

BETWEEN EAST AND WEST. TRANSLATION AS A MEANS OF CROSS-CULTURAL COMMUNICATION. EXAMPLES FROM CENTRAL AND EASTERN EUROPE IN THE MIDDLE AGES AND EARLY MODERN PERIOD

Márta FONT

University of Pécs
Institut of History
Department of Medieval and Early Modern History
H-7624 Pécs, Rókus u. 2.
font.marta@pte.hu

FONT, Márta. *Medzi Západom a Východom. Preklad ako prostriedok medzikultúrnej komunikácie. Príklady zo Strednej a Východnej Európy v stredoveku a rannom novoveku.* Vzdelanosť v stredovekej kresťanskej Európe sa vyznačovala jazykovými a kultúrnymi rozdielmi medzi latinským a gréckym svetom. Hovorový jazyk sa všade odlišoval od písaného. Na územiach, kde sa rozprávalo neo-latinčinou sa elementy ľudovej latinčiny vyskytovali aj v písaných textoch so zvyšujúcou sa frekvenciou. V strednej Európe sa sformovali lokálne varianty latinčiny, do ktorých ale prenikali elementy hovorového jazyka. Stretávame sa len s niekoľkými lingvistickými pamiatkami písanými v hovorom jazyku, a iba časť z nich tvoria preklady. Od začiatku nachádzame prekladovú literatúru v regiónoch pravoslávneho kresťanstva, kde bola prax *triglossia* skoro nahradená povýšením slovanského jazyka na liturgický. Tento proces bol sprevádzaný prekladom gréckych liturgických textov a neskôr aj kroník. V strednej Európe zostala na niekoľko storočí vedeckým jazykom latinčina. Od šestnásteho storočia je možné pozorovať preklady tiež na hraniciach latinského a pravoslávneho kresťanstva.

Klíúčové slová: preklad; stredná a východná Európa; stredovek; raný novovek;

Keywords: Translation; Central and Eastern Europe; Middle Ages; Early Modern Time;

Geographical and conceptual background

The notion of Europe at around the time of the first millennium differs considerably from that of today. For its contemporaries the term Europe,¹ when used at all, designated the community of peoples belonging to Western Christendom beginning with the disintegration of the Carolingian Empire until the end of the

¹ SASHALMI, Endre. Bevezetés. „Európa”, „Kelet-Európa” és a „Balkán” mint intellektuális-történeti konstrukciók. In SASHALMI, Endre (ed.). „Kelet-Európa” és a „Balkán” 1000-1800. Intellektuális-történeti konstrukciók vagy valós történeti régiók? (Kelet-Európa és Balkán tanulmányok 4. Pécs: Pécsi Tudományegyetem, 2007, pp. 3-4.

eleventh century. However, rather than *Europe*, this community right up until the fifteenth century far more frequently inherited such names from the early Middle Ages as “Christendom” (*res publica Christiana*) or “the Christian world” (*Orbis Christianus, Christianitas*). Another name for this community was “the Latin world” (*latinitas*),² its unifying strength being provided by the Latin Church. The “Latin world” embraced those countries who accepted papal supremacy in church matters, and who used the Latin tongue as a liturgical and cultural language, not only in self-definition, but for the outside world as well: the Orthodox world also referred to those in the bosom of the western church as “Latins”.

The true career of the word “Europe” began with the humanists in the fifteenth century, who understood it to mean the countries of the Latin Church and used it as synonymous with *res publica Christiana*. The humanists were fond of the term as *Europa* was an Antique word. In the mid-fifteenth century it became mostly a word for scholars, and in the next century entered general currency. In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries the two terms coexisted and expressed a united Christendom. It was only in the eighteenth century that *res publica Christiana* slipped into the background as a term designating a common belief. In the long run, the Reformation, which resulted in the division into various denominations, did not favour such terms of unification that were clearly religious in nature. And so it was that the word *Europe*, which did not refer to common belief, came to the fore: by the end of the seventeenth century *Europe* already designated the sovereign states that made up the continent. The 1713 Peace of Utrecht was the last such peace treaty where the expression *res publica Christiana* appeared, designating common faith as the foundation of unity.³

In the first millennium, then, Europe was used as a synonym for the *Christian world*. This is the time when the Europe that was identical with the *Christian world* began to “swell”, approaching the present continental concept. However, from the beginning Europe in the “unifying” sense carried with it potential fault lines, along which by the thirteenth century individual regions could clearly be differentiated. These faults clearly demarcated *Europa Occidens* and *Europa Oriens*, while in the neighbourhood of the two there was created a Middle Europe which showed traits that differed from both of the other two.⁴ The notion of a Middle Europe is used for all of the territory that came under the reach of the two great powers of the day, the Byzantine and Holy Roman empires.⁵ As at the turn of the millennium the schism between Rome and Byzantium had yet to occur, it seemed there was no cause to differentiate between later Central and Eastern Europe.

² BARTLETT, Robert. *Making of Europe. Conquest, Colonization and Cultural Change 950-1350*. London: The Penguin Press, 1993, p. 44.

³ SASHALMI, Endre. *A nyugat-európai államfejlődés vázlata*. Budapest: Pannonica, 2006, pp. 152-153.

⁴ SZÚCS, Jenő. *Vázlat Európa három történeti régiójáról*. Budapest: Magvető, 1983, pp. 8-10. HADLER, Frank. *Mitteleuropa - „Zwischeneuropa” - Ostmitteleuropa. Reflexionen über eine europäische Geschichtsregion im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert*. In *GWZO Berichte und Beiträge*, Leipzig: GWZO, 1996, p. 34.

⁵ FONT, Márta. *Im Spannungsfeld der christlichen Großmächte. Mittel- und Osteuropa im 10.-12. Jahrhundert*. Herne: Schäfer Verlag, 2008, pp. 18-19.

By the first millennium several power bases had formed along the borders of the two Christian empires, from which were created the previously outlined region. At this time these power bases should be treated equally, for in the course of the eleventh and twelfth centuries the fault line was only taking shape and was yet to gain its final form created from its internal borderlines. Contemporaries did not sense these lines; they did not write of new countries but only of lands lying in the neighbourhood of the empire and of races and groups who peopled them. Speaking of events at the turn of the millennium, no differences were sensed among Slavic ethnic groups: for instance, Adam of Bremen writes, "*Sclauonia igitur amplissima Germaniae provincia*".⁶ The new power bases of Middle Europe, the seeds of future Christian states, must have been sown across the power grids where conversion to Christianity took root in the last third of the tenth century (Prague, Poznań, Esztergom and Kiev). From the moment of the birth of Christian statehood these seemingly parallel phenomena took on numerous differences which would later become even more marked. One common feature of individual centres was that their missionary routes crossed one another. In the west Byzantine influence would later be driven into the background, while in the eastern part the relationship changed with the centres using Latin as the liturgical language. It is for this reason that we see the end of the twelfth century as the border of an era, when the Middle Europe of the millennium split into Central and Eastern Europe. From the thirteenth century we can speak of the three historical regions of Europe, of which in what follows we shall be addressing two, Central and Eastern Europe.

Literacy and the role of translation in the Middle Ages Christianity and literacy

Following the taking up of Christianity in Central and Eastern Europe, translation as one form of literacy appeared together with literacy itself. From the very beginning, Christianity existed in two linguistic and cultural mediums: the Latin Roman and the Greek Byzantine cultural spheres. From the outset, the spoken (in contemporary parlance "vulgar") language differed from the written ("literary"). Christian liturgy was in Latin or Greek, to which was added Aramaic, the original language of the Bible, forming the concept of *triglossia*, essentially the three languages accepted and used by the Church. In the course of missionary activity and in the phrasing of sermons in the liturgy the spoken tongue necessarily came to the fore, as otherwise it would not have been comprehended by the lay public. Independently of this, though, Latin and Greek remained the literary languages.

This practice was broken with in the mission among the Slavic communities. Of this there is but one trace in the Latin cultural sphere, the *Freising manuscripts*, which contain, carefully translated from the Latin, fragments of a prayer, a confession formula and a homily⁷. This notwithstanding, Latin remained the literary

⁶ MAGISTRI ADAMI BREMENSIS. *Gesta Hammaburgensis ecclesiae pontificum*. (Monumenta Germaniae Historica Scriptores rerum Germanicarum in usum scholarum 2. SCHMIEDER, Bernhard (ed.) Hannover: Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 1993, p. 311. (Lib. II. cap.18.)

⁷ The *Freising manuscript* is a document from 972-1039 in old-Slovenian language. See TÓTH H.,

tongue in the areas under the jurisdiction (*iurisdictio*) of Rome. In the areas under the Byzantine sphere of interest the Slavic mission of Constantine/Cyril and Methodius broke with triglossian tradition and created a Slavic literary language. This resulted in a double cultural attachment to Christianity among the Slavic races, with the creation of *Slavia Latina* and *Slavia Orthodoxa*. Within *Slavia Orthodoxa* the spoken and liturgical languages were closer to each other, although here too they differed: Old Church Slavonic (Old Slavic) and its various redactions referred not only to the liturgy but the language of literacy. However, the influence of the spoken language appeared in literary chronicles, and so language differentiation in literacy followed differentiation in Balkan and Eastern European languages.

From the twelfth century, due to the exclusiveness of Latin⁸ (in ecclesiastic administration and in the liturgy), we are justified in speaking of a western Church as being a Latin Church.⁹ In those Central European countries within the Latin cultural sphere the literary language was Latin; in the centuries of the Early Middle Ages most spoken language appeared in the form of odd expressions interspersed into Latin texts, and the occasional written record. Translations were sporadic. Taking a glimpse at the western part of Europe, the situation there is different. In French territories, chronicles appear in Old French from the twelfth century, often with known Latin versions.¹⁰ Where German was spoken, we know of texts in vernacular German from the thirteenth century. The *Sachsenspiegel* (roughly, Survey of Saxon Law), a written summary and supplementation of unwritten laws, leans upon Latin antecedents.¹¹

In the part of the Byzantine sphere of interest where Slavic languages were spoken, "translation literature" appeared as Christianity was taken up. At first the liturgical texts were translated into Old Slavic, which was closest to the spoken vernacular, and later into a version of Old Church Slavonic. Byzantine narratives of secular content also appeared in Old Slavonic, though generally translated not as entire works but in part, the translated parts being prepared as chronicle compilations designated as "хроника" to set them apart from stories of their own past. The latter they named "летопись". One example of an early translation is the Georgios Hamartolos Chronicle.¹² The first chronicles to arrive at the Kievan Rus were translated in Bulgaria; such a one was the first Sviatoslav Collection (1073), the second version of which contains Old Russian peculiarities

Imre. Újabb adalékok Metódnak és tanítványainak pannóniai tevékenységéhez. In *Aetas*, 2007, roč. 22, č. 3, pp. 24-34. LUKÁCS, István – PAVIČIĆ, Mladen. A szlovén irodalom története. [online] http://szlavintezet.elte.hu/szlavtsz/slav_ciril/szolven-irodalom.htm (time of download: 2015. 06. 26.)

⁸ The discussions between Methodius and Bavarian archbishops see: NÓTÁRI, Tamás. A salzburgi historiográfia kezdetei. (Szegedi középkortörténeti könyvtár 23.) Szeged: Szegedi Középkorász Műhely, 2007, pp. 262-277.

⁹ BARTLETT, ref. 2, pp. 18-19.

¹⁰ CSERNUS, Sándor. A középkori francia nyelvű történetírás és Magyarország (13-15. század). Budapest: Osiris, 1999, pp. 11-33.

¹¹ BLAZOVICH, László – SCHMIDT, József (eds.). *A Szász tükör*. Szeged: Csongrád megyei Levéltár, 2005, p. 13.

¹² ISTRIN, Vasilij M. Hronika Georgija Amartola v drevnerusskom perevode. Tekst, perevod, slovar', č. 1-2. Petrograd-Leningrad, 1920-1930.

and so was presumably prepared in Rus (1076).¹³ The fragment known as the Ostromir Gospel may have been prepared locally.¹⁴ Some scholars do not consider translation literature to be authentic literature from the aspect of Old Russian literary output.¹⁵

The Kingdom of Hungary

A unique situation was created in Hungary, which belonged to the Latin cultural sphere but where traces of the early Byzantine mission can be found.

Latin became the language of literacy, but there survives a single Greek diploma from the time of St. Stephen (997–1038), rewritten in the early twelfth century with a Latin translation attached. There were, therefore, those with a knowledge of Greek. The Greek text is simple to the degree of primitive, whoever wrote it being in possession of spoken Greek and everyday communication, possibly of Greek extraction. In no way does the phraseology show traces of contemporary literary Byzantine Greek.¹⁶ The diploma from the time of St. Stephen was rewritten (and translated) in 1109 by Simon, Bishop of Pécs (1108–1124/1134), whose knowledge of Greek made him equal to the task.¹⁷ At the beginning of the twelfth century a Venetian cleric by the name of Cerbanus translated sections of the works by two religious leaders (Maximus the Confessor and John Damascene) and dedicated them to David, Abbot of Pannonhalma.¹⁸ Scholarship has revealed that the phrasing of the mirrors-of-princes work written at the time of St. Stephen, *Institutio morum*, reflects Byzantine influence,¹⁹ though it is not a translation. The early thirteenth-century author of the *Gesta Ungarorum* uses words of Greek origin, although this case shows no proof of a knowledge of Greek.²⁰ We know that in royal diplomacy the Hungarian court kept in regular contact with Byzantium, but this does not presuppose a knowledge of Byzantine literature, and no translations were made.

One version of the complexly structured, fourteenth-century Hungarian chronicle composition was translated into German by Heinricus de Mügeln (c.

¹³ Izbornik Sviatoslava 1073 g. Faksimilnoie izdanie. Moskva, 1983.; SCHMIDT, Sz. O. (ed.). Svodnyj katalog slaviano-russkikh rukopisnykh knig, hraniashchikhsia v SSSR XI-XIII vv. Moskva: Nauka, 1984, pp. 36-40. (№ 4.), 41-43. (№ 5.); H. TÓTH, Imre – FERINCZ, István. Az óorosz irodalom vázlatá (XI-XVII. század). Szeged: JATE Press, 2006, p. 7.

¹⁴ Svodnyj katalog., ref. 13, pp. 33-35. (№ 3).

¹⁵ ROTHE, Hans. Was ist „altrussische Literatur“? (Nordrhein-Westfälische Akademie der Wissenschaften. Vorträge G362) Wiesbaden: Westdeutscher Verlag, 2000, pp. 77-78.

¹⁶ KAPITÁNYFY, István. Magistra Gentium. Bizánci hatások a középkori Magyarországon. In KAPITÁNYFY, István. Hungaro-Byzantina. Bizánc és a görögség középkori magyarországi forrásokban. Budapest: Typotext, 2003, p. 45. MORAVCSIK, Gyula. Bizánc és a magyarság. Budapest: Lucidus, 2003, p. 100.

¹⁷ MORAVCSIK, ref. 16, p. 100.

¹⁸ Ibidem, p. 101.

¹⁹ See: HAVAS, László (ed.). Sancti Stephani regis primi Hungariae Libellus de Institutione morum ad Emericum ducem. Debreceni: Debreceni Egyetem, 2004.

²⁰ KAPITÁNYFY, István. Imperium Constantinopolitanum. Anonymus és Bizánc. In KAPITÁNYFY, István. Hungaro-Byzantina. Bizánc és a görögség középkori magyarországi forrásokban. Budapest: Typotex, 2003, pp. 81-98.

1300 – after 1369), the famed Saxon meistersinger. He dedicated the chronicle, translated into Middle-High German, to Prince Rudolf of Austria.²¹ Fragments of the text have survived in a Latin version in verse,²² which research has associated with the same Henricus de Mügeln. The Latin text was dedicated to King Louis the Great. The German chronicle is definitely a translation, but there are parts which when compared with the Latin chronicle composition contain new information.

Fragmentary sentences in Hungarian find their way into Latin texts. Such is the 1055 founding document of Tihany Abbey. (*Feheru uaru meneu hodu utu rea*).²³ The first continuous text in Hungarian, the translation of a Latin funeral sermon, has survived in a codex from the end of the twelfth century (copied between 1192 and 1195).²⁴ The first poem in Hungarian (the *Ómagyar Mária siralom* – “Lamentations of Mary”), which comes from the end of the thirteenth century²⁵ and has no known Latin antecedent, points to use of the vulgar tongue (in modern parlance the vernacular) in the liturgy.

Divine Mother, and was written in Hungarian following a Latin original for Dominican friars.²⁶

Medieval codices in Hungarian have survived from the period between 1470 and 1530 which in content are closely connected to ecclesiastic literature. Translations were made for those with little knowledge of Latin. The value of translation lay in the creation of written Hungarian.²⁷

Slavia Latina

Among the Slavic peoples belonging to the *Slavia Latina* the earlier Byzantine practice can be seen in various places, for instance the use of the Slavic language in the liturgy or through literary translation works.

In Dalmatia, under the ecclesiastic jurisdiction of which the Croatian population fell,²⁸ Byzantine influence can be witnessed in the ninth century, while in the early tenth century the Constantinople Patriarch gave up his sphere of authority of Dalmatia to Rome. Additionally, the territory belonging to the Aquileia Patriarchy fell under the influence of the Carolingians and of Rome. The tenth-century synods of Spalatum (today's Split) bear witness to resistance against

²¹ SZENTPÉTERY, Emericus (ed.). *Scriptores rerum Hungaricarum*. I-II. Budapestini: Academia Magyar Történelmi Társulat, 1937-1938. (SRH), here: SRH II. 87-223.

²² SRH II. 227-272.

²³ GYÖRFFY, Georgius (ed.). *Diplomata Hungariae Antiquissima* (DHA). vol. I. 1000-1131. Budapestini: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1992, p. 150.

²⁴ KÓSZEGHY, Péter (chief ed.) – TAMÁS, Zsuzsanna (ed.). *Magyar Művelődéstörténeti lexikon* (MAMÜL). IV. Budapest: Balassi, 2005, pp. 13-14. MADAS, Edit. *A szóbeliség és írásbeliség határán*. In MADAS, Edit. *Középkori prédikációirodalmunk történetéből*. Debrecen: Debreceni Egyetem, 2002, pp. 83-125.

²⁵ MAMÜL VIII. Budapest 2008. 312-313. (Madas, Edit).

²⁶ MAMÜL VI. Budapest 2006. 118. (Vízkelety, András).

²⁷ MAMÜL VII. Budapest 2007. 179-180. (Madas, Edit).

²⁸ FONT, Márta (ed.). *Dinasztia, hatalom, egyház. Régiók formálódása Európa közepén*. Pécs: Pécsi Tudományegyetem, 2009, pp. 257-259. SZEBERÉNYI, Gábor. *A Balkán 800-1389*. In SASHALMI (ed.), ref. 1, pp. 291-297.

Latin and Greek traditions. Glagoticism, or the use of the Slavic language in the liturgy, was banned, although permitted where there was a lack of knowledge of Latin.²⁹ This duality, the ban in principle and acceptance of the contradictory practice, continued until the end of the eleventh century. “*Sclavos, nisi latinas literas didicerint, ad sacros ordines promoveri, et clericum, cuiuscumque gradus sit, laicali servituti vel mundiali fisco amodo subiugari sub excommunicationis vinculo amodo omnimodo prohibemus.*”³⁰ Despite the ban, at the beginning of the fourteenth century *alphabetum chrawaticum* and *glagoljašto* (= practicing Slavic in the liturgy) have a traditional role both in Istria and Zára (Zadar).³¹ Use of Slavic is borne out by the Benedictine Regula, translated into Slavic in the twelfth century, and by the mid-thirteenth-century letter from Pope Innocent IV in which he recognises, with certain regional limits, use of the Glagolitic liturgy.³²

The conversion of the Moravians is associated with Constantine-Cyril and Methodius.³³ The two proselytizers originally set out (in 864) to the land of the Moravians with Byzantine support, the basis for which must have been a request for recognition of the authority of the Moravian Prince Rastislav.³⁴ Their authorization to convert was eventually received from Rome (in 869) and so the mission's results and the activities of Methodius and his followers were essentially to lead to the formation of a spiritual culture in the Slavic tongue also supported by Rome. For this even the linguistic conditions were given – the importance of spreading the word in the vulgar Slavic tongue had already been stressed by Alcuin, its use had been sanctioned at the 813 Synod of Mainz,³⁵ and the *Freising fragments*, which contain prayer, confession and formula and sermon written in the Slavic language but the Latin alphabet, bear witness to its practical application.³⁶ In the Bohemian-Moravian territory, ecclesiastical culture in the Slavic language formed in the course of Methodius-type conversion appears to be pushed back from the end of the 870s. It is of course open to question whether the appearance of a liturgy in the Slavic language is everywhere proof of Byzantine influence. In

²⁹ FONT, ref. 28, pp. 241-244.

³⁰ FEJÉR, Georgius (ed.). *Codex diplomaticus Hungariae ecclesiasticus ac civilis* (CD). I-XI. Buda 1829-1844, here: vol. I. p. 96. (№ 67). FINE, John van Antwerp. *The Early Medieval Balkans. A Critical Survey from the Sixth to the Late Twelfth Century*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1983, pp. 280-281.

³¹ FONT, ref. 28, p. 257.

³² SOKCSEVITS, Dénes. *Horvátország. A 7. századtól napjainkig*. Budapest: Mundus Novus, 2011, p. 64.

³³ TÓTH, Imre H. *Cirill-Konstantin és Metód élete és működése. Bevezetés a szláv kultúrtörténetbe*. Szeged: JATE Press, 2003. VAVŘINEK, Vladimír. *Nagymorávia Bizánc és a Latin Nyugat között*. In FERINCZ, István – TÓTH, Imre H. (eds.). *Szlavisztikai tanulmányok 17*. Szeged: JATE Press, 1998, pp. 7-20.

³⁴ KŁOCZOWSKI, Jerzy. *Die Ausbreitung des Christentums von der Adria bis zur Ostsee. Christianisierung der Slawen, Skandinavien und Ungarn zwischen 9. und dem 11. Jahrhundert*. In BOSHOFF, Egon (hrsg.). *Die Geschichte des Christentums. Bd. IV.: Bischöfe, Mönche und Kaiser (642-1054)*. Freiburg – Basel – Wien: Herder Verlag, 1994, p. 891.

³⁵ JÓNÁS, Ilona. *Görög nyelvismeret Nyugaton a 9-10. században*. In JÓNÁS, Ilona. *Sokszínű középkor. Természet – társadalom – kultúra a középkori Európában*. Nagy Balázs – Novák Veronika (eds.). Budapest: ELTE, 2010, pp. 199-207.

³⁶ NÓTÁRI, ref. 8, pp. 262-277.

the case of the Bohemians it is hardly credible that Methodius baptized Bořivoj,³⁷ yet Slavic ecclesiastic tradition still existed in the tenth and eleventh centuries. In the Sázava monastery founded by Prokop the Hermit in 1032 the liturgy in the Slavic tongue can be followed up to 1096.³⁸ In the Bohemian territories the early Constantine-Cyril and Methodius cult can be regarded as questionable, as we only have data from the time of Charles IV (1347-1378), and their fete day for the Enlighteners of the Slavic Peoples falls not on the dates customary elsewhere (February 14 and April 6), but March 9.³⁹

The cult of Wenceslas, who died a martyr's death in around 930, was formed in the 970s, therewith making Wenceslas the patron saint of the Prague bishopric. Beyond the numerous Latin language legends about him, an Old Slavic version is also known,⁴⁰ which has been dated to the tenth century, but the Glagolitic version has survived only in a manuscript from the fourteenth or fifteenth century, while the Cyrillic Russian version stems from the sixteenth or seventeenth century.⁴¹ The Wenceslas cult spread in the twelfth century in the wake of the respect paid toward his grandmother, Ludmilla, also a martyr; there exists a Slavic version of his legend, which has survived in areas where Russian is spoken.⁴² Traces of the original Old Slavic liturgy are preserved in the Glagolitic *Kiev Missal*. The tenth-century text one can read here has survived in a Roman missal, it was translated from the Latin and contains several Czech linguistic elements.⁴³ The Bohemian Church's affiliation to Rome can be dated from the tenth century and the exclusive use of Latin in the liturgy from the end of the eleventh century. The first complete work to be written in Old Czech is the Dalimil Chronicle from the beginning of the fourteenth century.⁴⁴

No Byzantine traces can be found in the early conversion of the Poles: from the outset, the structure of the Polish church, its liturgy and literacy were attached to Latin trends. Poland's eastern border was also the borderline between the eastern and western Slavs, although it cannot be drawn in unambiguous terms in the geographical sense.⁴⁵ The same was valid for the line between Latin and Orthodox

³⁷ About the activity of Methodius see e.g.: BIRNBAUM, Henrik. Zum (hoffentlich) letzten Mal über den weitgereisten Method und die Lage Altmährens. In *Byzantinoslavica* 1996, roč. 57, p. 190.

³⁸ KŁOCZOWSKI, ref. 34, p. 897. FONT, ref. 5, p. 120. SOMMER, Petr (ed.). *Svatý Prokop, čechy a Střední Evropa*. Praha: Lidové noviny, 2006, 289 s. SOMMER, Petr. *Svatý Prokop. Z počátků českého státu a církve*. Praha: Nakladatelství Vyšehrad, 2007, 260 s.

³⁹ MAL, Paul. Regensburg als Ausgangspunkt der Christianisierung Böhmens. In STABER, Josef (hrsg.). *Millenium ecclesiae Pragensis 973-1973*. (Schriftenreihe des Regensburger Osteuropainstituts 1). Regensburg: Lassleben, 1973, p. 14.

⁴⁰ FONT, ref. 5, pp. 40-42.

⁴¹ TŘEŠTÍK, Dušan. *Počátky Přemyslovců. Vstup Cechů do dějin (530-935)*. Praha: Lidové noviny, 1997, pp. 117-137.

⁴² *Ibidem*, pp. 138-154.

⁴³ Facsimile from the edition of nineteenth century see: SOMMER, ref. 37, *Svatý Prokop: Picture No 4*.

⁴⁴ BLÁHOVÁ, Marie (ed.). *Kronika tak řečeného Dalimila*. Praha - Lytomyšl: Paseka, 2005, 276 pp.

⁴⁵ See RHODE, Gotthold. *Die Ostgrenze Polens: politische Entwicklung, kulturelle Bedeutung und geistige Auswirkung*. (Ostmitteleuropa in Vergangenheit und Gegenwart 2.) Köln - Graz: Böhlau, 1955, 457 pp. WOŁOSZYN, Marcin - DEBIEC, Maciej (eds.). *Frühzeit Ostmitteleuropas*.

Christianity,⁴⁶ while Poland's north-eastern border abutted the pagan Lithuanians. In the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries all of this was to have repercussions in Polish eastward expansion and the creation of a Polish-Lithuanian kingdom.⁴⁷ After 1340, in the territory of Halych that had fallen under the Polish crown, a Latin Church hierarchy evolved alongside the structure of the Orthodox Church.⁴⁸ It was in the Latin used by the Polish Chancellery⁴⁹ that the terms *Russia Minor* and *Russia Alba* were born, contributing greatly to the later usage of "Little Russian" meaning "Ukrainian" and "White Russian" meaning "Belorussian". The Latin and Slavic cultural environment created the Latin translation in the sixteenth century of the early ecclesiastic regulations of the Kiev Rus.⁵⁰

Lithuania, finally Christianized after 1387, attached itself to the Latin cultural sphere, and the archbishopric of Vilnius belonged to Rome. Parallel with this – and before Latin baptism – those aristocratic Lithuanians who had married into the Orthodox Rurik family. As a result, the eastward spread of Lithuanian the greater part of Lithuanian subjects were eastern Slavs and Orthodox Christians. At the first attempt – prior to the personal union with the Poles – the Lithuanian princes experimented with creating an Orthodox metropolis that was independent of Moscow; this happened again at the start of the fifteenth century. On both occasions the effort brought a temporary result: the Metropolitan bishop of Moscow, with the aid of the Moscow princes, succeeded in preventing the division of ecclesiastic authority over the eastern Slav territories.⁵¹

The cultural influence of the Latin region also spread over the Lithuanian and old Halych areas: here a role was played by the University of Cracow, which was attended by many students from the eastern parts of the country. In the fifteenth century we find 67 students from Vilnius and 94 from Lvov in Cracow.⁵² One result of the cultural interaction was the creation of the *Gustynsky* codex,

Das polnisch-ukrainische Grenzgebiet aus archäologischer Perspektive. Rzeszów: Mitel, 2007.

⁴⁶ RHODE, ref. 45, pp. 242-292.

⁴⁷ BARONAS, Darius. Byzantium and Lithuania. North and South look at each other. In KAIMAKAMOVA, Miliana – SALAMON, Maciej – SMORAĞ-RÓŻYCKA, Małgorzata (eds.). Byzantium, New Peoples, New Powers: The Byzantino-Slav Contact Zone, from the Ninth to the Fifteenth Century. (Byzantina et Slavica Cracoviensa V.) Cracow: Historia Iageiellonica, 2007, pp. 303-317.

⁴⁸ FONT, Márta. À la frontière du christianisme latin et orthodoxe La Galicie-Volhynie aux XIV^e -XV^e siècles. In *Specimina nova pars prima. Sectio Medievalis IV*, 2007, pp. 101-118. (Dissertationes historicae collectae per Cathedra Historiae Medii Aevi Modernorumque Temporum Universitatis Quinqueecclesiensis).

⁴⁹ ZOLTÁN, András. *Interslavica. Issledovania po mežslavianskim jazykovym i kulturnym kontaktam*. Moskva: Indrik, 2014, pp. 26-36.

⁵⁰ ŠČAPOV, Jaroslav N. *Drevnerusskie kniažeskie ustavy XI-XIV vv.* Moskva: Nauka, 1976, pp. 60-62, 125-127. FONT, Márta. Das Fortleben der Gesetzgebung der Kiever Rus' auf dem Gebiet der Ostslawen. In BÉLI, Gábor et al. *Institutions of Legal History with special regard to Legal Culture and History*. Bratislava – Pécs: University of Pécs, Faculty of Law, 2011, pp. 45-46.

⁵¹ FONT, Márta. Oroszország, Ukrajna, Rusz. Fejezetek a keleti szlávok történetéből. Budapest: Balassi, 1998, pp. 152-153. FONT, Márta – VARGA, Beáta. *Ukrajna története*. Szeged: JATE Press, 2006, pp. 95-96.

⁵² KŁOCZOWSKI, Jerzy. *Historia Polski do końca XV wieku*. Lublin: Instytut Europy Środkowo-Wschodniej, 2000, p. 139.

part of the Hypatian Chronicle, whose author was certainly also conversant with Latin written sources.⁵³ But the opposite is also true: composed at the end of the fifteenth century, Jan of Cracow's large-scale history tableau (*Annales seu Cronicae incliti regni Poloniae*) displays knowledge of works written in Slavic, among them the early twelfth-century material referring to Halych.⁵⁴

Slavia Ortodoxa

With the Bulgarians we can truly speak of Byzantine influence, although a debate broke out in the middle of the ninth century as to whether the Bulgarians had taken up Christianity from Rome or Byzantium. The name of the summary of the multi-layered argument is "The Bulgarian Question" (*Questio Bulgarica*),⁵⁵ in the background of which extended a complex system of power and politics relations. The debate, which was primarily taken up by the Pope in Rome (Nicholas I) and the Patriarch in Constantinople (Photios) came to an end with both the Bulgarian ruler and the organisation of the church adopting Byzantine Christianity. Slavic literacy soon appeared, built upon the foundations laid by Constantine-Cyril and Methodius, the "Enlighteners of the Slavs".

As a result of the followers of Methodius, St. Clement of Ohrid⁵⁶ and St. Naum having to leave Moravia, as well as the activities of Angelariy, Christianity took on an increasingly "Bulgarian" form. This can be stated despite the appearance of Bogumilism among the Bulgarians in the mid-tenth century.⁵⁷ The cultural radiation from the "literary centres" of Ohrid and Preslav also became determinant in the other regions where the liturgy took place in Slavic, and its importance would only be rivalled with the later influence of the monasteries on Mount Athos.⁵⁸

Christianization by the Kiev Rus took place at the end of the tenth century.⁵⁹ The Byzantine Church leant upon the already long tradition of conversion in the Slavic tongue, and made use of it in the course of the Moravian mission as well as of Old Slavic literature that had emerged in the Bulgarian territories. Because of the southern character of Old Slavic (Old Bulgarian), from the aspect of the Eastern Slavic language (and literacy) it is customary to speak of the influence of South Slavic.⁶⁰ Later, in the fourteenth century, when the land of the Balkan

⁵³ FONT, Márta. Magyarok a Kijevi Évkönyvben. (Szegedi középkortörténeti könyvtár 11.) Szeged: Szegedi Középkorász Műhely, 1996, p. 22.

⁵⁴ LIMONOV, Jurij A. Russkie istočniki Jana Długosza po istorii Kievskoj Rusi. In *Problemy istorii feodal'noj Rossii*. Leningrad, 1971, pp. 76-81.

⁵⁵ MAGYAR, István. „Questio Bulgarica” a kereszténység felvétele Bulgáriában. In *Századok* 1982, roč. 116, č. 5. pp. 839-879.

⁵⁶ OBOLENSKY, Dimitri. *The Byzantine Inheritance of Eastern Europe*. London: Ashgate, 1982, № III., pp. 149-154.

⁵⁷ FINE, ref. 30, pp. 171-179.

⁵⁸ OSTROGORSKY, Georg. Byzantium and the South Slavs. In *Slavonic and East European Review*, 1963, roč. 42, p. 8.

⁵⁹ FENNELL, John. *Russian Church to 1448*. London–New York: Longman, 1995, pp. 20-34. POPPE, Andrzej. *Christian Russia in the Making*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007, 362 s.

⁶⁰ LIHAČEV, Dmitrij Sz. *Oroszország kultúrája a reneszánsz hajnalán*. Budapest: Gondolat, 1971, pp. 35-116. THOMPSON, Francis J. „Made in Russia”. A Survey of the Translations allegendy made in Kievan Rus'. In *BIRKFELLNER, Gerhard (hrsg.). Millennium Russiae Christianitatis*.

Bulgarians and Serbs fell under the Ottoman yoke, more than one made their way from the Balkans to Muscovite Rus, taking leading ecclesiastical positions. Lihačev has called this the “second southern Slavic influence”, although this has been refuted by the American Henrik Birnbaum.⁶¹ The influence of Byzantine literature in the Orthodox territories did not extend to passing on Antique works, the reason perhaps being the sharp separation among Byzantine cultural levels. “The overwhelming part of the literacy, literature, and spiritual life of the medieval Bulgarian, Serb and Russian peoples was formed under Byzantine influence, but neither in the early phase, nor later, in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, when Byzantine influence was at its height, did either Ancient Greek or Byzantine Classicist works reach them. And this despite the high esteem in which the classic tradition was held in Byzantium itself during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, at the time of the Palaeologan Renaissance.”⁶²

In the tenth century Latin conversion also reached both the Kiev Rus and the eastern half of the Balkans, but left no trace in either place. Neither did efforts at unification, on the daily agenda from the thirteenth century, bring the two cultures closer. Beset with political problems, Byzantium leant toward acceptance of the union, but by that time the eastern Slavs’ own brand of Christianity had become so entrenched that the Russian Orthodox Church was not willing to compromise. Thus, Antique traditions, which had been transmitted via the Latin language in the regions where Latin held sway, truly did not reach the regions where Slavic language(s) were used. In Russia it can only be observed from the time of Peter the Great. For this reason there are no grounds for the use of the term “renaissance”, and although both Byzantine and Slavic literary history recognise and use it,⁶³ its meaning is literally “rebirth” / “recovery”. And Bulgarian literary history attaches the notion to a much later, eighteenth-century phenomenon.⁶⁴

Early Modern Cross-cultural phenomena The “White Russian Attila”

The Hungarian humanist and clerk Miklós Oláh (1493-1568) was in the 1510s held a post as secretary in the royal Hungarian chancellery, later entering the service of the Hungarian king Louis II (the Jagiellon). After the defeat at Mohács in 1526, he followed the widowed queen’s court to the Netherlands; between 1531 and 1542 he lived in Brussels. From 1543 he was in the service of Ferdinand

Tausend Jahre Christliches Rußland 988–1988. Köln – Wien – Weimar: Böhlau, 1993, pp. 295-354.

⁶¹ BIRNBAUM, Henrik. The Balkan Slavic Component of medieval Russian Culture. In BIRNBAUM, Henrik – FLIER, Michael S. (eds.). *Medieval Russian Culture*. Los Angeles – London: UCLA, 1984, pp. 3-30.

⁶² KAPITÁNYFY, István. *Magistra Gentium. Bizánci hatások a középkori Magyarországon*. In *Hungaro-Byzantina. Bizánc és a görögség középkori magyarországi forrásokban*. Budapest: Typotex, 2003, p. 53. MEYERDORFF, John. *Byzantium and the Rise of Russia*. Cambridge: University Press, 1981, 326 pp.

⁶³ ANGAR, Mabi – SODE, Claudia. *Byzanz*. Köln: DuMont Verlag, 2010, pp. 95-96. LIHAČEV, ref. 60, pp. 35-116.

⁶⁴ GJUZELEV, Vassil. *Bulgarien zwischen Orient und Okzident. Die Grundlagen seiner geistigen Kultur vom 13. bis zum 15. Jahrhundert*. Wien – Köln – Weimar: Böhlau, 1993, pp. 263-267.

and achieved the highest ecclesiastic Hungarian rank, that of Archbishop of Esztergom, also becoming Chancellor. During his stay in the Netherlands he wrote two works: *Hungaria* and *Athila*. The former is a geographical description in the humanist spirit, while the latter is a summary of medieval tradition, fed upon the oral traditions of the various German peoples (the Song of the Nibelungs, Edda) coloured by the imagination of the chroniclers. When writing *Athila* he also used other humanist historical works.

The original *Athila* manuscript is lost; it appeared in 1568 in Basel attached to Bonfini's work on Hungarian history. Shortly after, in 1574, it appeared in Cracow in Polish under the title, *Historia spraw Atyle Króla Węgierskiego*, and then in around 1580 a Belarusian translation was made. Neither the Polish nor the Belarusian translation provides the author's name, but only that of the translator. The Polish poet Cyprian Bazylik (c.1535 – after 1591) translated it into Polish,⁶⁵ but the Belarusian translator is unknown. The text, translated from the Polish, has survived in a manuscript known as the *Poznanski sbornik*, in the company of two Western European chivalric tales translated from Serbian (Tristan and Bovo D'Antona). The codex was probably copied in Vilnius, as its style shows an affinity to the language of the Old Belarusian/Old Ukrainian chancellery.

Bazylik's Polish translation has survived in a single copy, it can't have been too widespread; moreover, the beginning is missing, as becomes evident when compared with the Latin original. The Old Belarusian text is intact, but essentially is not a translation but a rewriting of the Polish text in the Latin alphabet into Cyrillic for readers unable to read Latin letters. Changes appear in the text: here and there Polish words are exchanged for Belarusian ones. Bazylik's Polish translation – that is, the content of the text – was made popular when Maciej Strykowski used it in his later, extremely popular work, *Kronika polska, litewska, zmódzka i wszystkiej Rusi*. Strykowski further mingled the text: he inserted the origin of the Huns into the history of the Lithuanians, believed to be Roman and borrowed from Jan Długos, thereby further compiling and extending it.

The popularisation of Miklós Oláh's work in Poland and the lands under Polish rule was much contributed to through the Hungarian István Báthory's occupation of the Polish throne between 1576 and 1586. Clearly this was why Attila became "king" of the Huns in the Polish translation. While it is true that Bazylik's translation was done in 1574, and Báthory only became King of Poland two years later, his candidature had already been put forward at the time of the 1572-1573 interregnum. Certainly it was in the interest of those of the Polish nobility who supported him that the Transylvanian prince be made popular. Of this we have only indirect – linguistic – evidence: in describing Attila's facial features Bazylik digresses from the Latin original, while the text is "tailored" to Báthory's true external form, something that can be examined in depictions of Báthory.⁶⁶

⁶⁵ ZOLTÁN, András. Oláh Miklós Athila című munkájának XVI. századi lengyel és fehérorosz fordítása. Nyíregyháza: Nyíregyházi Főiskola, 2004.

⁶⁶ Ibidem, pp. 17-19.

An early eighteenth-century description of “The Crowns”

In 2013 an interesting publication was issued with contributions from Hungarian and Russian authors under the title, “*A koronákról*”: egy XVIII. század eleji kézirat, az orosz-magyar kulturális kapcsolatok dokumentuma (“About the crowns”: an early eighteenth-century manuscript, a document on Russian-Hungarian relations).⁶⁷ A description of the manuscript, which is preserved in the Kazan University Library, had already been made in 1850 (it was published in 1882, as well) but for a long time it failed to attract the attention of scholars. In 2009 Margarita E. Byčkova came across it and initiated its publication. First Byčkova looked upon the manuscript as being connected with and part of a line of such known manuscripts as the “Titulyarnik” of 1672 or Lavrentiy Khurelich’s “Genealogia” from the 1670s. More thorough study of the manuscript revealed that it was a translation. Endre Sashalmi and Márta Font have established that the manuscript is based on *Commentatio Historica de Coronis*, a work by a Hungarian author from the Saxon community in Transylvania, Martin Schmeizel, written in 1712. It was with this work that Schmeizel gained his magister degree at the University of Jena. The dating now refined, it becomes possible to set the manuscript in a row of ideological propagandistic acts which were to prepare Peter I to take up the title of emperor. Most of these were carried out in the 1710s.

The translator, unknown to us, was a person who was equally knowledgeable of the thinking of the tsar’s court – more precisely, the title of emperor and the tsar receiving it – and scholarly works written in Latin. We can surmise that this was an intellectual, attached to Peter’s court, who embodied Peter’s “opening up” to Europe. In all events it is certain that he discovered the work of the Transylvanian Saxon, Martin Schmeizel. Of the 237 pages of the Latin treatise, the translator selected 51; that is, he abridged but did not fundamentally alter the structure of the work. “After more penetrating investigation it can be stated without doubt that the Russian manuscript is nothing other than a simplified version of Schmeizel’s work, but where the original 237 footnoted pages were written with academic precision, this has no concrete referencing (although sometimes its content is word for word) and is written for “daily use” and to a practical end.”⁶⁸

In the Latin text the section about the Hungarian crown comprises a separate, twenty-six-page unit at the end of the work: *Discursus peculiaris de origine et fatis sacrae, angelicae et apostolicae regni Hungariae Coronae*. It is worth noting that, taking ratio into account, the translator shortened this somewhat less than the rest of the work as a whole. It translated, practically in full, the papal demand for a Hungarian crown and its rebuttal. The anti-papal tone of the rebuttal surely met with agreement in the Orthodox-minded translator and his hoped-for readership. However, the tone of the anti-papal reasoning is not of Orthodox inspiration, but has remained within the thought patterns of the Transylvanian Lutheran Schmeizel and of the authors whose works Schmeizel had taken from.

⁶⁷ BYČKOVA, Margarita E. et al. „A koronákról”: egy XVIII. század eleji kézirat, az orosz-magyar kulturális kapcsolatok dokumentuma. Moszkva – Pécs: Institut Rossijskoj Istorii RAN–Pécsi Tudományegyetem, 2013.

⁶⁸ SASHALMI, Endre. Az orosz nyelvű kézirat forrása, a kézirat keletkezésének feltételezett körülményei és politikai jelentősége. In BYČKOVA, ref. 67, p. 40.

The depiction of the Hungarian crown in the Russian manuscript is taken from Schmeizel, who had taken it from Péter Révay,⁶⁹ and which is the most precise contemporary illustration. The Hungarian crown is in a different place in the Russian manuscript than in Schmeizel's work: not at the beginning of the "separate booklet", but at the end of the second chapter describing the crown. The part about the Hungarian crown – which the translator took practically word for word – was compiled not by the translator but the Transylvanian Saxon author of the Latin text. Of him, however, it is no surprise that he knew nearly every work about the Hungarian crown, for in the seventeenth century the fate, preservation and concept of the crown were much discussed by the Hungarian elite. Writings on the Holy Crown by some of them were known widely in Hungary and, via those published and distributed in German territories, throughout Europe.

Conclusion

Literacy in medieval Christian Europe was characterised by Latin-Greek linguistic and cultural differences. Everywhere the vulgar tongue differed from the written language. At first, in the Latinist world, Latin was everywhere the language of writing, but there were local variants to Latin. In the territories where neo-Latin languages were spoken, elements from the vulgar Latin also appeared in written texts with increasing frequency. In Central Europe local variants of Latin formed, but was infiltrated by elements of the spoken language (today we would say the vernacular). We encounter few linguistic relics written in the vulgar tongue, but only a part of these are translations. In France chronicles written in Old French are already appearing in the twelfth century, first translated from the Latin, then written in the original, with or without a Latin translation. In German territories in the thirteenth century the *Sachsenspiegel* appeared, translated from Latin into the Westphalia dialect. The earliest Central European writing on a secular theme is the *Dalimil Chronicle*, written in Old Czech in the early fourteenth century.

From the beginning we find translation literature in the regions of the Orthodox Christian world inhabited by Slavs, where the early practice of *triglossia* was superseded by the raising of Slavic into liturgical use. This was followed by translation of Greek liturgical texts and later of chronicles. These translations were not as a rule entire texts, but excerpts, and texts of varying origin were copied into collections.

In Central Europe the appearance of the spoken tongue in literature became considerable, yet not exclusive, with the Reformation. The language of science remained Latin (see the above examples). From the sixteenth century translation can also be observed on the borders of Latin and Orthodox Christianity, which is borne out by the fate of the Latin *Athila* and the manuscript about the crowns.

Words: 8558
Characters: 57 873

⁶⁹ RÉVAY, Péter. *De sacrae coronae regni Hungariae ortu, virtute, victoria, fortuna, annos ultra DC clarissimae brevis Commentarius*. Augsburg 1613.