
Elena Gkartzonika
(University of Ioannina)

**THE LONGUE DURÉE OF TRANSLATIONES AND
REMOTE ADMINISTRATION IN SERBIAN LANDS:
REVISITING THE LOCALIZED CONCEPTUALIZATION
OF THE ORDER OF SUCCESSION IN POWER, IN THE
CONJUNCTURE OF THE 13TH C.**

The historical features of the medieval forces, geographically located on the western coasts of the Balkan Peninsula and the river axes that intersect them and controlled by the Byzantine Archdiocese of Ohrid, are particularly distinct in the context of the formation of the medieval and contemporary Slavic world. Most notable in this context are the frequent border fluctuations and the constant translocation of the centers of Serbian power, issues that have preoccupied scholars for different reasons per period. At the time under discussion herein, Byzantine historians call the Serbians, in the context of a classicist tendency, Τριβαλοί/ *Triballi*. Using the modern terms of his times and further specifying his description, Laonikos Halkokondilis (1430-1490) will delimit the lands of Triballi in the confluence of the Morava and Istros/ Danube rivers, namely in the wider area of present-day Belgrade. Since its earliest appearance, the land of Triballi was not distinguished by any type of centralized state structure, a fact that had probably led D. Obolensky to argue that we know little about their local traditions and to compare Serbian structures with those of the Franciscans, the Hungarians and the Germans –not the Byzantines.¹

In the same context it is well known that the various *župi* (Жупа <župan = the eldest leader of a “*Sclavinia*”, a territorial determination of the authority of an extended family),² which were represented in the local council (Sabor/ Сабор), maintained significant independence even at the times when their Bulgarian neighbors were occupied by Basileios II (r. 976-1025). At that time,

¹ D. Obolensky, *The Byzantine Commonwealth Eastern Europe 500-1453*, London 1971, 248-9.

² Д. Јанковић, *Историја државе и права феудалне Србије XII - XV век*, Београд 1956; С. Новаковић, *Законски споменици српских држава средњег века*, Београд 1912 and В. П. Грачев, *Сербская Государственность в X-XIV вв (Критика Теории “Жупной организации”)*, Москва 1972, with detailed recordings of the corresponding structures in the region and related sources.

Diocleia, Zahumlje, Raskia, Bosnia and Croatia were areas not constituting Byzantine provinces but *rather its subordinate hegemonies*, as carefully stated by G. Ostrogorsky. The order of succession in the areas under the administration of the said Serbian župans was equally particular: Instead of the primogeniture they exercised seniority (старесина), according to which the eldest of the extended family was designated as a successor –not the firstborn son of a local ruler; the power was then shared among the surviving brothers, sons, nephews and cousins. Since it interweaved with the Byzantines and its neighboring powers (Bulgarian/ Hungarian), this tradition has caused repeated succession disputes, mainly because it coincided with their fragmentation. In this frame, L. Mavromatis³ notes that, from the end of the 12th c., *a relatively crystallized conception of state power emerges in Serbia*, characteristically describing the Serbian ruling class, including the most prominent of the clergymen, as *modeled after the Byzantine ruling class and the latter's perceptions regarding the organization of the state, the administration of the empire and the Roman tradition of the absolute and ideal monarch, whose authority derived both from the people and God, at a time when the Bulgarians and Pechenegs were attacking the borders and the Western Christian kingdoms were expanding –beyond the Byzantine Empire– around the Serbian forces, in whose administration were gradually rising monarchs by God's grace.*

In Mavromatis' description one observes a comparison between Byzantine structural changes (the *perceptions/ αντιλήψεις* referred to in the text) and some of the initial features of the structures under discussion herein, at a time when the first western powers were setting foot on the Peninsula's soil. Even though none of the latter was crystallized in that early period, the very interesting conclusion about "crystallization" seems to originate in an approach to intertemporal behaviors of the representatives of the higher secular and ecclesiastical aristocracy, following its creation, and of its relation to the most powerful mechanism of the time, the Church. However, by the time when the *Serbian aristocracy* according to Mavromatis, namely the župans- representatives of wider families, attempted to establish an autonomous structure that was akin to the then-known State, the whole Christianity was reshaping –a probable reason why the same historian had elsewhere wondered *if we can talk about a medieval Serbian state.*⁴ If all the above is seen under the light of a) the proximity of Serbian forces to the vulnerable Adriatic and northern Byzantine borders and b) the ongoing confrontation between Orthodoxy and Catholicism on the predominance in the region –and its commercial activity– in the 12th c. onwards, the Serbian župans, inter alios, seem to be given prominence as decisive factors of the territorial change, the geographical displacement, the fragmentation of the centralized power and the transformation of the local ones: In parallel and mainly due to the latter two, the Serbian župans began to undertake, insofar as they were allowed in the circumstances, independently or as allies, military operations in the wider area they resided, being more or less faithful to the

³ Λ. Μαυρομάτης, *Η Μοναρχική Ιδέα στη Μεσαιωνική Σερβία*, Σύμμεικτα 8 (1989), 361-370.

⁴ L. Mavromatis, *Peut-on parler d'un Etat medieval serbe?*, Byzantion 48 2 (1978), 417-429.

Orthodox or Catholic forces and taking advantage of the latter's approach for help or cooperation. Given the said conditions, we will attempt to approach the reasons why and the means by which the traditional local succession is gradually redefined in the transitional 12th c., in order to *crystallize* in the following century, inside or far from traditional, but various, centers of power.

The catholic attempts to occupy Constantinople, avoided with fewer or more losses by 1204, preoccupy the respective analyses, which place little importance on the increase in the provision of *pronoiai*, due to the proportionally increased military needs and the Byzantine emperors' uncertainty regarding their power and finances, which led to the introduction (by the Komnenoi on a wider scale) of the measure of concession of local peasants *as paroikoi* to foreign pronoiars, along with estates.⁵ In the context of the reorientation of the byzantine administrative structures related to ownership, it is worth mentioning the transfer of captive Serbs as soldiers-farmers or taxpayers – thus *pronoiaris* – to Nicomedia of Bithynia, ever since the time of John II Komnenos or Kaloioannes (1087-1143), a tradition well continued by his son and successor, Manuel Komnenos (1118-1180), with the creation of new *pronoiai*, intended mainly for non-Byzantine foreigners, in exchange for their military service in his own defense – not of the empire.⁶ The local family representatives were thus involved in recurrent battles, in order to claim and latter preserve non-inherited Byzantine estates and their inclusion in the ever-changing Byzantine administration.

In order to approach the characteristics of the powers on the Serbian lands in this context, we must examine the kind of power and the way its first representatives and founders ascended to it, bearing in mind that they derived from local župas, approached or forced to co-operate with the Byzantine power at a time of turmoil at the latter's borders. As it is known, the two most important areas of Trivalli were Duklja or Zeta and Raška. These two areas' importance will increase, due to their proximity to the Adriatic Sea, through which the hostile Crusaders sailed ashore onto the Byzantine Empire, a fact that will serve as the most important factor in the initial attempts to incite the unification of the Serbian forces against them, during one of the politically most active periods of the papacy, which assisted by all means available the Western military and economic (-commercial) expansion.⁷ In such a frame, the two regions will be-

⁵ See Τρ. Μανιάτη-Κοκκίνη, *Αυτοκρατορικές και Ηγεμονικές Δωρεές Προς Ξένους και από Ξένους στο Βυζαντινό Χώρο (12ος -15ος αιώνας)*, Το Βυζάντιο και οι Ξένοι 5 (11 Μαΐου 2000), Αθήνα 2003. Χωνιάτης, 273, the reference in: G. Ostrogorsky, *Ιστορία του Βυζαντινού κράτους*, Ευ. Χρυσός επιμ., Παναγόπουλος Ιωάννης μτφρ., Αθήνα 1978-81 [2002], vol. 3, 60 and 294 note 123.

⁶ See G. Ostrogorsky, *op. cit.*, 60 and 294, notes 120, 121, 122.

⁷ At the time of the ban on the appointment of bishops by the emperor in the West, known as the *investiture controversy*; U. R. Blumenthal, *The Investiture Controversy: Church and Monarchy from the Ninth to the Twelfth Century*, Pennsylvania 1988. The Pope recognized Diokleia in 1077 as a principality under the serb Mihailo I Vojislavljević (r. 1050-1081). His successor, Constantine Bodin (1072-1108), aiming at the appropriation of the proceeds of the region against the Byzantines, supported the Bulgarian uprising in Skopje (1072), detached himself from the Byzantine diocese of Durres and concluded a marriage alliance with the Norman governor of Bari (1081-1118), thus achieving the upgrading of

come the territorial core for the succession of the Serbian local powers, administered from the 12th c. onwards by the Nemanjić dynasty. Centered on Raska, the Nemanjići will achieve the emergence of their area, through which they will eventually manage to create structures that will lead them to administer most of their own affairs, by taking advantage of the weakening Byzantines.

The reasons and the ways in which the latter two coincided are foreshadowed by two major diplomatic moves: On the one hand, the upgrading of local župans to Great Župans (see note 7), a title which, if the momentum and the persons to whom it is attributed are taken into account, it is indicative of its character as a *pronoia*, while highlighting one of the first –if not the first– dynamic involvement of the Komnenoi in the Serbian succession to power. Due to this intervention and the lack of total control, caused by the multiple ongoing battles of the Byzantine Empire, Raskia has gradually become a powerful entity –at least compared to the other župas–, in which the desire of kin members for succession to the power will begin to intensify and will lead over time to the formation of the successor dynasty. This new structure, along with the titles that emerge for its members, when collaborating with Byzantium at their quest for power, imprints in this particular area the initial differences within the same (wider) family of a župa that could certainly be characterized in a political and local level as secessionist, divisive and centralized. On the other hand, the repeated attacks to Byzantium and its allied areas will further reinforce the tendency towards accepting allies, their descendants or allies of the latter in byzantine courts, at the times of military campaigns, negotiations for peace, following military defeats, the formation of alliances with Constantinople or at the end of diplomatic missions. This peculiar form of *honorary captivity*, usually in the imperial court, was essentially the result of a bilateral arrangement: The hostages served as guarantors for both the enmeshed sides, as key communicators or leverage in efforts to deter or, at least temporarily, alienate with each other or with the rest of attacking forces. In an equal way, they satisfactorily contributed to the reshaping of the relationship between the local forces and the occasional center, to alleviating contradictions and eventually, with their interaction or even fraternization, they were transformed into osmotic agents.

Bari's diocese to an archdiocese and his own to king by the controversial Pope Gregory VI, five years after the Byzantine defeat at Manzikert. See J. V. A. Fine Jr, *The Late Medieval Balkans: A Critical Survey from the Late Twelfth Century to the Ottoman Conquest*, Michigan 1994 [1987], 215. This expansion into the territories of the Byzantine Diocese of Durres and of the Archdiocese of Ohrid, then under the Ecumenical Patriarchate (JVA Fine (1994), 226), caused the occupation of the mainland and of much of the Dioclean coast by the Byzantine Empire between 1089-1101 in addition to the restoration of the patriarchal and byzantine control, through Bodin's nephew, Vukan Petrislav I (1050-1), the first Great Župan (Велики Жупан) of the renamed Grand Principality of Serbia (Велика Кнежевина Србија) also known as Raskia, centered on Novi Pazar and the territories of the short-lived *Katepanikton* of Serbia (Κατεπανίκιον Σερβλίας) in the Byzantine Thema of Sirmium as the core of its administrative control, see S. M. Ćirković, *The Serbs*, Tošić Vuk transl., Oxford-USA 2004, 30; D. Bulić, *Gradina-Kazanoviće, The establishment of catepanate in Ras between 971 and 976. Results of archeological research*, Istorijski Časopis 55 (2007), 45-62; B. Kršmanović, *The Byzantine province in change*, L. Maksimović, T. G. Kolias ed., Belgrade 2008, 189; J.V.A. Fine (1994), 224 and D. Obolensky, *The Byzantine Commonwealth*, 220-4.

For the wider period of the 12th-15th c., apart from the noble captives, the relocation of populations from one territory to another by means of and due to wedding agreements is yet another diplomatic instrument, equally creating the new population which we have already hinted at, namely the fugitives forced to move during or after a war or in the event of a disagreement with the center of power. All the above, as important factors in and outside the cities, resulted in significant developments in the Peninsula.

In the aforesaid frame, understanding the importance of mobility and its various cases (noble, lay people, farmers, etc.) is essential for two main reasons: Because this aspect of the Byzantine relations with the representatives of the Balkan powers has not concerned modern historiography⁸ much and because, as captives or fugitives, the latter were provided the opportunity to acquaint themselves with the Byzantine political-ideological propaganda/ diplomacy – an effective means of mitigating disputes– many areas of which are still unexplored. It is in such a way that our perception remains in favor of the pre-eminence of those populations living around Constantinople and not of those living in the provincial territories of the Peninsula, despite their lands' particular geo-strategic and economic prominence. This evaluative categorization, having lasted for several centuries, has equally, if not more, influenced since the 13th c. the characteristics of power and the boundaries of the particular centers. The Church, as an institution of assimilation, has contributed to this process and its development: Until the 12th c., the recovered northern areas of the Peninsula are represented as being accumulated by the Byzantine Patriarchate, with the enforcement of the Greek language in the liturgy.⁹ However, the new conditions imposed by the choices of the catholic powers on the northern border and frontier, in combination with those previously imposed by the Byzantines, who were now trying to control or renegotiate them, gave the Serbian župans and their descendants, who emerged in the battlefield as members of broader *aristocratic* or even imperial families around and outside the imperial court of Constantinople or Thessaloniki, the opportunity to raise power claims anew.

The differentiated political choices imposed partly by the cooperation with Byzantium will be adopted by those wishing to succeed in the administration of the region or its border with Hungary, the parallel expansion of the German Holy Roman Empire to Italy through which, forced Byzantium to turn its attention to its Northern border.¹⁰ The involvement of the Serbs in the diplo-

⁸ For the period before 1204, see Σ. Πατούρα, *Οι Αιχμάλωτοι ως Παράγοντες Επικοινωνίας και Πληροφόρησης (4ος - 10ος αι.)*, Αθήνα 1994.

⁹ See A. Dostál, *Η βυζαντινή παράδοση στην εκκλησιαστική Σλαβική λογοτεχνία*, Cyrillomethodianum II (Thessalonique 1972-73), 1-6.

¹⁰ F.i. the case of another Great Župan, Uroš I (Стефан Урош I, c. 1112-1145), Fine (1994), 226, Т. Живковић, *Једна хипотеза о пореклу великог жупана Уроша I*, *Историјски Часопис* 52 (2005), 13, 22, and his daughter Jelena, wife to the blinded (thus weakened) king Bela II of Hungary (c. 1109-13.2.1141), who is said to have organized the killing of 68 Árpád family members involved in the blinding of her husband, a decision with significant political and administrative implications, given the fact that it facilitated her plans to repatriate Hungarian land and distribute a significant portion to her own relatives. See P. Engel, *The Realm of St Stephen: A History of Medieval Hungary 895–1526*, London 2001, 49-50, F. Makk, *The Árpáds and the Comneni: Political Relations between Hungary and*

matic (mostly by means of wedding alliances) and military developments of the era was mainly incited 1. by the attempt to impose more taxes on the regions they resided and 2. by the Hungarian extension to their territories. The developments we have condensed herein allow us to conclude that the emergence of local nobles, equally due to the western powers now opposing to Hungary, had a negative effect on the latter's alliance with Byzantium. In fact, the emergence of the Serbians as forces capable of delaying, if not halting, the Hungarian consolidation and exit to the Adriatic coastal territories, in combination with their entry into the Hungarian hierarchy, would henceforth turn the Serbian forces into leverage for Byzantium and its allies, depending on their interests.

Not accidentally, the byzantine loss and re-conquest of Constantinople coincided with the rise and fall of the most prominent local power representatives in the Peninsula. For the Serbian case in particular, the 13th c. can be characterized as the Nemanjić period since it was the time when the most prominent historical figures left their aspirations imprinted on what remained of the state formation they wished to create. Particularly important is the well-known and well-analyzed case of Stefan (Στέφανος =crowned) Nemanja (1113-1199), a župan who prevailed against the Hungarian regency, with his fights against his brothers in the Hungarian borders and the help he provided to the Byzantines in consolidating their control in the area (1167),¹¹ in return for the title of the *Great Župan* (1168) –a title that asserted his participation in the Byzantine military operations, thus turning him into a *pronoiar* beyond the byzantine borders– of a broad area he still had to fight for (the valley of Morava), against the advancing

Byzantium in the 12th century, N. György transl., Budapest 1989, 24, 31 and B. Cartledge, *The Will to Survive: A History of Hungary*, London 2011, 518. An additional example is her son, Geza II, who became the Bosnian titular ban –an administratively identical title to that of the Serbian župans– in 1137 and, following his father's death in 1141, he reigned the Hungarian lands of the Árpáds with his mother and her brother Beloš Vukanović as regents until his adulthood in 1146. It is worth mentioning that the latter served as the Ban of Croatia between 1142 and 1158, even after his dissociation from the Hungarian rule, a fact that pinpoints the ways by which the independence of the western regions of Diocleia, Raska, Zahumlje, Bosnia and Croatia was achieved locally. Following 1141, in the assertion of local authority, he was succeeded by Uroš II, the son of the Byzantine Anna Diogenissa (ca. 1074–1145, Ch. Cawley, *Medieval Lands, Byzantium*, Diogenes, Emperor 1068-1071 (2010), ESIII, 181), who was in good terms with his brothers in Hungary, not with his neighboring brother, who had collaborated with the advancing Normans of Sicily, see *Monumenta Historiam Slavorum Meridionalium*, vol. XXIII, *Actæ Bosnæ*, IX, 2 and P. Stephenson, *Byzantium's Balkan frontier: a political study of the Northern Balkans 900-1204*, Cambridge 2000, 245. From 1150 Manuel I Komnenus attacked Srem (Сремски округ) and the areas along the Danube against the occupying German forces (JVA Fine (1994), 1 [238]), with the military assistance of the Serbian regency and based on his family relations with the Hungarian power (he was the son of the Hungarian Princess Eirene). As an obstruction –and diversion– served the conflicts on the South Dalmatian border, due to the advancing second Crusade. For the broader conjuncture see С. Пириватрић, *Одметник Теодора Продрома. Из Историје Византијско-Угарско-Српских Односа у XII веку*, Трећа Југословенска Конференција Византинолога, Крушевац 2000, 327-334.

¹¹ J. W. Birkenmeier, *The Development of the Komnenian Army: 1081–1180*, Leiden 2002, 162.

crusaders and the locals who had allied with them, accused for *bogomilism*.¹² His successes led the byzantine emperor, Manuel Komnenos, to treat him *with courtesy* (με πραότητα), as a *truly credible witness* (αληθώς εχέγγυο μάρτυρα) of his triumphant entry into Constantinople, as testified in a Speech by Eustathius of Thessaloniki, little capitalized by the relevant literature.¹³ Despite his widely-known description as a hostage to the byzantine emperor,¹⁴ the latter is described as allowing Stefan the *appearance* (θέα) and *ornaments* (ποικίλματα) *that resemble excellence* (ὄσα τὰς σὰς ἀριστείας ἰνδάλλουσιν), including him *in the ubiquitous scattered leaders he had trained* (στοὺς πανταχοῦ γῆς διεσπαρμένους περικλυτοὺς ἀρχηγούς που ἐκπαίδευσε).¹⁵ Manuel's death in 1180 and the consequent disputes over his succession, overturned Stefan's plans to consolidate his power and lands: After unsuccessfully supporting the legal successor, he was forced by Isaakios II Angelos (1156-1204) to hand over the lands under his immediate control (Zeta with Trebinje, Hvosno and Toplica) to his older son, Vukan and abdicate. In the meantime, a marriage was concluded between his second son, who thus received the promising surname "*the first-crowned*" (Првовенчани =Прωτόστεπτος/ *primus coronatus*,¹⁶ that would officially have his memory sealed in historical records as such) and is said to have inherited all of his father's possessions,¹⁷ with the same applying to the new emperor's

¹² On the fights against crusaders N. P. Zacour, H. W. Hazard ed., *A History of the Crusades: The Impact of the Crusades on the Near East*, vol. V, Wisconsin 1985, 319 and on his fights against locals M. D. Lambert, *Medieval Heresy Popular Movements from Bogomil to Hus*, UK 1977, 142; D. Obolensky, *The Bogomils: A Study in Balkan Neo-Manichaeism*, Cambridge 1972, 236-237, 284; Доментиан, *Животи Светога Саве и Светога Симеона*, Владимир Ђоровић ed., Београд 1938, 240, 246, 274.

¹³ See Ευστάθιος Θεσσαλονίκης, *Τοῦ αὐτοῦ λόγος εἰς τὸν αὐτοκράτορα κύρ Μανουήλ τὸν Κομνηνόν, ὅτε ἦν ἔτι τῆς ἀγιωτάτης τῶν Μύρων ἐκκλησίας ὑποψήφιος*, *Fontes rerum Byzantinorum, Subsidia Byzantina Lucis Ope Iterata*, Johannes Irmscher, Hans Ditten κ.ά. ed., vol. 5, Leipzig 1982, 43: 1 and 26.

¹⁴ F.i. A. Grabar, *L'empereur dans l'art byzantin: recherches sur l'art officiel de l'empire d'Orient*, Paris 1936, 40, notes 1 and 41 and D. Obolensky, *The Byzantine Commonwealth*, 221-2 and 379, note 22.

¹⁵ Ευστάθιος Θεσσαλονίκης, 42: 20-27, wherein Neeman's fights against the bogomils are also implied.

¹⁶ A neologism of 1196, that is of the following year after his father-in-law ascended to power, in which two meanings of венчани, namely the crowned and the married are intertwined. See Fr. Miklosich, *Lexicon Palaeoslovenico-Graeco-Latinum*, Vindobonae 1862-1865, 713. Serbian: venac = wreath, venčanje = wedding blessing, L. Cahen, *Serbian-English and English Serbian Pocket Dictionary*, London 1920, 9. Russian: Венец/-ца = coronation crown and wedding crown or wreath, венцать = marry-crown, *Oxford Russian Dictionary Revised with Editions*, Oxford 2000, 38.

¹⁷ After the council convened in Ras in 1196, he is referred to as Alexius' son-in-law and, as such, a successor to his father's throne, T. Živković, S. Bojanin, V. Petrović, *Selected Charters of the Serbian Rulers related to Kosovo and Metochia*, Αθήνα 2000, 22 (serb.) and 25 (engl.). His choice not to follow the Serbian succession law of *seniority* and at the same time neither *primogeniture* seem anticipated enough: On the one hand, Nemanja could not concede his administrative rights and alliances to neighboring rulers, despite some being 2nd or 3rd degree relatives. This reluctance was caused by the fact that the changes brought about by the Western campaigns and the Byzantine dynastic disputes had already altered within a

niece, Evdokia Angelina, who, according to the byzantine historian Niketas Choniates, *became heir to her husband's paternal satrapia*, which remained under the bishopric of Ras (in turn under the Byzantine archdiocese of Ohrid).¹⁸ What can be concluded from the above is that, in addition to the attacks in their lands, the conflicting interests of all the parties involved pertained to the inheritance of the *ad personam* local power that had just emerged and was intended to be exercised on the basis of the Byzantine standards. In such a context, the *first-crowned's* divorce with the byzantine princess¹⁹ that served as the covering background for the conflict between the two heirs of Nemanja's secular authority²⁰ comes as no surprise, especially if Nemanja's third son's advancement is taken into consideration.

For Rastko, a monk forced to flee his shelter in Ston (1192),²¹ his father's remaining bequest, namely the latter's fights against bogomilism in alliance with Byzantium and the scattered churches he had erected, served as the means in order to be offered refuge in Mount Athos, where he ultimately succeeded to lead the clerical and secular administration of the Athonite monastic state as the *Protos* of Karyes.²² In this favorable environment of administrative autonomy, the monk of Slavic origin and ousted local ruler, who had not exercised any kind of authority, was further about to create a Slavic monastery exclusively for Serbian monks – a breakthrough decision for its time.²³ Indeed, four years after his arrival in Athos (in 1196) Sava will welcome his father as monk Simeon, with whom he will be allowed by an imperially ratified act two years later (1198-

century the –actual or desired– stratification and had caused the diffusion of powers in the region, along with the alliances even within families; being a relative did not necessarily result in being an ally, as proven by several cases above. At this juncture, the pursuits acquired material substance: different religion choices, dependence on superior, albeit fragmented, powers or conclusion of marriages that brought about the desired political alliances faster. In this context, it is obvious that Stefan was not a decision-maker: He had to act in consultation with the Byzantine emperor, the rest of his local allies (*župans*- friends/ relatives) and the byzantine archdiocese of Ohrid.

¹⁸ Χωνιάτης Νικήτας (*Ακομινάτος*) *Ιστορία*, I. Bekker ed., CSHB, Bonn 1835, 704, 4-6: «οἷός Στέφανος κληροῦχον τῆς πατρῶας σατραπείας τὴν Εὐδοκίαν δεικνύς». On Ras see D. Obolensky, *The Byzantine Commonwealth*, 222.

¹⁹ М. Ласкарис, *Византијске принцезе у средњовековној Србији. Прилог историји византијско-српских односа од краја XII до средине XV века*, Београд 1926, 7- 37 and Αντώνιος Μηλιαράκης, *Ιστορία του Βασιλείου της Νικαίας και του Δεσποτάτου της Ηπείρου (1204-1261)*, εν Αθήναις 1898, Παράρτημα Β' Το νόσημα μιας βασιλίσσης παραμορφούμενον εν τη ιστορία, 630-40 [1994].

²⁰ Χωνιάτης, *Ιστορία*, 705:16-18: «καί φανείς κρείττων ὁ Βόλκος τῆς ἀρχῆς ἅμα καί τῆς πατρίδος ἐκτοπίζει τόν Στέφανον», Harry J. Magoulias transl., *O city of Byzantium*, 292, par. 532 and J.V.A. Fine (1994), 46.

²¹ F. Makk, *The Árpáds and the Comneni*, 120.

²² Κ. Παυλικιάνωφ, *Οι σλάβοι στην Αθωνική Μονή του Αγίου Παντελεήμονος*, Βυζαντινά Σύμμεικτα 9 (1999), 265.

²³ For *his brothers when they will come* (и ђелије ми довољне у Карејама, где да пребивају игуман и сва братија када долазе). See Ђоровић, *Списи св. Саве*, Београд, Сремски Карловци 1928, 5-13 and *Списи Светога Саве и Стевана Првовенчаног*, Л. Мирковић transl., Београд 1939, 29-34. See also Ђ. Šurmin, *Povjest književnosti hrvatske i srpske*, Zagreb 1898, 229.

1199) and shortly before his death to build the destroyed Chilandar Monastery. It seems that, if possible, the abdication of all –or most of– Nemanja’s family members, would uproot from Diocleia and Raska an ascending Slavic dynasty, which was now related by marriage to an otherwise weakened Byzantine imperial family and had been granted special *pronoiai*, thus multiplying the latter’s interlocutors and encouraging autonomy in regions, which the new emperor wished to bring back under his control –f.i. by claiming his niece’s dowry.

Despite this tactic bore fruits *in locum*, the same did not apply in the independent area of Mount Athos, where a *personal power* was gradually created and exercised based on strict and unchanging byzantine rules and standards, thus providing a safe environment for consolidating the paternal power not being able to be consolidated in a secular level. Sava initially placed under the auspices of the Serbian monastic center that was established under his direct control the *paternal possessions*, safeguarded as a heritage and a legacy and mentioned in detail as imperially accepted Serbian paternal endorsement to Chilandar.²⁴ Simeon died in 1199, was initially buried in Chilandar and was immediately sanctified as Saint Symeon the Myrrhbearer, despite his last wish being –according to Sava– his remains to be relocated to Serbia when God permits it. The ruler, who had no possessions (Neeman) but proved able to provide enough, certainly helped Sava in his further, and rapid, development: Apart from Karyes’ Typikon, he wrote Symeon’s Statute for Chilandar, containing his father’s first short vita.²⁵ Shortly after that, he became a monk and then archimandrite in 1204 in Thessaloniki,²⁶ having written the Liturgy of Saint Symeon in 1200, and composed the latter’s extended Vita “*not for the lay people but for the monks*”.²⁷

In the same context, Stefan the first-crowned had clarified, at the end of 1199, the division between the secular and the religious in an additional statute,²⁸ in which he divided the secular power into *imperial* (ц(ъ)с(а)пу), *princely* (кнзѣ) and *noble* (вл(а)д(и)кы), respectively specifying each on the basis of their divine origin; the *Greeks* are *emperors* (Грьке ц(ъ)с(а)рѣми) and the *Hungarians kings* (Оугре кральми). In addition to the above, he recasts for the first time the terms his father used for his possessions as *the paternal of the Serbian lands* (дѣдиноу земловъ сръбьсковъ)²⁹ and goes on describing the *peace* and *quiet* spread throughout that particular territory, stating however

²⁴ T. Živković, *Charters*, 21-24 (serb.) and 24-27 (engl. transl.).

²⁵ В. Ћоровић, *Списи св. Саве*, Београд, С. Карловци 1928, 1-4, 26-29, А. Соловјев, *Хиландарска повеља великог жупана Стефана (Првовенчаног) из године 1200-1202*, Прилози КИФ 5 (1925), 62-89 and Ф. Баришић, *Хронолошки проблеми око године Немањине смрти*, Хиландарски Зборник 2 (1971), 35.

²⁶ П. Зорић, *Законоправило Светога Саве и Правни Транспланти*, Београд 2005, 6, М. Вујаклија, *Лексикон страних речи и израза*, Београд 1988, 77 and М. М. Петровић, *Студенички типик и самосталност српске цркве*, Београд 1986, 22.

²⁷ М. Кашанин, *Српска књижевност у средњем веку*, Београд 1975, 128: «Биографију Немањину Сава је написао за монахе, не за световњаке».

²⁸ T. Živković, *Charters*, ó.п., 27-32 (serb.) and 32-36 (engl. transl.).

²⁹ Cf. S. Ćirković, *Between Kingdom and Empire: Dusan’s State (1346-1355) Reconsidered*, Βυζάντιο και Σερβία κατά τον ΙΔ’ αιώνα, ΕΙΕ/ΙΒΕ, Αθήνα 1996, 114.

that this happened under his own rule (*ελαδ(υ)χ(ε)σ(τ)βο*). In such a way he highlighted the origins of his personal power (imperial through his father-in-law, princely through his ex-wife and noble through his father), providing the justification for his great donation, geographically relocated, despite claiming otherwise, in an area contested by Westerns, Serbians, Byzantines, Hungarians and Bulgarians, who had threateningly approached it. Despite all that and the fact that it remained under Byzantine control, the said area was now the property of the Serbian monastery, whose leaders' relatives were claiming them along with the relatives of the weakened and indebted emperor. In short, they were the first *ecclesiastical lands*, to become subject of conflicts in relation to the construction of power. The same context was chosen by Sava in Chilandar's Typikon:³⁰ Sava (representing the ecclesiastical life of the recently designated Serbian power), following Stefan (who represented the former's political aspect), continues a literary dialogue with the Brotherhood of the Serbian monastic community (-society), which appears to have turned into a regulator of matters concerning the Serbian land. This dialogue, completely unexplored in contemporary literature, highlights the depth of developments in the Serbian and Orthodox worlds, with the central focus remaining on family relationships (father-son, brothers, father-in-law-son-in-law) and, of course, their effects: Sava focuses on his brother's case, whose territories' designation as *ecclesiastical lands* showcases the latter's desire to be associated with the Holy Mountain, which would entail the legitimization of his claims, bypassing any direct confrontation with the emperor- his ex-stepfather.³¹ It was a time when the fights between the orthodox-allied Stefan and the catholic-allied Vukan had escalated, due to the instability in Hungarian, Byzantine and Serbian lands, overthrowing Stefan and forcing him to flee to Bulgaria.³² This new alliance, at the pick of the advancing 2nd Crusade, in addition to the latter's furious attacks in Mt. Athos that resulted in Pope Innocent III taking the later under its protection (letters XIII, 40 and XVI, 168), made Sava leave Athos, despite the paternal and imperial respective prohibition, to fulfill his father's last wish and to reunite the Serbian forces to defend and augment the family's lands and power, projecting the paternal memory as a unifying bond.

His triumphant –judging from its result– reappearance in the Serbian lands after eight years of absence, in order to create a permanent *locus* of worship for the relics of the canonized, abdicated Serbian Great Župan, *their Lord and Autocrat and ruler of the whole Serbian land*, according to himself, *the Gatherer of the Lost Pieces of the Land of his Grandfathers and also their Rebuilder*, according to Stefan,³³ on Serbian soil, namely in the monastery

³⁰ See http://www.rastko.rs/knjizevnost/liturgicka/svsava-sabrana/svsava-sabrana_04.html# and *Списи Светога Саве и Стевана Првовенчаного*, Београд 1939, 43-107.

³¹ For a detailed analysis see Ελ. Γκαρτζονίκα, *Κοινωνία και κρατικές δομές στη Βαλκανική Χερσόνησο (13ος-15ος αι.): η Σερβία των Νεμάνια και η Βουλγαρία των Ασέν*, Ιωάννινα 2018, Διδακτορική Διατριβή, Πανεπιστήμιο Ιωαννίνων, 135-144.

³² K. Jireček, *Geschichte der Serben* 1, Gotha 1911, 289.

³³ Љ. Јухас-Георгиевска, *Стефан Првовенчани Сабрани списи*, Просвета и Српска књижевна задруга, Београд 1988, Fl. Curta, *Southeastern Europe in the Middle*

Nemanja had himself created in Studenica, will help the two brothers to step up their actions, to their greatest possible benefit: With the representative of religious authority expressing himself politically and the representative of the claimants of the political authority expressing himself theologically, the particularly brief account of both the powers' reconciliation showcases the core of the convention between the two different types of power, the political and ecclesiastical, as recorded in the Byzantine term *Symphonia*.³⁴ It is in this new framework that Sava began his pastoral work on the Serbian land and, in cooperation with Stefan, founded churches and monasteries, simultaneously forming and spreading their father's cult.

The description of the historical phenomenon of the shifting Serbian borders and powers could have ended here, as Sava's and Stefan's joint course defines the beginning of a new, albeit short, era for Serbian rule, which does not seem to have any relation with the immediately preceding (of the scattered Serbian župans) and following one (of the scattered and weakened successors). While the same forces will continue to play the leading role, the relationship among them has changed and the stakeholders have increased, since some have found their temporary or permanent way into the local and/or Byzantine administration. Having succeeded to create a state structure similar to that of Byzantium, the Serbian forces allied to the first Nemanjićs were now faced with the problems posed by their newly established, fluid political structure that was lacking ecclesiastical legalization: Sava was only a monk and Stefan was politically and diplomatically weakened, as a result of his marriage and divorce with the daughter of the then byzantine emperor, following the mediation of her uncle, the previous emperor (his brother's blinded prisoner at the time); as descendants to a paternal fragmented power, the two brothers (and their allies) had to reclaim (by the Byzantines in particular) and augment it, while facing external interference: The older Byzantine allies, the Hungarians, openly showed their preference for the Catholics (whose representatives, after all, had conquered in 1204 the byzantine empire's administrative center) and were now openly targeting the Serbs and other Balkan forces to secure more territory for themselves as well as for their new ally commanders. With the byzantine nobles being exiled in Asian lands and new, equivalent power formations seeking potential allies to reconquer Constantinople, it was the right time to openly claim autonomous Church and leave the Archdiocese of Ohrid, whose representatives had now condemned them as heretics, thereby creating additional problems for their monk leader.

Vukan's death in 1207 made it easier for the two brothers to seek orthodox alliances. The first generation of successors of the Serbian dynasty were ready

Ages 500-1250, Cambridge 2006, 90.

³⁴ Т. Тарановски, *Историја српског права у Немањинској држави*, Београд 1931, 236, Ев. Patlagean, *Ο Ελληνικός Μεσαίωναs Βυζάντιο 9ος-15ος αιώνας*, Λαμλαδά Δέσποινα μτρ., Αθήνα 2014, 247-250, 306-307, 461-464, 483, М. М. Петровић, *О Законоправили или Номоканону Светога Саве*, Београд 1990, 73-98, D. Nicol, *Histoire de la pensée politique médiévale*, Paris 1993, 64 and 65 note 3, Д. Богдановић, *Политичка филозофија средњовековне Србије*, Београд 1992 and Б. И. Бојовић, *Краљевство и светост. Политичка филозофија средњовековне Србије*, Београд 1999.

to secure their personal power and (re)assemble ancestral possessions according to it, but their political-diplomatic and military efforts would have remained idle and could have easily been disputed, had there not been a mass unification of forces: This is likely why, Sava composed the Typikon of Studenica, finalizing by it the political alliance and mutual support between him, Stefan and their allies. The Typikon, in conjunction with the political developments of the time, guaranteed the free status of the monastery (Chapter 12),³⁵ based on the life and work of monk Symeon, mentioning him anew as *Kral, Creator, Lord and the Emperor Tsar of the Serbian land* (...би почаствован од благоверног и христољубивог краља, блаженог оца нашег и ктитора господина Симеона. (...)) Бог постави овога самодржавнога господина да царује свом српском земљом),³⁶ namely with a plethora of political titles gathered for the first time in a hagiographic text, whose structure resembles that of Karyes and Chilandar, thus legitimizing its new status and detailing the functions of the new *local monastic center*, the ritual and procedural life of the monastic community as well as its administration,³⁷ in what can be described as a new model for the rules of the Serbian local Church (since the decisions will henceforth be reproduced in the Serbian monasteries) and a type of *lex specialis*.³⁸ In the same year Studenica's complex fortification will begin, while the monastery itself will be placed under the protection of the heir to the paternal secular title, the Great Župan Stefan Nemanjić, who was crowned in Žiča monastery in 1217, a *locus* that will be upgraded to an archdiocese seat in 1219, the same year Sava was himself appointed *archbishop of the entire Serbian Church* by the then anointed Patriarch of Constantinople Manuel I 1216 or 1217- 1222), a deacon and *hypatos ton philosophon* in Constantinople, who fled to Nicaea after the conquest of the Byzantine capital.³⁹

The independence of the Serbian land and Church offered the power required by Sava to legitimize and unify under its archdiocese the legislative work that had already expanded beyond the ecclesiastical environment, but presupposed two conditions: The recognition of the Patriarchate of Nicaea's sovereign rights and acceptance to be mentioned in his newly created church's diptychs after the patriarch of Nicaea.⁴⁰ For Sava, whose ecclesiastical aspirations were

³⁵ Заповедам свима вама од Господа Бога Свдржитеља да овај свети манастир буде слободан од свих ту владајућих, да не буде ни под ким, него под једном прослављеном Богородицом Добротворком и молитвама преподобнога оца нашега и ктитора и онога који изуманује: В. Ћоровић, *Списи светог Саве*, ch. XII, 72-75.

³⁶ В. Ћоровић, *Свети Сава Сабрани списи*, Житије светог Симеона Немање, 151.

³⁷ В. Ћоровић, *Списи светог Саве*, 14-150.

³⁸ S. Zorzetto, *The Lex Specialis Principle and its Uses in Legal Argumentation- An Analytical Inquire*, *Eunomia- Revista en Cultura de la Legalidad* 3 (Sep. 2012- Feb. 2013), 61-87.

³⁹ P. Vlasto, *The Entry of the Slavs Into Christendom: An Introduction to the Medieval History of the Slavs*, Cambridge 1970, 222, 233, R. Macrides ed., *George Akropolites The History*, Oxford 2007, 158-160.

⁴⁰ М. Марковић, *Прво путовање светог Саве у Палестину и његов значај за српску средњовековну уметност*, Београд 2009, 292 and М. Благојевић, *Србија у доба Немањића, од кнежевине до царства: 1168-1371*, Београд 1989, 67.

formally fulfilled by creating an additional ecclesiastical center,⁴¹ it was the means justified by the end. By accepting Nicaea's conditions and becoming its ally, he soon publicized his *Zakonik* (Законоправило), by which he created 11 additional episcopal centers, in order to strengthen the political unification and legalization of paternal possessions.⁴² In such a way, Sava unified the geographical area of his family's interest, expanded the borders of the Serbian land to include areas at the ends of the Kosovo valley that until then belonged to Ohrid and strengthened the institutions he introduced. It is noteworthy that the said institutions secured the two powers under formation and centralized their revenues: Once the strategic points of trade routes were conquered, the aim was to safeguard the production, distribution, services, trade and financial (then-on profitable) goods which were centrally controlled by the Nemanjići. This attitude, in accordance with the legal model inherited by the Byzantine ecclesiastical authority mediated by the paternal one, added particular political and spiritual value to the Nemanjić dynasty's sacred origin, which will also be legalized through the *Zakonik*, along with St. Symeon's worship with a unifying role among the Serbian forces. In this way, Sava increased the sphere of influence of his personal and family's power, thus transforming it into a state one, in the way it was practiced at the time in Byzantium.⁴³ This transfer of the Byzantine way, as a *translatio*, was to play a leading role in the coming centuries, affecting the state structures of the slavic world.

Despite the apparently successful implementation of his *Zakonik* locally, his brother's death in 1228 will make Sava leave the Serbian land again, this time for a pilgrimage to Palestine and Jerusalem until 1233, where he tried to safeguard the rights of his brother's successors to their newly-acquired administrative power. Donating to the monasteries and exchanging gifts with the Eastern Patriarchs, he was once more (cf. Mt. Athos) offered monastic cells on Mount Zion and Acre to be inhabited by Serbian monks, but Sava didn't manage to conclude his plans: On his way back from his pilgrimage to Serbia, he

⁴¹ T. Živković, *Charters*, 36-39 (serb.) and 39-44 (engl. transl.).

⁴² *Законоправило светог Саве*, М. М. Петровић, Љ. Штавланин Ђорђевић ed. and transl., Београд 2005, М. М. Петровић, *Ὁ Νομοκάνων εἰς Δ' τίτλους καὶ οἱ βυζαντινοὶ σχολιασταί. Συμβολὴ εἰς τὴν ἔρευναν τῶν θεμάτων περὶ σχέσεων Ἐκκλησίας καὶ Πολιτείας καὶ τῶν ἐπισκόπων Παλαιᾶς καὶ Νέας Ῥώμης*, Ἀθήναι 1970, διδακτορική διατριβή, Πανεπιστήμιο Αθηνῶν, *eadem*, *Законоправило Светог Саве на српскословенском и српском језику*, манастир Жича 2004, XI-XXXIX, 1-782, *eadem*, *Црквенодржавне идеје светог Саве између Цариграда и Рима*, Зборник радова Историјски институт САНУ 13 (Београд 1996), 105, *eadem*, Свети Сава као састављач и преводилац Законоправила – српског номоканона, *Историјски Часопис* 49 (2003), 27-45, *eadem*, *Црквенодржавне идеје Светог Саве између Цариграда и Рима*, Београд 1996, 105, А. Младеновић, О издању Законоправила Светог Саве, *Археолошки прилози* 28 (Београд 2006), 333-335, Ђ. Šurpin, *Ручјест књижевности хрватске и српске*, 229. J.V.A. Fine (1994), 118, П. Зорић, *Законоправило Св. Саве и Правни Транспланти*, Београд 2005, 3-4, С. Аврамовић, В. Станимировић, *Упоредна правна традиција*, Београд 2006, 164-165, Ελ. Γκαρτζονίκα, *Κοινωνία και κρατικές δομές στη Βαλκανική Χερσόνησο*, 176-190.

⁴³ В. I. Bojović, *Historiographie dynastique et idéologie politique en Serbie au Bas Moyen Age Essai de synthèse de l'idéologie de l'Etat médiéval serbe, Südostforschungen* 51(1992), 29-49.

died (1235)⁴⁴ in the Bulgarian capital of the newly-upgraded Bulgarian Tsar Ivan Asen II (r. 1218-1241), where he had also bore gifts.⁴⁵ The Bulgarian Tsar, recognizing the importance of his dead interlocutor, buried his body at the Holy Forty Martyrs' Church in Veliko Tarnovo, with the symbolically charged monuments he had transferred therein, attaching additional connotations to its symbolic value as a *center*, since it was then transformed from a *locus* of political memory to a place of *worship*. Sava's body remained there for 2 years before being transferred to the Serbian land.

This specific symbolic and diplomatic strengthening of Ivan Asen II's position at a local level that was transcending his own power's borders, unveil his attempt to endorse and legitimize his tsarist power, using Sava's relations to the exiled and in anticipation imperial and patriarchal powers in Nicaea: Shortly before his death, John III Vatatzes and his wife Irene had warmly welcomed Sava in their court and offered him lodging and gifts in gold for both himself and the monastery of Mount Athos, due to Sava's distant marriage affinity to Irene, whose mother was the sister of Radoslav's (Sava's nephew) mother,⁴⁶ whose father was Theodorus I Laskaris of Nicaea (1174-1222), who initially appointed Sava *archbishop of the entire Serbian Church*. Taking advantage of his role as the warden of Sava's relics will seek recognition of his tsarist title and the consent of the Eastern Patriarchs for the restoration of his own Church in Tarnovo,⁴⁷ by recognizing in return the sovereign rights of the exiled Patriarchate of Nicaea, accepting its leading mention in his newly created church's diptychs and the obligation to send to the Nicaean Patriarchate a monetary contribution.⁴⁸ Having fulfilled its role, Sava's relic's transfer will be decided in 1237, at a critical juncture in the life of Ivan Asen II, shortly before his death and following the second failed attempt to reach the Latin held capital of Byzantium, which turned him against his recent military, political and marriage alliances, not accepting the inferior title of the Bulgarian anax⁴⁹ and the tax imposed on his Church.

⁴⁴ Доментиан, *Животи Светога Саве и Светога Симеона*, Мирковић Лазар transl., Владимир Ћоровић ed., Београд 1938, 203 and *Теодосије Хиландарац, Живот светога Саве*, изд. Ђуре Даничић, прир. и предг. Ђорђе Трифуновић, Београд 1973, 199.

⁴⁵ He offered the Bulgarian Patriarchate all the appropriate for its proper operation and its *honorable upgrading: priestly vestments, golden books and candlesticks decorated with precious stones and pearls and other ecclesiastical utensils*. Доментиан, *Животи*, 204 and Сл. Милеуснић, *Свети Срби*, Нови Сад 2000, 43-44.

⁴⁶ A. Kazdan, Angelos, *ODB*, 98 (selected genealogy table).

⁴⁷ *Γεωργίου Ακροπόλιτη Χρονική συγγραφή*, Bonn 1836, 54-55: Regardless of the future question of the validity of the promotion, Akropolites highlights the effort for its ecclesiastical and political coverage. Елена Койчева, *Първите кръстоносни походи и Балканите*, София 2004, 131

⁴⁸ See D. Obolensky, *The Byzantine Commonwealth*, 241-3, mentioning the great profit of the exiled Patriarchate of Nicea from this move, 244 and 379, note 2, mentioning the Nicaean Akropolites description of Ivan Asen II as *the best and most beloved among the barbarians* and Ostrogorsky, *История*, 116 and 311. For the corresponding Serbian case see G. Ostrogorsky, *История*, 107-108.

⁴⁹ *Ephræmius*, Imanuel Beker ed., CSHB, Bonnae 1840, 330, § 8201

The death of the protagonists and founders of the dynasties that determined the characteristics of power in the land they wished to bequeath to their successors, has halted the progress of the establishment and constitution of state power in *loci* without demarcated boundaries, despite their monasteries served as *administrative centers* on important trade and/or military networks and the fact that the formers' memory remained closely linked to the local administrators' power. Having focused on social aspects of the secular and spiritual authority, which legitimized and perpetuated the memory of the ruler by acknowledging the construction or integration of space and the accumulation or vesting of property rights within the family, one is allowed to conclude that the distinctive pattern of the sanctification of individual rulers as a mechanism of local power administration can facilitate the understanding of the legitimation of claims on lands, principally characterized by the *translatio* of their borders and the creation of sacral, spatial, ritualistic and discursive frameworks, ultimately aiming at their appropriation, the political consolidation and the exploitation of resources, all expectations of the future that dictated either compromise or differentiation.

Елена Гарџоника

(Универзитет у Јањини)

ДУГО ТРАЈАЊЕ И УДАЉЕНА АДМИНИСТРАЦИЈА СРПСКИХ ЗЕМАЉА:
ПОТВРЂИВАЊЕ ЛОКАЛИЗОВАНОГ КОНЦЕПТА РЕДА У ПОСТИЗАЊУ МОЋИ У
XIII ВЕКУ

Добро познате карактеристике локалне моћи за време Немањића преиспитују се у овом раду, као и међусобне везе и промене у администрацији српских земаља. XIII век је разумљен као време кристализације, установљавања породичних односа и друштвене динамике, институционалне структуре, теоријских основа византијске државе и цркве. Проучавајући овај феномен породичних односа и архиепископске независности, занимљиво је пратити Житија Немањића и хагиографску традицију, тако да би се могло закључити да се преко житија спроводила и санктификација појединих чланова породице. Уз то могуће је пратити и стварање сакрализације, ритуализације и апропријације, политичке консолидације што је све уједно допринело препознавању Немањића у XIII веку.

