

Ludvíkovský, Jaroslav

Great Moravia tradition in the 10th cent. : Bohemia and Legenda Christiani

In: *Magna Moravia : sborník k 1100. výročí příchodu byzantské mise na Moravu*. Vyd. 1. Praha: Státní pedagogické nakladatelství, 1965, pp. 525-566

Stable URL (handle): <https://hdl.handle.net/11222.digilib/119660>

Access Date: 29. 11. 2024

Version: 20220831

Terms of use: Digital Library of the Faculty of Arts, Masaryk University provides access to digitized documents strictly for personal use, unless otherwise specified.

**GREAT MORAVIA TRADITION IN THE 10th CENT.
BOHEMIA AND LEGENDA CHRISTIANI**

1

Surprising archeological discoveries in South Moravia, which, as it happened, incidentally coincided with preparations for the 1100th anniversary of the arrival of the Thessalonian brothers Constantine-Cyrrill and Methodius in Moravia, contributed along with the above-mentioned significant commemoration to a considerable revival of interest in problems associated with the christianization of the Slavs residing in the territory of the present Czechoslovakia, with the dawning of their culture, and with the character of their social organization. In the set of these questions, whose importance as well as complexity was pointed out — neither for the first time, nor, to be sure, for the last time — at the Great Moravia Conference held in Brno and Nitra from the 1st to the 4th of October 1963,¹ the most disputable appears to be the question that was not discussed extensively at the said conference (owing to its appurtenance to the 9th century), yet, which has been the subject of unceasing controversies for about two centuries. I have in mind the question whether, and if so, how, the beginnings of Christianity in Bohemia were connected with the Moravian Missionary activity of Cyrrill and Methodius, and whether and to what extent the 10th century Bohemia of the Přemyslides adopted after the downfall of the Great Moravian Empire the Moravian spiritual and political traditions.

From the very beginning of this investigation, which assumed at first the form of a dispute about the performance of Slavonic liturgy in Bohemia, the above question was closely linked up with another controversy, i. e. that about the authenticity of a small-size Latin document entitled *Vita et passio sancti Wenceslai et sancte Ludmille, avie eius*, the author of which introduced himself in the preface to the readers as monk C h r i s t i a n, uncle of the second bishop of Prague St. Vojtěch (Adalbert), in other words as one who wrote towards the close of the tenth century.² This correlation of the two problems is natural, for nearly the entire Cyrillo-Methodian Czech tradition up to the discovery of the original Old-Slavic sources in the 19th century has been drawing directly or indirectly upon the first two chapters of *Legenda Christiani*, in which we read about the arrival of the Thessalonian brothers in Moravia, about Cyrrill's defence of Slavic liturgy, about the baptism of the Bohemian Duke Bořivoj by Archbishop Methodius in the seat of the Moravian Duke (King) Svatopluk, as well as about the foundation of the first Christian churches in Bohemia, St. Clement's in Levý Hradec and Virgin Mary's in the Prague Castle.

It stands to reason that in the present article I shall by no means be able to treat my subject and its rich bibliography in their full extent. This task would require a whole book, which, I am afraid, would have to be at least as voluminous as the few recent works dealing with *Legenda Christiani* only. Nevertheless, I should like to allude in the present treatise to some fundamental facts, dates,

and views, and maybe also errors that found publicity in the course of this long-lasting scientific discussion. The items to be discussed will, no doubt, be familiar to experts, yet, their survey may help a less initiated reader to acquire a better understanding of the problems, while for me it will be an opportunity to utter a few critical comments based on linguistic investigation of Christian's Legend.

2

B o h u s l a v B a l b i n (1621—1688), who was the first to publish *Legenda Christiani* in print (see Note 2), called it the most precious source for the study of early Bohemian history, a source much older than the well-known *Chronica Boemorum* by the Prague dean C o s m a s (died in 1125),³ and thus secured for the document a place of honour in baroque historiography as well as in *Acta Sanctorum*. The first opposer of the authenticity of *Legenda Christiani*, historian of the enlightenment era G e l a s i u s D o b n e r (1719—1790),⁴ did not believe that a son of the Bohemian Duke Boleslav I — for monk Christian was supposed to be the Duke's child — should be so recklessly outspoken when writing about his own father as to call him a fratricide, and neither was he willing to admit that a literary work of such standard could have originated in the 10th century Bohemia, and for these reasons he declared in his controversy with the publisher and defender of the Legend P. Athanasius (see Note 2) Christian's work to be a falsification from approximately the end of the 12th century. Notwithstanding, he was fully convinced that Slavic liturgy had actually been performed in Bohemia, finding support for his conviction also in the Ludmilian legend *Diffundente sole*,⁵ that is to say in Christian himself, as a matter of fact, for the legend *Diffundente sole* has by now been safely proved to be just a reworded extract from the opening chapters of *Legenda Christiani*.

A more radical and consequent standpoint than that of Dobner was taken by J o s e f D o b r o v s k ý (1753—1829), who represented the culmination of the Czech enlightenment movement and commenced modern Slavonic studies. His historical scepticism induced him to see in the legend by the bishop of Mantua G u m p o l d (written about 973—983)⁶ the oldest legend concerning St. Wenceslas as well as the source of all the remaining old writings dealing with this saint. As to the "Pseudo-Christian" with its reports on the Slavonic initiation of Christianity in Bohemia, Dobrovský fixed a rather late date for it, i. e. the end of the 13th or the beginning of the 14th centuries. The first Bohemian historical source he believed to be the Chronicle by Cosmas, which, to be sure, mentions the fact that the first Christian Bohemian Duke Bořivoj was baptized by the Moravian Bishop Methodius, but otherwise it does not contain any allusion whatsoever to the performance of Slavic liturgy; in the whole work there is but one indirect reference to it in the quotation from the Pope's epistle to the Czech Duke Boleslav II (I, c. 22), granting the establishment of a bishopric in Prague on the condition that the worship would not be performed "according to the rites or sect of the Bulgarian and Russian nations or in a Slavonic tongue". To tell the truth, Dobrovský put more faith in the *Annales Fuldenses*, in which it is stated that in the year 845 King Louis received 14 Bohemian princes who desired to turn Christians and had them baptized.⁷ The story about Bořivoj's baptism by Methodius he held to be "a Moravian myth", and its oldest literary presenta-

tion he saw in the legend *Diffundente sole*, which he published in the first volume of his "Kritische Versuche die ältere böhmische Geschichte von späteren Erdichtungen zu reinigen". The publication was entitled "Bořivoj's Taufe" (Prague 1803), and Dobrovský reprinted the legend *Diffundente sole* only to subject it to crushing criticism without realizing that he was in fact condemning Christian. This negative standpoint — particularly in reference to the possible existence of Slavic liturgy in the 10th century Bohemia — he maintained also in the following small volumes of his *Kritische Versuche* (II *Ludmila und Drahomir*, 1807; III *Wenzel und Boleslaw*, 1819; IV *Mährische Legende von Cyrill und Method*, 1826), and the same resolute attitude he manifested also in all his editions of his "Geschichte der böhmischen Sprache und Literatur" (1791, 1792, 1818). Slavonic liturgy and Slavonic literature in Bohemia he associated only with the existence of Prokop's monastery *Sázava* in the 11th century (1032—1096) and of the Prague monastery "Na Slovanech", founded for the Croatian Glagolitic monks by the Bohemian King and Roman Emperor Charles IV in the year 1346.

Dobrovský's views refuting the existence of Slavic liturgy in the 10th century Bohemia were shaken already in his life-time by the discovery of the so-called *First Old-Slavonic Legend about St. Wenceslas*, published by the Russian expert in Slavonic studies A. Ch. Vostokov, in the year 1827. In this no doubt very ancient document we can read apart from other things that Duchess Ludmila, widow of Duke Bořivoj, had his grandson Wenceslas instructed in reading Slavonic books, and it was only after this tuition that his father Duke Vratislav sent him to Budeč Castle to get instruction in Latin. The significance of the fact that the life and martyr's death of St. Wenceslas were described in such an ancient Old-Slavonic document, preserved in Russia, was realized not only by Czech scientists V. Hanka, F. Palacký, and P. J. Šafařík, but also by a German historian, the subsequently renowned publisher of the "Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen" Wilhelm Wattenbach, who was induced by this discovery to write a historical study "Die slawische Liturgie in Böhmen und die altrussische Legende vom heiligen Wenzel" (Breslau 1857), in which he endorsed the view — even if with a certain reserve — that this document testifies in favour of the performance of Slavic liturgy in the 10th century Bohemia. Vostokov's discovery, however, failed to be recognized as a contribution to the question of authenticity of *Legenda Christiani*, and no more was this question affected by Wattenbach's discovery of a 12th century fragment of this legend, which Wattenbach, to be sure, believed to be an independent legend describing the martyrdom of St. Ludmila, while it is, in fact, beyond doubt just a slight adaptation of the 4th chapter of Christian.⁸ And thus it happened that in the *Fontes rerum Bohemicarum I* (Prague 1873) Josef Emmler reprinted Christian's Legend in brier type as the last Wenceslas legend, declaring it to be a later falsification, the same attitude being maintained by the entire Czech historiography and history of literature up to the end of the 19th century.

A real change in the view of this problem and to a considerable extent also of the early stage of Czech history was brought about by the action of the historian Josef Pekař (1870—1937), who commenced in the year 1902 in the *Český časopis historický* his famous campaign with the object of rehabilitating Christian. A sum-up of this campaign, his dispute with his principal opponent B. Bretholz, publisher of the *Chronicle by Cosmas* (see Note 3), including, Pekař presented in his work "Die Wenzels- und Ludmila-Legenden und die

Echtheit Christians", Prague 1906. In his defence of Christian he already took into account the various recensions of the First Old-Slavonic Legend about St. Wenceslas, whether Russian-Cyrillic or Croatian-Glagolitic, which were being discovered one by one, as well as the Second Old-Slavonic Legend about St. Wenceslas, which was found in 1904 by N. K. N i k o l s k i j. The First Old-Slavonic Legend Pekař declared to be the primary historical source of the early stage of St. Wenceslas literary tradition, proving besides quite safely by a detailed analysis that Gumpold's Legend is but a stylistic amplification of the Legend *Crescente fide*.⁹ Taking a certain licence he designated *Legenda Christiani* as "the oldest Bohemian chronicle", that is to say, as a historical source by about 130 years to be antedated to Cosmas' Chronicle.

This rehabilitation of Christian by Pekař influenced significantly the Slavonic studies in general, and reinforced the repute of those research-workers who, to begin with P. J. Šafařík (1795—1861), endeavoured to prove the Czech origin of the First Old-Slavonic Legend about St. Wenceslas as well as of other ecclesiastical Old-Slavonic documents, discovered later (The Prague Glagolitic Fragments in 1855, The Old-Slavonic Canon about St. Wenceslas in 1863, The Kiev Fragments in 1874 etc.), by pointing out lexical and frazeological Bohemisms in the text of these documents. It is worth noting that just at the time of Pekař's campaign in defence of Christian (although independent of it) this linguistic method was applied to a numerous group of Ecclesiastical Slavonic writings by the Russian expert in Slavonic philology A. J. S o b o l e v s k i j (*Cerkovnoslavjanskije teksty moravskogo proischoždenija* 1900; *Žitija svjatyh v drevnom perevode na cerkovnoslavjanskij s latinskogo jazyka* 1904, etc.).

It is, however, necessary to point out that other contemporary Slavonic philologists, primarily Vatroslav Jagić himself as well as his Czech pupil Václav Vondrák, assumed a more sober attitude in this respect. There is particularly one Jagić's utterance which is often quoted, i. e. that "the Slavic liturgy in Bohemia was always only a tender indoor flower, which was bound to be damaged by every rough gust of wind".¹⁰ This does not mean, of course, that the above-mentioned research-workers should have been denying the existence of ecclesiastical Old-Slavonic literature in the 10th century Bohemia, as Dobrovský did, they just did not ascribe this phenomenon any special significance either in the 10th or in the 11th centuries.

3

Thus the above discussion went on and is still going on. And if it was possible for us just roughly to outline its course from the beginning of the 20th cent., its continuation during the past 60 years that have elapsed since the campaign started by Pekař confronts us with still greater difficulties. Let alone the extraordinary growth of investigation in the realm of Bohemian Ecclesiastic Old-Slavonic material, which has supplied us with a number of reliable surveys by respective experts,^{11a} literature dealing with *Legenda Christiani* alone has brought into play new aspects and new controversies, so that it is very hard indeed briefly to depict the characteristic features of this complex situation. Yet, on the other hand, it was just in this period that the connection between the question of the authenticity of Christian's Legend and the problem of the Moravian-Bohemian continuity, whether literary and cultural or political, appeared to be so impres-

sive that if wishing to give fair treatment to our subject we find it indispensable to allude at least to some of the basic theories characterizing the later phases and also the present phase of this old dispute. And, unfortunately, we shall have to do so even at the cost of presenting only partial and inevitably inaccurate information, for which we beg the reader's kind pardon.

Of the Czech literature published before the restoration of the Czechoslovak sovereignty in the year 1918 we must not fail to mention *České dějiny I* by V á c l a v N o v o t n ý, Prague 1912. Václav Novotný did not agree with Pekař and persisted till the end of his life (1932) in believing that Christian's Legend was a 12th cent. falsification, nevertheless he did not present the promised proofs of his statement — some minor notes, especially in the *Časopis Českého musea*, 1930, excepting — and now and then he stressed the probability that Christian drew upon some older sources. He took Cosmas's report on Bořivoj's baptism by Methodius for quite credible, otherwise, however, all he was willing to admit was (page 715) "that some quite negligible practice of Slavic liturgy may have survived u n d e r h a n d in some places in Bohemia" till the foundation of the Sázava Monastery (1032), which practically means that Novotný sided in this respect with the sceptical standpoint of at least Jagić, if not of Dobrovský.

Subsequent to the foundation of the Czechoslovak Republic, which reunited after the thousand years of separation the Czech-speaking provinces (Bohemia, Moravia, and Silesia) with the east part of the former Great Moravia, i. e. with Slovakia, the Czech Slavic philology, represented by that time not only by Jagić's pupils Fr. P a s t r n e k and V. V o n d r á k, but also by the younger generation of their pupils, began to display increasingly keener interest in the Czech Old-Slavonic literature. This interest found a special impulse in the thousandth anniversary of Duke Wenceslas's martyr's death. The very fact that this millennium was officially celebrated in 1929, thanks to Josef Pekař, who succeeded in establishing this chronology on the basis of the First Old-Slavonic Legend about St. Wenceslas and of Christian's Legend, indicates the associations we try to follow in this paper. The interrelations between the single branches of research implied in this investigation are demonstrated above all by a number of significant studies that were published in 1929, the year of the above celebration: 1. An extensive treatise by P e k a ř, entitled "Svatý Václav" (St. Wenceslas), which was published in the *Český časopis historický* and in which the author presented a definite and partly new formulation of his views of early Czech history, using for basis his former studies of *Christiani Legenda* and associated problems, while taking, however, fully into account the results arrived at by contemporary Slavic philology. 2. A memorial publication "Sborník staroslověnských literárních památek o sv. Václavu a sv. Ludmile" (Old-Slavonic literary documents concerning St. Wenceslas and St. Ludmila), the editorial work being in the hands of J o s e f V a j s and his associates, the Russian philologist N. J. S e r e b r j a n s k i j and J o s e f V a š i c a; the latter's contribution performed a stimulative investigation of the relation of the *Second Old-Slavonic Legend about St. Wenceslas* to its model, the legend by *Gumpold*, as well as to other Latin legends. 3. R o m a n J a k o b s o n published his "Nejstarší české písně duchovní" (The oldest Czech hymns), attempting to reconstruct the old-renowned song "Hospodine pomiluj ny" and offering a new evaluation of the beginnings of the Ecclesiastic Old-Slavonic writings in the Czech-speaking area.

The anniversary of 1929 gave impulse also to the plan of making up an imposing *Svatováclavský sborník* (St. Wenceslas Memorial), whose first part, comprizing 1115 pages, appeared in Prague in 1934. The first item was again the above-mentioned Pekař's study St. Wenceslas, which was reprinted here (pp. 9—101), supplemented by rich and valuable notes. Another long study in the Memorial was "První česko-církevněslovanská legenda o sv. Václavu" (The first Bohemian Ecclesiastic Old-Slavonic legend about St. Wenceslas) (pp. 863—1088) by Miloš Weingart, in which the author attempted a reconstruction of the said document, drawing upon the Russian-Cyrillic and Croatian-Glagolitic versions, while trying at the same time to prove that the *First Old-Slavonic Legend about St. Wenceslas* is older than both the Latin St. Wenceslas legends *Crescente fide* and *Christian*, bearing, according to him, traces of influence exercised upon them by the former text. Thus this text he holds to be the oldest native source of Czech history and the first original product of Czech literature. It is worth noticing that also significant archeological studies published in this volume, particularly "Václavova rotunda sv. Víta" (Wenceslas rotunde of St. Vite) by Josef Cibulka and "Praha, Bučěč a Boleslav" by Karel Guth, refer to the First Old-Slavonic Legend about St. Wenceslas and to *Christian* as to safe 10th century documents.

In *Svatováclavský sborník* II 2 (Prague 1939) an extensive study of 630 pages by the historian Václav Chaloupecký was published. The work was entitled "Prameny X. století Legendy Kristiánovy" (The Tenth Century Sources of *Legenda Christiani*) and was dedicated to the memory of Josef Pekař. In his estimation of *Christian*, however, Chaloupecký considerably differs from his teacher, even though he obviously endorses the latter's argumentation in favour of authenticity and endeavours to support it.^{11b}

The foundation stone of the Czech literary and historical tradition Chaloupecký believed to be an un preserved *Slavonic legend treating the life of St. Ludmila*, wife of Bořivoj and grandmother of St. Wenceslas. The existence of this legend was already assumed by Pekař, Serebrjanskij and Weingart, nevertheless, they abstained from fixing the date of its origin too definitely. Weingart, for instance, believed that this presupposed source was written later than the First Old-Slavonic Legend about St. Wenceslas.¹² According to Chaloupecký (and others before him) this assumed source was drawn upon by the authors of two texts that are, no doubt, closely connected, i. e. the short *Slavonic Prologue about St. Ludmila*¹³ and the Latin legend *Fuit in provincia Bohemorum*,¹⁴ the latter being in Chaloupecký's opinion the oldest preserved Latin legend dealing with events in Bohemia.

Another un preserved historical document *Privilegium Moraviensis ecclesie*, which is referred to by Cosmas I c. 15, Chaloupecký tried to reconstruct from the legend *Diffundente sole*, from *Christian*, and from the Cyrillo-Methodian legends *Beatus Cyrillus*¹⁵ and *Tempore Michaelis imperatoris*.¹⁶ The Ludmilian legend *Diffundente sole* — from which he quite rightly separated the homily *Factum est*¹⁷ — Chaloupecký declared to be the source of *Legenda Christiani* (just as Dobner and Dobrovský did), placing, however, the date of its origin in the 2nd half of the 10th cent., ignoring his teacher's opposite view, which was in the meantime substantiated by a critical analysis of the respective text presented by the philologist Bohumil Ryba.¹⁸ At the same time Chaloupecký expressed the opinion that the legend *Diffundente sole* is identical with the historical

document alluded to by Cosmas I c. 15 as *Epilogus eiusdem terre (sc. Moravie) et Boemie*.

All the standpoints in which Chaloupecký differed from Pekař had one object in common, namely to find for Christian's narrative some still older, whether preserved or unpreserved, sources and thus to increase the credibility of this long disputed document. A philological criticism of the expert in medieval literature Jan Vilikovský (NV, 1941, pp. 81—94), however, showed pretty soon and quite convincingly that this experiment of Chaloupecký turned out to be essentially a failure. It is true that Vilikovský accepted in accord with Chaloupecký his arguments concerning the antiquity of the legend *Fuit* and of its Ecclesiastic Old-Slavonic model (Pekař's attitude to the problem of relation of the legend *Fuit* to *Christian* betrayed reserve), but he refused his reconstruction of the *Privilegium*, and particularly he proved once more that the legend *Diffundente sole* is an extract from *Christian* and not its model. He found support for his argument also in the fact that the text of *Christian's Legend* had been reworded in *Diffundente* in such a way as to give the so-called *cursus velox* maximum assertion, this being in accord with the rhythmical taste of progressing Middle Ages.

Vilikovský observed in his review (page 82) that his scepticism did not, in fact, concern Chaloupecký's new theses concerning the earliest history of Bohemia, for all the most important pieces of information that served Chaloupecký as basis for his theory were, as a matter of fact, contained in *Christian's Legend* with the exception of the mention made in *Diffundente sole* about the arrival of Methodius to Bohemia with the object of baptizing St. Ludmila and a number of her compatriots. This Vilikovský's statement is quite correct. Chaloupecký indeed did not express any thesis that could not find at least a hypothetical support in *Legenda Christiani* and in the First Old-Slavonic Legend about St. Wenceslas. When trying to prove that Moravia was subjected to Bohemia as early as in the 10th cent. or that the founder of the Great Bohemian State was already St. Wenceslas's father Duke Vratislav, he never failed to stress that his arguments were but more or less probable conclusions, yet, it must be admitted that it was particularly in his synthetic statements that he gave his ideas a too definite formulation. This holds good also about the last chapter of his work (pp. 421—455), in which he discusses the history of Slavic liturgy in Bohemia and its political, cultural, and historical significance, and the same objection must be applied to the collection of translations of Old-Slavonic and Latin legends, entitled "Na úsvitě křesťanství" (The dawning of Christianity), Prague, 1942, where he presents an abridgement of his views expounded in "Prameny", while the interpretation of the Old-Slavonic documents is to be found in the contribution of their outstanding expert and translator Josef Vašica.

4

Of the Czech historians it was just V. Chaloupecký who expressed most emphatically the thesis about a cultural and political continuity connecting the Přemyslide Bohemia with Great Moravia. Yet, we must admit that he found support for his conviction not only in his largely disputable, yes, often doubtful, estimation of assumed sources of Chris-

tian's Legend, but also and primarily in the results of linguistic research carried on by Russian and Czech experts in Slavonic philology A. Sobolevskij, Roman Jakobson, Bohuslav Havránek, Miloš Weingart, and Josef Vašica. If we wish to grasp fully how these problems are interrelated, it will be useful to read a study published by Roman Jakobson (using the pseudonym Olaf Jansen) in a volume entitled "Co daly naše země Evropě a lidstvu" (What our countries gave to Europe and mankind), Prague 1939, or lectures "Slovanská bohoslužba v zemích českých" (Slavic liturgy in the Czech-speaking countries), broadcast by Josef Vašica prior to Chaloupecký's publication of "Prameny" and printed subsequently in Prague in 1940. The similarity of how Roman Jakobson, Josef Vašica, and Václav Chaloupecký conceived the dawning of Czech culture is obvious and conspicuous. And again, if we want to understand fully this similarity, we must not only know the development of Slavic linguistic research and of investigation of the problems connected with *Legenda Christiani* from Jos. Pekař and A. Sobolevskij onward, but it is also necessary to realize that Jakobson's article and the long treatise by Chaloupecký appeared in the first year of German occupation of Czechoslovakia, when Slovakia, which is identical with the eastern part of Svatopluk's Great-Moravian Empire, was by force and by treason separated from Bohemia and Moravia, while the other two quoted publications were printed in the years of increasing Nazi terror.

The initiator and editor of the publication "What our countries gave to Europe and mankind", Professor of English language and literature Vilém Mathesius, started his editorial preface by a comprehensible hint at the Munich event: "At a time of bitter experience but also of resolute will to strive for new life we publish this work, giving thus chance to voices of both native and foreign experts to bear testimony to the indestructible strength and value of our nation . . . To reinforce our self-confidence and to strengthen our resolution not to turn deaf ear to the spiritual call of our thousand years long tradition is a task imposed upon this volume by the very moment of its publication." The national apologetic tendency pervading these lines and characterizing all the three above-quoted essays as well as the publication "The dawning of Christianity" is, to be sure, not a guarantee of scientific truth, yet it neither need imply a detriment of this truth, and a reader who wants to do justice to Chaloupecký's historical work — all those probable errors and problematic conclusions including — ought not to forget what scientific and social situation was at its cradle. And, as I have already pointed out, one of its chief instigators was beyond doubt the contemporary progress of the Czech research in Old-Slavonic philology.

It is a pity that Chaloupecký's "Prameny" (The 10th cent. sources of Christian's Legend) found no such serious response from among the historians as was J. Vilikovský's philological criticism or the commentary of V. Richter, an expert in the history of architecture.^{18a} By no means can we ascribe such standard to fierce attacks against Chaloupecký's (but also Pekař's) theories that cover many a page of the book "České pohanství" (Bohemian paganism) by Závěš Kalandra (Prague 1946, pp. 556). Kalandra's merit lies in the fact that when investigating the old Czech myths narrated at length in the beginning of Cosmas's Chronicle he employed a comparative and ethnological method, but, unfortunately, it was he himself who discredited this method by investing it with an excessive degree of undisciplined imagination. Besides, it was regrettable that he consi-

dered it his duty to prove that Cosmas is older than Christian, and he actually devoted a large part of his treatise to this endeavour. His filiation of the legends, implying that *Christian* was a falsification of the beginning of the 14th century and that the *First Slavonic Legend about St. Wenceslas* was likewise a falsification, is altogether erroneous, due to his lamentable insufficiency of philological erudition. I refer here to my extensive review of his work, to which the author could, unfortunately, no more reply.¹⁹

A direct criticism of Chaloupecký's "Prameny" intended to be also an extensive work by Rudolf Urbánek, entitled "Legenda tak zvaného Kristiána ve vývoji předhusitských legend ludmílských a václavských a její autor" (Legend of the so-called Christian in the development of the pre-Hussite legends pertaining to Ludmila and Wenceslas, and its author), I. Prague 1947, pages 550; II. Prague 1948, pages 520. If V. Chaloupecký was a historian who resorted to the philological method of investigation, Urbánek, who likewise was a historian, made of his treatment of *Legenda Christiani* a nearly exclusively literary problem. Urbánek himself summed up the results of his toilsome research (page 3) in the conclusion that "to be sure, Christian himself has again disappeared from the 10th cent. Czech literature, yet, nevertheless, his old models keep existing, particularly the assumed Latin legend about St. Wenceslas, that can to a great extent be reconstructed and which must be looked upon as a 10th cent. document." In other words, taken from the historical point of view, the 10th century picture retains with Urbánek its essential, already acknowledged features, and Christian's Legend is declared to be a 14th cent. falsification just to be replaced by a Latin legend, traced back to the 10th cent. and communicating upon the whole the same story as Christian — only unpreserved. Similarly, Urbánek shifts the date of the preserved Slavonic legends about St. Wenceslas and St. Ludmila to the end of the 10th cent. or to the 11th cent. — associating them with the Sázava Monastery — again assuming a still older and unpreserved Slavonic legend about St. Wenceslas, while he acknowledges, even if with some reserve, the existence of Slavic liturgy and Slavic literature in the 10th cent. Bohemia, his attitude resembling that of V. Jagić or of V. Novotný.

As for me, I have rejected Urbánek's main theses and his filiation of the legends in an extensive review of his work.²⁰ Here I should just like to point out that Urbánek accepted from Chaloupecký, although engaging in dispute with him, his most cardinal error, i. e. his view that the Ludmilian legend *Diffundente sole* was older than *Christian*. Even so, he believes it to be a document from the latter half of the 11th cent. and an apology of the crumbling down Slavic liturgy, ascribing the authorship to Božetěch, abbot of the Sázava Cloister. Of the other Urbánek's standpoints the most significant, but at the same time also the most unfortunate, is his theory that the so-called "*Böddecke manuscript*" of *Christian* — more precisely said, its first five chapters²¹ — is not *Christian*, but an independent Ludmilian legend of the 12th cent., made use of by the falsifier of *Christian* (according to Urbánek it was Bavor of Nečtiny, abbot of the Břevnov Monastery) some two hundred years later as basis for his own work. This conclusion is quite erroneous, as can be seen from the comparison of the texts in question, but it is particularly implied in the fact that the adaptor of this part of *Christian* for the *legendarium* of the Böddecke Monastery (the manuscript coming from the 15th cent. is said to have been destroyed during the Second Great War) was very likely a German, unacquainted with the Czech history, and he took *Christian's*

Přemyslide myth for a part of the story about Methodius banning Moravia, presenting the whole thing obviously in a confused manner. And it makes no difference that the model of this pretty late adaptation — as Pekař already stated — was most likely a very old document, and that some passages in the adaptation had a better textual standard than other manuscripts of Christian's Legend.

5

It stands to reason that the publication of three long studies about *Legenda Christiani* in a single decade resulted in some confusion, for those who had been interested in this problem were prior to these publications made to believe that the question was definitely settled already, at least from the Czech research point of view. Urbánek's return to Dobrovský's standpoint was welcomed chiefly by Jan Slavík and F. M. Bartoš, who belonged to the older generation of historians and had been opposers to Pekař.²² Bartoš went even further than Urbánek and tried in a few articles to defend Dobrovský's negative attitude not only in reference to Christian but also to the question of Slavic liturgy. Also Zdeněk Nejedlý in his attempt to present a Marxist interpretation of myths narrated by Cosmas²³ expressed his mistrust of the theories fixing the 10th century as the date of origin of Christian's Legend and of the First Old-Slavonic Legend about St. Wenceslas. With Dobrovský's sceptical views sided also some of the younger historians, as we shall point out later.

The doubts expressed by Urbánek affected much less philological experts in Slavonic studies, for it was clear to them that the question of authenticity of Christian was most closely linked up with the question of Slavic literature in the 10th cent. Bohemia. Yet, even here Urbánek's work was not altogether without response. Thus it was Josef Vajs himself, who, though evidently with reluctance, took cognisance of Urbánek's denial of Christian's authenticity in the Notes to his publication of Josef Dobrovský's work "Cyril a Metod, apoštolové slovanští" (Cyrill und Method, der Slaven Apostel), Prague 1948. In the Selection (Výbor) from Czech Literature I, published 1957 by the Czechoslovak Academy — the editors being Boh. Havránek and Fr. Ryšánek — translated samples from Christian were printed as the last item in the series of medieval hagiographic texts. It is true that Roman Jakobson did not find Urbánek's arguments convincing, yet, even he was influenced by his reading of Urbánek's work at least as much as to acknowledge in his contribution to the Harvard Memorial dedicated to Prof. F. Dvorník on his 60th birthday²⁴ the Böddecke manuscript as an independent legend (*Legenda Bodecensis*, LB) and he thought it possible to reconstruct from this legend and from *Christian* (LC) the archetype of the original Czech-Latin source (*L). As a matter of fact, however, Jakobson's own quotations from LB show that LB is only a reworded version of LC, in a word, that *L is, in fact, Christian, even if it may be possible to make use here and there of the B manuscript for a critical revision of the LC text, as was already done by Pekař and Ryba. Irrespective of what we have just said and of the fact that Jakobson's identification and chronology of the hypothetic Slavic models of Cosmas's *Privilegium* and *Epilogus* appear to be too definite, Jakobson's arguments are particularly significant just for the study of Christian and of the relation of this Legend to the Slavic Biographies of Constantine-Cyril and of

Methodius, to the Russian "*Pověst vremennych lét*", as well as to the so-called *Skazanie o preloženii knig* (that is a report about the translation of the Scriptures into the Old-Slavonic language).

To tell the truth, the question of the Slavonic-Latin relations has become considerably more actual in the last years, as I have already mentioned in the introduction, this being chiefly due to the striking archeological discoveries in South Moravia and discussions that ensued from them. These discoveries, when taken together, confirmed in spite of all problems attached to them a fact that has just as long been known as often forgotten, i. e. that the Moravian Slavs had accepted Christianity already before the arrival of the Byzantine Mission invited by Duke Rostislav.²⁵ The Thessalonian brothers Constantine and Methodius came to a country in which the Latin liturgy had already struck roots, even though not very deep ones, and they were wise enough to respect this situation, acknowledging at the same time the Pope of Rome as the supreme head of their church. When estimating the Great-Moravian Era the contemporary Slavonic philology in Czech literature holds the view that was formulated on the occasion of the 1100th anniversary of the arrival of the Byzantine Mission by Josef Kurz in the following words: "The Old-Slavonic language and the Cyrillo-Methodian culture are manifestations of an endeavour to cross the gulf between Byzantine and Roman Christianity, they tend to alleviate the variances, and aim at a synthesis of the two branches".^{26a} An eloquent symbol of these tendencies is to be seen, after all, in the allusion made in the Slavonic Life of Methodius to the fact that the funeral rites over his body were performed in Latin, Greek, and Slavonic, as well as in Methodius's recommendation of Gorzad as his prospective successor, because the latter was a Moravian, "versed in Latin books".

This conception, seeing in the Great-Moravian culture a synthesis or symbiosis of Latin and Byzantine elements, reinforced, naturally, the position of those scientists who had already before been striving to interpret the culture of the Přemyslide 10th and 11th cent. Bohemia in this way. The simultaneousness of Old-Slavonic and Latin literary documents appears to be less surprising in this light. It stands to reason that in this situation the Czech experts in Slavonic studies do not feel constrained to admit that the hitherto obtained results of their research have been discredited. A clear manifestation of their attitude is their *Slovník jazyka staroslověnského*, *Lexicon linguae Palaeoslovenicae*, which is being published by the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences since 1958, the most renowned experts being editors and contributors thereof. This Dictionary of the Old-Slavonic Language contains namely entries not only from the so-called canonical texts, but also from ecclesiastical Old-Slavonic texts, the Czech origin of which the Czech Slavonic philologists take either for proved or at least for most probable — and there are not few of them.^{26b}

A critical investigation of these questions is, naturally, going on. A contribution of special significance are Vašica's studies of Cyrillo-Methodian legal documents, particularly his investigation of the oldest code written in Slavonic *Zakon sudnyj ljudem*, whose Great-Moravian origin Vašica managed to demonstrate partly by philological means and partly by analyzing the contents.²⁷ And just as in the realm of liturgy and hagiography also in that of canon law the Přemyslide Bohemia draws upon Cyrillo-Methodian tradition. This follows

especially from Vašica's statement that the Old-Slavonic Penitential (confessor's manual) *Někotoroja zapověď*, preserved in a Russian manuscript of the 14th — 15th century but quoted as early as in the 12th century, is of Czech origin. At the same time some portions of this penitential can evidently be traced back to western Latin penitentials, which corresponds with our views of the Slavonic-Latin symbiosis in the 10th—11th cent. Bohemia. Professor Vašica surmises from the existence of this Slavic Penitential that there lived at that time in Bohemia a number of priests who were not well versed in Latin, and that the Slavic version was compiled for their use, and this again leads him to the conclusion "that this Old-Slavonic Penitential of Czech provenience once more, and this time definitely, liquidates the recent legend about Slavic liturgy in Bohemia being but a tender indoor flower, which was bound to be damaged by every rough gust of wind".²⁸ And it is worth noting that this refusal of Jagić's sceptical view, expressed by the chief representative of the present Czech research in Slavic philology, is shared also by the younger, yes, even the youngest scholars in this branch, such as F. V. Mareš²⁹ and Radoslav Večerka.³⁰

Now, the new archeological investigation has turned out to be a real support not only for the endeavour to evaluate properly the Great-Moravian Era, but also for those philologists who tried to prove the literary and cultural connection binding Great Moravia to the 10th cent. Bohemia. The finds establishing such surprisingly high material and social standard of the 9th cent. Moravian Slavs refuted — even if we try to avoid all exaggerations — the sceptical views, still quite recently uttered and arguing that in the neighbouring Bohemia some 100 or 150 years later it is preposterous to assume such comparatively highly developed forms of culture as are represented by the First Old-Slavonic Legend about St. Wenceslas or by *Legenda Christiani*. This standpoint is all the more substantiated, since it is even in Bohemia that the research-workers have in the last years discovered some significant archeological facts testifying in favour of the Great-Moravian spiritual influence and positively confirming the credibility of Christian's report about the Cyrillo-Methodian beginnings of the Bohemian Christianity. I particularly have in mind the excavation of the rotunda under St. Clement's Church in Levý Hradec near Prague, where, according to Christian. Duke Bořivoj was supposed to erect the first Christian church in Bohemia after his return from Moravia, then finds resembling the Great-Moravian culture and discovered in Kouřim, or some excavations in the Prague Castle, where Ivan Borkovský found in 1950 a small church, probably identical with St. Mary's Church, founded, according to Christian, by Duke Bořivoj himself, while according to other writers of legends, by his son Spytihněv.³¹ The prominent Czech expert in this line of research Václav Richter came to the conclusion that the beginnings of Přemyslide architecture must be traced back to Great-Moravian influence. Consult his article on this problem, published in the present issue.

It would not be fair to deny that all these recent discoveries, whether philological or archeological, which are declared to support the theory of the cultural (and partly also political) Moravian-Bohemian continuity, imply many an unsettled and disputable problem. It is, therefore, not surprising to find that particularly the historians, who have been, so to say, put aside by this new turn in research and who, on the top of it, abandoned the views of Pekař and Chaloupecký also for ideological reasons, follow the theses and hypotheses of the

experts in Slavic philology and in archeology with critical attitude and with either secret or even manifest distrust. Sometimes you can hardly help feeling that an actual gulf has opened between the archeologists and philologists, on the one hand, and the historians, on the other. While, let us say, in the *History of Czech Literature I*, published by the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences in Prague in 1959 with Josef Hrabák as editor, the Old-Slavonic-Latin literature is given the entire first chapter (pp. 25—60)³² and while Rudolf Turek follows in the quoted book (see Note 31) traces of the Great-Moravian traditions throughout the whole early medieval era of Czech culture, in *Československá vlastivěda II, History vol. 1*, on the other hand, it is only the archeologist Jaroslav Böh m who deals with the Cyrillo-Methodian culture in the introductory chapter on Great Moravia. In the *Czech History* written by the academician Josef Macek, to be found in the same publication, the names of the Thessalonian brothers are not mentioned at all, yes, there is not a single allusion made in the book to the Sázava Monastery or to Charles' Monastery "Na Slova- nech", although the above institutions surely represent facts of significance not only from the literary point of view.

This is, of course, an extreme attitude, and I believe that the majority of scientists dealing with medieval Czech history would hardly side with it. To be sure, a representative of this historical research is, in fact, a member of the Preparation Committee of the Great-Moravia Exhibition (Brno 1963, Nitra and Prague 1964), and this very exhibition not only underlines the political significance of the fact that Great Moravia (or Old Moravia) was at least in its time the first common state of the Czechs and the Slovaks, but it also tries to demonstrate with numerous exponents just the disputed historical continuity passing on from Great Moravia to the Přemyslide Bohemia. On the other hand, one cannot fail noticing, that even among the Philologists there is a voice warning against an overestimation of the Cyrillo-Methodian literature,³³ or another voice (expert in Bohemistic studies), which we shall discuss later and which outright rejects the theory of the Slavic research expounding the idea of an uninterrupted literary Great-Moravian and Bohemian continuity. And we are neither surprised to find that also the views of Czech archeologists and historians of art and architecture are not always uniform in respect to these problems.

After all, there is nothing tragic about these divergencies. There is but one conclusion to be drawn from them, namely the demand to proceed responsibly in the research and hope that by and by it will be possible to bridge at least the most important discrepancies characterizing the present state of investigation, provided that the results obtained by all the respective single branches of research will be treated with mutual critical respect and confidence.

6

As was pointed out before, in the last years it was also Latin philology which entered the lists in the contest concerning the authenticity of *Legenda Christiani*, contributing thus as well to the discussion of the hypothetical Great-Moravian heritage in the 10th cent. Bohemia. Its methods had, naturally, been already employed by the historians, but unfortunately not with much luck, Josef Pekař excepting. It may be found useful if I briefly sum up here in a few items

the reasons that Latin philology and critical analysis of the text may give in favour of the authenticity of this document.³⁴

1. Christian's Legend displays in all its parts (prologue, the Cyrillo-Methodian legend, the Ludmilian legend with the *translatio*, St. Wenceslas legend with translation, *Miracula*) a remarkably uniform character, as to outlines of contents, language, and style, obviously with the exception of the longer literal quotation from Gumpold in the 3rd chapter and a few minor inconsistencies, which were due to the fact that the author drew upon various sources. The syntax is in Christian quite uniform,³⁵ and the same may be said also about his vocabulary. As to his stock of expressions, its major part (more than 80 per cent.) is the same as in the *Vulgate*, which, of course, is in no way surprising. From the *Vulgate* Christian borrowed also a great number of direct quotations and phraseological elements in general, and these may be found fairly well distributed throughout the whole of his *Legenda*.³⁶

2. Another characteristic feature of Christian's way of writing, again to be found in all parts of his work, is his rather frequent deviating from the regular word-order, his hyperbata and occasional shifting of the conjunctions from the first to the second or even further place in the sentence. His prose is rhythmical, but it does not display as yet the so-called *cursus Gregorianus*, which began spreading throughout Europe from the end of the 12th cent. and whose typical characteristic is the employment of regular concluding clauses, particularly of the so-called *cursus velox* (such as *saecula saeculorum* or *agere nimis dure*). Christian's *cursus* is uniform and is remarkably in accord with the *cursus* of other Latin 10th cent. texts that you may happen to select. The clause of the *velox* type does not exceed in him 14 per cent of the sentence conclusions. In contrast to it, the legend *Diffundente sole* contains 68,42 per cent, of the *velox* conclusions, which together with clauses of the strictly Gregorian type represent 81,58 per cent. The author of this legend was namely adapting Christian's word-order at the end of sentences in such a way as to produce just this rhythmical effect. The significance of this discovery for fixing the relative chronology of the two documents is beyond dispute.³⁷

Thus, in Christian's language and style nothing was found to oppose the view that the work originated in the 10th cent. But we must point out once more that the main emphasis is to be laid on the fact that *Legenda Christiani* is truly a uniform piece of literature, both from the linguistic and the stylistic points of view. It is by no means a mechanical conglomeration of numerous texts written by various authors in different centuries, and simply borrowed much later by the falsifying Pseudo-Christian without any stylistic adaptation, as Urbánek and others imagine. To be sure, minor interpolations are not altogether excluded, but even they would have to be safely demonstrated first.

3. The oldest complete manuscript of Christian is contained in the famous Codex of the Metropolitan Library in Prague, sign. G 5, written in the years 1320—1342. Fragment of the Ludmila part of the Legend, however, the so-called Wattenbach's legend (see above) or *Subtrahente se famula Christi* (about St. Ludmila's martyrdom), and the text *Recordatus avie sue* (St. Ludmila's transportation) were preserved in manuscripts from the end of 12th century. This was already stated by Josef Pekař, and a philologist must only fully corroborate his conclusions when performing a stylistic analysis of these fragments, whose style is inimitably Christian-like.

4. The above-quoted critical study of the texts by B o h u m i l R y b a (see Note 18) alone makes it clear that the archetype of Christian's Legend could not be chronologically so near the oldest preserved manuscript (from 1320—1342) as Dobrovský, Urbánek, and of late F. M. Bartoš imagined when they were fixing the date of origin for their Pseudo-Christian and suggested either the end of the 13th or beginning of the 14th century. On the contrary, a comparison of Christian's legend about St. Wenceslas with the 13th cent. legends treating the same subject, i. e. *Ut annuncietur* and *Oriente iam sole*, whose authors for the most part did no more but reword Christian's narrative, demonstrates safely that *Legenda Christiani* was written before the 13th century.³⁸

5. But we are taken still further back when attempting a critical comparison of Christian's text with old manuscripts of St. Wenceslas legend *Crescente fide*, no matter whether we consider the manuscript Clm 4605 from the 11th cent., which represents the so-called Bavarian recension, or the Bohemian recension in the so-called Stuttgart Passional from the first half of the 12th century. Our manuscripts of Christian present in many a place a better and more complete reading than these old documents, yes, one has the impression that the "Bohemian recension" to be found in the Stuttgart manuscript from the beginning of the 12th cent. was directly interpolated from Christian.³⁹ Now, this brings us pretty near the well-known Wolfenbüttel manuscript of the *Gumpold's Legend*; this manuscript was effected for Duchess Hemma (†1006) wife of Boleslav the Second, and in it Pekař could identify word reflexion while art historians again illumination reflexion of *Legenda Christiani*.⁴⁰

6. To be sure, the discussion of Christian created also problems that require treatment both by philological criticism and historical research. In the first place it is the question of various contradictions and of either real or alleged *anachronisms* in Christian's Legend (see for instance in the very first chapter the report about the baptism of the Bulgarians and Moravians and references to the activity of the Thessalonian brothers in general). These contradictions and errors have been pointed out by the opposers of Christian's authenticity from the very beginning, the authors of these arguments, however, being prone to forget that similar problems are connected more or less with every historical medieval work, e. g. with Cosmas. Their objections were successfully refuted already by Pekař. Of more recent literature we should like to mention in this connection at least the before-quoted essay by J a k o b s o n (page 534 and Note 24), in which the author points out a remarkable conformity of Christian with the report about the translation of books (*Skazanie o preložení knig*) to be found in the Russian Primary Chronicle (*Pověst vremennych lét*), which in any case makes Christian's information less isolated. F r a n t i š e k G r a u s⁴¹ has lately been quite right in stressing the fact that Christian's reproduction of the old tale about the beginnings of Christianity in Moravia reaching back to St. Augustine's time — which circumstance has so often been quoted as argument in favour of a late origin of the Legend — is in full accord with similar tendencies of numerous early medieval authors to shift as far back as possible the date of christianization of their countries or at least dioceses.

7. Quite a lot has been written about relative chronology of the two documents, *Legenda Christiani* and *Chronica Boemorum* by C o s m a s, this question being just the most important partial aspect of our problem. I have tried to contribute to the solution by analyzing the P ř e m y s l i d e m y t h in Christian, cap. 2.⁴²

In Christian's version of this story two different elements may be discerned. There is the narrative about the nomadic life of Ancient Czechs, which ends with the foundation of a town (Prague) and with a very wise man (Přemysl = a very wise man) being entrusted with the rule over the nation, which element no doubt reflects the old Antique theory about the origin of civilization, imparted to the Middle Ages by Cicero in his textbook of rhetoric *De inventione* I 2, which Christian might have got acquainted with from the early medieval encyclopedias by Isidore of Seville and by Hrabanus Maurus. Yet, apart from this literary element Christian's version contains another element. The tribe of the Czechs is stricken with famine and pestilence (*pestis*) and from this catastrophe it is saved by a wise sibyl and a wise man (Přemysl), who though being a simple farmer (ploughman) becomes duke, and by entering into matrimony with the virgin sibyl makes his people rid of the pest (and also by founding a town, as was already pointed out), whereupon his descendants rule over the nation. This motif seems to be a survival of old mythological and magical tradition and an evidence in favour of views concerning sacred marriage, ritual act of ploughing, and a ruler's power springing originally from witchcraft, as they are expounded in the well-known *The Golden Bough* by J. G. Frazer. But be it as it will, the tale about the pest is neither in Cosmas, who gave his readers a very detailed and novel-like elaboration of the myth about Přemysl, nor is it to be found in any other Czech source. And it is a motif so peculiar and so original that it could possibly not have been an invention of a late falsifier or any author writing after Cosmas. Similarly, I have attempted to explain the narrative conformity of Christian (cap. 5, page 106, 23 Pekař) with Cosmas (I. III, cap. 11), pertaining to the miracle about the incorrupted garment or veil of Duchess Ludmila, by suggesting that Christian borrowed this motif not from Cosmas, as Bretschneider and others supposed, but from an old partly historical and partly legendary tradition, maybe directly from the story about the transportation of the body of the Anglo-Saxon Queen and Saint Aedilthryd, to be found in Bede's *Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum* IV, cap. 19.⁴³

8. Christian's authenticity was made more probable also by the discovery⁴⁴ that the expression *campus* in the episode about the rival-Duke Strojmir in Christian c. 2 does not mean "a camp", as it has been so far interpreted, but a parliamentary ground or parliament. This ancient term alone speaks in favour of a comparatively very old chronology of the legend. It seems that already the so-called Dalimil, author of the oldest Czech chronicle in verses from the beginning of the 14th cent., was misled by this term when making in his version of the anecdote (cap. 72) the rival-Duke Stanimír meet Duke Bedřich on the "battle-field", which is a current meaning of the Latin word *campus*. Anyway, Dalimil did not grasp the main idea of the whole anecdote, and also this circumstance indicates that he had very likely borrowed this motif from Christian. In the light of the above remarks any dependance of Christian on Dalimil is, naturally, altogether out of the question.

9. In this connection I should like to draw the reader's attention to two more contributions, which may be considered as corroborating Pekař's arguments in favour of old chronology of Christian's work. The but recently departed Czech expert in Scandinavian philology Emil Walter subjected to investigation the strange names of St. Ludmila's murderers, which are found in the original form in *Legenda Christiani* only — the names in question being *Tunna* and

Gommon — and he offered convincing proofs of the Northern origin of these names. To be sure, he ascribes those names a mythological character and believes that they came to Bohemia in the latter half of the 10th cent. via Russia as an echo of the Varjag Kiev cycle of sagas.⁴⁵ As for me, I have expressed the opinion that the names may be historical. Tunna and Gommon may have been *Normans* (*vikings*) who came to Bohemia in the suite of the Lutician Princess Dragomir. Emil Walter published this suggestion of mine preliminarily with my consent in the *Scando-Slavica* in 1961.⁴⁶ Be it as it will, I think it improbable that a late falsifier should have coined these two strange names, which appear to us quite isolated in the list of Christian's proper names and whose Northern origin is today considered as very probable.

10. The second contribution concerns Christian's well-known narrative (cap. 2) about the baptism of the Bohemian Duke Bořivoj and his attendants by Archbishop Methodius at the court of the Great-Moravian King Svatopluk. In this narrative, which is today upon the whole ascribed a historical background,⁴⁷ we may read anecdotic and topical details, such as the assertion that the pagan Bohemian monarch was not allowed to sit at table when taking his meal, but had to repose on the ground, while Archbishop Methodius made use of this circumstance inducing him to accept Christianity. Josef Cibulka, who dealt with the activities of the western missions in Moravia in his book on the Great-Moravian architecture (see Note 25), has shown in his more recent and shorter essay, "Vypravování Legendy Kristiánovy o pokřtění Bořivojově" ("Narrative about Bořivoj's baptism in *Legenda Christiani*")⁴⁸ again and more extensively (Pekař just alluded to the problem with a brief remark, WLL, page 164) that the story about pagan Bořivoj not being invited to sit at table with Christian Svatopluk — which finds analogy in the episode in *Conversio Bagoariorum et Carantanorum* relating to the Carinthian Duke Ingo — is, in fact, substantiated by what we know about the early Christian practice documented for the missionary activity in Bavaria in the beginning of the 9th cent.; this practice was likely transferred to this area through the medium of penitentials of Irish or old British origin. The next circumstance Cibulka points out is that Christian's narrative about the three-stage conversion of Duke Bořivoj and his attendants (instruction in faith, baptism, instruction in commandments) is in full accord with Alcuin's missionary method (750—804). Professor Cibulka himself draws the attention to the fact that in Christian's time these prohibitions and instructions were no more valid, having long before been abolished, and thus he finds in Christian's description of Bořivoj's baptism an ancient element of Great-Moravian origin that Christian may have taken over from the un preserved *Privilegium Moraviensis ecclesie*. This is, naturally, a mere hypothesis, but upon the whole one is right in concluding that Cibulka's analysis of Bořivoj's baptism in *Legenda Christiani* should be considered as a contribution corroborating the ancient origin of the work. The fact that the Latin scholar Christian made use of western elements to adorn his anecdotic story of Bořivoj's baptism is no surprise. A significant piece of information for us is that he still knew very well those old elements, having evidently at his disposal respective ancient sources.

I hope that the conclusion to be derived from the foregoing remarks — though they are but fragmentary — is clear. Critical studies of the language and of the texts, performed in the last few years, have fully corroborated Pekař's rehabilita-

tion of Christian. For in the light of the results obtained by this research we cannot doubt⁴⁹ that the author of our legend was really monk Christian, who is introduced in the prologue to the reader as a relative (uncle) of Bishop Vojtěch (Adalbert) a Slavnikian (member of the Slavník family) by descent, while Vojtěch's and thus also his own kinship to the Přemyslide St. Wenceslas is stressed at the same time. The existence of such a monk in Vojtěch's neighbourhood is confirmed by the contemporary writer Bruno of Querfurt, who mentions in his *Vita sancti Adalberti* c. 15 among the messengers sent from Bohemia to Rome to bring back Bishop Vojtěch also an eloquent monk called Christian, a blood relation (brother) of the ruler of the country.⁵⁰ From what we know about St. Vojtěch's life we may conclude that Christian wrote his work in the years 992—994.

Thus it may rightly be said that *Legenda Christiani* is probably the most important document relating to the problem of the Moravian-Bohemian cultural and political continuity, as it can be chronologically fixed. Obviously, it cannot be drawn upon without critical attitude, the mere fact of great remoteness of the narrated events being a sufficient reason for it.

7.

In the preceding chapters we were able to follow one natural and upon the whole regular phenomenon, i. e. that denying Christian's authenticity and repudiating Great-Moravian traditions in the 10th cent. Bohemia were two correlative standpoints. There is no rule, however, utterly void of exceptions, and thus we shall still have to subject to critical evaluation two present research-workers who, to be sure, refer to Christian as a 10th cent. source, yet, they reject the idea of the Moravian-Bohemian cultural and political continuity, which has been defended by the group of historians headed by Pekař as well as by the Russian and Czech experts in Old-Slavonic studies. Unfortunately, I can deal with the standpoints of these two research-workers but briefly, owing to the limited extent of the present contribution.

The first of them, Oldřich Králík, is an expert in the Czech language and literature and he came in touch with our problem when being entrusted with the publication of Dobrovský's *Kritische Versuche*. His study of this genial representative of the Enlightenment Era evidently induced Králík to try to ascribe to Dobrovský, in opposition to Pekař, that part of the credit he was entitled to. One of the most significant studies by Králík, to be mentioned in this connection, is just his treatise „Josef Dobrovský a badání o počátcích českých dějin“ (J. Dobrovský and research into early Czech history), which was printed in a memorial publication dedicated to Zdeněk Nejedlý (Pocta Zdeňku Nejedlému), Olomouc 1959, pp. 73—140. Later he expounded systematically his views mainly in two books, „K počátkům literatury v přemyslovských Čechách“, (The dawning of literature in Přemyslide Bohemia), *Rozpravy ČSAV*, Prague 1960 (104 pages), and „Sázavské písemnictví XI. století“ (The 11th cent. literature from the Sázava Monastery), *Rozpravy*, Prague 1961 (94 pages), and also in numerous articles, published in Czech and foreign journals.⁵¹

Thus O. Králík wants to bridge the gulf between Dobrovský's essential sceptical attitude, the old scholar being for him an „unsurpassed example of scientific realism“,⁵² and the results of modern research work, which achieved rehabilitation

of Christian's Legend and substantiated the Czech origin of a greater number of Old-Slavonic documents, unknown to Dobrovský. Králík's endeavour may be summed up in the following theses:

1. "There are no supports for the assumption of a cultural growth in Bohemia in the half of a century that elapsed from the destruction of the Great-Moravian Empire to the decisive defeat of the Magyar invaders (year 955)." We have no real supports for the belief in a symbiosis of the Latin and Slavic rites in Přemyslide Bohemia in the first half of the 10th century".⁵³

2. A development of medieval culture in Bohemia was not possible before the rule of Boleslav the Second (967—999), i. e. before his establishing a bishopric in Prague (973) and the first Benedictine monasteries in Prague (St. George's) and in Břevnov near Prague. Yet, the most significant date must be considered the year 982, when the second Prague bishop, S t. V o j t ě c h (Adalbert), entered upon his office, for he was a man of European outlook, of great learning and aspirations, and a personal friend of Emperor Otto the Third.⁵⁴

3. St. Vojtěch was not an opposer of Slavic liturgy, as historians thought before, but its patron (V. Chaloupecký's opinion), or at least its friendly tolerator, as he was bound to see in it a useful instrument of Christian expansion eastward. It was not until in the time of St. Vojtěch that a revival of Great-Moravian cultural traditions and of Slavic literature appeared on the scene in Bohemia, representing *the first Slavonic Renaissance*.⁵⁵

4. The speaker of this Slavonic culture in St. Vojtěch's time is the so-called Christian, "the first conscious believer in the Slavonic idea in Czech history and even in Czech historical literature" (to be sure, within the frame of the then-existing ecclesiastical organization and propaganda).⁵⁶

5. It is as late as in Vojtěch's life-time that the First Slavonic Legend about St. Wenceslas comes into being (it may have originated even in his personal environment), which is a later product than the legend *Crescente*, but older than Christian. The Ludmilian legend *Fuit* is a "not very lucky extract from Christian", which originated until in the 11th cent. — just as the *Old-Slavonic Prologue about St. Ludmila* — in the bilingual atmosphere of the Sázava Monastery.⁵⁷

6. The Ludmilian legend found its first definite literary form in Christian. He derived it from the legend about St. Wenceslas, while Gumpold again was the first who inserted the Ludmilian story into the latter. The mention of St. Ludmila's martyrdom in *Crescente fide* is a later interpolation.⁵⁸

7. The narrative about Bořivoj's baptism is an outcome of Christian's desire to make of his writing a work of literary invention, and is in him a hagiographic expression of the idea that the empire of the Přemyslides is a continuation of the Great-Moravian Empire and the Prague bishopric the heir of the bishopric of Methodius. With this return to the Cyrillo-Methodian tradition in St. Vojtěch's time is connected also the cult of St. Clement in Levý Hradec, as well as the figure of the Slavonic priest Kaich.⁵⁹

8. Even though some weak home tradition cannot be altogether excluded (which, however, has not been substantiated at all), the most acceptable explanation of the revival of Slavic literature in Vojtěch's time would be the assumption of some influence from Bulgaria or perhaps Croatia.⁶⁰

9. Christian's Legend is, to be sure, an authentic work from the end of the 10th cent., yet, in a way it is a falsification. It is a historical work

only in a very small degree, being much more a mere legend or a kind of religious novel. Nevertheless, it is at the same time the first Czech piece of literature that may be attributed a historical conception.⁶¹

10. The bilingual Latin-Slavic environment that originated in Bohemia in the time of Vojtěch and Christian was perpetuated in the cultural and literary activity of the Slavonic Monastery in Sázava. "Sázava was the crossroad linking the Cyrillo-Methodian 9th century era as well as the tenth cent. period with Bishop Vojtěch, on the one hand, and the period of the first great Czech and Russian annalists C o s m a s and N e s t o r, on the other hand."⁶²

The reader of our recapitulation of the disputes concerning the problem of cultural Moravian-Bohemian continuity and *Legenda Christiani* will easily understand that Králík's attempt to reconcile the divergencies provoked protests in both camps. It was upon the whole rejected by the expert in Czech philology E m i l P r a ž á k⁶³ and the research-worker in Slavonic studies R a d o s l a v V e č e r k a,⁶⁴ even though both of them paid credit to the stimulative effect of Králík's work; and the attempt met with even more resolute antagonism on the part of historians studying the Middle Ages, Z d e n ě k F i a l a and D u š a n T ř e š t í k, who in an article subjected to criticism both the results and the method of Králík's research.⁶⁵

The standpoints of criticizing historians are, naturally, different from those of the philologists. The historians oppose the idea of a Slavonic policy of Bishop Vojtěch, and sum up their objections in the following sentence (page 526): "The contemporary sources do not supply us with the very least support entitling us to make whatsoever surmises concerning Vojtěch's attitude to Slavic liturgy, *Legenda Christiani* being, naturally, the only exception." They resort here, as it seems, to an equally categorical formulation as that used by Králík himself in reference to the Slavonic traditions in Bohemia before St. Vojtěch's time. Fiala's and Třeščík's arguments are, in fact, levelled against Králík's conception of Vojtěch's personality as a whole, and are to a great extent addressed to the Czech "bourgeois historiography of the already fully decadent stage" (page 531), seeing in Králík a victim of the same. It is pretty clear that the authors have in mind the works of V á c l a v C h a l o u p e c k ý and R u d o l f H o l i n k a,⁶⁶ but they seem to forget that O. Králík himself clearly abandons in most of his views concerning the 10th cent. the standpoints of Pekař and his followers as well as those of all the Czech research-workers in Slavonic studies. According to Králík it was just Josef Pekař, "who led our historical research for the time being astray", for "he was nearly an incredibly ready tributary to the charm of tales in ancient sources, and was willing to reconstruct history from Methodius to Wenceslas on the basis of semireligious and semihistorical novels, such as the legends".⁶⁷ And Králík's ironical remarks about erecting windmills and building the golden age of Czech culture in the period of Ludmila and Wenceslas⁶⁸ are surely aiming more at V. Chaloupecký than at any other Czech historian.

But let us now turn to the objections of the philologists. The reviewer of the first Králík's book on the subject, E m i l P r a ž á k, concentrated his objections chiefly on the author's chronology of the *First Old-Slavonic Legend about St. Wenceslas*, which is a most significant question in our present discussion. He is sceptical as to Králík's filiation of this legend (that is to say, after the Latin legend *Crescente fide*), and he stresses two features which testify in favour of its considerably old chronology, even if one need not fix the date of its origin

immediately after Wenceslas' death. Partly it is the author's considerate attitude to the fratricide Boleslav and to Drahomíra, who is presented here as a loving mother and nearly a saint herself, and partly it is the fact that this legend records just one miracle subsequent to Duke Wenceslas' death. One may give also other reasons speaking in favour of the antiquity and authenticity of this remarkable document, but it will be sufficient to point out here that, as to evaluation and the question of chronology, E. Pražák is in conformity with a decisive majority of research-workers that occupied themselves with the First Old-Slavonic Legend about St. Wenceslas.

Radoslav Večerka pays in his recension of "Šázavské písemnictví" main attention to the question of continuity of Old-Slavonic literature in Great Moravia and Bohemia. The character of Králík's work, which is based chiefly on the analysis of Latin documents, does not give much chance to Večerka, an expert in the Slavonic studies, to specify his objections in detail, yet, his essential standpoint is clearly expressed by his rhetorical question whether it was at all possible to introduce in Bohemia an Ecclesiastic Slavic literary activity in the 10th cent. as a novelty. Večerka evidently does not consider the assumption that the unpreserved Old-Slavonic legend about St. Ludmila and the First Old-Slavonic Legend about St. Wenceslas must have been written before the middle of the 10th cent. as subverted by Králík's argumentation, and he obviously persists in adhering to the theory about the Moravian-Bohemian literary continuity, which in his opinion fits in the general picture of Old-Slavonic culture in the Czech-speaking countries.

Králík inevitably used analyses of Latin literary documents as basis for his arguments. This is particularly true about his controverting the existence of an independent Ludmilian legend (whether Slavic or Latin) prior to Christian, and since I have formerly taken part in tackling this question at least indirectly, I think it proper briefly to comment here upon Králík's views of the origin and development of the Ludmilian legend.

When trying once to prove in my article "Crescente fide, Gumpold, and Christian" (see Note 34) that the preserved manuscripts of the legend *Crescente* from the 11th cent. represent only an abridgement of the original work, while Gumpold and Christian were surely acquainted with the full text, I called the reader's attention to the remark about St. Ludmila's martyrdom to be found in the 3rd chapter of this legend about Wenceslas.⁶⁹ I pointed out that this remark did not fit in very well in the narrative in *Crescente* relating about the dissatisfaction of Duchess Drahomíra and her suite with the ascetic upbringing of the young Duke Wenceslas, and I expressed the opinion that this portion of the text in *Crescente*, when compared with parallel parts of Christian's Legend, appeared to be a derived, interpolated text.⁷⁰

Now, it was just this formulation of mine that made Králík promptly deduce the above-quoted thesis, i. e. that it was G u m p o l d who introduced the Ludmilian motif into the legend about Wenceslas, and that an independent Ludmilian legend did not exist before Christian. In this connection I must first of all do away with a misunderstanding caused by my rather inaccurate wording. When writing that the text of *Crescente* gives in the quoted place the impression of interpolation I did not mean to assert that an actual interpolation must have taken place, on the contrary, the whole of my article indicates that all the defects of the preserved text of *Crescente* I am trying to explain by its abridgement.

But suppose such an interpolation actually occurred. Even should this be granted, it does not mean as yet that this interpolation was of necessity borrowed from some later text, e. g. from Gumpold or Christian; surely its source may have been some older Ludmilian legend. One fact is positive: the quoted allusion to St. Ludmila can be read in all the preserved manuscripts of *Crescente*, which implies the assumption that it was contained in the archetype as well. Moreover, we find Z. F i a l a and D. T ř e š t í k remarking in their polemic comment upon Králík (page 530) that “the juxtapositions adduced by Králík (“Josef Dobrovský“, page 81 n.) prove only that Gumpold copied *Crescente* also in the passage referring to St. Ludmila”. I believe they are right; the only alteration that might be introduced is to replace the word “copied” by “rhetorically reproduced” or the like. The preserved text of *Crescente* contains the basic motif of Wenceslas’ prophecy (*Videtur mihi hoc atrium maioris Pauli presbiteri desertum*), but not the prophecy itself. Gumpold transposes this motif into the Duke’s dream, presenting in Wenceslas’ own words an elaborate explanation thereof. The destruction of Paul’s house (*domorum destructio*) foretells the martyr’s death of Duchess Ludmila, the fact of it being uninhabited (*porticus populis deserta amplitudo*) the expulsion and robbing of the clergy. This amplification is in harmony with the mode and manner in which Gumpold rewrote the legend *Crescente*, yet, I think it very probable that even the text of *Crescente* used by Gumpold contained already the whole of Wenceslas’ prophecy, though it may not have been so artfully divided and so verbose — in a word, I believe we have to deal here with a sample of a b r i d g e m e n t of the original legend *Crescente*, similar to numerous other samples quoted in my article. To be sure, we cannot altogether exclude the possibility that the author of the legend *Crescente* was himself content with this not quite luckily formulated hint.

If O. Králík declares that the legend *Crescente* reflects already a more advanced stage of the Ludmilian legend,⁷¹ it is necessary to point out, in contrast to it, that St. Wenceslas’ prophecy in Gumpold expressly says that Duchess Ludmila will die a martyr’s death because of her Christian faith (*pro Christiani nominis ac fidei professione*), and also that Wenceslas’ mother Drahomíra is given by her own son a very harsh epitheton — “cursed” (*execrabilis memorie genitrix*). These are evidently hagiographic motifs, which, as it appears, have to be ascribed to Gumpold, yet, there is no doubt that Gumpold himself was not the originator of the legend about the martyrdom of Duchess Ludmila. The legend was sure to exist before *Crescente* was written, i. e. in early seventies of the 10th cent. at the latest.

V á c l a v C h a l o u p e c k ý declared, as it was already stated, the legend *Fuit in provincia Boemorum* to be the oldest Latin legend (ascribing it to the first half of the 10th century), and he wrongly amplified it by passages from Christian, which were added to it in one of the latest manuscripts of the legend. Králík, on the other hand, took *Fuit* for “a not very lucky extract from Christian”, effected in Sázava in the 11th century. This is indeed an antinomy very hard to solve. It must be admitted that the arguments with which Králík supports his view occasionally impress the reader as quite convincing (see Note 57). It was, in fact, already Pekař who thought of the possibility of *Fuit* being an extract from *Legenda Christiani*, yet, on the other hand, he did not fail to stress that Christian’s text makes in places the impression of being an artful rewording and extension of the simpler text of the legend *Fuit*,⁷² and these arguments do not appear to be less convincing. The Ludmilian legend *Fuit* really

forms, thanks to its relative stylistic simplicity, a counterpart to the legend *Crescente*, and it is hard to believe that an author just wanting to make an extract from *Crescente* should both, wish and be able to efface in this way the traces of its highly aspiring and original style. Neither can I understand why in a Ludmilian legend written in the Slavonic environment of the Sázava Monastery, and with Christian as the source, on the top of it, no allusion whatsoever should be made to the Slavonic liturgy or Slavonic script, not even such a brief one as that which we find in the legends about St. Prokop, the founder and abbot of the Sázava Monastery. In a word, I do not find any more reasonable way leading out of this enigma than Pekař's suggestion^{73a} that both *Christian* and the author of the legend *Fuit* likely drew upon the same un preserved Latin Ludmilian legend. As to me, I should just supplement the thesis of Pekař by the remark that Christian's model was probably some more extensive version of the legend *Fuit* than that which survived to our times. Some reader may say by way of objection that I am recommending here the same solution as that I suggested with the legend *Crescente*, but abridging legends was so common a phenomenon that there is no reason to doubt that it may have occurred in both cases.

As for the *Old-Slavonic Prologue about St. Ludmila*, it likewise was originally considered by Pekař (l. c.) as derived from the same common source, i. e. from the un preserved Latin legend. When he, however, published his last views on the subject (Svatý Václav 34, Note 27), he admitted the possibility that this original source may have been written in Slavonic, and he pointed out some conformities of words in the *Prologue*, the legend *Fuit*, and *Christian*. To be sure, Chaloupecký took even here a bolder view than Pekař, and he did not hesitate to present the hypothesis about the Ludmilian legend having originally been written in Slavonic, maybe as early as in St. Wenceslas' Life-time, and soon after translated into Latin as *Fuit* as a verified literary fact. This radical view cannot be accepted, but notwithstanding, the above hypothesis appears to be more justified than Králík's standpoint seeing in *Christian* the first literary representation of the Ludmilian legend.

Neither the narrative about Bořivoj's baptism can be classified as a mere product of Christian's imagination wishing to support the cause of the Přemyslide dynasty, or as merely reflecting Vojtěch's Slavonic policy in the matters of culture. The very pains Králík had to take in his endeavour to liquidate Levý Hradec and other documents testifying in favour of a safe historical background of this story speak against this standpoint. It is true that the denotation "chronicle", which Pekař applied to Christian's work, is not appropriate, because the legend has not the form of a chronicle. Yet, if we exclude from *Christian* the description of miracles taken from *Crescente*, all that is left is, to be sure, a legend, but a legend whose all-round character resembles the type of biographic *vitae*, i. e. legends of historical contents, or the so-called *historia ecclesiastica* of the early Middle Ages. If this were not so, how are we to explain the fact that the contents and the aim and idea of *Legenda Christiani* should have been the object of a hundred years' investigation and should have filled the pages of so many historical works?

In this connection I should like to make another comment; I am afraid that Králík over estimates not only Vojtěch's but also Christian's adherence to the Slavonic idea. It is true that *Christian* writes with obvious sympathy

about the activity of the Thessalonian brothers in Moravia, about Cyril's victory in Rome, and about the significance of the Slavic liturgy in the contemporary Slavonic world, particularly among the Bulgarians. But we could hardly attribute to him anything beyond respect and sympathy, or at the best esteem with regard to the Cyrillo-Methodian tradition. Christian himself is a *Latin scholar*, he acquired his considerable literary education as member of the ruling family most likely somewhere abroad, and the springs of his work were traditions of western. Latin hagiography and historiography. This, of course, does not exclude his friendly attitude towards priests performing Slavic liturgy and subordinate to Rome, neither his consulting Slavonic literary documents through their mediation. Yet, all this would not justify us in making of Christian a conscious propagator of the Slavonic idea. When Králík writes about "a remarkably ardent Slavonic feeling in Christian",^{73b} we cannot side with him, all the less so when he seeks confirmation of his view in Christian's allusion to Svatopluk's anathema pronounced by Methodius (c. 1). The conflict between Methodius and Svatopluk, as presented by Christian, has nothing in common with the question of Slavic liturgy.^{73c} As a matter of fact, the two above items are not treated as mutually dependent in the Bulgarian Legend or in the Life of Naum either. In Christian, Methodius charges Svatopluk and his attendants with pride, disobedience, and serving the devil. A suitable counterpart to this remark is to be seen in Christian's hint at the contemporary situation in Bohemia and at Vojtěch's controversies with the court and Bohemian nobility, as Králík himself admits.

Summing up I have to state that Králík does not seem to have been successful in convincing either the philologists or the historians when he suggested that the Slavic liturgy and literature came into being as late as in the time of Bishop Vojtěch and thanks to his friendly attitude. Králík's reasoning, which merged the 10th century in Bohemia up to 973 or even 982 into a mist of sterility without culture and literary production, thereupon illuminating St. Vojtěch's life-time with a glare of rich Slavic-Latin literary productivity, cannot but provoke a justified protest.

By saying so I do not mean to deny Králík's merits in his endeavouring to clarify the dawning of Czech national culture. In the present brief discussion I simply could not deal with a number of Králík's standpoints, pertaining, for instance, to the relations of Sázava to Russia, because they do not bear in any way upon our subject. Yet, of those comments of his that are related to our present problem I should like to quote by way of conclusion at least one remarkable statement: I have here in mind the fact that Králík classifies Christian's Legend — somewhat contrary to his general evaluation of this document — as the first Czech work that can claim to be attributed a historical conception (see Note 61). I stress this Králík's view once more, because it suggests an important idea, which will command our attention in the following chapter.

8.

Another research-worker, whose evaluation of *Legenda Christiani* in connection with the problem of the Moravian-Bohemian continuity induces the reader to make critical comments, is one of the younger Czech historians, a prominent expert in medieval history, *Fran tišek Gr a u s*. I have now in mind his article *Velkomoravská říše v české středověké tradici* (The Great-Moravian Empire in

Czech medieval tradition), published in ČSČH 11, 1963, pp. 289—305. Graus has been up till now devoting his researching endeavour to Bohemia in early Middle Ages and more recently also to Great Moravia, trying to evaluate critically the sources, whether legends or historical narratives, and making himself at the same time acquainted with the results of modern research in medieval problems,⁷⁴ and for this reason his voice certainly deserves attention. We have already commented upon the post-war Czech historiography, and we are not surprised to find also his tone rather sober, if not sceptical. Just as in some other of his works and reviews,⁷⁵ as well as in his lecture delivered at the Great-Moravia Congress in Brno in 1963,⁷⁶ Graus recommends also in this article (I shall quote the conclusion) “caution with respect to the far-reaching conceptions of some modern historians, who under the spell of neoromantic enthusiasm would like to draw wide-range conclusions, often on the basis of very poor knowledge and quite in contrast to reliable information found in the sources”.

F. Graus points out towards the end of his article — although he could just as well make this remark his starting point — that Svatopluk subjugated the Bohemians (after 874) for quite a short time only, the latter taking the first opportunity (in 895) to revolt against the Moravian supremacy. It certainly cannot be denied that this doubtless historical fact does not exactly support the theory about the Moravian-Bohemian cultural and political continuity. It is true that Graus himself does not expressly formulate this conclusion, but the tenor of his whole article implies it. Graus tries to show in it (see page 305) Great Moravia was practically absent from the medieval Bohemian tradition, and that it was not until in the 14th cent. that it was introduced into this tradition by people of learning, both along the secular line by adopting the “translation theory” (*translatio imperii* or *regni*) about the transfer of royal sovereignty from Moravia to Bohemia, and along the ecclesiastical line by introducing the cult of St. Cyril and St. Methodius.

Let us turn first to the latter question. Graus maintains that before the 14th cent. it was only an “epic recollection” of Svatopluk that lived in Bohemia, while the ecclesiastical worship of the Thessalonian brothers was introduced as late as in 1349 by a decree issued by the Olomouc Bishop Jan. This Graus’s view started off a minor controversy. Radoslav Večerka opposed it in his article (*Cyrlometodějský kult v české středověké tradici* (The Cyrillo-Methodian cult in Bohemian Medieval tradition), ČSČH 12, 1964, pp. 40—43. He raised two objections against Graus: 1. The cult of the Thessalonian brothers is documented as existing in the 10th cent. Bohemia as early as in Christian. 2. Its existence is substantiated by the *Old-Slavonic officium about St. Cyril and St. Methodius*, which, to be sure, we find preserved as late as in the 14th—16th cent. in Croatian Glagolitic documents, but the analysis of the text indicates that it originated in the 10th—11th cent. Přemyslide Bohemia.

These objections were responded to by Graus in an editorial note, in which 1. he declares that Christian confirms only the legend tradition about the Thessalonian brothers and not the existence of the ecclesiastical cult, and 2. he expresses his scepticism, combined with considerable irony, about attempts trying to fix the origin of sources in a period and in a territory which does not supply us with a single literary document, leaving a handful of words behind, at the best.

I cannot deal here with this second remark of his, although it is clear that the sceptical view manifested in it does not concern Czech Slavic studies only, but working methods of the linguistic science in general. But as to his assertion that Christian is informed only about the legend tradition concerning Cyril and Methodius and not about the ecclesiastical cult, I should like to point out one concrete fact, which, in my opinion, appears to be quite contrary to his theory.

I have in mind the fact that Christian gives Cyril in one place (90, 27 Pekař) the epithet *beatus*, and similarly also Methodius is once *beatus* in his text (95, 6), while in another place he is *pontifex beate memorie*. Without this epithet the name Cyrillus appears in Christian twice (89, 30; 90, 5), and Methodius four times (91, 14; 92, 17, 22; 93, 20). *Beatus* is in Christian a current designation of sanctity, used, as a rule, along with the proper name: *beatus Wenceslaus* (very often), *beatus Paulus apostolus*, *beatus Georgius*, *beatus Vitus* etc.. Apart from *beata Ludmila* (100, 2; 102, 21, 24; 104, 23) we read in the legend three times *beate memorie Ludmila* (88, 5; 96 33; 97, 32). Very often we find in Christian the term *sanctus* (rather in the function of a noun, as far as I have noticed), but we need not occupy ourselves here with the comparative study of these terms — it was already done by Pekař⁷⁷ — neither need we dwell upon the fact that these expressions appear occasionally in the titles of ecclesiastic dignitaries. What we have quoted suffices to demonstrate that Christian denotes Cyril and Methodius as saints — even if in a minority of instances.

Besides, the ecclesiastical cult of the Thessalonian brothers is documented in the East by the Methodius nameday in the Glagolitic *Evangeliarium Assemani*, compiled in Macedonia towards the end of the 10th cent., or in the beginning of the 11th cent.,⁷⁸ while the name Cyrillus is to be found in *Evangeliarium Ostromiri*, written in Novgorod in the years 1056—1057.⁷⁹ Because we have to deal here with copies of older models, we may safely assume that the cult of St. Cyril and St. Methodius was known in the area of Slavic liturgy as early as in the 10th century. In contrast to it, the *Italian legend*, which was written by Leo of Ostia (died 1115), according to the recent discovery made by Paul Devos and Paul Meyvaert,⁸⁰ calls, to be sure, in one place Constantine the Philosopher “*vir sanctus*” (c. 5) and describes the transportation of his body to St. Clement’s Basilica in Rome, yet, otherwise it never attributes to the two brothers the epithets *beatus* or *sanctus*. This is in full accord with the Slavonic biography *The Life of Constantine the Philosopher*, written most likely still in Methodius’s life-time (died 885), upon which Leo of Ostia drew through the mediation of Bishop Gauderich of Velletri (862—880), a contemporary of Methodius. It is until in later Latin legends that the names of the Thessalonian brothers are associated with the above epithets, this occurring in the legends *Quemadmodum* and *Beatus Cyrillus* with consistency, while in the “Moravian” legend *Tempore Michaelis imperatoris* less consistently (not so often in passages borrowed from the Italian legend, more often in other parts).⁸¹

What conclusions are to be drawn from these observations? Some people may say that *beatus Quirillus* and *beatus Methudius* speak in Christian simply in favour of a later origin of this document. But why should Christian use these attributes in one third of cases only? To tell the truth, I do not think improbable that Christian’s inconsistency in this matter actually reflects the then prevailing situation in the 10th cent. Bohemian ecclesiastical life: the Slavonic priests — very likely in Bohemia as well as in the Slavonic South — began to worship Cyril

and Methodius as saints, whereas the Bohemian priests of the Latin rite, including Christian, were at that time still somewhat reticent — Leo of Ostia was so as late as in 1100 — even if not hostile. I do not pretend to believe that this suggestion of mine settles for good the question of chronology and origin of the Cyrillo-Methodian officium, yet, the existence of the ecclesiastical cult (to be sure, Slavonic and restricted to a few localities) of the Thessalonian brothers in the 10th cent. Bohemia (and maybe also Moravia) appears to me to be a credible assumption on the basis of Christian's terminology.

Graus's article referred to here refutes, however, as we could see, not only the ecclesiastic Great-Moravian tradition in early medieval Bohemia, but also the "state" tradition, which is a problem of just as great import, if not greater. The merit of the problem was explained by F. G r a u s already before, in the introduction to his earlier article *Rex — dux Moraviae* in SPFFBU 1960, C 7, page 181. There he took a stand against the attempts of some Czech historians — particularly V. C h a l o u p e c k ý, but also the expert in historical law V. V a n ě ě k and the expert in numismatology P. R a d o m ě ř s k ý — to find in the narrative of Czech medieval annalists, the so-called Dalimil from the beginning of the 14th cent. and Pulkava (died in 1380), a contemporary of Charles the Fourth, about the unification of the Great-Moravian Empire with the Přemyslide state an old core of historical reality. He called the attention to the fact that the sources which allude to this *translatio* assume the sovereignty of an "empire", in a word, they operate with the idea of the imperial sovereignty of the Roman Empire, and for this reason they cannot be acknowledged as manifestations of some Czech national consciousness based on the belief in a union of the Great-Moravian Empire with the Bohemian state. They merely demonstrate penetration of medieval German imperial ideas into Czech annalistic literature.

This subject has now been treated more in detail by Graus in the above-mentioned article "The Great-Moravian Empire in Bohemian medieval tradition", page 301 n., the standpoint, however, being the same: the *translatio* theory expressed by the so-called Dalimil has no old basis, but is an obvious outcome of the conception of the Emperor's sovereignty over Moravia and Bohemia (page 302). I have no reason to question the correctness of the second part of Graus' conclusion, nevertheless, I should like to point out that V. Chaloupecký, whom Graus mentions in the first place when enumerating the defenders of wrong interpretation of *translatio imperii* in Bohemian medieval historiography, alludes to Dalimil and Pulkava only quite briefly, at least in his "Prameny" (pp. 221 and 454), and that the term *translatio imperii* does not occur in the text of "Prameny" at all, as far as I know. In connection with the Slavonic renaissance in the time of Charles the Fourth Chaloupecký quotes a well-known place in Pulkava's Chronicle relating to the transfer of the Moravian Kingdom to Bohemia (in 1086), but his own standpoint is to be found elsewhere, in the extensive chapter "K ř e s t B o ř i v o j ů v" (Bořivoj's baptism) (pp. 117—236), where we can read also the following significant passage (page 170):

"A characteristic and significant feature is the fact that the author of the legend *Diffundente sole* is the first to make of the Moravian history and Bohemian history one whole, seeing in the latter a direct continuation of the former. By formulating this conception of our history . . . the author of the legend *Diffundente sole* struck out a new path for all our historiography. For the latter has since never deviated from this conception of our past, seeing in the history of Old

Moravia practically just an introduction to our national, state, religious, and cultural history. And this interpretation of the relation between the old Moravian state and the Přemyslide Bohemian state, as well as the author's emphasis put on the idea, represent probably the most significant historical aspect of the work. In this light the Přemyslides appear to be real successors of the Moravian dynasty founded by Mojmír. And both ruling houses as well as both countries received their spiritual and political mission from the hands of the Slavonic apostles Cyril and Methodius."

In the above Chaloupecký's statement it is, of course, necessary to replace the legend *Diffundente sole*, which Chaloupecký unfortunately mistook for a model of Christian's Legend, by *Legenda Christiani* itself, and forget the moderate admixture of pathos, characteristic of Chaloupecký's work in general, but this granted, we must say that a sober historian, if he acknowledges Christian's Legend as an authentic historical document, can, yes even should, agree with Chaloupecký. Christian's Legend is, in fact — to use the above-quoted Králík's formulation — the first Czech work that can claim to be attributed a historical conception. Králík, of course, ascribed Christian an incredible degree of novel-like invention, and this we naturally could not endorse, but neither can we agree with F. Graus's utter ignoring Christian's historical conception. The very existence of *Legenda Christiani* disproved, in my opinion, Graus's thesis, maintaining that Great Moravia did not live at all in the Bohemian medieval tradition and that it was inserted into it by people of learning as late as in the 14th century. In this connection it is not even necessary to speak about *translatio imperii*, and neither does Chaloupecký, as I have already pointed out, speak of *translation*, but only of *continuity*.

Naturally, one cannot fail to see that Methodius's prophecy (or rather a promise) to Bořivoj (Christian, c. 2): *dominus dominorum tuorum⁸² efficietis cunctique hostes tui subicientur dicioni tue*, is a "plain *vaticinatio ex eventu*", as Graus himself says (CSČH 1963, page 300. Note 78). But what event was the basis of this vaticination? Chaloupecký in his "Prameny" (page 183 sq.) suggests that in the light of this quotation "Bořivoj and his successors on the Bohemian throne became rulers of Moravia, too, this happening in a time which was still within reach of the author's memory (author of *Diffundente sole*, to be sure), which means in the earlier half of the 10th century". It is no wonder that Chaloupecký's view, thus substantiated, found but little faith. Yet, when trying to interpret Methodius's (Christian's) utterances we need not go so far. They merely imply the assumption that in Christian's time the sovereignty of the Přemyslides extended also to the Moravian territory, even if we do not know how it came about and what the area of their realm actually was. Only this historical reality could form the background of Christian's *vaticinatio ex eventu*, that is to say, if this expression is to have any meaning at all. We are not surprised when we find Christian projecting this contemporary reality to the time of Bořivoj. Neither need this interpretation be in contradiction, as far as I see, to the frequently quoted Christian's allusion (c. 1) to Methodius's curse levelled at Svatopluk and his prediction about the destruction of the country, "which weeps up to the present day" (*usque in hodiernum diem deflet*). We do not know what was going on in Moravia in those days and how the Moravians managed to live in such a close neighbourhood of the Magyars. After all, it is not impossible that Christian had in mind the fate of Svatopluk's empire, torn to pieces, as we find

in Cosmas I c. 14, by the Magyars, Francs, and Poles. The name Moravia is not mentioned even once in this passage in *Legenda Christiani*. To be sure, towards the end of this chapter one can read about the neighbour's house stricken with fire (*qui domum vicini sui conspicit concremari*), which again induced some people to conclude that Moravia was not united with Bohemia since it was denoted as a neighbouring country. Nevertheless, even this objection must be refuted. Surely Moravia always kept and still keeps being for Bohemia a neighbouring country, although the two have been forming one state for a very long time.

But even if the author of *Legenda Christiani* had not included Methodius's prophecy in his work, the conclusive and decisive reality must be seen in the fact — and let us emphatically repeat this statement once more — that Christian united the history of Bohemia and Moravia (yes, even of Great Moravia, for in Christian Rostislav already is *magnificus imperator* with an archbishop and seven bishops in his domain) into one process with uninterrupted continuity, even though this process is obviously presented as *historia ecclesiastica*. From Christian there drew, as Chaloupecký rightly states, all the succeeding Czech historians. First of all it is *C o s m a s*, and he does so not only by recording, in spite of his aversion to Slavic liturgy, the report about the first Christian Duke of Bohemia Bořivoj being baptized by the Moravian Bishop Methodius at the court of the Moravian King Svatopluk (I c. 10), and by alluding once more to this event (I c. 14) in connection with the disappearance of King Svatopluk,⁸³ but also by including among the sources of early *B o h e m i a n* history the writings *Privilegium Moraviensis ecclesie* and *Epilogus eiusdem terre (Moravie) atque Bohemie*. The identification of these writings is an extraordinarily hard task,⁸⁴ but for our present purpose it is a matter of no importance. We take for granted that both these sources are in some way connected with Christian's Legend, and we have to take even more for granted that in the *Chronica* of Cosmas the idea of the Moravian-Bohemian continuity in the political sense was rooted and that it had Christian as its source. It makes no difference that *D a l i m i l* combined later this idea in his narrative (chapter 24).

kako jest koruna z Moravy vyšla,
... kako jest z té země Čechóm prišla,

with the imperial idea of *translatio imperii*, and that *P u l k a v a* later still made of this idea an ally of the imperial policy of Charles the Fourth.

9.

In the preceding chapter I have mentioned approximately all I can say from my point of view about Graus's polemical attitude towards V. Chaloupecký's views and also all I can bring forward in their partial defence. I should like, however, to use this opportunity for raising a question that concerns both Pekař and Chaloupecký, and which was neither expressed in Graus's article, nor has it been raised anywhere else up till now, as far as I know, yet, which must be formulated one day. I have in mind the fact that in his later publications Pekař began to incline to the belief — which was afterwards adopted by V. Chaloupecký as a firm conviction — that Christian was a Slavnikian, just as St. Vojtěch, that

is to say, he was one of the house which ruled according to Cosmas I c. 27 from the seat of Libice over a large part of East and South Bohemia, although in subordination to the Přemyslides, ruling in Prague, and which was finally exterminated by the latter in 995. Now, the question which, strange to say, occurred neither to Pekař nor to Chaloupecký would run as follows: How is it possible that Christian speaks for the whole of Bohemia, begins the Bohemian history with Přemysl, with the foundation of Prague and introduction of Christianity to Bohemia by Duke Bořivoj, not indicating with a single word that there ever existed in Bohemia another sovereign power besides that of the Přemyslides and another cultural and political center in addition to Prague? In the question of Christian's authenticity I have definitely been siding with Pekař and Chaloupecký for philological reasons,⁸⁵ and thus I consider it my duty to attempt an answer to this question, all the more so, since the historians and archeologists dealing with the problem of Great-Moravian influence on Bohemia usually devote special interest to that part of Bohemia which was under the sovereignty of the Slavníkians, which, naturally, means that the raised question concerns more or less also our present subject.

Pekař's and Chaloupecký's view that Christian was a member of the Slavník family is based, as I have already pointed out, on two facts. It is in the first place the fact that Christian calls Bishop Vojtěch *nepos carissime* (my dearest nephew), and the second reason is that Bruno of Querfurt speaks in his *Passio s. Adalberti*, c. 15, when enumerating the members of the deputation sent from Prague to Rome to induce Bishop Vojtěch to return home, of an eloquent monk, called Christian, who was entrusted with this task being a blood relation (brother) of the sovereign of the country, *quia frater carnis domino terrae fuit*. It was in the Middle Ages already that the person indicated by Bruno with the term *dominus terrae* was identified with Duke Boleslav the Second, while monk Christian was again identified with the mysterious Strachkvas, son of Boleslav the First, a person whom Cosmas envelops with many a phantastic tale. Pekař was the first to realize that the designation *dominus terrae* may be applied also to Slavník, the father of Bishop Vojtěch, who likewise was *dominus terrae*. It stands to reason that foreign authors, the so-called Canaparius and Bruno, could not know which Bohemian duke the head of the deputation was the brother of, for Slavník was a duke in Bohemia, as well. This explanation would do away with the long dispute trying to solve the question whether a son of Boleslav the First was capable of being so inconsiderate to his own father as to call him a fratricide, which was a circumstance that was often brought forward as an argument against Christian's authenticity. But irrespective of this, the explanation of Pekař is to be preferred for the simple reason that it brings into full accord the prologue of Christian's Legend and the text of Bruno's work.

Chaloupecký, of course, drew from this thesis some more conclusions. He saw in Christian's remark about Přemysl "who was occupied only with agriculture" (*cui tantum agriculture officium erat*) quite wrongly an expression of contempt, and tried to prove that the whole Legend was written in the Slavníkian spirit, full of hatred against the Přemyslides. When arguing thus, Chaloupecký failed to consider the fact that Christian, to be sure, writes with aversion about Drahomíra and Boleslav, yet, on the other hand, he extols Ludmila and Wenceslas, the first Bohemian saints of the Přemyslidge dynasty. In this matter, therefore, we cannot

give Chaloupecký the truth, on the contrary, the Bohemian, and we may even say Přemyslide, orientation of Christian, who was a Slavnikian, demands an explanation, if the identification defended by Pekař is not to be questioned once more.

A path leading to this explanation is indicated already in the above-mentioned prologue of Christian's Legend. In it the author addresses Bishop Vojtěch (Adalbert) in the following words: *Passionem beati Wenceslai simul cum beate memorie Ludmila . . . non pleniter disertam reperiens, dignum duxi, ut vestram sanctitatem, qui ex eodem tramite lineam propaginis trahitis, adirem, quo ex iussione vestra simul et licencia aliquo modo eam corrigerem . . .* *Trames* means a side-way, path, road, but also a side-line of a family (Aulus Gellius 13, 19, 15). We may, therefore, translate the words in question as follows: "you, who derive your origin from the same family" or "from a side-line of the same family". Be it as it will, the words definitely indicate blood-relationship between St. Vojtěch, on the one hand, and St. Ludmila and St. Wenceslas, on the other hand, in other words, between the Slavnikians and the Přemyslides. To apply this formulation to the kinship of Christian to Vojtěch, as it used to be done, would mean an act of unpardonable violence against Christian's style.

Bruno's *Passio s. Adalberti* (c. 21) appears to offer another testimony in favour of the blood-relationship of the Slavnikians to the Přemyslides. Bruno, a contemporary of Vojtěch and Christian, speaks with indignation about the murder of Slavnik's sons in Libice, and in this connection addresses Boleslav the Second, who broke his word given to the Slavnik's sons, in the following words:

Ecce iterum Iudas, qui per pacem didicit facere bellum, promittit vitam, ut inferat mortem. Dat Bolizlavus fidem, ut inopinato occidat fratres.⁸⁶ Nec longe quaeras exemplum: in eadem linea sanguinis occidit frater suus sanctissimum Ventizlaum.

This Bruno's remark can be explained only on the basis of the assumption that Bruno saw in the murder of Slavnik's sons by Boleslav the Second a fratricide. By way of explanation I have to add that the word *fratres* may indicate also cousins or even other relatives.

In contemporary sources we find, however, a few other statements that supplement and elucidate our belief in the kinship of the Slavnikians to the Přemyslides.

When the election of the new bishop was taking place in the Přemyslide territory at Levý Hradec on February 19th 982, the assembly of the Bohemians answered according to St. Vojtěch's biography by the so-called Canaparius (c. 7 — Bruno c. 8) the question who ought to be the new bishop unanimously: *quis alius nisi indigena noster* (our countryman) Adalbertus? Thus it is evident that neither "Canaparius" nor Bruno make any difference between the inhabitants who were subjects of the Přemyslide Dukedom and those who were under the rule of the Slavnikians; both were equally Czechs.

When St. Vojtěch was later ordained bishop in Mainz (Canaparius c. 8) and arrived with his suite in the "holy city of Prague" (*ad sanctam civitatem Pragam*), where formerly used to rule the Duke and martyr St. Wenceslas, and "where the latter still makes his merits manifest through numerous miracles" (*ingentibus usque hodie miraculis sua merita probat*), he descended from his horse, took off his shoes and entered the town walking barefoot. The same relation of Bishop Vojtěch to St. Wenceslas is implied in Christian's narrative, parti-

cularly in the words of the prologue: "*qui* (St. Wenceslas) *beatus vos* (St. Adalbert) *ad pontificale decus conscendere statuit*". Vojtěch, a member of the Slavník family, evidently chose St. Wenceslas for the protector of his bishopric, the formulation of this fact according to liturgical usage declaring that St. Wenceslas himself appointed him to be bishop.⁸⁷ Christian calls in the same sentence St. Wenceslas a common patron (*communis patronus*), i. e. Vojtěch's and his own. It is possible that even this formulation indicates not only the spiritual but also the human kinship of the three.

Equally noteworthy is in Bruno (c. 21) the passage describing how the besieged inhabitants of Libice asked on St. Wenceslas' day for armistice, their request, however, being answered by the Přemyslide besiegers with malicious irony: *Si vester sanctus est Ventizlavus, noster utique est Bolizlaus*.

This extraordinary esteem in which Bishop Vojtěch and the Slavník center Libice held the Bohemian Duke St. Wenceslas cannot be explained purely on the basis of worship. The fact that a Přemyslide was acknowledged as saint and protector in Libice just as much as in Prague speaks in favour of a spiritual — and let us say also political — unity of the Slavník Bohemia with the Přemyslide Bohemia. And as far as Vojtěch and Christian were concerned, this esteem was very likely strengthened by a kindred tie.

In this connection let us mention the interesting fact that the descendants of Theobaldus (Děpoltici), who represented a branch of the Přemyslide stock in the second half of the 12th cent. and the first half of the 13th cent., and who were in an armed conflict with King Přemysl the First, traced back their origin according to Dalimil (chap. 22) to the mythological Přemyslide Neklan, as well as to the dukes of Zlicko, who were relatives, also according to Dalimil (chap. 32), of Duke Slavník.⁸⁸ This was, of course, only a family tradition, finding likely support in the fact that the Děpoltici had their estates in the district of Kouřim, which originally was called Zlicko. But even so, this semi-mythological tale shows that the Děpoltici believed their fictitious ancestors to have been relatives of the Slavníkians, and that they (and Dalimil as well) were familiar with the idea of an ancient kinship binding the Přemyslides and the Slavníkians.

In a word, I believe there is no reason why we should distrust that which is implied in Christian's text, i. e. that Vojtěch came from the same family the members of which were also St. Ludmila and St. Wenceslas, which is an implication that finds support elsewhere as well. At the same time we can readily accept the assumption that the Slavníkians were by origin a side branch of the Přemyslide dynasty, just as later the Děpoltici, a branch, which due to historical circumstances (e. g. intermarriage with the royal house of Saxony) was suddenly growing mighty, and whose members appeared in the light of rivals of even the Přemyslides, this resulting in the end in their extermination.

This explanation, though not new, yet deserving greater attention, is, however, a subject to be tackled by historians, and one must admit that it is not easy to bring this theory into accord with Cosmas's report (I c. 27) about the extensive dukedom of Slavník.⁸⁹

As for me, I have just tried here to give an answer to the question which I have likewise put myself, namely how it is possible that Christian knows only one united Bohemia, only Prague and the Přemyslides, and that he practically dedicated to a Slavníkian, St. Vojtěch, a work in which he glorifies the first

Bohemian saints of the Přemyslide family. Finding support in information from contemporary sources I have come to the conclusion that the so-called Slavnikians (which means, in fact, Duke Slavnik and his sons) were close relatives of the Přemyslides and that the territory under their rule was invested with much smaller cultural and political independence than it was later assumed, thanks to Cosmas's Chronicle. It was only due to this fact that Christian the Slavnikian was able to declare his adherence to Přemysl, Bořivoj, and the Přemyslide Prague and become at the same time the speaker of the Great-Moravian ecclesiastical and political tradition in the whole of Bohemia, whether subject to the Přemyslide or to the Slavnik sovereignty. And it seems to me to be practically beyond dispute that he actually was the speaker and, in a way, even the creator of this tradition.

*

After finishing this commentary upon a few historical problems and upon the contemporary state of research into the Great-Moravian tradition in the 10th cent. Bohemia I feel rather perplexed when realizing that a reader — especially a foreign reader — who has no access to the various quoted sources and the respective literature will not profit much by reading the present study. Yet, I find some consolation in the hope that in spite of it this long procession of names, dates, and disputable problems will enable him to get at least a rough idea of one chapter in the history of Central Europe, a chapter which is not without interest. The contest between eastern and western influence on the Moravian and Bohemian soil from the 9th to the 11th cent., which did not imply, as we could show, liturgical and literary questions only, claims the interest of not only Czech research-workers, whose eagerness to get acquainted with their early national history has been stimulated of late by archeological finds, but of anyone who may be interested in the past and the future of Europe.

The present article, however, does not discuss so much historical problems as such, but it rather tries critically to evaluate a few historical sources, legends by character for the most part, of which the most significant — apart from the First Old-Slavonic Legend about St. Wenceslas — is *Legenda Christiani*. In order to support the thesis about the Moravian-Bohemian cultural and political continuity I have attempted besides other things to sum up in my work the reasons testifying in favour of the authenticity of Christian's Legend and establish its value of an original historical source. Now, by way of conclusion, I should like to stress here particularly the literary significance of this document, which is an organic product of formal hagiographic and historiographic traditions of Western Europe, comprising, nevertheless, an original Cyrillo-Methodian component, as well, conceived in the spirit of the Latin-Slavic symbiosis.

For all these reasons, whether historical or literary, we have to regret that *Legenda Christiani* is practically unknown outside the Czech-speaking countries and that it failed to find its proper place in the history of the European Latin literature.⁹⁰ And I should be very happy if my critical remarks relating to this old but still pressing problem of Czech science contributed at least a little towards filling this gap, inducing some foreign readers to get interested in Christian's Legend and problems associated with it, for — let me repeat it — Christian's work deserves such an interest, when judged on a wider basis than that of Czech history and culture.

NOTES

Abbreviations:

AB	Analecta Bollandiana
ČCH	Český časopis historický
CSČH	Československý časopis historický
FRB	Fontes rerum Bohemicarum
Chaloupecký, Prameny	Václav Chaloupecký, Prameny X. století Legendy Kristiánovy, Praha 1939.
LF	Listy filologické
NV	Naše věda
Pekař, WLL	Josef Pekař, Die Wenzels- und Ludmila-Legenden und die Echtheit Christians, Praha 1906
SPFFBU	Sborník prací filosofické fakulty Brněnské university

¹ The main contributions read at this conference are so far to be found in the publication: *Konferencia o Velkej Morave a byzantskej misii, Brno—Nitra 1.—4. X. 1963*. (Nitra, Archeologický ústav Slovenskej akadémie vied, 1963, 140 pages).

² *Editio princeps of Legenda Christiani: Bohuslaus Balbinus, Epitome historica rerum Bohemicarum I*, Prague 1677, pp. 40—65. Further editions: Const. Suysken, *Acta Sanctorum*, Sept. 16 (t. V., f. 354—363) and Sept. 28. (t. VII., f. 769—778), in the years 1755 and 1760. — P. Athanasius a S. Josepho (Elias Sandrich), *Vita S. Ludmillae et S. Wenceslai auctore Christiano monacho*, Prague 1767 (111 pag.) — Josef Emler, *FRBI*, Prague 1873, pp. 199—227. — Josef Pekař, *Die Wenzels- und Ludmila-Legenden und die Echtheit Christians*, Prag 1906, pp. 88—125 (the only critical edition).

³ *Cosmas's Chronicle* was published also by Josef Emler, *FRB II*, Prague 1874. — Critical edition: Berthold Bretzhold, *Die Chronik der Böhmen des Cosmas von Prag*, Mon. Germ. hist., N. S., t. II., Berlin 1923.

⁴ *Gelasius Dobner, Examen Historico-Chronologico-Criticum*, manuscript from 1755. The same, Wenceslai Hagek a Liboczan Annales Bohemorum (critical commentary) IV., 1772, p. 328 f.)

⁵ The legend *Diffundente sole*, published after Josef Dobrovský (see p. 527) by Josef Emler, *FRB I*, 1873, pp. 191—198, and with a critical supplement by Václav Chaloupecký, *Prameny*, pp. 481—493, the latter having quite rightly separated from it the homily *Factum est*. Cf. Note 17.

⁶ *Gumpold's Legend* was published by G. H. Pertz, *MGH, SS. IV.*, pp. 211—223. From the latter reprinted in *FRB I*, pp. 146—166.

⁷ *Annales Fuldenses auctore Ruodolpho*, *MGH, S. S. II.*, 1829, p. 35, ad a. 845: *Hludovicus XIII ex ducibus Boemanorum cum hominibus suis christianam religionem desiderantes suscepit et in octavis theophaniae baptizari iussit*.

⁸ Wilhelm Wattenbach, *Beitraege zur Geschichte der christlichen Kirche in Maehren und Boehmen*, Wien 1849, pp. 52—54. — *FRB I*, pp. 140—143.

⁹ The legend *Crescente fide* was published in the so-called Bavarian recension (Christianity in Bohemia begins here with Bořivoj's son Spytihněv) by Josef Emler, *FRB I*, pp. 183—190. The Czech recension (here Christianity begins with Bořivoj), incomplete, was published from a manuscript in the Metropolitan Chapter in Prague G 5, by Chaloupecký in his *Prameny*, pp. 493—501. The complete text from a Stuttgart manuscript (Zweifalten), originating from the beginning of the 12th cent., was reprinted by Jaroslav Ludvíkovský in his *Nově zjištěný rukopis legendy Crescente fide*, *LF 81*, 1958, pp. 56—68.

¹⁰ Vatroslav Jagić, *Entstehungsgeschichte der kirchenslavischen Sprache*, Berlin 1913, page 107 n.: „Mit recht sagt Vondrák, man sei im Aufsuchen der Spuren nach der slavischen Liturgie in Böhmen oft entschieden zu weit gegangen... Da war sie immer nur eine zarte Zimmerpflanze, die bei jedem rauheren Windhauch Schaden leiden musste.“

^{11a} *Riša Velkomoravská, sborník vedeckých prác*. Edited by Ján Stanislav, Prague 1933. — Josef Kurz, *Slovenské základy naší vzdělanosti* in the volume *Slovanství v českém národním životě*, edited by Josef Macárek, Brno 1947, pp. 9—19. — Miloš Weingart, *Československý typ církevní slovančiny* (published after the author's death by Ján Stanislav), Bratislava 1949. — Bohuslav Havránek, *Počátky slovenského písma a psané literatury v době velkomoravské* in miscell. publ. *Velká Morava, tisíciletá tradice státu a kultury*, Prague 1963; pp. 77—96. — Radoslav Večeřka, *Slovenské počátky*

české knižní vzdělanosti, Prague 1963. — The same, *Velkomoravská literatura v přemyslovských Čechách*, Slavia 1963, pp. 398—416. Compare with an article by the author in the present publication.

¹¹ V. Chaloupecký summed up his views more briefly after the Second Great War in the publication *Kniže svatý Václav*, a reprint from ČCH 47, 1946, Prague 1947.

¹² Svatováclavský sborník (The St. Wenceslas Memorial) I, page 949 n.

¹³ The *Slavonic Prologue about St. Ludmila* was reprinted by Josef Kolář in FRB I, pp. 123—124, and later by N. J. Serebrjanskij in *Sborník staroslovanských literárních památek o sv. Václavu a sv. Ludmile* with Josef Vajs as editor, Prague 1929, pp. 64—65.

¹⁴ The legend *Fuit* (the so-called Mencken's legend) was published by Josef Emler, FRB I, pp. 144—145; by O. Holder-Egger, MGH, SS. XV 1. p. 572; for the last time with an extensive critical commentary by V. Chaloupecký, *Prameny*, pp. 459—481. Chapter 8—14 is, however, in Chaloupecký's edition, in fact, the text of *Christian's Legend*, which Chaloupecký joined to the legend *Fuit* proper without scriptural support.

¹⁵ The legend *Beatus Cyrillus* was published for the first time by V. Chaloupecký, *Prameny*, pp. 501—505. He believes it to be a work from Cosmas's time, from the beginning of the 12th century. The second publication was effected by Jaroslav Ludvíkovský, bearing the title *Legenda Beatus Cyrillus*, SPFFBU, C 8, 1961, pp. 94—104, where the editor maintains (in accord with Jan Vilikovský) that the legend B. C. is an extract from the legend ("Moravian") *Tempore Michaelis imperatoris*. The third publication comes from Paul Devos, entitled *La Legenda Christiani est-elle tributaire de la Vie "Beatus Cyrillus"?* AB 1963, pp. 351—367. P. Davos suggests the thesis (not acceptable for us) that the legend B. C. was one of the sources of *Legenda Christiani*, being thus one of the oldest Bohemian literary documents written in Latin. As to Oldřich Králík (see below, chapter 5), he identified in his publications the legend B. C. directly with the *Privilegium Moraviensis ecclesie*.

¹⁶ The legend *Tempore Michaelis imperatoris* or the so-called Moravian Legend was published in *Acta Sanctorum, Martii t. II*, 1668, pp. 22—23. — Josef Dobrovský reprinted it in *Mährische Legende von Cyrill und Method* in the year 1826. Further it has been reprinted in FRB I, pp. 100—107, and in Chaloupecký's *Prameny*, pp. 505—521 along with the latter's critical commentary. The last publication of the legend was effected by Paul Devos according to the manuscript kept in the Olomouc Chapter. No. 12 (from the 14th cent.), and it was incorporated in his article *Une mosaïque: la Légende Morave des SS. Cyrille et Méthode*, AB 81, 1963, page 229 ff. Dobrovský fixed the chronology of this legend in the 1st half of the 14th cent., while Josef Peřák suggested as date of origin the 12th cent. or the 13th, at the latest, and V. Chaloupecký was in favour of the 13th or the beginning of the 14th centuries. Paul Devos and Paul Meyvaert hold the middle of the 14th cent. to be the probable chronology (*La Légende Morave des SS. Cyrille et Méthode et ses sources*, AB 74, 1956, page 441 f.).

¹⁷ The homily *Factum est* (based altogether on Christian), which is an outstanding piece of work from the literary point of view, was published by V. Chaloupecký, *Prameny*, pp. 538—556 (with a critical commentary; cf. also Note 5). He believes it to have originated towards the end of the 11th cent., but the chronology is likely a later one, judging by the style of the document.

¹⁸ Bohumil Ryba, *Kronika Kristiánova s hlediska textové kritiky* (Christian's Legend in the light of textual criticism), LF 59, 1932, page 112 sq. As to the legend *Diffundente*, see page 120.

^{18a} Václav Richter, *O středověké architektuře na Moravě*, Časopis Matice moravské 65, 1943, page 1 ff.

¹⁹ Jaroslav Ludvíkovský, *O Kristiána I* (For Christian), NV 26, 1948—1949, pp. 209—239.

²⁰ Jaroslav Ludvíkovský, *O Kristiána II*, NV 27, 1950, pp. 158—173, 197—216.

²¹ The *Böddecke text* of Christian was published by V. Chaloupecký in his *Prameny*, pp. 521—537. The manuscript was destroyed during the Second Great War in 1945 (according to information from AB 72, 1954, page 433, Note 4).

²² Jan Slavík, *Spor o podvrženou legendu* (A dispute about a spurious legend), *Svobodný zítřek* 1947, No. 36. — F. M. Bartoš, *O Dobrovského pojetí osudů slovanské bohoslužby v Čechách* (On Dobrovský's view of the fortunes of Slavic liturgy in Bohemia), *Historický sborník I*, 1953. The same, *Kniže Bořivoj na Moravě a založení Prahy* (Duke Bořivoj in Moravia and the foundation of Prague), the memorial "Josef Dobrovský 1753—1953". In contrast to R. Urbánek, F. M. Bartoš identified Christian in his article *Kdo je Kristián*,

LF 78, 1955, pp. 14–27, with the Archdean of St. Vite's Chapter in Prague and later a bishop, M. Rehoř of Valdek. Cf. also Bartoš's defence of the standpoints of Dobrovský and Urbánek, in which the author criticized my recension of Urbánek's work in the Theological Supplement of the Křesťanská revue 1955, pp. 268–271.

²³ Zdeněk Nejedlý, *Staré pověsti české jako historický pramen* (Old Czech mythology as a historical source), Prague 1953, page 13.

²⁴ Roman Jakobson, *Minor Native Sources for the Early History of the Slavic Church*, Harvard Slavic Studies, vol. II, 1954, pp. 39–73. Cf. the same, *The Kernel of Comparative Slavic Literature*, Harvard Slavic Studies I, 1953, pp. 1–71.

²⁵ František Pastrnek, *Či môžu Moravia v dobe cyrilometodějskej nazývati byť „konvertiti“?* (May the Moravians of the Cyrillo-Methodian era be called converts?) Miscellaneous publication "Riša Velkomoravská", Prague 1933, pp. 227–229. — A. V. Isačenko, *Začiatky vzdelanosti vo Velkomoravskej riši*, Turč. Sv. Martin 1948. — Josef Cibulka, *Velkomoravský kostel v Modré u Velehradu a začátky křesťanství na Moravě*, Prague 1958. The same, *Grossmährische Kirchenbauten*, misc. volume "Sancti Cyrillus et Methodius, Leben und Wirken", Prague 1963, pp. 49–117.

^{26a} Josef Kurz, *Význam činnosti slovanských apoštolů Cyrila a Metoděje v dějinách slovanské kultury*, Slavia 1963, page 323.

^{26b} The belief of the Czech experts in Slavonic studies in the continuity of the Cyrillo-Methodian tradition in the 10th–11th cent. Bohemia is upon the whole shared also by the student of Byzantine culture Professor František Dvorník, who, to tell the truth, stimulated the work of his Czechoslovak countrymen in many a way with his own research into Byzantino-Slavic problems. See for instance in his book *Les Slavs, Byzance et Rome*, Paris 1926, page 298, Note 1, but also page 321, a critical note 3. As to more recent works by Frant. Dvorník, Rom. Jakobson, and Dm. Čyževskýj, relating to these problems and dealing with the Czecho-Russian contact in the realm of hagiography, see Paul Devos, *Chronique d'Hagiographie Slave I. La Bohême, plaque tournante*, AB 72, 1954, pp. 427–438.

²⁷ Brief information on these questions has been given by Josef Vašica, *Právní odkaz cyrilometodějský*, Slavia 32, 1963, pp. 331–339, and Kirillo-Mefodičeskije juridičeskije pamjatniki, *Voprosy slavjanskogo jazykoznanija* 7, Moscow 1963, pp. 12–23.

²⁸ Josef Vašica, *Církevněslovanský penitenciál českého původu*, Slavia 29, 1960, pp. 31–48.

²⁹ F. V. Mareš, *Česká redakce církevní slovanštiny v světle Besed Řehoře Velikého*, Slavia 29, 1960, pp. 31–48.

³⁰ See Note 11a.

³¹ Ivan Borkovský, *Kostel Panny Marie na Pražském hradě*, Památky archeologické 44, 1953, pp. 129–200. — Miloš Solle, *Význam Kouřimě v počátcích českého státu*, the above periodical 54, 1963 pp. 67–86. Otherwise a sum-up of the respective literature is to be found in Rudolf Turek *Čechy na úsvitě dějin*. Prague 1963.

³² A similar attention was devoted to the Old-Slavonic (and also Latin) components of Bohemian literature by Antonín Škarka already, in his published university lecture *Nástin dějin české slovesnosti* I, 2nd ed. 1955.

³³ Cf. Karel Horálek, *Cyrilometodějská literatura a její společenský význam* (Cyrillo-Methodian literature and its social significance), a lecture at the Brno conference, published in the misc. publication quoted in Note 1), pp. 117–122. — The same, *K problematice cyrilometodějské literatury*, Slavia 32, 1963, 327–330.

³⁴ I myself have recapitulated the problem of Christian's Legend in a supplement to my study *Crescente fide, Gumpold and Christian*, SPFFBU, D 1, 1955, pp. 57–63, wherefrom I have reproduced a few formulations in the present work.

³⁵ Sufficient proofs thereof are to be found in a diploma treatise written under the guidance of Professor F. Novotný in the Faculty of Arts in Brno by Rudolf Ambro, entitled *Skladba vedlejších vět, vazeb participiálních a infinitivních v Kristiánově legendě* (Syntax of subordinate clauses, participial and infinitive constructions in Christian's Legend), Brno 1954, 219 pages in all (typewritten).

³⁶ Marie Julínková, *Slovník Kristiánovy legendy*, diploma treatise, Brno 1959, 142 pages in all (typewritten). — A solitary echo of Antique literature (from Juvenal) would have to be seen in the reading *rara avis* in the corrupted place in Christian (Pekař 110, 9), as suggested by Bohumil Ryba in the *Časopis Matice moravské* 1931, page 469 sq. and later, independent of him, by Paul Devos AB 1963, page 368 sq. I believe, however, that it was Karel Doskočil who was right when accepting in some of the manuscripts the reading *rara vis* (= *virtus*), see ČCH 1940, page 201 sq.

³⁷ As to the word order in Christian, see Jar. Ludvíkovský, *O Kristiána II* (For Christian II), NV 1950, page 199 sq. The same author discussed also the prosaic rhythm of the legend with respect to its chronology in his *Rytmické klausule Kristiánovy legendy a otázka jejího datování*, LF 74, 1951, pp. 169—190.

³⁸ As to the mutual relation of these legends and their dependence on *Legenda Christiani*, see Jaroslav Ludvíkovský, *Václavská legenda XIII. století "Ut annuncietur", její poměr k legendě "Oriente" a otázka autorství* (The Wenceslas 13th cent. legend "Ut annuncietur", how it is related to the legend "Oriente" and the question of its authorship), LF 78, 1955, pp. 196—209. Also Paul Devos was induced to arrive at the same chronology of these legends on the basis of the manuscript Codex Boll. 433 from the second half of the 13th cent., *Le dossier de S. Wenceslas dans un manuscrit du XIII^e siècle*, AB 82, 1964, pp. 88—105.

³⁹ Jar. Ludvíkovský, *Nově zjištěný rukopis legendy Crescente fide a jeho význam pro datování Kristiána* (Newly discovered manuscript of the legend Crescente fide and its significance for Christian's chronology), LF 81, 1958, pp. 56—68. — Oldřich Králík, *Sázavské písemnictví XI. století* (The 11th cent. Sázava literature), Prague 1961, page 22 sq.

⁴⁰ Josef Pekař, *Svatý Václav*, Svatováclavský sborník I, page 93, Note 108 — Oldřich Králík, *Sázavské písemnictví*, page 19 sq.

⁴¹ František Graus, *Velkomoravská říše v české středověké tradici*, ČSČH 11, 1963, page 292 and Note 24.

⁴² Jar. Ludvíkovský, *La légende du prince-laboureur Přemysl et sa version primitive chez le moine Christian*, *Charisteria Thaddaeo Sinko oblata*, Warszawa 1951, pp. 151—168.

⁴³ Jar. Ludvíkovský, *O Kristiána I*, (For Christian I), NV 26, 1948—1949, page 231.

⁴⁴ The same source page 233 sq. Cf. O. Králík, *Dalimil und Christian*, *Zeitschrift für Slawistik* VII, H. 5, Berlin, pp. 761—782.

⁴⁵ Emil Walter, *Namnen Tunna och Gommon i tjeckiska legender och krönikor*, *Studia Slavica Gunnaro Gunnarson sexagenario dedicata*, *Studia Slavica Upsaliensia* 1, Göteborg—Stockholm—Uppsala 1960, pp. 147—196.

⁴⁶ Emil Walter, *Ještě ke jménům Tunna a Gommon v českých legendách a kronikách*, *Scando-Slavica* VII, Copenhagen 1961, page 139 ff. — I am making use of this opportunity to express my thanks to Mr. Niels Lyhne Jensen, a Danish philologist in the university of Newcastle-on-Tyne, who kindly procured for me in summer 1961 valuable information about this subject. Unfortunately, I have not yet found time to study the material properly, but I hope to do so soon.

⁴⁷ The same standpoint is taken also by the prominent German historian Wilhelm Wostry in his amply documented study *Die Ursprünge der Primisliden*, *Zeitschrift für Geschichte der Sudetenländer*, 7 Jhrg. 1944, pp. 156—253. He, however, believes Bořivoj to have been appointed ruler by the Great-Moravian King Svatopluk, and takes him for the first historical Přemyslide, which implies the assumption that the family are actually not "Přemyslides".

⁴⁸ I was able to read this study, prepared for a memorial to be dedicated to Professor Jan Květ on his 70th birthday, in manuscript, thanks to Professor Cibulka's kindness.

⁴⁹ One cannot, of course, fail to realize that some research-workers still share these doubts. Not to speak of the older generation (expert in Czech philology F. Ryšánek, or the above-quoted historian F. M. Bartoš), Zdeněk Fiala, a representative of our younger historians, sides with the opposers of the authenticity, but so far he has expressed his scepticism by a few occasional demonstrative statements. His only concrete contribution to the old dispute consisted in his offering proofs that the date of St. Wenceslas's death, which Pekař identified in accord with Christian and the First Slavonic Legend about St. Wenceslas with the year 929, should be shifted to 935, this being the current chronological estimate prior to Pekař (*Dva kritické příspěvky k starým dějinám českým*, *Sborník historický* 9, 1962, page 6 sq.) Be it as it will, this detail alone cannot affect the problem of authenticity of this disputed document.

⁵⁰ Pekař's and Chaloupecký's view that Christian should be taken for a brother of Duke Slavnik I have been trying to defend against O. Králík's objections in my article *Kristián či tak zvaný Kristián*, SPFFBU, E 9, pp. 139—147. As to the relation of the Slavnikians and the Přemyslides in general, see the 9th chapter of the present study.

⁵¹ Let me mention at least the last two, published by the Academy of Science in the Soviet Union: Oldřich Králík, *Křeščenije Bořivojova i vopros o nepreryvnosti staroslavjanskoj literatury v Čechii*, *Trudy otdela drevnerusskoj literatury* XIX, Moscow—Leningrad 1963, pp. 148—168, and *Pověst vremennyh lét i legenda Kristiana o svjatyh Vjačeslave i Ljudmile* in the same publication, pp. 177—207.

⁵² O. Králík, *Josef Dobrovský*, page 78.

- ⁵³ The same, *K počátkům* (The beginnings), pp. 8—10.
- ⁵⁴ The same, *K počátkům*, page 8 and elsewhere.
- ⁵⁵ The same, *Josef Dobrovský*, page 113, *K počátkům*, page 12, *Křeščeníje*, page 159.
- ⁵⁶ The same, *K počátkům*, page 11, *Křeščeníje*, page 158.
- ⁵⁷ The same, *Sázavské písemnictví*, page 36 sq.
- ⁵⁸ The same, *K počátkům*, page 41, *Sázavské písemnictví*, page 53 sq.
- ⁵⁹ The same, *Křeščeníje*, page 159.
- ⁶⁰ The same, *Křeščeníje*, pages 155 and 159.
- ⁶¹ The same, *Josef Dobrovský*, page 137 sq., *Sázavské písemnictví*, page 58 sq.
- ⁶² The same, *Sázavské písemnictví*, page 6 ff., and naturally, the whole work.
- ⁶³ Emil Pražák, *Otázky české literatury 10. století*, LF 84, 1961, pp. 331—334.
- ⁶⁴ R. Večerkva, *Sázavské písemnictví XI. století*, LF 85, 1962, pp. 190—193.
- ⁶⁵ Z. Fiala, D. Třeštík, *K názorům O. Králíka o václavských a ludmilských legendách* (O. Králík's views of the Wenceslas and Ludmilian legends), ČSČH 9, 1961, pp. 515—531.
- ⁶⁶ Rudolf Holinka, *Svatý Vojtěch*, Brno 1947.
- ⁶⁷ O. Králík, *Josef Dobrovský*, page 137.
- ⁶⁸ The same, *K počátkům*, page 61.
- ⁶⁹ In cdm 4605 fo 135 r this passage runs as follows: Misitque (sc. mater Wenceslai) infelices viros per invidiam ad socrum suam, ut eam interficerent beatissimam matronam. Qui et fecerunt, sicut illis iussum fuerat. Cuius etiam anima exuta corporae (!) cum palma martyrii perrexit ad Dominum. In the manuscript of the Stuttgart passionnal (LF 81, 1958, page 59, see Note 9 above) we can read: Misitque infelices et funestos ad socrum suam, beatissimam Ludmilam, ut eam iugularent. Qui fecerunt, ut illis iussum fuerat. Cuius etiam anima, exuta ergastulo, a mundi huius carcere assumpta, cum palma martyrii procul dubio perrexit ad sublimem Dominum.
- ⁷⁰ SPFFBU, D 1, 1955, page 52.
- ⁷¹ O. Králík, *Josef Dobrovský*, page 86.
- ⁷² J. Pekař, WLL, page 209.
- ^{73a} The same source, page 211.
- ^{73b} O. Králík, *K počátkům*, page 11, *Josef Dobrovský*, page 128.
- ^{73c} This was stated by Josef Pekař already in WLL, page 179.
- ⁷⁴ The significance of legends for the study of the Middle Ages was pointed out by F. Graus, particularly in his book *Dějiny venkovského lidu v Čechách v době předhusitské I* (The history of the country-people in pre-Hussite Bohemia), Prague 1953, pp. 56—80.
- ⁷⁵ For the last time: F. Graus, *Literatura k dějinám Velkomoravské říše a k misii byzantské (cyrilometodějské) I*, ČSČH 1964, pp. 389—396.
- ⁷⁶ See Note 1. Graus's lecture was published also separately in French: *L'empire de Grande Moravie, sa situation dans L'Europe de l'époque et sa structure intérieure*, Prague 1963.
- ⁷⁷ J. Pekař, WLL, page 165, Note 6.
- ⁷⁸ *Evangelium Asseniani*, Tomus II. Ed. Josef Kurz, Prague 1955, fo 145 b 24, page 292.
- ⁷⁹ *Evangelium Ostromiri*, ed. A. Vostokov, St. Peterburg 1845, page 265 b β 11.
- ⁸⁰ Paul Meyvaert and Paul Devos, *Trois énigmes Cyrillo-Méthodiennes de la „Légende Italique“ résolues grâce à un document inédit*, AB 73, 1955, pp. 375—461. The Italian Legend is reproduced here (pp. 455—461) from the manuscript of the Prague Metropolitan Chapter N. XXIII with variants from the Vatican Latin manuscript 9668.
- ⁸¹ As to the chronology of these legends, see Notes 15 and 16. The fact that the author of the legend *Beatus Cyrillus* gives consistently both Thessalonian brothers the attributes *beatus* or (less frequently) *sanctus* seems to speak in favour of my view that this legend is a product of the 14th century. In this connection it may be pointed out that in the legend *Quemadmodum* the epithet *sanctus* strikingly predominates. Otherwise, cf. also V. Chaloupecký, *Prameny*, page 156.
- ⁸² It was Pekař already who in WLL, page 199 thought of the possibility of the athetesis of the word *tuorum*, but B. Ryba proved in LF 1932, page 241, that it must of necessity be attributed to the archetype. I should like to add that *dominus dominorum* is to be found in the Vulgate in two places (Psal. 135, 3, 27; Apoc. 17, 14), in both of them denoting God, and thus we can hardly imagine a man who was so familiar with the Vulgate as Christian using the two words without *tuorum*.
- ⁸³ With regard to this point and to the question of *translatio imperii* in general, compare also O. Králík's article quoted in Note 44, page 778 f.

⁸⁴ Cf. J. Ludvíkovský, *Kristián či tak zvaný Kristián*, SPFFBU, E 9, 1964, page 146, Note 9.

⁸⁵ See the above-quoted article.

⁸⁶ I believe that the context wants to have here the plural form, which, after all, is to be found in several editions.

⁸⁷ In NV 26, 1948–1949, page 231 f. I dealt with this passage, which Josef Dobrovský incorrectly derived from words with which *Cosmae continuator* (FRB II, p. 339) greets Bishop Tobias (in the year 1283), and which Dobrovský took for a proof of a late origin of *Legenda Christiani*. It was Frant. Pokorný who drew my attention to the old traditional conception that a certain saint may choose his priest. According to *Ordo Romanus*, found in a manuscript in Saint-Amand Monastery, from the beginning of the 9th cent. (L. Duchesne, *Origines du Culte Chrétien*, Paris 1920, page 497) a procession accompanying a newly ordained priest was crying: *Tali presbytero talis sanctus elegit*. This formula had naturally, to be amplified with the respective proper names.

⁸⁸ *Nejstarší česká rýmovaná kronika t. ř. Dalimila* (The oldest Czech chronicle in verses, ascribed to the so-called Dalimil). It was prepared for publication by B. Havránek and Jiří Daňhelka, and the historical notes were supplemented by Zdeněk Kristen. Prague 1957, pages 48 and 63.

⁸⁹ This objection was expressed by Josef Pekař already, *Nejstarší kronika česká*, ČCH 9, 1903, page 159 and in the same periodical 10, 1904, page 58. More recently it was raised e. g. by Jan Dąbrowski, *Studia nad początkami państwa Polskiego*, Rocznik Krakowski t. XXIV 2. 1. Wrocław—Kraków 1958. Similarly Zdeněk Fiala, *Přemyslovci a Slavníkovci*, Dějiny a současnost VI, 1964, page 16 f. Dąbrowski's idea of a mighty "State of Libice" was adequately rejected by Hynek Bulín, *Slezský sborník* 1960, page 127 f.

⁹⁰ Max Manitius, *Geschichte der lateinischen Litteratur des Mittelalters*, II. Teil, München 1923, page 182 sq., does not mention *Christian's Legend* with a single word (neither the legend *Crescente fide*, to tell the truth) when dealing with *Gumpold of Mantua*. We are not surprised at it, since Josef Dobrovský was his only authority. — A strange attitude was taken also by W. Wattenbach — R. Holzmann, *Deutschlands Geschichts-Quellen im Mittelalter*, Band I, 4. Heft, Berlin 1943, page 798 ff.: the book namely acknowledges the *First Old-Slavonic Legend about St. Wenceslas* as an authentic and valuable historical source, while declaring that *Christian's Legend* originated "according to the views of German scholars", at the earliest in the 12th cent., but possibly also in the 14th cent. This attitude can be explained by the fact that it was W. Wattenbach himself (see page 527 above) who studied the *First Old-Slavonic Legend* about St. Wenceslas, whereas the only German research-workers who read *Christian* were Pekař's opponent. B. Bretholz — and Th. Hirsch, of course (cf. Pekař, WLL, p. 4), and H. G. Voigt (*Die von dem Přemysliden Christian verfasste Biographie des heiligen Wenzel*, Prague 1907), the latter two, however, acknowledging *Christian's Legend* as an authentic 10th cent. document. — A positive attitude to the question of *Christian's Legend* has been assumed of late by Paul Devos, who seems to display an extraordinary interest in the documents of the early *Christian* era in Bohemia and Moravia, as can be seen also from the numerous quotations from his works in the present treatise. In AB 81, 1963, page 233 we can read this comment of his: "On peut dire que l'effort de réhabilitation de *Christian* entrepris il'y a soixante ans par Pekař a maintenant pleinement abouti. We may add to it that it was already Devos's predecessor Albert Poncelet who arrived at the conviction that *Christian's Legend* is an authentic work, as we can see in his reviews of Pekař's study WLL in AB 25, 1906, pp. 512–513, as well as of H. G. Voigt's above-quoted study, AB 26, 1907, page 353 ff., although shortly before he allowed himself to be misled by B. Bretholz (AB, 1906, page 124).

VELKOMORAVSKÁ TRADICE V ČECHÁCH 10. STOLETÍ A LEGENDA KRISTIÁNOVA

Resumé

Po úvodní poznámce o vztahu své práce k aktuální problematice velkomoravské a cyrilometodějské (1.) podává autor stručný přehled sporu o pravost *Kristiánovy legendy* od Dobnera a Dobrovského k Pekařovi (2.) a od Pekaře k Chaloupeckému a Urbánkovi (3.–4.).

Činí tak pro informaci cizího čtenáře, ale zároveň s úmyslem doložit, třebaš jen v základních obrysech, úzkou spojitost kristiánovské otázky s otázkou slovanské liturgie a staroslověnského písemnictví v Čechách 10. století. Objasňuje tuto spojitost jak u odpůrců pravosti sporné památky, počínajíc Dobrovským, jehož osvícenská skepse postihla spolu se slovanskou liturgií nutně i Kristiána, tak u jejich obránců, počínajíc v nové době Pekařem.

Pekař postavil na samý začátek naší václavské literární tradice, tedy před Kristiána, I. slovanskou legendu o sv. Václavu, uznáváje ji za primární historický pramen. Přihlížel vůbec k výsledkům bádání starších i současných slavistů, zvláště ruských, mezi nimiž nedlouho před jeho vystoupením na obranu Kristiána (1902–1906) začal A. I. Sobolevskij publikovat řadu studií, kde prokazoval český původ početné skupiny církevněslovanských textů, dochovaných v ruských rukopisech, zjišťováním bohemismů v nich, jak se o to pokusil u nás svého času už Šafařík u I. slovanské legendy o sv. Václavu a u Pražských zlomků hlalohských (1857).

Souběžnost dalšího vývoje obou sledovaných otázek dokumentuje autor příkladem Václava Novotného, který nepřijal Pekařovu rehabilitaci Kristiána a důsledně sdílel i v otázce slovanských počátků českého písemnictví skeptické stanovisko, ne-li Dobrovského, tedy Vatroslava Jagiće, původce známého výroku o slovanské liturgii v Čechách jako „útlé pokojové květině, která musila utrpět škodu při každém drsnějším závanu větru“. Ve smyslu kladném se projevila tato souvislost nejvýrazněji v období svatováclavského millenia (1929), které přineslo jednak definitivní formulaci Pekařovy obrany Kristiána a jeho názorů na počátky českých dějin (*Svatý Václav*, v ČCH 1929 a ve Svatováclavském sborníku I 1934), jednak významné práce a edice našich slavistů, Josefa Vajse, Romana Jakobsona, Miloše Weingarta a Josefa Vašiči, překonávajících stejně rozhodně jako Pekař skepsi Dobrovského a namnoze pokračujících metodou Šafaříkovou a Sobolevského v důkazech o českém původu některých církevněslovanských památek, především zase I. slovanské legendy o sv. Václavu, o které uveřejnil Miloš Weingart ve Svatováclavském sborníku I obšírnou monografii.

Zvláštní pozornost věnuje autor dílu Václava Chaloupeckého *Prameny X. století Legendy Kristiánovy* (Svatováclavský sborník II 2, 1939), kde Chaloupecký vyslovil nejrozhodněji z českých historiků thesi o kulturní a politické kontinuitě průmyslovských Čech s Velkou Moravou, stejně jako ve sborníku překladů staroslověnských a latinských legend *Na úsvitu křesťanství* (společně s J. Vašičou 1942). Autor odmítá s Janem Vilíkovským Chaloupeckého pokusy zjistit pro historické zprávy Kristiánovy starší zachované i nezachované prameny (rekonstrukce *Privilegia Moraviensis ecclesie*, přesunutím legendy *Diffundente sole* do 2. poloviny 10. století apod.) a nesushlasí ani s některými jeho příliš určitými daty a formulacemi. Konstatuje přesto, že Chaloupecký nevyslovil ve svých výkladech o počátcích českých dějin žádnou thesi, kterou by nebylo možno opřít aspoň hypoteticky o Kristiánovu legendu, o I. slovanskou legendu o sv. Václavu a vůbec o výsledky bádání ruských a českých slavistů. Illavně pak s Romanem Jakobsonem a Josefem Vašičou se Chaloupecký ve svých názorech, ovlivněných nepochybně také dobovým zřetelem národním a politickým (jde o publikace z let 1939–1942), pozoruhodně shoduje.

Rozhodně odmítá autor, dovoláváje se svých recensí v Naší vědě 1949 a 1950, dva velké kristiánovské spisy vydané po druhé světové válce a namířené proti Pekařovi a Chaloupeckému, Závise Kalandry *České pohanství* (1946) a Rudolfa Urbánka *Legenda tzv. Kristiána* (I 1947, II 1948), které se vracejí, postupem zcela pochybeným, k Dobrovského datování Kristiána do konce 13. nebo do začátku 14. století a důsledně zaujímají k cyrilometodějským počátkům české kultury stanovisko negativní nebo aspoň skeptické.

V další (5.) kapitole ukazuje autor na několika příkladech, jak dílo Urbánkovo obnovilo staré a vzbudilo nové pochybnosti o pravosti Kristiána (u Jana Slavíka, F. M. Bartoše, Z. Fialy aj.) a jak přispěl i Chaloupecký k jistému zmatku mezi účastníky této vědecké diskuse. Naopak dovazuje, jak bylo přesvědčení české školy slavistické o latinsko-slovanské symbiose v Čechách 10. a 11. století nejnověji posíleno hlavně Vašičovými studii o slovanské právní literatuře velkomoravské a v jistém smyslu i překvapujícími objevy archeologickými, které dosvědčují jednak existenci latinského křesťanství na Moravě před příchodem soluňských bratří, jednak hodnotovost Kristiánových zpráv o rozšíření slovanského křesťanství z Velké Moravy do Čech, což ukazuje v obou případech k synthesi latinsko-slovanské.

Přesto ovšem pochybnosti jak o datování Kristiána, tak o kulturní a politické kontinuitě moravsko-české trvají, a jsou to dnes zejména historikové, kteří se v tomto bodě namnoze rozcházejí s názory našich slavistů a ovšem i s Pekařem a Chaloupeckým. Tak vznikl v pojetí nejstarších českých dějin a počátků českého písemnictví v naší současné vědě

citelný rozpor. Vynikne zvlášt' nápadně, srovnáme-li akademické *Dějiny české literatury I* (1959) redigované Josefem Hrabákem, kde se věnuje období staroslověnsko-latinskému celá první kapitola (str. 25–60), s *Ceskoslovenskou vlastivědou II 1* (1963) redigovanou Josefem Mackem, kde sice pojednává o cyrilometodějské kultuře velkomoravské archeolog Jaroslav Böhmu, ale v českých středověkých dějinách se pak jména Cyril a Metoděj nebo Prokop a Sázava už vůbec nevyskytnou.

Ve snaze přispět k zmírnění těchto rozporů, k němuž lze dospět jen cestou diskuse a vzájemného přesvědčování, shrnuje autor v 6. kapitole filologické a textově kritické argumenty, jimiž chce doplnit a podepřít Pekařovu obranu Kristiána a které většinou už osvětlil ve svých starších pracích. Jsou to: 1. Jazyková a stylistická jednota Kristiánovy legendy. 2. Osobitý jeho slovosled a jednotný rytmický charakter celého díla, shodný s praxí 10. století. Rytmičtý důkaz o pozdějším původu legendy *Diffundente sole*. 3. Existence nepochoybných, stylisticky prokazatelných zlomků Kristiána (*Subtrahente, Recordatus*) v rukopisech z konce 12. století. 4. Očividná závislost václavských legend 13. století *Ut annuncietur a Oriente iam sole* na Kristiánově legendě. 5. Lepší a úplnější text zachovaných rukopisů Kristiána než text rukopisů legendy *Crescente fide* z 11. a 12. století. 6. Nové příspěvky k vysvětlení anachronismů Kristiánových. 7. Původní motivy v přemyslovské pověsti u Kristiána. Zázrak s neporušeným šatem sv. Ludmily. 8. Výklad termínu *campus* = sněmovní pole. Kristián pramenem Dalimilovým. 9. *Tunna* a *Gommon*, severská mytologická jména u Kristiána (výklad Emila Waltra). Či spíš jména vikungů z družiny kněžny Drabomyry? 10. Starobylé prvky v Kristiánově vyprávění o křtu Bořivojově (výklad J. Cibulky).

Podle autorova přesvědčení je Kristiánova legenda zvlášt' významným, protože jediným určitě datovaným (992–994) dokumentem pro otázku moravsko-české kulturní a politické kontinuity. Je ovšem třeba užívat tohoto pramene kriticky, už pro jeho časovou vzdálenost od vyprávěných událostí.

Další kapitola (7.) je vyplněna kritickým komentářem k názorům Oldřicha Králíka, jak je Králík vyložil hlavně ve dvou knihách, *K počátkům literatury v přemyslovských Čechách* (1960) a *Sázavské písemnictví XI. století* (1961) a v četných časopiseckých článcích. Králík chce smířit osvícenskou skepsi Dobrovského s výsledky moderního bádání, které rehabilitovalo, i podle Králíkova přesvědčení, Kristiánovu legendu a prokázalo český původ většího počtu staroslověnských památek, Dobrovskému ještě zcela neznámých. Z této snahy vyplynula Králíkova these, že se teprve sv. Vojtěch stal jako druhý pražský biskup (982) iniciátorem obnovy slovanské liturgie a velkomoravských tradic v Čechách, a že mluvčím této slovanské renesance doby Vojtěchovy byl tzv. Kristián (podle Králíka nejspíš Radim — Gaudentius, nevlastní bratr Vojtěchův). Do doby Vojtěchovy klade Králík i I. slovanskou legendu o sv. Václavu, Ludmilskou legendu prý fixoval literárně teprve „Kristián“ a výplodem jeho fantazie je podle Králíka také vyprávění o Bořivojově křtu, jímž chtěl „Kristián“ představit dynastii Přemyslovců jako dědičku říše Velkomoravské. *Staroslověnský prolog o sv. Ludmile* a latinská legenda ludmilská *Fuit* prý vznikly až v 11. stol. v bilingvním prostředí kláštera Sázavského, jehož kulturní a literární aktivitu oceňuje Králík velmi vysoko.

Hlavní jádro Králíkových hypotes bylo odmítnuto jak historiky Zdeňkem Fialou a Dušanem Třeštíkem (ČSCH 1961), kterým byla nepřijatelná představa o expansivní slovanské politice Vojtěchově, tak filology Emilem Pražákem (LF 1961) a Radoslavem Večerkou (LF 1962), kteří projevíli nesouhlas s Králíkovým pozdním datováním I. slovanské legendy o sv. Václavu, popř. (týká se R. Večerky) vůbec s předpokladem, že by mohlo být církevněslovanské písemnictví zavedeno v Čechách koncem 10. století jako novota odněkud z Bulharska nebo Chorvátska. K těmto závažným námitkám připojuje autor přítomné studie ještě několik kritických poznámek na okraj Králíkových názorů o vzniku a vývoji ludmilské legendy. Vysvětluje, že neměl v úmyslu označit (SPFFBU, D 1, 1955) kusou ludmilskou pasáž v legendě *Crescente fide* za pozdější interpolaci, nýbrž za výsledek krácení původního textu legendy. Ale i kdyby šlo v tomto případě o interpolaci, ludmilská legenda existovala nepochoybně už před touto nejstarší latinskou legendou Václavskou a dokonce ovšem před *Gumpoldem*, kterého Králík pokládá za jejího původce. Přes vážnost důvodů, kterými chce Králík prokázat, že latinská legenda ludmilská *Fuit* je pouhý výťah z Kristiána, přiklání se autor k názoru Pekařovu, že Kristián i autor legendy *Fuit* čerpali ze ztracené latinské legendy o sv. Ludmile, popř. sám naznačuje možnost, že předlohou Kristiánovou byla obšírnější verze legendy *Fuit* než je ta, která se nám dochovala. Přípouští i hypotesu (třebas bezpečně dosud neprokázanou), že byla původně sepsána slovanská legenda ludmilská, z které pak čerpali přímo nebo nepřímo skladatelé latinských legend ludmilských a slovanského prologu o sv. Ludmile. Stejně jako rozhodně odmítá Králíkovo tvrzení, že ludmilská legenda před Kristiánem neexistovala, tak není autor

ani ochoten uznat vypravování o křtu Bořivojově za pouhý výmysl legendistův. Soudí naopak, že Králík přecenil nejen Kristiánovu „románovou“ fantazii (pro kterou označuje Kristiánovu legendu v jistém slova smyslu za falzum), ale i jeho slovanství. Kristián sice dává najevo sympatii k slovanské liturgii a k cyrilometodějské tradici, ale sám byl latiník, a i když užil slovanských pramenů, jeho dílo vyrůstá z literárních tradic západní, latinské hagiografie a historiografie. Zato lze souhlasit s Králíkem, když označuje Kristiánovu legendu za první český spis s nárokem na historickou koncepci.

V 8. kapitole glosuje autor článek Františka Grause *Velkomoravská říše v české středověké tradici* (ČSČH 1963), kde Graus hledí dokázat, že Velká Morava v české středověké tradici nežila a že byla do této tradice učeně vřazena teprve ve 14. století, a to jak po lince „státní“, přijetím římské translační teorie (*translatio imperii*), tak po lince církevní, zavedením kultu sv. Cyrila a Metoděje (v Olomoucké diecési 1349). Proti této Grausově these uplatnil R. Večerka a mimo jiné námitku (ČSČH 1964), že kult soluňských bratří je doložen v Čechách 10. století už u Kristiána. Graus k tomu odpověděl v redakční poznámce, že Kristián sice dosvědčuje legendární tradici cyrilometodějskou, ale nikoli kult bratří. Do této kontroverze zasahuje autor upozorněním, že Kristián nazývá aspoň v několika případech Cyrila a Metoděje světci (*beatus, beate memorie*), kdežto ještě Lev z Ostie v tzv. Italské legendě (kolem r. 1100) jménům soluňských bratří nikde nepřikládá epitheton *beatus* nebo *sanctus*. Kristiánovo kolísání v této věci se autorovi zdá být odrazem reálné situace v českém církevním životě 10. století. Slovanští kněží začali patrně tehdy i v Čechách, jako současně na slovanském jihu (*Evangeliarium Assemani* z konce 10. století má svátek sv. Metoděje), uctívat Cyrila a Metoděje jako světce, zatímco čeští kněží latinského obřadu, byli v tom ohledu pochopitelně zdrženliví, třebaš namnoze asi chovali sympatie k cyrilometodějské tradici a k slovanské liturgii, jak dosvědčuje právě případ Kristiánův.

Pak se autor zabývá tou částí Grausových vývodů, kde Graus popírá, že by v českém středověku před Dalimilem a Pulkavou existovalo nějaké vědomí o souvislosti Velkomoravské říše a českého státu. Konstatuje, že naopak sama existence Kristiánovy legendy, jejíž autentičnost Graus nepopírá, stačí k vyvrácení jeho negativní these. O translační teorii nelze ovšem u Kristiána mluvit (ani Chaloupecký o něm toho termínu neuzívá), ale nezvratným faktem je, že Kristián spojil dějiny Moravy a Čech — je to samozřejmě *historia ecclesiastica* — v souvislý celek a že tedy měl jasnou představu o kontinuitě mezi Svatoplukovou Moravou a přemyslovským státem českým. Pokud jde o známou Metodějovu věštní Bořivojovi (Kristián, c. 2): *Dominus dominorum tuorum efficietis etc.*, sám Graus ji správně pokládá za „průhlednou vaticinatio ex eventu“. Ale pak z ní vyplývá aspoň tolik, že se v době Kristiánově (za Boleslava II.) vztahovala moc Přemyslovců na Moravu, ovšem neznámo jakým způsobem a v jakém rozsahu. Ze myšlenka historické moravskočeské kontinuity ve smyslu státní žila i v 11. století a v době Kosmově, potvrzují názvy spisů citovaných Kosmou jako prameny českých dějin, *Privilegium Moraviensis ecclesie* a *Epilogus Moravie atque Boemie*.

V poslední, 9. kapitole (exkursu) se pokouší autor dát odpověď na otázku, kterou si sám položil a která s thematem jeho studie souvisí jen volněji. Jak je možné, že Kristián, kterého autor pokládá s Pekařem a Chaloupeckým za Slavníkovce (bratra Vojtěchova otce Slavníka), mluví za celé Čechy, začíná českou historií Přemyslem, založením Prahy a zavedením křesťanství v Čechách pražským knížetem Bořivojem. Odpovídá pak na tuto otázku řadou citátů z Kristiána a z vojtěšských legend tzv. Canaparia a Bruna Querfurtského, z nichž podle jeho mínění vyplývá, že tzv. Slavníkovci byli asi takovou větví dynastie přemyslovské jako později (v 2. polovině 12. a 1. polovině 13. století) Děpoltici, kteří ostatně pokládali (podle Dalimila) své vybájené přemyslovské předky za příbuzné Slavníkovců. Pak by ovšem mělo slavníkovské panství mnohem menší míru samostatnosti kulturní a politické, než jaká se Slavníkovcům zpravidla přiznává vlivem pozdní zprávy Kosmovy. Jen tak se mohl Slavníkovec Kristián hlásit k Přemyslovi a Bořivojovi a stát se mluvčím velkomoravské tradice církevní a státní v celých Čechách.

V závěrečné poznámce upozorňuje autor cizího čtenáře na literární význam Kristiánovy legendy a dožaduje se pro ni místa v dějinách latinského písemnictví evropského 10. století jako pro jedinečnou památku, která sice vyrůstá z formálních tradic hagiografie a historiografie západní Evropy, ale přitom obsahuje osobitou složku cyrilometodějskou, pojatou v duchu symbiósy latinsko-slovanské.