scenes in program cycles goes in a slightly different way than A. Goldschmidt. The basic part is Christological. Its completion is the only one typological attempt to match Elijah's Ascension with Christ's Ascension. Then he put the biblical-historical panels side by side with the thematic framework mentioned above (history of Salvation from Eve's Creation and the Original Sin to the Last Judgement in the scene: Maiestas Domini and the door-knockers) completed with moralistic and allegorical scenes (the contest of virtues and vices and the victory of good over evil). At last, there are the non-biblical images (bishops: Alexander of Płock with his deacons and Wichman of Magdeburg with the saint patron of his cathedral — St Maurice with his companions). Finally he mentioned the profane element (the moulders: Riquin and Waismuth; Abraham is treated separately, as an addition from the realm of Russian art like the centaur).

W. Sauerländer singled out four factors in the history of the monument that caused the disarray of the iconographic program: 1) change of the size of the ordered door during their realization; 2) extension of the program with allegorical scenes; 3) changes of the arrangement of panels at random in the course of time and 4) corrections and interferences after taking them to Ruthenia.

[79] *Sauerländer W.* Die Bronzentür von Nowgorod. München, 1963. P. 61.

[80] *Sauerländer W.* Op. cit. P. 55. However, in the paper first published in German: Skulptur des Mittelalters. Frankfurt/M.–Berlin 1963 and then in Polish translation by A. Porębska: Rzeźba średniowieczna [Mediaeval sculpture]. Warszawa, 1978. P. 94 the author accepts the common opinion that the Door was not made in Płock but in Magdeburg.

Formal analysis of four scenes chosen at random led him to a conclusion that the masters had only a rudimentary knowledge of the basic early Christian iconography which gave in effect degenerated and «sclerotic» forms[81].

W. Sauerländer was the first to refer to New Testament Apocrypha (Protogospel by James and the Gospel according to Nicodemus) in his description of Annunciation and Descent to Abyss.

«The Novgorod door — the author concluded — both in their formal shape and in the program and method of presenting figures and scenes represent the phase of the Romanesque style which is distinguished by the extreme fossilization of formal and contents features. As a work of mature Saxon Romanism it presents those features in a specially sharp form».

He estimated it in a slightly different way in a later work concerning medieaval sculpture: «The Door of Plock... clearly show the change of style from the Otton period to mature Romanism towards the greater and greater loosening of the connections with antique tradition. A. Goldschmidt was right to say that the style of reliefs in Hildesheim (meaning the relief using illusionary effects) gave way to fully plastic figures in the Door of Plock»[82].

A similar work was published by Hans-Joachim Krause and Ernst Schubert in 1968[83]. Both publications complete each other as the latter includes quite a detailed description of particular panels preceded by a stylistic analysis and characterization of the contents of particular scenes based on divisions and distinctions introduced by A. Goldschmidt and W. Sauerländer. The authors stated that the arrangement of scenes did not have any didactic character as did the mediaeval cycles in Biblia Pauperum. Because of their consistent block character and dignified rigidity of figures, they were given almost symbolic significance.

A description of the Płock monument of art can be found in the fifth volume of a monumental series Propylaen Kunstgeschichte published in 1969[84]. The authors H. Fillitz and G. Zarnecki treated the object as an example of church doors from the region of Germany or Italy, richly decorated with figural reliefs, which resulted from Byzantine inspiration and a focus on individual objects, which was typical of German sculpture: doors, tomb slabs, chandeliers and triumphal crosses of the rainbow timber.

Zarnecki did not contribute anything new to the state of investigation. Moreover his invention is a suggestion that it could have been taken from Płock by Tatars in 1241. Emphasizing an influence of Italian art upon the creators of the door he associated them definitely with the door from S. Zeno basilica in Verona[85]. G. Zarnecki

[81] *Idem*. Die Bronzentüren. S. 58–61.

[82] *Idem*. Rzeźba. P. 94.

[83] *Krause H.J., Schubert E.* Die Bronzentür der Sophienkathedrale in Nowgorod. Leipzig, 1968.

[84] *Fillitz H.*. Das Mittelalter. I. Propyläen Kunstgeschichte. Berlin, 1969. Vol. 5. S. 106, 109.

[85] *Zarnecki G*. Tür der Kathedrale von Nowgorod... Commentary to the illustration 321a. P. 246.

formulated his point of view in a more detailed way in a later publication devoted to Romanism in Europe. Probably the older part of S. Zeno door was cast by Magdeburg artists, who had taken some decorative motifs from master Nicolaus and made use of them casting the tomb slab of Archbishop Wettin and the bronze door of the Plock cathedral[86].

The author of the next publication was Ute Götz from Magdeburg, who wrote a doctoral dissertation concerning the iconographic programmes of the church doors of the 11th and 12th centuries and took her degree at the University of Tybinga in July 1969. The thesis was edited as a typescript in 1971 and then published in Bamberg in the same year[87]. The author wrote about iconographic programms. After the description of the symbolic meaning of church doors based on theological and literary sources of the first millennium, adequate monuments of art were presented as a catalogue according to the following division: 1) Christological themes: a) homogenous Vitae Christi, b) Jesus Christ's life scenes completed with other images, c) the cycles concerning the saints; 2) Symbolical images; 3) Ecclesiastical and political programs; 4) Programs dedicated to the Saint Patrons (titles of churches); 5) Decorations of the Doors in ecclesiastical buildings that are not designed for celebrating sermons. The doors which were lost, with unknown programs.

The author formulated conclusions that include the review of iconographic programms and consider their connection with the symbolism of church doors, connection between the decoration of the doors and the portals and the meaning of the lion mouths in the doorknockers. The author then divided the 11th–12th century doors into groups against the background of the history of art. A separate subject that was described was the Damascene technique of the door decoration — namely encrusting.

The dissertation is provided with a great number of footnotes and rich bibliography. Among them five Polish authors: J. Lelewel, M. Gębarowicz, M. Walicki, T. Dobrzaniecki and Z. Świechowski. Thus, it is the first example of taking into account Polish literature. A similar attitude was later presented by another German author — Ursula Mende in her both comprehensive syntheses concerning mediaeval door knockers and Roman church doors in Europe of 800–1200[88].

In her dissertation U. Götz mentioned the Novgorod Door many times. She classed it as belonging to the group in which the events from Jesus Christ life

[86] *Idem*. Romanik. München, 1978. Belser Stilgeschichte im dtv. Bd. 6. S. 118. A similar view was expressed by *Hasak M*. Zur Geschichte der deutschen Bildwerke des XIII Jahrh. // Zeitschrift für Christliche Kunst. Düsseldorf, 1906. R. XIX. N 12. P. 370–380.

[87] *Götz U*. Die Bildprogramme der Kirchentüren des 11 und 12 Jahrhunderts. Dissertation zur Erlangung des Doktorgrades der Philosophischen Fakultät der Eberhard-Karls-Universität zu Tübingen vorgelegt von Ute Götz aus Magdeburg, 1971. A separate edition — Bamberg, 1971. The results of analyses by U. Götz were mentioned in the entry: Nowgoroder Bronzentür in Lexikon der Kunst. Berlin, 1975. Bd. 3. S. 592–593, when only a choice of German descriptions of the monument of art was listed in bibliography.

[88] *Mende U*. 1) Die Türzieher des Mittelalters. Berlin, 1981; 2) Die Bronzentüren des Mittelalters 800–1200. München, 1983.

were completed with other images. She tried to explain the lack of uniformity of the iconographic program and the alternations in panel arrangement with the dramatic history of the work of art. She argued in favour of H. Krohn's theory, according to which the door was to have replaced Wasyl's door which had been taken to Alexandrov. This was the time when the only restoration was made concerning the arrangement of the panels. Supposedly, it took place in the second half of 14th century[89].

U. Götz regarded Bishop Alexander as the founder of the Door but was convinced that the bishopric of Płock had belonged to metropolis of Magdeburg[90]. Providing the door not only with the images of ecclesiastical dignitaries but also of the artisans: Riquin and Waismuth belongs to early examples of the kind in European art (Verona, Ravello and Trani).

Describing the contents of particular panels the author sometimes referred to apocrypha and — which was a novelty — to Prudentius' *Psychomachia* and also to rudimentary influences of Byzantine art and also to the wooden door in Kolonia in S. Maria Church in Kapitol. Moreover she associated it with Saxon visual art with the tomb slab of Archbishop Wettin, the candlesticks of Erfurt, the altar from the cathedral in Erfurt. Among the monuments of Italian art, there are the reliefs of Piza and Monreale, which could be regarded as archetypes. U. Götz was the first one to associate the panel of Maiestas Domini with a tympan in Strzelno, referring to Zygmunt Świechowski[91]. The description of the iconographic program of the door is similar to that of A. Goldschmidt and W. Sauerländer. The dissertation of U. Götz exceeds in quality the two monumental works of the above-mentioned German author — U. Mende.

In her work concerning the door-knockers she described the lion knockers of the Door of Płock as older than the panel castings and treated them as Magdeburg products together with the door knockers preserved in Czerwińsk (they have been lost. — *R. K.*), Halle, Helmstedt, Lune and Hadmersleben[92].

The second work by U. Mende has a greater contribution to the state of research of our monument of art. One question is still to be explained — how the Płock Door was brought to Novgorod (the author dates them back to 1152–1156).

U. Mende was the first one to notice that bishop Alexander had been wearing a pallium, which he had not been entitled to use. It results from following closely the iconographic archetype, which was the tomb slab of Archbishop Friedrich von Wettin of the Magdeburg Cathedral for this panel.

[89] *Krohn H.* Mittelalterliche Plastik in Rusland // Ruslandbericht des Kunsthistorischen Instituts Köln. Exkursion. 1965. Köln, 1966. S. 248 and next. According to Götz, the last change of the arrangement of panels was made along with the restoration in 19th century — op. cit. S. 135.

[90] *Götz U.* Op. cit. S. 138.

[91] Ibid. P. 140, 143, 144. The article by *Świechowski Z.* Le Tympan du portail nord de l'eglise conventualle à Strzelno // Melanges R. Crozet II. Poitiers, 1966. 1131 ff.

[92] *Mende U.* Die Türzieher. S. 241.

A novelty in the research of the origin of the Door so far has been her view upon the role of Bishop Wichman's predecessor — Archbishop Friedrich von Wettin (1119–1152). U. Mende observed that he had been the person who had started, properly equipped and then enlarged the foundry in Magdeburg. The author was right to state that the order for the Płock door had been accepted with Friedrich's support and only after his death; the role of a patron had been taken over by Wichman who had resided in Naumburg. Moreover, U. Mende definitely rejected the theory about the dependence of Płock from Magdeburg and remined that the diocese of Płock had belonged to Gniezno metropolis. This presents the author as a reliable researcher seeking new solutions in a broad historical context. The Door was defined as an impressive work of visual art. The particular reliefs are characterized by block enclosing of figures against a neutral background, which does not give an impression of depth. In spite of simplifications and reserve the work is immensely expressive, quite vivid and with a great sense of significance of particular details. Individual treatment of shaping particular figures can be noticed, especially in the expression of surprise or dignity which is stressed by the gestures of their arms. Apart from that there is a hierarchy of significance of various people, which was emphasized by Riquin through the diversity of attire. In spite of incompetence and lack of models to present foreshortenings and movements of the figures, the creators felt and understood those technical problems, and presented them according to their skills (the movements of the angels, Eve's creation, and the scene with Elijah or the composition of allegorical Victory of virtues over vices).

Apart from the generally well-known historical figures that appear on the Door the author expresses her supposition that two figures of men with unusual attributes if they were to be laymen (a book and a scroll) may be treated on the basis of their rich attire — next to the images of bishops and craftsmen — as historical figures — their role being that of further donators or co-makers of the Door.

The Płock Door appears against the background of Romanic art of the half of the 12th century as an original work from the realm of Saxon sculpture. In her final explanation of the associations with foreign art U. Mende — like other, earlier authors — connected Riquin and Waismuth's work with the craftsmen who had made the door to S. Zeno Basilica in Verona. She explained the connections in the following way: the older part of S. Zeno panels had supposedly been made in Magdeburg foundry but with an assistance of the craftsmen from Verona[93]. Although she did not notice any elements taken directly from Italian sculpture, however, resemblance and analogies are detectable and that is why the author supposed that the craftsmen who had made the Door of Płock were associated with the activities of Master Nikolaus' Lombardian workshop whence the sculptors were called about 1140 to decorate the abbot church in Konigskutter. Those Italian craftsmen were not supposedly employed to make the bronze reliefs or to model the figures but U. Mende credited them with making ornaments and engravings on the already made mouldings. U. Mende's work includes the most thorough description of our monument of art in German scientific

[93] Ibid. S. 78–79.

literature of the early 80s of our century. Thus it closes another stage of German investigations concerning the subject.

Polish science lacked any systematic research concerning the Door of Płock until the 70s of 20th century.

The Polish writing of the interwar period concerning the Door of Płock was, except for M. Gębarowicz's article focused on reviewing Goldschmidt's German work but not on independent research. The conviction that bronze door was something strange in Poland found an expression in a statement by such a connoiseur and art lover as Archbishop A. J. Nowowiejski, who said that the door had never really been in the Płock cathedral[94].

Feliks Kopera mentioned the Door of Płock quite unexpectedly in his Dzieje malarstwa w Polsce[95], associating their origin with the patronage of prince Bolesław and his wife Anastazja and (erroneously) looking for the images of prince and princess on the panels.

Aleksander Brückner who was referred to in A. J. Nowowiejski's footnote did not examine the Door but quoted the information taken from Tatiščev concerning the image of Abraham and regarded the image as a product of Ruthenian art and signalled a difference of views of M. Gębarowicz and Goldschmidt[96].

The research of Polish art broken by the war was taken up anew after regaining freedom. The first stage of the research is characterized, apart from the merits also by political tinge shown in the emphasis put on the Polish provenience of the regained territories and the monuments of art associated with them. The tendency was sometimes marked by ever too categorical rejection of any connections with, and especially influences of German art.

This was the attitude of Marian Morelowski, quite devoid of any objectivity, clearly seen in his research mainly devoted to the Door of Gniezno with some accidental notes concerning the Door of Płock[97]. Accepting the assumption of higher «artistic» and «political» value of the program of the Gniezno door and the way of reasoning *in contrario* he denied any artistic value of the Płock-Novgorod Door —

[94] *Nowowiejski A.J.* Płock. Monografia historyczna, napisana podczas wojny wszechświatowej, poprawiona i uzupełniona w roku 1930 [Płock. The historical monograph, written during the World War, corrected and amended in 1930]. Ed. II. Płock, 1930. P. 187–188 (The first edition was published in 1917).

[95] *Kopera F.* (Dzieje malarstwa w Polsce [The History of Polish painting]. Kraków, 1925. Part I. P. 17) raised the cultural significance of Płock next to Cracow, Gniezno and Kruszwica. See: *Pohorecki F.* Op. cit. P. 122.

[96] *Brückner A.* Tysiąc lat kultury polskiej [A thousand years of Polish culture]. Paryż, 1955. P. 230–231. P. 1. It is the third edition, with a modified title Dzieje kultury polskiej [History of Polish culture] (1st ed.: 1930; 2nd ed.: 1939). The works of Russian authors quoted by Brückner are: *Tatiščev S.* Op. cit. Vol. IV. P. 134 and *Anisimov A.J.* Avtoportret russkogo skulptora Avrama // Isviestija Akademii Nauk SSSR. 1928. N 3. S. 173.

[97] *Morelowski M.*. Drzwi Gnieźnieńskie, ich związki ze sztuką obcą, a problem rodzimości [The Door of Gniezno, their connections with foreign art and the problem of their native character] // Drzwi Gnieźnieńskie [The Door of Gniezno] / Red. M. Walicki. Wrocław, 1956. Vol. I. P. 45.

as he called it. He described its iconographic program as strange for our culture, subordinated to foreign, invasive German policy, which can be proved by the image of Archbishop Wichman[98]. However M. Morelowski emphasized the associations of Polish art with French artistic environment. Explaining the provenience of the Door he stated that Wichman had wanted to gain the support of the bishop of Płock Alexander for his political objectives, and supposedly it had been him who had ordered the door and given them to the cathedral of Płock as a gift. However neither Alexander nor his successors liked the gift: «that is why they disappeared in such a mysterious way from the horizon of Płock, they were in Sigtuna in Sweden for some time and they reached the commercial centre of Novgorod at last; that the successors of Alexander sold the work which was so blatant in its political aspect, so weak artistically as so strange for our culture»[99].

Apart from free suppositions as to the founder of the door and the biased use of artistic value criterion the author simplified the historical facts according to the accepted assumptions or he did not know them at all.

A new stage of the research is connected with the stay of a delegation of the Płock Scientific Society (TNP) at the 13th Congress of History in Moscow on 20th August 1970. It was then that the President of TNP Jakub Chojnacki paid attention to a 19th-century plaster replica of the Romanesque Door of Płock presented in the History Museum in Moscow and an idea arose of making a faithful replica in bronze of original from Novgorod Velikij[100].

[98] Ibid. P. 94–95.

[99] Ibid. P. 95, 89.

[100] In connection with a trip to Moscow for the 13th Congress of History the president of TNP J. Chojnacki published several articles and news bulletins in a quarterly Notatki Płockie [The Notes of Płock] (NP): W sprawie katedralnych «Drzwi Płockich» z połowy XII w. w Nowogrodzie Wielkim [Concerning the cathedral «Door of Płock» from the middle of 12th century in Novgorod Velikij] // NP. 1970. N 4/58. P. 3–8; Jeszcze w sprawie romańskich «Drzwi Płockich» [One more note concerning the Romanesque «Door of Płock»] // NP. 1970. N 5/59. P. 12–17; Romańskich «Drzwi Płockich» ciąg dalszy [The Romanesque «Door of Plock» continued] // NP. 1971. N 1/60. P. 11–12; Delegacja do Moskwy i Nowogrodu Wielkiego w sprawie katedralnych «Drzwi Płockich» [A business trip to Moscow and Novgorod Velikij concerning the cathedral «Door of Płock»] // NP. 1971. N 3/62. P. 3–8; Kopia «Drzwi Płockich» wystawiona w Muzeum Historycznym miasta stołecznego Warszawy [A replica of the «Door of Płock» exhibited in the Museum of History of the capital city of Warsaw] // NP. 1972. N 4/68. P. 48, 49; Płocczanie w Magdeburgu na tropach «Drzwi Płockich» [The inhabitants of Płock in Magdeburg on the track of the «Door of Płock»] // Ibid. P. 50, 51; Kopia katedralnych «Drzwi Płockich» z połowy XII wieku już wykonana i wystawiona w Szczecinie [A replica of the cathedral «Door of Płock» from the middle of 12th century already accomplished and exhibited in Szczecin] // NP. 1972. N 3/67. P. 25; Romańskie «Drzwi Płockie» i wielki dzwon średniowieczny w Nowogrodzie [The Romanesque «Door of Płock» and a big mediaeval bell in Novgorod] // NP. 1973. N 2/71. P. 21, 22; Romańskie «Drzwi Płockie» w piśmiennictwie polskim (1582–1974) [The Romanesque «Door of Płock» in Polish writing (1582–1974)] // NP. 1974. N 4/78. P. 50–51; «Drzwi Płockie» zawisły w dniu 23 listopada 1981 roku w Bazylice Katedralnej [The «Door of Płock» were hinged on November 23rd 1981 in the Cathedral Basilica] // NP. 1981. N 4/109. P. 59–64; Romańskie «Drzwi Płockie» idea kopii i jej realizacja (Referat wygłoszony w dniu 28 lutego

The accomplishment of the enterprise was preceded by many informative and scientific articles. a crowning achievement of the series was an occasional publication The Romanesque Door of Płock 1154 — about 1430–1982[101]. It is a collective work and apart from scientific articles, it includes the records of the ceremony of bequest of the bronze copy of the Romanesque door by the state government.

Among the above mentioned publications there was an inquisitive and most comprehensive work. It was written by Kazimierz Askanas, a scholar studying the art of Płock[102]. He explained the origin of the incorrect names of the object, especially in foreign literature. He treated with a lot of attention the images of historical figures, associated with the accomplishment of the monument of art. He accepted the Magdeburg origin of the Door and mentioned the analogous products of the Western art, discerning, according to the suggestions of others, the affiliations of Riquin's workshop to Italian art. At the same time, he rejected two opinions of those who connected the origin of the object with Italy or Poland. Contrary to M. Morelowski and M. Gębarowicz, K. Askanas defended the artistic merits of the work and related them to the door of S. Zeno basilica in Verona and with the sculpture of S. Giuliano church on Lake Orta Island. He regarded the Door of Płock as «a work of Saxon art which infiltrated into Slavonic regions during the reigns of Bolesław Chrobry, Władysław Herman and Bolesław Krzywousty, when both courts, the German one and the Polish one, functioned as if they were one court, as Herbard a monk of Michelberg states, a co-author of St. Otto's life story».

K. Askanas is credited with the first critical attempt at presenting the history of the Door of Płock. He acquired a lot of A. Goldschmidt's opinions. However, he rejected the theory of Archbishop A. J. Nowowiejski and an earlier hypothesis of bishop W. Chośniak Popiel concerning the suggestion that the Novgorod inhabitants had bought the door in Magdeburg or had received it as a gift from the clergy

1982 r. w Bazylice Katedralnej) [The Romanesque «Door of Płock» — the idea of the replica and its accomplishment. (A paper presented on 28 February in the Cathedral Basilica)] // NP. 1982. N 1/110. P. 3–12; the paper was also reprinted in the collective paper — Romańskie Drzwi Płockie 1154 — ok. 1430–1982 [The Romanesque Door of Płock 1153 — about 1430–1982]. Płock, 1983. P. 70–84. All the above papers have informative character. They start from discovering and reminding the Polish readers about a plaster replica of the Door exhibited in the History Museum at the Red Square in Moscow. Then they present the course of efforts and attempts that have finally led to the effect that the bronze replica of the Novgorod original has been situated in the inner portal of the cathedral. J. Chojnacki was known as a great lover of the art of Płock keen on the idea of bringing a replica to Płock and very consistent as to its accomplishment. His attempts and publications inspired the investigators to taking up anem the scientific work concerning a range various questions associated with the artefact. One of the first descriptions is: *Kostanecki S.* O temacie i układzie Drzwi Płockich [About the subject and arrangement of the Door of Płock] // NP. 1971. N 3/62. P. 9–11.

[101] Romańskie Drzwi Płockie. Includes a list of those publications on P. 130, 131: *Zielińska Z.* Romańskie Drzwi Płockie w wydawnictwach Towarzystwa Naukowego Płockiego i publikacjach w językach obcych w latach 1970–1982 [The Romanesque Door of Płock in the publications in foreign languages during the years 1970–1982].

[102] *Askanas K.* Op. cit.

of Płock. Askanas stated that the Door of Płock had been brought to Novgorod as a plunder during a Lithuanian inroad under Mendog's command in 1262, who had then given it to the inhabitants of Novgorod as an acknowledgement of their alliance in common battles. It was hinged in St Sophia's Orthodox Church as a trophy and it is described in this way by Russian literature.

The author rejected the theories of A. Goldschmidt and M. Morelowski concerning the role of Wichman as a co-founder of the door. He tried to explain the fact of placing his image on the door by bishop Alexander's courtesy for Archbishop Wichman who had controlled the foundry of Magdeburg.

K. Askanas expressed the above mentioned opinions in their shortened version in both editions of the Sztuka Płocka[103].

The authors of an extensive elaboration about Polish pre-Romanesque and Romanesque art: Michał Walicki and Maria Pietrusińska — did not devoted much space to the description of the Płock Door and treated them indeed as associated with Płock, but nevertheless strange for our culture, as they had been in Novgorod Velikij from time immemorial[104]. An advantage of the publication is giving a summary of the basic state of research and bringing to mind the existence of the object of such a rank, which was earlier connected with Płock.

Some information about the Door of Płock was also mentioned by Teresa Mroczko writing about Polish decorative art of 12th century[105].

Z. Świechowski as a co-author of a collective work about the Romanesque art in Europe treated the object in a similar way. He also wrote about the Door of Płock a bit more broadly in the cycle *History of Art in Poland* in the volume *Romanesque Art in Poland*[106]. He determined the main moulder — Riquin as a trainee of master Azzo of Magdeburg, on the basis of resemblance of the image of bishop Alexander and Archbishop Friedrich von Wettin. Azzo was also hypothetically pointed by G. Zarnecki in Propylaen Kunstgeschichte[107] as a potential maker of the tomb slab of Friedrich von Wettin. However, Z. Świechowski accepted it for certain.

As it was already mentioned, in the 70s the problems concerning the Door of Płock were often discussed at numerous meetings of the Learned Society of Płock. It was an inspiration to take up new, more intensive research of the monument of art and to start cooperation with specialists of many different fields, also technical,

[103] *Idem*. Sztuka Płocka [The Art of Płock]. Płock, 1974. Ed. I. P. 31–37; Płock, 1985. Ed. II. P. 50–62.

[104] Różne rodzaje wystroju architektury w XI i XII wieku [Various kinds of architectural decor in 11th and 12th century] // SPPR. Vol. I, part 1. P. 227–228; part 2. P. 743–744. Otherwise M. Walicki suggested an idea of redeeming the lost artifact for the price of gold, but the idea did not reach the stage of accomplishment.

[105] *Mroczko T*. Polska sztuka przedromańska i romańska [Polish Pre-Romanesque and Romanesque art]. Warszawa, 1978. P. 142–144.

[106] *Idem*. Sztuka romańska w Polsce. Warszawa, 1982. P. 23, 67–69, 265, ill. 189–198 with comments.

[107] Compare *Fillitz H*. Op. cit. P. 245; picture 319a explanation.

who were preparing the copy for the cathedral of Płock first — of plastic and then of bronze like the Novgorod original[108].

However, the most important research and historical analysis for the history of the monument of art, as well as for the history of art were those by Andrzej Poppe, who started from palaeographic analysis of the Ruthenian inscriptions on the Door of Płock. Their comparison with the well-known Novgorod epigrams of the years 1438–1464 led to the recognition of many common features in them. The Ruthenian inscriptions on the Door were engraved according to A. Poppe somewhere round 1430, when it was probaly hinged in the Orthodox Church[109].

A. Poppe also deserves the credit for explaining the fact that a Romanesque artifact from a Magdeburg foundry of 12th century was provided with a Byzantine register, from Cherson, which was revealed in the name of «Korsun Door». A. Poppe determined precisely the dates of origin of the Door and bringing it from Magdeburg to Płock as 1153/1154. He also resumed the question of an unidentified figure at Christ's empty tomb, describing him as Joseph of Arimathea.

The same questions were recapitulated in two latest publications — in the commemorative book (of 1983) published for the occasion of delivery of the bronze copy[110] of the Door to the cathedral of Płock by the state government and in the review (of 1985) of U. Mende[111]. The results of the scientific research of A. Poppe enriched our knowledge of the artifact, filling some gaps concerning its origin, role and its history since the door arrived in Novgorod.

The Płock monument of art is mentioned in various works concerning general history of art, published in various countries[112] and in popular monographs of Novgorod[113], albums[114] and tourist foulders. The scenes from the panels of the Płock Door served as a starting point for religious meditations[115].

[108] The following articles can be an example of the latest — *Chyliński W.* Szczecińscy specjaliści w Nowogrodzie Wielkim [The specialists from Szczecin in Novgorod Velikij] // NP. 1971. N 5/64. P. 19–23 and *idem*. Stan prac przy wykonywaniu w Szczecinie kopii romańskich Drzwi Płockich [The state of research during the accomplishment of a replica of the Romanesque Door of Płock in Szczecin] // NP. 1972. N 1/65. P. 33–35.

[109] *Poppe A.* O napisach ruskich na Drzwiach Płockich [About the Ruthenian inscriptions on the Door of Płock] // NP. 1971. N 5/64. P. 16–19. It is an announcement crowning the palaeographic studies of the artifact. Its thesises were the subject of a paper presented by the author on 30 November 1971 in Novgorod Velikij, at the conference «Novgorod Wielikij. Archeologia, istoria, iskusstvo».

[110] Romańskie Drzwi Płockie. P. 30–39.

[111] *Poppe A.* O Drzwiach Płockich [About the Door of Płock] // NP. 1985. N 1/122. P. 14–22; *Łazariew N.N.* Istoria ruskogo iskusstva. M., 1954. T. 2. S. 715.

[112] *Ałpatow M.W.* Historia sztuki [History of Art]. Warszawa, 1968. Vol. 2. P. 110; *Souchal F.* L'alto Medioevo. Mediolan, 1969. S. 194–197; *Lazariev V.N.* 1) Iskusstvo Novgoroda. L., 1947; 2) Istoria ruskogo iskusstva. M., 1954. T. 2. S. 7–15.

[113] *Karger M.* 1) Novgorod. L., 1970. P. 78–82; 2) Novgorod. Architectural Monuments 11th–17th centuries.

[114] *Lichačov D.* Novgorod. L., 1984. Ill. 12–15.

[115] *Roth P.* Früchte Dich nicht. Würzburg, 1978.

Abreviations

BHS — Biuletyn Historii Sztuki, przed 1949 pt. Biuletyn Historii Sztuki i Kultury.

BL — Bibel Lexikon / Hrsg. von H. Haag. Leipzig, 1969.

EK — Encyklopedia katolicka. T. 1–20. Lublin, 1973–2014.

Künstle — *Künstle K.* Ikonographie der christlichen Kunst. Bde 1–2. Freiburg, 1926–1928.

LchI — Lexikon der christlichen Ikonographie / Hrsg. von E. Kirschbaum. Bde 1–8. Freiburg, 1968–1976.

LK — Lexikon der Kunst. Architektur. Bildende Kunst. Angewandte Kunst. Industrieformgestaltung.

Kunsttheorie / Hrsg. von G. Feist. Bde 1–5. Leipzig, 1968–1978.

LM — Lexikon des Mittelalters. Bde 1–3. München, 1980–1986.

LThK — Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche / Begründet von M. Buchberger. 2. Aufl. Bde 1–11. Freiburg, 1957–1967.

NP — Notatki Płockie.

PG — *Migne J.P.* Patrologiae cursus completus. Series graeca. T. 1–161. Parisiis, 1857–1866.

PL — *Migne J.P.* Patrologiae cursus completus. Series latina. T. 1–221. Parisiis, 1844–1855.

PSB — Polski słownik biograficzny. T. 1–30. Kraków, 1935–1988.

RDK — Reallexikon zur deutschen Kunstgeschichte / Hrsg. von O. Schmitt. Bde 1–6. Stuttgart, 1937–1973.

Reau — *Réau L.* Iconographiede l'artchretien. Vol. 1–3. Paris, 1955–1959.

WchS — *Forstner D.* Die Welt der christlichen Symbole. 3. Aufl. Innsbruck, 1977.

Referencrs

Adam A., Berger R. Pastoralliturgisches Handlexikon. Leipzig, 1982.

Adelung F. Die Korssunschen Thüren in der Kathedralkirche zur Heil Sophia in Nowgorod. Berlin, 1823.

Alpatow M. W. Historia sztuki. Warszawa, 1968. T. 2.

Anisimow A.J. Awtoportriet russkogo skulptora Awrama // Izwiestija Akadiemii Nauk SSSR. Otdielienije Gumanitarnych Nauk. 1928. № 3. P. 173–184.

Askanas K. Brązowe Drzwi Płockie w Nowogrodzie Wielkim. Płock, 1971.

Askanas K. Sztuka Płocka. Płock, 1974; Ed. 2: 1985.

Barbier V. Histoire de Tabbaye de Malonne de Tordre des chanoines reguliers de Saint-Augustin. Namur, 1894.

Bauch K. Das mittelalterliche Grabbild. Figürliche Grabmaler des 11. bis 15. Jahrhunderts in Europa. Berlin, 1976.

Beckwith J. Early medieval art. Carolingian, Ottonian, Romanesque. London, 1964.

Beenken H. Romanische Skulptur in Deutschland 11. und 12. Jahrhundert. Leipzig, 1924.

Boeckler A. Die bronze Tür von St. Zeno in Verona. Marburg, 1932.

Breslau P.D. Spazierfahrt nach Moskau. Leipzig, 1810.

Brykczyński A. La porte de bronze connue sous de nom de porte de Płock // Revue de l'Art Chrétien. 1903. N 3. P. 138–142.

Budde R. Deutsche romanische Skulptur 1050–1250. München, 1979.

Chantreau P.N. Voyage philosophique, politique et littéraire fait en Russie. Paris, 1793. Vol. 1–2.

Chojnacki J. W sprawie katedralnych «Drzwi Płockich» z połowy XII w. w Nowogrodzie Wielkim // NP. 1970. N 4. P. 3–8.

Chojnacki J. Jeszcze w sprawie romańskich «Drzwi Płockich» // NP. 1970. N 5. P. 12–17.

Chojnacki J. Romańskich «Drzwi Płockich» ciąg dalszy // NP. 1971. N 1. P. 11–12.

Chojnacki J. Delegacja do Moskwy i Nowogrodu Wielkiego w sprawie katedralnych «Drzwi Płockich» // NP. 1971. N 3. P. 3–8.

Chojnacki J. Kopia katedralnych «Drzwi Płockich» z połowy XII w. już wykonana i wystawiona w Szczecinie // NP. 1972. N 3. P. 23–25.

Chojnacki J. Kopia «Drzwi Płockich» wystawiona w Muzeum Historycznym miasta stołecznego Warszawy // NP. 1972. N 4. P. 48–49.

Chojnacki J. Płocczanie w Magdeburgu — na tropach «Drzwi Płockich» // NP. 1972. N 4. P. 50–51.

Chojnacki J. Co nowego w sprawie «Drzwi Płockich» // NP. 1972. N 5. P. 25.

Chojnacki J. Romańskie Drzwi Płockie i wielki dzwon średniowieczny w Nowogrodzie // NP. 1973. N 2. P. 21–22.

Chojnacki J. Romańskie Drzwi Płockie w piśmiennictwie polskim (1582–1974) // NP. 1974. N 4. P. 50–51.

Chojnacki J. Drzwi Płockie zawisły w dniu 23 listopada 1981 roku w Bazylice Katedralnej // NP. 1981. N 4. P. 59–64.

Cox W. Travels into Poland, Russia, Sweden and Danemark etc. London, 1784. Vol. 1–2.

Dalin O. von. Swea rikes historia. [B. m.], 1746–1750. Bd. 2.

Dehio G. von. Geschichte der Deutschen Kunst. Der Abbildungen. 2. Aufl. Berlin, 1921. Bd 1.

Dlugossii I. Vitae episcoporum plocensium abbreviatae // Monumenta Poloniae historica. Warszawa, 1961. T. 6.

Dobrzeniecki T. Joachim Lelewel jako historyk sztuki w świetle badań Drzwi Płockich i Gnieźnieńskich // BHS R. 14: 1952. N 1. P. 10–38.

Dobrzeniecki T. Legenda o Secie i Drzewie Życia w sztuce średniowiecznej // Rocznik Muzeum Narodowego w Warszawie. 1966. T. 10. P. 165–198.

Dzieje Płocka / Red. A. Gieysztor. Płock, 1973.

Dzieje sztuki polskiej / Red. M. Walicki. T. 1: Sztuka polska przedromańska i romańska do schyłku XIII w. Warszawa, 1971.

Fillitz H. Das Mittelalter I. Berlin, 1969.

Fiorillo J. D. Geschichte der Zeichnenden Künste in Deutschland und der Vereinigten Niederlanden. Hannover, 1817.

Die Frühmittelalterlichen Bronzetüren. Bd. 2: Goldschmidt A. Die Bronzetüren von Nowgorod und Gnesen. Marburg, 1932.

Fründt E. Sakrale Plastik Mittelalterliche Bildwerke in der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik. Berlin, 1965.

Furmankiewiczówna K. La porte de bronze de la cathédrale de Gniezno // Gazette des Beaux Arts. An. 1921. N 63. P. 361–370.

Gębarowicz M. Drzwi kościelne tzw. Płockie w Nowogrodzie Wielkim // Sprawozdania Towarzystwa Naukowego we Lwowie. 1923. R 3. P. 65–68.

Gibbon E. Geschichte des Verfalls und Untergangs des Römischen Reiches. [B. m.], 1776–1788. Bd. 15.

Gmelin J. G. D. Johann Georg Gmelins Reise durch Sibirien von dem Jahr 1733 bis 1743. Göttingen, 1751. Bde 1–4.

Goldschmidt A. Die Stilentwicklung der romanischen Skulptur in Sachsen // Jahrbuch der Königlich Preussischen Kunstsammlungen. 1900. Bd. 21. S. 227.

Goldschmidt A. Die Bronzetüren von Nowgorod und Gnesen. Marburg, 1932.

Götz U. Die Bildprogramme der Kirchentüren des 11. und 12. Jahrhunderts. Dissertation zur Erlangung des Doktorgrades der Philosophischen Fakultät der Eberhard-Karls-Universität zu Tübingen. [Tubingen], 1971.

Grimme E.G. Europäische Goldschmiedekunst Mittelalters. Reliquiare. Köln, 1972.

Gutkowska-Rychlewska M. Historia ubiorów. Wrocław, 1968.

Hamann R. Historia sztuki. Tłum. M. Wallis. T. 1–2. Warszawa, 1934.

Hasak M. Zur Geschichte der deutschen Bildwerke des 13. Jh. // Zeitschrift für christliche Kunst. Jg. 19. 1906. N 12. S. 370–380.

Herberstein S. von. Mein Siegm. Freih. zu Herberstain Raittung und Antzaigen Meines Lebens in Kovachich's Samml. kl. noch ungedr. Stücke. Ofen [?], 1805.

Hossmann S. Regentensaal. [B. m.], 1702.

Karamsin N.M. Istoria russkogo gosudarstwa. SPb., 1816–1829. T. 1–4.

Karger M. [*K.*] Nowgorod. L., 1970.

Karger M. [*K*] Nowgorod. Architectural monuments 11th–17th centuries. L., 1975.

Kehr P. Das Erzbistum Magdeburg und die erste Organisation der Christlichen Kirche in Polen // Abhandlungen der Preussischer Akademie der Wissenschaft. 1920. N 1.

Knapiński R. Romańskie Drzwi Płockie w Nowogrodzie Wielkim w opisie wygnańca — biskupa Chościak-Popiela // NP. 1983. N 4. P. 3–7.

Konczin J. Zachowane w stanie nienaruszonym // Kraj Rad. 1982. N 21. P. 20.

Kostanecki S. O temacie i układzie Drzwi Płockich // NP. 1971. N 3. P. 9–11.

Krause H.J., Schubert E. Die Bronzetür der Sophienkathedrale in Nowgorod. Leipzig, 1968.

Krohn H. Mittelalterliche Plastik in Russland // Russlandbericht des Kunsthistorischen Instituts Köln. Exkursion 1965. Köln, 1966.

Künstle K. Ikonographie der christlichen Kunst. Freiburg, 1926–1928. Bde 1–2.

Leisinger H. Romanische Bronzen. Kirchentüren im mittelalterlichen Europa. Zürich, 1956.

Lelewel J. Polska wieków średnich, czyli w dziejach narodowych polskich postrzeżenia. Poznań, 1851. T. 4.

Lelewel J. Drzwi kościelne Płockie i Gnieźnieńskie z lat 1133, 1155. Poznań, 1857.

Lexikon der Kunst. Architektur. Bildende Kunst. Angewandte Kunst. Industrieformgestaltung. Kunsttheorie / Hrsg. von G. Feist. Leipzig, 1968–1978. Bde 1–5.

Lexikon des Mittelalters. München, 1980–1986. Bde 1–3.

Lexikon fur Theologie und Kirche. Begründet von M. Buchberger. 2. Aufl. Freiburg, 1957–1967. Bde 1–11.

Lichaczow D. Nowgorod. L., 1984.

Ligtenberg R. Het Symbolum Apostolicum in de ikonografie der Middeleeuwen // Het Gildeboek. 1929. Jg. 12. P. 9–34.

Łazariew W.N. Iskusstwo Nowgoroda. M., 1947.

Łazariew W.N. Istoria ruskogo iskusstwa. M., 1954.

Łazariew W.N. Iskusstwo sriedniewiekowoj Rusi i Zapad (XI–XV ww.) // XIII Mieżdunarodnyj kongriess istoriczeskich nauk. M., 1970.

Mende U. Die Türzieher des Mittelalters. Berlin, 1981.

Mende U. Die Bronzetüren des Mittelalters 800–1200. München, 1983.

Meyer E.A. Goldschmidt, Die Bronzetüren von Nowgorod und Gnesen // Deutsche Literaturzeitung. 1933. Jg. 54. Col. 843–847.

Migne J.P. Patrologiae cursus completus. Series latina T. 1–221. Parisiis, 1844–1855.

Migne J.P. Patrologiae cursus completus. Series graeca T. 1–161. Parisiis, 1857–1866.

Molsdorf W. Christliche Symbolik der mittelalterlichen Kunst. Leipzig, 1926.

Morelowski M.T. Dobrzeniecki, Joachim Lelewel jako historyk sztuki w świetle badań Drzwi Płockich i Gnieźnieńskich // BHS R. 15: 1953. N 2. P. 95–96.

Mroczko T. Opus quod nobile claret // NP. 1982. N 2–3. P. 15–16.

Nowowiejski A.J. Płock. Monografia historyczna, napisana podczas wojny wszechświatowej, poprawiona i uzupełniona w r. 1920. Wyd. 2. Płock, 1930.

Panofsky E. Die deutsche Plastik des elften bis dreizehnten Jahrhunderts. München, 1924.

Pohorecki F.A. Goldschmidt, Die Bronzetüren von Nowgorod und Gnesen // Roczniki Historyczne. 1933. T. 9. P. 121–129.

Popiel W. Chościak Pamiętniki ks. Wincentego Chościak-Popiela, arcybiskupa warszawskiego, wydane przez ks. J. Urbana. Kraków, 1915. T. 1–2.

Poppe A. O napisach ruskich na Drzwiach Płockich // NP. 1971. N 5. P. 16–19.

Poppe A. Dlaczego Drzwi Płockie zwano Korsuńskimi? // NP. 1973. N 2. P. 15–20.

Poppe A. O dacie wykonania Drzwi Płockich w warsztacie magdeburskim // NP. 1977. N 2. P. 25–30.

Poppe A. Die Magdeburger Frage // Europa Slavica — Europa Orientalis. Giessener Abhandlungen. 1980. Bd 100. P. 297–340.

Poppe A. Some observations on the bronze doors of the St Sophia in Novgorod // Les pays du Nord et Byzance / Red. par R. Zeitler. Uppsala, 1981. P. 407–418.

Poppe A. O Drzwiach Płockich // NP. 1985. N 1. P. 14–20.

La porta come segno // Arte Cristiana. An. 70. 1982. N 693. P. 297.

Raupach D. Reise von St. Petersburg nach dem Gesundbrunnen zu Lipezk am Don. Nebst einem Beytrage zur Charakteristik des Russen. Breslau, 1809.

Réau L. Iconographie de l'art chrétien. Paris, 1955–1959. Vol. 1–3.

Reimer H. Reise der Russischen Kaiserlichen Ausserodentlichen Gesandschaft an die Ottomanische Pforte im Jahre 1793. SPb., 1803. Bd 3.

Romańskie Drzwi Płockie 1154 — ok. 1430–1982. Płock, 1983.

Sauerländer W. Die Bronzetür von Nowgorod. München, 1963.

Sauerländer W. Skulptur des Mittelalters. Frankfurt a. M., 1963.

Sauerländer W. Rzeźba średniowieczna Przeł. A. Porębska. Warszawa, 1978.

Souchal F. L'alto medioevo. Milano, 1969.

Sriedniewiekowaja Rus'. M., 1976.

Szaskolski I.P. Priedanije o Sigtunskich worotach i jego dostowiemost // Uczonyje Zapiski Leningradskogo Gosudarstwiennogo Uniwiersitieta. Serija Istoriczeskich Nauk. 1949. Wyp. 14. S. 120–135.

Świechowski Z. Sztuka romańska w Polsce. Warszawa, 1982.

Świechowski Z., Nowak L., Gumińska B. Sztuka romańska. Warszawa, 1976.

Tatiszczew S.P. Istorija Rossijskaja. SPb., 1784.

Tołstoj P.A. Swjatyni i driewnosti Wielikogo Nowgoroda. M., 1862.

Truhart A. Fama für Deutsch-Russland. Riga, 1806. Bd 2.

Walicki M. A Goldschmidt. Die Bronzetüren von Nowgorod und Gnesen // BHS. R. 3. 1935. N 193 4. S. 59–62.

Zarnecki G. Romanik. München, 1978.

Żebrowski T. Zarys dziejów diecezji płockiej. Płock, 1976.

Żebrowski T. Rola ośrodka kościelnego płockiego w dziejach Polski w średniowieczu // NP. 1987. N 3. P. 29–34.