



Croatica 442/43/44/1995-6.

Izvorni znanstveni članak

Henrik Birnbaum
(University of California, Los Angeles)

**HOW DID GLAGOLITIC WRITING REACH
THE COASTAL REGIONS
OF NORTHWESTERN CROATIA?***

UDK 808.101



Ungeklärt ist ... bis heute die Frage,
auf welchem Weg die Glagolica nach
Kroatien kam.

T. Eckhardt, *Azbuka* (1989), 39

The puzzle implied in the title of this contribution offered in honor of the preeminent specialist in the field of medieval Croatian literature

* I am indebted to my UCLA colleague Dr. Andrew Corin for valuable advice in preparing this paper.

today,¹ though long elucidated in some respects, still awaits a fully satisfactory solution. The present remarks do not aim, needless to say, at any definitive and exhaustive answer, but are merely intended to shed some additional light on the possibility of the alternative routes – from the north, i.e., from Moravia-Pannonia and/or Bohemia, or from the south, i.e., Macedonia by way of the intermediate regions of Dioclea (Duklja, Zeta), Travunia, Hum (Zahumlje), Bosnia, and, perhaps, southern and central Dalmatia – previously considered. It is also conceivable, of course – and has been so suggested by several scholars (our honoree included) – that Glagolitic writing made its way to northwestern Croatia, initially the Kvarner (Quarnero) basin and Istria, in particular, from both the north and the south.² What remains unresolved also under such a theory is whether the advent of Glagolitic literacy to the coastal regions of northern Croatia occurred more or less simultaneously or at different times. A second, related puzzle is the relatively late attestation – the time gap, as it were – of Croatian Glagolitic writing (initially serving exclusively liturgical purposes), which is extant in complete codices only from the late

¹ Cf., above all, his authoritative *Srednjovjekovna književnost (Povijest hrvatske književnosti, knj. 2)*, Zagreb: Liber/Mladost, 1975. See further, in particular, also his study "Društveni i gospodarski okviri hrvatskog glagoljaštva od 12. do polovine 16. stoljeća," *Croatica* II:2 (1971), 7-100 (reprinted in his *Nad iskonom hrvatske knjige*, Zagreb: Liber, 1983, 169-279), and now *Tropismena i trojezična kultura hrvatskoga srednjovjekovlja*, Zagreb: Matica hrvatska, 1994.

² Only a northern route (at first from Moravia) was assumed, e.g., by F. Dvornik, *The Slavs: Their Early History and Civilization*, Boston: American Academy of Arts and Sciences, 1956 [1959], 174, suggesting that "[t]he Slavonic liturgy and Slavonic letters probably reached Croatia and Dalmatia from Moravia before the end of Methodius's mission, if not earlier," citing M. Weingart's work on the Vienna Folia as proof of early Czech-Croat liturgical-literary contacts. For a more detailed discussion, proposing that the Slavic liturgy reached Croatia – or Croatian Pannonia, to be precise – quite early, namely, between 866 and 876 and that Methodius himself was involved in bringing it to Dalmatian Croatia and that some of his disciples after his death, in 885, may have settled in northwestern Croatia, while the Czech Church Slavonic Life of St. Wenceslas (Václav) is preserved in Croatian Glagolitic breviaries (which also contain readings on Constantine-Cyril, suggesting a familiarity with the *Vita Constantini*), see id., *Byzantine Missions Among the Slavs: SS. Constantine-Cyril and Methodius*, New Brunswick, N. J.: Rutgers University Press, 1970, 230-237. Among scholars who previously considered the possibility that Glagolitic writing reached North Croatian coastal regions from both the north and the south we may mention, notably, V. Jagić (*Rad JA* 2, 1868, 15) and J. Vajs (cf. *Rukovět' hláholské paleografie*, Prague: Slovanský ústav/Orbis, 1932, 135). It is noteworthy that Vajs thought primarily of Pannonia as the northern point of departure and of Macedonia (as part of Bulgaria) as the southern source, with Glagolitic moving through Zeta and [? H. B.] Dioclea, "which was often subject to the eastern state of Bulgaria and therefore could be a bridge by which Glagolitism reached the Croats from Bulgaria."

13th or 14th century. Fragmentary and epigraphic material is known from an earlier date, roughly the 12th century (the earliest inscriptions possibly going back even to the end of the 11th century). However, a Croatian-Dalmatian vernacular liturgy, using or preferring the Glagolitic script, existed as early as the first third of the 10th century (if not prior to that), the two Split Synods of 925 and 928, respectively, testifying to this fact. The Christianization of Croatian Dalmatia, including Istria and the Kvarner region, surely proceeded from the 9th century onward from Frankish Cividale (Old Aquileia) and, probably less forcefully, nominally Byzantine Grado (New Aquileia), as well as, beginning by the later 9th century, increasingly, from Venice.³ In this connection it may be mentioned that E. Hercigonja, while considering the Vienna Folia to represent the oldest tangible link between the Moravian (Czech) and the Croatian liturgical and graphic traditions, suggested that the two Apostle texts, the Gršković Apostle and the Mihanović (Prax-)Apostle Fragment, like the Vienna Folia dating from the 12th century and characterized by a transitional type of Glagolitic script (between the late Macedonian round and the early angular, uncial Croatian shape), may well have originated in the eastern borderlands of the Glagolitic territory – somewhere in Zahumlje, Zeta, Dioclea, or Bosnia – in other words, basically on the path from Macedonia, along which the Cyrillo-Methodian literacy was advancing (rather than the one coming from Moravia through Pannonia and/or Bohemia). Based on his own comparative study of relevant Glagolitic and Cyrillic texts, the Croatian scholar came to the conclusion that it was particularly apocryphal writings which were brought from Macedonia to the northwest, at first presumably to Bosnia as a result of the spreading of Bogomilism into these regions (still in the 11th-12th centuries) and subsequently also to some other, now Croatian literary centers.⁴ V. Štefa-

³ For details and discussion, see, e.g., A. P. Vlasto, *The Entry of the Slavs into Christendom*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970, 189-190 (with fn. d). A partial conversion of the Dalmatian (including Istrian and Kvarner) Croats even somewhat earlier and a different initial jurisdiction – Grado responsible for coastal Croatia, Cividale for Pannonian Croatia – has been suggested by, e.g., F. Šanjek, *Crkva i kršćanstvo Hrvata*, I: *Srednji vijek*, Zagreb: Kršćanska sadašnjost, 1988, 43-53.

⁴ Cf. E. Hercigonja, *Srednjovjekovna književnost*, 81-82 and 188 (n. 1). Here it should be noted, however, that the Bogomils (of Bulgaria and Macedonia) were presumably not identical with the adherents of the Cathar-dualist movement organized in the Bosnian Church. This latter, while sharing the Bogomils' dualist world view, rather had links—through the Dalmatian cities—with the Manicheists of Byzantium and the Cathar heretics of Italy (Lombardy) and southern France. For details, see F. Šanjek, *Bosansko-humski krstjani i katarsko-dualistički pokret u srednjem vijeku*, Zagreb: Kršćanska sadašnjost, 1975. Cf. now further N. Budak, *Prva stoljeća Hrvatske*, Zagreb: Hrvatska sveučilišna naklada, 1994, esp. 128-135. Budak seems to favor the hypothesis of an early southern route of Glagolitic from Macedonia via Dioclea,

nić went so far as to suggest that the Gršković Apostle "was brought by [some of] the numerous refugees from Bosnia to the Adriatic Sea, particularly at the time of the fall of the Bosnian state in 1463."⁵ The first page (recto) of the Kiev Folia, probably written toward the end of the 11th or the beginning of the 12th century (as opposed to the considerably older and also much more archaic main portion of this earliest known Slavic manuscript), long considered Croatian Church Slavonic by many scholars – myself included – possibly rather originated in Bulgaria as was suggested by B. Velčeva and more recently, following her, J. Schaeken.⁶

As was indicated at the outset, it is worth noting here that no very early complete or virtually complete Glagolitic manuscripts associated with Croatian Christianity have survived. For, though the above mentioned Vienna Folia clearly show Croatian traits, they cannot really be considered to be issued by, or produced for, the institutionalized Croatian (Dalmatian) Church, but rather, as was also already mentioned, point to the liturgical ties and shared graphic tradition linking Bohemia with the Croatian northwest. Going even further back in time, the Glagolita Clo-

Hum, Upper (Southern) and Central Dalmatia. He does so primarily on the basis of the letter of 925 by Pope John X to Archbishop John of Split and his suffragan bishops--notably those of Ston, Dubrovnik, and Kotor--and the results of the following Synod of 928. The Pope had warned the bishops of the danger of the "Methodian doctrine," implying the use of Slavic as a liturgical language, the Glagolitic script, and, possibly, heretic teaching. On the "Methodian doctrine," see also R. Katičić, "Methodii doctrina," *Slovo* 36 (1986), 11-44 (reprinted, with a postscript, in id., *Uz početke hrvatskih početaka*, Split: Književni krug, 1993, 67-98). In this connection, cf. further the view expressed by M. Pantelić ("O Kijevskim i Sinajskim listićima," *Slovo* 35, 1985, 5-57) that the Kiev Folia as well as the (liturgical) Sinai Folia point, in terms of their paleography and contents, to the Hum-Dioclea area; that the addition to both texts seem to have been written by the same hand (which would suggest that, at one point, they were in use in the Hum-Dioclea area); and that the names of the deceased persons found in the Cyrillic portion of the Sinai liturgy, and notably that of Petrunië, point more narrowly to the likelihood that this particular text segment was composed in the Dubrovnik region, where St. Petronila was worshiped. See further also E. Hercigonja, *Tropismena i trojezična kultura hrvatskoga srednjovjekovlja*, 47-48. For some thoughts concerning the border regions of Glagolitic and Cyrillic writing, see also B. Fučić, "Granična područja glagoljice i ćirilice," *Brački zbornik* 15 (Supetar, 1987), 17-28.

⁵ See E. Hercigonja, *Srednjovjekovna književnost*, 82 and 188 (n. 2); V. Štefančić, *Glagoljski rukopisi Jugoslavenske akademije* I, Zagreb: JAZU, 1969, 39.

⁶ Cf. B. Velčeva, "Kievskite listove," *Slavjanska fililogija* 17 (Sofia, 1983), 231-236, esp. 234-235; J. Schaeken, *Die Kiever Blätter*, Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1987, 170-171. Much earlier, in 1901, V. N. Ščepkin (*SBORJA S IAN* 67, XXIII-XXIV, fn. 1) had pointed out that the *e* reflex for *ь*- in strong position, instead of preserving *ь*- or, subsequently, expected a spoke against a Croatian origin of this fragment. This, however, is a disputable point, as short preserved *ь*- in several locations on the island of Krk is indeed reflected by *e*.

zianus, a relatively small fragment of what must have once been a much larger codex, generally considered to form part of the Old Church Slavonic canon, is usually thought to have been first found on the island of Krk, and shows some markedly Croatian features.⁷

In addition to the Apostle and other fragments with clearly Croatian features referred to above, some other, even smaller and incomplete texts deserve mention here. These are, in particular, the Baška Fragments (from a missal, Mt 26: 37-48), still from the 12th century, as is the highly archaic Cracow Missal Palimpsest, while the London Fragment (one folium) and the Vrbnik Fragments, both parts of a breviary, originated in the 13th century, as did the Kukuljević Missal Fragment and the – probably slightly older – Birbinj Missal Fragment, as well as some other minor text fragments.⁸

Of particular interest is, further, the Split Missal Fragment, probably written in the beginning of the 13th century in a highly archaic Glagolitic ductus and showing the ikavian reflex of ě. It contains texts for holidays, all falling in December (celebrating the Saints Ambrosius, Nicholas, Lucia, and Thomas). It was probably written in Bosnia, which, if correct, would prove that the Bosnian Glagolites became acquainted with an earlier version of the *Missale plenum* than the Franciscan version introduced by the mid-13th century. The Split Missal Fragment, showing certain common features with earlier, southern and eastern reductions as well as Bosnian Cyrillic texts, points to the southern route of Glagolitic writing, unless, of course, one would prefer to posit a direct pertinent liturgical-literary contact between Bosnia and Pannonia. However, the fragmentary *Missale festivum*, preceding the Franciscan missal reform of the mid-13th century and pointing to north Italian (or even French-Burgundian) Latin

⁷ See A. Dostál in his 1959 edition of the text, *Clozianus: Staroslověnský hlaholský sborník tridentský a innsbrucký*, Prague: ČSAV, 6, 9-10; cf. further A. P. Vlasto, op. cit., 380 (n. 172); more recently, cf. also S. Damjanović, *Glasovi i oblici općeslavenskoga književnog jezika*, Zagreb: Jadranka Filipović, 1993, 15-16. V. Štefanić, quoting earlier relevant research, went so far as claiming that the Glagolita Clozianus was actually written on the island of Krk; see his "Novija istraživanja o Kločevu glagoljašu," *Slovo* 2 (1953), 67-74; id., "Kločev glagoljaš i Luka Rinaldis," *Radovi Staroslavenskog instituta* 2 (1955), 129-153, esp. 129-130. In this sense, therefore, if not in a more general meaning (albeit limited to Croatian Glagolitism), the island of Krk can indeed be considered the "cradle" of Glagolitism, or, as V. Jagić put it, *vagina rerum glagoliticarum*, even though the Glagolitic script was, as is generally known, devised by Constantine-Cyril while still in Constantinople prior to his embarking on his (and his brother's) "Moravian mission." For the Croatian facet of this interpretation, see M. Bolonić, *Otok Krk. Kolijevka glagoljice*, Zagreb: Kršćanska sadašnjost, 1980.

⁸ For further details, see esp. J. Vajs, op. cit., 138-143; E. Hercigonja, *Srednjovjekovna književnost*, 81-86.

sources, which was discovered only some time ago and reported on by M. Pantelić and mentioned also by E. Hercigonja, does not suggest a link with the south or southeast, but rather with the west or, conceivably, the northwest.⁹

Here, two particular points need to be made. One is the fact that the angular shape of the Croatian Glagolitic script has been explained – rather convincingly – as due to the influence of the Latin Beneventan script, with its origins at the Monastery of Monte Cassino and used by the Benedictines also in Dalmatia (and coastal regions further to the north). This does not exclude the possibility that more practical considerations – the angular shape may have been more easily adapted to the graphic and calligraphic habits of the Croatian Glagolites – could have played a role as well.¹⁰ The other one is the orthographic reform of the mid-13th century, associated, it would seem, with the arrival of the then newly-founded Franciscans, or more precisely, Friars Minor (*Manja braća*, in Croatian), not replacing but supplementing the Benedictines already in place, and the introduction of the Franciscan *missale plenum* which heralded the fruition into what A. Corin has referred to as "mature Croatian Church Slavonic."¹¹ It is not until the late 13th and early 14th century (and the

⁹ On the *missale festivum*, see M. Pantelić, "Hrvatskoglagoljski odlomak 'Missale festivum,'" *Slovo* 22 (1972), 5-25; cf. further E. Hercigonja, *Srednjovjekovna književnost*, 82. On the Split Missal Fragment, see V. Štefanić, "Splitski odlomak glagoljskog misala starije redakcije," *Slovo* 6-8 (1957), 54-133. Generally on the rather meagerly attested Glagolitic writing from Bosnia, see further J. L. Tandarić, *Hrvatsko-glagoljska liturgijska književnost. Rasprave i prinosi*, Zagreb: Kršćanska sadašnjost / Provincijalat Franjevac-a-trećoredaca, 1993, 27-30 ("Glagoljska pismenost u srednjovjekovnoj Bosni"). In this connection a terminological issue should perhaps be clarified. The unqualified term *missal* is best applied to the full missal text (i.e., *missale plenum*), such as the one introduced by the Franciscan friars, while earlier, less complete texts without the lectionary, e.g., the Kiev Folia – also referred to as the "Kiev Missal" – and the "Sinai Missal" (5/N, which was to have been examined and edited by the late F. V. Mareš) are more accurately referred to as sacramentaries.

¹⁰ Cf., J. Vajs, op. cit., 136. On the Benedictines in early coastal Croatia, see, e.g., F. Šanjek, *Crkva i kršćanstvo*, 68-77, and I. Ostojić, "Benediktinci glagoljaši," *Slovo* 9-10 (1960), 14-42. Generally on this order in Croatia, see id., *Benediktinci u Hrvatskoj i ostalim našim krajevima*, 3 vols., Split: Benediktinski priorat, 1963-64. For a somewhat different explanation of the round vs. angular shape of the Glagolica, see T. Eckhardt, *Azbuka. Versuch einer Einführung in das Studium der slavischen Paläographie*, Vienna-Cologne: Böhlau, 40-41. See further eadem, "Napomene o grafičkoj strukturi glagoljice," *Radovi Staroslavenskog instituta* 2 (1955), 59-91, esp. 78-84.

¹¹ Cf. A. R. Corin, *The New York Missal: A Paleographic and Phonetic Analysis*, Columbus, OH: Slavica, 1991, 9-10, 16-28; id., "Variation and Norm in Croatian Church Slavonic," *Slovo* 41-43 (1993 [1994], 155-196, esp. 184-185); see further F.

time thereafter), however, that Croatian Glagolism reaches its full bloom (or "mature" phase).¹² It is quite conceivable that it was precisely the mid-13th century reform that accounts for the paucity of handwritten texts in Croatian Church Slavonic from before that period.

Here it is further worth pointing out the degree to which the handwritten evidence (and its chronology) is matched by the epigraphic material now easily assessed thanks to the excellent work by B. Fučić. Moreover, we have to consider also what we know about the church-historical and political events of the earliest period, notably the late 9th and the 10th centuries.¹³

Looking thus at the epigraphic evidence, we note that the earliest phase of Glagolitic writing in formerly Yugoslav territory has left only slight traces outside the Croatian northwest: one inscription in Macedonia (a graffito in the Church of St. Naum on Lake Ohrid), one inscription in Bosnia (Kijevci), two in central Dalmatia (in Plastovo near Skradino and in Knin, respectively), and one in Hercegovina (Humac). The compact core of Glagolitic epigraphic material from the 11th-13th centuries is all found in the Kvarner basin (11th century), followed (in the 12th century) by finds from central and northeastern Istria. More specifically, from the 11th century date inscriptions in Plomin (on Istria's eastern coast), Valun (on the island of Cres), and in Krk (on the island of the same name). From the transitional period between the 11th and the 12th centuries epigraphic data originate in Baška (on Krk) and Senj (on the Croatian Littoral). From the 12th century Glagolitic graffiti – or inscribed fragments – are found in central and northeastern Istria (Grdoselo, Hum, Roč) and toward the end of that century also from Draguč. Whereas this limited region of Glagolitic epigraphic data does not essentially change in the next, 13th and 14th centuries, the 15th century brings a substantial expansion, now to inland Croatia, the Zadar region (with the off-coast islands), and the area of Bihać, this extension continuing in the 16th century to all of Istria, western Croatia, and the Croatian Littoral. If anything, the dense

W. Mareš, "A Basic Reform of the Orthography at the Early Period of Croatian-Glagolitic Church Slavonic," in: *The Formation of the Slavonic Literary Languages*, G. Stone and D. Worth, eds., Columbus, OH: Slavica, 1985, 177-181; J. Vajs, *Liber Iob*, Veglæ, Palaeoslovenica Academia Veglensis, 1903.

¹² Cf. J. Vajs, *Rukovět'*, 147-151; id., *Najstariji hrvatskoglagoljski misal*, Zagreb: JAZU, 1948, 7-43; E. Hercigonja, *Srednjovjekovna književnost*, 81-94, 188-189 (nn. 1-14). For a selective listing of the relevant manuscripts with some additional information, see most recently *Rječnik crkvenoslavenskog jezika hrvatske redakcije*, I: *Uvod*, Zagreb: Staroslavenski zavod, 1991, 31-36.

¹³ Cf. B. Fučić, *Glagoljski natpisi*, Zagreb: JAZU, 1982, esp. 1-5 ("Topografija i kronologija"); see further also, e.g., the "Chronological Survey of Events" (in tabular form) found in F. Šanjek, *Crkva i kršćanstvo*, 421-507, esp. 441-465.

attestation of Glagolitic epigraphic data in the Croatian northwest, especially, in the early period, would seem to speak against an initial migratory route from the south and southeast, that is, ultimately from Macedonia. By the same token, the presence of Glagolitic inscriptions in the Kvarner-Istria region in increasingly high numbers suggests Glagolite activities there by no later than the late 11th-early 12th century. Yet the absence of Glagolitic graffiti from an even earlier period is perhaps surprising – for inscriptions in stone are by and large quite time and weather resistant (so that only relatively few have disappeared altogether or were rendered entirely illegible, in contrast, say, to the North Russian birchbark inscriptions), especially if we consider that a debate concerning – if not an outright struggle for – the acceptance of Glagolitic as the writing system of the Slavic, i.e., vernacular, liturgy is attested from no later than the early 10th century.

We are therefore turning now and before attempting at least a tentative answer to the complex question posed in the title of this essay to the political, notably church-political, social, and cultural-historical, situation of Dalmatia in the broad sense (i.e., including Istria and the Kvarner basin) in the late 9th and during the 10th centuries. Clearly there exists a certain discrepancy between the view of Dalmatia, the gulf of Kvarner and Istria, in the 10th-11th centuries, advocated by, on the one hand, N. Klaić, and, on the other, most other present-day historians, among them A. P. Vlasto, J. V. A. Fine, Jr., and L. Steindorff.¹⁴ While Klaić speaks of Byzantine Dalmatia as if its formal subordination to Byzantium, or rather to the Patriarchate of Aquileia Nova (Grado), also automatically implied the right – or at least the claim to the right – of the use of Slavic and the Glagolitic script as a liturgical language and its graphic vehicle, other historians view the orientation of Dalmatia, Istria and the gulf of Kvarner toward Italy – Frankish Aquileia (Aquileia Antiqua, i.e., Cividale), Venice, and, above all, Rome – as decisive no later than by the early 10th century. While the second of the Synods of 925 and 928, respectively, seems to have served primarily the purpose of confirming the elevation of Split to the archepiscopal see (and the abolition of the bishopric of Nin and the relocation of its ambitious, now defeated incumbent, Bishop Grgur), the

¹⁴ Cf. N. Klaić, *Povijest Hrvata u ranom srednjem vijeku*, Zagreb: Školska knjiga, 1975, 395-408; eadem, *Izvori za hrvatsku povijest do 1526. godine*, Zagreb: Školska knjiga, 1972, 30-86; eadem, "Historijska podloga hrvatskoga glagoljaštva u X i XI stoljeću," *Slovo* 15-16 (1965), 225-281; A. P. Vlasto, op. cit., 187-207, esp. 189-202 and 204-207; J. V. A. Fine, Jr., *The Early Medieval Balkans: A Critical Survey from the Sixth to the Late Twelfth Century*, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1983 [1989], 251-281; L. Steindorff, *Die dalmatinischen Städte im 12. Jahrhundert. Studien zu ihrer politischen Stellung und gesellschaftlichen Entwicklung*, Cologne and Vienna: Böhlau, 1984, 35-46.

decisions of the Synod of 925 had more immediate bearing on the use of the Slavic vernacular and the Glagolitic script. Thus, apparently, the study of Latin would henceforth be a condition for consecration, though the continued use of Slavic and Glagolitic in mass was not explicitly prohibited. Things change drastically only a century and a half later, when, in the schism of 1067-1071 between the legitimate, reform-minded Pope Alexander II and the anti-Pope Honorius II, who had found support in northern Italy, Honorius granted the Kvarner islands Krk, Osor, and Rab the right freely to use Slavic and Glagolitic, while the remaining cities of Lower Dalmatia – Zadar, Trogir, and Split – remained committed to Pope Alexander II and therefore did not enjoy this privilege. This, therefore, and the immediately following period, can be inferred to have been a time of flowering of Glagolitic writing, notably on the island of Krk.

It is also in this context that we should see the controversial issue of the allegedly poorly educated – viz., ignorant of Latin – and backward image of the Glagolitic priest (*pop-glagoljaš*) during the immediately following centuries. No one has better explained the mistaken notion of the poor and culturally underdeveloped Glagolite than our honoree, E. Hercigonja, demonstrating convincingly that this image, while to some extent justified for the 16th-18th centuries – when a mastery of Latin and theological sophistication were indeed *de rigueur* – was subsequently mechanically transferred by scholars of the 19th and 20th centuries (ever since V. Jagić) and thus in no way did justice to the spiritual, intellectual, and economic potential that Croatian Glagolitism represented during the time up to the early 16th century.¹⁵

Returning in conclusion to the question raised at the outset and seeking to somehow reconcile the various, in part contradictory strands of reasoning involved, it would appear that Glagolitic writing did indeed reach the coastal regions of northwestern Croatia – the Kvarner archipelago, Istria, the Croatian Littoral – by two routes, one from Moravia-Pannonia and most probably via the detour over Bohemia, the other from Macedonia via Duklja, Bosnia, and adjacent territories. It is highly unlikely, though, that these two moves of Glagolitism took place at the same time. If we discard here the possible early location of the Old Church Slavonic Glagolita Clozianus on the island of Krk (especially as this manuscript, just like the Codex Marianus, which also shows some Serbo-Croatian linguistic traits, most likely originated in the border region between Macedonia and Serbian-speaking territory), it stands to reason that the trail from the south, viz. from Macedonia, was opened up only later, perhaps in part in connection with the dispersion of the Bogomils, escaping per-

¹⁵ Cf. E. Hercigonja, "Društveni i gospodarski okviri (see n.1, above), 7-14 and 100; further id., *Srednjovjekovna književnost*, 25-26.

secution by the representatives of official Orthodoxy (Great Župan Stefan Nemanja, originally baptized a Catholic but later converted to the eastern faith, among them). Whether the Bosnian Cathars (i.e., the members of the Bosnian Church), distinct from the Bogomils proper, played any role in this context is not entirely clear (see n. 4, above). As for the northern route, it must have been traversed much earlier, probably no later than the last decades of the 9th century, shortly after some of Methodius' disciples may have arrived in the area. That Methodius himself should have been involved in bringing Glagolitic writing to northwest Croatia, though conceivable, particularly during his second trip to and from Rome and/or his last (and only) journey to and from Constantinople, I consider less likely.¹⁶ As for some of his disciples, however, they could either have gone to coastal Croatia directly (after Methodius' death) or returned there after having been set free from the slave market in Venice by the intervention of a representative of Emperor Basil I. And, as for the precise course of the route from the north – whether via Pannonia or Bohemia – we can only speculate: in terms of the geographic proximity, Pannonia – the region around and south of Lake Balaton, with a transitional, West-South Slavic-speaking population – would perhaps seem more likely, but with regard to the language and some of the literary themes (the legends of St. Wenceslas, and St. Vitus, as well as the apocryphal Gospel of Nicodemus), Bohemia proper may just as well have been the point of departure, and the common liturgical language was at any rate but slightly differently colored western Church Slavonic.¹⁷

¹⁶ In the "White Book" of the Salzburg Church, the *Conversio Bagoariorum et Carantanorum*, Methodius is referred to as "quidam Graecus, Methodius nomine, noviter inventis Sclavinis litteris linguam Latinam doctrinamque Romanam atque litteras auctoriales Latinas philosophice superduces vilescece fecit cuncto populo." Cf. H. Wolfram, *Conversio Bagoariorum et Carantanorum. Das Weißbuch der Salzburger Kirche über die erfolgreiche Mission in Kartanien und Pannonien*, Vienna, Cologne, Graz: Böhlau, 1979, 56-59, 138-141.

¹⁷ Cf. H. Birnbaum, *Aspects of the Slavic Middle Ages and Slavic Renaissance Culture*, New York: Peter Lang, 1991, 601-625 ("Issues in West Church Slavonic"); A. Vaillant, *L'Évangile de Nicodème. Texte slave et texte latin*, Geneva & Paris: Droz, 1968, XXVI-XXVIII ("Le vieux slave occidental"); F. W. Mareš, *An Anthology of Church Slavonic Texts of Western (Czech) Origin*, Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1979, 9-16 (sections 0.0-0.35), 31 (section 2). Note that Mareš, while weighing probabilities, assumed Czech origin in certain instances where A. Vaillant and B. Grabar were inclined rather to consider certain texts Croatian Church Slavonic in origin (this applies notably to the apocryphal Gospel of Nicodemus). On Czech Church Slavonic, its monuments and relation to Croatian Church Slavonic, see further M. Weingart, *Československý typ církevní slovančiny. Jeho pamiatky a význam*, Bratislava: SAVU, 1949, *passim*.

SAŽETAK

KAKO JE GLAGOLJSKO PISMO DOSPJELO DO OBALNOG
PODRUČJA SJEVEROZAPADNE HRVATSKE

U ovome radu sažimaju se i preispituju rezultati dosadašnjih istraživanja mogućih putova kojima se glagoljička tradicija protegnula do sjeverozapadnih obala hrvatskog područja. Nakon pregleda osnovnih obilježja najstarijih hrvatskoglagojskih pisanih spomenika – knjižnih (uglavnom fragmentiranih) i epigrafskih – te prikaza crkvenopolitičkih, socijalnih – i kulturnopovijesnih prilika u ondašnjoj Dalmaciji, autor potvrđuje da valja razlikovati dva puta: sjeverni (stariji, iz vremena nakon Metodijeve smrti, od Moravske, Panonije, Češke) i južni (mlađi, u vezi s pomicanjima bogumila – od Makedonije preko Duklje, Zahumlja, Bosne). Pritom se upućuje na oprez pri procjenjivanju pojedinih osobina spomenutih spomenika kao "sjevernih" i "južnih".

Uz to, autor se usput osvrće i na mnoga druga pitanja iz hrvatskoglagojske problematike, rasvjetljavanju kojih je presudno pridonio upravo Eduard Hercigonja (npr. predrasude o neukosti popova glagoljaša).