

SOME REMAINING PUZZLES IN CYRILLO-METHODIAN STUDIES

Henrik BIRNBAUM, Los Angeles

It may come as something of a surprise that in the study of the earliest recorded history (and literacy) of the Slavs – in other words, in research pertaining to the Cyrillo-Methodian period (and immediately subsequent times) – there remain to this day a number of controversial, indeed hotly debated issues. Due to considerations of space, only some, but not all, of these issues will be singled out for discussion here. They are: (1) the alleged gospel and psalter written in 'Rusian' letters, found by Constantine–Cyril during his stay in Cherson; (2) the location of the Moravian state to which the Thessalonian brothers traveled; and (3) the so-called *Methodii Doctrina*, or the attitude of the East Frankish clergy and of the Papacy toward Methodius and his teaching. A fourth puzzling fact, namely, the total silence about the Moravian (or Moravian-Pannonian) mission of Constantine–Cyril and Methodius (as well as their mission to Khazaria) in all the Byzantine sources – particularly surprising in view of the brothers' close personal relationship with Patriarch Photius and the imperial court – can only be noted but will not be commented on here or an explanation attempted. At any rate, the ultimate failure of both the Moravian and the Khazarian missions, at least from the Byzantine point of view, does not seem to be sufficient to account for the silence in imperial historiography; this is of course said without considering the enormous repercussions of the Moravian mission for subsequent Slavic religious and intellectual life.

Still another, thus fifth, as yet unresolved issue to be only briefly touched upon here is the proper interpretation of chapter VIII of the *Vita Constantini* (hereafter VC), where we read that

emissaries from the Khazars came to the Greek [i.e., Byzantine] emperor, saying: »From the beginning we have known one God who is above all, and worshipped Him facing east. However, we keep other shameful customs. The Jews exhort us to accept their faith and ways, while on the other hand the Saracens [i.e., the Arabs], offering us peace and many gifts, press us, saying: »Our faith is better than that of all other peoples«. Maintaining our former love and friendship, we therefore have come to you. For you are a great people and your empire is from God. And in requesting your counsel, we ask of you a learned man. Should he prevail over the Jews and the Saracens, we shall accept your faith.«¹

The cited phrasing found in the VC suggests that the majority of the Khazars had as yet not decided in favor of one of the three monotheistic religions – Judaism, Christendom, or Islam – while in fact it is known primarily from Arabic and Hebrew sources that the Khazar ruler (khagan), his court, and probably the majority of the people of Khazaria converted to Judaism c. 740 A.D. and to the Rabbinic variety of that religion two generations later, around 800 A.D.² How are we then to understand this seemingly inconsistent and contradictory tale of the VC? According to a recent interpretation by A. Arxipov, Constantine's anti-Jewish diatribe, indirectly echoed also in the »Philosopher's speech« found in the Old Russian Primary Chronicle (in the context of Vladimir's choice of religion), can be viewed against the background of the original Khazar–Jewish legend about the choice of faith (here, Judaism) polemically overlaying the story of the missionary work of the two preceptors (or »apostles«) of the Slavs, Constantine–Cyril and Methodius, which in turn was complicated by the »philosopher's« extensive sermon and his account of the symbols of faith. In fact, therefore, we are presumably dealing here with a

¹ See M. KANTOR, *Medieval Slavic Lives of Saints and Princes*, Ann Arbor, MI, 1983, 41-42.

² Cf. D. M. DUNLOP, *The History of the Jewish Khazars*, Princeton, NJ / New York, 1954/1967, chs. V-VII; A. KOESTLER, *The Thirteenth Tribe: The Khazar Empire and its Heritage*, New York, 1976, esp. 58-82 and 215-222 (to be used with caution); *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, A. P. Kazhdan, ed. in chief, Vol. 2, New York & Oxford, 1991, 1127, s.v. (authored by O. PRITSAK).

»compositional element« or device of the VC, viz., the »calling of the philosopher«. ³

But let us now turn to the three major puzzles to be discussed in this essay.

1. THE PHRASE »*rusьskymi pismeny*« IN THE *VITA CONSTANTINI*

As is well known to specialists in the field, the enigmatic statement found in the VC, chapter VIII, that prior to his setting out, at the request of the Byzantine emperor, on a mission to the Khazars, the learned Thessalonian found in Cherson – at the time a Byzantine outpost in the Crimea, recently repossessed – a gospel text and a psalter written in »Rusian« letters (*rusьskymi pismeny*), has caused much guesswork and bewilderment. For even though the Crimea in c. 860 probably was a multiethnic community (and this applies in particular to its main port city of Cherson), it is quite unlikely that among the peoples settled there were also Slavs, notably Slavs from the basin of the southern Dnieper (if we assume that the political history of Kievan Rus' does not predate the semi-legendary capture of the city on the Dnieper by Prince Oleg in 882). For, as is well known, the Slavs of the Dnieper region were at that time still separated from the northern shores of the Black Sea and the Sea of Azov by the steppe, populated by the Khazars and later also the Pechenegs, the latter remaining pagan until long after the conversion of Rus' in 966. Consequently, scholars have been looking for other explanations than identifying the Rus' referred to here with early Eastern Slavs; in fact, only a few highly nationalistic or otherwise subjective historians and philologists have continued to suggest that Constantine-Cyril indeed found an Old Russian text (or two such texts) and also encountered a man speaking that language. ⁴ Also, it seems highly unlikely that Constantine-Cyril should have been so very much concerned with the issue whether the Slavs (of Moravia or elsewhere) had their own

³ See A. АРХИПОВ, *По ту сторону Самбатиаона: Этюды о русско-еврейских культурных, языковых и литературных контактах в X-VI веках*, Oakland, CA, 1995, 50-54.

⁴ Cf., e.g., П. Я. ЧЕРНЫХ, *К истории вопроса о 'русских письменах' в Житии Константина Философа*, Уч. зап. Ярославского педагогического института 9 (1947), 1-14; В. А. ИСТРИН, *1100 лет славянской азбуки*, Moscow, 1963, esp. 18-19 and 103-106; Е. ГЕОРГИЕВ, *Письменность россов*, in: *Cyrillo-Methodiana: Zur Frühgeschichte des Christentums bei den Slaven, 863-1963*, M. HELLMANN et al., eds., Cologne & Graz, 1964, 372-381; A. AVENARIUS, *Ruské písmená v Živote Konštantinovem: Pokus o reinterpretáciu*, »Historický časopis« 27 (1979), 73-78.

writing system, as reported in chapter XIV of the VC (to which the emperor answered in the negative, referring to his predecessors, including his grandfather, Basil I), had Constantine–Cyril in fact already found and familiarized himself or otherwise experimented with a Slavic script in the Crimea, while en route to the Khazars.

Among alternative theories, a few deserve mention here, as do some recent attempts to find a reasonable explanation for what at first blush seems a very mysterious – or, if taken at face value, unlikely – statement of Constantine–Cyril's biographer. Of these more or less recent attempts only a few can be discussed below; however, they in turn provide references to the earlier pertinent literature.

One such theory has it that with the term *rusьskymi (pismeny)* the author did refer to Gothic by confusing one Old Germanic language (Gothic) with another (Old Scandinavian, or to be precise Early Old Swedish, the speech of the Varangians, in contemporary Slavic and Greek sources referred to as *Rus̃* or *Ῥωζ*). This hypothesis was advocated by, among others, the Czech–American scholar Francis Dvorník and the Polish Slavist Tadeusz Lehr–Splawiński.⁵ At first glance, such a conjecture seems appealing – the Goths had, after all, been Christianized much earlier (cf. the missionary activity of the Visigothic bishop Wulfila, d. 381, north and south of the lower Danube in the Byzantine province of Moesia), and there is evidence of a Gothic presence in the Crimea (cf. the Crimean Gothic lexical items reported by the imperial ambassador A. G. de Busbecq, d. 1592). However, on second thought, there is much that speaks against such an identification. Not only is it not particularly likely that the Old Scandinavian of the notoriously pagan Varangians and the language of the Christian–Arian Goths would have been mixed up by a medieval (or early modern) copyist. Also, the Arian Goths of the Balkans were in no way identical with their Crimean cousins who had remained at the northern shores of the Black Sea and very possibly had not been converted to Chri-

⁵ Cf. F. DVORNÍK *Les légendes de Constantin et de Méthode, vue de Byzance*, Prague, 1933, 185-189; see, however, also *id.*, *Byzantine Missions among the Slavs: SS. Constantine-Cyril and Methodius*, New Brunswick, NJ, 1970, 66 and 343 (n. 35), where he accepts the more recent Syriac theory; T. LEHR-SPLAWIŃSKI, ed., *Żywoty Konstantyna i Metodego*, Poznań, 1959, 30 (n. 45). Another identification with Gothic operates with the even more far-fetched idea that a scribe substituted *rouš'kymi* for (*p*)*rusьskymi*, *prōzŷkymi* (= *fr̃žŷkymi*) in the sense of Franks (Lat. *francus*), the latter used as a cover term for all Germanic or generally Western peoples; cf. Г. ИЛИНСКИЙ, »Slavia« 3 (1924), 45-64; П. А. ЛЯВ-РОБ, *Izv. ORJaS* 1 (1928), 38-48; I. DUJČEV, »Ricerche Slavistiche« 8 (1960), 49-50.

stianity, or at least not to its Arian variety. The idea of *rusьskymi pismeny* as referring to some Gothic script was therefore soon enough abandoned again, and a search for other explanations began.

The next hypothesis, still accepted by many, is based primarily on considerations of a philological nature. According to this theory, *rusьskymi* (or *rosьskymi*) here stands for an original *surьskymi* (*sorьskymi*) – with a metathesis of the consonants of the first syllable, thus *sur-* > *rus-*, (*sor-* > *ros*), by which for the original meaning 'Syriac' (i.e., Aramaic, the language of Jesus and of a large Christian community) could be substituted 'Rusian' (i.e., Old Russian), more in tune with the expectation of the later East Slavic copyist, for whom 'Syriac' here presumably made little sense. This hypothesis was first advanced by the French Slavist André Vaillant and subsequently accepted and further developed by such highly distinguished scholars as Roman Jakobson, Dietrich Gerhardt, Karel Horálek, Robert Auty, H. G. Lunt, and others.⁶ Undoubtedly Syrian (Syriac, Aramaic) speaking people, presumably mostly merchants, could have resided in the Crimea at the time and especially in the port city of Cherson; it is also known that Syriac was the language of the Syrian Christian refugees who had escaped from Arabic Islamic rule. Much therefore seemed to speak for the Syriac hypothesis and we could have left the matter at that, had not two (or three) voices been raised recently proposing a different solution.

In an essay *On 'rusьskymi pismeny' in the »Vita Constantini« and Rus'ian Religious Patriotism*, contributed to the Festschrift for his teacher, Riccardo Picchio,⁷ Harvey Goldblatt notes, among other things, that of all the preserved

⁶ See A. VAILLANT, *Les lettres russes de la vie de Constantin*, »Revue des études slaves« 15 (1935), 75-77; R. JAKOBSON, *Saint Constantin et la langue syriaque*, »Annuaire de l'Institut de philologie et d'histoire orientales et slaves« 7 (1939/44), 181-186; *id.*, *Minor Native Sources for the Early History of the Slavic Church*, »Harvard Slavic Studies« 2 (1954), 39-73, esp. 68 ff.; D. GERHARDT, *Goten, Slaven oder Syrer im alten Cherson?* »Beiträge zur Namenforschung« 4 (1953), 78-88; K. HORÁLEK, *Св. Кирилл и семитские языки*, *For Roman Jakobson*, The Hague, 1956, 230-234; R. AUTY, *The Gospel and Psalter of Cherson: Syriac or Russian?*, *To Honor Roman Jakobson I*, The Hague & Paris, 1967, 114-117; H. G. LUNT, *Again the rusьskymi pismeny*, »Cercetări de lingvistică« III, *Supliment* (Mélanges E. Petrovici), Bucharest, 1958 [1962], 324-326 (on a parallel, *sourskyj* > *rousbskyi*, in the *First Novgorod Chronicle*); see now also T. R. CARLTON, *Introduction to the Phonological History of the Slavic Languages*, Columbus, OH, 1990 [1991], 47-50. Cf. further F. Dvorník's later expressed opinion (see above, n. 5).

⁷ *Studia Slavica Mediaevalia et Humanistica...*, M. COLUCCI et al., eds., Rome, 1986 [1987], 311-328.

codices which contain the VC (or parts thereof) the vast majority is East Slavic – Goldblatt counted approximately forty (yet, if we include prologue or synaxary lives and hitherto known fragments, the number is presumably even considerably larger, exceeding one hundred, according to Giorgio Ziffer, one of today's leading experts on the VC) – and has the reading *rusьskym(i) pismeny*, while the much fewer South Slavic manuscripts show various readings: *rousьskymi* (i.e., essentially the same as the East Slavic ones), *roušb-kym(i)* (attributable to Vladislav Gramatik), and *rosьky* (or corrupted forms which can be derived from it). Given also the fact that the earliest attestation of this text – contrary to its counterpart, the *Vita Methodii* (VM), extant in much fewer witnesses, the oldest, however, in the *Uspenskij Sbornik* from c. 1200 – does not go back farther than the fifteenth century, it cannot be automatically assumed, so runs Goldblatt's (and Picchio's) argument, that they all reflect one uniform and complete text tradition of the VC, supposedly written in Moravia before 882. Instead, by considering in particular also the nationalistic (or "patriotic") ideology expressed by a Russian Church Slavonic text known as the *Skazanie o gramotě rusьstěi*, a work whose oldest extant copy is found in a manuscript immediately following that of the VC (in the former Lenin State Library), Goldblatt suggests (325) that, for lack of information, »one cannot... advance a conjecture on either the circumstances of textual transmission for the *Skazanie* prior to the fifteenth century or the precise relations between its textual history and that of [the] VC.« Yet the *Skazanie* provides the correct context in which to place the »Russian« episode of the VC, »precisely because it conveys a message conforming perfectly to the ideological atmosphere of the fifteenth-century 'Rus'ian' lands,« to wit, after the defeat of the Serbs at Kosovo Polje (in 1389) and the fall of Tărnovo, the Bulgarian capital (in 1393). The Greek »betrayal of Orthodoxy«, with the capture of Constantinople, in 1453, by the Muslim Ottomans, was suited to reinforce the idea of a religious and cultural transfer (»translatio«) from Byzantium and the Slavic Balkans to Muscovy (cf. the theological-political doctrine of Moscow as the Third Rome). The notion that Constantine–Cyril could have discovered »Russian letters« in Cherson or that he would have studied with a »Russian« in the Crimea would therefore be fully acceptable, indeed welcome, in fifteenth-century Muscovy. Based on the belief that Moscow was – by then – the center of the true Orthodox faith, the idea of the events in Cherson would thus become a central component of the new, Muscovite ideological outlook. It is on these grounds that Goldblatt therefore essentially accepts, and seeks sub-

stantially to motivate, the interpolation theory of the Cherson episode considered by previous scholarship.⁸

Goldblatt's explanation, and notably his association of the VC with the *Skazanie*, has been criticized by V. M. Živov.⁹ However, an altogether different interpretation of the enigmatic passage discussed here has recently been advocated by the Greek Slavist A.-E. Tachiaos.¹⁰ He first points out that there is in fact no support for the Syriac hypothesis in the manuscript tradition as no single extant text of the VC does actually have the allegedly correct reading (*sourbskymi*) – something one would have expected given the many witnesses of this text which have come down to us and considering the fact that letter transpositions within a single word were indeed not an uncommon phenomenon in medieval texts. In other words, to accept the Syriac hypothesis one would have to assume that the *sour-* > *rous-* (*sur-* > *rus-*) metathesis must have occurred very early, virtually in the antigraph (*Vorlage*) underlying all extant witnesses. Further, Tachiaos is of the opinion (64, n. 70) that the VC in its preserved form – or the material integrated in it – goes back to an original version composed in Moravia immediately after Constantine-Cyril's death (in 869). The Greek scholar subsequently is at pains in attempting to reconstruct the actual course of events during the – extended, he submits – stay of the Thessalonian brothers in Cherson (shortly after the Byzantine administration had been restored there and the local Church reorganized; cf. 68-69, n. 79). Specifically, Tachiaos points out that the Old Church Slavonic verbs *obrěsti* and *sъkazati* here were used in the specialized meaning of 'receive' and 'interpret, teach, preach' rather than the more common sense of 'find' and 'speak,' respectively. The episode related would therefore mean that Constantine »received« a gospel text and a psalter and a man (speaking that language), and that he soon began to read it and to »preach« in it. It is further suggested that Constantine, who already knew some Hebrew when he arrived in Cherson, here merely perfected his mastery of that language (which he reasonably could

⁸ So, e.g., A. С. ЛЬВОВ, *Български език* 1960/4, 297-319; *id.*, »Slavia« 44 (1975), 274-285.

⁹ See V. M. ЖИВОВ, *Slavia Christiana и историко-культурный контекст «Сказания о русской грамоте»*, »La cultura spirituale russa / Русская духовная культура«, Trento, 1992, 71-125, esp. 104-105.

¹⁰ See A.-E. N. TACHIAOS, *Some Controversial Points Relating to the Life and Activity of Cyril and Methodius*, »Cyrillomethodianum« XVII/XVIII (1993/1994), 41-71, esp. 61-71 (*The 'Russian letters' in Constantine-Cyril's Life*).

expect to need in Khazaria, converted some generations ago, at least in part, to Judaism, but for which he also possibly could have use in Cherson) while learning the very beginnings of the related Samaritan language.

What remains to be explained, therefore, is the mysterious *rusьskymi* (and variant readings). Here, Tachiaos's explanation is as follows: Though reported one after the other, Constantine–Cyril's study of Hebrew, Samaritan, and the »Rus'« languages – appearing as a »mystic« interpretation of three language incidents (68, n. 78, with a reference to Auty's reasoning concerning the sacred number three) – must not be viewed as necessarily having occurred in close time sequence. Clearly knowledgeable in Slavic – the dialect spoken in the environs of his hometown Salonica – Constantine is said to have encountered Slavs among the multiethnic population of the Crimea (69, n. 80). This is, in my opinion, one of the weak points of Tachiaos's argument, for while it is true that the Scandinavian Rus' ruled over the Slavic masses of the upper and mid Dnieper basin, there is no evidence of a Slavic presence in the Crimea around 860 (cf. above). We can perhaps accept the idea that a – or the – Slavic mission, within or outside the empire, was being prepared in Byzantium some time prior to the beginning of the Moravian mission of 862/863, a mission in the preparation of which the Thessalonian brothers may have been actively engaged during their stay at the Panteleimon Monastery on the Bithynian Olympus (so that Constantine–Cyril may have had some draft translations delivered to him in the Crimea, i.e., that he »received« them to be tested for his first Slavic sermons; cf. 69-70). Yet it is difficult to understand how he could »receive« such earlier prepared texts and, again, »receive« a Slavic-speaking man if subsequently, when asked by the emperor to embark on the Moravian mission, the lack of a Slavic writing system was precisely his chief concern. Also, it should be recalled that in the VC we are told (in chapter XIV) that only after having »composed [the] letters... he began to write the language of the Gospel, that is 'In the beginning was the Word...'*«* (quoted here after M. Kantor's English rendition; see n. 1, above). Considering all of the above and with all due respect to the refreshing aspect of finding »a completely different angle«, I am not sure that Tachiaos's reinterpretation outside »a grimly philological approach« and placing himself and his readers inside the prevailing context – in short, by »being there« (or, to put it with Leopold von Ranke, »wie es eigentlich gewesen ist«) – is in fact more convincing than earlier attempts to come to grips with this mysterious passage of the VC, continuing

to puzzle us. This therefore is one of the remaining controversial issues of Cyrillo–Methodian research today as much as ever.

2. THE LOCATION OF THE CYRILLO–METHODIAN STATE OF MORAVIA

Whereas I have not previously participated in the discussion of the passage of the VC just cited, I have in recent years been very much engaged in the debate prompted by Imre Boba's 1971 book and related writings, notably those by Charles Bowlus and Otto Kronsteiner. I would therefore not again enter here into this discussion, were it not for the recent appearance of two important monographs also challenging the traditional view, that is, the one placing Moravia in the present-day Czech Republic and in Slovakia, with its center in the northern Morava River valley. I will therefore not recapitulate my many arguments – archeological, historical, and philological – previously set forth but merely refer the reader to them. Rather, I will comment on and take issue with the two new major publications just indicated.¹¹

Of these two monographs, Bowlus's is a further attempt to support and provide additional evidence for the correctness of Boba's bold thesis of Moravia's claimed location south of the Danube. In this context it may be worth mentioning that an expert on early medieval history of the region of the stature of Herwig Wolfram, Professor of History at Vienna University and Director of the Institute for Austrian Historical Research, already some years ago stated: »Wer trotz dieser Belege, deren Zahl sich müheles vermehren läßt, die Kirche immer noch aus dem Dorfe tragen und Mähren nicht in Mähren lassen

¹¹ The original book by I. Boba causing the renewed discussion was *Moravia's History Reconsidered: A Reinterpretation of Medieval Sources*, The Hague, 1971. My three contributions to date are: *Where was the Center of the Moravian State? American Contributions to the Eleventh International Congress of Slavists*, Columbus, OH, 1993, 11-24; *The Location of the Moravian State-Revisited*, »Byzantinoslavica« 54 (1993), 336-338; *Zum (hoffentlich) letztenmal über den weitgereisten Method und die Lage Altmährens*, »Byzantinoslavica« 57 (1996), 188-193. The two new publications are: C. R. BOWLUS, *Franks, Moravians, and Magyars: The Struggle for the Middle Danube, 788-907*, Philadelphia, 1994; and M. EGGERS *Das »Grossmährische Reich« – Realität oder Fiktion? Eine Neuinterpretation der Quellen zur Geschichte des mittleren Donaupraumes im 9. Jahrhundert*, Stuttgart, 1995.

will, dem ist nicht zu helfen.«¹² To summarize Bowlus's reasoning in his own words:

It is apparent from the charter evidence that the military infrastructure of the Bavarian marches evolved to support operations against a Moravia located near the Danubian watergate. Royal itineraries suggest that most Moravian campaigns were launched from places in Upper Bavaria, not from localities along the Danube. There is no reason to presume that, on those occasions when armies did proceed along the Danube, they were moving against a Moravia north of the river. For the route southeast from Vienna which passed through Szombathely and skirted to the west of Lake Balaton before turning sharply eastward to Pécs, crossing the Drava at Osijek, whence it followed the outermost terraces of the Fruška Gora to Sirmium, was an ancient one that had been developed by the Romans and would become a favored avenue for the crusaders in the High Middle Ages. Most importantly, it is along this Pannonian route that we have charter evidence of Carolingian interests. Finally, it can be demonstrated that Carantania became the strategic center of Bavaria's eastern marches. Prosopographical research shows that almost all the major figures in the marches were closely connected with Carantania. The dominant place of Carantania in the military system of the Carolingian marches is difficult to explain if the political center of gravity of Moravia, whose princes Rastislav and Zwentibaldus, were the archenemies of Carolingian marcher lords, had been located in the modern Czech Republic or in Slovakia. Since Carolingian rulers simply did not build marcher lordships against nonexistent enemies, any future attempt to defend the traditional location of Moravia must account for the southeastern orientation of these lordships.¹³

As can be seen even from this brief summary of his own, Bowlus's reasoning relies, as did his previous pertinent research, primarily on military-historical and strategic considerations, beginning with Louis the German's campaign against Rastislav in 855 (115-119); admittedly, by and large these considerations make good sense. However, the church-political and other

¹² Cf. H. WOLFRAM, *Die Geburt Mitteleuropas. Geschichte Österreichs vor seiner Entstehung, 378-907*, Vienna, 1987, 360; see further *ibid.*, 539-540, n. 12.

¹³ For a different view of the ethnic composition as well as the role and position of Carantania, see H. WOLFRAM, *Karantaniya med vzhodom in zahodom. Obri, Bavarci in Langobardi v 8. in 9. stoletju*, »Zgodovinski časopis« 45 (Ljubljana, 1991), 177-187 (with German résumé).

points he makes continue to raise serious doubts. Thus, to take just one example of many, his analysis of the trial and incarceration of Methodius (now usually believed to have been at Reichenau rather than previously considered Ellwangen¹⁴) is less compelling. Why would the Bavarian bishops have felt so threatened or intruded upon by a man claiming ecclesiastic authority over a distant region which, of all things, at the time was under Bulgarian rule? For, the southern Morava valley was then presumably part of Bulgaria or was located in its immediate vicinity.¹⁵ The situation is also not helped even if we – with some hesitation – would accept H. G. Lunt's somewhat strained reading of *korolja* (in chapter IX of the VM) as meaning 'Carl's' (i.e., Carloman's) and not '(the) king's' despite the fact that Carloman did not become king until after the death of his father, Louis the German, in 876. Yet the events of the trial are set in 870, also the year, incidentally, of Sventopulk's (Svatopluk's, Zwentibaldus's) coup d'état, removing his uncle Rastislav from power. Many other examples could easily be adduced where Bowlus's line of reasoning – fully coinciding with that of Boba – is not convincing, not to speak of the fact that for him cultural-historical and philological arguments hardly play any role at all, and the archeological considerations are kept to a minimum (16-18, 54, 106, 174, 255-258). By the same token, there are points where the author may very well be correct, not unexpectedly again, in particular, when it comes to military events or situations. Thus, I would tend to agree with Bowlus (and Boba) that we cannot be sure that the place where the battle between Hungarians and Bavarians was fought in 907 was necessarily near Bratislava. Much speaks rather for the assumption that the *Brezalauspurc* of the sources was not the city on the Danube but Brazlav's »burg« near Lake Balaton, i.e., *the urbs Paludarum* or Moosburg/Zalavár, the onetime residence of Prince Kocel.

It would lead too far were I to attempt a full evaluation of Bowlus's book here. Let me merely reiterate: its strength lies in his grasp of the military exigencies of the East Frankish kingdom and the responses to them marshalled by its southern neighbors; its weakness in his uncritical acceptance of Boba's untenable hypothesis of the location of Rastislav's and Sventopulk's Moravia, the missionary field of Constantine-Cyril's and Methodius's activities.

¹⁴ See, e.g., J. MAB, *Das Bistum Freising in der späten Karolingerzeit*, Munich, 1969, 125-127.

¹⁵ Cf. H. WOLFRAM, *Die Geburt*, 522, n. 18, and Bowlus's critique in »Speculum« 64 (1989), 242, as well as in his recent book, 360, n. 40.

A vastly different picture – deviating both from the traditional view and (in some, not all respects) also from Boba's radically variant hypothesis – was recently drawn by the German historian Martin Eggers, whose pertinent ideas will be summarized below. To begin with, he suggests that the traditional («orthodox») view had found strong support in nonscholarly, nationalistically tinged – i.e., Czech or Slovak, as well as Czechoslovak – preferences. In my opinion, such considerations, in part even of a competitive nature (Czech vs. Slovak), have at most played a very subordinate role.

After first discussing the evidence of Bulgar and Avar settlements in the Carpathian basin, Eggers then proceeds to the two chief tenets of his reasoning, based, it must be said, on a thorough knowledge of the historical sources (something that can be said only with considerable qualification about Boba's hypothesis, showing great disregard, if not outright ignorance, by him of many relevant texts). One is that Mojmir's and Rastislav's Moravia (called so also in his German text, obviously to set it apart from the common designation *Mähren*, otherwise used in German) was located not where we traditionally assume it to have been, but also not where Boba sought to place it, south of the Danube, in the Sirmium-southern Morava region; according to Eggers, the original Moravia was in the Great Hungarian Plain (*Alföld*), on both banks of the Tisza River. Its capital, or chief residence place, was in his view *Maroswar* (modern *Marosvár*), or *urbs Morisena*, later renamed Csanád (Rom. *Cenad*) after one of King Stephen I's victorious generals, on the river Maros (Rom. *Mures*) east of where it enters the Tisza at Szeged. The town was located near today's Arad and seems to have been protected by ramparts which have now been excavated. It was thus in the heart of what was once considered the «Avar Desert» after the collapse of the Avar realm at the end of the eighth and the beginning of the ninth century. The Moravians of this area are said to have been a decidedly South Slavic tribe deriving their name from the region of the southern Morava River (south of the Danube), presumably therefore their ancestral home. Thus, Rastislav, too, must, according to this view, have been of South Slavic provenance (so that his name form with *Ra-* appears more correct than that with *Ro-*, also encountered in the sources). What does now Eggers base his assumption on? First of all, we have Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus's *De Administrando Imperio*. Here, ἡ μεγάλη Μοραβία as well as Prince Σφενδοπλόκος (= Sventopulk/Zwentibaldus) are mentioned several times, usually as residing south of the Hungarians («Turks») or in territories totally devastated and occupied by the Magyars. Though not fully reliable in

terms of his geographic orientation, the Byzantine emperor (and his presumed advisors), writing in the mid-tenth century, nonetheless must be considered an important witness. While various sources for the emperor's account have been postulated, the approximate borders of the tribe of the Moravians according to Constantine's conception can be drawn: the southern frontier was the Danube upstream from the Iron Gate; the northern frontier was marked by the Hungarians before they occupied Moravia; also in the east the Hungarians seem to have been the neighbors of the Moravians though this is not explicitly stated in the emperor's account; only toward the west the border of Moravia seems not clearly defined. However, if we assume that Pannonia west of the mid Danube was part of the Carolingian state, the Moravians could not very well have settled there. (Incidentally, the notion of a 'Greater Moravia' goes back to the term used in *De Administrando Imperio* where μεγάλη, however, hardly means 'great' but rather 'old, former,' possibly also, as H. Wolfram has argued, 'external,' i.e., not belonging to the empire.)

In the so-called Geographus *Bavarus* (*Descriptio civitatum et regionum ad septentrionalem plagam Danubii*, late ninth century) two ethnic groups, the *Marharii* (said to have had eleven towns) and the *Merchani* (claimed to have possessed thirty towns) are distinguished. While many scholars have sought to identify these two tribal names and the ethnic groups they designated (as perhaps representing different evolutionary stages), Boba placed the *Merchani* south of the Danube – despite the title of the treatise! – while Eggers sees in them his Moravians of the Great Hungarian Plain.¹⁶ A tentative proof of Moravia's location in the Tisza basin Eggers also finds in the information about a people, *Maroara*, contained in the Anglo-Saxon (late-ninth century) version of an »anti-pagan« work by the Spanish priest Paulus Orosius (early fifth century). The data found in Islamic historical and geographic sources of the late ninth century is vague and lends itself to multiple interpretations. Yet it seems to suggest a ruler *Swēf malik* (or *Swjīt-mlk*), frequently identified with Sventopulk/Svatopluk, whose realm and centrally located chief city was *M.rwāt* (= **Morwāt*, read so for the presumably corrupted *M.rdāt*).

Whereas the just listed references all can be considered direct (albeit in part vague and of dubious value), there are also a number of indirect references in contemporary sources. In Einhard's *Vita Karoli Magni*, the Germania of the Frankish ruler is identified as located »inter Rhenum ac Vistulam fluvios

¹⁶ Cf. my remarks in *Where was the Center of the Moravian State?* 18-19.

oceanumque ac Danubium.« This would therefore also include traditional Moravia but not necessarily, as Boba claimed, the territory of the Moravians south of the Danube since a space east of a line between the headwaters of the Vistula and the Danube Bend, which clearly did not belong to the Germania, must be considered as well. Boba has also, as pointed out by Eggers, simply ignored a passage in the *Conversio Bagoariorum et Carantanorum*, the »white book« of the Salzburg archdiocese, composed in 871¹⁷, where we read about Mojmir and Pribina as residing »supra Danubium«, i.e. north of the Danube. Other sources, reporting on an eastern campaign of the East Frankish Prince Louis, are, as Eggers shows, misconstrued by Boba as implying that the Moravians must have lived south of the Danube, as is his reading of another campaign, this one of King Louis the German against Rastislav. And, finally, the account of the revolt of Carloman (Karlmann) against his father, Louis, now allied with Rastislav, in no way points to a Moravian territory south of the Danube. On the other hand, Eggers agrees with Boba that Carloman's second uprising against his father (in 862/863) does not suggest that Moravia was in fact located in the traditional territory of Moravia. Additional events and their accounts are similar in nature – they do not permit any definitive conclusions other than that Rastislav was the only potential ally of rebels in the East Frankish kingdom. This changed only after Sventopulk had assumed power in Moravia in 871, after the coup of 870.

Much less convincing is what Eggers has to say about the indirect testimony of the hagiographic texts about the preceptors of the Slavs, Constantine–Cyril and Methodius, and those about their disciples. Thus, the notion of »upper Moravia« – *vyšneje Moravy* (in the genitive singular form) – is not only attested in a Bulgarian prologue *vita* of the fourteenth century (as claimed here) but goes back at least to the eleventh century as proven by the note in Old Church Slavonic of the Codex Assemanianus (on folio 145b, lines 21-23, rendered in Latin by the eighteenth-century Vatican librarian J. S. Assema-

¹⁷ On the *Conversio*, see esp. H. WOLFRAM, *Conversio Bagoariorum et Carantanorum. Das Weißbuch der Salzburger Kirche über die erfolgreiche Mission in Karantien und Pannonien*, Vienna, Cologne & Graz, 1979; *id.*, *Salzburg, Bayern, Österreich. Die Conversio Bagoariorum et Carantanorum und die Quellen ihrer Zeit*, Vienna & Munich, 1995, esp. 87-100 (»Moravien – Mähren oder nicht?«). On the *Conversio* as an example of tampering with the truth, see further *id.*, *Einleitung oder Lügen mit der Wahrheit – ein historiographisches Dilemma*, in: *Historiographie im frühen Mittelalter*, Vienna & Munich, 1994, 11-25, esp. 12-13 and 15.

ni¹⁸). This would support the two-Moravias-theory but also clearly point to »upper Moravia« (where Constantine-Cyril and Methodius were active) as the more distant one, lying outside the orbit of Byzantium's interests. Unclear is further why the information found in the two *vitae* of Naum would point to a Moravia located in the Great Hungarian Plain. The information given in the second of these *vitae* about the escape route from Moravia to Bulgarian-held Belgrade is not overly telling, as a vastly expanded Moravia under Sventopulk may by then indeed have included the region east of the mid-Danube even if its original core territory was perhaps farther to the northwest.¹⁹ And, the earthquakes, common in Sirmium (but not in the Morava valley north of the Danube), as well as the waterspouts, known in the Tisza basin – whether literary topoi or real phenomena – should not be decisive for our attempts to try to locate the original Moravia in the narrow sense. Of little consequence is also the reference to Moravia and the Moravians in the Old Russian Primary Chronicle. That the chronicler was mistaken in his positing the original Slavs as having settled along the Danube, »where now the Hungarians and Bulgarians dwell«, has long been proven (despite O. N. Trubačev's unlikely hypothesis of the Slavic protohome south of the Carpathians), and the intensive Russian-Czech contacts in the eleventh century rather point to a Moravia geographically close to Bohemia.

As Eggers points out (176), a survey of the Frankish annals and chronicles proves Boba's notion of a Moravia south of the Danube wrong on all counts. By the same token, these sources do not contradict, the German historian claims, the location of Moravia in the Great Hungarian Plain; indeed, in a few instances there are some hints to that effect (Louis the German's deceitful maneuvering in 863, the East Frankish-Bulgarian cooperation of 864). As the capital of that early Moravia Eggers posits, as was already indicated, Marosvár, and for Nitra (or Nitrava) he claims that this region was incorporated with Moravia only between 871/74 and 880, i.e., under Sventopulk.

If this theory may seem fairly farfetched, though not entirely inconceivable, Eggers's real surprise comes in the third section of his book, dealing with »the territorial and conceptual extension of Moravia under Sventopulk«. It should be mentioned here that in discussing Sventopulk's greatly expanded realm –

¹⁸ Cf. H. BIRNBAUM, »Byzantinoslavica« 44 (1993), 338.

¹⁹ Cf. H. BIRNBAUM, *Where was the Center ...*, 18-19; *id.*, »Byzantinoslavica« 57 (1996), 191.

allegedly originally centered south of the Danube – Eggers is much closer to Boba's ideas than in the previous section. His main historical source in this context is the so-called *Chronicle of the Priest of Dioclea* (or in Croatian *Ljetopis Popa Dukljanina*), a text of somewhat dubious value as a historical source which, however, he tries to vindicate. His argument runs roughly as follows: The time of Sventopulk's rule was marked by an enormous expansion. His original *regnum*, i.e., before his assuming power in Moravia (east of the mid Danube) in 871, included not only Bosnia, as posited by Boba, but also a portion of Slavonia between the rivers Sava and Drava. While Moravia (in the Great Hungarian Plain) and Bosnia-Slavonia thus were merged in 870/71 as a result of Sventopulk's overthrow of his uncle Rastislav, other territories were conquered or annexed from the East Frankish kingdom and incorporated in his *patrimonium*. This supposedly applied to Lower Pannonia (around Lake Balaton, i.e., Pribina's and Kocel's former vassal dukedom) in 884, possibly to Upper Pannonia (between the Raab/Rába River and the Danube, around the Neusiedler See) in 884 or 890, the entire region of the »Vulgarii« (north of the Danube, on the rivers Waag/Vák and Gran/Hron in today's Slovakia, with Nitra as its center) in 874/80, and all of traditional Moravia and Bohemia in 890. Less clear is Eggers's view of precisely the crucial area of Sirmium (with the city of the same name) and the region south of the lower Sava (up to Belgrade), which probably remained under Bulgarian rule. Dependent on Sventopulk's immense *regnum*, or in some dynastic relationship with him personally, were the rulers of the South Slavic territories along the Adriatic coast, formally under Byzantine suzerainty, from the Kvarner Archipelago in the north all the way to the Bay of Kotor and Lake Scutari (Skadarsko jezero) in the south as well as inland Serbia (or Raška, with Ras as its chief city). It is in view of Sventopulk's influence, if not dominance, also among these Southern Slavs that we are to understand the significance of the information contained in the *Chronicle of the Priest of Dioclea*. Whether, in the north, the Vistulans in South Poland or the Sorbians (residing north of the Czechs) at one point also came under Sventopulk's rule is left open by Eggers but considered possible.

We cannot examine all the details of Eggers's argument. One of his chief concerns is both to explain how and why the Priest of Dioclea wrote his *Chronicle of the Slavs* (*Regnum Sclavorum*) and how much of his claims is independently corroborated by other, reliable historical sources. For the most difficult problem, the claimed subjugation by Sventopulk (d. 894) also of distant

Bohemia, the German scholar suggests the relatively late conquest of the »Bulgarian« (Avar?) region around Nitra and, more importantly, that it was not the traditional Moravians of the northern Morava valley who at one point subdued their Czech neighbors but that, on the contrary, it were the Czechs – most of the time forming part of the East Frankish kingdom – that managed to become the masters of the Morava region before they, along with the (traditional) Moravians, were brought under the rule of Sventopulk's »Moravlĵans«.

Certainly not everything in Martin Eggers's »model« is fully convincing and it is therefore susceptible to criticism. Thus, for example, the role of Methodius in Sventopulk's mighty, far-flung realm is not particularly clearly presented; all we are actually told is that Sventopulk may have been in control of Bohemia before 890 if Methodius baptized Bořivoj sometime between 873, the year of Methodius's release from his Bavarian-Swabian captivity, and 885, the year of his death (cf. 289; note, however, that Methodius's baptism of the Czech prince is somewhat in doubt as it is not reported in his Life but only in later Czech sources). And, it is said (315) that Methodius possibly can have acted as a mediator between the »Hungarian king« and the »Moravlĵans«. However, Eggers points out (ibid.) that "Hungarian" here may be a later, Russian interpolation, and that the king referred to was presumably Charles III (»the Fat«) in whose entourage Methodius did indeed participate at a meeting with Khan Boris of Bulgaria at Tulln on the Danube in 884.

Eggers's fourth chapter, about the Hungarian landtaking and its consequences for the ethnic and political revamping of the mid-Danube region, does not call for any particular comments. Yet his discussion of Bohemia and Moravia (352-376) is important, in particular the fact that the earliest annalistic source of Bohemia, Cosmas of Prague, does not – contrary to Boba's claim – distinguish between cis-Danubian Moravia (i.e., Eggers's original Moravia proper) and (traditional) Moravia (north of the Danube; cf. esp. 365-366).

If, therefore, Boba's (as well as Kronsteiner's and Bowlus's) attempts to locate the center of Cyrillo-Methodian Moravia south of the Danube, in Sirmium on the Sava and in the southern Morava valley, must be considered an unmitigated failure, Eggers's revolutionizing reinterpretation of the sources pertinent to the mid-Danube region of the ninth century, while not necessarily compelling in all points and details, certainly deserves to be reckoned with in any future consideration of this complex set of problems.

3. THE METHODII DOCTRINA

Whereas the VC built around its protagonist's four disputations – with the deposed iconoclastic Patriarch John, the Muslim Arabs («Hagarites»), the Jewish Khazars, and the Latin clerics («trilingual heretics») in Venice – can be conceived of as an apology for the Christian Orthodox faith, the VM must rather be considered a church–political tract justifying the older brother's activities in territory formally claimed by the Roman Curia and the East Frankish–Bavarian Church. As is well known, the Thessalonian brothers were summoned to Rome by Pope Nicholas I and, upon their arrival there, were received by Nicholas's successor, Pope Hadrian II, easily convinced him of the truly Orthodox nature of their missionary activity, and were shown great honors by the Roman ecclesiastic establishment. Alone, after his brother's death, and released from his incarceration in Swabia (as indicated above, probably at the Abbey of Reichenau rather than at Ellwangen, as previously thought) by the intervention of the new pope, John VIII, and reinstated, now as archbishop of Pannonia and Moravia, Methodius was nonetheless called to appear in Rome once more to justify himself, as he had been indicted by the East Frankish–Bavarian clergy for heretical teaching. Methodius managed to defend himself as explicitly stated also in the papal epistle beginning with the words *Industriae tuae* (and thus known in scholarship under this heading). It was sent to Sventopulk in June of 880 and, while commending the Moravian ruler for his fidelity to the throne of St. Peter, stressed that Methodius professed the same Creed as Rome, notwithstanding the original complaint voiced by John of Venice and at first endorsed also by Sventopulk, including the accusation of celebrating Mass in Slavonic, a «barbaric» language. It was thus not Rome and the Roman Curia, though alerted by the East Frankish–Bavarian clergy, which questioned, at least initially, the legitimacy and true faith behind Methodius's activity in Moravia-Pannonia, or, if we are to accept Eggers's far-reaching hypothesis (cf. above), in the much larger realm of Sventopulk. Possibly, had Pope Nicholas I been alive at the time the Thessalonian brothers first arrived in Rome, things might have developed differently given the pope's fierce opposition to, and competition with, his opposite number in Constantinople, Patriarch Photius, whose protégés Constantine–Cyril and Methodius were. But as it turned out, it was not really the Papacy as such that objected to the Thessalonian brothers's activity in Moravia (whatever its precise location and extent) and in Lower Pannonia (centered around Lake Balaton), as it was the

Frankish-Bavarian clergy. The latter was represented by Methodius's suffragan bishop, Wiching, in Nitra, who considered the Byzantine missionaries, and notably Methodius by the time he alone was heading the Slavonic Church organization in territory claimed by the archbishop of Salzburg and his subordinate bishops (of Freising, Regensburg, and Passau), illegitimate trespassers.

It is also in this sense that we have to understand the thrust of the *Conversio Bagoariorum et Carantanorum* composed at the behest of Archbishop Adalwin by an anonymous author in 871 to justify primarily Salzburg's claim to Lower Pannonia; presumably, the treatise was written with the king, Louis the German, and his court as prime readers in mind. For despite its title, referring to the conversion of the Bavarians and the Alpine Slavs of Carantania, Bavaria was, needless to say, one of the strongholds, if not simply the chief venue, of the East Frankish Church, and Carantania north of the Drava River had been assigned to Salzburg by Emperor Charlemagne (in 811) and had previously, still in the eighth century, been identified by three popes as Salzburg's legitimate missionary field. The territories south of the Drava were given to the Patriarchate of Aquileia, i.e., at the time Aquileia antiqua or Cividale, likewise under Frankish control. But for Lower Pannonia there did not exist any such legal premise so that the extension of the activities of the East Frankish Church also to the region of Lake Balaton or, for that matter, to Moravia – after this state had gained its independence from the East Frankish (German) kingdom – was by no means automatic or necessarily implied. Here, therefore, was a genuine »battleground« for the Bavarian clergy, represented by the Church of Salzburg. It is in the *Conversio*, chapter XII, that we read the famous words:

*...usque dum quidam Graecus Methodius nomine noviter inventis Sclavinis litteris linguam Latinam doctrinamque Romanam atque litteras auctoriales Latinas philosophice superducens vilescere fecit cuncto populo ex parte missas et euangelia ecclesiasticumque officium illorum, qui hoc Latine celebraverunt.*²⁰

And in the so-called *Excerptum de Karentanis* (*Excerpt about the Carantani*), based on the *Conversio* but dating back to the turn of the twelfth/thirteenth centuries, the story about Methodius is contained in a somewhat abridged and modified form:

²⁰ Or in English rendition: »...until a Greek, Methodius by name, came along with newly invented Slavic letters and disparaged in a philosophical way the Latin language and the Roman teaching as well as the authentic Latin liturgy before the people, namely, as regards Mass, the Gospel, and the church offices of those who had celebrated this in Latin.«

*Post hunc interiecto aliquo tempore supervenit quidam Sclavus ab Hystrie et Dalmatie partibus nomine Methodius, qui adinvenit Sclavicas lit[t]eras et Sclavice celebravit divinum officium et vilescere fecit Latinum. Tandem fugatus a Karentanis partibus intravit Moraviam ibique quiescit.*²¹

One observation worth making here is that the epithet »philosopher« (and its derivative, »in a philosophical way«), bestowed upon Methodius's brother, Constantine–Cyril, in Byzantium, implied a token of distinction and subsequently was used as an honorific title also in Orthodox Slavdom; obviously it was known also in Rome and among the Latin clergy of Bavaria but was used here – with reference to Methodius – contemptuously and disparagingly.²²

All in all, however, we can say that in the eyes of the pope and the Curia the Slavic mission of the Thessalonian brothers and their disciples was generally viewed with sympathy and understanding, if occasional suspicion of heretical teaching and with certain reservations concerning the use of the Slavic vernacular (i.e., Old Church Slavonic in the liturgy and in pastoral work). By contrast, the attitude of the East Frankish-Bavarian clergy was consistently and overtly hostile. Here, the brothers, and particularly the surviving Methodius, consecrated archbishop of Pannonia and Moravia by Pope John VIII,²³ were constantly attacked by the clerics of the archdiocese of Salzburg.

Of course it is known that with Methodius's death in 885 the Slavic liturgy in Moravia (and Pannonia) came to an end, that some of his disciples escaped in several directions – to Bulgaria (with Belgrade as the first Bulgarian-held town, where Methodius's followers could feel safe and were received thanks

²¹ In English: »Thereafter, when some time had passed, a certain Slav came along from the regions of Istria and Dalmatia, who invented Slavic letters and celebrated the divine office in Slavic and disparaged Latin. Eventually he fled from the Carantanian territory, entered Moravia, and died there.« For the Latin texts, German translations, and commentaries, see H. WOLFRAM, *Conversio*, 56-59, 138-139, and 142-144.

²² Cf. H. WOLFRAM, *Conversio*, 138 and 141, with a reference to F. Grivec's classic work on the Thessalonian Brothers. See further Wolfram's writings cited in note 17, above. On the conflict with Methodius from the Bavarian point of view, cf. further J. MAB, *Das Bistum Freising*, 119-135.

²³ Specifically, Methodius is referred to as archbishop of Pannonia (or the Church of Pannonia) until the year 879, while beginning with the epistle *Industriae tuae* (of June 880) he is given the title of archbishop of the Moravian Church. By naming him to the traditional see of St. Andronicus in Sirmium, earlier destroyed by the Avars and no longer under the immediate control of the Roman Curia, the pope may have wished to award Methodius the role of overall spiritual head of the Southern Slavs.

to Khan Boris's friendly and understanding attitude), to Bohemia (where a Cyrillo-Methodian liturgical and literary tradition may have continued, Glagolitic writing and a liturgy in Slavonic flourishing once more, from the 1030s on, at the Abbey of Sázava southeast of Prague), and to Istria, the Kvarner islands, and northern Dalmatia (which, in part at least, may explain the early appearance of Glagolitic writing in that region, though the extant evidence only dates back to the end of the eleventh century).²⁴ Still, the expulsion of the Slavic-speaking, Slavic-writing, and Slavic-celebrating clergy dealt, needless to say, a definite blow to any attempt at establishing a Slavic Church under the auspices of the Roman Curia.²⁵ If Latin therefore prevailed in most of the territories under the supervision (and jurisdiction) of the Roman Church, Dalmatia (and Istria) constituted the exception. To be sure, here too, Latin was the preferred language of the liturgy and of the pastoral concerns of the Church. Yet, considering that the Dalmatian towns long remained formally under Byzantine suzerainty and that also one of the two sees of Aquileia – Aquileia nova, now relocated to Grado – was pro forma at least under the patriarch of Constantinople (while Aquileia antiqua at Cividale, controlled by the Franks, reported to the pope), the Papacy showed a certain leniency when it came to the use of language, even though the Church of Constantinople, while in principle admitting the use of the vernacular, gave preference to Greek.

But of the continued use of Slavic in the Church of Dalmatia we learn from documents very much antedating the earliest extant written records in Glagolitic. I am referring, of course, to the two Synods, held in Split in 925 and 928, respectively, where the language issue was considered crucial. Thus, in two epistles by Pope John X to the archbishop of Split, John (Ivan), and all his

²⁴ For some thoughts on the routes by which Glagolitic may have reached northwest Croatia, see my essay *How Did Glagolitic Writing Reach the Coastal Regions of Northwestern Croatia?* »Croatica« 42/43/44 (*Hercigonjin zbornik*), Zagreb 1996, 69-79.

²⁵ As a matter of curiosity, it may be mentioned that, when Emperor Charles IV founded, at the outskirts of medieval Prague, the Slavic monastery *Na Slovanech* (also known as *Emmauzy*) by bringing Croatian Glagolites from the Dalmatian island of Pašman (viz., from the Monastery of Sts. Cosmas and Damian at Tkon) to the heart of his empire, a measure later emulated in Polish Silesia (at Oels/Oleśnica) and Poland's capital (in the Cracow suburb of Kleparz), he thereby violated the official doctrine of the Roman Church, admitting, in theory at least, only the three sacred languages – Hebrew (as the language of *the Old Testament*), Greek (as that of *the New Testament*), and Latin (as the official liturgical language of the Church and the bishop of Rome).

suffragan bishops, as well as to King Tomislav of Croatia (or perhaps merely Dalmatia) and Prince Mihovil of Hum, the pope – only forty years after Methodius's death – expressed his grave concern about the possibility of a lack of full and mutual understanding within the Church of Rome, a prerequisite he considered inevitable for its spiritual unity. Here are echoed serious doubts with reference to Methodius's teaching, doubts that had been expressed as early as in 885 by Pope Stephen V in an epistle to Prince Sventopulk where, in warning the Slavic ruler, the pope wrote, among other things,

*Divina autem officia et sacra mysteria ac missarum solemnia, quae idem Methodius Sclavorum lingua celebrare praesumpsit... Dei namque nostraque apostolica auctoritate sub anathematis vinculo interdicimus.*²⁶

Still, in Pope John's epistle more than a generation later Methodius's name is not mentioned and he merely states,

*Et quia Sclavi specialissimi filii sancte Romane ecclesie sunt, in doctrina matris permanere debent.*²⁷

The Papacy's attitude toward the *Methodii Doctrina*, i.e., toward possible heretical elements in his conceivably Byzantine-inspired teachings, was thus ambiguous, to say the least. Also, it is not entirely clear whether the reluctance of the Roman Church to accept Slavonic as a liturgical language (and the Glagolitic script) rather than Latin was genuine or perhaps primarily owing to a fear that in the linguistically and graphically impenetrable writings, services, and sermons may have been concealed – unreachable for the Roman censure – a genuine heresy. As is well known, the two Split Synods ended in a compromise allowing the use of Slavonic and Glagolitic by making a command of Latin, the language and the script, a precondition for advancement in the Church hierarchy. Thus, for those who would or could not accomplish this feat the unfair image of the simple Glagolite priest (*pop glagoljaš*), less well educated than his Latin-trained counterpart, often a Benedictine monk or a higher cleric, would emerge. Finally, echoes of the struggle between the

²⁶ Or in English: »But the divine offices and the holy mysteries and the ceremonies of the Mass which this Methodius dared to celebrate in the Slavic language... For by God's and our Apostolic authority we prohibit this under the threat of anathema (i.e., excommunication)«.

²⁷ In English translation: »And since the Slavs are the very special sons of the holy Roman Church, they ought to remain in the teaching of their mother«.

Slavonic liturgy in Dalmatia (including the Kvarner islands and Istria) and the official Roman–Latin one can also be found in the account by Thomas the Archdeacon of Split (d. 1268), author of an important yet highly biased *History of Split* (expanded version from the sixteenth century known as *Historia Salonitana maior*).²⁸ Today, of course, when Constantine–Cyril and Methodius have been declared by Pope John Paul II to be the »co–patrons« of Europe (along with St. Benedict of Nursia), the shifting attitude of the Roman Church toward their role and accomplishment must be viewed in its historical dimension.

The above survey was intended to indicate some of the many genuine puzzles still remaining to be explored and, hopefully, one day to be resolved by future scholarship in the Cyrillo–Methodian field, notwithstanding the great many often brilliant advances already made and insights gained.

ADDENDUM

In a recent follow-up publication,²⁹ M. Eggers has reiterated and elaborated a number of points raised in his earlier study. Thus, while he repeats here his previous entirely untenable assertion (based on the generally rather unreliable information contained in the *Ljetopis popa Dukljanina*) that King Tomislav of Croatia was the grandson of Sventopluk,³⁰ and a number of his other claims strike one as misleading or outright erroneous – so, for example, the reference

²⁸ For details concerning the *Methodii Doctrina* and its Dalmatian facet, see R. KATIČIĆ, »*Methodii doctrina*« and *Dopuna članku »Methodii doctrina«*, in: *Uz početke hrvatskih početaka*, Split, 1993, 67-98 (with German résumé).

²⁹ M. EGGERS, *Das Erzbistum des Method. Lage, Wirkung und Nachleben der kyrillo-methodianischen Mission*, Munich, 1996 (»Slavistische Beiträge«, 339).

³⁰ Cf. Das »Großmährische Reich«, 343–350; *id.*, *Das Erzbistum des Method*, 90 and 92. To be sure, the exact ancestry of Tomislav, whom only few sources mention by name, is controversial. In all likelihood, though, he was a member of the Trpimir dynasty (Trpimirovići), presumably the son of Trpimir's son Mutimir (Muncimir). Cf., e.g., N. KLAIĆ, *Povijest Hrvata u ranom srednjem vijeku*, Zagreb, 1975, 275–278; J. V. A. FINE, Jr., *The early Medieval Balkans*, Ann Arbor, 1983 [1989], 261; N. BUDAK, *Prva stoljeća Hrvatske*, Zagreb, 1994, 30-33; I. GOLDSTEIN, *Hrvatski rani srednji vijek*, Zagreb, 1995, 269-301.

to Methodius as the creator of the Glagolica,³¹ or Methodius as the sole author of the *Vita Constantini*³² – the German scholar's new book nonetheless contains several persuasive arguments. Among other things, his insistence on Croatia (and notably Dalmatia and Istria) as the area where the Cyrillo-Methodian tradition was most firmly rooted makes good sense, while all attempts to somehow associate it with the Czech lands of Bohemia and – traditional – Moravia show certain shortcomings and weaknesses (not to speak of any highly dubious Cyrillo-Methodian traces in Southern Poland). According to Eggers, the Church Slavonic literacy in Bohemia must be seen as a result of the close contacts between the Sázava Abbey and Kievan Rus' (in the 11th century), and, subsequently (in the 14th century), as due to Emperor Charles IV's bringing Croatian Glagolite Benedictines to Prague. His assessment of the *Kiev Folia* as possibly having originated at the western edge of South Slavic territory and reflecting the compromise West–East rite (St. Peter's liturgy), introduced in the Patriarchate of Aquileia and its missionary field, i.e., Dalmatia and Southern Pannonia,³³ may indeed have some merit. Even Eggers' idea that the Bohemisms of the *Kiev Folia* may have something to do with the first – suffragan – bishop of Zagreb (subordinate to the archbishop of Esztergom), the Czech Duh, or his entourage is certainly worth considering, especially as E. Koschmieder had earlier attempted to demonstrate the affinity of what he regarded as Western-type neumes in the *Kiev Folia* with those of a Zagreb sacramentary.³⁴ Yet the question posed by Eggers – Old Church Slavonic or Old Bulgarian?³⁵ – is insubstantial here as no serious scholar has doubted the South Slavic, or, to be precise, East South Slavic (i. e., Old Bulgarian, rather than specifically Old Macedonian) origin of the language first recorded by the Thessalonian brothers.

All in all, however, it must be said that, even though Eggers' new study contains a number of valuable observations and insights, testifying to his erudition and frequent ability to derive novel interpretations from the sources

³¹ See *Das Erzbistum des Method*, 88.

³² *Ibid.*, 78.

³³ See *op. cit.*, 114-118.

³⁴ Cf. *ibid.*, 117. See further E. KOSCHMIEDER, »Slovo« 4-5 (1955), 5-23; cf., however, the arguments against this theory in J. SCHAEKEN, *Die Kiever Blätter*, Amsterdam, 1987, 43-78, esp. 54-55.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, 82-86.

studied (along with mistaken or unsubstantiated claims and even some embarrassing linguistic lapses), it is the archeological evidence in the territory claimed by him as the original Moravia, namely, the Great Hungarian Plain on both sides of the Tisza River, and specifically the at best meager finds at Marosvár, the sketch of the ground plan and vertical cross-section of the excavated church at Csanád (adopted from work by K. David and L. Marghitan) notwithstanding,³⁶ that raises serious doubts about the correctness of his whole hypothesis. It is another – equally grave – matter that it is difficult to understand why Methodius' archdiocese should have totally collapsed shortly after his death and certainly by the time of the advent of the Hungarians if large portions of it, namely, Dalmatia and its immediate hinterland, were left intact and never affected by the Magyar invasion, and the Curia did not, at least initially, show any sustained enmity toward the older of the Thessalonian brothers and his missionary work, the activity of his suffragan bishop (and successor), Wiching, rather being of an episodic character.

S u m m a r y

In this paper the author re-examines some remaining puzzles in Cyrillo-Methodian research. To begin with, the surprising fact is considered that neither the Moravian(-Pannonian) mission of the Thessalonian brothers nor the mission to Khazaria, headed by Constantine-Cyril, are mentioned in any of the Byzantine sources. Further, the unexpected formulation found in *the Vita Constantini* (VC) and attributed to Khazar envoys to Byzantium is discussed, given that Khazaria had, at least in part, converted to Judaism several generations earlier. In the main portion of the essay, three important, yet so far unresolved issues are being re-examined. They are: 1) the phrase *rusьskymi pismenny* found in the VC, where the author dwells in particular on two new interpretations, proposed by H. Goldblatt and A.-E. Tachiaos, respectively, interpretations which are found wanting in some respects, however; 2) the location of Moravia – here I. Boba's hypothesis is once again rejected entirely while the military-historical reasoning of C. Bowlus (intended to support Boba's theory) deserves at least further consideration in a more limited context, and M. Eggers' recent notion of Moravia's location in the Great Hungarian Plain (in the Tisza valley) has some merit, notwithstanding serious shortcomings and

³⁶ See illustration no. 4a and b at the end of the book.

outright flaws in his argumentation; 3) the so-called *Methodii doctrina*, i. e., the highly varying attitude toward Methodius and his teaching by the Papacy (and the Frankish Church) during his lifetime and Rome's skeptical position with regard to his »doctrine« in the region of Glagolitic Dalmatia (in the broad sense).

S a ž e t a k

NEKOLIKO PREOSTALIH ZAGONETAKA IZ ĆIRILOMETODSKE PROBLEMATIKE

U članku se razmatra nekoliko preostalih zagonetaka iz ćirilometodske problematike. Autor najprije kratko upozorava na iznenađujuću činjenicu da niti moravska(–panonska) misija Solunske braće niti misija predvođena Konstantinom u Kazariju nisu spomenute ni u jednom bizantskom izvoru. Također se osvrće na neobične formulacije zabilježene u *Životu Konstantina* (VC), a pripisane kazarskim poslanicima u Bizant s obzirom na to što je Kazarija bila, barem djelomično, preobraćena na židovstvo nekoliko pokoljenja ranije. Tri važna, do sada neriješena, problema razmatrana su u glavnom dijelu članka. To su: (1) izraz *rusьskymi pismeny* nađen u VC, pri čemu se autor posebice osvrće na nova tumačenja H. Goldblatta i A.–E. Tachiaosa ne nalazeći ih u nekim pogledima zadovoljavajućima; (2) smještaj Moravske – još jednom se potpuno odbacuje pretpostavka I. Bobe, dok vojno-povijesni argument C. Bowlusa kojim se nastoji potkrijepiti Bobina teorija zahtijeva daljnja razmatranja, a pridaje se određena vrijednost najnovijoj koncepciji M. Eggersa o izvornom smještaju Moravske u Panonsku nizinu (u dolini Tise), o široko rasprostranjenu »carstvu« kneza Svatopluka bez obzira na ozbiljne nedostatke i nedosljednosti u njegovoj argumentaciji, (3) tzv. *Methodii doctrina*, to jest vrlo različiti odnosi Papinstva i Franačke crkve prema Metodiju i njegovu učenju tijekom njegova života te skeptičan pristup Rima prema njegovoj doktrini u glagoljaškoj Dalmaciji (u širem smislu) nakon Metodijeve smrti.

Izvorni znanstveni članak

Primljeno: 2. svibnja 1996.

Autor: Henrik Birnbaum

*Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures
University of California, Los Angeles*