

The Cyrillo-Methodian tradition in the work of Milada Paulová as a historical discourse*

Lubomíra HAVLÍKOVÁ (Prague)

The Great Moravian and Cyrillo-Methodian issue has been reflected in the works of many figures in Czech historiography. Some have studied it from a historical standpoint, others from a philological, archaeological or art historical standpoint. In some cases it has been the centre of interest, in others it has only been viewed as marginal.

One of these was Milada PAULOVÁ.¹ In connection with the anniversary of Cyril and Methodius and the living Cyrillo-Methodian tradition² let

* The article is a part of the project 7AMB12SK161 („After the steps of Ss. Cyril and Methodius in the Slovak and Czech bibliography, before 1945”).

¹ For more on Professor Milada Paulová (1891-1970), Czech historian, Balkanist and Byzantinologist see *Byzantinoslavica* 69 (2011) 9-12, 70 (2012) 25-52 and the literature cited here (for ex. L. HAVLÍKOVÁ, *Česká byzantologie a Slovanský ústav*, *Slavia* 68 (1999) 442-451 [= *Slovanský ústav v Praze. 70 let činnosti*, Prague 2000, 60-69]; eadem, „První žena na Universitě Karlově“ (*Paměti M. Paulové*), *Slovanské historické studie* 34, Prague – Brno 2009, 127-166; eadem, *Osmdesát let mezinárodního časopisu Byzantinoslavica (1929-2009)*, *Slovanský přehled* 95 (2009) 262-267; eadem, „Byla jsem svého času první docentkou, pak první profesorkou...“. *Dopis Milady Paulové Haně Benešové*, *Slovanský přehled* 96 (2010) 367-374; eadem, *Stríčky života profesorky Milady Paulové*, Prague 2011, <http://www.zenyaveda.cz/prectete-si/ruzne-dalsi/stričky-zivota-profesorky-milady-paulove>; eadem, *Milada Paulová. 120^e anniversaire de sa naissance (née le 2 novembre 1891 à Dařevnice – morte le 17 janvier 1970 à Prague)*, *Byzantinoslavica* 69 (2011) 9-12; eadem, *K 120. výročí narození profesorky Milady Paulové (2. 11. 1891 – 17. 1. 1970)*, *Slovanský přehled* 97 (2011) 397-401; eadem, *Milada Paulová et son monde byzantin. Contribution à la relation entre M. Paulová et J. Hussey*, *Byzantinoslavica* 70 (2012) 25-52; eadem, *Od reorganizace k reorganizaci. Role časopisu Byzantinoslavica ve vývoji české byzantologie v letech 1945-1963*, *Slovanský přehled* 98/1-2 (2012) 189-207, etc.).

² See e.g. *Solušní bratři. 1100 let příchodu sv. Cyrila a Metoděje na Moravu*, ed. V. Bartůněk, Prague 1963²; *Cyrlometodějský sborník. K uctění 1100. výročí úmrtí sv. Metoděje (885-1985)*, ed. M. J. Pulec – M. Barbarič, Prague – Zagreb 1984; Š. VARGAŠ, *Cyrlometodské dědictví v náboženskom, národnom a kultúrnom živote Slovákov*, Bratislava 1991; *František Václav Mareš, Cyrlometodějská tradice a slavistika*, ed. E. Bláhová – J. Vintř, Prague 2000; F. MACHILEK, „*Velehrad ist unser Programm*“. *Zur Bedeutung der Kyrrill-Method-Idee und der Velehradbewegung für den Katholizismus in Mähren im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert*, *Bohemia* 45/2 (2004) 353-395; *Oni jsou otcové naši. Cyrlometodějský sborník*, ed. J. B. Lášek – H. Tonzarová, Brno 2005; *Poznávanie kultúrneho dedičstva sv. Cyrila a Metoda*, ed. J. Michalov – P. Hetényi – P. Ivanič – Z. Taneski, Nitra 2007; *Význam kultúrneho dedičstva sv. Cyrila a Metoda pre Európu*, ed. J. Michalov – P. Hetényi – P. Ivanič – Z. Taneski, Nitra 2008; K. SLÁDEK et al., *Význam cyrlometodějsví pro integraci slovanských národů do evropských struktur. Sborník příspěvků*, Prague 2009.

us recall a study that she published in the early 1950s in the 11th annual volume of the *Byzantinoslavica* journal (Fig. 1). Her French paper on the Cyrillo-Methodian tradition in the Czech environment was entitled *L'idée Cyrillo-Méthodienne dans la politique de Charles IV et la fondation du monastère Slave de Prague*.³ The original Czech paper⁴ is housed in the Milada Paulová fonds in the Masaryk Institute and Archive of ASCR, Public Research Institute in Prague,⁵ where an offprint of the printed French translation of the study is also archived. PAULOVÁ partly wrote out the original by hand (pp. 1-7) and partly on a typewriter (pp. 8-19). Her writing was small and neat but in some places barely legible (Fig. 2).

Her study focused on the issue of echoes of the Cyrillo-Methodian legacy in the 14th century, during the reign of King of Bohemia and Holy Roman Emperor Charles IV,⁶ a Luxembourg on his father's side and a Přemyslid on his mother's side. PAULOVÁ analysed the issue from several standpoints, dealing with it in the broad context of Central European history and the history of south-eastern Europe, Byzantium and Serbia, in line with her professional background. She dealt in detail with the political, ecclesiastical and cultural efforts of Charles IV, whose politics carried on from the old Cyrillo-Methodian tradition and endeavoured to revive the Slavonic liturgy in the Prague Emmaus Monastery (Na Slovanech) (Fig. 3), which he established.

Why did Charles IV, a propagator of Charlemagne,⁷ wish to restore the Cyrillo-Methodian tradition in Prague? In a nutshell, Charles's ecclesiastical and political efforts were in line with unifying trends in some European church circles in Rome or Avignon and Constantinople. As for his interest in the renewal of Slavonic liturgy this was not the first time the Cyrillo-Methodian legacy was harked back to in Bohemia, for let us also recall the efforts to preserve it in the 11th century at the Sázava Monastery, from which the Slavonic monks were eventually expelled in 1096.⁸

³ M. PAULOVÁ, *L'idée Cyrillo-Méthodienne dans la politique de Charles IV et la fondation du monastère Slave de Prague*, *Byzantinoslavica* 11 (1950) 174-186.

⁴ M. Paulová hesitated between two Czech titles: *Idea cyrilometodějská v politice Karla IV. a založení kláštera na Slovanech* [The Cyrillo-Methodian idea in the politics of Charles IV and the foundation of the Monastery Na Slovanech] or *Idea cyrilometodějská v politice Karla IV. a založení slovanského kláštera v Praze* [The Cyrillo-Methodian idea in the politics of Charles IV and the foundation of the Slav Monastery in Prague]. The second title eventually won.

⁵ Masaryk Institute and Archive of ASCR, M. Paulová fonds, shelf no. III A, inv.no. 658, box 16.

⁶ Charles IV of Luxembourg (1316-1378), 1346-1378 King of Bohemia, 1346-1355 Holy Roman King, 1355 King of Lombardy, 1355-1378 Holy Roman Emperor.

⁷ M. BLÁHOVÁ, *Nachleben Karls des Großen in der Propaganda Karls IV.*, *Das Mittelalter* 4 (1999) 11-25; F. MACHILEK, *Karl IV. und Karl der Große*, *Zeitschrift des Aachener Geschichtsvereines* 104-105 (2002-2003) 113-145.

⁸ See V. HUŇÁČEK, *Slovanská Sázava a česko-uhersko-ruské vztahy v XI. století*,

Let us now look more closely at the issue and ask ourselves what the geopolitical situation was like in Europe and what relations Charles IV had with south-eastern Europe, i.e. the Byzantine Empire, Serbia and the Dalmatian-Croatian environment. One testimony to Czech-Serbian relations⁹ is a letter from Charles IV to the Serbian tsar Stephen Dušan¹⁰ in 1355. This letter is dated 19th February 1355,¹¹ Pisa in Italy, where Charles IV arrived with his retinue on 18th January 1355¹² on the way to Rome for the imperial coronation. Here his court led a busy life and numerous delegations arrived from various countries.¹³ In Pisa Charles evidently met a papal delegation led by the Carmelite Peter Thomas, Bishop of Patti and

Bulletin Ústavu pro ruský jazyk a literaturu 14 (1970) 5-21; K. REICHERTOVÁ – E. BLÁHOVÁ – V. DVOŘÁKOVÁ – V. HUŇÁČEK, *Sázava. Památník staroslověnské kultury v Čechách*, Prague 1988; D. TŘEŠTÍK, *Slovanská liturgie a písemnictví v Čechách 10. století*, in: Svatý Prokop, Čechy a střední Evropa, ed. P. Sommer, Prague 2006, 189-218; L. JAN, *K nejnovější literatuře o sv. Prokopovi a sázavském klášteře*, Český časopis historický 107/2 (2009) 371-384; T. MRŇÁVEK, *Sázavský klášter a slovanská liturgie*, in: Orientalia et Occidentalia, volume 10. Slovanská spiritualita a mystika. Sůbor študií, Košice 2011, 145-183; idem, *Církev a liturgie v Čechách od sv. Cyrila a Metoděje po sv. Prokopa*, in: Řeckokatolický kalendář 2013, Prague 2012, 61-71; idem, *Sv. Prokop a liturgie na Sázavě*, in: ibidem, 98-105.

⁹ See L. E. HAVLÍK, *Na prahu dějin – České a jihoslovanské země v předfeudálním a raně feudálním období a Český stát a jihoslovanské státy v období vrcholného feudalismu (11.- poč. 14. století)*, in: Češi a Jihoslované v minulosti – od nejstarších dob do roku 1918, Prague 1975, 13-32; L. HAVLÍKOVÁ, *Česko-srbské vztahy ve středověku. K otázce jejich studia v české historiografii 20. století*, in: Studia Balcanica Bohemo-Slovaca VI/1. Příspěvky přednesené na VI. mezinárodním balkanistickém sympoziu v Brně ve dnech 25.-27. dubna 2005, ed. V. Štěpánek, Brno 2006, 103-117; eadem, *Středověké dějiny Srbů v dále české historičky Milady Paulové*, in: Od Morave do Morave II. Iz istorije česko-srpskih odnosa / Od Moravy k Moravě II. Z historie česko-srbských vztahů, ed. V. Koprivca – A. Korda-Petrović, Novi Sad 2011, 97-112; eadem, *Cesty ikon. Madona svatotomská a Jan Jindřich, Karel IV., Štěpán Dušan a Ioannes V. Palaiologos / Die Wege der Ikonen. Die Madona von Sankt Thomas und Johann Heinrich, Karl IV., Stephen Dušan und Johannes V. Palaiologos*, in: Stříbrný oltář v bazilice Nanebevzetí Panny Marie na Starém Brně. Sborník příspěvků přednesených na konferenci konané v kapitulní síni Augustiniánského kláštera na Starém Brně 21. října 2010 / Der Silberne Altar in der Basilika Maria Himmelfahrt in Alt Brunn. Sammelschrift der Beiträge, die auf der Konferenz im Kapitelsaal des Augustinerklosters in Altbrunn am 21. Ocktober 2010 vorgetragen wurden, ed. P. Suchánek – M. Číhalík, Brno 2011, 37-73.

¹⁰ Stephen Dušan (1331-1355), Serbian King, from 1346 tsar; in exchange for conversion to Catholicism he was to lead (as *capitaneus, capitaneatus*) a Christian army against the Turks.

¹¹ *Collectarius perpetuarum formarum Johannis de Geylnhusen*, ed. H. Kaiser, Innsbruck 1900, 167-169, no. 179; K. DOSKOČIL, *Listy a listiny z dějin československých 869-1938*, Prague 1938.

¹² F. KAVKA, 5. 4. 1355 *Korunovace Karla IV. císařem Svaté říše římské*, Prague 2002, 95; idem, *Karel IV. Historie života velkého vladaře*, Prague 1998, 184-187. Also see idem, *Vláda Karla IV. za jeho císařství (1355-1378): Part One (1355-1364), Part Two (1364-1378)*, Prague 1993; idem, *Čtyři ženy Karla IV.: královské sňatky*, Prague 2002.

¹³ F. KAVKA, 5. 4. 1355 *Korunovace Karla IV.*, 96; idem, *Karel IV. Historie*, 184-187.

Papal Nuncio,¹⁴ which was on its way to the court of Serbian monarch Stephen Dušan, who was showing a willingness at the time to replace Orthodoxy with Catholicism¹⁵ and he was corresponding and negotiating with the popes and monarchs on this matter. Charles IV gave this delegation his letter for the Serbian tsar.

On the way from Rome, perhaps again in Pisa, Charles IV met with a delegation from the ruling Byzantine Emperor Ioannes V Palaiologos,¹⁶ which is involved in the activities of the Byzantine Emperor, hurrying to defend Constantinople and the Byzantine Empire from the Turkish threat. At that time the Byzantine Emperor was seeking financial and moral support from the European monarchs and the Holy See (*sedes apostolica*) in the struggle against the Ottoman Turks, who had begun to permanently settle the Balkan Peninsula after the earthquake and the fall of the town of Kallipolis (Turkish Gelibolu) in 1356. He was travelling, touring the European royal courts and corresponding with the popes¹⁷ and the crowned and anointed heads of Europe. In the interests of creating an anti-Turkish coalition Ioannes V Palaiologos was willing to help put an end to the “Great (or Kerullarian) Schism”¹⁸ of 1054, which definitively divided the Christian church into Eastern (Greek Orthodox) and Western (Catholic) orbits and to accede to ecclesiastical union with Rome.

Charles's efforts to revive the Slavonic liturgy and to re-establish the Emmaus Monastery in Prague also followed unification trends. What had gone on beforehand? On the way through Croatia in 1337 Charles had briefly stopped off at the little town of Senj.¹⁹ Accompanied by Bartolomej

¹⁴ Peter Thomas (c. 1305-1366), of French origin, a Carmelite and apostolic preacher, Procurator General at the Papal Curia in Avignon, from 1354 Bishop of Patti and Lipari, from 1359 in Corona, from 1363 Archbishop of Crete, from 1364 Latin Patriarch in Constantinople. He led a papal diplomatic mission: Serbia (1355), Constantinople (1357), he negotiated over unification with Rome. As part of preparations for the crusade he led peace negotiations in Italy and Cyprus, he negotiated with Charles IV in on behalf of the Pope, and he took part in the campaign against Alexandria as Papal Legate (1365). See J. GILL, *John V. Palaeologus at the court of Louis I. of Hungary (1366)*, *Byzantinoslavica* 38 (1977) 31-37, here 37.

¹⁵ Regarding negotiations between the Roman Curia and Stephen Dušan see O. HALECKI, *Un empereur de Byzance à Rome. Vingt ans de travail pour l'union des églises et pour la défense de l'Empire d'Orient 1355-1375* (= Travaux historiques de la Société des Sciences et des Lettres de Varsovie, VIII), Varsovie 1930 (= Variorum reprints, London 1972), 46-47, here 21-30.

¹⁶ Ioannes V. Palaiologos (1341-1391), Byzantine Emperor from the Palaiologoi dynasty, a political rival to Ioannes VI. Kantakuzenos (1347-1354). See F. SEIBT, *Karel IV. Císař v Evropě (1346-1378)*, Prague 1999, 239 [*Karl IV.: Kaiser in Europa 1346 bis 1378*, Munich 1994].

¹⁷ Roman Popes Clement VI (1342-1352), Innocence VI (1352-1362) and Urban V (1362-1370).

¹⁸ Michael Kerullarios (1043-1058), Patriarch of Constantinople.

¹⁹ *Vita Caroli quarti – Karel IV. Vlastní životopis* [Charles IV. Autobiography],

Frankopan, Count of Krk and Senj, he also visited Grado²⁰ whence as a pilgrim he went on foot to visit Patriarch Nicholas,²¹ his stepbrother based in Aquileia.²² In October 1354 Charles IV visited him again on the way to the coronation in Rome and received two relics from him, two fragments of the alleged autograph of the Gospel of St Mark.²³

A visit to Dalmatia, where Charles made the acquaintance of the liturgy in Old Slavonic (*lingua Slavica*) and modified Glagolitic script (known as Croatian angular Glagolitic) in the Benedictine monasteries there²⁴ influenced his subsequent steps in Prague. The original liturgy in Old Slavonic had been abolished in Croatia in 1060 by the Split Synod in the reign of Peter Krešimir²⁵ and under the pontificate of Nicholas II²⁶ and this decision was confirmed by subsequent Split synods in 1063 and 1075.²⁷ According to the legend preserved and codified in the 1248 Bull of Pope Innocence IV,²⁸ which removed from Glagolitic the odium of being a heretical script, which it had previously been considered,²⁹ the creator of Glagolitic was St Jerome, who came from Illyria and translated the Vulgate. As J. VAŠICA stated, the monks whom Charles IV invited to Prague came from Tkon (known as the Rogovo Abbey on Čokovac Hill) on the Dalmatian island of Pašman,³⁰ where a Benedictine monastery was located with the Church of St Cosmas and St Damian, built in 1059 by

Prague 1978, Chapter IX, 84:...*qui de civitate Bude dedit nobis conductum per Ungariam, Chorvatiam, Dalmaciam usque in civitatem Senii supra litus maris...*

²⁰ *Vita Caroli quarti*, Chapter IX, p. 86: *Et cum nona die pervenissemus ante civitatem eorum Gradensem, acquiescentes consilio Bartholomei comitis Wegle et Senii...*

²¹ Nicholas of Luxembourg (1350-1358), illegitimate son of John of Luxembourg, Patriarch of Aquileia.

²² *Vita Caroli quarti*, Chapter IX, 86:... *ivimus pedes usque Aquilegiam.....usque ad patriarche noticiam perduxerunt...*

²³ F. KAVKA, *Karel IV. Historie*, 182. The autograph of the Gospel of St Mark is housed in the Treasury of St Vitus's Cathedral (see A. PODLAHA – E. ŠITTLER, *Chrámový poklad u sv. Víta v Praze. Jeho dějiny a popis*, Prague 1903, 250sq.).

²⁴ "In the twelfth century the term *lingua Slavica* was a synonym for the liturgical Old Church Slavonic language in the Croatian Glagolitic version in the northern Dalmatian coastal area", see L. E. HAVLÍK, *Problematika raně feudálního vědomí slovanského příbuzenství*, in: *Z tradic slovanské kultury u nás*, Prague 1975, 15-22, here 19.

²⁵ Peter Krešimir IV (1058-1074), Croatian King.

²⁶ Nicholas II (1059-1061), Roman Pope.

²⁷ *Magnae Moraviae fontes historici IV. Leges, textus iuridici, supplementa* (= Opera Universitatis Purkynianae Brunensis facultas philosophica 156). Operi edendo praefuit L. E. Havlík, Brno 1971, 129-131.

²⁸ Innocence IV (1243-1254), Roman Pope.

²⁹ L. E. HAVLÍK, *Problematika raně feudálního vědomí slovanského příbuzenství*, 19.

³⁰ J. VAŠICA, *Slovanská bohoslužba v českých zemích*, http://katolikrevue.ath.cx/traditio_orientalis/slovanska_bohoslužba_josef_vasica.htm, 10; K. STEJSKAL, *Řecké prvky v nástěnných malbách slovanského kláštera v Praze-Emauzích*, *Slovanský přehled* 53/6 (1967) 338-346, here 338.

Theodoric³¹ on the foundations of a Byzantine fortification and an old Christian basilica. After a second disaster befell the monastery in the 14th century, the Croatian Benedictines left for Prague, where they founded a monasterial community. This took place after the Prague Archbishop Ernest of Pardubice³² received authorization and approval on 9 May 1346 from Pope Clement VI to employ the Slavonic liturgy for the Slavonic (Glagolitic) Benedictine Emmaus Monastery and the Slav monks from Croatia.³³ On 21 November 1347 Charles IV in Nuremberg issued a founding charter for the monastery and donated generously towards it. Here he informed Ernest of Pardubice of the papal authorization to establish a Benedictine monastery at the Church of St Cosmas and St Damian³⁴ in Prague-Podskali *in honour of the Lord, St Jerome, who first translated the bible from Hebrew into Latin and Slavonic and Sts Cyril and Methodius, St Procope and St Adalbert, the Czech patron saints*.³⁵

The Prague Emmaus Monastery,³⁶ dedicated to “the Benedictines and another order” (*Benedicti vel alterius ordinis*),³⁷ was meant to become a place where new Slav monks (*glagoláši*) were expected to be trained for church missions to the (southern) Slav countries, whose population was considered from the standpoint of the Latin West to be “schismatics” and “heretics” (*scismatici et infideles*).³⁸ We can only imagine what *alterius ordo* could have meant in the 14th century. Perhaps this referred to Slavonic

³¹ Theodoric (11th century), Bishop of Biograd.

³² Ernest of Pardubice (1297-1364), first Prague Archbishop. For latest see Z. HLEDÍKOVÁ, *Arnošt z Pardubic. Arcibiskup. Zakladatel. Rádce* (= Velké postavy českých dějin), Prague 2008.

³³ M. PAULOVÁ, *L'idée Cyrillo-Méthodienne*, 179.

³⁴ The consecration was the same as for the home church of the Benedictine *glagoláši* at the Tkon Monastery, i.e. to St Cosmas and St Damian, doctors and brothers, Asia Minor martyrs from the turn of the 3rd and 4th centuries.

³⁵ The monastery church of the Virgin Mary, St Jerome, Sts Cyril and Methodius, St Procope and St Adalbert was not consecrated until 1372 (see F. KAVKA, *Karel IV. Historie*, 127). Mass was also supposedly performed here by the Czech national patron saints Adalbert and Procope, whose veneration increased under Charles IV and who had connections to the Old Slavonic period of Czech history (Sázava Monastery).

³⁶ E. POCHE – J. KROFTA, *Na Slovanech – stavební a umělecký vývoj pražského kláštera*, Prague 1956; K. STEJSKAL, *Das Slawenkloster*, Prag 1974; E. POCHE, *Ke stavební historii kláštera Na Slovanech*, in: *Z tradic slovanské kultury v Čechách*, Prague 1975, 67-72; V. PÍŠA, *Kostel sv. Kosmy a Damiána v klášteře Na Slovanech v Praze*, in: *ibidem*, 73-84; *Emauzy. Benediktinský klášter Na Slovanech v srdci Prahy*. Soubor statí věnovaných znovuootevření chrámu Panny Marie a sv. Jeronýma benediktinského kláštera Na Slovanech. Opatství Emauzy 21. 4. 2003, ed. K. Benešová – K. Kubínová, Prague 2007.

³⁷ M. PAULOVÁ, *L'idée Cyrillo-Méthodienne*, 183.

³⁸ A letter from the Roman Pope Clement VI to the Prague Archbishop Ernest of Pardubice (1344-1364) of 9th May 1346 (see M. PAULOVÁ, *L'idée Cyrillo-Méthodienne*, 183).

glagoláši of the Benedictine order. We know from Bruno Querfurtensis (c. 974-1009) that in the reformed Benedictine Monastery of St Boniface and St Alexius in the Aventinum in Rome both Latin Benedictines and Greek Basilians³⁹ lived side by side during the 10th and 11th centuries. Likewise monks at the Prague Emmaus Monastery coexisted, with Latin and Slavonic Benedictines, that *alterius ordo*, living side by side.

Research into the relationship between Charles IV and Stephen Dušan has been performed by PAULOVÁ's contemporaries and successors, who like her referred to Charles's "patriotism", "democratic nationalism" and "Slavonic patriotism" (J. B. NOVÁK, A. SOLOVJEV, J. ŠUSTA, Z. KALISTA, F. KAVKA, J. SPĚVÁČEK, J. MIKULKA, V. HROCHOVÁ, V. HUŇÁČEK and L. BOBKOVÁ)⁴⁰ or his "Helleno-Slavism" (K. STEJSKAL)⁴¹ and "Bohemocentrism" (J. SPĚVÁČEK).⁴² Charles IV was an advocate of universal brotherhood (*humane parilitatis consorcium*), he proclaimed both monarchs' Slav origins, regal dignity and honour (*regie dignitatis honor*) and the Slavonic native language which they had in common (*lingua nativitatis communis; idem nobile Slavicum ydioma*).⁴³ Some Slavonic scholars (J. BROZ, P. SYRKU,

³⁹ Bruno Querfurtensis, *Passio sancti Adalberti episcopi et martyris*, in: Fontes rerum Bohemicarum, tomus 1, Pragae 1873, 266-304, here 282-283 (17): *Usus vero sibi maximus erat colloquia quaerere spiritualium et seniorum, qui crebro illic pro caritate abbatis plures confluxerant: Graeci, inquam, optimi veniunt, Latini similes militarunt.*

⁴⁰ J. B. NOVÁK, *Patriotismus Karla IV.*, Český časopis historický 32 (1926) 9-32; A. SOLOVJEV, *Štěpán Dušan*, in: P. R. Rohden – K. Stloukal, *Tvůrcové dějin. Čtyři tisíciletí světových dějin v obrazech dob a osobností. II. Středověk*, Prague 1934, 423-427; J. ŠUSTA, *Karel IV. Za císařskou korunou. 1346-1355*, in: České dějiny II/4, Prague 1948, 381-384; Z. KALISTA, *Karel IV. Jeho duchovní tvář*, Prague 1971, 162; F. KAVKA, *Karel IV. Historie*, 185-186; J. SPĚVÁČEK, *Karel IV. Život a dílo (1316-1378)*, Prague 1979, 240, 307; J. MIKULKA, *Zur Frage nach Kaiser Karls IV. „Slawentum“ und zum „slawischen“ Programm seiner Politik*, Jahrbuch für Geschichte des Feudalismus 4 (1980) 173-185; V. HROCHOVÁ, *Karel IV., jižní Slované a Byzanc*, in: Mezinárodní vědecká konference „Doba Karla IV. v dějinách národů ČSSR“ pořádaná UK v Praze k 600. výročí úmrtí Karla IV. 29.11.-1.12. 1978. Materiály z plenárního zasedání a ze sekce historie, Prague 1981, 192-199; eadem, *Charles IV, les Slaves du Sud et Byzance*, Byzantinische Forschungen 12 (1987) 177-186; V. HUŇÁČEK, *Klášter na Slovanéch a počátky východoslovanských studií u nás*, in: Z tradic slovanské kultury u nás, Prague 1975, 175-185; L. BOBKOVÁ, *Velké dějiny země Koruny české IV b*, Prague – Litomyšl 2003, 296. See also F. SEIBT, *Karel IV.: císař v Evropě (1346-1378)*, Prague 1999; *The Crown of Bohemia, 1347-1437*, ed. B. Drake Boehm – J. Fajt, New York 2005, and other items.

⁴¹ K. STEJSKAL, *Emauzi a český helenoslavismus*, in: Z tradic slovanské kultury v Čechách, Prague 1975, 113-125; idem, *Řecké proky v nástěnných malbách slovanského kláštera v Praze-Emauzích*, 338-346.

⁴² J. SPĚVÁČEK, *Bohemocentrismus a univerzalizmus Karla IV.*, in: Mezinárodní vědecká konference „Doba Karla IV. v dějinách národů ČSSR“..., 96-105.

⁴³ As a summary see L. HAVLÍKOVÁ, *Česko-srbské vztahy ve středověku*, 111; eadem, *Cesty ikon. Madona svatotomská a Jan Jindřich, Karel IV., Štěpán Dušan a Ioannes V. Palaiologos / Die Wege der Ikonen. Die Madona von Sankt Thomas und Johann Heinrich, Karl IV., Stephen Dušan und Johannes V. Palaiologos*, 37-73. On the consciousness Slavic kinship see L. E. HAVLÍK, *Problematika raně feudálního vědomí slovanského příbuzenství*, 15-22.

V. JAGIĆ, St. IVŠIĆ and M. MURKO)⁴⁴ have believed that Charles was attempting to unite the Western Roman and Eastern Byzantine churches. Similar objectives were held, according to O. HALECKI,⁴⁵ by the Byzantine Emperor Ioannes V Palaiologos, whose relationships with the King of Bohemia and Holy Roman Emperor Charles IV, his brother the Moravian Margrave John Henry and the Serbian tsar Stephen Dušan have also been referred to by L. HAVLÍKOVÁ.⁴⁶ M. KOSTIĆ⁴⁷ came up with the theory that the monks of the Emmaus Monastery were to undertake a mission to the Serbian lands and compel Stephen Dušan to conclude a union with the Western church, but M. A. PURKOVIĆ⁴⁸ described this hypothesis as speculative and reproached him for not making sufficient use of preserved archive sources, referring to a letter addressed by the Papal Office to Prague Archbishop Ernest of Pardubice. The letter from Pope Clement VI indicates that Charles IV established Emmaus because his political interests were in line with the unification interests of the Roman Curia – as opposed to Poland, Hungary, Russia and Serbia. In his political calculations Charles anticipated both political-ecclesiastical missions to the East,⁴⁹ and the connection of Venice to the north of Europe via Bohemia.⁵⁰ Charles IV's eastern policy was also briefly mentioned in connection with the Luxembourg policy towards the East by D. I. MUREŞAN,⁵¹ who wrote on the relations between Charles's son Sigismund of Luxembourg with the Byzantine Palaiologoi, Manuel II and Ioannes VIII.

⁴⁴ M. PAULOVÁ, *L'idée Cyrillo-Méthodienne*, 180-181.

⁴⁵ O. HALECKI, *Un empereur de Byzance à Rome. Vingt ans de travail pour l'union des églises et pour la défense de l'Empire d'Orient 1355-1375*, 46-47.

⁴⁶ L. HAVLÍKOVÁ, *Cesty ikon. Madona svatotomská a Jan Jindřich, Karel IV., Štěpán Dušan a Ioannes V. Palaiologos / Die Wege der Ikonen. Die Madona von Sankt Thomas und Johann Heinrich, Karl IV., Stephen Dušan und Johannes V. Palaiologos*, 37-73.

⁴⁷ M. KOSTIĆ, *Zašto je osnovan slovensko-glagolaški manastir Emaus u Pragu?* Glasnik Skopskog naučnog društva 2 (1927) 195-160, here 163, note 6.

⁴⁸ A. M. PURGOVIĆ, *Avin'on'ske pape i srpske zemlje*, Požarevac 1934; see M. PAULOVÁ, *L'idée Cyrillo-Méthodienne*, 182.

⁴⁹ M. PAULOVÁ, *L'idée Cyrillo-Méthodienne*, 178. To the eastern policy of the Luxembourg see E. WINTER, *Die Luxemburger in der Ostpolitik der päpstlichen Kurie im 14. Jahrhundert*, Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Friedrich-Schiller-Universität. Gesellschafts- und sprachwissenschaftliche Reihe 7 (1957-1958) 81-87; D. I. MUREŞAN, *Une histoire de trois empereurs. Aspects des relations de Sigismund de Luxembourg avec Manuel II et Jean VIII Paléologue*, in: *Emperor Sigismund and the Orthodox World*, hrsgb. von E. Mitsiou, M. Popović, J. Preiser-Kapeller, A. Simon, Vienna 2010, 41-101, here 43-44.

⁵⁰ L. JAN, *Nerealizovaný projekt Karla IV. vybudovat obchodní spojení mezi Benátkami a severem přes Čechy*, in: *Rola komunikacji w średniowiecznych i wczesnonowożytnych dziejach Czech i Polski*, Gdańsk 2008, 41-47.

⁵¹ D. I. MUREŞAN, *Une histoire de trois empereurs. Aspects des relations de Sigismund de Luxembourg avec Manuel II et Jean VIII Paléologue*, 43-44.

To round off the study of M. PAULOVÁ let us add that the Great Moravian and Cyrillo-Methodian tradition with Byzantine connotations was also reflected in literary and artistic work of the Luxembourg period. Charles IV left nothing to chance in his endeavours to restore the Slavonic liturgy at the Emmaus Monastery and so also supported his efforts ideologically. He appealed not only to "Slavonic consciousness", but also to his glorious Slavonic forebears, dynastic continuity and tradition. As the son of Elisabeth Přemyslid⁵² he declared himself the heir of the Bohemian royal House of Přemyslid and the (Great) Moravian House of Mojmir on his mother's side, recalling his Great Moravian roots and his ancestor Svatopluk,⁵³ King of Moravia: *Even though Charles's mind was filled with pride for the glorious "kingdom" of his ancestors on his mother's side, the Empire of Svatopluk, "the Moravian King"...*⁵⁴ The Great Moravian tradition of the transfer of power, of kingdom (*translatio regni*) from (Great) Moravia to Bohemia was promoted at the beginning of the Luxembourg era by the patriotic chronicler Dalimil, who wrote: *kako jest koruna z Moravy vysla*⁵⁵ (how the crown came from Moravia) and *Král [Svatopluk] pozvav kněze českého, před cesař, postúpi jemu králevstvie svého*⁵⁶ (The King [Svatopluk] invited the Czech prince before the Emperor and gave him his kingdom). Likewise the Cyrillo-Methodian legend *Quemadmodum*, created at Charles's behest, which defended the Slavonic liturgy, supported the Cyrillo-Methodian tradition, which was also recalled by the *patrocinium* of the Emmaus Monastery church, dedicated to the Virgin Mary and St Jerome, Sts Cyril and Methodius, St Adalbert and St Procope, and built on the foundations of the older chapel.⁵⁷

To mark the occasion of the coronation of the St Thomas Madonna,⁵⁸ a Black Madonna icon of the Eastern (Byzantine) type, dedicated by Charles IV in 1356 to the Brno Augustinians,⁵⁹ a commemorative

⁵² Elisabeth Přemyslid (1292-1330), Queen of Bohemia, wife of John of Luxembourg.

⁵³ Svatopluk I the Great (871-894), Great Moravian Prince and King, the most powerful ruler in Great Moravia (*regnum Maravorum*).

⁵⁴ V. CHALOUPECKÝ, *Karel IV. a Čechy, 1316-1378*, Foreword to the book *Vlastní životopis Karla IV.*, translated from the Latin by J. Pavel, Prague 1946², 36: *I když Karlova mysl byla naplněna pýchou nad slavným „královstvím“ předků po matce, říši Svatopluka, „moravského krále“...* . Also see M. PAULOVÁ, *L' idée Cyrillo-Méthodienne*, 178, on the page 8 of the original.

⁵⁵ *Dalimil. Nejstarší česká rýmovaná kronika tak řečeného Dalimila*, Chapter 26,3, ed. B. Havránek – J. Daňhelka, Prague 1957; latest *Staročeská kronika tak řečeného Dalimila*, Chapter 26,3, Prague 1988, 316-317.

⁵⁶ *Ibidem*, Chapter 26,49-50, 316-317.

⁵⁷ E. POCHE, *Ke stavební historii kláštera Na Slovanech*, 67-72.

⁵⁸ On the coronation of Madonna in the year 1736 see P. ZELINKA, *Obraz Madony svatotomské. Slavnost korunovace milostného obrazu Madony Svatotomské v klášteře augustiniánů poustevníků u svatého Tomáše v Brně roku 1736*, Brno 2001.

⁵⁹ P. BALCÁREK, *České země a Byzanc. Problematika byzantského uměleckohistorického*

M. PAULOVÁ / PRAGUE

L'IDEE CYRILLO-METHODIENNE DANS LA POLITIQUE DE CHARLES IV ET LA FONDATION DU MONASTERE SLAVE DE PRAGUE

L'alliance politique de l'empereur byzantin Michel III avec Rostislav, prince de Grande-Moravie, dirigée contre la coalition bulgare-franque, et le rayonnement de la civilisation byzantine dans le territoire occupé par les peuples tchèque et slovaque, rayonnement dû aux effets de la mémorable mission de Constantin (Cyrille) et de Méthode, sont deux événements que les historiens ont abondamment étudiés et légitimement appréciés. Un fait historique beaucoup moins connu est, par contre, la forme prise, dans les pays slaves, et en Bohême surtout, par l'influence de la civilisation cyrillo-méthodienne en son déclin. Parmi les savants du passé, les historiens russes (Gil'ferding, Pal'mov) ont été les seuls à s'occuper de cette question qui, à travers certaines phases de son évolution, apparaît intimement liée à la conception slave.¹ La tradition cyrillo-méthodienne ne se perdit pas avec l'expulsion des disciples formés par les frères de Salonique, sous Svatopluk, ni avec la chute de la Grande-Moravie. Les moines slaves se réfugièrent dans le monastère d'Ostrov et ailleurs, et la tradition se maintint malgré les transformations qu'elle avait subies. Après le schisme de l'Eglise, son but fut de gagner les frères slaves à la cause de la vieille foi cyrillo-méthodienne, donc occidentale, par des croisades. Au 13^e siècle, Přemysl Ottokar II rattachait l'idéologie grande-morave à l'idée de l'indépendance de l'Eglise tchèque, partageant ainsi les projets d'expansion conçus par l'évêque d'Olomouc Brunon. Par une croisade menée contre la Lithuanie, ce dernier tâcha d'étendre le pouvoir du roi de Bohême jusqu'au territoire lithuano-russe situé à l'Est de la Pologne, espérant obtenir, en compensation des services rendus à l'Eglise et à sa mission, la subordination de la Lithuanie à l'archevêché de Prague, et, par là-même, l'indépendance ecclésiastique de l'empire d'Ottokar. La Pologne devait être enveloppée dans une sphère d'influences tchèques. L'archevêché, qui jadis fut celui de Méthode, devait être renouvelé et transféré à Olomouc. Au point de vue politique, cette remarquable conception s'appuyait, d'après l'historien tchèque V. Chaloupecký, sur une tradition ancienne selon laquelle la Grande-Moravie ayant jadis compris neuf évêchés, les rois de Bohême, en tant qu'héritiers de l'empire morave, devaient gouverner tous les pays «aliénés de quelque façon que ce fût».² Au même siècle (1248), la curie papale renouvela son assentiment à l'introduction de la liturgie slave en Croatie et en Dalmatie et, un siècle après, (1346), sous Charles IV, au

¹ А. Ф. Гильфердинг, *Гусь, его отношение къ православнои церкви*. СПб, 1893; И. С. Пальмов, *Вопросъ о чашѣ въ гуситскомъ движеніи*. СПб, 1981; *idem*, *Къ вопросу о сношеніяхъ чеховъ-гуситовъ с восточною церковью въ половинѣ XV в.* СПб, 1889.

² V. Chaloupecký, *Poslední Přemyslovci a Evropa*. Praha, 1940, 33. Dans le recueil: „Co daly naše země Evropě a lidstvu.“

Fig. 1 M. PAULOVÁ, *L'idée Cyrillo-Méthodienne dans la politique de Charles IV et la fondation du monastère Slave de Prague*, *Byzantinoslavica* 11 (1950) 174

1

Idea cyrilometodějská v prostředí Karla II a
zakládání kláštera na Slovanech, v Praze
město: (slovanští kláštera v Praze.)

Politický spolek byzantského císaře Michala IV. a Rostislavem, knížetem Veliké Moravy, namířený proti koalici bulharsko-francie a proměnou byzantské kultury do oblasti českého a slovenského národa velikým dílem a missi Konstantina (Cyrila) a Metoděje, jsou události v historické literatuře dostatečně známé a po zásluze zhodnocení. Mnohé známé a osvětlení je již doznívání cyrilometodějské kultury v slovanstých zemích a právě v Čechách. Ze starších badatelů jin než historikové (Gilferding, Pal'mov) věnovali pozornost této vývojové linii, která souvisí v některých fázích těsně i s myšlenkou slovanstou. Cyrilometodějská tradice nezaujala s vypuknutím řádu Polunostých bratří a Protoskepa, ani padem Veliké Moravy. Slovanští mniši našli útočiště v klášteře Ostrovském i jinde a tradice se rovněž udržela, i když v nové době. Po církevním rozkladu změnila se v touhu, sloužit slovanští bratry k staré slovansté cyrilometodějské, t. j. západní víře křížovými výpravami. Přemysl Otakar II. v století 13. spojoval velkomoravskou ideologii s myšlenkou osamostatnění církve církevní a tím

1) A. 1) 1) Гилфердинг, Изв. по отношению к православноу церкви.
Питроград, 1893. + Павлов, Вопрос о галлах в цеситанской
гвемжкы. Питроград, 1881; и др., и др., к вопросу о сносительных
техоб-гуситов с востокою церковью в нововине, 1896.
Питроград, 1889.

+ Уланз Сабуров

Fig. 2 Sample of the article manuscript (Masaryk Institute and Archive of ASCR, M. Paulová fonds, shelf no. III A, inv.no. 658, box 16)



Fig. 3 Emmaus Monastery (Na Slovanech), Prague



Fig. 4 I. Zeidler, Happy direction of navigation, Brno 1736, Moravian National Library Brno (J. SVOBODOVÁ, *Mater Dei, miraculis clara – slavná díky zázrakům / Mater Dei, miraculis clara – berühmt durch Wunder*, in: *Stříbrný oltář v bazilice Nanebevzetí Panny Marie na Starém Brně... / Der Silberne Altar in der Basilika Maria Himmelfahrt in Alt Brunn...*, 87)



Fig. 5a, b Church of the Virgin Mary at the Emmaus Monastery (Na Slovanech), Prague, gothic cedilla in the choir with the two-headed Byzantine eagle (photo: K. Benešovská)



Fig. 6 Velehrad, basilica *minor*, picture of Sts Cyril and Methodius by the Polish painter J. Matejko, 1885

print *Gemma Moraviae Thaumaturga Brunensis Pennicillo Divi Lucae Evangelistae delineata Brunae Moravorum ad S. Thomam Apostol. a Saeculis recon-dita...* with a graphic image was brought out by Jakub Maxmilian Swoboda in Brno (*Brunae Typis Jacobi Maxmiliani Swoboda*) in 1736. The copper-plate engraving, brought out also separately and devoted to the Cardinal bishop Wolfgang Graf von [Count of] Schrattenbach (1660-1738), depicted a sailing ship, the symbol of the Moravian church, in which Sts Cyril and Methodius baptise the Moravian King Svatopluk.⁶⁰ The engraving was made by Ignatius Zeidler in Brno in the year 1736 and is named “Happy direction of navigation” (Fig. 4).

At the court of Charles IV the “Byzantinizing” tradition also influenced Master Theodoric,⁶¹ while jeweller and councillor Wenceslas called Greek († 1381) also worked there. Known as *Graecus aurifaber*,⁶² he was possibly the artist behind the “Byzantinized” Charles University seal⁶³ and the heraldic motif of the two-headed eagle on the seals of Charles IV and his sons Wenceslas IV and Sigismund.⁶⁴ The two-headed eagle on the Luxembourg seals and on the cedula wall in the Emmaus Monastery nave (Fig. 5a, b) was interpreted as Charles's personal coat of arms and proof of his relations with Byzantium.⁶⁵ But this was not just a symbol of the Byzantine Empire – it also became symbol of other medieval Slav states such as Serbia and Russia, which in the sense of *translatio imperii* considered themselves to be heirs to the Byzantine Empire. Besides the Byzantine Palaiologoi dynasty this symbol was also used by some members of the Komnenos dynasty, members of the Serb Nemanjić dynasty and the Bulgarian tsars,⁶⁶ so it is theoretically possible to associate the symbol of

vlivu, Olomouc 2009, 112-113; for more details see L. HAVLÍKOVÁ, *Cesty ikon. Madona svatotomská a Jan Jindřich, Karel IV., Štěpán Dušan a Ioannes V. Palaiologos / Die Wege der Ikonen. Die Madona von Sankt Thomas und Johann Heinrich, Karl IV., Stephen Dušan und Johannes V. Palaiologos*, 37-73.

⁶⁰ J. ROYT, *Obraz a kult v Čechách 17. a 18. století*, Prague 1999, 158-169, here 168, fig. 31 and note 63 on the pages 180-181; J. SVOBODOVÁ, *Mater Dei, miraculis clara – slavná díky zázrakům / Mater Dei, miraculis clara – berühmt durch Wunder*, in: *Stříbrný oltář v bazilice Nanebevzetí Panny Marie na Starém Brně... / Der Silberne Altar in der Basilika Maria Himmelfahrt in Alt Brunn...*, 75-103, here 86-87.

⁶¹ K. STEJSKAL, *Emauzy a český helenoslavismus*, 119.

⁶² *Ibidem*.

⁶³ K. CHYTIĽ, *Typ sv. Václava na pečeti university Karlovy a ve viatiku Jana ze Středy a jeho deriváty*, *Památky archeologické* 36 (1928-1930) 201sq.

⁶⁴ K. STEJSKAL, *Emauzy a český helenoslavismus*, 121.

⁶⁵ E. POCHÉ – J. KROFTA, *Na Slovanech – stavební a umělecký vývoj pražského kláštera*, fig. 37; K. STEJSKAL, *Umění na dvoře Karla IV.*, Prague 1978, fig. 134; *idem*, *Emauzy a český helenoslavismus*, 121; P. BALCÁREK, *České země a Byzanc*, 104.

⁶⁶ Ch. CHOTZAKOGLU, *Die Palaiologen und das früheste Auftreten des byzantinischen Doppeladlers*, *Byzantinoslavica* 48 (1996) 60-68.

the two-headed eagle at the Emmaus Monastery not only with the Byzantine Emperor Ioannes V Palaiologos, but also with the Serbian tsar Stephen Dušan, the Balkan hegemon (*fere totius imperii Romaniae dominus, βασιλεὺς καὶ αὐτοκράτωρ Σερβίας καὶ Ρωμανίας, цар и самодержац Срба и Грка*).⁶⁷ By using the two-headed eagle, Charles IV wished to express his claims to the “Byzantine (Eastern Roman) legacy”. The series of image plaques which has not survived in the Vladislav Hall at Prague Castle, in which the Byzantine Emperors were depicted alongside other monarchs, could have been a manifestation of this political idea.⁶⁸

The political opinions of Charles IV reflected the situation in Europe at that time. As a universalist monarch he took advantage of an eastern policy of imperial protectionism within the framework of a utilitarian plan. He had a pragmatic approach to the Great Moravian and Cyrillo-Methodian heritage, which became a stimulus to restore the Slavonic liturgy and to establish the Emmaus Monastery for Slav monks in Prague, “a place of memory”⁶⁹ and a symbol *sui generis*, which represented the Cyrillo-Methodian tradition in the Czech lands, evoking ideas of the old Christian past and Byzantine-Great Moravian relations in the 9th century, the tradition, living in Moravia and Moravian Velehrad (Fig. 6) up to the present.

⁶⁷ B. FERJANČIĆ – S. ĆIRKOVIĆ, *Стефан Душан, краљ и цар 1331-1355*, Belgrade 2005, 145; M. DINIĆ, *Душанова царска титула у очима савременика*, in: *Зборник у част шесте стогодишњице Душановог законика*, Belgrade 1951, 87-118; Lj. MAKSIMOVIĆ, *Грци и Романија у српској владарској титули*, *Зборник Радова Византолошког Института* 12 (1970) 61-78; idem, *Српска царска титула*, *Глас САНУ, Одељење историјских наука* 10 (1998) 173-189.

⁶⁸ A. SALAČ, *Zur Geschichte de Bautätigkeit Karls IV. auf der Prager Burg*, in: *Renaissance und Humanismus in Mittel- und Osteuropa. Eine Sammlung der Materialien besorgt von J. Irmscher*, 2, Berlin 1962, 304sq.; K. STEJSKAL, *Emauzy a český helenoslavismus*, 123.

⁶⁹ Viz P. NORA, *Les Lieux de mémoire*, 7 vol., Paris 1984-1992 (*Realms of Memory*, New York 1996-1998; *Zwischen Geschichte und Gedächtnis*, Frankfurt am Main 1998); idem, *Mezi paměti a historií. Problematika míst*, *Caiers du CEFRES* 13 (= *Politika paměti*, ed. F. Mayer) (1998) 8-18, http://www.cefres.cz/IMG/pdf/nora_1998_mezi_pameti_historii.pdf; cf. G. KILIÁNOVÁ, *Identita a pamät'. Devín / Theben / Dévény ako pamätné miesto*, Bratislava 2005.