

CONVERSIO BAGOARIORUM ET CARANTANORUM – DOCUMENT OF AN EARLY MEDIEVAL SHOW TRIAL

TAMÁS NÓTÁRI*

The protagonists of the Slavonic (and Avar) mission in the 9th century were the Byzantine Empire, on the one hand, and the Frankish Empire, which relied on the Archbishopric of Salzburg and the Patriarchy of Aquilea pursuing fairly independent politics, on the other; this balance was disrupted by the papacy, which was gaining strength, taking firm steps with independent mission policy against the power of the Carolingian dynasty.¹ This threefoldness provided the background of the activity of Methodius known as the Apostle of the Slavs and of his conflict with the Archbishopric of Salzburg and its diocesan bishops. At the Council of Regensburg held in the presence of Louis the German in 870, Adalwin, archbishop of Salzburg and his bishops passed a judgment on Methodius, a missionary from Byzantium, then papal legate and archbishop of Sirmium, since they deemed that by his missionary activity pursued in Pannonia Methodius infringed the jurisdiction of Salzburg exercised over this territory for more the seventy years, and after that they held him in captivity for two and a half years. It was this lawsuit (show trial) regarding which the *Conversio Bagoariorum et Carantanorum* was drafted either as a bill of indictment or to legitimate the lawsuit subsequently, but it cannot be clarified.² The tendency of the presentation of the *Conversio* has been characterised quite to the point by Kahl as follows:

It plays a brave game on the verge of truth; its statements are just unattackable for well-informed readers, and it leaves open, what is more, suggests several different possibilities of combination for uninformed ones; being fully aware of the facts and his task the author conceals undesirable and ‘dangerous’ connections and facts and relates events far from each other with a considerable amount of cunning.³

* DR. TAMÁS NÓTÁRI (PhD)

Associate Professor

Károli Gáspár University, Budapest

¹ Reindel 249sqq.; Löwe “Der Streit” 3sq.; Eggers 19; Bosl 1sqq.

² Lošek “Sieben Fragen” 126sq.; Nótári 95sqq.

³ Kahl “Virgil” 112.

The present paper first highlights the historical background of the conflict between Methodius and the bishops of Bavaria: it outlines the process of Christianization of Carantania (1) and Avaria (2). Then, it investigates the activity of Methodius in Pannonia and Moravia, and the reasons for the trial held in Regensburg which led to the most shameful captivity of Methodius (3).

1. The Carantanians were the first Slavonic people who established relations with the Bavarian Dukedom and the Frankish Empire. What happened was that prince Boruth called the Bavarians to help him against the Avars probably in 741/42; and the victory over the Avars led to the rule of the Bavarians over the Carantanians.⁴ Somewhat before 743 the Carantanian prince Boruth was forced to send his son, Cacatius and his nephew, Cheitmar as hostages.⁵ There they were given Christian instruction by Lupo, a priest from Salzburg.⁶ After Boruth's death, about 750, the Bavarians let his son, Cacatius already turned Christian and made by the Slavs their prince go home on the orders of the Franks and at the request of the Slavs.⁷ However, three years later Cacatius died, and at the request of the Slavs and with Pippin's permission Boruth's nephew, Cheitmar (752-769) by then also a Christian and sent back by the Bavarians became the prince of the Carantanians.⁸ According to the fourth chapter of the *Conversio* Cheitmar's godfather, Lupo the priest sent his nephew, Maioranus ordained in Salzburg to accompany Cheitmar, who exhorted the prince that in the course of fulfilling his Christian obligations he should be obedient and humble towards the monastery of Salzburg – the *Conversio* intended to describe the result of this process as a kind of feudal relation.⁹ Cheitmar promised to follow the exhortation, and performed his service and received instruction there from year to year until the end of his life.¹⁰ It is worth paying some attention to the following points: The orders of the Franks played a major role in the release of both Cacatius and Cheitmar;¹¹ Lupo and Maioranus were no more than simple priests; and we do not find any reference to the fact that they were assigned to stay beside the Carantanian princes upon the instruction of the Bishopric of Salzburg – as for Maioranus, some sort of attachment to Salzburg, the place of

⁴ *Conversio Bagoariorum et Carantanorum* 4. Cf. Szádeczky, Kardoss 266sq.; Schellhorn 104; Kahl "Virgil" 116; Dopsch "Rupert" 101sq.; Wolfram "Conversio" 73sq.; Dopsch "Adel und Kirche" 27sq.; Pohl "Bayern" 59.

⁵ Cf. Kahl "Zwische Aquileia und Salzburg" 44.

⁶ *Conversio* 4.

⁷ *Conversio* 4.

⁸ Dopsch "Rupert" 103sq.; Schellhorn 104; *Conversio* 4.

⁹ Dopsch "Slawenmission" 307sq.

¹⁰ Wolfram "Conversio" 86sq.; Dopsch "Slawenmission" 307; Dopsch "Rupert" 107; *Conversio* 4.

¹¹ Pohl "Bayern" 65.

his one-time ordainment can be discovered, and accordingly he exhorted also Cheitmar to be faithful to the monastery. If there had been a closer relation between Cacatius and Cheitmar, Lupo and Maioranus, and Salzburg, which was elevated to the rank of bishopric in 739, then the author of the *Conversio* would have certainly not failed to emphasise that – so it is fairly probable that the initial steps of the Christianization of the Carantanians were made by the Franks, presumably by Pippin himself, and not by the Bavarian Church.¹²

Significant results were achieved by Salzburg, actively joining the mission, only after bishop Virgil, on Cheitmar's call, commissioned Modestus *episcopus chori* to lead the mission.¹³ Then, after Modestus died in 763, in spite several pagan revolts (*carmula*), Virgil successfully carried on with the missionary work among the Carantanians, which was considerably eased by the military victory of prince Tasilo III in 772 over the Carantanians, completely breaking their opposition.¹⁴ After Carantania had been annexed to Bavaria (although it was allowed to keep its own princes), nothing hindered the mission pursued by the Bishopric of Salzburg and supported by the Dukedom of Bavaria¹⁵ and later joined by the Bishopric of Freising.¹⁶ Although the *Conversio* does not refer to the active participation of the papacy, most probably Salzburg was backed by Rome's *tacitus consensus* in extending its territory because a part of Carantania lay on the territory of the Patriarchy of Aquileia too much busy with absorbing the bishoprics of Istria and therefore not carrying out missionary work in this region.¹⁷ Later on, when Ursus, the patriarch of Aquileia wanted to renew Aquileia's rights to Carantania, Arn the Archbishop of Salzburg adduced to the privileges granted by Pope Zacharias (741-752), Pope Stephen II (752-757) and Pope Paul I (757-767) which had annexed Carantania to Salzburg, and in 811 Charlemagne as umpire designated the River Drava cutting across Carantania as the border between the two dioceses.¹⁸ The original copies of the aforesaid papal charters have not been preserved; however, their existence cannot be questioned because it well fits into the character of Virgil's thorough procedure precisely preparing the mission that he had Carantania acknowledged by three consecutive popes as a territory subject to the supremacy of the Bishopric of Salzburg. Furthermore, it is not probable that Archbishop Arn, who maintained good personal relations with Charlemagne, would have dared to refer

¹² Kahl "Virgil" 115.

¹³ *Conversio* 5.

¹⁴ *Annales Iuvavenses maximi a. 772*; Wolfram "Das Fürstentum" 157sqq.

¹⁵ Störmer 207sqq.

¹⁶ Schellhorn 105.

¹⁷ Dopsch "Slawenmission" 308.

¹⁸ SUB II. Nr. 3; Eggers 24sqq.

to charters that had never existed against Patriarch Ursus who was very much aware of the legal background.¹⁹ In the mission performed among the Carantanians by Salzburg in the 8th century, the papacy undertook almost no role at all; however, this situation considerably changed by the 9th century.

2. Although the Avars tried to enter into negotiations with Charlemagne to make him acknowledge the western frontiers of their empire, these negotiations failed to produce any result. Following this, in September 791, the Frank army, including Alemann, Bavarian, Frisian, Saxon and Slavonic troops started from Regensburg towards Avaria. The Franks, with whom the Avars did not intend to fight, reached the River Raba without considerable resistance. However, from here they had to retreat due to an epidemic that decimated both soldiers and horses, and only the attack led by Pippin from the south-west yielded some success.²⁰ Then internal war broke out among the Avars during which both the *khagan* and the *jugurr* were killed. In 795, at the order of Eric, the *comes* of Friaul, first, Voinomir and then Pippin broke into the Ring and plundered it. In 796 the *tudun* and his suite assumed Christianity in Aachen in front of Charlemagne.²¹ Therefore, the new *khagan* had to submit to Frank rule, but against expectations no peaceful times ensued in the Avaricum partly because of the attempts at achieving independence made by the *tudun* in 797, 799, and 802, and partly because of the conflicts between the Avars and Slavs. Later, the Avars led by the *kapkan*, who were harassed by the Slavs, petitioned Charlemagne to settle between Savaria and the Danube. After the *kapkan*'s death, the *khagan* Abraham visited the emperor and asked him to renew the office of the *khagan*, a request that was satisfied by the emperor, who thought that he could resolve the Avar – Slav conflict by unifying the Avars, though this was attained only in the year 811 as a result of the armed intervention of the Franks.²²

In order to discuss the missionary tasks, a local council was held in Pippin's camp in 796, where Paulinus, the Aquileian Patriarch and Arn, the bishop of Salzburg were present.²³ The chief objects of the council were the methods to be employed in converting and baptising the Avars. They agreed on

¹⁹ Dopsch "Slawenmission" 309.

²⁰ *Annales qui dicuntur Einhardi a. 791; Annales Laureshamenses a. 791; Pohl W. "Die Awaren" 316sq.; Szádeczky-Kardoss 279sq.; Wolfram "Die Geburt Mitteleuropas" 254sq.*

²¹ *Annales qui dicuntur Einhardi a. 796; Annales regni Francorum a. 796; cf. Pohl "Die Awaren" 317sqq.; Szádeczky-Kardoss 1998. 286sqq.; Wolfram "Die Geburt Mitteleuropas" 257.*

²² *Annales regni Francorum a. 805; 811; cf. Deér 772sqq.; Szádeczky-Kardoss 1998. 307. Pohl "Die Awaren" 321sqq.; Wolfram "Die Geburt Mitteleuropas" 216.*

²³ Zagiba "Die Missionierung" 280; Wolfram "Die Geburt Mitteleuropas" 261; Wolfram "Arn von Salzburg" 22sq.; Eggers 26.

the following principles:²⁴ baptism should be voluntary in each case; the preacher has to reach the desired results by persuasion and not by terror.²⁵ The priest has to decide after how much time, or delay the holy baptism can be administered, but the number of days should not exceed forty. Traditionally, baptism could be administered at Easter or Lent, but under special circumstances the adults could be baptised on any Sunday. Only in mortal danger is it possible to deviate from Sunday. Those baptised in the name of the Holy Trinity need not be baptised again. Those who were baptised by ignorant priests, who did not say the baptising formula, only washed their body with water should be regarded as unbaptised and should be (re)baptised. In these principles one can trace Alcuin's influence who tries to encourage his friend, Arn to preach Divine Forgiveness rather than collect the tithe, and warns him that the newly christened souls must get stronger before setting the yoke of taxation on them.²⁶ He also reminds Arn that it was the aggressive collection of the tithe that endangered the success of the mission among the Saxons too.²⁷ At the same time, he turns to Charlemagne to remit the payment of tithe on Avar territory, a request that was probably satisfied by the emperor.²⁸ It is not by chance that the institution of the reduced, the so called Slavonic tithe persisted for three centuries.²⁹

There is no clear information, however, about the way in which the Danubian Council divided the conquered Avar territories among the dioceses meant to fulfill the missionary duties. The sixth chapter of the *Conversio* is probably based on a contemporary document reporting the three-fold division among Aquileia, Passau and Salzburg, drawn up by Pippin in 796 and later confirmed by Charlemagne.³⁰ However, there is no precise decision on the assignment of the region between the Enns and the Raba to the Bishopric of Passau, although the text of the *Conversio* would allow this conjecture, as one can read here about the activities and properties of the Salzburg bishopric, which stretched to the West from the Forest of Vienna, and even to the North from the Danube.³¹ It is a fact though that during the rearrangement of the *Ostland* they designated the Raba as the natural border between the jurisdictions of Passau and Salzburg.³² Nevertheless, missionary work did not immediately start once

²⁴ Szádeczky-Kardoss 291-292.

²⁵ Zagiba "Die Missionierung" 284.

²⁶ Cf. Diesenberger-Wolfram 86sq.

²⁷ Alcuin, *epist.* 107. Cf. Zagiba "Die Missionierung" 282.

²⁸ Alcuin, *epist.* 110.

²⁹ See Szádeczky-Kardoss 294sq.; Diesenberger-Wolfram 87.

³⁰ *Conversio* 6.

³¹ *Conversio* 11.

³² Dvornik "Byzantium" 94sq.; Wolfram "Die Geburt Mitteleuropas" 267; Wolfram "Arn von Salzburg" 23; Sós "Die slawische Bevölkerung" 27.

they had defined the basic principles of the task. In order to defeat the Roman aristocracy's resistance against Pope Leo III as well as to discuss the building of St. Paul's Cathedral and the rising of Salzburg to the rank of an archbishopric, Charlemagne sent twelve ambassadors in late 797 including Arn, Paulinus, the Patriarch of Aquileia and Fardulf, the Abbot of St. Denis. As a result of this diplomatic mission Arn received the *pallium* from Pope Leo on 20 April 798. Then after returning from Rome, he was ordered by the emperor to travel to the conquered territories and conduct missionary work there. As missionary work did not suit Arn's personality, following the Salzburg tradition, he entrusted the direct execution of the task to a missionary bishop, Theoderich. Bishop Theoderich (probably after the Council of Traismauer in June 799) was led by Arn and Gerold I, the *praefectus Bavariae* to the site of his activity, Carantania and the conquered Avaria, which mainly fell into the sphere of influence of the *tudun*, who had submitted himself to Charlemagne.³³

It is worth casting a glance at the role played by the papacy in Salzburg's missionary plans and activity in Pannonia. Neither Arn, nor his successors considered it necessary to have their jurisdiction over Pannonina confirmed by the Pope, and the reasons for that can be unambiguously explored. During the pontificate of Leo III the papacy reached the nadir of its power when in 799 its enemies made an attempt on the Pope's life, and formally deprived him of his dignity.³⁴ Later, however, he managed to escape, and sought shelter with Charlemagne who was staying in Paderborn. The ruler let him return to Rome accompanied by a huge entourage.³⁵ Arn became a member of the committee competent to pass a decision on the charges *perjurium* and *adulterium* – brought regarding the conflict between the Pope and his enemies. However, as Leo III was unable to prove his innocence convincingly during the investigation, on 23 December 800 he was forced to take a ceremonial cleansing oath.³⁶ In this period Arn was able to become more thoroughly acquainted with the Pope, so he did not deem it necessary to ask the head of the Church having lost both his power and reputation to confirm his claim to titles regarding Pannonia, which had been quite effectively guaranteed by Charlemagne.³⁷ As we have seen the thought of the mission came from the ruler himself, and during the implementation thereof neither approval, nor help was requested from the Pope.

³³ *Conversio* 8. Cf. Schmidinger 92-101; Wolfram "Conversio" 109-111; Wolfram "Die Geburt Mitteleuropas" 261; Wolfram "Arn von Salzburg" 25sq.; Wavra 190.

³⁴ Zimmermann 27sqq.

³⁵ Abel-Simson II. 163sqq.

³⁶ *Annales regni Francorum a. 800*; Classen 42sqq.

³⁷ Dopsch "Slawenmission" 312; *Conversio* 10.

In 828/29, while reorganising the *Ostland*, the River Rába was designated as the natural border between the territories of the authority of Salzburg and Passau,³⁸ and from that time the Archbishopric of Salzburg achieved considerable results in its missionary work in Pannonia.³⁹ After having been expelled from his country by Mojmir I (approx. 822-846) around 833, Priwina fled to the Franks, he was introduced to Louis the German by Ratbold, assumed Christianity in the Saint Martin church in Traismauer (Treisma), and established his own principality in Pannonia with Louis the German's help in 838/39.⁴⁰ In addition to this region, Louis the German granted further territories to Priwina in 847.⁴¹ The centre of his estate in Upper Pannonia reaching at least to the present Town of Pécs was Mosapurc (Mocsárvár), on the place where the present Zalavár is located.⁴² So in the principality of Priwina (and of his nephew, at the same time co-ruler, Rastislav) the missionaries from Salzburg consecrated more than thirty churches with the assistance of the local nobility in the next few years.⁴³ While Salzburg exercised its local rights through wandering bishops during the Carantanian mission, Pannonia was quite frequently visited by the archbishops themselves following Arn in the archbishop's seat – Adalram (821-836), Liupram (836-859) and Adalwin (859-873) – to consecrate churches and to ordain a priest for each church.⁴⁴ The Mission in Pannonia was connected with the Carolingians until 867. Pippin and Charles assigned this territory to Salzburg, and Louis the German bestowed several benefices upon the Archbishopric of Salzburg, which supported his power and implemented several political tasks in the missionary in Carantania and Pannonia.⁴⁵ Priwina's death, who was assassinated by the Moravians in 860/61, did not interrupt the missionary work, because his son, Chozil continued to maintain the long-time close relations with Salzburg. Changes came only in 864 when Constantine's and Methodius's activity in Moravia produced its effect on Chozil's principality too.⁴⁶ To counterbalance the influence of the missionaries from Byzantium, in 864/65 Archbishop Adalwin increased the intensity of the missionary work,⁴⁷ and within a short time, with the duke's assistance, who at this time was still

³⁸ Wolfram "Die Geburt Mitteleuropas" 267; Sós "Die slawische Bevölkerung" 27.

³⁹ Bosl 6; Eggers 26.

⁴⁰ *Conversio* 10; Sós "Die slawische Bevölkerung" 29sq.; Boshof 142; Eggers 18.

⁴¹ *Conversio* 12.

⁴² See Bogay 52sq.; Sós "Ausgrabungen" 222sq.; Boshof 143.

⁴³ *Conversio* 11-13; Dopsch "Slawenmission" 315; Wolfram 321sq.; Zagiba "Die Salzburger Missionäre" 59.

⁴⁴ *Conversio* 13; Schellhorn 109.

⁴⁵ Dopsch "Slawenmission" 316.

⁴⁶ Wolfram "Conversio" 56, 138; Dopsch "Slawenmission" 316.

⁴⁷ Wolfram "Salzburg, Bayern, Österreich" 330sq.

faithful to the Eastern Frankish Empire and the Archbishopric of Salzburg, he consecrated twelve churches.⁴⁸

3. The Moravian prince Rastislav (846-870), nephew of Mojmir, who was driven away by the Frankish ruler after he had joined Karlmann, who revolted against his father, Louis the German, acquired considerable independence.⁴⁹ First, he tried to obtain missionaries for his country from Rome. Then, after he failed with the Pope, in 862 he turned to the *basileus*, Michael III to ask for missionaries teaching and converting in Slavonic for his country where several other, Roman, Greek and German missionaries had already acted.⁵⁰ Rastislav was, of course, attracted not only by liturgy in Slavonic: One of his political aims was to maintain closer relations with Byzantium with a view to counterbalance the Frankish influence; and he could safely do that because Byzantium was geographically separated from his country by Bulgaria.⁵¹ So, due to the geographical distance, a political alliance would not threaten with the danger of Byzantium's hegemony.⁵² Accordingly, he followed the way many other rulers did: He made efforts to loosen the relation with the country converting his people so that conversion could not become the means of conquest.⁵³ The *basileus* (not to overshadow his relations maintained with the Frankish king and the Bavarian bishops) did not intend to set up an independent diocese on this territory, and so – contrary to the Moravian prince's request – instead of a bishop or an archbishop, he appointed the brothers Constantine and Methodius to be the heads of the missionaries.⁵⁴

Methodius and Constantine (or, as he is known by his monk's name he adopted a few weeks before his death: Kyrillos, that is, Cyrill⁵⁵) born in Thessaloniki as the children of an affluent family from Byzantium, having the social standing they had were excellently educated; and as their home country was populated mostly by Slavs who settled there, mastered, in addition to their mother tongue, Greek, Slavonic too. Later the elder brother, Methodius occupied a high office in the government, whereas and the younger brother, Constantine went to Constantinople to continue his studies. There he soon obtained the

⁴⁸ *Conversio* 13.

⁴⁹ *Annales Bertiniani* a. 861; see Bosl 12; Hermann 125sqq.

⁵⁰ *Vita Constantini–Cyrilli cum translatione Sancti Clementis* 7; Schellhorn 107; Dopsch "Slawenmission" 317; Richter 282sq.; Eggers 19.

⁵¹ Grivec "Konstantin und Method" 61.

⁵² Dopsch "Slawenmission" 318.

⁵³ H. Tóth 2003. 96.

⁵⁴ *Vita Constantini–Cyrilli cum translatione Sancti Clementis* 14.

⁵⁵ *Vita Constantini–Cyrilli cum translatione Sancti Clementis* 10.

degree of professor of philosophy; and after that he performed missionary work among several peoples, such as, for example, the Avars and the Khazars.⁵⁶

After the brothers pursued their missionary work for three years (according to the *Vita Methodii*),⁵⁷ for forty months (according to the *Vita Constantini*), or for four and a half years (according to the *Vita Constantini-Cyrilli cum translatione Sancti Clementis*, i.e., the Italian legend),⁵⁸ the time seemed to have come for setting up an ecclesiastical organisation independent of the Franks.⁵⁹ It can be assumed that this effort came from the prince rather than Constantine and Methodius.⁶⁰ The brothers attempted to return to Constantinople to take the necessary steps.⁶¹ Heading for Venice, their journey took them to Chozil's court where they were received with great respect.⁶² And, contrary to the about-turns of the leadership of Rastislav, then his nephew and successor, Svatopluk I (870-894) motivated by current political interests, the prince most certainly continued to support the cause of Methodius, the promotion of Slavonic liturgy, with honest conviction (he himself mastered Glagolitic script).⁶³ This is rendered probable also by the fact that after Constantine's death Chozil urged the Pope, Adrian II to send Methodius back to Pannonia and appoint him archbishop, while later the Moravian prince gave no assistance to revive missionary work in Slavonic.⁶⁴ Acknowledging the opportunity offered to Rome by the activity of the missionaries sent from Byzantium to the Moravians, that is, that he could subject Pannonia and Illyria to direct papal supremacy, Pope Nicholas I invited the brothers (as Chozil's delegates) just staying in Venice to Rome.⁶⁵ However, by the time they arrived, the Pope had been dead for more than a month.⁶⁶ His successor, Adrian II desired to continue this policy: As after the assassination of Michael III and the removal of patriarch Photios it was no longer possible for the brothers to return home,⁶⁷ and on 14 February 869 Constantine died in Rome, first, he made Methodius papal legate commissioned to convert the Slavs in Pannonia and Moravia, then, by consecrating him bishop

⁵⁶ *Vita Constantini-Cyrilli cum translatione Sancti Clementis* 1; Bernhard 24; Bosl 15sq.; H. Tóth 10sqq.; 36sqq.

⁵⁷ *Vita Methodii* 5; Paskalevski 14sqq.; 65sqq.

⁵⁸ *Vita Constantini-Cyrilli cum translatione Sancti Clementis* 7.

⁵⁹ About the different legends of Constantine and Methodius see Bujnoc 39sqq.; 127sqq.; 167sqq.

⁶⁰ Kosztolnyik 216; Dittrich 96sqq.

⁶¹ Dopsch "Slawenmission" 319.

⁶² Bosl 17; Burr 41; Eggers 20.

⁶³ H. Tóth 115.

⁶⁴ *Vita Methodii* 5; Dopsch "Slawenmission" 320.

⁶⁵ Richter 286; Schellhorn 113; *Vita Constantini-Cyrilli cum translatione Sancti Clementis* 8.

⁶⁶ *Vita Constantini-Cyrilli cum translatione Sancti Clementis* 9.

⁶⁷ See valuable remarks on the literature dealing with the relation between Photios and Constantine: Grivec "Erlebnisse" 156sqq.

he ordained the Greek missionary Archbishop for Sirmium, the capital of one-time Illyria.⁶⁸

Having been taught a lesson by the failure of the Bulgarian mission, Adrian II made a concession on celebrating the liturgy in Slavonic, presumably owing to the influence of Anastasius Bibliothecarius.⁶⁹ Albeit several questions have arisen concerning the originality of the letter that contains this licence, and characterises Methodius as a man of great knowledge, threatens those who reviled at liturgical books in Old Bulgarian with excommunication, and is addressed to Rastislav, Svatopluk I and Chozil; diplomatic circumstances and current ecclesiastical politics support the authenticity of the letter and the licence contained therein.⁷⁰ If as they had originally planned Constantine and Methodius had been able to return to Byzantium and bring news on their achievements in organising the church in Moravia and Pannonia, then Rome most certainly would have been once and for all forced to waive its claim to both territories. Probably that is why the Pope made a concession to the missionaries, and appointed Methodius a legate through Chozil's good offices.⁷¹ It is undecided whether Chozil's action was motivated by his commitment to the person of the missionaries and Slavonic liturgy, or to his long-term political ambitions.⁷² In any case, it was him who initiated Methodius's ordainment to be archbishop with the Pope. Methodius's appointment to be the archbishop of Pannonia was to the seat of Saint Andronikos,⁷³ which suited both Chozil's power goals and the papacy's objectives regarding the Slavs. However, the seat of Saint Andronikos was Sirmium, the ecclesiastical and secular centre of the one-time Western Illyria. And by that Adrian II manifested fully in harmony with Nicholas I's intentions that he wanted to make Sirmium – as it belonged most probably to the Bulgarian power sphere – the *metropolia* of the entire Slavonic territory. That is, he wanted to extend Methodius's powers not only to Pannonia and Moravia but also to Bulgaria.⁷⁴ As a matter of fact, Methodius was not able to take his seat in Sirmium; the centre of his activity was most probably at Chozil's headquarters, Mosapurc.⁷⁵ By ordaining Methodius, the Pope expressed his territorial jurisdiction claim to all of Illyria. Now this was diametrically opposed to the

⁶⁸ Bosl 17sq.; Burr 42; Schellhorn 113; Bernhard 25; Richter 286sq.; Eggers 20sqq.

⁶⁹ *Vita Methodii* 8; H. Tóth 131.

⁷⁰ Dopsch "Slawenmission" 329.

⁷¹ *Vita Methodii* 8.

⁷² *Vita Constantini–Cyrilli cum translatione Sancti Clementis* 15. Cf. Pirchegger 307sqq.

⁷³ *Vita Methodii* 8.

⁷⁴ Dopsch "Slawenmission" 331; Norwood 271sqq.; Dvornik "The Patriarch Photius" 57sqq.; Beševliev 350sqq. About the most important document of the Latin mission in Bulgaria, the *Responsa Nicolai papae I. ad consulta Bulgarorum* see Dujčev 403sqq.

⁷⁵ H. Tóth 133.

jurisdiction of the Archbishopric of Salzburg obtained in the meantime, which had performed missionary work in Moravia and Pannonia for decades. And the archbishop of Salzburg did learn of this grievance from the report of *archipresbyter* Rihpald, who had fled from Mosapurc.⁷⁶

At the beginning of 870, when the hostilities between Rastislav and his nephew, Svatopluk I flared up, Svatopluk surrendered Methodius to his enemies – it is contested that it was not in Pannonia but on Moravian territory where Methodius was cast into captivity – the bishops of Bavaria, who took legal action against him in Regensburg in the presence of Louis the German.⁷⁷ Ignoring his dignity as archbishop in the lawsuit, they charged him with teaching unlawfully on the territory that belonged to the Archbishopric of Salzburg.⁷⁸ (In the very same year, Svatopluk, who had seized power, surrendered his uncle to the Franks, who cast him into captivity, but Svatopluk himself soon fell into the captivity of the Franks too, and was charged with high treason.⁷⁹ Slavomir instigated an uprising against the rule of the Franks, and came to power for a few months; then, after somewhat obscure negotiations carried out with the Franks, Svatopluk was raised to his country's throne again.⁸⁰) Methodius pleaded that he had been given licence by the Pope to do so, and insisted on the position that Pannonia and Moravia – as part of the Illyricum – were directly subject to the Pope's jurisdiction, and charged the Bavarian church dignitaries, primarily the bishop of Passau and the archbishop of Salzburg, with having exceeded their territorial jurisdiction driven only by ambition and greed.⁸¹ Examining the legal claims of the two opposing parties, the Pope and the archbishop of Salzburg and his bishops, we can establish the following: On the grounds of their several decades long missionary work Salzburg and Passau could undoubtedly lay morally well-founded claims to this territory. However, for the aforesaid reasons, they had not had it approved by Rome, and while during the reign of Charlemagne the king's or the emperor's permit was sufficient, during the last thirty years of the 8th century the Eastern Frankish ruler no longer had the influence over the papacy that he used to have at the beginning of that century. Salzburg could rightfully refer to the certificates issued by Pope Zacharias, Pope Stephen II and Pope Paul I to support its claims to Carantania,⁸² however, with respect to Pannonia and Moravia the privileges granted by Charlemagne⁸³

⁷⁶ Bosl 43; Eggers 34; H. Tóth 137.

⁷⁷ Eggers 31sq.; Richter 287; Grivec "Konstantin und Method" 91sqq.; Bosl 18; Burr 44sqq.

⁷⁸ Schellhorn 111; Eggers 32; Olajos 491sqq. Cf. *Vita Methodii* 9.

⁷⁹ Richter 287.

⁸⁰ *Annales Fuldenses a.* 871.

⁸¹ *Vita Methodii* 9; Burr 50; Eggers 32sq.

⁸² Löwe "Ermenrich von Passau" 229.

⁸³ *Conversio* 10.

was not accepted by the papacy. So making use of this gap in the law the Pope was able to enforce his claims to the entire Illyricum.⁸⁴

In Methodius's lawsuit held in the presence of Louis the German, the latest in the autumn 870, in Regensburg, Adalwin, archbishop of Salzburg presided the proceedings in a fairly low key. In addition to him, we have knowledge of the attendance of Anno, bishop of Freising and Ermenrich, bishop of Passau, and of the latter's quite desperate outbursts against Methodius almost coming to blows.⁸⁵ During the trial, in the heat of the dispute, Methodius fully aware of his Byzantine intellectual superiority called his prosecutors rough,⁸⁶ and Ermenrich being indignant at his scornful tone almost attacked Methodius with his horsewhip, but he was prevented from doing so – as the Pope's letter *Ad deflendam pravitatem* reveals.⁸⁷ Although Methodius referred to the powers bestowed on him by the Pope, the Council of Regensburg declared the deprivation of his dignity, and he was held in captivity for two and a half years under severe circumstances (as the *Vita Methodii* records it) at a Swabian monastery – probably in Ellwangen –, in a cold, uncovered cell.⁸⁸ Anno, bishop of Freising several times prevented Methodius from turning to the Pope because of the insults suffered by him.⁸⁹ From this we can deduce that the captivity in the monastery was supervised by Anno.⁹⁰ Later Methodius managed to contact Pope Adrian II through secret delegates and letters, but the Pope appeared to be quite irresolute; and, according to all indications, did not reply to the letters of either the Bavarian bishops or Louis the German or Methodius.⁹¹ Towards Rome archbishop Adalwin tried to keep up the appearance from first to last that he had nothing to do with the entire case, nor was aware of it.⁹²

Pope John VIII, who ascended the throne on 14 December 872, energetically intervened in the dispute, and both in his letter addressed to Louis the German,⁹³ and through his legate, the bishop of Ancona, resolutely informed the ruler, the archbishop of Salzburg and his bishops that the rights of the Holy See obtained over Illyria through *patrimonium Petri* – had not terminated

⁸⁴ Burr 50sq.; Dopsch "Slawenmission" 332sq.

⁸⁵ Löwe "Ermenrich von Passau" 232; Eggers 33; Maß 214sqq.

⁸⁶ *Vita Methodii* 9.

⁸⁷ Burr 44; Löwe "Ermenrich von Passau" 233; Maß 216; Ziegler 312sqq.; *Magnae Moraviae Fontes Historici I-V*, red. Halvík (1966-1977) III. 168.

⁸⁸ *Vita Methodii* 9; Eberl 9sqq. About the different localisations of the monastery see Burr 48; 52sq.; Dopsch "Slawenmission" 333; Löwe "Ermenrich von Passau" 234; Hauck 724.

⁸⁹ *Magnae Moraviae Fontes Historici* III. 169; Eggers 41; Maß 216sqq.

⁹⁰ Löwe "Ermenrich von Passau" 236.

⁹¹ Schellhorn 117sq.

⁹² Kosztolnyik 217.

⁹³ Jaffé II. 2970.

either due to the time elapsed or changes in the territory, and at least one hundred years would have been needed for these rights to lapse.⁹⁴ In his epistle *Audacia tua*, the Pope summoned Anno, bishop of Freising, whom he called the *instigator* and *auctor* of the proceedings against Methodius,⁹⁵ to appear in Rome in order to clear himself concerning their unlawful proceedings against Methodius, and for the period they held Methodius in captivity he suspended the exercise of his bishop's rights.⁹⁶ In his letter *Ad deflendam pravitatem*, the Pope criticised Ermenrich, bishop of Passau in an indignant voice for his violent action, and commanded him to account for his acts in Rome, and until then forbade him to exercise his bishop's rights and consecrate the Eucharist, and, in case he were reluctant to go to Rome, he threatened him with excommunication.⁹⁷ The charges brought against the bishops asserted that they had unlawfully sat in judgement over an archbishop whom they prevented from appealing to the Pope, and treated him unfairly and humiliatingly.⁹⁸ In his letter addressed to Adalwin, the Pope instructed the archbishop to lead Methodius to Pannonia, and make sure that he could take his archbishop's seat again Adalwin being the reason for Methodius having been deprived of his dignity shall carry it through that he could get it back.⁹⁹ The Pope reserved the right to pass the final decision in the case.¹⁰⁰ Archbishop Adalwin might have fulfilled this duty before he died on 14 May 873; Ermenrich departed this life on 26 December 874, Anno in 875; so, as the *Vita Methodii* puts it, they were not able to avoid St Peter's judgement.¹⁰¹

In the following it is worth looking more profoundly at the charges recorded in the *Conversio* that were brought against Methodius in the Council of Regensburg. As a matter of fact it cannot be ascertained if the *Conversio* was drafted as a bill of indictment in the lawsuit or in order to legitimate it subsequently.¹⁰² In his 1979 edition, Herwig Wolfram, on the grounds of the relevant sentence in chapter fourteen of the *Conversio*, accepted 871 as the year of drafting;¹⁰³ in his monograph in 1995, however, he modified his position, and based his determination on the medieval form of calculation, which demands that the year indicated in the text should be added to the years passed;

⁹⁴ Jaffé II. 2976.

⁹⁵ *Magnae Moraviae Fontes Historici* III. 169sq.

⁹⁶ *Magnae Moraviae Fontes Historici* III. 169sq.; Eggers 43.

⁹⁷ *Magnae Moraviae Fontes Historici* III. 168.

⁹⁸ Schellhorn 120.

⁹⁹ Jaffé II. 2975.

¹⁰⁰ Löwe "Ermenrich von Passau" 236sq.

¹⁰¹ *Vita Methodii* 10; Burr 56; Maß 221; Eggers 44.

¹⁰² Schellhorn 118.

¹⁰³ Wolfram "Conversio" 15. 141.

accordingly, he finally declared that 870 was the year of dating.¹⁰⁴ In his edition Fritz Lošek shared this position.¹⁰⁵

Regarding the person of the author deductions can be made only from some references made in the work; however, it is not possible to identify him with absolute certainty. Wolfram deems it probable that archbishop Adalwin himself might have been the *auctor*, but he phrases his view rather cautiously.¹⁰⁶ On the other hand, it can be ascertained with utmost probability from a passage in the first person which can be read in the fifth chapter that the author came from Bavaria.¹⁰⁷ Archbishop Adalwin's authorship is supported by the following considerations: Another formulation in the first person singular directly follows the point of the text where Adalwin is named; so the writer might have named himself.¹⁰⁸ Similarly, one can ponder over the fact that the attribute *piissimus* is used in the text of the *Conversio* as the attribute of only two persons, and they are Adalwin¹⁰⁹ and Louis the German:¹¹⁰ possibly the author and the addressee of the work.¹¹¹

The twelfth chapter of the *Conversio* formulates the charges against Methodius as follows:

*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 evangelia ecclesiasticumque
officium illorum, qui hoc Latine celebraverunt.*

The first chapter of the *Excerptum de Karentanis* refers to the same in a short sentence: *Hoc enim observatum fuit, usque dum nova orta est doctrina Methodii philosophi.* The attribute *philosophus* used with reference to Methodius in the *Conversio* was originally Constantine's permanent *epitheton ornans*,¹¹² and in his letter *Industriae tuae* Pope John VIII (872-882) also called Constantine a philosopher (*Constantino quodam philosopho*).¹¹³ It indicates Constantine's growing esteem that, in his letter addressed to bishop Gauderich, Anastasius

¹⁰⁴ Wolfram "Salzburg, Bayern, Österreich" 193.

¹⁰⁵ Lošek "Die *Conversio*" 6; Lošek "Sieben Fragen" 124sq.

¹⁰⁶ Wolfram "Salzburg, Bayern, Österreich" 197.

¹⁰⁷ *Conversio* 5. ...*orta seditione, quod carmula dicimus.* Cf. *Lex Baiuvariorum* 2, 3. *Si quis seditionem excitaverit contra duces suos, quod Baiuvarii carmulum dicunt.*

¹⁰⁸ *Conversio* 9; 10.

¹⁰⁹ *Conversio* 9. ...*anno nativitatibus Domini DCCCXXI Adalrammus piissimus doctor sedem Iuvavensem suscepit regendam.*

¹¹⁰ *Conversio* 12. *Pervenit ergo ad notitiam Hludowici piissimi regis, quod Priwina benivolus fuit erga Dei servitium et suum.*

¹¹¹ Lošek "Die *Conversio*" 6sq.

¹¹² Wolfram "Conversio" 138.

¹¹³ MGH EE VII. Nr. 255.

Bibliothecarius calls him *tantus et talis revera philosophus*, and then *mirabilis vere philosophus* and *sapientissimus vir*;¹¹⁴ and in Anastasius Bibliothecarius's usage Constantine's name and the attribute *philosophus* was so much intertwined that he never mentioned him without this *appositio*.¹¹⁵ So, for example, in his *epistola* written in 875 to Charles the Bald he calls him *magnus vir* again,¹¹⁶ and in the translation of the files of the Council of Constantinople 869 *Constantinus philosophus* is qualified as *magnae sanctitatis vir*¹¹⁷ by him.¹¹⁸ Herwig Wolfram – although with respect to Constantine he does not doubt that the attribute *philosophus* was flattering – considers this *appositio* attached to Methodius's name a libel having a damning, defamatory sense.¹¹⁹ Wolfram's statement that the *Conversio* assigned Constantine's *epitheton* to his brother, Methodius is most certainly sound, but the assertion that this *appositio* – in accordance with Christian Latinity – bears a negative overtone cannot be accepted in this form; as it was shown by Ludger Bernhard too.¹²⁰ As a matter of fact, it is possible to identify a trend in the Middle Ages both in Latin and Greek literature that rejected philosophy and the Antique heritage in general, but much more dominant was the range that strived to integrate, receive the philosophy and literature of the Antiquity into Christianity, which was backed by Augustinus as the most significant *auctoritas* of patristics from the Golden Age,¹²¹ who deemed it was righteous to use the attribute *philosophus* with regard to any person having expertise in any intellectual activity.¹²²

According to the *Excerptum de Karentanis* Methodius brought in *nova doctrina*, in the twelfth chapter of the *Conversio* three points crystallise, the arguments against Methodius were formulated around these: He engaged a negative conduct towards (i) the *lingua Latina*, (ii) the *doctrina Romana*, and (iii) the contempt of the *litterae auctores Latinae*.¹²³ These three elements never questioned by the Western Church and its missionaries were presented by Methodius as valueless for the entire people, that is, *philosophice superducens*. As we have seen the term *philosophus* itself did not connote a disparaging overtone; in its wider sense preserved from the Antiquity it was a synonym of a

¹¹⁴ MGH EE VII. Nr. 15.

¹¹⁵ About the relations between Anastasius Bibliothecarius and Constantine see H. Tóth 126.

¹¹⁶ MGH EE VII. Nr. 13.

¹¹⁷ MGH EE VII. Nr. 5.

¹¹⁸ Cf. Burr 52; Bernhard 25.

¹¹⁹ Wolfram "Conversio" 23, 138.

¹²⁰ Bernhard 1987. 28.

¹²¹ Cf. Aug. *trin.* 14, 2.

¹²² Brunhölzl 17.

¹²³ Kronsteiner 149sq.; Bernhard 30; Eggers 78.

*man of intellect acting professionally, with expertise.*¹²⁴ On the other hand, the verb *superducere* calls for further explanation: both in its basic and figurative sense the meaning *to cover over, to cover with, to lay a cover over* provides the starting point.¹²⁵ In the terminology of forgiving sins we often meet the synonyms of ‘to cover’, ‘to hide’ (*abscondere, operire*),¹²⁶ while the meaning ‘to conceal’, ‘to hide’ might occur in the strictest sense of the word; as, for example, in Cassiodorus’s comments on Psalm 118 and Psalm 135, in which he refers to the relevant scene of the *Exodus*.¹²⁷ On the grounds of the above, the phrase *philosophice superducere* of the *Conversio* can be translated as *to cover with learned argumentation, or to conceal under the guise of education*.¹²⁸

A good example for Methodius’s philosophic argumentation is served by the dispute his brother, Constantine carried on in Venice with his adversaries, the Latin bishops, priests and monks, who demanded that he should give an explanation why and how he had created an independent writing for the Slavs, albeit neither the apostles, nor the popes, nor the Fathers of the Church had done that ever before.¹²⁹ At their request, firstly, he replied with several rational arguments adducing to a host of passages from the Bible; namely, that in the East, beyond the frontiers of the Roman and Byzantine Empire there were numerous peoples who praised God in their own language and used their own writing; secondly, he showed that the doctrine of *triglossia* deriving from Isidorus Hispalensis¹³⁰ the adherents of which he called *the disciples of Pilatus, Pilatiani* – was diametrically opposed to the Holy Scripture itself since by that they placed themselves on a common platform with the judge who had falsely condemned Jesus.¹³¹ As a matter of fact, the *Vita Constantini* interprets the writing invented by the saint as a product of divine manifestation; it considers the arguments of those who oppose it – i.e., the adherents of *triglossia, teaching-of-three-languages* – arguments that derive from the devil, and puts the reception of the brothers by the Pope in the most favourable light.¹³² The objectives of the brothers visiting Rome (Constantine brought along the relics of St. Clement, pope and martyr, too)¹³³ was adjudged favourably by Pope Adrian

¹²⁴ Curtius 215.

¹²⁵ Bernhard 35.

¹²⁶ Ps. 31, 1. *Beatus cui absconditum est peccatum*; 84, 3. *Remisisti iniquitates plebis tuae, operuisti omnia peccata eorum*.

¹²⁷ Exod. 34, 29sqq.

¹²⁸ Bernhard 36.

¹²⁹ H. Tóth 121sqq.

¹³⁰ H. Tóth 92.

¹³¹ *Vita Constantini–Cyrilli cum translatione Sancti Clementis* 15; 16. Cf. Devos–Meyvaert 68sq.

¹³² *Vita Constantini–Cyrilli cum translatione Sancti Clementis* 14.

¹³³ Cf. See also Esser 126sqq.; H. Tóth 124.

II, who gave licence to Methodius to celebrate Mass in Slavonic on his missionary territory, with the proviso that he should recite the Gospel and the Creed in Latin.¹³⁴

After Pope John VIII had achieved that the Archbishopric of Salzburg released Methodius from captivity, and placed him back to his dignity as archbishop, he prohibited him to celebrate liturgy in Slavonic.¹³⁵ The violation of this prohibition was what provided the opportunity for the Bavarian bishops to make charges once more against Methodius through Svatopluk's fiduciary clerical, Iohannes (de Venetiis) in Rome for disseminating heretical tenets contrary to those accepted by the Church.¹³⁶ Thereupon, in his letter *Praedicationis tuae* John VIII summoned his legate, after he had resolutely exhorted him in a letter that he was allowed to offer the Holy Sacrament of the Mass only in Latin or Greek and use Slavonic exclusively in the sermon.¹³⁷ As a result of his visit paid to the Pope, Methodius attained that John VIII granted him licence to celebrate the entire Holy Mass in Slavonic.¹³⁸ In his letter *Industriae tuae* addressed to prince Svatopluk I, the Pope expounds that the writing invented by Constantine, the philosopher is not contrary in any respect to the Bible since the Lord should be glorified by each nation and in each language; and that has given licence to Methodius to celebrate mass in Slavonic.¹³⁹ Methodius was of course instructed to hold liturgy for the prince in Latin, whereas Slavonic was meant to be used only for the common people not having command of the Latin language. To this end the Pope also assigned a bishop called Wiching, who celebrated mass in accordance with the Latin Rite, to assist him.¹⁴⁰ This linguistic duality is indicated also by the term *ex parte* in the relevant sentence of the *Conversio*.¹⁴¹ Methodius cleared himself before the body convoked by the Pope also of the charges which asserted that he celebrated mass not in adherence to the Gospel, the teachings of the Apostles and the form bequeathed by the Fathers; and that he prayed the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed improperly, omitting the term *filioque*; that is, the teaching of the Latin

¹³⁴ Schellhorn 113sq.; Kosztołnyik 216; Eggers 78.

¹³⁵ Cf. *Magnae Moraviae Fontes Historici* III. 169, 191; H. Tóth 147.

¹³⁶ About the identification of Iohannes de Venetiis see Grivec "Konstantin und Method" 105; Boshof 144

¹³⁷ MGH EE VII. Nr. 201.

¹³⁸ Bosl 20; Bernhard 40.

¹³⁹ MGH EE VII. Nr. 255; Eggers 60sq.

¹⁴⁰ MGH EE VII. Nr. 255; Kosztołnyik 219; Zagiba "Die Salzburger Missionäre" 63sq. About the expression *populus* in the *Conversio* see Hellmann 161sq.; 166.

¹⁴¹ *Conversio* 12.

Church that the Holy Spirit proceeded from the Father and *the Son* – as it was expounded by John VIII in his letter written to Svatopluk.¹⁴²

The dogmatic background of the *filioque* controversy can be summed briefly as follows. After the Council of Constantinople 381 proclaimed that the Holy Spirit was consubstantial with the Father and the Son, the relation between the three divine persons had to be clarified. This could crystallise in the process of determining the origin of the second and third divine persons. When setting up this explanation (especially but not exclusively) the Western Fathers of the Church inclined to define the Holy Spirit as proceeding – in order to avoid mingling the substance of the second and third persons – not only from the Father but also from the Son.¹⁴³ This view was supported by Augustinus's reasoning that all the qualities that do not express any difference between the divine persons are common in all the three.¹⁴⁴ On the basis of all these, so to speak as a natural consequence, did the Western Church include the term *filioque* in the confessions of the Apostles' Creed beside the formulation *qui ex patre procedit* with regard to the Holy Spirit, which was uttered first presumably in the Council of Braga 675, and was accepted in that same year in the Council of Toledo that restored unity with the Arian Goths, and was finally made as it were compulsory for Latin Christianity through being adopted by Charlemagne. The controversy between the Latins and the Greeks was referred to Pope Leo III, who accepted that the Holy Spirit proceeded from the Father and the Son, but did not deem it appropriate to transform the Creed in such fashion adverting to the point that in addition to this tenet there were several fundamental dogmas that could not be inserted in the text of the Creed, and that this amendment would produce obtuseness and confusion in popular beliefs.¹⁴⁵

After that, the conflict seemed to be settled for half a century. Then patriarch Photios, primarily driven by personal political ambitions, thematised the *filioque* dispute again. In 858, the *basileus*, Michael III removed patriarch Ignatios from his seat, and placed Photios in his position, who asked Pope Michael I to give his consent to this because of the conflict that had evolved within the Church concerning this action, but the Pope was not willing to. In 863 qualified his appointment to be patriarch unlawful, and deprived him of his dignity instead. Thereupon, Photios turned to the Frankish ruler, and wanted to have Michael I dethroned as a heretic by adducing to the term in the Creed that, in his view, could be considered only an aberration in Western Latin Christianity, being contrary to the teaching of the Bible; i.e., to *filioque*. And in

¹⁴² MGH EE VII. Nr. 255.

¹⁴³ Bernhard 43.

¹⁴⁴ Aug. *trin.* 15, 48.

¹⁴⁵ Bernhard 43.

the counter-synod held in 867 the patriarch had the dethroning and excommunication of the Pope proclaimed.¹⁴⁶ In their charges the Bavarian bishops made assertions on Methodius's heretic teachings on the essence of the Holy Trinity; i.e., that in the masses celebrated by him Methodius omitted the reference from the Creed that the Holy Spirit proceeded from the Father and *the Son*.¹⁴⁷ The rightness of the teaching proclaimed by Methodius was verified by John VIII in his letter *Industriae tuae*; and the fact that Methodius did not add the term *filioque* to the Creed recited in the Mass could not have been a stumbling-block for the Pope either because in Rome the *credo* was continued to be prayed in the mass without this term for several centuries thereafter.¹⁴⁸ The question might arise that if Methodius unambiguously rejected the *filioque* doctrine, how he was able to protect the true nature of his faith before the Pope. On the other hand, it should be added that several of the Greek Fathers of the Church made efforts to clarify the relation between the second and the third divine persons. For example, around 360, in his letter written to Serapion, Athanasios expounded that the Holy Spirit was connected to the Son by the same relation as the Son to the Father. Also a formulation equal word for word to the Latin phrase *qui a patre filioque procedit* can be found in Cyrillus Alexandrinus's work entitled *Thesaurus de Sancta et Consubstantiali Trinitate*. Accordingly, when producing evidence of the rightness of his preaching Methodius was able to remain fully in harmony with the thinking of the Eastern Greek Church too. So the Pope reacknowledged his archbishop's rank granted by Adrian II, and licensed his further activity on the territory assigned to him.¹⁴⁹ However, it is worth noticing that it was to the Moravians and not to Pannonia that Methodius returned, and that later archbishop Theotmar (873-907) most certainly attained that conversion in Pannonia should be performed by Salzburg under Rome's supervision.¹⁵⁰

From these events we can deduce the fierce conflicts between Methodius and Svatopluk. All the more because Svatopluk turned to John VIII seeking permission, among others, for placing his country directly under the protection of the papacy; and by his said desire, which the Pope did fulfill, made his conviction and orientation unambiguously clear: Although an archbishop from Byzantium served liturgy in Slavonic in his country, his principality belonged under the authority of Rome.¹⁵¹ Methodius's life was made hard most probably

¹⁴⁶ Cf. Ioh. 15, 26; H. Tóth 119.

¹⁴⁷ *Vita Clementis* 17; *Vita Methodii* 12.

¹⁴⁸ Bernhard 45.

¹⁴⁹ MGH EE VII. Nr. 255.

¹⁵⁰ Kosztolnyik 218.

¹⁵¹ MGH EE VII. Nr. 255; Richter 289.

not only by Svatopluk but also by Wiching, appointed bishop of Nitra in 880, whom even the Pope did not stand by against all consequences, as it comes out from John VIII's letter *Pastoralis sollicitudinis* addressed to Methodius, because Wiching, who wanted to take the archbishop's seat of the Moravian Church, encouraged by the Bavarian clergy, launched several campaigns of slander against Methodius asserting that in the controversy it was him the Pope had agreed with in secret, and in order to prove that he did not shrink back even from trying to support this by a forged papal letter.¹⁵²

The reason for the conflict should be looked for not so much in Methodius' person but in his effort to build an ecclesiastical organisation around his fundamental idea: the liturgy in Slavonic, which met with the opposition of the clergy who supported the Latin language. This is indicated by the fact that after Methodius died on 6 April 885 the Latin party immediately took firm action. The letter *Quia te zelo* coaxed from Pope Stephen V by Wiching with accusations against Methodius was received by Svatopluk in the autumn 885.¹⁵³ It strongly limited the liturgic use of Slavonic, and confirmed that the Moravian Church belonged directly under the authority of Rome.¹⁵⁴ And in 886 they attained that Wiching, formerly excommunicated by Methodius but praised by the Pope in his letter *Quia te zelo*, was appointed archbishop.¹⁵⁵ All this greatly helped Svatopluk to extend his independent power. Methodius named Gorazd, who was of Moravian origin, and not one of his adherents from Byzantium for his successor.¹⁵⁶ However, after Methodius's death Svatopluk partly had the disciples executed, and partly expelled them from Moravia, because they had become uncomfortable for his political orientation.¹⁵⁷ Several of them were allowed to stay in Bulgaria and were given the opportunity to cultivate the intellectual heritage of Constantine and Methodius.¹⁵⁸

¹⁵² *Magnae Moraviae Fontes Historici* III. 211sq.; Boshof 145; Eggers 60; Bosl 11sq.; 19; H. Tóth 150.

¹⁵³ *Magnae Moraviae Fontes Historici* III. 217sqq.

¹⁵⁴ H. Tóth 164; Richter 290.

¹⁵⁵ *Magnae Moraviae Fontes Historici* III. 221sq.; Dittrich 272sqq.

¹⁵⁶ *Vita Methodii* 17; Grivec "Konstantin und Method" 142sqq.

¹⁵⁷ Bosl 22; Kosztolnyik 221; Eggers 69sqq.

¹⁵⁸ Dopsch "Slawenmission" 335.

A Conversio Bagoariorum et Carantanorum – egy kora középkori koncepció per dokumentuma

Összefoglalás

A szlávok és az avarok keresztény hitre térítése egyfajta sajátos középutat jelentett a kora középkor missziós politikájában az önzetlen, evangéliumi tanítást élő és terjesztő ír misszionáriusok, s a szászokat vérrel és vassal a kereszténység tömeges felvételére kényszerítő, Nagy Károly iniciálta misszió között. A IX. századi szláv misszió főszereplői egyfelől a Bizánci Birodalom s legfőbb egyházi méltósága, a konstantinápolyi pátriárka, másfelől pedig a Frank Birodalom voltak, amely utóbbi – kiváltképp Német Lajos alatt – a Salzburgi Érsekségre és a meglehetősen önálló politikát folytató Aquileiai Pátriárkátusra támaszkodhatott; ezen egyensúlyt bontotta meg a Karolingok hatalmával szemben megerősödő, önálló missziós politikával fellépő pápaság. E hármasság szolgált a szlávok apostolaként ismert Metód működésének, illetve a Salzburgi Érsekséggel és annak megyéspüspökeivel történt konfliktusának háttéréül.

A bizánci származású hittérítő, majd pápai legatus és sirmiumi érsek, Metód felett – érseki méltóságát semmibe véve – 870-ben a Német Lajos jelenlétében megtartott Regensburgi Zsinaton Adalwin salzburgi érsek (859-873) és püspökei ítéletet hoztak, mivel úgy vélték, hogy Pannóniában kifejtett missziós tevékenységével Salzburg hevenőt esztendeje e terület felett gyakorolt joghatóságát sérti, s ezt követően két és fél éven át fogságban tartották. E per kapcsán – kideríthetetlen, hogy vádiratként, vagy a pert utóbb legitimálandó keletkezett a Conversio Bagoariorum et Carantanorum, amelynek tizenkettedik fejezete említést tesz a mű keletkezésének okáról, vagyis a Metód által feltalált szláv betűkről és az általa folytatott igehirdetésről, amivel a nép szemében értéktelenné igyekezett tenni a latinok missziós munkáját. Ugyanebben a szellemben nyilatkozik Metódról a XII. és XIII. század fordulóján keletkezett, mintegy a Conversio függelékében található Excerptum de Karentanis. A Conversio ábrázolási tendenciáját Kahl igen találóan a következőképpen jellemzi: merész játékot folytat az igazság határán, állításai a jól tájékozott olvasók számára éppen csak hogy támadhatatlanok, a járatlanok számára pedig számos eltérő kombinációs lehetőséget hagy nyitva, sőt sugall; a tényekkel és feladatával legteljesebb mértékben tisztában levő szerző nem csekély rafinériával hallgat el nem kívánatos és „veszélyes” összefüggéseket és tényeket, s kapcsol össze egymástól távol álló eseményeket. Jelen írás e szöveghelyek behatódott értelmezéséhez kíván néhány adalékkal hozzájárulni. Ennek során először a karantanók közti (1.), majd a pannóniai misszió (2.) alakulását vázoljuk röviden, majd a történeti háttér ilyenén való összegzését követően térünk rá Metód regensburgi perének körülményeire, a Conversióban megfogalmazott vádakra, illetve ezek háttérére, valamint Metód tanításának további sorsára a pápaság, a frank király és a morva fejedelem politikai viszonyainak tükrében (3.).

Bibliography

- Abel–Simson *Jahrbücher des fränkischen Reiches unter Karl dem Großen I–II* (1969)
- Bernhard “Die Rechtgläubigkeit der Slawenmissionare aus römischer Sicht” in *Der heilige Method, Salzburg und die Slawenmission*, ed. Piffel-Perčević–Stirmemann (1987) 23-49
- Beševliev *Die protobulgarische Periode der bulgarischen Geschichte* (1981)
- Bogyay “Die Kirchenorte der *Conversio Bagoariorum et Carantanorum*; Methoden und Möglichkeiten ihrer Lokalisierung” 1960 *Südost-Forschungen* 52-70
- Boshof “Die Passauer Mission” in *1000 Jahre Ostarrichi; Seine christliche Vorgeschichte. Mission und Glaube im Austausch zwischen Orient und Okzident*, *Pro Oriente* 19 (1997) 140-147
- Bosl “Probleme der Missionierung des böhmisch-mährischen Herrschaftsraumes” in *Cyrillo-Methodiana; zur Frühgeschichte des Christentums bei den Slaven 863-1963*, ed. Hellmann–Olesch–Stasiewski–Zagiba (1964) 1-38
- Brunhölzl *Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters I* (1975)
- Bujnoc *Zwischen Rom und Byzanz*, *Slavische Geschichtsschreiber I* (1972)
- Burr “Anmerkungen zum Konflikt zwischen Methodius und den bayerischen Bischöfen” in *Cyrillo-Methodiana; zur Frühgeschichte des Christentums bei den Slaven 863-1963*, ed. Hellmann–Olesch–Stasiewski–Zagiba (1964) 39-56
- Classen *Karl der Große, das Papsttum und Byzanz; die Begründung des karolingischen Kaisertums* (1985)
- Curtius *Europäische Literatur und lateinisches Mittelalter* (1961³)
- Deér “Karl der Grosse und der Untergang des Awarenreiches” in Braunfels (ed.) *Karl der Grosse. Lebenswerk und Nachleben I* (1966) 719-791
- Devos–Meyvaert “La date de la première rédaction de la «Légende Italique»” in *Cyrillo-Methodiana; zur Frühgeschichte des Christentums bei den Slaven 863-1963*, ed. Hellmann–Olesch–Stasiewski–Zagiba (1964) 57-71
- Diesenberger–Wolfram “Arn und Alcuin 790 bis 804: zwei Freunde und ihre Schriften” in *Erzbischof Arn von Salzburg*, *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung*, *Ergänzungsband* 40 (2004) 81-106
- Dittrich *Christianity in Great-Moravia* (1962)
- Dopsch, H. “Adel und Kirche als gestaltende Kräfte in der frühen Geschichte des Südostalpenraums” 1976 *Carinthia I* 24-49
- Dopsch, H. “Rupert, Virgil und die Salzburger Slawenmission” in *1000 Jahre Ostarrichi; Seine christliche Vorgeschichte. Mission und Glaube im Austausch zwischen Orient und Okzident*, *Pro Oriente* 19 (1997) 88-139
- Dopsch, H. “Slawenmission und päpstliche Politik; Zu den Hintergründen des Methodios-Konfliktes” in *Der heilige Method, Salzburg und die Slawenmission*, ed. Piffel-Perčević–Stirmemann (1987) 303-340
- Dujčev “«Responso» di papa Niccolò ai Bulgari neoconvertiti” 1968 *Aevum* 403-428
- Dvornik “Byzantium, Rome, the Franks, and the Christianisation of the Southern Slavs” in *Cyrillo-Methodiana; zur Frühgeschichte des Christentums bei den Slaven 863-1963*, ed. Hellmann–Olesch–Stasiewski–Zagiba (1964) 85-125

- Dvornik "The Patriarch Photius and the Roman Primacy" 1963 *Chicago Studies* 94-107
- Eberl "Der hl. Methodius in Ellwangen" in Paskalevski *Die Vita des Heiligen Methodius*, Bulgarische Bibliothek, Neue Folge 12 (2006) 9-13
- Eggers *Das Erzbistum des Method. Lage, Wirkung und Nachleben der kyrillomethodianischen Mission*, Slavistische Beiträge 339 (1996)
- Esser "Wo fand der hl. Konstantin-Kyryll die Gebeine des hl. Clemens von Rom?" in *Cyrillo-Methodiana; zur Frühgeschichte des Christentums bei den Slaven 863-1963*, ed. Hellmann-Olesch-Stasiewski-Zagiba (1964) 126-147
- Grivec "Erlebnisse und Forschungsergebnisse" in *Cyrillo-Methodiana; zur Frühgeschichte des Christentums bei den Slaven 863-1963*, ed. Hellmann-Olesch-Stasiewski-Zagiba (1964) 148-160
- Grivec *Konstantin und Method. Lehrer der Slaven* (1960)
- H. Tóth *Cirill-Konstantin és Metód élete, működése* (Life and Work of Constantine-Cyryll and Methodius) (2003³)
- Hauck *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands II* (1954⁸)
- Hellmann "Der Begriff 'populus' in der *Conversio Bagoariorum et Carantanorum*" in *Cyrillo-Methodiana; zur Frühgeschichte des Christentums bei den Slaven 863-1963*, ed. Hellmann-Olesch-Stasiewski-Zagiba (1964) 161-167
- Hermann "Slawisch-germanische Beziehungen im südostdeutschen Raum von der Spätantike bis zum Ungarnsturm" Veröffentlichungen des Collegium Carolinum 17 (1965)
- Jaffé *Regesta pontificum Romanorum* (1956)
- Kahl "Virgil und die Salzburger Slawenmission" in *Virgil von Salzburg; Missionar und Gelehrter*, ed. Dopsch-Juffinger (1985) 112-121
- Kahl "Zwischen Aquileia und Salzburg. Beobachtungen und Thesen zur Frage romanischen Restchristentums im nachvölkerwanderungszeitlichen Binnen-Noricum" in Wolfram-Daim (ed.) *Die Völker an der mittleren und unteren Donau im fünften und sechsten Jahrhundert* (1980) 33-81
- Kosztolnyik „Róma és a területi egyház küzdelme a közép Duna-medencében a 9. század folyamán" (Struggle between Rome and the Local Church in Middle-Danube-basin in the 9th century) 1997/2-3 *Aetas* 212-221
- Kronsteiner "Die Übersetzungstätigkeit des hl. Method in der Salzburger Kirchenprovinz" in *1000 Jahre Ostarrîchi; Seine christliche Vorgeschichte. Mission und Glaube im Austausch zwischen Orient und Okzident*, Pro Oriente 19 (1997) 148-153
- Lošek *Die Conversio Bagoariorum et Carantanorum und der Brief des Erzbischofs Theotmar von Salzburg*, MGH Studien und Texte 15 (1997)
- Lošek "Sieben Fragen zu sieben ausgewählten lateinischen Denkmälern des Salzburger Frühmittelalters; Gemeinsamkeiten und Unterschiede" in *Tassilo III. von Bayern; Großmacht und Ohnmacht im 8. Jahrhundert*, ed. Kolmer-Rohr (2005) 121-136
- Löwe *Der Streit um Methodius. Quellen zu den nationalkirchlichen Bestrebungen in Mähren und Pannonien im 9. Jahrhundert* (1948)

- Löwe "Ermenrich von Passau, Gegner des Methodios; Versuch eines Persönlichkeitsbildes" in *Der heilige Method, Salzburg und die Slawenmission*, ed. Piffel-Perčević–Stirnemann (1987) 221-241
- Maß "Bischof Anno von Freising" in *Cyrillo-Methodiana; zur Frühgeschichte des Christentums bei den Slaven 863-1963*, ed. Hellmann–Olesch–Stasiewski–Zagiba (1964) 210-221
- Norwood "The Political Pretensions of Pope Nicolas I" 1946 *Church History* 271-285
- Nótári *Források Salzburg kora középkori történetéből* (Sources from the early medieval history of Salzburg) (2005)
- Olajos "La question de la survivance avare: les sources grecques et latines de l'histoire des Avars ou IX^e siècle" in Janssens–Roosen–van Deun (ed.) *Philomathestatos; Studies in Greek and Byzantine Texts presented to J. Noret for his sixty-fifth birthday*, Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 130 (2004) 487-501
- Paskalevski *Die Vita des Heiligen Methodius*, Bulgarische Bibliothek, Neue Folge 12 (2006)
- Pirchegger "Karantanien und Unterpannonien zur Karolingerzeit" 1912 *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung* 272-319
- Pohl "Bayern und seine Nachbarn im 8. Jahrhundert" in *Tassilo III. von Bayern; Großmacht und Ohnmacht im 8. Jahrhundert*, ed. Kolmer–Rohr (2005) 57-66
- Pohl *Die Awaren; ein Steppenvolk in Mitteleuropa 567-822 n. Chr.* (1988)
- Reindel "Bayern vom Zeitalter der Karolinger bis zum Ende der Welfenherrschaft (788-1180)" in Spindler (ed.) *Handbuch der bayerischen Geschichte I* (1981²) 249-349
- Richter "Die politische Orientierung Mährens zur Zeit von Konstantin und Methodius" in Wolfram–Schwarz (ed.) *Die Bayern und ihre Nachbarn I*, Veröffentlichung der Kommission für Frühmittelalterforschung 8 (1985) 281-292
- Schellhorn "Erzbischof Adalwin von Salzburg und die Pannonische Mission" 1964 *Mitteilungen der Gesellschaft für Salzburger Landeskunde* 103-121
- Schmidinger "Das Papsttum und die bayerische Kirche; Bonifatius als Gegenspieler Virgils" in *Virgil von Salzburg; Missionar und Gelehrter*, ed. Dopsch–Juffinger (1985) 92-102
- Sós "Ausgrabungen von Zalavár" in *Cyrillo-Methodiana; zur Frühgeschichte des Christentums bei den Slaven 863-1963*, ed. Hellmann–Olesch–Stasiewski–Zagiba (1964) 222-261
- Sós *Die slawische Bevölkerung Westungarns im 9. Jahrhundert*, Münchener Beiträge zur Vor- und Frühgeschichte 22 (1973)
- Strömer "Zum Problem der Slawenmission des Bistums Freising im 9. Jahrhundert" in *Der heilige Method, Salzburg und die Slawenmission*, ed. Piffel-Perčević–Stirnemann (1987) 207-220
- Szádeczky-Kardoss *Az avar történelem forrásai 557-től 806-ig* (The Sources of the Avar History from 557 to 806) (1998)
- Wavra *Salzburg und Hamburg; Erzbistum und Missionspolitik in karolingischer Zeit* (1991)

- Wolfram "Arn von Salzburg und Karl der Große" in Dopsch-Kramml-Weiß (ed.) *1200 Jahre Erzbistum Salzburg; die älteste Metropole im deutschen Sprachraum* (1999) 21-32
- Wolfram *Conversio Bagoariorum et Carantanorum; das Weißbuch der Salzburger Kirche über die erfolgreiche Mission in Karantainen und Pannonien* (1979)
- Wolfram "Das Fürstentum Tassilo III., Herzogs der Bayern" 1968 *Mitteilungen der Gesellschaft für Salzburger Landeskunde* 157-179
- Wolfram *Die Geburt Mitteleuropas; Geschichte Österreichs vor seiner Entstehung; 378-907* (1987)
- Wolfram *Salzburg, Bayern, Österreich; die Conversio Bagoariorum et Carantanorum und die Quellen ihrer Zeit*, Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung, Ergänzungsband 31 (1995)
- Zagiba "Die Missionierung der Slaven aus 'Welschland' (Patriarchat Aquileja) im 8. Und 9. Jahrhundert" in *Cyrillo-Methodiana; zur Frühgeschichte des Christentums bei den Slaven 863-1963*, ed. Hellmann-Olesch-Stasiewski-Zagiba (1964) 274-311
- Zagiba "Die Salzburger Missionäre als Pflege des Choralgesanges bei des Slaven im IX. Jahrhundert" 1946/47 *Mitteilungen der Gesellschaft für Salzburger Landeskunde* 57-64
- Ziegler "Der Konsens der freisinger Domherrn im Streit um Methodius" in *Cyrillo-Methodiana; zur Frühgeschichte des Christentums bei den Slaven 863-1963*, ed. Hellmann-Olesch-Stasiewski-Zagiba (1964) 312-328
- Zimmermann *Papstabsetzungen des Mittelalters* (1968)