

You have downloaded a document from



*The Central and Eastern European Online Library*

The joined archive of hundreds of Central-, East- and South-East-European publishers, research institutes, and various content providers

**Source:** PALAEOBULGARICA / СТАРОБЪЛГАРИСТИКА

PALAEOBULGARICA

**Location:** Bulgaria

**Author(s):** Thomas Daiber

**Title:** Roman or Byzantine Liturgy? Theological Terminology in the VITA METHODII

Roman or Byzantine Liturgy? Theological Terminology in the VITA METHODII

**Issue:** 2/2015

**Citation style:** Thomas Daiber. "Roman or Byzantine Liturgy? Theological Terminology in the VITA METHODII". PALAEOBULGARICA / СТАРОБЪЛГАРИСТИКА 2:21-47.

<https://www.ceeol.com/search/article-detail?id=305179>

Thomas Daiber (Giessen, Germany)

## ROMAN OR BYZANTINE LITURGY? THEOLOGICAL TERMINOLOGY IN THE *VITA METHODII*\*

### 1. MODEL OR TRANSLATION

Although the *Vita Constantini* (VC) has been written immediately after the death of Cyril and is preserved in no less than 58 cyrillic manuscript copies from 15th to 18th c. (Mirčeva 2014: 23–49), the earliest of these date back only to the beginning of the 15th century. Originally, VC has been written in Glagolitic letters, probably with editorial advise or at least approval of Methodius (Grivec, Tomšić 1960: 15–16). While VC is contained in numerous recent copies, the *Vita Methodii* (VM) is preserved in considerably less copies (only 19 from 12–13th to 18th c.; Mirčeva 2014: 58–63), but the oldest manuscript reaches back to the 12th c.<sup>1</sup> Both *vitae* caused discussions whether the original language they had been written in, would be not Old Church Slavonic (OCS) but Greek: *hodie haec opinio obsoleta est* (Grivec in Grivec, Tomšić 1960: 15)<sup>2</sup>. Instead of assuming a translation Grivec proposed to understand Greek remnants in VC and VM in terms of cultural proximity.

Grivec showed that the authors of VC and VM display a solid knowledge of Greek learning and in respect to VC he mentioned, that its author, *quamquam Slavus, Graeca eruditione ita imbutus est, ut etiam res Slavicis vel libere tractando saepius Graecum dicendi genus usurpaverit* (Grivec, Tomšić 1960: 15); regarding VM Grivec conceded, that its author sometimes *potius Graecam quam occidentalem mentem et dicendi rationem ostendit* (Grivec, Tomšić 1960: 19).

---

\*The article was presented as a report of the Fifth International Conference “Written Heritage and Information Technologies” (El’Manuscrit–2014), held in Varna, Bulgaria, September 15–20, 2014. The author expresses his deep gratitude to Slavia Barlieva (Cyrillo-Methodian Research Centre at the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, Sofia) and Heinz Miklas (Vienna University) for helpful remarks on the paper.

<sup>1</sup> The oldest copy from the Успенский сборник (end of 12th, beginning of 13th c.), Moscow, State Historical Museum, f. 80370, № 4 (№ 175/8; 1063) is the usual base of editions (also printed in Grivec, Tomšić 1960).

<sup>2</sup> Along with the edition of Grivec (in Grivec, Tomšić 1960) of VM [= G], KIO 1973: 160–212 (ed. Bonju Angelov and Christo Kodov), MMFH 2 and Florja 2000 (first published in Koroljuk, Florja 1981) have been used for reference.

Identifying ‘a Greek style of thinking and speaking’ in VM Grivec brought up the problem how to distinguish between cultural and lingual influences. How to discern, if a given text has been modelled according to culturally authoritative standards rather than it has been translated from the language of the authoritative culture? Grivec regarded the *vitae* as modelled in Greek style, while others at his time (cf. Grivec, Tomšić 1960: 32) did so regarding the liturgical texts for the feasts of the brothers. On the other hand, Kryš’ko now declares, that the parts of the Kanon for St Cyril developed „под пером греческого автора канона путем комбинирования тропарей, имеющих различное происхождения“ (Kryš’ko 2009: 52 [summary]).

There is no Royal Road to choose between the possibilities “modelled after” or “translation of” a foreign source. If the coherence of a text can be achieved only if its propositions have to be reconstructed in a language different from that, which is actually used in the text, then the text clearly is a translation. If this way of objective demonstration cannot be pursued then it is always possible to see not a translation from a foreign language, but an imitation of a foreign lingual style. Sometimes a literal translation is more an imitation than intended, only consider the translations of the Biblical “behold” (= Greek ἰδοὺ). Furthermore, sometimes a translation is expected to show characteristics of the culturally authoritative model (in the times of the Old Russian patriarch Nikon for example). For the Slavic translations of the OCS period it is assumed that their translational principle does not include the intention of imitation (Trost 1973). Beyond the question if VM originally had been composed in another language than OCS, it can be concluded, that it has been written for a public who understood the communicative function of language elements not usual in Slavic. And both *vitae*, as Chaburgaev (1994: 56) remarked, have been written after the Moravian failure of Cyril and Methodius’s mission by authors „стремившиеся утвердить славянскую письменную культуру в борьбе с её противниками“.

While asking according to which rite Methodius had celebrated liturgical offices in Moravia, we will have to deal with some Greek and Latin remnants in VC, having in mind questions of imitation and translation, regarding the verbal elements of the text, and also considering possible intentions of the author, regarding the use of these verbal elements.

## 2. BYZANTIUM AND ROME

What has been the reason for the resistance of the Frankish clerics to the mission of Methodius and his pupils in Great Moravia?

Most if not all scholars agree, that the Slavic mission in Great Moravia should be understood as part of the East-West-rivalry. The ruler of Great Moravia, Rostislav, tried to escape from too great Frankish influence in his country by means of Byzantine Christianisation (Stökl 1976: 80), and so the inverse resistance of the Frankish clergy to the mission is explained, too. To assume a geopolitical East-West-factor is the more plausible as it is seen in other cases at work. Envisaged

Christianisation has been an important condition in the agreement between the pagan Bulgarian Khan Boris I and the Frankish King Ludwig the German in 862, by which Bulgaria sought help against the Great Moravia of Rostislav (Podskalsky 2000: 51). But if it is taken for granted that the “Frankish argument” is valid for the beginning of the Moravian mission, because Rostislav, situated between the Frankish empire and the Bulgarian state, tried to overcome his isolation by means of political help from Byzantium, it is still an open question, if the “Frankish argument” automatically is valid for the end of the Moravian mission of Methodius and his pupils, too.

Within the East-West-rivalry it should be consequent that the Roman Popes would have consistently supported the opposition of Western clerics against the Byzantine missionaries in Great Moravia, but they did not. Pope Nicholas I legalised the Slavonic translation, Adrian II affirmed the jurisdictional duties and rights of Methodius in his missionary work and his successor Pope John VIII freed Methodius from prison (in Reichenau?)<sup>3</sup> and made him archbishop of the archdiocese Sirmium (Western Illyricum). It is notable, that a Roman Pope appoints a Byzantine cleric the head of a region under Roman jurisdiction as a counteraction to the widening Byzantine influence on the Balkans. Here, the geopolitical intention is at work by saving a part of Illyricum to Roman jurisdiction and is, at the same time, also not at work by expecting a Byzantine cleric to organize the Roman patrimony. I do not dare to deal in detail with historic events, which is beyond my competence, but I want to draw attention to the point, that the geopolitical intention neither is at work regarding the deprecating arguments of the Western clergy as reported in the *vitae* of both brothers.

In VC and VM the opposition to the Byzantine brothers from the side of the Western clergy is not formulated in political but in linguistic terms using the argument of the ‘three holy languages’, which excludes the Slavonic idiom to be used liturgically, but it is also told in both *vitae* and documented by the actions of the Roman Popes that in the centre of the Latin Christianity this very argument was called “heresy”. It is unrelated to the times of Cyril and Methodius if later the monk Chrabr tries to show the dignity of the Slavic letters respectively language by its triumph over the “Latin” heresy of the three holy languages. A linguistic argument has not been part of Rome’s discussions with Byzantium at Methodius’s time (after the Great Schism in 1054, of course, Rome’s approach to national liturgies has changed; Hürner 2010: 364).

The arguments on the local level of the Western clergy don’t fit into the scheme of political rivalry. The opposition of the Frankish clergy is formulated as

---

<sup>3</sup> Supported by Grivec (1960: 100 and onwards) the “Suebian” (cf. *сѡбѣѡ* in VM, G 159) town Ellwangen has been the place of Methodius’s imprisonment, but Methodius’s name (as Grivec already knew) is attested in a book of the monastery on the island Reichenau (Löwe 1982). There are several arguments which don’t need to be resumed here; if Goldberg (2004: 89) speaks of an “allemanisches Kloster” a new regional, but unneeded term enters the debate.

an argument against the Slavic language and is doubting the orthodoxy of Methodius. The thesis, that the Slavic mission in Great Moravia has been ended because the successors of Rostislav were approaching again the politics of the Frankish empire is drawn per analogy to the intention of Rostislav himself. It is well possible, that the renewed contacts with the Frankish empire have only been the enabling condition for the Western clergy to drive out the Slavic speaking missionaries. But the enabling condition may not at the same time represent the motives of the Western clergy; the Western clergy formulated its opposition to the Eastern brothers as opposition to the Slavic language.

The oldest extant manuscripts of OCS show translations both of the Byzantine (“Prague fragments”) and the Roman rite (“Kiev fragments”; both edited in Mareš 1979), commonly explained as both being translations by Cyrill and Methodius themselves:

Nach der Schilderung der Vita Constantini feierten die Brüder die slavische Liturgie zunächst nach byzantinischem Ritus, trugen dann aber der westlichen Orientierung Mährens insofern Rechnung, als sie eine griechisch-lateinische Mischform der Meßgebete, die sog. Petrusliturgie, ins Slavische übersetzten (Fragmente sind im ältesten liturgischen Denkmal [glagol.], den „Kiever Blättern“, erhalten) (Podskalsky 1982: 58).

It is possible that the translations of Roman liturgical texts, produced already by the Slavonic apostles or their pupils, arose out of the need to have not only a liturgy for Saturday and Sunday but also *formulae* for the mass on common weekdays respectively prayers for the times of the day:

Es liegt nahe anzunehmen, dass man am Anfang der Slavenmission in grossem Umfang Chordienst im Griechischen abgehalten hat. Ein vollständiger Textapparat zum Stundengebet scheint erst in nachmährischer Zeit zustande gekommen zu sein (Kölln 2003: 22)<sup>4</sup>.

This general picture of the two liturgies in use during the Moravian mission fits well to the historic events of the Slavic mission. The Kiev fragments, however, dated paleographically around the year 925, show significant influence of the Sinaitic tradition, at least in its second (younger) part (Hürner 2010), so that it cannot be excluded that the “Western” character of the Kiev fragments is but a consequence of the Sinaitic tradition and the far reaching hypothesis about the Kiev fragments as a direct testimony from the hand of Methodius or his pupils

---

<sup>4</sup> I got the reference to Kölln 2003 from Hürner 2010: 13. Notably, VC amply recounts that Cyril shortly after coming to Moravia translated prayers: Вѣскорѣ же вѣсь црѣквенѣин чинъ пріемъ, наоучи ѣ вѣрнѣици, и часовѣмъ, и вѣрнѣи, и павѣрнѣици, и таннѣи словѣжѣ (КЮ 1973: 105) “Shortly after he has acquainted himself with the order of the church he taught them the Laudes or Orthros (?), the Liturgy of the hours, the Vespers, the Compline and the secret Liturgy (= Liturgy including the form for the Last Supper)”. The variant прѣложѣ (КЮ 1973: 111) instead of пріемъ is explained by Cooper (2003: 57): “Cyril received or accepted the translations that he found, put them into a graphic system that made them easier to read, and then taught the offices to the Moravians (...) it is possible to conclude that Cyril transcribed the western services that already had been translated – by the Franks, or perhaps the Irish, or maybe even the Moravians themselves – before him.”

can be questioned. Sinaitic influence has already been noted (Hannick 1985: 112) in the Prague fragments, too.

However, it is not of decisive importance for our purpose to know, if Cyril or Methodius themselves, respectively their pupils translated Roman liturgical texts. The Sinaitic influence in Kiev and Prague fragments shows, that there is a common stock of texts in East and West and the differences between Byzantium and Rome are far from being unbridgeable in the 9th century. Regarding liturgy, Charles the Great, e.g., had considered for a short time after his coronation (800) the possibility of a political re-union of the Eastern and Western regions into one Christian empire and therefore inaugurated the *Missa Graeca*, symbolizing the unity of East and West by the use of Greek lingual elements in liturgy (Atkinson, Sachs 1982: 133). The same interchangeability holds also for music<sup>5</sup>, which plays a major part in liturgy:

the musical traditions of the Greek East and the Latin West evidently remained sufficiently compatible to allow for a modicum of exchange and even mutual appreciation well into the second millenium AD (Lingas 2006: 142).

While many scholars agree with (Dostál 1965: 84)<sup>6</sup>, that “the two brothers did bring the Byzantine liturgy to Moravia” and maybe consequently added Roman *formulae* or even translations of Roman offices (*officia*), it is obvious that practicing Christian liturgy according to Byzantine rite in the 9th c. does not raise any theological or aesthetical obstacles, which would be sufficient to explain the aggressive reaction from the side of Western clergymen<sup>7</sup>.

Maybe there is a cultural cause which can explain the Western disapprobation of Eastern liturgy. The Slavic-Frankish opposition remembers the “master narrative” of a nationalistic historiography, which simply may not be true for the Middle Ages. Štih (2014: 43) polemicalises with this “master narrative” by stressing that Slavic feudal landowners in Carinthia after the Christianisation of their country nevertheless could keep their autonomy. In analogy to Štih’s observations<sup>8</sup> it can be hypothesized, that political reasons could well be valid for the be-

---

<sup>5</sup> Written tradition of music in Konstanz (to take a region related to the Slavic mission) begins with the 9th century, but the notation in neumes “gave room for much liberty of design” (Schuler 1989: 133). Should Cyril and Methodius also have brought Byzantine music to Moravia, it would not have caused disconcertment.

<sup>6</sup> The question of liturgy has been subject to harsh discussions; cf. Snopek (1918) in favour of Methodius having brought Byzantine liturgy to Moravia contra Alexander Brückner.

<sup>7</sup> Even Podskalsky (1982: 58), renowned as an eminent scholar in the field, hides the intentions of the Frankish clergy behind the assumption: „das entschlossene Vorgehen mußte neben Anerkennung auch Widerstand provozieren“.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. also Kahl 2011 (written 2005), who points out that Christianisation in Slavic territories does not always mean a turn from pagan to Christian belief but a turn from an “apostatic” form of Christian belief (“apostatisches Heidentum”; 109) to the Roman doctrine and that after the official act of Christianisation subsequent rework was necessary to keep Roman doctrine in its place. This rework has to do with practical questions: What is the role of the Church, the meaning of political power, the legitimation of properties and so on. A Byzantine view on these issues should have

gining of the Slavic mission, but its implementation into Moravian society met cultural resistance. By calling for Byzantine missionaries Rostislav tried to assure the formal independency of Moravia from the Frankish empire, but underneath that “master narrative” of two collectives (Frankish empire, Great Moravia) there is a smaller narrative of two groups encountering each other on local level. The introduction of Byzantine liturgy had to be deprecated first of all by the local Western clergy, because it introduced a new balance of power between church and state which - under Western eyes – is unfavourable to the church. We have to outline, why using Byzantine liturgy could be negatively experienced especially on the side of the Western clergy.

### 3. LITURGY

[1] ДА НА МЪШН ПЪРВѢН ЧЪТОУТЬ ДПЛЪ Н ЕВАНГЛІНІЕ РИМЬСКЪИ, ТРАЧЕ СЛОВѢНЬСКЪИ  
(KIO 1973: 189; G 158)

that during the Mass they shall read in Roman (in „Latin“) the Apostolos and the Gospel, afterwards in Slavic<sup>9</sup>.

The passage from VM seems to unambiguously show that the liturgical indispensable books (Apostolos respectively Acts and Gospel) first had been read in Latin and only afterwards in Slavic, what would be a clear sign in favour of the thesis that Methodius basically had celebrated according to the Latin rite and the Slavic liturgy has only been an adjunct to the latter. Already Snopek (1918: 17)<sup>10</sup> declared on the opposite, that Methodius had celebrated according to Byzantine rite, and supposed that Methodius provoked resistance to his work because the conflict about the *filioque* has already been part of the theological debates of the time. This is an argument slightly *avant la lettre*<sup>11</sup> but should be considered again.

---

been much more disturbing to Western clergy than to Western political rulers. All these practical (political) questions about the church and the legitimation of political power *in nuce* are expressed in liturgy.

<sup>9</sup> Literal translations are given for all quotations from OCS which will be subject to interpretation. Quotations from the object language are numbered for the purpose of cross-reference.

<sup>10</sup> It will always be arguable if Methodius has been accused of “Photianism” (= damnation of the *filioque*), because the official reception of the *filioque* into the Roman creed took place only in 1014 (under Pope Benedikt VIII). I will try to show that besides possible geopolitical reasons the resistance to Methodius and his pupils reflects deep differences between orthodox and catholic theology which have been already seen and felt in Methodius’s time but only later have been coined as the *filioque*-problem. If the controversy had only been about politics it would have led to diplomatic discussions between Byzantium and Rome, not to a criminal trial *ad personam*. Cultural differences don’t arise from a specific problem but the other way around: differences emerge as a collective phenomenon and when they come to consciousness they get the name of a specific problem. If all actors in the 6th century already had known that they would work towards the schisma of the Church they would have acted more cautiously.

<sup>11</sup> The first appearance of a “combat term” does not mean that a combat already has begun; only if there is external reason for a combat, terms get activated for use in it (cf. also Treadgold 2011). The *filioque*-Problem can be traced back to writings of Latin Church fathers and has been firstly problematically noted in 645/ 646 (Sicienski 2010: 6), but “following the death of Maximus

The decision for a certain form of liturgy is important when liturgy is the model for worldly organisation<sup>12</sup>. If the Spirit proceeds only from the Father, than the Son is the one who transmits the Spirit. In this understanding, the Son is to mortal eyes the visible person of the hypostasis and the utmost true icon of the Father who is the invisible hypostasis. This results in an ontological model – outlined in Dionysius the Areopagite – where all mundane phenomena are classified according to their iconic closeness to the Father. Because in the Father the spiritual and the physical powers are united, phenomena on earth will resemble the more their transcendent source of power, the more they unite both powers (granted them by the transcendental source of power) in themselves. So, the Byzantine emperor being at the same time head of the empire and of the church unites both physical and spiritual power. Admittedly, Caesaropapism never came to be an official dogma of Byzantine theology, but in fact functioned as the backbone of the imperium. In the *non-filioque*-creed of Byzantium the legitimation of political power is dependent on a transcendental model with only one source of power, while, on the contrary, the *filioque*-creed makes the legitimation of power possible in two ways. In the *filioque*-creed the Son is not “only” transporting the Spirit, but also emanating Him by Himself, acting like the fully enabled representative of God on earth. There is less an ontological hierarchy in the legitimation of power but rather the idea of succession by a representative. While the spiritual succession from the Son to apostle Peter to the Roman Pope is settled, there is way for a second succession which would legitimate physical power, too, which is granted by the Father but blessed by the Son. So Pope Gelasius I. could write the

---

the Confessor in 662 there is a centuries-long silence about the *filioque* from Eastern sources (...) However, with the beginning of the iconoclastic controversy in the eighth century, tension between Byzantium and the West increased (exacerbated by the political and cultural divisions created by Charlemagne’s imperial coronation), and the *filioque* was quickly catapulted from the obscure theological backwaters to become a *casus belli*” (ibidem: 87). “During the tenth and eleventh centuries political, cultural, and religious factors were rapidly driving East and West further part. Of course, each side was quite aware of the dissimilarities in their respective discipline and worship, and while some were willing to write these off as unimportant, increased contact (and conflict) during the crusades led both sides to the conclusion that these practices (the first of which was usually the use or omission of the *filioque*) were manifestations of a substantively different faith” (ibidem: 111). VM, probably written shortly after the death of Methodius, makes a clear distinction between the positions of the Western clergy and the Roman pope; even the fact, that the *filioque* became a prominent argument at the time of pope Nicholas I (800–867) in the conflicts with Photius, has no echo in the narration of VM. There is no need to think that its author is already engaged in the global “combat” East vs. West. The introduction to VM, however, is arguing in terms of the *filioque*, which gives reason to date the introduction to VM some decades later than the actual narration, when the “combat term” finally had its commonly accepted discourse function.

<sup>12</sup> Munteanu (2008: 19) sees the “dogmatischen Hauptunterschied” between the Eastern and the Western Church as an important, but subordinated factor in comparison to existing political differences (cf. 24–25). A clear border between religious dogma and political intention is not easy to draw, anyway, if the legitimation of politics – like in the Middle Ages – is done by means of theological terms.

letter “Duo sunt” in 494 to Byzantine emperor Anastasius I reminding him that political power is subordinated to the spiritual, this is episcopal one, because the latter blesses the former.

Where is the link between politics and liturgy? While the development of the Roman Mass has not come to an end in the 9th c., the Byzantine Liturgy had been elaborated since at least three centuries according to the idea of iconic closeness. The attendants in Byzantine liturgy act as icons of the attendants of the everlasting liturgy in heaven, expressed, for example, in the famous Cherubikon (cf. 4.2). The Roman Mass, on the contrary, invites its attendants to gather as a herd around the spiritual representative of the Son which will guide His herd through the course of time. One could say, that the idea of legitimating political power in Byzantine orthodoxy is rooted in the concept of an ontological liturgy: the more iconic closeness to the source of power, the more power is legitimated. In the Roman understanding political power is granted to the first member of the herd by blessings of the immediate successor of Peter – the Church itself<sup>13</sup>.

This is only a rough and stereotypical sketch of differences between the Byzantine and Roman understanding of liturgy. But if the main points can be accepted than it is understandable, firstly, why liturgy matters in collective Christianisation<sup>14</sup> and, secondly, that the introduction of Eastern ontological thinking by way of liturgy could have motivated the opposition of the Frankish clergy. Štih (2014) shows that the Christianisation and cultural integration of Carinthia into the Frankish empire went along the route of assimilation by a unified liturgical rite. Because the liturgic rite expresses not only theological content but, as its consequence, concepts of the legitimation of political power, it is of importance to consider again the arguments on liturgy in VM. The differences between East and West, as theoretical they may seem in discussions about liturgy, will have practical impact on every day life if it comes to questions like “is the abbot or is the ruler the moral example for the community?”, “who is expected to support monasteries?”, “is political power always brought under the primacy of the cathedral?” and so on. The answer to these questions have to be performed on the local level in a constant uniform way to allow for “assimilation” (Štih 2014) as the sociological effect of Christianisation. If Methodius and his pupils acted along the Eastern lines of thinking they would have introduced in everyday jurisdictional questions another model of legitimating power which allocates – in Western eyes – too much of spiritual dignity to political power and too less independence to the Church. While the owners of political power did not have reason to comply about that, the Western clergy had.

---

<sup>13</sup> Compare the actual praxis of canonization: The Western culture noticed with irritation that the Orthodox Church had canonized on August 20th 2000 the last Russian Czar (Nikolaj II); on the contrary the canonization of two Roman Popes on April 27th 2014 (Johannes Paul II und Johannes XXIII) provoked comments in Russian newspapers about an “irrational belief” in the position of the Pope.

<sup>14</sup> The same is true for Hungary which also faced the question if it should be Christianised according to Byzantine rite because of political implications; cf. Szigeti 1963.

Recapitulating the sketchy remarks about the political implications of liturgy Wyrwoll (1966: 13) can be quoted, who, explicitly referring to Cyril and Methodius, mentions:

Immer deutlicher wird in dieser Zeit der tiefe Unterschied in der Auffassung von der sichtbaren Einheit der Kirche. Ist sie abhängig von der politischen Einheit? Ist sie geeint als Herde des hl. Petrus und seiner Nachfolger?

Exactly this is the question: political unity of the Christian world under one political ruler (the Byzantine model) or unity of all Christian believers as a herd under the leadership of the Pope? Christian liturgy performs before the eyes of the catechumens the transcendental fundament of the worldly order: leadership according to iconic closeness or leadership according to succession. It is therefore liturgy, which will be the theoretical subject of discussion, in complaining about practical effects in everyday “herding”.

#### 4. THE LITURGY QUESTION IN VM

##### 4.1.a. *The introduction: filioque*

Having noted political consequences as implications of liturgy we will now point to the very beginning of VM which overtly speaks about the *filioque* and also about liturgy.

Already Grivec has noted that the introduction to VM is outstanding in comparison to the rest of VM and that actually VM does not start but with the second chapter:

Caput primum Vitae Methodii stylo proprio eleganti eminet; opinari licet caput id e scriptis Constantini et Methodii originem ducere, ita ut ipsa vita de facto capite secundo incipiat (G 145).

It may be added that the first chapter of VM is not only outstanding by its elegant style but also by its content. The introduction starts right away with an argumentation towards an orthodox view on Trinity, clearly segmented into three steps. The first step is to point to the certainty of a theistic belief:

[2] Бъ ... есть створнаъ ... виднама же и невиднама и оукраенаъ всеюю красотою, юже кѣто ... можетъ ... того познати, нже есть сътворнаъ снцъ дѣла (KIO 1973: 185; G 147)

God has created the visible and the invisible (world) and ornated it with all beauty, by which everyone can identify the One, who has created all this.

That the Creator “is manifest” (Romans 1:19; King James Version 1611) in his creations is an inaugurating declaration which could transport some confessional intention by its allusion to “beauty” bringing to mind the (posterior, of course) story about Vladimir’s Christening in the so-called Old Russian “Chronicle of Nestor”, but speaking of beauty rather than of sublimeness of God’s works is not specific enough to invariantly point to a specific Christian confession. While the inaugurating declaration is theistic, the second argument now advances the specific Christian belief in God, that is, the trinitarian belief:

God is honoured by “us Orthodox” as a trinity consisting in three hypostases (ὕποστασις; note the Greek term in VM):

[3] (нже...) всен православѣрнии славимъ въ свѣѣн тронци, срѣѣчь въ оцѣн и снѣѣ и стѣѣ дсѣѣ, еже естъ въ трѣѣхъ оупостаѣхъ, еже можетъ кзѣто три лица рещи, а въ еднномъ бжѣствѣ (КЮ 1973: 185; G 147)

(whom...) all we Orthodox Christians adore in the Holy Trinity, this is in the Father and in the Son and in the Holy Spirit, who (the Trinity) exists in three hypostasises, what one could name three persons, but in one Deity.

The adjective православѣрнии displays the long declensional NomPl associated with definite reference as if the text turns to persons present at reading time. In applying to “us orthodox Christians” the sentence prepares for a confessional specific argument, which takes shape when the text proceeds to identify the – *sit venia verbo* – “rock of offence” (1 Peter 2:8): Does the Spirit go out only from the Father or “also from the Son” (= *filioque*)? So, the text goes on from a first theistic to a second trinitarian and now to a third specific Orthodox statement:

[4] Отъ тогоже оца и стѣѣн дхѣѣ исхождеть, якоже рече самъ снѣѣ бжнемъ (вожн G 150)  
глаголь: „Дхѣѣ истинный, нже ѡ оца исхождеть“ (КЮ 1973: 185)

And from this Father goes out also the Holy Spirit, which says the Son in godly voice (perceptible): „The Spirit of truth, which goes out from the Father.“

VM unmistakably declares that the Holy Spirit exclusively goes out from the Father and underlines this point with various biblical quotations, the one in the cited passage referring to John 15:26 (“the Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father”; King James Version 1611). It seems, the passage would be even more clear if the variant *synъ božni* (G 150) is accepted. Firstly, the reading *božiemъ glasomъ* = “in godly (divine) voice” obfuscates the argument as if the Spirit goes out only from the Father, but the Son Himself would have a “godly voice”, too, which sounds contradictorily. Secondly, the position of the adjective in the reading *božiemъ glasomъ* precedes its noun and thus could suggest a definite meaning (Hansen 2004: 56), but we never heard of that voice in the foregoing text and it also is not a coined expression, while the reading *synъ božni* is. In the reading *synъ božni* the adjective is at its canonical position behind the noun and displays the usual meaning “God’s Son” which is needed for the argument: the Spirit goes out from the Father and His Son is testifying this truth in His own words openly and audibly (*glasomъ*).

#### 4.1.b. Excursus on a reading variant

The claim, that in VC *synъ božni glasomъ* should be read with the meaning “as the Son of God testifies perceptible” can provoke objections. According to G (the variant is not mentioned in KЮ) the reading is only found in one copy of VM and the overwhelming majority of the copies reads *božiemъ glasomъ*. We have an alternation of readings and each side contains two parts: the majority reading *synъ | božiemъ glasomъ* and the minority reading *synъ božni | glasomъ*. The first side of the alternation demands that a “godly voice” can be embedded in the context of the argument, while the second side of the alternation demands for an explanation of the isolated *glasomъ*.

Not surprisingly, related to the first side of the alternation it is argued that “godly voice” is not appropriate within the wider context of the passage, and re-

lated to the second side of the alternation it is shown that *glasomъ* is a normal addition and can be understood as an adverb. Our argument is put forward in terms of the traditional principle of textual emendation known as the “harder reading” or *lectio difficilior potior*. “Because scribes tend to smooth or otherwise remedy rough or difficult readings rather than create them” (Epp 2011: 105) it has become a problematic<sup>15</sup>, but nevertheless heuristic rule to decide between competing readings based on the criterion that the smooth reading is probably not the original reading but shows redactional work of scribes. Our question can be formulated as such: Is *synъ | božiemъ glasomъ* or rather *synъ božni | glasomъ* the *lectio difficilior*, that is, the probably original reading?

It could be argued, that the collocation *synъ božni* suggests a *lectio facilior*. On a stylistic level the majority reading *božiemъ glasomъ* is more unusual than the composition *synъ božni*. But it should be kept in mind, that the editorial rule to prefer the more difficult reading is only meaningfully applied, if the context supports both competing readings. Now, the context of the passage is twofold: On the one hand the traditional *božiemъ glasomъ* simply could be the introduction to the following quotation (Jn 15:26) which is, in fact, direct speech of Jesus. In this sense *božiemъ glasomъ* perfectly fits into the narrow context of the sentence. On the other hand, as mentioned above, the sentence functions as the concluding argument within a scale of arguments, building up from theistic to trinitarian to orthodox belief. The last argument, that the Spirit only goes out from the Father, should be demonstrated by the last sentence, but gets tellingly disturbed, if the Son is characterized to speak with an own “godly voice”, too. It is rhetorically rather unadep at this point of the argumentation to declare, that the Sun has his own voice – which He has, of course, but at the same time out of love to the Father He is attuning His free will to the Father’s (Lk 22:42: “nevertheless not my will, but thine, be done”; King James Version 1611). It takes a theological effort to describe what the Son’s “godly voice” could mean in a context which declares that the Holy Spirit only proceeds from the Father, heaving in mind that “the Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do” (Jn 5:19; King James Version 1611). The context is not suggesting considerations about the Son’s “godly voice” and implications of free will and submission to God’s will, but the context is leading plainly to the argument that the Holy Spirit only goes out from the Father. At this point of the argumentation to declare, that the Son has His own voice, too, is not false in a theological sense, but fairly unexpected in a rhetorical sense.

---

<sup>15</sup> “Moreover, the application of the rule is so subjective that it can hardly be called a textual rule or canon. For what looks like a linguistically or contextually difficult reading to one scholar, is not difficult to another. Furthermore, often two readings are equally difficult, or two others equally easy. Do we have to locate the more difficult or easier reading in such cases as well?” (Tov 1982: 440).

To sum up, in the narrow context on sentence level the traditional reading *božiemъ glasomъ* can be understood as introducing direct speech, but it doesn't fit neither on a theological, nor on a rhetorical level into the argument structure of the passage. This seems typical for the redactional work of a scribe, whose intervention remedies an immediate difficulty but weakens the coherence within the wider context.

On the other side, the reading *synъ božni glasomъ* literally can only be understood as a tautology resp. redundancy “He speaks with His voice”. In such a context the instrumental of the noun *glasomъ* appears to be a semantically “bleached” addition to a *verbum dicendi*. SJS (1: 401) points to an example in Codex Zographensis and its parallel in Codex Marianus (also quoted in Cejtin, Večerka, Blahová 1994: 142), that sometimes (SJS: “sed”) it seems odd to literally translate *glasomъ* as “voice”. I cannot but state, that exactly the passage pointed to by SJS offers the solution to the problem. Both Codex Zographensis and Codex Marianus contain a table of contents to the Gospel of Luke. The narration about the woman who suddenly calls out of the crowd (Lk 11:27–28) is only two verses long, but nevertheless is mentioned in the table of contents by the words  $\Theta$   $\text{взъзъпнвзъшнн гласомъ отъ народа}$ . (Jagić 1960: 187). This is basically the periphrasis of the first sentence (Lk 11:27) of the story itself which reads  $\text{взъзъвнргъшн гласъ една жена отъ народа рече емоу}$ . The construction in the table of contents  $\text{взъзъпнвзъшнн гласомъ}$  is conceptually equivalent to the formulation in the text itself  $\text{взъзъвнргъшн гласъ ... рече}$ ; if *the verbum dicendi* is stripped off on both sides of the equation the ‘minimal pair’  $\text{гласомъ/ възъзъвнргъшн гласъ}$  remains. Again, it would be odd to assume that the formulation in the table of contents means “having cried with her voice” because it is unclear how the woman could have done otherwise. Instead, the alternation  $\text{гласомъ/ възъзъвнргъшн гласъ}$  shows the meaning of an isolated locative *glasomъ*: the voice of the woman was acoustically profiled, perceptible against the grounding noise of the crowd. Speaking about the etymology of Polish “głóśny” (Boryś 2008: 163) not only gives Czech, Russian and Slovenian parallels, but also sees Common Slavic \*golsъnъ to have the meaning ‘slyszalny, donośni’. In the light of parallel meanings in other Slavic languages there is good reason to think, that also OCS *glasomъ* could have the adverbial meaning ‘perceptible/ audible’<sup>16</sup>.

In respect to the problematic passage in VM it can be resumed: the construction *reče ... synъ božni glasomъ* is grammatically acceptable and conveys the distinct meaning ‘says ... audible/ perceptible’. Reading the sentence in VM this way, does not disturb the argumentation of the wider context but on the contrary supports it (‘also the Son says audible/ perceptible, that the Spirit goes out from the Father’) and is still fitting into the narrow context of the sentence which in-

---

<sup>16</sup> There are connections between instrumental and adverbial meaning: The instrumental of the o-stems -omъ is an analogic adoption of the u-stems. The original ending (-ō) is preserved in some adverbials (Aitzetmüller 1991: 80).

roduces direct speech. The fact, that *glasomъ* could have been used in adverbial meaning, is no argument against, but instead in favour of the reading *synъ božni glasomъ*. It is the more logical reading and at the same time the *lectio difficilior*, because it refers to a more unusual meaning of the locative<sup>17</sup>.

#### 4.1.c. The introduction: Cherubikon

The first chapter of VM supports the Eastern dogma, that the Holy Spirit exclusively goes out from the Father. This result would be enough to go to next argument (4.2) but because this paper deals with liturgy it is worth pointing to the first part of sentence [3]:

[5] Оутъ велнкотъи бо н дѡбротъи дѣлѡ по размыслѡ н родителѡ нхъ мѡудрѣствоуѣтьсѡ<sup>18</sup>,  
нже поють ангелъи трѣсвятимъ гласѡмъ н всѡ правѡвѣрнимъ славимъ (rest of sentence cf. [3])  
(KIO 1973: 185)

“For from the greatness and beauty of created things is their Creator correspondingly discerned<sup>19</sup>, Whom the angels sing the thrice-holy hymn and we all Orthodox Christians adore...<sup>20</sup>

The Angel’s “thrice-holy voice” alludes to the Divine Liturgy of John Chrysostom containing the *trisagion* or thrice-holy hymn in its centre, which in the 6th century became the Cherubikon as it is sung until today<sup>21</sup>. The *trisagion* resp. Cheru-

<sup>17</sup> The adverbial meaning of *glasomъ* could have posed a difficulty in particular to all Middle Bulgarian scribes who under the development of the loss of nominal morphology could have had trouble to interpret the adverbial meaning of an isolated instrumental and therefore could have been tempted to “smooth” it by giving it an adjectival function. Of course, speaking about the possible loss of the reading *synъ božni glasomъ* can only be a speculation. It is beyond the scope of this article to trace the use of *glasomъ* in all OCS texts and their respective redactions.

<sup>18</sup> Original reading мѡдрѣстьвоуѣтьсѡ (G 147), according to Florja (2000: 101) во всех списках испорчен. The conjecture < мѡдрѣствѡуѣтьсѡ (< θεωρεῖται) was proposed by Bodjanskij 1865 (G 150); VM produces LXX Sap 13:5 in all but one word (particle бо in Wackernagel position) as an interlinear translation: ἐκ [отъ] γὰρ [бо] μεγέθους [велнкотъи] καὶ [н] καλλονῆς [дѡбротъи] κτισμάτων [дѣлѡ] ἀναλόγως [по размыслѡ] ὁ γενεσιουργὸς [родителѡ] αὐτῶν [нхъ]. The reading of the Vulgate is different (*a magnitudine enim speciei et creaturae cognoscibiliter poterit creator horum videri*).

<sup>19</sup> English translation according to NETS 2009.

<sup>20</sup> Florja translates: (Ибо) по величию и красоте созданий размышлением познается Создатель их, о котором поют ангелы трисвятым гласом и (которого мы) все правоверные славим в Святой Троице... (Florja 2000: 95). His translation serves as base for the reading of Knjazevskaia, Alekseev (1999).

<sup>21</sup> Moran (1979: 17): “The hypothesis that psalm 23 with its interjection ‘Lift up your gates’ was used as the original chant of the Great Entrance which was gradually replaced by the refrain οὐ τὰ χερουβῖμ has been raised by several scholars (...). The process by which a troparion sung as a refrain between the verses of a psalm came to replace completely the original psalm has been well documented in musicological and liturgical studies.” Also Conomos (2012: 2) describes the process “when the trope becomes a troparion – a fully-fledged hymn in its own right, more or less independent of the host verse or response that had originally inspired it. The *Trisagion* hymn, for example, is clearly a Trinitarian trope on Isaiah 6:3 – ‘Holy, holy, holy, Lord of Sabaoth’.” Because a troparion is sung within a mode of the Oktoechos (Osmoglasie), one is tempted to give the word гласъ in this

bikon is placed in Byzantine liturgy right at the beginning of the Great Entrance, when non-believers and all not yet baptised attendants have to leave. After the Great Entrance only orthodox Christians gather for liturgy and no wonder, that in the quoted passage from VM the reference to the angels is followed by reference to “us” orthodox Christians. There is little doubt, that the quoted passage of VM alludes to the Cherubikon as sung in the liturgy of John Chrysostom. But this does not mean, that VM invariantly points to Byzantine liturgy; precisely this troparion, the Cherubikon starts its way into Roman liturgy in the 9th c. within the development of *Missa Graeca*. A well dated manuscript (Jan. 868 – Dec. 872) from Düsseldorf<sup>22</sup> substitutes the Roman offertorium by the Greek Cherubikon, which is presented in Latin transliteration. This will become more important when speaking about the “custom” to first read the Holy Mass in Latin, than in Slavic.

#### 4.1.d. *The introduction: conclusions*

The reading of the first chapter of VM shows that:

1. The author of VM introduces the text with a passage that speaks about the *filioque*-problem.
2. The *filioque*-problem is addressed according to the Byzantine position.
3. The *filioque*-problem is embedded in an allusion to liturgy (*trisagion*) and Byzantine Orthodoxy as if the attendant in the liturgy would accept as well that the Spirit only goes out only from the Father. This exactly is (see above 3) the consequence of the ontological principle in Orthodox thinking which is best expressed by the Cherubikon itself:

Иже херувимы тайно образуеще и животворящей Троице Трисвятую песнь припевающе<sup>23</sup>.

The emphasis on singing a thrice-holy hymn and the unexpected change to 1st PersPl (поют > вси славим) in VM conserves an echo of the *trisagion* itself which is sung in the 1st PersPl. Without speculation it can be stated that the author of VM positions the *filioque*-problem in the context of liturgy, which is

---

sentence the specific meaning ‘modus of Byzantine church music’ (Cejtlin, Večerka, Blahová 1994: 170), but this is a far-fetched and syntactically not fully supported suggestion.

<sup>22</sup> MS D1(9); Semmler (1994: 202): “bietet als Textgrundstock ein Gregorianisches Sakrament, das um das von Papst Hadrian I. und Karl dem Großen angeregte Supplementum angereichert ist”, and (206–207): „anstelle des mit dem Festanlaß wechselnden lateinischen Offertorium setzten sie das unveränderliche griechische Cherubikon ein (...) In dieser Vollständigkeit ist die im 9. Jahrhundert entstandene, im abendländischen Früh- und Hochmittelalter verbreitete missa graeca nur in wenigen okzidental Handschriften erhalten“.

<sup>23</sup> Barrett (2013: 112) translates: “We (who are) mystically representing the Cherubim and singing the thrice-holy hymn to the life-giving Trinity, let us put away all earthly care, as we are about to receive the king of all, invisibly escorted by the angelic orders. Alleluia.” Ibidem: This is “the text sung for a typical Sunday celebration in the Divine Liturgies of St John Chrysostom and St Basil”. Because out of the four Cherubika only this version contains the word “thrice-holy” VM refers to the typical liturgy on Sundays.

called up by reference to the central Cherubikon which itself invites all orthodox Christians to worship and expressing the ontological principle of iconicity (херувимы тайно образующе).

Such specific meaning of the formulations used in VM hardly results by chance and it can be additionally stated that the author of the introduction to VM is implicitly assuring us that Methodius as an orthodox Christian had celebrated in accordance to the Byzantine rite.

The author of VM, trying to defend Methodius's work, openly refers to the *filioque* and to Byzantine ontological thinking and so with a high degree of probability we can assume that the opposition of the Western clergy to Methodius's work arouse in particular because of the Byzantine ontological thinking and its political respectively jurisdictional implications.

It is left an open question, as Florja (2000: 101 „исповедание веры“ Методия) puts it, if the introduction to VM actually is written on the base of Methodius's own works, especially on the base of an official declaration of his creed which Methodius had been forced to give in the course of his trial and by which the Pope had confirmed his orthodoxy also according to Roman comprehension. I myself would not think so, because the *filioque*, which is the central theme in the introduction of VM, only later (cf. footnote 11) became the terminological fixed point of debates between Byzantium and Rome and only after the introduction of the *filioque* as a usual discourse pattern a contemporary reader of VM could understand the implicit allusions of the introduction. But, of course, there is no objective dating of texts by aesthetics of reception. In any case, the argument structure of VM with its concise theological implications additionally underlines the notion of Grivec, that the introduction to VM is stylistically different from the rest of VM.

#### 4.2. A Latin Letter

The author(s) of VM had overtaken the demanding task to portray a person and his work within an ongoing theological debate which itself had not yet been settled in fixed theological terms. Already in the 9th c. it was felt that the differences between Rome and Byzantium had evolved into dimensions which lay beyond pure theological reasoning. The differences between Rome and Byzantium only later came to be known under the commonly accepted terms “*filioque*” and “Caesaropapism”. In the 9th c. these terms weren't either commonly in use nor had been clearly seen the political consequences of the different theological concepts. The political differences between Roman and Byzantine thinking which arose out of different ontologies have terminologically been conceptualized only later in the 10th c.

The introduction to VM suggests that the question of liturgy, resp. of Byzantine ontological thinking – formulated in terms of the *filioque* – has been a major topic in the conflict with the Western clergy. It would not make sense if the introduction to VM defended Methodius's firm orthodox belief in liturgical terms, if liturgy had not been the controversial subject. Of course this does not decide the

question if Methodius actually had celebrated according to Byzantine rite. Within the *vita* this question is addressed directly in another famous passage.

The letter of Pope Adrian II to Rostislav, Svjatopulk and Kocel, preserved only in its OCS translation in VM, addresses the problem of liturgy from another point of view. The most prominent passages are (KIO 1973: 189 [G 157] – my translation – Knjazevskaja, Alekseev 1999 – Latin reconstruction in Grivec 1960: 257):

[6] Она же оувѣдѣвъша апльскаго стола <sup>24</sup> , достоаща ваша страны, кромѣ канона не створните ничьоже	Both being aware a) that your countries belong of the Apostolic See, b) that the Apostolic See agreed in respect to you regions (apostolicam sedem vestras regiones concedisse) did nothing a) against b) outside the Canonical Law (extra canonem)	Они же, уведав что страны ваши находятся под властью апостольскаго престола, не сделали ничего противного канонам.	Illi autem cum cognovissent, ad apostolicam sedem pertinere vestras regiones, contra canonem nihil fecerunt
[7] Да взы оучитъ, такоже еете проснан, сзказати кзники въз <sup>25</sup> яззыкѣ <sup>26</sup> вашь по вьсеому црквиному чинноу испълнь, н сз стгоу мзшею, рекъше сз службу, н крщениемь.	that he (Methodius) would teach you, as you have asked for, by reading aloud (praedicans) the books to your people fully empowered (plenus) according to the order of the Church, also with the Holy Mass i.e. liturgy (cum sancto officio id est cum missa), and baptism.	чтобы учил вас, как вы просили, излагая на языке вашем Книги полностью для всего церковного чина, в том числе со святой мессой, то есть службой, и с крещением.	ut vos doceret, prout rogastis, interpretans libros in linguam vestram, secundum totum ecclesiasticum ordinem plene et cum sancta missa (id est cum liturgia) et baptismo
[8] Сь же едннз хранити обзычан, да на мзши пьрвѣе чьтуютъ апль н еванглане рнмьскы, таче словѣньскы	Only one custom is to be conserved, – that during the Mass firstly the Apostolos and the Gospel is read in Latin, afterwards in Slavic.	Только один этот сохранять вам обычай, чтобы во время мессы сначала читали Апостол и Евангелие полатыни, потом по-славянски.	Hanc unam servate consuetudinem, ut in missa primo legant apostolum et evangelium Romane, dein Slovenice

<sup>24</sup> G 157 without comma.

<sup>25</sup> In most Slavic languages the verb “speak to” will be construed with the preposition κ + Dative (κ нему), except Polish (do njego). A Greek template for the uncommon preposition in VM most probably would have shown the preposition στον, because στον can either mean “to” like in Ὅταν στο Θεό Μιλῶ = “Whenever I speak to the Lord” and “in” like in μιλῶ στον άνεμο = “I speak into the wind”. But in the context of a Latin translation, that it is, the preposition “ad” (loqui/ praedicare/ dicere ad...) is the most probable origin of the Slavic formulation (cf. *loquens ad populum semones Domini*, Jeremiah 43:1); кннѣи could have been “libri, charti, caudices, codices”.

<sup>26</sup> KIO 1973: 189 (misprint): ѡзѣкъ.

The letter is full of theological terms. Grivec (1960: 257) assumes that the OCS text in VM is based on a Greek version of the Latin original. In accordance with the introductory notes of this paper I would rather speak of an imitation of administrative language for Slavic readers; the characteristics of Latin administrative language are imitated for readers in the Byzantine world by means of imitating Greek administrative language.

There are some questions as to the wording of VM, firstly in [6] the participle ΔΟΥΛΩΣΑΜΕΝΑ. The dual *vaša strany* points to Great Moravia and Pannonia, the regions of missionary activity, which belong (Pannonia, of course, is subject to discussions) to the jurisdiction of the Apostolic See; the syntactic structure of the sentence therefore is based on the literal meaning of *dostojati do...* = “to stand to” = “to belong to” and the translations (variant *a* in the second column) render this meaning and construction by using a prepositional phrase (*pertinere ad/nachoditʹsja pod*; another Latin possibility: *ad apostolicam sedem convenisse*). The construction in VM shows no explicit prepositional phrase, which can be explained that the verbal prefix *do-* at the same time functions as a preposition (*do*) (Večerka 1989: 122). But still, the meaning “to belong” is more typical with the noun *dostojanie*, while the verb *dostojati* typically is used in impersonal constructions. If we assume that the OCS text is a direct translation from a Latin letter, an elliptic construction can be considered like the AcI *apostolicam sedem vestras regiones concedisse* = “your countries, which the Apostolic See has agreed upon [to be missionized]”. Such a formulation would contain a Latin verb having the meaning “to grant, concede”, which similar to *dostojati* also can be used in impersonal constructions and could be the trigger for the OCS construction. Likewise, ΚΡΟΜΕΪ ΚΑΝΟΝΑ can be the translation not of “against”, but “outside” the Canonical Law (*extra ordinem*). I do not pretend that these remarks are more than speculations (problematic in itself) with regard to an assumed Latin original and I do not want to query the quoted translations (= *a*). Pointing to possible variants (= *b*) just stresses the notion that the OCS text of Adrian’s letter linguistically is more complicated than the surrounding narration which is a clear sign of its translational origin.

The Greek term κανών in [6] means “Canonical Law”, but is testified in the New Testament (2 Corinth 10:16 et al.) also as “county”. Because of the ambiguity of the Greek term the Biblical translations differ; the Vulgate underlines the jurisdictional meaning by translating *in aliena regula*, but the Russian Synodal Bible translates an areal meaning в чужом уделе, while King James Version, 1611 tries a sort of abstract meaning “in another man’s line of things”. In respect to VM the translation of κανών implies different associations. The hint to Canonical Law assures the addressees of the letter that Methodius did nothing outside his consecrated clerical duties. The areal meaning gives the letter a more geopolitical tone: Methodius and his pupils did not act in regions which haven’t been agreed by Rome to be christianised from the side of Byzantium. The areal meaning of κανών alludes the “master narrative” (cf. 2) of political rivalries between Byzan-

tium, the Apostolic See and the Frankish, resp. Moravian governments, but it is not clear why political rulers would complain about a more widespread missionary activity of Methodius which also would expand their own political influence. Moreover, both translation variants a) and b) of sentence [6] already include the regional argument (“counties belonging to”) and it would be slightly redundant to speak again of “counties”. It is more probable, in accordance with the existing translations, that κανών here means Canonical Law and the Moravian rulers complain about Methodius as having infringed his clerical duties according to Roman jurisdiction.

The formulation in [7] is more complicated. The phrase *εὐκαζᾶα κηνηγῖ ἐν ἰαζυκῖ ἐαση* would be literally “speaking the books to your language”, and it is not very probable that the author of VM, displaying good writer’s skills, would not have been able to formulate a normal sentence as the Russian paraphrase assumes it to be. If *jazykō* is understood as equivalent to “ethnos” (cf. Cejtin, Večerka, Blahová 1994: 807) VM does not speak about interpreting the Holy Scriptures in the native language of the attendants, but of reading aloud books to an audience. Most probably (as in Grivec’s reconstruction) the original word has been *lingua*, which also in Latin has the meaning “people, nation”. Perhaps, the word “books” is an allusion to the blessing of Cyril’s Gospel translation in San Clemente, but the verb *εὐκαζᾶα* (Participle present active) typically does not have the meaning “reading”, so it is not easy connected with the object “books”<sup>27</sup>. In Latin an equivalent sentence could have run like *praedicans libri in vostrum populum*, because *sъkazati* can have the meaning *возвестить* “proclaim” (Starčevskij 1899: 760). In VC the verb *sъkazati* is used in this meaning: After Cyrill has learned the Syrian language

взскорѣ начеть чнети и сказѡвати (G 109: сказати) и днелѡахс се емоу, бѡ хвалеще  
(G 109: мнѡзи емоу днелѡ и хвалеще) (KIO 1973: 96)

Cyril quickly began to read and to sermonize *сказѡвати* to the people, perhaps on a regular base, as the iterative verb in KIO seems to suggest. With respect to the syntactic structure of [7] and to the prototypical meaning of the verb *sъkazati*, there is reason to think that VM does not speak about the allowance of using translated books but of reading the pericopes in Slavic and preaching about them.

This reading makes a difference, because it does not stress the fact, that the “books” have been “interpreted” in the Slavic vernacular of the people. It speaks about the manner how Methodius is allowed to celebrate liturgy, namely to read aloud the Slavonic translation (and the homily) to the audience.

These remarks will be more convincing if the second part of the sentence is considered, which clearly can only be understood by assuming a Latin origin. The crucial part of sentence [7] is the phrase *по всемоу црквиномуу чинноу испълнь* which does not sound like a proper OCS sentence. If *ispōlnъ* is taken as an ad-

<sup>27</sup> The verb *sъkazati* has a variety of meanings (SJS 4: 268–271); “to interpret” is among them, based actually on this passage.

verb, it stands in maximal distance to its verb *sъkazati* and the meaning would be, that Methodius’s “interpreting” or “preaching” (< *sъkazati*) is “full according to the order of the church including Holy Mass and baptism”. If “full” = *plene* would characterize the “interpreting” of books, a meaning emerges like ‘the books are interpreted according to the orders of the Church and can be used during Holy Mass and baptismal liturgy’ (cf. the preposition *для* in the Russian translation or, you better would say, interpreting periphrasis). Likewise, if “full” = *plene* would characterize the preaching of Methodius, it is also unclear why Holy Mass and baptism additionally are mentioned. We did not expect Methodius to preach only on hourly services.

It seems that the Slavic scribe felt the need to translate a special Latin term notwithstanding that its literal translation would cause a somewhat unusual Slavic syntax. Such a special term *plenus* is documented not long after Methodius’s time. In this passage of VM *ispъlnъ*<sup>28</sup> has to be taken as an adjective = “full of”. Methodius is said to be “full” = *plenus* in regard to all Church order: he is in episcopal “perfection”.

Speaking about the performance of Church services and especially speaking about the duties of the clergy in the Canonical law the adjective *plenus* added to its primary meaning “full” the meaning of “perfection” and also the specific meaning “perfect in every sense”. In *vitae* of Roman Saints *plenus* in the meaning of ‘full’ can be attributed to episcopos like

*plenus auctoritatis et gratiae inplebat episcopi dignitatem* (Kritzinger 2009: 200, footnote 1095).

Augustinus often uses *plenus* in the sense of “perfected” respectively “perfect”. E. g., a catechesis is perfect, if it leads to a certain goal:

*Narratio plena est, cum quisque primo catechizatur ab eo quod scriptum est* (Arnoldi 2011: 58; cf. footnote 377: *semper tamen plena atque perfecta sit*)<sup>29</sup>.

Already Benson (1967) has shown that in the formal, terminologically shaped context of the Canonical Law *plenus* means episcopal “perfection”. The formula *plenitudo potestatis* implies a specific jurisdictional meaning, which Benson defines using the example of Innocent III’s writings (1160/ 61–1216):

In Innocent’s terminology, it was equivalent to the “fullness of ecclesiastical power” or the “primacy of ordinary power” (*plenitudo ecclesiae potestatis* and *principatus ordinariae potestatis*). Innocent maintained that the jurisdiction of all lesser churches and prelates derives from the Roman See (...) (Benson 1967: 196)

Obviously, if we don’t want to settle with the unclear phrase “interpreting resp. preaching fully in regard to all Church order...” we should assume that the passage in VC is translated from the original Latin expressions of the Pope’s let-

<sup>28</sup> In VM *испълнъ* shows a Jer (ъ) like its adjectival use in Codex Zographensis (Cejtlin, Večerka, Blahová 1994: 267).

<sup>29</sup> Cf. also Arnoldi 2011: 149: *plenitudinem scientiae, quod est caritas*, where Augustinus does not mean the abundance of science, but its “perfection”.

ter and the adjective *isplъnъ* has to be understood as *plenus* in the specific sense of “ordained in full power according to the Church law”. This, of course, implies that *isplъnъ* here is an adjective, because as the *terminus technicus* for authorisation it only can apply to Methodius. In Latin the adjectival use of *plenus* is attested in the *Summa aurea* of Henricus de Segusio (Hostiensis; ca. 1200–1271), where it is said in regard to the Pope:

est etiam plenus, id est, habens plenitudinem potestatis... (Krüger 2007: 184, footnote 231)

Despite the nice effect, that the passage of VM reveals a plain sense, if *isplъnъ* is not analysed as an adverb to *skazati* but as an adjective to Methodius, it could be argued, that the adjective *isplъnъ* is normally constructed with the genitive, but in Adrian’s letter it is not. This objection, of course, would not rise with *isplъnъ* as adverb, but in fact it is no argument against *isplъnъ* as an adjective, because *isplъnъ* + genitive would reveal the ablative meaning as if Methodius, “full” of the Church order, would emit this order. This is not meant, but exactly the contrary: Methodius is not the source of the power, but he is in charge (*plenus*) according to this power (*po vsemu cerkovnomu činu*).

Another argument against *isplъnъ* = *plenus* with the adjectival meaning ‘*habens plenitudinem potestatis*’ could be that the (above quoted) instances for the defined meaning of *plenus* in the context of Canonical Law are later than Adrian’s letter in VM (but cf. Benson 1967). This argument has to be left to others. It is beyond the scope of this article to trace the development of Roman theological terminology. It is sufficient for the present argumentation to assume the possibility that the term *plenus* had undergone a semantic development already present at Methodius’s times. The quotation from Augustinus (see above) shows that this is no assumption without reason.

It can be resumed, that Adrian’s letter speaks in the context of Canonical Law (*kanon*) about Methodius as a celebrant in liturgy (*skazati*) who is *isplъnъ* = *plenus* = “full authorised with regard to all Church order”. Methodius is allowed to read aloud the Gospel and surely also the homilies, which is the service of the deacon, but above that he is also in full authorisation as a representative of the bishop to celebrate the Mass and to baptise. According to old ecclesiastic law the deacon is not subordinated to the presbyter; both have different duties and both are subordinated on the same level to a bishop. Only the bishop has the right to baptise and the priest as well as the deacon can baptise only as representatives of the bishop:

Inde venit, ut sine chrismate et episcopi iussione, neque presbyter, neque diaconus jus habeant baptizandi (Hieronymus 1857: coll. 173).

Hence it is, that neither presbyters nor deacons have any right to baptise without the chrism and command of their bishop (Bingham 1840: 19).

While Adrian’s letter assures Methodius of the full rights of a priest including the conferred right of the bishop to administer the Holy Mass and to baptise, it shows that Methodius’s legitimation has been a point of debate among the Western

clergy. This is somewhat puzzling in contrast to VM 6, 2 where pope Nicholas already had consecrated Methodius на поповѣство (KIO 1973: 188). Why granting Methodius again the rights of a priest if he already had been one? Maybe the abstract term поповѣство in contrast to three “priests” and two “lecturers”<sup>30</sup> which have been ordained at the same time by Nicholas conveys the meaning, that Methodius has been consecrated by Nicholas as part of the clerical community but holding in fact not the rank of a local priest but a more superordinate rank in regard to a whole jurisdictional district, e.g. the rank of a deacon<sup>31</sup>. But, admittedly, there is a term for deacon in OCS and the matter is not easily clarified.

In any case, the term *plenus* in pope Adrian’s letter shows, that his letter should not be read as a confirmation, that the Slavonic translation of the Scriptures have been allowed during liturgy, but as a description what exactly Methodius is allowed when it comes to administering liturgic services. This is another argument for the thesis, that liturgy has been the very point of conflict between Methodius and the Western clergy. Pope Adrian at least states or affirms that Methodius is allowed to read the “books” – the Apostolos and the Gospel – in the native language of the people and additionally is in full charge of a priest’s duties<sup>32</sup>.

If we accept a Latin origin of the OCS sentence and accordingly the interpretation, that the Pope spoke about the allowance “to read aloud the Slavonic Gospel” and additionally about Methodius having a priest’s duties then sentence [8] poses no more problems. Methodius should read aloud first the Latin gospel, afterwards the translation during the Holy Mass.

It remains to discuss what the word мѣша can mean in a translation from Latin. Firstly, it can be assumed, that the Pope probably did not use a Latin term *liturgia*, which officially as a loan word is said to appear for the first time only in writings of Pius VI in 1794 (Schmidt-Lauber 2003: 18). The Pope either had written ‘*missa id est* λιτουργεῖα’ or he had written only ‘*missa*’ and the Slavic translator added “this means liturgy (служба)” for his readers. But the Slavic scribe does not explain other terms like *canon* or *catholic*. Why then explaining *missa*?

---

<sup>30</sup> The post of a lecturer has been of high obligation in the OCS; cf.: “They shall appoint a Reader (anagnōstēs) after proving (dokimaze) him with a great proof (dokimazia). (...) A minister (diaknonei), knowing that it is right for him to fulfil the work of a preacher” (Horner 1904: 303; Saidic version) – Note, that a priest can only be ordained by a bishop and Methodius, by coming to Moravia firstly not being ordained by a Roman bishop, could not claim to be a priest according to Roman law.

<sup>31</sup> Grivec concluded, that before the time of Adrian’s letter Methodius had been appointed “apostolischer Missionar oder Legat” (1960: 88).

<sup>32</sup> For a detailed description of the not in every sense clear distinction between the various Church ranks see Julius 2003: 12. It requires additional work to clarify to which extend the Church hierarchy has been a topic of dispute in Great Moravia.

What would have happened if the Pope had not written *missa* but *officium*? In this case the proper Slavic translation would be служба but the Slavic term is missing the ambiguity of the Latin *officium* which normally means all liturgical services including the hourly services but additionally can mean the Holy Mass as the *summum officium*. It is probable, that in the broad context of formal permissions the Pope wanted to underline the fact that Methodius is not allowed only to administer all possible liturgical *officia* but especially to administer the Holy Mass. Already Adrian could have made an explanatory addition to the neutral term *officium* and the Slavic translator had to translate *cum sancto officio id est cum Missa*. This word order is contra-intuitiv to Slavic eyes which expect мѡша to be the *explanandum* and has been reversed (by the author of VM? by a scribe?) in order to imitate a formal expression to Slavic readers.

These remarks, of course, are speculations, but also without considering a possible wording of the Latin letter it can be stated that there is reason to assume that firstly Adrian did not use a Greek word 'liturgia' in its letter but the regular Latin term *officium* and that secondly it cannot be concluded that the phrase of VM *сз стѡю мѡшею, рекъше сз слоужбою* would mean as if Methodius has been allowed to celebrate the Latin 'Mass' resp. the Greek 'liturgia'. Pope Adrian's letter speaks not about texts, types of liturgies or their Slavic translations, but very formally about Methodius's duties and rights in administering liturgical services. The letter of Pope Adrian II allows Methodius to fulfil all solemn duties of a priest and to read the Apostolos and the Gospels during the service additionally in Slavic translation. The liturgical rite itself could have been the Roman one, but could also have been a sort of *Missa Graeca*, that is a Roman rite augmented with Greek elements like this has been accepted practice (Atkinson, Sachs 1982; Atkinson 1989). The content of Adrian's letter points to a Roman liturgy, and the introduction to VM points to a liturgy with Greek elements.

## 5. CONCLUSIONS

These have been only small remarks on details in the reading of VM which do not change the overall picture of the historic events but shed a little light on the reason why the mission of the Slavic brothers met immediately the resistance of the Western clergy.

1. The introduction to VM is written in defence of Methodius and is already referring to the *filioque*-problem. The introduction alludes to the *Cherubikon* as the characteristic mark of Byzantine liturgical rite.

2. The letter of Pope Adrian II, as reported in VM, is basically a translation from Latin and leads to the assumption that the Western clergy did not accept Methodius as being authorized to fulfil all liturgic duties. Obviously, Methodius had been accused of administering Church services which can only be celebrated by the bishop or his deputy.

The conclusions about the ‘real’ intention of the Western clergy against the work of the Slavic apostles includes, of course, some speculation:

3. The scribe of the introduction to VM assures that Methodius has been firm in the *non-filioque*-belief. So we can infer that the resistance of the Western clergy had something to do with the Slavonic translation of Greek elements in liturgy – exactly this argument against language is put forward in the reported protest against the Slavic mission (“Three holy languages”).

4. VM assures that Methodius has been allowed to celebrate “the Mass this is liturgy”. It is not probable that the Pope has approved of using the Divine Liturgy of Chrysostom in Moravia. Not only would that have been beyond the scope of his intentions, after all it would make no sense then to call for the “custom” to first read the Latin Gospel and afterwards the Slavic. It is more probable that the Pope approved a praxis like the *Missa Graeca*, that is to augment the Latin rite with Greek elements in Slavic translation. While these foreign elements express Byzantine ontological thinking, again the resistance of the Western clergy to the foreign language elements in liturgy is motivated.

The assumption that the opposition of the Western clergy to the Slavic missionaries had something to do with liturgy and not with the “master narrative” of great politics between Byzantium and Rome finds some support in a ‘close reading’ of VM. Of course, it could be argued that the introduction of Greek elements in form of *Missa Graeca* did not cause problems in other parts of the Western church, so why should it have been problematic in Moravia? The answer would be that only in combination with Byzantine teachers the political differences between Roman and Greek liturgical understanding could really lead to observable contradictions. Liturgy is the model of worldly order, but this worldly order has to be implemented into societal “fieldwork” of implementing Byzantine thinking could only have been done by Byzantine teachers and here, on a local level in everyday life, the differences between West and East could have become effective. This could well have been reason enough for the Western clergy to tackle the Slavonic language: because the Slavonic parts in liturgy express a foreign to Western eyes relation between political and spiritual power. Ontology matters, also in liturgy, and I would like to end this paper again with the question “iconic resemblance” or “succession”. The Byzantine understanding differs greatly from the papal doctrine:

es gibt einen obersten Primat in der Kirche, aber er ist nicht an Rom gebunden, nicht an den einen Nachfolger Petri auf seinem römischen Bischofsstuhle, sondern er gehörte Rom nur, solange es Hauptstadt des römischen Weltreiches war. Denn der Bischof der Hauptstadt muß auch das Haupt der Hierarchie sein. Jetzt aber ist Konstantinopel die Hauptstadt des Reiches, und darum ihr Bischof der Inhaber des obersten Primates in der Kirche (Wyrwoll 1966: 26).

If this paper could renew discussions about the political implications of liturgy related with the work of the Slavic apostles it would have achieved its goal.

## LITERATURE

- Aitzetmüller 1991 A i t z e t m ü l l e r, R. Altbulgarische Grammatik als Einführung in die slavische Sprachwissenschaft (= Monumenta Linguae Slavicae Dialecti Veteris, Fontes et Dissertationes, 30). Freiburg i. Br., 1991.
- Arnoldi 2011 A r n o l d i, S. A. L. Manichäismus und Bibelexegese bei Augustinus: De Genesi contra Manichaeos. Diss. phil. München, 2011.
- Atkinson, Sachs, 198 A t k i n s o n, C. M., K. J. S a c h s. Zur Entstehung und Überlieferung der „Missa graeca“. – Archiv für Musikwissenschaft, 39, 1982, № 2, 113–145.
- Atkinson 1989 A t k i n s o n, C. M. The Doxa, the Pisteuo, and the Ellinici Fratres: Some Anomalies in the Transmission of the Chants of the “Missa Graeca”. – The Journal of Musicology, 7, 1989, № 1, 81–106.
- Barrett 2013 B a r r e t t, R. ‘Let Us Put Away All Earthly Care’: Mysticism and the Cherubikon of the Byzantine Rite. – Studia Patristica, 64, 2013, 111–124.
- Benson 1967 B e n s o n, R. L. Plenitudo Potestatis: Evolution of a Formula from Gregory IV to Gratian. – Studia Gratiana, 14, 1967, 193–218.
- Bingham 1840 B i n g h a m, J. Scholastical History of Lay-Baptism. – In: B i n g h a m, J. Origines ecclesiasticae; Or, The Antiquities of the Christian Church, and Other Works. Vol. 8. London, 1840, 3–142.
- Bodjanskij 1865 Б о д я н с к и й, О. М. По поводу жития Мефодия. – ЧОИДР, 1865, № 3, 344–352.
- Boryś 2008 B o r y ś, W. Słownik etymologiczny języka polskiego. Warszawa, 2008.
- Cejtlin, Večerka, Blahová 1994 Ц е й т л и н, Р. М., Р. В е ч е р к а, Э. Б л а г о в а. Старославянский словарь (по рукописям X–XI веков). Москва, 1994.
- Chaburgaev 1994 Х а б у р г а е в, Г. А. Первые столетия славянской письменной культуры: истоки древнерусской книжности. Москва, 1994.
- Conomos 2012 C o n o m o s, D. What is a Troparion? – Musicology Today, 12, 2012, 1–14.
- Cooper 2003 C o o p e r, Jr., H. R. Slavic Scriptures. The Formation of the Church Slavonic Version of the Holy Bible. London, 2003.
- Dostál 1965 D o s t á l, A. The Origins of the Slavonic Liturgy. – Dumbarton Oaks Papers, 19, 1965, 67–87.
- Epp 2011 E p p, E. J. Traditional “Canons” of New Testament Textual Criticism: Their Value, Validity, and Viability – or Lack thereof. – In: The Textual History of the Greek New Testament. Changing Views in Contemporary Research (= Text-Critical Studies, 8). Atlanta, 2011, 79–127.
- Florja 2000 Ф л о р я, Б. Н. Сказания о начале славянской письменности (= Славянская библиотека). Санкт-Петербург, 2000.
- Goldberg 2004 G o l d b e r g, E. J. Ludwig der Deutsche und Mähren. Eine Studie zu karolingischen Grenzkriegen im Osten. – In: Ludwig der Deutsche und seine Zeit. Darmstadt, 2004, 67–94.
- Grivec 1960 G r i v e c, F. Konstantin und Method. Lehrer der Slaven. Wiesbaden, 1960.
- Grivec, Tomšić 1960 G r i v e c, Fr., Fr. T o m š i ć. Constantinus et Methodius Thessalonicensis. Fontes (= Radovi staroslovenskog instituta, 4). Zagreb, 1960.
- Hannick 1985 H a n n i c k, Ch. Der liturgische Standort der Prager Glagolitischen Fragmente. – In: Litterae slavicae medii aevi. FS Franciscus Venceslaus Mares (= Sagners Slavistische Sammlung, 8). München, 1985, 109–117.

- Hansen 2004 H a n s e n, B. The Life Cycle of a Definiteness Marker: The Long and Short Form of the Adjective in Old Church Slavonic, Russian, Serbian and Croatian. – Zbornik matice srpske za filologiju i lingvistiku, 47, 2004, № 1/2, 51–73.
- Hieronymus 1857 H i e r o n y m u s S t r i d o n e n s i s. Dialogus contra Luciferianos. – In: M i g n e, J. P. Patrologia cursus completes. Series Latina. T. 23. Paris, 1857, coll. 153–182.
- Horner 1904 H o r n e r, G. W. The Statutes of the Apostles or Canones ecclesiastici. Edited with Translation and Collation from Ethiopic and Arabic MSs.; also a Translation of the Saidic and Collation of the Bohairic Versions; and Saidic fragments. London, 1904.
- Hürner 2008 H ü r n e r, D. Paläographische und graphematische Studien zu den westkirchenslavisch-glagolitischen Kiever und Prager Blättern. Magisterarbeit Univ. Wien, 2008.
- Hürner 2010 H ü r n e r, D. Paläographie und Graphematik der westkirchenslavisch-glagolitischen Kiever und Prager Blätter im Kontext der sinaitischen Tradition unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Einträge des Demetrius Sinaiticus. Diss. phil. Univ. Wien, 2010.
- Jagić 1960 J a g i ć, V. Quattuor Evangeliorum versionis palaeoslovenicae Codex Marianus Glagoliticus characteribus cyrillicis transcriptum [1883]. Graz, 1960.
- Julius 2003 J u l i u s, H. Landkirchen und Landklerus im Bistum Konstanz während des frühen und hohen Mittelalters. Eine begriffsgeschichtliche Untersuchung. Diss. phil. Univ. Konstanz, 2003.
- Kahl 2011 K a h l, H.-D. Heidenfrage und Slawenfrage im deutschen Mittelalter. Ausgewählte Studien 1953–2008 (= East Central and Eastern Europe in the Middle Ages 450–1450, 4). Leiden–Boston, 2011.
- King James Version 1611 The Holy Bible, an Exact Reprint Page for Page of the Authorized Version Published in the Year MDCXI. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1833 (reprints).
- KIO 1973 К л и м е н т О х р и д с к и. Събрани съчтения. Т. 3. София, 1973.
- Kølln 2003 K ø l l n, H. Westkirchliches in altkirchenslavischer Literatur aus Grossmähren und Böhmen (= Historisk-filosofiske Meddelelser; Det Kongelige Danske Videnskabernes Selskab, 87). Kopenhagen, 2003.
- Knjazevskaĵa, Alekseev 1999 Житие Мефодия. Подг. текста и перевод О. А. Князевской, комм. А. А. Алексеева (= Библиотека литературы Древней Руси. Т. 2: XI–XII в.). Санкт-Петербург, 1999. Quoted after Электронные публикации Института русской литературы (Пушкинского дома) РАН <[www.pushkinskiydom.ru/Default.aspx?tabid=2155](http://www.pushkinskiydom.ru/Default.aspx?tabid=2155)>.
- Koroľjuk, Floĵa 1981 Сказания о начале славянской письменности (= Памятники средневековой истории народов Центаральной и Восточной Европы). Отв. ред. В. Д. Королюк. Вступ. статья, перевод и комм. Б. Н. Флори. Москва, 1981.
- Kritzinger 2009 K r i t z i n g e r, P. Bischöfliche Repräsentation: Ursprung und Entwicklung bis zum Niedergang des Weströmischen Reiches. Diss. phil. Univ. Jena, 2009.
- Krüger 2007 K r ü g e r, E. Der Traktat „De ecclesiastica potestate“ des Aegidius Romanus. Eine spätmittelalterliche Herrschaftskonzeption des päpstlichen Universalismus (= Forschungen zur kirchlichen Rechtsgeschichte und zum Kirchenrecht, 30). Köln, 2007.

- Krys'ko 2009 К р ы с ь к о, В. Древнеславянский канон первоучителю Кириллу: источники и реконструкция (песнь шестая). – *Palaeobulgarica*, 33, 2009, № 4, 3–59.
- Lingas 2006 L i n g a s, A. Medieval Byzantine chant and the sound of Orthodoxy. – In: *Byzantine Orthodoxies, Papers from the 36th Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies*. Aldershot, 2006, 131–150.
- Löwe 1982 L ö w e, H. Methodius im Reichenauer Verbrüderungsbuch. – *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters*, 38, 1982, 341–362.
- Mareš 1979 M a r e š, Fr. V. W. An Anthology of Church Slavonic Texts of Western (Czech) Origin (= *Slavische Propyläen*, 127). München, 1979.
- Mirčeva 2014 М и р ч е в а, Б. Опис на преписите на славянските извори за Кирил и Методий и техните ученици (= Кирило-Методиевски студии. Кн. 23: Кирило-Методиевски извори. Т. 2). София, 2014.
- MMFH Magnae Moraviae Fontes Historici/ Prameny k Dějinám Velké Moravy, II. Textus Biographici, Hagiographici, Liturgici. Ed. D. Bartoňková, L. Havlík, J. Ludvíkovský, Z. Masařík, R. Večerka (= *Opera Universitatis Purkynianae Brunensis, Facultas Philosophica*, 118). Praha–Brno, 1967.
- Moran 1979 M o r a n, N. K. The Musical 'Gestaltung' of the Great Entrance Ceremony in the 12th Century in Accordance with the Rite of Hagia Sophia. – *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik*, 28, 1979, 167–193.
- Munteanu 2008 M u n t e a n u, D. Das Filioque – ewige Streitfrage oder Herausforderung der ökumenischen Trinitätslehre? – *Teologia* 12, 2008, 2, 18–37.
- NETS 2009 A New English Translation of the Septuagint. 2nd. ed. Oxford, 2009. Online with corrections and emendations made in June 2014: <<http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/nets/edition/>>.
- Podskalsky 1982 P o d s k a l s k y, G. Christentum und theologische Literatur in der Kiever Rus' (988–1237). München, 1982.
- Podskalsky 2000 P o d s k a l s k y, G. Theologische Literatur des Mittelalters in Bulgarien und Serbien 865–1459. München, 2000.
- Schmidt-Lauber 2003 S c h m i d t - L a u b e r, H.-Ch. Begriff, Geschichte und Stand der Forschung. – In: *Handbuch der Liturgik. Liturgiewissenschaft in Theologie und Praxis der Kirche*. Göttingen, 2003, 17–41.
- Schuler 1989 S c h u l e r, M. Die Musik am Konstanzer Dom um 1100. – *Freiburger Diözesan-Archiv*, 109, 1989, 131–139.
- Semmler 1994 S e m m l e r, J. Vom Sakramentar zum Missale. Bemerkungen zu drei liturgischen Handschriften der Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Düsseldorf. – In: *Bücher für die Wissenschaft. Bibliotheken zwischen Tradition und Fortschritt*. München, 1994, 201–212.
- Siecienski 2010 S i e c i e n s k i, A. E. The Filioque. History of a Doctrinal Controversy. Oxford, 2010.
- SJS Slovník Jazyka Staroslověnského. Bd. 1. Ed. J. Kurz. Prag, 1966; Bd. 4. Ed. Z. Hauptová. Prag, 1997.
- Snopek 1918 S n o p e k, Fr. Die Slavenapostel. Kritische Studien, zugleich als Replik gegen meine Rezensenten. Kremsier, 1918.
- Štih 2014 Š t i h, P. Die Integration der Karantanen und anderer Alpenlawen in das fränkisch-ottonische Reich. Einige Beobachtungen. – *Carinthia*, 1, 204, 2014, 43–59.

- Stökl 1976 S t ö k l, G. Geschichte der Slavenmission. – In: H a e n d l e r, G. Geschichte des Frühmittelalters und der Germanenmission. 2. Aufl. Göttingen, 1976, 77–95.
- Szigeti 1963 S z i g e t i, K. Denkmäler des Gregorianischen Chorals aus dem ungarischen Mittelalter. – Studia Musicologica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae, 4, 1976, № 1/2, 129–172.
- Treadgold 2011 T r e a d g o l d, W. Review of T. M. Kolbaba. Inventing Latin Heretics: Byzantines and the Filioque in the Ninth Century, 2008. – The American Historical Review, 116, 2011, № 3, 855–856.
- Trost 1973 T r o s t, K. Die übersetzungstheoretischen Konzeptionen des cyrillisch-mazedonischen Blattes und des Prologs zum Bogoslovie des Exarchen Joann. – In: Slavistische Studien zum VII. Internationalen Slavistenkongreß in Warschau 1973. München, 1973, 497–525.
- Tov 1982 T o v, E. Criteria for Evaluating Textual Readings: The Limitations of Textual Rules. – The Harvard Theological Review, 75, 1982, № 4, 429–448.
- Večerka 1989 V e č e r k a, R. Altbulgarische (altkirchenslavische) Syntax. Band 1: Die lineare Satzorganisation. Ed. F. Keller, E. Weiher (= Monumenta Linguae Slavicae Dialecti Veteris, Fontes et Dissertationes, 27). Freiburg i. Br., 1989.
- Wyrwoll 1966 W y r w o l l, N. Politischer oder petrinischer Primat? Zwei Zeugnisse zur Primatsauffassung im 9. Jahrhundert. Diss. theol. Rom, Univ. Gregoriana, 1966.

## РИМСКА ИЛИ ВИЗАНТИЙСКА ЛИТУРГИЯ? БОГОСЛОВСКАТА ТЕРМИНОЛОГИЯ В ПРОСТРАННОТО ЖИТИЕ НА МЕТОДИЙ

*(Резюме)*

Статията показва, че въпросът каква литургия е била отслужвана от Методий в Моравия може да е бил истинската конфликтна точка между славянските апостоли и западното духовенство. След като са очертани разликите между византийското и римското литургическо мислене и съответните им политически последици, са анализирани уводът на Житието на Методий и писмото на папа Адриан II, като се предлага различен прочит на старобългарския текст. Стига се до заключението, че Методий е имал разрешение да отслужва литургия според римския обред (вероятно нещо като Missa Graeca), докато уводът на Житието на Методий потвърждава, че той се е придържал към византийското източно православие. Различни моменти подсказват, че славянските мисионери не са срещали съпротива на нивото на „високия прочит“ на конфликта между Изтока и Запада, но на местно ниво западното духовенство е имало причини да се съпротивлява срещу разпространението на източното мислене на западни територии.

*Томас Дайбер,  
Университет „Юстус Либих“, Гисен*