

Универзитет „Евро-Балкан“

**ВИЗАНТИСКАТА МИСИОНЕРСКА
ДЕЈНОСТ И ЕВРОПСКОТО
НАСЛЕДСТВО**

Зборник на трудови од
Четвртиот меѓународен симпозиум
„Денови на Јустинијан I“, Скопје, 11-12 ноември, 2016 г.

Уредник
Митко Б. Панов

Скопје, 2017

Византиската мисионерска дејност и европското наследство

Зборник на трудови од Меѓународниот симпозиум
„Денови на Јустиниан I“ Скопје, 11-12 ноември 2016

Издавач:
Универзитет „Евро-Балкан“, Скопје

Уредник:
Митко Б. Панов

Лекторка:
Јордана Шемко Герогиевска

Ликовна и техничка обработка:
Игор Панев

Печати: Контура

CIP - Каталогизација во публикација
Национална и универзитетска библиотека "Св. Климент Охридски", Скопје

94(495.02)
930.85(497)

МЕЃУНАРОДЕН симпозиум "Денови на Јустинијан I" (4 ; 2016 ; Скопје)
Византиската мисионерска дејност и европското наследство : зборник
на трудови од Четвртиот меѓународен симпозиум "Денови на Јустинијан
I", Скопје, 11-12 ноември, 2016 г. / уредник Митко Б. Панов. - Скопје :
Универзитет "Евро-Балкан", 2017. - 236 стр. ; 23 см

Трудови на мак. и англ. јазик

ISBN 978-608-4714-17-0

а) Културна историја - Балкан б) Словенска писменост в) Византија -
Историја - Собири
COBISS.MK-ID 104897034

"Euro-Balkan" University

**THE BYZANTINE MISSIONARY
ACTIVITY AND ITS LEGACY IN
EUROPE**

Proceedings of the
4th International Symposium "Days of Justinian I"
Skopje, 11-12 November, 2016

Edited by
Mitko B. Panov

Skopje, 2017

УРЕДНИК

МИТКО Б. ПАНОВ

МЕЃУНАРОДЕН НАУЧЕН КОМИТЕТ

ФЛОРИН КУРТА (*Универзитет во Флорида*)

ЕЛИЗАБЕТА ДИМИТРОВА (*Универзитет Св. Кирил и Методиј, Скопје*)

ХРВОЈЕ ГРАЧАНИН (*Универзитет во Загреб*)

ДРАГИ ЃОРЃИЈЕВ (*Институт за национална историја, Скопје*)

ЈАНЕ КОЦАБАШИЈА (*Универзитет Евро-Балкан, Скопје*)

ВИКТОР ЛИЛЧИЌ (*Управа за заштита на културно наследство / Унив. Св. Кирил и Методиј,*)

ЃУЗЕПЕ МАИНО (*Универзитет во Болоња*)

ГЕОРГИ НИКОЛОВ (*Универзитет во Софија*)

МИТКО Б. ПАНОВ (*Институт за национална историја / Универзитет Евро Балкан, Скопје*)

КАРОЛИН С. СНАЈВЛИ (*Гетисбург колеџ*)

ДОНАТЕЛА БИЛАЃИ МАИНО (*Универзитет во Болоња*)

ВИТОМИР МИТЕВСКИ (*Македонска академија за науки и уметности, Скопје*)

ЕНДРЈУ РОУЧ (*Универзитет во Глазгов*)

АЛЕКСАНДАР СПАСЕНОВСКИ (*Универзитет Св. Кирил и Методиј, Скопје*)

МАЈА ЈАКИМОВСКА–ГОШИЌ (*Институт за македонска литература, Скопје*)

СЕКРЕТАРИ НА РЕДАКЦИЈА

ДРАГАН ЃАЛЕВСКИ (*Институт за национална историја, Скопје*)

ИГОР ПАНЕВ (*Универзитет Евро-Балкан*)

EDITED BY

MITKO B. PANOV

INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE

FLORIN CURTA (University of Florida)

ELIZABETA DIMITROVA (University Ss. Cyril and Methodius, Skopje)

HRVOJE GRAČANIN (Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb)

DRAGI GJORGJIEV (Institute of National History, Skopje)

JANE KODJABASIJA (Euro-Balkan University, Skopje)

VIKTOR LILČIĆ (Cultural Heritage Protection Office / University Ss. Cyril and Methodius, Skopje)

GIUSEPPE MAINO (University of Bologna)

DONATELLA BIAGI MAINO (University of Bologna)

VITOMIR MITEVSKI (Macedonian Academy of Science and Arts, Skopje)

GEORGI NIKOLOV (Faculty of History, Sofia University)

MITKO B. PANOV (Institute of National History / Euro-Balkan University, Skopje)

ANDREW ROACH (Glasgow University)

CAROLYN S. SNIVELY (Gettysburg College)

ALEKSANDAR SPASENOVSKI (Law Faculty, University Ss. Cyril and Methodius, Skopje)

MAJA JAKIMOVSKA - TOSIC (Institute of Macedonian Literature, Skopje)

EDITORIAL SECRETARIES

DRAGAN GJALEVSKI (Institute of National History, Skopje)

IGOR PANEV (Euro-Balkan University, Skopje)

СОДРЖИНА / CONTENTS

ПРЕДГОВОР / FOREWORD	9
<i>Димитар Пандев</i> СЛОВО ЗА СВЕТИ КЛИМЕНТОВИТЕ ПАТЕШЕСТВИЈА	13
<i>Yuri Stoyanov</i> ST. CONSTANTINE-CYRIL'S MISSION TO THE ABBASID COURT AND EASTERN ORTHODOXIDEOLOGY OF WARFARE	19
<i>Hrvoje Gračanin and Marko Petrak</i> THE NOTION OF THE <i>METHODII DOCTRINA</i> IN THE CONTEXT OF THE CHURCH SYNOD OF SPLIT (AD 925)	28
<i>Ратомир Грозданоски</i> МИСИОНЕРСТВОТО НА СВЕТИ КЛИМЕНТ ОХРИДСКИ – НАДВОРЕШНО И ВНАТРЕШНО	43
<i>Дејан Борисов</i> ТРИ ПЕРИОДИ ВО МИСИОНЕРСКАТА ДЕЈНОСТ НА СВЕТИ КЛИМЕНТ ОХРИДСКИ	54
<i>Драган Ѓалевски</i> ДИПЛОМАТСКИТЕ АСПЕКТИ НА ВИЗАНТИСКОТО МИСИОНЕРСТВО	66
<i>Miguel Pablo Sancho Gómez</i> THE LIMITANEI IN BELISARIUS ARMY (526-541)	82
<i>Katarzyna Maksymiuk</i> A NEW PROPOSAL FOR THE IDENTIFICATION OF THE SASANIAN COMMANDER MERMERÓĒS OF BYZANTINE SOURCES: ŠĀPUR OF RAY FROM MENRĀN	93
<i>Митко Б. Панов</i> СОЗДАВАЊЕТО НА ГЛАГОЛИЦАТА ВО ПРЕТСТАВАТА НА РУСКИТЕ И БАЛКАНСКИТЕ ИСТРАЖУВАЧИ (1850-1865)	99

<i>Далибор Јовановски и Иванка Додовска</i> СВРТУВАЊЕ КОН СРЕДНОВЕКОВНОТО МИНАТО – СЛУЧАЈОТ НАГРЦИЈА. ПОЛИТИКА, ИДЕНТИТЕТ, ИСТОРИЈА, ОБРАЗОВАНИЕ, ТЕРИТОРИЈА	110
<i>Маја Ангеловска-Панова</i> БОГОМИЛСТВОТО НИЗ ПРИЗМАТА НА МАКЕДОНСКАТА ИСТОРИОГРАФИЈА: ИНТЕРПРЕТАЦИИ И РЕИНТЕРПРЕТАЦИИ ВО ОПШТЕСТВЕНИ КОНТЕКСТИ	121
<i>Александар Спасеновски</i> ПРАВНИТЕ АСПЕКТИ ПОВРЗАНИ СО ПОКРИВАЊЕТО НА ЖЕНАТА – МУСЛИМАНКА КАКО ОБЛИК НА ВЕРСКА СЛОБОДА ВО СОЦИЈАЛИСТИЧКА ЈУГОСЛАВИЈА И ВО РЕПУБЛИКА МАКЕДОНИЈА	131
<i>Andrea Torno Ginnasi</i> ISAAC I'S SWORD AND THE NORMAN COUNTERPART: IMAGES OF "MILITARY KINGSHIP" FROM BYZANTIUM TO MEDIEVAL SOUTHERN ITALY	136
<i>Jasmina S. Ciric</i> BRICKWORK OF ST. NICOLAS CHURCH IN PRILEP: READING THE TEXTURE OF THE RHOMB	148
<i>Jessica Varsallona</i> SOME REMARKS ON THE ICONOGRAPHY OF THE VAULT OF THE ORATORY OF FORTY MARTYRS AT SYRACUSE	157
<i>Виктор Лилчиќ Адамс</i> ЈУСТИНИЈАНОВИОТ ОПТИЧКИ ТЕЛЕГРАФ НИЗ РЕПУБЛИКА МАКЕДОНИЈА	168
<i>Гоце Ангеличин Жура и Рубин Земон</i> ЈУСТИНИЈАНА ПРИМА ВО СВЕТЛИНАТА НА НАЈНОВИТЕ ИСТРАЖУВАЊА	181
<i>Трајче Нацев и Драган Веселинов</i> МОЖНИ РИЗИЦИ И ОПАСНОСТИ КАЈ АРХЕОЛОШКИТЕ ЛОКАЛИТЕТИ ВО ДОЛНИОТ ТЕК НА РЕКА БРЕГАЛНИЦА	190

<i>Соња Енџекова Сопотска</i> ВИЗАНТИСКИОТ КОНТЕКСТ ВО КНИЖЕВНОТО ДЕЛО НА СВ. КЛИМЕНТ ОХРИДСКИ И НЕГОВИОТ ХЕРМЕНЕВТИЧКИ ИДЕНТИТЕТ ВО СОВРЕМЕНОСТА	199
<i>Макеј Хелбиг</i> ЗЕЛЕНЧУКОТ И ЗАЧИНИТЕ ВО 17-ТАТА КНИГА <i>DE AGRICULTURA</i> НА <i>ETYMOLOGIARUM</i> <i>SIVEORIGINUM LIBRI XX</i> ОД ИСИДОР СЕВИЛСКИ	213
<i>Јане Коџабашија</i> ИСТОРИСКИОТ РАЗВОЈ НА ЦРКОВНОТО ПЕЕЊЕ НА ТЕРИТОРИЈАТА НА МАКЕДОНИЈА	223
<i>Димитри Кумбароски</i> ПАЛЕОГРАФСКИ ОПСЕРВАЦИИ НА ОХРИДСКАТА ИРМОЛОГИЈА ИН. 101 СИГ. IV/43	231

Hrvoje Gračanin

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences

University of Zagreb

Marko Petrak

Faculty of Law

University of Zagreb

THE NOTION OF THE *METHODII DOCTRINA* IN THE CONTEXT OF THE CHURCH SYNOD OF SPLIT (AD 925)

Abstract: The paper redress the issue of the so-called *Methodii doctrina*, to which the letter of Pope John X refers in the context of the well-known church synod of Split in 925. The prevailing scholarly opinion is that the pejorative tone in which the *Methodii doctrina* is shrouded in the letter should be interpreted liturgically, i.e. as the celebration of ecclesiastical rituals in the Slavonic language. However, the paper argues that the notion, as it stands in the papal letter, of the *Methodii doctrina* is not to be reduced only to the question of liturgical language, but that it also implies some very important matters of a general ecclesiastical character. Starting from the fact that the Pope obviously saw the necessity to impose the „Latin matrix“ at the 925 synod of Split, the paper analyses the manner in which the *Methodii doctrina* and the life of the ecclesiastical structures of the Slavonic liturgical language in the territories of Dalmatia in the tenth century might have differed from the mentioned matrix and contends that these differences were a result of the Byzantine missionary activity.

Introduction

In the letter of Pope John X to the metropolitan archbishop of Split and his suffragan bishops in Dalmatia, written in the context of the well-known church synod of Split in 925, a specific notion of the so-called *Methodii doctrina* comes to fore.¹ Pope John X complained that the *Methodii doctrina*

¹ On the 925 church synod of Split, see contributions in Atanazije Matanić (ed.), *Vita religiosa morale e sociale ed i concili di Split (Spalato) dei Secc. X-XI. Atti del Symposium internazionale di storia ecclesiastica, Split, 26.-30 settembre 1978*, Medioevo e umanesimo (Padova: Antenore, 1982). The papal letter is preserved in a much later manuscript titled *Historia Salonitana maior* dating from the sixteenth century. On the *Historia Salonitana maior*, see the most recent survey by Neven Budak, „Historia Salonitana and Historia Salontiana maior.

is widespread in Dalmatia, demanding that the tendency be put to an end, because it neglected „the doctrine of the Gospel, volumes of the canons and even the apostolic precepts“ (*...doctrinam Evangelii atque canonum volumina apostolicaeque etiam precepta praetermittentes...*).² According to the prevailing opinion of the scholars, this pejorative notion of the *Methodii doctrina* should be interpreted liturgically, i.e. as the celebration of the rituals in the Slavonic language.³ However, the Pope was pointing out the neglect of *doctrina Evangelii, canonum volumina* and *apostolica precepta*, which was undoubtedly a reference to the doctrine of the Church and the norms of the Canon law. Therefore it is reasonable to assume that the *Methodii doctrina*, as it is understood in the papal letter, should not only be reduced to the question of liturgical language, but that it also implies some very important matters of a general ecclesiastical character. We propose here that the circumstances which may have laid behind these matters are arguably to be best explained against the background of the Byzantine missionary activities in the eastern Adriatic region.

The *Methodii doctrina*

The *Methodii doctrina* was first mentioned in the *Conversio Bagoariorum et Carantanorum* from the 870s, as the „doctrine of the philosopher Methodius“ (*doctrina Methodii philosophi*), and what was meant by that is explained in the following passage: „...a certain Greek named Methodius, after the Slavonic letters had recently been invented, obscured in a philosophical

A Contribution to the debate about the relation of the two texts“, in Mirna Willer, Marijana Tomić (eds.), *Summer School in the Study of Historical Manuscripts. Proceedings*, Studies in library and information sciences 2 (Zadar: Sveučilište u Zadru, 2013), 101-131.

2 The latin text of the Papal letter is published in Marko Kostrenčić, Jakov Stipišić, Miljen Šamšalović (eds.), *Codex diplomaticus regni Croatiae, Dalmatiae et Slavoniae*, vol. I: *Diplomata annorum 743-1100 continens* (Zagreb: JAZU, 1967), 28-30 (no. 22).

3 Cf. Nada Klaić, „Kako i kada postaje »Metodova doktrina« kulturno dobro Hrvata [How and when »the doctrine of Methodius« became the cultural heritage of Croats]“, *Croatica Christiana Periodica* 10 (1986), 17-39; Ivanka Petrović, „Prvi susreti Hrvata s ćirilometodskim izvorištem svoje srednjovjekovne kulture [The first encounters of the Croats with the Cyrillo-Methodian origin of their medieval culture]“, *Slovo. Časopis Staroslavenskog instituta* 38 (1988), 21ff; Eduard Hercigonja, „Glagolism and glagolism“, in Ivan Supić (ed.), *Croatia in the early Middle Ages: A cultural survey* (London: Philip Wilson; Zagreb: AGM, 1999), 378ff; Radoslav Katičić, „Methodii doctrina“, *Slovo. Časopis Staroslavenskog instituta* 36 (1986), 21-22; *Idem*, *Literatur- und Geistesgeschichte des kroatischen Frühmittelalters*, ÖAW, Philosophisch-Historische Klasse, Schriften der Balkan-Kommission, Philologische Abteilung, vol. 40 (Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1999), 340ff; Neven Budak, *Prva stoljeća Hrvatske* [First centuries of Croatia] (Zagreb: Hrvatska sveučilišna naklada, 1994), 129; Julia Verkholantsev, „Littera specialis...a beato Jeronimo: How did Sts. Cyril and Methodius lose recognition as inventor of the Glagolitic letters to St. Jerome?“, *Ricerche slavistiche* 8(54) (2010), 248.

manner⁴ the Latin language, the Roman doctrine and the authoritative Latin writings, and made the Mass, the Gospel, and the church office of those who celebrated it in Latin become in part worthless to the entire folk“ (*...quidam Grecus Methodius nomine noviter inventis Sclavinis litteris linguam Latinam doctrinamque Romanam atque litteras auctoriales Latinas philosophice superducens vilescere fecit cuncto populo ex parte missas et ewangelia ecclesiasticumque officium illorum, qui hoc Latine celebraverunt*).⁵ This claim is summarized in a slightly modified form in the late 12th/early 13th-century *Excerptum de Karentanis*, with a noteworthy geographical addition regarding where Methodius arrived in Carinthia from: „Following this, after some intermediate time, a certain Slav named Methodius, who invented the Slavonic letters, came from the parts of Histria and Dalmatia, and he celebrated the Divine Office in Slavonic and made Latin become worthless; after he eventually had been chased away from the Carinthian parts, he entered Moravia and there he rested“ (*Post hunc interiecto aliquo tempore supervenit quidam Sclavus ab Hystris et <D>almatie partibus nomine Methodius, qui adinvenit Sclavicas literas et Slavice celebravit divinum officium et vilescere fecit Latinum. Tandem fugatus a Karentanis partibus intravit Moraviam ibique quiescit*).⁶

4 We follow here the suggestion by Tamás Nótári, „Conversio Bagoariorum et Carantanorum - document of an early medieval show trial“, *Sectio Juridica et Politica, Miscolc* 25/1 (2007), 109-110 about a possible meaning of the phrase *philosophice superducens*. On the use of the term *philosophus* for Methodius, see Fritz Lošek, „Einleitung“, in *Idem, Die Conversio Bagoariorum et Carantanorum und der Brief des Erzbischofs Theotmar von Salzburg*, *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Studien und Texte* 13 (Hannover: Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 1997), 45-46; with Henrik Birnbaum, „Some remaining puzzles in Cyrillo-Methodian studies“, *Slovo. Časopis Staroslavenskog instituta* 47-49 (1997-1999), 26.

5 *De conversione Bagoariorum et Carantanorum*, cap. XII, XIV, ed. Lošek, *Die Conversio Bagoariorum et Carantanorum*, 130, 134. This translation of the pertinent passage differs from the one by Francis Dvornik, *The Slavs. Their Early History and Civilization*, *Survey of Slavic Civilization* vol. II (Boston: American Academy of Arts and Sciences, 1956), 93, as well as from the one by Birnbaum, „Some remaining puzzles“, 25, note 20.

6 *Excerptum de Karentanis*, ed. Lošek, *Die Conversio Bagoariorum et Carantanorum*, 132-133; ed. Georg Heinrich Pertz, *Historiae aevi Salici*, *Monumenta Germaniae Historica* XIII. *Scriptores* XI (Hannover: Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 1854), 15; with Herwig Wolfram, *Conversio Bagoariorum et Carantanorum. Das Weißbuch der Salzburger Kirche über die erfolgreiche Mission in Karantänien und Pannonien mit Zusätzen und Ergänzungen*, *Dela SAZU, Razred za zgodovinske in družbene vede* 38, *Zbirka Zgodovinskega časopisa* 44 (2nd ed., Ljubljana: Slovenska akademija znanosti in umetnosti; Zveza zgodovinskih društev Slovenije), 82, 214-217. It is worth noting that the author of the *Excerptum* understood the *De conversione*'s participial phrase in the ablative absolute about the invention of the Slavonic letters as relating to Methodius. In much the similar vein, Archdeacon Thomas of Split – rephrasing what was said at the 1061 church synod of Split – makes St. Methodius the creator of the „Gothic letters“ (*Goticas litteras*), calls him a heretic (*heretico*) and records that he „deceivingly wrote a great deal against the precept of the Catholic faith in that same Slavonic language“ (cap. XVI: *multa contra catholice fidei normam in eadem Sclavonica lingua mentiendo conscripsit*), ed. Olga Perić, *Archdeacon Thomas of Split, History of the Bishops of*

The *Methodii doctrina* is also alluded to in the letters of Pope John VIII, which refer several times to St. Methodius' teaching and preaching: „And that we have heard that Methodius, your archbishop, who was ordained and sent to you by our predecessor, namely Pope Hadrian, teaches differently than what he has professed, by words and writings, to believe before the Apostolic See, we are very much surprised; however, for this reason, we are dispatching [an epistle] to him in order that he would arrange to come before us without any impediment so we would hear from his mouth whether or not he observes and believes just as he has promised“ (*Quia vero audivimus, quia Methodius vester archiepiscopus ab antecessore nostro, Adriano scilicet papa, ordinatus vobisque directus aliter doceat, quam coram sede apostolica se credere verbis et litteris professus est, valde miramur; tamen propter hoc direximus illi, ut absque omni occasione ad nos venire procuret, quatenus ex ore eius audiamus, utrum sic teneat et credat, sicut promisit, aut non*; AD 879); „Even though you ought to save and instruct, with doctrines of your preaching, the Lord's folk which has been committed to you as their spiritual pastor, we have heard that you do not teach with your teaching what the Holy Roman Church had learned from the prince of the apostles himself and what it preaches every day, and that you hurl the folk themselves into error. Therefore we order you with this letter of our apostolate to arrange to come presently before us, with every impediment disregarded, so that we would hear from your mouth and learn truthfully about your doctrine whether or not you observe and preach just as you have promised to the Holy Roman Church to believe, by words and writings“ (*Predicationis tuę doctrinis populum Domini quasi spiritali pastori commissum salvare instruereque cum debeas, audivimus, quod non ea, quę sancta Romana ecclesia ab ipso apostolorum principe didicit et cottidie predicat, tu docendo doceas et ipsum populum in errorem mittas. Unde his apostolatus nostri litteris tibi iubemus, ut omni occasione postposita ad nos de presenti venire procures, ut ex ore tuo audiamus et veraciter cognoscamus doctrinam tuam, utrum sic teneas et sic predices, sicut verbis et litteris te sanctę Romanę ecclesię credere promisisti, aut non*; AD 880); „we have put you before us and admonished you to be bound to follow the doctrine of the Holy Roman Church according to the trustworthy tradition of the holy fathers, and caused both the Creed and the true faith to be taught and preached by you“, and „therefore let this doubt

Salona and Split, edited, translated and annotated by Damir Karbić, Mirjana Matijević Sokol and James Ross Sweeney, Central European Medieval Texts 4 (Budapest-New York: Central European University Press, 2006), 78. On the other hand, Pope John VIII clearly identifies St. Methodius' brother St. Constantine-Cyril as the alphabet's inventor in a letter to Prince Svatopluk of Moravia from June 880: *Litteras denique Sclaviniscas a Constantino quondam philosopho reppertas; Iohannis VIII. papae registrum*, ed. Erich Caspar, in *Epistolae Karolini aevi* V, *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Epistolae VII, Pars prior* (Berlin: Weidmann, 1928), 223 (no. 255). Moreover, the *Excerptum* calls Methodius *Sclavus*, whereas he is *Grecus* in the *De conversione*.

cease and, with God's assistance, instill all the faithful with the worship of the orthodox faith just as the evangelical and apostolic doctrine maintains (... *te coram nobis positum sanctę Romanę ecclesię doctrinam iuxta sanctorum patrum probabilem traditionem sequi debere monuimus et tam symbolum quam rectam fidem a te docendam et predicandam subdidimus...*; *Ideoque cesset ista dubietas et Deo cooperante, sicut evangelica et apostolica se habet doctrina, orthodoxę fidei cultum fidelibus cunctis inculca...*; AD 881).⁷

From the original contestation between St. Methodius and the Salzburg church it is evident that the so-called Apostle of the Slavs was accused of an averse attitude toward the *lingua Latina*, the *doctrina Romana* and the *litterae auctoriales Latinae*.⁸ In other words, St. Methodius was allegedly opposed to the very core of what constituted the Latin Christian dogma of the Roman Church. The principal doctrinal transgression was probably the omission of the *filioque*, which the Salzburg church used as a pretext to denigrate St. Methodius and effect his dismissal. However, his gravest offence was undoubtedly his encroachment in the missionary territory of the Salzburg church. In our opinion, the *Methodii doctrina* is best understood in this context as an instrument of disqualification devised by the Bavarian clergy. That is to say, the *Methodii doctrina* probably never had any particularly concrete theological content, which could be deduced from, in essence, quite generally intoned accusations against St. Methodius, but was just a ploy to undermine, by stigmatizing St. Methodius' liturgical practices, his position and missionary activities that were both seen as a thorn in the side of the Salzburg church. St. Methodius managed to exonerate himself before Pope John VIII, since the Roman creed still did not contain the *filioque* addition at that time.⁹ Nevertheless, the problem lingered on and was revived in full force during the pontificate of Pope John X, but now in the context of the church of Dalmatia.

⁷ *Iohannis VIII. papae registrum*, ed. Erich Caspar, 160 (no. 200), 161 (no. 201), 244 (no. 276). The same idea of Methodius' teaching is also present in the *Žitije Metodijevo (Life of Methodius; the late 880s)*, cap. 7: *oučenija svojego* („his teaching“ = *eius doctrina*); cap. 8: *oučitelja našego* („our teacher”); cap. 9: *na našei oblasti oučiši* („he taught in our province”); cap. 12: *oučenije Methodija* („the teaching of Methodius“ = *Methodii doctrina*), as well as in other writings of the Old Slavonic tradition. Cf. Katičić, „Methodii doctrina“, 17-18.

⁸ Cf. also Nótári, „*Conversio Bagoariorum et Carantanorum*“, 109.

⁹ Cf. Nótári, „*Conversio Bagoariorum et Carantanorum*“, 111ff; Maddalena Betti, *The Making of Christian Moravia (858-882): Papal Power and Political Reality*, East Central and Eastern Europe in the Middle Ages, 450-1450, vol. 24 (Leiden-Boston; Brill, 2014), 142ff; with Verkholtantsev, „*Littera specialis*“, 235, note 23. On the *filioque* controversy, see now exhaustively Peter Gemeinhardt, *Die Filioque-Kontroverse zwischen Ost- und Westkirche im Frühmittelalter*, Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte 82 (Berlin-New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2002). On Sts. Constantine-Cyril's and Methodius' missionary activities, cf. Ian Wood, *The Missionary Life: Saints and the Evangelisation of Europe, 400-1450* (Harlow: Pearson Education Limited, 2001), 173-176. Birnbaum, „Some Remaining Puzzles“, 28 assumes that there were possible heretical elements in St. Methodius' „conceivably Byzantine-inspired teachings“.

The *liber Sclavorum qui dicitur Methodius*

Some twenty years ago, an important remark was made about a possible relation between the *liber Methodius* in the *Chronicle of the Presbyter Diocleas* (or in Croatian *Ljetopis Popa Dukljanina*) and the notion of the *Methodii doctrina* as expressed in the aforementioned letter of Pope John X.¹⁰ As it is well known, the *Chronicle of the Presbyter Diocleas* - titled in Latin *Regnum Sclavorum* - is, at least ostensibly, a medieval chronicle that recounts the reigns of South Slavic rulers until the mid-twelfth century. It is thought to have been probably written by Grgur (Gregory), bishop of Bar (*Antivari*), or possibly some cleric from the bishopric of Bar, in the second half of the twelfth century.¹¹ The relevant passage of the *Chronicle*, in which the *liber Methodius* features, gives an account of the assembly (*synodus*) of all people of the Slavic kingdom convoked by king Svetopelek in *planitie Dalmae*, in the valley of Dalma located between *Inferior Dalmatia* and *Superior Dalmatia*. The assembly is said to have discussed legal, theological and institutional matters of the Church (*de lege divina et sacra scriptura ac de statu ecclesiae*), as well as legal and institutional matters of the state

10 Cf. Budak, *Prva stoljeća*, 133.

11 The most important modern editions of the *Chronicle of the Presbyter Diocleas* are: Ferdo Šišić (ed.), *Letopis popa Dukljanina* (Beograd-Zagreb: Zaklada tiskare Narodnih novina, 1928); Vladimir Mošin (ed.), *Ljetopis popa Dukljanina* (Zagreb: Matica hrvatska, 1950); Slavko Mijušković (ed.), *Ljetopis Popa Dukljanina* (Titograd: Grafički zavod, 1967); Branko Banjević, Marko Špadijer, Danka Barović, *Praesbiteri Diocleatis Regnum Sclavorum* (Zagreb: Nacionalna zajednica Crnogoraca Hrvatske; Cetinje: Matica crnogorska, 2003); Dragana Kunčer (ed.), *Gesta regum Sclavorum*, vol. I, *Izvori za srpsku istoriju 7, Latinski izvori 1* (Beograd: Istorijski institut; Manastir Ostrog, 2009); Angeliki Papageorgiou (ed.), *To Χρονικό του Ιερέα της Διόκλειας. Κείμενο, μετάφραση, σχόλια, τα πρόσωπα και ο χώρος* (Athens: Armos, 2012); on the dating, authorship and the content of the *Chronicle of the Presbyter Diocleas*, including the *vexata quaestio* of the relation between facts and fiction in that work, cf. Ludwig Steindorff, „Die Synode auf der Planities Dalmae. Reichseinteilung und Kirchenorganisation im Bild der Chronik des Priesters von Dioclea“, *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung* 93 (1985), 279-324; Eduard Peričić, *Sclavorum regnum Grgura Barskog. Ljetopis popa Dukljanina* [Grgur of Bar's Sclavorum Regnum. The Chronicle of the Presbyter Diocleas] (Zagreb: Kršćanska sadašnjost, 1991); Lujo Margetić, „Poruka i datacija tzv. Ljetopisa Popa Dukljanina [The message and the dating of the Chronicle of the Presbyter Diocleas]“, *Croatia Christiana Periodica* 22 (1998), 1-30; Paul Stephenson, *Byzantium's Balkan frontier: a political study of the Northern Balkans, 900-1204* (2nd ed., Cambridge, 2004), 119-121; Papageorgiou *To Χρονικό του Ιερέα της Διόκλειας*, 12-23. The new hypotheses related to the authorship and authenticity of the work have been presented by Solange Bujan, „La Chronique du Prêtre de Dioclée, un faux document historique“, *Revue des Études byzantines* 66 (2008), 5-38, and Tibor Živković, *Gesta regum Sclavorum*, vol. II, *Izvori za srpsku istoriju 7, Latinski izvori 1* (Beograd: Istorijski institut; Manastir Ostrog, 2009), but up to this day they have not been widely accepted; see for example the critical remarks by Aleksandar Radoman, „*Gesta regum Sclavorum*: nova istoriografska mistifikacija“ [*Gesta regum Sclavorum*: the new historiographical mistification], *Matica* 14 (2013), 103-124.

(*de potestate regis, de ducibus, et comitibus, et centurionibus, et de statu regis*). On the basis of ancient grants of privilege, both Latin and Greek (*antiqua privilegia, tam latina quam graeca*), extended by the Pope and by the Byzantine emperor (*missa ab Apostolico et ab Imperatore*), the kingdom's territory was structured in two main parts: 1. *Maritima*, which consisted of White Croatia (*Croatia Alba*, also called *Inferior Dalmatia*) and Red Croatia (*Croatia Rubea*, also called *Superior Dalmatia*); and 2. *Transmontana*, which consisted of Bosnia and Rascia. At the end of the passage, the *Presbyter Diocleas* gives his final observation concerning these legislative and organizational affairs which, in the *Presbyter Diocleas*' concept, applied to the vast territory in the eastern Adriatic and deep in the interior: *Multas leges et bonos mores instituit, quos qui velit agnoscere, librum Sclavorum qui dicitur Methodius legat; ibi reperiet qualia bona instituit rex benignissimus* („He instituted many laws and good customs, and if anyone wishes to know about these, let him read the Slavonic book called the Methodius. There he will learn which good institutions were set up by this most benign king“).¹²

What is in fact the *liber Sclavorum qui dicitur Methodius* from the *Chronicle of the Presbyter Diocleas*, apart from the (more or less) obvious that it would have been composed in the Slavonic language and written in the Slavonic alphabet, and would have contained legal norms? Naturally, the question has a bearing only if we do not outrightly dismiss such a code as a mere fabrication, which we think would be a mistake, even though the information deriving from the *Chronicle* belongs to the sphere of legends rather than to any concrete and palpable historical situation. A detailed account of various older opinions on that issue was given by a renowned Croatian historian Ferdo Šišić in his edition of the *Chronicle of the Presbyter Diocleas*, thus we omit them here.¹³ The opinion of Marko Kostrenčić (1884-1976), Croatian legal historian, is especially singled out among the rest, as the one which presents „a totally new and independent standpoint“ on the subject.¹⁴ What did Kostrenčić propose? Throughout his scholarly career, Kostrenčić claimed that the *liber Methodius* should be identified with the *Nomocanon of St. Methodius*.¹⁵ He also based this assumption on the fact that the *Vita*

12 A *Presbyter Diocleas*, cap. IX, ed. Mošin, 52-56; ed. Kunčar, 46-60. Various recent interpretations of the *Presbyter*'s account of the *synodus in planitie Dalmae* and the mentioned division of the Svetopelek's kingdom are given by Steindorff, „Die Synode auf der Planities Dalmae“, 279ff; Peričić, *Sclavorum regnum*, 240ff; Martin Eggers, *Das «Großmährische Reich» - Realität oder Fiktion? Eine Neuinterpretation der Quellen zur Geschichte des mittleren Donauraumes im 9. Jahrhundert*, Monographien zur Geschichte des Mittelalters 40 (Stuttgart: Anton Hiersemann, 1995), 198ff; Margetić, „Poruka i datacija“, 1ff; Stephenson, *Byzantium's Balkan frontier*, 119ff.

13 Šišić, *Letopis*, 126ff.

14 *Idem*, 129.

15 He presented his standpoint on the true identity of the *liber Methodius* already in 1916 in his *Review* of the vol. V of Vladimir Mažuranić' *opus magnum*, „Prinosi za hrvatski

Methodii, one of the so-called Pannonian legends written in Slavonic, states that St. Methodius, beside the translation of the Holy Scripture done with the assistance of his two pupils, additionally translated the *Nomocanon from Greek into the Slavonic language*.¹⁶ In spite of differing opinions, which have been successfully refuted after a further discussion, Kostrenčić's assumption is today widely accepted: „There is a general agreement that the book here referred to as ‘Methodius’ must be the *Nomokanon of Methodios*“.¹⁷ This is also the starting point of our examination that follows.

As it is well known, the most important element of the *Nomocanon of St. Methodius* is the Slavonic abbreviated adaptation and translation of the *Synagoge L titularum*, made between 865 and 885. Originally, the *Synagoge L titularum* was composed in Antioch by John Scholastikos, who was later the patriarch of Constantinople (565-577). At the time of Sts. Constantine-Cyril and Methodius, it was still a highly important collection of Canon law in Byzantium.¹⁸ In our view, the very text of the *Chronicle of the Presbyter*

pravno-povijestni rječnik [Contributions to the Croatian legal history dictionary]“, published in *Mjesečnik Pravnčkog društva u Zagrebu* 42 (1916), 374; see also Marko Kostrenčić, *Hrvatska pravna povijest. Zakonik cara Stefana Dušana* [Croatian legal history. The Code of Emperor Stefan Dušan] (Zagreb: Tisak i naklada St. Kugli, 1923), 131, 294ff; *Idem, Načrt historije hrvatske države i hrvatskog prava* [An outline of the history of the Croatian state and the Croatian law] (Zagreb: Školska knjiga, 1956), 134f.

16 Kostrenčić, *Hrvatska pravna povijest*, 294ff; cf. *Vita Methodii*, cap. XV, 5, ed. Fran Grivec, Franjo Tomšič, *Constantinus et Methodius Thessalonicensis. Fontes*, Radovi Staroslavenskog instituta 4 (Zagreb: Staroslavenski institut, 1960), 164.

17 Quoted from Clarence Gallagher, „St. Methodios the canonist: the Greek origins of Slavonic canon law“, in: *Idem, Church law and Church order in Rome and Byzantium: a comparative study*, Birmingham Byzantine and Ottoman Monographs 8 (Aldershot-Burlington: Ashgate Variorum, 2002), 111; cf. Božidar Pejčev, „*Librum Sclavorum qui dicitur Methodius*“ in *Ijetopis Popa Dukljanina*, in: Evangelos Konstantinou (ed.), *Leben und Werk der byzantinischen Slavenapostel Methodios und Kyrillos. Beiträge eines Symposiums der Griechisch-Deutschen Initiative Würzburg im Wasserschloss Mitwitz vom 25. - 27. Juli 1985 zum Gedenken an den 1100. Todestag des Hl. Methodios* (Münsterschwarzach: Vier-Türme-Verl., 1991), 83-86; Budak, *Prva stoljeća*, 131; Cyril Vasil', *Fonti canoniche della chiesa cattolica bizantino-slava nelle eparchie di Mukačevo e Prešov a confronto con il Codex canonum ecclesiarum orientaliū (CCEO)* (Roma: Pontificio Instituto Oriental, 1996), 75, n. 184. Opposing views: Ludwig Steindorff, „*Liber Methodius*. Überlegungen zur kyrillomethodianischen Tradition beim Priester von Dioclea“, *Mitteilungen des Bulgarischen Forschungsinstitutes in Österreich* 8 (1986) (Tagung: *Europa in der zweiten Hälfte des 9. Jahrhunderts und das slawische Schrifttum*), 157-172. Further discussion: Lujo Margetić, „*Liber Methodius* i pitanje vrela devete glave Ijetopisa Popa Dukljanina [The *Liber Methodius* and the question of the sources of the ninth chapter of the *Chronicle of the Presbyter Diocleas*]“, *Croatica Christiana Periodica* 24 (2000), 1-9.

18 *Συναγωγή κανόνων ἐκκλησιαστικῶν εἰς ν' τίτλους διηρημένη*, as its full Greek title is, is composed of Apostolic canons and the canons of the councils of Nicaea, Ankyra, Neokaisareia, Serdica, Gangra, Antioch, Laodikeia of Phrygia, Constantinople, Ephesus and Chalcedon, as well as the canonical epistles of St. Basil the Great; on the *Synagoge L titularum* of John Scholastikos, see Vladimir N. Benešević, Ioannis Scholastici *Synagoga L titularum*

Diocleas not only mentions the liber Methodius, but also contains some important indications which can further strengthen the belief that the liber Methodius was really the Nomocanon, and that its author was really St. Methodius. Certain specifications regarding the characteristics of the book are made by the Presbyter himself: it has already been pointed out that the book called Methodius is the „Slavonic one“ (liber Sclavorum) and the legal one, i. e. that its contents are „the laws and customs“ (leges et boni mores). Moreover, certain indications can be found in the Presbyter’s text for the assumption that the liber Methodius had a nomocanonical structure. As we have seen, the synodus in planitie Dalmae discussed legal, theological and institutional matters of the Church (de lege divina et sacra scriptura ac de statu ecclesiae), as well as legal and institutional matters of the state (de potestate regis, de ducibus, et comitibus, et centurionibus, et de statu regis).

ceteraque ejusdem opera juridica, vol. I (München: Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1937); Nicolaas van der Wal, Johannes Henricus Antonius Lokin, *Historiae iuris graeco-romani delineatio. Les sources du droit byzantin de 300 à 1453* (Groningen: E. Forsten, 1985), 51ff; Clarence Gallagher, *Dionysius Exiguus and John Scholasticos: Rome and Constantinople in the Sixth Century*, in: *Idem, Church law and Church order in Rome and Byzantium*, 18ff; Spyros Troianos, *Byzantine Canon Law to 1100*, in Wilfried Harmann, Kenneth Pennington (eds.), *The History of Byzantine and Eastern Canon Law to 1500* (Washington: CUA Press, 2012), 118ff; *Idem, Le fonti del diritto bizantino*. Translated in Italian by Pierangelo Buongiorno (Torino: G. Giappichelli Editore, 2015), 115ff; on the Slavonic version of the *Synagoge L titulorum* in the context of Cyrillo-Methodian missions, cf. Heinrich Felix Schmid, *Die Nomokanonübersetzung des Methodius. Die Sprache der kirchenslavischen Übersetzung der Synagoge des Johannes Scholasticus* (Leipzig: Marert & Petters, 1922; Josef Vašica, „Metodějův překlad nomokanonu“, *Slavia* 24 (1955), 9-41; Fran Grivec, „Cyrillo-Methodiana, II: O Metodovem Nomokanonu [On the Methodius’ Nomocanon]“, *Slovo. Časopis Staroslavenskog instituta* 6-8 (1957), 35ff; Sergey Viktorovich Troitsky, „Апостол славянства св. Мефодий как канонист“, *Журнал Московской Патриархии* 3 (1958), 38-51; *Idem*, „Мефодий как славянский законодатель“, *Богословские труды* 2 (1961), 83-142; P. Ivan Žužek, „The Determining Structure of the Slavonic Syntagma of Fifty Titles“, *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 33 (1967), 139-160; Josef Vašica, Karel Haderka, „Nomokanon“, in: *Magnae Moraviae Fontes Historici*, vol. 4. *Textus Iuridici Supplementa* (Brno: Universita J.E. Purkyně, 1971), 246ff; Charalambos K. Papastathis, *Τὸ νομοθετικὸν ἔργον τῆς κυριλλομεθοδιανῆς ἱεραποστολῆς ἐν Μεγάλῃ Μοραβίᾳ*, Ἑλληνικὴ Ἐταιρεία Σλαβικῶν Μελετῶν 2 (Thessaloniki: Hellenic Association for Slavic Studies, 1978); Kirill Maksimovič, „Aufbau und Quellen des altrussischen Ustjurer Nomokanons“, in Ludwig Burgmann (ed.), *Fontes Minores* 10, Forschungen zur Byzantinischen Rechtsgeschichte 22 (Frankfurt a. M.: Löwenklau-Gesellschaft e.V., 1998), 477-508; Clarence Gallagher, „St. Methodios the canonist: the Greek origins of Slavonic canon law“, in *Idem, Church law and Church order in Rome and Byzantium*, 95ff; Kirill Maksimovič, *Паннонские юридические памятники древне русской книжности. Автореферат диссертации на соискание ученой степени доктора филологических наук*, PhD dissertation (Института русского языка им. В. В. Виноградова РАН, Moscow 2007); *Idem*, „Byzantine Law in Old Slavonic Translations and the Nomocanon of Methodius“, *Byzantinoslavica* 65 (2007), 9-18; Ivan Biliarsky, Mariyana Tsibranska-Kostova, „Legatum iuridicum Sancti Methodii et Iles Balkans“, *Études Balkaniques. Recherches interdisciplinaires sur les mondes hellénique et balkanique. Cahiers Pierre Belon* 19-20 (2013-1014), 43-63.

In the same context, ancient privileges (*antiqua privilegia*), accorded by the Pope and by the Byzantine emperor (*missa ab Apostolico et ab Imperatore*), were mentioned. According to the *Presbyter*, the norms regarding these ecclesiastical and statal issues were all contained in the *liber Methodius*.¹⁹ Is not already this consequent bipartition (Church/State, Pope/Emperor) a kind of indication that the *liber Methodius* may have been by its legal nature the Nomocanon made of ecclesiastical canons (*κανόνες*), as well as of the laws of the state (*νόμοι*)?

Finally, apart from the very title of the book, the *liber Methodius*, which certainly implies a reference to St. Methodius, is there any other indication in the text of the *Chronicle of the Presbyter Diocleas* which would place this book within the Cyrillo-Methodian context? At the very beginning of the same passage (cap. IX), which contains the description of the *synodus in planitie Dalmae* and mentions the *liber Methodius*, the *Presbyter Diocleas* gives an account of how Constantine, the most holy man (*Constantinus vir sanctissimus*), who is erroneously said to have been given the name Cyril by Pope Stephen upon becoming a monk (*cui nomen postea Kyrillus a papa Stephano impositum est, quando consecravit eum monacum*), baptized the king Svetopelek and his whole kingdom. The *Presbyter* also points out that Constantine composed the Slavonic alphabet (*litteram lingua sclavonica componens*), translated the Holy Scripture *from Greek into the Slavonic language* (*commutavit evangelium Christi, atque psalterium, et omnes divinos libros Veteris, et Novi testamenti de Graeca littera in Sclavonicam*) and introduced the Slavonic liturgy according to the Greek rite (*missam eis ordinans more Graecorum*). After reading of the *Presbyter's* account about St. Constantine-Cyril and his Christianization of the Slavic kingdom, which is organically followed by a description of the *synodus in planitie Dalmae*, it does not seem difficult to conclude that the *liber Methodius* may have also been part of the same evangelization context.²⁰

¹⁹ *Presbyter Diocleas*, cap. IX, ed. Mošin, 56; ed. Kunčar, 60. Cf. Kostrenčić, *Hrvatska pravna povijest*, 131.

²⁰ *Presbyter Diocleas*, cap. IX, ed. Mošin, 48-50, 52-56; ed. Kunčar, 38-40, 46-60. On the Cyrillo-Methodian context of the cap. IX of the *Chronicle of Presbyter Diocleas*, including a discussion on possible older literary sources which are used by the *Presbyter* in the composition of that chapter (*Vita Constantini, Vita Methodii, Vita Clementis Bulgarici, Legenda Italica, Legenda Moravica, Legenda Christiani*), see Margetić, „Poruka i datacija“, 25ff; Eggers, *Das «Großmährische Reich»*, 194f; Steindorff, „*Liber Methodius*“, 157ff; Margetić, „*Liber Methodius*“, 1ff; cf. also Sante Graciotti, „Un episodio dell'incontro tra Oriente ed Occidente: la letteratura e il rito glagolitico-croato“, in Franz Zagiba (ed.), *Geschichte der Ost- und Westkirche in ihren wechselseitigen Beziehungen. Acta Congressus Historiae Slavicae Salisburgensis in memoriam ss Cyrilli et Methodii anno 1963 celebrati*, vol. II, Annales Instituti Slavici 3 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1967), 67-79; Angeliki Papageorgiou, „The wake behind the mission of Cyril and Methodius: Byzantine resonances in the Chronicle of the Priest of Diokleia“, in Anthony-Emil N. Tachiaos (ed.), *Kyrillos kai Methodios: To Byzantio kai o kosmos ton Slabon. Diethnes Epistemoniko Synedrio 20 - 30 Noembriu 2013 / Cyril and*

The *Methodii doctrina* in the letter of Pope John X

When Pope John X brought up the *Methodii doctrina* in his letter to the higher clergy of Dalmatia in 925, approximately half a century had passed since the term was first mentioned in the *Conversio Bagoariorum et Carantanorum*. As proposed above, the term *doctrina Methodii* seems to have been primarily used in the 870's and 880's as a means to discredit St. Methodius as a heretic, which echoes in later traditions preserved especially in Archdeacon Thomas of Split's *History of the Bishops of Salona and Split*, even if its content may have in some way also been related to the *filioque* controversy. Therefore, the meaning which the *doctrina Methodii* must have had at that point was personally oriented, that is to say, it was designed to disparage St. Methodius personally and to counter his accomplishments rather than to imply a concrete set of beliefs that have been or could be disseminated in a written form. However, until the 920's something seems to have happened with what the term started to signify, which may perhaps explain why Archdeacon Thomas of Split would refer centuries later to St. Methodius', „deceivingly writing a great deal against the precept of the Catholic faith in the Slavonic language“.²¹ The Pope's letter reminds in an admonishing tone that „if someone would teach anything else but that which is found in

Methodius: Byzantium and the World of the Slavs. International Scientific Conference 20th-30th November 2013 (Thessaloniki: Hellenic Association for Slavic Studies, 2015), 718-727. Ivan Biliarsky, „The first article of the code ‘Zakon sudnyj ljudem’ and the legal legacy of Sts Cyril and Methodius and their Moravian Mission“, in Pavel Kouřil et al., *The Cyril and Methodius Mission and Europe - 1150 Years Since the Arrival of the Thessaloniki Brothers in Great Moravia* (Brno: The Institute of Archaeology of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic, 2014), 219 has remarked that the work done by Sts Cyril and Methodius had a strong legal aspect and a left a considerable legal legacy, but it was primarily evangelistic and eschatological, which would put all other aspects in the secondary position. It is not necessary perhaps to downplay one aspect in favor of the other one, even though, as Biliarsky emphasizes it, the brother „were not sent with the goal of creating, correcting, systematising or making ‘Byzantinised’ legislation“ (*ibidem*). The *Presbyter's* account seems to imply that at least St. Methodius' legal expertise could be appropriated by secular authorities and that his evangelization effort involved a substantial canonical and juridical dimension.

21 See note 6 above. It is worth pointing out that there is a scholarly tradition which attributes the authorship of the 9th-century Slavonic code of law titled *Zakon sudnyj ljudem* (*Court Law for the People*) to St. Methodius, which would only support the assumption about his skills in excerpting and translating Byzantine legal collections. Cf. Kiril Maximovich, „Das älteste Recht der Slawen zwischen Ost und West: der hl. Method als Gesetzgeber“, in Andreas Bauer (ed.), *Europa und seine Regionen. 2000 Jahre Rechtsgeschichte* (Köln: Böhlau, 2007), 71-79; with Kiril Petkov, *The Voices of Medieval Bulgaria, Seventh-Fifteenth Century. The Records of a Bygone Culture*, East Central and Eastern Europe in the Middle Ages, 450–1450 vol. 5 (Leiden-Boston: Brill, 2008), 48, 553, note 73. See also now Biliarsky, „The first article of the code ‘Zakon sudnyj ljudem’“, 225-226, who is inclined to view both St. Constantine-Cyril and St. Methodius as authors of the mentioned code of law.

the sacred canons and volumes, even if it be the angel from heaven, he will be anathematized“ (*Si quis aliud docuerit praeter id, quod in sacris canonibus atque voluminibus reperitur, etiam si angelus de celo fuerit, anathema sit*), and then moves on to the point: „However, let this be far from the faithful who worship Christ and believe to may obtain another life through meritorious act that they disregard the doctrine of the Gospel, volumes of the canons and even the apostolic precepts, and flee to the doctrine of Methodius, which we have not found among the sacred authors in any volume“ (*Sed absit hoc a fidelibus, qui Christum colunt et alima vitam per operationem se credunt posse habere, ut doctrinam evangelii atque canonum volumina apostolicaque etiam precepta pretermittentes ad Methodii doctrinam confugiant, quem in nullo volumine inter sacros auctores comperimus*).²² From what the letter says it may perhaps be surmised that the Pope was actually in possession of a writing which set forth doctrinal matters (or was it an informed report to the Curia with specifically listed contentious items?), and had it compared to the volumes of officially sanctioned ecclesiastical teachings, which resulted in a conclusion that it contained, as far as the Latin Church goes, heretical concepts.²³ Moreover, the emphasis – *inter alia* that was pointed out in the papal letter – on the *canonum volumina*, which is a sure reference to the Canon law of the Latin Church, is an additional significant indicator of what the *doctrina Methodii* may have become by that time.

Not less intriguing is the question about how the *doctrina Methodii* could find such a good footing in the eastern Adriatic region that it finally attracted the attention of the Papacy, the fact resonating in the *Excerptum de Karentanis*’ (erroneous) claim that St. Methodius came to Carinthia from Istria and Dalmatia.²⁴ It has already been noticed in the scholarship that the eastern Adriatic was the area where the Cyrillo-Methodian tradition was particularly strong.²⁵ At least southern parts of the region (the Duklja-Hum area) seem to have been firmly exposed to its influences by the early tenth century, whereas

22 Kostrenčić, Stipišić, Šamšalović (eds.), *Codex diplomaticus*, vol. I, 29-30 (no. 22).

23 *Contra Budak, Prva stoljeća*, 129, who explicitly says that no heresy based on Methodius’ teaching could have been meant under the term *Methodii doctrina*.

24 See note 6 above. Verkholtantsev, „*Littera specialis*“, 250 explains that, „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“.

25 Cf. Martin Eggers, *Das Erzbistum des Method. Lage, Wirkung und Nachleben der kyrillomethodianischen Mission*, Slavistische Beiträge 339 (München: Verlag Otto Sagner, 1996), 90ff; with Birnbaum, „Some remaining puzzles“, 30. Budak, *Prva stoljeća*, 130-133 has opted for the area of early medieval Duklja as a focal point for spreading of the Cyrillo-Methodian tradition along the eastern Adriatic coast; with *Idem*, „Frühes Christentum in Kroatien“, in Günther Hödl, Johannes Grammayr (eds.), *Karantainen und der Alpen-Adria-Raum im Frühmittelalter*, 2. St. Veiter Historikergespräche (Wien-Köln-Weimar: Böhlau Verlag, 1991), 227.

the Kvarner and Istra areas were included in the circle somewhat later.²⁶ It is thought that these influences reached the eastern Adriatic from two directions – the northern one from Moravia and the southern one from Macedonia and Bulgaria.²⁷ Particularly noteworthy is the southern route, since it ran precisely through coastal Duklja, where the *Chronicle of the Presbyter Diocleas* was composed.²⁸ Even though the interpretation may vary regarding the extent and intensity of Byzantine authority over the eastern Adriatic, the extant sources seem to indicate that Byzantium was capable of continuously exerting both direct and indirect influence in the region throughout the period from the ninth to eleventh centuries, in spite of setbacks and intermittent withdrawals, and that its presence was felt constantly, not the least in terms of economic and cultural impacts.²⁹ Given the fact that Byzantium was so much interested in maintaining its position in the region one way or the other, and to this end was prepared to employ the array of available means and strategies, it is readily conceivable that the Cyrillo-Methodian tradition could have been made use for such a purpose at the time when the empire experienced, during the late ninth and the early tenth century, the ebbing of its authority in Dalmatia, which had already started under Emperor Basil I (867-886), whose reign actually saw marshalling of the empire's forces in the eastern Adriatic and a brief but conspicuous renewal of direct control over the region.³⁰

26 Cf. Martin Eggers, *Das Erzbistum des Method. Lage, Wirkung und Nachleben der kyrillomethodianischen Mission*, Slavistische Beiträge 339 (München: Verlag Otto Sagner, 1996), 90ff; with Birnbaum, „Some remaining puzzles“, 30.

27 Cf. Henrik Birnbaum, „How Did Glagolitic Writing Reach the Coastal Regions of North-western Croatia?“, *Croatica: prinosi proučavanju hrvatske književnosti* 42-43-44 (1996), 67-79.

28 It perhaps needs to be pointed out that Margetić, „*Liber Methodius*“, 6 thinks that the *Presbyter* is distinctly pro-Byzantine, while Angeliki Papageorgiou, „The Byzantine Citizen in the Gesta regum Sclavorum“, in Miša Rakocija (ed.), *Niš i Vizantija XIV: Simpozium, Niš 3-5. jun 2015. Zbornik radova* (Niš: Grad Niš, 2016), 88 concludes that the author of the *Chronicle* (she believes him to be Cistercian Rudger-Rüdiger, the archbishop of Bar from 1299 to 1301, as proposed by Tibor Živković) concludes that the *Presbyter* „makes every effort to weaken and diminish the influence and the presence of the Byzantine Empire throughout the ages“.

29 See Jadran Ferluga, *Vizantiska uprava u Dalmaciji* [The Byzantine administration in Dalmatia], SAN Posebna izdanja 291, Vizantološki institut 6 (Beograd: Naučno delo, 1957), 46ff; Ivo Goldstein, „Byzantine Presence on the Eastern Adriatic Coast 6th - 12th Century“, *Byzantinoslavica* 57 (1996), 257-264; *Idem*, „Byzantine Rule on the Adriatic (in Dalmatia, Istria and on the western Adriatic): possibilities for a comparative study“, *Acta Histriae* 7/1 (1999), 59-76; Paul Stephenson, *Byzantium's Balkan Frontier. A Political Study of the Northern Balkans, 900-1204* (2nd ed., Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 28-29, 74, 123-135, 144-150, 154-155, 203-205, 226-229, 253-256, 260-266; Tibor Živković, *Južni Sloveni pod vizantijskom vlašću od 600-1025* [South Slavs under the Byzantine rule] (2nd. ed., Beograd: Čigoja štampa, 2007), 229-255, 263-267, 284-289; with Mladen Ančić, „The Waning of the Empire. The disintegration of Byzantine rule on the Eastern Adriatic in the 9th century“, *Hor-tus Artium Medievalium* 4 (1998), 15-24 for a differing view.

30 The setback was the overthrow, in 879, of the Croatian prince Zdeslav who was a Byzan-

The assumption seems even more probable considering that the Cyrillo-Methodian mission was in its core designed to benefit Byzantium's religious and political expansion.³¹ That there was a struggle for influence in Dalmatia at that time is testified by Pope John VIII's remark in a letter dispatched in June 879 to the Dalmatian clergy, heads of the people and inhabitants of Dalmatian towns: „Moreover, if you suspect anything on the part of the Greeks or the Slavs regarding your turning to us and your consecration or receiving a pallium, know it for certain that we will arrange to assist you with our authority according to the statutes of the holy fathers and our pontifical predecessors (*Porro si aliquid de parte Grecorum vel Sclavorum super vestra ad nos reversione vel consecratione aut de palii perceptione dubitatis, scitote pro certo, quoniam nos secundum sanctorum patrum decessorumque nostrorum pontificum statuta vos adiuvere auctoritate curabimus*).³²

Concluding remarks

Let us now go back to the context of the 925 church synod of Split. Starting from the assumption about a possible relation of the *liber Methodius* and the *Methodii doctrina*, it is not difficult to imagine that the notion of the *Methodii doctrina*, as expressed in the letter of Pope John X, also includes issues regarding the content of the *Nomocanon of St. Methodius*, which seems to be that to which the neglect of *canonum volumina* from the letter precisely refers. In this context one should especially emphasize that some of the crucial neuralgic canonical issues of that time and space which, apart from the Slavonic language, were also discussed and defined by the norms of the mentioned church synod of Split in 925, had been regulated in the *Nomocanon of St. Methodius* differently than in the Latin Church, such as,

tine candidate on the throne, which might have been followed by Basil's decision to have the towns of the Byzantine Dalmatia paying their dues to the neighboring Slavic rulers instead of to the *strategos* (cf. Ančić, „The Waning of the Empire“, 19-20).

31 Cf. Marcello Garzaniti, „The Constantinopolitan project of the Cyrillo-methodian mission in the light of the Slavonic Vitae of Thessalonican brothers“, in Anthony-Emil N. Tachiaos (ed.), *Kyrillos kai Methodios: To Byzantio kai o kosmos ton Slabon. Diethnes Epistemoniko Synedrio 20 - 30 Noembriu 2013 / Cyril and Methodius: Byzantium and the World of the Slavs. International Scientific Conference 20th-30th November 2013* (Thessaloniki: Hellenic Association for Slavic Studies, 2015), 51ff, who tentatively connects the arrival of Cyrillo-Methodian tradition to Croatia with St. Methodius' activity and Prince Zdeslav (p. 58). About the goals of the mission see also Vladimír Vavrínek, „Cyril and Methodius: A Lost Mission. Was there an official Byzantine project for the Slavonic mission?“, in *ibidem*, 25-38; Sergej A. Ivanov, „With the Emperor's Help: Hearty Mission and Byzantine Diplomacy“, in *ibidem*, 87-93.

32 *Iohannis VIII. papae registrum*, ed. Erich Caspar, in *Epistolae Karolini aevi V*, Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Epistolae VII, Pars prior (Berlin: Weidmann, 1928), 157 (no. 196).

perhaps, the (il)licitness of clerical marriage or the autonomy of the local church.

The subject obviously deserves a more detailed study, but, on balance, it is hard to avoid suggesting that the need to impose the „Latin matrix“ could indicate *a contrario* the „real presence“ of the *Nomocanon of St. Methodius* in the territory of Dalmatia (or the *Presbyter's Croatia Alba et Croatia Rubea*) in the early tenth century within the ecclesiastical structures of the „Slavonic matrix“. In other words, the fact that the *Methodii doctrina* and the life of ecclesiastical structures of the „Slavonic matrix“ in the territory of Dalmatia in the tenth century differed from the „Latin matrix“ was most likely a result of Byzantine influences and missionary activities of Cyrillo-Methodian provenance.