

JULIA VERKHOLANTSEV

*LITTERA SPECIALIS... A BEATO JERONIMO:*  
HOW DID STS. CYRIL AND METHODIUS LOSE  
RECOGNITION AS INVENTORS OF THE GLAGOLITIC  
LETTERS TO ST. JEROME?

In both Orthodox and Catholic Churches, Sts. Cyril and Methodius are now venerated as the creators of the Slavonic letters and as the Apostles to the Slavs.<sup>1</sup> Until the eighteenth century, though, Cyril and Methodius shared this honor with St. Jerome, a celebrated translator of the Vulgate Bible, who was also believed to be a creator of the Slavonic (Glagolitic) letters due to his extraordinary philological talents and, more importantly, his alleged Slavic origin.<sup>2</sup> This belief was first recorded in a special permission that Pope Innocent IV

(<sup>1</sup>) For the sake of terminological clarity in this paper, the term “Slavonic” refers to the ecclesiastical language and tradition that developed from the Old Church Slavonic language introduced among the Slavs by Sts. Constantine-Cyril and Methodius. The term “Slavic” indicates ethnic attribution.

(<sup>2</sup>) St. Jerome (347-419/420) is generally believed to have been born in the town of Strido(n), presumably situated somewhere between Dalmatia and Pannonia. Alternatively, a local Istrian tradition has it that St. Jerome was born at Zrenj near Buzet in Istria. A complete Mass, devoted to St. Jerome, and a special Holy Office devoted to the holiday of the *Translatio* of St. Jerome are attested only in an Istrian Glagolitic codex – the Ljubljana-Beram Breviary of 1396, see Marija Pantelić, *Privotisak glagoljskog misala iz 1483. prema Misalu kneza Novaka iz 1368*, “Radovi Staroslavenskog Instituta”, 6 (1967), 6, pp. 39-40. A strong local devotion to St. Jerome also explains the inclusion of his name in a late fourteenth-century Glagolitic amulet-invocation against the devil, written in Istria, although St. Jerome does not belong to popular protectors against the devil, see Marija Pantelić, *Hrvatskoglagoljski amulet tipa Sisín i Mihael*, “Slovo”, 23 (1973), pp. 161-203, especially p. 188.

granted to Philip, the bishop of Senj (Dalmatia), in 1248, by which the pope allowed to hold the liturgy in Church Slavonic in Philip's diocese. In the following decades and centuries, the reputation of Jerome as a Slavic Apostle grew and he became widely accepted as the inventor of the Glagolitic letters and the Roman Slavonic Rite.

The belief in Jerome's Slavic legacy did not survive the scrutiny of nineteenth-century philology and therefore he did not make it to the honorary podium of Slavic cultural history, as did Cyril and Methodius. Although scholars today almost unanimously refute the legend of Jerome's Slavonic letters, his reputation as a Slavic Apostle nevertheless endures in folk historiography and, occasionally, even in scholarly literature.<sup>3</sup> While it is clear that St. Jerome had no hand in the creation of the Glagolitic letters and the Slavonic liturgy, a perplexing question remains: How did Jerome get credit for the work of Cyril and Methodius in the Croatian Glagolite tradition? This paper attempts to answer this question. While offering hypotheses of why the Glagolites chose St. Jerome as a patron of their letters, the paper examines information about the involvement of Sts. Cyril and Methodius in the establishment of the Slavonic Rite that was available among the Glagolites.

#### *The Moravian Mission of Sts. Cyril and Methodius*

The circumstances of the Byzantine mission to Great Moravia that was undertaken by Sts. Cyril and Methodius around 863 remain one

(<sup>3</sup>) The theme of the Glagolitic script's existence before Cyril and Methodius is popular in the Internet forums and livejournals. Occasionally, Jerome's authorship is used as a proof. In addition, there are several scholarly works that seriously consider this legend, see E. V. Afanas'eva, St. Petersburg, an unpublished dissertation, 1988, and *The Ancient Slavonic Translation of the Book of Job and its Greek Original*, in *18<sup>th</sup> International Congress of Byzantine Studies. Summaries of communications = XVIII Mezhdunarodnyi Kongress Vizantinistov. Rezume soobshchenii. MGU im. M. V. Lomonosova, 8-15 avgusta 1991*. Moskovskii Gosudarstvennyi Universitet, Moscow 1991. The Croatian scholar Marko Japundžić, who has claimed that the Slavic Glagolitic liturgy and writing originated in Croatia at the time of its baptism at the turn of the seventh and eighth centuries, also comes very close to accepting a possibility of Jerome's authorship of Slavonic letters, see Marko Japundžić, *Hrvatska glagoljica*. Hrvatska uzdanica, Zagreb 1998, pp. 9-34.

of the most enigmatic and controversial questions in Slavic medieval studies. The main difficulty in resolving this question is explained by the scarcity of unambiguous documented information which would be needed for any hypothesis to be unconditionally accepted. Most scholars agree that the Byzantine scholar and “philosopher” Constantine-Cyril created the letters that are presently called Glagolitic for the purpose of the mission to Great Moravia in the early 860s and, together with his elder brother Methodius, used them to establish the Slavonic liturgy.<sup>4</sup> It is also generally agreed that after Cyril’s death in 869, Methodius, in his capacity as archbishop, continued to disseminate the Slavonic liturgy among the Western and Southern Slavs.<sup>5</sup>

The task of the Holy Brothers was delicate and went beyond mere evangelization. During the ninth century, Moravia had already been evangelized by the Frankish missionaries of Passau, who

<sup>(4)</sup> Constantine took the name of Cyril at the tonsure shortly before his death in 869 and is now known as St. Cyril.

<sup>(5)</sup> This point of view is shared by most scholars of early Slavic history, although they may not agree on all the details. The literature on this topic is voluminous and in many languages. Documents related to the mission in Moravia are published in several collections. The most recent and comprehensive is *Magnae Moraviae Fontes Historici. Prameny k dejinám Velké Moravy*, 1-5. Edited by Dagmar Bartoňková, Lubomír Havlík, Jaroslav Ludvíkovský, Zdeněk Masařík, Radoslav Večerka. Univerzita J. E. Purkyně, Brno 1967 (further as *MMFH*). The main sources of information about the holy brothers are their vitae. The Church Slavonic *Vita Constantini* was written in Moravia before 885 (earliest copies are from the fifteenth century). The Church Slavonic *Vita Methodii* dates from late ninth or early tenth century (the earliest copy is from the twelfth century). A thorough study of the legends as historical sources, analyzing them in the context of the ninth-century Byzantium has been published by Francis Dvornik, *Les légendes de Constantin et de Méthode vues de Byzance*. (Byzantinoslavica. Supplementa, 1). Prague 1933. An English translation along with the Church Slavonic texts and commentaries are in *Medieval Slavic Lives of Saints and Princes*. Edited by Marvin Kantor. (Michigan Slavic Translations, 5). University of Michigan, Ann Arbor 1983. A Russian translation with an extensive and updated critical commentary is in B. N. Floria, *Skazaniia o nachale slavianskoi pis'mennosti*. Aleteia, St. Petersburg 2004. In addition to Church Slavonic vitae, the Latin *Vita Constantini-Cyrilli cum Translatione S. Clementis*, also known as the *Italian Legend*, provides additional evidence for Cyril’s life (*MMFH*, II, pp. 120-133).

claimed jurisdiction over it.<sup>6</sup> The Moravian ruler Rastislav, however, weary of German supervision, was seeking ways to make his Church independent. Not long before 863 he turned to the Byzantine Emperor Michael III with a request for a bishop and teacher for his land, capable of instructing Moravians about the Christian faith in their own language.<sup>7</sup> The sources indicate that he might have turned to Rome with a similar request several years earlier.<sup>8</sup> While the pope did not seem to act on Rastislav's request, the Byzantine emperor evidently appreciated the chance to spread his influence to lands already claimed by Western clergy.

The choice of the emperor's ambassadors demonstrates the importance of the Moravian mission to Byzantium. Both Cyril and Methodius were experienced missionaries and celebrated holy men. Equally important, they were proficient in a South Slavic (Macedonian) dialect, which was spoken in their native city of Thessaloniki. The brothers used this language as the foundation for the Church Slavonic language, into which they translated liturgical and selected biblical books,<sup>9</sup> recording them in the specially devised Glagolitic letters.<sup>10</sup> The linguistic aspect of the Byzantine mission stood in con-

<sup>(6)</sup> The Irish and Scottish missionaries were the first to preach in these territories, before the Franks. On the history of conversions in this region, see Ian Wood, *The Missionary Life. Saints and the Evangelisation of Europe 400-1050*. Harlow - New York 2001, pp. 145-206, especially pp. 173-174.

<sup>(7)</sup> *MMFH*, III, p. 144.

<sup>(8)</sup> *MMFH*, III, pp. 143-144.

<sup>(9)</sup> There is an on-going dispute about the number and identity of texts initially translated by Cyril and Methodius and later by Methodius and his assistants, see Francis J. Thomson, *Has the Cyrillomethodian Translation of the Bible Survived? in Thessaloniki. Magna Moravia: Proceedings of the International Conference, Thessaloniki 16-19 October 1997*. Thessaloniki 1999, pp. 149-164; Biserka Grabar, *Ćirilometodski i staroslavenski prijevodi u hrvatskoglagoljskim prijepisima*, "Slovo", 36, 1986, pp. 87-94; A. V. Mikhailov, *K voprosu o literaturnom nasledii Svv. Kirilla i Mefodiiia v glagolicheskikh khorvatskikh missalakh i breviariakh*, "Russkii filologicheskii vestnik", 26/II, Varshava 1904.

<sup>(10)</sup> The graphic foundation of the Glagolitic letters has not been definitely determined. It has been linked to such systems of writing as Greek minuscule and cursive scripts, zodiacal, medical, chemical and shorthand signs, Merovingian Latin, Hebrew, Gothic, Armenian, Georgian, Coptic letters, and Germanic runes. However, while at times one can see a certain degree of resemblance between individual

trast with the established practice of the Frankish Church, which claimed jurisdiction over the Moravian Church, and created uncertainty about the orthodoxy of the new Slavonic liturgy.

The Frankish clergy had been apprehensive of the Slavonic liturgy from its very beginning and continually challenged it. As soon as 867, Cyril and Methodius had to travel to Rome to obtain the Roman Curia's approval of the Slavonic liturgy and ordination for their disciples. At that time, the Slavonic books were blessed by Pope Adrian II and the Slavonic liturgy was sung at the Papal Basilica of St. Peter and other churches.<sup>11</sup> Subsequently, popes alternately forbade and allowed the use of the Slavonic liturgy depending on the political situation in their rivalry for the Slavic flock with Constantinople and the Frankish Church. When Pope John VIII forbade the Slavonic liturgy in 879, Methodius again travelled to Rome to validate the legitimacy of the Slavonic liturgy, which the pope, having had a change of heart, reconfirmed in his bulla of 880. Then again, in 885, his successor Pope Stephen V once more forbade the Slavonic liturgy, allowing the vernacular only in sermons and explanations of the biblical texts.<sup>12</sup> After Methodius' death in 885, the Frankish clergy,

Glagolitic letters and signs of other alphabets, no single system of writing may be genetically connected to Glagolitic. For some recent studies that summarize previous scholarship on this matter and offer new ideas, see Boris Uspenskii, *O prois-khozhdanii glagolitsy*, "Voprosy iazykoznanii", 1 (2005), p. 63; T. A. Ivanova, *Glagolitsa: novye gipotezy*, "Trudy otdela drevnerusskoi literatury", 56 (2004), pp. 78-93; Vojtěch Tkaččík, *Über den Ursprung der Glagolica*, in *Glagolitica. Zum Ursprung der slavischen Schriftkultur*. Edited by Heinz Miklas, Sylvia Richter, Velizar Sadovski. Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Wien 2000, pp. 9-32; Horace Lunt, *Thoughts, Suggestions, and Questions about the Earliest Slavic Writing Systems*, "Wiener Slavistisches Jahrbuch", 46 (2000), pp. 271-286. There have been some attempts to prove that the Slavs had developed their own writing before Cyril and Methodius. However, all attempts to date the Glagolitic letters to the time before the Cyrillo-Methodian mission remain isolated and have not been widely accepted by the scholarly community. Most of these theories are discussed by Radoslav Katičić, *Uz pitanje o postanku i starosti glagoljice*, "Croatica", 42-43-44 (1996), pp. 185-198.

<sup>(11)</sup> *Vita Constantini*, Chapter XVII, *MMFH*, II, pp. 110-111.

<sup>(12)</sup> The letter *Commonitorium Dominico episcopo Iohanni et Stefano presbyteris euntibus ad Sclavos* (The reminder to Bishop Dominic and presbyters John and Stephen on their journey to the Slavs), *MMFH*, III, pp. 226-229.

supported by both secular and ecclesiastical authorities, eradicated Slavonic from the communal worship in Moravia and restored the exclusive use of the Latin liturgy. Attested historical sources do not answer all the questions historians might have about the Cyrillo-Methodian mission, but from what is known about the turmoil around the Slavonic liturgy in Moravia and Pannonia at the end of the ninth century it becomes clear that the new Slavonic liturgy was as much a political tool as it was a religious ritual.

*Was the Slavonic Liturgy a Heresy?*

Why did the Slavonic letters' legitimacy become such a point of contention at the end of the ninth century? Was the establishment of a new liturgical language considered heresy by the Christian doctrine? Or was its legitimacy a question of politics rather than dogma?

The *Vita Constantini*, a devotional account of St. Constantine-Cyril's life, which relates the Cyrillo-Methodian mission, records objections made by the Frankish and Latin clergy against the Slavonic liturgy first in Moravia and later in Venice. As it pertains to the genre of a *vita*, the opposition to the Slavonic liturgy is described as a result of devil's instigating:

The Devil, not bearing this good, entered into his devices and began to arouse many, saying to them: God is not worshiped by this. For if this pleased Him would He not have established it so that from the very beginning [the Slavs] would worship God by writing their own language with letters?<sup>13</sup> But he chose only three languages: Hebrew, Greek and Latin, which are appropriate for giving glory to God. And so spoke the Latin and Frankish archpriests, priests and their disciples.<sup>14</sup>

<sup>(13)</sup> In about half of the attested copies of the *Vita Constantini*, a variant is писаниа, 'writings' (*Vita Constantini*, Chapter XV, *MMFH*, II, p. 102).

<sup>(14)</sup> "Дьяволъ, не терпѣ сего добра, нѣ вшедъ въ своа съсоуды, начатъ многы въздвизати, глагола имъ: не славитсѣ богъ о семъ. аще бо бы емоу сице оудно было, не бы ли могъ створити, да быша исперва писмены пишюще бесѣды своа, славиа бога? но три языки оубо есть токмо (избралъ) евѣискъ, греческъ и

In 867 in Venice, where, according to a hypothesis advanced by a number of scholars, Cyril and Methodius arrived to seek the Grado Patriarch's official approval of their mission,<sup>15</sup> Cyril is being reproached for the lack of authority of his new writings:

When he [Constantine] was in Venice, the Latin bishops, priests and monks gathered against him like ravens against a falcon. And they advanced the trilingual heresy, saying: "Tell us, O man, how is it that you now teach books [letters] that you yourself created for the Slavs, which none else have invented before, neither the Apostle, nor the pope of Rome, nor Gregory the Theologian, nor Jerome, nor Augustine? We know of only three languages worthy of praising God in books, Hebrew, Greek, and Latin."<sup>16</sup>

The Church Slavonic word that indicates Cyril's creation is **кѣнигы**, 'the books, writings, Holy Scripture, letters'. Traditionally, translators of the *Vita Constantini* use the meaning 'the letters' to match it with the translation of the Church Slavonic **писмены**, 'the letters', in the passage describing the Frankish clergy's allegations quoted above.<sup>17</sup> However, there is a reason why the Latin clergy in

латиньскыи, илиже достонитъ словоу богу въздавати. бѣша же се глаголюще латиньстии и фряжестии архирѣи съ иерѣи и оученици", *Vita Constantini*, Chapter XV, *ММФН*, II, pp. 102-103.

(<sup>15</sup>) Analyzing the text of the *Vita Constantini*, Floria substantiates the assumption made by E. Golubinskii and I. Malyshevskii that the initial object of Cyril's and Methodius' expedition was the consecration of their disciples by the Patriarch of Grado and that a special Synod met in Venice to decide on this case, see B. N. Floria, *Skazaniia o nachale slavianskoi pis'mennosti*, cit., pp. 256-258, 260-261. Other proposed destinations for Cyril's and Methodius' expedition include Rome, Constantinople, and Aquilea (*ММФН*, II, p. 104).

(<sup>16</sup>) "Въ наѣцѣхъ же бывъшоу емоу, собращася на нь латиньстии епископи и поповѣ и чернорисци яко врани на соколъ, и въздвигоша триязычноу ересь, глаголюще: (чловѣче), скажи намъ, како ты еси нынѣ створилъ словѣномъ книги, и оучиши а, иуже нѣсть никтоже инъ первѣе обрѣлъ, ни апостолъ, ни римьскыи папезь, ни фелогъ григори, ни иеронимъ, ни авгоустинъ? мы же три языки токмо вѣдъмъ, илиже достонитъ въ книгахъ славити бога, еврѣиски, еллиньскы, латиньскы", *Vita Constantini*, Chapter XVI, *ММФН*, II, pp. 105-106.

(<sup>17</sup>) *Vita Constantini*, Chapter XVI, *ММФН*, II, p. 105 (*pisma*), *Medieval Slavic Lives...*, cit., p. 71 (*letters*), B. N. Floria, *Skazaniia o nachale slavianskoi pis'mennosti*, cit., p. 170 (*письмена*).

Venice should also be concerned with Cyril's invention of the **кѣнигы** in its primary meaning – the books. Indeed, the controversy was not so much over the Slavonic letters *per se* but rather over their application, that is, that they were used not simply for catechization and preaching but that the new letters were used to translate holy canonical books into a language in which no previous authoritative Christian Father had written before. The Latin clergy themselves recorded texts in Slavic using the Latin letters. But these were sermons, prayers and confessional formulae, utilized for catechetical purposes, not for canonical books.<sup>18</sup> Therefore, the concern about the “Slavonic letters” addresses the issue of using a language different from Latin, whereas the concern about the “Slavonic books” addresses the use of theologically problematic liturgical books, which, incidentally, contain texts from the Scripture. In this way, one can see different aspects of anxiety that the Slavonic letters aroused among the Frankish and Latin clergy: the Frankish clergy were disturbed by the competition created by the Slavonic clergy and their new letters, whereas the Venice Synod clergy could have been seriously alarmed by the potential doctrinal unorthodoxy and inaccuracy of the newly translated liturgical and biblical books.

Cyril's dispute in Venice with the Frankish and Latin clergy is described in the sources as a controversy with “heretical trilinguists”, in which Cyril refutes the idea that only three languages may be used in worship.<sup>19</sup> To oppose a popular view which takes the *vita's* account at face value, Francis Thomson has argued that there was no doctrine of “three liturgical languages” either in the Western or in the Eastern Churches. He proposes to distinguish between the idea of Hebrew, Greek and Latin as the three sacred languages (as a symbolic *trinitas linguarum*) and the doctrine prescribing the use of only Hebrew, Greek and Latin in the liturgy. Thomson's arguments

<sup>(18)</sup> The most famous example is the Freising Fragments, recently published again in *Brižinski spomeniki. Monumenta Frisingensia. Znanstvenokritična izdaja*. Edited by France Bernik, Igor Grdina, Janez Zor, Marko Kranjec, Jože Faganel, Darko Dolinar. Založba ZRC, ZRC SAZU, Ljubljana 2004.

<sup>(19)</sup> Francis J. Thomson, *SS. Cyril and Methodius and a Mythical Western Heresy: Trilinguism. A Contribution to the Study of Patristic and Mediaeval Theories of Sacred Languages*, “Analecta Bollandiana”, 110 (1992), pp. 67-121.

are as follows. Only Slavic sources refer to the controversy about the Slavonic liturgy as a dispute of St. Cyril with trilinguists-Pilatists. Also, in the sources, this is not a self-identifying term, it is Constantine who calls them “trilinguists”. While all Latin sources acknowledge the opposition to liturgical innovation by papacy, nowhere in the Latin sources is a mention of trilinguism in liturgy recorded. With no reference to the Cyrillo-Methodian mission, “Trilinguism” seems to be a Byzantine definition of one of the errors of the Western Church found in especially compiled catalogues of Latin errors. However, this “error” did not seem to concern the language of liturgy.

Further, Thomson argues that there never existed a doctrine of “three liturgical languages” but that the idea of three sacred languages was inspired by the presence of the Greek and Hebrew words in the Latin Mass, constituting a symbol of *trinitas linguarum*. This symbolic unity of three sacred languages in one Mass is not tantamount to a doctrine of liturgical trilinguism. (Besides, nobody celebrated the Divine Office in Hebrew or Greek in the Roman and Frankish Empires.) Thomson also maintains that Isidore of Seville and others before and after him, who called these languages sacred, only referred to Hebrew, Greek and Latin as languages of the Bible and advocated the knowledge of these languages for accurate interpretation. Importantly, during the first centuries of Christianity, the Roman Church was eager to elevate Latin, which was not a language of the original Holy Scriptures, to the same status as Greek and Hebrew.

Finally, Thomson points out, both Roman and Byzantine ecclesiastical authorities insisted that their subjects use Latin and Greek languages respectively in the services. However, this was done primarily due to considerations of religious unity and cultural homogeneity in imperial provinces.

It should be noted that the argument that the Slavonic language does not belong among the three sacred languages is made only by the Frankish and Latin clergy in Moravia and Venice and is not supported by the Byzantine Patriarch and the Apostolic Pontiff in Rome. From the Byzantine perspective, there seemed to be no doctrinal concern about creating a new alphabet for the Slavs. Accord-

ing to the *Vita Constantini*, when Emperor Michael charged Constantine with a mission to the Slavs the latter responded that he would accept the commission if the Slavs had their own letters. The lack of literacy among the Slavs (whether in Greek or in Slavic) seemed to trouble Byzantine emperors for generations: Michael replied that his father and grand-father had been looking in vain for the Slavic letters. He thought that the time had come to create them.<sup>20</sup>

Roman popes, too, blessed the Slavonic liturgy several times. When Cyril and Methodius arrived in Rome in the winter of 868, Pope Adrian II blessed the Slavonic books, ordered the Slavonic liturgy to be sung in principal Roman churches, and ordained Cyril's and Methodius' disciples, as well as Methodius himself, as priests.<sup>21</sup> Again, in 880, Pope John VIII, after having questioned Methodius on the tenets of his faith, bestowed on him all duties and privileges of the archbishop of Moravia. John VIII's letter to Prince Svatopluk of Moravia demonstrates that considerations of Methodius' adher-

<sup>(20)</sup> *Vita Constantini*, Chapter XIV, *MMFH*, II, pp. 99-100.

<sup>(21)</sup> The sources show some variation in the description of these events. The *Vita Constantini* relates that the pope put the Slavonic books in the Church of Santa Maria Maggiore and sanctified them. Then he ordered bishops Formosus and Gauderic to ordain Cyril's and Methodius' disciples. The ordination was accompanied by the service in Slavonic at St. Peter's. After that, for several days the liturgy was celebrated in Slavonic in various churches of Rome (*Vita Constantini*, Chapter XVII, *MMFH*, II, pp. 110-111). One of the copies of the *Italian Legend* relates that Adrian II consecrated Methodius bishop, while others mention only a priestly office (*Vita Constantini-Cyrilli cum translatione S. Clementis*, *MMFH*, II, p. 130). In the *Vita Methodii*, the pope called Cyril's opponents *пѣлатъныи и трѣязъчычныи* ("Pilatusists and trilinguists") and condemned them. He also put the Slavonic Gospel on the altar at St. Peter's and consecrated Methodius. Later, at the requests of Prince Kocel of Pannonia and Rastislav of Moravia, the pope consecrated Methodius archbishop of Sirmium and Moravia (*Zhitie Mefodiia*, *MMFH*, II, pp. 146-154). There is a scholarly dispute regarding the nature and geography of Methodius' office as archbishop (Imre Bobe, *The Episcopacy of St. Methodius*, "Slavic Review", 26, 1967, pp. 85-93; Henrik Birnbaum, *Where was the Missionary Field of SS. Cyril and Methodius?* in *Thessaloniki...*, cit., pp. 47-52; Martin Eggers, *The Historical-Geographical Implications of the Cyrillo-Methodian Mission Among the Slavs*, in *Thessaloniki...*, cit., pp. 65-86; Horace G. Lunt, *Cyril and Methodius with Rastislav Prince of Moravia: Where Were They?* in *Thessaloniki...*, cit., pp. 87-112).

ence to the teachings of the Latin Church were John's primary concern:

Accordingly, we questioned this Methodius, your venerable archbishop, in the presence of our brother bishops, whether he adheres to the creed of faith [*fidei symbolum*] in the orthodox way and during the sacred liturgical rites sings as is held by the holy Roman Church and as was announced and established by holy six universal councils of holy fathers according to the evangelical authority of our Lord Christ. He thus declared that he believes and sings [the Psalms] according to the evangelical and apostolic teaching, as the Holy Roman Church teaches and as was established by the fathers. Moreover, we, having learned that he is orthodox and useful in all ecclesiastical teachings and matters send him back to you again to govern the God's church [...]<sup>22</sup>

The mention of the *fidei symbolum* refers to the doctrinal dispute between the Western and Eastern Churches over the addition of the word *filioque* to the Nicene Creed.<sup>23</sup> Apparently, Methodius' loyalty

(<sup>22</sup>) “*Igitur hunc Methodium venerabilem archiepiscopum vestrum interrogavimus corampositis fratribus nostris episcopis, si orthodoxe fidei symbolum ita crederet et inter sacra missarum sollempnia caneret, sicuti sanctam Romanam ecclesiam tenere et in sanctis sex universalibus synodis a sanctis patribus secundum evangelicam Christi Dei nostri auctoritatem promulgatum atque traditum constat. Ille autem professus est se iuxta evangelicam et apostolicam doctrinam, sicuti sancta Romana ecclesia docet et a patribus traditum est, tenere et psallere. Nos autem illum in omnibus ecclesiasticis doctrinis et utilitatibus orthodoxum et proficuum esse repperientes vobis iterum ad regendam commissam sibi ecclesiam Dei remisimus...*”, the letter *Dilecto filio Sventopolcho glorioso comiti* (To beloved Svatopluk, glorious ruler), June 880, *MMFH*, III, pp. 203-204.

(<sup>23</sup>) The dispute concerned a disagreement regarding the Procession of the Holy Spirit. The Eastern Church refused to recognize the dogma of the double Procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son, believing that it proceeds only from the Father. This important doctrinal difference was expressed in the Nicene Creed by adding *filioque*, “and from Son”, to the original phrase *et in Spiritum Sanctum... qui ex Patre procedit*, “and in Holy Spirit..., which proceeds from the Father”. During the apostolate of John VIII, in the Roman practice, the *Symbolum fidei* did not yet contain the addition *filioque*. Methodius followed the same practice, whereas the Frankish Church included it (*ivi*, p. 203). The theological dispute about the nature of the Holy Spirit is also apparent in Pope Stephen V's letters, see the letter *Stephanus episcopus servus servorum Dei Zventopolcho regi Sclavorum* (Bishop Ste-

to the Papal See so much pleased the pope that in his letter he expressed his warmest approval of Methodius, referring to him as “confrater noster” and “reverentissimus” and lavishing on him the highest praise. The letter clearly shows that the pope did not consider the use of Slavonic in the liturgy a breach of doctrine:

Finally, we rightly commend the Slavonic writing, invented by a certain Constantine the Philosopher so that God’s praise may duly sound in it, and we decree that in this language the glory and acts of our Lord Christ be interpreted. Indeed, by sacred authority we admonish to praise God not only in three but in all languages, as is taught saying: *Praise the Lord, all you Gentiles! Laud Him, all you peoples!*<sup>24</sup> [...] And nothing in the faith or doctrine inhibits either to sing masses or to read the Holy Gospel or divine lectures from New and Old Testaments in this Slavonic language, [if they are] well translated and interpreted, or to sing all other offices of the hour: for He who made the three principal languages, that is, Hebrew, Greek and Latin, also created all others for His praise and glory.<sup>25</sup>

Indeed, the use of the Slavonic language *per se* was not the central issue. The teaching in the vernacular, in the form of preaching, was a long established practice of Roman and Frankish missionaries. However, the theological differences between the Eastern and Western Churches, such as the dispute on the Procession of the Holy

phen, the Servant of God’s Servants to Svatopluk, the King of the Slavs), *ivi*, pp. 220-221, and the letter *Commonitorium Dominico episcopo...*, cit., p. 228.

(<sup>24</sup>) New King James Bible, Ps. 117, 1. (The distinction between the *populus* = Jews and the *gens* = all other peoples is made by Jerome in his translation from the Hebrew.)

(<sup>25</sup>) “*Litteras denique Sclaviniscas a Costantino quondam philosopho repper-  
tas, quibus Deo laudes debite resonent, iure laudamus et in eadem lingua Christi  
domini nostri preconia et opera enarrentur, iubemus. Neque enim tribus tantum,  
sed omnibus linguis Dominum laudare auctoritate sacra monemur, quę præcipit di-  
cens: “Laudate Dominum omnes gentes et collaudate eum omnes populi” [...] Nec  
sane fidei vel doctrinę aliquid obstat sive missas in eadem Sclavinica lingua canere  
sive sacrum evangelium vel lectiones divinas novi et veteris testamenti bene trans-  
latas et interpretatas legere aut alia horarum officia omnia psallere, quoniam, qui  
fecit tres linguas principales, Hebream scilicet, Grecam et Latinam, ipse creavit et  
alias omnes ad laudem et gloriam suam*”, the letter *Dilecto filio Sfantopolcho glo-  
rioso comiti*, cit., pp. 207-208.

Spirit, had already become a matter of serious disagreement. These were expressed in the liturgical and biblical texts, which Methodius and his followers disseminated in Slavonic. The linguistic barrier, which did not allow for easy investigation of the translated texts used by the Slavs in religious rites, caused understandable uneasiness in Rome. This is why, from the very beginning of the Moravian mission, the leaders of the Slavonic Church were repeatedly summoned to Rome to testify personally (and, most likely, in Latin) to their doctrinal orthodoxy and allegiance to the Roman Curia. Even Pope Stephen V, who appeared to be a severe critic of Methodius' leadership of the Moravian Church, was apparently ready to negotiate with Methodius' successor. In the letter of instruction that Stephen V addressed to his legates to Moravia, Bishop Dominic and Presbyters John and Stephen, in which he accuses Methodius of self-government and charges his messengers to eradicate the Slavonic liturgy in Moravia, he indicates that he could prove more lenient, were Methodius' successor to come directly to Rome and profess his creed:

By our apostolic authority forbid the successor, whom Methodius against the decisions of all holy Fathers himself dared to ordain, to perform his service until he comes to us and explains his position personally [literally, 'in live voice'].<sup>26</sup>

However, Methodius' successor, Gorazd, never went to Rome to defend his faith. Instead, the proponents of the Slavonic liturgy were forced to leave Moravia, while some of them were imprisoned and sold at the slave market in Venice. Despite this crisis, the Slavonic liturgy did not die. It soon flourished again in Bulgaria, where Cyril's and Methodius' disciples received cordial welcome.

If the creation of the new letters and the establishment of the liturgy in a new tongue was not a doctrinal issue (or at least one not clearly defined), then the case of the Slavonic liturgy depended largely on politics. Cyril and, after Cyril's death, Methodius skill-

<sup>(26)</sup> "*Successorem, quem Methodius sibimet contra omnium sanctorum patrum statuta constituere praesumpsit, ne ministret, nostra apostolica auctoritate interdicite, donec suam nobis praesentiam exhibeat et causam suam viva voce exponat*", the letter *Commonitorium Dominico episcopo...*, cit., p. 229.

fully negotiated with the authorities and traveled repeatedly to Rome and Constantinople when it was necessary, expanding the corpus of Slavonic translations and training clergy. The role of Methodius was especially decisive in the expansion and preservation of the Slavonic liturgy. His contribution to the cause of disseminating the Slavonic liturgy was invaluable during the years subsequent to Cyril's death, and his remarkable diplomatic skills allowed the Slavonic liturgy to take deep roots and persevere through the years to come despite numerous obstacles.<sup>27</sup>

#### *The Beginnings of Sts. Cyril's and Methodius' Cult*

The date and route by which the Slavonic liturgy appeared in Croatia are unclear. Some scholars attribute its emergence to the efforts of Cyril and Methodius themselves. Others argue that it was brought to the Croatian lands later by the Holy Brothers' disciples at the end of the ninth or the beginning of the tenth century. Why, then, did the Glagolitic clergy seek another patron for their letters and not simply resort to the authority of Sts. Cyril and Methodius as the Slavic Apostles? Jerome's reputation as the inventor of the Slavonic Glagolitic letters could only have been established in the absence of other contenders for this position. What happened to Cyril's and Methodius' cult in the decades and centuries following their death? And, more importantly, were they ever venerated as the creators of the Slavonic letters in Croatia?

Unfortunately, there is no adequate body of surviving manuscripts to accurately document the beginnings of Sts. Cyril's and Methodius' cult. There are no direct documents regarding the date and manner of their canonization and little is known about the first several centuries of their veneration. In addition, as Anthony-Emil Tachiaos has observed, sanctity and missionary self-sacrifice were at the core of Cyril's and Methodius' cults as saints.<sup>28</sup> As a result,

<sup>(27)</sup> Josip Bratulić, *Rimska Kurija i misija Konstantina-Ćirila i Metodija*, "Slovo", 36 (1986), pp. 45-50.

<sup>(28)</sup> Anthony-Emil N. Tachiaos, *Cyril and Methodius of Thessalonica. The Acculturation of the Slavs*. St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, Crestwood, NY, 2001, p. 146.

the ecclesiastical texts devoted to them focused much more on their spiritual virtues than on their intellectual and cultural achievements. Therefore, it is hard to determine the extent to which their role as the Slavic Apostles, and more specifically as patrons-inventors of the Slavonic letters, contributed to the development of their cults during the first several centuries.

The foundations of Sts. Cyril's and Methodius' cult were already laid by the end of the ninth century, shortly after their death. At that time, the saints' *vitae* were written by their disciples in Moravia and their representations were placed in Cyril's burial place.<sup>29</sup> Methodius is thought to have contributed eight chapters to the *Vita Constantini*, the complete text of which was composed some time between Cyril's death in 869 and 880, possibly originally in Greek. Cyril's *vita*, although it incorporates a fair amount of secular elements, is, nevertheless, written as a hagiographical composition and celebrates above all his sanctity, divine gifts and Christian virtues. The *Vita Methodii* was written between Methodius' death in 885 and Moravia's fall to the Hungarians in 905. Its main focus is the demonstration of Methodius' orthodoxy and holiness, the hardship and self-sacrifice of his work as a holy shepherd. Importantly, it documents the recognition and admiration of Methodius by secular and ecclesiastical hierarchs, especially by the pope. In both texts, Constantine-Cyril, although a layman, is given precedence as far as the missionary work is concerned, while Methodius, although an archbishop, acts as Cyril's assistant and his successor.<sup>30</sup>

For the sake of celebrating the saints' feast days, shorter liturgical texts were composed, consisting of *encomia*, services and short *synaxarium* readings. These were written partly in Moravia and partly in Bulgaria, where the missionaries found refuge after Methodius'

<sup>(29)</sup> The fresco depicting Sts. Cyril and Methodius bringing the relics of St. Clement to Rome is in the Basilica of St. Clement in Rome, where St. Cyril is buried.

<sup>(30)</sup> Some scholars argue that Cyril was consecrated bishop in Rome, in 869, and that he declined this title because he felt the approach of death. This claim is based on the text of the *Italian Legend* as well as on the fact that on all early icons Cyril is depicted as bishop (*MMFH*, II, p. 130; Michael Lacko, *Early Iconography of Sts. Cyril and Methodius In Slav Eastern Churches*, "Slovak Studies", 12, 1972, pp. 193-200).

death.<sup>31</sup> In Bulgaria, the cult of the Holy Brothers was developed in the centers of the Slavonic missionary and literary activity: in Preslav and, especially, in Ohrid, the workplace of Clement, Cyril's and Methodius' disciple. Clement of Ohrid is believed to be the author of the *Encomia* to St. Cyril and Methodius. In the *Encomium* to St. Cyril, as well as in the *Office*, his invention of the Slavonic letters is mentioned as only one of many accomplishments. He is presented as a universal figure of Christian *oikumene* and, just like in his *vita*, his multi-national missionary activity is emphasized and he is likened to Apostle Paul. After Methodius' death, the *Encomium* to both Holy Brothers was composed, as well as a separate *Office* to St. Methodius. The *Office*, written by Cyril's and Methodius' disciple Constantine of Preslav, praises the pastoral work of Methodius, linking him to Apostle Andronicus, the first bishop of Pannonia.<sup>32</sup>

The oldest known iconographic representation of St. Cyril in the Slavic Orthodox churches is an eleventh-century fresco in the Cathedral Church of Hagia Sophia in Ohrid. On the wall of the southern nave, St. Cyril is depicted along with St. Clement of Ohrid, his disciple. The Greek inscription identifies St. Cyril as *Agios Kyrillos didaskalos ton Slavon* – 'St. Cyril the teacher of the Slavs'. Both figures are shown as bishops, clothed in episcopal garments. In his right hand, Cyril holds a book of the Gospels.<sup>33</sup>

The most important source, apart from Cyril's and Methodius' *vitae*, that documents Cyril's invention of the Slavic letters was

(<sup>31</sup>) As it is with many other issues concerning Cyrillo-Methodian mission, there is some disagreement about the place and authorship of these texts. Due to the fact that the *Encomium* and *Office to St. Cyril* do not mention his brother Methodius scholars assume that they were composed during Methodius' life.

(<sup>32</sup>) Incidentally, these references of Cyril and Methodius to Apostles Paul and Andronicus come up in the Rus' *Primary Chronicle*, in the passage which commemorates the beginnings of the Slavic letters, see Horace G. Lunt, *What the Rus' Primary Chronicle Tells Us about the Origin of the Slavs and of Slavic Writing*, in *Rhetoric of the Medieval Slavic World. Essays presented to Edward L. Keenan on his Sixtieth Birthday*, "Harvard Ukrainian Studies", 19 (1996), pp. 335-357.

(<sup>33</sup>) Mirjana Ćorović-Ljubinković, *Odras kulta Ćirila i Metodija u balkanskoj srednevekovnoj umetnosti*, in *Simpozium 110-godišnjina od smrtta na Kiril Solunski*, vol. I. Edited by Radmila Ugrinova-Skalovska. Makedonska Akademija na Naukite i Umetnostite, Skopje 1970, pp. 123-130.

written in a prominent center of Slavonic writing in Bulgaria, Preslav. This is the treatise *On the Letters*, often ascribed to one monk Khrabr after its title, *сказание о письменехъ чрьноризьца хробра* (On the Letters of Monk Khrabr or On the Letters of the Brave Monk), originally written in Glagolitic at the end of the ninth or the beginning of the tenth century.<sup>34</sup> The treatise *On the Letters* analyzes Cyril's invention of the Slavonic letters vis-à-vis Greek grammatical thought. The author refers to Cyril's holiness and to divine Providence to argue the sacred origin of the Slavonic letters:

But then the lover of man, God, [...] having pitied the Slavic race, sent them Constantine the Philosopher, who was named Cyril, a man righteous and sincere. [...] But the Slavic Scriptures, Constantine alone, named Cyril, both made the letters and translated the Scriptures in few years [...] Therefore, the Slavic letters are holier and more venerable, for a holy man has made them, while the Greek were made by the heathen Hellenes.<sup>35</sup>

Little is known about the historical context of this treatise. This apologia appears to have been written in defense of the Glagolitic letters against those Bulgarian bookmen, who insisted on writing with the "Greek" letters that they had used before Cyril's invention. Yet it is unclear how widely this treatise circulated in Bulgaria and in the Balkans generally. Its copies are mostly found in later Rus'

<sup>(34)</sup> An edition of the Church Slavonic *O Pismenekh* is in Kuio Markov Kuev, *Chernorizets Khrabur*. Izd-vo na Bălgarskata akademija na naukite, Sofija 1967. Opinions on the interpretation of the title vary, viewing the word *хробръ*, 'brave', either as a personal name of the author or as a modifier of the word *чрьноризьць*, 'monk'. The original composition is not preserved. William Veder provides a reconstruction of the treatise based on textological analysis of attested manuscript copies. Based on textual reconstruction, Veder argues that the text that is presently known as the *Treatise On the Letters of Monk Khrabr* shows traces of two independent compositions: the treatise *On the Script* and the treatise *On the Letters*. Veder dates the original composition to before ca. 919 and believes it to be a work of anonymous writers, see William R. Veder, *Utrum in Alterum Abiturum Erat? A Study of the Beginnings of Text Transmission in Church Slavic*. Slavica, Bloomington, IN, 1999.

<sup>(35)</sup> *Ivi*, pp. 160, 165.

manuscripts and no copies have been attested in any of the Croatian Glagolitic manuscripts.<sup>36</sup>

*The Cult of Sts. Cyril and Methodius in Croatia*

In Bulgaria, where the cult of Cyril and Methodius was brought and cultivated by their disciples, the saints were undoubtedly venerated as the patrons of the Slavonic (Cyrillic) letters. The situation in Croatia is not that clear. First and foremost, due to the lack of preserved sources, the early stages of Cyril's and Methodius' cult in Croatia are obscure and, unfortunately, no definitive conclusions can be drawn. The cult is documented only since the beginning of the fourteenth century, the date of the oldest attested Croatian Glagolitic missal, Illirico 4, from the Vatican Library (1317-1323), which contains a saints' calendar.<sup>37</sup> The calendar lists Cyril's and Methodius' feast day on February 14, the day of Cyril's death. The majority of other Glagolitic missals and breviaries follow the same practice, with only a few manuscripts having separate feast days for Cyril and Methodius. Judging from the calendars alone, it is hard to determine in what capacity Cyril was venerated by the Glagolites because his liturgical class is generally not specified, while Methodius' class is usually indicated as (bishop)-confessor.<sup>38</sup>

Calendars do not provide any information about the extent of veneration of the Holy Brothers among the Glagolites, nor do they in any way indicate that Cyril and Methodius were venerated as the

<sup>(36)</sup> For the list of the manuscripts see *ivi*, pp. 17-20.

<sup>(37)</sup> Biserka Grabar, *Kult Ćirila i Metodija u Hrvata*, "Slovo", 36 (1986), pp. 141-145.

<sup>(38)</sup> Liturgical classes: apostles, evangelists, martyrs, confessors (including doctors, abbots, etc.) and virgins. For example, Vatican Library Missal Illirico 4 (1317-1323): February 14 – Cyril and Methodius, confessor; Vienna Library Missal Codex Slav 4 (14<sup>th</sup> c.): February 14 – Cyril and Methodius, confessor; the 15<sup>th</sup>-century Missal from the Bodleian Library (MS canon lit. 349): February 14 – Cyril and Valentine and Methodius, martyr; June 4 – Cyril, bishop-confessor; First Vrbnik Missal (1456): February 14 – Valentine, martyr, Cyril and Methodius, confessor; Second Vrbnik Missal (1463): February 14 – Cyril and other confessors; the 15<sup>th</sup>-century Breviary (Ljubljana, #22): February – Cyril and Methodius, confessor, and Valentine, martyr (Josip Vajs, *Najstariji hrvatskoglagojski misal*. Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti, Zagreb 1948).

Slavic Apostles and/or the patrons of the Slavic letters. Furthermore, no attested Glagolitic manuscripts contain the full text of the *Vita Constantini* and *Vita Methodii*. Fragments from the *Vita Constantini* and the *Encomium to St. Constantine*, however, are included in the *Office to Sts. Cyril and Methodius*, which is found in the Glagolitic breviaries starting from the end of the fourteenth century.<sup>39</sup> Among the nine attested breviaries that contain the *Office*, scholars distinguish several textual types, depending on the features used for classification.<sup>40</sup> In general, the fragments include the story about the embassy of Moravian Prince Rastislav to the Byzantine Emperor Michael III, the preparation of Constantine for the Moravian Mission in Constantinople, the coming of the Byzantine missionaries to Moravia (*v stranu češ'ku*), and their activity among the Moravian Slavs (*v zemli češkoj*) up until the first conflict with Frankish clergy and Cyril's death.<sup>41</sup> The parts of the *Vita Constantini* about the Holy Brothers' activity among the Pannonian Slavs, Constantine's apologia of the Slavonic liturgy and letters in Venice, and Rome's approval of the Slavonic books are not included in the Glagolitic *Office*.

The saints' class in the *Office* is defined by the selection of biblical readings from the Common of saints, specific for each class. The oldest type of the *Office*, represented by the Ljubljana Breviary #161 (1396), has readings from the Common of Martyr, whereas other types follow the protocol for the Common of Confessor, in which both brothers are referred to as bishops (*arhierěi*).<sup>42</sup>

<sup>(39)</sup> Ivan Berčić, *Dvie službe rimskoga obreda za svetkovinu svetih Ćirila i Metoda*. U knjižarnici F. Župana, Zagreb 1870.

<sup>(40)</sup> For a detailed discussion of textual variation of the *Office to Sts. Cyril and Methodius* see Marija Pantelić, *Glagoljski brevijar popa Mavra iz godine 1460*, "Slovo", 15-16 (1965), pp. 94-149; Ivanka Petrović, *Sadržajne i literarne osobine odlomaka "Žitija Konstantina-Ćirila" u hrvatskoglagoljskim i ruskim tekstovima*, "Croatica", 19 (1983), pp. 113-129; Marko Japundžić, *Kult i služba Svete Braće Ćirila i Metoda u glagoljskoj literaturi*, in *Tragom hrvatskoga glagolizma*. Kršćanska sadašnjost, Zagreb 1995, pp. 16-46.

<sup>(41)</sup> The quotes in parentheses are from the *Office* in the Breviary of Priest Mavar. Interestingly, the *Office* markedly places the activity of Cyril and Methodius in the Czech lands and not in Moravia. Some breviaries also contain a hymn praising the Czech people, see Marija Pantelić, *Glagoljski brevijar...*, cit., pp. 117-118.

<sup>(42)</sup> *Ivi*, pp. 113-114.

The archaic language of the citations from the *Vita Constantini* and *Encomium* led scholars to the assumption that the *Office* originated in tenth or eleventh-century Bohemia.<sup>43</sup> The Czech scholar Vojtěch Tkadlčík has suggested, however, that the Glagolitic *Office to Sts. Cyril and Methodius* was composed around the 1360s or 1370s at the scriptorium of the Prague Slavonic Monastery Na Slovanech, where the Croatian Glagolites were active at that time.<sup>44</sup> His analysis convincingly demonstrates that the *Office's* language and rhetoric express the ideological and religious aspirations of the Prague Glagolites vis-à-vis the Czech cultural milieu. Tkadlčík explains the archaic language in citations by the fact that the Glagolites drew from old versions of the *Vita Constantini* and *Encomium*. Tkadlčík concludes that the foundation of the Benedictine Monastery Na Slovanech, which promoted the Roman Slavonic liturgy and writing, gave the formerly limited cult of Sts. Cyril and Methodius a new life both in Bohemia and in Croatia, where the text of the *Office* migrated at the end of the fourteenth century.

The fact that among the Croatian Glagolitic manuscripts the *Office to Sts. Cyril and Methodius* is found predominantly in Franciscan breviaries prompted Vjekoslav Stefanić to hypothesize that the Franciscans could have used one of the Bosnian Glagolitic texts as a source for their version of the breviary.<sup>45</sup> Unlike in Dalmatia and Croatia, where the cult of the Holy Brothers was abandoned because Methodius came to be perceived as a heretic by the church officials, liturgical books in Macedonia, Hum and Bosnia retained the cult of Cyril and Methodius and could have provided models to the Croatian Franciscan Glagolites for their reform of liturgical books.

Although in the *Office*, as attested in the Ljubljana Breviary, it is said that Cyril put together letters and began writing books (*i abie*

<sup>(43)</sup> In the beginning, Ivan Berčić dated it to the end of the ninth century. Vatroslav Jagić dated it to the period from the tenth to thirteenth, whereas Petr A. Lavrov, Josef Vajs, Josef Vašica, Radoslav Večerka and Marija Pantelić date it to the tenth or eleventh century Bohemia.

<sup>(44)</sup> Vojtěch Tkadlčík, *K datování hlaholských služeb o sv. Cyrilu a Metoději*, "Slovo", 27 (1977), pp. 85-128.

<sup>(45)</sup> Vjekoslav Stefanić, *Glagoljaši u Kopru god. 1467-1806*, "Starine", 46 (1956), p. 211.

*složivъ pismenaě slova načet besědu pisati*), there is no specification of which letters – Cyrillic or Glagolitic – are being referred to.<sup>46</sup> Generally, until about sixteenth century, Cyrillic and Glagolitic scripts were customarily designated by their ethnic attribution as “Slavic” or “Slavonic” letters.<sup>47</sup> When historical context and manuscript evidence are missing it becomes especially difficult to determine, which of the two alphabets is being referred to. As far as the *Office* is concerned, it is likely that among the Glagolite clergy the letters that Cyril “put together” were thought to be Cyrillic. As a matter of fact, in Bohemia, where the *Office* most likely originated and where Cyril was said to have labored, by the thirteenth century, the Slavonic liturgy was already associated with the Cyrillic letters. This is clear from the fact that the Cyrillic part of the famous Reims Gospel was believed to be an autograph of St. Procopius, a founder of the eleventh-century Sázava Monastery in Bohemia.<sup>48</sup> Consequently, even though the Croatian liturgical books contained some information about Cyril and his letters, it remains unclear, whether the Glagolites had sufficient basis to connect their own letters with those that St. Cyril invented.

Interestingly, the *Office* shows a somewhat vexing negligence of Methodius. If we look at the contents of the *Office* in all its variants, it is mostly devoted to Cyril and mentions Methodius only in passing. The readings, taken from the *Vita Constantini* focus on Cyril; hymns and antiphons are either devoted to Cyril or to both brothers. This negligence is to some extent corrected in a later version of the *Office*, attested in the Breviary of Priest Mavar (1460), where there are several antiphons addressed specifically to Methodius. Yet, re-

<sup>46</sup> Ivan Berčić, *Dvie službe...*, cit., p. 57-58.

<sup>47</sup> Vjekoslav Štefanić, *Nazivi glagoljskog pisma*, “Slovo”, 25-26 (1976), pp. 17-76, especially p. 20.

<sup>48</sup> The King of Bohemia and Holy Roman Emperor Charles IV gave an incomplete Cyrillic Gospel, believed to have been written by St. Procopius, to the Croatian Benedictine Glagolites as a gift upon their establishment of the Slavonic Monastery in Prague in 1347. The paleographic and linguistic study of the manuscript along with the literature on the subject is in Teotyn Rott-Żebrowski, *Kirillov-skaia chast' Reimsskogo evangeliia*. Uniwersytet Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej, Wydział Humanistyczny, Lublin 1985.

markably, although in Priest Mavar's Breviary the brothers are called the "attendants of the Slavonic books" (*knigъ slovin'skihъ služiteli*) and are said to have translated the Slavonic books and to have taught the Czech people, nowhere in the text of the *Office* does one find any explicit indication that St. Cyril invented the Slavonic letters.<sup>49</sup>

To conclude, the examination of the manuscript evidence leads us to the following conclusions. First of all, until the end of the fourteenth century, when the *Office to Sts. Cyril and Methodius* is first attested, there are no Glagolitic sources that show the existence of a special cult of Cyril and Methodius as the creators of the Slavic letters among the Croatian Glagolites. Even if the *Office* was known to the thirteenth-century Glagolites, it did not provide explicit evidence whether the Slavonic letters that St. Cyril invented were Glagolitic (and not Cyrillic). That the Glagolites did not resort to the authority of St. Cyril, a scholar and a saint, in validating their letters to the pope suggests that they were unaware, or at least unsure, of his authorship of their Glagolitic letters.

#### *Cyril and Methodius in Historical Sources*

While there are no early sources that explicitly identify Cyril and Methodius as the inventors of the Slavonic letters (at least, there are no attested sources), there are sources that view Methodius and his teaching in a very negative light.

Already in 870, in order to support the legal claim of the Salzburg See on Pannonia, Adalwin, archbishop of Salzburg, gave orders to document the missionary activities of the Salzburg Church in these lands.<sup>50</sup> The treatise *Conversio Bagoariorum et Carantanorum* (Conversion of the Bavarians and Carantanians) was written at approximately the same time as the Bavarian clergy imprisoned and tried Methodius. It is possible that the *Conversio* was compiled as a part of the accusation evidence. In this document, an anonymous

<sup>(49)</sup> Marija Pantelić, *Glagoljski brevijar...*, cit., pp. 132-139.

<sup>(50)</sup> Pannonia, an old Roman province, was located in the territory of today's Slovenia and western Hungary.

writer (possibly, Adalwin himself?) presents Methodius as the inventor of the infamous Slavonic letters and questionable teaching and accuses him of stealing business from the Latin bishop Rihpald:

He [Rihpald] remained there for a long time, performing his duties, just as his archbishop allowed him, until some Greek, Methodius by name, as a philosopher, has recently invented the Slavonic letters and by replacing with them the Latin language and Roman doctrine, as well as the Latin authoritative letters, for all people in this region rendered worthless the masses and the Gospels and the services of those ecclesiastics, who have celebrated them in Latin. He [Rihpald] was unable to tolerate this, so he returned back [to the Salzburg see].<sup>51</sup>

As in Moravia and Pannonia, the controversies over the Slavonic liturgy in the Balkans began as soon as it arrived in the late ninth or early tenth century. In Dalmatia, where the Slavonic liturgy was brought either by Cyril and Methodius or by their students, it did not find many supporters among the Latin clergy either.<sup>52</sup> The earliest attested documents regarding the Slavonic liturgy in this region are associated with the Split Church Synod of 925. Around the time of the Synod, Pope John X addressed both secular and ecclesiastical hierarchies in Croatia to ensure that the Slavonic liturgy did not take deep roots and was not preferred over Latin.<sup>53</sup> The pope's disap-

<sup>(51)</sup> “*Qui multum tempus ibi demoratus est exercens suum potestative officium, sicut illi licuit archiepiscopus suus, usque dum quidam Graecus Methodius nomine noviter inventis Sclavinis litteris linguam Latinam doctrinamque Romanam atque litteras auctoriales Latinas philosophice superducens vilescere fecit cuncto populo ex parte missas et euangelia ecclesiasticumque officium illorum, qui hoc Latine celebraverunt. Quod ille ferre non valens sedem repetivit Iuvavensem*”, Herwig Wolfram, *Conversio Bagoariorum et Carantanorum. Das Weissbuch der Salzburger Kirche über die erfolgreiche Mission in Karantanien und Pannonien*. Böhlau, Wien 1979, p. 56.

<sup>(52)</sup> There is substantial literature concerning the question of when and in what way the Slavonic liturgy and writing were introduced in Croatia. For a detailed discussion of probable routes of Glagolitic to Croatia and a summary of literature on this subject see Henrik Birnbaum, *How Did Glagolitic Writing Reach the Coastal Regions of Northwestern Croatia?*, “*Croatica*”, 42-43-44 (1996), pp. 67-79.

<sup>(53)</sup> The exact date of the letters is not established. Most likely, they were written right before the Synod.

proval of the Slavonic liturgy shows that by then the Slavonic writing had spread sufficiently to cause the Roman Curia's concern. In his letter to Archbishop John of Split and his suffragan bishops, the pope reproached them for allowing what he called *Methodii doctrina* ('Methodian teachings') to spread in their churches. By "Methodian teachings" he most likely was implying the overindulgence in the use of the Slavonic liturgy, which he perceived as neglect of Latin canonical texts and teachings.<sup>54</sup>

But let it be far from the hearts of the faithful [God forbid], who worship Christ and believe that they can attain another life by their devotion, that they, overlooking the teaching of the Gospel and the canons of the Apostolic books, be attracted by the teaching of Methodius, whom we could not find in any book among the holy writers.<sup>55</sup>

There is a clear opposition between two *doctrinae* in this letter: the *doctrina* of the Gospel and the *doctrina* of Methodius. The Roman Curia's main concern about the legacy of Methodius' teachings, however, was not the fact that they were in the Slavonic tongue, as is usually interpreted. Rather, the Roman Curia was concerned because it was unable to verify the canonicity of these liturgical texts, since in the third decade of the tenth century there was no leader of Methodius' calibre in Dalmatia who could be summoned to Rome to vouch for the orthodoxy of the Slavonic translations. That is why, as a precaution, the pope urged the Dalmatian hi-

<sup>(54)</sup> Radoslav Katičić provides literature on the research and editions of the sources in question, see Radoslav Katičić, *Methodii Doctrina*, "Slovo", 36 (1986), pp. 11-44. Among other things, Katičić suggests that John X was familiar with the ninth-century correspondence of the Roman Curia regarding Methodius' activity in Moravia and Pannonia and therefore was well informed about the details of his teachings.

<sup>(55)</sup> "*Sed absit hoc a fidelibus, qui Christum colunt, et aliam vitam per orationem se credunt posse habere, ut doctrinam euangelii atque canonum volumina, apostolicaque etiam praecepta praetermittentes, ad Methodii doctrinam confugiant, quem in nullo volumine inter sacros auctores comperimus*", *Codex Diplomaticus Regni Croatiae, Dalmatiae et Slavoniae*, vol. I. Edited by Marko Kostrenčić, Jakov Stipišić, Miljen Šamšalović. Izdavački zavod Jugoslavenske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti, Zagreb 1967, p. 30.

erarchy to take measures to unify the practice in their churches according to the Latin rite, if the Slavs wished to remain in Roman jurisdiction (or what he calls a “Mother church”):

Whence, we advise you, our dears, that together with our bishops, John [...] and Leon [...], you put effort to boldly set all things right in your Slavonic land on grounds, say, that in no way you dare to depart in anything from the instruction of aforementioned bishops, so that in the land of the Slavs the Divine Office is performed according to the customs of the Holy Roman Church, that is, in Latin, and not in a foreign [language], because no son must speak or know something, except what his father has advised him. And since the Slavs are very special children of the Holy Roman Church, they have to remain in the teaching of the Mother [...]<sup>56</sup>

The memory of the dissenting Methodius did not fade away. Another criticism of Methodius comes from the thirteenth-century *Historia Salonitana* written by Archdeacon Thomas of Split. This detailed historical account, which contains documents from the Split Synod of 925, also provides records of the Split Synod of 1060. In agreement with its previous decisions, the Synod of bishops once more condemned the Slavonic liturgy and pronounced Methodius a heretic:

Among these [the prelates of Dalmatia and Croatia] it was decreed and established that no one in the future should presume to celebrate the divine mysteries in the Slavonic tongue, but only in Latin and Greek, and that neither should anyone of that language be elevated to holy orders. For they said that a certain heretic called Methodius had devised a Gothic alphabet, and he perniciously wrote a great deal of falsehood against the teachings of the Catholic faith in that

<sup>56</sup>) “Unde hortamur vos dilectos, ut cum nostris episcopis Joanne [...] et Leone [...] iuncti, cunctaque per sclauiniam (variant: salonitanam) terram audacter corrigere satagatis; ea uidelicet (variant: nempe) ratione, ut nullo modo ab illorum supradictorum episcoporum doctrina in aliquo deuiare praesumatis, ita ut secundum mores sanctae romanae ecclesiae in Sclauonorum terra ministerium sacrificii peragant in latina scilicet lingua, non autem in extranea, quia nullus filius aliquid loqui debet, vel sapere, nisi ut pater ei insinuauerit; et quia Sclau specialissimi filii sanctae romanae ecclesiae sunt, in doctrina matris permanere debent [...]”, *ibid.*

same Slavonic language. On account of this, he is said to have been condemned by divine judgement to a swift end.<sup>57</sup>

Finally, another late twelfth or early thirteenth-century source served as a reminder of Methodius' unwelcome appearance in the Balkans. A short document, titled *Excerptum de Karentanis*, based on the *Conversio Bagoariorum et Carantanorum* but somewhat elaborated, was included in a manuscript, Vindobonensis 423. This document calls Methodius a Slav, credits him with the invention of the Slavonic letters and states that he brought his teachings to Pannonia from the Dalmatian Coast:

After this, in some time, there arrived a certain Slav from the land of Istria and Dalmatia, Methodius by name, who invented the Slavonic letters and celebrated the Divine Office in Slavonic, and undermined the Latin language [literally: made Latin worthless]. Finally, he was driven away from the Carantanian lands, went to Moravia and there he rests in peace.<sup>58</sup>

By the thirteenth century, the only areas within the Roman Church's jurisdiction where the Glagolitic Slavonic liturgy survived were Istria and Dalmatia, hence the association of Methodius with this region. The "demotion" of Greek Methodius to a Slav is note-

(<sup>57</sup>) "*Inter que siquidem hoc [i.e. synodus omnium prelatorum Dalmatie et Chroatie] firmatum est et statutum, ut nullus de cetero in lingua Sclavonica presumeret divina misteria celebrare, nisi tantum in Latina et Greca, nec aliquis eiusdem lingue promoveretur ad sacros (ordines). Dicebant enim, Goticas literas a quodam Methodio heretico fuisse repertas, qui multa contra catholice fidei normam in eadem Sclavonica lingua mentiando conscripsit; quam ob rem divino iudicio repentina dicitur morte fuisse dampnatus*", *Thomae Archidiaconi Spalatensis Historia Salonitanorum atque Spalatinorum Pontificum*. Edited by Olga Perić, Damir Karbić, Mirjana Matijević Sokol, James Ross Sweeney. Central European University Press, Budapest - New York 2006, pp. 78-79. In his work, Thomas calls the Glagolitic letters "Gothic" and the Glagolitic clergy – "the Goths".

(<sup>58</sup>) "*Post hunc interiecto aliquo tempore supervenit quidam Sclavus ab Hystrie et Dalmatie partibus nomine Methodius, qui adinvenit Sclavicas literas et Sclauice celebravit divinum officium et vilescere fecit Latinum. Tandem fugatus a Karentanis partibus intravit Moraviam ibique quiescit*", Herwig Wolfram, *Conversio Bagoariorum...*, cit., p. 58; *MMFH*, III, pp. 434-435.

worthy in this document. It shows that ecclesiastical issues were connected to ethnic identity.

In all above mentioned sources, the perpetrator of the controversy and disorder charged with heretical teachings is Methodius, not Constantine-Cyril. In fact, there is no mention of Cyril in any of the early anti-Slavonic-liturgy documents. The only Croatian source that informs about Constantine-Cyril is the *Chronicle of the Presbyter Diocleas*, written in the twelfth century in what is today's Montenegro. Yet the account that it provides is idiosyncratic. Attested only in later copies, the *Chronicle* is rather problematic as a historical source due to numerous errors and to the author's political agenda. It nevertheless demonstrates an erroneous understanding in twelfth-century Dalmatia of the beginnings of the Slavonic writing. The author, believed to be Grgur, the bishop of Bar (1172-1196), relates a distorted story of the Moravian mission, moving it to the Croatian lands, to the kingdom of a legendary King Svetopelek (the son of Zvonimir).<sup>59</sup> In this version, Constantine-Cyril the Philosopher baptized Svetopelek and his kingdom according to the Greek Rite. Guided by the Holy Spirit, Constantine invented the Slavonic letters, translated all biblical books of the New and Old Testament from Greek into Slavonic, and established the liturgy in the Greek Rite. The author mentions no Moravia or Rastislav or any other historically accurate figure. Quite the contrary, in Grgur's story Pope Stephen admires and supports Constantine and the Slavonic liturgy, while in fact the historic Pope Stephen V (885-891) banned the Slavonic liturgy and assisted the restoration of the Frankish clergy in Moravia after Methodius' death. The name of Methodius comes up in an unexpected way, too. The author relates that King Svetopelek adopted a "liber Sclavorum qui dicitur Methodius" as a book of laws and customs for his state. It is believed that this "liber Methodius" probably stands for the *Nomokanon*, translated by Methodius into Church Slavonic and named in his honor.<sup>60</sup>

<sup>(59)</sup> The figure of the Croatian King Svetopelek is clearly inspired by the Moravian prince Svatopluk ('Sventopluk' or 'Sventopulk,' in Latin sources).

<sup>(60)</sup> Božidar Pejcev, *Librum Sclavorum qui dicitur Methodius im Ljetopis Popa Dukljanina*, in *Leben und Werk der byzantinischen Slavenapostel Methodios und Kyrillos*. Edited by Evangelos Konstantinou. Vier-Türme-Verlag, Münsterschwar-

As sources demonstrate, in thirteenth-century Dalmatia, the events of the Moravian mission devolved into myth, while Methodius grew to be a *persona non grata*. Since no *vitae* of Cyril and Methodius are attested in Croatian Glagolitic codices, the only source of information about Cyril and his invention could come from the *Office to Sts. Cyril and Methodius* that is found in manuscripts from the late fourteenth century. The lack of accurate information about Cyril in the *Historia Salonitana* and in the *Chronicle of the Presbyter Diocleas* suggests that the *Office* may not yet have circulated in Dalmatia at that time. As for Methodius, his reputation as a heretic and adversary of the Latin Church may have rendered him an undesirable patron and discouraged the Glagolites from evoking his name in relation to their letters. Incidentally, the lack of a strong “institutional memory” of Cyril and Methodius supports the hypothesis that the Slavonic liturgy was brought to Dalmatia only after Cyril’s and Methodius’ death. At the same time, in the Slavic Orthodox churches of Bulgaria, Macedonia, Serbia and Rus’, where the Cyrillic letters had long supplanted the original Glagolitic, Cyril and Methodius were venerated as the Slavic Apostles, and Cyril was considered as the inventor of the Slavonic (Cyrillic) letters. In Bohemia, too, the emergence of the Cyrillic letters was connected with Cyril’s acts. Thus, by mid thirteenth century, the appropriation of Cyril as a creator of their letters by the Orthodox Slavs left the role of the Glagolitic letters’ patron vacant. It was then natural that the Glagolites, who had by that time adopted the monastic rules of the Western Church and the Roman liturgical protocol, looked for a patron among the Latins.

#### *St. Jerome as a Patron of the Slavonic Letters in Croatia*

As mentioned above, one of the issues debated at the Split Synod of 925 was the use of Slavonic in the Divine Office. The resulting decree, outlined in the tenth canon of the Synod, did not completely prohibit the Slavonic liturgy but did significantly limit its scope:

zach 1991, pp. 83-85; Ludwig Steindorff, *Liber Methodius. Überlegungen zur kyrillich-methodianischen tradition beim Priester von Dioclea*, “Mitteilungen des bulgarischen Forschungsinstitutes in Österreich”, VIII (1986) 1, pp. 157-172.

No bishop in our province should dare to elevate [any one serving in] the Slavonic language to whatever rank; only those in clerical state or monks [are allowed to use it (?)] to serve God. Nor in his diocese should he allow to him to serve the mass, except if there is a necessity in priests; [in which case] by applying to the Roman Pontiff, he may obtain a license for their priestly offices.<sup>61</sup>

The papal epistles and the special resolution of the Synod may serve as evidence that Slavonic was in relatively wide use in Croatia. Otherwise, the Latin hierarchy would not have been concerned merely on account of a few Glagolite priests. The words *in clericatu et monachatu* could mean that the Synod intended to limit the use of Slavonic to clerics, who were monks, implying that it had also been used by others, non-monastic clergy. There were also practical reasons for retaining the Slavonic liturgy in Dalmatia. If only for the time being, it was instrumental for the evangelization and education of common people in rural areas, in which monasteries were involved. And it was relatively harmless since by keeping the Latin-illiterate Glagolites out of the higher clergy ranks the Roman Curia prevented them from entering ecclesiastical hierarchy.

However, while the law banned the ordination of the Slavonic priests, it also suggested the remedy – a supplication to the Apostolic Pontiff. Consequently, when in 1248 the bishop of Senj, Philip, appealed to Innocent IV for a special license to celebrate the Divine Office in Slavonic in his diocese, he acted strictly according to the canon law. Philip's letter of request has not survived<sup>62</sup> but the pope's decretal, dated March 29, 1248, reiterates the letter's content:

(<sup>61</sup>) “*Ut nullus episcopus nostre prouincie audeat in quolibet gradu Slauinica lingua promouere, tantum in clericatu et monachatu deo deseruire. Nec in sua ecclesia sinat eum missas facere, preter si necessitatem sacerdotum haberent, per supplicationem a Romano pontifice licentiam eis sacerdotalis ministerii tribuatur*”, *Codex Diplomaticus...*, I, cit., p. 32. The editors of the *MMFH* offer a different reading of the first sentence: “*Ut nullus episcopus nostrae provinciae audeat <quempiam> in quolibet gradu slavinica lingua promovere; (potest) tam(en) in clericatu et monachatu Deo deservire*”, *Capitula Synodi Spalatensis, MMFH*, IV, p. 124. The English translation of this syntactically confusing passage takes into account both textual variants.

(<sup>62</sup>) It is possible that the request was even made in person since Philip himself traveled to Lyon at that time as a special envoy of Split Archbishop Ugrin.

Your petition directed to us maintains that there are special letters in Slavonia, which the clergy of that land say they have from Blessed Jerome, and which they use in celebrating the Divine Offices. That you become like them and follow the custom of the land in which you are bishop, you have petitioned us for permission to celebrate the Divine Offices in these letters. Therefore, considering that the word is subject to the matter and not the matter to the word, we, by the authority of this letter, grant you the permission requested, only in those places, where this custom is lawfully in use, and provided the meaning does not suffer from this difference in letters.<sup>63</sup>

The specific circumstances of, and impetus for, Philip's petition are unknown. From the pope's correspondence, however, it is possible to infer that, at least in 1248, the Glagolites did not necessarily claim that St. Jerome himself invented their special letters but, rather, that he provided them with a means to write. The pope acknowledged Philip's obligation as a bishop to support the Slavonic liturgy, as long as faith (the "word") does not suffer and is accurately preserved. Philip, who was not a Glagolite, considered it imperative that he should keep to the custom of the Glagolite clergy and not ignore, condemn, or ban it. And, following (whether knowingly or not) the recommendations of the Split Synod, he turned to the pope for a special permission to observe the Glagolite Rite in his diocese.

Due to the Slavic Jerome legend's improbability, this historical event is usually referenced in contemporary scholarship as an at-

<sup>(63)</sup> "*Porrecta nobis tua petitio continebat, quod in Sclavonia est littera specialis, quam illius terre clerici se habere a beato Jeronimo asserentes, eam observant in divinis officiis celebrandis. Unde cum illis efficiaris conformis, et in terre consuetudinem, in qua consistis episcopus, imiteris, celebrandi divina officia secundum dictam litteram a nobis suppliciter licentiam postulasti. Nos igitur attendentes, quod sermo rei, et non res est sermoni subiecta, licentiam tibi in illis dumtaxat partibus, ubi de consuetudine observantur premissa, dummodo sententia ex ipsius varietate littere non ledatur, auctoritate presentium concedimus postulatam*", *Fontes historici liturgicae Glagolito-Romanae a XIII ad XIX saeculum*. Edited by Lucas Jelić. Sumpibus Societatis Libris Catholicis Edendis Zagrabiae, Zagreb 1906 (*saec. XIII*), p. 9. The English translation follows a revised reading of this document suggested by Mile Bogović, who pointed out to a mistake in the edition: instead of *Unde cum illis efficiaris conformis* it should read *Unde ut illis efficiaris conformis*, Mile Bogović, *Hrvatsko glagoljsko tisućljeće*, "Senjski zbornik", 25 (1998), pp. 56-57.

tempt by the Glagolites to defend the Slavonic liturgy using Jerome as a shield. Undoubtedly, Jerome's authority as a biblical translator may have made their case stronger for the Roman Curia. The view that the Glagolites consciously fabricated the Jerome legend, however, appears to overly simplify the matter.<sup>64</sup>

First of all, evidence suggests that the Glagolites may have derived the idea that Jerome was involved in the creation of the Slavonic liturgy (however factually inaccurate it may seem today) from learned Latin treatises. The original source of information about St. Jerome's "Slavonic" letters may have been a notoriously perplexing treatise, titled the *Cosmographia*, by an as-of-yet unidentified author posing as St. Jerome.<sup>65</sup> The author presents his treatise as an amended and explicated edition of the account of the lands and peoples that one Aethicus Ister, a Scythian philosopher and cosmographer of noble birth, had encountered during his travels. This remarkable work is a bit of a literary puzzle, variously dated and attributed. However, it has been proven that the author cannot be St. Jerome for a number of reasons, both linguistic and textological. At the end of

<sup>64</sup>) It should be noted that the Third Order Franciscan Glagolites seemed to have doubts about Jerome's authorship of the Glagolitic letters. Petar Runje refers to the early sixteenth-century testimony of Dinko Zavoreo that the Franciscan Glagolites from the very beginning did not accept the belief that Jerome created the Slavonic letters, see Petar Runje, *O knjigama Hrvatskih Glagoljaša*. Kršćanska sadašnjost, Zagreb 1998, p. 106. Whether this testimony is accurate or not, by the end of the fifteenth century, the Franciscan fathers accepted the patronage of St. Jerome. In a petition letter to the Holy See, dated by Stjepan Ivančić to 1600, they name both Jerome and Cyril as patrons of the Slavonic liturgy, see Stjepan Ivančić, *Povjestne Crte o samostanskom III redu sv. o. Franje po Dalmaciji, Kvarneru i Istri i Poraba Glagolice u istoj redodržavi*, prilog B. Tisk. E. Vitaliani, Zadar 1910, p. 165; Lucas Jelić, *Fontes historici...*, cit. (*saec. XVI*), p. 38. The mention of Cyril's name next to Jerome's is most likely explained by the appearance in fifteenth-century liturgical books of the *Office to Sts. Cyril and Methodius*, which promoted St. Cyril's role as the Slavic Apostle.

<sup>65</sup>) Michael W. Herren is currently preparing a new edition and English translation of the *Cosmographia* for Oxford Medieval Texts. So far, the two most used editions are *Die Kosmographie des Aethicus*. Edited by Otto Prinz. (Quellen zur Geistesgeschichte des Mittelalters, 14). Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Munich 1993, and *Aethici Istrici Cosmographia ab Hieronymo ex Graeco in Latinum breviarium redactam*. Edited by Heinrich Wuttke. Dyk, Leipzig 1853.

the *Cosmographia*, the author includes “the letters of Aethicus”: the shapes and names of twenty two letters, which do not correspond to any known system of writing.<sup>66</sup> These letters were further publicized by the Benedictine scholar Rabanus Maurus (776-856), who incorporated the account of Aethicus’ letters in his treatise, *De inventione linguarum* (On the Invention of Writing), with the following commentary:

We have also discovered letters of Aethicus, philosopher and cosmographer of Scythian nationality and noble birth, which the venerable Jerome, priest, brought all the way to us, explaining in his own words. Since he [Jerome – J. V.] highly appreciated his [Aethicus’ – J. V.] learning and diligence, he also wished to make his letters known. If, so far, we have been deceived in these letters and somehow fall into error, [you will] correct us.<sup>67</sup>

According to the notions of that time, both Aethicus, a Scythian and a native of the *Istriae regio*, and St. Jerome, a native of Stridon, were considered to have been Slavs. Although the symbols depicted in the *Cosmographia* and in *De inventione linguarum* were not at all similar to the Glagolitic letters, neither by shapes nor by names, they seem to be the only explanation for the theory that the Glagolites’ Slavonic letters were connected to St. Jerome.

The above mentioned Latin sources prompt a hypothesis that the theory about Jerome’s Slavonic letters originated not among the Glagolites but among the Latin clergy, sympathetically inclined towards Dalmatian Slavonic monasteries. Having found mention of Aethicus’ letters, distinguished and brought forth by St. Jerome, they could easily conclude that these were the special letters of their Croatian Slavonic fellow-monks. To the Latin clergymen’s inexpert

<sup>(66)</sup> Otto Prinz, *Die Kosmographie des Aethicus*, cit., pp. 243-244.

<sup>(67)</sup> “*Litteras etiam Aethici philosophi cosmographi natione Scythica, nobili prosapia invenimus, quas venerabilis Hieronymus presbyter ad nos usque cum suis dictis explanando perduxit, quia magnifice ipsius scientiam atque industriam duxit; ideo et ejus litteras maluit promulgare. Si in istis adhuc litteris fallimur, et in aliquibus vitium agemus, vos emendate*”, Rabanus Maurus, *De inventione linguarum ab Hebraea usque ad Theodiscam, et notis antiquis*, in *Patrologiae Cursus Completus. Series Latina*, vol. 112. Edited by Jacques-Paul Migne. Col. 1581.

eye, there may have been some similarity between the Glagolites' letters and the letters in the *Cosmographia* and the *De inventione linguarum*. Thus, it is possible that the suggestion that the Slavonic Glagolitic letters were received from St. Jerome was made to the Glagolites, who then embraced it without critically examining the sources upon which their Latin brethren relied. It is hard to tell what role may be attributed to Bishop Philip (who himself was not a Glagolite) in the emergence of this belief. Other than his obvious interest in the institution of the Slavonic Rite in his diocese, we possess no proof that he himself developed the theory of St. Jerome's Slavonic letters.

If we follow the generally accepted assumption that the Glagolites devised the legend about Jerome for the mere purpose of validating their letters and books, we should question the value that such a fabrication would have in an appeal to the pope. Philip's testimony about the Slavonic letters' association with Jerome possessed no power as chief evidence to defend the Slavonic liturgy. After all, it was presented only as a belief and its accuracy was not investigated by the Roman Curia. It is more likely that Philip connected Jerome to the tradition of the Glagolites not so much to validate their letters but to describe them as proper Catholics, loyal to the pope and the Western Church. And then, was it at all necessary to defend the Slavonic Rite of the Glagolite monks, who had already been observing it with the permission of the Split Synod of 925 (albeit with no option of entering the ecclesiastical hierarchy)? A close reading of the pope's decretal to Philip even suggests that the bishop of Senj could have been asking for the authorization of the Slavonic Rite at his own cathedral church and in so doing commended the customs of the local Glagolites to strengthen his case. Stjepan Damjanović, following a revised reading and interpretation of the papal decretal by Mile Bogović, argues that Philip's request concerned his whole diocese and papal *privilegium* was given to him personally and as a bishop of Senj.<sup>68</sup> Damjanović also suggests viewing papal approval

<sup>68</sup>) Stjepan Damjanović, *Otpis pape Inocenta IV. senjskom biskupu Filipu iz godine 1248*, in Id., *Jazik otačaski*. Matica hrvatska, Zagreb 1995, pp. 82-89; Mile Bogović, *Glagoljica u Senju*. Jadranska tiskara, Senj 1994, pp. 13-17. (I am grateful to the anonymous reviewer who directed my attention to these publications.)

of the Slavonic liturgy in the context of the decisions made by the Fourth Lateran Council of 1215. The ninth canon (*De diversis ritibus in eadem fide*), issued by the council, calls for the adequate provision of priests capable of ministering to Christians of different languages and rites by celebrating the divine services, administering the church's sacraments, and instructing them in their mother tongue.<sup>69</sup> The expression *sermo rei et non res sermoni subjecta* in the decretal demonstrates that Innocent IV considered the canon of liturgy more important than its language.<sup>70</sup>

Although the Split Synods of 925 and 1060 forbade ordination of the Slavonic priests and the promotion of the Slavonic liturgy in Dalmatian dioceses, the Glagolite monks and clerics continued to celebrate Divine Offices in Slavonic. In time, they adopted monastic rules of the Western Church: first Benedictine, and later Third Order Franciscan and Pauline. Already at the beginning of the twelfth century the Glagolites engaged in revising their liturgical books that contained original translations from Greek adapting them to the text

<sup>(69)</sup> “*Quoniam in plerisque partibus intra eandem civitatem atque dioecesim permixti sunt populi diversarum linguarum, habentes sub una fide varios ritus et mores, districte praecipimus ut pontifices huiusmodi civitatum sive dioecesum, provideant viros idoneos, qui secundum diversitates rituum et linguarum divina officia illis celebrent et ecclesiastica sacramenta ministrent, instruendo eos verbo pariter et exemplo*” (“Since in many places peoples of different languages live within the same city or diocese, having one faith but different rites and customs, we therefore strictly order bishops of such cities and dioceses to provide suitable men who will do the following in the various rites and languages: celebrate the divine services for them, administer the church's sacraments, and instruct them by word and example”), *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, volume One. *Nicaea I to Lateran V*. Edited by Norman P. Tanner. Sheed & Ward - Georgetown University Press, London - Washington, DC, 1990, pp. 239-239.

<sup>(70)</sup> This dictum has been taken from St. Hilary of Poitiers: “*Intelligentia dictorum ex causis est assumenda dicendi, quia non sermoni res, sed rei est sermo subiectus*” (“The meaning of what is said should be taken from the reasons for saying it, since the words should be subject to the things and not the things to the words”), *De Trinitate*, 4, 14. It has been also referenced in a decretal *De verborum significatione* by Pope Gregory IX, Innocent IV's predecessor, see *Corpus Iuris Canonici*, vol. II (*Liber Extra*). Edited by Emil Friedberg. Ex officina Bernhardi Tauchnitz, Leipzig 1881, Liber V, Tit. 40, Cap. 6, p. 913.

in the Vulgate.<sup>71</sup> During the thirteenth century, the Glagolites further systematized their liturgical books according to the Roman models (*po zakonu rimskago dvora*) and developed their letters fashioning them after the Montecassino Beneventan script.<sup>72</sup> All of these activities show that the Glagolites eagerly interacted with the Latin ecclesiastical communities and, therefore, it may be concluded that by accepting the creator of the Vulgate as their patron the Glagolites were simply reiterating their loyalty to Rome. Whether the belief in St. Jerome's Slavonic letters originated among the Glagolite or the Latinate clergy, the Glagolites did not find it necessary to defend their belief, while the Roman Curia never challenged it.<sup>73</sup>

On the contrary, there are reasons to believe that the Roman Curia had a pragmatic interest in approving the Slavonic Rite as potential strategy of conciliating non-Catholic Slavs.<sup>74</sup> Eduard Hercigonja

(<sup>71</sup>) On the subject of revision of the biblical readings in Croatian liturgical books according to the Latin Bible see studies by Leszek Moszyński, *Wpływ Wulgaty na kształt starochorwackiego ewangeljarza z Omišlja*, "Slovo", 36 (1986), pp. 111-122; Johannes Reinhart, *Eine Redaktion des kirchenslavischen Bibeltextes im Kroatien des 12. Jahrhunderts*, "Wiener slavistisches Jahrbuch", 36 (1990), pp. 193-241, and Id., *Najstarije svjedočanstvo za uticaj Vulgate na hrvatskoglagoljsku Bibliju*, "Slovo", 39-40 (1989-1990), pp. 45-52.

(<sup>72</sup>) On the liturgical reforms, see Andrew Corin, *O reformama hrvatskoglagoljskih liturgijskih knjiga u 13. stoljeću*, in *Prvi hrvatski slavistički kongres. Zbornik radova*. Edited by Stjepan Damjanović et al. Hrvatsko filološko društvo, Zagreb 1997, pp. 527-538. Manuscript illuminations in Glagolitic manuscripts show strong dependence on the Beneventan style. Glagolitic scribes not only imitated illuminations and decorations of the Latin manuscripts but also modified their own script to emulate the graphic shape and style of Beneventan letters. In addition, some Croatian Glagolitic codices feature Latin initials, illuminated by Italian masters, see Josef Vajs, *Rukovět' hlaholské paleografie*. Orbis, Prague 1932, pp. 135-136, 144; Viktor Novak, *Scriptura Beneventana: s osobitim obzirom na tip dalmatinske beneventane. Paleografska studija*. Tisak "Tipografije", Zagreb 1920, pp. 62-66.

(<sup>73</sup>) We find no polemic documents, in (Glagolitic) Slavonic or Latin, substantiating Jerome's authorship of the Slavonic letters dating to the thirteenth or fourteenth century. The newly aroused interest of humanists to Jerome's birthplace in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries (e.g. works of Flavio Biondo, Marko Marulić and José de Espinoza de Sigüenza) had broader objectives and was outside of the Glagolites' relationship with Rome.

(<sup>74</sup>) Moreover, in 1246, Innocent IV was even inclined to allow the Orthodox Slavonic Rite in the Church of the Rus' Principality of Halych, should the Halych

links papal good graces towards the Glagolites to a tactic that Rome tried to implement with the break-off heterodox Bosnian Church that also used Slavonic in liturgy.<sup>75</sup> After all, the Glagolites offered an attractive bait – the Slavic ecclesiastical language in the Roman Rite, which could be useful to Rome in acquiring new devotees among the Slavs. In this respect, it is interesting that the term “Sclavi” and “Sclavonia” were used in the 1248 papal letter rather than “Croats” and “Croatia” or “Dalmatia”. Other contemporaneous Latin sources show that the geographical term “Slavonia” also referred to Bosnia.<sup>76</sup>

In sum, St. Jerome’s role as a patron of the Slavonic Glagolitic letters was as useful to the Roman Curia as it was to the Catholic Croatian Glagolites.

### *Conclusion*

The assumption that in 1248 the Croatian Glagolites intentionally created the legend of St. Jerome’s Slavonic letters in order to protect themselves from the Latin clergy’s censure has been taken for granted by generations of scholars and has migrated from textbook to textbook without adequate analysis. This view relies on common sense from a contemporary point of view: since, as is now known, St. Jerome was not a Slav and could not have invented the Slavonic letters, clearly the Glagolites made that legend up. Yet what seems obvious may not be accurate. The present study shows that additional research and evidence are required to better explain why the Croa-

Prince Daniel Romanovich accept the jurisdiction of the Apostolic See, Bulla *Cum te de cetero specialem*, August 27, 1247, *Documenta Pontificum Romanorum Historiam Ucrainae Illustrantia (1075-1953)*, vol. I (1075-1700). Edited by Athanasius G. Welykyj. Basilianus, Rome 1953, pp. 36-37.

<sup>(75)</sup> Eduard Hercigonja, *Glagoljaštvo u razvijenom srednjovjekovlju*, in *Hrvatska i Europa. Srednji vijek i renesansa (XIII-XVI. stoljeće)*, vol. II. Edited by Ivo Supičić, Josip Bratulić. Hrvatska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti, Zagreb 2000, pp. 177-179.

<sup>(76)</sup> John V. A. Fine discusses the question of the general Slavic identity in the early Balkans in *When Ethnicity did not Matter in the Balkans: A Study of Identity in Pre-Nationalist Croatia, Dalmatia, and Slavonia in the Medieval and Early-Modern Periods*. University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor 2006, p. 94.

tian Glagolites, apparently either ignoring or ignorant of the history of the Cyrillo-Methodian mission, chose St. Jerome as the patron of their letters. More detailed and critical examination of the available evidence suggests that the Glagolite clergy may have accepted and complied with Jerome's authority not so much by design as due to the lack of unambiguous information about Sts. Cyril's and Methodius' role in the creation of their letters. Moreover, if indeed the belief that St. Jerome had created the Slavonic Glagolitic letters was initially inspired by Pseudo-Jerome's *Cosmographia* and Rabanus Maurus' treatise *De inventione linguarum*, its roots then are more likely to be found among the Latin clergy in Dalmatia, or even the Roman Curia. Whether conceived by the Latin clergy or not, the idea of Jerome as a patron of Slavonic letters was favorably accepted among the thirteenth-century Croatian Glagolites, who otherwise seemed to be without an eligible patron saint at that time.<sup>77</sup>

#### SUMMARY

Although the subject of the emergence of the early Slavic letters still offers many unresolved questions, most sources demonstrate that the Slavonic letters were invented and introduced among the Slavs by the Byzantine missionaries Sts. Cyril and Methodius. However, since the thirteenth century, an alternative belief has been documented among the Dalmatian clergy, who considered St. Jerome, a celebrated translator of the Vulgate Bible, to be the creator of the Slavonic (Glagolitic) letters. This belief is first recorded in a special permission that Pope Innocent IV granted to Philip, the bishop of Senj, in 1248, by which the pope allowed to hold the Slavonic liturgy in Philip's diocese. In the following decades and centuries, the reputation of Jerome as a Slavic Apostle grew and he became widely accepted as the inventor of the Glagolitic letters and the Roman Slavonic Rite in and outside Croatia.

<sup>(77)</sup> John Fine provides an engaging account of the further trajectory of this belief among the Croats, see John V. A. Fine, *The Slavic Saint Jerome: An Entertainment*, in *Cultures and Nations of Central and Eastern Europe. Essays in Honor of Roman Szporluk*. Edited by Zvi Gitelman, Lubomyr Hajda, John-Raul Himka, Roman Solchanyk. Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute, Cambridge, Mass., 2000, pp. 101-112.

The traditional explanation views the emergence of this belief as a deliberate attempt by the Croatian Glagolite clergy to defend the Slavonic liturgy by using Jerome as a shield. The present paper reexamines the roots of this belief, offering hypotheses of why the Glagolites chose St. Jerome as a patron of their letters. The paper particularly focuses on the question of why the memory of Sts. Cyril and Methodius was overlooked in this matter. The paper examines primary sources in their historical context and hypothesizes that the legend originated among the Latin clergy, perhaps even among the papal entourage at the Roman Curia, and was aimed at incorporating the Croatian Glagolitic tradition into the Roman Church. Further, the paper examines evidence about the involvement of Sts. Cyril and Methodius in the establishment of the Slavonic Rite that was available to the Glagolite clergy. The paper suggests that the Glagolites may have accepted and complied with Jerome's authority not so much by design as due to the lack of unambiguous information about Sts. Cyril's and Methodius' role in the creation of their letters.

#### RIASSUNTO

Sebbene il tema della comparsa del primo alfabeto slavo presenti ancora molte questioni irrisolte, la maggior parte delle fonti dimostra che tale alfabeto è stato inventato e introdotto tra gli Slavi dai missionari bizantini ss. Cirillo e Metodio. Tuttavia, a partire dal secolo XIII una convinzione alternativa a questa è documentata presso il clero dalmata, il quale riteneva che s. Girolamo, il celebre traduttore della Bibbia Vulgata, fosse il creatore dell'alfabeto slavo (glagolitico). Questa credenza è stata registrata per la prima volta in un permesso speciale accordato da papa Innocenzo IV a Filippo, vescovo di Segna, nel 1248, con il quale il Papa permetteva di celebrare la liturgia slava nella diocesi di Filippo. Nei decenni e nei secoli successivi la fama di Girolamo come Apostolo degli Slavi crebbe ed egli fu ampiamente accettato come l'inventore dell'alfabeto glagolitico e del Rito romano-slavo dentro e fuori la Croazia.

La spiegazione tradizionale vede nella comparsa di questa credenza un tentativo intenzionale da parte del clero glagolita croato di difendere la liturgia slava usando Girolamo come scudo. Il presente articolo riesamina le radici di questa credenza, fornendo delle ipotesi sul perché i glagoliti abbiano scelto s. Girolamo come patrono del loro alfabeto. Il contributo si concentra in particolare sulla questione del perché il ricordo dei ss. Cirillo e Metodio sia stato trascurato riguardo a questo argomento. L'articolo esamina le fonti primarie nel loro contesto storico e ipotizza che la leggenda abbia avuto origine presso il clero latino, forse addirittura nell'en-

tourage papale presso la Curia Romana, e che fosse intesa a incorporare la tradizione glagolitica croata nella Chiesa Romana. Inoltre, il contributo esamina le prove relative al coinvolgimento dei ss. Cirillo e Metodio nell'istituzione del Rito slavo a disposizione del clero glagolita. Si suggerisce che i glagoliti potrebbero aver accettato l'autorità di Girolamo e potrebbero essersi attenuti ad essa non tanto in base ad un piano, quanto per la mancanza di informazioni chiare circa il ruolo dei ss. Cirillo e Metodio nella creazione del loro alfabeto.

