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Abstract. The article analyzes the complex of historical and archaeological materials related to the
architecture of the lost St. Peter’s Church in Przemyśl (Peremyshl), which existed approximately from the
XII–XIII centuries to 1679. Based on the systematization of the available data, an attempt is made to recreate
the chronology of changes in the planning structure and appearance of the structure from the time of its
appearance to dismantling.
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Problem statement

The architecture of Przemysl (Peremyshl) of the Rurik dynasty era is mainly associated with acropolis
(“dytnets”) and a complex of monumental buildings associated with the power and authority presence here.
At the same time, most of the urban planning space of the second most important city of the Galician
principality was located eastward, where important architectural accents were also placed, first of all sacred
structures. Except for the St. Nicholas rotunda; the level of interest in them and the state of research is
significantly lower. Among the buildings located in this vast area was the Church of St. Peter (Peter and
Paul, Apostles), for which there is both historical documentary evidence and more recent data of
archaeological research, which should receive their own comprehensive interpretation.

Analysis of recent research and publications

Since the building, although in a rebuilt form, existed until the second half of the XVII century,
evidence of it has been preserved in some documents, as well as image on an print from 1617/18. On the
basis of these data, with the beginning of the modern era, attempts to create a historical (Pawłowski, 1869;
Dobryansky, 1893), and then – in the second half of the twentieth century – the architectural interpretation
of this building (Żaki, 1958; Kunysz, 1981) are being made. This interpretation, however, was based
primarily on a late medieval schematic image, which shows the contours of the structures of the Jesuit
complex, which appeared here in the XVII century. The new array of material appeared after archaeological
excavations, which were started in 2015. (Koperski, 2017).
The historical interpretation of the temple, first of all, is connected with the clarification of its confessional affiliation and, probably, was influenced by the author’s own identity. The definition of the architectural qualities of the structure was based on two iconographic sources mentioned above – a print and a scheme of the XVII century, the hypothetical variability of which, in the absence of more reliable material, was quite wide.

**Highlighting outstanding issues**

As a result of archaeological research, it was found that the structure had a larger size than expected, a slightly different location and has two construction periods. At the same time, it was revealed that the remains of the foundations and floors were significantly destroyed by Jesuit college built in the late Middle Ages and placed in the centre of the former temple. In addition, other sites suffered significant losses after laying sewers. In this regard, the task of interpreting opened fragments remains relevant, both in the context of the appearance of a later temple and an earlier one, which probably existed in its place since the XII century.

**Purpose of the article**

The article aims to reconstruct the probable chronology of the development and architectural image of the medieval St. Peter’s Church in Przemysl based on the generalization of source, iconographic and archaeological material.

**Results and discussion**

**Chronology of mentions.** The first information about St. Peter’s church dates back to the period of the establishment of *Latinocratic rule* on the territory of Galician Rus in the second half of the XIV century. This time is characterized by uncertainty about the political and ecclesiological status of new power and institutions in the newly conquered lands. There were several concepts of the “transition period”, including the annexation of all the acquired territories to the Lublin Roman-Catholic Diocese, the strengthening Lebus bishops power, the preservation of certain separate character of Galicia, or it full incorporation into the Hungarian kingdom. If in the second half of the 1370s, from a political point of view, the Sub-Carpathian region was put on the path of direct Hungarian rule, then in an ecclesiological sense, Pope Gregory XI, with his bulls (1372, 1375), approved the concept of Latin expansion as a kind of “correction” of the church network historically already compiled here (Maciejowski, 1839). Therefore, the way was opened to seize and use all the church buildings of the Galician Metropolitanate of the Constantinople Patriarchate. This model was a repeat of the strategy already used in the Balkans after the Fourth Crusade (1204), when a significant part of Eastern Roman Empire, including Constantinople, was under the rule of Western feudal lords (Fine, 1994).

It was in this context that the interpretation of the seizure of the Rus church by the newly arrived Latin Bishop of Przemysl Eric Vinsen arose as “ecclesiam cathedralem s. t. S. Petri cum possessionibus suis de minibus schismaticorum revindicavit, revindicatam restauravit, ac restauratam sub novo titulo” (“church of St. Peter, which was in the hands of schismatics, was returned and restored under a new title”) (Pawłowski, 1869). It also follows that the re-consecrated church has become a cathedral (Łękawski 13–14). Subsequently the building, already as a Roman Catholic one, under the administration of canon Jan, was mentioned in 1398. In 1406, the church burned down (Orłowicz, 1917) after which the process of restoring began. After the conversion to Latin the old Orthodox Cathedral on Castle Hill, worships continued to be held here on Wednesdays (Łękawski 13–14). Also mentioned in the Przemysl book in 1421 (Księga Ławnicza, 1402–1445). In 1618 it was transferred to Jesuits. Two images of the structure also belong to the same time – one on a well-known print by H. Brown (1617–1618), which shows the upper parts of the building (Fig. 1), the second in the scheme of Jesuit possessions from the first half of the XVII century, which shows the contours of the plan (Fig. 2). In 1679, it was dismantled by the Jesuits, after which, on the site where it was located, the college building was erected.
In addition to this historical information, there is also fictional information associated with the structure. In particular, a fragment of the inscription found in the Stare Misto in 1900 refers to the consecration of the church by the Latin Bishop John on May 12, 1212, but further, Saint Jadwiga of Silesia is mentioned, who was canonized only in 1267. In addition, in the XVIII century, appeared some note that tells about the arrival of the Franciscans to Rus and their use of the Church of St. Peter in 1235. However, the text says that the brothers sent by Pope Gregory IX first settled in Lviv and Halych, and only then in Przemysl (Lękawski, 7). Thus, the realities of later times were adapted for 1235, when Lviv did not yet exist, especially it was not a city more important than Halych and Przemysl.

In the historiography of modern times, which coincided with the formation of modern national collectives, there is an increase in unambiguity in the interpretation of the ethno-confessional affiliation of the building (Holubets, 1928). Fundamentally at this time new data on the history and appearance of the structure did not appear.

Archaeological research. In the second half of the XX century, in the area of the building’s location, a small area with the remains of a medieval foundation was explored. The nature of its execution on lime mortar allowed the archaeologists A. Źaki and A. Kunysz to claim that the temple was made of stone. In addition, this was confirmed by the length of time during which the Jesuits dismantled it after the construction of a new baroque building (Źaki, 1958; Kunysz, 1981). However, at that time, Kunysz accepted as reliable the contours of the structure placed in the scheme of Jesuit parcel of the XVII century, in respect of which he made his attempt to reconstruct the plan of the lost building (Fig. 3). To outline it, he uses the diminutive form “kostiolek” (from Polish “koscioł”), and compares it with a similar church of St. Salvator in Krakow.

During 2015–2017, new excavations were carried out at the location of the temple, during which were obtained material that revealed new information about the structure. It was revealed that its location does not coincide with one indicated on the Jesuit scheme, and its dimensions are significantly larger. Although the archaeological layer was damaged by the later construction of the college and engineering networks, a brick floor and a stone foundation were discovered, and below them an earlier floor made of clay tiles and two fragments of an older foundation on a sand-lime mortar (Koperski, 2017).

Architectural interpretation. The materials obtained as a result of archaeological research allow us to speak about the existence of two temples on the same site. The character of the older one corresponds to the traditions of Rus architecture (XII–XIV centuries), the later one – the Gothic era (from the XIV century); the ancient structure was somewhat larger than the later, and its plan probably had the shape of a “Greek cross”, as it is depicted in the Jesuit scheme of the XVII century. Due to the current data, we can question: a) what was the nature of the architecture of both temples? b) at what moment did the destruction of an ancient structure occur, replaced with a new one?

Iconographic materials that date back to the XVII century are not literal and give only approximate data about the structure. Since in Brown’s print the temple looks like a small one nave basilica, and in the Jesuit scheme the plan of the “Greek cross”, T. Lenkavsky attempted to reconstruct it as a wooden church.
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(this was indicated by Brown’s print) with wide but low projections of the transept (Fig. 10). Thus, the author of the reconstruction agreed on both iconographic sources, since only the upper part of the building is visible on the print. It is also difficult to say unequivocally about the structure of the building of the Gothic period as a result of the excavations carried out in 2015–2017. Stone foundations indicate it as wooden. The opened fragment of the stone foundation has a small opening, probably for a door, followed by brick pavement identical to that of nave. This combination suggests that “hands” of the “Greek cross” had an even lighter solution than on the reconstruction of Lenkavsky. These could be two porches in front of the entrance (Brown’s print shows a small single-pitched roof), and the Jesuit scheme shows not the plan in the modern sense, but the general contours (as well as the neighbouring new basilica).

The developed extensions, however, reflected the tradition of an older temple that existed in the Rurik dynasty era. This is evidenced by the nature of the foundation fragment, in the form of a rectangular break (Fig. 4, fragment 1), which formed the transition of different sides of the “Greek cross”. A fragment on a sand-lime mortar was also found on a site located almost symmetrically – on the north side (Fig. 4, fragment 2). This gives an idea of the size of one of the sides of the central, possibly under-dome space.

Such data indicate that in ancient Rus times, St. Peter’s Church in Przemysl could have had a planning structure close to the early church in the Tsarynka tract in Halych (Fig. 6), but noticeably larger. Interesting results are obtained by comparing two ancient Rus fragments of the Przemysl church with the domed space of the Church of St. Nicholas in Lviv, which has a similar cross-shaped planning structure. Although the available materials from the excavations in Przemysl are too fragmentary, it is worth noting that the corresponding dimensions in both temples are almost the same (Fig. 5).
As a result of summarizing the above data, it can be assumed that the original Church of St. Peter in Przemyśl had a planning and three-dimensional structure similar to the churches of St. John in Halych (Tsaynka tract) and St. Nicholas in Lviv (Fig. 8). Although the nature of the foundation on a sand-lime mortar does not allow us to talk about the large thickness inherent in most stone buildings of the Galician school, nevertheless, the very fact of its construction, as A. Kunysh wrote about it, is an argument for the stone nature of the original structure (the so-called "Poligon" in Halych had thin foundations (Dyba, 2005)). This type of temple, although less popular than the cross-domed one, is also found in the East – for example, the Church of the Virgin Παρθένου Παναγίας (XII–XIV centuries, Naxos Island) (Fig. 9), the Church of St. Paraskeva in the Amari Valley (XIII century, Crete island) in Greece, the Church of St. Stephan, Lmbatavank monastery (VII century, Artic) Karmaravor temple (VII century, Ashtarak) in Armenia (Fig. 10) or some objects in Croatia. A significant number of burials, under the floor of the side parts of the planning cross of the ancient temple, as well as a large cemetery around, indicate that the structure and the area around was an ancient necropolis, which was used both in the Rurik Era and after the Polish-Hungarian conquest. Hypothetically, it can be assumed that the structure could be associated with a community of urban fishermen, whose patron was considered St. Peter.

An important issue in the history of the Church of St. Peter in Przemyśl is the establishment of time and circumstances, the destruction of an old building and the emergence of a new one. It is important to note that there was no question of expansion or reconstruction: the new building was smaller and simpler than previous. There are three most obvious events when the destruction of an ancient structure could have occurred. The first was in 1380 when the building was seized by the newly arrived Latin Bishop Erich. The second one is connected with the fire of 1406, after which a long period of its restoration began. The third may be the Volokh’s attack on Przemyśl in 1498, during which some Franciscan monks were killed.

The tradition of interpreting Orthodox structures after the establishment of Latinocratic rule, which was developed in Greece after the Fourth Crusade, meant their mandatory transformation without the possibility of long-term existence of parallel ecclesiastical systems. Therefore, churches that were subordinate to the patriarch of Constantinople should be interpreted as sacred objects, but already of a new subordination. Therefore, in the large cities of Galician Rus, “Latin” temples often appeared on the basis of existing “Greek” ones. In this sense, the phrase “renovabit restavrabit” for the Church of St. Peter, referring to the activities of the newly arrived Latin Bishop Erich in 1380, can be understood as an adaptation of the building to the specifics of the western liturgy.

The largest recorded destruction of the structure was the fire of 1406, after which the transfer of the ancient Rus cathedral on Castle Hill to the Latin community took place. This indicates that the Church of St. Peter was in a state that did not allow its full functioning. At this time, the main church of the Latin community was probably the rotunda of St. Nicholas. Analysis of documents related to the construction of new sacred objects in Przemyśl at that time indicates a constant lack of funds and a long construction time. Thus, it is the period after 1406 that can be considered the most likely time for the appearance of a new temple. Since in that time, it did not have the status of a cathedral, for its construction was used wood. In general terms, it followed the outline of the old one, whose remains were probably still visible on the spot. The narrow foundations of the old structure may indicate that some elements of the upper levels were probably made of wood, which led to such strong destruction by fire. The materials of the old building, apparently stone, could have been used for the construction of urban fortifications, which, in the newly conquered country, were given great importance.

Conclusions

1. Analysis of the source and recently obtained archaeological data allows us to make an assumption about the appearance of the first of the two temples of St. Peter in Przemyśl, which belongs to the old Rus’ era. Based on various data, it can be supposed that its planning structure was similar to that used in the early Church of St. John in Halych in the Tsarynka tract. The closest in size and structure to the Przemyśl Church, in this case, is the Church of St. Nicholas in Lviv, the dimensions of the middle cross (~underdome space) of which are almost the same. In this case, the appearance of the Przemyśl church is reconstructed by analogy with these two structures.
2. A comparison of the available data about architectural image transformation of the building suggests that the most likely time for the disappearance of the ancient temple and the construction of a new, slightly smaller one in its place is 1406. It is this date that is associated with the largest recorded destruction of the structure as a result of a fire. Since it was followed by the transfer of the ancient Orthodox cathedral on Castle Hill to the Latin community, this may indicate that the Church of St. Peter was in a state that did not allow its full functioning. Other possible dates of the disappearance of the building of the ancient Rus era, for example, 1380 or 1498, require additional arguments.
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ХРОНОЛОГІЯ ТА АРХІТЕКТУРА ХРАМУ СВЯТОГО ПЕТРА У ПЕРЕМИЩІ ВІД ДАВНЬОРУСЬКОЇ ДОБИ ДО XVII ст.

Анотація. Архітектура Перемишля Княжої доби здебільшого асоціюється із дитинцем, пов'язаним із перебуванням тут осередку влади та авторитету. Водночас рівень зацікавленості рештою містобудівної тканини, другого за значенням міста Галицького князівства, що розташоване східніше, є відчутно нижчою. Серед будівель цього великого ареалу була розташована і церква св. Петра, щодо якої є як історичні документальні свідчення, так і новіші археологічні матеріали, котрі потрібно комплексніше інтерпретувати.

Аналіз джерельних та недавно отриманих археологічних матеріалів дає змогу уявити вигляд першого із двох храмів св. Петра у Перемишлі, котрий належить до Давньоруської доби. На основі врахування різних даних можна припустити, що його планувальна структура була аналогічною до використаної у ранній церкві (св. Івана) в урочищі Царинка. Найближчим за розмірами та структурою до перемишльського храму є церква св. Миколая у Львові, габарити середньовічного (підкупольного простору) яких майже однакові. Тому зазначений вигляд перемишльського храму реконструюється за аналогією до цих двох споруд.

Зіставлення наявних даних про трансформації архітектурного образу будівлі дає можливість припустити, що найбільш імовірним часом зниження давнього храму і будівництво на його місці нового, деяко меньшого за розміром, є 1406 р. Саме з цією датою пов'язане найдавніше зафіксоване руйнування споруди після пожежі. Охоплюючи після неї відбулися передача литописних обчислів давнього руського собору на замковій горі, що може свідчити про те, що храм св. Петра знаходився в стані, який не давав йому змоги поновитися. Інші ймовірні дати зниження споруди давньоруської доби, наприклад 1380 або 1498 роки, потребують додаткових аргументів.
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