

PAWEŁ LATOSZEK*
WNHiS UKSW, Warszawa

ŚWIĘTOŻYZNA – PRESUMED WIFE OF ŚWIĘTOPEŁK I

One of more mysterious figures in the history of early medieval Slavdom is Świętożyzna, a woman, who is considered to be the first wife of the Moravian prince Świętopełk. The most credible source providing information on her is the historic manuscript, the Gospel Book of Cividale. Researchers associate the indicated character with the information on the nameless Czech princess, who was abducted during the attack of Franks on Moravia in 872¹.

The only researcher who went to so much trouble to connect the two aforementioned persons was Lubomír E. Havlík². The Polish historians dealing more broadly with the history of the so-called Great Moravia, such as Henryk Łowmiański in a monumental work about the beginnings of Poland, describing its history as the first Slavic State predating us in its transformations, were satisfied with defining her as a rather non-identified person³. Nor did Krzysztof Polek, the main Polish researcher studying the indicated subject in Poland, attempt to connect the woman with the imminent strengthening of the relations between the Moravians and Czech *regnum*, even though he was the only serious researcher to say that she was the daughter of *one of the local princes*⁴. Gerard Labuda on the other hand, making at one time references to the Czech dependence on Moravia in the second half of the 9th century, completely disregarded the fact that the aforementioned woman could marry Świętopełk⁵.

The present article aims at considering the actual possibility of linking the two references and the most probable origin of the abducted girl, taking into account the relations between Moravia and Bohemia.

* Translated by Spektra Sp. z o.o.

¹ L.E. Havlík, *Velká Morava a středoevropské Slované*, Praha 1964, pp. 135, 230 and n.

² Ibidem; Idem, *Kronika o Velké Moravě*, ed. 3, Brno 2013, p. 187; Idem, *Svatopluk Veliký, král Moravanů a Slovanů*, Brno 1994, pp. 51, 64 and n.

³ H. Łowmiański, *Początki Polski. z dziejów Słowian w i tysiącleciu n.e.*, vol. 4, Warszawa 1970, p. 404. The source [...], on the other hand, tells us with satisfaction about the Germans who robbed the wedding procession of a certain Czech princess going to Moravia: it is hard to tell whether the bridegroom was, as is supposed, Świętopełk himself [...].

⁴ K. Polek, *Państwo wielkomorawskie i jego sąsiedzi*, Kraków 1994, „Prace Monograficzne Wyższej Szkoły Pedagogicznej w Krakowie”, No. 183, p. 44. 5 Vide: G. Labuda, *Studia nad początkami państwa Polskiego*, vol. 2, ed. 2, Wodzisław-Śląski 2012, pp. 75-78.

⁵ Vide: G. Labuda, *Studia nad początkami państwa Polskiego*, vol. 2, ed. 2, Wodzisław-Śląski 2012, pp. 75-78.

1. Szventazizna from the Gospel of Cividale

The Gospel Book of Cividale is a historic manuscript coming from the turn of the 6th and 7th centuries; it contains the Gospel of St. Mark, which in the Middle Ages was regarded as an autograph, thus it was treated as a relique at that time. The book was written in uncial script; it belongs to one of the oldest preserved gospels. In the 13th or 14th centuries, 7 fonds of the gospel were taken out of the book, two of which were given to Charles IV in 1354 in Aquileia, and these are still in Prague today, while the remaining 5 were in 1420 brought to Venice and placed in Cividale⁶. However, it is not the feature due to which the code is most known.

The names of pilgrims to one of the Aquileia monasteries in the 9th and 10th centuries, where the code was kept, were written on the free space of the code cards. Hence the book is otherwise referred to as the Codex Aquileiensis. Those records are in disarray; many have been written by the pilgrims themselves or a local scriptor, some of them have been probably written at the request of persons who had never visited the monastery. The lion's share of them comes from the second half of the 9th century; it includes the names of Longobards, some Frankish rules, and what is most interesting, the names of Slavic origin⁷.

There are about 350 Slavic names from the Western and Southern Slavic regions⁸. Among the persons authenticated in other sources which are more famous, one can find the family of Bulgarian rulers: Borys-Michał, with sons, or the records of the names of the princes of Świętopełk from Moravia; Rościsław, Prybina and Kocel⁹. There is also the name of a certain Świętożyzna (*Szventazizna*) placed next to the name of a man, a certain Przeclaw (*Predezlavus*) [fol. 4]¹⁰, and what is interesting, the figure is probably mentioned in the Annals of Fulda (*Annales Fuldenses*) as the oldest son of the Moravian prince Świętopełk¹¹; moreover, next to them, the indicated historic manuscript contains the name of the Moravian ruler himself (as: *Szuentiepulc*)¹². The aforementioned characters appear together in another source, namely in *Ordo ducum vivorum cum coniugibus et liberis*, where next to the name of Świętopełk (*Zuuentibald*) we can find again the name of a certain Świętożyzna (*uuengizigna*)¹³. The researcher, who dealt primarily with the subject, Lubomír E. Havlík, thought that it was only a presumption that it could be the name of the first wife of Świętopełk¹⁴. However, taking

⁶ A. Wędzki, *Kodeks z Cividale*, in: *Mały słownik kultury dawnych Słowian*, ed. L. Leciejewicz, Warszawa 1990, p. 177; A. Gieysztor, *Ewangeliarz z Cividale*, in: *Słownik Starożytności Słowiańskich*, vol. 1, p. 2, ed. W. Kowalenko, G. Labuda, T. Lehr-Splawiński, Wrocław-Warszawa-Kraków 1962, p. 462 and n.; K. Szczepkowska-Naliwajek, *Relikwiarze średniowiecznej Europy od IV do początku XVI wieku*, Warszawa 1996, p. 35.

⁷ A. Gieysztor, op. cit., p. 463; V. Novak, *Latinska paleografia*, Beograd 1954, p. 111 and n.

⁸ Cf. e.g. T. Lehr-Splawiński, *Działalność Konstantyna i Metodego a Słowaczyna*, „Rocznik Słowistyczny” 16/1948 p. 1, p. 129.

⁹ A. Gieysztor, op. cit., p. 463; vide: F. Sławski, *Ewangeliarz z Cividale*, ibidem, p. 463.

¹⁰ *Evangeliarum de Cividale*, in: MMFH, vol. 3, Brno 1969, p. 332. In literature see: L.E. Havlík, *Kronika o Velké Moravě*, p. 187; Idem, *Svatopluk Veliký...*, p. 64 and n., K. Polek, op. cit., p. 61.

¹¹ Vide: *Annales Fuldenes* a. 896, in: MGH SS rer. Germ., vol. 7, ed. F. Kurze, Hannoverae 1891, p. 132. *Priznolawo quodam Sclavo duce*. See below, ref. 47.

¹² *Evangeliarum de Cividale*, p. 332; W. Swoboda, Świętożyzna, in: *Słownik Starożytności Słowiańskich*, vol. 5, ed. G. Labuda, Z. Stieber, Wrocław-Warszawa-Kraków-Gdańsk 1975, p. 591.

¹³ *Liber confraternitatum vetustior*, in: MGH Necr., vol. 2, Berolini 1904, p. 12, col. 30, v. 5.

¹⁴ Vide: L.E. Havlík, op. cit., p. 64 and n.; Idem, *Velká Morava a středoevropsí Slované*, p. 135, 230 and n.

into account the juxtaposition of her and his son Przeclaw, one may surmise as credible that it is the name of his mother, and the wife of Świętopełk.

It is worth noting that the later wife of ŚwiętopełkI, not better confirmed by sources, was probably the daughter of Carloman – Gisela, married when peace was established with her brother Arnulf in 885¹⁵; she appears only in the Annals of John Aventine living at the turn of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. Therefore, having established that the name from the aforementioned gospel belonged to the first wife of the Duke of Moravia, not according to a hypotheses but all likelihood, let's concentrate on the information about their marriage.

2. The nameless Czech Princess of 871

The Annals of Fulda inform about a certain event that took place in 871 after a convention held by Louis the German in Frankfurt, when the indicated king sent the Bavarian army under the command of Bishop Arn and Count Rudolph to the Czech border because the Slavs at that time intended to attack Bavaria. The Czechs laid an ambush for the invaders in a heavily fortified camp at the exit of a strait where anyone trapped person was to die; then the narration moves to Moravia:

Interea Sclavi Marahenses nuptias faciunt, ducentes cuiusdam ducis filiam de Beheimis; quod cum suprandicti viri, id est Arn et [alii], qui cum eo erant, comperissent, ilico armati adversarios sequebantur. illi autem fugientes ad vallum memoratum ignari venerunt; ibique propter (angustiam) loci [angustiam] equis et armis derelictis vix nudi evaserunt. nostrates vero supervenientes DCXLiiii equos cum frenis et sellis atque eiusdem numeri scuta, quae fugientes dimiserant, invenerunt; et haec nullo resistente tollentes ad castra laeti reversi sunt¹⁶.

Let's start by saying that the aforementioned events constitute one element of a longer story we are pleased to know from the Annals of the monastery in Fulda regarding the crisis of power which affected the Great Moravian State in the years 869-874. The writer called Meginhard made a note in the year 869 that the King Louis the German divided his army into three separate units each of which was directed against a different group of Slavs. 1) the king himself, commanding Franks and Alemans, was to defeat Rościsław 2) Carloman was to set out with the Bavarian army against Świętopełk, 3) whereas Louis the Younger with the troops of Thuringii was to fight with Rościsław¹⁷. Dušan Třeštík believes that it was the matter of dealing with a number of minor incidents but the main intention was to remove Rościsław¹⁸. However, when the army was ready, Louis the German fell ill, so his unit was headed by Charles the Fat, who arrived with the army at Mikulčice¹⁹, he did not besiege the castle but only burnt the surrounding villages and fields. Carloman did the same

¹⁵ *Ioannis Aventini Annales Boiorum*, lib. IV, cap. XIX 27, in: MMFH, vol.1, Pragæ – Brunæ 1966, p. 366; L.E. Havlík, *Svatopluk Veliký...*, p. 64; Idem, *Kronika o Velké Moravě*, p. 235.

¹⁶ *Annales Fuldenses*, a. 871, p. 75.

¹⁷ *Ibidem*, a. 869, p. 68

¹⁸ D. Třeštík, *Powstanie wielkich Moraw. Morawianie, Czesi i Europa Środkowa w latach 791-871*, transl. E.H. Kaczmarek, Warszawa 2009, p. 268, 270. Perhaps the conflict had been growing for a long time and the princes simply used the situation to throw Rościsław off the throne. Vide: K. Polek, op. cit., p. 42.

¹⁹ L.E. Havlík, op. cit., ps. 167 and n.; Z. Váňa, *Świat dawnych Słowian*, transl. A. Kroh, Warszawa 1985, pp. 59, 66.

with the rulership of Świętopełk, and then the East-Frankish princes grouped together and congratulated themselves on the victory²⁰. Interestingly, no army was sent against the Czechs, as the researchers noted,²¹ which may indicate that the Slavs from the Czech Basin did not constitute a significant threat yet.

At that time, as the logic suggests, probably negotiations were held between Świętopełk and Carloman as regards the ceding of power to him after the fall of Rościsław²². According to the note made by Meginhard regarding the next year, which was 870, we are provided with information that the first one had surrendered his duchy to Carloman, for which Rościsław, angry with his nephew, prepared an ambush for him, inviting him to the feast. Świętopełk was warned in time. The uncle went to meet his nephew and then was captured by him, tied and given back to Carloman²³. The next year's record shows that the Bavarian army captured and put Świętopełk to prison but the Moravian Slavs thinking that their prince was dead, chose a certain Sławomir, who was a priest, to be their prince (*princeps*). He took over the leadership under threat²⁴, after which the rebellion in Moravia started for good. Simultaneously, an attempt was made to prove the fault of Świętopełk, however, in the face of escalated rebellion he was justly released, and then he was assigned a large group of Bavarian warriors to help him defeat Sławomir²⁵. When Świętopełk encamped near Mikulczyce, and Sławomir handed over power to him in a *regnum*, the first one attacked a poorly guarded Bavarian camp, together with a team stationed in the town and then the Franks were slaughtered²⁶.

The indicated events are followed by a description of the attack on the suite of our Czech princess. We learn from it that the suite was robbed of weapon abandoned by the fleeing Slavs and over 600 horses. The previous sentence describing the event, namely sending of a Bavarian unit to the Czech borders informs us: 1) that it is a continuation of events associated with the depicted crisis, 2) shortly afterwards, the Czechs appear in the indicated sequence of events for the first time, against whom king Louis did not deign to send a separate army then. The next year provides us with information that the king sent an army consisting of Thuringii and Saxons against the Moravians; however, they dispersed without a ruler accompanying them, after which the Franks made a pile, kidnapping many Slavic women and horses, while in the meantime soldiers were sent from France to help, against whom several Czech princes had to fight and those were: Świętosław, Wityśław, Herman, Spitymir, Mojsław, and Borzywoj as the sixth²⁷. It is worth noting that in the indicated war the Czechs

²⁰ *Annales Fuldenses*, a. 869, p. 69.

²¹ D. Třeštík, op. cit., p. 269; K. Polek, op. cit., p. 41. There was peace in Bohemia at that time concluded in 869 between Bohemians and Carloman, after the attack on Bavaria (H. Łowmiański, op. cit., p. 403).

²² H. Łowmiański did not agree with this view (Conf. Ibidem, p. 347).

²³ *Annales Fuldenses*, a. 870, p. 70 and n. Some sources report that Rościsław was first to be poisoned by Świętopełk, however, he happily escaped the danger (*Legenda Chrystiani, Vita et passio sancti wenceslai et sancte Ludmille ave eius*, cap. I, w: FRB, vol. 1, ed. J. Truhlář, Praha 1873, p. 201). It is known that Rościsław was judged and sentenced to death but Louis changed the penalty to a life sentence in a monastery.

²⁴ *Annales Fuldenses*, a. 871, p. 73.

²⁵ Ibidem, a. 871, p. 73 and n.

²⁶ Ibidem, a. 871, p. 74. From the inscription under year 884 (*Annales Fuldenses*, a. 884, p. 110.) one can find out that Comes, Wilhelm and Engelszalk, against who Sławomir fought, died at that time as well.

²⁷ *Annales Fuldenses*, a. 872, p. 75 and n. *Iterum quidam de Francia mittuntur Karlmanno in auxilium contra Sclavos supradictos; alii destinantur contra Behemos. zuentislan, witislau, Heriman, Spoitimar, Mayslan, (Gori-*

are on the side of the Moravians, undermining the peace given to Carloman in 869. Some of the enemies drowned in the Vltava River, while those who could escape, disappeared in the cities. Then the stolen valuables were returned to the Czechs, and at the end of the events connected with the attack on Bohemia the author underlined that the expedition was led by Archbishop Liutbert, and those who were sent to help Carloman, bishop Arno and Abbot of the Fulda Monastery, Sigihard, although fought bravely and were supposed to defeat the enemies, most often ordered their people to retreat²⁸. The only problem appearing at this point is the recollection of Borzywoj (Goriwei) only in one text edition of *Annales...*, namely, in the Schlettstadt code from the beginning of the 10th century. Moreover, after the addition he becomes the sixth of the princes, which does not agree with the correct numbering in both editions because there should be only five of them²⁹. The matter can be explained solely by means of a hypothesis that in the first edition his name was added later and on the margins, while the second edition was drawn up before Borzywoj was added to the first edition³⁰. It does not change the fact, however, that he probably took part in the aforementioned fights.

3. The problem of closer relationships between Great Moravia and Bohemia in the light of the sources

Bearing in mind that the Czechs on the side of Moravians appear in plural after the preparations to marriage mentioned under year 871 (apparently not only, probably, the ruler of Moravia had the marriage with a Czech Slavic woman in his plans) should, on the one hand, not cause any doubts because marriages in the Middle Ages constituted one of the best ways to establish political agreements, e.g. alliances. On the other hand, however, it is strange that the fact we are interested in did not appear in the aspect of a settlement reached by the Slavs. We learn more about the closer relations from the monk Kristian – Strachkwas, the son of Bolesław I, from his *Legend* written by him in the second half of the 10th century. *Vita et passio sancti wenceslai et sancte Ludmille ave eius*, whose oldest known copy comes from the codex drawn up for Bishop Jan of Dražice in the years 1329 – 1342, is of course a hagiographical text which, with great historical interest,³¹ pictures inter alia the beginnings of the Přemyslid Dynasty in terms of the legitimacy of their power in the Czech Basin. We will be interested in fragments related to the person of the aforementioned Borzywoj, with whom a certain problem is associated since the primary foundation for the work of Kristian was an anonymous legend *Crescente fide*, and only the Czech edition (out of two well-known editions – Czech and Bavarian) mentions Borzywoj as the first Bohemian ruler, the second mentions Spitygniew. The Bavarian edition is older and was written in the monastery of St.

wei, cum magna [maxima] multitudine sibi rebellare nitentes (Dei auxilio freti) in fugam veterunt et alios quidem occiderunt, alios vero (vulneraverunt. [...]).

²⁸ Ibidem, a. 872, p. 76.

²⁹ G. Labuda, op. cit., p. 75; H. Łowmiański, op. cit., p. 404, said after F. Palacký, that the writer not knowing who was really meant, replaced the proper letter 'B' with 'G', hence it must be Borzywoj, known from the *Kristian's Legend*.

³⁰ G. Labuda, op. cit., p. 75, ref. 62. D. Třeštík (*Počátky Přemyslovců*, Praha 1981, pp. 77-79) explained it in another way that it was a mechanical mistake made by the author, later corrected by him. After K. Polek, op. cit., p. 50 and n.

³¹ A. Kuźmiuk – Ciekankowska, *Święty i historia. Dynastia Przemyślidów i jej bohaterowie w dziele mnicha Krysztiana*, Kraków 2007, pp. 12, 26.

Emmeram in Regensburg between 974 and 984; the Czech edition, was written in Bohemia as a supplement made to the original edition with additions coming from local traditions. The information concerning the marriage of Borzywoj with Ludmiła is derived by Kristian from the *Fuit*³² legend probably written down by him as well. However, the origins of the pieces of information on the history of Cyril and Methodius and the baptism of the first one are not clear.

Let us quote here what we know from the son of Bolesław I about closer relations between Bohemia and Moravia. Kristian – Strachkwias wrote that when the power over the castle town of Prague fell to Borzywoj, *he went to the prince or the king Świętopelk in Moravia, by whom he was kindly received and invited, together with the others, to a feast. However, he was not assigned a seat or a place among the Christians but following the custom of pagans he was asked to sit on the floor under the table. Then Bishop Methodius sympathising with him in the injustice, as it is said, spoke to him. Methodius asked him why, being such an eminent person, he was more willing to lie on the ground together with pigs because of the godless worship of idols? Then he asked in reply: «How [much] would I suffer for this kind of dangerous thing or what good things would the Christian ritual bring to me?» Bishop Methodius answered: «If you shalt renounce idols and their demons, though shalt become master of thy lords and all thy enemies shall be subject to thy dominion and thy seed shall multiply daily, as great a river as possible, into which rivers of various streams flow.» Borzywoj said: «and if it is the way this thing is, what is preventing me from being baptised?» «nothing» – bishop answered [...]*³³. After that Methodius taught him in the Christian faith, the Bohemian prince together with thirty of his companions fasted and afterwards all of them were baptised; then a clergyman Kaik, who was set in St. Clement's Church in Levý Hradec³⁴, was assigned to them by Methodius.

The events from the second story took place probably soon afterwards the abovementioned ones. Kristian broadly discussed the situation which occurred in Bohemia after the baptism of Borzywoj; The Czechs believed that he abandoned the old customs of fathers and accepted the unknown customs of Christianity *so they rioted against him, [...] and hounded him abroad and even intended to kill him; and thus, [when] the prince learned [about it], he left them and returned to the king Świętopelk, or Bishop Methodius in Moravia*³⁵. His place was taken by a

³² Ibidem, pp. 28-30, 36.

³³ *Legenda Chrystiani...*, cap. II, p. 202. *Hic cum excellentissime forme et egregie iuventutis flore nitesceret, quodam tempore negotii sui populique sibi commissi causa ducesum vel regem zuentepulc Moravie adit, a quo benigne suscipitur et ad convivium pariter cum reliquis adsciscitur. Verum sessionis ei locus inter Christicolos minime conceditur; sed ritu paganorum ante mensam pavimento iubetur insidere. Cuius presul Metudius iniurie condolens, fertur dixisse ad eum: Ve, inquit, quod tu talis tantusque haut erubescis a principalibus repelli sedibus, cum et ipse in fascibus ducatum obtineas, sed magis cupias ob nefandam ydolorum culturam cum subulcis humotenus incubare. At ille: Quid, inquit, ob huiuscemodi rem pericli pacior vel quid boni michi conferet Christianitatis ritus? Si, inquit presul Metudius, abrenunciaveris ydolis et inhabitantibus in eis demonibus, dominus dominorum tuorum efficiaris, cunctique hostes tui subicientur dicioni tue et progenies tua cottidie augmentabitur velut fluvius maximus, in quo diversorum confluunt fluenta rivulorum. Et si, inquit Borivoi, res se ita habet, que mora est baptizandi? nulla, inquit pontifex [...].*

³⁴ Vide: A. Wędzki, *Levý Hradec*, in: *Mały słownik kultury dawnych Słowian*, ed. L. Leciejewicz, ed. 3, Warszawa 1990, p. 208; L. Leciejewicz, *Słowianie zachodni. z dziejów tworzenia się średniowiecznej Europy*, ed. 2, Wodzisław Śląski 2012, p. 142; H. Lowmiański, op. cit., p. 418.

³⁵ *Legenda Chrystiani...*, cap. II, p. 203. *Que cernens perfidus chelidrus, propriis armis sumptis antiqua bella repetit. Populum cunctum Boemorum in furem principis accendit, eo quod paternos mores relinqueret et novam atque inauditam sanctitatis legem Christianorum arripere. Surgunt adversus eum uno animo eademque sententia*

man named Stojmir, who was once banished and thus became so much Germanised that the Slavs could not communicate with him. The supporters of Borzywoj and traitors – the allies of Stojmir, finally came to an agreement that they would meet in the field behind Prague and it was there that they were to decide about their future actions. Both groups, however, were secretly dressed in armour under their clothes and brought with them hidden weapons to be used when the negotiations did not meet their expectations and were to murder the opposing party at a given signal. They did not come to an agreement during the meeting and the signal was given. Let's change! Those who were on the side of Borzywoj knew about the trap and killed their opponents³⁶. Afterwards, they hurried to Moravia, brought the previous king [and] restored him to the place of [his] property³⁷.

The closer relationship between Moravia under the reign of Świętopełk and the Slavs under the rule of their prince Borzywoj, in the light of the *Legend...* is clearly described. After the visit at the court of the Moravian ruler and his baptism, the latter hid against the supporters of paganism at the court of his stronger ally³⁸. The sources of the indicated information presented by historians were different; [...] *nowadays most researchers point to the fact that our author used the Bulgarian tradition here because the way in which Kristian presented the fate of the Slavic mission is reflected in Bulgarian sources from the first half of the 10th century. However, there are also opinions that Moravian parts of the Kristian's Legend were taken either from the Roman tradition (Kristian was in Rome in 992), or from the tradition of Great Moravia that survived in Bohemia. [...]*³⁹ Of course, the saints depicted by Kristian became a pretext to relate the history. The figure of Constantine (Cyril) is referred to in his work to tell the story of the common tradition of the Slavs, i.e. the letter written by him, just as it is in *the Novel of the years which had passed*. When it comes to the issue of Borzywoj's baptism, not only Methodius is meaningful. Świętopełk himself is significant as well, after all, the act of conversion takes place at his court, under his patronage, so it is him who introduces him to a Christian community and it is his court that becomes a shelter during the Stojmir's rebellion⁴⁰. What is important, the relations of Kristian cannot be confronted with any other source, including *the Life of Methodius*⁴¹, who

suisque eum a finibus perturbare conantur, seu eciam vitam auferre moliantur. Quo agnito princeps sese ab eis removet rursusque regem zuentepulc seu pontificem Metudium Moravie repetivit.

³⁶ Ibidem, p. 203 and n.

³⁷ Ibidem, p. 204. *Moravie dehinc properantes, pristinum ducem reducentes, loco proprio restituunt.*

³⁸ It is worth noting, however, which Latin equivalents of the word 'prince' are provided here for Świętopełk and Borzywoj. The latter is not referred to as dux, but solely as princeps, i.e. the first from among the Czechs something like a tribe ruler, while Świętopełk acts as a 'king' (regem); it displays their mutual relationship, they were not equal princes (as duces), but the Moravian ruler clearly stood higher in the hierarchy of the Slavic rulers.

³⁹ A. Kuźmiuk – Ciekawska, op. cit., p. 37. Among other things, due to the appearance of the figures of Constantine (Cyril) and Methodius in the manuscript, its authenticity was questioned because no traces of continuing the tradition of the work of the Apostles of Slavs in Bohemia after the fall of the Great Moravia were found. A. Kuźmiuk – Ciekawska, (ibidem, p. 25) clearly stated that *the issue of the existence or non-existence of Slavic liturgy and literature in Bohemia cannot be a decisive criterion of truthfulness [...]. The author of our legend does not mention anywhere the existence of the Slavic liturgy in Bohemia contemporary to him and the fact that he writes about it with great affection may result from various reasons. His disquisition on the Moravian history is an ideological construction created for the purposes of the work [...].*

⁴⁰ Ibidem, pp. 131, 137 and n. See also: A. Paner, Przemysłodzi. *Od Borzywoja i do Przemysła ii Otokara. Ludzie i wydarzenia w latach 872-1278*, Gdańsk 2008, p. 38 and n. See: information on the Czech prince available in L.E. Havlík, *Svatopluk Veliký*, 54 and n.; Idem, *Kronika o Velké Moravě*, p. 200, as a Moravian governor.

⁴¹ K. Polek, op. cit., p. 51; H. Łowmiański, op. cit., p. 410.

does not mention such an event but we cannot doubt, that it is a historical fact, since the very act of prince's conversion from the hands of Methodius is confirmed, although at a bad date, by the oldest bohemian annals⁴².

The researchers investigating the problem tried to establish the dates of the aforementioned events; although the discrepancies in literature were very large, certainly the act of baptism had to take place prior to the year 885 and their earliest possible date is considered to be 870, with a tendency to adopt rather early years⁴³. Additionally, other impacts of higher-lying Moravia on the Bohemian lands are pointed out, for example the discovery of a number of objects of Moravian origin from Stary Kouřim⁴⁴. The closer relations between Bohemia and the Great Moravia can be clearly seen at the Forchheim Convention⁴⁵.

4. The probable origin of Świętożyzna and conclusions

It is necessary to return to the main character of the present work at this point – Świętożyzna⁴⁶. The closer relationship of the Moravian State with the Slavs from the Czech Basin was clearly depicted above, and taking into account the story from the *Annals of Fulda* regarding the attack on the wedding conduct, it may be assumed that the girl was saved and that the marriage took place. I would like to remind that Przeclaw is a figure evidenced in sources⁴⁷,

⁴² Kolejno: *Annales Pragenses*, a. 894, in: FRB, vol. 2, ed. J. Emler, Praha 1874, p. 376. *Hoc anno baptizatus est Borivoi, primus christianum in Boemia* [...]; *Annales Bohemicae*, a. 894, ibidem, p. 380. *Borzivoy, dux Boemie, baptisatur a Methodio* [...]; *Annales Gradicensis et Opatovicenses*, a. 894, ibidem, p. 386. *Borivoi est baptizatus* [...]. The year 894 is also given by Cosmas from Prague: *Cosmae Pragensis, Chronica Boemorum*, lib. I, cap. XIV, in: MGH SS rer. Germ. N.S., vol. 2, Berolini 1923, p. 32.

⁴³ A. Barciak, *Chryścianizacja Czech w obrządku łacińskim*, in: *Chryścianizacja Polski południowej. Materiały sesji naukowej odbytej 29 czerwca 1993 roku*, Kraków 1994, „Rola Krakowa w dziejach narodu”, ed. J.M. Małecki, No. 13, p. 33; K. Polek, op. cit., p. 51; D. Třeštkík, op. cit., p. 85. Conf. H. Łowmiański, op. cit., p. 415.

⁴⁴ A. Barciak, op. cit., p. 27.

⁴⁵ Vide: *Annales Fuldenses*, a. 874, p. 82 and n.

⁴⁶ In a popular-scientific book by W. Chrzanowski (*Świętopełk i wielki. Król wielkomorawski (ab. 944-894?)*, Kraków 2008, p. 69 and n.), the author stated that she could not have been the daughter of Borzywoj, as *the sources would have reported, such a significant event with [his -] participation*; Lucani or Zlicani were considered an option. Lucani were the enemies of the Czechs at that time, so the author decided that she was the daughter of the Duke of Zlicani. However, I must make some accusations at this point against the author, even though he wrote the work about the reign of Świętopełk, the work itself is far from being perfect because he is not a historian. It is especially seen in the description of the aforementioned events. 1) The mention from the *Annals* is ... wrongly juxtaposed with the events of the year 872, although the date of the attack on the suite of the Czech princess is clearly defined in the source of the yearbook type. I do not know why the author did so but it is an unacceptable error. 2) Not using original sources, e.g. while quoting the *Legend of Kristian*, he cannot state what type of prince Borzywoj was and therefore it is hard to agree with him that he had to be mentioned by the sources. There are more such shortcomings in his biography of Świętopełk; I underline in the main text why Zlicani and Lucani should be excluded.

⁴⁷ Przeclaw is rather correctly identified with the oldest son of Świętopełk in today's literature. Suffice it to say that the emperor Konstantin Porfirogeneta provided us with clear information, that the Moravian prince had three sons (Konstantyn Porfirogeneta, *De administrando imperio*, cap. 41, in: *Testimonia najdawniejszych dziejów Słowian. Seria Grecka*, z. 3, *Pisarze z V – X wieku*, Warszawa 1995, „Prace Słowistyczne” 103, p. 451.), but as was underlined by K. Polek, the Frankish sources know only two: Mojmir II and Świętopełk II, nevertheless, when the historian was doing his work it had already been suggested that the third one could be Predslav (K. Polek, op. cit., p. 61; MMFH, vol. 3, p. 398). The final conclusion is drawn due to I. Panic (*Ostatnie lata wielkich Moraw*, Katowice 2000, „Prace Naukowe Uniwersytetu Śląskiego w Katowicach” No. 1847, pp. 149-151, 154), that he was in fact the third son of Świętopełk, most likely the ruler of Pocis after his death who in 896 surrendered to the care of king Arnulf; see above, ref. 11.

and by the figure's juxtaposition in the Gospel of Cividale with the name of the woman other than Gisela one may draw a very probable conclusion that Świętopełk had previously had another wife. In the light of the available information the name Świętożyzna can be easily associated with a young woman from the attacked conduct.

The marriage of the girl and the Moravian ruler was the first stage on the way to a closer relationship between the two countries. Bohemia was to be finally subordinated to Świętopełk, according to the information provided by the chronicle of Abbot Reginon of Püm in 890⁴⁸.

Lubomír E. Havlík, as I mentioned above, was the only person to associate her with the Moravian ruler but he couldn't connect her more closely with one Czech prince known to us⁴⁹. We can only think about the possible origin of the heroine because in the period we are discussing at this point, the Czech basin is depicted as *a group of small political units*⁵⁰. Apparently, the Frankish sources do not provide us with knowledge on the existence of several units of power in the Czech Basin, because both the basin and the Slavic people living there (regarded in the light of the indicated sources as a homogeneous ethnic group), were called by a common name *Bohemani, Bohemi* etc.⁵¹ The princess of 871 is also defined as *ducis filiam de Behemis*. Hence, the difficulty. Probably the number of territorial units, which concentrated over time, is expressed by the number of the Czech princes appearing in the Annals of Fulda: there are 14 of them mentioned under the year 845⁵², there are only six in 872⁵³, finally there are only two in 895 – Spitygniew and Witzl⁵⁴, whereby Spitygniew is the son of Borzywoj, the second one is the ancestor of the Slavník dynasty⁵⁵. Following this trail, there are six of them in 871 but the direction is wrong; Henryk Łowmiański correctly assumed that *the source does not claim that those were all Czech princes at that time [...]*⁵⁶.

⁴⁸ *Reginonis abbatius Prümensis Chronicon*, a. 890, in: MGH SS, vol. 1, ed. G.H. Pertz, Hannoveræ 1826, p. 601. The closer relations between Bohemia and Moravia are also displayed in Thietmar. Vide: *Thietmari Merseburgensis episcopi Chronicon*, lib. VI, cap. 99, in: MGH SS rer. Germ. N.S., ed. R. Holtzmann, vol. 9, Berolini 1935, p. 393.

⁴⁹ L.E. Havlík, *Svatopluk Veliký...*, p. 51. *Jakýsi syazek mezi některými z nich [Świętosław, Wityslaw, Herman, Spitymir, Mojsław – P.L.] a Moravou naznačuje sňatek dcery tohoto knížete r. 871, patrne přímo ze Svatoplukem.*

⁵⁰ L. Leciejewicz, op. cit., p. 142.

⁵¹ G. Labuda, *Czesi*, in: *Słownik Starożytności Słowiańskich*, vol.1, ed. W. Kowalenko, G. Labuda, T. Lehr-Splawiński, Wrocław-Warszawa-Kraków 1961, p. 303; H. Łowmiański, op. cit., p. 396.

⁵² *Annales Fuldenses*, a. 845, p. 35.

⁵³ *Ibidem*, a. 872, p. 76.

⁵⁴ *Ibidem*, a. 895, p. 126.

⁵⁵ H. Łowmiański, op. cit., p. 397; G. Labuda, *Spitygniew*, in: *Słownik Starożytności Słowiańskich*, vol. 5, ed. G. Labuda, Z. Stieber, Wrocław-Warszawa-Kraków-Gdańsk 1975, p. 361; A. Paner, op. cit., p. 38 and n. It depends on the source interpretation to decide whether we want to see the supreme authority in the Czech Basin in the two figures, it says exactly that all (omnes) Czech princes stood in front of Arnulf, of which *primore erat Spitygniewo, witzla*. Anyway, it all went into the direction of the consolidation of power.

⁵⁶ H. Łowmiański, op. cit., p. 404. The echoes of the relations prevailing in the Basin lasted until the time when Cosmas wrote his chronicle; he quoted a list of as many as 8 predecessors of the Premyslid Dynasty (Cosmas Pragensis, *Chronica Boemorum*, lib. I, cap. IX, p. 21). He successively mentions Przemysł, Niezamysł, Mnat, Wojn, Unisław, Krzesomysł, Neklan and Gościwit. He mentions the father of Borzywoj – Gościwit, but in chapter 10 he wrote that under his predecessor, Neklan, there was a battle between the Czechs and the Lucani over the River Ohře; they were to be under the command of a certain Włościsław. The Lucanic people were defeated by the Czechs but he mentions two other tribes as well – Lemuzi and Litomeri, who were naturally inclined to consolidate with the Czechs. It is worth noting here that Cosmas reserved the name Czech (Boemos) for the territories near Prague, governed by the Premyslids. He left some trace of the means by which the Czech princes consolidated the lands of the Basin, and as the aforementioned Polish historian maintained, Cosmas took the story about the Lucani from

Kristian (Strachkwaz) himself provides us with little knowledge on the relations prevailing in the times of Borzywoj in the Czech Basin. At the beginning of chapter 3, recalling the father-in-law of the Czech prince he wrote that Sławibor came from the country (*pravincia*), province, called Pšov⁵⁷; he was the prince of Pšov⁵⁸. The Stodorans are also a Polabi tribe, so, besides the note, regarding the residents of Pšov, that the Basin was not consolidated, no additional data is available. However, Borzywoj does not appear as the prince of the entire Bohemia anywhere in Kristian's Legend. He is recalled only as the prince of a Czech province; hence we can deduce that he was one of many (?) 'tribal' princes in the Basin⁵⁹; he himself was probably the ruler in the territory that was its centre, which is indicated by the erection of the church by him on Levý Hradec, as well as by the dispute won by him over the reign in Prague itself⁶⁰. In conclusion, taking into account the broad outline I have presented regarding the issue of the establishment of close relationship between Moravia and Bohemia, I conclude that the nameless princess mentioned in 871 in the *Annals of Fulda* came from the Prague province of Bohemia, ruled by Borzywoj at that time. At best, given his baptism from the hands of Methodius, as well as his good relations with Świętopełk during the rebel of Stojmir, the possibility of finding a shelter at his court, we face a girl from a very close environment of Borzywoj, perhaps even his own sister (sic!).

The indicated conclusion, in my opinion, has its foundation in the substance of the sources because both the fact that the Frankish sources do not mention the events connected with the establishment of the relationship between Borzywoj and Świętopełk, as well as the way in which the information on the attack on the Czech conduct was included in the *Annals of Fulda*, display their common ground. The Franks could not make any mention on the stays of the Prague prince in Moravia, as there were no witnesses of the events from abroad (and couldn't be, taking into account the political situation created by Świętopełk after he had taken over the power⁶¹), who could report about it to the writer of the *Annals of Fulda*..., or even to the Abbot Reginon. These were the intra-Slavic issues tackling only the matters concerning 'Prague and Mikulčice'. The same refers to the attack on the wedding conduct. The fact that such a broad account was included in the *Annals of Fulda* is only a coincidence because they clearly state that Bishop Arno and Count Rudolph learned about the procession during the armed expedition and immediately started to chase the prince's conduct. The marriage concerned only the intra-Slavic matters, hence, the sister of Borzywoj may be taken into account here.

the tribal tradition that survived (Idem, *Plemiona*, in: *Słownik Starożytności Słowiańskich*, vol.4, ed. G. Labuda, Z. Stieber, Wrocław-Warszawa-Kraków 1970, p. 135.), however, I wouldn't rely too much on the data taken from the work of Cosmas. The same is true about Zlicani appearing only in the XIVth century in the *Chronicle* by Dalimil. (A. Paner, op. cit., p. 29, ref. 53).

⁵⁷ *Legenda Chrystiani*..., cap. III, p. 204.

⁵⁸ Vide: A. Wędzki, *Pszowianie*, w: *Słownik Starożytności Słowiańskich*, vol. 4, ed. G. Labuda, Z. Stieber, Wrocław-Warszawa-Kraków 1970, p. 414.

⁵⁹ H. Łowmiański, *Początki Polski*, p. 412; A. Paner, op. cit., p. 38.

⁶⁰ More detailed information on the territory in which Borzywoj established his regnum is provided by A. Paner (ibidem, p. 42).

⁶¹ K. Polek, op. cit., p. 46; H. Łowmiański, op. cit., p. 348 and n.; D. Třeštík, *Powstanie wielkich Moraw*, p. 276.

Świętożyzna presumed wife of Świętopełk I Summary

One of the most secretive persons in early medieval Slavia is Świętożyzna. Because her name appears in the Gospel Book of Cividale beside the name of the Moravian prince, she is considered to be his wife. She is also identified with anonymous bohemian princes, whose wedding conduct was attacked by Franks in 872. The Author of this paper tries to connect references of Świętożyzna and find approximate place of her origin including political contacts between Great Moravia and Bohemia in the second half of IXth century.

Keywords: Great Moravia, Świętopełk I, Świętożyzna, Gospel book of Cividale, Slavia

About the author: **Latoszek Paweł** – born in 1991 in Warsaw. He studied History in the Institute of Historical Sciences at Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University in Warsaw, where he wrote his Master's thesis on the influence of Great Moravia on Polish lands at the turn of the 9th and 10th centuries under the guidance of Fr. prof. Waldemar Graczyk. He deals with the topics of early medieval Slavdom, the origins of European countries on a daily basis.