

**HISTORIA SALONITANA  
AND HISTORIA SALONITANA MAIOR  
A CONTRIBUTION TO THE DEBATE ABOUT THE  
RELATION OF THE TWO TEXTS**

**NEVEN BUDAK**

*Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, History Department,  
University of Zagreb, Croatia*

**ABSTRACT**

*Historia Salonitana* (HS) is a history of the church of Salona and Split, written by Thomas the Archdeacon of Split in the 13<sup>th</sup> century. *Historia Salonitana maior* (HSM) is today considered to have been written by an anonymous author sometime in the 16<sup>th</sup> century. Its importance lies in a number of documents inserted in what was originally Thomas' HS, like the sources pertaining to the synods held in Split in 925 and 928 which also contain the letters of popes John X and Leo VI.

Why Thomas, who had the archive of the Split church at his disposal, did not include these sources in his HS? Several authors agreed that the composer of the text on the synods was John, the Archbishop of Split, who personally attended the synods, because he refers to the bishops as "us". However, the report is not as consistent as it seemed. The introduction to the decisions of the first synod is not written in the first person plural, but in the third person plural. The final version of the text is the result of the work of at least three authors. The first composed the report on the 925 synod. The other was most probably Archbishop John, who reported on the second synod. The third author was the composer of HSM, who introduced papal letters into the text.

The fact that Thomas mentioned only the bishop Gregory of Nin, might be explained with the presumption that only the Archbishop's report was known to him. This would mean that the other report on the first synod, together with the papal letters was not kept in the archive of the chapter of Split. The *Korčula Codex* reveals the possibility that the chapter of Zadar had its own archive. It was probably the place where another note on the synod of 928 was kept, but maybe also two letters by Pope John X and the decisions of the 925 synod. It is very likely that the whole report on both synods is a compilation of different sources. Whether this compilation was made up at one time or in two stages – shortly after the synods and then around 1500 – remains an open question.

**KEYWORDS**

*Historia Salonitana, Historia Salonitana maior, Thomas the Archdeacon, Synods of 925 and 928, Split, Salona, Zadar, John X, Leo VI, Gregory of Nin, Formin, Šimun Kožičić Begna*

There are few examples that the early mediaeval history of a nation depends so much on two written sources, as in the case of Croatia. Croatian historians have at their disposal, of course, several more texts and at least one of them, Constantine Porphyrogenitus' *De administrando imperio*, is as important as the two presented in this paper, but the interpretations of so many very important political and ecclesiastical issues rely on *Historia Salonitana* (HS) and *Historia Salonitana Maior* (HSM) – as they are known under their abbreviated names – that it is not possible to neglect them in almost any discussion on the beginnings of Croatian history.<sup>1</sup>

From the mid-19<sup>th</sup> century into the seventies of the following century several historians investigated and analysed both texts. The discussion intensified immediately after World War II and lasted into the seventies. This does not mean that there was no interest in these sources during the 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> centuries. On the contrary, the opinions of early scholars, like Johannes Lucius (1604 – 1679) or Daniele Farlati (1690 – 1773), greatly influenced later evaluations of both manuscripts, but I think it suffices to take a look at the more recent works.<sup>2</sup>

A very detailed overview of secondary literature on the relation between the two manuscripts was provided by Nada Klaić and even though published in 1967, it is still valid, because little was written on the matter afterwards, except for the book by Stjepan Gunjača in which he published both sources and analysed their relation exhaustively, and a treatise by Lujo Margetić.<sup>3</sup> However, Gunjača did something professionally inadmissible, though not quite unusual. His book was prepared for print already in 1971, but he failed even to mention the edition of HSM published by Nada Klaić in 1967. It was a known fact that the two were not in the best of relations, but it was still too much not to reveal

- 1 On Constantine's *De administrando imperio* see, most recently: U početku bijaše *De administrando imperio* : Konstantin VII. Porfirogenet i percepcija najranije hrvatske povijesti = In the Beginning there was *De administrando imperio* : Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus and the Perception of the Earliest Croatian History : radovi s međunarodnog znanstvenog skupa, Zagreb, 18. veljače 2010. = Proceedings of the conference held in Zagreb on February 18<sup>th</sup>, 2010 / edited by Trpimir Vedriš. // *Radovi Zavoda za hrvatsku povijest* 42 (2010), 13-165.
- 2 Johannes Lucius. *Addenda vel corrigenda in opere De regno Dalmatiae et Croatiae, Inscriptiones Dalmaticae*. Venice, 1674. P. 73.; Farlati, Daniele. *Illyricum sacrum*. Vol. I, Venice, 1751. Pp. 319, 405.
- 3 Klaić, Nada. *Historia Salonitana Maior*. Beograd : Naučna knjiga, 1967.; Gunjača, Stjepan. *Ispravci i dopune starijoj hrvatskoj historiji*. Zagreb : Školska knjiga, 1973.; Margetić, Lujo. *Historia Salonitana i Historia Salonitana Maior : neka pitanja*. // Margetić, Lujo. *Hrvatska i Crkva u srednjem vijeku*. Rijeka : Pravni fakultet Sveučilišta, 2000. Pp. 127-167. (First published in *Historijski zbornik* 47 (1994), 1-36).

that Klaić published the manuscript with a detailed commentary and that it was at that time – and still is today – the best publication of this important source, even though Gunjača also published it in his book, parallel with HS, thus enabling readers to make comparisons between the two texts more easily. This is just one, but a very bitter example of how scholars neglect their colleagues if they expose unpleasant arguments for their theses.

However, Gunjača did refer to Klaić's edition in the second volume of his *Ispravci i dopune starijoj hrvatskoj historiji* (Corrections and Additions to the Earlier Croatian History), published that same year).<sup>4</sup> Discussing whether in the introduction to the synod of 925 it was written "Urborum" or "Serborum", Gunjača evaluated Klaić's edition of HSM as a simple forgery, because she opted for "Serborum".<sup>5</sup> He accused her wrongly, because he did not understand the system of her footnotes, that she falsely claimed that "Urborum" can be found in only one manuscript. On the contrary, Klaić marked all the manuscripts as containing (*proceres*) "Urborum" (leaders of the citizens?), but she thought it was a mistake instead of "Serborum" (leaders of the Serbs).<sup>6</sup>

My initial idea about this paper was to give some kind of basic information on HS and HSM to readers not well acquainted with the topic and to comment on the methods used by scholars approaching the texts. It was my misapprehension that today our understanding of both texts and their relation was built upon rather firm grounds, since there has been almost no significant discussion about them for four decades. Thomas' HS was published several times, also in Russian and English translations, with good and, especially in the Russian case, exhaustive comments.<sup>7</sup> Therefore there is really not much to be said about it. The case of HSM, however, is very different. Although it contains some of the most important sources for Croatian early mediaeval history, as was already said, it was published only twice and only one of these editions – the one by Nada Klaić – was up to usual standards for

4 Gunjača, S. Op.cit., p. 263.

5 Klaić, N. Op. cit., pp. 98-99: "Quique pervenientes dicti episcopi, Dalmatiarum peragrantes civitates Croatorum atque serborum proceribus convenientes..."

6 Gunjača's mistake was noticed by Margetić, L. *Historia Salonitana*. Op. cit., p. 161.

7 English translation and commentary with bibliographical notes on all editions: Thomas the Archdeacon. *Historia Salonitanorum atque Spalatinorum pontificum* = History of the Bishops of Salona and Split / edited by Damir Karbić, Mirjana Matijević Sokol and James Ross Sweeney. Budapest ; New York : Central European University Press, 2006. Russian edition: Foma Splitskij. *Istorija arhiepiskopov Saloni i Splita* / ed. by Olga A. Akimova. Moscow : Institut slavianovedeniia i baikanistiki, 1997.

such publications. Otherwise, only parts of HSM, differing from HS, were published as separate source materials in editions of mediaeval sources without context.<sup>8</sup> Until today nobody made the effort of collecting all the existing manuscripts of HSM.

There are six existing manuscripts of HSM according to Miho Barada, who in 1949 tried to list all of them:

1. One from the Propaganda archive in Rome (Barada marked it as A)
2. One from the Vatican library, former Barberini library, Barb. Lat. 3218, from around 1600 (B)
3. One from the archive of the Split chapter, written by Johannes Lucius, but containing only differences between HS and HSM (b)
4. One from the same archive, once in the possession of Rafael Levaković (ca 1590 – 1650) (c) who copied it from the *Collectanea* of Šimun Kožičić Begna (1460 – 1536) (Barada failed to mark this non-existent manuscript, but following his system, it should be marked as C)
5. Another manuscript from the same archive, copied from the manuscript c in 1719 (cl)
6. The third from the same archive, copied in 1749 (dl) from a Paduan manuscript copied in 1739 (d) from the lost manuscript D, once owned by Fillipo Riceputi (1667 – 1742)
7. One from the Vienna State Archive (d2), copied from d1

However, when concluding which manuscripts of HSM were available at the time when he wrote his article, Barada made a strange mistake. He listed B, b, c, c1, d1, and d2, forgetting A. Nada Klaić, commenting on Barada's contribution, warns about the omission of manuscript A from his final list.<sup>9</sup>

Arguments used in the discussion about the manuscripts were often not very scientific, leaving some questions still open.<sup>10</sup> Therefore, this paper cannot give complete information on HSM, because more accurate work has to be undertaken in archives and libraries where the manuscripts are kept. The focus of the lines to follow will be on some

8 Documenta historiae croaticae periodum antiquam / collegit, digessit, explicuit Fr. Rački. Zagrabiae : Sumptibus Academiae scientiarum et artum, 1877.; Codex diplomaticus regni Croatiae, Dalmatiae et Slavoniae. V. I / sabrali i uredili Miljen Šamšalović i Jakov Stipišić. Zagreb : Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti, 1967.

9 Klaić, N. Op. cit., p. 1.

10 Mirjana Matijević Sokol presented some of Gunjača's arguments and discussed them, taking side with Nada Klaić. See Matijević Sokol, Mirjana. *Historia Salonitana i Historia Salonitana maior* – Gunjačin pristup. // Stjepan Gunjača i hrvatska srednjovjekovna povijesno-arheološka baština. 1 / [glavni urednik Tomislav Šeparović]. Split : Muzej hrvatskih arheoloških spomenika, 2010. Pp. 331-339.

erroneous methods used in the discussion on the relation of the two texts, but in the end a suggestion will be made about the origin of the materials included in HSM that were seemingly unknown to Thomas.

*Historia salonitanorum pontificum atque spalatensium*, or *Historia Salonitana*, was written by Thomas the Archdeacon of Split in the mid-thirteenth century. It is a history of the church of Salona and Split, written in the form of *gesta episcoporum*.<sup>11</sup> The author's intentions for composing such a work could have been manifold. He might have intended to write a gloryfying history of his church, praising the good bishops and criticising the bad ones. Probably he also wanted to support the idea of deriving the origins of the Split bishopric from Salona, an old intention among the Split clergy in the attempt to claim the apostolic origins and thereby the right to the position of metropolitan in the ecclesiastical province of Dalmatia and Croatia. Finally, Thomas could have had a very personal motive. After the death of Archbishop Guncel, he believed he would become his successor, but although he was elected by his fellow clergymen, he never achieved this goal of his life. So the final part of his *Historia* can be read as a justification of his own deeds and a strong criticism of his opponents. But, in whatever way Thomas' goals and the influence his subjectivity had on his reports are judged, there is no doubt about the authenticity and dating of his work, and even several of his sources were identified by scholars who researched them, proving that he was generally not making up the events he was describing.<sup>12</sup> The great interest that Thomas attracted in different historiographies (one should mention, for example, his famous report on the Mongol invasion, his description of the establishment of the commune in Split or his report on the Fourth Crusade)<sup>13</sup> resulted in the mentioned editions and translations of *Historia Salonitana*.

11 On the character of Thomas' work see: Ivić, Nenad. *Domišljanje prošlosti*. Zagreb : Zavod za znanost o književnosti Filozofskoga fakulteta, 1992.

12 On Thomas and the quality of his work see: Matijević Sokol, Mirjana. *Toma Arhidakon i njegovo djelo : rano doba hrvatske povijesti*. Jastrebarsko : Naklada Slap, 2002.

13 Steindorff, Ludwig. *Der fremde Krieg : Die Heerzüge der Mongolen 1237-1242 im Spiegel der altrussischen und lateinischen Chronistik*. // *Südosteuropa. Von vormoderner Vielfalt und nationalstaatlicher Vereinheitlichung : Festschrift für Edgar Hösch / Hrsg. Konrad Clewing, Oliver Jens Schmitt*. München : R. Oldenbourg, 2005. Pp. 93-118. Abbreviated Russian translation: *Čužaja vojna : Voennye pochody mongolov v 1237-1242 g. v chronike Fomy archidiakona Splitskogo*. // *Drevnjaja Rus' 4 (34), dekabr' 2008*, pp. 18-29.; Mayer, Hans Eberhard. *Geschichte der Kreuzzüge*. Stuttgart : Kohlhammer, 2005. P. 372; Steindorff, Ludwig. *Die dalmatinischen Städte im 12. Jahrhundert : Studien zu ihrer politischen Stellung und gesellschaftlichen Entwicklung*. Köln ; Wien : Böhlau Verlag, 1984. Pp. 166-170.; Steindorff, L. "Podestà". // *Lexikon des Mittelalters*. Bd. 7. München ; Zürich : Artemis-&-Winkler-Verlag, 1995.

The situation with *Historia Salonitana Maior* is not at all as clear as with its predecessor. In fact, there were authors who doubted that HSM is younger than Thomas' history, and Stjepan Gunjača insisted that it was actually some kind of a concept Thomas had made as a preparation for his capital work.<sup>14</sup> Barada, too, on the basis of a comparison of a small chapter from both HS and HSM, concluded that HSM was older than HS. His argument was that HSM brings a more reliable version of the story about the secession of Dubrovnik from the see of Split in the time of the emperors Basil II and Constantine VIII. Since, in his words, "it is impossible to think that the author of HSM corrected Thomas", HSM must have preceded Thomas' HS. In Barada's opinion, both HS and HSM were compiled from an older, more reliable but not preserved manuscript. It is not necessary to point to the absurdity of the argument that it is impossible to imagine that a potential 16<sup>th</sup>-century author, who added several reliable sources to HS, could correct the work of his predecessor. It is also unacceptable to invent non-existent manuscripts as an argument in support of one's hypothesis which was presented without any kind of textual analysis. Nada Klaić justly concluded that it was inadmissible to make conclusions about the relation of these two texts by comparing only one short chapter.<sup>15</sup>

The first author who referred to HSM was Johannes Lucius, the "founding father" of Croatian historiography, who was in the mid-seventeenth century convinced that HSM was written around 1600 and was, apart from what it contained of Thomas' manuscript, a useless forgery.<sup>16</sup>

Regardless of these extreme opinions, *Historia Salonitana Maior* is today considered to have been written by an anonymous author some time in the 16<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>17</sup> Its importance for Croatian history lies in a number of documents inserted in what was originally Thomas' *Historia*, some other added information in different chapters as well as the story about the assassination of Zvonimir, who was believed by the author to have been the last Croatian king.<sup>18</sup> The most significant collection of

14 Gunjača, Stjepan. *Historia Salonitana Maior*. // Rad Jugoslavenske akademija znanosti i umjetnosti 283(1951), 175-244.; Gunjača, S. *Ispravci i dopune*, pp. 23-179.

15 Klaić, N. *Op. cit.*, p. 19.

16 See ft. 1. Also: Poparić, Bare. *Pisma Ivana Lučića Trogiranina*. // *Starine Jugoslavenske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti* 31(1905), 317.

17 Nada Klaić believed that the person who commissioned the supplement of Thomas' *Historia Salonitana* was Šimun Kožičić Begna (1460-1536), the bishop of Modruš. Klaić, N. *Op.cit.*, p. 64. On Begna see: *Zbornik radova o Šimunu Kožičiću Benji*. Zagreb : Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti, Razred za filološke znanosti, 1991.

18 On the legend about the assassination of king Zvonimir: Goldstein, Ivo. *Kako, kada i zašto je nastala legenda o nasilnoj smrti kralja Zvonimira?* : prinos proučavanju mehanizma na-

documents are those pertaining to the synods held in Split in 925 and 928 (there is also a collection on the synods held in Salona in 530 and 533, but they are less interesting for what is considered to be Croatian mediaeval history, because they precede the time of Slavic settlement and the appearance of Croats in the 9th-century sources).<sup>19</sup> The 925-928 documents contain the letters of popes John X and Leo VI to Tomislav, king of the Croats and to Dalmatian bishops, the decisions made by the councils and a short report on events related to the council. These sources are so important because on the basis of the data they contain:

1. Tomislav was proclaimed by historians to be the first king of Croatia<sup>20</sup>
2. Some historians believed that he was the first Croatian ruler who put also Dalmatian cities and islands under his control<sup>21</sup>
3. There are different opinions where exactly was the Slavonic liturgy used in Croatia and Dalmatia, but it is generally accepted that it became a problem in the eyes of Pope John X<sup>22</sup>

stajanja legendi u hrvatskom srednjovjekovnom društvu. // Radovi Instituta za hrvatsku povijest 17(1984), 35-54.; Rokay, Peter. Motiv neostvarenog križarskog rata u biografijama srednjovjekovnih evropskih vladara. // Zvonimir kralj Hrvatski : zbornik radova/ uredio Ivo Goldstein. Zagreb : Hrvatska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti ; Zavod za hrvatsku povijest Filozofskog fakulteta, 1997. Pp. 241-246.; Bratulić, Josip. Legenda o kralju Zvonimiru. // Zvonimir kralj hrvatski: zbornik radova/ uredio Ivo Goldstein. Zagreb : Hrvatska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti ; Zavod za hrvatsku povijest Filozofskog fakulteta, 1997. Pp. 235-240. In support of the idea that the legend actually represents a reliable report of events and that Zvonimir was indeed invited by both the pope and emperor Alexius to join the crusade see: Frankopan, Peter. Co-operation between Constantinople and Rome before the First Crusade : a study of the convergence of interests in Croatia in the late eleventh century. // *Crusades* 3(2004), 1-13.

- 19 Prozorov, Vadim. The Sixth Century Councils of Salona. // *Vjesnik za arheologiju i povijest dalmatinsku* 104(2011), 309-337.
- 20 Since the mid-nineteenth century and the articles published by Franjo Rački and Ivan Kukuljević, Croatian historians tried hard to prove that Tomislav was crowned in 925 as the first Croatian king. This was important because arguments taken from history were needed to oppose Hungarian attempts to reduce or even annul Croatian autonomy within the common Hungarian-Croatian kingdom. With the millenary celebration of this alleged coronation in 1925, the myth was cemented in the Croatian national memory, in spite of the attempts made by historians like Ferdo Šišić and especially Nada Klaić who subjected it to criticism. Raukar, Tomislav. Kralj Tomislav u hrvatskoj historiografiji : 1925.-1995. // *Prvi hrvatski kralj Tomislav : zbornik radova*. Zagreb : Zajednica Duvnjaka Tomislavgrad ; Tomislavgrad : Općinsko poglavarstvo, 1998. Pp. 205-229.
- 21 Foretić, Vinko. Dalmacija prema Hrvatskoj do 1107. // *Pomorski zbornik* 7(1969), 757-811.; Koščak, Vladimir. Pripadnost istočne obale Jadrana do splitskih sabora 925-928. // *Historijski zbornik* 33-34(1980-1981), 291-355. Most recently: Raukar, Tomislav. *Hrvatsko srednjovjekovlje : prostor, ljudi, ideje*. Zagreb : Školska knjiga ; Zavod za hrvatsku povijest Filozofskog fakulteta, 1997. P. 38. Rejecting any Croatian rule over Dalmatia before the mid-eleventh century see: Ferluga, Jadran. *L'amministrazione bizantina in Dalmazia*. Venezia : A spese della Deputazione, 1978.
- 22 Budak, Neven. Prilog valorizaciji humsko-dukljanskog kulturnog područja u prvim fazama njegova razvitka (do 12. st.). // *Starohrvatska prosvjeta* ser. III, 16(1986), 125-139.

4. It is generally believed that Gregory, the bishop of Nin, tried to gain the metropolitan position for his church, and after failing to do so was forced to leave Nin which ceased to be a diocese.<sup>23</sup>

Apart from these crucial pieces of information, the documents of the councils contain more interesting data on different aspects of secular and clerical life of the time. Without the above mentioned information provided by HSM, we should rely only on what Thomas tells us in his *Historia*, accordingly:

1. Tomislav was just a *dux*, and the first crowned king (*rex*) was Stephen I Držislav, several decades later.<sup>24</sup>
2. The first Croatian ruler to govern also Byzantine Dalmatia may have been Držislav's father Michael Krešimir II, some thirty years after Tomislav, or even Držislav himself.
3. The first data on Slavonic liturgy would be related to the synod of 1060, supported by the earliest glagolitic inscriptions dating from the eleventh century.<sup>25</sup>
4. We would be informed about the existence of Gregory, the bishop of Nin, but without knowing anything about his activities and when he actually lived, apart from the fact that it must have been before 1070.<sup>26</sup>

All in all, several datings would be shifted for a number of decades, if not a whole century or more and Tomislav would lose his mythical position as the first crowned ruler of Croatia. What would that mean for the national consciousness of the Croats, one can only guess knowing that Tomislav has not only a monument in Zagreb, Croatia's capital, but also a plaque commemorating his coronation in almost every place in Croatia and in places with Croatian communities outside its borders, while bishop Gregory of Nin, as the second most important mythical figure, has three monuments in different towns in Croatia (Nin, Split and Varaždin).<sup>27</sup>

23 Raukar, T. Hrvatsko srednjovjekovlje, pp. 35-36, 179-180.

24 Budak, Neven. Prva stoljeća Hrvatske. Zagreb : Hrvatska sveučilišna naklada, 1994. Pp. 35-36.

25 Klaić, Nada. Povijest Hrvata u ranom srednjem vijeku. Zagreb : Školska knjiga, 1971. Pp. 368-369, 395-407.; Fučić, Branimir. Glagoljski natpisi. Zagreb : Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti, 1982.

26 Thomas mentions Gregory in HS in the context of a synod held in Split in 1075. Thomas the Archdeacon. Op. cit., p. 87.

27 Budak, Neven. Using the Middle Ages in modern-day Croatia. // Gebrauch und Missbrauch des Mittelalters, 19.-21. Jahrhundert = Uses and Abuses of the Middle Ages: 19th – 21st Century = Usages et Mésusages du Moyen Age du XIXe au XXIe siècle / Hrsg. János M. Bak, Jörg Jarnut, Pierre Monet and Bernd Schneidmüller. München : Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 2009. Pp. 241-262. On bishop Gregory see: Budak, N. Prva stoljeća Hrvatske, pp. 159-198.

It is instructive to take a look at the arguments used by Stjepan Gunjača in his attempt to proclaim HSM a concept of HS.<sup>28</sup> He starts by criticising Lucius, whose opinion about HSM strongly influenced later researchers, and reproaches him that it is not possible – contrary to Lucius' claim – that a concept (for Lucius it was the HS) could be more concise than its expanded version, the HSM. For Gunjača, a concept has to be broader than the final version, because an author usually (always?) leaves out parts which he/she sees as redundant, and not the other way round.<sup>29</sup> He believes that Thomas did not destroy his concept, as authors, according to Gunjača, normally do, and he also did not sign it either, since it was only a concept. Because of that, this concept started a life of its own, as an anonymous work copied and distributed in many manuscripts through centuries.<sup>30</sup> He also stresses that many scholars were not sure should they believe Thomas' HS if it was not supported by other sources, but after he proved that HSM was Thomas' concept, it became clear that the archdeacon used genuine and reliable sources for his *Historia*, quoting them in extenso in the concept, but leaving them out in the final version of his text. In this way, Gunjača wanted to support the idea that HSM was a concept for HS by claiming that the HSM was evidence of the authenticity of HS.<sup>31</sup> This is obviously a vicious circle, with one source supporting the authenticity of the other, but with no real arguments in favour of Gunjača's main thesis that HSM was written by the same author as HS, and that it preceded the final version of Thomas' *Historia*.

However, it seems that Gunjača was right when he insisted that the manuscript kept in the Propaganda archive in Rome was not the original version of HSM (as Lucius might have believed), but that it was a copy of an older manuscript.<sup>32</sup> He traced several errors which were typically committed by copyists: *Eo adunato* instead of *coadunato*, *speculissimus* instead of *specialissimus*, *clauī generi* instead of *clauīgeri*, and many others. In some cases, words were left out and lacunas were kept in order to insert them at a later stage of copying. The copyist, whose Latin was clearly weak, used the last (but incomplete) sentence of a passage as the title of the next one, although the wording itself

28 In his writings on the topic, Gunjača uses the abbreviation IHSPAS (*Incipit historia salonitanorum pontificum atque spalatensium*) for HS and IHSP (*Incipit historia salonitanorum pontificum*) for HSM. These abbreviations were not accepted by the majority of scholars.

29 Gunjača, S. *Ispravci i dopune*, p.28.

30 *Ibid.*, p. 34.

31 *Ibid.*, p. 30.

32 His opinion was also accepted by Margetić, L. *Historia Salonitana*, pp. 159-160, 165-166.

made no sense (*Virum valde egregium et bonitate plenum Crescentium nomine*).<sup>33</sup> In Gunjača's opinion, this can explain why there are some parts included in HS missing from HSM, although they were very important for the understanding of the history of the church of Split (e.g., the chapter on Lawrence, the eleventh-century archbishop and an outstanding figure not only of his time). But although Gunjača may be right in this case, still this can in no way prove that HSM preceded HS.

Further, Gunjača discusses the reason why HSM ends with the synod of 1185, while HS describes events up to 1266. He believes that it is so because the ending of the concept was lost long ago, and the manuscript was copied without it.<sup>34</sup> This is, of course, a usual and very comfortable solution to the problem, but it can in no way be proved. Moreover, the text of the synod is preserved independently of HSM, but the version included in HSM is full of mistakes.<sup>35</sup> Would it be possible, as Gunjača thought, that Thomas made so many mistakes in his alleged concept, if his final work, the HS, was written in very good Latin?

Vjekoslav Klaić noticed in 1925 that Thomas, except in the first two chapters, almost never quoted his sources.<sup>36</sup> Gunjača added that sources are mentioned also in two fragments of the text that are otherwise missing from HSM. From this he concluded that Thomas quoted sources in the original version of his concept, which was not preserved, and that these exceptions, regarding quoting, imply that HS was really written on the basis of HSM. In this case we can see Gunjača's method at its best: he supposed that an original manuscript of HSM existed, although it was not preserved, and that it included numerous quotations of Thomas' sources. The existing manuscript of HSM represents a further step in the editing of the text, with HS as the final version. But how did it happen, then, that HS contains more source quotations than HSM, even if there are just a few distributed through four chapters?

Many more such examples could be quoted from Gunjača's book, but these suffice to show how he approached the problem of relation between the two manuscripts. Mostly because he wanted to

33 Gunjača, S. *Ispravci i dopune*, pp. 37, 123-127.

34 *Ibid.*, p. 122.

35 For the text of the synod see: *Codex diplomaticus regni Croatiae, Dalmatiae et Slavoniae*. V. II / sabrao i uredio Tadija Smičiklas. Zagreb : Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti, 1904. Pp.192-194.; Gunjača, S. *Ispravci i dopune*, p. 122.

36 Klaić, Vjekoslav. *Prilozi hrvatskoj historiji za narodnih vladara. // Zbornik kralja Tomislava u spomen tisućugodišnjice hrvatskog kraljevstva = Dissertationes in memoriam anni millesimi a Tomislavo primo croatorum rege praeteriti editae. U Zagrebu : Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti, 1925, p. 215.*

prove that king Zvonimir died a violent death, he needed to show that the king's epitaph included in HSM was authentic. For this he had to convince his readers that HSM was more reliable than HS, and in order to achieve this goal he had to find arguments that HSM was Thomas' own concept of his HS. Gunjača did not hesitate to claim that there was a lost, much older manuscript of HSM, although there is no evidence whatsoever that the existing copies of HSM were made on the basis of a manuscript older than the 16<sup>th</sup> century. He did not restrain himself from referring to Zvonimir's epitaph, as though it was an existing monument, and argued that it supported the authenticity of what was written in HSM about Zvonimir's death, because it was archaeological evidence. Finally, he invoked logic as an argument, claiming that it was obvious that a wider version of the text had to precede its more limited counterpart – an idea for which he found an advocate in Miho Barada. Gunjača's analysis of HSM and its relation to HS is an excellent example of how even an outstanding scholar, very insightful and skilful, can be blinded by his preconception. In spite of a thoughtful and diligent analysis of both texts, based on parallel editing of HS and HSM, enabling the reader to see the differences clearly, most of his conclusions were an outright failure. This, however, does not mean that in many details his observations are not stimulating and useful for further necessary research of the topic.

Nada Klaić started her analysis of HSM noting that the language of HS is consistent throughout the text, while that is not the case with HSM.<sup>37</sup> She quotes examples from HSM that show how poorly educated its author was.<sup>38</sup> This is an important argument, but a thorough analysis of the language of both texts still remains to be done. And although we today know that HSM grew out of HS, Nada Klaić did not invest too much effort in proving this. She stated in a very lapidary manner that it was clear from comparing the first few sentences of both texts that HSM was a revised version of HS, and there was no need to look for further evidence. This is very similar to the method used by Barada who compared only one chapter from both texts, what Klaić criticised heavily.<sup>39</sup>

There are also some strange remarks made by Klaić in the analysis of individual chapters. Trying to explain possible reasons for the omis-

37 Klaić, N. *Historia Salonitana Maior*, p. 24.

38 For example: *Ibid.*, pp. 38-39.

39 *Ibid.*, pp. 39-43.

sion of the first chapter of HS from HSM (the chapter on ancient Dalmatia<sup>40</sup>), she argued that it was because the intention of the author of HSM was to describe the history of Salona.<sup>41</sup> Clearly, HSM contains a history of the church of Salona (and Split) and not of Salona itself. But it might be true that the chapter, with no reference to the ecclesiastical history, was indeed not interesting to the compiler of HSM.<sup>42</sup>

It seems obvious that Klaić, unlike Gunjača, had an unbiased approach to the problem of the relation of both texts. She analyses each chapter thoroughly, using historical, linguistic and also codicological arguments. Referring to the problem of different number of chapter titles in the texts, she admitted that Gunjača had been right in claiming that more titles in HS suggest at a first glance that this text was more recent than HSM. But that is so only until we take a look at the oldest (Split) manuscript of HS. There it is obvious that titles were added after the manuscript was finished and only if space at the ending of the previous chapter allowed it. This meant that not all the titles corresponded fully with the subject of the chapter(s) to follow. These titles were already expanded by the copyist of the Trogir manuscript of HS and the compiler of HSM had, of course, the freedom to divide his text into as many chapters as needed. It catches one's eye that Klaić was not sure if the first editor of HS, Franjo Rački, included all the titles into his edition of HS.<sup>43</sup> Does this mean that she did not have the Split and Trogir manuscripts in front of her when she made the analysis?

Klaić stresses that until then (and this fact has remained unchanged since) nobody undertook a palaeographic analysis of the oldest manuscript A of HSM, which could shed at least some light on the time of its composing.<sup>44</sup>

In spite of the quality of analysis she conducted, Klaić's explanations about the principles of editing should arouse suspicion today. She quotes Ferdo Šišić, who in his manual published in 1914 wrote that an editor should not stick blindly to the text he is editing, but that he should rather correct the mistakes done by the scribe and make the text

40 Thomas the Archdeacon. *Op. cit.*, pp. 3-8.

41 Klaić, N. *Historia Salonitana Maior*, p. 25.

42 This is also suggested by Margetić, L. *Historia Salonitana*, pp. 161-162.

43 Klaić, N. *Historia Salonitana Maior*, pp. 53-54; Thomas the Archdeacon. *Historia Salonitana / digessit Fr. Rački. Zagrabiae : in taberna Libraria eiusdem societatis typographicae, 1894.*

44 Klaić, N. *Historia Salonitana Maior*, p. 66.

generally more correct and ready for the use by scholars and students.<sup>45</sup> Klaić agreed with Šišić and added that at that time (1967) there was no satisfying version of the text of the synods (not to mention the other fragments of HSM), so she decided to prepare one using the existing editions. In the text she published she used corrections and amendments suggested by former editors with which she agreed, putting those she rejected into footnotes.<sup>46</sup> Because of this, the modern reader cannot tell which is the original version of the text containing all the mistakes and vaguenesses ascribed to the composer or the copyists of HSM. However, she decided to keep the original forms of mediaeval Latin.<sup>47</sup> Today such a remark would be totally redundant, but back in the sixties there were still tendencies to 'correct' the 'corrupt' mediaeval Latin. Klaić also noticed that the author or copyist of the manuscript A was not consistent with orthography, mixing medieval and classic rules. She decided to preserve all the characteristics of his orthography in the edition.<sup>48</sup>

Because of all the dilemmas Klaić faced in preparing her edition of the manuscript A of HSM, this edition in itself becomes a good source for introspection into the way historians were dealing with mediaeval texts only a few decades ago, although her thorough work on the preparation of the text cannot be seen as final. As she herself pointed out, several steps still have to be made before another; maybe more reliable edition would be prepared. First of all, all the existing manuscripts have to be collected and re-examined according to modern rules of editing; palaeographic analysis of the manuscript A has to be carried out; and finally, a linguistic analysis of the Latin language of the oldest manuscripts is necessary. In spite of all these desiderata, Klaić's edition of HSM is an important cornerstone for all those who want to investigate the early Croatian history. Gunjača's edition, in spite of all the criticism his commentaries deserve, is also an interesting contribution to better understanding of HSM.

Lujo Margetić agreed with Nada Klaić that HSM was younger than HS, but he stressed that there might be some arguments in favour of Gunjača's opinion.<sup>49</sup> In his treatise he discussed the arguments pre-

45 Šišić, Ferdo. *Priručnik izvora za hrvatsku povijest = Euchiridion fontium historiae Croatiae*. U Zagrebu : Kr. hrv. slav. dalm. zemaljska vlada, 1914. P. 212.

46 Klaić, N. *Historia Salonitana Maior*, p. 67.

47 *Ibid.*, pp. 67-68.

48 *Ibid.*, p. 68.

49 Margetić, L. *Historia Salonitana*, p. 154.

sented by both Klaić and Gunjača, and in his meticulous way supported or rejected a number of them. His final conclusions were that HSM is an adaptation of HS; that the manuscript A of HSM is not the original version, but a copy; that HSM ends with 1185 because the territory of the Split diocese was substantially changed by the secession of the bishopric of Krbava at the synod held in that year, which is – in Margetić's opinion – a turning point in the history of the church of Split; that the author of HSM had pro-Croatian feelings and therefore left out those chapters from HS which were anti-Croatian, and inserted the legend about Zvonimir's death. Finally, Margetić positively evaluates Klaić's hypothesis that Šimun Kožičić Begna could have been the commissioner of HSM.<sup>50</sup>

As already mentioned, HSM contains sources otherwise unknown (or neglected) by Thomas, but very important for some events in the history of the Kingdom of Croatia and Dalmatia, like for instance the synods of Split held in 925 and 928. The main question that every historian who decides to use *Historia Salonitana Maior* as a source for the synods has to answer is: why Thomas, who had the archive of the Split church at his disposal, did not include the documents concerning the four ecclesiastical councils (two held in Salona and two in Split) in his *Historia Salonitana*? Were they not kept in the Split chapter archive and if so, where were they stored and why? Or did Thomas, for some reason, decide not to include them in his work? If that was the case, what were the reasons that made him ignore sources so important for his own diocese? Finally, are some or all of the documents inserted in Thomas' work a simple forgery created by a very educated and competent humanist?

After Johannes Lucius had discarded all of the amendments included in HSM as simple 16<sup>th</sup>-century fabrications, other scholars became more critical in trying to distinguish between the sources that could be marked as authentic and those that were composed at a later stage. Three examples are the most interesting for understanding the problem: documents related to the synods held in Split in 925 and 928, the so called epitaph of King Zvonimir, and the synodal acts of 1185.<sup>51</sup>

Documents related to the synods of 925 and 928 contain, in the following order: a letter of Pope John X to the Archbishop of Salona/Split, another letter by the same Pope to the Croatian king Tomislav and the Zachulmian duke Micheal, a short description of events pre-

50 Ibid., p. 167.

51 Klaić, N. *Historia Salonitana Maior*, pp. 95-106, 111-112, 124-125.

ceding the synods and explaining reasons for its summoning, decisions of the first synod, a short note about the disagreement of the bishop of Nin with these decisions, another letter by John X to the Archbishop and other Dalmatian bishops, a note about the second synod, and finally a letter by Leo VI to all the Dalmatian bishops (except the Archbishop).

In brief, according to HSM, Dalmatian bishops could not agree about whom they should elect as the metropolitan of the (newly established?) ecclesiastical province of Croatia and Dalmatia.<sup>52</sup> Zadar was the capital of Byzantine Dalmatia and following the tradition of placing the ecclesiastical centre in the same city as the administrative one, the bishop of Zadar should have had priority. On the other hand, the bishopric of Nin covered a huge territory, bigger than all other dioceses together, and the close relation of the bishop to the royal Croatian court gave him a certain advantage. The Archbishop of Split played the card of tradition, claiming that his church was the direct heir to the metropolitan see of Salona, which lay only a few kilometres away, but in the territory of the Nin bishopric. Pope John X, judging by the letter sent to the Archbishop, had his own reasons for summoning the synod. He was worried about the spreading of the Slavonic liturgy in Dalmatia, probably recognising it as a potential threat from Constantinople.<sup>53</sup> The first synod decided that the Archbishop of Split should become the metropolitan of the Croatian-Dalmatian province, but both Formin of Zadar and Gregory of Nin decided to oppose such a decision. For that reason another synod was summoned three years later. Its decisions were even more fatal for Gregory. His bishopric was dissolved and he was forced to take over one of the antique Roman sees (probably the one in Skradin (Scardona) and reestablish it as a new diocese.

Obviously, assuming they are authentic, these documents are of great importance for the ecclesiastical history of Dalmatia/Croatia in general, and for Split particularly.<sup>54</sup> They are considered to be the oldest surviving pieces of historical writing from Dalmatia, and most schol-

52 The literature on the synods in 925 and 928 is vast. For earlier literature see: Šišić, F. *Op. cit.*, pp. 211-224. Also: Klaić, N. *Povijest Hrvata*, pp. 86-88.

53 Katičić, Radoslav. *Methodii doctrina*. // *Slovo* 36(1986), 1-44.; Budak, N. *Prva stoljeća*, pp. 128-129.

54 For a detailed overview of secondary literature on the synods see: Gunjača, S. *Ispravci i dopune*, pp. 324-328; also Klaić, N. *Povijest Hrvata*, pp. 293-311; Raukar, T. *Hrvatsko srednjovjekovlje*, pp. 35-36. Most recently and very detailed: Katičić, Radoslav. *Litterarum studia : književnost i naobrazba ranoga hrvatskog srednjovjekovlja*. Zagreb : Matica Hrvatska, 1998. Pp. 384-392.

ars agree, on the basis of textual analysis, that their author was John, the Archbishop of Split who personally participated in the synods.<sup>55</sup> Why, then, did Thomas not include any mention of them in his work? Gunjača tried to prove that Thomas used these sources, because he copied them in what Gunjača believed was his concept (HSM), but that the part of HS containing the description of the synods was lost.<sup>56</sup> Nada Klaić, on the other hand, believed that Thomas left out the mention of the synods in order to suggest that Split became the archbishopric and the metropolitan see at a much earlier date, soon after Salona fell into the hands of the barbarians, i.e. sometime in the 7<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>57</sup> However, trying to explain the omission of data that would have been expected to be included in the manuscript by interpreting possible thoughts and motives of the author is always tricky and never more than simple guessing. Can we try to find some better arguments to explain why Thomas knew nothing about these synods?

A possible answer might be offered by another manuscript, known as the *Korčula Codex*. It was also never edited or even thoroughly analysed, but there is a description provided by Vinko Foretić, who found it in the library of the Chapter of Korčula in the fifties of the last century.<sup>58</sup> According to Foretić, it is a 12<sup>th</sup>-century codex containing, among others, different works by Joseph Flavius, Euthropius, Paul the Deacon, and Isidor. It also contains the *Liber pontificalis*, but in a version partly unknown elsewhere, because it was amended by notes relating to Dalmatian/Croatian history. Since in one of the notes it is mentioned that Pope Anastasius IV (1153-1154) gave the *palium* to Lampredius, the Archbishop of Zadar, Foretić thought that the whole manuscript was composed within the archdiocese of Zadar, to which Korčula most probably belonged in the mid-12<sup>th</sup> century, at the time of the composition of the codex.<sup>59</sup>

In the note related to Pope John X, the anonymous author of the codex wrote that this pope made peace between the Bulgarians and the

55 Katičić, R. *Litterarum studia*, pp. 390-391.

56 Gunjača, S. *Ispravci i dopune*, pp. 138-139.

57 Klaić, N. *Povijest Hrvata*, p. 23.

58 Foretić, Vinko. *Korčulanski kodeks 12. stoljeća i vijesti iz doba hrvatske narodne dinastije u njemu. // Starine Jugoslavenske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti* 46(1956), 23-44.; Katičić, R. *Litterarum studia*, pp. 624-634.

59 Katičić, R. in his work *Litterarum studia*, p. 626 suggests that the codex could have been written in Korčula, and not in Zadar, as believed by Foretić, but it is not very probable that such a complex manuscript could have been composed in a centre without a bishop and a Benedictine monastery.

Croats through his emissaries, bishop Madalbert and duke John, and that he established the true dogma in Dalmatia and made the Croats tributary to St Peter ever after.<sup>60</sup> This note proves that at least the synod in 928 was really held and that the papal letters contained in HSM are almost surely authentic (although, as Gunjača claimed, following the opinions of Farlati and Rački, preserved in a revised version).<sup>61</sup> In Katičić's opinion, the note on the synod of 928, contained in the *Korčula Codex*, is a summary of the entire report on both synods. It was written in much better Latin than the original report and, according to Katičić, proves the connections between different Dalmatian ecclesiastical centres, because its author was acquainted with the textual heritage of the church of Split.<sup>62</sup> Katičić presumes, obviously, that the text on both synods was composed and preserved in Split. But is that necessarily so?

Several authors who wrote about this text, including Gunjača, Katičić and Klaić agreed that its composer was John, the Archbishop and the first metropolitan of Split, who personally attended the synods.<sup>63</sup> Their main argument was that it was clear from the text that the author was one of the bishops, because he referred to the bishops as "us", and called Gregory of Nin "our brother". In some instances they recognised the first person plural form as *pluralis maiestatis*, the Archbishop referring to himself. However, a thorough analysis of the text may reveal that the report on the synods is not as consistent as it seemed to the aforesaid authors.

The whole fragment about the synods starts, as already mentioned, with two letters by John X to the Archbishop of Split and to the Croatian king Tomislav and the Zachulmian duke Michael. These letters are preceded by no introduction, showing once again that the compiler of HSM was not a very talented writer. The introduction, or rather dating of the whole event by naming John X, Tomislav and Michael, comes only after the letters. The author then explains why the Dalmatian and Croatian clergy and rulers addressed the pope, asking him to send them emissaries who would instruct them about the true dogma. It seems that nobody noticed that this introduction was not written in the first person plural, but in the third person plural, by an

60 Foretić, V. Korčulanski kodeks, p. 30.

61 Gunjača, S. Ispravci i dopune, pp. 324-325.

62 Katičić, R. Litterarum studia, pp. 628-629.

63 Gunjača, S. Ispravci i dopune, pp. 339-345; Klaić, N. Povijest Hrvata, p. 28.

observer reporting about the event, but not participating in it. I will quote the text according to Klaić's edition, leaving out the papal letters and distinguishing the two main parts of the text by using Garamond in italic for the parts written by the observer, and Calibri for the parts presumably written by Archbishop John of Split:<sup>64</sup>

*Tempore Joannis pape sanctissimo consulatu peragente in provintia Croatorum et Dalmatiarum finibus Tamisclao rege et Michaele in suis finibus presidente duce.*

*Beatissimus igitur Joanne romane ecclesie presidente cathedra dictus Croatorum rex et Michaele, cum suis proceribus simulque episcopis Dalmatiarum: idem Joannes archiepiscopus primus Spaletio, Forminus, Gregorius ceterisque episcopis, consulenter proposcerunt dictum venerabilem papam, ut ad eos destinare dignaretur episcopos suos et monitorium chrystiane religionis dogma continentem. Quorum postulationibus sepefatus pontifex assensum prebes Joannem venerabilem episcopum anchonitane ecclesie, Leonem vero palestrinensem episcopum, cum suis epistolis meliflue ructantibus eloquia destinavit, ut cum prefatis personis, iudicibus et episcopis sinodaliter congregatis et perpera extirpare et deo placita canonice sancire deberent.*

*Quique pervenientes dicti episcopi, Dalmatiarum peragrantes civitates et Croatorum atque Vrborum<sup>65</sup> proceribus convenientes, congregati in Spalato episcopis et iudicibus, celleberrimum concilium peragere. Ubi divino iuvamine freti, hec que secuuntur capitula observare censuere.*

(This fragment is followed by the decisions of the synod, written in the first person plural.)

*Hec ita habita deliberatione, que supra scripta continetur, cuncta per ordinem sancta synodus romano pontifici confirmanda per dictos suos legatos episcopos et Petrum, presbiterum spalatensem, insertis literis nuntiare decrevit, quatenus divinitus antique religionis dogma in ecclesiis Dalmatiarum arbitrio summi pontificis universa prelibata sortirentur.*

Sed cum terminare cuncta legitime antiquo more prestolaremur... fuit fratris nostri episcopi nonesis, qui sibi vindicare cupiens primatum Dalmatiarum episcoporum, hoc quod non expediebat, contra dictam sinodum in auribus apostolicis iniustum

<sup>64</sup> Klaić, N. *Historia Salonitana Maior*, pp. 95-106.

<sup>65</sup> Klaić suggests that the correct reading should be "Serborum". See: Klaić, N. *Historia Salonitana Maior*, p. 99, ft. 620.

iniecit certamen. Quam ob rem diversa et nuntiis recitantibus de his partibus, et literis patentibus non equalia, ambiguitas romane ecclesie facta, non diffinita ad nos, et finienda adhuc, epistola a beatissimo papa Joanne per legatum nostrum remissa est, cuius vero epistole tenor tecta (sic!) hoc est.

(The fragment is followed by the letter of Pope John X addressed: *Joannes episcopus servus servorum dei reverendissimo et sanctissimo confratri nostro Joanni, sancte salonitane ecclesie archiepiscopo, et Formino episcopo omnibusque suis suffraganeis episcopis.*)

Unde frequenter eadem poscentibus nobis diffinitionem recipere hac de causa terminanda iniunctam sibi operis Bulgariam petentes Romanorum legati, Madalbertus venerabilis episcopus et Joannes dux, illustris, dux Cumas, que secuntur epistole, ad nos post bienium devenerunt.

(The letters are missing.)

Pervenientes igitur se (sic!) prefati legati ad confinia nostra et sicut illis opus iniunctum apostolica iussione fuit, Bulgariam perrexerunt. Quique peracto negotio pacis inter Bulgaros et Croatos, repetito itinere ad nos venerabilis Madalbertus episcopus in ecclesia spatatensi adveniens, sinodaliter nos episcopos Joannem, Forminum, Gregorium cum Croatorum principe et eius proceribus congregavit. Cum quibus residens, cuncta provintie antike consuetudines iusto moderamine perscrutans, firmavit omnia secundum veterum statuta in omnibus ecclesiis episcoporum privilegia redintegrari [iussit]; ita dumtaxat, ut ecclesia sancti Domnii, sicut ab initio primatum obtineat et intra limites diocesei sui cuncta canonice peragat.

(The fragment is followed by the decisions of the second synod. They are, however, not cited literally, as is the case with the decisions of the first synod, but retold or reinterpreted by the author of the whole text).

*His ita secundum apostolicam iussionem Madalbertus venerabilis episcopus perscrutata omnia et comperta veraciter feliciter sancivit, ita ut nullus unquam huius ordinationi violator existat. Cum cunctaque prelibata per dictum apocrissarium romano pontifici fuerint presentata et ab eo divina auctoritate et sancti Petri per suas literas et palii missione confirmata.*

(The fragment is followed by the letter of Leo VI to Forminus, the bishop of Zadar, to Gregory, the bishop of Nin, and to all other Dalmatian bishops.)

I believe that the distinction between the two parts is quite clear. The first section refers to the first synod. It is written by a neutral observer who first dates the event, then explains the reason why the Croatian and Zahulmian rulers together with the bishops, approached the Pope. He then describes the arrival of the Pope's emissaries and the gathering of the synod. This is followed by the citation of the synod's decisions and, finally, the information about how these were sent to Rome.

The other section relates to the second synod. Its author explains the reasons for the Pope's intervention and the sending of his emissaries to Dalmatia. Then he tells how the emissaries convoked the synod and retells the decisions made. While the author of the first section stressed dogmatic issues as the most important for the first synod, the author of the second section insists on preserving old customs and the confirmation of the leading position of the church of Split within the province.

The final section, starting with "*His ita secundum apostolicam iurisdictionem...*" is again written in a neutral form, but that is not a sufficient reason not to regard it as a part of the Archbishop's report.

Both sections are imbued with papal letters which are not always connected in the best way with the rest of the text. The first two letters come before the beginning of the description of the event and the last letter (by Leo VI) is cited only after the end of the description of the second synod. Moreover, in the version we know today, the author refers to more letters related to the mission of Madalbertus and dux John, but they are missing from the text.

It is difficult to come to any firm conclusions without a thorough linguistic analysis, but I think that the following suggestion can be made:

The final version of the text on both synods, contained in HSM, is the result of the work of at least three authors. One, who remains completely anonymous, composed the report on the first synod which included also the decisions made in 925. The other was most probably Archbishop John, who reported on the second synod. It seems that he did not intend to include original papal letters into his report, or to copy the conclusions of the synod, which he rather retold in his own words. Finally, the third author was the composer of HSM, who introduced papal letters into the text. Since he was an unskilled historian and not too good a Latinist either, the letters are inserted in wrong places, and for some reason he did not copy those that were missing, although he referred to them in the text.

The fact that Thomas the Archdeacon mentioned almost nothing about the synods in his HS, except that bishop Gregory of Nin once upon a time caused trouble to the Archbishop of Split, might be explained with the presumption that only the Archbishop's report was known to him.<sup>66</sup> From it he could only get the information that Gregory and Forminus opposed Archbishop John on the question of primacy in the province, but that the Pope decided in favour of the Split church, respecting old customs. Thomas could not even determine the exact date of these events and it is quite possible that he related Gregory with Archbishop John IV (1050 – 1059).

This would mean that the other report on the first synod, together with the papal letters, was unknown to Thomas because it was kept somewhere else, and not in the archive of the chapter of Split. So far nobody has suspected the existence of these sources in Split, probably because only Split, as the metropolitan see, was seen as a place where important ecclesiastical documents regarding the archbishopric could have been kept. But, of course, other episcopies also had their archives, although none of them have been preserved from this early period.

If we take a look at the addressees of the letters contained in HSM, we shall notice that they were:

1. John, the Archbishop of Salona, and all of his suffragans
2. Tomislav, king of the Croats, Michael, duke of the Zahumljani, John, the Archbishop of Salona, and all of his suffragans
3. John, the Archbishop of Salona, Formin, bishop of Zadar, and all of his (!) suffragans
4. Formin, bishop of Zadar, Gregory, bishop of Nin, and all other bishops in Dalmatia

It should be noticed that the last letter, sent by Leo VI, was not addressed to the Archbishop of Salona/Split, but to the bishops of Zadar and Nin in the first place.<sup>67</sup> The address of the third letter names specifically, apart from the Archbishop, only the bishop of Zadar.<sup>68</sup> So

66 He revealed even Archbishop John only once, in a brief sentence: "John was archbishop in the year of Our Lord 914, in the time of Duke Tomislav." Thomas the Archdeacon. *Op. cit.*, pp. 60-61. It is impossible to imagine that Thomas would not include the mention of the synods held under John, had he known about them.

67 Klaić, N. *Historia Salonitana Maior*, p. 105: "Leo episcopus servus servorum dei Formino, sancte jadaratensis ecclesie episcopo, et Gregorio, sancte nonensis ecclesie episcopo, omnibusque episcopis per Dalmatiam commorantibus, dilectis filiis ac fidelibus nostris."

68 *Ibid.*, p. 102: "Joannes episcopus servus servorum dei reverendissimo et sanctissimo confratri nostro Joanni, sancte salonitane ecclesie archiepiscopo, et Formino episcopo omnibusque suis suffraganeis episcopis."

where could have the anonymous composer of HSM found these letters? Could it be that they were distributed in copies also to other addressees, and not only to the Archbishop of Split? Is it not possible to presume that Forminus, the bishop of Zadar, received his own copies and held them in the chapter archive of his own diocese?

The *Korčula Codex* reveals the possibility that the archive of the Split Chapter was not the only place where important ecclesiastical documents regarding Dalmatia were kept. The chapter of Zadar must have had its own archive, even if it has been lost. If one of John X' letters was addressed to Formin, the bishop of Zadar, could it not be possible that it was also kept in the archive of the Zadar chapter, especially if there were also other records regarding the synod of 928, as proved by the *Korčula Codex*? Could we not think that all the letters written by the popes to the Dalmatian bishops at that time were sent as copies also to the bishop in the Dalmatian capital, and that in the same way copies of the synodal acts were kept in other sees as well? If Thomas had not seen the letters and the report on the first synod in the Split chapter archive, they obviously had to be stored somewhere else, and there are at least some arguments to trace them in Zadar.

Although the compiler of HSM has remained anonymous until this day, some scholars made presumptions on who he might have been. Šimun Kožičić Begna, bishop of Modruš and canon of the Zadar chapter, was the first author known to have made use of HSM. He included it into his *Collectanea*, a work lost in the meantime, but copied by Rafael Levaković.<sup>69</sup> Levaković's manuscript, although Barada claimed that in his time it was kept in the archive of the Split chapter, has also been lost, but preserved in the copy marked by Barada as c1.<sup>70</sup> Klaić believes that the manuscript marked by Barada as A might even be a remainder of Levaković's *Collectanea*.

Gunjača, who analysed the manuscript A, noticed that the text of HSM, included in the third volume of *Decreta et relationes* kept in the archive of the *Congregatio de propaganda fide* in Rome, has two paginations. One follows the page numbering of the codex itself, ranging from leaf 607 to 651, while the older one contains numbers from 289 to 336. The text of HSM is in this codex preceded by the manuscript

69 On Begna: Zbornik radova o Šimunu Kožičiću Benji. Op. cit., esp. Antoljak, Stjepan. Šimun Kožičić Begna i njegovo doba, pp. 11-25. Also: Nazor, Anica. Kožičić Benja, Šimun. // Hrvatski biografski leksikon 7(2009), 838-841.

70 Klaić, N. *Historia Salonitana Maior*, pp. 2-3.

titled *Memorie archiepiscoporum salonitane ecclesie*. This text has also both paginations, the new one (604-606) and the old one (289-291) (sic!).<sup>71</sup> Gunjača believed that both texts belonged to some kind of a collection (*collectanea*), but he wanted to avoid the conclusion that both were written at the same time. The *Memorie*, namely, lists Andrew II Cornello (1527-1536) as the last Archbishop of Split, which is the *terminus ante quem non* for this text. Gunjača wanted HSM to be older than the 16<sup>th</sup> century in order to make his hypothesis that HSM was the concept for HS more plausible. Klaić, however, investigated the manuscripts and concluded that both – *Memorie* and HSM – were written by the same hand and at the same time.<sup>72</sup> The fact that this manuscript can be related to Šimun Kožičić Begna made Klaić believe that he was the one who commissioned the compiling of HSM. His intention was to write a history of the church in Illyricum (Dalmatia), for which he was collecting sources. In his *Collectanea*, according to Farlati, there was a catalogue of the archbishops of Salona and Split, naming them from the first one up to the year 1185, which is also the final year included in HSM. Begna's catalogue is more accurate than HSM, and although Klaić proved that he used HSM for the composition of the catalogue, he did not blindly follow its text.<sup>73</sup> While the author of HSM identifies Pope John X with John IV, the author of the catalogue correctly relates the first synod with John X, but does not mention Leo VI and the second synod.<sup>74</sup> The close relation between HSM and Begna's catalogue is demonstrated also by the omission of Archbishop Lawrence from both of them.<sup>75</sup>

Nada Klaić was convinced that Begna was in some way responsible for the composition of HSM, although she believed that he only commissioned the collecting of materials for his ecclesiastical history, but that HSM was composed by an anonymous, and obviously not very well educated Dalmatian priest. Following Šišić's presumption, she also believed that it had to be someone from Split, because that could have been, as they both thought, the only place where such sources could be found.<sup>76</sup>

71 Gunjača, *S. Historia Salonitana Maior*, pp. 182-183.

72 Klaić, *N. Historia Salonitana Maior*, pp. 5-6.

73 *Ibid.*, pp. 59-64.

74 *Ibid.*, p. 60.

75 *Ibid.*, pp. 63-64.

76 *Ibid.*, pp. 58, 64.

It was already noted that the *Korčula Codex* is the evidence that the memory of the synod held in 928 was preserved in the archdiocese of Zadar, most probably in Zadar itself:

*“Johannes X. sedit annos XII, menses II, dies VI. Hic fecit pacem inter Bulgaros et Chroatos, per legatos suos Madalbertum scilicet episcopum, et Johannem ducem, et composuit in Dalmatia ecclesiasticum dogma ut primitus fuerat, cuius beneficii gratia Chroati sancto Petro effecti sunt tributari in perpetuum.”*<sup>77</sup>

It seems that the author of this brief notice referred to the fragment of the report on the synod in which it was described how the two legates came to Croatia on their way to Bulgaria, but not to its continuation in which it was said that only Madalbert returned to Split to preside over the meeting of the bishops and lords. Nevertheless, it still clearly shows that some kind of record about the events that took place in 928 was kept in Zadar, although the only evidence known to us comes from the Archbishop of Split. It is also striking that there is no mention about the first synod.

Begna's catalogue, on the other hand, makes no mention of the second synod, but notes the existence of two letters sent by John X and from the wording “...cui Joannes X. duas dedit epistolas et formam credendi pro Croatis transmisit”. We might conclude that the author was also acquainted with the text of the decisions made by the synod in 925.<sup>78</sup>

It should also be remembered that the text of the synod held in 1185, with which HSM ends, is preserved in the chapter archive in Trogir.<sup>79</sup> This is further evidence that important documents related to synods were kept in all diocesan archives, which is not at all surprising.

HSM contains another argument in favour of Zadar as the place in which it was commissioned and most probably composed. Chapter VIII of HS tells the story about the beginnings of Dubrovnik, while chapter IX begins with the description of the hard life of the refugees from Salona, living on the Dalmatian islands after the destruction of their city and continues by telling the legend of the beginnings of mediaeval Zadar:

77 Foretić, V. *Korčulanski kodeks*, p. 30.

78 Klaić, N. *Historia Salonitana Maior*, p. 60.

79 See footnote 30.

## [Chapter VIII]

“It was about this time that some strangers – driven from the city of Rome, as they say – landed in their boats not far from Epidaurus. [...] The aforementioned foreigners established themselves in the region and tore down the city of Epidaurus greatly by repeated attacks. When it was torn down they took it, and after taking it they left it to waste completely. However, the newcomers intermixed with the populace, and they became one people. They built Dubrovnik and settled there. From that time they sought to obtain the *pallium* for their own bishop.”

## [Chapter IX]

*“Meanwhile, the Salonitans dwelling on the islands were much irked by the barrenness of the land and the shortage of water. They were also filled with a great longing to return to their homeland. But although Salona lay deserted and no enemy ventured to remain there, it did not appear to the Salonitans that it could ever be made a secure place to stay. For everything had been devastated by enemy fires, and the towers and walls lay in ruins; only the theatre building, which had been built in the western part of the city, had remained intact up to this time. Thus the hapless citizens were pulled in opposite directions, between the urging of material want and a lingering fear of the enemy. And because the greater part of them were by now scattered all over the world, and those who remained were few and destitute, they did not presume to think of rebuilding their city.*

And so it came that some of them left the islands and searched for suitable places to settle along different parts of the Dalmatian coast. Sailing westward some came to the harbour of an ancient but destroyed city; seeing that the place was quite suitable to dwell, they prepared there some sort of fortification and lived in it. The location of the site with nearby islands and the advantage of the harbour pleased them greatly, and they no longer felt the need to return to Salona. [...]”<sup>80</sup>

The author of HSM left out the text in italic, thus creating the impression that it was the inhabitants of either Dubrovnik or Epidaurus who settled in Zadar and founded the town.<sup>81</sup> Was this an accidental error of the copyist, or could we discern a hidden motive in this omission? Was it not the intention of the author to avoid the interpretation

80 Thomas the Archdeacon. Op. cit., pp. 47, 49.

81 Klaić, N. *Historia Salonitana Maior*, p. 35; Margetić, p. 154.

according to which the citizens of Zadar were Salonitans by their origin, because that is what Thomas the Archdeacon wanted his readers to believe? His intervention in Thomas' text was not competent, but then, the author of HSM did not display great skills in the rest of his text either.<sup>82</sup> In my opinion, this is another piece of evidence that HSM was composed in Zadar, or at least that it was at a certain time reedited in that city.

Although I made almost no mention about the report on the synods held in Salona in 530 and 533, which were also left out in HS but included in HSM, it seems quite possible that they too were preserved in Zadar rather than in Split. While Zadar experienced an uninterrupted continuity of urban life in the late antique and early mediaeval periods, allowing – at least theoretically – its ecclesiastical archives from the 6<sup>th</sup> century to survive, Salona was abandoned and little can be said about the period between the mention of its last archbishop at the beginning of the 7<sup>th</sup> century and the appearance of the bishop of Salona (actually Split) at the synod in Nicea in 787.<sup>83</sup>

I think it is justified to suppose that Thomas the Archdeacon made no mention about the synod of 925, because he had no sources at his disposal in the archive of the Split chapter. The only note he had was the one presumably made by Archbishop John on the second synod, in which the Archbishop's conflict with Gregory of Nin (and Forminus of Zadar) was mentioned. Zadar was probably the place where another note on the synod of 928 was kept, but it is possible that in its chapter archive also two letters by Pope John X and the decisions of the 925 synod could have been found. It is impossible to say where the author of HSM found the third letter by John X or Leo VI's letter, which he also included in his work. I think it is very likely that the whole report on both synods, in the form in which it was recorded in HSM, does not originate from one single source, but is a compilation of different sources. Whether this compilation was made up at one time or, what is more plausible, in two stages – shortly after the synods and then around 1500 – remains an open question.

HSM is still a source which should attract our attention. I believe that a new edition, taking into account all existing manuscripts and compared with the existing manuscripts of HS, could reveal more about

82 Although Margetić wanted to prove the opposite. See: Margetić, L. *Historia Salonitana*, pp. 157-158.

83 *Ibid.*, p. 136.

the time of its composition, as well as the reasons and methods that stood behind it. A thorough linguistic analysis is also desirable. In spite of the efforts done by a number of researchers, of which only a smaller part was presented in this text, there is a lot of work for historians to explain this very important source for the history of the eastern Adriatic.

## References

- Antoljak, Stjepan. Šimun Kožičić Begna i njegovo doba. // Zbornik radova o Šimunu Kožičiću Benji. Zagreb : Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti, Razred za filološke znanosti, 1991. Pp. 11-25.
- Bratulić, Josip. Legenda o kralju Zvonimiru. // Zvonimir kralj hrvatski: zbornik radova/ uredio Ivo Goldstein. Zagreb : Hrvatska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti; Zavod za hrvatsku povijest Filozofskog fakulteta, 1997. Pp. 235-240.
- Budak, Neven. Prilog valorizaciji humsko-dukljanskog kulturnog područja u prvim fazama njegova razvitka (do 12. st.). // Starohrvatska prosvjeta ser. III, 16(1986), 125-139.
- Budak, Neven. Prva stoljeća Hrvatske. Zagreb : Hrvatska sveučilišna naklada, 1994. Pp. 35-36.
- Budak, Neven. Using the Middle Ages in modern-day Croatia. // Gebrauch und Missbrauch des Mittelalters, 19.-21. Jahrhundert = Uses and Abuses of the Middle Ages: 19th – 21st Century = Usages et Mésusages du Moyen Age du XIXe au XXe siècle / Hrsg. János M. Bak, Jörg Jarnut, Pierre Monet and Bernd Schneidmüller. München : Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 2009. Pp. 241-262.
- Codex diplomaticus regni Croatiae, Dalmatiae et Slavoniae. V. I / sabrali i uredili Miljen Šamšalović i Jakov Stipišić. Zagreb : Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti, 1967.
- Codex diplomaticus regni Croatiae, Dalmatiae et Slavoniae. V. II / sabrao i uredio Tadija Smičiklas. Zagreb : Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti, 1904.
- Čužaja vojna : Voennye pochody mongolov v 1237-1242 g. v chronike Fomy archidivakona Splitskogo. // Drevnjaja Rus' 4 (34), dekabur' 2008, pp. 18-29.
- Documenta historiae croaticae periodum antiquum / collegit, digessit, explicuit Fr. Rački. Zagrabiae : Sumptibus Academiae scientiarum et artum, 1877.
- Farlati, Daniele. Illyricum sacrum. Vol. I, Venice, 1751.
- Ferluga, Jadran. L'amministrazione bizantina in Dalmazia. Venezia : A spese della Deputazione, 1978.
- Foma Splitskij. Istorija arhiepiskopov Saloni i Splita / ed. by Olga A. Akimova. Moscow : Institut slavianovedeniia i baikanistiki, 1997.
- Foretić, Vinko. Dalmacija prema Hrvatskoj do 1107. // Pomorski zbornik 7(1969), 757-811.
- Foretić, Vinko. Korčulanski kodeks 12. stoljeća i vijesti iz doba hrvatske narodne dinastije u njemu. // Starine Jugoslavenske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti 46(1956), 23-44.
- Frankopan, Peter. Co-operation between Constantinople and Rome before the First Crusade : a study of the convergence of interests in Croatia in the late eleventh century. // Crusades 3(2004), 1-13.

- Fučić, Branimir. Glagoljski natpisi. Zagreb : Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti, 1982.
- Goldstein, Ivo. Kako, kada i zašto je nastala legenda o nasilnoj smrti kralja Zvonimira? : Prinos proučavanju mehanizma nastajanja legendi u hrvatskom srednjovjekovnom društvu. // Radovi Instituta za hrvatsku povijest 17(1984), 35-54.
- Gunjača, Stjepan. *Historia Salonitana Maior*. // Rad Jugoslavenske akademija znanosti i umjetnosti 283(1951), 175-244.
- Gunjača, Stjepan. *Ispravci i dopune starijoj hrvatskoj historiji*. Zagreb : Školska knjiga, 1973.
- Iohannes Lucius. *Addenda vel corrigenda in opere De regno Dalmatiae et Croatiae, Inscriptiones Dalmaticae*. Venice, 1674.
- Ivić, Nenad. *Domišljanje prošlosti*. Zagreb : Zavod za znanost o književnosti Filozofskoga fakulteta, 1992.
- Katičić, Radoslav. *Litterarum studia : književnost i naobrazba ranoga hrvatskog srednjovjekovlja*. Zagreb : Matica Hrvatska, 1998.
- Katičić, Radoslav. *Methodii doctrina*. // Slovo 36(1986), 1-44.
- Klaić, Nada. *Historia Salonitana Maior*. Beograd : Naučna knjiga, 1967.
- Klaić, Nada. *Povijest Hrvata u ranom srednjem vijeku*. Zagreb : Školska knjiga, 1971.
- Klaić, Vjekoslav. *Prilozi hrvatskoj historiji za narodnih vladara*. // Zbornik kralja Tomislava u spomen tisućugodišnjice hrvatskog kraljevstva = *Dissertationes in memoriam anni millesimi a Tomislavo primo croatorum rege praeteriti editae*. U Zagrebu : Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti, 1925.
- Košćak, Vladimir. *Pripadnost istočne obale Jadrana do splitskih sabora 925-928*. // *Historijski zbornik* 33-34(1980-1981), 291-355.
- Margetić, Lujo. *Historia Salonitana i Historia Salonitana Maior : neka pitanja*. // Margetić, Lujo. *Hrvatska i Crkva u srednjem vijeku*. Rijeka : Pravni fakultet Sveučilišta, 2000. Pp. 127-167. (First published in *Historijski zbornik* 47 (1994), 1-36).
- Matijević Sokol, Mirjana. *Historia Salonitana i Historia Salonitana maior – Gunjačin pristup*. // Stjepan Gunjača i hrvatska srednjovjekovna povijesno-arheološka baština. 1 / [glavni urednik Tomislav Šeparović]. Split : Muzej hrvatskih arheoloških spomenika, 2010. Pp. 331-339.
- Matijević Sokol, Mirjana. *Toma Arhidakon i njegovo djelo : rano doba hrvatske povijesti*. Jastrebarsko : Naklada Slap, 2002.
- Mayer, Hans Eberhard. *Geschichte der Kreuzzüge*. Stuttgart : Kohlhammer, 2005.
- Nazor, Anica. *Kožičić Benja, Šimun*. // *Hrvatski biografski leksikon* 7(2009), 838-841.
- Poparić, Bare. *Pisma Ivana Lučića Trogiranina*. // *Starine Jugoslavenske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti* 31(1905).
- Prozorov, Vadim. *The Sixth Century Councils of Salona*. // *Vjesnik za arheologiju i povijest dalmatinsku* 104(2011), 309-337.
- Raukar, Tomislav. *Hrvatsko srednjovjekovlje : prostor, ljudi, ideje*. Zagreb : Školska knjiga ; Zavod za hrvatsku povijest Filozofskog fakulteta, 1997.
- Raukar, Tomislav. *Kralj Tomislav u hrvatskoj historiografiji : 1925.-1995*. // *Prvi hrvatski kralj Tomislav : zbornik radova*. Zagreb : Zajednica Duvnjaka Tomislavgrad ; Tomislavgrad : Općinsko poglavarstvo, 1998. Pp. 205-229.

- Rokay, Peter. Motiv neostvarenog križarskog rata u biografijama srednjovjekovnih evropskih vladara. // Zvonimir kralj Hrvatski : zbornik radova/ uredio Ivo Goldstein. Zagreb : Hrvatska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti ; Zavod za hrvatsku povijest Filozofskog fakulteta, 1997. Pp. 241-246.
- Steindorff, Ludwig. Die dalmatinischen Städte im 12. Jahrhundert : Studien zu ihrer politischen Stellung und gesellschaftlichen Entwicklung. Köln ; Wien : Böhlau Verlag, 1984.
- Steindorff, Ludwig. Der fremde Krieg : Die Heerzüge der Mongolen 1237-1242 im Spiegel der altrussischen und lateinischen Chronistik. // Südosteuropa. Von vormoderner Vielfalt und nationalstaatlicher Vereinheitlichung : Festschrift für Edgar Hösch / Hrsg. Konrad Clewing, Oliver Jens Schmitt. München : R. Oldenbourg, 2005. Pp. 93-118.
- Steindorff, Ludwig. "Podestà". // Lexikon des Mittelalters. Bd. 7. München ; Zürich : Artemis-&Winkler-Verlag, 1995.
- Šišić, Ferdo. Priručnik izvora za hrvatsku povijest = Euchiridion fontium historiae Croatiae. U Zagrebu : Kr. hrv. slav. dalm. zemaljska vlada, 1914.
- Thomas the Archdeacon. Historia Salonitana / digessit Fr. Rački. Zagrabiae : in taberna Libraria eiusdem societatis typographicae, 1894.
- Thomas the Archdeacon. Historia Salonitanorum atque Spalatinorum pontificum = History of the Bishops of Salona and Split / edited by Damir Karbić, Mirjana Matijević Sokol and James Ross Sweeney. Budapest ; New York : Central European University Press, 2006.
- U početku bijaše De administrando imperio : Konstantin VII. Porfirogenet i percepcija najranije hrvatske povijesti = In the Beginning there was De administrando imperio : Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus and the Perception of the Earliest Croatian History : radovi s međunarodnog znanstvenog skupa, Zagreb, 18. veljače 2010. = Proceedings of the conference held in Zagreb on February 18<sup>th</sup>, 2010 / edited by Trpimir Vedriš. // Radovi Zavoda za hrvatsku povijest 42 (2010), 13-165.
- Zbornik radova o Šimunu Kožičiću Benji. Zagreb : Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti, Razred za filološke znanosti, 1991.

### Biographical sketch

Dr. Neven Budak has been Professor of Croatian mediaeval history at the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb since 2002. He studied history at the University of Zagreb (acquired his PhD in 1991). As an Alexander-von-Humboldt fellow he spent one year at the University of Münster, Germany, and received several grants, among others from the Max-Planck Institute in Göttingen and several institutions in Austria. He is the author of several books and more than sixty articles of which many were published in France, Belgium, Italy, Germany, Austria, Hungary, Slovenia, Serbia, Russia, and Australia. He has been a member of editorial and advisory boards in Croatia, Slovenia, Austria, Germany, Poland, Russia, and Australia. He is the founder

and member of several scientific associations. He held lectures at universities in Great Britain, Ireland, Austria, Germany, Canada, Hungary, Poland, Slovenia, Bulgaria, and Japan. For four years (2000-2004) he held the office of Dean of the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences in Zagreb and Head of the Board of the Croatian Historical Museum (2003-2007). He is currently Head of the National Committee for Historical Sciences (since 1999), member of the National Committee for Higher Education (since 2009), Head of the Doctoral Programme in Medieval Sciences at the University of Zagreb (since 2007), and Head of the Board for Doctoral Studies of the same University (since 2010).

### ***HISTORIA SALONITANA I HISTORIA SALONITANA MAIOR*** **PRINOS RASPRAVI O ODNOSU DVA TEKSTA**

#### **Sažetak**

U prvom dijelu članka prikazuju se neke metode kojima su razni autori pristupali problemu odnosa dvaju važnih izvora za hrvatsku srednjovjekovnu povijest: Povijesti salonitanskih i splitskih prvosvećenika (*Historia Salonitana: HS*) Tome Arhidakona i Veće salonitanske povijesti (*Historia Salonitana maior: HSM*). Potom se analizira skup izvora koji se odnose na splitske crkvene sabore 925. i 928., kako bi se pokušalo odgovoriti na pitanje zašto Toma nije ove izvore uključio u svoje djelo? Brojni istraživači su se složili da je autor opisa sabora sam splitski nadbiskup Ivan, jer je tekst pisan u prvom licu množine, a autor govori o biskupima kao o "nama". Međutim, u toj je formi pisan samo drugi dio opisa, koji se odnosi na sabor 928., dok je prvi pisan u neutralnoj formi. Autor opisa prvog sabora inzistira na dogmatskoj problematici i citira zaključke sabora, dok autora drugog dijela zanimaju samo pitanja odnosa biskupija, a zaključke sabora prepričava. Moguće je, dakle, da je izvještaj o saborima sastavljen iz dva dijela, od kojih se jedan, onaj o drugom saboru, čuvao u Splitu kao zapis nadbiskupa Ivana, dok je drugi bio pohranjen negdje drugdje. Nevješti sastavljač HSM je onda umetnuo papinska pisma koja je vjerojatno pronašao u nekom drugom, a ne splitskom arhivu. Toma je poznavao samo splitski izvještaj, pa zato u HS i spominje ninskog biskupa Grgura, ali ništa drugo. Korčulanski kodeks upućuje na mogućnost da se i u zadarskom kaptolskom arhivu čuvao zapis o saboru 928., a onda možda i ostali dokumenti koji Tomi nisu bili poznati, kao primjerice papinska pisma. Jedno od tih pisama upućeno je izravno zadarskom biskupu Forminu, pa je i logično da se čuvalo u Zadru, a ne u Splitu. Može se pretpostaviti da su odluke sabora bile dostavljane svim biskupima, pa tako i zadarskom. Kako se već dugo pretpostavlja da je

Šimun Kožičić Benja naručitelj sastavljanja HSM, njegov se boravak u Zadru može dovesti u vezu s nastankom HSM upravo u tom gradu, o čemu možda svjedoči i prerađeno Tomino poglavlje o tome kako su se izbjeglice iz Salone naselile u Zadru i osnovale ga, jer su u verziji sadržanoj u HSM Salonitanci (Splićani) zamijenjeni Dubrovčanima (Rimljanima).

**Ključne riječi:** *Historia Salonitana*, *Historia Salonitana maior*, Toma Arhiđakon, splitski crkveni sabori 925 i 928, Split, Salona, Zadar, Ivan X, Lav VI, Grgur Ninski, Formin, Šimun Kožičić Benja