

Havlík, Lubomír Emil

Constantine and Methodius in Moravia : (the role played by the Byzantine mission in the political relations of Great Moravia to the Franconian Empire, Byzantium and to the Roman Curia.)

Sborník prací Filozofické fakulty brněnské univerzity. C, Řada historická.
1964, vol. 13, iss. C11, pp. [27]-50

Stable URL (handle): <https://hdl.handle.net/11222.digilib/102750>

Access Date: 17. 02. 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.

LUBOMIR HAVLÍK

CONSTANTINE AND METHODIUS IN MORAVIA

(The role played by the Byzantine Mission in the political relations of Great Moravia to the Franconian Empire, Byzantium and to the Roman Curia.)

The millennium celebrations of the arrival of the Byzantine Mission in Moravia reminded a hundred years ago the great merits of Constantine and Methodius for the development of Slavonic culture. On the other hand, the questions of the position and role of both leading members of the Mission, especially of Methodius, in the political development of the Great Moravian State have receded a bit to the background and if these problems were taken into account this was due exclusively from the viewpoint of the development of the Moravian Church, ancient Slavonic liturgy and dogmata of the Church, so that a distorted impression would arise, as if the entire history of Great Moravia depended on the mentioned factors. It is not the objective of this study to deny the importance of the old Slavonic language as the first literary language of the Slavs and the everlasting merits the Byzantine Mission gained for their efforts for the further development and advance of Old Slavonic culture. At the same time we cannot but see that the questions of cultural development were frequently rather a means of certain contemporary political tendencies, that also the activities of the Byzantine Mission could take place only within the frame of the home and foreign policy of the Great Moravian State which very strongly influenced the cultural life of Moravia, even though the cultural means comprehensibly became, on the other hand, a strong moral factor in the struggle for independence of the Great Moravian State.

Therefore it is necessary to devote attention just to this political activity of the Byzantine Mission in Moravia which actually represents a part of the political history of Great Moravia, just as the history of the Moravian Church does. Chronologically and thematically the activities of the Byzantine Mission in Moravia are divided into two periods, viz. the time from their arrival in Moravia until after the innerpolitical crisis of the Great Moravian State, i.e. the time of consolidation of the position of this early feudal state, its defence and efforts for securing political independence against the aspirations of the East Franconian Empire, the time, when Constantine the Philosopher was first the leading person of the Mission and who was then replaced by his brother Methodius towards the end of that

period. The other period of the Byzantine Mission's activities in Moravia was marked by Methodius's leadership and into it falls the time of the origin, the political development of the Great Moravian Empire and its growth in respect of power, the confirmation of its immediate protection by the Roman Curia and, finally, also the time when under Methodius's disciples Gorazd and Clement a crisis occurred within the Byzantine Mission and its activities in Moravia thus came to an end.

*

The conditions which ultimately led towards the realization of the Byzantine Mission's arrival in Moravia reach with their roots back to the first third of the ninth century when written sources for the first time mention the Moravians.¹ And towards the end of this third Duke Moymar annexed to the Moravian State, developing in the region of the River Morava already since the seventh to the eighth century, the territory of another state formation, lying to the East of the Low and White Carpathians and being ruled by Duke Pribina, who was expelled from there² and later received a principality in Pannonia from the East Frankonian King Ludwig the German.³ Thus arose on the territory of Moravia of today, of the northern part of Lower Austria of today and on the territory of Slovakia a powerful state which the Greek Emperor Constantin Porphyrogenetos later called Great Moravia.⁴

Towards the end of the eighth century, when Charlemagne defeated the Avars and founded the Eastern Mark, the Moravian and later the Great Moravian State became the direct neighbour of the Franconian Empire which laid claim to its territory and strove to bring old Moravia into dependence or at least into tributari-ness. One of the instruments of these efforts for expansion on the part of the Franconian Empire was to extend the jurisdiction of the Bavarian Church, especially that of the Episcopate of Passau, to the territory of Great Moravia. The endeavours of Passau that for the territory of the Eastern Mark ordained during the ninth century several chorbishops,⁵ seeking to extend their influence also to the north of the Danube (ancient Moravia), however, met at first with the rivalry of Salzburg, especially in the eastern parts of Great Moravia. These efforts on the part of Salzburg found expression, for instance, in the consecration of the church in Nitra around 828.⁶ The Bavarian Church, in connection with its efforts for ecclesiastical rule of Moravia, as a matter of fact sought to create the tradition that Christianization of the Moravians was its exclusive aim.⁷ In this sense it still tried in 900 to influence the Roman Curia, too, whom it wanted — naturally in vain — to convince that Moravia at the beginning of the ninth century belonged under the jurisdiction of Passau.⁸ Even though Passau gained in the first half of the ninth century a certain influence on the ecclesiastical administration of Great Moravia, the biased assertion cannot be accepted that its territory would legally

belong under the jurisdiction of Passau, nor the allegation that the Christianization of the Moravians was the work of the Bavarian clergy. A great share in it was also played by missionary currents coming from Byzantium and from the Balkans, from the lower region of the Danube,⁹ from the surroundings of the Adriatic Sea; from the territory of the ancient Longobards and the region of the Byzantine Ravenna exarchate in northern Italy to which belonged Venice and actually the region of the Aquileia patriarch already since the eighth century.¹⁰ This is proved not only by contemporary archaeological finds of sacral architecture in Moravia, typologically connected with the Adriatic region and the Balkan lower Danube region, but quite unambiguously also by data on the biography of the Moravian Archbishop Methodius telling us that clergymen from Italy, Greece and the Franconian Empire were active in Moravia.¹¹ The old cultural relations of the Adriatic and Balkan regions, both of which belonged to the Byzantine sphere of culture, with the central Danube region are revealed as early as the eighth century also by creative motives appearing in the decorative industry of Great Moravia next to motives of Black Sea and South Caucasian-Persian origin. It is notable that a similar connection does not show itself as far as the territory of the Franconian Empire is involved; thus it seems that its third place in the Christianization of the Moravians — if, of course, the formulation of the biographer is not influenced by contemporary, as well as political motives¹² — does correspond to the real situation, even though it is evident, on the other hand, that many church buildings in Moravia had their origin just in the Franconian region, especially in the Bavarian region, upon which strong insular influences acted up till the eighth century.¹³ Christianity as the very ideology of feudalism in the first place had to do with the members of the leading strata of society and the ruling classes.¹⁴ Political reasons induced the old Moravians towards the end of the second third of the ninth century to give preference to the Greek elements of Moravian Christianity, in later years, in the time of close relations between Great Moravia and the Roman Curia, they emphasized against Franconian-Bavarian aspirations the Roman origin of the Christianization of Moravia.¹⁵

Even though the territory of Great Moravia did not belong in accordance with canon law under the jurisdiction of the Passau episcopate, church organisations of archipresbyteriates existed here under its sponsorship.¹⁶ These organisations originated within the framework of the individual principalities and as formations superior to grand parishes,¹⁷ developing within the framework of districts. This organisation became a dangerous pretext for claims to power on the part of the East Franconian King Ludwig the German, as it is apparent from two military expeditions by which he tried in 846 and 855 to bring Great Moravia into dependence and tributariness.¹⁸ Their aspirations against the Moravians and other eastern, mostly Slavonic neighbours, sort of a “Drang” in the vesture of the ninth century, the Franconians and the Bavarians tried hard to cover by the idea of

so-called Roman universalism, flourishing then especially in the later centuries, however, in the Franconian conception the Roman universum merged with the Empire of the Franconians¹⁹ and the Franconian emperors applied their jurisdiction to all countries of the Roman universe (except for the East Roman Empire).²⁰ If thus the Passau episcopate was the sponsor of the clerical organisation in Moravia, this organisation at the same time constituted not only a reason, but also an instrument of political aspirations of Franconian universalism. In view of this situation it was necessary for the Moravians as part of the Roman universe, but not of the Franconian Empire, to look for such a support that would put up a barrier to Franconian and Bavarian designs for incorporating Great Moravia into the Franconian universe.

Such support could be afforded to the Moravians only by an institution superior to the power of the Franconian emperors and kings. In Europe of that time this institution was above all the Roman Curia through the spiritual power of which all temporal power, thus of the Franconian emperors and kings, too, was derived (from God) according to theological-supreme views. It was thus a political design of the first order when the Great Moravian ruler Rostislav at some time in 861 or 862 turned to Rome.²¹ The thing he was concerned with was that Great Moravia, by establishing an independent episcopate of her own, would extricate herself from the influence of the Bavarian episcopate and monasteries, and that the Church organisation in Moravia which, as a component of the state machinery, was to be a support of state power, but did not fulfil this function and, on the contrary, was an instrument of Franconian-Bavarian aspirations of power, became through the Moravian Church directly subordinate to the Roman Curia. In this way, Rostislav would gain at the same time recognition of the legal existence and position of Great Moravia in the Roman universe and towards the Franconian Empire. Great Moravia thus for the first time interfered with world politics of that time.

Pope Nicholas I at that time, however, could not get along without the help of the East Franconian King Ludwig the German in his fight against Emperor Ludwig II and the West Franconian episcopate. Besides, the Roman Curia's interests in Illyria against the claims of the Constantinople patriarchate were at stake.²² Since Rostislav's request at that moment was of no importance to the policy of the Roman Curia, the Moravians were turned down in Rome. For these reasons they turned in 863 to another institution capable of complying with their wishes. Just as the establishment of relations with the Roman Curia was connected with long term activities of clergymen from Italy in Moravia, so was the approach to Byzantium connected with the work of the Greek clergy in Moravia and with the previous relations of Moravia with Byzantium. The East Roman Empire considered itself to be the actual continuator of the traditions of the Roman Imperium and the Roman Emperor (basileus) to be the only temporal representative.

of the Roman universe. That is why it did not regard the relatively young Caroline rank of emperor, established by the Roman Curia, as equivalent, contested the Franconian emperors the Roman-universalistic function of emperor and mostly did not even recognize them as emperors, but only as kings. The Roman emperor was to grant the Moravians an independent episcopate and strengthen their position towards the East Franconian Empire which just then had concluded an alliance with the Bulgarian Empire and thus threatened to assault Great Moravia from two sides.²³ Moravian biographies about Constantine the Philosopher and Archbishop Methodius do not elucidate fully the original idea of Rostislav's message;²⁴ they talk of the propagation of Christianity in Moravia and beyond it in the Slavonic language, about the dispatch of a bishop and scholars who would settle legal relations and work out a code.²⁵ The Moravians' request was given favourable consideration in Constantinople; this was due, on the one hand, to the friendship between Ludwig the German and the Bulgarian Chagan Bogoris, who as a neighbour of Byzantium found himself in political respect in a similar situation as Rostislav towards the Franconians. He, therefore, sought help against Byzantium, which laid claims to the Christianization of the Bulgarians,²⁶ with Ludwig the German and promised to have himself baptized by Franconian-Bavarian priests. The decision of Byzantium with regard to the Moravians was influenced by the strife between it and the Roman Curia over the person of the Constantinople patriarch, the office of whom went to Fotios, who, in turn, was deposed in 863 by the Roman Curia. The Roman See appointed Ignatios patriarch, for Fotios's election was influenced by bribery and Byzantium refused to hand over Illyria. Emperor Michael III and Patriarch Fotios, however, refused to recognize the decision of the Roman synod. For these two reasons the Moravians' request was welcomed by Byzantium, for to the detriment of the Roman Curia and Ludwig the German it could strengthen its influence not only in the Balkans, but with regard to Bulgaria also in the middle Danube region.

Even though Byzantium did not comply with Moravia's demands to full extent (e.g. as regards the dispatch of a bishop), it sent to Moravia its Mission, headed by Constantine the Philosopher and the Archont-Abbot Methodius (evidently his real name was Michael), who arrived in Moravia either in summer 863 or towards the end of spring 864, in order to demonstrate its interest in this area towards the Roman Curia and Ludwig the German.²⁷ The Mission delivered to Rostislav a letter from Emperor Michael III who praised the Moravian ruler's efforts for gaining a higher rank and pointed out that due to their own script and language the Moravians had reached a position which in the ninth century no other nation could gain, because a similar practice existed only in the ancient Christian times, as is actually shown by the instances of the Syrians, Copts, Georgians, Armenians, Goths, and others. In the close of the letter, Michael compared the Moravian ruler to Emperor Constantine.²⁸ A very interesting part of this letter is Michael's remark

on Rostislav's efforts to gain higher rank, which shows that after all the Moravians had reached a certain position within the framework of the (East) Roman universe and which, together with the privilege of using the Old Slavonic language and the Glagolitic alphabet, also constituted an important political success in the struggle against the Church of Bavaria and the East Franconian Empire, which the Roman Curia as well had to take into account. Great Moravia had thus become a direct participant in the political tug of war in Europe.

The Moravian-Byzantine friendship and the arrival of the Byzantine Mission in Moravia precipitated Ludwig the German's enmity towards Great Moravia. Pope Nicholas I, too, gave his blessing to a war against the Moravians²⁹ backed up not only by his interest in Ludwig the German, but also by the break with Byzantium and the activities of the Byzantine Mission in the middle Danubian region. Therefore the joint interests of the East Franconian King and the Roman Curia, as well as of the Bulgarians, who defended themselves against Byzantium by their alliance with Ludwig the German and therefore were to attack Moravia from the south-east, united against Great Moravia. The Bulgarians, however, did not take part in the campaign against Moravia, because they were defeated by Byzantium and forced to accept baptism from there, but Rostislav was compelled by Ludwig the German to conclude peace at Devín in 864 and to promise allegiance.³⁰ The factual position of Moravia was, as a matter of fact, not touched, but the result of the war contributed in Moravia towards the recognition that the friendship with remote Byzantium was not yet a sufficient means against the claims of the Franconians and the interests of the Roman Curia.

The new situation, of course, made the position of the Byzantine Mission in Moravia worse and sharp clashes occurred between it and the Franconian-Bavarian clergy,³¹ especially when it wanted to implement in Moravia the privilege of the East Roman Emperor and on top of all represented a possible nucleus out of which an independent Moravian Church might grow at some time. Its activities were made possible only due to Rostislav's support who regarded his oath to Ludwig as extorted from him and thus unbinding³² and sought an opportunity for redressing the events of 864.³³ All these circumstances induced the Byzantine Mission to think of securing its work in Moravia, perhaps by ordaining³⁴ its disciples in Aquileia,³⁵ with which Moravia was entertaining old relations,³⁶ perhaps in some way or other it was thinking of returning to Constantinople. Finally, the possibility is not excluded that, upon acquainting themselves with the situation in Moravia, both brothers were intending to turn right to the Roman Curia. All these considerations, however, remain assumptions; one thing is but certain, i.e. that we meet with the Byzantine Mission in 867 in the Lake Balaton region in Pannonia at Prince Kotzel's³⁷ and in October of the same year in Venice.³⁸

In the meantime revolutionary political changes had taken place in Constantinople. Emperor Michael III was murdered and the new Emperor Basileios I

deposed Patriarch Fotios and started negotiations with the Roman Curia for reconciliation.³⁹ These events also exerted influence on the further fate of the Byzantine Mission. However, we do not know, whether the invitation of the Mission to come to Rome⁴⁰ was the reply to its own request, proceeding from the changed relations between the Roman Curia and Byzantium, or whether the invitation to Rome was for the same reasons conditioned by the initiative of the Roman See. But the fact remains that Pope Nicholas I was concerned at that time — after having gained for a time obedience over Bulgaria (866) — with gaining supremacy also over Illyrium in the face of Byzantium and also with the clarification of the conditions prevailing in the middle Danubian region, where Byzantium had sent its Mission. Constantine and Methodius accepted the invitation extended by the Roman See and arrived in Rome after the middle of December⁴¹ where, in conformity with the original intentions of the Moravians from 861—862, they at first recognized the supremacy of the Roman Curia over the middle Danubian region, including Great Moravia.⁴² By this act the Byzantine Mission tried to completely outmanoeuvre the aspirations of the Bavarian episcopate and of Ludwig the German towards Great Moravia. The Roman Curia's attitude was backed up by the news about the reinstallation of the pro-Curial Constantinople Patriarch Ignatios⁴³ and the Mission's success in Rome was helped along by several dignitaries of the Curia, e.g. Arsenius, Anastasius, and others.⁴⁴ Moreover, the Byzantine Mission procured from Pope Hadrian II ordaining of its disciples (Gorazd, Clement, Nahum, Angelar, and Sava),⁴⁵ approval of its activities in Moravia and sanctioning of the old Slavonic text. Roughly speaking the Roman See granted the Moravians all that they had reached in Constantinople before for the recognition of its supremacy over Great Moravia.

The interests of the Moravians, however, were directed towards higher aims, i.e. not only towards liquidating the Franconian-Bavarian aspirations, but also towards establishing an independent Church directly subordinate to the Roman See. The latter, however, first sent Methodius to Moravia with a special dispatch wherein it solemnly granted the use of Old Slavonic after preceding citation in Latin and appointed him papal legate for all Slavonic countries.⁴⁶ The See of Rome, it must be admitted, tried through the mediation of Methodius to directly subject to itself the church administration in Moravia and its influence upon its Slavonic neighbours, as well as in Pannonia, belonging at that time under the archiepiscopate of Salzburg, but the episcopate of Bavaria in conformity with the interests of Ludwig the German, preparing already in 863 in connection with the negotiations of the Byzantine Mission in Rome a military intervention against Moravia, which was to frustrate the plans of the Roman See and of the Moravians. The attack of the Franconians and Bavarians was realized just at a time when the papal legate Methodius was returning from Rome to Moravia. On account of the war events he, however, did not reach Moravia and stayed with Prince Kotzel in

Pannonia, from where he returned after a short time again to Rome with a plan resulting, on the one hand, from the defeat of the Franconian princes in Moravia,⁴⁷ on the other hand, from the efforts of the Moravians to gain their own episcopate. The situation after the defeat of the Franconians created for this at that time extremely favourable political conditions, from which also the Roman See evidently proceeded, following, on the one hand, the consolidation of its positions in the middle Danubian region against the Bavarian episcopate and, on the other hand, also its increase of strength in Illyrium against the Constantinople patriarchate.⁴⁸ Therefore the Roman Curia restored the ancient abolished Pannonian archiepiscopate in Sirmium at the head of which it placed Methodius. To the new archiepiscopate also belonged Great Moravia.⁴⁹ This action of the Moravians, motivated by securing Great Moravia against East Franconian aspirations, and the proceeding of the Roman Curia which was anxious to strengthen its positions in the middle Danubian region and in Illyrium against the Bavarian episcopate and Byzantium, were of advantage to both the Roman See and the Moravians, for the new archiepiscopate was to make a significant contribution towards strengthening the independence of the Great Moravian State.⁵⁰

After the victory of the Moravians in 869 and after the establishment of the archiepiscopate it thus seemed that the further activities of the Byzantine Mission in Moravia and the development of Great Moravia were secured in all respects. But just then, due to the intrigues on the part of the Franconian royal sons, strife for power broke out between Rostislav and his nephew Sventopulk which ended in a crisis of the Great Moravian State, followed after a short time by the loss of its independence in 870.⁵¹ After Rostislav had been taken prisoner, Archbishop Methodius was also taken prisoner by the Bavarian bishops, contrary to law brought to trial and imprisoned in the Swabian Monastery of Ellwangen.⁵² Methodius was accused of having seized Pannonia — the Bavarian episcopate did not consider the decision of the Roman See — jurisdiction over which was still being claimed by the Archbishop of Salzburg. Ultimately, Sventopulk, too, was taken prisoner by the Franconians.⁵³

The decline of the political power of Great Moravia, however, was not of long duration; the Moravians rose against the Franconian occupation, drove out the Franconian-Bavarian clergy⁵⁴ and put Slavomar at the head of the uprising. The Franconians and the Bavarians in Moravia got themselves into such an onerous situation that they were forced to release Sventopulk from prison and tried to win him over for ruling Moravia under the aegis of Bavaria. But Sventopulk allied himself with the Moravians and inflicted a crushing defeat upon the Bavarian troops in 871,⁵⁵ which, in turn, meant the restoration of Great Moravia's independence, especially when in the following year 872 he defeated three other enemy expeditions (Saxons, Thuringians, Franconians, Bavarians) in Moravia.⁵⁶ With the restoration of Great Moravia's independence Sventopulk tried to renew

the former relations to the Roman Curia and to the newly established archiepiscopate. In a special message he therefore asked Pope John VIII to release Methodius from prison.⁵⁷

The Roman See had got itself at that time again into trouble with the Constantinople patriarchate which ruled over Bulgaria and moreover was seeking an alliance with Ludwig the German through Archbishop Agathon.⁵⁸ Besides, it did not think of letting the arbitrary uncanonical proceedings of the Bavarian episcopate and the latter's interference with its rights in Pannonia without response. Therefore it took a very resolute stand against the violent acts of the Bavarian episcopate and by means of dispatches, as well as of messages to Ludwig the German, and to Carloman ordered the Bavarian bishops to release Methodius, punished the instigators of his imprisonment and made it clear to the East Frankonian King that Pannonia belonged in first respect under its jurisdiction.⁵⁹

In the autumn of 873 the papal legate, Bishop Paul of Ancona, accompanied the Moravian Archbishop to see Sventopulk who handed over into Methodius's hands all the property of the Church and the clergy.⁶⁰ The centre of his activities as original Pannonian Archbishop was transferred to Moravia, because the Archbishop of Salzburg actually did not want to let go Pannonia despite interventions on the part of the See of Rome.⁶¹ For the sting of the complaints about liturgical ceremonies being conducted in the Slavonic language to be broken, the Roman Curia prohibited their very execution.⁶² After Methodius's return to Moravia, peace between the Moravians and Ludwig the German was finally negotiated at Forchheim in 874. At these negotiations Sventopulk was represented by the presbyter John of Venice.⁶³

With the termination of the crisis of the Great Moravian State and the return of Archbishop Methodius to Moravia ended the first period of the Byzantine Mission's political activity in Moravian services which in essence was defined by the years 863—864 to 869—870. With the peace treaty signed at Forchheim, however, simultaneously begins the second phase of the Mission's activities in Moravia, in which the person of Methodius plays the leading role.

The new period of the Byzantine Mission's activities under Methodius was linked with efforts for the further consolidation of Great Moravia and with the aggrandizement of the territorial range of Moravian rule, i. e. with the origin and rise of the Great Moravian Empire.⁶⁴ The existence of the empire was the current consequence of a certain period of the social development of early feudalism.⁶⁵ The conquests of the Great Moravian nobles were very closely connected with Christianization of the neighbouring Slavs, whose princes and magnates were forced either to accept baptism and for tribute and/or feudal service keep their hitherto position, or to refuse being baptized and lose all. In this respect, Sventopulk's and Methodius's efforts reached full agreement, in particular, when the Church of Moravia as the preacher of feudal ideology and component of the

state machinery very strongly came out in support of Moravian rule in those countries. In co-operation with worldly and clerical power, the upper and lower Oder regions,⁶⁶ the basin of the Vistula,⁶⁷ Bohemia,⁶⁸ the Serbian Elbe region⁶⁹ and maybe other lands as well got into the union of the Great Moravian Empire during the years 874 to 880. The Empire thus created became one of the foremost European powers of that time. "The Moravian Empire began to spread over all countries", writes the biographer of Methodius.⁷⁰

The growth of the position of Great Moravia in respect of power and the successes of the Church of Moravia in the Christianization of the Slavs, the consolidation of the positions of the Slavonic liturgy by the clergy in the Church of Moravia, and the co-operation between Sventopulk and Methodius⁷¹ were an unpleasant fact for the Franconian-Bavarian clergy who was striving to bring about a split in Moravia and weaken her politically in this way. As a pretext served several dogmatic differences between the Franconian-Bavarian clergy and the Greek and Slavonic clergy,⁷² in addition it was the manner of proprietorship of Church means⁷³ and the use of Old Slavonic.⁷⁴ The split, however, did not occur: Sventopulk saw through the plans of the Franconian-Bavarian clergy and, in order to strengthen his relations to the Roman Curia and reinforce his position at the same time — and in the case of the Roman See's positive attitude to strengthen that of Methodius as well — turned with the whole matter to Rome asking for a decision.

We can learn of this from the letters sent by the See of Rome to Sventopulk and Methodius in 879.⁷⁵ In the letter to Sventopulk the Holy See pointed to the Roman origin of Christianity in Moravia and corroborated its patronage not only over it, but also wrote about Sventopulk's commendation in the Lord's protection.⁷⁶ As Sventopulk himself had not asked for it, respectively for the protection by the Roman Curia that year,⁷⁷ this fact can be explained only by the contemporary aims of the Pope's policy, trying to gain Illyrium. Whilst in Bulgaria the efforts of John VIII did not meet with success,⁷⁸ he succeeded in Dalmatia to induce the Croatian Duke Branimir to turn away from Byzantium and put himself under the protection of the Roman Curia. Evidence of Branimir's commendation is given by John VIII's epistle of July 7th 879, wherein the Roman Curia for commendation confirms its assistance against all enemies,⁷⁹ that is, immediately before issuing the letter addressed to Moravia. The appeal for commendation made by the Roman Curia to Sventopulk fell in with the action John VIII undertook to increase the power of the Roman See. In Moravia this action met with a prompt response as we can learn from John VIII's memorable privilege of June 880⁸⁰ wherein the Roman See informs Sventopulk that at his request, with the neglect of other worldly rulers, it would take him with all the people and the entire country under its protection and promised help against all enemies of this world.⁸¹ This important fact used to be formerly often overlooked. The essence

of the question was that the Roman Curia sanctioned by a special act the position of the Great Moravian Empire as a power within the framework of the Roman universe — as it was otherwise not possible at that time — and secured it permanently against the aspirations on the part of the Franconian Empire; moreover, it confirmed that Sventopulk, with the exception of the fictitious spiritual power of the Roman See, had no other worldly power, especially not the power of the Franconian emperors or kings, over him, that he was an independent and sovereign ruler even in respect of law; The Great Moravian Empire thus stood in Europe, within the framework of the Roman universe, next to the Franconian Empire, similarly as, for instance, the Anglo-Saxon kingdom of Alfred the Great or the Asturian kingdom of another of Sventopulk's contemporaries, Alphonso III, the Great, in Spain.⁸² Great Moravia had thus become an important partner in the high international stakes of political powers in Europe.

The Roman See's inspiration of 879 thus met with a positive response in Moravia, especially when Archbishop Methodius, together with Sventopulk, immediately grasped the scope of the Roman Curia's suggestion for securing the independence of Great Moravia against the aspirations of its western neighbours, even though it was naturally the interests of the Roman See's policy that played the principal role in this offer. A great part in realizing the „Roman See's protection“ was played just by Archbishop Methodius who himself, together, with Sventopulk's magnate Zemizhizny delivered the monarch's message and request in Rome. The question of the Moravian archiepiscopate and of Methodius's person was very closely connected with the position of the Great Moravian Empire. The Roman Curia, however, was consistent in its policy towards the Franconians and also in this case supported Methodius against the Franconian-Bavarian clergy. It therefore confirmed Methodius in the function of archbishop, but in order to foil the complaint of the Franconian-Bavarian clergymen it ordained from among its ranks the monk Wiching designated by Sventopulk as Bishop of Nitra, whereby it subordinated him as all clergymen of any nationality on the territory of the Great Moravian Empire to the authority of Methodius. Besides, the Roman Curia demanded that Sventopulk should send to Rome another clergyman who would have to be ordained for another episcopate, in order that Methodius, together with these two could himself ordain further bishops for the territory of the Great Moravian Empire.⁸³ Finally, the Slavonic-Glagolitic alphabet was solemnly approved and Old Slavonic was used in liturgical ceremonies, of course, again only after previous Latin citation.

The promising prospects of the future which in 880 opened up not only to the further development of Great Moravia and the flourishing state of its cultural life, but also to the activities of the Moravian Church and, in particular, of its Slavonic part which, it is true, conformed to Roman Latin rites, but at the same time kept its Byzantine character, very soon turned out to be less rosy than they

seemed in the beginning. If by the privilege of 880 a definite end was put to foreign intervention, the domestic clergy of Franconian-Bavarian origin and Latin liturgy, led by the Bishop of Nitra, Wiching, who tried to usurp the leadership of the Moravian Church, succeeded in the position of the Bavarian episcopate. His attempt to seize the archiepiscopate, however, failed when Methodius returned from Rome and delivered to Sventopulk the Papal privilege.⁸⁴ That Wiching's attempt was a fraud was confirmed by the very Roman See the following year upon Methodius's inquiry.⁸⁵

In these times also fell Methodius's invitation by Emperor Basileios I. to visit Constantinople,⁸⁶ the motives of which are not sufficiently accounted for; maybe the question was that Methodius as envoy of the imperial court gave a report on his activities in Moravia, maybe it concerned the solution of territorial jurisdiction of some contested areas to the South of the Moravian archiepiscopate which, together with Bulgaria fell into the sphere of Fotios's Constantinople patriarchate.⁸⁷ Methodius's stay in Byzantium falls into the last two thirds of the year 881 and obviously had no influence any more upon the re-establishment of Moravian-Byzantine political relations.

Depending on the good relations to the Roman Curia, Sventopulk directed his attention in those times to the further enlargement of his domain, especially in Pannonia. An opportunity to do so offered itself in 882 when he took care of the expelled margrave of the Eastern Mark, Aribo, and intervened in his favour in the quarrel with the descendants of former margraves and with Arnulf, Duke of Carinthia.⁸⁸ After devastating part of the Eastern Mark and repelling an attack of the Bulgarians into the Tisa region, which Sventopulk obviously already ruled over in the previous years,⁸⁹ he ravaged in two large expeditions of 883 and 884 Arnulf's realm in Pannonia over which he then ruled, and annexed a substantial part of Pannonia to his empire.⁹⁰ At the news of these events the Franconian Emperor Charles III finally displayed his willingness to discuss matters at issue with Sventopulk and his princes and met him on Monte Comiano in the Viennese Forest in autumn of 884 where peace was concluded.⁹¹ Apparently Archbishop Methodius took part in these negotiations.⁹²

No sooner had peace been made in the middle Danubian region than the Franconian-Bavarian clergy intending to gain first position within the Church of Moravia revived the question concerning the priority of Latin liturgy and by its conduct against the Slavonic part tried to bring about a split. Under the disguise of dogmatic disputes the struggle for the leading positions in the Church broke out again. This struggle was led for the selfish interests of a less numerous group of clergymen headed by Wiching, Bishop of Nitra, the plotter of the fraud of 880. Fighting broke out in full force at the time when the Moravian Gorazd was elected Methodius's successor upon the latter's recommendation.⁹³ The wave of Wiching's resistance was so strong that Methodius was forced to suspend the

Bishop of Nitra and lay him under an interdict.⁹⁴ As Wiching did not want to submit himself to his archbishop, Sventopulk, as he had already done in 879, turned again to the Roman See to settle this dispute. In the end Wiching, too, departed for Rome, apparently only after Methodius's death, when the opportunity opened up to him to stand at the head of the Church of Moravia. The letter from the Roman Curia of 885 tells us all about these events.⁹⁵

Pope Stephen V — in the same way as his predecessors — welcomed the support Sventopulk and the Great Moravian Empire could afford him in his struggle against the Franconian Empire and Byzantium which at that time was already firmly installed in Bulgaria and thus had become direct neighbour of the Great Moravian Empire and Croatia as well. For this reason he hastened to confirm by a long letter that Sventopulk's relation to the Roman See, despite his negotiations with Emperor Charles III, had not undergone any changes, that Sventopulk was enjoying the immediate protection of the Roman Curia and of all worldly princes had chosen the latter to be his highest patron (and not the Franconian Emperor), that the Roman See wanted to help Sventopulk in overcoming the obstacles put in his way by other countries (e. g. the Franconian Empire) and that all worldly power (Sventopulk's, too) was springing only from the spiritual power of the Roman Curia, from the hands of God, as the contemporary theological-juridical conception was preaching it. Sventopulk's independence and sovereignty were still emphasized by giving him the title of king which Pope Stephen V included in the address of the letter and testifies to the sanctioning of this rank of Sventopulk's by the Church.⁹⁶

After this passage relating to constitutional law followed a lengthy enlightenment on dogmata connected with the verification of Wiching's correctness of belief: from this it is quite evident that the objective of Wiching's visit to Rome was to lift the ban, which he actually reached to the effect that he was again entrusted with the Nitra episcopate. This was an obvious failure of the Franconian-Bavarian party in Moravia, connected with the overall tendency of papal policy, that Wiching did not become archbishop of Moravia, although the Roman Curia at the same time prohibited the Slavonic liturgy, unless reading in the Slavonic language was preceded by citation in Latin.⁹⁷

The leadership of the Moravian Church thus remained in the hands of Gorazd. A turn in this question was not brought about until papal legates came to Moravia in 886 in order to put right the points at issue between the two parties. But not even in the commonitorium of Pope Stephen V which they brought to Sventopulk⁹⁸ did the Roman See take a decision as yet: the elected Archbishop Gorazd, called in it the successor of Methodius, should only stop to perform his functions, as long as he did not appear before the Roman Curia, in order to explain in person his uncanonical election as archbishop.⁹⁹ Notwithstanding, the stopping of Gorazd's activities by the legates of the Roman Church caused a serious crisis

of the Moravian Church, aggravated by the supporters of Wiching to such an extent that at some synod, held in Sventopulk's presence, the Bishop of Nitra secured his object that Sventopulk assisted by the legates of the Roman See entrusted him with the administration of the Church of Moravia at least for the time until Gorazd's election would be settled. However, there is no news any more about the decision of the Roman See in Gorazd's case. On the other hand, Wiching, according to papal decree, acquired the right to expel those Greek and Slavonic clergymen that did not submit to him, a thing which he actually carried out: 200 clergymen were expelled who then betook themselves to Bulgaria, Croatia, Byzantium, Vistula Land and to Bohemia, others were sold as slaves and the leading personalities, such as Gorazd, Clement, Nahum, Sava, Angelar, Constantin, Laurentius and others were thrown into prison and finally deported in 887.¹⁰⁰ Of course it is justified to assume that a number of Slavonic clergymen recognized the primacy of Latin and Wiching as head of the Church and remained in Moravia. The expulsion of the representatives of the Slavonic Church of Moravia was carried out in the absence of King Sventopulk.¹⁰¹



With the expulsion of Methodius's disciples ended in essence the actual activities of the Byzantine Mission in Moravia. The political aims and the interests of the Moravian ruling class and of the monarchs Rostislav and Sventopulk as well were determined above all by the practical needs of the Great Moravian State. Moravia was exposed to the constant danger of aggression on the part of the Franconian Empire, especially of Bavaria, and therefore she was looking for effective support and help. She hoped to find same in Byzantium; in the course of time the alliance with it proved to be an invaluable help in the innerpolitical life of the Great Moravian State, in its cultural development as well as in the cultural development of all Slavs and particularly in the active share of the Byzantine Mission in establishing Great Moravia's foreign relations, e.g. to the Roman Curia. In this active share in securing the independence of the Great Moravian State against the Franconian Empire resides the prime importance of its political activities in Moravia, which is by no means lesser than that in respect to culture. To be sure, the Byzantine Mission's activities actually formed a single indivisible political-cultural unit, even though — and this must be admitted — the political component and its importance created to a certain extent just those conditions for cultural development which, on the other hand, became, in turn, a powerful moral factor in the struggle for a Great Moravian State. If, however, the Byzantine Mission's political activities were, on the one hand, of such a scope and importance to the Great Moravian State, they were, on the other hand, a disturbing momentum within the West Roman universe with regard to the Franconian Empire which did not fail to consider them as a suitable pretext for

its interventions. It is true that the Byzantine Mission, together with the Great Moravian rulers Rostislav and Sventopulk, knew how to ward off politically these Franconian attacks by its diplomacy, but by the fact that in the defence against them the Moravians availed themselves of the political ecclesiastical-legal interests of the Roman See, it based the question of securing the independence of Great Moravia in political respect only on the policy of the Roman Curia. There is no doubt that the Roman See's help to the Moravians against the Franconians was very effective. That is why it could not either remain without response in the minds of the Moravian magnates of Sventopulk's Court and of him himself and it was evidently from here that Sventopulk's decision to give preference to Latin and his efforts for eliminating the duplicity of the Moravian Church sprang in the long run. Practical state interests brought in the long run the Moravian magnates of Sventopulk's Court nearer to Wicking, not because of his nationality, but because of the fact that he was the representative of Latin liturgy. It is, of course, always necessary to distinguish the state interests of Sventopulk's Court from the not quite unselfish interests of the Bishop of Nitra. Even though it was Sventopulk's sympathy with the Roman See and with Latin culture, following from the objective historical conditions of the period which caused an interruption of the further development of Slavonic feudal culture in Moravia in the native language and resulted in the Slavs of Central Europe coming for another thousand years into the sphere of the Latin world of culture and into conflict between its influence and its belonging to a broader Slavonic unit, his action cannot be negatively appreciated. The Slavonic liturgy was only part of the efforts and one of the instruments for creating an independent Church organisation in Moravia and for securing the political independence of Great Moravia and we daresay that it fulfilled this task. After all, Sventopulk himself did not even cause the activities of the Byzantine Mission to come to an end. The causes leading to this lie much deeper, for instance, also in the relationship between the Roman Curia and Byzantium inasmuch contestable jurisdiction is involved and it is impossible in this connection to fail to see that the virtual interruption of the development of Old Slavonic culture and civilisation in Moravia was actually brought about by the Roman See, in co-operation with Wicking, by the work of its legates, when through the Great Moravian Empire and King Sventopulk it reached the consolidation of its supremacy in the middle Danubian region both against Byzantium and especially against the Franconian-Bavarian episcopate of the Franconian Empire and the further existence of the Slavonic party in the Moravian Church could in no respect be any more helpful to Roman Latin-universalistic designs. All that followed afterwards was only the logical consequence of the Roman See's policy whose orders were completed by Wicking's hard course of action in Moravia.

Even though the cultural importance of the Byzantine Mission was kept in the

memory of the Slavonic world for a very long time, the political significance of its activities in Moravia was of no lesser weight; moreover, it allows us an insight into the intricate wheelwork of mutual limitations and relations in Europe towards the end of the first half of the Middle Ages. Only in connection with the efforts of the Great Moravian State for securing its independence was it possible to evaluate the activities of the Byzantine Mission and its importance in the relationship of Great Moravia not only to Byzantium and the Franconian Empire, but also to the third important factor which at that time was the Roman Curia. In the relationship of Great Moravia to those partners the variability of development of the political interests of the individual participants is very strikingly reflected.

If we realize and appreciate all these facts, the task of Constantín and Methodius in Moravia reveals itself, especially since their activities in themselves already possessed a distinct political character — even though they were veiled in the form of contemporary Christian ideology — differently from what it used to be till now and for more underlines their realistic vitality, importance and the role they played in the history of Great Moravia and in the cultural development of all Slavs.

Translated by L. G. Winter

NOTES

- ¹ The information of *Ann. regni Franc. ad a. 822*, ed. F. Kurze 159 where the legates of the Moravians (*Marvanorum*) are mentioned when visiting Emperor Louis the Pious in Frankfort. Further, the Moravians (*Marharii*) are mentioned — about 817 perhaps — by *Descriptio civitatum et regionum ad septentrionalem plagam Danubii*, ed. B. Horák—D. Trávníček *Rozpravy CSAV* 66, Praha 1956; cf. *H. Łowmiański*, *O pochodzeniu Geografa Bawarskiego*, *Roczniki Historyczne* XX, 1951, Poznań 1955 and *L. Havlík*, *Moravané v údajích frankobavorského Descriptia* (*The Moravians in the data of the Franco-Bavarian Descriptio*), *Hist. čas. VII*, 1959, 282—289. The Moravians possessed 11 *zhupas* (*civitates*; *vicariates*) according to this document. The Moravians might be referred to in some other documents where the dukedoms and rulers of the Slavs near the river Danube are mentioned, cf. *Ann. Lauriss. ad a. 803*, *MG SS I*, 194, *Ann. Lobiens. ad a. 803*, *MG SS II*, 195; *Ann. reg. Franc. ad a. 811*, *F. Kurze* 135.
- ² The region ruled by Pribina might be identified with the other Moravians (*Merehani*) of *Descriptio*, perhaps, if their number of 30 *zhupas* does not include the whole of Great Moravia about the middle of the 9th cent., though.
- ³ *Conversio Bagoariorum et Carantanorum*, c. 10, 11, ed. *M. Kos*, Ljubljana 1936.
- ⁴ *De administrando imperio*, č. 38, 40, 41, 42, 13, ed. *Gy. Moravcsik*, Budapest 1949. The term Great Moravia is used to call the state which arose on the territory of today's Moravia, the northern part of Lower Austria and on the territory of Slovakia towards the end of the 1st third of the 9th cent. The term Great Moravian Empire (*Moravian Empire* or the *Empire of Great Moravia*) is used for the last third of the 9th cent. and for the beginning of the 10th cent. However, the documents of the 9th cent. use the name "*regnum Moravorum*" when dealing with the state and the name "*Moravians*" (with many variants) for the denotation of the people, cf. *L. Havlík*, *K otázce národnosti na území Velké Moravy* (*On the problem of the nationality on the territory of Great Moravia*), *Hist. čas. V*, 1957, 493—503 and *id.* 3. *Některé úvahy k ethnogenetickému procesu na území Moravy*, *Tři příspěvky*

z problematiky Velké Moravy (3. Some considerations of the ethnogenetic process on the territory of Moravia, Three contributions concerning the problems of Great Moravia), International Conference concerning Great Moravia and Byzantine mission, Brno 1963.

- On history of Great Moravia in general vid. V. *Novotný*, *České dějiny* (Czech History) I/1, Praha 1912; I. L. *Cervinka*, *Slované na Moravě a Říše velkomoravská* (The Slavs in Moravia and the Empire of Great Moravia), Brno 1928; J. *Dekan*, *Začátky slovenských dejín a Říša veľkomoravská* (The beginnings of Slovak History and the Empire of Great Moravia), *Slovenské dejiny II*, Bratislava 1951; P. *Ratkoš*, *Dejiny Slovenska* (The History of Slovakia) I, Bratislava 1961, 85–118 and recently L. *Havlík*, *Velká Morava a středoevropská Slované* (Great Moravia and the Slavs of Central Europe), Praha 1964.
- ⁵ There, Erchanfried was active at the beginning of the 9th cent., Otgar about 813, Anno about 836, Reg. d. Karol. I, 1358 (1319), Albrich in 859, Reg. d. Karol. I, 1440 (1399), and Madalwin in 903, *Urkundenbuch d. L. ob d. Enns II*, 36. Vid. M. *Vancsa*, *Geschichte Nieder- u. Oberösterreichs I*, Gotha 1905, 126–168.
- ⁶ Conv. Bag. et Carant., c. 11, M. *Kos* 136, J. *Cibulka*, *Velkomoravský kostel v Modré a začátky křesťanství na Moravě* (Die grossmährische Kirche in Modrá bei Velehrad und die Anfänge des Christentums in Mähren), Praha 1959, 247 seq.
- ⁷ The first attempts to christianize the Slavs on the Danube were connected with the trip of Abbot Amand to the Empire of Samo about 630 (*Vita s. Amandi ep. Traiect. auct. Baudemundo* 14, *Acta Sanct. Boll.* 6, febr. I, 848, *Vita s. Amandi metr. auct. Milone* III, 5 v. 145–179, MG Poet. lat. aevi Car. III, 591, 592), and with the activity of Rupert, Bishop of Salzburg (*Gesta Ruperti, W. Levison*, *Die älteste Lebensbeschreibung Ruperts von Salzburg*, *Neues Archiv* 28, 1903, 310; *Vita Trudperti*, MG Script. rer. Mer. IV, 357; Conv. Bag. et Carant. c. 1, M. *Kos*, 126–127). On the Christianization of the Moravians recently vid. Z. R. *Dittrich*, *Christianity in Great Moravia*, *Bijdragen van het Instituut voor middeleeuwse Geschiedenis der Rijksuniversiteit te Utrecht XXXIII*, Groningen 1962.
- ⁸ Cod. dipl. Boh. I, 30. The data of the charter are distorted in a tendentious way: the information on the jurisdiction of Passau really had to do only with the German usurpation of 870/871. Otherwise, the charter expresses mere pretensions and efforts of Passau to gain jurisdiction over Moravia. The analysis of the letter to this point vid. L. *Havlík*, *Velká Morava a Franská říše* (Great Moravia and the Empire of Francia), *Historické studie VIII*, 1963, 136 seq. The later tradition of Passau tried to demonstrate that the Christianization of the Moravians had been the work of Passau and that Moravia belonged under the jurisdiction of Passau. These pretensions are expressed, e. g. in the letters of Pilgrim, Bishop of Passau, from the last third of the 10th cent. (Cod. dipl. Boh. I, 53, 366, 370) and later by Berchtold of Kremsmünster who quoted that Reginhar, Bishop of Passau, had baptized all Moravians (*Bernardi Cremis. Historiae*, MG SS XXV, 655). Another information of Kremsmünster attributed this event to year 831 (*Notae de episcopis Pataviensibus*, MG SS XXV, 623).
- ⁹ Those might have been, e.g. the missionaries who were forced to leave Bulgaria in the time when the Christians were persecuted during the reign of Omurtag (814–831) and his successor Malamir (831–836), cf. F. *Dvorník*, *Les Slaves, Byzance et Rome au IX^e siècle*, Paris 1926, 155. Contacts between the Basin of the Carpathians and Byzantium were very old, and their traces can be followed back to the 7/8th cent.
- ¹⁰ It is worth noting that Paulinus, Patriarch of Aquileia, already took part in the synod held in the Eastern Mark in 796 which dealt with the Christianization of the Avars on the middle Danube, Ph. *Jaffé*, *Bibl. rer. Germ.* VI, 311–318. Probably questions of jurisdiction over the Slavs were discussed there; with this synod might be connected the arrival of the ministers from the Patriarchy of Aquileia in the countries of the middle Danube. Some parts of the liturgical relics of Great Moravia seem to give evidence of that, vid. L. *Pokorný*, *Liturgie pěje slovansky* (The liturgy is sung in Slavonic), *Solušští bratři*, Praha 1962, 160–193. Vid. also F. *Žagiba*, *Die Missionierung der Slawen aus "Welschland"* (Patriarchat Aquileia) im 8.–9. Jahrh., *Cyrlomethodiana, Festschrift d. Görres-Gesellschaft* 1963.
- ¹¹ ... *iz Vlachъ i iz Grьkъ i iz Nѣmьcъ*, *The Life of Archbishop Methodius*, Chapt. V. This document, together with *The Life of Constantine the Philosopher* has been edited by F. *Pastrnek*, *Dějiny slovanských apoštolů ss. Cyrila a Metoděje* (The History of SS. Cyril and Methodius, the Apostles of the Slavs), Praha 1902; П. А. *Лавров*, *Материалы по истории возникновения древнейшей славянской письменности*, Ленинград 1930, and F. *Grivec*—F. *Tomšič*, *Constantin et Methodius Thessalonicenses*, RSI 4, Zagreb 1960. New studies have been written on both Lives by V. *Vavřínek*, *Staroslověnské životy Konstantina a Metoděje* (*Vies slavonnes de Constantin—Cyrille et de Méthode*), *Rozpravy ČSAV* 73/7, Praha 1963.

- As to the traces of Byzantine political theories vid. *M. Anastos*, *Political Theory in the Lives of the Saints Constantin and Methodius*, Harvard Slavic Studies II, 1954; on Carolingian missionary theories vid. *R. E. Sullivan*, *Carolingian Missionary Theories*, *The Cathol. Historical Review* 42, 1956, 273—295.
- ¹² I mean the relations of Great Moravia to The Curia in the seventies of the 9th cent.
- ¹³ Such an influence can be seen, e.g. in the theory of Antipodes brought to Moravia by the clergy of Bavaria; this theory was attacked by Constantine the Philosopher in Moravia, cf. *The Life of Constantine*, Chapt. XV; *H. Löwe*, *Ein literarischer Widersacher des Bonifatius, Virgil von Salzburg und die Kosmographie des Aethicus Ister*, Mainz 1952; *I. Dujčev*, *Un episodio dell'attività di Constantino Filosofo in Moravia*, *Ricerche slavistiche* III, 1954; *F. Repp*, *Deutsch-slawische Kulturbeziehungen auf dem Raume Osterreichs vor Kyrill und Method*, *Votr. auf. d. Berl. Slawistentagung*, Berlin 1956, 181 and id. *Zur Erklärung von Kap. XV. der Legende von Konstantin*, *Zeitschrift f. slaw. Philologie* XXVI, 1957, 114—118 and the answer of *I. Dujčev*, *Nochmals zur Erklärung von Kap. XV der Legende über Konstantin*, *Zeitschr. f. slaw. Phil.* XXVII, 1958, 177—178. Direct Irish influence did not reach Moravia and made a stop in West Europe in the 8th cent., cf. *W. Delius*, *Geschichte der irischen Kirche von ihren Anfängen bis zum 12. Jahrh.*, München—Basel 1954, and *G. Schreiber*, *Irland im deutschen und abendländischen Sakralraum*, *Arbeitsgem. f. Forsch. d. L. Nordrhein—Westfalen, Geisteswis. H. 9*, Köln—Opladen 1956.
- ¹⁴ There were many survivals of older cults at the same time to which clung the inhabitants dwelling in regions more distant from the centres of social life, cf. information on rude Moravian Christianity in the acts of the synod of Mainz in 852, *MG Leg. I*, 410. The Christianity of many other countries (e.g. Saxony, Bavaria, East Francia as well) was of the same character, though.
- ¹⁵ The Life of Archbishop Methodius, Chapt. VIII, IX, especially X: *jako i prvěje otci naši ůtř svėtajego Petra krěšteněje prijěli*. Similarly the letter of The Curia of 879: *sicut antecessores nostros, sanctos videlicet sedis apostolicae praesules parentes vestros ab initio docuisse cognoscitis*, *Cod. dipl. Boh. I*, 22.
- ¹⁶ *..archiepierej, ijerej i učenicj*, *The Life of Constantine the Philosopher*, Chapt. XV. The Dukedom of Blatenland formed one archipresbyteriate, *Conv. Bag. et Carant.*, c. 12. On the archipresbyteriates of Moravia vid. *L. Havlik*, *Znojenské Hradiště sv. Hypolita (Hradiště of St. Hippolitus in Znojmo)*, *Vlast. věstník moravský X—XI*, sep. Brno 1956, 8 seq., idem (*Great Moravia and the Empire of Francia*), 138; on the archipresbyters of Eastern Mark, idem, *Staří Slované v rakouském Podunají v době od 6. do 12. stol.* (*The Old Slavs of the Austrian Countries on the Danube from the 6th to the 12th cents.*), *Rozpravy ČSAV* 73/9, Praha 1963, 65.
- ¹⁷ *vsě crkěvi i strižbniky vř vsěchř graděchř*, *The Life of Archbishop Methodius*, Chapt. X.
- ¹⁸ *Ann. Fuldenses ad a. 846*, *F. Kurze* 36; *Ann. Bertiniani ad a. 846*, *G. Waitz* 34. The description of the annals gives evidence of the attempts to institute dependence rather than stabilize it. *Ann. Fuldenses ad a. 855*, *F. Kurze* 45—46 actually describe the defeat of Ludwig the German suffered by Rostislav.
- ¹⁹ Expressed by *Ann. Fuldenses ad a. 876* on the occasion of the election of Emperor Charles the Bald: *Imperatorem et augustum omnium regum cis mare consistentium appellare praecepit*, *F. Kurze* 86. Out of the Emperor's two functions (1. Ruler of the Franconians, 2. Temporal representative of the spiritual power of The Curia) the first function clearly predominated. According to circumstances the tendency was misused partially by individual Carolingian kings who pretended to become emperors as well.
- ²⁰ Some formulations of the Moravian-Franconian relations in the *Annals of Fulda* (e.g. in the years 874, 884) are due to this one-sided conception.
- ²¹ *.. u sego světitelěskago stola prosiste učitelja*, *The Life of Archbishop Methodius*, Chapt. VIII. On the part played by Great Moravia in the middle Danube region vid. *L. Hauptmann*, *Uloga Velikomoravske države u slavenskonjemačkoj borbi za Podunavlje*, *Rad JAZU* 243, Zagreb 1932, 224 seq.
- ²² On the controversy between The Curia a Byzantium concerning Illyrium vid. *F. Dvorník*, *La lutte entre Byzance et Rome à propos de l'Illyricum au IX^e siècle*, *Mélanges Ch. Diehl*, Paris 1930. On the relations of the Slavs to Byzantium and to The Curia cf. *F. Dvorník*, *Les Slaves . . .*, Paris 1926, and on the relations of The Curia to the countries of Europe vid. *A. Lapôte*, *L'Europe et le Saint-Siège a l'époque carolingienne I*, Paris 1895.
- ²³ Cf. *F. Dvorník*, *Les Slaves 155 seq.* and id. *Les Légendes de Constantin et de Méthode vues de Byzance*, Praha 1933, 212 seq. *Idem*, *The Slavs, Their Early History and Civilization*, Boston 1956, 81—82. Vid. also *J. Dékan*, (*The Beginnings*) 71 seq.

- ²⁴ The Life of Constantine the Phil., Chapt. XIV. The Life of Archbishop Methodius, Chapt. V. On the relations between Moravia and Byzantium vid. *F. Dvorník*, *Les Slaves 147 seq.* and *id.* *Les Légendes*, pass. Cf. also *J. Bidlo*, *Ríše byzantská v 9. stol. a Veliká Morava* (The Empire of Byzantium in the 9th cent. and Great Moravia), *Dějiny lidstva III*, Praha 1937, *Ф. М. Россейкин*, *Буржуазная историография о византино-моравских отношениях в середине IX. в.*, *Визант. врем.* III, 1950.
- ²⁵ In this way the last part of the message is explained by *J. Vašica*, *Zakon sudnyj ljudem*, *Byzantinoslavica XII*, 1951 and *id.* *K otázce původu Zakona sudneho ljudem* (On the problem of the origin of *Zakon sudnyj ljudem*), *Slavia XXX*, 1961.
- ²⁶ The Christianization of the Bulgarians and their relations to Byzantium and to The Curia are dealt with by *F. Dvorník*, *Les Slaves 148 seq.*, *A. Бурмов*, *Против буржуазно-идеалистические становишта по вопросу за начало на християнство в България през IX. в.*, *Исторически преглед 10/2*, 1954, 36–52, *E. Георгиев*, *По вопросу за християнизирването на средновековна България*, *Истор. преглед 10/5*, 1954, 82–104, and *I. Dujčev*, *Vztahy mezi Cechy, Slováky a Bulhary ve středověku* (The relations between the Czechs, Slovaks and the Bulgarians in the Middle Ages), *Československo-bulharské vztahy v zrcadle staletí*, Praha 1963, 11–40.
- ²⁷ The Mission worked in Moravia 4 years and 6 months according to information by *Vita cum transl. s. Clementis*, c. 7, ed. *A. Milev*, Sofia 1955: thus the date of its advent to Moravia was shifted to the middle of 863. The model of the so-called Roman legend was then (except the *Translatio* of Bishop Gauderich) *The Life of Constantine*, Chapt. XV, cf. *P. Meywaert*, *P. Devos*, *Trois énigmes cyrillo-méthodiennes de la Légende Italique*, *Annal. Boll.* 73, 1955 and *Autour de Leon d'Ostie et de sa Translatione s. Clementis*, *Annal. Boll.* 74, 1956, 189–240. This Life indicates the sojourn of the Mission in Moravia with 40 months (*The Life of Methodius*, Chapt. V mentions a period longer than 3 years) which suggests that the mission came to Moravia in 864. The lability of the year 863 was already referred to by *F. Hýbl*, *Slovanská liturgie na Moravě v IX. věku* (The Slavonic liturgy in Moravia in the 9th cent.), *Čes. čas. hist.* XIV, 1908. According to data from *The Life of Constantine* and to the fact that the Mission could not stay in Blatenland longer than three months (without the permission of the Archbishop of Salzburg) and that its arrival in Rome was close towards the end of 867, we are allowed to place the advent of Constantine and Methodius to Moravia in the time between March and the beginning of June 864. *J. Dekan* (*The Beginnings*) 74 dates their advent to Moravia at the beginning of May 864.
- ²⁸ *Богъ, ѝже велѣтъ възјакому, да би въ разумѣ истинныи пришесть и на болши се чинъ сътечалъ, видѣвъ вѣроу твою и подвигъ, сътвори и нынѣ на наша лѣта, явилъ бже въи въ вашъ языкъ, жегоже не бѣ испрѣва было, нъ трѣтѣю въ прѣваја лѣта, да и вы приидете се великыихъ языкѣхъ, ѝже славетъ бога своимъ языкомъ. I to ti poselachomъ того, જેમાઁ જę bogъ javi. moઁza čystiva i blagovѣrna, kъnъžna zęlo i filosoфа... da i ty... pamѣtъ svojo ostavljaје pročitimъ rodomъ, podobno velikujemu cęsarju Konstantinu.* *The Life of Constantine the Phil.*, Chapt. XIV.
- ²⁹ *Ph. Jaffé*, *Reg. pont. Rom.*, No. 2758 (2084).
- ³⁰ *Ann. Fuldenses ad a. 864*, *F. Kurze* 62. Vid. *Z. Fiala*, *Vztah českého státu k německé říši do počátku 13. stol.* (The relation of the State of Bohemia to the German Empire until the beginning of the 13th cent.), *Sborník historický VI*, 1959, 37–38, cf. *L. Havlík* (Great Moravia and the Empire of Francia), 144.
- ³¹ *The Life of Constantine the Phil.*, Chapt. XV. On the activities of the Mission in Moravia vid. *H. П. Грацианский*, *Деятельность Константина и Мефодия в Великоморавском княжестве*, *Вопросы истории I*, 1945, and recently *L. Havlík*, *Byzantská mise a Velká Morava*, (*The Mission of Byzantium and Great Moravia*), *Sborník Matice moravské LXXXII*, 1963, 105–131.
- ³² *Ann. Fuld. ad a. 864*, *F. Kurze* 62.
- ³³ *Ann. Fuld. ad a. 865, 866*, *F. Kurze* 63, 64.
- ³⁴ It is possible that the Moravians made efforts to achieve the consecration of several bishops for Moravia; besides they were anxious to have their own Church hierarchy and independent Church province under the supremacy of Aquileia, perhaps, if the words of *Vita cum transl. s. Clementis*, c. 8 refer just to Aquileia and not to Rome.
- ³⁵ So *F. Grivec*, *Reversi sunt ex Moravia*, *Episoda iz življenja sv. Cirila in Metoda*, *JiC* 3, 1937, 62–91 and *id.* *Slovenski knez Kocelj*, *Ljubljana 1938*, 58 seq.
- ³⁶ Those might be the contacts established in connection with Moravian Christianization and which the Mission could follow up. The evidence of this meaning is approved by the model of the Moravian Sacramentary (*The Fragments of Kiev*) which originated in Aquileia in the times of Patriarch Paulinus; this model was brought both to Moravia and Bavaria. The

- Fragments of Salzburg, too, were elaborated according to this model, cf. *K. Gamber, Das glagolitsche Sakramentar der Slawenapostel Cyrill und Method und seine lateinische Vorlage, Ostkirchl. Studien 6, Würzburg 1957, 165—173*. The relations between Aquileia, Pannonia and Great Moravia are also evident from the names of the Evangeliary of Cividale, cf. *K. Piuk, Zur Frage der Slawen in Pannonien im 9. Jahrh., Wiener Slaw. Jahrb. I, 1950, 112—130*, and *A. Cronia, Revision der slavischen Eigennamen im alten Evangeliar von Cividale, Wiener Slav. Jahrb. II, 1952, 6—21*. The Evangeliary contains the names of Sventopulk and his wife Sventozhizny among others.
- ³⁷ The Life of Constantine the Phil., Chapt. XV. On the Dukedom of Blatno vid. *L. Hauptmann, Mejna grofija spodnjepononska, Ljubljana 1923*, and *F. Grivec, Slovenski knez Kocelj*.
- ³⁸ The Life of Constantine the Phil., Chapt. XVI.
- ³⁹ Michael III was assassinated on September 23rd, 867; Fotios was removed three days later. The news about the events in Constantinople could reach Rome in the second week of October at the latest, and Venice about the middle of October.
- ⁴⁰ The invitation of The Curia arrived before November 13th. The Life of Constantine, Chapt. XVII, The Life of archbishop Methodius, Chapt. VI.
- ⁴¹ The new Pope Hadrian II who welcomed the mission to Rome had been enthroned on December 14th.
- ⁴² ... *ona že uviděvša apostolskajego stola dostojěště vašę strany kromě kanona ne stvoriste ničěsože nř kř namř pridoste*, The Life of Archbishop Methodius, Chapt. VIII.
- ⁴³ This happened on November 26th and news of it could reach Rome about the middle of December, before the arrival of the Mission, though.
- ⁴⁴ *A. Lapötre, L'Europe 111, id. De Anastasio Bibliothecario, Paris 1885; E. Perels, Papst Nikolaus I. und Anastasius Bibliothecarius, Berlin 1920*.
- ⁴⁵ Methodius was ordained as well, The Life of Constantine, Chapt. XVII, The Life of Methodius, Chapt. VI, *Vita cum transl. s. Clem., c. 9* is mentioning Constantin's consecration to bishop, cf. *S. Sakač, De dignitate episcopali s. Cyrilli Thessalonicensis, Orient. Christ. Per. XVI, 1950*.
- ⁴⁶ *Slava vř vyšěmichř bogu* (Gloria in excelsis deo), The Life of Archbishop Methodius, Chapt. VIII, Cod. dipl. Boh. I, 12. On the letter vid. *M. Kos, O pismu papeža Hadriana II. knezom Rastislavu, Svetopolku in Koclju, Razpr. SA, fil. hist. razr. II, č. 12, Ljubljana 1944, 267—301*, and *F. Grivec, Quaestiones Cyrillō-Methodianae, Orient. Christ. Per. 18, 1952, 131 seq.*
- A summary of the letter has *Pochvalne slovo* (The laudatory word on Kyrill and Methodius), cf. *F. Grivec, Sermo panegyricus in memoriam ss. Cyrilli et Methodii, Acta Acad. Velehrad, 18, 1947, 1—25*. The fact that Methodius was the legate of The Curia is confirmed besides the epistle of 869 also by John's VIII. letter addressed to Anno, Bishop of Freising, in 873 (Methodium archiepiscopum, legatione apostolicae sedis ad gentes fungentem, Cod. dipl. Boh. I, 21), and by The Life of Archbishop Methodius, Chapt. XII: *Metodii... apostolsko dějaniivje dělajetř i vř rřku jeho sřtř otř boga i otř apostolskajego stola vřšę Slověnskųję strany*.
- ⁴⁷ Ann. Fuld. ad a. 869, *F. Kurze 67—69*, Ann. Bert. ad a. 869, *G. Waitz 101, 105*.
- ⁴⁸ Vid. *F. Dvorník, Les Slaves 201 seq., idem, Les Légendes 267 seq., cf. L. Havlík* (The Mission of Byzantium) 116.
- ⁴⁹ The Life of archbishop Methodius, Chapt. VIII. The archiepiscopate of Salzburg protested against the Methodius' activities in Pannonia by means of the Libellus de conversione Bagoariorum et Carantanorum which was intended to justify the claims of Salzburg upon this territory.
- ⁵⁰ *L. Havlík* (The Mission of Byzantium), 116.
- ⁵¹ Ann. Bert. ad a. 869, *G. Waitz 105, 109, 114*, Ann. Fuld. ad a. 870, *F. Kurze 70—71*. The troops of Carloman robbed and carried off the royal treasure of Moravia and the counts Wilhelm and Engilsalc became administrators of Moravia, cf. *L. Havlík* (Great Moravia and the Empire of Francia) 147 seq.
- ⁵² The Life of Archbishop Methodius, Chapt. IX, Cod. dipl. Boh. I, 17, 18, 19, 21, *F. Dvorník, Les Slaves 209 seq.* On the Methodius trial held against all canon law vid. *S. Sakač, Bemerkungen zum Methodius-Prozess in Bayern 870, Orient. Christ. Per. XX, 1954, 175—180, F. Grivec, Quaestiones 113—117, and R. Rogošić, De incarcerationione et migrationibus Methodii Slavorum praecceptoris et archiepiscopi, Slavica 25, 1956, 262—282*. On the place of imprisoning *F. Grivec* (Prepir o Metodovih ječah, *Zgodov. čas. 6—7, 1952, 1953, 159—170*) writes that Methodius was jailed first in Nieder-Altaiach and then in Ellwangen afterwards, cf. *id. Metodova ječa — Ellwangen, Zgodov. čas. 10—11, 1956—1957*. Vid. also *A. W. Ziegler, Der Sla-*

- wenapostel Methodius im Schwabenlande, Dillingen u. Schwaben, Festschr. z. 400 Jahrf. d. Univ. Dillingen, 1949, Jahrb. d. hist. Ver. Dillingen 52, 1950, *id.* Methodius auf dem Wege in die schwäbische Verbannung, Jahrb. f. Gesch. Osteuropas I, 1956. Methodius may have been captured about summer 870, the trial was held about spring 871, cf. *L. Havlík* (The Mission of Byzantium), 117.
- ⁵³ Ann. Fuld. ad a. 871, *F. Kurze* 73.
- ⁵⁴ The Life of Archbishop Methodius, Chapt. X.
- ⁵⁵ Ann. Fuld. ad a. 871, *F. Kurze* 73–74, Ann. Bert. ad a. 871, *G. Waitz* 117. The mentioned battle took place in front of “*urbs antiqua Rastizi*”.
- ⁵⁶ Ann. Fuld. ad a. 872, *F. Kurze* 75–76.
- ⁵⁷ The Life of Archbishop Methodius, Chapt. X.
- ⁵⁸ Ann. Fuld. ad a. 872, 873, *F. Kurze* 75, 81. *E. Honigmann* (Studies in Slavic Church History, B. Un Archêveque ignatien de Moravie, Rival de S. Méthode, Byzantion XVII, Amer. Ser. III, 1944–1945, 163 seq.) supposes Patriarch Ignatios tried to gain supremacy over Moravia with the aid of Archbishop Agathon. However, Agathon had been appointed archbishop for the territory of Serbian Moravia which belonged to Bulgaria and under the supremacy of the patriarchy of Constantinople, cf. *F. Dvorník*, Les Slaves 234 seq., *id.* The Slavs 97, and *L. Havlík* (The Mission of Byzantium), 119. The letter of the Curia to Duke Montemir was in connection, perhaps, with the loss of Sirmium and its neighbourhood of benefit to Bulgaria, Cod. dipl. Boh. I, 16.
- ⁵⁹ Vid. the commonitorium from 873 brought by legate Bishop Paul to Germany and the letters of The Curia to Ludwig the German, Carloman, Archbishop Adalwin and to Bishops Hermanarich and Anno, Cod. dipl. Boh. I, 18, 13, 14, 17, 19, 21. The Life of Archbishop Methodius, Chapt. IX.
- ⁶⁰ The Life of Archbishop Methodius, Chapt. X.
- ⁶¹ Cf. The Life of Archbishop Methodius, Chapt. X; even The Curia refused to be influenced by the attitude of Salzburg as is evident from the relations of The Curia to Kotzel, Duke of Pannonian Blatenland, Cod. dipl. Boh. I, 15.
- ⁶² We learn of this later on from the letter of The Curia, addressed to Methodius in 879, Cod. dipl. Boh. I, 23.
- ⁶³ Ann. Fuld. ad a. 874, *F. Kurze* 82–83. The formulation of the peace treaty in the Annals of Fulda is dependent on the one-sided Franconian point of view, cf. *L. Havlík* (Great Moravia and the Empire of Francia), 152 seq.
- ⁶⁴ On the problem of the Empire of Great Moravia and its territorial extent vid. *L. Havlík*, Územní rozsah Velkomoravské říše v době posledních let vlády krále Svatopluka (The territorial extent of the Empire of Great Moravia during the last years of the reign of King Sventopulk), Slovanské štúdie III, 1960, 9–80, *idem*, Tři kapitoly z nejstarších česko-polských vztahů (Three chapters concerning the oldest Czecho-Polish relations), Slovanské historické studie IV, 1961, 40–63.
- ⁶⁵ A similar formation was the contemporary Empire of East Franconia, the Empire of Bulgaria, the Empire of Byzantium, as well as the later Empire of Bohemia during the reign of Boleslas I and Boleslas II, as the Russia of Kiev or the Empire of Poland under Boleslas the Gallant. On the problems of empires vid. *L. Havlík*, 2. Evropské říše první poloviny středověku a Velkomoravská říše, Tři příspěvky z problematiky Velké Moravy (2. The European empires of the first half of the Middle Ages and the Great Moravian Empire, Three contributions concerning the problems of Great Moravia), International Conference concerning Great Moravia and Byzantine Mission, Brno 1963.
- ⁶⁶ Cosmae Chronica Boemorum I, 14.
- ⁶⁷ The Life of Archbishop Methodius, Chapt. XI, Cod. dipl. Boh. I, 30.
- ⁶⁸ Ann. Fuld. ad a. 895, *F. Kurze* 126; Reginonis Chronica ad a. 890, *F. Kurze* 134; Christiani monachi Passio S. Venceslai, c. 2; Thietmari Merseburg. episcopi Chronicon VI, 99; Cosmae Chronica Boemorum I, 10, 14.
- ⁶⁹ Thietmari Mers. Chron. VI, 99.
- ⁷⁰ The Life of Archbishop Methodius, Chapt. X. It is difficult to agree with *F. Dvorník's* statement (The Slavs 96) that Sventopulk intended to rule over Bavaria.
- ⁷¹ The contemporary written documents contain nothing about disagreements between Sventopulk and Methodius. All tradition speaking of their antagonism is based on later statements though, e.g. on the statement of the Greek Life of Bishop Clement, ed. *H. Г. Тулицкий*, Греческое пространное житие св. Климента Словенского, Сергиев Посад 1918. The contemporary sources, on the contrary, reveal their co-operation: The Life of Archbishop Methodius, Chapt. XI, refers of the christening of the duke of the Vistulians and describes

- the help of Methodius to Sventopulk's fight against the heathens; other references came from the letter of The Curia of 880 and from the letter of the episcopate of Bavaria of 900. A bitterness might be evoked by the attitude of Methodius to the contemporary morals of the Moravian noblemen as is evident from the anonymous homily (Cloza), *J. Vašica*, Anonymní homilie rukopisu Clozova po stránce právní (The anonymous homily of the Cloza manuscript from the point of view of law), *Slavia* 25, 1956, 221—233.
- ⁷² The question concerned practising of the Symbolum Filioque, which was used by the Franconian Church but not by The Curia and the Patriarchate of Constantinople, as well, as is to be seen from the acts of the Concilium of 879—880.
- ⁷³ According to an older practise in Moravia the Church possession was only granted to the Church and remained the property of temporal lords, according to Roman Canonic Law — this mode was defended by Methodius and traces of it can be followed in *Zakon sudnyj ljudem*, Chapt. 1 — the Church was a really proprietor of all that had been once bestowed upon it. Thus in Moravia, already in the 9th cent. the quarrel about Church property preceded the great struggle of investiture in the 11th cent., cf. *F. Dvorník*, *The Slavs* 95.
- ⁷⁴ May be that the mission of Byzantium intended to use at first Slavonic liturgy of Byzantine rites. In the course of time (also from the political point of view) the mission adapted itself to the rites already used formerly in Moravia. Recently *F. Zagiba* (*Die Bairische Slawenmission und ihre Fortsetzung durch Kyrill und Method*, *Jahrb. f. Gesch. Osteuropas* NF 9, 1961, 1—56) writes about Western Greek liturgy and *L. Pokorný* (*The liturgy is sung in Slavonic* 185 seq.) thinks of the origin of a special Cyrillo-Methodian liturgy in Moravia. The papal ban on Old Slavonic liturgy in 873 (*Cod. dipl. Boh. I*, 23) concerned probably the use of Old Slavonic as the only language of liturgy, not its usage after preceding quotation in Latin. It is worth noting that the head of the variances was not the Latin clergy as a whole against the Greek and Slavonic ministers but the clergy of Franconian and Bavarian descent maintaining Latin liturgy who withstood the clergy of Greek and Slavonic (for the most part Moravian) descent.
- ⁷⁵ *Scire vos volumus and Praedicationis tuae* from June 14th, *Cod. dipl. Boh. I*, 22, 23. Sventopulk's mission to Rome was led by John of Venice mentioned already in 874. He was not the same John who was mentioned as the familiarus of The Curia, *F. Rački*, *Documenta hist. Croatiae*, Zagreb 1877, *Acta* 5, 6, 7, 8, cf. *L. Havlík* (*The Mission of Byzantium*), annotation 96.
- ⁷⁶ *Scire vos volumus, quia nos . . . pio amore quasi carissimos filios amplectamur . . . vos omnes Ihesu Christo Domino commendamus . . .*
- ⁷⁷ This might be followed from the privilege *Industriae tuae* from 880 (*Cod. dipl. Boh. I*, 24) where this Sventopulk's petition is mentioned at first.
- ⁷⁸ John VIII intended to recognize the patriarchy of Fotios only after Bulgaria would come under the obedience of The Curia. The Pope tried to win Bulgaria over to his side through his influence over King Michael as early as in 878. His effort was successful and the Bulgarians remained within the sphere of the Patriarchate of Constantinople, *F. Dvorník*, *Les Slaves* 233 seq.
- ⁷⁹ *Documenta hist. Croatiae*, *Acta* No. 5, cf. also No. 6, 7, 8, 9.
- ⁸⁰ *Industriae tuae*, *Cod. dipl. Boh. I*, 24. On the importance of this privilege vid. *L. Havlík* (*Great Moravia and the Empire of Francia*), 156 seq.
- ⁸¹ . . . *contemptis aliis saeculi huius principibus beatum Petrum . . . in omnibus adiutorem ac defensorem pariter cum nobilibus viris fidelibus tuis et cum omni populo terrae tuae amore fidelissimo elegisti . . . te quasi unicum filium amore ingenti amplectimur et cum omnibus fidelibus tuis paternitatis nostrae gremio . . . recipimus . . . nutrire optamus atque nostris assiduis precibus omnipotenti te Domino commendare studemus . . . et in hoc saeculo adversa omnia superare . . .*
- ⁸² Asser, the Bishop of Sherborn and biographer of King Alfred (871—899) explained Alfred's investiture in Rome by the insignia of consulate in 853 in the way that his kingship was derived from the spiritual power of The Curia; Asser intended to gain more appreciation to Alfred's dignity and more stability of his rule. On Pope's taking Alfred as his spiritual son vid. *R. H. Hodgkin*, *A History of the Anglo-Saxons II*, Oxford 1935, 557 seq. The tendency to overlook the Carolingian empirehood — similar as in the case of Sventopulk — corresponds Alfred's close relation to The Curia — again similar to that of Sventopulk. Therefore the Anglo-Saxon documents of the 9th cent. never call the rulers of the Franconians by the title emperor but always by the title king. A similar situation existed in Spain during the reign of Alphonso the Great (866—910) of Asturia, and in Moravia as well. Only the Byzantine basileus was called emperor (цѣсарь) in Moravia.

- The significance of this position of Great Moravia in Europe could be seen also in the fact that, e.g. the State of Poland or the State of Hungary reached a similar relation to The Curia more than a hundred years later after Great Moravia and that the State of Bohemia tried to do the same for several centuries.
- 83 We learn from the letter of the episcopate of Bavaria that within the Empire of Great Moravia there were one archbishopric and three bishoprics towards the end of the 9th cent. (Cod. dipl. Boh. I, 30) which existed as late as the beginning of the 10th cent., Cod. dipl. Boh. I, 33. Some later letters, written by Bishop Pilgrim of Passau, mention four episcopates by their names (Speculi-Julium, Vetvar, Nitrava, Faviana), Cod. dipl. Boh. I, 366. The total sum of seven episcopates in Great Moravia is given by another letter of Bishop Pilgrim (Cod. dipl. et epist. Moraviae I, 93) and Christiani mon. Passio S. Venceslai, c. 1, as well. On bishops of Moravia in the times of Sventopulk, cf. Thietmari Mers. Chron. VI, 99. On the letters of Pilgrim cf. *L. Havlík* (The Old Slavs of the Austrian Countries) 73 seq.
- 84 This is told in The Life of Archbishop Methodius, Chapt. XII, and by the letter of The Curia from 881, Cod. dipl. Boh. I, 25.
- 85 Pastoralis sollicitudinis tuae from March 23rd, Cod. dipl. Boh. I, 25.
- 86 The Life of Archbishop Methodius, Chapt. XIII; on the visit vid. *F. Dvornik*, Les Slaves 271, and id. Les Légendes 275; *L. Havlík* (The Mission of Byzantium) 125. Lively cultural relations and trade existed perennially.
- 87 The letter of The Curia addressed to Duke Montemir in the half of the seventies of the 9th cent. might testify to this fact, perhaps. The Pope recommended that the Duke should join the archbishopric of Methodius if the political circumstances would allow so. Cod. dipl. Boh. I, 16.
- 88 Ann. Fuld. ad a. 884, *F. Kurze* 111.
- 89 P. Ratkoš, K otázce hranic Velkej Moravy a Bulharska (On the problem of the boundary between Great Moravia and Bulgaria), Hist. čas. III, 1955, and *L. Havlík*, the territorial extent of the Empire of Great Moravia) 60–67. Sventopulk asked Emperor Charles III by a legation to Worms in November 882 to settle his feud Arnulf, but without success, Ann. Fuld. ad a. 882, *F. Kurze* 109.
- 90 Ann. Fuld. ad a. 884, *F. Kurze* 111–113. Still in 892 a part of Pannonia as far as Drava did belong to the Great Moravian Empire, Ann. Fuld. ad a. 892, *F. Kurze* 121, cf. *L. Havlík*, (The territorial extent of the Empire of Great Moravia) 67–72.
- 91 Ann. Fuld. ad a. 884, *F. Kurze* 101, 113. The formulation of the peace treaty — not speaking of its real items — of the Annals of Fulda brings — concerning the relation between Moravia and Franconia — the one-sided Franconian conception of the relation which directly opposed to the position of the Great Moravian Empire in Europe but also to the privilege of The Curia of 880 expressively commemorating that the protection of The Curia was granted, neglecting all other temporal rulers. In fact, Charles III could present himself as Emperor of the Roman (practically West-Roman) Empire — even not acknowledged in his function by the real Roman Emperor, the Emperor of Byzantium — and, moreover, in the function of the worldly representative of the universalistic spiritual power of The Curia. Only in this way we can explain Sventopulk's oath given not to the emperor of the Franconians but to the worldly representative of The Curia outside the Franconian Empire as well: as a matter of fact the oath was a fief allegiance to The Curia ensuing from the privilege of 880. The rightness of this explanation is borne out by another letter of The Curia of the following year (885, Cod. dipl. Boh. I, 26) which confirmed the direct protection of the Curia granted already before and aimed against the rulers of Franconia, cf. *L. Havlík*, (Great Moravia and the Empire of Francia) 160–163.
- 92 The news about Methodius's meeting with a Hungarian king on the banks of the Danube gives evidence of this, The Life of Archbishop Methodius, Chapt. XVI, cf. *F. Grivec*, Vitae Const. et Methodii, Acta Acad. Velehrad. XVII, 1941, 124. The denomination of king was used in Byzantine hagiography for the kings and emperors of Franconia for the most part (the dignity of emperor was not acknowledged for the rulers of Franconia). Therefore, it is not excluded that the mentioned *кѣралъ* (king) was just Charles III, because some later copyist — knowing nothing about a Frankish king on the middle Danube but well acquainted with the rule of Hungarian kings in those regions — might correct the text according to the situation of his time. It is possible, of course, that the reports from The Life of Archbishop Methodius might be in connection with the Duke of the Magyars who invaded the Basin of the Carpathians in the 9th cent., or that it might concern the King of Bulgaria as well. *L. Havlík*, (The Mission of Byzantium and Great Moravia) 126.

- ⁹³ The Life of Archbishop Methodius, Chapt. XVII, cf. also the commonitorium of Pope Stephen V, Cod. dipl. Boh. I, 27.
- ⁹⁴ We hear of in from the letter of Pope Stephen V, Cod. dipl. Boh. I, 26.
- ⁹⁵ Zventopolco, regi Sclavorum, Cod. dipl. Boh. I, 26. Quia te zelo fidei sanctorum principi Petro... omni devocione devovisti eiusque vicarium per cunctis huius fluctivagi saeculi principibus principalem patronum elegisti, eiusque cum primatibus ac reliquo terrae populo tuicioni pariter commissisti; ... deum exoramus... in cuius manu sunt omnia iura regnorum... Nos etiam... debitam sollicitudinem pro te gerentes in quocumque indigneris negocio, ... protectorem invenies in omnibus. Quem obfidei dignitatem cum omnibus tuis fidelibus, nulla terrarum obsistente intercedere... amplectimur...
- ⁹⁶ On Sventopulk and his dignity of king cf. *L. Havlík*, (Great Moravia and the Empire of Francia) 165—170, and *id.* Great Moravia and the Slavs of Central Europe, Chapt. II/4, quot. 303.
- ⁹⁷ It is difficult to specify what the subject of the interdict was like when being in essence that described in 869 and 880 as privilege, i. e. the granting of usage of the Old Slavonic language after preceding quotation in Latin. In fact, the interdict might concern nothing else but the use of the Old Slavonic language without preceding Latin; in this way the commonitorium (Cod. dipl. Boh. I, 27) can be interpreted as well.
- ⁹⁸ The commonitorium to Bishop Dominic and clergymen John and Stephen, Cod. dipl. Boh. I, 27.
- ⁹⁹ Gorazd's citation to The Curia and his deposition as the Archbishop pronounced in the commonitorium might lead to the conclusion that Gorazd had been consecrated as Bishop already before, cf. *H. Richter*, *Slovanské kapitoly z české historie*, II. Slovo k otázce cyrilometodějské (A Word to the Problemy of Cyril and Methodius), Olomouc 1922.
- ¹⁰⁰ News about these events is brought by the Greek Life of Bishop Clement, Chapt. VII—XIII, written about 1100 by Theophylact, Archbishop of Bulgaria, on the basis of a brief Old Slavonic text. The biographer narrates that the disciples of Methodius were expelled by German soldiers, probably those of Bishop Wiching. On Bishop Clement cf. *M. Kusseff*, *St. Clement of Ochrida*, The Slavonic and East European Review 28, 1948/1949. Another news on the events is presented by The Life of Nahum, cf. *M. Kusseff*, *St. Nahum*, The Slav. and East Europ. Review 29, 1950/1951. Some of Methodius's disciples appeared on the territory of Bulgaria, e. g. Angelar, Clement, Nahum, Sava, Constantin. But we have no evidence of the fate of Gorazd: according to one supposition he might be buried at Berat, according to another he might have continued in his work in the land of the Vistulians (Minor Polonia), cf. *K. Lanckorońska*, *Studies on the Roman—Slavonic Rite in Poland*, Roma 1961, 12—70.
- ¹⁰¹ The biographer of Clement, though he was tendentious against Svantopulk because of his sanctioning developments in favour of the Latin clergy and The Curia, expressedly emphasized that the expelling of Methodius's disciples was performed during the absence of Svantopulk because he held them in high esteem and would never have given his consent to this action, if he had been at home. It is necessary to stress this part of The Life, because it has been overlooked until now and Svantopulk has been unjustly accused of animosity towards the disciples of Methodius.

KONSTANTIN A METODĚJ NA MORAVĚ

Velmi malá pozornost byla dosud věnována otázkám politického významu působení byzantské mise na Moravě, zvláště pak v souvislosti s vysokou evropskou hrou politických sil. V úsilí Velké Moravy o zabezpečení samostatnosti vůči Franské, resp. Východofranské říši se moravští panovníci Rostislav a Svatopluk orientovali nejprve na politiku Východořímské říše a cařihradského patriarchátu. Byzanc ve shodě se svými zájmy (proti Východofranské říši a kurii) poslala na Moravu svou misi, vedenou Konstantinem a Metodějem. V dalším období se stala oporou Moravanů proti franko-bavorským politickým aspiracím římské kurie, sledující upevnění svých posic v Podunají (hlavně proti bavorskému episkopátu) a snažící se vytvořit z Velkomoravské říše protiváhu na podporu svých politických záměrů ve Franské říši i snahám Byzance v Ilyriku. Orientace velkomoravské politiky na kurii na jedné straně sice zabezpečila v evropském měřítku Velkomoravskou říši proti nárokům Říše franské i po stránce právní, avšak na druhé straně způsobila přerušování rozvoje slověnské duchovní kultury na Moravě v domácím jazyce.