

## THE SLAVS IN THE BYZANTINE EMPIRE

The Slav invasion and settlement of the Balkans can be divided into three phases. During the first, covering the first half of the sixth century, the Slavs were still based north of the Danube but kept up a constant pressure of raids across the river, which yielded them plunder, slaves and bribes to remove themselves. They were behaving much as other barbarian peoples before them and the Byzantine authorities reacted predictably. There were as yet few attempts to make permanent lodgements south of the Danube. The events of this half-century are treated in Prokopios's Gothic War. A few landmarks must suffice here. The wide-ranging movements of the Getae in the North Balkans from 517 may have brought Slavs in as contingents in their armies. Prokopios alludes to a large-scale Slav raid on Thrace about 527. In the 530s there were further substantial incursions and in the 540s massive raids, which at one moment menaced Constantinople itself. In 547-8 a great offensive reached the Adriatic coast and devastated Dyrrachium (Durazzo). In the 550s the Imperial City was again menaced; this time the Slavs were strengthened by Kutrigur Turks.

As usual, the Empire made some attempt to tame the barbarians by attracting them as mercenary contingents into its armies and employing them on other war fronts: as early as 536-7 we find a record of such Slav mercenaries fighting against the Ostrogoths in Italy. This was an important method of rapid if superficial civilisation,<sup>a)</sup> and though the barbarian military units might remain pagan as long as they preserved their unity, they saw the civilised world and gained some inkling of Christianity, while some of their officers were soon converted as a necessary step in their careers. Germanic barbarians had done exactly the same.

Such acts of ambitious individuals had naturally no effect on the main mass of the Slavs still outside the Empire. The first steps towards general

- a) It is probable that some of the earliest Latin loanwords in Slav are due to these mercenaries since Latin was the language of the Byzantine army down to and including Justinian's time. *Cesari* is an obvious example, perhaps also such military words as *ceta* (*buinta*, *centa* = target) and *duska* (< *discus*). The usually suggested Gothic intermediate step is not necessary.

Conversion may only be expected to follow a favourable political and military situation when the barbarians realize that the adoption of the civilised way of life is the best way to hold on to and expand the advantages which they have already wrested from their opponents; and the regulator of civilised life, as of their own, is religion.

The earliest records of such Slav officers accepted into Byzantine military service come at the beginning of the second phase, which cover the second half of the sixth century. By then permanent settlement south of the Danube had been made and enough was known by the Slav about the Empire to make the capture of a great port such as Thessaloniki (Saloniki) a definite, if as yet remote, aim. The historian Agathia records three undoubtedly Slav names of officers employed, presumably with their own contingents, on the Persian front: Vsegord, Svarun and Dobrojezda. This was in 555. It is evident that Dobrojezda's son, Leontios, was a Christian. They were Slavs from the north-west shore of the Black Sea, known to the Greeks as Antai. (a)

Before the death of Justinian in 565 a new factor was added. The Avars, incited by the Byzantine government to attack the Slavs in the rear, established themselves in their turn in the former Hunnic lands. They were a Turkic people, more warlike than the Slavs. (b) Their military might was based, as always among nomads, on cavalry and they succeeded in imposing their rule, at least transitorily, on many of the more peaceable Slavs. Under their leadership, and notably from the reign of Justin II (565-78) under their great military commander Bajan, the severity of the invasions increased. Sometimes the Slav penetration were attempts to escape the clutches of the Avars, sometimes Slav formed the mass of troops under Avar command. A large-scale invasion of Greece led by a Slav in 577/8 seems to have been of the former kind. The Byzantine provinces immediately south of the Danube must be assumed permanently lost by about this time, their sees abandoned and their population subject to the new pagan overlords. Justinian, who prided himself on his alliance with the Antes against other Slavs by adopting the by-name *Antikos*, did his best to protect Macedonia, the centre of Balkan communications, by strong new defences along the

- a) To what extent the Antai or Antes were predominantly Slav or (more probably) mixed with other peoples such as Iranians cannot be entered into here. The name Antai is attested in Byzantine use from c. 550 to c. 630, after which it disappears, evidently with the loose federation which it denoted.
- b) The Avars who settled in Europe probably had no right to that name. There may have been a Mongol element in their blood but their language was apparently Altaic.

Danube, but in vain; he had to move the civil capital of Illiricum back from Sirmium in Pannonia to Saloniki. Sirmium was destroyed by the Avars in 582. It could be seen in retrospect that to allow the militaristic and less adaptable Avars to manipulate the Slavs, who were potentially sedentary settlers and valuable as such, was an irreparable mistake. Thereby the Slavs' adoption of Orthodox civilisation was certainly delayed.

The last two decades of the sixth century show a rapid decline in Byzantine resistance. On the one hand the barbarian pressure continued to increase, especially as the Avars were now always enemies. On the other, the Empire was increasingly endangered from the 580s by the recrudescence of Persian power. Constantinople's position at the hub of communications, equally accessible from all points of the compass, though an overwhelming economic advantage, was a recurrent military weakness. The heart of the Byzantine Empire - Asia Minor - had to be defended at all costs from eastern enemies. But equally the approaches to the capital and to Saloniki, the second city of the Empire, from the north and west had to be guarded. The Slavs owe their permanent lodgement in the Balkans at least partly to the fatal division of Byzantine power between two fronts. By the 580s they reached the point of being able to lay siege to the city of Saloniki, sometimes with Avar help. The most serious of many such attempts to take the city came in the early seventh century: a siege in 612 is recorded in an inscription in the church of St Demetrios, the patron saint of the city; and others followed in 614-16 and about 618. The *Miracles of St Demetrios* show that by this time the most favourably placed Slavs had already adopted much of the Byzantine art of war. Slavs are reported in the Peloponnese in the 580s. It is evident that by 600 all the country north of Saloniki was virtually lost to the Empire and that the penetration of peninsular Greece followed at once.

The third phase therefore runs from the beginning of the seventh century. The Emperor Maurice's last half-hearted attempt at maintaining the Danube as the frontier of the Empire was abandoned by his successor Phokas. Slav settlement reached its peak in the North Balkans. Heraklios had to abandon Greece in order to save Asia Minor from the Persians; the major part of his Balkan troops had been withdrawn in 602/3 and transferred to the Eastern Front. In 617 a combined Avar and Slav attack on the Imperial City was beaten off; in August 626 it was threatened by Persians from the one side and Slavs from the other.

Further Slav attempts to reduce Saloniki continued to be made till the end of the seventh century but in the main it was now a question of how much territory the Slavs could occupy permanently in face of only local and inferior Byzantine resistance. Peninsular Greece and the Peloponnese gradually filled up. The islands were not beyond Slav attention: a large expedition to Crete took place in 623. This implies considerable occupation of the Peloponnese already.

Justinian's proud new metropolitan see, Justiniana Prima, which he had erected at his alleged birthplace, (a) can scarcely have continued to exist except in shreds and patches. To create it he had detached from the Vicariate of Saloniki all the lands to the north and west of the new town, from the Sirmium district of Pannonia to the South Dalmatian province of Prevalitana. It is thought that the towns of Justiniana Prima Ulpiana (modern Lipljan) and Nissa (Nis) must have been abandoned by the end of Heraklios's reign. They fell to ruin since the Slavs were not yet interested in urban life. Like the Germanic peoples faced with Roman towns, they saw them as 'walled tombs'. Justiniana Prima is last mentioned in 602.

Once again the Byzantine Empire received an unexpected and dangerous blow. No sooner had Heraklios got the better of the Persians than the armies of Islam suddenly erupted out of the Arabian peninsula. The Persian Empire was rapidly overwhelmed. Syria was lost to the Byzantine Empire first (from 634); attacks on Asia Minor began in 647 on Cyprus in 649. By the 660s Constans II despaired even of defending the capital. But control of the sea just tipped the scales in Byzantine favour, as neither the Slavs nor the bedouin Arabs were maritime peoples, though the latter early appreciated the value of Syrian and Egyptian skill at sea. The first great Arab blockade of Constantinople took place in 674-8; the Slavs immediately made further ineffectual attacks on Saloniki. The last Arab attempt to win the Imperial City came in 717-18. From that date the Byzantine Empire regained confidence that it could hold its own against Islam and a certain stability in the East was slowly re-established. (b)

Small wonder that little attention could be given to Greece in the

- a) It is now identified with the ruins at Carichin Grad, some 6 km. from Lebane (S.W. of Leskovac in Serbian Macedonia).
- b) So also in the West. After the Moslem conquest of the Iberian peninsula from 711, Charles Martel's victory over the Saracens in France in 732 marks the limit of their attempts at expansion into Western Europe. The Carolingians shortly afterwards went over to the counter-attack but the Byzantine Empire's offensive against Islam scarcely got under way before the second half of the tenth century.

seventh century. Byzantine historians provide little information on the extent and organisation of the new Slav areas of settlement. Throughout the seventh and eighth centuries effective Byzantine rule, secular and ecclesiastical, scarcely reached beyond the seaports to which the Greeks tenaciously clung, except in a limited part of Central Greece, Saloniki, Patras, Nauplia, Monemvasia, Corinth (with the great fortress of Acrocorinth) remained Greek; the interior was left to the barbarians. As farmers the Slavs wanted land but they were often prepared to use land which had been less attractive to the resident population - marsh and forest. (a) The fact that the Byzantine writ hardly ran outside the maritime towns does not imply that the interior of Greece was emptied of Greeks. In the Peloponnese it is probable that the Greek peasant population still outnumbered the infiltrating Slavs at least till the middle of the eighth century. When the Emperor Constantine Porphyrogenetos wrote, in the middle of the tenth century, that all Greece 'became Slav and was lost to civilisation', he was not thinking of proportions of blood.

Here and there Byzantine institutions survived even in the interior of the Balkans. It is known for example that the garrison and population of Serdica (modern Sofia) held out for a long time in the middle of a Slav sea - possibly until its capture by the Bulgarians in 809 - but the town gradually dwindled till it was no more than a village round the church of the Holy Wisdom; hence the modern name. Even such small Greek centres may have exerted an influence on the surrounding Slavs quite out of proportion to their size; but the silence of history does not allow us to follow the process.

The social organisation of the Slavs during the centuries of immigration appears to have been still largely tribal *sensu lato*. To them would still apply Prokopios's term *birokratia*, implying the communal responsibility vested in the tribal council or *veche*. But the sixth and seventh centuries must have given rise here and there to a more powerful military aristocracy. Fluctuating supra-tribal combinations came into temporary being when a capable war-leader could impose himself. Thus five tribes concerted in the siege of Saloniki in 614-16 under a common

- a) Some of these bad lands must in fact have been created by the ravages of the Slavs themselves and their Avar partners. Pillage and enslavement on top of sheer destruction produced at least in parts of the Balkans those depopulated wastes such as are frequently bewailed in Western sources after the passage of various Germanic peoples, especially in the fifth century (*loca invia, solitudines*). The Vandals were among the worst devastators.

commander. But there is little sign that the process of settlement led to larger units stable enough to become a new stage in social development. The 'great family', no doubt similar to the institution preserved almost to our own times in the *zadruga* of Serbia and Montenegro, was the social unit. This system allowed the Slavs to intermingle with existing populations, taking advantage of less favourable parcels of land. Thus in contradistinction to many other areas colonised by Slavs, no strong political organisations arose in Greece such as could in due course become foci of resistance to hellenization.

The density of Slav settlements in Greece was also far from even; study of Slav place names suggests that the western parts both of peninsular Greece and of the Peloponnese received or retained a dense Slav population than the eastern. Over 500 Slav place names are still identifiable in the area Epirus-Acarmania-Aetolia, only some 300 in the larger area Thessaly-Attica. Similarly in the Peloponnese there are about three times as many Slav place names in the western as in the eastern half (Argolis, Laconia). As is to be expected, the absolute figure for Macedonia is very high indeed.

Byzantine hold on Greece reached its lowest ebb about the year 700. The Empire became resigned to the disaster. Its own political instability and the armies and fleets of Islam were capable of destroying it; the Slavs did not seem such a formidable menace. They were on a par with the Goths and might in fact, if a little tamed, provide that extra military manpower as mercenaries which was so urgently needed. As with the Goths, their loyalty would no doubt be precarious, but it was better than nothing. The Byzantine government was thus now quite glad to accept Slav colonisation of certain areas where they might act as buffers against further barbarian incursions. Moreover it early practised deliberate transportation of Slavs to depopulated regions where they could be peacefully hellenized and drawn on for manpower - for instance the transfer of considerable numbers under their own chiefs to Bithynia in 658 and 688/9. Perhaps Constantinople had similar hopes of the Bulgars who were admitted into the Dobrudja in about 679 and soon dominated all the Slavs of that region. But in the event Bulgar rule over Slavs was to be a greater menace to the Byzantine Empire than that of the Avars.

Slav Greece may be said to cover the period 600-860. It is difficult to say what the Byzantine Empire considered its effective northern frontier to be in the seventh-eighth centuries. Macedonia was certainly

lost. Kastoria (in present-day Greek Macedonia) apparently remained in Byzantine hands but probably little to the north of it. Thrace up to the Balkan range had to be held at all costs.

Full of Slavs though Greece might be Constantinople never considered it irretrievably lost. So gradual was the process of recovery that few events were recorded before the end of the eighth century. The creation of a *Theme* is the sign of the effective reimposition of Byzantine administration. The Theme of Thrace, on the doorstep of the City, was organised as early as the reign of Justinian II (658-95), soon after the settlement of the Bulgar horde, that of Macedonia (Western Thrace, centred on Adrianople) not till the end of the eighth century, following the successful pacificatory campaigns of Stavrakios (783) under Empress Irene. A *Theme* of Saloniki became practicable not later than 836.

The Slavs of northern Greece were, for strategic and economic reasons, of more immediate concern: any spread of Bulgarian power had to be countered. The campaign of 783 repeated the work of Constantine V in 758, who also resettled in Bithynia a large number of Slavs restive under Bulgarian aggression. The policy of protecting and encouraging the loyalty of the Slav peasantry can be observed also in some clauses of the *Farmers' Law* which probably took form as early as the end of the seventh century. But peace was always precarious. The habit of raiding, two centuries old, was always liable to break out afresh: a typical case is noted in 768 when Constantine V had to ransom Christian prisoners taken by the Slavs on various North Aegean islands.

Yet in an empire where hellenization counted far above racial origin an Imperial career was now open to any enterprising Slav. By the eighth century - and patently in the ninth - this process must have gone far. It is even asserted that the insignificant Iconoclast Patriarch Niketas (*fungebatur* 766-80) was a Slav, but the details of his career are unknown. (a) Thomas, a Slav of Asia Minor, became a prominent officer under the Emperor Leo (813-20). He attempted to avenge the murder of his patron by the usurping Michael II by a general revolt in which he himself was acclaimed as rival emperor. He is said to have drawn support from the as yet relatively uncivilised Slavs of the Peloponnese. The seriousness of the revolt was indirectly responsible for the occupation of undefended Crete by the Moslems in 827.

- a) It is quite plausible to accept a Slav derivation for the name of the prominent Byzantine family Rangavis, which provided an emperor in Michael (*regnabat* 811-13), though it is more probably Armenian.

The Peloponnese was still largely outside Imperial control. In about 807 a dangerous Slav attack on the city of Patras was heavily defeated - particularly dangerous in that Saracens were prepared to combine with the Slav land army in this enterprise. The Byzantine authorities were very sensitive to the danger of such an alliance. The Battle of Patras' was probably decisive in making the Peloponnese thenceforward accessible to rapid rehellenization; it was reorganised as a *Theme* not later than the reign of Michael I Rangavis.

By the middle of the ninth century further Themes of Strymon and Epirus had been set up, perhaps expansions or conflation of what had earlier been called *αρχοντια*, (arkontia) a) that is, a province predominantly inhabited by Slavs under special administration. The *Theme* of Strymon, centred on Serres, now linked those of Saloniki and Macedonia into a solid Byzantine reacquisition. The increase in tempo and urgency of Byzantine measures of rehellenization at this time was obviously motivated by the ever more formidable menace of the virtually Slav state of the Bulgars, whose ruler Krum had just defeated and slain the Christian Emperor himself (811). Slav tribes not under his direct rule were still liable to join his armies on campaign. *The Life of St Gregory the Decapolite*, who died in Saloniki in 842, provides a few sidelights. We learn that in the early decades of the ninth century - that is, when SS Cyril and Methodios b) were born in Saloniki - the Slavs living on the lower reaches of the Strymon were very active as pirates and no doubt still pagan. But the tide was now about to turn. Only a small area of agricultural hinterland remained in control of the city and therefore particular attention was paid to those Slavs who were a danger to its communications and food supplies. By 879 the evangelisation of these Slavs was well in hand; for Paul, Bishop of the Strymonians, a tribe which stood across the Bulgarian trade-route, and Peter, Bishop of the Druguvitai who, with the Sagudatai, occupied part of the rich plains to the west of the city, were signatories to the acts of the Council of Constantinople in that year. The Ezerites and Serbs of Macedonia also had bishops by 879.

Evangelisation necessarily started from the coastal cities which the Greeks held. We must suppose that the main source of missionaries was

- a) This is clearly what is meant by Knjahnije in VM 2-3, which Methodios was sent to govern at an early age: see p. 33.
- b) Cyril and Methodios were the monastic names of Constantine and Michael Q): see pp. 32 and 56 below.



Saloniki itself, together with such monasteries as may have survived here and there inland. Peoples admitted to permanent settlement 'within the Empire' - an elastic expression - were of course expected to show their gratitude by conversion and provision of manpower. As the Slavs everywhere formed only small compact bodies or were already intermingled with existing populations, there was nothing spectacular for historian to record. We hear of missionaries working among the Balkan Slavs in the seventh, perhaps even in the sixth century. An individual mission which evidently had some local success is suggested by the so-called *Legend of Saloniki* which has become attached to St Cyril-Constantine. It refers with a high degree of probability to the work of St Cyril of Cappadocia among the Macedonian Slavs in the valley of the River Bregalnica (a tributary of the Vardar) in the seventh century. The natural base for such work would have been Stobi, on the Vardar route between Saloniki and Skopje, which had not yet been reduced to ruins.

The rapid Christianisation of the Slavs in Greece from the middle of the ninth century is part of the great work set in train by Basil I and Patriarch Photios, which achieved the conversion of Bulgaria itself in 864/5 and was already reaching out to the Serbs north of Macedonia. Moreover, as much of the Balkan peninsula as possible was to be reclaimed for the Greek language. In most areas hellenization went *pari passu* with conversion. Only here and there can we detect a bilingual period: Slav-speaking Christians are indicated by such place names as *Γιαννακοβο* in Macedonia, *Αναστασοβα* and *Νικοβο* in the Peloponnese. By the end of the century the Slav language was almost everywhere extinct.

In the Peloponnese also Byzantine administration had been reinstated by and large by the middle of the ninth century; Byzantine money began to circulate again after long absence. The pattern of recovery was the same as in the north. The only known bishopric at the worst period (c. 680) was Corinth but even this may then have been an empty title. A probably recent see of Monemvasia is recorded in 787. In the ninth century Patras took the lead, being raised to a metropolis about 805. The metropolis of Corinth followed shortly after. Several saintly bishops are recorded in this century: Athanasios of Methone, Vasilaios of Lacedaimon, and in the tenth century Peter of Argos and an Armenian, St Nikon, who died in the Peloponnese about 998 after much work in Crete and among the Maniots.

Only gradually were the inland dioceses re-established all over Greece. It has been calculated that there were not above twenty-five all told down to the reign of Leo VI (886-912). Of these about ten were in the Peloponnese. By then only a few pockets of unabsorbed and probably still pagan Slavs remained in the less accessible mountains, for example the Ezeritai and Milingi of the Taygetos range. As late as the 920s Romanos I revised the taxes, or tribute, which they were paying. These and no doubt some other small clans were not absorbed into the Greek population for a long time. Their alien character was still obvious to the Frankish masters of the Morea in the thirteenth century, when William Villehardouin built castles to control them. Some were still distinct in the fifteenth century.

By the time that the work of SS Cyril and Methodios laid the foundation of Slav Orthodox culture among Slavs outside the Byzantine Empire, the population of the Empire itself had taken in a considerable proportion of Slav blood, whether in Thrace, Anatolia or Greece. This admixture, as in the case of the Armenians, cannot be exactly estimated but had its effect on the course of Byzantine history. But above all success in reimposing Byzantine rule virtually coincided with success in hellenization. Those regions were lost to Greek (or Latin) speech which had not returned to the Empire by the end of the ninth century - Bulgaria, Serbia and much of Macedonia. Later vicissitudes have not greatly altered down to the present day the new frontier then established between Greek and Slav speech. Peninsular Greece was one of the few areas where a large immigrant population of Slavs failed to impose itself. Little enough is known of their evangelisation; nothing suggests that Byzantine policy could favour the raising of their barbarous tongue to civilised use.

# The Balkan Slavs

## Bulgaria

The Bulgars - whose name is interpreted as 'mixed people-mixture'- part of a vast semi-nomadic horde speaking a Turkic language which ranged the steppes round the Sea of Azov in the fifth-seventh centuries, migrated under Khazar pressure from this 'Great Bulgaria' (as the Greeks called it) and reached the lower Danube about the year 660. The Byzantine government allowed, since it could not prevent, their leader Asparuch (Isperich) to bring them over the river and settle in the Dobrudja about the year 679. The next two centuries saw the gradual Slavisation of the Bulgars, the firm foundation of a state and its increasing penetration by the irresistably attractive culture of the Greeks.

Byzantine interest in this people and all its cousins on the steppes was of long standing: they were a possible menace to the security of the Empire, especially to its Crimean and Caucasian outposts. As early as 619, according to tradition, a Bulgar chieftain Kubrat (or Kovrat), who attempted to create a single Bulgar Empire of the steppes, was converted to Christianity as a friend and ally of the Emperor Heraklios. But this seems to have been a personal act without consequences for his subjects. Certainly none of his five sons, of whom Asparuch was one, was a Christian.

The conversion of Asparuch's successor Terbel (Tervel, 702-16?) is to be assumed. He was deeply involved in Byzantine politics in 704/5, helping the exiled Justinian II to regain his throne. For this he was rewarded with the high rank of Caesar and a daughter of Justinian's to wife; this surely implies baptism as a prerequisite. Again in 717/18 the Bulgarian ruler was of great service in defeating the last and most formidable Arab siege of the Imperial City. The full statehood of Bulgaria may be dated from 716 when a political and commercial treaty was made with the Empire. Strictly supervised trading by Bulgars in Constantinople and Saloniki was permitted from this time.(a) Byzantine policy entered a new stage: to civilise and Christianise this power on her

- (a) The old channels of trade had not wholly ceased to function via Byzantine ports on the Black Sea coast and less certainly on the right bank of the lower Danube. Towns far in the interior, such as Singidunum (Belgrade), Naissa (Nis) and Serdica (Sofia), which appear to a greater or lesser degree to have survived the disasters of the sixth century, may still have had some commercial importance.

northern doorstep, which was absorbing more and more of the Sclaviniae (nominally Byzantine territories settled by Slavs) in the North Balkans.

The sedentary Slavs in the regions closest to the Bulgar settlements, who now looked to the Bulgars for military protection and gradually became their subjects, were perhaps more amenable than the Bulgars to these new influences which closer relations with the Empire were to bring. These were the 'Seven Tribes' (a conventional number, not to be taken literally), evidently a Slav political unit in the making. In the early eighth century no Bulgar leader could afford, it would seem, to opt for Christianity in the face of the uncompromising attitude of the Bulgar military aristocracy which for the most part was stoutly maintaining its pagan traditions and steppe culture. Not till the apartheid between Bulgar and Slav at the higher social levels had been broken down - a process which remained slow down to 800 - did Bulgar exclusiveness lose its force. Up to that time it was only the occasional Bulgar in especially close relations with Constantinople who ventured on the decisive step of baptism. So Telerig (regnabat c. 772-7), who was converted when he fled into exile and, like Terbel, was graciously allotted a Greek wife by the Emperor Leo the Khazar. But altogether little is recorded of Bulgaria in the eighth century: the iconoclast troubles within the Empire were not favourable to missionary work outside and the second half of the century was filled with inconclusive hostilities. We may note in passing that this necessity for a constant watch on Bulgaria diverted Byzantine attention from Italy and contributed to the loss of Ravenna (751) and thus to a complete revision of Papal policy both towards the East and the West.

A new line of exceptionally able Bulgar rulers started with Krum (regnabat c. 803-14) whose assumption of the title Khngan announced him as heir to the Avar power recently broken by Charlemagne. (a) His sweeping conquests brought a considerable Christian population in the North Balkans for the first time under Bulgarian rule. He removed many Christian craftsmen into the interior of Bulgaria. Even quite high-ranking Byzantine officials and army officers appear to have remained, more or less voluntarily, in Bulgarian employ. Further, some Bulgarian prisoners-of-war, exchanged in the peace negotiations of 812, had been baptised in captivity.

- (a) Krum came of the Kutrigur Bulgars of Pannonia who had entered Europe in Justinian's reign and became more or less subject to the Avars from 567

As the military advantage now tended to lie with Bulgaria, so the penetration of Greek culture was the self-perpetuating Byzantine answer. Greek as the cultural language made considerable headway in Bulgaria from the beginning of the ninth century. Two now fragmentary Greek inscriptions recording Krum's crushing defeat of the Emperor Nikephoros (811) have survived; these must have been done to the orders of Krum himself. In his reign Bulgar and Slav reached approximate social and legal equality. The highest offices were now open to Slavs, witness Dragomir, his ambassador to Constantinople. There is reason to believe that Krum introduced a new code of laws for Bulgaria, more suitable for a now sedentary people than the tribal law of steppe nomads; this code may have been recorded in Greek. But in religious matters Krum was scarcely disposed to listen to the Greeks: he offered all Christian prisoners-of-war the alternatives of apostasy or death. No Greek was likely at this time to contemplate evangelisation of Bulgarians; the great barbarian war-leader who had brought Byzantine arms so low was an object of execration throughout the Empire.

Omurtag (c. 814-c. 831) had the wisdom to conclude a peace of thirty years on his accession.(a) The new southern frontier with the Empire was heavily fortified - the 'Great Fence'. Persecutions of Christians continued. Several bishops were martyred, including Manuel, Bishop of Adrianople, who had been deported to Bulgaria when Krum took that city.

Prisoners were forced to eat meat in Lent or suffer for their faith. The Byzantine authorities hastened to redeem as many as possible. These, it is curious to note, included the parents of the future Emperor Basil I (867-86); Basil himself was apparently born in Bulgaria. But it is permissible to suppose that the little we know of the treatment of Christians in Bulgaria under Krum and Omurtag is coloured by Byzantine hysteria. Both rulers may have been personally as tolerant as circumstances permitted.

In the generation of Omurtag's sons the Bulgar element was rapidly losing its identity in the Slav though the process was scarcely complete before the end of the ninth century. Two of Omurtag's sons adopted Christianity, of whom one lost his life in a persecution on the accession

- (a) Among Omurtag's surviving Greek inscriptions are two on columns, the one letel incorporated in the Church of the Forty Martyrs at Turnovo (built by John Asen II in 1230), telling of his glorious martial exploits and his new palace by the Danube; the other, now in the Sofia Archaeological Museum, recording the provieionr of the treaty with the Empire.

of a third son, Malamir, in 831 or 832. This may have been, however, the normal Turkish elimination of rival claimants; Malamir appears a relatively tolerant throughout his reign, though not himself a Christian.

The 830s were thus still a period of very tentative adoption of Byzantine ways and a reserved attitude towards the Byzantine religion - more so on the part of the Bulgars than of the Slavs. An inscription found near Philippi in Greek Macedonia, dating from the reign of Presjan, still uses the words Bulgar and Christian as opposites: a Christian meant Greek.(a) The adoption of Christianity must not be politically and socially disadvantageous. This was the problem before the exceptionally capable ruler who succeeded in 852 - Boris.(b) He saw that it was time to bring Bulgaria into the comity of Christendom; a proportion of his subjects, Greek and Slav, was already Christian. The Bulgar language was now virtually extinct; Bulgaria was a Slav state. In comparison with Rastislav of Moravia contiguity with the Byzantine Empire and the persistent infiltration of Greeks and Greek ways inevitably gave Boris's religious policy a far greater political content. Was it possible to make Bulgaria a Christian state without sacrificing its power and independence? He learnt that the polarity of secular power and spiritual authority invested in king and bishop, and at the highest level in emperor and patriarch, was the correct and only model of a Christian state. Given this, Bulgaria would take its place as a civilised country. But he also knew that all Orthodox dioceses had to belong to one of the Patriarchates, in his case manifestly to that of Constantinople, and that the Emperor of Byzantium was held to be the supreme *fidei defensor* of all Orthodox peoples. He was prepared to bargain his entry into the Christian world against some measure of independence for a Bulgarian church. The precise form of Christianity to be adopted was indifferent. There was still also a portion of the Bulgar aristocracy to be reckoned with, opposed to Greek and Christian ways.

His first overtures appear to have been made to Louis the German in 862. The two rulers met at Tulln on the Danube. Louis sought Bulgarian military help against his rebellious son Carloman and his Moravian supporters. Bulgaria had had a common frontier with Moravia since about 825 and contacts with the Franks for some years before that.

- (a) Cf. p. 246: a century later a similar situation between the Russians of Kiev and Constantinople produced the same usage.
- (b) Bulgar Bogor(is), thought to be cognate with Mongolian bogori = small. Boris is variously given as the nephew of Malamir (831-6?) or as Presjan's son. Some consider, probably rightly, that Presjan and Malamir are one and the same person, ruling 831-52.

The Franks were likely to remain conveniently distant allies rather than exacting neighbours. Byzantine reaction was swift and sharp. No extension of Frankish influence into Bulgaria could be tolerated; the spheres of influence agreed in 811 must stand. In this ecclesiastical and political needs were at one. The war which ensued in 863/4 ended in Boris's discomfiture. The peace terms imposed the rejection of the Frankish alliance and baptism into the Eastern church, which would undertake the further evangelisation of Bulgaria.

Boris was baptised forthwith by the Patriarch of Constantinople; the Emperor as godfather gave him his own name Michael. This took place in 864 or 865, though there is some disagreement in the sources. Boris's sister Maria may also have played a part: she had spent the greater part of her life in Constantinople and was completely hellenized. Later tradition that Methodios had some part in Boris's baptism can be ruled out: it is not supported by the biographies of Constantine or Methodios. There was also a territorial settlement which finally recognised Bulgaria's foothold south of the Balkan range (therefore called by them Zagorje, in Greek form Ζαγορη) - a situation going back to Terbel over a century before. Though a concession of weakness on the Byzantine side, with grave consequences for the future, it was no doubt the unavoidable *quid pro quo* for Bulgarian adherence to the Eastern church - the overriding necessity for Constantinople at this difficult moment. Boris had to crush a serious revolt of the remaining conservative Bulgar magnates at home, which nearly cost him his life and throne. But he steadfastly followed the principle of many later Slav rulers in seeing his duty in promoting what he believed to be right for his people.

But no sooner had Byzantine clergy gained a foothold in Bulgaria than it became plain to Boris that Constantinople contemplated nothing less than a stranglehold on the new Bulgarian church. A letter sent by Patriarch Photios in 865 made clear what Boris was well aware of - that Bulgarian bishops, all necessarily Greeks, would come under the Patriarch of Constantinople with all the political implications thereof. There was no promise of ecclesiastical autonomy; naturally Bulgaria was still eminently a missionary area. There was no likelihood that Bulgaria would be handled in similar fashion to Moravia; Boris was to be

a subservient Byzantine vassal. Consequently, in August 866 Boris made an approach to Pope Nicholas and perhaps again to Regensburg.

Nicholas wanted nothing better than to gain the obedience of Bulgaria. In 860 he had made another unheeded demand to the Emperor for the return of the former *Illyricum occidentale* and Sicily to his jurisdiction. His attention was shortly to be drawn to possibilities in Moravia. The tension between Rome and Constantinople was increased by the proffered prize of Bulgaria. It must be repeated that Boris, like Rastislav, was no doubt personally indifferent to the precise form of Christianity which he adopted. Even the most sincere and intelligent barbarian convert, among whom Boris can be numbered, could have no personal judgment in matters of theology and liturgy. But he is at once confronted with a multitude of practical difficulties in changing over his way of life to that of a Christian. He is unable to distinguish the essential from the inessential in the mass of prescriptions and rules thrust at him. He wants to know, in short, how little of existing customs need be changed; for enforcing change is the dangerous part. In answer to Boris's immediate difficulties of this kind Photios had sent him in 865 a long and elaborate disquisition in difficult Greek on the fundamentals of the Christian faith under the title 'On the duties of a prince'. Photios perhaps judged that it was the task of humbler men to deal with the 'trivialities'. Pope Nicholas did not so judge. He was aware of Boris's dissatisfaction. In a detailed reply to a long list of questions from Boris (November 866) the Pope gave his rulings on these things so important to a neophyte. These hundred odd answers, based partly on the instructions of Pope Gregory the Great to St Augustine for his mission to the English, are yet in no sense propaganda in favour of Rome. Greek practices which differ from Roman are not condemned as such, and none of them bear upon doctrine. Nicholas even corrects Boris's misunderstanding of certain Byzantine teachings. Conversely, Photios had not directly attacked Rome at any point in his recondite essay: to eradicate pagan practices and to know the duties and authority of a Christian prince was the burden of his message. Further, the Pope did not attempt to deny existing Byzantine rights: he merely pointed out that if Bulgaria was to come under Roman obedience the appointment of prelates would rest with the Holy See (answer to question no. 73). The granting of a Patriarch is put in its right perspective: all must be done in due order - first bishops, then a prelate of higher rank. Naturally the Roman view is adopted that the order of precedence of the



Patriarchates is Pome, Alexandria, Antioch, Constantinople, Jerusalem (nos. 92 and 93). In the last reply (no. 106) the Pope exhorts Boris to do nothing until he receives a bishop from him. Nicholas sent his replies by the hand of two bishops, Paul of Populonia and Formosus of Porto, with a mission for the conversion of Bulgaria. Louis had meanwhile sent his own mission under Bishop Hermanrich of Passau. The Pope delivered a direct snub to the Frankish church by causing Louis' mission to be expelled from Bulgaria (867). Hermanrich never forgave this slight. The Pope did not envisage the appointment of a Patriarch for Bulgaria; he could not even accede to Boris's wish to retain Formosus as bishop since such translations were not readily granted. It is clear that Boris was convinced that the best policy for his country's future was to extract the maximum of ecclesiastical independence from the offers made to him.

Constantinople had been greatly incensed by all Nicholas's actions, above all by his treatment of Photios and his interference (as it seemed to them) in Bulgaria. A Papal mission sent to Constantinople in spring 867 via Bulgaria was refused further conduct at the Imperial frontier unless the legates unreservedly acknowledged Photios, which of course they could not do. Relations were further exacerbated by the unavoidable raising of a dogmatic disagreement. As long as the addition of filioque to the Creed had been a local aberration of the Far West, not formally approved by the Papacy, Constantinople had been content to ignore it. But now Frankish missionaries had imported it into Bulgaria and Pope Nicholas supported it. To preserve an Orthodox Bulgaria Constantinople took the most serious possible step: Pope Nicholas was excommunicated (summer 867). At the same time Louis was conceded the Imperial title in the hope that he could thereby be detached from cooperation with the Pope. In the last months of 867 all the main actors changed: Basil ousted his protector Michael and at once (3 November) replaced Photios by Ignatios; on 13 November Nicholas I died. One of Pope Hadrian II's early acts was to secure some control of the Moravian mission. But he evidently thought that Papal influence in Bulgaria was secure enough without hastening to implement the appointment of an archbishop. In the early days of his pontificate he was much occupied with scandals in the church in Rome itself. He continued to temporise. Boris became impatient at the tardiness of Rome in dealing with his demands and

particularly by the refusal of both Nicholas and Hadrian to countenance the appointment of Formosus, to whom Boris had become greatly attached. The Byzantine authorities took full advantage of this and intimated that a suitable prelate would be granted by them without delay. In 869 Bulgaria swung back again into the Byzantine orbit. A council which sat in Constantinople from October 869 to February 870 - the VIIIth Ecumenical Council in Western reckoning - formally placed Bulgaria under the Patriarchate of Constantinople in an extraordinary session on 4 March 870, which the Papal legates refused to accept as valid.

The Pope was able to complain that he had been tricked. Boris requested all Latin missionaries to leave Bulgaria. Ignatios at once appointed Bulgaria's first archbishop with several other bishops and numerous clergy.

It is possible to argue that all Boris's approaches to the West were purely diplomatic - intended to frighten Constantinople into making him this very concession out of fear of losing Bulgaria altogether. This he achieved, and the matter appeared settled, though throughout the 870s Rome tried to regain the lost ground. The rivalry for the obedience of Bulgaria was throughout complicated by the Photian-Ignatian quarrel within the Eastern church in which the Holy See had become deeply involved. The Pope expected Ignatios to abide by the stipulation that his recognition as Patriarch was dependent on his keeping his hand off Bulgaria. Thus after the death of Ignatios (23 October 877) the Pope again tried to make his approval of the reappointment of Photios dependent on Byzantine abandonment of Bulgaria and railed against the perfidy of the Greeks. Indeed a further council held in Constantinople from November 879 to March 880 did concede the return of Bulgaria to Rome and thus end one aspect of the twenty-year-old quarrel. Pope John VIII for his part recognised Photios: Byzantine goodwill was not much needed in order to obtain help against the Moslems in South Italy. (a) The Pope would in future consecrate the Bulgarian archbishop but the Creek clergy were to remain and continue their Work. In the

- (a) It was at this council that Photios ensured that the canons made clear the Eastern rejection of the addition of filioque to the Creed (there were to be no further changes whatever in the Creed). John VIII by implication accepted even this though Rome had not yet made any dogmatic pronouncement on the matter. It was evidently Imperial policy to prevent this new and potentially serious bone of contention interfering with political needs. In S. Italy too the extension of Byzantine power (especially 876-915) was not accompanied by interference with the existing Latin sees subordinate to Rome.

event the arrangement was a dead letter, as the Emperor must have calculated. Boris adhered to the decrees of 870 and the Pope could do nothing. Theodosius of Nin, as special legate from the Pope to Boris in 880, met with a refusal to entertain dependence on Rome. As late as the pontificate of Stephen V (885-91) Rome was still adjuring Boris to respect its rights but was consistently ignored. By then Boris had embraced the idea of a church using the Slav language and was strong enough to pursue his own policy. Most remarkable of all, Formosus, the bishop on whom Boris had placed such hopes in the 609, occupied the Papal throne from 891 to 896 but apparently now gave up these ineffectual appeals, for no approach by him to Bulgaria is known. The Papacy itself was too weak to maintain the aggressive policy of Nicholas I.

The status accorded to the head of the Bulgarian church in 870 is not made unequivocally clear in Byzantine sources. In 871 Pope Hadrian II used the ambiguous term *antistes*. Byzantine references are to an archbishop and indicate a precedence for the Bulgarian Primate above metropolitans and autocephalous archbishops. This anomaly can be explained by supposing that he was not an autocephalous archbishop but one whose consecration, if not also nomination, was reserved to Constantinople, whereas an autocephalous archbishop was normally elected and installed by his own clergy. The political implications of this are obvious.

Boris's policy must be contrasted with that of Svatopluk in Moravia. The latter was too much under the spell of Latin prestige and too wedded to the economic advantages of the Frankish ecclesiastical system to support Methodios wholeheartedly; he rejected the degree of independence guaranteed by a Slav church directly subordinate to Rome. Boris's tergiversations were designed mainly to protect his independence. He knew that Greek culture was already entrenched in his country. As a matter of course he sent his son Symeon to be educated in Constantinople. In 870 he had won half his battle. Learning of events in Moravia, he began to see the advantage to Bulgaria of a church using the Slav language; it would make for further independence from Constantinople. For since 870 Greek had been the language of the Bulgarian church and of the clergy sent from Constantinople. No wonder then that he received with enthusiasm in 885/6 the Moravian exiles who unexpectedly arrived on the borders of his dominions at Belgrade. It is

clear that Boris was aware of, less probably in touch with, the Moravian mission and that the Governor of Belgrade was cognisant of Boris's wishes. It is not so clear what the Byzantine reaction to this development was. If Methodios, as seems certain, left competent Slav teachers behind in Constantinople in 882, it would appear that the Byzantine authorities were not by then wholly unfavourable to the use of the Slav liturgical language. But as long as the allegiance of Bulgaria had been at all doubtful they countered Latin with Greek and showed no readiness to ingratiate themselves with the Bulgarians by a concession over language. Photios nowhere suggests that he was in favour of such a thing for Bulgaria (as opposed to Moravia), which in Constantinopolitan eyes was a treacherous country where enemies of the Empire were wont to take refuge. Nor is it surprising that Photios should omit to mention to Boris in his letter of 865 the interesting experiment then going on in Moravia: Moravia had been since 863 the Empire's vital ally (formally or not) in keeping Bulgaria and the Franks apart and in reducing the danger of a westward-looking Bulgarian policy in general. Throughout the 870s Bulgarians went to Constantinople to be trained and the Greek missionaries in Bulgaria are not known to have paid serious attention to the, Slav language. Only after 880, and particularly after Methodios's visit to the Capital, are there signs of a more liberal attitude in Byzantine ecclesiastical policy. It was now clear that Greek influence was assured and that the educated Bulgarian would automatically learn Greek. The church could be allowed to be bilingual. However there were still strong reasons for neither Constantinople nor Bulgaria embracing wholeheartedly the Glagolitic alphabet as the medium for the Slav texts. Each would prefer an alphabet as like the Greek as possible. Thus if Constantinople was now prepared to acquiesce in the usage of the Slav language in the Bulgarian church, it might still refuse to sanction this 'Western' alphabet. Therefore Methodios's pupils and books were probably not put to active use. Moreover Basil died in 886 and his son Leo adopted a more intransigent policy in Bulgarian affairs, which led to a long period of estrangement and war. Any reluctance on the Byzantine side to permit the Bulgarian church to decide its own path was brushed aside.

Of the traditional 'Seven Teachers' of the Slavs, fathers of the Slav Orthodox church - the *sedmichislennitsi* - four now found acceptance for their ministry in Bulgaria. Cyril and Methodios were dead; of Gorazd we have already collected together the little that can be surmised.

END

Clement, Naum, Laurence (also called Sava) and Angelar were left. Angelar, and probably Laurence also, died shortly after coming to Bulgaria. The tradition now lay in the hands of Clement and Naum. Without this new field of activity in Bulgaria the Slav language church might have been doomed to early extinction.

The sources

I. The Life of St Clement in OCS is lost but certainly existed. There are two Lives in Creek:

(a) The longer Life attributed to Archbishop Theophylakt of Ohrid (fungebntur c. 1085 - 1109), sometimes known as the Bulgarian Logend (*Legenda bulgarica*) and usually dated c. 1100, a learned and rhetorical work partly based on the lost Life. Most scholars accept Theophylakt's authorship but Snegarov has recently put forward some arguments for doubting this. He prefers to date it to after 1200, perhaps c. 1235 when the Patriarchate of Turnovo was created and Ohrid saw itself losing all its glory. (a) Certain passages of the *Life* may be read as a defence of Ohrid and its privileges; others bear upon the polemics between Greeks and Latins. Theophylakt was a prolific writer and many works were loosely attributed to him. But none of them are noticeably Bulgarophile, as the Life of Clement is, so the real author may be rather Archbishop Demetrios Khomatianos (fungebatur c.1235), who is known to have been a devotee of St Clement and conversant with OCS. The value of the Life is variable, containing as it does obvious misconceptions, such as the statement that Methodios personally baptised Boris.

(b) The *Short Life*, generally attributed to Demetrios Khomatianos - also known as the *Ohrid Legend* - of little value, and if Snegarov is right, in fact a still later work. The manuscript is thirteenth or fourteenth century.

2. Two *Offices* of St Clement, one OCS and one Greek. The Creek one was composed at Ohrid probably over a considerable period (eleventh - fourteenth century). The OCS *Office*, of which there is only one manuscript of 1435, couples him with St Panteleimon, the patron of the monastery founded by St Clement at Ohrid, so there is a presumption that it was composed there not long after his death (916), together with the lost *Life*.

3. The *Life of St Naum* (commemorated on 23 December) in OCS shows signs of being a companion to the lost Life of Clement by the same author, a disciple of the two saints still working in the area of their ministry. There is a tradition that Bishop Marko commissioned these two *Lives*. The late medieval manuscript was found in the Zographou monastery on Mt Athos. There is also a Greek Life (sometimes referred to as the *Macedonian Legend*) of unknown date and authorship, and another still unpublished.

(a) Thus the venerated relics of St John of Rila were transferred from Ohrid to Turnovo at this time.

Boris was now within sight of his goal. It remained to train a hierarchy for a Bulgarian Slav church. All the early episcopal appointments naturally fell to Greeks; whether the changeover could be effected without further disagreement with the Byzantine authorities remained to be seen. Boris retained Naum at Court. Clement was sent to work in Macedonia. This is not to be interpreted as a disgrace: he was sent with a new civil governor for the province, a Slav Dometa, evidently to ensure proper conditions for his work. He was given property - 'three houses in Devol' - and other privileges. Clement was probably a Macedonian by birth and preferred to devote himself to missionary and teaching work among the Macedonian Slavs (the area was almost wholly Slav) rather than to remain attached to the Court, for him too political and too Greek. At most Boris may have felt that it was better to keep the Greek and Slav missionaries somewhat apart and not to risk too strong a reaction on the part of his Greek advisers until the Slav work was well established. The only potential stumbling-block was the use of the Glagolitic alphabet to which Clement loyally adhered.

Boris was a great builder. Among his earliest foundations is to be reckoned the Court Chapel at Pliska. Tradition records that he built seven cathedrals for his new bishoprics. The number seven must, as always, not be taken too literally. Among these can be identified, with variable certainty: the basilica on an island in Lake Prespa one of the churches at Ohrid,(b) and one at Nesebur (Mesembria); the church at Vodocha (near Strumitsa), which would seem therefore to be the cathedral of the see of Bregalnitsa (dateable to c. 886-9); and the church at Cherven, south of Ruse on the Danube. Bulgarian were now, in greater or less degree, such Greek sees as Belgrade or Morava,(c) Dorostol (Drustur), Serdica (modern Sofia), whose church of the Holy Wisdom still survives, Philippopolis (Plovdiv) and Develt (a short way south of Burgas). The seven bishops from Bulgaria who attended the Council of 879-80 in Constantinople therefore represented the majority, if not the totality, of the episcopacy. Boris's most important monastic foundation was St Panteleimon (Patlejna), on a steep hillside on the opposite bank of the River Ticha from the new royal residence at Preslav. A fragmentary inscription in Latin from Preslav, which appears to relate to

(b) A Bishop of Ohrid signed the acts of the Council of Constantinople of 879-80.

(c) Probably a Byzantine foundation of c. 879-80

the dedication of a church, is the only witness left to the activities of the Papal mission of the 860s in the sphere of architecture.

The remains of Pliska give rise to many difficulties of interpretation. The small basilica within the palace area can in all probability be ascribed to Boris's reign. The date of the huge basilica outside - some 320 by 96 feet, of which half is a vast atrium - is still in dispute. Early excavation reports of Bulgarian savants, followed by several later scholars, too readily assumed that all the monuments belonged to the first creative period of Bulgarian culture in the ninth-tenth centuries. But it has become increasingly clear that old sites destroyed and abandoned in the invasion period were later reoccupied by squatters, eventually to become in some cases important new settlements. Nearby Madara is a case in point. Originally an Imperial fortress watching the steppes (fifth-sixth centuries), it became a Bulgarian centre in the eighth-ninth centuries, and not merely a fortress but one of the main cult centres, as the famous cliff sculpture - the 'Madam rider' - and the remains of a pagan shrine side by side with Christian edifices bear witness. An inscription on the rock-face which mentions Khan Omurtag and the goddess Tangri suggests that in the first half of the ninth century Madara was the religious and Pliska the political capital. The layout and mere size of Pliska leave little room for doubt that it too was originally a Roman military camp with outer *vallum* and inner stone defences. The drainage and heating systems in the palace area are likewise typically Roman. The place was reoccupied by the Bulgars in the seventh-eighth centuries. Understandably the new inhabitants often used old materials to hand: several stone blocks with Latin inscriptions can be seen in the palace walls. The plan, size and construction of the great basilica are strongly against its being a new foundation of Boris. A basilica of this type would normally be dated not later than the sixth century and this is surely its true age. How far Boris restored it to use is problematical. Within the palace complex itself, the Court Chapel stands not far from what is believed to be a pagan shrine. Somewhat later a small basilica was built to the west of the palace, this time overlying a pagan religious edifice. This basilica is of the dimensions which we should expect for the time and place, in contrast to the great basilica standing isolated some distance away.

By 889 Boris was sufficiently satisfied that Christianity was well and truly established in his realm to take the decision to abdicate and retire to the monastery of his own foundation at Preslav. This proved too

sanguine. His eldest son Vladimir aligned himself with that faction in the Bulgarian ruling class which still embraced the lost cause of rejecting everything Greek. Though Vladimir was nominally a Christian there may still have been some diehard anti-Christians among his supporters. He entered into relations with Arnulf of Bavaria who encouraged his anti-Greek policy. Though the crisis was essentially political the Greek hierarchy was inevitably involved. Vladimir imprisoned Archbishop Stephen and allowed other persecutions. Boris still commanded enough authority to come out of his retirement in 893 and depose his son. It was now a question of proving the political ability of Symeon, his younger son, whose devotion to Greek Christian culture was beyond all doubt.

The year 893 marks the coming of age of the Bulgarian Slav church. At a council summoned by Boris in the autumn of that year he installed Symeon as the new ruler and decreed the official adoption of the Slav language in the church. The capital was now formally transferred from Pliska (near the modern village of Pliskov-Aboba) to Preslav, a better strategic point and less linked with Bulgaria's pagan past. Boris then again withdrew to the contemplative life. He died on 2 May 907.

The work of St Clement in Macedonia continued to be based on the tradition of his masters. Born about 840, he became a pupil of Methodios in his Olympian monastery, and remained one of his closest collaborators. Perhaps Methodios brought him from the Slav province which he governed. It is permissible to suppose that he received the name Clement when accompanying Cyril and Methodios on their mission to Khazaria, at the time of the invention of St Clement's relics at Kherson. One of the Office hymns compares him to Timothy, the closest companion of St Paul. Clement transplanted the Glagolitic alphabet to Macedonia. According to the *Life* some 3,500 pupils passed through his hands in seven years; these gradually extended the area of missionary and pastoral labours. Clement's work remained essentially educational, earning for him, as for his revered masters, the title of 'teacher'. As little knowledge of Greek could be expected in the remoter parts of Macedonia he wrote for his flock many homilies in Slav; also hymns and prayers. Clement was therefore, if traditional ascriptions are correct the first prolific author of original compositions in Church Slavonic; to him must go a share in the glory of its development as a written language extending beyond close translation of Greek sacred texts. The area of



Clement's ministry can only be defined approximately. His first centre is given as Devol, south-west of Lake Ohrid which lay in the region then known as Kutmichevitsa, commonly taken to be roughly the triangle Saloniki-Skopje-Valona. The highway from Durazzo to Saloniki and on to the Imperial City - the *Via Egnatia* - skirted the lake, at that time frequently called Lake Devol.

Symeon elevated Clement to a bishopric soon after his accession in 893. He thus became the first Slav bishop of the Bulgarian church, a matter of great pride to later Bulgarian writers. The precise location of his see remains enigmatic. Its name only appears in an ambiguous adjectival form in the Slav texts, suggesting a place Velika, which agrees with some but not all Greek transcriptions. Velika occurs nowadays several times in the toponymy of the upper Vardar valley and it would seem that the local Slavs so named the river itself (the 'Great River'). The see is surely to be sought on one of the main lines of communication of Macedonia, plausibly on the River Vardar itself. As Tunicki pointed out, Theophylakt's *Life* implies that the new see was not too far distant from Ohrid, which Clement continued to visit frequently, but that the diocese did not include, or at least was not identical with, the region of his educational labours. A conceivable identification is therefore modern Veles on the Vardar. This would have been a strategic centre suitable for Clement's talents in organising the Slav Bulgarian church against Greek encroachments from Saloniki. Boris had appreciated this fact in creating the see of Bregalnitsa, not far east of Veles. Velika is obviously in Macedonia. The view still occasionally advanced that it is not to be sought in the Balkans but represents an inaccurate reminiscence of Great Moravia or its alleged capital Velegrad (Velihrad) may be dismissed. That Clement was promoted bishop by Methodios himself rests on a passage in the unreliable *Short Life* and finds no confirmation elsewhere. Indeed it agrees neither with what we know of Methodios's later years nor with the established fact that Symeon made Clement a bishop; he would not have ignored an earlier Methodian consecration.

Clement died on 27 July 916 and was buried in his own monastic foundation of St Panteleimon at Ohrid. A fresco in the church of the Holy Wisdom at Ohrid shows him standing next to St Cyril. The work belongs to Archbishop Lee's improvements in the middle of the eleventh century and can lay no claim to being a likeness. It is now beyond reasonable doubt that Clement was the builder of the original

church of the Holy Virgin (Bogoroditsa) at Ohrid, now known as St Clement's. This church probably enshrined his relics for a time. The extant inscription recording Clement's death is however not contemporary. Clement's St Panteleimon can scarcely be other than the church now revealed under the Imaret Mosque. Theophylakt's Life notes that he founded two churches at Ohrid 'much smaller than the cathedral'. The inspiration of these 'round' churches - frequently of trefoil (triconchal) plan - in the Ohrid region and elsewhere in the Balkans is to be found in the numerous fourth-sixth century Byzantine baptisteries and martyria.

On Clement's elevation to a bishopric, with power to ordain the priests whom he had trained for the Slav church, Naum took over his educational work in Macedonia. He had remained in the capital during the years 886-93, engaged perhaps more in learned work in the circle of Boris's son Symeon than in evangelisation. Little has been handed down of his activities and no extant writings are ascribed to him. He founded a monastery at Devol and another on Lake Prespa. He retired into monastic life in 900 and died on 23 December 910. The monastery of St Naum, at the south end of Lake Ohrid, was dedicated to him and his relics were transferred there at an early date. It became a notable centre of spiritual healing - and remained such for a millenium until within living memory.

Invaluable though the contribution of the Macedonians was, from 893 Preslav became not merely the civil capital but also the main centre of Bulgarian culture. Yet Symeon was not the man of vision that his father had been. Born about the time of Boris's baptism, he was educated in Constantinople and knew Byzantine strength and weakness from the inside. Indeed he was sometimes sarcastically called the 'half-Greek': ability to speak Greek, not blood, made one a Greek. Such was the influx of things Greek into Bulgaria from 864 that he must have gone to the City (c. 878) already proficient in the language. He attended the academy in the Magnaura Palace. Liutprand of Cremona confirms that Symeon studied Aristotle and other classical authors, therefore profane learning. But his father appears to have destined this younger son for an ecclesiastical career, that is, as a future Archbishop or Patriarch of Bulgaria. In Constantinople Symeon underwent the novitiate. His subsequent career does not suggest that he had a vocation for the Church; his association with the Patlejna monastery at

Preslav, where he probably lived until he was called to the throne, suggests rather a patron of letters and the other arts.

Though Boris's court at Pliska was already on the way to adopting Byzantine manners, from 893 Symeon completed this Byzantinisation on an even greater scale at Preslav, now laid out as a great new walled city. The place had been of some importance since the early ninth century when Omurtag made a military camp there but the fine buildings all date from after 893 -churches, monasteries, hospitals. Recent investigation has shown that this Bulgarian town was, unlike Pliska, on a new site. The palace with its associated church thus raises no problems. It is not absolutely certain whether we can identify the edifice known as the 'Round Church' with the 'Golden Church' mentioned in Old Bulgarian texts as a splendid foundation of Symeon's. As with the great basilica at Pliska, the plan of the Round Church suggests a Byzantine building of not later than Justinian's reign. Would Symeon have ordered the erection of such an archaic structure, recalling the church of SS Sergius and Bacchus in Constantinople or San Vitale at Ravenna? It is however a fact that no single early Slav church in the Balkans was built in the contemporary style of the Imperial capital until after the Byzantine reconquest begun in the 970s. Resources evidently did not as a rule stretch to summoning master-craftsmen from the capital. Local craftsmen therefore copied what was still to be seen, more or less in ruins, about them - that is, churches built before about 500. Armenian, Cappadocian, perhaps Georgian and other monks, to be found in many parts of the Balkans, may have contributed to the adoption of 'provincial' styles. While this is an adequate explanation of this widespread tendency to archaism in the Slav Balkans, we might have expected differently of the Constantinople-educated Symeon. New edifices were so often raised on the ruins of old, more or less mechanically following the original ground-plan that we can not accept the whole design of the Round Church as certainly the work of Symeon - new in 906/7.(a) Whatever may be the truth about the foundations, the decoration of the church was certainly due to him, in particular the marble facings and ceramic tiles. Such tiles were very unusual in contemporary Byzantine architecture. Together with the carved figures of animals and some other decorative features, they suggest a specifically Bulgar taste connected

- (a) According to a note in an OCS translation of St Athanasius's *Sennonr* against the *Arianr* made by the monk Theodore (Todor Doksov--see p. 300), preserved however only in a very late Russian copy.

the art of the steppes and thence with Persia and Central Asia. The graffiti, mainly on the walls of the narthex, are of the greatest importance. Their wording and a few legible dates allow no room for doubt that they were made between 893 and 927. One of these inscriptions is part of a text recording, in all probability, Boris's installation of his son Symeon as ruler in 893. But they are naturally not incontrovertible evidence of the date of the walls themselves, whether made of old or fresh plaster - a point on which the experts are still in disagreement. The atrium at the west end is likely to have been an addition to Symeon's. A large atrium is characteristic of many early Christian churches and for the same reason of churches built many centuries later in newly Christianised lands. It was in the atrium that the unbaptised and those undergoing penance or excommunicate, not admitted to the church proper, and the catechumens, not permitted to be present throughout the whole liturgy, (b) could participate at a distance in the mysteries of the faith. Structures recently brought to light to the south of the church may also prove to be monastic buildings associated with it. The style of the Patlejna monastery (St Panteleimon), about a mile to the east beyond the river, is more typically Byzantine.

John the Exarch gives a lyrical description of the glories of this Bulgarian capital. Bulgaria reached under Symeon a never to be recaptured peak of wealth and power. Symeon was the first but far from the last Slav ruler to imagine himself on the throne of the Emperor - the only true emperor appointed by God - in Constantinople.

From the time of his accession war with the Empire became the normal state of affairs and warlike operations tended almost uniformly to Bulgaria's advantage. His southern frontier soon reached within striking distance of Saloniki. (c) For the political unification of all the Balkan Slavs under Bulgaria was the obvious first step in his ambition to attain Imperial power. After the extraction of favourable peace terms in 897 and again in 913 (following a dangerous attack on the City itself when the Byzantine authorities refused to pay the yearly blackmail for Symeon's quiescence), success seemed within his grasp. The Patriarch Nicholas Mystikos, Regent for Constantine VII, whose legitimacy and

- (b) The catechumens (or learners) are dismissed by the deacon at the end of the Liturgy of the Word (Synaxis) and before the commencement of the Eucharist proper.
- (c) A frontier marker of 904, only some 20 kilometres north of Saloniki, has been found with the inscription

therefore claim to Imperial status was debatable even in many Byzantine eyes, acceded to the betrothal of Symeon's daughter to the young Emperor. Symeon might not rule in person but he would at least expect to dominate his son-in-law. But the Empress Zoe soon imposed her veto on the proposal. Though Symeon won another imposing victory in 991 Romanos Lecapenos put new heart into Byzantine resistance, made himself co-emperor and married his own daughter Helen to Constantine (919-20).(a) The negotiations of 913 had brought Symeon the style of Emperor and Autocrat of the Bulgars, recognised at a coronation ceremony performed by the Patriarch of Constantinople.

By 920 his hopes of accession to the Imperial throne were slipping away. Further campaigns, which did not spare Christian churches and monasteries, gave him control of most of the Balkans and brought him to the gates of Constantinople in 922 and again in 924. The Emperor continued to recognise him as basileus - in Slav, tsar - and therefore as a brother but nothing more.

The status of the head of the Bulgarian church thus remained equivocal. Symeon needed a Patriarch to match his assumed Imperial status, in due Byzantine form. It is probable that he made a unilateral declaration to this effect in 917 or 919, but Constantinople could not be expected to recognise this elevation, nor indeed that of succeeding patriarchs during the remainder of Symeon's reign.(b) After 924 he ever styled himself Emperor of the Bulgars and Greeks, as the realisation of his ambition receded. Symeon died suddenly on 27 May 927. Recognition of the Bulgarian Patriarchate was only conceded by Constantinople in the general settlement on the accession of Peter when he also received the title of basileus (927), or at the time of his marriage to a granddaughter of Lecapenor Maria, which took place shortly after (not later than 932). He was recognised as a 'son' in Byzantine diplomatic hierarchy.

Thus Byzantine pride was saved. Peter, still a minor, came under the Imperial wing (the reverse of the situation attempted by Symeon) and

- (a) A side-effect of the running sore of the Bulgarian menace was thus the strengthening of Imperial autocracy in the person of a succession of soldier emperors, from Romane to John Tzimiskes, nipping in the bud the possibility of a greater political role for the Patriarchate, which Nicholas had momentarily achieved.
- (b) As many as five are quoted - John, Leontij, Dimitrij, Sergij, Grigorij - but the list is unsubstantiated in reliable sources. It is quite probable that the first patriarch did not assume office until 926, a mere year before Symeon's death.

END

could be granted a patriarch whose independence was not likely to be troublesome. At the same time the Bulgarian ambassador to Constantinople was given precedence over all others. With Bulgaria at its greatest extension, the patriarchate included many Greek sees, especially in Thrace and the west Balkans.

Meanwhile the mustard-seed of the Slav church which Boris had sown grew into a great tree. The council held in autumn 893, it is believed, not only decreed the general use of the Slav language in the church but also made the perfected Cyrillic alphabet official. The adaptations would have been decided during the previous half-dozen years after the arrival of Clement and Naum. The prime mover was surely Symeon himself, with his fresh Greek learning, to whom the Glagolitic alphabet must have been unattractive. If Constantinople had any further thoughts of preventing the use of the Slav language in the Bulgarian church, she had now to abandon them; forced hellenization now ceased until the collapse of Bulgarian independence at the end of the tenth century. The official declaration on alphabets is deduced directly from the statement in several Russian annals that the *prelozenije knigu* took place thirty years after the conversion of Bulgaria, taken as 863; the phrase is perhaps best translated 'transliteration of the texts'. East Bulgaria with the two capitals, which politically and intellectually had so far taken the lead over the wilder West, was more penetrated by Greek culture and had long been in the habit of using the Greek alphabet; it did not take kindly to the Glagolitic script brought by Clement and his companions. It was of course learnt and used there but the decision of 893, which also took into account the need for the hellenized Cyrillic alphabet as the normal secular and administrative script, thus making as little change in existing habits as possible, created a division between East Bulgaria and Macedonia which was not entirely effaced for several centuries thereafter. Clement out of devotion to his masters developed his educational and literary activities in Macedonia on the basis of the Glagolitic alphabet and the language of the translations of Constantine and Methodios. In his hands Church Slavonic reached a relatively stable artificial norm returning to or confirming its original Macedonian character. But the dialects of East and West Bulgaria (including Macedonia) were certainly no more identical then than they are today. (a) Preslav set about imposing its own East Bulgarian

- (a) The modern Macedonian language (lately elevated to separate written and literary status) is a later development, born of the overlay of Serbian dialect on Bulgarian.

norm on the ecclesiastical language. The sacred texts were all transcribed into Cyrillic and at the same time revised in language, removing words and forms which were too Macedonian or too Moravian to be readily acceptable in the East. Without being in any sense condemned or pro-scribed, Glagolitic gradually came to be felt as a provincial survival. The position of the priest Constantine is in all this difficult to define. As almost certainly a disciple of Methodios, though not numbered among the Seven, he must have been an important voice at the council of 893. By 906 at latest he had been promoted Bishop of Preslav, that is, court bishop; perhaps this took place in 893 at the same time as the promotion of Clement. His attitude to the schism of the alphabets is not clear. His own training was of course Glagolitic, as the Acrostic Prayer (*Azbuchnaka molitva*), attributed to him with a high degree of probability, bears witness. While admitting the excellence, indeed the Divine inspiration, of St Cyril's alphabet, the *literati* of Preslav could not but feel that it would be a barrier to the further assimilation of Greek culture.

It must also be clearly recognised that the Bulgarian church was from 893 Orthodox in all respects, using exclusively Greek liturgies and other services. If Clement used a liturgy of St Peter in Macedonia, in deference to Moravian practice, no evidence thereof survives. The preservation of such a text on Athos is at best a very indirect pointer. It is much more probable, as we have seen, that the *Kiev missal* (and no doubt other Western texts now lost) indicates not so much a general as a rather special and local usage which SS Cyril and Methodios freely conceded to some Central European Slavs, whereas they themselves translated and normally used Byzantine liturgies and other services from the very beginning of their Moravian mission. Clement's work may be safely assumed to have followed in the main the usages of the Eastern church. Moreover the work of translation had still to be completed. According to Theophylakt's *Life of Clement* the saint finished the translation of the Triodion shortly before his death (916). The Triodion contains the Byzantine offices for the period Lent-Pentecost, during which the Canons - or hymns - on Lenten weekdays consist of only three odes instead of the normal nine. Whether the translation of the Triodion was entirely Clement's work - either because it had never been done or because the first translation was lost in Moravia - or was merely completed by him, cannot be established. A reference in the Russian Primary Chronicle suggests that the *Oktiokh*, the complementary service-book

for the rest of the year, had already been translated in Moravia.(a) And the use of the Oktoikh and Triodion implies of course the use of the Orthodox Liturgy. Only the Glagolitic alphabet was linked with the West and this was rejected in 893 for official Bulgarian use.

The work of the 'Preslav School', under Symeon's personal patronage not only set the character of the Bulgarian church once and for all as an Orthodox church of Slav language: it further enlarged Old Church Slavonic as a literary language. While Clement, as far as we know composed original works of strictly religious content only, the capital could embrace new genres of Christian literature. Many new sacred texts were translated, (b) but now also Greek works of learning, particularly history. What Bulgaria needed was still typically the 'world chronicle' which carried on the history of the Bible into modern times, thereby showing the continuity of God's operation in the world down to and including the Byzantine Empire. Such was the Chronicle of John Malalas, which goes down to the reign of Justin II, translated in the tenth, possibly only in the eleventh century. And there are other similar compilations. Here too we may note Symeon's Encyclopaedia (Izbornik), a choice of extracts from Greek theological, historical and other learned works covering the essentials of Christian education and life. Made about the year 900, this only survives in a Russian copy made for Svjatoslav in 1073.(c) It was prefaced by an encomium of Symeon inverse.

The main work of this group of authors no doubt falls after 893. How far it already existed in Boris's later years is difficult to answer. Symeon's return to Bulgaria in the 880s is a likely enough moment for new departures. But it may be that little was achieved during the disturbed years of Vladimir's rule (889-93) and before the dispute over alphabet had been settled.

The following authors (with works confidently ascribed to them) are known by name:

I. John the Exarch. Assumed to be a Bulgarian, since his command of Greek is by no means perfect, he may have been born as late as

- (a) The reference is in the material of Western provenance s.a. 898.
- (b) The treatment of existing texts in some cases went far beyond revision: the East Bulgarian Psalter is virtually a new translation, mainly following Theodoret in the Commentary. At least parts of the O.T. were newly done by order of Symeon (after the loss of Methodios's version), who not unnaturally favoured the texts current in Constantinople when he studied there.
- (c) Byzantine models were such works as the Emperor Constantine's *Excerpta de legationibus* and Patriarch Photios's *Myriobiblon*.



890.(a) His notable translations are two treatises and many sermons of St John Damascene. His version of St Basil the Great's Hexaemeron is rather an adaptation with additional matter, probably made c. 915. Both the Hexaemeron and the treatises of St John have adulatory addresses to Symeon in their Prefaces. The Preface to the Nebesa, that is St John's Exposition of the True Faith, resumes what was then known about the early Cyrillomethodian translations.

2. The monk (chernorizets) Hrabr. His Essay on the Slav alphabet variously entitled in different copies, is vital for an understanding of the position at the end of the ninth century. He shows acquaintance with Greek grammatical and literary scholarship and demonstrates that the Slav alphabet is as well designed for the Slav language as the Greek is for Greek. The arguments are aimed at Greek pride: Greek is not such an ancient language as Syriac, which was Adam's tongue; the Greek did not invent their own alphabet but adapted the Phoenician. Hrabr magnifies St Cyril's achievement in designing a wholly new alphabet (therefore the Glagolitic)(b) for the Slavs, who, as the saint consistently maintained, have a right to a sacred tongue and script of their own. 'For it is easier,' says Hrabr, "to build on others' work than to create from scratch.' Such arguments are evidently addressed to Bulgarians conversant with Greek who found the Glagolitic too troublesome and obscure. That the author, whose pseudonym is no genuine monastic name, was either one of the early companions of Cyril and Methodios or prompted by one of them is sufficiently clear. Naum has been suggested and, with less probability, Boris's brother Doks.(c) The work must date from about 893 when the question of alphabets was being actively discussed. The author knows the *Vita Constantini* and writes of the 'chief disciple', that is Clement, as still alive.

3. Constantine the Priest, later Bishop of Preslav. He was the compiler and translator of a Gospel commentary based on St Chrysostom, St Cyril of Alexandria and St Isidore, written about 893/4. Three manuscripts of the thirteenth-fourteenth centuries are extant. The *Acrostic*

- (a) So little is known about John that there are widely different estimates of his dates. Another view maintains that he was born nearer the middle of the ninth century and spent some time in Constantinople in the 870s. The ostensible reference to Methodios as still alive in the Preface to his Nebesa is scarcely conclusive.
- (b) The alphabet is not named but the argument surely requires the Glagolitic in all other respects. The work may have been revised when Glagolitic went out of use in East Bulgaria.
- (c) It has been suggested that Doks represents [sic], which might be loosely rendered hrabru in Slav.

*Prayer* would appear to be his Preface to this work, following fairly closely the matter and manner of St Cyril's verse Preface to his translation of the Gospels. It may therefore also be dated c.894. There are at least eight Cyrillic manuscripts of the poem, dating from the twelfth- thirteenth centuries onwards, and showing clear signs of adaptation from a Glagolitic original.(c) Two of the manuscripts of the Gospel commentary also contain a description of the hierarchical organisation and services of the church - a free adaptation of a Greek original - which is likely to be Constantine's work too; there was need for such an essay in the still only imperfectly Christian Bulgaria of the 890s.

Constantine's *Outline of History* (Istorikii vukratuce), based on the [sic] of Patriarch Nikephoros, also dates from the 890s.

In 906/7 Constantine made a translation at Symeon's command of St Athanasius's Tracts against the Arians, of which only later Russian copies are extant. Though the Arian heresy was a thing of the past other heresies were becoming troublesome in Bulgaria against which these polemics could be useful, as witness the work of

4. Cosmas the Priest, whose Treatise against the Bogomils is to be dated c. 960-72

5. Gregory the Priest, alleged translator of parts of the Old Testamen and of John Malalas's Chronicle.

To the above must be added Tsar Symeon himself who appears to have made or helped to make the Zlatostruj, being the Slav translation of selected sermons of St John Chrysostom. There are two manuscript traditions of this very popular compilation; we cannot say which is closer to Symeon's version.

Many remain anonymous to us. Other valued devotional work translated at an early date were: the Ladder to Paradise of St John Climacus - a fundamental treatise on the monastic life, the Spiritual Meadow of John Moschos (the Sinai Paterik) and works of St Ephraim the Syrian. More secular were the Physiologos (though it contains much moral symbolism) and the geographical work of Cosmas Indicopleustes. It should be noted, however, that despite Symeon's alleged enthusiasm as a young man for the pagan Classics there is no sign of their translation side by side with Christian literature. They could fulfil no spiritual need in a country of such young civilisation.

(c) E.g. 11. 12 and 26 represent Glagolitic letters unknown to the Cyrillic alphabet.

The Classical Renaissance so conspicuous in Byzantine culture during the century from Photios to the scholar-emperor Constantine Porphyrogenetos left practically no mark on the emergent Slav peoples. This humanism was the preserve of an exclusive Byzantine administrative class (and thus somewhat parallel to our Classical education of the eighteenth-nineteenth centuries), into which barbarians did not easily gain admission. The Slavs were adopting Christianity in the only proper way - in all its aspects simultaneously: as theology, as ritual, in all its associated arts. But since they now had their own liturgical language, Greek was primarily a source of Christian knowledge, far less a medium of knowledge in general. Moreover the Christian works of doctrine and spirituality which urgently demanded translation were the fundamental expositions written by the Fathers of the fourth-sixth centuries. More recent elaborations were of less immediate value: even the works of St John Damascene were for them relatively modern.

The decline of Bulgaria was as rapid as its rise. With the accession of the unwarlike Peter (927), high in dignity as an acknowledged basileus but without Symeon's authority, Constantinople regained the initiative and henceforward never made any secret of her determination to destroy Bulgarian power. A tame province, not a rival, was the most she could tolerate in the North Balkans. This thorn in her flesh, which had been her undoing, had been there long enough. As early as 931 Serbia and parts of Macedonia passed under Byzantine suzerainty. A few years later Bulgaria was subjected to severe attacks by the Magyars, who had already shorn the state of all its dependencies north of the Danube when they settled in Transylvania and the Alfold. Nikephoros Phokas was unwise enough in 965, when Peter's Byzantine empress Maria-Irene died, to refuse Bulgaria its annual 'tribute' and thereby reawaken quiescent hostility. Byzantine diplomacy then brought the Prince of Kiev's Russians into play. In 966/7 Svjatoslav of Kiev, receiving an inducement of 800 pounds of gold, started an invasion of Bulgaria from the north and took Preslav. What little cohesion the Bulgarian state still had disappeared on the death of Tsar Peter on 29 January 969. The general who ascended the Imperial throne in December of the same year, John Tzimiskes, embarked on the conquest of Bulgaria from the south. He also found it necessary to put an end to Russian conquest from the north which were proving far too successful for what Constantinople had envisaged as the contribution of a useful but minor ally.

Preslav was snatched from the Russians and their forces finally defeated before Dorystolon (Dorostol) in July 971. By the end of the year Peter's successor, Boris II, had abdicated and all East Bulgaria was in Byzantine hands. The Byzantine authorities formally abolished the Bulgarian patriarchate and reunited the conquered territories to the Patriarchate of Constantinople. A Greek Metropolitan was installed at Dorostol where the Bulgarian Patriarch had apparently resided for most of Peter's reign.(a) Patriarch Damian (fungebatur ab 945) now migrated with the centre of political resistance by stages into Macedonia.

Resistance to incorporation in the Byzantine Empire was organised by the sons of a renegade Armenian officer, Nicholas. Hence they are known as the Komitopouloi.(b) Tzimiskes had had to withdraw his troops hurriedly from Bulgaria without completing the conquest of the whole country in order to meet an Arab menace in the East. On his death in January 976 Byzantine hold on East Bulgaria further relaxed. By summer of that year Samuel, the most vigorous of the brothers, had regained nominal control of a considerable area. The Byzantine conquest had to be started all over again by Basil II.

Basil's first important campaign took place in 986. His main opponent was Samuel who managed to eliminate his brothers in the years 986/7. The civil war in Asia Minor which required Basil's full personal attention and Russian help,(d) again put a temporary halt to campaigns in Bulgaria until 991. Samuel was thus able to consolidate his position in Macedonia, take Dyrrachium, and embark on conquests in Thessaly on his own account.

The Komitopouloi had taken the expelled head of the church under their wing. The wandering 'patriarchate' moved from the Danube via Sofia into remoter Macedonia, reaching Lake Prespa about 976. The lake island of St Achilles became Samuel's capital for the next twenty years. The existing basilica was rededicated to this saint when his relics

- (a) Perhaps from the time of its recognition by Constantinople about 927.
- (b) The names of the brothers are given as Moses, Aaron, David and Samuel, very rarely used by those who considered themselves Greeks but current in the Transcaucasian Christian states; that of their mother was Ripsime (Armenian Hrip'sime) a famous Armenian martyr of the third century, and is recorded on a monument inscription dated 993.
- (c) Moses and Aaron should perhaps be discounted as brothers; Yahya of Antioch more interested in these events than the Greek historians, only mentions two in all. They may have been cousins of the Bulgarian Tsar Roman, whose legitimate position Samuel never defied, only proclaiming himself Tsar on the latter's death.

were deposited there in 983. The patriarchal title appears to have been unofficially readopted about this time. In the 990s Samuel and the Patriarchate moved on to Ohrid, where the most impressive remains of his reign are still to be seen. Samuel proclaimed himself Tsar and his primate Patriarch in 998. But the war of attrition finally went against Samuel. Basil occupied Preslav and Pliska in 1002, Skopje in 1004. By 1008 all Bulgaria was at Basil's mercy and he had earned himself the title of the 'Bulgar-slayer' (Voulgaroktonos). Samuel had died soon after his decisive defeat on 29 June 1014; the final collapse came under his nephew John Vladislav.

Byzantine relief was profound. Among other celebrations Basil held a service of thanksgiving in the Parthenon, then an Orthodox cathedral. As soon as the conquest was complete the Patriarchate of Ohrid was demoted to an archbishopric.<sup>(a)</sup> The Emperor reserved the right to appoint to the see. This was tantamount to restoring the original situation of 870, when Bulgaria received its first autocephalous archbishop; the title also remained unchanged. Autocephaly under Imperial patronage was to blot out the memories of the intervening patriarchate which Constantinople had never loved. At its most extensive the proscribed Bulgarian Patriarchate had embraced not only most of Bulgaria proper but also Serbia, Bosnia, Montenegro, Albania, Epirus and parts of Thessaly - some two dozen sees. Its eparchy was thus for a short time at the height of Samuel's power wider than the recognised Bulgarian state had been.

The Byzantine authorities dealt lightly with the Bulgarian church; it was an important factor in their peaceful control of the country in the future. The autocephaly granted to Ohrid meant that the Archbishop could appoint his own bishops; the Patriarch of Constantinople did not interfere in this or indeed in any internal affairs. Greek became the administrative language of Bulgaria. But though the Archbishop and many of the bishops were thenceforward Greeks, the lower hierarchy of the church remained, as far as can be told, predominantly Slav. It would be misleading to say that the Slav church was persecuted. Yet there was certainly as time went on considerable destruction of Slav service-books and much local and unofficial hellenization. Ohrid itself is a typical case: no Slav manuscripts have survived there of earlier date than Tsar Dushan

- (a) Ohrid was besieged by Basil in 1015 but probably only taken in 1018. The administrative capital of Byzantine Macedonia was however fixed at Skopje, where the Governor resided.

(mid-fourteenth century) whereas there are many Greek ones of all ages. Some deliberate destruction by the Greeks, whether in war or peace, is beyond doubt. Perhaps their intensified attack on the Bogomil heresy was partly responsible: all Slav manuscripts looked alike to them; it is less trouble to destroy everything than to pick out the heretical works. The earliest extant Balkan manuscripts in Church Slavonic date however from the period of troubles. Of those written in the Macedonian region the Codices Zographensis, Marianus and Assemanianus probably date from before the complete conquest of Samuel's state. (b) All three must owe their preservation to having been taken to Athos, with which Macedonia was always in close touch. Two others preserved in St Catharine's Monastery on Mount Sinai (no doubt reaching there via Athos) - the Sinai Psalter and Euchologium - also date from the eleventh century but a more precise date and provenance cannot be given. The Cyrillic Savvina Knigaa is an East Bulgarian manuscript of the eleventh century, no doubt of Preslav, which continued to thrive under a Greek governor. But the production of Slav texts could not be expected to revive until the period of new Bulgarian and Serbian independence in the 1180s.

There is no sign of the removal of bishops by the Greek authorities even in the period immediately following the conquest. Though a new archbishop, John of Debar, was appointed to Ohrid in 1018, he was a Slav and occupied the see until his death in 1036/7. Indeed Basil, when ordering church affairs in 1018/19, retained under Ohrid some of the wholly non-Bulgarian dioceses which might more naturally have been reattached to Saloniki or some other Greek metropolis. In 1020 Ohrid in fact received an addition of ten sees and three more a few years later.

Among the outstanding incumbents of the see of Ohrid may be mentioned:

I. Leo (fungebatur 1037-56), appointed from the Church of the Holy Wisdom in Constantinople on the death of John of Debar - an outstanding patron to whom are due the exquisite frescoes in the Church of the Holy Wisdom at Ohrid. In humbler form the church had probably been Samuel's cathedral. The eleventh century frescoes were only the first of many splendid works painted by Byzantine artists (with or without

(b) Ass. is particularly clearly a product of the Ohrid area since the appended Menology is rich in Macedonian saints - Clement, Naum and various saints of Saloniki specially honoured in those parts.

local Slav assistants) in Macedonia, now that it was reincorporated in the Empire.(a)

2. Theophylakt (fungebatur c.1085-c.1109), reputed author of the important Greek Life of St Clement. Ohrid became a natural mixing place of Greek and Slav in the Church, just as Macedonia as a whole was notorious for its mixed population. Greek prelates of Ohrid defended their autocephaly by championing - up to a point - the Slav element in the archdiocese. To promote the cult of St Clement was part of the policy. Theophylakt, pupil of the great humanist Psellos, who felt himself, like Ovid at Tomi, an exile among barbarians, is typical of the attitude of condescending approval.

3. Demetrios Khomatianos (fungebatur c.1217-35), a noted canonist and further promoter of the cult of St Clement.

The Byzantinisation of Bulgaria and Macedonia went deep in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. Several Athonite monasteries became considerable landowners in Macedonia. This helped to establish the important cultural link between Athos and the later Serbian state. Influences from the shores of the Adriatic, however, also penetrated without difficulty into the interior. There is a clear Western element in the decoration of most of the great Macedonian Glagolitic codices of the late tenth or early eleventh centuries, especially of Coder Assemanianus. On the other hand Ohrid as the centre of Clement's Macedonian ministry based on the Glagolitic alphabet had never given up this use. Under Samuel there may well have been a certain tendency for this Macedonian element to increase in the church. But even if Glagolitic still predominated for sacred texts, Cyrillic was certainly the administrative alphabet, as a commemorative inscription of Samuel himself shows. Knowledge of Glagolitic was propagated, side by side with Cyrillic, to the Orthodox Slavs of Serbia. It is difficult to say when Glagolitic ceased to be actively used in Macedonia, perhaps not till the end of the fourteenth century. It was still read by a few on Athos in that century especially in the Bulgarian Zographou monastery. But its use became more and more restricted. The Bitolj Triodion of the twelfth century may serve as the type of hybrid text in alternating Glagolitic and Cyrillic; the scribe was evidently equally practised in both alphabets.

(a) It will also be recalled that it was the actions of Leo of Ohrid and the Patriarch Michael Kerularios in banning all Latin rites that precipitated the act of the Papal legates on 16 July 1054, when they laid the Papal excommunication on the altar of the Church of the Holy Wisdom in Constantinople.

During the period 1018 to 1186 the archdiocese of Ohrid was gradually whittled away (Bosnia and Montenegro being lost first) until it became purely the diocese of Macedonia. Macedonia no longer commanded any special prestige. The 'Bulgarian theory' was more and more introduced into texts: St Cyril was a Bulgarian; he had translated the Scripture 'into Bulgarian'; his first mission had been to the Bulgarians; Boris had been baptised by Methodios. Nobody knew or wished to remember the curious episode of the Moravian mission.

The second half of the eleventh century saw Bulgaria proper at her lowest ebb, with Constantinople itself hard hit by the new Turkish menace in the East and able to do little more than hang on to possession of the country. The Danubian frontier could no longer be held against repeated incursions of Pechenegs, Uz and other barbarians. The economic balance of the Empire was lost: the profits of commerce were passing rapidly into Venetian hands;(a) the value of the Byzantine gold solidus (later known as hyperpyron and bezant) as an international standard fell rapidly after a remarkable stability of over 500 years. By the second half of the twelfth century the Empire was manifestly succumbing to fatal combination of maladies - loss of Asia Minor to the Seldjuk Turk (especially from 1176) and economic strangulation by the Latins. The Westernising policy of Manuel Komnenos (regnabat 1143-80), who twice took a Latin princess to wife, was the outward sign of impotence thinly disguised as far-sighted policy. With his death in September 1180 the Balkan peoples fell to exploiting the defencelessness of the Empire. The leaders of the Third Crusade (1189) were already giving a thought to its dismemberment.

By 1186 it was possible to proclaim the Second Bulgarian Empire in the Church of St Demetrios (Dimitiur) at Turnovo, which became the capital and primatial see. Bishop Basil adopted the title of autocephalous archbishop, as in the time of Boris.

The creation of a new Bulgarian patriarchate for a new Bulgarian Empire was however not straight-forward. Byzantine political intrigue might support one aspirant to the Bulgarian throne rather than another but this was little more than playing a traditional game which had not passed beyond Byzantine control. Kalojan (1197-1207) saw the best way

(a) The concessions made to Venice in 1082 gave her a virtual stranglehold on Byzantine trade except in the Black Sea and certain reserved areas such as Cyprus and Crete. The Doge assumed the style 'Dalmatiae sive Chroatae diux et imperialis protosevastos' since his fleet alone could ensure free navigation of the Adriatic.



being duly recognised as Emperor of Bulgaria in soliciting a crown from the Holy See: his patriarch would then also be a Roman consecration. The Pope appears to have been under the erroneous impression, based perhaps on a diplomatic embassy to Symeon from Pope John X in 924/5, that previous Bulgarian emperors, particularly Peter, had received that dignity from the Holy See. Kalojan despatched Archbishop Basil of Turnovo to Italy in 1200 to put these matters in train. Faced by the deviation of the Fourth Crusade to Constantinople in early 1203, the usurping Byzantine Emperor Alexios III immediately sought help wherever it might be found and offered Kalojan the desired recognition of his own imperial and his primate's patriarchal titles. But Kalojan continued his negotiations with Rome, convinced no doubt that the Latins had come to stay. He was justified and immediately after the capture of the City in April 1204 proceeded to appropriate such Imperial territories in the North Balkans as he could lay hands on. The Pope's legate finally reached Bulgaria in November 1204. Cardinal-Legate Leo brought Kalojan a royal but not an imperial crown, and invested the archbishop of Turnovo with the title of Primate only. Kalojan ignored the distinctions, called himself Tsar and assumed that Primate was the equivalent of Patriarch. Thus Bulgaria came under the protection of Rome. But the weakness of the Latin Emperor Baldwin was a tempting as that of Alexios. In 1205 Kalojan defeated Baldwin and took him prisoner. Perhaps only his own death in October 1207 prevented him from establishing himself in Constantinople. Bulgarian arms thus contributed much to the downfall of the Latins and, though Bulgaria was at times a formidable rival, to putting heart and hope into Greek recovery. For the Greek government at Nicaea revived the Imperial and Patriarchal titles in 1208 and thereafter took its part, with Epirus, as focus of resistance to the Latin Empire.

But the approach of the Bulgarian church to the Papacy lacked all serious intention. Kalojan's successors did no more than flirt with Rome whenever this was expedient. Nor did expediency counsel a policy of ecclesiastical dependence on Nicaea or Ohrid. The Byzantine rump at Nicaea together with its insecurely based patriarchate never looked likely, until the last moment of its success, to recapture Constantinople.

Kalojan had brought Ohrid under Bulgarian rule again in 1204 but it was lost to Theodore, the Despot of Epirus, in 1217; to Theodore the archbishopric was of great value as the best counterpoise to the Patriarchate at Nicaea. Ivan Asen II (1218-41) repudiated the Roman link in

1232. So great was Asen's part in breaking Theodore's ambitions (a) (though, like Kalojan, Asen himself might well aspire to a restore Imperial throne) that John Vatatzes of Nicaea was not slow to ally his family to that of Asen by marriage and to recognise in 1235 Asen's long-standing assumption of the independence of the Bulgarian Orthodox Church headed by the Archbishop of Turnovo. The still weak Patriarch of Nicaea continued to temporise but a synod held at Gallipoli (Kallipolis), at which the Emperor John Vatatzes and Asen were present, at last approved the re-establishment of the Bulgarian patriarchate. Both the Emperor and the representatives of the Athonite republic insisted at the synod on the independence of Athos from Bulgarian political and ecclesiastical control. That St Sava of Serbia had any part in persuading the Greeks to recognise a Bulgarian patriarchate, as sometimes asserted, is highly improbable. The patriarchal church at Turnovo was built, together with the Imperial palace, on the summit of Tsarevets Hill, in a great loop of the river gorge, defended by precipices on three sides and a strong wall on the fourth. All was destroyed by the Turks in 1393-6.

The theoretical union of Bulgaria with Rome had lasted some thirty years. Throughout Bulgarian policy had been purely political; the formal union with the Latins counted for virtually nothing. Submission to Rome was all that was required of Greek clergy in the Latin Empire; this made, Orthodox bishops were to remain in office just as before 1204. In theory all the traditional customs of the East were to be left inviolate; in practice there was considerable persecution on the part of the Latins. Greek bishops and other clergy who for conscience' sake would not serve under the Latin hierarchy after 1204 betook themselves not only to the centres of Greek resistance but also to Bulgaria. Asen made a point of being gracious to all Greeks in the Balkans and especially sought the favour of the Athonite monasteries with grants of land and other endowments.(c) Neither Rome nor the Latin Patriarchate at Constantinople could offer him any tangible advantages, even though the Lateran council of 1215, which re-defined Papal primacy, had purposely made its acceptance as easy as possible.

The political manoeuvres of Michael VIII Palaeologos again brought

- (a) Theodore proclaimed himself Emperor at Saloniki in 1224 and was crowned by the Archbishop of Ohrid. But his decisive defeat by Asen at the Battle of Klokotnitsa (1230) nullified this. The threat of a peninsular Empire was not wholly removed till 1259, long after Asen's death in 1241
- (b) n/a
- (c) Vatopedi, for example, received important gifts immediately after Asen's victory at Klokotnitsa in 1230.

about an uneasy union with Rome for all territories over which he had some ecclesiastical control during the decade 1272-82. But the Orthodoxy of the Bulgarians was staunch enough to reject the kind of compromise later exemplified in the Uniate churches.

After the Turkish conquest of the Balkans the Bulgarian church reverted, with Serbia and Ohrid, to that status which the Empire from the beginning had tried to impose on it - subordination to the Patriarchate of Constantinople. But by then there was no Christian Empire and the Ecumenical Patriarch was head of the Orthodox communities throughout the Ottoman Empire - the Rum milleti - and consequently of far greater authority than at any time when Constantinople was a Christian capital.

## **CROATIA AND DALMATIA**

The movement of the Slavs into the Balkans seriously threatened the Dalmatian coast by about the year 600. In July of that year Pope Gregory I wrote to the Archbishop of Salona: 'de Sclavorum gente quae vobis valde imminet et affligor vehementer et conturbor'. Further attempts to hold the Danube-Sava frontier became futile from the reign of the incapable semi-barbarian Emperor Phocas (602-10). By the accession of Heraklios (610) the situation of Salona and even some of the Dalmatian islands was already desperate; indeed Spalato owed its future importance to refugees from Salona, abandoned in the course of his reign. Further down the coast the inhabitants of Epidaurus fled to the more defensible islet of Ragusa.

There is a tradition, better authenticated of the Serbs than the Croats, that these two peoples carried out a migration separate from the general Balkan invasion, invited by Heraklios himself who needed help against the Avars. The centre of dispersion of the Croats was a 'White Croatia' north of the Carpathians - a geographical expression only recorded by Constantine Porphyrogenetos. In course of time both Croats and Serbs became the political nuclei of larger areas in the Balkans, dissolving into the mass of Slav tribes already settled in those parts but imposing their own names.

In these early centuries Croatia may be considered to include the northern half of the Adriatic coast and thence eastwards at least to the River Vrbas and northwards to the river Sava, which was an artery rather than a frontier. The Mesopotamia up to the River Drava was

end

known as Pannonian Croatia; most of this was lost to the Magyars in the tenth century.

All these Slavs arrived in the Balkans as pagans. Their descent on Dalmatia is reflected in some Roman churches: Pope John IV (640-2) had a mosaic executed in the chapel of St Venantius (baptistery of St John Lateran) recording the persecution of Christians in Dalmatia. He was himself a Dalmatian and sent agents to redeem Christian Captives from the inflowing pagans and to save relics. The latter he deposited in the new chapel. The looting of Dalmatian churches by the Slavs is noted in several sources. By this time they were firmly established along the greater part of the coast; those who settled in the region of the River Neretva (Narentans) were already strong enough in 642 to mount an expedition across the Adriatic to attack the territories of Benevento. The Narentans were peculiar in taking early to the sea and piracy.

The incoming Slavs (often mixed with Avars) were not disposed to destroy, even if they could, the civilised coastal towns. It was to their advantage that they should continue as markets and ports. Many of the towns paid protection money to the new barbarians for immunity from their depredations. Nevertheless such was the disorganisation of the church in Dalmatia, and a fortiori in the hinterland, by the seventh century that probably little sustained evangelical work could be then undertaken. The leading ecclesiastical centres on the coast were now Spalato (replacing Salona) and Dyrrachiuma in the extreme south, the main point of communication with South Italy. The Emperor Constantine was informed that the conversion of the Croats was attempted soon after their arrival in the seventh century: Heraklios had requested the Pope to organise missions, since the whole Dalmatian coast was still in the Papal diocese of Illyricum. No record remains of any such large-scale attempt at their conversion, though the Imperial author alludes to a bishop and even an archbishop sent from Rome. But some sort of work in those parts went on, as would appear from a reference in a Papal letter of 680. As in Greece, this is eminently the case of a gradual process - the slow effect of contact between the various centres of civilisation and Slav tribes, whose political organisation remained for long at a primitive stage. It is noticeable that those Croats who settled within the immediate radiation of the coastal towns, particularly Zadar, Trogir and Split, (b) were civilised and converted comparatively quickly,

(a) Italian Durazzo, Slav Drach; Albanian Durrës.

(b) Italian Zara, Trau, Spalato.

whereas the Narentans, who had no large town or bishopric on their coast (between the Rivers Cetina and Neretva), were among the last, perhaps not fully till after 900. The earliest new purely Slav ports probably date from the mid-tenth century, notably Biograd (sometimes referred to as Zara Vecchia), and were in that favourable part of Dalmatian Croatia which the Romance-speaking population had evacuated in the seventh century, taking refuge on the Quarnero islands.(a)

The eighth century remains a dark age. There is an occasional allusion to some individual missionary enterprise, such as the work of a certain Ursus on the Dalmatian coast towards the end of the century. With the loss of Ravenna (751) and Emperor Leo's transference of Sicily, South Italy and the Western parts of the Balkan peninsula to the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the Patriarchate of Constantinople the whole Dalmatian coast became for a short time a Byzantine responsibility. But Ursus must have come from North Italy or from even farther afield in the Frankish dominions. It was not till the early years of the ninth century that the political scene became sufficiently reshaped for conversion of the barbarians to become a matter of urgency in the policy of all the interested states. The Franks had by then succeeded in extending their political control round the head of the Adriatic after breaking the power of the Avars in the 790s. They had occupied Istria as early as 788 and made their first attack on the Avars from this direction, that is, probably with Croat help. Byzantine interests extended all up and down the Dalmatian coast and embraced Venice. Constantinople attempted also to maintain what control she could over the inland Slavs; in this she was now more and more to find a rival in Bulgaria.

Frankish suzerainty over Pannonian Croatia dates from c.795, when the Croat chieftain Vojnomir accepted it (being baptised not long after), and over Dalmatian Croatia from c.803. The Frankish secular authority was the Markgraf of Friuli (Forum Julii); the ecclesiastical authority was Aquileia (Cividale).(d) By 811 it had become necessary for the Byzantine

- (a) The Dalmatian islands (some 50 large and 500 small) remained for the most part outside Slav settlement until c.950. On the Croatian coast settlement probably started with Pag. Further south, Hvar, Korčula, Mljet and Brač (italice Lesina, Curzola, Meleda, Brazza) were among the earliest to become Slav, some as Narentan lairs. In particular Hvar was probably, with Brač, ruled by a Slav chieftain as early as the first half of the ninth century. Slav colonies (Narentan?) are even known from the Gargano region across the Adriatic in the tenth-eleventh centuries but they must have rapidly lost their language and identity.
- (b) N/a
- (c) N/a
- (d) The name Aquileia can be ambiguous. As a result of the Lombard invasion of 568 North-east Italy became ecclesiastically divided between the Byzantine and the Lombard

and Frankish Empires to make a general settlement defining their respective spheres of interest in the North-west Balkans (Treaty of Air). The dividing-line was drawn at the River Cetina, a short way south of Split. But Constantinople retained a theoretical suzerainty over all the offshore islands and over the coastal settlements from Grade to Venice. Thus both the Pannonian and Dalmatian Croats came more and more under Frankish influence in the ninth century. Borna of the Dalmatian and Ljudevit of the Pannonian Croats (with residence at Sisak) reaffirmed their loyalty to Louis the Pious in 814. Less directly affected by Frankish pressure, Borna remained loyal and even paid homage to Louis in person at Air in 820. Ljudevit was more troublesome. After his removal about 823, Pannonian Croatia became for many years a bone of contention between the Franks and Bulgars. Its importance as a geographical link between Moravia and Pannonia on the one hand and the North Balkans on the other is clear enough despite lack of information for the rest of the ninth century.

Venice, though scarcely yet ranking as a separate power, was already vitally interested in the free navigation of the Adriatic and paid 'tribute' to the coastal Slavs, particularly the Narentans, to safeguard this. It was paid occasionally till as late as 996. Venice herself continued to be for a long time a Latin-Byzantine hybrid. The same duality was imposed on the life of the Dalmatian ports, especially Zadar and Split, and thence came to affect many coastal Slavs as well. A curious example is afforded

(d)... (later Frankish) churches. Paulinus of Aquileia took refuge from the Lombards on the lagoon island of Grado (Aquilegia nova). A large part of Northern Italy had broken off relations with Rome in the middle of the sixth century (the Schism of the Three Chapters). Grado, still Byzantine throughout the seventh century, ended this schism in 607; the Lombard see of Aquileia (finally located at Cividale) did not. Further, the schism had emboldened Aquileia, supposedly founded and evangelised by St Mark, to call itself a Patriarchate in rivalry to Rome. After the split both Aquileias - Grado and Cividale - used this title. The coastal province of Grado remained of importance to Constantinople; Heraklios presented the see with St Mark's reputed episcopal throne. The bringing of this and other relics to Venice in 829 started the process by which the patronage of St Mark and the patriarchal title (still in use) were transferred to the increasingly important political centre of Venice, finally and permanently in 1156. Meanwhile Cividale (Old Aquileia) became Frankish with the extinction of the Lombard kingdom in 774 and detached Istria, with its leading sees of Trieste, Parenzo and Pola, from Byzantine Grade. When the peninsula passed into Frankish hands (788- 98), Grado, and then Venice, continued to dispute this loss but never regained Istria for long. In view of all these fluctuations it is impossible to be certain whether 'Aquileian' clergy working in Istria and Croatian Dalmatia in the ninth century are from Cividale or Grade. But generally speaking Grade was of minor importance and wealth compared with the Frankish see and with Venice, which developed its own bishoprics from the later ninth century. In default of precision Aquileia will be taken to mean Old Aquileia.

by the *Evangelarium spatense*, written in Dalmatia - almost certainly at Split - at the end of the eighth century, three pages of which are the Greek text of the opening of St John's Gospel transcribed in the Latin alphabet. Again, the earliest Croat forms of the popular names John Joseph, Stephen and others are clearly based on spoken Greek forms and were only later reformed on Latin models.

The gradual advance southwards of the Frankish sphere of influence as far as the River Cetina brought in its train an increasing interest on the part of the Patriarchate of Aquileia. Until the fall of Ravenna in July 751 Dalmatia had been a part of the Exarchate and her ecclesiastical affairs came within the competence of Rome. Thereafter Zadar, local administrative centre since the abandonment of Salona, stepped into Ravenna's shoes but the Bishop of Split had long been the highest ecclesiastical authority. (a) Split was now the custodian of Salona's relics of SS Domnius and Anastasius.

Thus on the one hand the transference of Illyricum to the Patriarchate of Constantinople introduced a theoretical rather than a practical change: the Greek language and Byzantine religious practices found little extension outside the Greek population of the ports; Latin was the main liturgical and Dalmatian the main vernacular language. (b) On the other hand Aquileia's entry on to the scene, beginning in the last decades of the eighth century, was as much at the expense of Rome and Constantinople; for example, as early as 817 Split had to submit to a curtailment of its interests in the now Frankish territories to its north.

The first successful work of considerable scale among the Dalmatian Croats appears to be due principally to missions from Frankish Aquileia whose control of Istria gave access alike to Carniola and to Croatia. Her initiative was confirmed by the general agreement on spheres of influence between Charlemagne and Constantinople made in 811/12. Aquileia was better placed than Salona (and then Split) to gather up the *disiecta membra* of barbarised Illyricum. Borna (c.810-c.812) and his successor Vladislav (c.821-c.835) were at least nominal Christians.

- (a) It is not known when Split became a Metropolitan archbishopric - perhaps as early as 615. The tradition that John of Ravenna, as Papal legate in Croatia, became its first archbishop in 640, is probably without foundation in fact.
- (b) The interpenetration of all these languages is reflected in the local Slav religious vocabulary. Thus, *kaludjer* or *kalujer* (monk), from Greek *kalojeros*, is still widely used even in Catholic Croatia, while *kriz* (cross), current in Orthodox parts, demands prototype *\*croge[m]* from Dalmatian or North Italian (Aquileian?) Romance, parallel to Venetian *doge* < *duce[m]*. In early times both *manastir* from Greek and *klostar* from the Latin world were in general use.

Indeed we should probably put the date of a Christian dynasty back to Godeslav and his successor Visheslav to judge by the edifices at their capital of Nin (Latin Nona). These include a baptistery and a funerary chapel dedicated to the Holy Cross. On the lintel of the chapel door is preserved the inscription GODES[L]AV IUPPANO [...] ISTO DOMO COSTRUXIT. Neither palaeographical nor other considerations preclude a date between 788, when the Franks occupied Istria, and 800 which is the probable date of the slightly later baptistery with its font bearing a Latin inscription of Vigeslav. Such unsophisticated and diminutive buildings were presumably the work of local craftsmen copying what was to hand in Zadar, the environs of Salona and elsewhere. The closest extant parallels to the two buildings at Nin are however to be found at Grade and Pola. It is not safe to conclude the establishment of a bishopric for the Dalmatian Croats as early as the beginning of the ninth century, though the presence of a missionary bishop at the prince's court would be (as we have seen elsewhere) likely first step. The fact that from about 835 the Croatian princes more often than not resided at other places than Nin - in particular Klis above Split and Bihac on the route to Trogir - would not preclude a missionary bishopric with Nin as its working centre. The acts of the Synod of Split (928), though biased, may well have described the earliest cleric appointed to Nin correctly as archypresbyter sub ditione episcopi. Whether the cleric, whatever his rank, was attached directly to Rome as is widely believed, or to Aquileia, cannot yet be certainly resolved. According to one local legend Nin and its environs were evangelised 'in apostolic times' by a Bishop Anselm and his deacon Ambrose, who brought relics of St Marcella from Francia. Such a legend might well grow up about the first missionary bishop actually appointed from Aquileia - by his name patently a Frank. The cult of St Marcella is also authenticated in North-east Italy.

It is of course improbable that Aquileia was solely responsible for the evangelical work which led to the new bishopric. We should look also to Byzantine Zadar and to Split. But when the Curia finally took a hand in the affairs of Nin it was only to connections with Aquileia to which it objected.

Throughout much of the ninth century Nin looked alternately more towards Frankish Aquileia or towards Byzantine Split as politics determined. Vigeslav, Borna and Vladislav belonged to one house; Mislav



was of a different line. He and his powerful successor Trpimir (c.845-64) now resided at Klis and understandably favoured closer relations with Split and through Split with Constantinople. These were close enough for Archbishop Peter of Split to stand godfather to Trpimir's son. But a transference of jurisdiction is improbable: both Trpimir and Mislav are known to have accepted the Frankish obligation to pay the tithes. Trpimir also founded the first Benedictine monastery in these parts, at Riznice near his castle of Klis.

Trpimir's death only intensified the dynastic rivalry. Domagoj, of the line of Vladislav and pro-Frankish, seized power and held it between about 864 and 876. Then Trpimir's sons Zdeslav, who had fled to Constantinople, and Mutimir regained the ascendancy with Byzantine help. Zdeslav sent for Greek priests from Constantinople. Finally Branimir, Domagoj's son or nephew, succeeded in evicting them (879) and returned to Frankish allegiance with virtual independence. Rome was quick to take advantage of this by entering into close relations with Branimir: the re-establishment of Eastern ecclesiastical influence in Northern Dalmatia would have undermined the whole policy of the 870s designed to secure to the Papacy the various provinces of former Illyricum. A trial of strength with the Frankish church here took second place.

It was Domagoj, *sclavorum pessimus dux* to the Venetians, who made the first move to change the status of Nin. Either it was a matter of disengaging himself ecclesiastically from Split and Aquileia and achieving a relative independence directly under the Holy See, or (more probably) the see still needed formal establishment and this again had now better be taken to Rome. For there had almost certainly been a Bishop of Nin in the reign of Trpimir. The shadowy archpriests or bishops of Nin up to this time cannot even be given names. Pope Nicholas I, however took no steps. We could judge the situation better if we knew exactly in what year during the period 864-7 Domagoj's request reached him, for these were the years of Nicholas's preoccupation with events in Bulgaria and of awakening interest in the work of SS Cyril and Methodios in Moravia. Perhaps Nicholas or his successor felt unable to take the matter up since the years 867-71 saw unusually close cooperation of the Franks and Greeks to the advantage of the Papacy against the Saracens in South Italy and on the Dalmatian coast.(c) Thus Byzantine prestige

- (c) The Byzantine fleet raised the siege of Ragusa by a Saracen fleet in late 867. Bar was invested and finally recaptured from the Saracens in early 871. Byzantine administration then remained in South Dalmatia (now reorganised as a Theme to meet the military situation) and was gradually reimposed in South Italy, partly as a protectorate of local Lombard princelings. Neither Constantinople nor Venice would tolerate a power (now the Saracens, later the Normans) which might control the exit of the Adriatic by holding at the same time both South Italy and the lower Dalmatian or Albanian coast.

was exceptionally high along the coast and the Slavs were taking employment in the Byzantine as well as in the Frankish forces.

Domagoj nevertheless caused a new bishop of Nin to be elected, to which irregular act approval was only obtained from Hadrian II about 870. This date may therefore be taken as the final establishment of the see. The bishop of Nin was recognised as *episcopus nonensis* or *episcopus chroatorum*. The first bishop known by name is Theodosius consecrated in 879 on the advice of the Papal legate John, who returned from his mission to Moravia by way of Dalmatia and is thought to have visited Nin. It is clear that Pope John VIII now desired that the Bishop of Nin should be consecrated by himself, so as to counter and further Byzantine influence by subordinating what was virtually still a missionary bishopric directly to Rome. Nevertheless it is not certain whether Theodosius was consecrated in Rome or Aquileia. Since a later Pope, probably Stephen V (885-91), reprimanded the Patriarch of Aquileia, Walpert (*fungebatur* 874-900), for consecrating a bishop at Split *ultra vires*, it may well be that Theodosius's consecration was also Aquileian. Precisely in the years 879-80 - the climax of the battle over Bulgaria - Patriarch Photios saw to the strengthening of the ecclesiastical organisation of Split but at the same time recognised and even agreed to an extension of the powers of Frankish Aquileia on the coast: Rome was still the interloper. Yet on 7 June 879 the Pope wrote to the new ruler Branimir in terms implying that Croatia was now a Papal concern. The letter was perhaps hopeful rather than actual. On the same date he exhorted Theodosius to receive consecration nowhere but at Rome. A few days later he appealed to the Byzantine hierarchs of Dalmatia, and once more to Boris of Bulgaria, to return to the Roman fold. There was no reply in either case. In 881, after Theodosius had had consultations with him in Rome, the Pope again wrote to Branimir as if Croatia had accepted Roman jurisdiction. Branimir presumably favoured this policy; it remains doubtful whether Theodosius did. Moreover, the Archbishop of Split considered that he had rights, to which he was not slow to give voice. The discussions in Rome evidently bore on this involved three-cornered problem. Even if

end

some bishops of Nin had received Roman consecration, others had not. The tone of the Papal correspondence reveals a determination to drive a wedge between Aquileian and Byzantine establishments on the central part of the Dalmatian coast.

The election of Theodosius of Nin to succeed Archbishop Marinur of Split, who died in 885, was a setback to Papal policy. The Pope protested and exhorted him to come to Rome for his pallium. The see of Nin was filled by one Adelfred, who by his name could well have been another Frank from Aquileia. The next decades are however lost in obscurity; virtually nothing is known of the Bishop of Nin and his work except the foundation of further churches. That of St Peter at Gornji Muc near Split is dated to 888 by an inscription set up by Branimir. Mutimir (regnabat c.892-c.910) built a church near Knin and confirmed his father Trpimir's church endowments. He remained on good terms with Split.

Theodosius's episcopate however did not outlast the death of Branimir in 892. It was now becoming increasingly clear to all parties that some new regulation of Dalmatian affairs was needed at the highest level. For the see of Nin was no sooner well established than it began to develop pretensions on its own part. While the jurisdiction of the archbishop of Split was recognised in the coastal towns and islands, notably Krk (Veglia),(a) Zadar, Trogir, Ragusa and Rotor (Cattaro), it had none inland. The bishopric of Nin, being essentially a missionary see for the Croats, could now claim all territory under the rule of the Croat prince. This became a considerable pretension when Tomislav (c.912-28?), (b) thought to be Mutimir's son and therefore of the house of Trpimir, was successful in welding the Dalmatian and Pannonian Croats into one state, with its northern frontier on the River Drava. The Magyars had all but extinguished Christianity on their side of the frontier. A Croatian church independent of both Aquileia and Split would now be no anomaly if Tomislav had pressed for it. But this was not necessary. In 924 Tomislav was recompensed for his military support of the Byzantine Empire against the Bulgarians and Serbs by recognition of his political control of the Dalmatian seaboard towns, including Split and Zadar whose Prior (mayor) remained the representative of Byzantine interests. At the same time the Patriarch of Constantinople surrendered

- (a) Slav Krk from Culicum, no doubt an ancient Illyrian name; Veglia from Dalmatian Vetula.
- (b) The date of his death is quite uncertain; it has been put as late as 940.

his ecclesiastical jurisdiction over them to the Pope. Thus Tomislav's church (including Nin) was brought formally under Rome at this date, confirmed by his assumption of the title of King with Papal approval most probably after his victory over the Bulgarians in 924. At the Synods of Split in 925 and 928 an attempt was made to regulate all outstanding problems. For the question of ecclesiastical jurisdiction had been exacerbated by another equally grave matter: the orthodoxy and ecclesiastical language of the Croats now came under attack.

The Slav liturgical language had gained a firm foothold in the Croat church, at least in its Dalmatian portion. By 925 it is plain that native clergy, known as glagoljasi, were numerous, if not in the majority. The beginning of the connection with the Cyrillomethodian mission may reach back to 870, when Kotsel's Pannonia came under the thumb of the Franks. An immigration of Moravian exiles is very probable in 885 though none of the leaders known to us by name settled in Dalmatia. The Life of Methodios unfortunately does not state clearly whether the saint himself passed through Dalmatia either on his way back from Rome to Moravia in the earlier part of 880 or on his journey to Constantinople. Nor do we know the substance of Theodosius's consultations with the Pope in 880. It remains therefore an open question whether Methodios and Theodosius knew one another and consequently whether a deliberate policy of introducing the Slav liturgical language and the Glagolitic alphabet was embraced by the latter.

The Slav liturgy was much in the mind of the Pope at this moment. It is at least conceivable that John VIII approved it for Theodosius' see of Nin at the same time as he confirmed it for Methodios in Moravia - and a formal or conditional approval at some date seems demanded. However that may be, it can scarcely be doubted that the Glagolitic alphabet and a Latin liturgy in Slav were transplanted to Dalmatia before the end of the ninth century.(b) The situation in Croatia was thus not very dissimilar to that in Moravia: the Slav books were brought to people with nearly a century of Christianity behind them in other forms. Rome appreciated that Illyricum, including Bulgaria, might only be won back from Constantinople by concessions to local wishes. Thus John VIII underwrote in 873 Methodios's insistence on the continuation of the Slav church, especially as Methodios was himself a Greek still

- (c) There are no traces of a fully Byzantine liturgy in OCS in Croatia. The point is of importance: apparently only the more Westernised Cyrillomethodian texts were taken or accepted there.

with potentially great influence at home. With the return of Photios to the Patriarchal throne in 877 there was even more reason to maintain the concession. In all that happened in those years (879-85), perhaps the most decisive in the whole history of the Slav church, Theodosius is a key figure. He knew what was going on in Bulgaria and Moravia; he knew about the use of the Slav liturgy up and down Dalmatia. Unfortunately his part is still elusive to us. It would have been shortsighted, we may judge, on the part of the Pope not to try and unify the policy of Methodios's archbishopric of Sirmium and the Croatian bishopric of Nin (or even the archbishopric of Split) on the basis of the free use of the Slav liturgical language and to dangle this before (but) Bulgaria and Serbia as no bar to dependence on Rome.

The success of the Slav clergy, at least among the people, must have been rapid. It is less certain that the Court and ruling class generally took much interest in a Slav church. The attraction of the predominantly Latin culture of the great coastal cities, politically so important to any Croat state, was too great. At all events the vigour of this transplantation is the best evidence that clergy from the north, with or without the formal approval of Aquileia or Rome, became an important element in Croat Christianity from the late ninth century. By 925 the position of the Latin church was greatly strengthened by the virtual withdrawal of the Byzantine administration. An attack on the anomaly could be undertaken. (a) For Split now became a Latin metropolis.

At the first Synod of Split (925) the Latin hierarchy gained most of its points. Split became the metropolis for the whole coast from Istria to Ragusa and Kotor; for Tomislav, at the height of his power, had some pretensions to rule the whole. (b) The see of Nin was placed under Split. The archbishop now styled himself *primas Dalmatiae totiusque Croatiae* and boasted that his province extended *usque ad ripas Danubii*. But the suppression of the Slav language was not pressed. The anomaly was, as we have seen, always a special concession on the part of the Holy See and a concession not readily forthcoming. It might be held now to have outlived its usefulness in Dalmatia to Papal policy. However Pope John X in approving the Canons may have decided that Croatia was not yet a 'mature' church and that the abrupt prohibition of the Slav

- (a) Greek as such was not under attack. The Greek liturgy continued to be used in the coastal towns after the withdrawal of the Byzantine church as long as there were enough Greek residents in the town.
- (b) The province of Hum was more or less independent under Michael of a different dynasty.

liturgy and removal of the glagoljash priests was not practicable. Many of them knew no Latin. For the tone of his instructions to the Synod had been much less liberal: he treated the 'Methodian doctrine' as something strange and unacceptable. At the same time (924/5) he wrote to Tomislav...

Canon X of the Synod provided that the Slav language might continue to be used but only as a special concession--where there was a lack of Latin priests. The gradual suppression of the Slav parochial priesthood by preventing further exclusively glagoljash recruits was envisaged as the best method. The corollary was that the Slav liturgy should not be allowed to extend itself outside Croatia proper into any of the sees just recovered from the Eastern church. As far as possible all licensed glagoljashi should be proficient in Latin also. There is no sign at this time that the Latins went so far as to persecute the adherents of the Slav language; they were satisfied with limiting its use and putting an end to the autonomy of the see of Nin. The charge of heresy was not pressed either; it was not a serious issue. This was far from the liberal policy of John VIII some fifty years earlier. But the disappearance of Moravia and the loss of Bulgaria and its Serbian satellite made all the difference: the Papal Legate Madalbert, who attended the Synod on his way back from a mission to Bulgaria, would have been quite clear on this.

The Bishop of Nin, Grgur (Gregory) I, did not however accept the decrees without protest. The Pope too had second thoughts, not so much on language as on organisation. He summoned Grgur and the Archbishop of Split to Rome for further discussions. A second synod was convened at Split in 928 to reconsider the question of the bishopric of Nin. The new Pope, Leo VI (fungebatur 928), went further than his predecessor. He did not favour Croat separatism. The synod through his legate Madalbert now decreed the abolition of the see of Nin and Grgur was transferred to Scardona (Skradin). By this decision all question of developing a Croat church with an independent hierarchy - whether Latin or Slav or mixed - was indefinitely postponed, which we may judge to have been a considerable disappointment to Tomislav the King, with his eye on the recognition of the Bulgarian Patriarchate. From 928 the Archbishop of Split naturally consecrated the bishop

appointed for Croatia, but where he resided and with what title is uncertain. It is interesting to observe that Archdeacon Thomas of Split (1200-68), a rabid pro-Latin, ignores the decisions of 925-8, presumably because they did not debar the Slav liturgy. The two synods balanced the suppression of Nin by the creation of the see of Ston (Stagno) in Hum as a new centre of Latin influence further down the coast.

For over a hundred years the situation did not substantially change. The Slav language was tolerated within a probably gradually shrinking area, but supported by ties with Bohemia, as the literary evidence shows, and perhaps also with Macedonia; for these were the two other preserves of the Glagolitic alphabet.

A new radical examination of the ecclesiastical position was not made until after the events of 1054 and the Lateran Council of 1059. By this time Venice had fully emerged as the dominant influence in the life of the Dalmatian cities, especially Ragusa, now virtually an independent city-state with a Latin archbishopric (1022). Croatia, still powerful under Stephen Držislav (969-97), acknowledged as King by Constantinople, then declined into anarchy and in the eleventh century began to look to the young Christian state of Hungary for support against Venice. Despite the episode of Samuel's Macedonian Empire and the reimposition of Byzantine rule after 1018 at various times throughout the eleventh century on varying portions of the Dalmatian coast, Byzantine civilisation was in constant retreat before Latin. Surviving Byzantine practices up and down the coast were more and more frowned upon. The Normans, self-styled protectors of the Papacy from 1059, had in mind to recover Pope all former Illyricum and therefore also stood behind the Papal policy of uniformity. They began to stamp out Greek customs in South Italy also. The synod held at Split in 1059-60, attended by all the Dalmatian bishops and the Papal legate Mainard, confirmed the Lateran canons in so far as they applied. The additions are significant: no clergy are henceforward to wear long hair or a beard (this aimed at remnants of Byzantine practice); no Slavs to be ordained to the priesthood who are incompetent in Latin (this above all to obviate possible heresy). This still did not amount to a formal suppression of the Slav liturgical language but we should hardly be wrong in supposing a now much less tolerant spirit in the Dalmatian Latin church bent on uniformity; these were the greatest days of the archdiocese of Split under the reforming Archbishop Laurence (fungebatur 1060-99). The decrees

were at any rate interpreted as a suppression of the Slav liturgy and the Pope confirmed them. The King of Croatia, Peter-Kreshimir (regnabat 1058-74), who was half Venetian, apparently acquiesced. We can perhaps give credence to Thomas of Split's statement that the Croatian upper class was by and large pro-Latin. Most glagoljashi were parish priests still ignorant of or incompetent in Latin, and married as well; they ministered to the peasantry. Toleration would be extended only to those priests who were proficient in Latin and conformed in other respects. The argument that Methodios was a heretic and that the alphabet which he propagated (Glagolitic) was therefore to be eschewed was now aired. This was countered on the Slav side by attributing it to St Jerome. For the first time we hear of some open persecution: churches using the Slav language were forcibly closed. The prohibition on its use was reaffirmed more clearly by Pope Alexander II in 1063.

The Croat clergy were not prepared to acquiesce in their own extinction. The Bishop for Croatia, Rainer, who had attended the synod, was evidently lukewarm towards the Slav language and did not fight the decision. His clergy took matters into their own hands. Thomas of Split tells an involved story of the appeal to Rome by clergy of Krk headed by the glagoljash priest Cedula (or Zedula). On being falsely informed that the Pope supported their views, Cedula was despatched to Rome to be consecrated in place of the traitor Rainer. This can only mean that the Croat glagoljashi hoped to secede from the Dalmatian Latin hierarchy. What took place in Rome is obscure but Cedula proceeded to act as bishop on the island of Krk. Alexander was obliged to send a legate, John of Porto, to declare him an impostor (*pseudoepiscopus*) and instruct the Croat authorities to recall the glagoljashi to obedience. This could be mostly *parti pris* on the part of Thomas, who calls Cedula *malesanus, fantasticus pontifex* and *fatuus senex*, but there is nothing to show that the Pope was inclined at this moment to grant Croatian autocephaly and did in fact consecrate Cedula. Cedula died in 1064 and was succeeded, properly or improperly, by another *pseudoepiscopus*. Troubles with the Latin clergy became more serious. Whatever the true status of these two bishops may have been, a compromise was reached: Bishop Rainer's authority was reimposed in 1066.

A general settlement of the affairs of the Dalmatian church was attempted by Pope Alexander II about 1066/7 through a synod held perhaps at Omis (Almissa). The whole coast was divided into two



archbishoprics, that of Split northwards from Omish, that of Duklja (Dioclea) southwards as far as Durazzo. Omish is at the mouth of the River Cetina, the old dividing line of 812. Ragusa had some claims to be considered the natural ecclesiastical centre of South Dalmatia but those of Bar to this new metropolitan status were now vigorously pushed especially as the Pope intended Serbia, and perhaps Bosnia, to be attached to Dioclea. From this time rivalry between Ragusa and Bar comes to the fore and the claims of Durazzo to its former suffragan sees in Dioclea (where it must have been responsible for much of the missionary work) disappear. The archdiocese of Split was to contain the bishoprics of Trogir (established not later than 1000), Skradin near Sibenik (Sebenico), Biograd (Peter-Kreshimir's new capital), Zadar, Nin, Rab (Arbe), Osor (Lussin) and Krk. Nin thus reappeared as an episcopal town. However, its importance after its resuscitation does not seem to have been great. Owing to Norman attacks on the Dalmatian seaboard (they were in full control of Apulia by 1071) the reorganisation was not fully achieved till 1075. In that year a synod at Split confirmed the status of Nin: *in hoc sinodo restauratus est episcopatus nonensis*, and in 1078 Archbishop Laurence held a local synod there. There was no intention of tolerating the Slav language but it continued to be used more or less in secret in many outlying parts, particularly on the island of Krk. It must be borne in mind that most of the Dalmatian towns had accepted some measure of Venetian protection since 1000, for in 998 they themselves called in the Venetian fleet to rid them of the Narentan pirates. The Doge then arrogated to himself the title of *dux dalmatiae* - recognised even by the Emperor Otto III. In 1000 the island of Krk, among others, had passed into Venetian hands and remained so with a Croat interlude (1058-1118) until the middle of the fourteenth century. But neither Venetian doges nor harassed Croat princes were concerned to suppress the use of the Slav liturgical language in such remote corners as Krk.

On the death of Peter-Kreshimir in 1074 revolts broke out between rival political and ecclesiastical factions. Pope Gregory VII called in his Norman allies to restore order. At the ensuing synod of Split (1075/6) no concessions were made to the *glagoljashi*. In October 1076 Zvonimir-

(a) Nin, Skradin, Biograd and Knin were all royal residences in the eleventh century; it remains uncertain whether these sees were always formally distinct and where the *episcopus regius et palatinus* resided at any given time.

(b) Venice formally incorporated the diocese of Zadar with its dependent islands (Krk, Rab, Osor, Hvar) in 1154/5.

Demetrius, who had managed to gain control of all the Croat provinces was crowned King of Croatia and Dalmatia in St Peter's church near Split, receiving his crown from the Papal legate. He forthwith built a new cathedral at Biskupija near his residence of Knin. He probably shared the hostile attitude of the Latin hierarchy towards the Slav liturgical language. With Guiscard holding the Byzantine fortress of Durazzo (1081) and a complaisant ruler of Dioclea, the Pope was in a position to enforce uniformity of ecclesiastical practice, just as he was doing in Bohemia. Yet his handling of Ballran affairs cannot be called narrow-minded. He expected Guiscard to introduce Roman rites and customs into territories conquered by him but placed no bar on the retention of the Greek rite for those who desired it. He may therefore have extended some tolerance to the use of the Slav language also. The end of the eleventh century nevertheless marks the low water mark of the fortunes of the Slav language.

The house of Trpimir was now extinct, for Zvonimir was an upstart. On his death in 1089 St Ladislav of Hungary (1077-95) claimed the succession through his sister Helen, the widow of Zvonimir. Hungary was becoming the leading power in Central Europe and now turned her protection of Croatia into domination. Inland Croatia was soon in Ladislav's hands; he proceeded to establish the see of Zagreb (Agram) in 1093/4, attached to his own primate's see of Esztergom (Gran). Its first bishop was a Czech. From this time Croatia became a purely Latin Catholic domain.

The pacification of all Croatia was complete by 1097 when Koloman, Ladislav's nephew, was crowned in Biograd. The Pacta conventa of 1102 defined the status of all parts of Croatia in the Hungarian kingdom: while the Mesopotamia was fully integrated into Hungary, Croatia was to enjoy a personal union with Hungary under a single crown without derogation of her laws and customs. It does not seem that all the minor Croatian bishoprics under Split were immediately dissolved but they certainly lost importance. Krk, perhaps a few other islands, and a handful of monasteries alone kept the use of the Slav language and Glagolitic alphabet alive.

The twelfth century continued to be a difficult time. The Emperor of Constantinople, Manuel, took advantage of the death of Geza of Hungary (1163) to reassert himself in the Balkans. The re-establishment of Byzantine power in much of Croatia, Dalmatia, Bosnia and

end

Montenegro (a) in the second half of his reign (1167-80), though short-lived was marked by the same anti-Slav measures as had for a long time been prominent in Byzantine-dominated Bulgaria and Serbia. Many Croatian Glagolitic books were destroyed. As usual, suppression and destruction were not methodical; it is even recorded that Pope Alexander attended a Slav liturgy in the church of St Anastasia at Zadar on his way to Venice in 1177.

Byzantine pressure relaxed after the death of Manuel; indeed this was the last flicker of a Byzantine Dalmatia. Henceforward Venice disputed it alone with Hungary. Both Bulgaria and Serbia now rapidly rose to independence. With the establishment of the Latin Empire of Constantinople by the Fourth Crusade (1204), the Nicaean Emperors had little option but to grant Bulgaria and Serbia autocephaly, in an attempt to ensure their adherence to the Eastern church and to the principle of the Byzantine Empire. A similar complaisance is visible too in the Catholic attitude to Dalmatian Croatia though the ascendancy of the Western church was not in any doubt. The Fourth Lateran Council of 1215 relaxed the theoretical ban on the Slav liturgical language through the general provision of Canon IX. From that time the Glagolitic use of Croatia began slowly to recover some of its lost ground. This was still toleration rather than approval. Qualified Papal permission given in 1248 marks the turning-point. Benedictine monks on Krk thought it advisable to apply again to Pope Innocent IV in 1252 for specific permission to use the Slav language. The permission was given insofar as concerned those incapable of learning Latin.

As far as the perpetuation of the Glagolitic alphabet is concerned, manifestly the main credit goes to those monasteries which most consistently cultivated the language. Foundation dates for the considerable number of Benedictine houses which came into being up and down Dalmatia are for the most part unknown. About 1059 a Benedictine house was founded exclusively for Slavs near Biograd - the monastery of St John the Evangelist at Rogovo. It is thought that the Benedictine Rule was translated into Croat at this time. Those houses which are most likely to have cultivated the Slav use before that date, and were certainly strong foci of it subsequently are: St Lucia near Bashka and

- (a) This Venetian name for Zeta only came into common use from the fourteenth century.

St Nicholas at Omishalj, both on the island of Krk; St John the Baptist at Povlja on the island of Brach; and St Nicholas at Otochac (Lika). Almost equally important were: two others on Krk- St Mary at Koshljun and St Laurence; St Mary on the island of Zirje (off Sibenik) and St George (Juraj) Koprivski at Obrovac. The monastery of SS Cosmas and Damian at Tkon on the island of Pashman, to which the Rogovo monks fled in 1129 after the destruction of Biograd by the Venetians, was also an important later centre. It is believed that Charles IV of Bohemia brought Glagolitic monks from here for his foundation of Emmaus in the middle of the fourteenth century. These houses are concentrated on the coast and islands of Dalmatian Croatia. It cannot be assumed that they were all exclusively and continuously Glagolitic. No Glagolitic houses are reliably known from Istria, still less from inland.

In the days of its greatest flourishing the Glagolitic use was still confined to the eight Croatian coastal dioceses, to wit Pazin (Pedena in South Istria), Rijeka (Fiume), Senj, Krk, Zadar, Shibenik (created 1298), Split and Hvar (b) - much less in some than in others. It was a relict phenomenon, tolerated but not encouraged by any high authority. In the days of its final decline it hardly extended outside the dioceses of Senj and Shibenik. More early Glagolitic material has however survived from Krk, the backwater which from 1133 was virtually independent under the Croat house of Frankopan (Frangipani), originally known under the name of Krchki. To the determined separatism of these Croats is due the curious historical chance that only in this one corner of Croatia survived the Western form of the Cyrillomethodian tradition - a church using the Roman rite in Slav translation and in the Glagolitic alphabet; moreover that it helped by its very conservatism to preserve texts in danger of extinction in Bohemia, such as the First OCS Legend of St Wenceslas as it is now to be found in the Breviary of Novi.

Church Slavonic in course of time here took on a Croat cast and the ductus of the alphabet was also modified, partly under the influence of Cyrillic, partly under that of Latin script. At a place such as Split the Latin, Glagolitic and Cyrillic alphabets were all in use concurrently at certain times, though for more or less different purposes. The sacred texts were generally brought into conformity with Roman practice,

- (b) As defined in 1147, the episcopus insularum administered Hvar, Brach, Vie and other lesser islands.

especially from 1248 when Papal recognition of the Slav use was renewed.(a)

Glagolitic as a secular alphabet for Croat literature saw a considerable development in the fourteenth-fifteenth centuries, evolving for the purpose a special cursive variant. But it was gradually superseded by the Croatian form of the Latin alphabet. After about 1600 the ecclesiastical language and script had little currency outside the service-books of the church and even here continued to be used regularly only in the Mass. Latin became more and more general for all other offices; even the silent parts of the Mass might be said in Latin. In 1927 a Latin transcription of the whole Missal was permitted and made. The alphabet has been virtually extinct since that date.

No very early Glagolitic manuscripts of the Croatian church have survived. The earliest of importance is the fragmentary Bashka Missal of the twelfth century. The best are of the fourteenth century: the Vrbnik Breviary (c.1300, from Krk); Codex Vaticanus Illyricus 4, a missal of between 1317 and 1323, probably from Krk; Prince Novak's Missal (1368); Cod. Vat. Illyr. 5-6, breviaries of the late fourteenth century. The first printed Glagolitic service-book was the 1483 Missal; it has not been definitely established where it was printed.

The Dalmatian coast provides an example of a gradual changeover from the Eastern to the Western world. For a considerable time after the Slavs first arrived there the world they saw wore a Byzantine aspect. Ravenna, Venice and Istria perpetuated a predominantly Byzantine style round the head of the Adriatic for long after Byzantine power had ebbed away from those parts. The splendid churches of Torcello and Parenzo (Porech)(b) bear witness to this. The present St Mark's at Venice was built with the cooperation of Byzantine craftsmen over more than a century from the time of Pietro Orseolo I (976-8). The radiation of Aquileian Christianity to Istria and Dalmatian Croatia propagated a 'Lombard' style which itself contained Eastern elements. Decorative sculpture of interlaced patterns, sometimes reminding us even of early Irish Christian work, is particularly characteristic, from Visheslav's font (end of the eighth century) to Peter-Kreshimir's pulpit at Split (c. 1070) and immediately proclaims its affinity with Lombard work such as can

- (a) The Psalter long retained a very archaic and conservative aspect, more so even than Ps. Sin. at some points. Traces of Cyrillomethodian usage, in the form of the liturgy of St Peter appear to have survived into the seventeenth century.
- (b) Parenzo basilica dates from about 550 or somewhat later and is now one of the least altered Byzantine monuments of that time.

be seen in the cathedral of Cividale (Frankish Aquileia). Thus the small centrally organised churches, such as Holy Cross and St Nicholas at Nin, St Mary at Trogir and St Ursula at Zadar, which include the earliest in expert buildings of the Croat princes, are Byzantine only by indirect transmission - in its far western provincial forms whether of North or South Italy.

The Eastern saint Hermagoras, believed to be St Mark's successor at Aquileia, became in Slav mouths Mogor. Further down the coast all the names of the Eastern saints of the important churches early received Slav forms: at Zadar, St Anastasia became Stoshija, St Chrysogonus- Krshevan; at Trogir St Laurence became Lovrec; at Split St Domnius (a Syrian from Nisibis, martyred in 304) appears as Dujam or Dojam; St Tryphon of Kotor as Tripun.(a) St Demetrios of Saloniki,(b) SS Sergiu and Bacchus, SS Cosmas and Damian were all popular saints. Little by little, with some rallies, Byzantine culture retreated southwards. But it had never been deep-rooted: it had been superficially imposed on an old Latin world. The whole of the Dalmatian coast was on the Latin side of the Latin-Greek language frontier, which started at about Durazzo and ended on the Black Sea coast a little south of the Danube, following roughly north-easterly line. Greek was in Dalmatia only the language of the seaboard communities and their church.(c) For those portions of the coast and its hinterland which became parts of Orthodox states the Adriatic was a potent source of Latin influences.

The Croatian church was from its very beginning Latin (Catholic) with the unusual local features brought by the Methodian disciples. We have followed it mainly from the Dalmatian point of view since the ecclesiastical history of inland Croatia before 1094 is largely surmise. There is nothing inherently improbable in some Pannonian followers of the Cyrillomethodian tradition remaining in the interior, at Sisak, Ptuj and other places on the routes to the South. The lack of large towns and active bishoprics in this region would be apt to favour its survival. Evidence of mixed Western and Eastern practices can be deduced for

- (a) The first church of St Tryphon was consecrated in 809, when his relics were brought there from Constantinople. Similarly, relics of St Anastasia were brought to Zadar in 811, and the cathedral of St Peter rededicated to her.
- (b) This saint was in fact a Pannonian who had little or no historical connection with the city of his adoption. An early church dedicated to him (early sixth century) has been identified near Pola in Istria.
- (c) The Dalmatian Romance language survived on some of the Quarnero islands into the eighteenth century. It died out at Ragusa-Dubrovnik c.1500, despite official attempts to keep it alive in preference to Slav.

Zagreb before 1094 from service books in the Cathedral library. Thus a Latin manuscript, probably of the eleventh century, preserves such Eastern rites as the Blessing of the Waters (6 January). It is less likely that such aberrant features were recent importations from Hungary (after 1000), where Greek practices were also to be found in the eleventh century. Similar anomalies suggest the early circulation of Cyrillomethodian liturgical books in this area, possibly influenced by, but not copied from, Glagolitic books of Dalmatian Croatia.

Carniola (modern Slovenia) had remained the preserve of Frankish Aquileia, which owned extensive lands there. But the same would apply; some Cyrillomethodian usages at Emona (Ljubljana), are probable. But much in all these parts, as in Moravia, was destroyed by the Magyars; Emona, for example, was sacked by them about 919.

Though peculiarities of Bosnian history somewhat complicate the picture, in its essentials the eastern frontier of Croatia has remained remarkably stable both as a frontier between the Catholic and Orthodox worlds and as a political frontier between Europe proper and the Balkans. Through Croatia passed the later military frontier between Austria-Hungary and the Turkish Empire. The narrow strip of Dalmatian coast and the islands were secured to the Western world and Catholicism by being absorbed into or becoming cultural dependencies of Catholic Hungary or the Venetian maritime Empire.

## **SERBIA**

The Serbian tribe brought by Heraklios to Macedonia, probably from the region of the Upper Tisza (Theiss), eventually moved north and settled in the difficult country between the Rivers Drina and Ibar. This was the Serbian heartland. Established far from the Adriatic coast and off the main routes of Balkan communications, the Serbs long remained unheeded by the chroniclers of the civilised world. Between the early seventh and the early ninth centuries we know of no serious attempt to evangelise them. But by the time of Vlastimir, who ruled over an embryonic Serbian state in the second quarter of the ninth century, what had been an unregarded backwater of the Balkans became an object of rivalry between the Byzantine Empire and Bulgaria, both now intent on extending their control over the interior. The first attempt of Bulgaria to incorporate Serbia dates from 839-42, though Omurtag

(c. 814-31) may have laid some claims to it. But the Serbs held their own until a Byzantine occupation followed about 871. During the reign of Tsar Symeon Serbia still theoretically recognised Byzantine suzerainty but in practice, especially after 897, was a Bulgarian dependency and inevitably under much more immediate Bulgarian cultural influence. The conversion of the Serbs was thus due partly to Byzantine and partly to subsequent Bulgarian enterprise.

If we were to believe the Emperor Constantine, the growing power of Serbia towards the middle of the ninth century was coupled with a massive reversion to paganism, to prevent which the Serbian rulers appealed to Constantinople in the time of the Emperors Michael III and Basil I. But it seems improbable that there was a previous state of grace from which the Serbs had relapsed. It is more important to observe that at least during Kotsel's reign in Pannonia (c.861-74) communication must have been possible between Serbia and Great Moravia - a fact of which the Pope was presumably aware in planning Methodios's diocese - as well as with the Dalmatian coast, in Byzantine hands as far north as Split. We must therefore not exclude the possibility of some Cyrillomethodian pupils reaching Serbia - perhaps even sent by Methodios himself - precisely in the 870s when the Byzantine thrust into these parts was developing from other directions. But if there were any such participation it cannot now be detected in such general indications as names: there is for example no sign of the early use of Clement in Serbia as baptismal name or church patron. No more can be said than that the Serbian state must be accounted Christian from about 870.

Vlastimir was probably a pagan. His sons only appear in the record with the Slav names Mutimir, Strojimir and Gojnik. In the next generation we find Stephen and Peter. This change agrees with the imprecise notices of strong Byzantine missions to Serbia, as well as to other Slavs nearer the Adriatic coast, in the 870s. Peter Gojnikovic (c.892-917) was certainly a Christian prince, adroit enough to tack between client of Constantinople and ally of Tsar Symeon. He had spent long years as a hostage in Bulgaria, whence came the backing to evict his brothers. The first Serbian bishopric had already been founded at Ras (or Rashka), near modern Novi Pazar on the River Ibar, the then political centre. Its affiliation is uncertain. Subordination to Split or Durazzo has been suggested, both then Byzantine. The ruins of a very early church of SS Peter and Paul exist at Ras but cannot be dated with any precision; the



building follows the rotunda plan of early Christian baptisteries so often adopted of necessity in the ninth-tenth centuries for the first court chapels. We cannot be far wide of the mark in supposing that the Serbian bishopric came into being shortly after 871 in the reign of Mutimir and was part of the general plan, confirmed by the Council of Constantinople in 879-80, which envisaged the creation of a number of bishoprics for the Slav-populated parts of the Empire, notably in Greece and for the Slavs on the River Morava, lying just to the east of Serbia proper.

The annexation of Serbia by Bulgaria in 924, perhaps as early as 917 on the fall of Peter Gojnikovic, was important for the future direction of the Serbian church. By now at latest Serbia must have received the Cyrillic alphabet and Slav religious texts, already familiar but perhaps not yet preferred to Greek.

Serbia regained some measure of independence on the death of Tsar Symeon (927). Chaslav, who returned to rule Serbia about 931 under Byzantine auspices, was of the line of the exiles brought up at the courts of Preslav in its great days. Chaslav also enlarged the state, incorporating parts of Bosnia and Travunia. In Travunia he took over or made closer contact with territories lately ruled by Michael of Hum, who controlled much of the southern half of the coast from about 910, except Ragusa (Dubrovnik) which paid him 'tribute'. Michael was a sufficiently prominent Christian prince to be addressed by the Pope as excellentissimus dux Chulmorum. As an ally of Bulgaria he was much concerned in Serbian affairs but disappears from the record after 925.

The conquest of Bulgaria begun by John Tzimiskes in 969 and completed by Basil the Bulgar-slayer in 1018 ushered in a long period of uncertainty for the Serbian interior, a period of over two centuries during which, although Serbia was mainly a preserve of the Eastern church, she was not wholly committed to it and for political reasons often looked West rather than East. From about the year 1000 the more southerly Dalmatian towns, especially Ragusa and Kotor, became gradually more Slav in population (though the process was scarcely complete before the end of the thirteenth century) and the trade-routes into the interior increasingly active. From these ports the influence of the Latin church and the culture of the Adriatic coasts seeped into the hinterland. But the long alternation of Byzantine and Bulgarian domination over Serbia continued. After a short period of Byzantine suzerainty (c. 972-90)

Serbia reverted until 1018 to a Bulgarian province under Samuel.(a) The Serbian church consequently came under the Patriarchate of Ohrid, which introduced, we must suppose, Macedonian elements into its life. From this time at latest must date the knowledge and use - restricted, it is true - of the Glagolitic alphabet in Serbia.(b) Finally the full Byzantine conquest of Samuel's state did not change the attachment of Ras to the reconstituted archbishopric of Ohrid, through which Greek influences again made themselves actively felt. But the Byzantine Empire reincorporated thereby not only the South Dalmatian provinces but also Bosnia and thus contributed to those closer contacts of Serbia with the Adriatic and Latin Croatia which Samuel's expansion had already initiated.

Indeed before the medieval Serbian state was truly born in the second half of the twelfth century, the several attempts to create such a state all started from the coastal provinces. In the 1040s the weakness of the Empire enabled Stephen Vojislav, semi-independent ruler of Zeta from about 1018 and brought up in Ragusa, to unite Zeta (approximately later Montenegro) with Travunia and Hum (approximately later Hercegovina). The Serbs of the interior were drawn into this enlarged state under his successor Michael (1051-81). By now, though nominally Byzantine, the coastlands were becoming rapidly more Latin in culture, a process which had become noticeable in the tenth century and was only temporarily checked by transitory reimposition of Byzantine rule, especially after 1018. We may draw a conventional dividing-line at the year 1000. The towns felt themselves Byzantine only as long as the Byzantine navy controlled the Adriatic and could treat Venice, the heir of Ravenna, as a colonial market. After 1000 Venetian and other Italian cultural influences tend to outweigh the Byzantine. Stephen and his son Michael were both in a difficult position in that, instead of a single ecclesiastical authority in their realm, there were portions of three archdioceses - Split, Durazzo, Ohrid - but not the metropolis of any. The creation of the Latin metropolitan diocese of Dioclea (Duklja) in 1066/7, with its ecclesiastical centre at Bar,(d) was thus an improvement from the point of

- (a) It is possible that during the period of Byzantine control Res was attached to the metropolis of Durazzo.
- (b) No previous radiation from Macedonia can be detected, that is, dating from the ministry of St Clement after 885. It cannot of course be excluded though it cannot have been considerable. Glagolitic continued to be known and used sparingly in Serbia down to 1200, perhaps even later.
- (c) N/a
- (d) Italian Antivari from Greek. The town was probably founded in the seventh century during the Slav inroads and became a bishopric at an unknown date.

view of the ruler of Zeta and of the ambitious Bishop Peter of Bar. It was to embrace all the coast south from the River Cetina, but the bishopric of Ragusa was in practice excepted.(a) Michael indeed preferred Ragusa's independence as a buffer against the encroachments of Split to which the see of Ragusa had been originally subordinate. The new metropolis was, according to the Pope, to include, besides sees formerly subordinate to Byzantine Durazzo and Latin Split, Travunia (Trebinje), Bosnia and Serbia.

All this amounted to an attachment of Zeta to Rome, though much of the earlier evangelical work in Dioclea must have been done by Byzantine Durazzo. Indeed Michael's relations with Gregory VII were so good that the Pope sent him a crown in 1077.(b) By this act he hoped to block Norman pretensions to rule any part of the East Adriatic coast; for the Normans had made themselves protectors of the Papacy in 1059 and from 1071 became a naval power to be reckoned with. Zeta was now a mature state with king and archbishop.

But two things must be borne in mind. The Roman attachment did not imply the sweeping away of all Byzantine clergy and practices on the coast, a fortiori further inland. The overlapping of the Roman and Byzantine ecclesiastical organisations is characteristic of South Dalmatia and their relative weight at any moment difficult to assess. Thus Bar, like Dioclea, had formerly been a suffragan see of Durazzo but with Samuel of Bulgaria's conquest of that town, the terminal of the vital Via Egnatia, in 989, Bar preferred to throw in its fortunes with its northern neighbours. Its rise to importance in the middle of the eleventh century increased the Latin component without suppressing the Byzantine. Even after the 1050s the Papacy did not press a thoroughgoing policy of extirpation of Byzantine practice in these parts: recognition of her jurisdiction, and its extension inland, was the first priority.

Secondly, the precise status of the interior provinces is obscure. Serbia (Ras) and Bosnia were to be included in the archdiocese of Dioclea (Bar) in 1067. This was the Papal intention but scarcely the reality. There is nothing to show that Ras did not maintain its dependence on Ohrid. It is not to be supposed that Michael made any violent changes

- (a) The status of archbishopric was accorded in 1022 (perhaps as early as 1000, according to a possible interpretation of Benedict VIII's Bull of 27 September 1022) but apparently lost again about 1050. During these years Ragusa claimed ecclesiastical jurisdiction over all the coastal sees from Ston (Stagno) in Hum to Ulcinj (Dulcigno), and possibly also over Serbia proper.
- (b) A fresco in the new Cathedral of St Michael at Ston, founded by Michael, show him so crowned.

which would weaken his authority. In any case inland Serbia was lost again before 1077. Moreover, Split was never wholly reconciled to the decisions of 1066/7 and Ragusa's ambitions were gaining substance and strength. Michael's son, Constantine Bodin, second King of Zeta (1081-c. 1106) and still ruler of Serbia and parts of Bosnia,(a) attempted to regulate the situation with more precision: Bar must have a position in the church consonant with the political scene. In 1088/9 Bodin persuaded the Antipope Clement III (1084-1100)(b) to reaffirm the disputed metropolitan status of Bar and redefine the archdiocese. The list of sees virtually repeats that of 1066/7: those of Zeta, all those about Lake Scutari(c), - which Durazzo probably still claimed - and the sees of Travunia, Bosnia and Serbia (Rascia). The title of church and prelate thenceforward usually appears in the form *diocensis atque antibarensis*. Once again all this proved partly a paper scheme.

Bodin's death saw the end of Zeta as the nucleus of a Serbian state. The Emperor Alexios Komnenos still held the upper hand in the Balkans and annexed this so-called Kingdom of Dioclea. Bosnia drew closer to Croatia in the course of the eleventh century and became part of the Hungarian state shortly after Croatia itself.(d) It seems unlikely that the religious complexion of the Serbian bishopric of Ras had been much changed by all these manoeuvres; it had continued to look towards Ohrid. However, it was now clear that any future Serbian ruler would attempt to re-establish the vital link between Raska and the Coast and, conversely, that the culture and religion of the interior would remain to a greater or less degree under the influence of Bar, Kotor and Ragusa through their role as terminals of the trade-routes debouching on the Adriatic.

For the moment Ragusa was satisfied with having defeated the claims of Split and achieved full ecclesiastical independence. Though Pope Innocent II might still write to the Archbishop of Split in 1139 as 'sole metropolitan of all Dalmatia', this was merely to repeat his official title.

- (a) Bodin had proclaimed himself 'Emperor' at Prizren in 1072 as leader of the Balkan Slavs against the Greeks but this had no lasting significance.
- (b) Clement III was made Pope in 1080 by the Emperor Henry IV after the humiliation which Gregory VII had imposed on him at Canossa in 1077. He was recognised as Pope in Rome in 1084 (Urban II being the new rival Pope), when he crowned Henry as Emperor. Both Hungary and Croatia belonged to the party of Clement.
- (c) Principally Skadar (italice Scutari) itself, Ulcinj (Dulcigno), Svach, Polat (Pilot), Drivast.
- (d) The part of Bosnia concerned was then known as Rama, of uncertain extent. From 1138 the Hungarian rulers used the title *Hungarie, Dalmacie, Chroacie, Rameque rex*.

But Ragusa's ambitions continued to grow in the south. As a high proportion of her trade was with Albania and Epirus she was determined to get rid of the archbishopric of Bar which might in the future be the metropolis of an unfriendly state or too firmly under Byzantine administration. This policy was pressed vigorously in the twelfth century. Bar itself was in a weak position after the collapse of the Kingdom of Dioclea. Rome came down on the side of Ragusa from about 1120, when Calixtus II called on all the clergy of the Southern sees to submit to Girardus of Ragusa, to whom at the same time he sent a pallium. From then on the Pope generally tended to support Ragusa against Bar. At the same time Ragusa gave more colour to her pretensions to the 'Serbian lands' (ranging far into the interior) by a liberal falsification of alleged Papal rulings in her favour.

Late in 1154, after several bishops in the archdiocese of Bar had shown themselves once again recalcitrant to overtures from Ragusa, Pope Innocent II formally transferred the sees of Kotor, Ulcinj and perhaps others to the obedience of Ragusa. Not long after Ragusa reached the high tide of her success. On 29 December 1167 Pope Alexander III extinguished the metropolis of Bar and placed all its sees under Ragusa. The whole Adriatic seaboard became, at least theoretically, fully Roman. But neither Bar nor Split accepted this change passively.

From this date the political fortunes of inland Serbia again became a decisive factor in the fortunes of the coast. Byzantine ascendancy over Serbia and the latter's ecclesiastical dependence on Ohrid continued throughout the twelfth century. But both Bulgaria and Serbia were constantly on the watch for signs of Byzantine weakness of which they might take advantage. These were evident enough by 1167 when the Emperor Manuel was in such straits that he was obliged to offer the Pope ecclesiastical union in return for military aid. As the century drew to an end this weakness became more and more manifest. The Bulgarians achieved independence (the second Bulgarian Empire) in 1186. Serbia had been under the thumb of Manuel since 1150 but on his death (1180) Stephen Nemanja (Grand Zupan c.1168-95) rapidly brought about a new independence of the Serbian state and inaugurated the two centuries of its greatness.

Nemanja(b) once more faced the problem of reconciling Rome-facing

(b) The origins of the Nemanja family are obscure. The first two known to have used the family name Urosh (believed to be Hungarian and derived from ur=lord, prince) and perhaps also the name Stephen, were local zupans of Rashka from c.1113 to c.1163. The original Hungarian connection (not now discernable) presumably date from Hungarian ascendancy in Croatia and Bosnia and was maintained by intermarriage. Nemanja himself was born at Ribnica (near modern Podgorica). It has not been satisfactorily proved whether he was the son of Urosh II or of his brother Desa. At any rate the family had no roots in Zeta, of which they were merely regaining control in the first half of the twelfth century.

Zeta with the Orthodox regions of the interior. He followed in the main the policy of the kings of Dioclea by keeping the see of Bar clear of politically disadvantageous subordination to Ragusa or Split, whose ecclesiastical rivalry again became acute in the 1180s. Nevertheless Gregory of Bar had to make some concessions to Split for his own security. The deeds and opinions of the bishops of Ras during all this long period are quite unknown to us. Nemanja is supposed to have been baptised a Catholic in infancy; Serbian annals preserve the tradition of his baptism in the Church of SS Peter and Paul by Leontios, Bishop of Ras, at the age of thirty. If these later annals - kept, it is true, by Orthodox Serbs - are to be trusted, they would appear to confirm the strongly Orthodox temper of Rashka and Nemanja's recognition of the wisdom of conversion to Orthodoxy in the 1160s, that is, at the moment when he finally established himself as Grand Zupan.

Nemanja remained an ally of Venice against Hungary and the Empire until the Emperor Manuel defeated and took him prisoner about 1172 and forced him to recognise his suzerainty; Manuel's successful campaigns since 1165 had given him temporary control of Croatia, Bosnia and most of the Adriatic coast. Hungary resumed her possession of Croatia and North Dalmatia.

Nemanja was soon released from Byzantine captivity. By 1186 he had regained a firm grip on Zeta. Its ports, particularly Bar, Budva and Kotor, were as always one of Serbia's main economic and cultural life lines. (b) Indeed Zeta with its earlier kings and more precocious literature could not but be an object of envy to the wilder interior. Nemanja's youngest brother Miroslav had for long been ruler of the province of Hum in his name. Together they attempted to reduce Ragusa. The attempt failed but the essential was gained by a treaty with this city-state (c) (September 1186) which gave the Ragusans commercial

(b) The trade-route from the coast into the interior was known in Italy as the *via di Zenta* since it followed the course of the River Zeta - nowadays an oasis in the dry plain - upstream and penetrated the difficult country of the Tara and Lim gorges to arrive at Ras in Serbia.

(c) Ragusa then held only the coastal strip from the base of the Peljeshac (Sabbioncello) peninsula in the north to the north point of the Bocche di Cattaro in the south. The expansion of its territory came mainly in the fourteenth-fifteenth centuries.

END

privileges in his dominions. A similar agreement was made with Split. Of the two, Ragusa handled the more valuable part of the commercial traffic: she was from the first the main outlet for Serbian, and later Bosnian, precious metals.(a) Commercially speaking she was also much better placed than Bar and the southern ports and soon overhauled them. But Ragusa received no ecclesiastical encouragement from Nemanja. Bar was now in his hands and Gregory of Bar naturally supported Nemanja's policy.

All the Balkans now turned against the tottering Byzantine Empire. It would seem that this first ruler of a great Serbia dreamed the common Balkan dream - of supplanting the Emperor in Constantinople. He attempted to influence Frederick Barbarossa in his favour at Nish in July 1189, when the Third Crusade was passing through the Balkans. But when in 1203-4 the Fourth Crusade did basely occupy and ravage the Imperial City it was the Western European dynasts who installed themselves there - and Venice who reaped most of the commercial advantage - not a Slav ruler.

New churches sprang up in the environs of Ras during Nemanja's reign. The church of the Virgin and St Nicholas was probably built in 1165-8. St George's monastery - whose ruins are now known as Djurdjevi Stupovi - on an eminence some five miles to the north-west of Ras, probably belongs to the 1180s. The style of their architecture is a blend of East and West. Important churches were now built all over the Serbian dominions from Kotor, taken by Nemanja in 1186, and Ston to Kurshumlja on the vital strategic route to Nish. Each of Nemanja's brothers was an active patron in the province which he administered. To Miroslav is ascribed the church of St Peter at Bijelopolje on the River Lim; to Preslav - St George at Budimlje; to Srachimir - the church of the Mother of God at Gradac (Chachak) on the River Morava. Nemanja's greatest foundation was the monastery of Studenica. Its church of the Mother of God was built about 1183-91. Though the monastery was in all respects Orthodox we find here, as almost everywhere, some architectural features of Dalmatian provenance notably the use of marble facings. Studenica was his Zaduzbina, that is a personal foundation for the good of the patron's soul, where he expect

- (a) Serbian mining (principally silver) developed rapidly from the early thirteenth century and provided a large part of the royal revenues. The technical skill was furnished largely by Germans ('Saxons') who emigrated from Transylvania at the time of the Mongol raids. Commercial treaties with Ragusa were renewed at frequent intervals after 1186 on similar terms.

to be buried and commemorated in perpetuity. Though in his later year his devotion was exclusively to the Orthodox Church he appears to have been perfectly tolerant of Catholics in his lands, as the arrangement with his son Vukan suggest. It is known that he sent princely gifts to St Peter's in Rome and St Nicholas in Bari.

It was only in the generation of Nemanja's sons that some stability in political and ecclesiastical affairs was at last reached. But not without struggle. The contrast between interior and seaboard was in fact intensified. In 1190 Serbia had once more to bow before Byzantine arm. Isaac Angelos tried to bolster up his weakness and ensure future Serbian loyalty by arranging a marriage between his niece Evdokia and Nemanja's second son Stephen. The displacement of Isaac by his brother Alexios in 1195 led to a settlement whereby Nemanja abdicated - which was his own wish; Stephen, as son-in-law of the Emperor and sevaslokrator since 1190, became ruler of Serbia, and the eldest son Vukan(Vlk) remained the local prince of Zeta, no doubt with increased autonomy as a palliative. To justify the succession of the younger son Nemanja alluded to the precedent of Jacob.

Zeta had after all formerly been a kingdom. Vukan made another bid to restore this. His wife was a relative of Pope Innocent III (elected January 1198) and he himself was undoubtedly a Catholic. By January 1199 he had persuaded the Pope to resuscitate for him the royal title - King of Dalmatia and Dioclea - and to confirm again the independence of his church with a pallium for his archbishop. Ragusa thus lost her ecclesiastical hold on Zeta. The Pope soon had second thoughts about the justice of this and for some months held up the re-establishment of Bar's independence. In 1199 two Papal legates convoked a synod at Bar which enforced again all the Latin regulations for the church and its clergy (tithe, celibacy, no beards). But it prudently did not attempt to include the see of Ras among its suffragan sees. Ragusa, backed by Venice, continued to protest against Bar's position. But Vukan was too important to Papal policy. Andrew, brother of King Emerich (Imre) of Hungary, was at this moment poised to extend Hungarian suzerainty over the whole of the Western Balkans. Indeed Emerich, who even assumed the title of rex Rasciae, was surely instrumental in negotiating Vukan's royal promotion and submission to the Pope in return for recognition of Hungarian suzerainty over his kingdom. Papal jurisdiction would follow in the wake of Catholic arms.

Vukan's fortunes reached their zenith in 1202-3 when in concert



with Hungary he conquered his brother Stephen's Serbian lands. Stephen soon succeeded in re-establishing himself with Bulgarian help. If Vukan attempted formally to introduce Catholicism in Serbia little came of it. A *modus vivendi* was agreed between the two brothers through the good offices of the youngest brother Rastko, who returned to Serbia from Athos in 1207: Vukan was as before to rule the coastal provinces in Stephen's name.

Yet the weakness of Stephen's own position, especially vis-a-vis Hungary, now at the height of its influence over Balkan affairs, and the impotence of the Byzantine Empire immediately after 1204, invited Serbian compromise with the Latin world. Stephen did not suppress Bar, though its authority was weak; it remained Vukan's ecclesiastical centre. Stephen now even repudiated his Greek wife and married a Venetian. In the face of the disapproval of his younger brother and most Orthodox clergy in Serbia he continued in a pro-Roman policy, culminating in his coronation by a Papal legate in 1217 as King of Serbia.<sup>(a)</sup> Western pressure on all parts of the Balkans dictated this move. Stephen had even once gone so far as to assert that he would 'always obey the precepts of the Roman Church'. Pope Clement III had acted on the assumption that the ruling dynasty of Serbia (Rascia) was loyal to Rome. Pope Honorius III now expected Stephen to acknowledge Papal supremacy and promote the establishment of the Catholic church in his realm through the see of Bar. The Bulgarian church accepted the protection of Rome in 1204 so that at the moment of Vukan's ascendance the Curia may well have thought that the major part of the Balkans - that Illyricum abstracted from Rome in the eighth century - was at last within its grasp. It is not easy to gauge how far Stephen's complaisance went. But it seems clear that Serbian sentiment, attached to the Byzantine world at heart, at last made itself unequivocally felt. The Latin claim to Serbia was exposed as a fiction. The Bishopric of Ras had apparently not wavered; it looked as always towards Ohrid. From Ohrid or from Bulgaria had come the Slav service-books which the Serbian church had long been using. Three centuries of Orthodoxy in Greek and Slav form weighed more than passing political considerations. It was Rastko who had consistently represented in his policy this popular sentiment, which now triumphed.

(a) Hence he is known as Stevan prvovenchani - the 'first-crowned'.

## The Sources

1. The most important biography of St Sava (Rastko) is the Life by Domentian, probably completed about 1242/3 and considered reliable since Domentian was almost certainly his close companion during the last years of his life.
2. The monk Theodosius's Life of St Sava, written not earlier than 1261. Like Domentian, Theodosius (Teodosije) was a monk of Hilandar.
3. With these must be coupled the three Lives of St Symeon (Stephen Nemanja); viz. (a) by his son St Sava, written c.1208, included in the Studenica Typikon, now only extant in a seventeenth-century copy; (b) by his son Stephen (Prvovenchani), written not later than 1216; (c) by the same Domentian, written in 1264, drawing freely on (b). These display an interesting contrast in style and intention: the first is typical of the hagiographical genre; the second, by Nemanja's successor, is notably political - a dynastic tract. None is intended, naturally, to be a plain and sober historical biography.

Rastko (Rastislav), the younger brother, was the most remarkable of the three. He was born about 1174 and was destined for the normal career of a younger son, being made by his father Prince of Hum at an early age. He had received a good education together with his brother Stephen and from boyhood showed a serious and ascetic bent. Within two years the young man abandoned uncongenial rule in Hum and fled to Athos, in the autumn of 1192 or shortly after, to embrace the monastic life. He first entered the Russian monastery of St Panteleimon; soon he moved to Vatopedi. According to tradition a Russian monk was responsible for his spiritual direction. He was professed at St Panteleimon under the name of Sava.(b)

His flight was not viewed with favour by his family. His father sent in vain to Athos to persuade him to return. Sava replied: You have accomplished all that a Christian sovereign should do; come now and join me in the true Christian life. Athosite monks had already been frequent visitors at Nemanja's court. It was probably the admonitions of one such which had determined Sava to abandon the world. Nemanja took his son's advice to heart. He summoned his state assembly to Studenica and announced his own abdication and withdrawal into the monastic life (25 March 1195).(c) For the moment he remained at

- (b) The imprecision in dates does not allow us to say whether Sava underwent a novitiate of three full years, as was usual but not obligatory. He must have come to Athos in his eighteenth year or thereabouts. The younger the postulant, the longer the novitiate imposed was likely to be.
- (c) The year 1195 is now considered a better reckoning than the generally accepted 1196.

Studenica but on the further insistence of his son joined him on Athos in 1198. His eyes were now fully opened to the significance of the Holy Mountain. Here father and son together founded, with Imperial approval, the Serbian monastery of Hilindar (June 1199). Stephen Nemanja, as the monk Symeon, died there on 13 February 1200.<sup>(a)</sup> The international life of the Athonite community comes out clearly at Symeon's funeral: the rites were performed in turn, presumably each in their own liturgical language, by Greeks, Iberians (Georgians), Russians, Bulgarians and finally Serbs. Nemanja's relics were brought back to his zaduzbina Studenica in 1207, where they soon began to work miracles.

By the time of Stephen's coronation in 1217 Nemanja was already looked upon as a national saint and the time was ripe for a decisive change. The status of Ohrid, to which the see of Ras was still subordinate, now became as equivocal as that of Bar had often been. With the dismemberment of the Byzantine Empire in 1204 Ohrid passed, precisely in 1217, into the hands of the Greek Despot of Epirus. It was not only less accessible but in a potentially hostile state. Theodore of Epirus (regnabat 1214-30), though resistant to the Latins, looked upon the 'Empire' of Nicaea as no more legitimate than his own realm. Who could tell whether the City would be redeemed from the Latins and if so at whose hands? There was no love lost between Arta, the Epirote capital, and Nicaea. But in Serbian eyes there could be no question that the Patriarch at Nicaea had a better claim to the obedience of all the Orthodox than any prelate in the Despotate, despite some signs that Theodore Laskarios of Nicaea was prepared to discuss union with Rome. Thus when the creation of an independent Serbian church became a political desideratum authority had to be sought in Nicaea. Theodore of Epirus himself, though uncompromisingly independent in politics,

- (a) The tradition that Nemanja died at the age of eighty-six or thereabouts is strong but hardly bears examination. If he had been born about 1114 he would only have set about raising a family of sons at the age of fifty - exceedingly improbable in those times. The dates of birth of Vukan and Stephen are unknown but there is little doubt about Sava's. Further, Nemanja's younger brother Miroslav died in 1199 - another octogenarian? If we accept the tradition of his second baptism in Orthodoxy at the age of thirty (no doubt an approximate figure) it would be reasonable to bring this into relation with his rise to power and with Manuel's conquests ending in Nemanja's defeat and capture about 1172. Vukan, the eldest son who remained a Catholic, could have been born before this baptism, Stephen and Rastko after. Thus if Nemanja was in fact born in, say, 1135, the chronology would make better sense, viz. (i) married c.1160, (ii) Vukan born early 1160s, (iii) Orthodox baptism in late 1160s, (iv) Stephen born 1170 (his first marriage was in 1196, i.e. aet. c.25, died in 1227), (v) Rastko born c.1174, (vi) abdicated 1195 aet. 60. (vii) died 1200, aet. 65 approximately.

shrank from the irregular step of declaring his own church autocephalous. Demetrios Khomatianos, appointed to Ohrid in 1217, liked to think of himself and acted as a patriarch but stopped short of actually assuming the title.<sup>(a)</sup> For all his political concessions Stephen never committed himself to ecclesiastical subordination to Rome: he had had too much trouble with his brother Vukan's machinations. Long tradition and the immediate history of the dynasty were both against such a step. The Orthodox piety of his father Nemanja, whose venerated relics Sava had brought back to Serbia at his request, and the advice of his brother Sava, the monk of Athos (with which through the royal foundation of Hilandar relations were now very close), were decisive. Though the Byzantine government, even in this time of weakness, was still chary of granting autocephaly, in the cases of Serbia and Bulgaria such a concession promised to be of no little advantage. For it is the duty of all Orthodox states to support their suzerain the Emperor, and the Emperor ardently desired their aid against the Latin encroachers and usurpers.

Consequently Sava was sent to Nicaea to negotiate for autocephaly. This may well have been in his mind since his return to Serbia ten years earlier. Now Stephen at last wished it and wished him as head of his church. Sava was consecrated as first archbishop of Serbia by the Patriarch Manuel Sarantenos (fungebatur 1215-22) in 1219. Sava had become hieromonakh (monk in priest's orders) about 1200 and Domentian states that he was commonly accorded the title of archimandrite, that is a monk, especially an abbot, deemed worthy of a bishopric.

The details of the negotiations with and in Nicaea are not known for certain in default of documents but all appears to have been settled amicably. The Patriarch did not even insist on his right personally to consecrate the head of the Serbian Church in perpetuity. The Papal Legate seems to have finally withdrawn from Serbia at this moment. Archbishop Demetrios of Ohrid's official title - Archbishop of Justiniana Prima and All Bulgaria - was now an empty formula. Bulgaria had been lost as long ago as 1186. Ohrid as the self-styled heir of Justiniana Prima had now lost Serbia too. The archbishop protested, as he was bound to do, at the creation of a Serbian autocephalous church on the grounds that Nicaea had no canonical right to detach Serbia from Ohrid, itself autocephalous, without his agreement. Radoslav, who had

- (a) He went as far as to crown Theodore 'Emperor of the Greeks' about 1228 after the capture of Saloniki in 1224.

succeeded his father Stephen in September 1228, showed some signs of complaisance in this matter towards Theodore of Epirus, who was his father-in-law, but Sava was strong enough to nullify it.

As Dvornik rightly says, the case of Serbia is 'of unique interest in the study of relations between East and West'. In the long run the centuries-old Byzantine culture of both Serbia and Bulgaria and their possession of the Slav ecclesiastical language made them consciously or unconsciously strive for national churches in the Eastern manner and reject the universalism of the Papacy which had more than once come close to catching the Balkans in its net. Whereas to be politically independent of Byzantium was their constant ambition, alienation from her communion was not. And whereas the Latins were inevitably the sworn foes of the ousted Greeks, they were often politically and economically useful to the Balkan Slavs. Stephen's Roman crown and Nicaean archbishopric symbolise the relative weight of these factors.

The Latin organisation of Bar was not suppressed by Stephen after 1217 but left in being for the Catholics in his dominions. Tolerance prevailed: churches passed from Catholic to Orthodox and vice versa. Stephen's own Life of his father is quite without parti pris. But the Eastern was henceforward the 'established' and the Western the 'disestablished' church in the Serbian state. The established church was now to use nothing but the Slav liturgical language with its Greek background: Latin played no further important part.

The quarrel between Ragusa and Bar continued but was finally more or less settled during the pontificate of Innocent IV (1243-54). Despite all, Bar felt itself strongly attached to Serbia. *Dominus noster rex Urosius est nobis papa* was its firm reply to the Pope in 1247; it was not prepared to accept subordination to Ragusa. The Pope found it politic to permit the use of the Slav language in the province of Bar, as he did for Croatian Dalmatia. In 1248/9 the Pope appointed John de Piano Carpini (of Mongolian fame) Archbishop of Bar, hoping that he might reconcile a parties. But he died in 1252 without effecting much. Ragusa finally threw up her claims in 1255/6.

Sava returned from Nicaea to Serbia after a further short stay at Hilindar and in the Philokalos monastery at Saloniki. There followed a thorough reorganisation of the new autocephalous church. He established his archiepiscopal see at the monastery of Zicha, founded by his brother King Stephen and built with the help of Greek masters in the

years 1208-15. This was to be the coronation church of the dynasty.(a) But Studenica, which may be called the cathedral of Ras though it remained a private dynastic foundation, was still the real centre of ecclesiastical and political life.

New bishoprics were founded to cover every province: at the monastery of the Archangel Michael on the island of Prevlak in the Gulf of Kotor, for Zeta; at Ston (church of the Mother of God, now disappeared) for Hum; and at Dabar (Banja on the River Lim) near the Bosnian border - the monastery of SS Nicholas and George - all these in the potentially more Catholic parts. Four others were erected in the interior at Hvosno, north-east of Pech - the monastery church of the Mother of God; at Kurshmlija - Nemanja's St Nicholas, now known as the bishopric of Toplica at Budimlje (now Ivangrad, near Andrijevitza) - the monastery of St George; at Arilje (that is, St Achilles), known as the bishopric of Moravica. The unreliable lists of sees traditionally associated with St Sava sometimes include the doubtful Grachanica and Branichevo and two others which strictly speaking were still outside Nemanja's and Stephen's dominions at their widest extension - Belgrade and Prizren, whose Greek bishop probably remained under Ohrid.(d)

Sava naturally drew upon Athonite monks for his bishops. The monasteries of Saloniki may perhaps have provided some too: they were by this time centres of Greco-Slav mixing second only to Athos itself. Sava had close ties of friendship with the Orthodox Metropolitan of Saloniki and with several monasteries in the province.(e) It will be noted that the Serbian sees were normally situated in monastic churches on the main routes of communications. In a country such as Serbia, which of all the Balkan Slav states was the most deficient in towns, such a disposition was inevitable. In the early stages of the conversion of a

- (a) As Stephen's first wife Evdokia was not merely a Byzantine princess but a porphyrogenete, the church was, and still is, painted the Imperial colour - a kind of dark red commonly called 'purple'. Despite considerable rebuilding in the fourteenth century after devastating Cuman raids in 1290 its general appearance is believed to have been preserved. The plan betrays a strong Athonite influence (in particular that of the Monastery of Pantokrator) but there are also Italianate decorative features. Zicha did not long retain the primacy; Arsenije (fungebotur 1234-63) removed to Pech in 1253 for safety from such barbarian incursions.
- (b) This took the place of Nish, once more in Bulgarian hands.
- (c) N/a
- (d) The northern frontier ran from the confluence of the River Lepenica with the Morava to the course of the River Neretva, the southern from the headwaters of the Morava to the mouth of the Drim. Prizren probably changed hands several times: Demetrios of Ohrid complained to St Sava for replacing a bishop of Prizren by one of his own.
- (e) The diocese was much disturbed at this time. There was a Latin archbishop also till 1224.

end

country without urban communities monasteries, apart from the Court are the natural centres for evangelisation and for the training of native clergy. This stage was unusually prolonged in Serbia. Indeed the social structure of the Serbian (including Montenegrin) countryside remained remarkably conservative until very recent times. This is to be seen especially in the widespread retention of the *zadruga* or 'great family' and in the very high proportion of Slav (pagan) names used in preference to those of Christian saints. The Serbian *slava* is a good example of the reinterpretation of a pagan rite in Christian terms: the clan ancestor became a Christian saint, frequently St Nicholas.

Sava's remaining years were devoted to establishing the Byzantine principle - that the spiritual authority and temporal power should work hand in hand to guide the state - until 1227 in the person of two brothers and thereafter of uncle and nephew. The autocephaly of the Serbian church was affirmed in every way, not the least in a new manual of Christian law (*Nomokanon*) which Sava translated or had translated in Saloniki for Serbian use on his way back from Nicaea. This master copy was deposited at Zicha and was still being faithfully copied in the fourteenth century. This code, a selection of both canon and secular law to suit Serbian conditions, remained influential in the Orthodox Balkans, and even in Russia, for centuries to come.

Sava made two pilgrimages to the Holy Land. On the first he made a special study of Palestinian monasticism, staying at the famous house dedicated to his own patron saint near Jerusalem. In Jerusalem itself he set up a hospice for Serbian pilgrims and houses for Serbian monks thus laying the foundation for the active relations which obtained particularly in the fourteenth century. Serbian monks kept up the link with the Monastery of St Sava. His experiences there were applied in the monastic reforms which he put in train in Serbia after his return (no later than early 1230). A rule based on that of St Sava's monastery - the 'Jerusalem Rule' - was more and more widely adopted in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries to the exclusion of the Studite Rule which had been the model for Sava's charters for Studenica and Hilandar. Legend has it that the monks of St Sava presented him with the icon of the Virgin with Three Hands (*Trikherousa*), reputed to have belonged to St John Damascene who had been a monk there. This Sava took back to Studenica. In 1371 however, to save it from the Turks, the icon was tied to an ass which was turned loose; God caused the animal to find its way to Hilandar, where the icon still is.

With the accession in 1234 of Radoslav's brother, Vladislav, who was married to a daughter of the Bulgarian Emperor Asen, Sava decided that the time had come for him to retire from active affairs. He caused Arsenije to be elected archbishop in his stead and set out in the same year on his second pilgrimage, perhaps with a view to permanent retirement into a Palestinian or Athonite monastery. This time, after revisiting Palestine, he went on to various Egyptian monasteries, including St Catharine's on Mount Sinai. Finally, via Nicaea, he arrived at the Bulgarian capital, Turnovo.(a) Here he died on 14 January 1236. His body was first laid in the new church of the Forty Martyrs at Turnovo but soon brought back to the monastery church of the Ascension at Milieshevo. The Bulgarians' request to keep the holy relics was refused.

The Nemanjich dynasty, which had produced its saint and patriot in St Sava, displayed an enthusiasm for pious foundations which did not cease till the collapse of the state before the Turks at the Battle of Kosovo in 1389. Of the more important may be mentioned briefly the monasteries of Sopochani, built and decorated by Stephen Urosh I (regnabat 1243-76), Grachanica by Stephen Urosh II Milutin (regnabat 1282-1321)(b) and Dechani by Stephen Urosh III (regnabat 1322-31), which earned him the by-name Dechanski. The abbots of these royal foundations counted among the most important functionaries of the state. It is in the interior decoration of these churches, particularly those of the thirteenth century, that the best work of the time in the Byzantine tradition is to be found. For the exiled court of Nicaea and the restored Empire from 1264 were both too poor to devote their resources to splendid building, whereas Serbia was riding the crest of prosperity which her silver mines brought.

If Serbian church interiors, which are the immediate and necessary background of the Orthodox services, were wholly Byzantine in conception, generally Macedonian in style and always having the indispensable symbolic dome over the crossing, their exteriors, as we have noted earlier, often incorporated features of the Western architecture of the Adriatic coast. Craftsmen from Dalmatia were appreciated and offer more readily available than Greeks. This continued to be true down to

- (a) It seems improbable that any diplomatic mission had been attached to Sava's journey, as is sometimes suggested, specifically that he was to negotiate at Nicaea in favour of a Bulgarian patriarchate which Vladislav might now wish to promote for his father-in-law. The patriarchate was in fact agreed between John Vatatzes and Asen in spring 1235; but we do not know precisely when Sava was in Nicaea.
- (b) The frescoes include a fine genealogical tree of the Nemanjich dynasty.



the end of Serbian independence. The porch added to the Church of the Holy Wisdom at Ohrid by Archbishop Gregory in 1314 is wholly Italian in style. Dechani, built about 1327-35, amazes by its contrast of an Italianate exterior and a Greek interior; its architect was a Franciscan from Kotor.

Few Serbian rulers between the time of St Sava and the Turkish conquest were without some connections, often close, with the Catholic world. Stephen Urosh I was much under the influence of his Catholic wife Helen, whose open patronage of Catholics caused some misgivings among the Orthodox. Her son, Dragutin (regnabat 1276-82) became a Catholic after his deposition. Milutin was obliged to go softly with the considerable number of Catholics in his enlarged state, who had their own bishop. Yet he was the son-in-law of the Emperor and *sevastokrator*, and recognised Byzantine suzerainty. The coast of old Dioclea remained, as always, largely Catholic. Latin had to be employed side by side with Slav and Greek in Macedonia, the meeting-place of all Balkan currents. No intolerance appears until Stephen Dusan, proclaimed 'Emperor of the Serbs and Greeks' and so crowned at Skopje on 16 April 1346, made clear in his Law Code (1349-54) that the Serbian Empire, with its new Patriarchate at Pech, was Orthodox. Yet he was not harsh on Catholics: they were no longer allowed to proselytise, and conversely converts to Catholicism were to be persuaded (but not forced) to return to Orthodoxy. We may also note Milutin's veneration of St Nicholas of Bari, who had become a Catholic saint by the felonious transfer of his relics from Myra to Bari in 1087. Again, the style of Serbian coinage was a hotch-potch of Byzantine, Venetian and even Hungarian motifs. While Vladislav's issues were predominantly Byzantine and had Cyrillic inscriptions those of Stephen Urosh I and his successors were more Venetian with Latin inscriptions (VROSIVS REX).

Western traits are visible, though not so immediately, in the literary field also. An early example of this duality is Prince Miroslav's Gospel Book. It was written about 1180-90 in an Athonite-Macedonian ductus of Cyrillic but not by ecclesiastical scribes accustomed to using it (one scribe at least normally used the Latin alphabet) and the ornamentation except for the first miniature, is in the Benedictine style current in Dalmatia. That it was written in Miroslav's province of Hum is further underlined by certain Westernisms of language, clearly of Ragusan provenance. Conversely the Cyrillic ductus current in Serbia from the

thirteenth century was strongly under the influence of that of Ragusan documents, itself considerably influenced by contemporary Latin minuscules. This interaction is hardly surprising in a Ragusan chancellery where Latin and Cyrillic documents were written indifferently by the same clerks. Even the principal Lives of the Serbian dynastic saints are not innocent of certain Latin stylistic features.

Serbia remained near the frontier between Orthodox East and Catholic West. Whereas in the early years of the thirteenth century both Serbia and Bulgaria had seemed momentarily within Rome's grasp, by the time of the Council of Lyons (1274) the hastily botched up union engineered by Michael Palaeologos appealed to neither. The day of a restored Papal Illyricum was past. St Sava had decided the direction of the Serbian Church once and for all. Even a recent religious map of Yugoslavia still shows roughly the balance of forces which prevailed in the days of the medieval Serbian Kingdom: a nearly solidly Catholic Croatia and coastline down to Kotor with an Orthodox hinterland except in Bosnia, a patchwork of all possible denominations.

Symeon and his son Sava were early recognised as saints in Serbian piety. Symeon, like the early princes of other Slav countries - Wenceslas, Vladimir and Boris and Gleb - with whom may also be coupled St Stephen of Hungary, remained exclusively a national saint. The Patriarchate of Constantinople was not as a rule eager to recognise such laymen as saints of the Ecumenical church. In their own countries they represented God's Grace manifested towards the legitimate dynasty. St Sava continues to be highly venerated on Athos. He is also recognised as a saint in the Catholic church. The cell which he built in 1199 at the administrative centre of Karyes (Orahovica in Serbian) and himself frequently used for retreat after his father's death, still stands and the Rule which he drew up for it is still followed. For the Serbian church St Sava is not only the first native archbishop but also its Illuminator (prosvetitelj) and Teacher (uchitelj), the proud title accorded to St Cyril the Teacher of the Slavs. His biographers Domentian and Theodosius reflect the temper of the time in stressing that Sava was sent by God to fulfil the unfinished work of his forebears and to integrate Serbia finally into the comity of Eastern Orthodox churches. He was of that small company who sacrifice their own immediate salvation to return to the world for the sake of the salvation of others - the whole Serbian people.

So Sava saw it himself. The close link with Athos proved the keystone of the arch. The saintly pair - Symeon and Sava - represent dynasty and church, the twin pillars of the Serbian state, the source of its remarkable strength. So the Serbians conceived it. All the succeeding members of the house of Nemanja were held to have the Divine charisma for their rule.

The state has need of the church, but the church has no need of the state. Here the church long outlived the state. In the dark days of Ottoman rule the Serbian monasteries were the main foci of Serbian culture. The Turks became so alarmed at the veneration accorded to Sava's relics, not only by their Serbian subjects but also by many Moslems, that they were publicly burnt by Sinan Pasha in 1594.

### **BOSNIA AND THE BOGOMIL HERESY**

Ignoring as we may diverse heresies which flourished here and there, a general survey of early Balkan Slav Christianity would yet be incomplete without some account of the Bogomils. A full exposition of their beliefs and customs must be sought elsewhere.

Briefly, Bogomilism was both dualist and 'puritan'. It was dualist in that it believed that Satan or Satanael, God's rebel elder son, was the creator of the universe. All matter therefore derives from an autonomous evil principle at war with God. Our bodies and their functions are unsanctified and cannot be sanctified. Satan made the body of man; the soul only was from God. It was puritan in that it rejected most of the dogmas and rites of the church as a human superstructure without the authority of Christ - an illusion which Satan has foisted on us. Thus typical Bogomil doctrine rejected all the Old Testament except the Psalms and retained of the New only Jesus's teachings in the Spirit. His whole human life, as partaking of matter, was necessarily mere appearance. Atonement and Redemption become meaningless if man, created not by God but by Satan, never fell. The Mother of God and the Cross are hateful debasements; the sacraments, including marriage, valueless; the Doctors of the church - false teachers. The doctrine of the Trinity was interpreted in various unorthodox ways. Their practice therefore was deceptively simple: prayer to God and to his true emanation, Jesus - especially the Lord's Prayer; non-involvement as far as possible in all the toils of matter, including sexual abstinence; the avoidance of wine and all food of living origin.

There will necessarily be an order of more 'perfect' Bogomils able, unlike the majority of men, to follow the most strict interpretation of these abnegatory principles. Further, since the church goes hand in hand with government, there was a strong element of social protest in Bogomilism, a refusal to obey civil and military authority in any way which conflicted with this conception of 'primitive Christianity'. Naturally over a long period of time doctrine and custom varied from place to place. Some consider this social disobedience the mainspring of the movement's success.

The main ingredient in Bogomil belief was the Paulician heresy indigenous to the Byzantine Empire's troubled eastern frontier over against the Monophysite churches and Islam. Both the Byzantine authorities and the Armenians took repressive measures against the Paulicians in the eighth and ninth centuries. On several occasions Constantine V Copronymos (regnabat 741-75) took the unwise step of forcibly transferring large bodies of Paulicians to Thrace, since, partly by virtue of their strict religious principles, they were a well-disciplined and martial people (a): the defence of the western approaches to the Imperial City was a more and more insistent need against Bulgars and others. This Iconoclast Emperor considered Paulicians less dangerous in the religious sense than some of his more Orthodox subjects. For about a century the heresy continued quietly spreading in Thrace.

The expansion of the Bulgarian state southwards at the expense of the Empire and its entry into Christendom in the 860s marked a new phase. From the earliest years of their Christianity the Bulgarians were faced not only with rival Christian missions but also with the presence among them of this self-styled pure and primitive form of Christianity. Monophysite Armenians, Jews and even Moslems, resident in the country added to the confusion. It is very likely that the Slav peasantry in parts of Bulgaria was from the first in closer contact with Bogomil beliefs than with the Orthodoxy which was then being laboriously imposed on it from above. Dualist doctrine had the same advantage of theological simplicity that Arianism had had for the semi-civilised Germanic peoples.

The young Bulgarian church was immediately made aware of the danger. The last of Pope Nicholas I's Responsa to Boris warns of the danger of false teachings without being specific about heresy as such. A few years later (about 872) the newly appointed Archbishop of

- (a) The Paulicians themselves were no doubt of many races, but a considerable proportion must have been Armenians.

Bulgaria received from Peter of Sicily a tract on the dualist heresy which he had been commissioned to investigate by the Emperor Basil I. John the Exarch attacks heretics, presumably of this persuasion, in his *Shestodnev*, written c.915: he argues at length that there is no evil principle (*zula sila*) in the Creation.

The Paulicians and similar sects could not be stamped out either in Thrace or in Asia Minor; in Bulgarian territory it was far beyond the means of scattered missions to oppose their spread.

The peculiarly Bulgarian form of the heresy, however, does not seem to have arisen before the reign of Peter (927-69); for it was in his time that the eponymous founder of it, Bogomil,<sup>(a)</sup> lived and propagated a personal variant, or selection, of these diverse doctrines. The region in which he worked is not known for certain but is likely to have been Macedonia. Theophylakt of Ohrid alludes to 'a beastly heresy', which can scarcely be other than Bogomilism, as developing thereabouts in the years following St Clement's death (916). Whether SS Clement and Naum themselves had to contend with it does not appear from the available sources.

Bogomil's preaching met with marked success. From the middle of the tenth century the sect as a native heresy began to flourish. The Patriarch of Constantinople, Theophylakt (fungebatur 933-56), sent an official warning to Tsar Peter against this new heresy. The Bulgarian church itself, after a century of development, was not above reproach and needed in some respects to set its own house in order. This is clear from Cosmas the Priest's *Tract Against the Bogomils*, written about 972. He points to many shortcomings in the Bulgarian church which helped to account for the vigour of this popular movement - in particular, worldliness and ignorance of the clergy. Cosmas's strictures certainly appear to indicate an element of social protest in the Bogomil movement; its adherents were still largely drawn from the lower classes. His account is also one of the best sources for its beliefs at that stage, though in the nature of things it cannot be taken as a complete and unbiassed account.

The havoc wrought by the laborious Byzantine reconquest of Bulgaria during the next half-century was largely responsible for the further

- (a) Originally, as in some early texts, Bogumil, a calque of Greek meaning dear to God, but the later and more normal form for a Slav binomial name is generally adopted. It is curious, however, that his followers are always referred to as 'Bogomils' and not, as would be expected, by a derivative from the heresiarch's name. This has led a few scholars to doubt his existence and put the name 'Bogomils' on a par with 'Cathars' - that is, pure ones - a name known from the early eleventh century in Languedoc and North Italy.

dispersion of the Bogomil doctrines. The Paulician sect had even been strengthened about Philippopolis (Plovdiv) by another large transference of its adherents from Asia Minor by John Tzimiskes about 975; they were left undisturbed in their beliefs provided that they kept the Bulgarians at bay. There is nothing to suggest that Tsar Samuel was not himself Orthodox but some members of his family are suspect of Bogomil leanings and he may have found himself, under pressure of political and military needs, obliged to be more or less tolerant to the sect in his dominions. It was at this time that Bogomilism spread into Serbia and Bosnia, both for a time under his rule, and probably beyond.

The Byzantine authorities fared no better in dealing with the heresy in conquered Bulgaria. There is by this time more reason to associate it with a movement of national resistance to Greek domination and the hellenization of the country, including the official Church. On top of this Bulgaria was devastated by nomad incursions, especially by the Pechenegs in 1048, and soon Constantinople was too occupied with new difficulties on her eastern frontier to give more than scant attention to Bulgaria. Bogomil religious leaders had no doubt always been recruited if lapsed Orthodox, from the lower, parish clergy, of Slav race. Now the Greeks increasingly filled the higher ranks of the Bulgarian church, this dichotomy was rendered more acute and obvious. At the same time insofar as the movement became anti-Greek, it tended also to invade the higher levels of Bulgarian society. It was, in short, becoming more respectable.

The twelfth and thirteenth centuries show the heresy at its most vigorous. From the Balkans it had spread westwards, by the agency of merchants and perhaps Crusaders, via North Italy to Southern France where the so-called Albigensian Crusade had to be organised for its suppression. By about 1100 Bulgarian Bogomilism had already penetrated into educated Byzantine circles. Alexios Komnenos (1081-1118) took the drastic step just before his death of having a prominent Bogomil leader, Basil, burnt as a heretic. Evidently the movement had come out into the open even within the Byzantine Empire. Several bishops and even one Patriarch - Kosmas Attikos (1146-7) - were suspect of contamination by these doctrines. A synod held at Constantinople in 1140 called for the destruction of various pernicious Greek works which contained doctrines similar to those of the Massalians, 'otherwise called Bogomils'. Notices of more or less solidly Bogomil districts within the Byzantine Empire reach to the end of the twelfth century. In the East

the movement was strong enough to require organisation on a territorial principle. The main 'churches' were called Bulgaria and Dragovitia.(a)

Further west Bosnia, centred on the valley of the River Bosna, had become the most infected area. For long disputed between its ring of more powerful neighbours, Bosnia was not yet firmly integrated into any ecclesiastical body. A Bosnian see is assumed by Pope Alexander III in 1066/7, perhaps a Latin see recently founded by the Croat Peter-Kreshimir IV in the archdiocese of Split. If it survived it must have been transferred to Ragusa about 1100. That Bar's writ ever ran in Bosnia is dubious; Ragusa was always Bosnia's most important link with the outside world, as is clear from Ban Kulin's commercial treaty of 1189. Bosnia became under its bans a refuge for persecuted heretics, supporting its resistance to political extinction. Kulin (c.1180-1204) and his successors all appear to have been favourable to, or at least tolerant of, this popular movement.

A more stern persecution of heretics in general and Cathars in particular was set in motion by the Edict of Verona in 1184. About 1199 Vukan of Zeta denounced Kulin to the Pope as a heretic and the Pope encouraged Hungary, which then dominated most of the North Balkans, to take repressive measures in Bosnia. Kulin hastened to submit to Papal enquiry. He made formal abjuration to the Papal Legate John de Casamaris in April 1203 but the condemnation of the heresy by the Bosnian synod remained a dead letter. The Pope's plans for strengthening Bosnian Catholicism by three or four new bishoprics did not succeed.

The Bogomils were also strong in the province of Hum (modern Hercegovina) (d) where a Papal Legate reported the heresy as rife in 1180. Some Bogomil influence has been claimed in the miniatures of Miroslav's Gospel Book. Bogomils were also numerous in the cities of Split and Trogir; they took refuge in Bosnia when the Dalmatian coast became too dangerous for them under the purifying measures of Bernard of Split (1199-1200). Stephen Nemanja and his son attempted to stamp the heresy out in their dominions, with what success is difficult to estimate. These persecutions no doubt helped further to concentrate the sectarians in Bosnia.

(a) Bulgaria=Macedonia; Dragovitia=Thrace, with centre at Plovdiv, the former territories of the Slav tribe Dragovitai or Druguvitai. The latter may also have remained more strictly Paulician than Bogomil.

(d) This name dates from 1448 when Stephen Vukchich was created by Frederick III 'Duke (Herzog) of St Sava'.

Constant Hungarian pressure on Bosnia had only limited success.(a)

The heresy was difficult to pin down. When in danger its adherents had always assumed the outward mask of Orthodox or Latin Christians. They claimed after all to be the purest Christians of all. They now passed under various local names, of which the most usual was Patarenes.(b) Ban Kulin's son Stephen was nominally a Catholic but could do little to influence what may by now have been the predominant religion of his land. He was deposed by the convinced Bogomil Ninoslav (1232-c1250). But Ninoslav (Matthew) also found it politic to be outwardly accommodating to a Papal Legate despatched in 1232. Pope Gregory IX, who harried the heresy in all the affected areas, succeeded in having a German Dominican appointed Bishop of Bosnia (1234), perhaps now directly subject to Rome.

In August 1247 the Bosnian see was transferred to the Hungarian archbishopric of Kalocsa. But the Hungarian arm hardly reached so far. Until Ninoslav's death Bosnia was regarded by all as an heretical state of which Bogomilism was the official religion. The head of the 'church' (Did) and twelve elders acted as the supreme council, chancellery and court of the land. But owing to the secretiveness of the convinced Bogomils and the bias of all outside observers it is well-nigh impossible to arrive at the truth. The strength of the Bogomil church and the complaisance of Ninoslav are held by some scholars to have been greatly exaggerated. Catholic bishops of Bosnia, subject to a distant metropolis in Dalmatia or Hungary, admittedly failed to get to grips with the scattered and mobile heretics; but anything in the nature of a formal Bogomil church has been denied. Even the 'elect' - the Krshchani - have been considered not so much heretics as an archaic, perhaps gnostic, monastic sect. It is true that the Bogomils did not generally go as far as the Cathars in their rejection of the church. Thirteenth-century Bosnia may represent their most successful attempt to be treated as an 'elect' order within it. But Orthodoxy does not accept such esoteric orders.

(a) Hungary claimed Bosnia again under the Pacta Conventa of 1202, as formerly Croatian territory which Bela III had given to his son Ladislas in 1137, but it could not formally be brought under the Hungarian crown.

(b) Patarene is often supposed to be from pater, a mode of address between them, or from paternoster, in allusion to the one Christian prayer constantly on Bogomil lips. But the consistent spelling is against this. The name appears to have originated in the eleventh century for a Milanese sect practising poverty: the Pataria was the quarter of Milan where the rag-merchants congregated. The name was therefore only transferred to the Bogomils and certainly spread to Bosnia via Ragusa. Another name, Balun, is even more obscure (Sadnik and Aitzetmuller, Handwörterbuch, no. 145): it is apparently perpetuated in the Croat surname Babunid.



Bogomilism must be considered as much the cause of the spread of the Glagolitic alphabet to Bosnia as the province's links with Croatian Dalmatia. The Greek conquerors of Macedonia were apt to assume the heretical nature of the unreadable and now 'unofficial' Glagolitic writings and destroyed many. Refugees took them to Bosnia, where the Cyrillic script was normal.(b) Thus local orthographic habits arose from a Glagolitic veneer over a Serbian Cyrillic cursive style.

Meanwhile the movement was losing its impetus in Bulgaria and Serbia. Under the Second Bulgarian Empire (from 1186) the heresy was sometimes persecuted, sometimes tolerated. It was formally condemned by Tsar Boril at the Synod of Turnovo (1211) but later rulers appear to have still shown some tolerance whenever it was politically expedient. A similar condemnation was promulgated at the Serbian Synod of Zicha in 1221. From these and other sources we learn that the heresy was still strong about Plovdiv and Ohrid.

The Latin conquest of Constantinople in 1204 contributed to this decline. There was more persecution within the Latin-ruled lands. Indeed the excuse for the capture of the Dalmatian town of Zadar (Zara) in 1202 by the Crusaders at the instigation of Venice was that it was a stronghold of the heresy, no doubt the chief focus of its continued radiation to North Italy. Venice had long wished to reduce this inconvenient fortress, now in Hungarian hands, and acquire permanent control of it. These persecutions led to some further emigration to the West and to greater concentration in the less accessible parts of Bosnia and Hercegovina. Concurrently persecution in the West may have brought refugee back to the Balkans.(c) As the Serbian state expanded in the fourteenth century it again absorbed Bogomil subjects, not only in Bosnia itself. The heresy was thus a running sore which Tsar Dushan found it necessary to condemn explicitly in his Law Code (Zakonik) of 1346.

Throughout the fourteenth century Bosnia continued to harbour the heresy, while Catholic and Orthodox now competed more openly for its ecclesiastical allegiance. Bosnia was at its most powerful under Stephen Tvrtko I (1353-91), half Croat and half Serb, who assumed the title of King of Bosnia and Serbia in 1377 and had himself crowned at St Sava's

- (b) The Latin alphabet, normal in Hungary and most of Croatia, had limited currency there before the eighteenth century, though the coinage minted from the abundant native silver from the middle of the fourteenth century usually had Latin inscriptions.
- (c) The main 'Albigensian Crusade' was over by 1215 but the Pyrenean fortress of Montsegur was only destroyed in the 1240s. The movement declined rapidly in the south of France from the middle of the thirteenth century.

tomb at Mileshevo. His predecessor Stephen II Kotromanich (1314-53) who had conquered Hercegovina, had passed from Orthodoxy to Catholicism and received on two occasions Franciscan inquisitors and missionaries. Tvrtko also veered between the two. Bosnia's independence was for a short time less precarious; any national sentiment which may have centred on Bogomilism was now satisfied.

With the Turkish conquest of the Balkans the heresy finally lost its *raison d'être*. Bosnia and Hercegovina were occupied in 1463 and 1483 respectively. Orthodoxy or Catholicism was strengthened as the life-line of the conquered Slav peoples. The Bosnians, who had never firmly opted for the one or the other, and as Bogomils considered both equally erroneous, went over in large numbers to Islam. As Moslems the nobility were able to preserve their estates and position. Bosnia to this day remains the most obviously Moslem area of the Slav Balkans.

There are few material traces of the heresy left. By its nature it was iconoclast and did not encourage the building of religious edifices.(a) It may suffice to note two things. At Arilje, south of Uzice toward Bosnia, Stephen Dragutin, King of Serbia from 1276 to 1282, built St Achilles as a new episcopal church about 1295.(b) A well preserved contemporary fresco shows Dragutin and his brother Milutin (a great ecclesiastical builder) enthroned on either side of their grandfather Stephen the First-crowned. Below them a disputation is in progress between Orthodox bishops and Bogomil 'priests'. The latter are of course on the left side of Stephen, the side of the goats. Secondly, the so-called Bogomil sepulchral monuments (*siechak*, pl.*stechci*), numerous in certain parts of Hercegovina, have in all probability no close connection with the Bogomil heresy. There are no specifically Bogomil symbols by which they could be definitely identified as monuments of these heretics. Some are clearly Orthodox or Catholic. The best suggestion is that the majority, which belong to the late period of the fourteenth-fifteenth centuries, were erected by the local tribes of Vlach, highland pastoralists speaking dialects akin to Romanian. They were then still a prominent element in the population and provided the

- (a) The virtual absence of twelfth-century Serbian icons is sometimes ascribed Bogomil influence. Cosmas felt the need in his Tract to defend the use icons once again against Bogomil disapproval.
- (b) Dragutin inherited North Bosnia in 1282 through his wife, a daughter of the Hungarian King Stephen V. Stephen Kotroman of Bosnia (1272-98) married Dragutin's daughter. Dragutin himself was converted in 1291 to Catholicism. But the church essentially Byzantine in style.

animal transport for the trade caravans which plied between the Dalmatian ports, especially Ragusa, and the interior. What the religious beliefs of these Vlachs were cannot be ascertained.

The chief remaining record of the Bogomil movement is therefore in written form - its service-books and scriptures together with the polemics of those who sought to eradicate it. Dualist texts spread as far as the Pyrenees and Novgorod in North Russia. The manuscripts that survive date mostly from the declining days of the heresy, the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. Various copies of New Testament compilations - Tetrevangels and Apostols - have been held to be Bogomil copies, though this is often difficult to substantiate. The thirteenth century Provencal Cathar Missal is unambiguously dualist and may well go back to a now lost Bulgarian original. Above all there are the numerous apocrypha which, as is the general habit of sects and heresies, tend to take the place of the Orthodox canon. Some of these were already well-known works, grafted onto material of the Old Testament (for example, the Book of Enoch) or the New (the Gospel of Nicodemus and the Gospel of St Thomas, otherwise known as the Childhood of Jesus). Others appear to have been original Bogomil compositions, more directly promulgating dualist doctrine. Among these we may note: the so-called Interrogatio sancti Iohannis, whose date and original language are however uncertain, Latin versions alone being known; the vision of Isaiah, the Story of Adam and Eve and the Razumnik (passing under many different titles). They were the esoteric core of the heresy, concealed as far as possible from the light of day.